LAW OF TORT

CONTENTS – LAW OF TORT (WBJS PRELIM 2020)

6.6 Case Law Illustration
6.7 Precautionary Principle
6.8 Public Trust Doctrine

---

7. Malice in Law

7.1 Meaning and Types of Malice
7.2 Application in Defamation & Malicious Prosecution
7.3 Comparative Table
7.4 Importance in Law
7.5 Practical Scenarios
7.6 Exam Relevance
7.7 Intention vs Motive

---

8. Damages in Tort Law

8.1 Meaning and Distinction from Fine
8.2 Key Distinctions
8.3 Types of Damages
8.4 General Principles
8.5 Remoteness of Damage
8.6 Liquidated vs Unliquidated Damages

---

9. Meaning and Origin of Tort

9.1 Definition of Tort
9.2 Essential Characteristics
9.3 Origin and Evolution
9.4 Note for Students
9.5 Essential Conditions of Liability (ABC Rule)
9.6 Summary Table
9.7 Practical Illustration (Negligence)
9.8 Defences in Tort (Contributory & Composite Negligence)
9.9 Evidence in Accident Cases
9.10 Application of Res Ipsa Loquitur

---

1. The Rule of Strict Liability

The principle of strict liability was established in the landmark 1868 English case of **Rylands v. Fletcher**. It holds that a person who brings onto their land something likely to do mischief if it escapes is prima facie liable for all the damage which is the natural consequence of its escape, even if they were not negligent.

1.1 Breaking Down the Options

To give you the full picture, here is what those other famous cases actually represent:

Case	Legal Principle Established

Case	Legal Principle Established
Donoghue v. Stevenson	The **"Neighbor Principle"** and the modern law of **Negligence**. (The famous snail in the ginger beer bottle!)
Rylands v. Fletcher	**Strict Liability** for the escape of dangerous substances from land.
Lloyd v. Grace, Smith & Co.	**Vicarious Liability**; specifically that a principal is liable for the fraud of their agent committed in the course of business.
Ormrod v. Crosville Motor Services	Agency and **Vicarious Liability** regarding the use of a motor vehicle.

1.2 Key Elements of Rylands v. Fletcher

For strict liability to apply under this rule, three specific conditions must usually be met:

1. **Dangerous Thing:** Something likely to do mischief if it escapes (water, fire, chemicals, etc.).
2. **Escape:** The substance must actually move from the defendant's land to a place outside their occupation or control.
3. **Non-Natural Use:** The land must be used in a way that is not ordinary or "natural" for the benefit of the community.

2.0. ***Basically tort*** is a species of civil injury or civil wrong.

2.1 To understand why, we look at the classic definition provided in **the Limitation Act, 1963, and by legal scholars like Salmond and Winfield.**

What Makes a Tort a "Civil Wrong"?

A tort is a breach of a duty imposed by law (not by a contract) which is redressible by a court through unliquidated damages (compensation that the judge decides, rather than a fixed amount).

2.2 **(A) Criminal injury:** Crimes are offenses against the State/Society and result in punishment (jail or fine). Torts are offenses against an Individual and result in compensation.

(B) Substantial injury: While many torts involve substantial injury, it isn't a "species" of wrong. In fact, under *Injuria Sine Damno* (injury without damage), you can sue for a tort even if you suffered no physical or financial loss (e.g., Trespass).

(C) Both civil and criminal: While some acts (like Defamation or Assault) can be *both* a tort and a crime, a "Tort" by its very definition is the civil side of that wrong.

2.3 The "Civil Wrong" Hierarchy

It is helpful to view "Civil Wrongs" as a broad category that includes:

1. **Breach of Contract:** A wrong based on a private agreement.
2. **Breach of Trust:** A wrong based on fiduciary duty.
3. **Tort:** A "residual" civil wrong that is neither a breach of contract nor a breach of trust.

Fun Fact: The word "Tort" comes from the Latin term *Torquere*, which means "to twist." It implies conduct that is twisted or crooked.

Defamation is a unique legal "double agent." It is one of the few acts that simultaneously sits in the world of Torts (Civil) and Crimes (Criminal).

In India, if someone publishes a false statement that harms your reputation, you can actually sue them in two different courts at the same time. Here is how they differ:

2.4 Comparison of Defamation: Civil vs. Criminal

Feature	Civil Defamation (Tort)	Criminal Defamation (Crime)
Source of Law	Common Law (Judgments)	Section 499 & 500 of IPC (now Sec. 356 of BNS)
Objective	To compensate the victim for loss of reputation.	To punish the offender for a wrong against society.
Outcome	Payment of Damages (Money).	Imprisonment (up to 2 years) and/or Fine.
Standard of Proof	Preponderance of Probabilities (More likely than not).	Beyond Reasonable Doubt (Near certainty).

2.5 Why pursue one over the other?

- **The Tort Path (Civil):** You choose this if you want a massive payday. If a celebrity's reputation is ruined, they might sue for 100 Crores in damages. The goal is to "make the victim whole" again financially.
- **The Criminal Path:** You choose this if you want the offender to face the stigma of being a "convicted criminal" or to spend time in jail. It's more about deterrence and public justice.

The "Truth" Defense

There is a fascinating difference in how "Truth" works as a defense:

1. **In Tort:** If the statement is true, it is a complete defense. You cannot be sued for telling the truth, even if it's mean.
2. **In Criminal Law:** Truth alone is not enough. You must prove the statement was true AND that it was published for the "public good."

2.6 Current Legal Status

The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Criminal Defamation in the famous case of **Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India (2016),** ruling that the "Right to Reputation" is a part of the Right to Life under Article 21 and balances out the Right to Freedom of Speech.

3. The *liability of independent tort feasors is s*everal only.

3.1 Here is a breakdown of why this is the case and how it differs from other types of liability in tort law:

Understanding Independent Tortfeasors

Independent tortfeasors are individuals who act **separately** and without a common design or conspiracy, but whose independent acts happen to cause different or distinct injuries to the same person.

- **The Key Distinction:** Unlike "joint tortfeasors" (who act together toward a common goal), independent tortfeasors do not share a common purpose.
- **Liability:** Because their acts are separate, they are held **severally liable**. This means each person is only responsible for the specific damage caused by their own act.

3.2 Comparison of Liability Types

Type of Tortfeasor	Nature of Action	Type of Liability
Joint Tortfeasors	Act in concert, via conspiracy, or shared duty (e.g., master/servant).	**Joint and Several** (Plaintiff can sue one or all for the full amount).
Independent Tortfeasors	Act independently; their separate acts result in distinct injuries.	**Several** (Each is liable only for their portion of the harm).

3.3 Common Misconception

In modern legal practice, if the independent acts of two people combine to produce a single, **indivisible injury** (where you can't tell which part of the harm came from whom), courts often apply "Joint and Several" liability to ensure the victim is compensated.

However, in strict legal theory and traditional examinations regarding the definition of **independent** tortfeasors, the answer is **Several only**, as their liabilities are technically distinct.

Determining whether an injury is **indivisible** is the pivot point where "Several" liability often shifts into "Joint and Several" liability in a courtroom. To make this distinction, courts generally look at the **causation** and the **practicality** of splitting the bill.

3.4 Here are the **primary tests and factors** used:

1. The "Single Indivisible Injury" Rule

This is the most common test. If two independent acts occur and the resulting harm cannot be logically or scientifically apportioned between the two, the injury is indivisible.

- **Example of Divisible Injury:** Driver A hits your car door (dent), and Driver B hits your trunk (shattered glass). These are distinct and measurable; liability is **Several**.
- **Example of Indivisible Injury:** Two separate factories dump chemicals into a stream at the same time. The combined toxicity kills all the fish. You cannot point to one specific chemical as the sole cause of death; liability becomes **Joint and Several**.

2. The "But-For" Test (Multiplied)

The court asks: "Would the harm have occurred 'but for' the defendant's specific action?"

- If the answer is that the injury required **both** actions to happen simultaneously to occur at all, it is indivisible.
- If the injury would have happened anyway regardless of one party's actions, the court may look at "Substantial Factor" analysis.

3. The Burden of Proof Shift

In many jurisdictions, once a plaintiff proves that both defendants were negligent and contributed to the harm, the **burden of proof shifts** to the defendants.

- The defendants must prove exactly how much of the damage *they* caused.
- If they cannot prove their specific share (because the injury is a "messy" mix), the law treats the injury as indivisible, and both are held fully responsible to the victim.

3.5 Summary Table: Divisible vs. Indivisible

Feature	Divisible Injury	Indivisible Injury
Evidence	Clear evidence of who caused what.	No logical way to separate the harm.
Typical Scenario	Successive accidents (Time gap).	Concurrent accidents (Same time).
Outcome	**Several Liability** (Pay your share).	**Joint & Several** (Pay the whole).

To see how these tests work in practice, we can look at a few **landmark scenarios** where the courts had to decide if independent actors should be treated as one unit or as separate entities.

1. The "Two Fires" Scenario (*Anderson v. Minneapolis, St. P. & S.S.M. Ry. Co.*)

This is a classic law school case. Imagine two independent forest fires—one started by a locomotive's sparks and one from an unknown source. They merge and burn down a house.

- **The Problem:** Either fire alone would have destroyed the house.
- **The Ruling:** Because the damage (a burnt house) is **indivisible**, the court applied the **Substantial Factor Test**. Both parties were held liable for the whole harm, even though they acted independently.

2. Successive Car Accidents

In many "pile-up" scenarios, time is the deciding factor.

- **Scenario A:** Car 1 hits a pedestrian, breaking their leg. Five minutes later, Car 2 runs over the same pedestrian's arm.
    - **Result: Divisible.** Car 1 pays for the leg; Car 2 pays for the arm. (**Several Liability**).
- **Scenario B:** Car 1 and Car 2 hit a pedestrian at almost the exact same instant, resulting in a single fatal injury.
    - **Result: Indivisible.** It is impossible to tell which impact was the "killing blow." (**Joint and Several Liability**).

3. Pollution and Nuisance Cases

Environmental law frequently deals with independent tortfeasors.

- **The Case:** Multiple independent factories discharge smoke into the air, affecting a nearby farmer's crops.
- **The Ruling:** If the court can determine the volume of smoke from each factory, they will likely apportion damages (**Several**). However, if the chemicals from Factory A and Factory B react in the air to create a *new* toxic gas that causes the harm, it becomes an **indivisible** injury.

3.6 Summary of Legal Logic

The transition from "Several" to "Joint and Several" usually follows this flow:

1. **Identify the Tortfeasors:** Are they acting together (Joint) or separately (Independent)?
2. **Examine the Injury:** Can the harm be "carved up" logically?
3. **Apply the Policy:** If the injury is a single "mess," the law favors the **victim** by making the defendants figure out the split among themselves (Joint and Several), rather than making the victim prove the impossible.

4.0 The Latin phrase *res ipsa loquitur* literally translates to **"the thing speaks for itself"** and is a rule of evidence. While it is used in negligence cases, it is technically a rule of evidence regarding the use of **presumptions**.

4.1 Why it is a Rule of Evidence:

In a standard personal injury case, the plaintiff (the person suing) has the burden to prove exactly how the defendant was negligent. However, under *res ipsa loquitur*, the court allows the jury to **infer** negligence based on the very nature of the accident, even without direct evidence of a specific mistake.

It shifts the "burden of proof." Once the plaintiff establishes that the accident is the type that normally doesn't happen without negligence, the defendant must then prove they *weren't* negligent.

4.1.1 The Three Requirements:

For this rule of evidence to be applied, three things must usually be true:

1. **The event doesn't normally occur** unless someone was negligent (e.g., a piano falling out of a window).
2. **The defendant had exclusive control** over the object or instrument that caused the injury.
3. **The plaintiff did not contribute** to the cause of the accident.

Classic Example:

If a barrel of flour falls out of a warehouse window and hits a passerby on the sidewalk, the victim might not be able to see exactly *why* it fell. Under this rule, the court presumes the warehouse was negligent because barrels don't just fly out of windows on their own.

To help clarify the **differences between Res Ipsa Loquitur** and **Strict Liability**, and to introduce other essential maxims in tort law, here is a breakdown:

4.2 Res Ipsa Loquitur vs. Strict Liability

While both doctrines help a plaintiff win a case when direct evidence is hard to find, they function very differently in the eyes of the law.

Feature	Res Ipsa Loquitur	Strict Liability
Nature	A **Rule of Evidence** (an inference).	A **Rule of Substantive Law** (a standard).
Role of	Relies on the *presumption* of	Negligence is **irrelevant**; the act itself triggers

Feature	Res Ipsa Loquitur	Strict Liability
Fault	negligence.	liability.
Burden	Shifting the burden to the defendant to explain.	Liability is automatic if the act caused the harm.
Typical Use	Medical mishaps, falling objects.	Ultrahazardous activities (explosives, wild animals).

4.3 Other Essential Legal Maxims in Tort Law

If you are studying for a legal exam or simply curious about the "DNA" of tort law, these four maxims are the most frequent companions to *Res Ipsa Loquitur*:

1. **Ubi Jus Ibi Remedium** * *Meaning:* "Where there is a right, there is a remedy."
    - *Significance:* This is the foundation of tort law. It means that if a person's legal rights are violated, the law must provide a way to fix it.
2. **Volenti Non Fit Injuria** * *Meaning:* "To a willing person, no injury is done."
    - *Significance:* This is a defense. If you voluntarily consent to a known risk (like playing a contact sport), you cannot later sue for injuries that are a natural part of that risk.
3. **Damnum Sine Injuria** * *Meaning:* "Damage without legal injury."
    - *Significance:* You might suffer a loss (e.g., a competitor opens a shop next door and you lose money), but if no legal right was violated, you have no grounds for a lawsuit.
4. **Injuria Sine Damno** * *Meaning:* "Legal injury without actual damage."
    - *Significance:* The opposite of the above. Even if you didn't lose money or get hurt, if a legal right was violated (like someone trespassing on your land), you can still sue because the "injury" is to the right itself.

4.4 Why "Rule of Evidence"?

Courts often emphasize that *res ipsa loquitur* is not a separate type of lawsuit (like "negligence" or "trespass"). Instead, it is a **procedural tool** used during a trial to help a jury decide if the evidence is sufficient to move forward without a "smoking gun."

5. 'Injuria Sine Damno' is a tort.

In the world of law, this Latin maxim is a foundational principle of **Tort Law**. It describes a situation where a legal wrong has been committed, even if no actual physical or financial harm occurred.

5.1 Breaking Down the Latin

To understand why it's a tort, you have to look at the literal translation:

- **Injuria:** Legal injury (infringement of a legal right).
- **Sine:** Without.
- **Damno:** Damage (substantial loss, money, or physical harm).

So, **Injuria Sine Damno** means **"Injury without damage."**

5.2 Why is it a Tort?

In **Tort law,** some rights are so sacred that the mere violation of them is "actionable" (you can sue), even if you didn't lose a single penny.

The Classic Example: *Ashby v. White (1703)*

This is the famous case that established this principle.

- **The Incident:** A man was wrongfully prevented from voting in an election by a police officer.
- **The Outcome:** The candidate the man wanted to vote for won anyway, so he suffered **zero actual damage** (his candidate won, and he didn't lose any money).
- **The Ruling:** The court held that the man could still sue because his **legal right to vote** was violated. The "injury" was the violation of the right itself.

5.3 The Opposite: *Damnum Sine Injuria*

To fully grasp the concept, it helps to look at its "**twin"** phrase, which describes the opposite scenario:

Term	Meaning	Is it a Tort?	Example
Injuria Sine Damno	Legal right violated, but no money lost.	**Yes**	Being trespassed upon even if the trespasser didn't break anything.
Damnum Sine Injuria	Money lost, but no legal right violated.	**No**	You open a cafe, and a competitor opens a better one next door, making you go bankrupt. You lost money, but no "right" was violated.

In a legal case, the **Burden of Proof** is the obligation to prove the facts. The "weight" of this burden changes drastically depending on whether you are in a **Civil (Tort)** court or a **Criminal** court.

The simplest way to think about it is: In a **Tort,** you just need to be "**more likely right than wrong**." In a **Criminal case**, you have to be "**certain**."

---

1. Tort Case: Preponderance of Evidence

In a Tort case (like *Injuria Sine Damno*), the burden of proof lies with the Plaintiff (the person suing).

- **The Standard: Preponderance of Evidence**.
- **What it means:** You only need to prove that your version of events is **more than 50% likely** to be true.
- **The Goal:** To compensate the victim (usually with money/damages).

---

2. Criminal Case: Beyond a Reasonable Doubt

In a Criminal case, the burden of proof lies with the **Prosecution** (the State/Government).

- **The Standard:** Beyond a Reasonable Doubt.
- **What it means:** The evidence must be so strong that there is no logical explanation other than that the defendant committed the crime. If there is even a 10% chance they didn't do it, the jury/judge must acquit.
- **The Goal:** To punish the wrongdoer and protect society.

5.4 Comparison Table

Feature	Tort / Civil Law	Criminal Law
Who brings the case?	The Victim (Plaintiff)	The Government (Prosecutor)
Burden of Proof	Preponderance of Evidence (51%+)	Beyond a Reasonable Doubt (~99%)
Primary Remedy	Compensation (Money)	Punishment (Jail/Fines)
Verdict	Liable / Not Liable	Guilty / Not Guilty

5.5 Why the Difference?

The stakes are much higher in Criminal law. Because the government has the power to take away a person's **liberty** (jail) or even their **life** (in some jurisdictions), the law makes it intentionally difficult to get a conviction.

In a **Tort case, nobody is going to jail;** it's usually just a dispute over who pays for a mistake or a violated right. Therefore, the "scale" only needs to tip slightly in one direction.

5.6 Famous Example: In the **O.J. Simpson** trials, he was found **"Not Guilty"** in criminal court because the jury had "reasonable doubt." However, he was later found "Liable" in civil court for the same event because the family only had to prove it was "more likely than not" that he was responsible.

6.0 Strict Liability and Absolute Liability

6.1 Strict Liability is a unique "shortcut" in tort law. Usually, to win a case, you have to prove the other person was **negligent (careless) or intentional (meant to do it).**

With Strict Liability, those details don't matter. If you are involved in certain "inherently dangerous" activities and something goes wrong, you are responsible—even if you took every possible precaution.

---

1. The "No Fault" Rule

In a normal tort, the court asks: *"Did you act like a reasonable person?"*

In a Strict Liability tort, the court asks: *"Did the harm happen because of your activity?"*

If the answer is yes, you pay. It doesn't matter if you were the most careful person on Earth.

---

2. When does Strict Liability apply?

There are three main categories where this "automatic" responsibility kicks in:

A. Abnormally Dangerous Activities

If you engage in something that is naturally risky, you carry the burden of any accidents.

- **Example:** Using dynamite for construction. Even if you use the best safety gear and follow every law, if a freak vibration cracks a neighbor's foundation, you are liable.

B. Wild Animals (and some domestic ones)

- **Wild Animals:** If you keep a pet tiger and it escapes, you are strictly liable for any damage it causes. You can't argue "but the cage was double-locked!"
- **Domestic Animals:** In many places, the "One-Bite Rule" applies. Once you know your dog is dangerous, you are strictly liable for any future bites.

C. Product Liability

If a company sells a toaster that explodes while being used normally, the customer doesn't have to prove exactly *where* the factory was careless. They just have to prove the product was defective and dangerous when it left the manufacturer.

---

3. The Indian Context: "Absolute Liability"

In India, the Supreme Court took this a step further. After the **Bhopal Gas Tragedy**, the court realized that "Strict Liability" had too many loopholes (like "Acts of God").

They created **Absolute Liability** (in the case of ***M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*).**

- **The Difference:** Under Absolute Liability, there are **zero exceptions**. If an enterprise is engaged in a hazardous industry and a leak occurs, the industry is 100% liable for damages, no matter what caused the leak.

6.2 Comparing Strict Liability vs Absolute Liability in Indian Law

---

Summary of Liability Types

Type of Liability	Must Prove Fault?	Example
Negligence	**Yes**	A driver goes over the speed limit and hits a car.
Strict Liability	**No**	A professional fireworks display causes a fire.
Absolute Liability	**No (No defenses)**	A chemical plant leaks toxic gas into a city.

In **Strict Liability,** the law allows the defendant to walk away if they can prove the accident was caused by something completely outside their control. In **Absolute Liability** (the Indian standard), those excuses are legally blocked.

Here are the **specific defenses that exist for Strict Liability** but are **not** allowed in Absolute Liability:

---

1. Act of God (Vis Major)

This is for "unforeseeable" natural disasters like an earthquake, a direct lightning strike, or a freak flood.

- **Strict Liability:** If a dam bursts because of an unprecedented, "once-in-a-thousand-years" flood, the owner might not be held liable.
- **Absolute Liability:** It doesn't matter. If your hazardous enterprise causes harm, even if triggered by an earthquake, you pay.

2. Default of the Victim (Plaintiff)

If the person who got hurt was actually the one who caused the problem.

- **Strict Liability:** If a person jumps over a "Danger" fence and pokes a tiger with a stick, the owner isn't liable. The victim's own foolishness is a defense.
- **Absolute Liability:** The enterprise is still liable. The focus is on the "hazard" itself, not the behavior of the person injured.

3. Statutory Authority

If a specific law or Act of Parliament gives a company the power to do something dangerous (like running a railway or a gas line).

- **Strict Liability:** A company can argue they were just doing what the law told them to do.
- **Absolute Liability:** Legal permission to operate does not grant legal permission to cause harm without compensation.

6.3 The "M.C. Mehta" Comparison

Defense	Strict Liability (UK / Rylands v. Fletcher)	Absolute Liability (India / M.C. Mehta)
Act of God	Allowed	Not Allowed
Act of a Third Party	Allowed	Not Allowed
Victim's Fault	Allowed	Not Allowed
Consent of Victim	Allowed	Not Allowed

6.4 Why did India make this change?

After the **Bhopal Gas Tragedy in 1984,** the Supreme Court of India realized that the old British "Strict Liability" rules were too weak for modern industrial hazards. Large corporations could easily blame a "rogue employee" (Third Party) or a "freak storm" (Act of God) to avoid paying thousands of victims.

By creating **Absolute Liability**, the court ensured that if a company makes a profit from a "hazardous or inherently dangerous" activity, they must also bear the **absolute cost** of any disaster it causes, with no loopholes.

Key Takeaway: In India, if you run a chemical plant and it leaks, "I'm sorry, it was a lightning strike" is not a legal defense.

6.5 The **Polluter Pays Principle (PPP)** is essentially the environmental version of **Absolute Liability.** It is a simple but powerful rule: if you make a mess that damages the environment, you—not the government or the taxpayers—are responsible for the bill to clean it up.

In India, this isn't just a "suggestion"; it is a **mandatory part of environmental law.**

1. The Core Idea

The principle shifted the burden of environmental damage from the victim to the polluter.

- **Before PPP:** A factory would dump chemicals into a river. The local farmers would get sick, and the government would have to spend tax money to clean the water. The factory kept all the profit.
- **With PPP:** The factory is legally obligated to pay for the medical costs of the farmers **and** the full cost of restoring the river to its original state.

---

2. Beyond Just "Cleaning Up"

In Indian courts (specifically the **National Green Tribunal**), the "cost" a polluter pays is broken down into **three parts:**

1. **Compensation:** Money paid to the individuals who suffered health issues or lost their livelihoods (like fishermen who can no longer fish in a polluted lake).
2. **Restoration:** The actual cost of reversing the environmental damage (e.g., replanting a forest or decontaminating soil).
3. **Environmental Compensation (Fine):** A penalty meant to deter the company from doing it again.

---

3. The "Sustainable Development" Connection

The Polluter Pays Principle is one of the three pillars of **Sustainable Development** in India, alongside:

- **The Precautionary Principle:** "Look before you leap." If an activity might cause major damage, the burden is on the company to prove it is safe *before* they start.
- **Public Trust Doctrine:** The government is a "trustee" of natural resources (like air, water, and forests) and cannot just give them away to private companies.

---

4. Why it works with Absolute Liability

They are a perfect "legal tag-team." Because India uses **Absolute Liability**, a company cannot use an "Act of God" or "Third Party" defense to avoid the Polluter Pays Principle.

If a truck carrying toxic waste crashes because of a landslide (Act of God) and spills into a forest, the company still has to pay for the cleanup under the Polluter Pays Principle. The cause of the accident is irrelevant; the **fact of the pollution** is what triggers the payment.

6.6 Real-World Example: *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India*

In this landmark case, tanneries in Tamil Nadu were discharging untreated chemicals into the Palar River, ruining the drinking water for the whole area. The **Supreme Court** ruled that:

- The tanneries had to pay for the cleanup.
- They had to compensate the villagers.

- If they couldn't operate without polluting, they had to shut down entirely.

The **Precautionary Principle** is the legal version of the old saying, *"Prevention is better than cure."* In environmental law, it dictates that if an action or policy has a suspected risk of causing severe harm to the public or the environment, the **burden of proof** falls on those wanting to take that action to show it is safe—even if scientific evidence isn't 100% certain yet.

---

1. The Core Philosophy

In the past, the law followed the **"Assimilative Capacity" rule:** humans assumed nature could absorb a certain amount of pollution, and we only stopped an activity once we had "scientific proof" that it was causing damage.

The Precautionary Principle flips this:

- **The Old Way:** "Prove it's harmful, and then we'll stop."
- **The Precautionary Way:** "Prove it's safe, or we won't start."

[Image illustrating the shift from reactive to precautionary environmental law]

---

2. The Three Key Elements in India

The Supreme Court of India (specifically in the ***Vellore Citizens* case**) defined the **Precautionary Principle** using **three rules**:

1. **Anticipation of Harm:** The State and statutory authorities must anticipate, prevent, and attack the causes of environmental degradation.
2. **Lack of Scientific Certainty:** Just because we don't have "absolute scientific proof" of damage yet doesn't mean we should delay taking action to prevent it.
3. **Onus of Proof:** The "Onus" (burden) is on the developer or the industrialist to prove that their activity is environmentally benign.

---

3. A Famous Example: The Taj Trapezium Case

The **Taj Trapezium Case (*M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*)** is the classic Indian example of this principle in action.

- **The Problem:** Air pollution from nearby foundries and chemical industries was turning the white marble of the **Taj Mahal** yellow (acid rain).
- **The Debate:** The industries argued there wasn't "conclusive scientific evidence" linking their specific smoke to the yellowing of the marble.
- **The Ruling:** The Supreme Court applied the Precautionary Principle. They ruled that since the Taj Mahal is an irreplaceable monument, the risk of waiting for "perfect science" was too high. They ordered the industries to either switch to natural gas or relocate.

---

4. Precautionary vs. Polluter Pays

These two principles work together to protect the environment:

Principle	When it happens	Purpose

Principle	When it happens	Purpose
Precautionary	**Before** the damage occurs.	To stop or modify a project to prevent harm.
Polluter Pays	**After** the damage occurs.	To ensure the mess is cleaned up and victims are paid.

6.7 Why it's Controversial

While it's great for the environment, it can sometimes slow down **innovation or infrastructure**.

- **Critics** argue it can be used to block new technologies (like 5G, GMOs, or new medicines) because it is almost impossible to prove something is "100% safe" for all time.
- **Supporters** argue that once an ecosystem (like a coral reef or an old-growth forest) is destroyed, no amount of "Polluter Pays" money can ever truly bring it back.

The **Public Trust Doctrine** is a legal principle that says certain natural resources—like air, running water, the sea, and forests—are so important to the people that they cannot be owned by any private individual.

Instead, the **State (Government)** holds these resources in **"trust"** for the benefit of the general public.

---

1. The Core Concept: The Government as a Trustee

Think of the government not as the "owner" of the environment, but as a **Trustee** or a "manager."

- **The Public:** They are the "beneficiaries" (the ones who have the right to enjoy the resource).
- **The State:** They are the "trustee" (the ones obligated to protect it).

Just as a trustee cannot sell off a child's inheritance for their own profit, the government cannot sell off public rivers or parks to private corporations for their exclusive use.

---

2. The Three Restrictions on the State

Under this doctrine, the government is restricted in three ways:

1. The resource must be available for use by the **general public.**
2. The resource must **not be sold** to private parties for a profit.
3. The resource must be maintained for **specific types of use** (like navigation, fishing, or recreation).

---

3. The Landmark Case: *MC Mehta v. Kamal Nath* (1997)

This is the **most famous application of the Public Trust Doctrine in India**.

- **The Situation:** A former Environment Minister, Kamal Nath, had links to a company that built a luxury club called "Span Motels" on the banks of the Beas River in Himachal Pradesh. To protect the motel from flooding, the company **diverted the course of the river** using heavy machinery.

- **The Ruling:** The Supreme Court of India was outraged. They ruled that the Beas River was a public resource and the government had no right to "lease" the riverbed to a private company for commercial purposes.
- **The Outcome:** The court cancelled the lease, ordered the motel to pay for the restoration of the river (Polluter Pays), and established that the **Public Trust Doctrine is part of the law of the land in India.**

---

4. Why it Matters Today

This doctrine is the "last line of defense" for public spaces. It is frequently used to stop:

- **Beach Privatization:** Preventing hotels from blocking public access to the ocean.
- **Lake Encroachment:** Stopping builders from filling in urban lakes to build apartment complexes.
- **Forest Diversion:** Ensuring that protected forests aren't handed over to mining companies without extreme scrutiny.

6.8 Summary of Environmental Principles

You have now seen the four "gears" that drive Indian Environmental Law:

Principle	Main Goal
Precautionary Principle	Stop damage **before** it starts by requiring proof of safety.
Polluter Pays Principle	Make the person who caused the mess pay for the **cleanup**.
Absolute Liability	Ensure companies have **no excuses** (like Acts of God) when disasters happen.
Public Trust Doctrine	Remind the government they **don't own nature**; they only guard it for us.

In the Indian Constitution, **Article 21** is often called the **"Smallest Article with the Largest Heart."** It is just one sentence long, yet it has been expanded by the Supreme Court to **cover almost every aspect of a dignified human life.**

The text reads:

"No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law."

---

1. The Two Pillars: Life and Personal Liberty

- **Right to Life:** This isn't just the right to "exist" or "breathe." The courts have ruled that it means the right to live with **human dignity**.
- **Personal Liberty:** This covers the right to move freely, the right to privacy, and protection against arbitrary arrest.

---

2. The Evolution: *A.K. Gopalan* to *Maneka Gandhi*

The power of Article 21 changed dramatically because of two landmark cases:

- **The Narrow View (*A.K. Gopalan*, 1950):** Initially, the court said Article 21 only protected you from the executive (police) acting without a law. If the Parliament passed a law to take your liberty, you couldn't do much.
- **The Broad View (*Maneka Gandhi*, 1978):** The court changed its mind. It ruled that any "procedure" used to take away a person's life or liberty must be **"fair, just, and reasonable,"** not arbitrary or fanciful. This introduced the concept of **"Due Process"** into Indian law.

---

3. The "Unenumerated" Rights

Over the years, the Supreme Court has "read into" Article 21 many other rights that aren't explicitly written in the Constitution. If a right is essential for a dignified life, it falls under **Article 21.**

Right	Case / Source
Right to Privacy	*Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*
Right to Clean Environment	*M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*
Right to Free Legal Aid	*M.H. Hoskot v. State of Maharashtra*
Right to Shelter	*Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corp.*
Right to Speedly Trial	*Hussainara Khatoon v. Home Secretary*
Right to Sleep	*Ramlila Maidan Incident case*

---

4. Connection to Environmental Law

As we discussed earlier, the **Precautionary Principle** and **Polluter Pays Principle** are actually enforced through **Article 21.**

The logic is simple: You cannot enjoy your "Right to Life" if the air you breathe is toxic or the water you drink is poisoned. Therefore, **the right to a healthy environment is a fundamental part of the right to life.**

---

5. Key Features of Article 21

- **Available to Everyone:** Unlike some rights that only apply to Indian Citizens, **Article 21** applies to **"any person"** (including foreigners and even corporations in some contexts).
- **Emergency Protection:** Even during a National Emergency, Article 21 **cannot be suspended**. It is your ultimate safeguard.

7.0 Malice In Law

7.1 Understanding "Malice in Law"

'Malice' in law means **a wrongful act done intentionally without just cause or excuse.**

In legal terms, "malice" is often divided into two categories: **Malice in Fact** and **Malice in Law**. While we usually think of malice as "hatred" or "spite" in daily conversation, the law treats it more objectively.

- **Malice in Fact:** This refers to the actual evil motive, spite, or ill will in the mind of the person doing the act. (This matches options A and B, but is not the general legal definition).
- **Malice in Law:** This refers to a "technical" malice. It doesn't matter if you were "angry" or "mean"; what matters is that you **intentionally** committed an act that violates someone else's rights without a legal justification.

Key Distinctions

To help you remember for your exams, here is how "Malice in Law" differs from other concepts:

Term	Legal Meaning	Focus
Malice in Law	Doing a wrongful act on purpose without a valid excuse.	The **Act** itself.
Malice in Fact	Doing an act out of spite, or a desire for revenge.	The **Motive** or Feeling.
Criminal Intention	The "Mens Rea" or state of mind required to commit a crime.	**Guilty Mind**.

In the famous case of ***Baylis v. Lawrence*****,** it was established that "Malice in Law" simply means a **wrongful act done intentionally without just cause or excuse**.

If you park your car in front of someone's driveway to block them, and you do it on purpose without a medical emergency or legal right, you have committed "Malice in Law"—even if you don't actually hate your neighbor. The law focuses on the **intentional violation of a right**, not the emotional state of the violator.

That is a great way to see how "Malice in Law" works in practice. In legal exams, these two areas—**Defamation** and **Malicious Prosecution**—are the most common places where the definition of malice is tested.

7.2 The key difference is that one usually requires **Malice in Law** (implied), while the other requires **Malice in Fact** (proven motive).

---

1. Malice in Defamation (Malice in Law)

In a standard civil case for defamation, the law **implies** malice. You don't have to prove the defendant hated you.

- **The Rule:** If I publish a false statement that hurts your reputation, and I do it intentionally without a "just cause" (like a legal duty or privilege), the law says I acted with malice.
- **Application:** Even if I thought I was being helpful or "just joking," the fact that I intentionally published a false, harmful statement without a legal excuse satisfies the requirement of **Malice in Law**.

2. Malicious Prosecution (Malice in Fact)

This is the "exception" where the court looks deeper into your heart. To win a case for malicious prosecution, the plaintiff **must prove** that the defendant acted with **Malice in Fact** (Actual Malice).

- **The Rule:** You must show that the person who started the legal proceedings against you did so with an **improper motive**—like spite, revenge, or to extort money—rather than a desire to bring a criminal to justice.
- **Application:** If a neighbor files a false police report against you just because they are angry about your loud music, that is Malice in Fact.

7.3 Summary Table for Quick Reference

Legal Area	Type of Malice Required	What must be proved?
Defamation	**Malice in Law**	That the act was intentional and without excuse.
Malicious Prosecution	**Malice in Fact**	That there was a "guilty mind" or "improper motive."
False Imprisonment	**Malice in Law**	That the detention was intentional and unauthorized.

7.4 Why this distinction matters

"Malice in its legal sense," almost always refers to *a wrongful act done intentionally without just cause or excuse.* This is because the law prefers objective standards (what you did) over subjective ones (what you were feeling).

Let's put your detective hat on. Here are two scenarios. Try to decide if the person is acting with **Malice in Law** (a wrongful act done intentionally without excuse) or **Malice in Fact** (acting out of spite/ill will).

Scenario A: The Honest Mistake

A store manager detains a customer because they honestly, but mistakenly, believe the customer stole a watch. The manager has no personal grudge against the customer; they are just trying to do their job, but they technically break the law regarding "False Imprisonment" because they had no "just cause" (the person didn't actually steal).

Scenario B: The Grudge

A person knows their neighbor is innocent, but they report them to the police for theft anyway, just to ruin the neighbor's reputation because they had a fight over a fence last week.

7.5 The Legal Breakdown

Scenario	Primary Type of Malice	Reason
Scenario A	**Malice in Law**	There is no "ill will," but the act of detaining an innocent person is a **wrongful act done intentionally without a valid legal excuse.**
Scenario B	**Malice in Fact**	The act is driven by a **specific improper motive** (revenge/spite). This is "express malice."

7.6 Why this matters for your exam

If a question asks: *"Is 'ill will' necessary to prove Malice in Law?"*

The answer is **No.** As long as the act is **intentional** and **unlawful**, the law doesn't care if you were smiling or crying while you did it.

Quick Check:

Imagine a newspaper publishes a false story about a celebrity. They didn't do it because they hate the celebrity; they just didn't double-check their facts before printing.

Is this Malice in Law?

Yes. They intentionally published the story without a "just cause" (truth). In the eyes of the law, that is enough to hold them liable.

This is a classic "trap" in legal studies. While they sound like the same thing, the law separates them strictly—especially in **Criminal Law**.

Think of it this way: **Intention** is the *what* (the immediate goal), while **Motive** is the *why* (the ultimate reason).

1. Intention (The Immediate "What")

Intention refers to the person's state of mind regarding the **act** itself and its immediate consequences.

- **Legal Standing:** It is a core element of a crime (*Mens Rea*). If you intended to pull the trigger and hit someone, you have the "intent" to kill.
- **Relevance:** It is **highly relevant** in determining guilt.

2. Motive (The Ultimate "Why")

Motive is the ulterior reason or the emotion that drove the person to form the intention.

- **Legal Standing:** Generally, motive is **irrelevant** to determining guilt. A "good" motive does not excuse a crime, and a "bad" motive doesn't make a legal act illegal.
- **Relevance:** It is mostly used by police to find suspects or by judges when deciding how long a sentence should be.

The "Robin Hood" Example

Imagine a man steals a loaf of bread from a wealthy baker to feed a starving child.

- **His Intention:** To take the bread without paying (Theft).
- **His Motive:** To save a child from hunger (Charity/Survival).

The Legal Verdict: He is guilty of theft. Why? Because his **intention** was to commit a wrongful act. His "good" **motive** does not change the fact that he broke the law, though a judge might give him a lighter punishment because of it.

7.7 Comparison Table

Feature	Intention	Motive
Definition	The objective or goal of the act.	The reason behind the goal.
Legal Status	Essential to prove a crime.	Irrelevant to proving a crime.
Position	The immediate stage before the act.	The stage that precedes intention.
Example	Intending to push someone.	Doing it because you are jealous.

Why this connects to "Malice"

This is why **Malice in Law** (which we just discussed) is about **Intention**. If you intentionally do something wrongful without a legal excuse, the law doesn't care if your **Motive** was "to be funny" or "to help a friend"—you are still legally "malicious."

8. The term **'damages'** means money compensation for the loss suffered.

8.1 Why "Damages" is different from a "Fine"

In legal terminology, people often confuse **Damage** (singular) with **Damages** (plural). They have very different meanings:

- **Damage:** The actual injury, loss, or harm caused to a person or property.
- **Damages:** The money claimed by, or ordered to be paid to, a person as compensation for that loss.

8.2 Key Distinctions

It is important to distinguish "Damages" from "Fines" because they belong to two different branches of law:

Feature	Damages (Option A)	Fine (Option B)
Branch of Law	Civil Law (Torts, Contracts).	Criminal Law.
Purpose	To **compensate** the victim (put them back in the position they were in before the harm).	To **punish** the offender and deter others.
Recipient	Paid to the **injured party** (the plaintiff).	Paid to the **State/Government**.
Amount	Based on the actual loss suffered.	Based on the severity of the offense and statutory limits.

8.3 Types of Damages

Depending on the case, a court might award different types of money compensation:

1. **General Damages:** Compensation for non-monetary losses, like pain and suffering.
2. **Special Damages:** Compensation for specific, out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., medical bills or lost wages).

3. **Nominal Damages:** A tiny amount (like $1) awarded when a right was violated but no actual financial loss occurred.
4. **Exemplary/Punitive Damages:** Large sums awarded in rare cases to make an example of a defendant who acted with extreme malice.

8.4 Summary for your exam

When you see **"Damages"** in a legal context, always think **"Compensation."** When you see **"Fine,"** think **"Punishment."**

Calculating damages is one of the most practical parts of law. The court uses different "yardsticks" depending on whether the case is about a broken **Contract** or a **Tort** (like an accident).

The fundamental rule across all civil law is the principle of **Restitutio in Integrum**—which is just a fancy Latin way of saying "restore the person to their original position."

---

1. In Contract Law (Section 73)

When a contract is broken, the court follows the rule established in the famous case of *Hadley v. Baxendale*. They look for two things:

- **Direct Losses:** Losses that naturally arose from the breach (e.g., if I don't deliver a machine, you lose the profit that machine would have made).
- **Remote Losses:** These are **not** compensated unless both parties knew about the risk when they made the deal.

2. In Tort Law (Personal Injury/Accidents)

Calculating damages for an accident is more complex because you can't always put a price tag on a broken leg or emotional trauma. The court splits the "measure" into two categories:

Category	What it covers	How it's measured
Pecuniary (Economic)	Medical bills, repair costs, lost salary.	Fixed mathematical calculation (receipts).
Non-Pecuniary	Pain and suffering, loss of enjoyment of life.	Subjective "Fairness" based on previous cases.

3. The "Duty to Mitigate"

This is a very important "trap" in legal exams. Even if someone harms you, you cannot just sit back and let the losses pile up. You have a **duty to mitigate** (minimize) your loss.

- *Example:* If someone breaks your window, you must cover it with a tarp. You can't let the rain ruin your $5,000 carpet and then ask the defendant to pay for the carpet too. You can only claim the cost of the window and the tarp.

Summary of Calculation Steps

1. **Causation:** Did the defendant's act actually cause the loss? (**"But-for" test**)
2. **Remoteness:** Was the loss a foreseeable result or was it too far-fetched?
3. **Quantification:** What is the actual dollar amount needed to "fix" the situation?

8.5 Quick Test:

If 'A' fails to deliver a wedding dress to 'B' on time, and 'B' is so sad she cancels the entire $20,000 wedding, can 'B' claim the full $20,000 from the tailor?

The Answer: Usually **No**. The tailor is liable for the cost of the dress or the cost of a replacement, but the cancellation of the whole wedding is often considered too "remote" unless the tailor was specifically warned that the entire wedding depended on that one dress.

This is a distinction that comes up constantly in both exams and real-world legal practice. It essentially boils down to whether the "price" for breaking a rule was decided **before** or **after** the trouble started.

1. Liquidated Damages

These are damages where the amount is **fixed and agreed upon** by the parties in advance, usually written right into the contract.

- **The Logic:** "If I am late finishing your house, I will pay you $100 for every day I'm late."
- **The Benefit:** It saves time and legal fees because you don't have to prove the exact value of your loss in court; you just point to the contract.
- **The Rule:** The amount must be a "genuine pre-estimate" of the loss. If it's an absurdly high amount designed just to scare the other person, the court might call it a **Penalty** and refuse to enforce it.

2. Unliquidated Damages

These are damages that are **not pre-determined**. The court has to listen to the evidence and decide what is fair after the harm has occurred.

- **The Logic:** Most Tort cases (like car accidents or defamation) involve unliquidated damages. You can't agree in advance how much a broken leg is worth because you didn't plan the accident.
- **The Process:** The judge looks at receipts, doctor's reports, and previous court cases to "liquidate" (calculate) the amount.

8.6 Comparison Table

Feature	Liquidated Damages	Unliquidated Damages
When decided?	At the time of making the contract.	By the court after the breach/harm.
Who decides?	The parties involved.	The Judge or Jury.
Basis	Specific sum mentioned in a clause.	Based on the actual loss/injury proven.
Type of Law	Mostly Contract Law.	Mostly Tort Law and some Contracts.

Summary Trick

- **Liquidated** = "Liquid" (Easy to pour out a specific amount, already measured).
- **Unliquidated** = "Unmeasured" (Needs the court to do the measuring).

---

9. 'Tort' is derived from the latin term 'tortum' is a **French word**.

While the legal concept has deep roots, the journey of the word "Tort" through history is a classic example of how legal terminology evolved:

- **The Latin Root:** It comes from the Latin word ***tortum***, which means "twisted" or "crooked." (Think of the modern word *extort* or *contort*).
- **The French Influence:** After the Norman Conquest of England in 1066, French became the language of the law and the ruling class. The French word **"Tort"** (meaning "wrong") was adopted into the English legal system.
- **The English Usage:** In early English law, "Tort" became the specific term for a **civil wrong** that is not a breach of contract.

9.1 What exactly is a Tort?

In simple terms, a Tort occurs when someone's "twisted" or "crooked" behavior causes harm to another, leading to a legal liability.

9.2 Key Characteristics of a Tort

To distinguish a Tort from other legal issues, look for these three elements:

1. **Civil Wrong:** It is an infringement of a right *in rem* (a right available against the world at large), not a private right under a contract.
2. **Unliquidated Damages:** Unlike a contract where the penalty might be pre-decided, in Tort, the **Court** decides the amount of compensation (damages) based on the severity of the harm.
3. **Not a Crime:** While some actions (like assault) are both a Tort and a Crime, a Tort is handled in civil court, and the goal is **compensation**, not punishment (jail).

9.3 Comparison of Legal Terms

Word	Origin	Legal Meaning
Tortum	Latin	Twisted / Crooked
Tort	**French**	A Civil Wrong
Wrong	English	General term for an unlawful act

9.4 A Note for Students

It is a common "trick" question in law exams to ask whether Tort is Latin or French. Remember: The **derivation** is Latin (*tortum*), but the **word itself** as used in law is French.

Three essential conditions (the "ABC") of liability in Tort law:

In Tort law, liability isn't just about someone getting hurt; it's about proving a specific chain of events. Lawyers often use the "**ABC" or the "Three Pillars" rule** to determine if a case has merit.

To hold a defendant liable in Tort, the plaintiff (the person suing) must prove **these three conditions:**

1. A - A Duty of Care

The plaintiff must show that the defendant owed them a legal duty of care. You aren't legally responsible for everyone in the world, only for those who could be "reasonably foreseen" to be affected by your actions.

- **The "Neighbor Principle":** Established in the famous *Donoghue v. Stevenson* (the "Snail in the Bottle") case, you must take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions which you can reasonably foresee would be likely to injure your "neighbor" (anyone closely and directly affected by your act).

2. B - Breach of Duty

Once a duty is established, you must prove the defendant breached it. This happens when the defendant fails to act like a "reasonable person" would in the same situation.

- **The Standard:** It's not about being perfect; it's about being careful. If a doctor performs a surgery with the same skill as any other competent doctor, but the patient still suffers a rare complication, there is no breach. If the doctor leaves a pair of scissors inside the patient, that is a clear breach.

3. C - Causation (Damage)

Even if someone was reckless (Breach), you cannot sue them in Tort unless you suffered actual damage as a direct result of that breach.

- **The "But-For" Test:** Would the damage have occurred "but for" the defendant's actions? If the answer is no, then the defendant caused the damage.
- **Remoteness:** The damage must be a foreseeable consequence. If a car accident causes a small fire, but that fire causes a nearby chemical plant to explode five miles away, the driver might not be liable for the explosion because it is too "remote."

9.5 The Two Critical Legal Maxims

In Tort, there is a famous distinction regarding these conditions that often appears in exams:

Maxim	Meaning	Is it a Tort?
Damnum Sine Injuria	Damage without legal injury. (e.g., A new shop opens next to yours and you lose money).	No. Loss of money isn't a legal wrong.
Injuria Sine Damno	Legal injury without actual damage. (e.g., Someone trespasses on your land but doesn't break anything).	Yes. The violation of your right is enough to sue.

9.6 Summary Table

Element	Question to Ask
A - Duty	Did the defendant have a legal obligation to be careful?
B - Breach	Did the defendant's conduct fall below the standard of a reasonable person?
C - Causation	Did the defendant's breach directly cause the plaintiff's loss/injury?

9.7 To see the "ABC" conditions in action, let's look at a **classic road accident scenario.** This helps illustrate how courts **distinguish between a "pure accident" and "legal negligence."**

The Scenario: The Distracted Driver

The Facts: Driver X is driving down a city street. He receives a text message, looks down at his phone for three seconds, and fails to notice that the car in front (Driver Y) has stopped at a red light. Driver X rear-ends Driver Y, causing whiplash to Driver Y and ₹50,000 in car repairs.

Applying the "ABC" Test

1. A - Duty of Care (Established)

In law, every driver owes a duty of care to all other road users (pedestrians, cyclists, and other drivers).

- **Reasoning:** It is highly "foreseeable" that if you drive a heavy metal vehicle carelessly, you will injure someone nearby.

2. B - Breach of Duty (Proven)

Did Driver X act like a "reasonable person"?

- **The Standard:** A reasonable driver keeps their eyes on the road. By looking at his phone while the vehicle was in motion, Driver X's conduct fell below the required standard of care.
- **Result: Breach of duty is confirmed.**

3. C - Causation/Damage (Proven)

Did the breach *cause* the specific harm?

- **The "But-For" Test:** But for Driver X looking at his phone, would the crash have happened? No.
- **The Damage:** There is physical injury (whiplash) and financial loss (repair costs). These are not "remote"; they are the direct result of the collision.

9.8 What if the situation changes? (Defenses)

Tort law also considers the behavior of the victim. This leads to two very important concepts:

A. Contributory Negligence

Suppose Driver Y's brake lights were broken. The court might find that while Driver X was negligent for texting, Driver Y was also 20% responsible because his broken lights made it harder to see him stop.

- **Result:** The compensation Driver Y receives would be reduced by 20%.

B. Composite Negligence

If two cars (X and Z) both drive recklessly and collide with a third innocent car (Y), both X and Z are "joint tortfeasors." Driver Y can recover the full amount from either of them.

9.9 Summary Table for Road Accidents

Element	Evidence Required in Court
Duty	Proof that the defendant was operating the vehicle on a public road.

Element	Evidence Required in Court
Breach	Evidence of speeding, jumping a signal, or distracted driving (e.g., phone records).
Causation	Medical reports for injuries and surveyor reports for vehicle damage.

9.10 A Final Note: *Res Ipsa Loquitur*

In some accidents, the negligence is so obvious that "the thing speaks for itself" (*Res Ipsa Loquitur*). For example, if a truck is parked on a hill and its handbrake isn't engaged, causing it to roll down and hit a house, the plaintiff doesn't need to prove exactly *how* the driver was careless—the accident itself is proof of negligence.