

# Chapter 2: Negligence: The Duty of Care – General Principles and Public Policy

Outline	2.1	Introduction	2.5	The influence of the Human Rights Act 1998
	2.2	Donoghue v Stevenson [1932]		
	2.3	The three-stage test: foreseeability, proximity and “fair, just and reasonable”	2.6	Summary
	2.4	Complex duty cases involving policy considerations		



## Aims of this Chapter

This chapter will enable you to achieve the following learning outcome from the CILEx syllabus:

- 4 Understand the law of negligence

## 2.1 Introduction

Negligence is the most important modern tort. In the words of Alderson B in ***Blyth v Birmingham Waterworks Co [1856]***:

*“Negligence is the omission to do something which a reasonable man guided upon those considerations which ordinarily regulate the conduct of human affairs, would do, or doing something which a prudent and reasonable man would not do.”*

While other torts are signified by a particular interest of the claimant which is protected (e.g. defamation protects reputation, private nuisance protects use and enjoyment of land, and so on), the tort of negligence protects many interests including those of the claimant’s person, property and some economic interests. That said, certain of those interests continue to create problems for the courts, in the sense that it is not always clear how far the law should attach liability to the negligent infliction of certain kinds of damage. The extent to which compensation for psychiatric damage and pure economic loss can be recovered in the tort of negligence is considered separately in **Chapter 3** and **Chapter 4**. As Lord Bridge stated in ***Caparo Industries plc v Dickman [1990]***: *“It is never sufficient to ask simply whether A owes B a duty of care. It is always necessary to determine the scope of the duty by reference to the **kind of damage** from which A must take care to save B harmless”* (emphasis added).


In order to succeed in a negligence action, the claimant must prove that:

- the defendant owed them a duty of care;
- the defendant was in breach of that duty;

- the claimant suffered damage, which was caused by that breach of duty; and
- the damage was not too remote.

The claimant may have certain defences raised against them, for example, the allegation that they were contributorily negligent.

Any claimant in a negligence action must overcome certain legal “hurdles” in order to establish that the tort of negligence has been committed. If the claimant knocks over any of the hurdles, their claim fails.





Laura met some friends on a Friday night and had a good few drinks. She decided to drive home, even though she knew that she was drunk. On the way, she lost control of her vehicle and crashed into her neighbour's parked car. In this example, it is clear that Laura owes a duty to all road users, including people who have their cars parked in the street, to take care not to damage their property. Laura is in breach of that duty because she failed to exercise the level of care that a reasonably prudent driver would have exercised. The neighbour's damage was caused by Laura's breach and it is one of the kinds of damage that tort law generally compensates (the other kind, of course, is personal harm). So Laura will be liable to her neighbour in negligence.


To be actionable in tort, the defendant's lack of reasonable care must occur in the context of a **duty to take care**.

Many duty relationships have been recognised by the courts for a very long time – for example, one highway user to another, doctor to patient, employer to employee and manufacturer to those affected by its product. In the main, such duties of care have been identified in the courts with Parliament playing a very limited role.

This chapter will focus on the duty of care and its interaction with key concepts including:

- **reasonable foreseeability** by the defendant of the damage to the claimant;
- sufficient legal **proximity** (closeness) between the defendant and the claimant;
- whether it is **just and reasonable** for a duty of care to exist between the claimant and defendant; and
- **public policy** – whether it is in the wider interests of society as a whole for the duty of care to exist.

Note also how the duty of care fits into the wider framework of the underlying principles of negligence.



### Self-assessment Question

(5) What must every claimant prove in a negligence action?

## 2.2 The way to *Donoghue v Stevenson* [1932]

Not every negligent act will result in liability in negligence. There has to be some control device in order to determine when liability is capable of arising. This function is performed by the duty of care. When a case reaches court the judge may have to determine whether the defendant owed the claimant a duty to take reasonable care in the circumstances in which the claimant alleges the defendant was negligent.

Before 1932, there was no recognised general test for determining whether a duty existed in circumstances which had not previously come before a court. Courts would find a duty of care only when a claim fell squarely within precedent, or by analogy with established case law. The use of analogy allowed for some incremental (i.e. gradual) extension of duties of care, but courts were generally cautious in relying upon it. This display of judicial conservatism was particularly frustrating in the light of the rapid speed of change brought about by the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century. The proliferation of industrial production increased social and individual welfare, but it also increased the incidence and seriousness of accidents. However, for a long time, courts would persist in finding a duty of care only in a small number of situations, and mainly when there was already a contract between the two parties. An early attempt to extend duties of care more widely (or to bring tort law out of the shadow of contract) occurred in *Heaven v Pender* [1883], but the most famous, and famously successful, attempt came in *Donoghue v Stevenson* [1932]. The date of the case is significant as it marks a step away from the conservative idea that people owe duties of care only towards those they have a contract with

**© 2018 Copyright CILEx Law School Limited**

All materials included in this CLS publication are copyright protected.

All rights reserved.

Any unauthorised reproduction or transmission of any part of this publication, whether electronically or otherwise, will constitute an infringement of copyright. No part of this publication may be lent, resold or hired out for any purpose without the prior written permission of CILEx Law School Ltd.

**WARNING: Any person carrying out an unauthorised act in relation to this copyright work may be liable to both criminal prosecution and a civil claim for damages.**

This publication is intended only for the purpose of private study. Its contents were believed to be correct at the time of publication or any date stated in any preface, whichever is the earlier.

This publication does not constitute any form of legal advice to any person or organisation.

CILEx Law School Ltd will not be liable for any loss or damage of any description caused by the reliance of any person on any part of the contents of this publication.

Published in 2018 by:  
CILEx Law School Ltd  
College House  
Manor Drive  
Kempston  
Bedford  
United Kingdom  
MK42 7AB

**British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this manual is available from the British Library.  
ISBN 978-1-84256-1036-5