

# Table of Contents

Preface .....	V
---------------	---

*Ewa Bagińska*

<b>THE DEVELOPMENT OF LIABILITY FOR »REPRODUCTIVE TORTS« IN POLISH LAW .....</b>	<b>3</b>
I. Introduction .....	3
II. The legal framework for prenatal tests and abortion in Poland .....	4
III. The role of »conscientious objection« in the enforcement of patients' rights to prenatal testing and abortion .....	5
IV. Liability for refusal of an ethical (where the pregnancy is the result of a crime) or therapeutic abortion .....	8
V. The development of liability for the denial of prenatal testing and/or a eugenic abortion .....	12
VI. Conclusions .....	17

*Jean-Sébastien Borghetti*

<b>STRICT LIABILITY IN TORT AND THE BOUNDARIES OF TORT LAW .....</b>	<b>19</b>
I. The development of <i>responsabilité du fait des choses</i> .....	22
A. Birth .....	22
B. Coming of age and decline .....	29
II. <i>Responsabilité du fait des choses</i> and <i>non-cumul</i> .....	33
A. The affirmation of the <i>non-cumul</i> rule .....	33
B. The extension of the <i>non-cumul</i> rule .....	40
III. <i>Responsabilité du fait des choses, non-cumul,</i> and the reform of the law of obligations .....	49

*Giovanni Comandé*

<b>AWARDING DAMAGES FOR NON-PECUNIARY LOSSES: FROM FULL TO PERSONALIZED COMPENSATION. A QUEST TOWARDS NEUROCOGNITIVE RESEARCH</b> .....		55
I.	Making the victim whole: a principle, a fundamental right or an illusory promise? .....	55
II.	Different languages, converging notions and blurred principles .....	60
III.	Sample techniques for awarding non-pecuniary damages and their relations with the full compensation principle .....	64
	A. The English way to intangible losses .....	65
	B. German tables and descriptions .....	66
	C. A Franco-Italian approach to scheduling .....	67
	D. The problematic Italian search for a synthesis .....	68
	E. Awarding methods and full compensation: a summary .....	71
IV.	<i>Est modus in rebus?</i> Neurocognitive patterns to understand full compensation .....	73

*Ina Ebert*

<b>CLIMATE LIABILITY AND LIABILITY INSURANCE</b> .....		79
I.	Liability for the consequences of climate change .....	79
II.	Liability for greenhouse gas emissions as such .....	80
	A. Claiming compensation for damage caused by climate change .....	80
	B. Legal hurdles for claimants .....	81
	1. Political question doctrine and displacement .....	81
	2. Legal standing .....	81
	3. Causation, attribution and time related issues .....	82
	C. Climate liability vs. asbestos and tobacco .....	83
	D. Litigation so far .....	84
	1. <i>Comer v. Murphy Oil</i> .....	85
	2. <i>Kivalina v. ExxonMobil</i> .....	86
III.	Other climate related liability risks .....	86
IV.	Coverage issues .....	87
V.	Consequences and outlook .....	88

*Jörg Fedtke*

<b>EVOLUTIONARY MISMATCH AND RESPONSIBILITY</b> .....	91
I. Environmental change .....	92
II. Mismatch .....	94
III. Responsibility .....	96

*Israel Gilead*

<b>ON THE DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF UNFORESEEABILITY IN NEGLIGENCE LAW</b> .....	103
I. Introduction .....	103
II. The three different implications of the unforeseeability of harm .....	104
A. First possible implication of unforeseeability – D’s conduct was ex ante reasonable .....	104
B. Second possible implication of unforeseeability – P’s harm is not sufficiently related to D’s negligent conduct .....	105
C. Third possible implication of unforeseeability – Denial of D’s liability for P’s harm on policy grounds .....	106
III. The different legal elements used to deny D’s liability for P’s unforeseeable harm .....	107
A. The question – how to associate the different implications of unforeseeability with the different elements of negligence liability .....	107
B. A simple answer – each implication of unforeseeability corresponds with a missing element of liability .....	108
C. An even simpler answer – discarding <i>normative</i> foreseeability .....	108
D. The common answer – more complex and confusing .....	110
IV. The importance of specifying which legal element of liability is missing because of the harm’s unforeseeability .....	111
V. The recent debate in Israel’s Supreme Court regarding the implications of unforeseeability .....	112
VI. Applying the unforeseeability analysis to the »proximity« requirement .....	114
VII. Conclusion .....	115

*Ernst Karner*

**QUANTIFICATION OF MORAL DAMAGES IN PERSONAL INJURY CASES**

<b>IN A COMPARATIVE VIEW</b> .....	117
I. Monetary compensation for non-pecuniary loss? .....	117
A. Difficulties and necessity of compensation for non-pecuniary loss .....	117
B. The dilemma of incommensurability .....	118
II. The different assessment methods .....	120
A. Two types of assessing damages .....	120
B. Countries relying on judicial discretion .....	120
1. Austria .....	120
2. Germany .....	121
3. Switzerland .....	122
4. England and the US .....	123
C. Countries relying on tabular compensation schemes .....	124
1. Italy .....	124
2. France .....	125
3. Spain .....	127
III. Unification of compensation? .....	129
A. Different amounts throughout Europe .....	129
B. Reasons for different levels of compensation? .....	131
C. Different amounts in similar systems – highest awards .....	131
D. Ranking according to highest amounts .....	132
E. Evaluation of injuries .....	133
F. Unification of injuries .....	135
IV. Final remarks .....	135

*Bernhard A. Koch*

<b>WHY TORT LAW SEEMS TO FAIL SOMETIMES</b> .....	137
I. Introduction .....	137
II. Suggested, but not actual failures .....	138
A. Purported flaws due to practical constraints .....	138
1. Imperfect defendants .....	138
2. Imperfect claimants .....	140
3. Imperfect evidence .....	140
B. Alleged shortcomings relating to procedure .....	141
C. Failure to meet actual or imaginary goals .....	142
1. Compensation .....	142

	a. The principle of »full compensation« .....	142
	b. Overcompensation .....	144
	c. Compensation to all in need? .....	144
	2. Prevention .....	145
	D. Alternative funds more readily accessible .....	149
III.	Actual, but mostly unavoidable weaknesses .....	150
	A. Cutting off claims by the calendar .....	150
	B. Cutting off claims by percentage points .....	152
	C. Cutting off claims by seemingly random caps .....	154
	D. Putting a price tag on the priceless .....	156
IV.	Not so bad after all .....	157

*Helmut Koziol*

	»SUPPLEMENTARY« LIABILITY .....	161
I.	Problem at issue .....	161
	A. The example of liability for auxiliaries .....	161
	B. The fundamental question .....	162
II.	Starting points for »supplementary liability« in the legal system .....	164
	A. An ancient example .....	164
	B. Liability for auxiliaries .....	165
	C. Modern example: importer's, dealer's and producer's product liability .....	165
III.	Fundamental ideas and scope of »supplementary liability« .....	166
	A. Fundamental ideas .....	166
	B. Possibility of shifting the burden as basic prerequisite for »supplementary liability«? .....	168
	C. Liability for damage or bearing of risk? .....	170
	1. Causation as fundamental prerequisite under the law of damages .....	170
	2. The criteria for imputation under the law of damages .....	172
	D. Attempt at a system of »supplementary liability« .....	176

*Christian Lahnstein*

	OBSERVATIONS ON THE ROLE OF LIABILITY INSURANCE .....	181
I.	Liability insurance and tort law .....	182
II.	How insurers could better observe liability developments .....	188

*Ulrich Magnus*

**GERMAN PRODUCT LIABILITY LAW, THE EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE AND**

<b>THE PRINCIPLES OF EUROPEAN TORT LAW</b> .....	191
I. Introduction .....	191
II. Features of German product liability law .....	191
A. The sources of German product liability law .....	191
B. The German Product Liability Act .....	192
1. Primary agricultural products and game .....	193
2. Exclusion of development risks .....	194
3. Caps .....	194
4. Non-material damage .....	196
5. Preservation of existing special liability systems .....	196
6. Further characteristics of liability under the Product Liability Act .....	199
C. Characteristics of product liability under § 823 (1) BGB .....	199
1. The beginning of a specific product liability law in Germany .....	199
2. Specific duties of care .....	200
3. Inclusion of all property damage, even so-called »Weiterfresserschäden« .....	201
4. Reversal of burden of proof .....	202
III. The recent case law .....	202
A. The jurisprudence of the CJEU .....	202
1. The early decisions .....	202
2. When product put into circulation – damage .....	204
3. Product put into circulation – limitation .....	206
4. Compensation of threatened damage .....	207
B. Recent decisions of the German Federal Supreme Court .....	209
1. Defect of electricity – putting electricity into circulation – producer of electricity .....	210
2. Defect and causation .....	211
3. Costs of retrofitting as damage .....	211
IV. Product liability law under the PETL .....	213
V. Conclusions .....	214

*Miquel Martín-Casals*

<b>LOSS OF HOUSEKEEPING CAPACITY IN THE NEW SPANISH COMPENSATION SCHEME FOR ROAD TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS</b> .....		217
I.	Introduction .....	217
	A. Compensation for loss of earnings and loss of housekeeping capacity in the old 1995 scheme .....	219
	B. Guidelines of the new 2015 compensation scheme for the assessment of loss of earnings and loss of housekeeping capacity .....	222
II.	The need to compensate for the loss of housekeeping capacity .....	222
III.	Compensation for loss of housekeeping capacity according to the new compensation scheme .....	224
	A. Which housework is recoverable? .....	224
	B. Housework for whom? .....	226
	C. The valuation of unpaid housework .....	228
	D. Compensation for loss of housekeeping capacity in the different scenarios .....	230
	1. Compensation in the case of death of the housekeeper .....	230
	2. Compensation in the case of permanent injuries of the housekeeper .....	232
	3. Compensation in the case of temporary injuries of the housekeeper .....	233
IV.	Conclusion .....	236

*Olivier Moréteau*

<b>INDIVIDUAL LIABILITY IN A VULNERABLE ENVIRONMENT: REVISITING THE ETHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF TORT LAW</b> .....		239
I.	Introduction: An ethic of responsibility .....	239
II.	Damage to nature is reparable .....	244
III.	Individuals are liable for collective decisions .....	248
IV.	Liability to future generations .....	254

*Johann Neethling*

<b>ADULTERY AS ACTIONABLE TORT – A SOUTH AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE</b> .....	259
I. Introduction .....	259
II. Facts of <i>RH v DE</i> .....	260
III. <i>Iniuria (contumelia)</i> and loss of <i>consortium</i> .....	261
IV. Decisions of the Supreme Court of Appeal and the Constitutional Court .....	263
A. Enticement, loss of <i>consortium</i> and <i>contumelia</i> .....	263
B. Adultery as ground of action .....	264
1. Justification for adultery as ground of action .....	264
2. Justification for abrogation of adultery as ground of action .....	267
3. Recognition of the right to feelings as an independent personality right .....	277
4. Actionable <i>iniuriae</i> where adultery is involved .....	279
5. Continued existence of abduction, enticement and harbouring as grounds of action .....	283
6. Aquilian action for loss of <i>consortium</i> .....	284
7. Interdict and adultery .....	284
V. Forfeiture of marital benefits as a result of adultery .....	285
VI. Conclusion .....	286

*Mirosław Nesterowicz*

<b>CIVIL LIABILITY OF A PHYSICIAN (A MEDICAL CLINIC) FOR FAILURE TO WARN A THIRD PARTY OF THREAT OF AN INFECTIOUS DISEASE FROM A PATIENT</b> .....	289
--	-----

*Luboš Tichý*

<b>PREVENTIVE LIABILITY – A NEW PARADIGM IN TORT LAW?</b> .....	303
I. Problem and methodology .....	303
II. Prevention as an objective and function of tort law .....	304
III. Prevention in the broad sense (general prevention) .....	306
IV. Historical and current development of preventive liability .....	307



V.	Preventive liability – a new paradigm .....	309
	A. Basis .....	309
	B. Conduct required by the duty of prevention and its forms ....	311
	1. Conduct’s objective .....	311
	2. Duty of notification .....	312
	3. Duty of intervention .....	312
	4. Intentional inactivity .....	312
	C. Extent of duty (protected interests and other factors) .....	313
VI.	Necessity of statutory regulation of the duty of prevention and preventive liability. The responsible person .....	313
	A. Preventive function of tort law and duty of prevention .....	313
	B. A responsible person .....	314
VII.	Preventive liability – liability for violation of duty of prevention .	314
	A. Unlawfulness and fault .....	314
	B. Damage .....	315
	C. Causation and attribution .....	315
	D. Limitation of attribution. Defences .....	316
	E. Sanction .....	316
VIII.	Policy justification .....	317
	A. Restriction to the party autonomy .....	317
	B. Floodgates – new burden for the courts? .....	318
	C. Reasons for the introduction of liability for prevention .....	319
	D. Criminal law’s paradigm – guarantor vs. »Samaritan« .....	319
	E. Between freedom and protection .....	320
	List of Authors .....	323