

Question 1

Patty is in the business of transporting human organs for transplant in City. She is paid only upon timely delivery of a viable organ; the delay of an hour can make an organ nonviable.

David transports gasoline over long distances in a tank truck. Recently, he was hauling gasoline through City. As David was crossing a bridge in City, his truck skidded on an oily patch and became wedged across the roadway, blocking all traffic in both directions for two hours.

Patty was delivering a kidney and was on the bridge several cars behind David when the accident occurred. The traffic jam caused Patty to be two hours late in making her delivery and made the kidney nonviable. Consequently, she was not paid the \$1,000 fee she would otherwise have received.

Patty contacted Art, a lawyer, and told him that she wanted to sue David for the loss of her fee. "There isn't a lot of money involved," she said, "but I want to teach David a lesson. David can't possibly afford the legal fees to defend this case, so maybe we can put him out of business."

Art agreed and, concluding that he could not prove negligence against David, decided that the only plausible claim would be one based on strict liability for ultrahazardous activity. Art filed a suit based on that theory against David on behalf of Patty, seeking recovery of damages to cover the \$1,000 fee Patty lost. The facts recited in the first three paragraphs above appeared on the face of the complaint.

David filed a motion to dismiss. The court granted the motion on the grounds that the complaint failed to state a cause of action and that, in any event, the damages alleged were not recoverable. It entered judgment in David's favor.

David then filed suit against Patty and Art for malicious prosecution.

1. Did the court correctly grant David's motion to dismiss on the grounds stated? Discuss.
2. What is the likely outcome of David's suit for malicious prosecution against Patty and Art? Discuss.

Answer A to Question 1

Patty instituted a suit via her lawyer Art for losses incurred due to Patty's inability to deliver a kidney on time owing to a traffic jam. The traffic jam occurred when David's truck skidded on an oily patch and became wedged across the roadway. There are two issues that need to be determined. First, the validity of the court's decision to dismiss Patty's cause of action for damages based on strict liability owing to an ultrahazardous activity. Secondly, whether David will be successful in recovering against Patty and Art in a claim of malicious prosecution.

1. David's motion to Dismiss based on Failure to State a Cause of Action

David has instituted a motion to dismiss for failure to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted. In the alternative, David argues that damages would not have been recoverable against David for strict liability from malicious prosecution. A motion to dismiss based on a failure to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted is a 12(b)(6) motion in federal court. This motion can be filed as a preliminary motion to the filing of a complaint or contained within the answer. Along with failure to include an indispensable party it can be raised at any time prior to trial or at trial itself. The motion charges that the plaintiff has failed to adequately state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted. It requires the judge to accept that all the facts that are stated by the plaintiff are taken to be true and then requires a determination as to whether there exists an adequate basis for relief. In other words, even if everything that plaintiff asserted in the complaint is true, would that be sufficient to allege a cause of action against the defendant?

In the current case, in order to determine whether the motion to dismiss was appropriately granted in Art's favor, it is necessary to examine Patty's allegations against David. Patty's lawyer, Art, determined that a negligence claim would not be viable against David. Likely because there is nothing to indicate in the facts that David engaged in any activity whereby he breached the standard of care towards a

foreseeable plaintiff. There is nothing to indicate that he was negligent in driving his truck, but rather he skidded on an oily patch in the middle of the road and then his truck swerved to block all lanes of traffic. As a result, Art decided to pursue Patty's claim on a strict liability theory for transporting an ultrahazardous activity.

Strict Liability for an Ultrahazardous Activity

Strict liability for transporting an ultrahazardous activity is an action whereby the defendant is engaged in an ultrahazardous activity. This is where the activity is so dangerous that the danger of its harm cannot be mitigated even with the exercise of reasonable care. Secondly, the activity has to be one that is not of common usage in the community. In a strict liability claim for ultrahazardous activity, in jurisdictions that still retain contributory negligence, this is not a valid defense to a strict liability claim.

In the current case, David transports gasoline over long distances in a tank truck. In the current case, he was transporting gasoline through the City. It is important to note that transporting gasoline through residential parts of a city is inherently an ultrahazardous activity because of the dangers that can occur if any gasoline spills, owing to the fact that gasoline is highly combustible and can cause serious injuries and damage to property in a matter of seconds. No amount of care can mitigate against these risks, and transporting gasoline through a residential community is not a matter of common usage in the community.

However, in the current case, when David was transporting the gasoline across the bridge, he skidded on an oily patch. There is no indication that he is responsible for the oily patch, rather, it was already spilled on the road when he arrived at the scene. As a result he skidded on the spill and his truck wedged across the roadway and blocked traffic in all directions. This blockage caused a traffic jam to develop in both directions and the delay of two hours caused Patty to be late in making her organ delivery. Yet the crucial distinction in this case is that the ultrahazardous nature of the gasoline was not the cause of Patty's damages. Even if David had been transporting a truck filled

with benign materials, such as flowers or children's toys, he still would have skidded on the oily patch and his truck would have wedged across the highway and caused the traffic jam. For strict liability to attach for transporting ultrahazardous activity, the nature of the harm or loss has to emanate from the ultrahazardous activity. This is not met in this case. There is nothing about the inherently dangerous nature of transporting gasoline that is the cause of Patty's harm.

As a result, even if the judge was to take all of the allegations that Patty made in her complaint to be true, she has failed to state sufficient facts necessary to constitute a cause of action for strict liability for transporting dangerous materials. Therefore, the judge was correct to grant David's motion to dismiss.

Patty's Damages are not recoverable

Moreover, David claimed that the damages that Patty claimed in her complaint were not recoverable. In this case, Patty sought to recover the \$1,000 fee she would have been paid had she been able to deliver the kidney while it was still viable.

As already noted, under strict liability the damages have to accrue from the inherent dangerousness of the activity - which in this case would have been transporting gasoline. However, in this case, the nature of Patty's damages resulted from the truck skidding on the oily patch, and as previously mentioned this could have occurred to any truck, even one transporting regular household goods. As a result, Patty is not entitled to recover for damages based on a theory of strict liability.

Her only viable claim would have been under a negligence theory which requires a duty under the applicable standard of care to all foreseeable plaintiffs (which under the majority Cardozo theory is to all plaintiffs in the zone of danger). There has to be a breach of the duty, causation (both factual and proximate), as well as damages. In this case, David would be held to the standard of care of a reasonable person driving a big truck along a bridge. The facts do not indicate that he was negligent in any manner,

such as driving too fast, or driving while distracted. As a result, Patty would be unable to establish a prima facie case for negligence and would be entitled to no damages. It is likely that Art realized that the negligence claim would be a non-starter and as a result he decided not to pursue the claim.

In conclusion, the court was correct to grant David's motion to dismiss for failure to state a cause of action and, in any event, the damages alleged were not recoverable because Patty failed to assert an appropriate and viable cause of action.

2. David's Suit for Malicious Prosecution against Patty and Art.

David decided to file suit for malicious prosecution against both Patty and Art. To establish a prima facie case for malicious prosecution, the plaintiff is required to show that there was an institution of civil proceedings against the plaintiff. Second, there was a termination of the proceedings in favor of the plaintiff. There also has to be a lack of probable cause. Moreover, the institution of the civil proceedings has to be for an improper purpose and the plaintiff has to show damages.

David's suit for Malicious Prosecution against Patty

In David's suit against Patty, David can show that Patty instituted a claim against him for strict liability based on transporting an abnormally dangerous activity. Since the judge granted the motion to dismiss, there was a termination in his favor.

The third prong requires David to show that the proceedings were instituted for an improper purpose. In the current case, when Patty came to Art for advice she was clear that she wanted to sue David for the loss of her fee, i.e., the \$1,000 she would have received if she could have successfully delivered the kidney. In her mind, she believed that she had suffered damages and that David was to blame because he had caused the traffic jam on the bridge. As a result, it is unclear whether her motive to bring the suit was based on lack of probable cause. As a layperson, she likely did not have the legal knowledge to ascertain the proper basis for determining probable cause, and she

came to her lawyer for advice to determine the merits of her case. As a result, it is likely that the court will find that Patty's decision to bring suit against David was based on her relying on the legal expertise of Art and she might have honestly believed that there was sufficient probable cause to bring the action.

The fourth prong requires bringing the suit for an improper purpose. This requirement is likely met in this case, because Patty acknowledged that there was not a lot of money involved in the action; however, she wanted to teach David a lesson and try to run him out of business. As a result, the primary motivation behind the suit was not to recover damages, but rather to seek revenge and damage to David. This is an improper purpose because the legal system is not to be used in a civil proceeding in order to extract a revenge against a defendant or for an improper purpose.

Lastly, the plaintiff has to show sufficient damages. In the current case, David was forced to respond to an action for strict liability and although the matter was dismissed under a motion for failure to state a cause of action, this still might have resulted in David losing days at work because of the lawsuit. There is also the loss of professional and social reputation from being forced to defend against a lawsuit. However, David would have to present evidence of any such pecuniary loss in order to meet the damages prong.

In conclusion, David would likely not succeed in his suit for malicious prosecution against Patty because he cannot show that she instituted the proceedings without probable cause. Patty likely relied on Art's advice that there was a viable claim for strict liability and, as a result, she thought there was sufficient merit in the action to proceed to court.

David's suit for Malicious Prosecution against Art

David also filed suit against Patty's lawyer Art for malicious prosecution.

Again, the first two prongs are easily met, because Art was the attorney that brought the strict liability action against Patty and there was a termination in Art's favor with the court's decision to grant the motion to dismiss based on failure to state a cause of action.

In the current case, the third prong, whereby the plaintiff has to show that the action was brought with a lack of probable cause, is likely to bring David more success against Art. An attorney is held to possess the required duty of competence, whereby he has to possess the legal skill, knowledge, preparedness and ability to pursue the case. In this case, Art realized that a negligence action would not be successful, but he still decided to pursue a claim for strict liability. This was the only plausible claim that he could bring against David and if he failed to adequately research the facts of the case based on the elements of strict liability, then he will be held liable for bringing a cause of action based on lack of probable cause. On the other hand, if Art honestly believed, with sufficient preparation and research in the case, that a strict liability cause of action might be viable in this case, then arguably there is sufficient probable cause. However, as previously noted under the first part, there was no connection between the ultrahazardous nature of transporting the gasoline and the accident that occurred in this case, and, as a result, Patty would be unable to recover damages based on a strict liability theory. As a result, Art should have realized this and counseled Patty against filing suit, and therefore, David will be able to successfully demonstrate the lack of probable cause in a suit for malicious prosecution against Art.

The fourth prong requires the plaintiff demonstrating that the suit was brought for an improper purpose. In the current case, Patty told Art that she knew that there was not a lot of money involved in the case, but that she simply wanted to teach David a lesson and run him out of business. A lawyer is held to a duty of candor and fairness to the court and an adversary. He is required to properly research the cause of action to

ensure that there is a viable cause of action. A lawyer signs Rule 11 motions asserting that there is a proper factual basis to the claim and legal contentions are accurate and that a claim is not being brought for an improper purpose. In the current case, Art should have counseled Patty against bringing a lawsuit for an improper purpose and made her aware of the legal basis of the claim and whether there were sufficient facts to bring a cause of action. Attorney representation can be expensive, and Art should not have taken a frivolous claim simply as a means of earning fees and wasting time. As a result, David will be able to show that the cause of action was brought for an improper purpose.

As previously noted, as long as David can show damages in the form of lost wages from days missed from work owing to the need to defend the lawsuit or other pecuniary losses, he will have sufficiently demonstrated the damages prong.

In conclusion, David will be successful in a claim for malicious prosecution against Art. Even though his case against Patty is not likely to be successful owing to the inability to demonstrate that Patty consciously knew that there was a lack of probable cause to the action. However, as an attorney, Art will be held to a higher professional standard, and he had an ethical duty to ensure that he only brings suit where there is a sufficient legal and factual basis and that the suit is not being brought for a frivolous purpose or to waste time or embarrass an opponent. As a result, he should be entitled to damages, based on the damages he incurred due to the inappropriate suit brought against him for strict liability.

Answer B to Question 1

1. Patty (P) v. David (D) – Motion to Dismiss Suit for Strict Liability

A motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim looks at the facts in a light most favorable to the party it is being asserted against. The court will then see if sufficient facts have been pled to sustain a prima facie case of the cause of action alleged. The court does not evaluate the merits nor go beyond the complaint.

In the present case, P filed a claim of strict liability for ultrahazardous activity against D. Therefore, the elements of the claim must be evaluated in light of the complaint to see if grant of the motion was proper. Additionally, the court noted the case would be dismissed because the damages alleged were not recoverable.

Strict Liability – Ultrahazardous Activity

Strict liability is tort liability without fault. It applies in cases of products liability, ultrahazardous activities, and wild animals. Here, the allegation is one of ultrahazardous activity. The elements of strict liability are 1) an absolute duty of care, 2) breach of that duty, 3) causation, and 4) damages.

Absolute Duty of Care – Is the activity an ultrahazardous activity?

For there to be an absolute duty of care (a duty that may not be met by reasonable protective measures), a court must decide if an activity is in fact ultrahazardous. An ultrahazardous activity is one where the activity is 1) highly dangerous even with remedial measures, and 2) not within common usage within the community. This is a question of law to be decided by the trial judge.

In the present case, D was driving a tanker truck filled with gasoline. P will argue that this is a dangerous activity, because no matter how safe D behaves the tanker is a giant gas bomb waiting to explode. D can argue that it is not that dangerous because, as the facts show, there was no explosion when the tanker crashed. However, because the

court will view the facts in a light favorable to P, the tanker is probably sufficiently dangerous.

However, the second element poses a problem for P. The activity must not be in common usage within the community. Here, D's tanker truck was transporting gas. This is an activity in common usage within all US communities, because gasoline is the primary fuel for automobiles, which is the most common method of transportation in the US. Additionally, gasoline must be transported by some means to service stations. Tanker trucks are the most common, if not [the] exclusive method of delivering gas to service stations in the US. Therefore, driving a tanker truck is an activity of common usage in City.

Therefore, the duty element has not been met, because driving a tanker truck is not an ultrahazardous activity.

Breach: if the duty element had been met, any damage caused by the ultrahazardous activity would be sufficient breach. Here, the truck crashed and blocked traffic for 2 hours.

Causation

Causation has 2 parts: 1) actual (factual) cause and 2) legal (proximate) cause. Both must be met for the causation element to be sustained.

Factual Cause

The test for factual cause is the "but for" test. This asked but for the defendant's conduct the injury would not have occurred. In the present case, but for D crashing the tanker on the bridge, P would not have been late for her delivery, the kidney would have been viable, and P would have been paid \$1,000. Viewing the facts in a light most favorable to P, factual cause is met.

Proximate Cause

Proximate cause is a question of foreseeability. First, the court must ask what is dangerous about the activity. Here, a tanker truck filled with gas is dangerous because it could explode or cause a fire. Second, the court will isolate the breach. Here, the breach was a crash that resulted in blocked traffic on the bridge. Lastly, the court will match up the danger of the activity to the breach; if they do not match up, then the injury is not the type of harm that would result from the ultrahazardous activity. Therefore, it would not be foreseeable. In the present case, the danger of explosion or fire does not match the breach of mere traffic jam. Thus, P's injury was not foreseeable.

Damages

Strict liability compensates damages from personal injury or property damages. In the present case, the type of harm is economic damages. Economic damages are those damages which result from the loss like lost wages or lost business opportunity. Therefore, there is not sufficient damage that P may be compensated for. While she may argue that the breach damaged the kidney. However, the kidney did not belong to her. At the very least it belonged to the kidney donor or the recipient. Additionally, one cannot have ownership interest in human tissue (see 13th Amendment). Thus, there is no personal injury or property damage that P has pled to sufficiently make a prima facie case.

Conclusion

The motion to dismiss was proper, because P did not sufficiently plead facts to sustain a cause of action of strict liability for an ultrahazardous activity. Tanker driving is not an ultrahazardous activity. There is no proximate causation between the crash and the loss of \$1,000. Additionally, the damages requirement is not met because it is mere economic damages. Additionally, the trial judge was correct to assert that P's alleged damages are unrecoverable.

2. D v. P and Art (A) – Malicious Prosecution

Malicious prosecution is a tort that protects the interest of only having process instituted against a party for proper purpose and only when there is a valid case. The elements are 1) institution of legal proceeding, 2) termination of case in plaintiff's favor, 3) absence of probable cause, 4) improper ulterior purpose for bringing legal process, and 5) damages.

Institution of proceedings: Typically, malicious prosecution involves the institution of criminal proceedings. However, institution of civil proceedings will sustain a cause of action as well. Here, P (under the advisement and representation of A) filed a civil claim for \$1,000 in lost damages in strict liability for an ultrahazardous activity (see above). A civil complaint was filed against D. This is sufficient to meet the first element/institution of legal proceeding.

Termination: The second element, termination of the case in plaintiff's favor, is met because the case was dismissed on failure to state a cause of action. This was a termination in D's favor, because he filed the motion to dismiss. The case was terminated on the granting of the motion.

Absence of probable cause

Probable cause is the reasonable belief that there was a valid cause of action. In the present case, P relied on A's advice as her attorney to form her basis of probable cause. A told her that he believed there was a plausible claim for strict liability. Reliance on counsel will sustain a finding of probable cause. Therefore, this element is not met, as to P.

A, on the other hand, probably did not have probable cause. As discussed above, the claim of strict liability lacked sufficient facts to make a prima facie case. The complaint was just so bad that an attorney with minimal competence could not have a reasonable belief that there was a valid cause of action based on strict liability. Therefore, this element is met as to A.

Improper purpose is any purpose except that of justice. Here, the just purpose would be to make P whole again, after the loss of her \$1,000. This is the point of tort liability: to make the plaintiff whole. In the present case, she wanted to “teach D a lesson.” P and A will argue that this is not improper because D should be a safer driver. D may argue that strict liability has no punitive damages; therefore, strict liability is not to punish. Therefore, teaching a lesson is an improper purpose.

Additionally, and more flagrantly, P believed that D could not afford the legal fees, and bringing the strict liability case would cause him to go out of business. A acquiesced in assisting her in the case. This is an improper purpose because the \$1,000 was not a lot of money to her, but it would be a total loss of D’s livelihood. This is not a proper basis for suit because it is merely to harass and damage D.

Defenses: A may assert that he would qualify for immunity based on the prosecutor exemption. However, this will not happen because of the exception for state prosecutors filing criminal charges.

Conclusion: D will probably prevail against A. However, he will probably not prevail against P, because she had probable cause.