

Negligence and Illegality

Sharon Erbacher



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON

2017

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>Preface</i> | v |
| <i>Table of Cases</i> | xiii |
| <i>Table of Legislation</i> | xix |
| | |
| 1. Introduction..... | 1 |
| I. The Disordered State of Illegality Doctrine..... | 1 |
| II. Taxonomy of Illegality Claims in Negligence Law | 2 |
| A. Categories of Claims Arising from an Illegality..... | 2 |
| B. Review of the Current Law | 4 |
| i. The Physical Injury Cases..... | 4 |
| ii. Sanction-shifting and Related Claims | 7 |
| iii. Illegal Profits and Earnings | 7 |
| C. Academic Commentary..... | 8 |
| III. Book Purpose | 8 |
| IV. Scope and Terminology | 12 |
| V. Structure | 14 |
| VI. Focus on the Common Law..... | 15 |
| 2. Theoretical Perspectives..... | 17 |
| I. Introduction | 17 |
| II. Debates about the Proper Basis of Tort Law..... | 17 |
| III. Main Features of Corrective Justice Theory | 19 |
| IV. Reasons for Adopting a Corrective Justice Framework..... | 21 |
| V. Key Implications of Adopting a Corrective Justice Framework | 24 |
| VI. Public Policy and Corrective Justice..... | 28 |
| A. Terminology | 28 |
| B. Extra-relational Public Policy..... | 29 |
| C. Relational ‘Policy’ of Legal Coherence | 30 |
| VII. Conclusion | 31 |
| 3. The Tort–Crime Interface..... | 32 |
| I. Introduction | 32 |
| II. Consistency between Tort Law and Criminal Law an Important Value of the Legal System | 33 |
| III. An Award of Compensation is not ‘Profit’..... | 36 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| IV. | Illegality Doctrine Does Not Support the Criminal Law in a Conceptually Coherent or Rational Way | 39 |
| V. | Conclusion | 42 |
| 4. | Policy and Discretion..... | 43 |
| I. | Overview | 43 |
| II. | Defining Public Policy | 44 |
| III. | Public Policy Out in the Open | 45 |
| IV. | Lord Sumption's Stance Against Public Policy Reasoning..... | 48 |
| V. | Evaluation of a Public Policy Approach..... | 50 |
| A. | The Destabilising Effect of Public Policy Reasoning on the Law of Illegality..... | 51 |
| B. | Incommensurability..... | 54 |
| VI. | Public Policy in Negligence Claims..... | 57 |
| VII. | Are These Objections to Public Policy Reasoning Overstated?..... | 60 |
| VIII. | Concluding Remarks on Public Policy | 62 |
| IX. | A Structured Discretion | 62 |
| A. | A Judicially Structured Discretion..... | 64 |
| i. | A Structured Discretion Introduces a Theoretical Incoherence into Negligence Law..... | 65 |
| ii. | A Structured Discretion Will Make Decisions More Difficult and Unpredictable | 66 |
| B. | A Statutorily Structured Discretion | 68 |
| X. | Conclusion | 70 |
| 5. | The Connection Tests | 72 |
| I. | Overview | 72 |
| II. | The Reliance Test | 74 |
| III. | The Inextricable Link (Sufficient Connection) Test | 78 |
| IV. | The Causation Test | 84 |
| A. | Overview of the Causation Test..... | 84 |
| B. | Development of the Causation Test in the United Kingdom..... | 85 |
| C. | The Doctrinal Incoherence of a Causation Test | 90 |
| i. | No Valid Test for Identifying the Claimant's Illegal Conduct as the Effective Cause of the Harm | 90 |
| ii. | A Causation Test is Inconsistent with 'Scope of Liability' Causation | 93 |
| D. | The Conceptual Incoherence of the Causation Test..... | 98 |
| V. | A Statutory Causation Test..... | 101 |
| A. | Overview of the Statutory Defences..... | 101 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| B. | The Statutory Defences are Inconsistent with the Correlative Structure of Negligence Liability | 102 |
| VI. | Conclusion | 104 |
| 6. | Overview of the Coherence Rationale | 105 |
| I. | Introduction..... | 105 |
| II. | The Principle of Coherence is not Dependent on Corrective Justice for its Validity..... | 107 |
| III. | Concerns about Legal Coherence are Relational Concerns..... | 108 |
| IV. | Categories of Claims Where a Legal Incoherence Might Arise..... | 110 |
| A. | Allowing Recovery would Enable the Claimant to Escape the Effects of the Law Proscribing the Conduct..... | 111 |
| B. | Allowing Recovery would Enable the Claimant to Profit from Wrongdoing..... | 111 |
| i. | Exemplary Damages..... | 112 |
| ii. | Illegal Profits and Earnings..... | 114 |
| V. | The Limited Application of the Coherence Rationale to Personal Injury Claims..... | 115 |
| VI. | Other Misappropriations of the Coherence Rationale | 117 |
| VII. | Does an Exclusive Focus on Legal Coherence Result in an Unjustifiably Narrow Doctrine of Illegality?..... | 119 |
| VIII. | Conclusion | 121 |
| 7. | Statutory Purpose | 123 |
| I. | Introduction..... | 123 |
| II. | Brief Overview of <i>Miller v Miller</i> | 125 |
| III. | Implications of the Statutory Purpose Explanation | 127 |
| IV. | Evaluation of the Statutory Purpose Explanation: Claims for Harm Sustained in the Course of Committing an Illegal Act | 128 |
| A. | Discerning Statutory Purpose can be a Highly Speculative Exercise..... | 128 |
| B. | Appeals to Statutory Purpose can Involve Unarticulated Value and Policy Judgements..... | 134 |
| C. | Focus on Statutory Purpose Distracts the Court from a Relational Analysis of Duty of Care | 137 |
| V. | Evaluation of the Statutory Purpose Explanation: Sanction-shifting Claims and Claims for Illegal Profits and Earnings | 138 |
| VI. | Statutory Purpose Explanation Is Arguably Better Adapted to Other Areas of Private Law Illegality..... | 140 |
| VII. | Conclusion | 142 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 8. | No Loss or Damage: Sanction-shifting and Related Claims..... | 144 |
| I. | Introduction..... | 144 |
| II. | Background..... | 145 |
| III. | The Consistency Rule | 146 |
| A. | Overview of the Consistency Rule..... | 146 |
| B. | Is there a Convincing Rationale for a Consistency Rule Tied to the Claimant’s Culpability?..... | 149 |
| IV. | A Corrective Justice Perspective..... | 152 |
| A. | Introduction | 152 |
| B. | Overview of the No Loss or Damage Explanation | 153 |
| i. | Proposition One: No Violation of a Right (No Damage) | 153 |
| ii. | Proposition Two: No Legal Value (No Loss) | 155 |
| C. | The No Loss or Damage Explanation is Compatible with a Loss-based Model of Negligence Law | 157 |
| V. | Loss or Damage that is Irrecoverable..... | 160 |
| A. | Pecuniary Penalties..... | 160 |
| B. | Non-pecuniary Losses Resulting from Detention | 162 |
| VI. | Loss or Damage that is Recoverable..... | 165 |
| A. | Loss of Earning Capacity | 166 |
| B. | Other Non-pecuniary Damages | 169 |
| C. | Claims to be Indemnified for a Third Party Civil Liability | 170 |
| VII. | Culpability of the Claimant is Irrelevant..... | 173 |
| VIII. | Corporate Responsibility..... | 176 |
| IX. | Conclusion | 180 |
| 9. | No Loss or Damage: Illegal Profits and Earnings..... | 181 |
| I. | Introduction..... | 181 |
| II. | The No Legal Value Proposition | 182 |
| III. | Relevance of the Proceeds of Crime Legislation | 184 |
| IV. | Statement of the No Legal Value Proposition | 185 |
| V. | Application of the No Legal Value Proposition to the Case Law | 186 |
| A. | Illegal Earnings | 186 |
| B. | Illegal Profits..... | 188 |
| VI. | Application of the Statutory Purpose Explanation..... | 191 |
| VII. | Onus of Proof | 192 |
| VIII. | Conclusion | 193 |
| 10. | A Relational Explanation: Joint Illegal Enterprise Cases | 194 |
| I. | Introduction..... | 194 |
| II. | The Illegal Relationship Between the Parties will not of <i>Itself</i> Negate Duty of Care | 196 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| III. | Background: The Standard of Care Approach | 197 |
| A. | Development of the Standard of Care Approach | 197 |
| B. | The Standard of Care Approach is not an Appropriate Explanation of the Joint Illegality Cases | 199 |
| IV. | The Relationship Between the Parties Is such that the Claimant Cannot Expect the Defendant to Act Carefully (the <i>Joyce</i> Principle) | 201 |
| V. | Support for the <i>Joyce</i> Principle in the United Kingdom | 204 |
| VI. | The <i>Joyce</i> Principle should be Adopted as the Basis for Resolving Joint Illegality Cases..... | 205 |
| VII. | Is an ‘All or Nothing’ Approach Ever Appropriate? | 207 |
| VIII. | Corrective Justice Requires an Examination into the Standard of Care that could Reasonably be Expected | 208 |
| IX. | The Requirements for the Establishment of the <i>Joyce</i> Principle | 212 |
| X. | Application of the <i>Joyce</i> Principle to Joint Illegal Enterprise Cases..... | 213 |
| A. | Nature, Purpose and Scope of the Joint Enterprise..... | 213 |
| B. | Time at Which the Claimant’s Knowledge of the Risks Is to be Assessed | 215 |
| XI. | Joint Illegal Relations that Displace the Normal Standard of Care | 216 |
| A. | The Joyriding Cases..... | 216 |
| B. | Illegal Road-racing | 220 |
| C. | Fleeing the Scene of a Crime | 221 |
| XII. | Does the <i>Joyce</i> Principle Give an Unjustified Advantage to a Criminal Accomplice? | 223 |
| XIII. | Interaction with Defences | 224 |
| XIV. | Conclusion | 226 |
| 11. | Conclusion | 227 |
| | <i>Index</i> | 233 |