

Accessory Liability

Paul S Davies



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON

2015

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Foreword</i> | v |
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | vii |
| <i>Tables of Cases</i> | xvii |
| <i>Table of Legislation</i> | xxxi |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| I. What is Accessory Liability? | 1 |
| II. Why is Accessory Liability Important? | 2 |
| A. Pragmatic Factors | 3 |
| i. Insolvency | 3 |
| ii. Preserving Relationships | 3 |
| iii. Convenience | 3 |
| B. Moral Considerations | 4 |
| III. Doctrinal Difficulties in the Law of Obligations | 5 |
| A. Equity | 5 |
| B. Contract | 6 |
| C. Tort | 7 |
| IV. Looking Across the Legal Landscape | 8 |
| V. Approach of the Book | 10 |
| 2. Fundamentals | 12 |
| I. Principles Underpinning Accessory Liability | 12 |
| A. Responsibility | 12 |
| B. Culpability | 13 |
| C. Protecting Rights | 14 |
| D. Deterrence | 15 |
| E. Loss-shifting | 16 |
| F. Property | 17 |
| G. Law and Economics | 17 |
| H. Evidential Considerations | 18 |
| I. Consistency in the Law | 19 |
| J. Freedom of Action | 19 |
| K. Preliminary Conclusions | 20 |
| II. Conduct Element | 21 |
| A. ‘Aid, Abet, Counsel or Procure’ | 22 |
| i. Aid | 22 |
| ii. Abet | 24 |

| | |
|---|----|
| iii. Counsel | 27 |
| iv. Procure | 29 |
| B. Causation | 31 |
| i. <i>Novus Actus Interveniens</i> | 33 |
| ii. The Test of Causation | 36 |
| iii. Substantial Cause | 37 |
| C. Preliminary Conclusions: Causal Participation in a Primary Wrong | 39 |
| III. Mental Element | 40 |
| A. Intention | 41 |
| B. Knowledge | 42 |
| i. Content of Knowledge | 43 |
| ii. Standard of Knowledge | 44 |
| C. Dishonesty | 49 |
| D. Unconscionability | 50 |
| E. Recklessness | 51 |
| F. Negligence | 52 |
| G. Preliminary Conclusions | 52 |
| IV. Nature of Accessory Liability | 54 |
| V. Distinguishing Accessory Liability | 56 |
| A. Free-standing Duty of Care | 56 |
| B. Innocent Agency | 57 |
| C. Vicarious Liability | 58 |
| D. Corporate Attribution | 60 |
| E. Conspiracy | 61 |
| F. Joint Enterprise | 62 |
| 3. Crime | 64 |
| I. Scope of Accessory Liability | 64 |
| A. Co-principals | 65 |
| B. Joint Enterprise | 66 |
| C. Innocent Agency | 68 |
| D. Vicarious Liability | 69 |
| E. Conspiracy | 69 |
| F. Inchoate Liability for Assisting or Encouraging an Offence | 69 |
| II. Primary Offence | 70 |
| III. Conduct Element | 71 |
| IV. Mental Element | 75 |
| A. Intention | 75 |
| B. Knowledge | 76 |
| i. Content of Knowledge | 76 |
| ii. Standard of Knowledge | 77 |
| C. Recklessness | 78 |
| D. Negligence | 79 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| V. | Defences | 80 |
| | A. Defences Available to the Principal | 80 |
| | B. Withdrawal | 81 |
| | C. Duress | 82 |
| | D. Preventing the Commission of an Offence | 82 |
| | E. Acting Reasonably | 83 |
| VI. | Nature of Liability | 83 |
| VII. | Rationales of Liability | 85 |
| | A. Responsibility | 85 |
| | B. Culpability | 85 |
| | C. Evidential Considerations | 86 |
| | D. Public Acceptability | 86 |
| VIII. | Conclusions | 87 |
| 4. | Equity | 88 |
| I. | Seeds of Confusion: The Effect of <i>Barnes v Addy</i> | 88 |
| | A. Trustee <i>de son tort</i> | 90 |
| | B. Receipt-based Liability | 91 |
| | C. Accessory Liability: Knowingly Assisting a Dishonest and Fraudulent Design | 93 |
| II. | A New Start: <i>Royal Brunei Airlines Sdn Bhd v Tan</i> | 95 |
| III. | Primary Wrong: Breach of Contract | 96 |
| | A. Breach of Trust | 96 |
| | B. Breach of Fiduciary Duty | 99 |
| | C. Breach of Confidence | 100 |
| | D. Undue Influence | 102 |
| | E. Conclusions | 103 |
| IV. | Conduct Element | 104 |
| | A. Inducement | 104 |
| | B. Assistance | 106 |
| | C. Encouragement | 108 |
| | D. Causation | 108 |
| V. | Mental Element | 109 |
| | A. Knowledge | 109 |
| | i. Content of Knowledge | 110 |
| | ii. Standard of Knowledge | 112 |
| | B. Negligence | 114 |
| | C. Unconscionability | 115 |
| | D. Dishonesty | 116 |
| | i. Reception | 118 |
| | ii. Label | 119 |
| | iii. Misplaced Criminal Concept | 119 |
| | iv. <i>Actus Reus</i> or <i>Mens Rea</i> ? | 120 |
| | v. 'An Unnecessary Distraction, and Conducive to Error' | 121 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| vi. Implicit Defences | 122 |
| VI. Explaining Accessory Liability | 123 |
| A. Responsibility | 123 |
| B. Culpability | 123 |
| C. Protecting Rights | 124 |
| D. Deterrence | 125 |
| E. Loss-shifting | 125 |
| F. Property | 125 |
| VII. What Shape should Accessory Liability Take? | 126 |
| A. Distinguishing Inducement and Assistance | 127 |
| B. The Impact of a Defendant's Gain | 129 |
| C. One General Approach to Accessory Liability | 130 |
| 5. Contract | 132 |
| I. The Leading Case: <i>Lumley v Gye</i> | 132 |
| A. The Basis of <i>Lumley</i> | 133 |
| i. The Narrow View: Status | 133 |
| ii. The Broader View: Contract | 134 |
| B. Dealing with <i>Lumley</i> : Signs of Confusion | 135 |
| i. Requiring a Breach of Contract | 137 |
| ii. An 'Economic Tort'? | 138 |
| iii. The 'Genus Tort' | 140 |
| II. Accessory Liability Recognised: <i>OBG Ltd v Allan</i> | 141 |
| III. Primary Wrong | 142 |
| A. Type of Breach | 142 |
| B. Void, Voidable and Unenforceable Contracts | 143 |
| C. Exclusion Clauses and Force Majeure Clauses | 145 |
| IV. Conduct Element | 145 |
| A. Inducement | 145 |
| i. Prevention Distinguished | 146 |
| ii. Direct/Indirect | 147 |
| iii. Scope of Inducement | 149 |
| B. Assistance | 150 |
| C. Encouragement | 153 |
| D. Advice | 154 |
| E. Preliminary Conclusions | 156 |
| V. Mental Element | 156 |
| A. Malice | 156 |
| B. Intention | 157 |
| C. Knowledge | 158 |
| i. Content of Knowledge | 158 |
| ii. Standard of Knowledge | 159 |
| D. Negligence | 160 |
| E. Preliminary Conclusions | 161 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| VI. Explaining Accessory Liability | 162 |
| A. Responsibility | 162 |
| B. Culpability | 163 |
| C. Protecting Rights | 163 |
| D. Property | 164 |
| E. Deterrence | 165 |
| F. Loss-shifting | 165 |
| G. Positive Rationales for Accessory Liability: Preliminary Conclusions | 166 |
| VII. Against Accessory Liability: Defending Breach of Contract | 166 |
| A. Privity of Contract | 167 |
| B. Efficient Breach | 168 |
| C. Commercial Morality | 170 |
| D. Trade Unions | 171 |
| VIII. What Shape should Accessory Liability Take? | 172 |
| A. Fusion | 174 |
| 6. Tort | 177 |
| I. Mapping Accessory Liability in Tort Law | 177 |
| A. Early Orthodoxy: ‘Aid, Abet, Counsel or Procure’ | 177 |
| B. The Obscurity of Joint Tortfeasance | 178 |
| C. Distinguishing Accessory Liability | 180 |
| i. Vicarious Liability | 180 |
| ii. Conspiracy | 181 |
| iii. Innocent Agency | 181 |
| iv. Negligence | 182 |
| D. Bringing Out Accessory Liability | 182 |
| II. Primary Wrong | 183 |
| A. Necessity of Primary Tort | 183 |
| B. Can Accessory Liability Attach to All Primary Torts? | 184 |
| i. Breach of Statutory Duty | 184 |
| ii. Nuisance | 185 |
| iii. Intellectual Property Torts | 186 |
| iv. Negligence | 187 |
| III. Conduct Element | 188 |
| A. Combination | 188 |
| B. Authorisation | 191 |
| C. Inducement | 194 |
| D. Assistance | 195 |
| i. <i>CBS Songs Ltd v Amstrad Consumer Electronics plc</i> | 195 |
| ii. <i>Credit Lyonnais Bank Nederland NV (Now Generale Bank Nederland NV) v Export Credits Guarantee Department</i> | 196 |
| iii. Potential for a Wider Approach? | 198 |
| IV. Mental Element | 203 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| A. | Mirroring the Mental Element of the Primary Tort | 203 |
| B. | Intention | 205 |
| C. | Knowledge | 206 |
| i. | Content of Knowledge | 207 |
| ii. | Standard of Knowledge | 208 |
| V. | Explaining Liability | 209 |
| A. | Responsibility | 210 |
| B. | Culpability | 211 |
| C. | Protecting Rights | 211 |
| D. | Deterrence | 212 |
| E. | Economic Efficiency | 213 |
| VI. | What Shape should Accessory Liability Take? | 213 |
| A. | Concerns Surrounding Certainty | 214 |
| B. | Consistency with the Criminal Law | 216 |
| C. | Consistency with the Private Law | 219 |
| D. | Conclusions | 220 |
| 7. | Defences | 222 |
| I. | Defences Available to the Primary Wrongdoer | 223 |
| II. | Justification | 226 |
| A. | Equal or Superior Right | 230 |
| B. | Performance of a Duty | 234 |
| C. | Staple Article of Commerce | 240 |
| D. | Public Morals | 247 |
| E. | Statutory Justification | 248 |
| III. | Withdrawal | 250 |
| IV. | Limitation | 251 |
| V. | Conclusion | 253 |
| 8. | Remedies | 255 |
| I. | 'Secondary' Liability Exposed | 255 |
| II. | Compensation | 256 |
| A. | Equity | 256 |
| B. | Contract | 258 |
| C. | Tort | 261 |
| D. | Clauses Expressly Agreed with the Primary Wrongdoer | 261 |
| E. | Contributory Negligence | 263 |
| III. | Gain-based Awards | 264 |
| A. | Liability for the Primary Wrongdoer's Gain | 264 |
| B. | Accounting for the Accessory's Gain | 267 |
| IV. | Hypothetical Bargain Measure of Damages | 269 |
| V. | Contribution | 271 |
| VI. | Punitive Damages | 272 |
| VII. | Injunction | 274 |
| VIII. | Combining Remedies | 275 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 9. Conclusions | 279 |
| I. 'Knowing Assistance' | 279 |
| II. A Standard Approach Across All Obligations | 283 |
| III. The Nature of Accessory Liability | 284 |
| IV. A Narrow But Coherent Law of Accessory Liability | 285 |
| | |
| <i>Index</i> | 287 |