

## PRESENTERS

### **Dr Andrew Butler, Crown Counsel, Crown Law Office, Wellington**

Andrew Butler has been Crown Counsel in the Crown Law Office's Human Rights team since 1999. Prior to that he was a senior lecturer at Victoria University of Wellington, specialising in human rights, public law and equity, trusts and restitution. He holds a BCL from University College Dublin, an LLM from Osgoode Hall Law School, Toronto and a PhD from the European University Institute, Florence. He has written extensively here and abroad on human rights and public law and is the general editor of *Equity and Trusts in New Zealand* (Brookers, Wellington, 2003).

### **Geoff McLay, Senior Lecturer in Law, Victoria University of Wellington**

Geoff McLay is a senior lecturer in law at Victoria, where he has taught since completing an LLM at the University of Michigan in 1994. At Victoria he has taught undergraduate and graduate courses including torts, advanced torts, intellectual property, competition law, comparative constitutional law, and ethics. He has published a wide range of articles in these areas and is the co-author of *Intellectual Property in New Zealand* (Lexis-Nexis, Wellington, 2002). In 2003 he was awarded a joint university research excellence award.

*The statements and conclusions contained in this booklet are those of the author(s) only and not those of the New Zealand Law Society. This booklet has been prepared for the purpose of a Continuing Legal Education course. It is not intended to be a comprehensive statement of the law or practice, and should not be relied upon as such. If advice on the law is required, it should be sought on a formal, professional basis.*

# CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Scope.....	1
A new substantive law of government liability.....	1
<b>2. A VERY SHORT HISTORY OF CROWN LIABILITY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Introduction- the importance of history .....	3
The “King can do no wrong” and the Petition of Right.....	3
<i>Petitions do not lie in tort</i> .....	4
<i>“The King can do wrong” and liability in tort</i> .....	4
<i>The officer on his (or her) own</i> .....	5
The colonies strike back.....	7
The Crown Proceedings Act 1950 .....	8
<i>The paradox of the Crown Proceedings Act – liability as an ordinary citizens for the extraordinary public</i> .....	9
<b>3. THE REVOLUTION IN PUBLIC AUTHORITY LAW.....</b>	<b>13</b>
The “equality principle”.....	13
The equality principle and administrative law – the example of <i>Takaro</i> .....	16
<b>4. NEGLIGENCE AND GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES.....</b>	<b>21</b>
Introduction .....	21
The general approach to finding a duty of care.....	22
<i>A genuinely difficult issue</i> .....	22
<i>The common law approach to the duty question</i> .....	23
<i>New Zealand – just muddling through</i> .....	24
Where does the obligation come from – the statute, the common law, the relationship between the government and the citizen? .....	27
Remedial gap or part of the essential division between public and private law? .....	30
Negligence, discretion and the interface with administrative law .....	33
<i>Lord Keith’s exclusionary rule</i> .....	34
<i>Liability within “justiciability”</i> .....	34
<i>The “policy- operational” distinction</i> .....	34
<i>The rejection of the policy –operational distinction</i> .....	35
<i>Barrett - A newer approach governmental discretion</i> .....	38
<i>Gorringe – A possible limitation on Barrett</i> .....	40
The new law of government inspections and the old law of supervision.....	42
<i>The building cases</i> .....	42
<i>(Non)liability of regulators</i> .....	43
<i>Carter- a man, a woman, a company and a boat</i> .....	46
<i>Rutherford – a relic of a forgotten theory?</i> .....	48
<i>Carter - the possibility of a claim for breach of statutory duty</i> .....	50
<i>Carter as the trend for the future</i> .....	51
A duty to prevent others causing harm?.....	51
Introduction.....	51
<i>Examples of cases where government might be said to have created a risk</i> .....	52
<i>Failure to prevent a crime or apprehend a criminal</i> .....	54
<i>Third parties, crimes and the common law</i> .....	57

<b>5. MISFEASANCE IN A PUBLIC OFFICE .....</b>	<b>63</b>
Introduction.....	63
The justification for the tort .....	64
The relationship between misfeasance and other torts.....	65
<i>Misfeasance and the other intentional torts</i> .....	65
<i>Misfeasance and negligence</i> .....	66
<i>The elements of the tort</i> .....	66
<i>The exercise of power as a public officer – the misfeasance/non-feasance divide</i> ....	68
<i>Targeted malice</i> .....	71
<i>Untargeted malice</i> .....	71
<i>Recklessness as to the legality</i> .....	72
<i>“Knowledge” of the harm</i> .....	72
<i>Problems with untargeted malice</i> .....	73
Duty to the plaintiff? .....	75
Causation, damage and remoteness .....	76
<b>6. THE VICARIOUS LIABILITY REVOLUTION.....</b>	<b>79</b>
The errant employee-sheeting home responsibility or overburdening the employer? ...	79
<i>The importance of expanding notions of vicarious liability</i> .....	79
<i>The traditional test</i> .....	79
<i>The traditional test and child sexual abuse</i> .....	80
<i>Limiting “enterprise liability”</i> .....	81
<i>Control rather than employment?</i> .....	82
The New Zealand approach .....	83
<i>Vicarious liability actions and exemplary damages</i> .....	85
<i>Exemplary damages and negligence</i> .....	86
<i>Exemplary damages for acts “attributable” to the Crown</i> .....	88
<i>Vicarious liability and misfeasance in a public office</i> .....	89
Non delegable duty – the revolution that wasn’t?.....	89
<i>Lewis</i> .....	89
<i>S and W - a case of non –delegable duties to prevent abuse?</i> .....	92
<i>But not a non-delegable duty in Canada</i> .....	92
<b>7. LIABILITY FOR BADLY CONDUCTED INVESTIGATIONS OR INQUIRIES .....</b>	<b>97</b>
Introduction.....	97
No duty of care?.....	98
Failure to follow the rules - a misfeasance in public office? .....	100
The damage requirement.....	102
Possible exceptions for liability .....	103
<i>“Witness immunity”</i> .....	103
<b>8. NUISANCE, RYLANDS V FLETCHER AND PUBLIC AUTHORITIES .....</b>	<b>111</b>
The land based torts as a loss spreading instrument through the community.....	111
<i>Thames Water-</i> the case for not spreading the loss .....	112
<i>Introduction</i> .....	112
<i>The facts</i> .....	112
The approach of the High Court and the Court of Appeal.....	112
<i>Ryland v Fletcher</i> and public authorities .....	113
<i>Thames Water</i> and the burden of public obligation .....	115

The importance of other means of redress .....	115
The Importance of the statutory scheme .....	115
Lord Hoffmann and the proper realm of public law - redux .....	116
Public law for a privatised company? .....	118
Human rights actions are subject to the same “public law” .....	118
<b>9. BORA/BAIGENT COMPENSATION .....</b>	<b>121</b>
Introduction .....	121
Comparable provisions .....	121
White Paper .....	122
<i>Baigent’s case</i> .....	123
Public law nature of the remedy .....	125
<i>Baigent’s case</i> .....	125
<i>Manga v Attorney-General</i> .....	126
<i>Dunlea v Attorney-General</i> .....	127
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	128
BORA compensation a discretionary remedy .....	128
Concurrent tortious and BORA liability/relationship between tort and BORA .....	130
<i>Baigent’s case</i> .....	130
<i>Manga v Attorney-General</i> .....	131
<i>Dunlea v Attorney-General</i> .....	132
<i>Wilding v Attorney-General</i> .....	134
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	134
Strict liability? .....	135
Statutory immunities .....	136
ACC bar .....	136
Scope of rights for which compensation an available remedy .....	137
<i>Administrative law damages?</i> .....	137
<i>Free movement</i> .....	141
<i>“Wrongful” convictions</i> .....	141
<i>Other rights</i> .....	143
Correct defendant(s) .....	143
Limitation periods and delay .....	146
<i>Limitation Act</i> .....	146
<i>Delay</i> .....	147
Mode of trial .....	147
Summary judgment .....	148
What is recoverable? .....	149
Contributory negligence, mitigation of losses and plaintiff’s (mis)conduct .....	150
Exemplary damages .....	150
<i>Caselaw</i> .....	150
<i>Author’s view</i> .....	151
Amounts .....	152
<i>BORA compensation only</i> .....	152
<i>Concurrent claims</i> .....	154
Conclusion .....	155
<b>10. DAMAGES FOR BREACH OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1993 .....</b>	<b>157</b>
The Human Rights Review Tribunal’s remedial powers .....	157
Damages and the Crown .....	157
Likely approach to damages .....	158

Deferred or modified remedies .....	159
<b>11. HUMAN RIGHTS DAMAGES: JUSTIFICATION STRIPPING – A COMBINED BORA/COMMON LAW APPROACH.....</b>	<b>161</b>
Introduction.....	161
<i>The conceptual uncertainty of Baigent’s case</i> .....	162
<i>The facts</i> .....	163
<i>The Courts’ holdings</i> .....	163
The notion of justification, stripping and government liability .....	164
<i>The “secret” law of government liability</i> .....	164
<i>Examples of justification stripping for m police liability</i> .....	165
<i>The common law and the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990</i> .....	166
<i>Tort and judicial review</i> .....	167
<i>Sugrue and justification stripping</i> .....	169
<i>The implications of justification stripping</i> .....	171
Creating immunities.....	171
The common law – human rights cocktail.....	173
<i>Introduction</i> .....	173
<i>Getting around immunities</i> .....	174
<i>Sugrue actions for the legal but unreasonable</i> .....	177
The advantage of common law .....	178
<i>Baigent damages are discretionary</i> .....	178
<i>Might you get more?</i> .....	178
<i>The question from Sugrue</i> .....	178
<i>The new law of contract and tort damages</i> .....	179
<i>“Remedial discretion” and allocating risk amongst the parties</i> .....	181
<i>Kuwait Airways and the damages revolution for actions in conversion</i> .....	181
<i>An example of police conversion as point of departure</i> .....	183
<i>Sugrue and speculation about damage for unreasonable search and seizure under     the bill of rights</i> .....	184