

## PRESENTERS



### **Andrew Barker QC, Shortland Chambers, Auckland**

Andrew is a barrister in practice at Shortland Chambers. He formerly lectured in tort law at the University of Otago. Andrew has written and presented extensively on issues in tort law, and negligence liability in particular, as well as more general issues in commercial litigation.



### **Professor Geoff McLay, Victoria University, Wellington**

Geoff has taught and written about the law of torts throughout his 20-plus years at Victoria University. He has also taught torts in both Canada and the United States. Geoff served as Law Commissioner from 2010 – 2015, currently serves as the chair of the Legislation Design Advisory Committee’s external subcommittee and is also the editor of the New Zealand Law Reports.

*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.*

Cover and text stocks used in this publication are from Forestry Stewardship Council certified mills, manufactured under the environmentally responsible paper manufactured environmental management system ISO 14001, using pulp from well managed forests and other controlled sources.

# CONTENTS

<b>1. NEGLIGENT MISSTATEMENT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
<i>Carter Holt Harvey v Ministry of Education</i> .....	4
<i>NRAM Ltd (formerly NRAM plc) v Steel</i> .....	6
<i>Playboy Club London Ltd v Banca Nazionale Del Lavoro SpA</i> .....	9
CONCLUSION.....	10
<i>Building negligence – Southland Indoor Leisure Centre Charitable Trust v Invercargill City Council</i> .....	11
<i>James Hardie PLC v White</i> .....	15
<b>2. REMOTENESS OF DAMAGES .....</b>	<b>19</b>
CAUSATION IN THE LAW OF NEGLIGENCE.....	19
THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF REMOTENESS.....	20
THE SCOPE OF THE DUTY OF CARE – <i>SAAMCO</i> .....	21
<i>SHERWIN CHAN &amp; WALSHE LTD V JONES</i> .....	22
<i>HUGHES-HOLLAND V BPE SOLICITORS</i> .....	24
<i>Other subsequent UK decisions</i> .....	26
<i>Impact in New Zealand</i> .....	29
<b>3. MIXED TEA LEAVES FOR THE FUTURE OF ACCIDENT COMPENSATION?.....</b>	<b>31</b>
MENTAL CONSEQUENCES.....	31
<i>The Christchurch attacks and calls for ACC reform</i> .....	31
THE IMPORTANCE OF <i>W</i> : RETHINKING THE LINK BETWEEN MENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND PHYSICAL INJURY .....	32
ACC AND THE LINE BETWEEN ILLNESS AND ACCIDENTS .....	33
ACCIDENT COMPENSATION AND THE “HUG OF DEATH”: ARE ENVIRONMENTAL DISEASES COVERED? .....	35
<b>4. DEFAMATION: QUITE A BIT OF SOUND AND FURY, BUT WHERE TO NEXT? .....</b>	<b>37</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	37
THE BILL OF RIGHTS AND DEFAMATION: SIMPLICITY RESTORED .....	37
<i>The really big news: Durie v Gardiner – defence of responsible communication on a matter of public interest</i> .....	37
<i>The Bill of Rights and settlement agreements</i> .....	43
DISPOSAL OF CLAIMS FOR INSUFFICIENT DAMAGE .....	44
<i>Introduction</i> .....	44
<i>The Jameel principle</i> .....	44
<i>Adoption of the Jameel principle in New Zealand</i> .....	45
<i>Access to justice concerns – and a retreat from Jameel?</i> .....	45
<i>STOCKER V STOCKER</i> – INTERPRETATION OF SOCIAL MEDIA POSTS.....	48
<i>CRAIG V WILLIAMS</i> – JURY DIRECTIONS ON QUALIFIED PRIVILEGE AND DEFAMATION DAMAGES.....	49
<i>The background</i> .....	49
<i>Reply to attack qualified privilege – where does justification fit in?</i> .....	49
<i>The Judge’s misdirections on when qualified privilege is lost</i> .....	50
<i>Were the misdirections material?</i> .....	50
<i>Defamation damages – excessive awards and guidance for the jury</i> .....	51
<i>MEDIAWORKS TV LTD V STAPLES</i> – PROTECTION OF SOURCES IN DEFAMATION PROCEEDINGS.....	52
<i>Introduction</i> .....	52
<i>The relevance of the source’s identity in establishing defences of truth and honest opinion</i> .....	53
<i>Illegality and unlawfulness</i> .....	54
<i>Public interest in the media’s communication of information to the public and their access to sources</i> .....	54
<b>5. CONSPIRACY .....</b>	<b>57</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	57
WHAT IS THE TORT OF CONSPIRACY? .....	57
CONSPIRACY BY UNLAWFUL MEANS .....	58
<i>Wagner v Gill</i> .....	59
<i>JSC BTA Bank v Ablyazov</i> .....	61

<b>6. TRESPASS AND NUISANCE .....</b>	<b>65</b>
THE NATURE OF NUISANCE – BACK TO THE EMPIRE APARTMENT COMPLEX.....	65
<i>The Supreme Court’s decision in Wu v Body Corporate 366611</i> .....	65
<i>How was BEMA different from Wu?</i> .....	67
SOME INTERESTING CASES ABOUT LICENCES.....	68
NUISANCE – A WAY OF PROTECTING PRIVACY? .....	69
<b>7. NON-DELEGABLE DUTIES AND VICARIOUS LIABILITY .....</b>	<b>71</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	71
THE BASIC PROBLEM RESTATED .....	71
WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN VICARIOUS LIABILITY AND A NON-DELEGABLE DUTY? .....	73
COMMENT MADE IN THE 2016 SEMINAR BOOK .....	74
DEVELOPMENT SINCE 2016 SEMINAR.....	74
COX – THE CARELESS NON-EMPLOYED EMPLOYEE.....	75
<i>The application of Cox to foster parents</i> .....	77
MAHAMUD AND THE THUG EMPLOYEE.....	78
<i>The thug employee becomes the thug boss at the Christmas party</i> .....	79