

---

---

# Contents

---

---

Preface to the Sixth Edition	xxi
Acknowledgments	xxiii

---

---

PART I  
Liability for Manufacturing Defects 1

---

---

CHAPTER ONE	Manufacturers' Strict Liability for Defect-Caused Harm	3
A.	The Role of Negligence in the Formative Period	4
1.	Negligence from First-Year Torts	4
2.	The Fall of the Privity Rule	6
3.	The Rise of Res Ipsa Loquitur	8
	<i>Escola v. Coca-Cola Bottling Co.</i>	9
	Authors' Dialogue 1	13
B.	The Modern Rule of Strict Liability in Tort	14
1.	Implied Warranty as a Bridge to Strict Liability in the 1950s and Early 1960s	14
	<i>Greenman v. Yuba Power Products, Inc.</i>	16
2.	Adoption of §402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts in 1965	19
	<i>Pulley v. Pacific Coca-Cola Bottling Co.</i>	20
3.	Codification of the Strict Liability Rule in the Restatement (Third) of Torts in 1998	22
	Problem One	23
4.	Policy Objectives Supporting Strict Liability in Tort	25
	James A. Henderson, Jr., Coping with the Time Dimension in Products Liability	26
	Problem Two	28
5.	Why Strict Liability for Manufacturing Defects Is a Workable Liability System	30
	James A. Henderson, Jr., Why Negligence Dominates Tort	30
C.	Defect as the Linchpin of Strict Products Liability	33
1.	What Makes a Product Defective? (The Conceptual Dimension)	33
	<i>Cronin v. J. B. E. Olson Corp.</i>	33
	Problem Three	37
2.	How Does the Plaintiff Prove Original Defect? (The Practical Dimension)	38
	<i>Speller v. Sears, Roebuck &amp; Co.</i>	40
	Note: Sanctions for Spoliation in Products Liability Litigation	44
	Problem Four	46

D. The Boundaries of Strict Products Liability	47
1. What Are (and What Are Not) Products?	47
<i>Winter v. G. P. Putnam's Sons</i>	50
Problem Five	55
Postscript on Blood and Other Human Tissue	55
2. Which Activities Constitute "Selling or Otherwise Distributing" in a Commercial Context?	57
<i>Magrine v. Krasnica</i>	60
3. When Is a Product Seller or Other Distributor "In the Business of Selling or Distributing"?	66
Authors' Dialogue 2	67
CHAPTER TWO      Assigning Responsibility Inside and Outside the Commercial Chain of Distribution	69
A. Allocating Responsibility Between Product Distributors and Other Defendants and Among Members of the Distributive Chain	69
1. Joint and Several Liability	69
2. Letting Retailers and Wholesalers Out of the Litigation	72
Authors' Dialogue 3	74
Problem Six	76
3. Contribution Among Members of the Distributive Chain	76
4. Indemnity Rights up the Distributive Chain	78
5. Settlement and Release Between the Plaintiff and Members of the Distributive Chain	80
B. Assigning Responsibility Collectively to the Distributive Chain	82
1. Holding Members of the Distributive Chain Liable Collectively in the Normal Course of Events	84
2. Special Circumstances that May Justify a More Aggressive Approach to Shifting Responsibility to the Entire Chain	85
Problem Seven	90
Charles W. Wolfram, Modern Legal Ethics	95
C. Assigning Responsibility for Product-Related Workplace Accidents	97
1. Direct Attack by the Employee Against the Employer	97
a. The Worker Compensation Bar to Employer Tort Liability	97
b. The Intentional Tort Exception to the Worker Compensation Bar	97
<i>Laidlow v. Hariton Machinery Co.</i>	101
c. The Dual Capacity Doctrine	109
2. Allocating Responsibility Between the Employer (the Worker Compensation System) and the Product Manufacturer (the Products Liability System)	111
<i>Kotecki v. Cyclops Welding Corp.</i>	111
Authors' Dialogue 4	116
CHAPTER THREE      Causation	119
A. Did the Product Actually Cause the Plaintiff's Harm?	120
1. But-For Causation in General	120

2. Special Problems of Proof: Circumstantial Evidence	121
3. Special Problems of Proof: Reliance on Experts	122
<i>Rider v. Sandoz Pharmaceutical Corp.</i>	127
Authors' Dialogue 5	131
Problem Eight	133
B. Did the Defendant Supply the Product?	134
1. Defendant Identification in General	134
2. Creative Attempts to Solve a Unique Problem: Market Share	135
Problem Nine	140
C. Did the Defect in the Defendant's Product Contribute to Harming the Plaintiff?	141
1. All-or-Nothing Causation	141
<i>Midwestern V.W. Corp. v. Ringley</i>	141
<i>Gigus v. Giles &amp; Ransome, Inc.</i>	144
Authors' Dialogue 6	146
Problem Ten	146
2. Enhanced Injury	147
<i>Lahocki v. Contee Sand &amp; Gravel Co.</i>	147
Authors' Dialogue 7	152
3. Loss-of-a-Chance	153
Problem Eleven	155
D. Did the Defective Product Proximately Cause the Plaintiff's Harm?	155
<i>Union Pump Co. v. Allbritton</i>	155
Authors' Dialogue 8	159
Problem Twelve	162
Problem Thirteen	164

## PART II

## Liability for Generic Product Risks 165

---

CHAPTER FOUR	Liability for Defective Design	167
A.	Do We Need Governmental Review of Product Designs? Why Not Leave Responsibility for Design Safety Entirely to the Market?	169
B.	If We Need Governmental Review of Product Designs, Why Not Rely Primarily on Nonjudicial Regulatory Agencies? Why Rely So Heavily on the Tort Liability System?	170
C.	If We Must Rely Primarily on the Tort System, Why Limit Liability to Defect-Caused Harm? Why Not Adopt Broad Enterprise Liability?	172
	James A. Henderson, Jr., Why Negligence Dominates Tort	173
D.	If We Need a Defect-Based Judicially Administered Liability System, Must We Rely on External Standards for Defective Design? (Inferring Defect from Product Malfunction)	175
E.	External, Objective Risk-Utility Standards for Determining Design Defect	177

1. The Reasonable Alternative Design Standard for Determining Design Defect	177
a. Defining the Standard for Determining Design Defect	180
<i>Smith v. Louisville Ladder Co.</i>	180
<i>Bourne v. Marty Gilman, Inc.</i>	187
Problem Fourteen	193
Authors' Dialogue 9	194
Problem Fifteen	196
b. From Which Vantage Point in Time Should the Product Be Judged? Time of Manufacture, Time of Sale, or Time of Trial?	197
(1) Manufacturers' Responsibility for Post-Sale Increases in Knowledge of Risk	198
(2) Manufacturers' Responsibility for Post-Sale Improvements in Risk-Avoidance Techniques	199
(a) State of the Art as a Defense	199
<i>Boatland of Houston, Inc. v. Bailey</i>	200
(b) Admissibility of Subsequent Remedial Measures	207
(3) Manufacturers' Responsibility for Post-Sale Shifts in Public Attitudes Toward Risk	211
c. How Do Negligence and Strict Liability Theories Differ? Should Design Claims Be Submitted to Juries on Both Theories?	213
(1) How Do Negligence and Strict Liability Theories of Defective Design Differ in Substance?	213
(2) Should Trial Courts Give Juries Design Claims on Both Negligence and Strict Liability Theories in the Same Case?	214
<i>Lecy v. Bayliner Marine Corp.</i>	214
d. Can a Warning Substitute for a Reasonable Alternative Design?	219
<i>Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Company v. Martinez</i>	219
2. Product Category Liability	226
<i>O'Brien v. Muskin Corp.</i>	226
James A. Henderson, Jr. & Aaron D. Twerski, Closing the American Products Liability Frontier: The Rejection of Liability Without Defect	234
Ellen Wertheimer, The Smoke Gets in Their Eyes: Product Category Liability and Alternative Feasible Designs in the Third Restatement	237
Carl T. Bogus, War on the Common Law: The Struggle at the Center of Products Liability	239
<i>Parish v. Jumping, Inc.</i>	242
<i>Dawson v. Chrysler Corp.</i>	246
Authors' Dialogue 10	250
F. The Consumer Expectations Standard for Determining Design Defect	254
1. Consumer Expectations as a Sword to Impose Liability	255
<i>Heaton v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	255
<i>Potter v. Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co.</i>	260

Problem Sixteen	267
The Uniform Commercial Code and the Consumer Expectations Test	267
2. Consumer Expectations as a Shield Against Liability	269
<i>Halliday v. Sturm, Ruger &amp; Co.</i>	269
Authors' Dialogue 11	276
G. The Two-Prong Standard for Determining Design Defect	278
<i>Soule v. General Motors Corp.</i>	278
Authors' Dialogue 12	288
Problem Seventeen	289
H. Idiosyncratic Standards for Determining Design Defect	290
I. Special Duty Problems in Design Litigation	292
1. Whether and to What Extent Should Courts Defer to Markets on a Case-by-Case Basis?	292
<i>Linegar v. Armour of America, Inc.</i>	292
<i>Scarangella v. Thomas Built Buses, Inc.</i>	295
Authors' Dialogue 13	300
2. Whether and to What Extent Should Courts Defer to Safety Statutes or Administrative Regulations?	300
3. Beyond the Pale: High Profile No-Duty Cases	304
<i>Hamilton v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.</i>	304
<i>In re September 11 Litigation</i>	309
J. Relying on Expert Testimony to Prove Design Defect: <i>Daubert</i> Revisited	312
K. Special Problems of Misuse, Alteration, and Modification	314
<i>Morguson v. 3M Co.</i>	316
 CHAPTER FIVE      Liability for Failure to Warn	 323
A. The Basic Duty to Warn at Time of Sale	324
1. The General Rule	324
2. No Duty to Warn of Obvious or Generally Known Risks	326
<i>Jamieson v. Woodward &amp; Lothrop</i>	327
<i>Greene v. A.P. Products, Ltd.</i>	332
Problem Eighteen	339
To Speak or Not to Speak; Or, "Digging Your Own Grave with the Best of Intentions"	340
Problem Nineteen	341
3. No Duty to Warn of Unknowable Risks	341
<i>Anderson v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.</i>	342
Liability Insurance and Long-Tail, Unknowable Risks	349
<i>Olson v. Prosooco, Inc.</i>	350
4. Informed-Choice Warnings	352
Problem Twenty	355
<i>Liriano v. Hobart Corp.</i>	356
Authors' Dialogue 14	360
B. Who Must Warn Whom?	361
<i>Persons v. Salomon North America, Inc.</i>	361

C. The Sufficiency of the Defendant’s Warning	367
<i>Tesmer v. Rich Ladder Co.</i>	368
Problem Twenty-One	371
<i>Lewis v. Sea Ray Boats, Inc.</i>	373
James A. Henderson, Jr. & Aaron D. Twerski, Doctrinal Collapse in Products Liability: The Empty Shell of Failure to Warn	377
<i>Broussard v. Continental Oil Co.</i>	380
D. Post-Sale Warnings	384
<i>Lovick v. Wil-Rich</i>	385
E. Special Problems with Proximate Cause	391
1. Would the Product User/Consumer Have Heeded an Adequate Warning?	391
<i>Golonka v. General Motors Corp.</i>	394
2. If the User/Consumer Had Heeded the Warning, Would the Plaintiff’s Harm Have Been Reduced/Avoided?	400
3. What If the Defendant’s Failure to Warn Causes Plaintiff to Suffer Harm from Another Product	401
<i>Powell v. Standard Brands Paint Co.</i>	401
Authors’ Dialogue 15	402
4. Did the Plaintiff Suffer the Sort of Harm that an Adequate Warning Would Have Aimed at Preventing?	405
Problem Twenty-Two	406
F. Other Forms of Defective Marketing	406
 CHAPTER SIX	 409
Express Warranty and Misrepresentation	
A. Express Warranty	409
1. What Is Warranted	409
<i>Baxter v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	411
Problem Twenty-Three	412
2. Basis of the Bargain—The Reliance Controversy	413
<i>Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc.</i>	414
<i>Yarusso v. International Sport Marketing, Inc.</i>	421
Note: The Implied Warranty of Fitness for Particular Purpose	424
B. Misrepresentation	425
<i>Crocker v. Winthrop Laboratories</i>	427
Note: Representations as the Mood Music for Determining Product Defect Under Existing Law	433
 CHAPTER SEVEN	 435
Federal Preemption	
A. Federal Preemption of Warning Claims	436
<i>Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc.</i>	437
Authors’ Dialogue 16	447
Note: FDA-Approved Warnings: The Preemption War	448
<i>In Re Vioxx Products Liability Litigation</i>	449
Note: Claims Based on Fraud on the FDA	461

Note: FIFRA Warnings: Limiting Preemption	462
B. Federal Preemption of Design Defect Claims	465
<i>Geier v. American Honda Motor Co.</i>	467
CHAPTER EIGHT      Affirmative Defenses	479
A. Conduct-Based Defenses	479
1. Background Principles	479
a. Introduction	479
b. Contributory Negligence	480
c. Comparative Fault	481
(1) Multiple Defendants	482
(a) Unit Rule	482
(b) Individual Rule	482
(2) Assumption of the Risk and Last Clear Chance	482
(3) Superseding Cause	483
<i>Barry v. Quality Steel Products, Inc.</i>	483
2. Application of Comparative Fault in Products Liability	488
a. Can Fault and Defect Be Compared?	489
(1) Manufacturing Defects: Comparing Apples and Oranges	489
(2) Generic Defects: Comparing Fault Under Risk-Utility Balancing	490
b. Should Fault and Defect Be Compared?	490
(1) Are Products Liability Cases Different?	490
<i>Webb v. Navistar Int’l 1994 Transportation Corp.</i>	490
Social Control of Product-Related Accidents: The Seat Belt Defense and Governmental Control of Drivers’ Behavior	501
(2) The Crashworthiness Imbroglia: Should Fault Be Compared with Enhanced Injury?	502
<i>D’Amario v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	502
(3) Should Plaintiff’s Fault Be Compared with Defendant’s Breach of Express Warranty?	508
(4) No Duty/Primary Assumption of Risk: Reintroducing Plaintiff’s Conduct as a Total Bar	509
<i>Green v. Allendale Planting Co. &amp; the KBH Corp.</i>	510
Problem Twenty-Four	514
c. Is Comparative Fault a Defense that Only Defendants Can Raise, or Can Plaintiffs Use It as an Affirmative Gambit?	514
B. Non-Conduct-Based Defenses	515
1. Time-Based Defenses	515
Authors’ Dialogue 17	516
a. Open-Ended Time Bars	516
(1) Knowledge of Injury as a Trigger	518
(2) Knowledge of the Causal Connection Between the Injury and the Product as a Trigger	518
(3) Knowledge of the Defendant’s Identity as a Trigger	520
b. Fixed-Period Time Bars	520
Problem Twenty-Five	522

Note: Constitutionality of Statutes of Repose	523
2. Contract-Based Defenses	524
3. Worker Compensation Barriers	525
4. Governmental Immunity	525
5. Government Contractor Defense	525

### PART III Special Problem Areas 529

---

CHAPTER NINE	Special Products and Product Markets	531
A.	Component Parts and Raw Materials	531
	<i>Zaza v. Marquess &amp; Nell, Inc.</i>	531
	Authors' Dialogue 18	540
B.	Prescription Drugs and Medical Devices	540
1.	Liability Based on Failure to Warn	541
a.	Warning the Health Care Provider	541
	<i>Sterling Drug, Inc. v. Yarrow</i>	543
b.	Warning the Patient Directly	549
	<i>Perez v. Wyeth Laboratories Inc.</i>	550
2.	Liability for Defective Drug Designs	561
	<i>Brown v. Superior Court (Abbott Laboratories)</i>	561
	Authors' Dialogue 19	561
	James A. Henderson, Jr. & Aaron D. Twerski, Drug Designs <i>Are Different</i>	570
	George W. Conk, The True Test: Alternative Safer Designs for Drugs and Medical Devices in a Patent-Constrained Market	575
3.	Pharmacists' Liability for Prescription Products	578
C.	Used Products	581
1.	The Tort Rules Governing Liability	581
	<i>Crandell v. Larkin and Jones Appliance Co.</i>	581
	Note: Tort and Contract—Something Old, Something New	584
2.	The Role of Disclaimers in Determining Liability for Used Products	586
	Problem Twenty-Six	591
	Authors' Dialogue 20	592
D.	Food, Nonprescription Drugs, and Cosmetics	593
1.	Food Products	593
2.	Nonprescription Drugs and Cosmetics	598
CHAPTER TEN	Special Elements of the Plaintiff's Recovery	603
A.	Recovery of Compensatory Damages	603
1.	Limitations on Noneconomic Damage Awards	603

2. Modifications of the Collateral Source Rule	604
3. Reforms Allowing Periodic Payment of Damages	604
B. Recovery for Pure Emotional Upset	605
<i>Kennedy v. McKesson Co.</i>	606
C. Recovery for Pure Economic Loss	611
<i>East River Steamship Corp. v. Transamerica Delaval, Inc.</i>	612
<i>Grams v. Milk Products, Inc.</i>	621
Problem Twenty-Seven	629
Charles W. Wolfram, Modern Legal Ethics	630
D. Special Problems in Toxic Torts Litigation	631
1. Increased Risk of Future Injury	631
<i>Mauro v. Raymark Industries, Inc.</i>	632
2. Recovery for Emotional Upset	636
<i>Metro-North Commuter R.R. Co. v. Buckley</i>	637
3. Medical Monitoring	643
<i>Bower v. Westinghouse Elec. Corp.</i>	643
Authors' Dialogue 21	653
E. Recovery of Punitive Damages	654
1. The Legal Standard	654
<i>Owens-Illinois, Inc. v. Zenobia</i>	654
2. Federal Constitutional Control of Punitive Damages	662
<i>State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Campbell</i>	662
Authors' Dialogue 22	671
<i>Philip Morris USA v. Williams</i>	672

PART IV  
Institutional Perspectives 679

---

CHAPTER ELEVEN	Special Features Reflecting the Fact That Most Products Defendants Are Corporations	681
A. The General Rule of Limited Shareholder Liability (and Exceptions Thereto)		681
<i>Nelson v. International Paint Co.</i>		684
Problem Twenty-Eight		692
B. A Special Extension of Liability: Successor Corporations		699
CHAPTER TWELVE	Adjusting the Liability System to the Demands of a National Economy	707
A. The Patchwork Quilt of Existing State Law		707
B. Uniform Laws Approach		709
C. The Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability		710
D. Federal Legislative Solutions		710
1. Substantive Law Reform		710
2. Insurance Availability: The Risk Retention Act		710

E. Are Judicial Solutions Viable?	711
1. Federal Common Law	711
2. Federal Preemption of State Law	714
3. National Management of Mass Tort Litigation	714
F. Areas of Special Federal Competence	717
1. The Federal Bankruptcy System	717
Kenneth Pasquale and Arlene G. Krieger, <i>Combustion Engineering</i> and the Interpretation of Section 524(g)	718
2. Admiralty	722
 CHAPTER THIRTEEN	
International Perspectives on Products Liability	725
A. Foreign Products Liability Law	725
Mathias Reimann, Liability for Defective Products at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century: Emergence of a Worldwide Standard?	725
Hideyuki Kobayashi & Yoshimasa Furuta, Products Liability Act and Transnational Litigation in Japan	745
B. Does the American Liability System Put American Firms at a Competitive Disadvantage?	750
1. Effects of the American Liability System on Costs and Prices of American Products	750
2. Effects of the American Products Liability System on Product Innovation	754
 Table of Cases	757
Table of Statutes and Other Authorities	771
Index	777