- Donoghue v Stevenson[1932] In Scotland, lady was bought a ginger beer in an opaque bottle, drank most of it but at end found a decomposed snail in the bottle. Claimed she suffered injury and shock and wanted to claim. She didn't buy the drink though so she wasn't involved in contract, and boyfriend couldn't claim as he didn't personally suffer. First time manufacturer had been liable to a consumer.

- Roe v Ministry of Health (1954) – we mustn't judge a 1947 situation with 1954 spectacles (with hindsight). Patient went into hospital for minor operation but became totally paralysed, caused by spinal anaesthetic that was contaminated, from when it was stored. Wasnt known that contamination could happen in the way that it did, so not liable.

- Brown v Rolls Royce Ltd (1960) not supplied with barrier cream, but debate as to its efficacy, so her claim failed because couldn't prove that she wouldn't have got dermatitis if she had been provided with it.

- Nettleship v Weston (1971) learner driver, ran into lamppost and injured claimant. Held that being a learner made no difference to duty of care. Wasn't enough to say, not qualified but I was doing my competent best. Denning: requirement that all drivers are insured against 3rd party risks/liability. Must be liable so injured can be compensated.

- Roberts v Ramsbottom (1980) – stroke at wheel of car – no excuse for failing to live up to standard. Had no idea obviously that this was about to happen. Neil J: continuing to drive means he fell under standard of care. Question is whether insurance company can avoid paying by establishing he hadn't fallen under standard.

- Mansfield v Weetabix (1998) – lost control but unaware of disabling condition (and could not reasonably have been aware). Not liable (or differently put, claimant received NO compensation).Lorry driver crashed into shop but had no awareness of condition, so insurance company had to pay. THIS WAS A ONE OFF CASE. Looks at capacity of defendant in a way that is not typical.

- Mullin v Richards (1998) – the reasonable child of that particular age Sword fight with rulers, one ruler shattered and left fragment in claimants eye but this behaviour is reasonable to 15 year old, cant be expected to understand implications (see also Orchard v Lee (2009)). 2 13 year olds playing tag and runs backwards into lunch lady and his head on her cheekbone. Quite serious injury

- Marshall v Osmond (1983); defendant acting in heat of moment, not a lot of time to think. Police not liable when knocked over claimant in car chase but he was a suspect. Actions cannot be judged by same standard of care where there is a lack of time to think.

- Bolton v Stone (1951) woman standing outside house and is hit by cricket ball from local cricket pitch over 17ft fence. HoL lost her case because of the chance of that happening are so low even though it was a foreseeable risk.

- Paris v Stepney BC (1951) one eyed man employed as mechanic was blinded as piece of rusty metal flew into his good eye. HoL said employers were negligent in not providing goggles, so although risk was low, the fact was one eyed made it more serious.

- Latimer v AEC Ltd (1953) factory floor left with slippery residue, cleaned up by employers as best as they could. HoL said factory owner not liable because only other precaution that could have been taken was to shut entire factory.

    - Bricks thrown at policeman
    - Sued the club
    - Because premesis had been allowed to fall into disrepair, hooligans were able to do that
- Tomlinson v Congleton BC [2004] 1 AC 46
    - Someone went diving into water
    - Hit head on bottom and was paraplegic
    - His action's fault
- Siddorn v Patel [2007] EWHC 1248 (QBD)
    - Dancing on roof, fell through skylight
    - Courts said no, injured as a result of your actions
- The Calgarth [1927] P 93
    - When you invite someone to house to use stairs, not inviting them to slide down the bannisters
- Gould v McAuliffe [1941] 2 All ER 527
    - Guy looking for loo in pub, so strayed off into area where he shouldn't have been.
    - Injured as process, but acting reasonably, so he maintained visitor status
- Lowery v Walker [1911] AC 10
    - D was farmer, and villagers used his field as shortcut to the station
    - Did nothing about that, instead but an unruly horse in field and someone was injured.
    - Held liable
- Kiapasha (t/a Takeaway Supreme) v Laverton [2002] CA
    - Kebab shop, rainy night, someon slipped, fell and sued takeaway
    - Had put in non slip floor and doormat, mop system
    - Had taken reasonable precautions given size and circumstance so not liable
- Trustees of the Portsmouth Youth Activities Committee (A Charity) v Poppleton [2008] EWCA Civ 646
    - Claimant fell of climbing wall and injured himself so tried to sue maintaining there wasn't enough padding to protect him
    - Court held that always a risk of falling awkwardly, doesn't matter how much padding there is, so your fault.
- Phipps v Rochester Corporation [1955] 1 QB 450
    - Rochester building new houses, large trenches for foundations.
    - Sister aged 7 and boy aged 5 and boy fell in one, so parents sued
    - Not liable, parents should have made sure where children were and been responsible.
- Bourne Leisure Ltd v Marsden [2009] EWCA Civ 671
    - Family on caravan holiday
    - Given map and know there are ponds
    - Mother was talking, little boy wandered off and drowned in pond
    - Initially held negligent, as failed to draw attention to specific location
    - CoA overturned as parents know it was there
- But 8 years earlier the Court of Appeal had held in the civil law that damages could be reduced for contributory neg
  - Froom v Butcher [1975]
- Even earlier a motor cyclist was found contributory negligent for failing to wear a crash helmet
  - O'Connell v Jackson [1971]