Employers Liability:

Injuries in the workplace. Now one of the most important heads of negligence.

Are other means of getting compensation than tort.

<u>3 Types of employers liability</u>

(1) Primary/Personal

(2) Vicarious

(3) Statutory

<u>(1) Primary/Personal Liability.</u>

Q - Does the employer owe a personal duty of care?

A non-delegable personal duty (under c.law) to his employees to see that reasonable care is taken of them.

Non-delegable: employer can delegate the duty but **cannot delegate his responsibility & liability** attached to his duty Wilsons and Clyde Coal v English

Duty is owed to individual employees: each individual employee – with respect to their differences

Paris v Stepney

	4 Forms	from <i>Wilson</i> – Not Strict – Just Must have	t Guideline.
Emplo		(1) Competent Staff. t employ 'reasonably competent' em tion if employees act in a way which Hudson v Ridge Manufacturing	
Must t	(2 ake <i>'reasonable</i>) Adequate Materials & Equipr care' to provide proper appliances,	<mark>ment.</mark> , maintain their condition.
Employer not	liable for injur	Defective Goods: ies caused by defective goods – as lo <u>Davie v New Merton Board Mills</u> decision reversed by	
	"(1) (a) an employmen his employ (b) the third party to be also a	vers' Liability (Defective Goods) Act 196 employee suffers personal injury in the cou at in consequence of a defect in equipment er for the purposes of the employers busine defect is attributable wholly or partly to th (whether identifiable or not), the injury sh attributable to negligence on the part of root he is liable)"	urse of his nt provided by ess; and the fault of a hall be deemed
		<u>'equipment'???:</u> Courts given it a broad interpretatio Even a ship amounts to equipment <u>Coltman v Bibby Tankers</u>	
		(3) Safe System of Work employer must	
tive employee prog warnings agai General Cleaning Christm if they don't follow th Wilson v Tyneside Wi	nst dangers. Contractors v as em – not liable:	Be aware of employees foreseeab carelessness.	Be aware of employees Mer Health (questionable in light of white <u>Walker v Northumberland</u> <u>Barber v Somerset</u>
	Com	mon Practices in Industries will be Thompson v Smiths Ship Repairers	

Must take 'reasonable steps' to see place of work is reasonably safe. Latimer v AEC Ltd Wilson v Tyneside Window Cleaning Even amount to a **duty to dismiss** the employee – <u>Coxall v Goodyear</u>

(2) Vicarious Liability					
Responsible on someone else's behalf – Without Fault. eg. 1 employee commits a tort against another – the employer is held responsible as well as first defendant.					
Emplo	Justifications: Convenience. yers more likely to be able to afford	l it.			
C Must be an Employee: Several Tests all for Guidance only. No one test is paramount.					
(a) Integral Part of the Business Stevenson Jordan & Harrison v <u>McDonald & Evans</u>	(b) Terms of the contract Ferguson v Dawson	(c) Control how much control the employers have over the workers. More control – more likely to be employees. Problematic – difficult in skilled professions.			
(d) Relationship as a Whole. Modern Approach: long list of facto are they part & parcel of business? Are they integral? Are they working for their own benefi Who's equipment are they using? Intentions of the parties?	Who is rest t? <u>Viasy</u> Not alwa	e) Temporary Employee esponsible for temporary employees? The permanent employer? Or the temporary employer? Or Both? stems Ltd v Thermal Transfer Ltd sys both, depends upon control again: Lawley v Luminar Leisure Ltd			

(3) Statutory Liability.