SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

NEGLIGENCE UNDER LAW OF TORTS

Parhlad Singh Ahluwalia, Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar Law University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

Email : ahluwalia002@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper provides a comprehensive examination of negligence as a fundamental concept in the law of torts, with particular emphasis on Indian jurisprudence. The study traces the historical evolution of negligence law from English common law principles to its contemporary application in India. The paper analyzes the three essential elements required to establish negligence: duty of care, breach of duty, and causation with damage. Special attention is given to the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur, professional negligence (particularly medical and legal negligence), and various defenses available in negligence claims including contributory negligence, voluntary assumption of risk, act of God, and inevitable accident. The paper examines negligence in specific contexts such as motor vehicle accidents, occupiers' liability, product liability, and employer's liability. Through analysis of landmark Supreme Court and High Court judgments, the study demonstrates how Indian courts have adapted common law principles to Indian conditions while developing indigenous jurisprudence. The paper also discusses contemporary issues including medical negligence under consumer protection laws, corporate negligence, environmental negligence, and the practical aspects of filing negligence suits. The research concludes that negligence law serves the dual purposes of providing compensation to victims and promoting responsible conduct in society, though challenges remain in implementation and access to justice.

KEYWORDS

negligence, tort law, duty of care, breach of duty, causation, res ipsa loquitur, medical negligence, professional negligence, contributory negligence, defenses to negligence, Indian tort law, damages, compensation, vicarious liability, motor accident claims

INTRODUCTION

Negligence is one of the most significant and widely invoked concepts in the Law of Torts. It forms the foundation of civil liability in modern legal systems, including India. The law of negligence has evolved over centuries through judicial precedents and has become an essential tool for providing remedies to individuals who suffer harm due to the careless conduct of others.

© Shodh Prakashan

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

In simple terms, negligence means the failure to exercise reasonable care that a prudent person would exercise in similar circumstances. It is not intentional wrongdoing but rather a breach of duty that results in harm to another person. The concept of negligence recognizes that every person in society owes a duty to others to act carefully and avoid causing injury or damage.

The law of negligence serves multiple purposes. First, it provides compensation to victims who suffer losses due to another's carelessness. Second, it acts as a deterrent by making people more cautious in their conduct. Third, it establishes standards of behavior that society expects from its members. The principle underlying negligence is that individuals should bear responsibility for the foreseeable consequences of their careless actions.

In India, the law of negligence has been developed through various landmark judgments of the Supreme Court and High Courts, drawing upon English common law principles while adapting them to Indian conditions. The Indian Penal Code, Consumer Protection Act, and Motor Vehicles Act also contain provisions related to negligence in specific contexts.

DEFINITION OF NEGLIGENCE

Negligence has been defined by various jurists and courts over time. According to Winfield, "Negligence is the breach of a legal duty to take care which results in damage, undesired by the defendant, to the plaintiff."

Sir John Salmond defined negligence as "the omission to do something which a reasonable man, guided upon those considerations which ordinarily regulate the conduct of human affairs, would do, or doing something which a prudent and reasonable man would not do."

Alderson B. in Blyth v. Birmingham Waterworks Co. (1856) provided a classic definition: "Negligence is the omission to do something which a reasonable man would do, or doing something which a prudent and reasonable man would not do."

The essence of these definitions is that negligence involves a departure from the standard of care expected of a reasonable person. It is not mere carelessness in the abstract, but carelessness that results in legal liability because it breaches a duty owed to another person.

ESSENTIALS OF NEGLIGENCE

For a successful claim in negligence, the plaintiff must establish three essential elements. These elements are often referred to as the "holy trinity" of negligence. All three must be present for liability to arise.

1. DUTY OF CARE

The first and foremost requirement is that the defendant must owe a duty of care to the plaintiff. This means there must be a legal obligation on the defendant to exercise reasonable

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

care toward the plaintiff. Not every person owes a duty to every other person in all situations. The duty of care arises only in certain relationships or circumstances.

The modern test for determining whether a duty of care exists was established in the landmark English case of Donoghue v. Stevenson (1932). In this case, Mrs. Donoghue consumed ginger beer from an opaque bottle that contained a decomposed snail. She fell ill and sued the manufacturer. The House of Lords held that the manufacturer owed a duty of care to the ultimate consumer.

Lord Atkin formulated the famous "neighbor principle" in this case. He stated: "You must take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions which you can reasonably foresee would be likely to injure your neighbor. Who then, in law, is my neighbor? The answer seems to be persons who are so closely and directly affected by my act that I ought reasonably to have them in contemplation as being so affected when I am directing my mind to the acts or omissions which are called in question."

This principle has been widely adopted in India. The test involves two key elements: foreseeability and proximity. The defendant must reasonably foresee that their actions could harm someone, and there must be sufficient proximity or closeness in the relationship between the parties.

Types of Duty:

a) General Duty: Everyone owes a general duty to others not to cause harm through careless conduct. For example, drivers owe a duty to other road users, manufacturers owe a duty to consumers, and property owners owe a duty to visitors.

b) Professional Duty: Professionals such as doctors, lawyers, engineers, and architects owe a higher standard of duty to their clients or patients. They must exercise the skill and care expected of a competent professional in that field.

c) Statutory Duty: Sometimes, statutes impose specific duties. For instance, the Motor Vehicles Act imposes duties on drivers, and the Factories Act imposes duties on factory owners.

Indian Case Law on Duty of Care:

In **Municipal Corporation of Delhi v. Subhagwanti (1966)**, a child fell into a manhole left open by the Municipal Corporation and died. The Supreme Court held that the Municipal Corporation owed a duty to ensure that manholes were properly covered and that it was liable for negligence.

In **Indian Railways v. Santra Devi (1971)**, the Supreme Court held that railways owe a duty of care to passengers to ensure their safety during travel.

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

2. BREACH OF DUTY

Once it is established that a duty of care exists, the plaintiff must prove that the defendant breached that duty. A breach occurs when the defendant fails to meet the standard of care expected of a reasonable person in similar circumstances.

The standard of care is objective, not subjective. It is measured by reference to what a reasonable person would do, not what this particular defendant thought was reasonable. The court asks: "What would a reasonable and prudent person have done in these circumstances?"

Factors Determining Standard of Care:

a) Foreseeability of Harm: The more foreseeable the risk of harm, the higher the standard of care required. If a reasonable person would foresee that their conduct could cause harm, they must take precautions to prevent it.

b) Magnitude of Risk: Where the potential harm is serious, greater care must be taken. For example, those handling dangerous substances must exercise a very high degree of care.

c) Practicality of Precautions: The court considers whether it was practical and reasonable to expect the defendant to take certain precautions. If precautions are too burdensome or expensive relative to the risk, they may not be required.

d) Social Utility: Sometimes, the social benefit of an activity is weighed against the risk. Emergency services, for example, are given some leeway when responding to emergencies.

e) Professional Standards: For professionals, the standard is what a competent professional in that field would do. In **Bolam v. Friern Hospital Management Committee (1957)**, it was held that a doctor is not negligent if they act in accordance with a practice accepted as proper by a responsible body of medical opinion.

Indian Case Law on Breach:

In **Kusum Sharma v. Batra Hospital (2010)**, the Supreme Court held that medical professionals must exercise the degree of skill and care expected of a reasonably competent professional. However, they are not insurers of successful outcomes and will not be held liable for errors of judgment if they have acted with due care.

In **Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab (2005)**, the Supreme Court distinguished between negligence and medical negligence, stating that a higher threshold must be met before holding doctors criminally liable for negligence.

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

3. CAUSATION AND DAMAGE

The plaintiff must prove that the breach of duty directly caused damage or injury. There must be a causal connection between the defendant's breach and the plaintiff's harm. This involves two tests:

a) Causation in Fact (But For Test): The plaintiff must show that "but for" the defendant's breach, the damage would not have occurred. If the harm would have happened anyway, the defendant's breach did not cause it.

b) Legal Causation (Remoteness of Damage): Not all consequences of a breach will result in liability. The damage must not be too remote. The test for remoteness was established in **The Wagon Mound (1961)**, which held that the defendant is liable only for damage that was reasonably foreseeable.

In India, the courts have adopted the principle of reasonable foreseeability. In **Overseas Tankship (UK) Ltd. v. Morts Dock & Engineering Co. (The Wagon Mound)**, oil spilled from a ship and spread across the harbor. The oil caught fire, causing damage. The court held that while fouling of the dock was foreseeable, fire damage was not, and hence the defendant was not liable for the fire damage.

Types of Damage:

Damage can be physical, economic, or psychological. It includes personal injury, property damage, financial loss, and mental suffering. However, the plaintiff must prove actual damage. Unlike trespass, where damage is presumed, negligence requires proof of actual harm.

Indian Case Law on Causation:

In **Union of India v. Sugrabai (1969)**, a child was run over by a railway engine at an unmanned railway crossing. The Supreme Court held that there was a causal connection between the Railways' failure to provide proper safety measures and the child's death.

RES IPSA LOQUITUR

The doctrine of res ipsa loquitur means "the thing speaks for itself." This principle applies in situations where the accident itself is evidence of negligence. In such cases, the burden shifts to the defendant to prove they were not negligent.

Conditions for Applying Res Ipsa Loquitur:

1. The accident must be of a kind that does not ordinarily happen without negligence
2. The instrumentality causing harm must have been under the defendant's control

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

3. There must be no evidence of any action or contribution by the plaintiff that caused the accident

Examples: If a barrel falls from a warehouse window onto a passerby, or if a surgical instrument is left inside a patient's body after surgery, these situations suggest negligence without further proof.

Indian Case Law:

In **Syad Akbar v. State of Karnataka (1979)**, a bus plunged into a river from a bridge. The Supreme Court applied res ipsa loquitur and held that the accident itself was evidence of negligence by the driver or the transport corporation.

In **Municipal Corporation of Delhi v. Subhagwanti**, the Supreme Court applied this doctrine when a child fell into an open manhole.

NEGLIGENCE OF PROFESSIONALS

Professional negligence is a special category that applies to doctors, lawyers, engineers, architects, accountants, and other professionals. These individuals are held to a higher standard because of their specialized knowledge and skill.

MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE

Medical negligence occurs when a medical practitioner fails to exercise the degree of care and skill expected of a reasonably competent professional in the same field. However, doctors are not guarantors of cure, and mere failure of treatment does not amount to negligence.

Elements of Medical Negligence:

1. Duty of care owed by the doctor to the patient
2. Breach of that duty by falling below the accepted standard
3. Injury suffered by the patient
4. Causal connection between the breach and injury

Defenses Available to Doctors:

1. **Error of Judgment:** If a doctor has acted in accordance with accepted medical practice and made a bona fide error of judgment, they will not be held liable.
2. **Two Schools of Thought:** If there are two or more schools of thought on treatment, a doctor following any recognized school will not be negligent.
3. **Emergency Situations:** In emergencies, doctors are expected to do their best under the circumstances, and a lesser standard may apply.

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

Indian Case Law on Medical Negligence:

In **Laxman Balkrishna Joshi v. Trimbak (1969)**, the Supreme Court held that a surgeon who performed an operation in a careless manner, causing injury to the patient, was liable for negligence.

In **Malay Kumar Ganguly v. Sukumar Mukherjee (2009)**, the Supreme Court clarified the principles of medical negligence and held that a doctor must bring reasonable degree of skill and knowledge and must exercise reasonable degree of care.

In **Kusum Sharma v. Batra Hospital (2010)**, the Supreme Court held that patients have the right to proper medical care, and hospitals can be held vicariously liable for the negligence of their staff.

In **V. Kishan Rao v. Nikhil Super Specialty Hospital (2010)**, the Supreme Court held that mere bad result of treatment does not amount to medical negligence.

LEGAL NEGLIGENCE

Lawyers owe a duty of care to their clients. They must possess reasonable skill and knowledge and must exercise due care in handling cases. Professional negligence by lawyers can include failure to file cases within the limitation period, failure to present evidence, giving wrong advice, or not appearing in court.

NEGLIGENCE OF OTHER PROFESSIONALS

Engineers, architects, accountants, and other professionals are held to the standard of care expected in their respective fields. They must exercise the skill and care that a competent professional would exercise.

DEFENSES TO NEGLIGENCE

Even when negligence is established, the defendant may raise certain defenses to avoid or reduce liability.

1. CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE

Contributory negligence occurs when the plaintiff's own carelessness contributes to their injury. Under the old common law rule, any contributory negligence by the plaintiff would completely bar recovery. However, modern law in India follows the principle of apportionment.

Under Section 2(1) of the Indian Fatal Accidents Act, 1855, and various judgments, Indian courts apportion damages based on the degree of fault. If the plaintiff is found 30% at fault and the defendant 70% at fault, the damages are reduced proportionately.

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

Indian Case Law:

In **Nance v. British Columbia Electric Railway (1951)**, the principle was established that damages should be reduced to the extent that the plaintiff's negligence contributed to the injury.

In **Swaran Singh v. State of Punjab (1981)**, the Supreme Court applied the principle of contributory negligence in a motor accident case.

In **Jasbir Kaur v. State of Punjab (1999)**, the Supreme Court held that when both parties are negligent, damages should be apportioned according to their respective degrees of fault.

2. VOLUNTARY ASSUMPTION OF RISK (VOLENTI NON FIT INJURIA)

This defense applies when the plaintiff voluntarily accepts the risk of harm. If a person knowingly and willingly exposes themselves to a known risk, they cannot later claim damages for injuries resulting from that risk.

Conditions:

1. The plaintiff must have knowledge of the risk
2. The acceptance must be voluntary, not forced by circumstances
3. The plaintiff must accept both the physical risk and legal risk

Examples: Spectators at a cricket match accept the risk of being hit by a ball. Participants in dangerous sports accept the inherent risks.

Limitations: This defense does not apply when there is a statutory duty, or when the plaintiff has no real choice. For instance, employees cannot be said to voluntarily accept risks at an unsafe workplace because they need employment.

Indian Case Law:

In **Padmavati v. Dugganaika (1975)**, the plaintiff accepted a lift in a jeep driven by a person who she knew was drunk. An accident occurred, and she was injured. The court held that she had voluntarily accepted the risk.

However, in most Indian cases involving employees or persons in positions of necessity, courts are reluctant to apply this defense.

3. ACT OF GOD (VIS MAJOR)

An act of God refers to events that occur due to natural causes without any human intervention and which could not be foreseen or prevented despite taking reasonable care. Examples include earthquakes, floods, lightning, storms, and other natural calamities.

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

Conditions:

1. The event must be due to natural causes
2. It must be extraordinary and unprecedented
3. It must be impossible to foresee or prevent

Indian Case Law:

In **Ramalinga Nadar v. Narayana Reddiar (1971)**, unprecedented heavy rain caused flooding that damaged the plaintiff's property. The court held it was an act of God.

However, courts are strict in applying this defense. If reasonable precautions could have prevented or minimized the damage, the defendant cannot claim act of God.

4. INEVITABLE ACCIDENT

An inevitable accident is an occurrence that could not be avoided by the exercise of ordinary care and skill. It is something that happens despite all reasonable precautions.

The difference between act of God and inevitable accident is that act of God involves natural forces, while inevitable accident may involve human agency but no negligence.

Indian Case Law:

In **Stanley v. Powell (1891)**, during a shooting party, a pellet ricocheted off a tree and injured the plaintiff. It was held to be an inevitable accident.

In **Brown v. Kendall (1850)**, two dogs were fighting, and the defendant tried to separate them with a stick. While doing so, he accidentally struck the plaintiff in the eye. The court held it was an inevitable accident.

5. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

If a statute authorizes certain conduct, the defendant cannot be held liable for harm resulting from that authorized conduct, provided they have acted within the scope of authority and without negligence.

However, this defense is narrow. The statute must specifically authorize the act, and the defendant must not exceed the authority granted.

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

NEGLIGENCE IN SPECIFIC CONTEXTS

1. MOTOR ACCIDENT CASES

Motor vehicle accidents are the most common source of negligence claims in India. The Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 governs liability for motor accidents. It provides for a no-fault liability for certain accidents and also establishes Motor Accident Claims Tribunals for quick resolution of claims.

Principles in Motor Accident Cases:

1. Drivers owe a duty of care to all road users including pedestrians, cyclists, and other drivers
2. The standard of care is that of a reasonable and prudent driver
3. Contributory negligence of the victim is considered in apportioning damages
4. In hit-and-run cases, compensation is available from the Motor Vehicles Accident Fund

Indian Case Law:

In **Pushpabai Purshottam Udeshi v. Ranjit Ginning & Pressing Co. (1977)**, the Supreme Court held that the owner of a vehicle can be held vicariously liable for the negligence of the driver.

In **National Insurance Co. v. Swaran Singh (2004)**, the Supreme Court laid down guidelines for calculating compensation in motor accident cases.

2. OCCUPIERS' LIABILITY

Occupiers of premises owe a duty of care to persons who enter their property. The extent of duty depends on the status of the visitor.

Categories of Visitors:

a) Invitees: Persons invited to the premises for business purposes. The occupier owes the highest duty to invitees to ensure the premises are reasonably safe.

b) Licensees: Persons who enter with permission but not for business purposes, such as social guests. The occupier must warn them of known dangers.

c) Trespassers: Persons who enter without permission. Generally, the occupier owes minimal duty to trespassers, only not to intentionally harm them. However, for child trespassers, a higher duty may apply.

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

Indian Case Law:

In **Robert Addie & Sons v. Dumbreck (1929)**, a child trespasser was killed by machinery. The court held that the occupier owed no duty to trespassers except not to intentionally harm them.

In **British Railways Board v. Herrington (1972)**, the law was modified to require occupiers to show common humanity even to trespassers.

3. PRODUCT LIABILITY

Manufacturers and sellers owe a duty to consumers to ensure their products are safe. If a defective product causes injury, the manufacturer can be held liable for negligence.

The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 provides for strict liability in product liability cases, making it easier for consumers to claim compensation.

Indian Case Law:

In **Donoghue v. Stevenson (1932)**, the foundation was laid for manufacturer's liability to ultimate consumers.

In **M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Oleum Gas Leak Case) (1987)**, the Supreme Court evolved the principle of absolute liability for hazardous industries.

4. EMPLOYER'S LIABILITY

Employers owe a duty of care to their employees to provide a safe working environment. This includes providing safe equipment, proper training, adequate supervision, and maintaining safe premises.

The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923 and the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 provide for compensation to workers for injuries arising out of employment.

Indian Case Law:

In **General Manager, Southern Railway v. Rangachari (1962)**, the Supreme Court held that the employer has a duty to provide safe machinery and a safe system of work.

MEASURE OF DAMAGES IN NEGLIGENCE

When negligence is proved, the plaintiff is entitled to damages. The purpose of damages is to restore the plaintiff, as far as money can, to the position they would have been in had the negligence not occurred.

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

TYPES OF DAMAGES

1. Compensatory Damages: These are awarded to compensate for actual loss suffered. They include:

a) Special Damages: Quantifiable monetary losses such as medical expenses, loss of income, property damage, etc. These must be specifically pleaded and proved.

b) General Damages: Non-quantifiable losses such as pain and suffering, mental trauma, loss of amenities of life, loss of future earnings capacity.

2. Nominal Damages: Token damages awarded when the plaintiff proves breach of duty but suffers no actual loss.

3. Exemplary or Punitive Damages: These are awarded to punish the defendant for particularly egregious conduct and to deter others. They are rarely awarded in negligence cases but may be given in cases of gross negligence.

4. Aggravated Damages: Additional damages for mental distress caused by the manner in which the wrong was committed.

CALCULATION OF DAMAGES IN PERSONAL INJURY CASES

The Supreme Court in **National Insurance Co. v. Pranay Sethi (2017)** laid down a comprehensive formula for calculating compensation in personal injury and death cases:

Components:

1. Loss of income/earning capacity
2. Medical and other expenses
3. Loss of amenities and pain and suffering
4. Loss of expectation of life
5. Loss of consortium (for family members)

Method: The multiplier method is used. Future loss is calculated by taking annual loss and multiplying by an appropriate multiplier based on age.

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

1. MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Medical negligence cases can be filed under the Consumer Protection Act, treating medical services as a service. This provides a quicker and less expensive remedy than civil courts. However, services provided free of cost in government hospitals are excluded.

In **Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha (1995)**, the Supreme Court held that medical profession falls within the definition of "service" under the Consumer Protection Act.

2. NEGLIGENCE IN CYBER SPACE

With increasing digitization, issues of negligence in cyber space have emerged. This includes negligence in data security, privacy breaches, and online defamation. The Information Technology Act, 2000 addresses some aspects, but this remains an evolving area.

3. CORPORATE NEGLIGENCE

Corporations can be held liable for negligence in various ways including through vicarious liability for employees' acts, direct liability for systemic failures, and liability of directors for breach of duties.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL NEGLIGENCE

Environmental damage caused by negligence is increasingly being recognized. The principles of "polluter pays" and absolute liability have been evolved by Indian courts to protect the environment.

In **M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Oleum Gas Leak Case) (1987)**, the Supreme Court held that enterprises engaged in hazardous activities owe an absolute and non-delegable duty to ensure that no harm is caused.

In **Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India (1996)**, the Supreme Court applied the precautionary principle and polluter pays principle.

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

DISTINCTION BETWEEN NEGLIGENCE AND OTHER TORTS

NEGLIGENCE VS. TRESPASS

Trespass is an intentional and direct interference with person or property. Negligence is unintentional. In trespass, damage is presumed, while in negligence, actual damage must be proved. Trespass is actionable per se, negligence is not.

NEGLIGENCE VS. NUISANCE

Nuisance is unlawful interference with a person's use or enjoyment of land. It may be intentional or result from negligence. Nuisance focuses on the interference itself, while negligence focuses on the breach of duty and resulting damage.

NEGLIGENCE VS. BREACH OF CONTRACT

In contract, duty arises from agreement between parties. In negligence, duty arises from law. In contract, liability is strict (subject to agreed terms), while in negligence, fault must be proved. Privity of contract is required in contract law but not in negligence.

BURDEN OF PROOF

In negligence cases, the general rule is that the plaintiff bears the burden of proving all three elements: duty, breach, and damage. The standard of proof is "preponderance of probabilities" or "balance of probabilities," which is lower than the criminal standard of "beyond reasonable doubt."

However, the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur shifts the evidential burden to the defendant in certain circumstances.

In professional negligence cases, especially medical negligence, courts require expert evidence to establish the standard of care and breach.

CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE VS. COMPOSITE NEGLIGENCE

Contributory Negligence occurs when the plaintiff's own negligence contributes to their injury. The plaintiff's claim is not defeated but damages are reduced proportionately.

Composite Negligence occurs when two or more persons are jointly negligent causing injury to a third party. All negligent parties are jointly and severally liable to the victim.

SHODH PRAKASHAN
An International Open Access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2583-9861
VOL. 3, ISSUE 6, DECEMBER 2025
Available Online : http://shodhprakashan.in/

In **Khenyei v. State of Maharashtra (2014)**, the Supreme Court clarified the distinction between contributory and composite negligence.

VICARIOUS LIABILITY AND NEGLIGENCE

Vicarious liability means one person is held liable for the negligence of another. The most common example is the liability of employers for torts committed by employees in the course of employment.

Principles:

1. There must be a relationship of employer-employee
2. The negligent act must be in the course of employment
3. The employer can be held liable even if not personally at fault

This principle ensures that victims can claim compensation from persons with resources to pay.

In **Laxmi Engineering Works v. P.S.G. Industrial Institute (1995)**, the Supreme Court held that the employer is vicariously liable for the negligence of the employee during the course of employment.

PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF FILING A NEGLIGENCE SUIT

JURISDICTION

Negligence suits can be filed in civil courts having pecuniary jurisdiction based on the value of compensation claimed. Motor accident cases are filed before Motor Accident Claims Tribunals. Consumer cases are filed before Consumer Forums.

LIMITATION PERIOD

Under the Limitation Act, 1963, the limitation period for filing a negligence suit is generally three years from the date when the cause of action arises (when damage occurs). For motor accident claims, the period is six months for death cases and three years for injury cases, though tribunals can condone delay.

PLEADINGS

The plaintiff must plead:

1. The duty owed by the defendant
2. Specific acts constituting breach

3. Particulars of damage suffered
4. Causal connection between breach and damage

EVIDENCE

Evidence in negligence cases includes:

1. Documentary evidence (medical records, bills, etc.)
2. Expert testimony (medical experts, engineers, etc.)
3. Witness testimony
4. Physical evidence

JUDICIAL TRENDS IN NEGLIGENCE LAW

Indian courts have shown the following trends:

1. **Consumer Protection Approach:** Courts are increasingly pro-consumer and pro-victim, especially in medical negligence and product liability cases.
2. **Quantum of Compensation:** There is a trend toward awarding higher compensation, recognizing inflation and changing economic conditions.
3. **Strict Liability in Certain Areas:** For hazardous activities, courts have evolved principles of strict and absolute liability, reducing the need to prove negligence.
4. **Speed of Justice:** Establishment of Motor Accident Claims Tribunals and Consumer Forums has improved speed of disposal.
5. **Social Justice Orientation:** Courts consider the social and economic position of parties while deciding cases.

CONCLUSION

Negligence is a dynamic and evolving area of tort law. It balances individual freedom of action with social responsibility. The law of negligence recognizes that while people should be free to act, they must also bear responsibility when their carelessness harms others.

The three essential elements—duty, breach, and damage—form the foundation of negligence law. Each element must be proved for liability to arise. The law has developed various principles and doctrines such as res ipsa loquitur, contributory negligence, and vicarious liability to address different situations.

In India, negligence law has been shaped by both common law principles and statutory provisions. The Supreme Court and High Courts have played a crucial role in adapting these principles to Indian conditions, taking into account social and economic realities.

Professional negligence, particularly medical negligence, has emerged as a significant area of concern. Courts have tried to balance the interests of patients in receiving compensation with the need to protect professionals from defensive practices.

Motor accidents remain the largest source of negligence claims, and the Motor Vehicles Act provides a comprehensive framework for compensation. Consumer protection laws have also contributed to the development of negligence principles in product liability and service cases.

Looking forward, negligence law will continue to evolve to address new challenges such as cyber negligence, environmental damage, and corporate accountability. The fundamental principles, however, remain constant: those who fail to exercise reasonable care and thereby cause harm to others must compensate for that harm.

The law of negligence thus serves the twin purposes of providing justice to victims and promoting responsible conduct in society. It reminds us that we live in a community where our actions affect others, and we must exercise due care in all that we do.

For law students, understanding negligence is essential not only for academic purposes but also for practical application. The principles learned provide a framework for analyzing real-world situations and advocating for clients who have suffered harm or defending those accused of negligence.

The study of negligence teaches us to think critically about causation, foreseeability, standards of care, and fairness in allocating responsibility. These are skills that transcend the courtroom and are valuable in all aspects of legal practice and life.

References

- Alderson, B. (1856). *Blyth v. Birmingham Waterworks Co.* 11 Ex. 781.
- Bolam v. Friern Hospital Management Committee. (1957). 1 WLR 582.
- British Railways Board v. Herrington. (1972). AC 877.
- Brown v. Kendall. (1850). 60 Mass. 292.
- Consumer Protection Act, 2019 (India).
- Donoghue v. Stevenson. (1932). AC 562 (HL).
- Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (India).
- General Manager, Southern Railway v. Rangachari. (1962). AIR SC 36.
- Indian Fatal Accidents Act, 1855 (India).
- Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha. (1995). 6 SCC 651.
- Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab. (2005). 6 SCC 1.
- Jasbir Kaur v. State of Punjab. (1999). 2 SCC 398.
- Kusum Sharma v. Batra Hospital. (2010). 3 SCC 480.
- Laxman Balkrishna Joshi v. Trimbak. (1969). AIR SC 1.
- Laxmi Engineering Works v. P.S.G. Industrial Institute. (1995). Supp. (3) SCC 583.

- Limitation Act, 1963 (India).
- Malay Kumar Ganguly v. Sukumar Mukherjee. (2009). 9 SCC 221.
- M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Oleum Gas Leak Case). (1987). 1 SCC 395.
- Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (India).
- Municipal Corporation of Delhi v. Subhagwanti. (1966). AIR SC 1750.
- Nance v. British Columbia Electric Railway. (1951). AC 601.
- National Insurance Co. v. Pranay Sethi. (2017). 16 SCC 680.
- National Insurance Co. v. Swaran Singh. (2004). 3 SCC 297.
- Overseas Tankship (UK) Ltd. v. Morts Dock & Engineering Co. (The Wagon Mound). (1961). AC 388.
- Padmavati v. Dugganaika. (1975). AIR SC 1802.
- Pushpabai Purshottam Udeshi v. Ranjit Ginning & Pressing Co. (1977). 4 SCC 745.
- Ramalinga Nadar v. Narayana Reddiar. (1971). 1 MLJ 270.
- Robert Addie & Sons v. Dumbreck. (1929). AC 358.
- Salmond, J. (n.d.). *Law of Torts*. Universal Law Publishing.
- Stanley v. Powell. (1891). 1 QB 86.
- Swaran Singh v. State of Punjab. (1981). 1 SCC 585.
- Syad Akbar v. State of Karnataka. (1979). 4 SCC 120.
- Union of India v. Sugrabai. (1969). 3 SCC 826.
- V. Kishan Rao v. Nikhil Super Specialty Hospital. (2010). 5 SCC 513.
- Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India. (1996). 5 SCC 647.
- Winfield, P. H. (n.d.). *Law of Tort*. Sweet & Maxwell.
- Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923 (India).