

Something To Prove: The Impact of the Burden of Proof in Property Damage Claims



Pamela D. Pengelley

By Pamela D. Pengelley, BSc, LLB, Cozen O'Connor, Toronto

E*stablishing whether the plaintiff or defendant has the burden of proof in a civil action can mean the difference between winning and losing a case. In a subrogated claim for property damage, it is usually the plaintiff, the insurance company suing in its insured's name, who has the burden of proving that a defendant is responsible for the loss.*

However, the burden of proof is ultimately determined by the facts of each case, and there are important exceptions to the general rule that the plaintiff has this burden. Subrogation professionals will benefit by being alert to those situations in which it may be the defendant, rather than the plaintiff, who has something to prove.

What Is Negligence?

The most commonly raised allegation in property damage claims is that of negligence. Negligence is legally defined as the failure to use

reasonable care. A person is considered negligent at law if he or she fails to act as a reasonable and prudent person and causes harm as a result. In other words, a negligent person either has done something that a reasonable person would not do or has failed to do something that a reasonable person would do, which results in damage or loss.¹ In order to succeed in a negligence action, the plaintiff must show the following:

- A duty of care: A duty of care arises when the defendant can foresee that his or her failure to act as a reasonable person will expose another to a risk of harm.
- A breach of this duty: The defendant failed to act as a reasonable person would have acted in the same circumstances.
- Damages and causation: The

defendant's negligent act has caused the plaintiff to suffer damage. In other words, *but for* the defendant's negligence, the damage would not have occurred. A defendant is usually only held liable for reasonably foreseeable damages; however, the law recognizes that damage can be physical, economic or psychological.

It is usually, but not always, the plaintiff who must prove to a court that *more likely than not*, a defendant has been negligent.² If the evidence shows that it is just as unlikely as likely that a defendant has been negligent, a plaintiff has not proven its case. Furthermore, it is not uncommon in property damage claims that the cause of a loss be equivocal. Consider the facts of *Canadian National Railways Co. v. Hammil*.³

The plaintiff sent a refrigerated railway car to the defendant to be loaded with potatoes. Before the defendant could finish loading the railway car, a fire occurred which destroyed the potatoes and damaged the car. Unfortunately, there was no evidence showing how the fire might have started except for

It is important for subrogation professionals to be aware of cases where the burden of proving a case may rest with a defendant rather than a plaintiff. A claim for property damage that initially appears weak or that seems to be based on little or no evidence may actually give rise to excellent recovery prospects.

the plaintiff's unsupported suggestion that the defendant's employees may have been smoking cigarettes while loading the car. The defendant denied all liability on the basis that it was just as likely that the fire started accidentally as by its negligence.

On the facts of this case, it would be extremely difficult for the plaintiff to convince a court that more likely than not, the fire was caused by the defendant's negligence, because no one knew what caused the fire. However, if this

were a case where the defendant had the burden of proof, then the plaintiff could relax: the defendant would have to show that more likely than not, it had not been negligent and did not the cause of the fire. The lack of evidence would become the "defendant's problem." In other circumstances, a defendant may be responsible for the damage, even where it can prove that it was not negligent.

It is important for subrogation professionals to be aware of cases where the burden of proving a case may rest with a defendant rather than a plaintiff. A claim for property damage that initially appears weak or that seems to be based on little or no evidence may actually give rise to excellent recovery prospects.

Circumstances Affecting the Burden of Proof

Bailment

"Bailment" is a legal relationship that arises when a person, the "bailee" agrees to hold property belonging to another, the "bailor," for a certain period of time, and then to return the property to the owner once that time has elapsed. When a person accepts payment for holding another's property, he or she is held to a higher standard of



EXPERT. EASE.

Let our experience work for you.

When you work with Crawford Healthcare Management, you gain the experience that only an expert can bring. Providing insightful, customized claims management solutions since 1941, we are committed to providing services that are focused on attention to detail and carried out with integrity.

Since we have a 90% employee satisfaction rate, and an average employee stays with us for 10 years, you can be sure Crawford professionals will put their experience to work for you, providing breakthrough solutions with speed and accuracy.

Call 1-888-634-8765 or email info@crawco.ca to learn how our experience can work for you.



care than a "gratuitous bailee," who holds property for another without benefit. A bailee who accepts payment is required to take the same care of the property in his or her possession as a reasonable and prudent owner would, and will be responsible for any damage to the property caused by his or her negligence.

A bailee is not an insurer of property in his or her possession. However, if the property is damaged, the bailee is presumed to be responsible for the loss unless he or she can prove the loss or damage was not caused by his or her negligence. This is essentially the reverse of the typical negligence action described above, where the plaintiff must prove on a balance of probabilities that the defendant was negligent. The law's rationale for placing the onus on the bailee is simply that as the person in charge of the property, the bailee is the one who has the best information about the loss. As a result, the bailee should have the burden of explaining himself or herself when the property is damaged.⁴

The case of *Hammil*, above, is an example of a bailment. The bailment was created when the defendant took possession of the plaintiff's railway car for the purpose of loading it with potatoes. Accordingly, the plaintiff did not have to prove that the defendant had been negligent and that this caused the fire. Instead, it was the defendant who had to prove that the fire was not caused by its own negligence. The defendant could not give a sufficient explanation for the cause of fire and was accordingly held liable for the full amount of damages.

Carriage of Goods

A "carrier" is a party who contracts



"It's a check for a hundred thousand dollars. Do you like it?"

May all your holiday wishes come true!
Merry Christmas from
Blakeney Henneberry Murphy



Blakeney Henneberry Murphy

BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS

8 King Street East, Suite 1501

Toronto, Ontario M5C 1B5

Phone: 416-408-4400

Fax: 416-408-4900

www.litigation.ws

to transport goods. The common law distinguishes between a "common" carrier, who carries goods for everyone on regularly scheduled routes, and a "private" carrier, who reserves the right to reject unattractive offers to carry goods. In either instance, a carrier has a duty to transport goods safely from the place of shipment to the place of delivery.


At common law, a private carrier will be regarded as a bailee for any damage to property that has been entrusted to the carrier for transit. However, a common carrier is liable almost to the same degree as an insurer of the cargo. Regardless of whether a common carrier has caused the loss, he or she will be liable for damage to the cargo during transport unless he or she can establish that the loss falls within a relatively few classes of exemptions, as follows:⁴


- damage caused by an "Act of God," an event that is beyond the carrier's power to predict or control
- damage caused by a "public enemy" (e.g., an act of terrorism)
- damage caused by the fault of the owner, such as the owner's failure to properly pack the goods before transport
- damage caused by natural deterioration of the goods

The policy reasons for imposing this level of liability on carriers are similar to those in cases of bailment. The carrier, as the party in possession of the goods, has the sole opportunity to protect the goods and has all the evidence about how the loss occurred.⁶

However, the liability of carriers has been modified by various provincial and federal statutes that, depending on the context, may

we
UNDERSTAND
your business






JPL Vehicle Leases

JPL is a privately held Canadian company which provides leasing solutions and savings to our customers.

We offer:


- > Customized leases to suit the needs of your business.
- > Any make or model anywhere in Canada.
- > One point of contact for your requirements and a "one stop shop" from acquisition, upfitting to remarketing.
- > Acquisition of new and used vehicles.
- > No kilometer restrictions or wear and tear clauses.
- > Vehicle remarketing through a variety of sources.
- > Upfitting and branding.

JPL can be your strategic partner which will provide acquisition, management and remarketing of your fleet. We improve our service to you by anticipating what our clients want and exceed it consistently.



Contact: Brenda Burns
 JPL Jim Peplinski's Leasemaster
 3109 Bloor Street West
 Toronto, ON
 M8X 1E2

800 465 1174 ext 3893
 416 207 3893
 416 236 3490 fax
 bburns@jimlease.com
 jimlease.com



**Jim Peplinski's
LEASEMASTER**

One Goal • A Thousand Assists



CENTRIC INVESTIGATION SERVICES
 Trusted, Experienced, Licensed, Bonded & Insured
 (A member of CPI-Ontario)

**WANTED: A MARKETING & BUSINESS
DEVELOPMENT MANAGER.
EXCELLENT REMUNERATION.**

We wish you a Merry Christmas & a Safe Holiday!

Tel: 905-882-8335 / 1-877-882-8335 • www.centricinvestigation.ca
 35 West Pearce Street, Unit 4, Richmond Hill, ON L4B 3A9 • Fax: 905-882-8336

We Can Deliver

WE WILL GO WHERE OTHERS WON'T!



Independent Medical Evaluations
Occupational Therapy Evaluations
Functional Abilities Evaluations
Vocational Evaluations
Transferrable Skills Analysis, Labour Market
Diagnostic Testing
File Reviews

tel: 416-510-2468 fax: 416-510-8766
toll free: 1-877-304-2239
email: info@arsi.ca web: www.arsi.ca

For All Your Assessment Requirements Across Canada

Assessment Rehabilitation Services Inc.

Independent, objective, expert claims quantification and trusted advice.*

Throughout Ontario and around the world, PricewaterhouseCoopers provides strategic assistance to insurance companies, policyholders and their legal counsel in investigating and resolving claims. We invite you to connect with our Insurance Claims Services group to discuss the benefits of cost-effective solutions to your complex insurance issues.

- Commercial insurance claims review and preparation
- Personal injury claims loss quantification
- Expert witness testimony and assistance at mediation, arbitration or court hearings
- Educational seminars
- Software for Net Weekly Income Calculations

Contact:

Toronto

Bruce Webster
416 815 5250

John Seigel
416 815 5087

Hamilton

Jim Forbes
905 972 4105

Michael Iantomasi
905 972 4119

Southwestern Ontario

Bruce Webster
(519) 640 8009

Gary Phelps
(519) 640 8008

Ottawa

Kas Rehman
(613) 755 4328

Ron Jackson
(613) 755 4343

replace the common law. These statutes tend to broaden the categories of exemptions available to a carrier, to include, for example, liability for damage resulting from riots or strikes, quarantine or the authority of law. These statutes may also impose monetary limits on a carrier's liability, based on the number of packages being carried or the weight of the goods. Carriers may also further attempt to limit their liability by contract. As a result of the complexities of this area of law, the advice of a lawyer who is experienced in handling carrier claims is usually necessary.

Nuisances

A person may commit a legal nuisance when he or she indirectly causes physical injury to another person's land or interferes unreasonably with that person's use or enjoyment of their land. The question that is asked in a nuisance case is, "Is the defendant using his or her property in a reasonable manner, having regard to the fact that the defendant has a neighbour?" In determining what constitutes "unreasonable" interference, courts have considered the following factors:⁷

- the severity of the interference, having regard to its nature, duration and effect
- the character of the locale
- the usefulness of the defendant's conduct
- the sensitivity of the property or use interfered with

Examples of common nuisances include vibrations caused by construction work that damages the foundation of nearby buildings, or damage caused by burst water or sewage pipes. If a plaintiff can establish that a defendant has cre-

*connectedthinking

PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS 

© 2006 PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, Canada. "PricewaterhouseCoopers" refers to PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, Canada, an Ontario limited liability partnership, or, as the context requires, the network of member firms of PricewaterhouseCoopers International Limited, each of which is a separate and independent legal entity. *connectedthinking is a trademark of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP.

ated a nuisance, the defendant may be liable for resulting damages even if the defendant has not been negligent. Importantly, negligence is not a prerequisite to proving nuisance. Negligence examines the *reasonableness of a defendant's conduct*, whereas nuisance law only considers whether the *effect of the defendant's conduct, from the plaintiff's point of view*, is reasonable in the circumstances.⁸

Dangerous Activities

Where a person engages in an activity that is hazardous or inherently dangerous, that person may be absolutely liable for any resulting damage. All the plaintiff is required to demonstrate is that it has suffered loss at the hands of the defendant and, unlike in a case of bailment, the defendant cannot excuse itself on the basis that it took every possible precaution to prevent the damage from occurring.

A classic example used to illustrate absolute liability is that of the owner of a tiger rehabilitation centre. Notwithstanding that the owner buys the strongest tiger cages available, erects "state-of-the-art" tiger-proof fencing and hires experienced tiger keepers to watch over the animals, if a tiger should accidentally escape, the owner is liable for any and all damages that result. Another example is that of a factory owner who houses dangerous chemicals in his warehouse and carefully ensures that the storage of the chemicals accords with all industry guidelines. If the chemicals somehow escape from their containers, the owner is still liable for the damage. The absence of negligence is not a defence.

The law imposes this absolute liability in situations that are inher-

ently dangerous in order to discourage reckless behaviour and unnecessary loss by forcing potential defendants to take every possible precaution. It also has the effect of simplifying litigation and allowing a plaintiff to become whole more quickly.

Summary

In property damage claims where there is little or no evidence as to what has caused a loss, a subrogating insurance company may nevertheless have an excellent opportunity to recover against a potential defendant. A defendant who was in possession of the plaintiff's property as a bailee or carrier at the time of loss may have to prove that it was not responsible for the plaintiff's loss or that it satisfies an exception to liability. The common rationale for calling on a defendant to account for loss in these cases is that the defendant, as the party with control of the goods at the relevant time, will have the best knowledge of events leading up to the loss and the opportunity to have taken precautions to prevent the damage from occurring.

Alternatively, where a defendant's actions or conduct have the effect of damaging the plaintiff's property, a plaintiff may be able to hold a defendant liable even without proving negligence. If the defendant's actions are inherently dangerous or interfere unreasonably with the plaintiff's property, the defendant may be liable. In order to obtain optimal recovery in subrogated property claims, legal counsel must be alert to potential theories of liability that arise on the facts of each case.

Pamela D. Pengelley received a Bachelor of Science degree from the

University of Toronto in 2002, where she graduated with First Class Honours and a scholarship for academic excellence. She earned a Bachelor of Laws degree from Osgoode Hall Law School in 2005. She received the Harold Sonny Ladoo Prize for Creative Writing in 2002, and was awarded the Canadian Law Library Review's Feature Article of the Year Award in 2005. She is currently completing her articles with Cozen O'Connor, a Toronto-based firm specializing in insurance litigation.

¹ *Arland and Arland v. Taylor*, [1955] O.R. 131 (Ont. C.A.).


² In other words, the plaintiff must prove its case on "a balance of probabilities," or show that it is at least 51 per cent likely that a defendant has been negligent.

I, S, S
Insurance Shuttle Services

**TRANSPORTING INJURED
PEOPLE ACROSS CANADA**

- Reduce/eliminate fraud.
- Only authorized trips allowed.
- Flat rate trips (regardless of weather and traffic).
- Exclusively dedicated to the insurance industry.

385 Traders Blvd. E.
Mississauga, Ontario
L4Z 2E5
Tel: (905) 502-6500
Toll Free: 1(800) 891-7775
Fax: (905) 502-7100
Email: info@abletransport.ca
www.abletransport.ca



- ³ (1973) 43 D.L.R. (3d) 731 (P.E.I.S.C.).
- ⁴ "The Ruaehehu" (1925), 21 Ll. L. Rep. 310.
- ⁵ *George C. Anspach Co. v. Canadian National Railway Co.*, [1950] O.R. 317 (Ont. H.C.).
- ⁶ McNeil, J., "Motor Carrier Cargo Claims," (Toronto: Carswell, 1986) at p. 4.
- ⁷ *Ontario Ltd. v. Huron Steel Products (Windsor) Ltd.* (1992), 9 O.R. (3d) 305n (C.A.) (Q.L.) at 5 of 20; *Rideau Falls Generating Partnership v. Ottawa (City)*, [1999] O.J. No. 1066 (C.A.) at para. 6.
- ⁸ *Pugliese et al. v. National Capital Commission et al.* (1977), 17 O.R. (2d) 129 (C.A.) (Q.L.) at 22-3 of 26. A negligent act may, however, be a constituent element of a nuisance, or may itself constitute a nuisance; *Huron Steel*, *supra* note 7 at 10 of 20.

© Cozen O'Connor, (2006), All Rights Reserved. Comments in the Cozen O'Connor Subrogation and Recovery Alert are not intended to provide legal advice. Readers should not act or rely on information in the Alert without seeking specific legal advice from Cozen O'Connor on matters which concern them. For additional information concerning Cozen O'Connor's Subrogation and Recovery Program, please contact Chris Reain, Subrogation and Recovery, Cozen O'Connor, One Queen Street East, Suite 2000, Toronto ON, M5C 2W5; (416) 361-3200, creain@cozen.com or www.cozen.com.

Reprinted with permission.

WP

www.kcl.ca

Setting the Standard

in Health and Disability Management Throughout Southwestern Ontario




NANCY
HASTON
& ASSOCIATES INC.

Specialists in Case Management,
Occupational Therapy, Vocational
Rehabilitation and Future Care
Cost Analyses.

www.nancyhaston.com

email: rehab@nancyhaston.com toll free: 1-800-465-1614 fax: 416-927-8677



Kleinfeldt Consultants Limited

Consulting Engineering
Services Since 1961

2400 Meadowpine Blvd.,
Suite 102,
Mississauga, Ontario
L5N 6S2
Tel: (905) 542-1600
Fax: (905) 542-2729

Engineering Solutions for the Insurance and Legal Professions

- Structural Collapse Assessment
- Fire Investigation
- Environmental Engineering
- Slip & Fall Assessments
- Building Code Compliance
- Expert Witnessing
- Litigation Support Services