BLOGS

9 Landmark Cases on Tort Law for CLAT PG 2025

Ruchika Mohapatra · 18 Nov 2024

Here's a list of 9 landmark cases on Tort Law for CLAT PG 2025!

- Kasturi Lal v State of UP: This case dealt with the vicarious liability of the state.SC held that State will not be liable in case of the exercise of sovereign powers. However, this judgment is now considered outdated and not aligned with contemporary legal principles regarding state liability.
- Bird v Jones: Jones prohibited the plaintiff from moving in the direction he wished to go. Plaintiff was free to remain where he was, or move in any other direction but the one direction obstructed by Defendant. Plaintiff sued the Defendant for false imprisonment. It was held that since the plaintiff was allowed to move in all other directions, it doesn't amount to false imprisonment. To amount to false imprisonment, the plaintiff must be confined to some boundary of sorts.
- Perera v.Vandiyar: This case deals with tresspass. The Court held that going beyond the purpose for which a person has entered the land would amount to trespass. In this case, the tenant hadn't paid rent and the landlord cut off gas and electricity supply. This was a breach in covenant, however, it did not amount to trespass as he did not venture into the leased premises.
- State of Rajasthan v. Vidyawati: The Supreme Court held that the state must be equally liable as other companies for the acts of its employees. The concept of sovereign immunity and the rule of 'King can do no Wrong' are no longer applicable.
- Dixon v. Holden: Defamation, in this case, was defined as an injury to a man's reputation. The Court stated that, "A man's reputation is his property, and if, possible, more valuable, than other property".
- Abrath v. North Eastern Railway: The Court laid down 3 principles necessary to form a reasonable and probable cause to prosecute: 1. Person complaining took due care to be informed of the facts 2. He honestly believed his allegations to be true 3. The facts were such

as to constitute prima facie evidence.

- Hicks v. Faulker: If the defendant has honestly and bona fide instituted the prosecution, he is not liable even though due to a defective memory, he had forgotten the true facts and has gone on with the prosecution.
- Adam v. Ward: This case dealt with qualified privilege. It was held that a privileged occasion in one where the person who makes a communication has an interest/duty to make such communication and the person to whom it is made has an interest to receive.
- Cassidy v. Daily Mirror Newspaper Ltd: Mr. Cassidy didn't share a house with his wife but he visited her occasionally. The newspaper published his picture stating that his engagement had been fixed with a certain woman. This was held to be defamatory as it reflected poorly on Mr. Cassidy's wife by insinuating that she was perhaps his mistress. The Court held that the innuendo had been established and the innocence of the defendant was not a valid defence.

Read More: Law of Torts: Detailed Notes, Cases and Multiple Choice Questions