

## UNIFORM COMPARATIVE FAULT ACT

### Section

1. Effect of Contributory Fault.
2. Apportionment of Damages.
3. Set-off.
4. Right of Contribution.
5. Enforcement of Contribution.
6. Effect of Release.
7. Uniformity of Application and Construction.
8. Short Title.
9. Severability.
10. Prospective Effect of Act.
11. Repeal.

### Section 1. [Effect of Contributory Fault].

(a) In an action based on fault seeking to recover damages for injury or death to person or harm to property, any contributory fault chargeable to the claimant diminishes proportionately the amount awarded as compensatory damages for an injury attributable to the claimant's contributory fault, but does not bar recovery. This rule applies whether or not under prior law the claimant's contributory fault constituted a defense or was disregarded under applicable legal doctrines, such as last clear chance.

(b) "Fault" includes acts or omissions that are in any measure negligent or reckless toward the person or property of the actor or others, or that subject a person to strict tort liability. The term also includes breach of warranty, unreasonable assumption of risk not constituting an enforceable express consent, misuse of a product for which the defendant otherwise would be liable, and unreasonable failure to avoid an injury or to mitigate damages. Legal requirements of causal relation apply both to fault as the basis for liability and to contributory fault.

### COMMENT

This Section states the general principle, that a plaintiff's contributory fault does not bar his recovery but instead apportions damages according to the proportionate fault of the parties.

Harms Covered. The specific application of that principle, as provided for in this Act, is confined to physical harm to person or property. But it necessarily includes consequential damages deriving from the physical harm, such as doctor's bills, loss of wages or costs of repair or replacement of property. It does not include matters like economic loss resulting from a tort such as negligent misrepresentation, or interference with contractual relations or injurious falsehood, or harm to reputation resulting from defamation. But failure to include these harms specifically in the Act is not intended to preclude application of the general principle to them if a court determines that the common law of the state would make the application.

Conduct Covered. (a) Defendant's Conduct. The Act applies to "acts or omissions that are in any measure negligent or reckless toward the person or property . . . of others." This includes the traditional action for negligence but covers all negligent conduct, whether it comes within the traditional negligence action or not. It

includes negligence as a matter of law, arising from court decision or criminal statute. "In any measure" is intended to cover all degrees and kinds of negligent conduct without the need of listing them specifically.

In some states reckless conduct goes by a different name, such as willful or wanton misconduct. The decision must be made in the particular state whether the language used is sufficiently broad for the purpose or if additional language is needed.

Although strict liability is sometimes called absolute liability or liability without fault, it is still included. Strict liability for both abnormally dangerous activities and for products bears a strong similarity to negligence as a matter of law (negligence per se), and the factfinder should have no real difficulty in setting percentages of fault. Putting out a product that is dangerous to the user or the public or engaging in an activity that is dangerous to those in the vicinity involves a measure of fault that can be weighed and compared, even though it is not characterized as negligence.

An action for breach of warranty is held to sound sometimes in tort and sometimes in contract. There is no intent to include in the coverage of the Act actions that are fully contractual in their gravamen and in which the plaintiff is suing solely because he did not recover what he contracted to receive. The restriction of coverage to physical harms to person or property excludes these claims.

The Act does not include intentional torts. Statutes and decisions have not applied the comparative fault principle to them. But a court determining that the general principle should apply at common law to a case before it of an intentional tort is not precluded from that holding by the Act.

For certain types of torts, such as nuisance, the defendant's conduct may be intentional, negligent or subject to strict liability. In the latter two instances the Act would apply, but not in a case in which the defendant intentionally inflicts the injury on the plaintiff.

A tort action based on violation of a statute is within the coverage of the Act if the conduct comes within the definition of fault and unless the statute is construed as intended to provide for recovery of full damage irrespective of contributory fault.

(b) Plaintiff's Conduct. "Fault," as defined in Subsection (b), includes conduct of the plaintiff or other claimant, as well as a defendant.

"Contributory fault chargeable to the claimant" includes legally imputed fault as in the cases of principal and agent and of an action for loss of services of a spouse. It also covers a situation in which fault is not imputed but would still have barred recovery prior to passage of the Act-as, for example, a wrongful-death action in which the decedent's contributory negligence would have barred recovery even though it was not imputed to the person bringing the action.

Contributory fault diminishes recovery whether it was previously a bar or not, as, for example, in the case of ordinary contributory negligence in an action based on strict liability or recklessness. Last clear chance is expressly included with its variations.

"Assumption of risk" is a term with a number of different meanings-only one of which is "fault" within the meaning of this Act. This is the case of unreasonable assumption of risk, which might be likened to deliberate

contributory negligence and means that the conduct must have been voluntary and with knowledge of the danger. As used in this Act, the term does not include the meanings (1) of a valid and enforceable consent (which is treated like other contracts), (2) of a lack of violation of duty by the defendant (as in the failure of a landowner to warn a licensee of a patent danger on the premises), or (3) of a reasonable assumption of risk (which is not fault and should not have the effect of barring recovery).

"Misuse of a product" is a term also with several meanings. The meaning in this Section is confined to a misuse giving rise to a danger that could have been reasonably anticipated and guarded against. The Act does not apply to a misuse giving rise to a danger that could not reasonably have been anticipated and guarded against by the manufacturer, so that the product was therefore not defective or unreasonably dangerous.

The doctrine of avoidable consequences is expressly included in the coverage.

Causation. For the conduct stigmatized as fault to have any effect under the provisions of this Act it must have had an adequate causal relation to the claimant's damage. This includes the rules of both cause in fact and proximate cause.

"Injury attributable to the claimant's contributory fault" refers to the requirement of a causal relation for the particular damage. Thus, negligent failure to fasten a seat belt would diminish recovery only for damages in which the lack of a seat-belt restraint played a part, and not, for example, to the damage to the car. A similar rule applies to a defendant's fault; a physician, for example, negligently setting a broken arm, is not liable for other injuries received in an automobile accident.

**1979 Addition to Comment:** Adaptation of the Act to Modified Form of Comparative Negligence. If a state now using the modified form of comparative negligence should decide that in the light of its experience it is wedded to that form and not willing to change to the pure form, the Act may be adopted for this purpose, as indicated below, by adding the words in italics:

#### Section 1. [Effect of Contributory Fault]

(a) In an action based on fault seeking to recover damages for injury or death to person or harm to property, any contributory fault chargeable to the claimant, if not greater than the combined fault of all other parties to the claim, including third-party defendants and persons released under Section 6, diminishes proportionately the amount awarded as compensatory damages for an injury attributable to the claimant's contributory fault, but does not bar recovery. This rule applies whether or not under prior law the claimant's contributory fault constituted a defense or was disregarded under applicable legal doctrines, such as last clear chance.

(b) Whenever both parties to a claim and counterclaim have sustained damage caused by fault or both, each party can recover from the other in proportion to their relative fault in accordance with Section 3, regardless of whose fault is the greater.

(c) "Fault" includes acts or omissions that are in any measure negligent or reckless toward the person or property of the actor or others, or that subject a person to strict tort liability. The term also includes breach of warranty, unreasonable assumption of risk not constituting and enforceable express consent, measure of a product for which the defendant otherwise would be liable, and unreasonable failure to avoid an injury or to mitigate

damages. Legal requirements of causal relation apply both to fault as the basis for liability and to contributory fault.

## Section 2. [Apportionment of Damages].

(a) In all actions involving fault of more than one party to the action, including third-party defendants and persons who have been released under Section 6, the court, unless otherwise agreed by all parties, shall instruct the jury to answer special interrogatories or, if there is no jury, shall make findings, indicating:

(1) the amount of damages each claimant would be entitled to recover if contributory fault is disregarded; and

(2) the percentage of the total fault of all of the parties to each claim that is allocated to each claimant, defendant, third-party defendant, and person who has been released from liability under Section 6. For this purpose the court may determine that two or more persons are to be treated as a single party.

(b) In determining the percentages of fault, the trier of fact shall consider both the nature of the conduct of each party at fault and the extent of the causal relation between the conduct and the damages claimed.

(c) The court shall determine the award of damages to each claimant in accordance with the findings, subject to any reduction under Section 6, and enter judgment against each party liable on the basis of rules of joint-and-several liability. For purposes of contribution under Sections 4 and 5, the court also shall determine and state in the judgment each party's equitable share of the obligation to each claimant in accordance with the respective percentages of fault.

(d) Upon motion made not later than [one year] after judgment is entered, the court shall determine whether all or part of a party's equitable share of the obligation is uncollectible from that party, and shall reallocate any uncollectible amount among the other parties, including a claimant at fault, according to their respective percentages of fault. The party whose liability is reallocated is nonetheless subject to contribution and to any continuing liability to the claimant on the judgment.

### COMMENT

Parties. It is assumed that the state procedure provides for bringing in third-party defendants as parties. If not, the procedural statutes or rules may need to be amended to permit it, at least for purposes of contribution.

The limitation to parties to the action means ignoring other persons who may have been at fault with regard to the particular injury but who have not been joined as parties. This is a deliberate decision. It cannot be told with certainty whether that person was actually at fault or what amount of fault should be attributed to him, or whether he will ever be sued, or whether the statute of limitations will run on him, etc. An attempt to settle these matters in a suit to which he is not a party would not be binding on him. Both plaintiff and defendants will have significant incentive for joining available defendants who may be liable. The more parties joined whose fault contributed to the injury, the smaller the percentage of fault allocated to each of the other parties, whether plaintiff or defendant.

In situations such as that of principal and agent, driver and owner of a car, or manufacturer and retailer of a product, the court may under appropriate circumstances find that the two persons should be treated as a single party for purposes of allocating fault.

Percentages of fault. In comparing the fault of the several parties for the purpose of obtaining percentages there are a number of implications arising from the concept of fault. The conduct of the claimant or of any defendant may be more or less at fault, depending upon all the circumstances including such matters as (1) whether the conduct was mere inadvertence or engaged in with an awareness of the danger involved, (2) the magnitude of the risk created by the conduct, including the number of persons endangered and the potential seriousness of the injury, (3) the significance of what the actor was seeking to attain by his conduct, (4) the actor's superior or inferior capacities, and (5) the particular circumstances, such as the existence of an emergency requiring a hasty decision.

A rule of law that a particular defendant owes a higher degree of care (as in the case of a common carrier of passengers) or a lesser degree of care (as in the case of an automobile host in a state having a valid automobile-guest statute) or that no negligence is required (as in the case of conducting blasting operations in an urban area) is important in determining whether he is liable at all. If the liability has been established, however, the rule itself does not play a part in determining the relative proportion of fault of this party in comparison with the others. But the policy behind the rule may be quite important. An error in driving on the part of a bus driver with a load of passengers may properly produce an evaluation of greater fault than the same error on the part of a housewife gratuitously giving her neighbor a ride to the shopping center; and an automobile manufacturer putting out a car with a cracked brake cylinder may, even in the absence of proof of negligence in failing to discover the crack, properly be held to a greater measure of fault than another manufacturer producing a mechanical pencil with a defective clasp that due care would have discovered.

In determining the relative fault of the parties, the fact-finder will also give consideration to the relative closeness of the causal relationship of the negligent conduct of the defendants and the harm to the plaintiff. Degrees of fault and proximity of causation are inextricably mixed, as a study of last clear chance indicates, and that common law doctrine has been absorbed in this Act. This position has been followed under statutes making no specific provision for it.

Joint and Several Liability and Equitable Shares of the Obligation. The common law rule of joint-and-several liability of joint tortfeasors continues to apply under this Act. This is true whether the claimant was contributorily negligent or not. The plaintiff can recover the total amount of his judgment against any defendant who is liable.

The judgment for each claimant also sets forth, however, the equitable share of the total obligation to the claimant for each party, based on his established percentage of fault. This indicates the amount that each party should eventually be responsible for as a result of the rules of contribution. Stated in the judgment itself, it makes the information available to the parties and will normally be a basis for contribution without the need for a court order arising from motion or separate action.

Reallocation. Reallocation of the equitable share of the obligation of a party takes place when his share is uncollectible.

Reallocation takes place among all parties at fault. This includes a claimant who is contributorily at fault.

It avoids the unfairness both of the common law rule of joint-and-several liability, which would cast the total risk of uncollectibility upon the solvent defendants, and of a rule abolishing joint-and-several liability, which would cast the total risk of uncollectibility upon the claimant.

Control by the court. The total of the several percentages of fault for the plaintiff and all defendants, as found in the special interrogatories, should add up to 100%. Whether the court will inform the jury of this will depend upon the local practice.

The court should be able to exercise any usual powers under existing law of setting aside or modifying a verdict if it is internally inconsistent or shows bias or prejudice, etc. On the same basis as the remittitur principle, a court might indicate its intent to set aside a percentage allocation unless the parties agreed to a somewhat different one.

Illustration No. 1. (Simple 2-party situation).

A sues B. A's damages are \$10,000.

A is found 40% at fault.

B is found 60% at fault.

A recovers judgment for \$6,000.

Illustration No. 2. (Multiple-party situation).

A sues B, C and D. A's damages are \$10,000.

A is found 40% at fault.

B is found 30% at fault.

C is found 30% at fault.

D is found 0% at fault.

A is awarded judgment jointly and severally against B & C for \$6,000. The court also states in the judgment the equitable share of the obligation of each party:

A's equitable share is \$4,000 (40% of \$10,000).

B's equitable share is \$3,000 (30% of \$10,000).

C's equitable share is \$3,000 (30% of \$10,000).

Illustration No. 3. (Reallocation computation under Subsection (d) ).

Same facts as in Illustration No. 2.

On proper motion to the court, C shows that B's share is uncollectible. The court orders that B's equitable share be reallocated between A and C. The court orders that B's equitable share be allocated between A and C.

A's equitable share is increased by \$1,714 ( $\frac{4}{7}$  of \$3,000).

C's equitable share is increased by \$1,286 ( $\frac{3}{7}$  of \$3,000).

### Section 3. [Set-off].

A claim and counterclaim shall not be set off against each other, except by agreement of both parties. On motion, however, the court, if it finds that the obligation of either party is likely to be uncollectible, may order that both parties make payment into court for distribution. The court shall distribute the funds received and declare obligations discharged as if the payment into court by either party had been a payment to the other party and any distribution of those funds back to the party making payment had been a payment to him by the other party.

### Section 4. [Right of Contribution].

(a) A right of contribution exists between or among two or more persons who are jointly and severally liable upon the same indivisible claim for the same injury, death, or harm, whether or not judgment has been recovered against all or any of them. It may be enforced either in the original action or by a separate action brought for that purpose. The basis for contribution is each person's equitable share of the obligation, including the equitable share of a claimant at fault, as determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 2.

(b) Contribution is available to a person who enters into a settlement with a claimant only (1) if the liability of the person against whom contribution is sought has been extinguished and (2) to the extent that the amount paid in settlement was reasonable.

### COMMENT

Sections 4, 5 and 6 are expected to replace the Uniform Contribution Among Tortfeasors Act (1955) in a state following the principle of comparative fault. The three sections, however, apply whether the plaintiff was contributorily at fault or not.

Section 4 is in general accord with the provisions of the 1955 Uniform Act, but the test for determining the measure of contribution and thus establishing the ultimate responsibility is no longer on a pro rata basis. Instead, it is on a basis of proportionate fault determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 2. A plaintiff who is contributorily at fault also shares in the proportionate responsibility.

Joint-and-several liability under the common law means that each defendant contributing to the same harm is liable to him for the whole amount of the recoverable damages. This is not changed by the Act. Between the defendants themselves, however, the apportionment is in accordance with the equitable shares of the obligation, as established under Section 2.

If the defendants cause separate harms or if the harm is found to be divisible on a reasonable basis, however, the liability may become several for a particular harm, and contribution is not appropriate. See Restatement (Second) of Torts § 433A (1965).

Section 5. [Enforcement of Contribution].

(a) If the proportionate fault of the parties to a claim for contribution has been established previously by the court, as provided by Section 2, a party paying more than his equitable share of the obligation, upon motion, may recover judgment for contribution.

(b) If the proportionate fault of the parties to the claim for contribution has not been established by the court, contribution may be enforced in a separate action, whether or not a judgment has been rendered against either the person seeking contribution or the person from whom contribution is being sought.

(c) If a judgment has been rendered, the action for contribution must be commenced within [one year] after the judgment becomes final. If no judgment has been rendered, the person bringing the action for contribution either must have (1) discharged by payment the common liability within the period of the statute of limitations applicable to the claimant's right of action against him and commenced the action for contribution within [one year] after payment, or (2) agreed while action was pending to discharge the common liability and, within [one year] after the agreement, have paid the liability and commenced an action for contribution.

COMMENT

Illustration No. 9. (Equitable shares previously established by court).

A sues B and C. His damages are \$10,000.

A is found 40% at fault.

B is found 30% at fault.

C is found 30% at fault.

A, with a joint-and-several judgment for \$6,000 against B and C, collects the whole amount from B.

On proper motion to the court, B is entitled to contribution from C in the amount of \$3,000.

Illustration No. 10. (Equitable shares not established).

A sues B. His damages are \$20,000.

A is found 40% at fault.

B is found 60% at fault.

Judgment for A for \$12,000 is paid by B.



B then brings a separate action seeking contribution from C, who was not a party to the original action.

C is found to be liable for the same injury, and as between B and C, C is found to be 50% at fault.

Judgment for contribution for \$6,000 is awarded to B.

If A had voluntarily joined or been brought in as a party to this second action, proportionate fault would have been determined for all parties, including A and B, and contribution against C would have been awarded on that basis.

#### Section 6. [Effect of Release].

A release, covenant not to sue, or similar agreement entered into by a claimant and a person liable discharges that person from all liability for contribution, but it does not discharge any other persons liable upon the same claim unless it so provides. However, the claim of the releasing person against other persons is reduced by the amount of the released person's equitable share of the obligation, determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 2.

#### COMMENT

Effect of release on liability of other tortfeasors. The provision that release of one tortfeasor does not release the others unless the release so provides is taken from the Uniform Contribution Among Tortfeasors Act (1955). It is a common statutory provision.

Effect of release on right of contribution. The question of the contribution rights of tortfeasors A and B against tortfeasor C, who settled and obtained a release or covenant not to sue admits of three answers: (1) A and B are still able to obtain contribution against C, despite the release, (2) A and B are not entitled to contribution unless the release was given not in good faith but by way of collusion, and (3) the plaintiff's total claim is reduced by the proportionate share of C. Each of the three solutions has substantial disadvantages, yet each has been adopted in one of the uniform acts. The first solution was adopted by the 1939 Uniform Contribution Act. Its disadvantage is that it discourages settlements; a tortfeasor has no incentive to settle if he remains liable for contribution. The second solution was adopted by the 1955 Contribution Act. While it theoretically encourages settlements, it may be unfair to the other defendants and if the good-faith requirement is conscientiously enforced settlements may be discouraged.

The third solution is adopted in this Section. Although it may have some tendency to discourage a claimant from entering into a settlement, this solution is fairly based on the proportionate-fault principle.

"Discharges . . . from all liability for contribution." A reallocated share of contribution, as provided in Section 2(d), comes within the meaning of this phrase, and the discharge of the released person under this Section applies to that liability as well. Since the claim is reduced by the amount of the released person's equitable share, the increased amount of that share as a result of the reallocation is charged against the releasing person.

#### Illustration No. 11. (Effect of release).

A was injured through the concurrent negligence of B, C and D. His damages are \$20,000. A settles with

B for \$2,000.

The trial produces the following results:

A, 40% at fault (equitable share, \$8,000)

B, 30% at fault (equitable share, \$6,000)

C, 20% at fault (equitable share, \$4,000)

D, 10% at fault (equitable share, \$2,000)

A's claim is reduced by B's equitable share (\$6,000). He is awarded a judgment against C and D, making them jointly and severally liable for \$6,000.

Their equitable shares of the obligation are \$4,000 and \$2,000 respectively.

Illustration No. 12. Release to one tortfeasor; another's share is uncollectible).

Same facts as in Illustration No. 11.

It is now found that D's share of \$2,000 is uncollectible. Upon proper motion to the court that share is reallocated as follows:

A's equitable share is increased by  $\frac{4}{9}$  (his own proportionate fault), plus  $\frac{3}{9}$  (B's proportionate fault), or \$1,556.

C's equitable share is increased by  $\frac{2}{9}$  or \$444.

Immunities. The problem of a wrongdoer who is entitled to a legal immunity could be treated like a released tortfeasor in this Section-join him to the action to determine his equitable share of the obligation and subtract it from the amount of the claimant's recovery. But this would unfairly cast the whole loss on the claimant. This might be adjusted by spreading the immune party's obligation among all of the parties at fault, including the claimant, as in Subsection 2(d). But this same result is also accomplished by leaving the immune party out of the action altogether; a far easier and simpler solution. This Act therefore makes no provision for immunities. It must be borne in mind, however, that some states treat some immunities as not applying to a suit for contribution. This raises different problems, which can be handled under third-party practice.

Worker's compensation. An injured employee who has received or is entitled to worker's compensation benefits from his employer may ordinarily bring a tort action against a third party, such as the manufacturer of the machine that injured him, and recover for his injury in full. Under the rule in most states, the defendant is not entitled to contribution from the employer, even though the employer was negligent in maintaining the machine or instructing the employee in its use. This casting of the whole loss on the tort defendant may be unfair and greatly in need of legislative adjustment. It is so affected by the policies underlying the worker's compensation systems, however, and these policies vary so substantially in the several states that it was felt inappropriate to include a section on the problem in a uniform act.

Several solutions are possible. Thus, contribution against the employer may be provided for. Or the recovery by the employee may be reduced by the proportionate share of the employer. Or the amount of that proportionate share may be divided evenly between the employer and employee, so that the compensation system bears responsibility for it. Provision also needs to be made for the relation of the tort defendant to the compensation benefits. In any event, contributory negligence on the part of the employee will come within the scope of this Act and will affect the amount of recovery.

Section 7. [Uniformity of Application and Construction].

This Act shall be applied and construed so as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law with respect to the subject of this Act among states enacting it.

Section 8. [Short Title].

This Act may be cited as the Uniform Comparative Fault Act.

Section 9. [Severability].

If any provision of this Act or application of it to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the invalidity does not affect other provisions or applications of the Act that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Act are severable.

Section 10. [Prospective Effect of Act].

This Act applies to all [claims for relief] [causes of action] accruing after its effective date.

Section 11. [Repeal].

The following acts and parts of acts are repealed:

COMMENT

A state that has adopted either of the two Uniform Contribution Among Tortfeasors Acts will of course plan to repeal it. This is also true of other statutory provisions on contribution for tortfeasors.

This Act does not necessitate any changes in the statutory language of Article 2 of the Uniform Commercial Code, but it may have the effect of slightly modifying some of the Comments to §§ 2-314 to 2-316 and 2-715 on proximate cause and the effect of contributory fault.