

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: History of Product Liability Law	1
1-1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1-1:1 The Doctrine of Strict Product Liability.....	1
1-1:2 The Role of the American Law Institute and the Restatements.....	3
1-2 PENNSYLVANIA JUMPS ON THE BANDWAGON	4
1-2:1 Pennsylvania Law Gets Muddier, The Mud Gets Screened . . . Into More Mud.....	6
1-2:2 Pennsylvania, Now Unstuck.....	7
1-3 <i>TINCHER</i> —WILL PENNSYLVANIA FINALLY GET IT RIGHT?	9
1-4 NOTABLE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE RESTATEMENTS (FOR WHAT IT’S WORTH IN THE POST- <i>TINCHER</i> WORLD).....	10
Chapter 2: The Rise and Fall of the Second Restatement of Torts	13
2-1 ADOPTION OF RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS	13
2-2 IMPACT OF ADOPTING THE SECOND RESTATEMENT.....	15
2-2:1 The First Step Toward Deviation: <i>Berkebile v.</i> <i>Brantly Helicopter Corp.</i>	16
2-2:2 Two-Part Strict Liability Analysis: <i>Azzarello v.</i> <i>Black Bros. Co., Inc.</i>	18
2-3 AMBIGUITIES AND INCONSISTENCIES—POST <i>BERKEBILE</i> AND <i>AZZARELLO</i> FALLOUT.....	20
Chapter 3: The Rise (and Demise) of Restatement (Third) of Torts	25
3-1 A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF TORTS.....	25
3-2 THE THIRD RESTATEMENT MAKES ITS WAY TO PENNSYLVANIA (AT LEAST FOR A LITTLE WHILE)	30
3-2:1 Justice Saylor and the Restatement (Third) of Torts ...	32
3-2:2 The Third Circuit’s False Prophecy	37

Table of Contents

3-2:3	<i>Tincher</i> and Pennsylvania’s Current Confusion.....	42
3-3	RESPONSES TO RESTATEMENT (THIRD) IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS.....	45

Chapter 4: Post-*Tincher v. Omega Flex, Inc.*—The (Pennsylvania

	Products Liability Law) Saga Continues	69
4-1	INTRODUCTION.....	69
4-2	THE <i>TINCHER</i> CASE—BACKGROUND	72
4-2:1	The <i>Tincher</i> Trial	73
4-2:2	<i>Tincher</i> —Post-Trial and Appeal.....	79
4-2:3	The Supreme Court’s Opinion	81
4-3	GETTING TO THE POINT.....	82
4-4	BACK TO THE FOUNDATIONS.....	88
4-4:1	The Duty	90
4-4:2	Breach of Duty.....	92
4-4:3	Proving “Defective Condition” in the Context of a Design-Related Claim.....	93
4-5	CONSUMER EXPECTATIONS STANDARD	97
4-6	RISK-UTILITY STANDARD	100
4-7	COMBINED TESTS.....	104
4-8	RESTATEMENT THIRD—REJECTED	107
4-8:1	The Burden of Proof	114
4-8:2	<i>Cancelleri v. Ford Motor Co</i> : A Trial Court Applies <i>Tincher</i>	117
4-8:3	Current <i>Tincher</i> Rulings: Retroactive Application of <i>Tincher</i> to Properly Preserved Cases and Unreasonably Dangerous Determination	120
4-8:4	Moving Forward.....	123
4-9	RISK/BENEFIT ANALYSIS VS. CONSUMER EXPECTATIONS TEST—GUIDANCE FROM “OUT OF STATE”	126
4-10	CONCLUSION.....	166
4-11	APPENDIX: CASES RELEVANT TO <i>TINCHER</i>	166

Chapter 5: The Restatements in Practice..... 173

5-1	RISK-UTILITY ANALYSIS UNDER THE RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS.....	173
5-2	RISK-UTILITY ANALYSIS UNDER THE RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF TORTS.....	177
5-3	APPORTIONING ENHANCEMENT ON DEFENDANT	181

Table of Contents

5-4 DEVELOPMENTS IN CRASHWORTHINESS
POST-TINCHER 183

Chapter 6: Strict Liability Concepts..... 189

6-1 INTRODUCTION..... 189

6-2 PENNSYLVANIA’S STRICT LIABILITY THEORY
OF RECOVERY 190

6-3 CATEGORIES OF PRODUCT DEFECTS 191

6-3:1 Design Defects..... 192

6-3:2 Manufacturing Defects 196

6-3:3 Inadequate Warnings 198

6-3:4 Unavoidably Unsafe Products..... 199

6-3:5 Failure-to-Warn Jury Instructions 199

6-4 DAMAGES 202

6-4:1 Economic Loss Doctrine 202

6-4:2 Emotional Distress 203

6-4:3 Punitive Damages 204

6-5 DEFENSES 205

6-5:1 Contributory Negligence / Comparative Fault 205

6-5:2 Assumption of the Risk 208

6-5:3 Unintended Use / Misuse / Subsequent Changes 209

6-5:4 Statute of Limitations..... 211

6-5:5 Sophisticated User Doctrine 213

Chapter 7: Breach of Warranty..... 215

7-1 BREACH OF WARRANTY—GENERALLY 215

7-2 BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY 215

7-3 BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY OF FITNESS
FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE 217

7-4 BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY OF
MERCHANTABILITY 217

7-5 DEFENSES 219

7-5:1 Privity 219

7-5:2 Notice of Breach of Warranty 220

7-5:3 Disclaimer of Warranties 221

7-6 MAGNUSON-MOSS WARRANTY—FEDERAL
TRADE COMMISSION IMPROVEMENT ACT 222

7-6:1 Introduction and the Rules Governing the
Contents of Warranties..... 222

7-6:2 Standards for Written Warranties 224

7-6:3 Implied Warranties 226

7-6:4 Remedies Under the Act 226

Table of Contents

Chapter 8: Negligence	229
8-1 INTRODUCTION TO NEGLIGENCE	229
8-1:1 Elements of a Negligence Claim	229
8-1:2 Scope of Applicability of Negligence in Products Liability	231
8-1:2.1 Counsel Should Include Negligence Claim in Many Situations	231
8-1:2.2 Standard of Care for Products Liability Defendants	232
8-1:2.3 Negligence and the Risk-Utility Test	233
8-1:3 Plaintiff Must Establish that Defendant Owed a Duty.....	234
8-1:3.1 Existence of a Duty as a Question of Law.....	234
8-1:3.2 Foreseeability in the Duty Analysis.....	235
8-1:3.3 The Relationship of Duty to Product’s Design, Manufacture, or Warning.....	236
8-1:4 “Unreasonable Risk of Harm to Others”	236
8-2 DEFENSES TO NEGLIGENCE	237
8-2:1 Contributory Negligence and Comparative Negligence	237
8-2:2 Assumption of the Risk in Negligence Cases.....	238
8-2:2.1 Inherent Harms in Using 19th Century Doctrine	239
8-2:2.2 Varied Forms of Assumption of the Risk	239
8-2:2.2a Assumption of Risk May be Express or Implied	239
8-2:2.2b Primary and Secondary Implied Assumption of Risk	239
8-2:2.3 Jurisdictional Applications of Assumption of the Risk.....	240
8-2:2.3a The Firefighter’s Rule	240
8-2:2.3b Assumption of Risk in Products Liability Cases	240
8-3 RES IPSA LOQUITUR.....	241
8-4 LITIGATING NEGLIGENCE AND HANDGUNS	242
8-5 NEGLIGENCE CLAIMS POST- <i>TINCHER</i>	242
8-5:1 The Court’s Summary of Duty of the Defendant	242
8-5:2 Breach of Duty	244

Table of Contents

8-5:3 Adoption of a Combined Risk-Utility and Consumer Expectation Standard Test245

Chapter 9: Manufacturing and Design Defects249

9-1 INTRODUCTION.....249

9-2 MANUFACTURING FLAWS IN PRODUCTS

LIABILITY LITIGATION.....251

9-2:1 Introduction to Manufacturing Flaws.....251

9-2:2 Key Elements of a Negligent Manufacture Claim.....251

9-2:2.1 Proving that the Manufacturer Breached the Standard of Care.....253

9-2:2.2 Failure to Perform or Inadequate Performance of Required Testing254

9-2:3 Manufacturing Defects and Strict Liability.....255

9-2:3.1 Negligence Principles Inapplicable to Manufacturing Defect Claims.....255

9-2:3.2 “Manufacturing Defect” Defined.....256

9-2:3.3 Products May be Subject to Manufacturing Defect.....256

9-2:3.4 Proof of a Manufacturing Defect in Strict Liability Claims.....256

9-2:3.5 Manufacturing Defects in Older Products.....257

9-2:4 Proving that the Manufacturing Defect Caused the Injury.....258

9-3 DESIGN FLAWS IN PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION258

9-3:1 Design Flaws Generally258

9-3:1.1 Factors to Consider in Product Design258

9-3:1.2 Judicial Concern About Repercussions of Design Defect.....259

9-3:1.3 Design Defect as Most Common Products Liability Claim259

9-3:1.4 Idiosyncratic Consumers259

9-3:1.5 Admissibility of Post-Distribution Evidence to Prove Design Defect260

9-3:2 Identifying a Negligent Design Claim.....260

9-3:2.1 Elements of a Negligent Design Claim260

9-3:2.2 History of Negligent Design Claims261

9-3:2.3 Breach of the Duty of Care Regarding Product Design262

9-3:3 Design Defects in Strict Liability263

Table of Contents

9-3:3.1	No Uniformity Among States in Determining Whether Design is Defective.....	264
9-3:3.2	Absence of Safety Device as Defect.....	264
9-3:3.3	Product Need Not Be Accident-Proof; Causation.....	265
9-3:4	Design Defects and Risk-Utility Analysis.....	265
9-3:4.1	Use of Negligence Concepts in Risk-Utility Analysis.....	265
9-3:4.2	Wade Factors.....	266
9-3:4.3	Additional Factors Used in Risk-Utility Analysis.....	268
9-4	SAFER, FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVE DESIGNS IN DESIGN CASES.....	268
9-5	POST- <i>TINCHER</i> ANALYSIS.....	269
Chapter 10: Warning Defects.....		273
10-1	INTRODUCTION TO WARNING DEFECT CLAIMS—THE NATURE OF WARNING CLAIMS.....	273
10-1:1	Warnings as Independent Basis for Products Liability.....	273
10-1:2	Warnings vs. Instructions.....	274
10-1:3	Effects of Limitless Warning Claims.....	274
10-1:4	General Rule: Duty to Warn is Limited to One’s Own Products.....	274
10-1:4.1	Disadvantage to Asbestos Victims.....	274
10-1:4.2	Respirator Manufacturers’ Liability for Asbestos Injuries.....	275
10-1:4.3	Liability for Replacement Parts Containing Asbestos.....	275
10-2	WARNINGS AND THE NEGLIGENCE-STRICT LIABILITY DILEMMA.....	275
10-2:1	Strict Liability Warning Claims vs. Claims Based on Negligence.....	277
10-2:2	Knowledge Requirements for Warning Claims Based on Negligence.....	277
10-2:3	Knowledge Requirement for Strict Liability Warning Claims.....	278
10-3	SUFFICIENCY OF WARNINGS.....	278
10-3:1	Satisfying the Sufficiency Requirement.....	278
10-3:1.1	Warning Must be Adequate in Form and Content.....	279

Table of Contents

10-3:1.2	Adequacy of Warning as a Question for the Jury	280
10-3:1.3	Adequacy of Warning as a Question of Law	280
10-4	WARNINGS AND ESTABLISHING CAUSATION	281
10-4:1	Burden of Proof	281
10-4:1.1	Proving That Inadequate Warning Caused Injury.....	281
10-4:1.2	No Causation When Product User Was Already Aware of Danger	282
10-4:1.3	Overcoming Plaintiff's Failure to Read Warning on Causation	282
10-5	WARNING DEFECTS AS MENTIONED IN <i>TINCHER</i>	282
Chapter 11: Compensatory Damages		285
11-1	INTRODUCTION.....	285
11-2	OVERVIEW OF COMPENSATORY DAMAGES IN PRODUCTS LIABILITY ACTIONS.....	286
11-2:1	Damages for Medical Expenses	286
11-2:2	Damages for Death.....	287
11-2:2.1	Wrongful Death.....	287
11-2:2.2	Survival.....	288
11-2:3	Loss of Consortium.....	289
11-2:4	Physical Impairment.....	290
11-2:5	Disfigurement	291
11-2:6	Wrongful Life	291
11-2:7	Loss of Earning Capacity	292
Chapter 12: Punitive Damages.....		293
12-1	OVERVIEW	293
12-2	STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND PUNITIVE DAMAGES.....	298
12-2:1	When a Cause of Action Accrues	299
12-2:2	Introduction of New Claims.....	300
12-2:3	Exceptions	303
12-2:3.1	Discovery Rule.....	303
12-2:3.2	Fraudulent Concealment	305
12-3	CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE IMPOSITION OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES.....	308

Table of Contents

Chapter 13: Indemnity, Contribution and Apportionment	309
13-1 INTRODUCTION—ALLOCATION OF FAULT	309
13-2 INDEMNITY	310
13-2:1 Impact of Settlement on a Claim for Indemnity	311
13-3 CONTRIBUTION	313
13-3:1 Impact of Settlement on Contribution Claims.....	313
13-4 APPORTIONMENT OF LIABILITY BETWEEN JOINT TORTFEASORS.....	315
Chapter 14: Jurisdiction, Venue and Related Principles	321
14-1 “GENERAL JURISDICTION” DISTINGUISHED FROM “SPECIFIC JURISDICTION”	321
14-1:1 Long-Arm Statutes Provide for Specific Jurisdiction	322
14-1:1.1 The <i>World-Wide</i> Breakthrough	323
14-1:1.2 Crucial Principles of <i>World-Wide</i>	324
14-1:2 Long-Arm Statutes More Restrictive Than the Due Process Clause.....	326
14-1:3 The Facts of <i>Asahi Metal Industry Co. v. Superior Court of California</i>	326
14-1:3.1 The <i>Asahi</i> Holding.....	327
14-1:3.2 The Three <i>Asahi</i> Opinions	327
14-1:3.3 The Third Circuit Has Not Yet Chosen Among <i>Asahi</i> Tests	329
14-1:3.4 Internet’s Effect on Personal Jurisdiction	330
14-1:3.5 <i>J. McIntyre Machinery, Ltd. v. Nicastro</i> : Plurality Reverts to “Purposeful Availment” Standard.....	330
14-1:3.6 Evaluating the Viability of the Stream-of-Commerce Theory Post- <i>Nicastro</i>	331
14-2 ESTABLISHING GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.....	333
14-2:1 Proving “Continuous and Systematic” Contacts	333
14-2:2 <i>Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown</i> : “Stream-of-Commerce” Theory Does Not Apply in General Jurisdiction Analysis	333
14-3 VENUE AND FORUM NON CONVENIENS	334
14-3:1 Venue and Jurisdiction Distinguished	334
14-3:2 Transfer of Venue; 28 U.S.C.S. § 1404(a).....	334
14-3:3 State Venue Statutes.....	335

Table of Contents

14-3:4	Court May Dismiss Case in Favor of Suitable Alternative Forum	337
14-3:5	Forum Non Conveniens in State Court.....	337
Chapter 15: Discovery Process.....		343
15-1	DISCOVERY PROCESS.....	343
15-1:1	Overview of Discovery in Products Liability Litigation.....	343
15-1:1.1	Nature of Discovery Varies From Court to Court.....	343
15-1:1.2	Non-Expert Discovery of Plaintiff is Relatively Straightforward	344
15-1:1.3	Plaintiff's Non-Expert Discovery of Defendant Is Far Reaching	345
15-1:1.3a	Plaintiffs Seeking to Prove Design Defect are Entitled to Broader Scope of "Relevant" Information	345
15-1:1.3b	Identifying Overly Broad or Unduly Burdensome Discovery Requests.....	347
15-1:1.3c	General Rule: Party Resisting Discovery Bears the Burden of Explaining Propriety of Objections	348
15-1:1.3d	Both Parties Should Prepare to Compromise.....	349
15-1:1.4	Plaintiffs and Defendants: Similar Approach to Expert Discovery	350
15-1:1.5	Court May Dismiss Case as Discovery Sanction.....	350
15-1:2	2000 Amendments to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	352
15-2	DISCOVERY DEVICES IN PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	353
15-2:1	Laws of Forum Court Govern Discovery.....	353
15-2:2	Interrogatories	353
15-2:3	Requests for Production of Documents and Things.....	356
15-2:4	Requests for Admissions.....	360
15-2:5	Depositions.....	363
15-3	DISCOVERY OF EXPERT WITNESSES.....	366

Table of Contents

15-3:1	Discovery of Expert Witnesses – In General.....	366
15-3:2	Expert Discovery Pursuant to Federal Rules.....	367
	15-3:2.1 Disclosures	367
	15-3:2.2 Trial Preparation.....	368
15-4	LIMITS ON DISCOVERY	369
15-4:1	Use of Privileges and Other Devices to Protect Documents From Disclosures.....	369
15-4:2	Trade Secrets.....	370
15-4:3	Attorney-Client Privilege	371
15-5	DISCOVERY FROM DEFENDANTS AND FOREIGN NON-PARTIES.....	373
15-5:1	Generally	373
15-5:2	Hague Evidence Convention – Background.....	374
15-5:3	Terms of the Hague Evidence Convention.....	375
15-5:4	Application of the Hague Evidence Convention by American Court From Ratification Through <i>Aerospatiale</i>	377
15-5:5	Discovery From Foreign Nationals Domiciled in Countries That Have Not Signed the Hague Evidence Convention	378
15-6	FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (FOIA)	378
15-6:1	Generally	378
15-6:2	Materials Subject to the Act	379
15-6:3	Nine Exemptions	380
	15-6:3.1 Generally	380
	15-6:3.2 National Security and Foreign Policy Exemption	380
	15-6:3.3 Internal Personnel Rules and Practices Exemption	380
	15-6:3.4 Statutory Exemptions	380
	15-6:3.5 Trade Secrets Exemption	381
	15-6:3.6 Inter-Agency Memorandum Exemption	381
	15-6:3.7 Personnel and Medical Records Exemption	381
	15-6:3.8 Law Enforcement Records Exemption.....	381
	15-6:3.9 Financial Institution Exemption.....	381
	15-6:3.10 Geological and Geophysical Information Exemption	382
15-6:4	Procedure Under FOIA	382

Table of Contents

Chapter 16: Evidence in Products Liability Litigation	385
16-1 OVERVIEW OF EVIDENCE IN PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION.....	385
16-2 EVIDENCE OF OTHER OCCURRENCES OR ACCIDENTS	386
16-2:1 Evidence of Prior Occurrences or Accidents.....	386
16-2:1.1 Evidence of Prior Occurrences is Often Admissible	386
16-2:1.2 Requirement for Substantial Similarity....	386
16-2:1.3 Trial Judge’s Discretion in Determining Whether Prior Occurrence is Substantially Similar.....	387
16-2:1.4 Exception to Substantial Similarity Requirement: When Evidence is Offered to Explain Scientific or Physical Principles	387
16-2:1.5 Grounds for Admission of Substantially Similar Occurrences.....	389
16-2:1.6 Admissibility of Substantially Similar Civil Lawsuits	389
16-2:1.7 Admissibility of Accident Evidence Involving Similar Product Produced by Entity Other Than Defendant.....	390
16-2:1.8 Admissibility of Prior Accidents Appearing in Governmental Reports	390
16-2:2 Evidence of the Absence of Other Occurrences or Accidents.....	391
16-2:3 Evidence of Subsequent Occurrences or Accidents.....	393
16-3 EVIDENCE OF STATE-OF-THE-ART.....	393
16-3:1 State-of-the-Art Defined	393
16-3:2 Admissibility of State-of-the-Art Evidence in Claims Based on Negligence	394
16-3:3 Admissibility of State-of-the-Art Evidence in Claims Based on Strict Liability.....	395
16-3:3.1 Inconsistent Approaches to Admissibility.....	395
16-3:3.2 State-of-the-Art Evidence and Common Law Strict Liability Cases	395
16-4 EVIDENCE OF TRADE CUSTOMS, INDUSTRY PRACTICES, AND TECHNICAL STANDARDS.....	395

Table of Contents

16-4:1	General Rule: Evidence of Trade Customs, Industry Practices, and Technical Standards is Admissible	395
16-5	EVIDENCE OF STATUTES, ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE CODES	399
16-6	EVIDENCE OF SUBSEQUENT REMEDIAL MEASURES	399
16-6:1	Introduction of Remedial Measures Evidence	399
16-6:1.1	Repair Doctrine Becomes Operative After Triggering “Event”	399
16-6:1.2	Examples of Post-Accident Modifications.....	401
16-6:1.3	Applicability of Repair Doctrine to Strict Liability Actions.....	401
16-6:1.4	Repairs Doctrine Applies to Warning, Manufacturing, and Design Changes.....	401
16-6:1.5	Exceptions to Repair Doctrine.....	402
16-6:1.6	Admissibility of Subsequent Remedial Measures to Impeach	403
16-6:1.7	Admissibility of Subsequent Remedial Measures on the Issue of Feasibility	403
16-6:2	Subsequent Remedial Measures in the Federal Courts.....	404
16-6:2.1	Congress Revised Fed. R. Evid. 407 in 1997	404
16-6:2.1a	The Original Rule Was Promulgated Because Subsequent Conduct Was Not an Admission of Liability	404
16-6:2.1b	The Original Rule Was Also Promulgated Because of Public Policy	405
16-6:2.1c	Subsequent Remedial Measures May be Introduced to Prove Ownership	406
16-6:2.2	Products Liability Cases.....	406
16-6:2.2a	Federal Courts Exclude Subsequent Remedial Measures in Negligence Cases	406

Table of Contents

16-6:2.2b	Defendant Cannot Introduce Subsequent Remedial Measures Taken by a Plaintiff	407
16-6:2.2c	Evidence of Subsequent Remedial Measures Not Admissible in Strict Liability Cases	407
16-6:2.2d	Party's Motive for Making the Subsequent Remedial Measure is Irrelevant	408
16-6:2.2e	Expert May be Permitted to Base Testimony on Subsequent Remedial Measure.....	408
16-6:2.3	Post-Manufacture, Pre-Accident Remedial Measures Fed. R. Evid. 407 Applies Only to Remedial Measures Taken After Event.....	408
16-6:2.3a	Cases Illustrating Inapplicability of Fed. R. Evid. 407 to Measures Taken Before Event.....	409
16-6:2.4	Remedial Measures Taken by Third Persons Rule 407 Only Applies to Actions Taken by Defendant	411
16-6:2.4a	Rule 407 Does Not Apply to Remedial Measures Taken by Third Parties	412
16-6:2.5	"Superior Authority" Exception	412
16-6:2.6	Fed. R. Evid. 407 Does Not Require Exclusion of Evidence of Defendant's Investigation into Accident	412
16-7	DEMONSTRATIVE EVIDENCE	414
16-7:1	Demonstrative Evidence: A Ubiquitous Aspect of Product Litigation	414
16-7:1.1	Authentication of Demonstrative Evidence; Fed. R. Evid. 901, 902	414
16-7:1.2	Substantial Similarity	415
16-7:1.2a	Examples of Cases Discussing Substantial Similarity Requirement.....	415

Table of Contents

16-7:1.3	Exclusion of Demonstrative Evidence on Grounds of Prejudice, Confusion, or Waste of Time.....	417
16-7:1.3a	Fed. R. Evid. 403 Recognizes Discretionary Role of Trial Judge	417
16-7:1.3b	Exclusion on Grounds of Unfair Prejudice	418
16-7:1.3b1	Cases Discussing Prejudicial Effect of Demonstrative Evidence	419
16-7:1.3c	Exclusion on Grounds of Being Confusing and Misleading.....	419
16-7:1.3c1	Distinguishing Between Confusion and Misleading Evidence	420
16-7:1.3d	Exclusion on Grounds of Being Cumulative and Time Consuming	420
16-7:1.3d1	Examples of Demonstrative Evidence Excluded Because of Undue Delay, Waste of Time, or Needless Presentation of Cumulative Evidence	420
16-7:1.4	Conditional Admissibility; Limiting Instructions.....	422
16-7:1.4a	Examples of Limiting Instructions	422
16-7:2	Demonstrative Evidence in Products Liability	423
16-7:2.1	Actual, Allegedly Defective Product	423
16-7:2.1a	Admissibility of Product Following Significant Alterations.....	423

Table of Contents

	16-7:2.1a1 Situations Where an Altered Product is Admitted.....	424
16-7:2.1b	Spoliation of Evidence.....	424
	16-7:2.1b1 Defective Product is Frequently Destroyed, Damaged, or Lost	425
	16-7:2.1b2 Protective Orders and Sanctions as Remedies for Spoliation	428
	16-7:2.1b3 Spoliation of Evidence is Not a Separate Tort in Pennsylvania.....	428
Chapter 17: Expert Evidence and Products Liability		429
17-1	INTRODUCTION TO EXPERT TESTIMONY	429
	17-1:1 Experts Play Crucial Role in Almost All Product Liability Cases	429
	17-1:2 Expert Testimony Must Assist Trier of Fact	430
17-2	QUALIFICATIONS OF EXPERTS	430
	17-2:1 Court May Qualify Witness as Expert in Wide Range of Endeavors	431
	17-2:2 Fed. R. Evid. 702 Provides Liberal Rule of Qualification	431
	17-2:3 Determination of Competency of Expert Witness is Discretionary.....	432
	17-2:4 Determination of Expert's Qualification is Fact-Intensive	432
	17-2:5 Witness With General Competence and Specific Competence May Qualify as an Expert.....	433
17-3	FACTUAL BASIS FOR EXPERT TESTIMONY.....	434
	17-3:1 Fed. R. Evid. 703 Provides Liberal Rule of Qualification	434
	17-3:2 Courts' Determination of Whether Facts are of Type "Reasonably Relied On" by Expert in Field	436
17-4	EXPERT METHODOLOGY AND RELIABILITY	436
	17-4:1 Introduction to Reliability Analysis of Expert Methodology	436

Table of Contents

17-4:2	Ascendancy of <i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> and Demise of <i>Frye v. United States</i>	437
17-4:2.1	Supreme Court Sets Forth Standards for Admissibility of Expert Testimony	437
17-4:2.2	<i>General Electric Co. v. Joiner</i> Endorses District Court’s Broad Discretion in Admitting Testimony	438
17-4:2.3	<i>Kumho Tire Co., Ltd. v. Carmichael: Daubert</i> Applies to Testimony Based on Technical or Other Specialized Knowledge.....	439
17-4:2.4	<i>Weisgram v. Marley Co.</i> : Court of Appeals May Reverse if Testimony is Erroneously Admitted	440
17-4:3	States Continuing to Apply <i>Frye</i> or Applying Idiosyncratic Standards	440
17-4:3.1	Pennsylvania Continues to Apply <i>Frye</i>	441
17-4:4	Methods for Fulfilling Gatekeeping Function Under <i>Daubert</i>	443
17-4:5	Federal Courts Continue to Interpret <i>Daubert</i>	443
17-4:5.1	Third Circuit Expanded Upon <i>Daubert</i> Criteria	443
	17-4:5.1a Examples of Courts Applying <i>Daubert/Paoli</i> Factors.	444
17-4:5.2	“Fit” Requirement	446
17-4:5.3	Expert Should Explain Underlying Reasoning or Methodology	447
17-4:5.4	Opinions Developed Solely for Litigation Purposes.....	448
17-4:5.5	“Indicia of Reliability”.....	449
17-4:5.6	No Single Factor is Determinative in <i>Daubert</i> Analysis.....	450
17-4:5.7	Failure to Test Expert’s Theory is Important Factor	451
17-4:5.8	<i>Daubert</i> ’s Focus is on Methodology, Not Conclusions	452
17-5	THE USE OF EXPERT WITNESSES UNDER THE CONSUMER EXPECTATION AND RISK-UTILITY STANDARDS.....	454

Table of Contents

Chapter 18: Automotive Products Liability Law (Lemon Law)457

18-1 PENNSYLVANIA LEMON LAW.....457

 18-1:1 Nonconformity.....458

 18-1:2 Presumption of Reasonable Number of Attempts....459

 18-1:3 Damages.....460

18-2 MAGNUSON-MOSS WARRANTY ACT (MMWA) AND
UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE (UCC)460

 18-2:1 Breach of Warranty460

 18-2:2 Damages.....461

18-3 UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES AND CONSUMER
PROTECTION LAW (UTPCPL).....461

 18-3:1 Purpose of the Law.....461

 18-3:2 Violations462

 18-3:3 Damages.....462

18-4 LEMON LAW STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.....463

 18-4:1 Accrual of Time for UCC Breach of Express and
 Implied Warranties464

 18-4:2 Caveat – Argument for a Six-Year Limitations
 Period466

 18-4:3 Significant Changes467

Chapter 19: Federal Preemption.....469

19-1 PREEMPTION OF STATE LAW CLAIMS469

 19-1:1 Preemption in General, Application to Common
 Law Claims in Product Liability Actions,
 Preemption and Products Liability469

 19-1:2 Preemption as a Defense.....472

19-2 PREEMPTION IN PENNSYLVANIA.....473

19-3 SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF PREEMPTION474

 19-3:1 The Federal Hazardous Substances Act.....474

 19-3:2 Toys, The CPSC, CPSA and NTMVSA.....476

 19-3:3.1 Conflict Preemption and the CPSA483

 19-3:3.2 Express Preemption and the CPSA.....486

19-4 MEDICAL DEVICES AND FEDERAL PREEMPTION....488

 19-4:1 MDA Classifications.....488

 19-4:2 Express Preemption Under the MDA489

19-5 OSHA AND PREEMPTION491

 19-5:1 Field Preemption Under OSHA495

19-6 PREEMPTION AND THE FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY
ACT OF 1971497

 19-6:1 Express Preemption and the FBSA.....498

Table of Contents

19-6:2	The FBSA's Savings Clause Does Not Preserve Common Law Claims	503
19-7	SUMMARY JUDGMENT WHERE PREEMPTION EXISTS	509
19-8	CONCLUSION.....	509

Chapter 20: Food, Drugs and Rock and Roll . . . or Medical Devices

	(Hair Today, Gone Tomorrow)	511
20-1	FOOD	511
20-2	MEDICAL DEVICES	519
20-3	PREEMPTION IN DESIGN DEFECT AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY FAILURE TO WARN.....	520
20-3:1	Drugs and Preemption.....	521
20-3:1.1	In General.....	521
20-3:1.2	Express Preemption	522
20-3:1.3	Conflict in the Circuits.....	527
20-3:1.4	Pennsylvania Law	528
20-4	HAIR PRODUCTS.....	528

Chapter 21: Recalls.....531

21-1	“RECALL” DISTINGUISHED FROM “RETROFIT”	531
21-2	FEDERAL AGENCIES WITH STATUTORY AUTHORITY TO RECALL PRODUCTS	532
21-3	NO COMMON LAW DUTY TO RECALL IN VAST MAJORITY OF JURISDICTIONS.....	532
21-4	“POST-SALE DUTY TO WARN” DISTINGUISHED FROM “DUTY TO RECALL”.....	533
21-5	STATUTORY AND OTHER AUTHORITY AUTHORIZING RECALLS.....	534
21-5:1	National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act.....	534
21-5:2	Consumer Product Safety Act	534
21-5:3	Food Drug and Cosmetic Act.....	535
21-5:4	National Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards Act	536
21-5:5	Recreational Vessels Act	536
21-5:6	Federal Trade Commission	537
21-6	DEFINITION OF DEFECT FOR PURPOSES OF RECALL.....	537
21-6:1	Regulatory “Defect” Versus Products Liability Defect	537
21-6:2	National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act.....	538

Table of Contents

- 21-6:3 Consumer Product Safety Act and “Defect” -
Statutory Basis for Recall, “Imminently Hazardous
Product” and “Substantial Product Hazard” 539
- 21-7 VOLUNTARY RECALLS AND MANDATORY
RECALLS..... 540
- 21-8 RECALL NOTICES AND EVIDENTIARY
CONSIDERATIONS..... 541
 - 21-8:1 Recall Notices are Generally Admissible to
Show that Defect Existed While in Hands of
Manufacturer..... 541
 - 21-8:2 Failure to Recall as Evidence for Punitive Damages541
 - 21-8:3 Recall Notice Must be Relevant to be Admitted 542
 - 21-8:4 Recall Notice May be Inadmissible Under Repair
Doctrine and Fed. R. Evid. 407 542
 - 21-8:5 Public Policy 542
- 21-9 CPSC RECALL RESOURCES 543

- Table of Cases..... 559**

- Index 589**

