Pedestrian-Motor Vehicle Accidents: Tort & Accident Benefits Law to Know

Presented by:

Deanna S. Gilbert, Partner 416-868-3205

dgilbert@thomsonrogers.com





YOUR ADVANTAGE, in and out of the courtroom.









Introduction

- Statistics on pedestrian MVAs
- Advice to clients
 - o Tort
 - Accident Benefits



Tort Law



Overview & Relationship to Other Judicial Systems

- 1 MVA can = tort, CC charge & HTA charge
- Different burdens of proof
- Onus (generally)
- Impact of charges/convictions in tort



Reverse Onus

- "Pedestrian" under HTA
- s. 193 of *HTA*
- Applicable to MVAs on "highway"
- Evidentiary implications:
 - o Trial
 - Expert reports



Contributory Negligence





Contributory Negligence: The Concept

- Liability is not binary
- Reduces damages
- 3 ways to be contributorily negligent:
 - 1. Caused the accident
 - 2. Put himself/herself into foreseeable harm
 - 3. Caused severity of the injury



Contributory Negligence: Accident/Foreseeable Harm

Obligations & expectations of motorists

- Reverse-onus discharged by showing no negligence
- Higher duty at street crossings, but sharp look-out otherwise
- Assume pedestrians will behave rationally
- Near school/playground, drive slowly & lookout for kids



Contributory Negligence: Accident/Foreseeable Harm Cont.

- Outies to kids:
 - ➤ Reduce speed
 - >Keep proper lookout
- Kids are unpredictable so take precautions



Contributory Negligence: Accident/Foreseeable Harm Cont.

- Obligations & expectations of pedestrians
 - No absolute right to cross
 - Duty to exercise due care



Contributory Negligence: Accident/Foreseeable Harm Cont.

- E.g. Circumstances of Contributory Negligence
 - Dart-out
 - Crossing not at intersection
 - Crossing at night in dark clothes
 - Stumbling onto highway
 - Not keeping proper lookout
- No default % → Fact based



Contributory Negligence: Severity of Injury

- Cyclists → helmets
- Proximate cause of injury
- Expert evidence adduced by defence



Tender Years Doctrine

- Concept
- Ages 13+



Negligent Supervision

- Concept & allegations
- Ways responsible adult is sued





Hit and Runs



Hit and Runs: Where Plaintiff Insured

- s. 265(1)(a) requirement for UID coverage
- Sue own insurer: 2 levels
- O.A.P. 1
 - o "Insured persons"
 - o If "hit by" a UID
 - o \$200K limits



Hit and Runs: Where Plaintiff Insured Cont'd

- OPCF-44R
 - o "Insured person"
 - o If "struck by" a UID
 - Policy limits
- Broad definition → "Walked into"



Hit and Runs: Where Plaintiff Insured Cont'd

- OPCF-44R: Corroborated by "other material evidence"
 - Independent witness evidence
 - Physical evidence indicating involvement of UID
- "Independent" = Extrinsic, not neutral
- Indicating = Sign of
 - Engineering evidence
 - Injuries



Hit and Runs: Where Plaintiff Not Insured

- The Fund
- UID Coverage
- Reasonable efforts to identify
- \$200K limit



Accident Benefits





Overview

- No-fault
- Main categories of benefits
- Insurer to whom apply



Pedestrian "Accidents"

- s.3(1) SABS: Use or operation of automobile directly causes
- 2 part test
 - Purpose test
 - Causation test
- Pedestrian struck by vehicle
- Pedestrian who fell by vehicle?



Conclusion

- Nuances
- Importance of investigation
 - Obtaining the complete, unredacted police file;
 - Speaking directly with witnesses;
 - Going to the scene;
 - Taking photographs of the scene;
 - Reviewing Google Earth;



Conclusion Cont'd

- Reviewing online news articles and videos;
- Obtaining 911 calls;
- Seeing whether any private retail stores or homes in the area had surveillance that may have captured the area of the accident;
- Obtaining the Defendant's dash cam video;
- Obtaining the defendant's automobile property; damage file;



Conclusion Cont'd

- Downloading the data from the Defendant's event data recorder (AKA the vehicle's "black box"); and,
- Retaining an engineer.



Thank You

Deanna S. Gilbert, *Partner* 416-868-3205 dgilbert@thomsonrogers.com

Also, thanks to my summer student, Allahnah, for creating this power point!

