Essay #2: The Case Study

Michael McCorkell - N01500049

Moses Newman - N01590506

Humber Polytechnic

Law, Ethics & Prof. Practice - ENGI-3500-0NA

Leila Kheradpir

March 26, 2025

What are the potential liabilities in torts law that arise in this case?

In this case study, the potential tort laws that needs to be taken responsibility for leading the focus on carelessness and product responsibilities. Tort law establishes a legal framework for holding people accountable when their actions (or failures to act) causes injuries. We will discover whether the IT business and the newly licensed engineer failed in their responsibility to avoid foreseeable harm, and if so, to what degree they are responsible for.

Negligence and Duty of Care

To start off, the duty of care is a fundamental principle in tort law compelling people and organizations to take reasonable precautions to avoid foreseeable harm to others. This allows both the newly licensed engineer and the IT company to rely on their software, particularly structural engineers working on critical infrastructure projects. The breach of duty occurs when the IT firm and engineer disseminated software that failed to take into consideration in all relevant design criteria, resulting in an improper structural design. This crucial factor is the key factor of demonstrating negligence. Since the program was created for steel buildings, it’s unsurprising that engineers would utilize it for difficult projects like bridges including the lack of specific warnings contributes to the problem. As the bridge collapse & resulted the loss of five lives, it was directly related with the flawed software. To concluded, this tragedy caused severe consequences such as financial, ethical, legal implications, and worst of all the lives of those involved.

Product Liability and Defective Software

In addition to this carelessness, the IT business and engineer might face product responsibility charges. Product liability law holds manufacturers and developers accountable when are found faulty and cause injuries. To simply put, these can be divided into three types:

1. Design Defects: Problems with the product's design that render it dangerous.
2. Manufacturing Defects: Errors that occur in production.
3. Failure to Warn/report When the product does not include proper warnings or instructions on its limitations or hazards.

The software's failure to account for all essential design features may be considered a design flaw, but the real problem is with its fundamental operation. These tools lacked in the specific warnings about the scope of the project, lead engineers rely on it for a project unsuitable in this field. Regardless, the manufacturer/software developer can be held liable for product-related injuries. In short, the software was

posed an unacceptable danger for its intended use despite it already showing enough proof & evidence on it failing to do the bare minimum causing multiple problems.

Relevant Principles of Tort Law and its applicability in this case

Professional Standards and Negligence

The IT industry, as an employer, is also responsible for upholding professional standards. If the firm does not execute a complete review and testing method before releasing the software, it may be seen as a systemic failure in quality assurance.

Foreseeability and Reasonable Reliance

Another significant concept in tort law is reasonable reliance, which happens when one party appropriately relies on other's goods, service, or competence. The structural engineering firm that used the program had a fair expectation that it would be beneficial for bridge design. If a product is offered for a certain purpose, the inventor must either guarantee its safety or include explicit warnings about its limitations.

Contributory negligence.

Although the IT company and the engineer are primarily liable, the structural engineering firm that used the software may be able to claim contributory responsibility. Engineers are frequently requested to validate calculations and perform independent tests rather than simply relying on software findings. If the corporation failed to do due diligence in establishing the software's suitability for the project, it may have some responsibility for the failure. This might reduce the total responsibility of the IT business and engineer.

Using this knowledge, indicate the likely outcome of the case

Given the evidence/facts from the previous statements above, the Engineer and Firm team will be found liable in courts that don’t take kindly to preventable disasters especially in the lack of proper warnings and critical design flaws make a strong case for negligence. Their career may never recover from a harsh but necessary consequence needed especially when public trust is broken. This will make a big wake-up call for the industry making sure that they learn, improve and change on what this matter has caused to avoid issues moving forward. Here are some breakdowns that will result in the outcome to backup our claim:

1. **Liability of the Software Developer (Engineer & IT Firm)**

The investigation concluded that the software was inadequate for the bridge’s unique conditions and lacked sufficient warnings. This strongly suggests negligence in design and documentation.

2. **Breach of Standard of Care:**

Engineers are expected to ensure their products meeting the industry standards since other software did not account for critical parameters (subsurface conditions, span length), and the developer failed to meet professional expectations.

3. **Failure to Warn:**

The absence of clear disclaimers about the software's limitations could be seen as misrepresentation by commission. This may lead to the courts ruling that manufacturer warning users of foreseeable risks.

4. **Government/Regulatory Liability**

If the province approved the design without independent review, they might face claims of negligent oversight. However, governments often have sovereign immunity protections unless gross negligence is proven.

5. **Damages and Penalties**

Given the fatalities, the court will likely add:

- Compensatory Damages:
    - Wrongful death claims for the victims' families (in this case the 5 lives that were lost).
    - Economic losses (reconstruction costs, traffic disruption).
- Punitive Damages:
    - If gross negligence is proven, punitive damages may be imposed to deter similar conduct.
- Professional Consequences:
    - The engineer's P.Eng license could be suspended or revoked by Professional Engineers Ontario.
    - The IT firm may face reputational damage and loss of future contracts.