











### Professional negligence – a few key points

- Keep in mind that professional negligence follows regular negligence doctrine with regard to *superior knowledge*.
- "[I]f a person in fact has knowledge, skill, or even intelligence superior to that of the ordinary person, the law will demand of that person conduct consistent with it. ... expert skiers, construction inspectors, and <u>doctors</u> must all use care which is reasonable in light of their superior learning and experience, and any special skills, knowledge or training they may personally have over what is normally possessed by persons in the field." Prosser and Keaton on Torts § 32 (emphasis added)





Professional negligence - Example: Elective ear surgery

Patient gives permission to surgeon to operate on left ear. While patient is under anesthetic, surgeon decides to operate on right ear. Right ear is made better.

Is there a good claim for professional negligence?

## Professional negligence - Example: Elective ear surgery

Patient gives permission to surgeon to operate on left ear. While patient is under anesthetic, surgeon decides to operate on right ear. Right ear is made better.

Is there a good claim for professional negligence? No.

Why not? No damages. A prima facie case for negligence requires injury/damages.



#### Professional negligence - Example: Emergency trauma surgery

Unconscious GSW patient arrives in emergency room needing surgery to the abdomen to survive. Physicians operate. The surgery is performed incompetently, below the customary standard of practice, causing permanent impairment.

Is there a good claim for professional negligence?

### Professional negligence - Example: Emergency trauma surgery

Unconscious GSW patient arrives in emergency room needing surgery to the abdomen to survive. Physicians operate. The surgery is performed incompetently, below the customary standard of practice, causing permanent impairment.

Is there a good claim for professional negligence? Yes.

## Why?

All the elements are there. In brief: the hospital and physicians had a duty to perform the surgery to the customary standard of practice, and they did not, resulting in damages. Consent is irrelevant.









- Damages are not necessary to make out a case for battery. Thus, the patient who is not injured, and is in fact better off because of the touching, still has a case.
  - Note: A "harmful" touching for purposes of battery is not necessarily one that causes harm.
- Consent for emergency treatment is implied by law for public policy reasons.





### Medical battery - Example: Elective ear surgery

Patient gives permission to surgeon to operate on left ear. While patient is under anesthetic, surgeon decides to operate on right ear. Right ear is made better.

Is there a good claim for medical battery?

### Medical battery - Example: Elective ear surgery

Patient gives permission to surgeon to operate on left ear. While patient is under anesthetic, surgeon decides to operate on right ear. Right ear is made better.

Is there a good claim for medical battery? Yes.

## Why not?

All the elements are there. Note that cutting on someone's ear is harmful/offensive, and injury is not an element. So surgery without permission is battery even if it helps the patient.



## Medical battery - Example: Emergency trauma surgery

Unconscious GSW patient arrives in emergency room needing surgery to the abdomen to survive. Physicians operate. The surgery is performed incompetently, below the customary standard of practice, causing permanent impairment.

Is there a good claim for medical battery?

## Medical battery - Example: Emergency trauma surgery

Unconscious GSW patient arrives in emergency room needing surgery to the abdomen to survive. Physicians operate. The surgery is performed incompetently, below the customary standard of practice, causing permanent impairment.

Is there a good claim for medical battery? No.

## Why?

There's a prima facie case, because all the elements are there. But the hospital and physicians can prove an affirmative defense of consent. For a patient incapable of giving or withholding consent in an emergency situation like this, consent is implied by law.



# Informed consent action requirements:

- 1. A risk should have been disclosed.
- 2. The risk was not disclosed.
- 3. The patient would have made a different decision if the risk had been disclosed.
- 4. The patient was injured as a result.

## Informed Consent: How to categorize it?

- Is it battery?
- Is it negligence?

## Informed Consent: How to categorize it?

- Is it battery?
- Is it negligence?
- An informed consent action is most commonly considered a negligence action, but it is possible in some courts it could be brought as a battery claim.

## Informed Consent: How to categorize it?

- Is it battery?
- Is it negligence?
- An informed consent action is most commonly considered a negligence action, but it is possible in some courts it could be brought as a battery claim.
- As a conceptual matter, however, it's probably best to think of an informed consent action as its own thing.

## Informed Consent: Some context ...

- Policy premise: Patients should get enough information ahead of time to make an intelligent, reasoned decision about their care.
- Typical facts for suit: A complication of treatment arises about which the patient was not apprised ahead of time.
- May also be applied to:
  - Lack of disclosure about treatment alternatives
  - Lack of disclosure of risks of forgoing treatment

## Informed Consent - Key Points

- 1. The standard of care is an important point of contention. Some courts use the "physician rule," others a "patient rule."
- 2. Actual causation is a barrier to many suits. The patient must show that *but for the lack of disclosure about risk,* the patient (or a reasonable patient in some courts) would have refused treatment.
- 3. Damages are necessary to make out a case. The patient who is not told of a risk, but who suffers no physical injury, has no cause of action.



Informed consent requirements (in detail)

- 1. A risk should have been disclosed.
- 2. The risk was not disclosed.
- 3. The patient would have made a different decision if the risk had been disclosed.
- 4. The patient was injured as a result.











## Informed Consent - Example: Heart Bypass Surgery

A patient with severe blockage in coronary arteries undergoes a triple bypass operation. The surgeon never discloses that there is a rare risk of chest wound infection. The patient suffers a chest wound infection, resulting in considerable injury. Even if the patient had been told about the risk, the patient would have undergone the surgery anyway, as would any reasonable patient.

**Result?** 

Why?



## Informed Consent - Example: Heart Bypass Surgery

A patient with severe blockage in coronary arteries undergoes a triple bypass operation. The surgeon never discloses that there is a rare risk of chest wound infection. The patient suffers a chest wound infection, resulting in considerable injury. Even if the patient had been told about the risk, the patient would have undergone the surgery anyway, as would any reasonable patient.

Result? No informed consent action.

Why? The causation requirement is not met: Actual causation is lacking.



## Informed Consent - Example: Kidney Surgery

A patient goes under anesthesia having consented to surgery on the left kidney. After doing the left side, the surgeon, feeling a burst of energy and having needed materials on hand, does the right kidney as well. The additional right-side kidney surgery, which the patient never would have consented to, carries elevated risks of collapsed lung, infection, and pneumonia. Happily, the surgery and recovery turns out complication-free, the outcome being greatly enhanced kidney function.

**Result?** 

Why?

## Informed Consent - Example: Kidney Surgery

A patient goes under anesthesia having consented to surgery on the left kidney. After doing the left side, the surgeon, feeling a burst of energy and having needed materials on hand, does the right kidney as well. The additional right-side kidney surgery, which the patient never would have consented to, carries elevated risks of collapsed lung, infection, and pneumonia. Happily, the surgery and recovery turns out complication-free, the outcome being greatly enhanced kidney function.

**Result?** 

Why?



## Informed Consent - Example: Kidney Surgery

A patient goes under anesthesia having consented to surgery on the left kidney. After doing the left side, the surgeon, feeling a burst of energy and having needed materials on hand, does the right kidney as well. The additional right-side kidney surgery, which the patient never would have consented to, carries elevated risks of collapsed lung, infection, and pneumonia. Happily, the surgery and recovery turns out complication-free, the outcome being greatly enhanced kidney function. Result? No informed consent action.

Why? There's no injury/damages.









## Medical Battery - Example: Kidney Surgery

A patient goes under anesthesia having consented to surgery on the left kidney. After doing the left side, the surgeon, feeling a burst of energy and having needed materials on hand, does the right kidney as well. The additional right-side kidney surgery, which the patient never would have consented to, carries elevated risks of collapsed lung, infection, and pneumonia. Happily, the surgery and recovery turns out complication-free, the outcome being greatly enhanced kidney function. Result? Why? Medical Battery - Example: Kidney Surgery

A patient goes under anesthesia having consented to

# A. Yes, there's a good medic battery action here.

## B. No, there's not.

Why:

## Medical Battery - Example: Kidney Surgery

A patient goes under anesthesia having consented to surgery on the left kidney. After doing the left side, the surgeon, feeling a burst of energy and having needed materials on hand, does the right kidney as well. The additional right-side kidney surgery, which the patient never would have consented to, carries elevated risks of collapsed lung, infection, and pneumonia. Happily, the surgery and recovery turns out complication-free, the outcome being greatly enhanced kidney function. Result? There's a good battery claim. Why? There was an act, intent, a touching, and cutting on

a kidney counts as harmful/offensive.