



Informing Progress - Shaping the Future

FOIL Update 7th November 2024



Tindall v Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police UKSC 33

The UK Supreme Court's decision in *Tindall v Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police* UKSC 33 represents a significant clarification in the law concerning the liability of public authorities, particularly the police, in negligence cases. This case arose from a tragic incident involving Malcolm Tindall, who died in a road traffic accident caused by black ice after the police had attended an earlier accident at the same location.

The background to the case was as follows - On March 4, the police were called to an accident on the A4130 near Henley-on-Thames, where a car had skidded on black ice. The initial crash involved a vehicle driven by MK, who stopped on the M40 motorway after hitting the central reservation. Following the crash, MK left his vehicle and crossed to the hard shoulder. Subsequently, another collision occurred when CB's vehicle collided with MK's stationary car, leading to the deaths of both CB and Mr Tindall, who was driving another vehicle. CB's passenger was injured in this second collision. After attending to the initial incident and clearing debris, the police left the scene without taking further action to warn other road users or address the icy conditions. Shortly thereafter, Malcolm Tindall's vehicle skidded on the same patch of ice, resulting in a fatal collision.

Mrs. Tindall brought a claim against the Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police, arguing that the police had a duty of care to road users to either remedy the hazardous condition or provide adequate warnings. The claim was initially allowed to proceed by the High Court, which suggested that there was a triable issue regarding whether the police's actions amounted to making matters worse or assuming responsibility for road safety. The Court of Appeal decided that the police did not owe a duty of care to road users to protect them from harm. They found the police had not made matters worse by their actions at the scene and did not assume responsibility for road safety. Although the police's actions were deemed as ineffective, they did not create additional danger or assume a duty to prevent harm, as their relationship with Mr Tindall was not different from that with any other road user.

Legal Issues and Arguments

The central legal issue was whether the police's actions constituted an exception to the general rule that there is no duty of care for omissions. The claimant argued using the other established exceptions to the general rule, their argument on the "interference principle" that the police were liable for making matters worse because MK had tried to flag down other drivers to warn them about the danger of black ice and would have continued to do so if the police had not arrived, this proved to be most significant in the context of the legal judgment.

The defence contended that their actions did not worsen the situation, nor did they assume any responsibility for managing road conditions. They argued that public authorities should not be held liable for failing to confer benefits unless they have undertaken specific responsibilities or created new dangers.

Supreme Court Judgment

The Supreme Court unanimously upheld the decision of the Court of Appeal, which had struck out Mrs. Tindall's claim. The court acknowledged the "interference principle" which can establish liability if one party's actions prevent another from receiving the help they require. However, for liability to arise under this principle it must be shown that the defendant knew or should have known their actions would prevent such help. In this case, the police were not aware of MK's attempts to warn other road users about the ice, nor that their intervention would stop those efforts. Consequently, no duty of care was established on these facts.

No Duty for Omissions: The court reaffirmed that public authorities are not generally liable for omissions unless they fall into the established exceptions to that general rule. Which include having assumed responsibility or made matters worse.

Assumption of Responsibility: The court found no evidence that the police assumed responsibility for road safety simply by attending and clearing debris. Their actions did not constitute an assumption of control over the hazard.

Making Matters Worse: The court concluded that by leaving the scene without additional intervention, the police did not make matters worse; they left conditions as they found them.

Legal and Practical Implications

This ruling has significant implications for both legal practitioners and public authorities:

Clarification of Duty: The judgment provides clarity on when public authorities might owe a duty of care in operational contexts. It emphasises that liability does not arise from mere presence at an incident unless specific exceptions apply.

Impact on Public Authorities: Public bodies can operate with greater certainty regarding their potential liabilities. This decision reinforces that operational decisions made without assuming control or creating new hazards do not typically attract negligence liability.

Influence on Insurance Market: For insurers, this ruling may reduce potential claims against public bodies, influencing risk assessments and policy formulations. It underscores a more restrictive approach to expanding negligence liability for public authorities.

Conclusion

The Supreme Court's decision in *Tindall v Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police* underscores a conservative approach to expanding negligence liability for public authorities. A trend that started with the decision in *Michael* and was endorsed in the decision in *Robinson*.

By affirming that no duty arises from non-intervention unless specific exceptions apply, it stabilises legal expectations and reduces uncertainty in claims against public entities. This ruling will likely deter similar negligence claims against public authorities and influence future legal interpretations regarding duty of care in operational contexts. It serves as a critical precedent in delineating the boundaries of public authority liability in negligence cases within the UK legal framework.

This publication is intended to provide general guidance only. It is not intended to constitute a definitive or complete statement of the law on any subject and may not reflect recent legal developments. This publication does not constitute legal or professional advice (such as would be given by a solicitors' firm or barrister in private practice) and is not to be used in providing the same. Whilst efforts have been made to ensure that the information in this publication is accurate, all liability (including liability for negligence) for any loss and or damage howsoever arising from the use of this publication or the guidance contained therein, is excluded to the fullest extent permitted by law.