

Employees tortuous action

Law



Daniel could seek damages from Malik for spilling the beer on his son because that got him fired. This might not have standing because his boss might decide not to fire him later when he learns of the true circumstances of the events. Daniel could also seek damages from the concession owner due to the negligence of the employee; he went into a diabetic coma. He ordered a diet and got regular. It was a reasonable expectation to get what he wanted, the employee then acted negligently. In the employee's defense, the concession owner could say that the scene was so distracting that the mistake was not negligent and that ultimately Malik should be held responsible for having spilt the beer in the first place. Finally, Malik being shot would not amount to a tortuous claim against Daniel. Daniel acted in self-defence against a perceived threat. Malik's decision to confront Daniel with a gun was not a reasonable response to being shoved. Daniel would probably win.