

Torts 10 ind wrk 1

Law



Torts 10 Ind Wrk of Torts 10 Ind Wrk Introduction The owner of the animal often compared a veterinarian's qualification and competence on the basis of their reputation made by him or her in their location. These veterans are also licensed by the State Licensing Board (Randolph, n. d). When the service application does not seem to recover, the owner has the right to a second opinion or a third party. But in case the animal succumbs to treatment, the owner of the pet can take action against the veterinarian.

Discussion

Animal laws and procedures are different in each state. Not only that, but it is often the case filed cannot recover the market value of the animal as pets are considered property as household goods. But changes are made in some state laws to recognize the special bond between the animal and its owner (Randolph, n. d).

Normally, the owner of the pet will try to reach a compromise with the vet. In other cases, the owner of the pet stores a complaint with the authorization of the state that issues licenses and supervises veterinarians. The Board takes the necessary measures as revealed through their review and investigation of the case (Randolph, n. d). The owner of the animal may even file a complaint against the veterinarian or veterinary hospital - even though the case may cost expensive and time consuming. These controls on veterinary practices will also help curb the malpractice veterinary possible (Randolph, n. d).

Case Study

The claim of the owner of the animal that has suffered damage and / or injury caused must prove that it occurred during the performance veterinary. Therefore, the jurisprudence of the Courts, in veterinary liability requires that <https://assignbuster.com/torts-10-ind-wrk-1/>

the claimant prove the following requirements:

The occurrence of any damage or injury and their quantification.

The negligent act or omission of performance of the veterinarian, who has been undertaken against the liability claims (e. g., veterinarian supplies too much anesthesia the dog).

The existence of a causal link between the damage and / or injury suffered and the negligence of the veterinarian (for example, the dog had not died, if the vet would not put a doubled amount of anesthesia necessary).

Vet Response

Wet in result of claims can raised the argument that the teeth cleaning procedure was correct but due to negligence of the owner the dog died. The owner did not bring back the dog to me when its condition worsened.

References

Randolph, M. (n. d.). Veterinary Malpractice | Nolo. com. Retrieved from:
<http://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/free-books/dog-book/chapter5-8.html>.