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The poles were twenty-five feet away from Edgewood Avenue. Twenty-five feet seems to be a reasonable spacing or poles to be place along a road. hink the kids should have been more responsible and not have tried to “ jump the hills”. The driver, Mitchell, should be held responsible for the death of his friends. 5. 6 Does the doctrine of assumption of risk protect the Respondents from liability to Hurst? Yes, the doctrine of assumption of risk does protect the Respondents from liability to Hurst. This is because the assumption of risk is when the plaintiff who knowingly and voluntarily enters into or participates in a risky activity that results in injury. Craig A Hurst voluntarily entered the spectator area.

The ice rink was encircled with wooden dash board and protected Plexiglas up to a certain height in order to protect the spectators. Craig A. Hurst took a risk by entering the building because he knew he could have gotten hurt. 6. 2 Is there a design defect? Yes, there is a design defect because the pump should have turned off when it detects that it is pulling more than it should. Sta-Rite had twenty prior suction-entrapment accidents involving their drain cover and pumps. This shows that Sta-Rite had a design defect.

Sta-Rite should have taken the proper safety percussions when making their drain cover. They should have had designed the pool drain pump with the automatic shut off mechanism. 6. 3 Is Emerson liable? No, Emerson is not liable. Emerson clearly stated that children should be kept away. In the owner’s manual it also said that all people and pets should be kept at least thirty feet away. Pearce claimed he was only six to ten feet away. Therefore, Emerson took all the right safety actions and Pearce should have followed the safety procedures.