

6. John, a novice skier, brought a negligence action against Big Bear Ski Resort for injuries that allegedly occurred when he became entangled in underbrush concealed by loose snow. John was skiing on the resort's novice trail. No warning signs regarding the underbrush were posted. May the defendant, Big Bear Ski Resort, be held liable? What is the basis for liability?
7. The plaintiff was injured in an automobile accident caused entirely by the defendant driver. The plaintiff was not wearing his seat belt. He was thrown from the car and sustained a head injury when he landed on the pavement. The defendant offered evidence that had the plaintiff been wearing his seat belt, he would not have been thrown from the car. If the doctrine of comparative negligence is followed, will this reduce the damages to which the plaintiff is entitled? Explain.
8. Black sued a retail store for injuries. He slipped on rainwater as he stepped on a mat just inside the door to the store. Prior to the fall, a store employee placed a "Caution: Wet Floor" sign approximately 5 feet in front of the door. In accordance with store procedure, the employee mopped the entrance area periodically on rainy days. What defense will the retail store assert? Is this defense different from contributory negligence?
9. The defendant company has been a bicycle manufacturer for 50 years. It has always used reputable raw material suppliers. During the manufacturing process, it always follows quality control standards, making safety checks on every 10th bicycle that comes off the assembly line. Jane purchased a new bicycle from the company. While riding the bike under normal

conditions, she jumped a low curb. Because three spokes of the front wheel were defective, the wheel collapsed, and Jane was injured. As a result of the accident, she is now paralyzed from the waist down. Discuss the liability of the company on the grounds of negligence and strict liability.