

11-1-1985

Student Notes Section

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.law.miami.edu/umlr>

Recommended Citation

Student Notes Section, 40 U. Miami L. Rev. Iss. 1 (1985)

Available at: <http://repository.law.miami.edu/umlr/vol40/iss1/14>

This Casenote is brought to you for free and open access by Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Miami Law Review by an authorized administrator of Institutional Repository. For more information, please contact library@law.miami.edu.

STUDENT NOTES SECTION

The casenotes in this issue discuss two products liability cases, one free speech case in a procedural context, and police liability under a protective order.

The Third Circuit case of *Schoenborn v. Boeing Co.* deals with the government contractor defense which immunizes contractors from liability for defectively designed products built at the government's request. The author argues that the court wrongly extended this already overused defense.

In *Planned Parenthood Ass'n/Chicago Area v. Chicago Transit Authority*, the Seventh Circuit used Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 52(a)'s "clearly erroneous" standard to review bench findings which determine the protection courts give to first amendment expression on government property. The case confronts an unexplored issue of appellate review in first amendment cases in the wake of the Supreme Court's decision in *Bose Corporation v. Consumers Union*.

The New York Court of Appeals held that a judicial order of protection creates a "special relationship" between a police department and the protected party in *Sorichetti v. City of New York*. That relationship provides the basis for police liability in the event of injury to the protected party. The decision emphasizes the significance of protective orders and the consequences of an inadequate police response to domestic violence situations.

In *Vaughn v. Chadbourne*, the First District Court of Appeal of Florida held a contractor subject to strict liability for a defect in paving mix which it applied to a county road. The roadway eventually eroded, producing a patent defect. The court distinguished the accepted-work doctrine, a privity rule which would ordinarily insulate a contractor from liability for a patent defect that causes a third party's injury, because the contractor itself manufactured the paving mix.