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 **QUESTION**

The tort of trespass to Chattel in is made of: Trespass to Chattels Conversion and Detinue Discuss the above and support with case law. Students may consider the following: define and explain each tort State the elements of Trespass to Chattel, conversion and detinue Explain the concepts of innocent delivery or receipt, lost property rule and give examples of conversion Give examples of persons qualified to sue for Trespass to Chattel Discuss the remedies and defence to Trespass to Chattel, conversion and detinue Differences between conversion and Detinue Suppo References Kodilinye and Alison The Nigerian Law of Torts Spectrum Law publishing, 1999)195 Vivienne Harewood Principles of Tort Law (Cavendish Publishing) 293 Ese Malemi Law of Torts (Princeton Publishing Co. 2008)159

 **Define and explain each tort**

 There are seven forms of malicious tort in common law: assault, battery, false incarceration, property trespass, chattel trespass, conversion, and deliberate infliction of emotional distress.

 **Trespass to chattels** applies to the use of properties without the owner's consent. The tort of transfer can easily be confused with trespass to chattels and they all deal Unfair personal property intervention. Generally, without his or her consent, a trespass refers to the unlawful use of the property of another person. There are two forms of trespass under malicious tort: (1) chattel trespass and (2) property trespass.

 Trespass to land is the unauthorized entrance into or use of the land of another person without the permission or fair justification of the owner. In the other hand, a chattel trespass is a deliberate interference with the legal ownership of a personal property by another party. A "chattel" refers to any intimate, moving or unmoving property. Trespass to chattels does not refer to real estate or to any property interest.

 **Detinue** is an attempt in tort law to compensate over the wrongful takeover of personal property. It is introduced by a person who claims to have a greater right than the actual possessor to their immediate possession. For a complainant, Detinue was a means to pursue restitution of their particular property in court. In 1977, it was repealed and replaced by land tort interference, such as transfer. Under detinue, the defendant may have taken the land by legal means, but wrongly holds it. In order to pursue restitution of it by detinue, the applicant would not ever have to have the land in their hands.

 **Conversion,** which is often also wrongly called chattel trespass, entails the unlawful interference with another's mobile object. Money (as was seen in **Wymore Building Inc. v. Gray, [2012] O.J. 4181**), products, machinery, materials, or other significantly tangible objects, and potentially, intangible things such as knowledge and electronic evidence, may be such an item.

 **State the element of trespass to chattel conversion and detinue**

 You are expected to demonstrate the following elements to prove trespassing to chattels:

 **Purpose to trespass**: It is necessary to simply ‘wish to do the act’ to illustrate this aspect of trespass. You don't actually need to demonstrate intent to harm a single party.

 **Lack of consent of the owner**: Unwanted, illegal intervention must occur, meaning that the person interfered with or dispossessed the chattel without the permission of the owner.

 **Chattel interference**: A person commits a chattel trespass by (1) dispossessing another chattel, (2) using or intervening with a chattel in another's custody, or (3) destroying the chattel. Interference does require the dispossession of a chattel, but transfer must be quite short.

 Bear in mind the ownership error is not a legitimate defence against chattel trespass. In other words, if the person didn't know the property belongs to you, it doesn't matter. It is necessary to own or damage the property itself to prove intervention.

 By taking personal property that belongs to someone else without consent, the most straightforward and clear way to commit conversion is. For instance, whether you take a framed photograph from the wall of a local restaurant or a record from someone's desk, you might be held responsible for conversion, given that you hold the property for a prolonged amount of time and thereby conflict with the use and ownership of it by the legitimate owner. It does not matter whether the details, images, or other material is expected to be written. However, whether you momentarily delete documentation or photos from someone's office or home and copy the records expected to restore the documents to the owner, you will not be responsible for conversion and this temporary intrusion does not actually rob the legitimate owner of the property's ownership or usage. This was seen in the case of Harper **& Row Pubs. v. Nation Joins** where it was held that "Conversion requires not merely temporary interference with property rights, but the exercise of unauthorized dominion and control to the complete exclusion of the rightful possessor.".

 By acquiring and keeping property from someone who does not have the right to give the property up, you may therefore commit conversion. For example, if a bank employee presents you with bank client account checking records, you might both be responsible for transfer because the employee obviously does not have approval from his or her boss to sign over the records of a customer. But the legal analysis is not that straightforward, because whether or not you may be considered accountable for conversion depends on whether the papers you receive are originals or copies under these conditions.

 As a rule of thumb, copies of records belonging to someone else will normally be obtained and preserved, but you cannot obtain and maintain the originals of those documents. "The reason is that "the ownership of copies of records does not amount to an interference with the property of the author necessary to constitute transfer," as opposed to the documents themselves. This was seen in **FMC Corp. v. Capital Cities/ABC, Inc** in which the court held that defendant could be liable merely for depriving plaintiff of the use of his confidential information and noting that "there is perhaps no very valid and essential reason why there might not be conversion of intangible property”. However, if the legitimate owner no longer has either the originals or copies of the records in question, you will be found responsible for transfer for obtaining and keeping copies. And if you are found responsible for transfer and are forced to return the documents in question, you are usually entitled to keep copies of the documents for yourself under the First Amendment and to disseminate any details hidden therein.

 To create detinue, there are four elements required: Make a Demand, Refuse a Demand, Unfair Rejection, Consecutive Harm

 **Present a demand**; the applicant must make a case that the chattel be returned at the time of the request and be entitled to the chattel.

 **Refuse the Demand**: The defendant must refuse the appeal (whether expressly refusing or failing to respond at all). A claimant who does not have the chattel's custody and has lost the possession will also commit detinue on certain occasions by denying the complainant their right to possession.

 **Unreasonable denial**: If the chattel is in the hands of the claimant, the failure to return the chattel may be unreasonable.

 **Consequential harm**: The complainant has incurred damage as a result of the actions of the defendant. This will usually be calculated as the value of the chattel.

 **Differences between conversion and Detinue**

Detinue covers the same ground as conversion by detention however there are the following differences between the two causes of action.

 The defendant would not be responsible for conversion by imprisonment where the goods have been missing or stolen, either by mistake or by the defendant's negligence, prior to the claim for their restitution by the claimant. Except under those cases, the defendant will be liable in detinue until he proves that the goods have not been lost or ruined by his incompetence. Therefore, responsibility of detinue is stricter in this regard than in conversion by incarceration. The core of the detinue is a refusal to yield on invitation, but it is just one of many ways of conversion.

 The complainant can demand clear restitution of the products in detinue, but he may not do so in conversion. Therefore, if the complainant wants to recover the goods in kind and not just their worth in the form of restitution, he would sue in default, for the claimant already has the damages in conversion. Except in detinue, though, the right of the courts to order particular reimbursement is arbitrary and did not have to be exercised where the chattel is an ordinary trade article and of little exceptional importance to the claimant and when damages can adequately reimburse.

 In conversion damages are generally assessed on the value of the goods at the date of conversion whereas in detinue they are assessed on the value of the goods at the date of the trial. Thus, if the value of the chattel has increased between the date of the refusal to surrender and the date of the trial, the plaintiff should sue in detinue, but if there has been a decrease in value during the period he should sue in conversion.

 **Give examples of persons qualified to sue for Trespass to Chattel**

 A person who wants to sue in trespass to chattel can sue under trespass to goods, conversion and negligence that is involved in the commission of the trespass or conversion. These actions are substantiated by the provisions of the **Torts (Interference with Goods) Act 1977**. The act creates a new action called. “Wrongful interference with goods”. It defines it in S.1 as: a) Conversion of goods called trover. b) Trespass to Goods c) Negligence in so far as it results in damage to goods. d) Subject to S.2 of the Act, any other tort as far as it results in damage to goods or to an interest in goods.

 **Discuss the defences to Trespass to Chattel, conversion and detinue**

Some defences to trespass to chattels are:

 **Consent**: This is the most common defence to trespass. If the owner of the property gave you permission to use their personal property, you can claim consent. Keep in mind that consent can be given through both words and actions. However, this defence will not work if the consent was induced by fraud or was given by someone who is incompetent, intoxicated or a minor.

 **Public Necessity**: This defence can be used if you intentionally interfere with another person’s chattel to protect the public. However, if you acted unreasonably when taking another person’s chattel, this defence will not be available to you. An example of when this defence would be available is if you took another person’s gun in order to prevent someone else from shooting up an entire building.

 **Private Necessity**: This defence can be used when the purpose of using another person’s chattel is to protect your own interests. Private necessity can only be claimed if you were attempting to protect yourself from death or serious bodily harm. As such, this defence is not as commonly used.

 **Privileged Invasion to Reclaim Personal Property**: Lastly, if you take someone’s personal property because it is actually your own property, you can argue privilege as a defence. In order for this defence to be successful, the defendant must have taken your property or it must be in the defendant’s possession because of an act of god, such as a storm or flood.

 Some common defences to a claim of conversion include:

 **Abandonment of the property**; Abandonment is the voluntary relinquishment of ownership so that the property ceases to be the property of any person and becomes the subject of appropriation by the first taker. In some jurisdictions, abandonment of property requires intent plus an act. A sufficient act is one that manifests a conscious purpose and intention of the owner of personal property neither to use nor to retake the property into his possession. The intention to abandon may be inferred from strong and convincing evidence, and may be shown by conduct clearly inconsistent with any intention to retain and continue the use or ownership of the property. This was seen in the case of Herron **v. Whiteside**. In this the court held that the inmate's admission to escape convincingly implied that, at the moment of his escape, he intended and acted to permanently separate himself from his property. The act of escape was inconsistent with any intention to retain ownership of property left at the penitentiary.

 **Lack of Value**: Some states will not allow a claim of conversion if the property has little to no monetary value;

  **Privilege**: In some circumstances, a person may be considered privileged to commit an act that would be considered conversion. An example is if the action was necessary to protect the person’s own property or to avoid physical harm.

 There are several potential defences available for detinue. These include, but are not limited to:

 **Consent**: It is a defence to show that there can be no trespass if the interference occurs with the plaintiff’s consent. Consent can either be express or implied.

 **Jus Tertii**: It is a defence to show that a third party has a better right to possession than the plaintiff.

 **No right to possession**: The legal ownership of a chattel can be complicated. Registration of a vehicle is not proof of ownership, for example. If someone has purchased a chattel, ownership may be passed to another through it being given as a gift. There may be contractual obligations (in particular for commercial equipment) or other facts that demonstrate that the person demanding the return was not the rightful owner.

 **The demand was invalid**: If a demand has been made, it may be vague, confusing or otherwise invalid. If the demand isn’t valid, then a refusal may not have been unreasonable.

 **There was no refusal**: If the refusal to return something is not specific, and a sufficient amount of time has not passed to imply that there is a refusal, then the element of refusing the demand to return the chattel may not be met.

 **It wasn’t reasonable to return the chattel**: There may be a reasonable excuse because the chattel had not been returned in time.

 **Discuss the remedies to Trespass to Chattel, conversion and detinue**

 If you wish to bring a claim for trespass to chattel or land, there are various remedies that may be available to you, including:

  **Compensatory Damages**: Compensatory damages applies if damage to the chattel has been sustained or not capable of being returned. The aim for this type of damages is to put an injured person in the same situation as they would have been in had the trespass not been committed.

 **Nominal Damages**: Trespass is a tort of strict liability, which means that nominal damages (i.e., damages awarded to a person who has suffered a legal wrong) apply even where no actual damage has been sustained by the plaintiff.

  **Injunctions**: An injunction is a Court order preventing a party from doing something, or alternatively, forcing a party to do a specific thing. In order for the Court to grant an injunction, the Court must be satisfied that the damages suffered by the plaintiff are significant (such as where the trespass is ongoing).

 **Exemplary Damages**: Exemplary damages, also referred to as punitive damages (i.e., damages awarded in order to punish the defendant and deterring others from engaging in similar conduct) may be awarded in certain circumstances involving trespass to chattels. Exemplary damages (although not traditionally so) are available for any tort.

 In an action in detinue, the plaintiff may seek (1) judgment for the value of the goods as assessed and damages for their detention; or (2) judgment for return of the goods or recovery of their value as assessed and damages for their detention; or (3) judgment for return of the goods and damages for their detention. Once the court has given judgment for the specific restitution of goods, the judgment is enforceable as of right. However, such a judgment is not obtainable as of right, and it seems that even if a right to claim for specific restitution of goods is conferred by statute or by Rules of Court, such claims are still considered according to traditional principles
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