Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad Co., 248 N.Y. 339 (1928)

A defendant owes a duty of care only to those who are foreseeably endangered by their conduct.

Summary

In Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad Co., the New York Court of Appeals, in an opinion by Judge Cardozo, considered whether a railroad was liable for injuries to a passenger caused by a chain of events initiated by the railroad's employees. Two railroad employees, assisting a passenger to board a moving train, dislodged a package containing fireworks. The fireworks exploded, causing scales on the platform to fall and injure Mrs. Palsgraf. The Court held the railroad was not liable because the employees' actions were not a breach of duty to Mrs. Palsgraf, as the explosion and resulting injuries were not foreseeable consequences of their actions. The case established the concept that the duty of care in negligence cases is owed only to those within the zone of foreseeable risk.

Facts

Mrs. Palsgraf was standing on a Long Island Railroad platform when two railroad employees, assisting a passenger to board a moving train, dislodged a package the passenger was carrying. The package contained fireworks, which exploded upon hitting the tracks. The explosion caused scales at the other end of the platform to topple, striking and injuring Mrs. Palsgraf. The railroad employees were not aware of the contents of the package.

Procedural History

Mrs. Palsgraf sued the Long Island Railroad for negligence. The trial court found in favor of Mrs. Palsgraf. The Appellate Division affirmed. The New York Court of Appeals then reviewed the case.

Issue(s)

Whether the railroad owed a duty of care to Mrs. Palsgraf under the circumstances.

Holding

No, because the railroad did not breach a duty of care owed to Mrs. Palsgraf, as the injury was not the foreseeable consequence of the employees' actions.

Court's Reasoning

The Court, in an opinion by Judge Cardozo, held that the railroad was not liable because the employees' actions were not a breach of duty to Mrs. Palsgraf. The Court reasoned that negligence is not actionable unless it involves the invasion of a

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

legally protected interest, and the duty of care extends only to those who are foreseeably endangered by the conduct. The Court found that the railroad employees had no reason to believe their actions would endanger Mrs. Palsgraf; thus, there was no negligence toward her. Judge Cardozo wrote, “The risk reasonably to be perceived defines the duty to be obeyed.” The Court distinguished between acts that create a risk of harm and acts that are merely tortious in the abstract without foreseeable harm to the plaintiff.

The Court noted that if the package had contained something innocuous, like books, the employees’ conduct would not be a tort as to Mrs. Palsgraf. The Court argued that the “orbit of the danger” determined the scope of the duty. If a person’s actions create a risk of harm only to one person, that person is not liable to a different, and unforeseeable, person who is injured. The Court noted that “Proof of negligence in the air, so to speak, will not do.”

Judge Andrews, in his dissenting opinion, argued for a broader view of causation and foreseeability. He argued that the railroad’s negligence, while not directly aimed at Mrs. Palsgraf, was a direct cause of her injuries because the package’s explosion was the immediate cause. He believed that the duty of care should extend to all persons harmed by a negligent act, regardless of whether the harm was foreseeable.

Practical Implications

Palsgraf is a landmark case in tort law, and its principles are fundamental to the understanding of negligence. The case established the principle that the scope of the duty of care is limited to those who are foreseeably endangered by the defendant’s conduct. This means that in negligence cases, a defendant is only liable for harm that was a reasonably foreseeable consequence of their actions.

This case influences how attorneys approach negligence claims, especially those involving causation and damages. It underscores the importance of establishing a direct link between the defendant’s conduct and the plaintiff’s injury, and the foreseeability of that link. It has had a profound effect on tort law, particularly in defining the scope of the duty of care in negligence cases. The case helps to determine when a defendant is liable for injuries that result from their actions by focusing on the foreseeability of the harm. The case illustrates the crucial concept that duty is not a universal obligation but is owed to those who are within the zone of foreseeable risk. The rule of law has also been refined by later cases, many of which cite Palsgraf, and which explore the nuances of foreseeability and proximate cause.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.