OF THE TERRITORY OF
PAPUA AND NEW GUINEA

were very severe and he is now left

Special damages come to £12: Nagwigg The Plaintiff's financial

the accident. There is nowever a risk that in the future he will find

loss in relation to his earning capacity is not likely to be very great.

theserg aid blueds thempolyme philass it sesting the these the present

employment ceese.

and

BOLESLAU ZMARZLY

with the ri benefit operations in the future should his condition

entities a good deal and is likely to TURNEGUL a good deal more in the

There are several views that could be taken of the evidence and on this issue it is largely a contest between the Plaintiff and the Defendant as witnesses. The Defendant was quite unreliable as to the position in which he left his vehicle and his willingness to draw absurd conclusions as to the Plaintiff's conduct made his evidence quite unreasonable. The Plaintiff is supported to some extent by Mr. Bliaux. His evidence was I think the most reliable as to matters which he actually observed. There is no doubt that the Defendant's truck was parked across about five feet of the bitumen surface of the roadway and I think that in all the circumstances I should conclude that the Defendant switched off his tail light when he decided to leave the vehicle there all night.

The question whether the Plaintiff was also negligent is one of considerable difficulty. The weather conditions called for the utmost care in driving and the Plaintiff may well have been driving too fast to see clearly. In the circumstances of this case however I am not prepared to draw the inference that the Plaintiff was negligent because he was driving into what was a situation of great danger and difficulty and the accident was one which could well happen without negligence on his part. A large vehicle parked under the trees under those weather conditions could easily go unnoticed by the most careful driver. Similarly there is in my opinion no justification for drawing the inference that the Plaintiff was driving too fast. The damage done to the vehicles affords no reliable indication of speed.

I find therefore that this accident was caused by the negligence of the Defendant and that the Plaintiff is entitled to damages.

- 2 -

ASTUD WENT AND ANY OUTER

Special damages come to £1202.3.2. The Plaintiff's financial loss in relation to his earning capacity is not likely to be very great. He is still able to earn £35 per month which was his rate of pay before the accident. There is however a risk that in the future he will find the accident. There is however a risk that in the future he will find the must be accident as severe disadvantage in seeking employment should his present employment cease.

The Plaintiff's injuries were very severe and he is now left with the risk of further operations in the future should his condition become any worse. There is no prospect of any real improvement. He has suffered a good deal and is likely to suffer a good deal more in the future.

I assess the general damages at £5,000. at nolitage dark add

There will be judgment for £6,202.3.2. with costs to be taxes.

The political was quite unrulable as to the political and the williams to drew about the lainties and his williams to drew about the plainties conduct made his evidence quite unresemble.

The plainties is copported to some ovient by ur. Bitaus. His evidence was think the most reliable as to matter which he actually observed. There is no doubt that the Defendant's truck was parted across about its feet and the days of the days of the feet and the feet across about its feet and the days of the days of the feet and the days of the days of the days of the feet and the days of the days of

stances I should conclude that the Defendant seitered off his tall light when he decided to leave the vehicle there all micht.

The question whather the Plaintiff was also regiles to the deset of considerable difficulty. The weather conditions called for the deset of care in driving and the Plaintiff may well have been driving too feet to see clearly. In the circumstances of this case however I as not prepared to draw the inference that the Plaintiff was regiligent because he see difficulty what was a situation of great despon authout registered to the part. A large weather could well happen without registered on his part. A large weather conditions and easily go unnoticed by the root terms under those weather conditions and my opinion no justification for drawing the laterage that the Fishelff my opinion no justification for drawing the laterage affords no religion.

I find therefore that the Plaintiff is entitled to damage:.