

law

by Essay Essay

Submission date: 01-May-2021 02:12AM (UTC-0400)

Submission ID: 1575169481

File name: law_docs.edited_1.docx (19.82K)

Word count: 353

Character count: 1816

MARKETING LAW

Author's Name

Institutional Affiliation

Instructor

Date

The doctrine of respondeat superior exemplifies the general rule that an employer is responsible for its employees' wrongful acts or omissions. Under this doctrine, an employer is liable for the negligent actions of their agent or employee, mainly if such acts occur in the course and scope of employment or agency. In my opinion, the plaintiffs wanted to be compensated for the damages on their car and for their injuries. Therefore, they charged Chilis as they argued that the patron was an agent from Chilis. Thus the restaurant was liable to them, based on the doctrine of respondeat superior. Further, they argued that the patron committed the offense in the course of employment. Therefore, Chilis was supposed to take responsibility for the wrong acts. However, I don't think the plaintiffs had a good chance of winning the case against Chilis since the restaurant denied that the agent was not theirs.

According to the existing elements, there was insufficient evidence to ascertain that the patron was an agent of Chilis restaurant. This is because; no material indicated whichever initial communication amid the patron and the restaurant supervisor. For them, the event took place very fast and none of their members joined the pursuit. Even though the accusers contended that Chilis commendably agreed to a work rapport with the patron since they accepted his inspection reports during the hunt and never instructed him to stop the pursuit, the circumstances are not enough to prove that the patron was an agent of Chilis restaurant. Therefore, the restaurant patron cannot be held liable for the actions. The patron was pursuing petty crime since the boys wanted to go away without paying for their meal.

In my opinion, the ruling given by the court about the case was fair. Even though the plaintiffs had a right to file the lawsuit, making the restaurant pay for the patron's actions wouldn't have been acceptable. This is because there was no information provided to firmly

indicate that the patron was Chili's agent and that the restaurant had any effective control over the patron.

law

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off