



Strictly Speaking

The Newsletter of the
Product Liability Committee

Volume 12 Issue 3

In this Issue

- [Note from the Annual Meeting Marketing Chair](#)
- [Additive Manufacturing: Creating New Players in the Field of Product Liability](#)
- [Examining the Intervening and Superceding Acts Defense in Product Liability Claims Arising After a Manufacturer's Recall](#)
- [You Scream, I Scream, We All Scream. For.....Listeriosis \(Coverage\)? Applicability of the Pollution Exclusion to Bacteria Related Claims](#)
- [Post-Sale Safety Improvements – Good Idea?](#)

Post-Sale Safety Improvements – Good Idea?

by Kenneth Ross



As we know, the key focus in many product liability cases where design defect is alleged is whether there was a “reasonable alternative design” that would have prevented the accident. The plaintiff’s expert says that they could have made a safer product at a reasonable cost and that the manufacturer was negligent in not incorporating this safer design into its product or that this safer design is proof that the product was defective when sold. It is up to the jury to decide whether the technology was available at that time and whether the safer design should have been implemented.

One important piece of evidence that can be used against the manufacturer in such cases is where the manufacturer improved the product’s design after the sale of the product to the plaintiff. This article will discuss the law concerning pre-sale and post-sale safety improvements and practical suggestions on how to analyze and document these changes.

The Law – Defective at the Time of Sale

The first law I want to discuss involves evidentiary rules affecting the admissibility of post-sale safety improvements. In cases where the improvement was made after sale but prior to the accident, this evidence is generally admissible and not subject to the subsequent remedial measure rule, Rule 407 of the Federal Rules of Evidence.

For safety improvements made after an accident occurs, in many situations, Rule 407 would exclude such evidence. This exclusion is meant to not discourage manufacturers from fixing a safety problem after an accident occurs. However, this exclusion does not work if the evidence is offered to rebut a manufacturer’s position that the precautionary measure proposed by plaintiff is not feasible. It also does not apply to actions by third parties such as competitors who come out with safety improvements before or after an accident involving a manufacturer’s product. And, in some states, it does not apply to actions brought under strict liability.

Of course, all of this evidence would go to support the plaintiff’s position that the manufacturer could have made the product safer and that this improvement could have been made before sale to the plaintiff. So it supports a negligence or strict liability claim that the product was defective when it was sold.

For planning purposes, I have told clients that they should assume that any post-sale safety improvement will at least be discoverable and possibly will be admitted into evidence to support the plaintiff’s claim. Therefore, the manufacturer must be prepared to explain why that improvement was not available or appropriate before sale to the plaintiff. This will be discussed more fully below.

The Law – Post-sale Duty to Warn

Post-sale safety improvements can also create a post-sale duty to warn. The Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability (“Restatement”) includes a section devoted to post-sale warnings. Section 10 provides four factors that must be established by the plaintiff to recover against a defendant for failing to issue post-sale warnings.

This section makes it clear that, in certain circumstances, this post-sale duty may



Already knowing the answers when you walk into court isn't unfair, it's un-stupid.



Our court-qualified scientists, engineers, chemists and researchers share over 40 years experience and expertise in product testing everything from candles to SUV's.



For more than 30 years, our expert scientists have been investigating and resolving the root cause of product performance issues, defects, and failures.



Forensic Engineering, Accident Reconstruction and Expert Witness Services for over 25 years. Proudly bringing Engineers and Attorneys together through DRI, since 2004.

Join a Committee

Committee Leadership



Committee Chair

Patrick J. Sweeney
Sweeney & Sheehan

patrick.sweeney@sweeneyfirm.com



Vice Chair

Anne M. Talcott
Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt

atalcott@schwabe.com



Newsletter Chair

James M. Dedman, IV
Gallivan White & Boyd

jedman@gwblawfirm.com

Newsletter Vice Chair

Sarah Walling
Jenkins Fenstermaker

saw@jenkinsfenstermaker.com

exist whether or not the product is defective at the time of sale. Therefore, such a duty might arise where the product was not defective at the time of sale, but due to post-sale improvements in technology, was arguably unreasonably dangerous, especially when compared to products previously introduced into commerce,

Section 10 also raises the issue of whether a manufacturer either has a duty to warn prior customers about a post-sale safety improvement or has a duty to offer the improvement to prior customers.

Products are always being improved. Whether it is a new safety feature developed to reduce a risk identified after sale or a new warning label or guard required by a new industry standard, the manufacturer must analyze whether this improvement could create a duty to issue a post-sale warning.

Let's first look at what the Restatement says. Comment a to Section 10 says: "If every post-sale improvement in a product design were to give rise to a duty to warn users of the risks of continuing to use the existing design, the burden on product sellers would be unacceptably great."

Then, in the Reporter's Notes to this comment, the Reporters point out that it will be difficult for a plaintiff to prove each of the four factors enumerated in Section 10 if the warning is about the availability of a product safety improvement. Therefore, the Reporters were trying to point out how difficult it would be for a plaintiff to prove a case under the post-sale duty theory. Of course, it is up to the jury and the Restatement would allow a plaintiff to make the argument.

With reference to any duty to recall a product that has received post-sale safety improvements, Section 11, Comment a, states:

Duties to recall products impose significant burdens on manufacturers. Many product lines are periodically redesigned so that they become safer over time. If every improvement in product safety were to trigger a common-law duty to recall, manufacturers would face incalculable costs every time they sought to make their product lines better and safer.

In an illustration to Comment a, the Restatement describes the following situation:

[The manufacturer] develops an improved model that includes a safety device that reduces the risk of harm to users. The washing machines sold previously conformed to the best technology available at time of sale and were not defective when sold. [The manufacturer] is under no common-law obligation to recall previously-distributed machines in order to retrofit them with the new safety device.

These statements and this illustration make it clear that, with a few minor exceptions, there is no common law post-sale duty to recall where the product was not defective when sold. In contrast, Section 10 makes it clear that the product does not need to be defective at the time of sale to give rise to a post-sale duty to warn.

So, where does this leave the manufacturer? Since a post-sale improvement is an "alternative design" and an admission that the product can be made safer, the plaintiff might argue that this improvement proves that the product without the improvement was defective when sold and that the improvement could have been developed much earlier.

This, in effect, potentially turns the post-sale safety improvement into an admission that the manufacturer is fixing a defective product. Thus, the jury could hold the manufacturer liable for selling a defective product, as well as for negligent failure to warn those customers that purchased the product before it was "improved."

For example, in *Tabieros v. Clark Equipment Co*, 944 P.2d 1279 (Haw. 1997), the Hawaii Supreme Court held that "a manufacturer has no duty to 'retrofit' its products with 'after-manufacture' safety equipment, although it may be found negligent or strictly liable for failing to install such equipment – or not otherwise making its product safer – existing at the time of manufacture."

To add to a manufacturer's uncertainty, a California case suggests that negligence for failure to conduct an adequate retrofit campaign may be found, even when the product is not defective when sold. The California Court of



[Click to view entire Leadership](#)

Upcoming Seminar



DRI Publications



[Coverage B: Personal and Advertising Injury Compendium](#)

DRI Social Links



[PDF Version](#)

Appeals in *Hernandez v. Badger Construction Equipment Co.*, 28 Cal. App. 4th 1791 (1994), held the manufacturer negligent for not informing its prior customers that an optional safety device was now mandatory and for not trying to retrofit old products that did not have the safety device. The *Hernandez* court, relying in part on *Balido v. Improved Machinery, Inc.*, 29 Cal.App.3d 633 (1972), justified imposition of liability based on the rationale that “Badger did not do ‘everything reasonably within its power to prevent injury’ to plaintiffs.”

The Supreme Court of Kentucky in *Ostendorf v. Clark Equipment Company*, 122 S.W.3d 530 (2003) discussed whether a manufacturer had a common law duty to retrofit existing products when post-sale safety improvements were developed. They held that the manufacturer had no such duty and that the plaintiff could only recover if they could show that the product was defective at the time of sale. However, evidence of the retrofit and the safety improvements could be introduced to support such a claim.

In addition, the Court refused to adopt Section 11 of the Restatement saying that:

A retrofit campaign is a complex process requiring an abundance of technical, administrative, and legal coordination. Imposing liability on a company for a good faith—but perhaps incomplete—effort to undertake that task might dissuade that company from acting until required to by a government directive.

What to Do?

Manufacturers should take no solace in the helpful language in the Restatement on safety improvements. There are many opportunities for plaintiffs to argue that the manufacturer should have done more. Furthermore, manufacturers should be very mindful of these arguments when making significant improvements in safety.

Assuming that the products in the field can be retrofitted with this new technology, the manufacturer should seriously consider offering such technology to prior customers. It will enhance safety for those customers who take the new technology and make any litigation involving a customer who refused it more defensible. This consideration and the basis for their decision should be well-documented in case it is challenged later.

There is no rationale for manufacturers to offer true post-sale safety improvements to customers at no charge. The customer would have paid for the safety improvement now being offered as an improvement if it had been on the product originally. Consequently, they should be required to pay for at least the cost of the improvement now. Despite that, be careful in making a profit as it might not look very good to a jury. Furthermore, a plaintiff might actually argue that providing a safety improvement for free is an admission that the manufacturer is really trying to fix a defective product. And, of course, a manufacturer should be very careful in trying to charge a customer to fix a defective product in the field that is out of warranty.

Products evolve over time and the law supports making safety improvements. Consequently, no manufacturer should avoid trying to make better and safer products. When the law or standards change or when competitors come out with a safer product, the manufacturer has no choice. In all cases when making significant improvements in safety, the manufacturer should consult with experienced product safety counsel to decide whether it should offer the improvement to prior customers and how to make the offer so they do not run the risk of being considered as acting negligently or selling a defective product. And, counsel can advise them on how to adequately document this decision.

Doing these things will help minimize the future risk of these safety improvements being used against the manufacturer and tarnishing the safety of prior products made without the improvement.

Kenneth Ross is a former partner and now Of Counsel in the Minneapolis, Minnesota office of *Bowman and Brooke LLP* where he provides legal advice to manufacturers and other product sellers in all areas of product safety, regulatory compliance and product liability prevention including dealing with the CPSC. Mr. Ross can be reached at 952-933-1195 or kenrossesq@comcast.net. Other articles authored by Mr. Ross can be accessed at www.productliabilityprevention.com.