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**Response to Question 1**

The case under discussion is an example of business tort where one former employee of a company not only breached his employment contract but also caused damage to his employer, intentionally by provoking their current employees through monetary incentives. Dwayne caused damage to Gryphon Consultancy by inciting their employees who broke their employment contracts as a consequence. Such a business tort can be referred to as Tortious Interference wherein one party interferes in the business relationship of other parties as a result of market competition (“Intentional Interference with Contractual Relations”). Gryphon Consultancy can claim for the financial loss it has suffered since the defendant had knowledge of the employment contract between Gryphon Consultancy and its employees. In addition, the defendant had the intent to interfere with the business expectancy and contract owing to the business competition. The result should be the payment of damages in terms resulting from economic expectancy and the number of damages must be determined according to the economic expectancy along with the assurance from Dwayne to prevent such a case in the future.

**Response to Question 2**

In the case under discussion, Stella Liebeck, a 79-year-old lady dropped her coffee resulting in three-degree burns on her genitals, thighs, groin, and buttocks. She claimed $20,000 as compensatory damages of the medical treatment she took. As the case progressed, a amount of other cases also exposed regarding McDonald’s coffee causing some severe burns to the clients. McDonald's negligence resulted in huge losses to customers and the jury awarded a high amount of damages as compensatory and punitive damages. In my opinion, the jury has awarded a very amount of damages to Liebeck as compared to what she demanded as an indemnity of the accident. Though the results of the case were justified since the company was negligent at its end despite receiving several cases. However, the amount of punitive damages awarded by the jury was not justified with respect to the case.

**Response to Question 3**

The era of driverless cars is approaching after the decades of research in navigation and control methods, sensors and mapping. The partial or full autonomy is, however, a question of who is responsible for the road accidents that are driver otherwise. The decision of liability is not very clear in this case. This case pertains to product liability in business tort in which manufacturers and sellers are held responsible for the damages and loss. Manufacturers cannot be held liable for the cases where the automation system is installed afterward manufacturing by some third party. Product liability law guides in the case of autonomous vehicles and in this regard the product liability law framework of the US can guide liability questions. The liability, in this case, is generally considered as impediment liability (Villasenor). The technology of sensors and smart grids can also be used as a guide to decide who is responsible for the accident.

**Response to Question 4**

Under Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act (PLCAA), the gun manufacturers and dealers are not responsible if the crime is committed by the firearm purchased from them but in case of breach of contract, defective products, and criminal misconduct. The presence of such a law does not protect the gun manufacturers from the cases of product liability arising from selling the defective products. In addition, the gun seller has to take certain ethical considerations into account such as assuring that the buyer has a license of keeping gun, knowing the history of the buyer, selling the safest versions to the general public with training or instructions on usage to prevent any damage (Maitland). In addition, informing authorities of any suspicious buyers and completing clarification before handing over guns is also imperative. The theory of negligence might have applied if Congress did not pass any law to protect gun dealers.
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