Part 1

On the basis of defense, this case seems very accurate in association with Justin King case. The defendant , in King case may claim that why Mr. King was not wearing helmet and due to this he get injuries. But Mr. King was good without helmet and he think he use assumed of risk. So I use Westlaw research with the key word of “assumption of risk” through advance search and get many cases. But my main focus was on negligence during vehicle accident .There were over 400 cases available and was tough for me to decide one case, so I searched for helmet and fond few cases. Of them this is more relevant to Mr. King. So I selected McKinley v. Casson, for this research.

Part 2

Bluebook Citation: McKinley v. Casson, 80 A. 3d 618 (2013)

In October 2009, Robert McKinley and Michele Casson had a motor vehicle accident. It was occurred near Summit bridge in Delware (North). Both were on Route 896 when accident occurred. Casson, due to anxiety of driving near bridge she pull over right hand trying to push away from the construction barrier in to merge lane. However she claimed that she was slowed down progressively but alternatively Mckinley claimed that she abruptly stopped due to her and cause collide in the rear side of SUV.

McKinley was wearing helmet but suffered from severe injuries. On September ,2010, he filed a negligence suit looking for compensations contrary to Casson for the injuries. But McKinley was without helmet at the time of accident and court rejected this assumption as a secondary assumption of risk. But Supreme court denied this assumption of not having helmet by finding trial court errand and verdict that Casson futile to exercise practical care and she was responsible for over 50% liable for the accident.