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The facts explain that when the accident occurred Mad Max was driving the bus and he failed to maintain control. This caused injury to several children that caused parents to file suit against QDCC.

The issue was to identify if QDCC was liable for the harm caused to the plaintiff’s children or not. I agree that in this situation it is essential to determine if Max was driving negligently.

I agree that the Doctrine of Respondeat Superior is applicable in the current scenario. It is thus crucial to find if the principal-employer is liable for the harm caused to the third party. This will reveal the responsibility of the employer in the accident caused by the employee.

The application of the Doctrine of Respondeat suggests considering other factors such as the time and place of the incident. It also suggests findings the role of the employer in initiating the act. This further reveals that the act was on commonly performed by employees on behalf of their employers. After considering all these points I think that employer can be proved liable for the harm caused by Mad Max. This is due to the fact that the incident occurred in the morning time when the driver had to perform his during of carrying children to the designated place. The act of carrying children to the trip was thus initiated by the employer. This makes QDCC responsible for the accident. I also agree that the tortious act of Max satisfies the conditions of the scope of employment.

In conclusion, I accept the claims that parents must be able to collect the punitive damages for the harm experienced by their children. QDCC will be liable to pay the damages to the plaintiff because the employer's liability is proved.
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