7. Special duty problems: economic loss

This chapter explains when and how the courts have found that a duty of care should be owed by defendants for purely economic loss. This differs from 'consequential' economic loss, where financial loss is suffered as a secondary consequence of another harm, such as personal injury or property damage. The tort of negligence distinguishes between these, using duty of care as a device to control whether and when claimants will be able to recover their pure economic losses. The discussions cover the meaning of 'pure' economic loss; exceptions to the exclusionary rule; claims for pure economic loss in negligence before *Murphy v Brentwood District Council* [1990]; and extended applications of the principles established in *Hedley Byrne v Heller* [1963].
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