

1: Causation in the Law (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Loss causation requires that a plaintiff show that the loss was a direct result of the defendant's wrongful actions and that it was independent of other causes. It is an essential element of a claim for negligent misrepresentation.

This is why they are a great tool for promoting weight loss in people who are overweight or obese. Loss of appetite and feeling full very quickly can also be the result of bariatric weight loss surgery, since this decreases the volume of food that the stomach can comfortably hold. Loss of Appetite and Cancer: Cancer and cancer treatments, like chemotherapy or immunotherapy, can cause many changes to metabolism, the digestive system and to hormone production. All of these factors can decrease hunger. An enlarged spleen and compressed stomach, leading to fullness. Edema and ascites, or buildup of fluid in the abdomen that leads to bloating. Fatigue, sleepiness or even calmness caused by certain medications. Increased nausea and vomiting. Development of mouth sores, oral infections, dry mouth and mouth pain. These can lead to difficulty swallowing and pain when chewing. Changes in taste and smell that decrease the pleasure associated with eating. Constipation, cramps and abdominal pain. Depression and anxiety, which can make it hard to eat. Bladder cancer, stomach cancer, rectal cancer and colon cancer are types that tend to affect appetite most because these cause inflammation and other negative changes to the digestive organs. Conventional Loss of Appetite Treatments The first step to treating appetite loss is identifying and addressing the underlying cause. Some treatments that may be used to reverse loss of appetite and its effects can include: Supplements and meal replacement products that can provide electrolytes and relieve constipation, cramping or fatigue. Medications that contain progesterone, which can improve appetite and weight gain. Examples are megestrol acetate or medroxyprogesterone. Steroid medications, which can decrease symptoms like swelling, nausea, weakness, or pain associated with underlying illnesses. Metoclopramide, which helps move food out of the stomach more easily. Antidepressant or anti-anxiety medications. A cannabinoid product called dronabinol that is used to stimulate appetite. In some states within the U. Exercise programs, which can stimulate appetite hormone secretion. In severe cases, tube feeding might be used to get calories and nutrients directly into the stomach to treat weight loss and nutrient deficiencies. Change Your Eating Patterns Here are tips for changing the times of day that you eat, the amount you eat at once, and other factors to consider: Rather than eating one or two big meals that can lead to indigestion or fullness, split meals into five to six smaller meals a day. Also add snacks whenever you feel hungry. Try to eat at regular times each day, since this pattern helps train your body and regulate your appetite. Eat whole foods that are energy-dense if you find it hard to eat big enough meals – meaning foods that should provide a decent amount of calories, healthy fats and protein. You can increase your calorie intake without feeling overly full by adding oil, butter, cheese, coconut milk, or nut butters to recipes. Make food taste more appealing by adding sea salt, spices and condiments you like. Drink moderate amounts of water between meals rather than with meals, and try to base your fluid intake on your level of thirst. Keep a variety of fresh foods at home so you always have access to something you like. Eat in a relaxed environment where you are not rushed, such as with family or friends not when driving or working! Change the texture or temperature of food if it makes it easier to consume, such as by blending, steaming, boiling or chilling. Here are natural remedies that can help treat nausea: Sit up for about an hour after eating to relieve any pressure on the stomach. Try to eat at least three hours before bedtime to help you digest. Drink ginger tea or apply ginger essential oil over your chest or abdomen. To make your own ginger tea, cut ginger root into slices and place them into a pot of boiling water for 10 minutes. Take a supplement containing vitamin B6, which helps to decrease PMS, morning sickness and symptoms of an upset stomach. Inhale peppermint essential oil or rub it into your neck and chest. Get some fresh air, open a window and take a calming walk outside. Some ways to help improve gut health and digestion include: Eating an anti-inflammatory diet. Eating high-fiber foods to help prevent constipation, including chia or flax seeds, cooked veggies, avocado, roasted root veggies, and foods high in magnesium. Eating probiotic foods, like fermented yogurt or cultured veggies. Doing an appropriate amount of exercise not too much or too little. Not taking any unnecessary medications, including antibiotics you can talk to your doctor about this. Take Steps To Treat Depression and Anxiety

Depression and anxiety can affect your appetite by altering stress hormones and increasing inflammation. If you cope with depression or anxiety by drinking alcohol, smoking cigarettes and drinking lots of caffeine, know that these substances will blunt hunger too especially caffeine and smoking. Some ways that you can manage stress and help fight depression include: Practicing yoga, meditation and breathing exercises. Spending more time outside, and getting some sunlight exposure to boost vitamin D levels. Seeking out emotional support from family, friends, a therapist or a support group. Unwinding by using essential oils like lavender, chamomile or holy basil. Taking an Epsom salt bath before bed to relax muscular tension. Getting a massage or visiting an acupuncturist. Depending on many factors, exercising can both increase your appetite and also help to normalize it longterm because of how it affects hormones and inflammation. Exercise also has numerous other health benefits – including helping to relieve stress, lower inflammation, improve sleep, and maintain muscle mass, which is beneficial for your metabolism, especially as you age. Aim to get seven to nine hours of sleep per night. To regulate your circadian rhythm, try to sleep and wake at similar times each day. Sleep in a cool, very dark room. Eat a nutrient-dense diet. Limit sugar, processed grains and caffeine. Diffuse peppermint oil and other uplifting oils in your home. Practice meditation and other stress-relieving activities before bed. Give yourself mental breaks throughout the day to unwind, rest, take a slow walk outside or practice deep breathing. Precautions Talk to your doctor if you regularly experience gastrointestinal symptoms beyond loss of appetite, such as nausea, vomiting, bloating, pain and constipation. Your doctor can recommend tests that might help identify an underlying cause. It can also be helpful to meet with a registered dietitian or nutritionist for advice on meal planning, grocery shopping and symptom management if loss of appetite is interfering with your quality of life. There are many causes of loss of appetite, some of which only cause short-term changes in hunger and others which cause long-term changes. The most common causes of decreases in hunger include: [Click here to learn more about the webinar.](#)

2: Unexplained weight loss Causes - Mayo Clinic

Homeowners Insurance Policy B includes a concurrent causation of loss provision indicating that, when loss is caused by two or more different perils at the same time, if any peril causing damage is excluded under the policy, then the entire loss is excluded from coverage, even if the other perils would otherwise be covered by the policy.

Nature and Functions of Causation Law is concerned with the application of causal ideas, embodied in the language of statutes and decisions, to particular situations. This involves, first, a conception of what a cause is outside the law. To this a variety of answers empirical Hume and metaphysical Kant have been given and each has its contemporary supporters. Secondly, a theory is required of how causal notions should function in different contexts. In the context of application the notion of cause is a multi-purpose tool. One function, perhaps fundamental, is forward-looking: This use of cause serves to provide recipes and make predictions. It also yields the idea of a causal process. Another function is backward-looking and explanatory: A third function is attributive: For the first of these purposes the emphasis falls on a cause as consisting of the whole complex of conditions required if a certain outcome is to follow J. Even when applied to a specific situation this involves considering what generally happens when certain conditions are present. In the second, explanatory, context the focus is on selecting from the whole complex the particular condition or conditions that best explain a given outcome. The aim can be either to explain a class of events or a particular event. In the third, attributive, context the aim is again selective, but from a different point of view. Here the purpose is to settle the extent of responsibility that attaches to a particular human action or other event or state of affairs. This responsibility is then attributed to an agent or, metaphorically, to the other event or state of affairs in question e. In law the second and third of these functions of the notion of cause are prominent, often in combination. Many legal inquiries are concerned to explain how some event or state of affairs came about, especially an untoward event such as death or a state of affairs such as insolvency. But in law the third function is particularly salient and controversial. Whether someone is liable to punishment or to pay compensation or is entitled to claim compensation often depends on showing whether the person potentially liable or entitled has caused harm of a sort that the law seeks to avoid. All systems treat it as a more serious offence to cause death than to attempt to do so. It is a civil wrong to cause injury to another by negligence in driving a vehicle, but the claim is barred or reduced if the negligent conduct of the person injured is also a cause of the injury. An insurer is required to pay for losses caused by an event of the type defined in the insurance policy, such as fire or flooding, but not if the cause of the loss is something else. The attribution of responsibility on causal grounds is not confined to law. Historians and moralists, for example, assess the responsibility of agents for the outcomes, political, social, economic or military of what they did or failed to do. Unlike lawyers, they are concerned with responsibility for good as well as bad outcomes. Moore propose a general theory of causation in relation to responsibility. These uses of causation by historians, moralists and lawyers raise the question, adumbrated by Collingwood, of whether the attribution of responsibility requires a different conception of cause from that employed for prediction or explanation. In the legal theory of causation this problem is of central importance. The notion that causal connection between agency and harm must be established is however often implied even when the word is not used. In legal contexts the possible range of agency is not confined to human conduct, but may extend to damage done by the agency of juristic persons, animals, inanimate objects such as motor vehicles and inanimate forces such as fire. In all these instances the use of the notion of cause is central to the legal inquiry, since to establish responsibility it must be shown that the harm was done or brought about by the agency that the law treats as a potential basis for the existence or extent of liability. The relationship between causing harm and legal responsibility is however complex. The complexities concern the incidence of responsibility, the grounds of responsibility, the items between which causal connection must be demonstrated, and the variety of relationships that can in some sense be regarded as causal. So far as the incidence of responsibility is concerned, while in law the relevant causes may be human or animal behaviour or natural events or processes, legal responsibility attaches in modern law only to natural persons human beings and juristic persons such as states, corporations and other institutions to which

personality is ascribed in law. It is not a necessary condition for two reasons. First, in legal contexts people are often made responsible for harm caused by other persons. In these instances the ground of responsibility is, from the point of view of the person held responsible, not that he, she or it has caused harm but that they bear the risk that some other person, animal, thing or process may cause harm. Much law is indeed concerned with the distribution of social risks. The responsibility of the person who bears the risk may be additional or alternative to the responsibility of the person if any who wrongfully caused the harm in question. Thus, if an employer is responsible for harm caused by his or her employee to another person the employee may or may not also be legally responsible for that harm. A second reason why causing harm is not a necessary condition of legal responsibility is that there are many contexts in which a person is civilly or criminally responsible irrespective of whether any harm has been caused by their conduct or that of an agency for which they are responsible. Both inside and outside the law many actions are regarded as wrongful whether or not they cause tangible harm. Moreover the imposition of penalties in civil law and of punishments in criminal law need not bear any relation to the harm if any caused by the conduct for which the penalty or punishment is imposed. To cause harm to another is also not a sufficient condition of legal responsibility, even in the eyes of those, such as the early Epstein, who would in general favour making agents strictly liable for the harm they cause. For a person to be legally responsible for causing harm to another requires, apart from a number of conditions relating to jurisdiction, procedure and proof, that the conduct should be of the sort that the law designates as unlawful. It also requires that the purpose of the law should encompass harm of the sort for which a remedy is sought. Thus, in some contexts only physical, not economic or psychological harm grounds a legal remedy. There is also a complication concerning the items between which causal connection must in law be shown to exist. The inquiries with which law is concerned relate to particular events. Did one action, event, process or state of affairs event for short cause another? The link that must be established in legal proceedings between events is of a special type. For example, if a claim for damages is brought against a motorist for causing injury to the claimant by driving negligently, only that description of his or her manner of driving that amounts to negligence is capable of constituting a relevant cause. In a legal context, therefore, the link to be established must be framed in terms of a link between particular aspects of events. The claimant in a civil action will typically argue, for example, that the fact that Smith drove at sixty miles an hour in a built-up area on such-and-such an occasion caused the collision that in turn caused the victim to suffer a broken leg. Though it is controversial whether causal connection is to be conceived as a relation between events or facts Davidson, in law both are relevant. The events in issue must be identified from the point of view of the time, place and persons involved, but the aspect of the events between which a causal link must be shown has to be specified in such a way as to show that it falls within the relevant legal categories, such as in the example given above negligence and physical injury. The relationship between causing harm and legal responsibility is also complex because of the great variety of relationships between agency and harm that can be regarded as in some sense causal, or analogous to a causal relationship. Again, legal responsibility is often imposed, in the context of interpersonal relationships, on those who influence others by advising, encouraging, helping, permitting, coercing, deceiving, misinforming or providing opportunities to others that motivate or enable them to act in a way that is harmful to themselves or to others. Whether complicity in the agency of another can be regarded as causal or analogous has been denied Moore but defended Gardner. In some cases coercion, deceit the persons held responsible would naturally be said to have caused the persons influenced to act as they did, while in others they would not, though the weaker interpersonal relationship is in some respects analogous to more plainly causal relationships. Failing to help or provide opportunities to others by advising, warning, informing or rescuing them or supplying them with agreed goods and services are other grounds of responsibility for negative agency that, again, are at least analogous to causal relationships. The existence of this wide spectrum of causal or near-causal grounds of responsibility recognised in law and morality raises the question whether any uniform theory of causation is capable of accounting for all of them. Criteria for the Existence of Causal Connection in Law The theories concerning the criteria for the existence of causal connection in law fall into two classes. Some focus on the type of condition that the alleged cause must constitute in relation to the alleged consequence. Others are concerned with a specific feature that the cause

must possess in relation to the consequence in order that causal connection may be made out. Must the cause be a necessary condition, a sufficient condition or a necessary member of a set of conditions that are together sufficient for the outcome? The second type of theory concerns the criteria for determining the limits of legal responsibility for causing harm. Even supposing that the alleged cause constitutes the right sort of condition of the outcome. But what are the appropriate criteria of limitation? In many legal contexts and in the view of many theorists a single criterion is called for. It should be remembered, however, that the search for a single criterion may be no more than a response to legal doctrine. Some theorists for example Leon Green and others since the 1950s up to Wright and Stapleton today hold that only the issue of causally relevant condition or cause-in-fact is genuinely causal. It alone raises questions to which an objective, scientifically valid, answer can be given Becht and Miller. Even this has been questioned by Malone, who has pointed to the incorporation of normative considerations in the rules for proving cause-in-fact in civil law. These normative considerations are, however, more concerned with the rules of proof in law than with what has to be proved. The second type of theory concerns questions of responsibility that would in the view of these causal minimalists be better addressed directly rather than by asking whether on the facts a causal relation existed between agency and harm. One way of doing this is to ask what would be the fairest way of distributing the relevant social risks. Another way would be to place responsibility, especially in civil law, on the person best placed to avoid the loss most cheaply. In practice legislators and judges have seldom abandoned the traditional causal terminology in discussing the second issue, but the proposal to do so has been repeatedly revived. The but-for theory, endorsed by many legal and philosophical theorists including Mackie, has the heuristic advantage that a simple and often reliable way of ruling out the existence of causal connection between agency and harm is to ask whether the harm would in the circumstances have occurred in the absence of the agency. If the harm would have occurred in any event the agency is probably not its cause or one of its causes. If it would not have occurred in the absence of the agency the agency will be a causally relevant condition or, if one endorses causal minimalism, a cause-in-fact of the harm. There are however cases in which the but-for test is difficult to reconcile with our intuitive judgements of responsibility. These concern two types of case in particular, those of over-determination and of joint determination. If two hunters independently but simultaneously shoot and kill a third person, or two contractors independently fail to deliver essential building supplies on time, it is intuitively clear that each should be held responsible for the death or building delay. Yet the but-for test seems to yield the conclusion that neither has caused the harm. Again, in interpersonal relationships it is often the case that advice etc. Many reasons bear on the decisions we make. Sometimes it is not possible to be sure that in the absence of one of them the decision would have been different. We know only that to the person reaching the decision the reasons taken into account were jointly sufficient to induce him, her or it to decide as he or she did. In reply it is argued Mackie that in these cases all the agencies that are singly or jointly sufficient for the outcome together constitute its cause. But in law this does not solve the problem because, unless the agents are acting in concert, the responsibility of each agency has to be independently established. This can be done either by an appeal to intuitive notions of responsibility or by recourse to an alternative ground of responsibility based on risk. On the alternative view an agency that provides an independently or jointly sufficient condition of harm bears the risk that that harm will eventuate even if it would in the circumstances have come about in any event. Some of those who reject the but-for criterion. They advocate the view that in a specific situation a causally relevant condition is a necessary element of a set of conditions jointly sufficient for the harmful outcome. NESS supporters therefore appeal to the idea that particular causal links are instances of generalisations about the way in which events are connected.

3: Hair loss - Symptoms and causes - Mayo Clinic

Causation. Related Content. If the loss would have happened in any event, then the breach could not be said to have caused the loss. End of Document. Also Found In.

Public policy[edit] Policy at this level is less than *ordre public* , but nevertheless significant. The policy is to give bound to the scope of people who can claim damages, how much they can claim, and within what timeframe. The claimant must prove that the breach of the duty of care caused actionable damage. The test for these purposes is a balance between proximity and remoteness: All these devices are useful in their way. But ultimately it is a question of policy for the judges to decide. For this purpose, a weighing evaluative process is required, rather than a clear-cut rule of law. For example, in *Meah v McCreamer* and others No. Four years later, he sexually assaulted and raped three women. The illegal nature of his conduct was not raised at the civil trial , and the claimant was held entitled to damages to compensate him for being imprisoned following his conviction. In separate proceedings, the three women assaulted obtained a judgment for compensation, so he sought indemnification from the negligent driver and his insurers for the amounts he had been ordered to pay. This was not a claim for his own personal injuries nor direct financial loss, but indirect loss. The three women could not have sued the driver directly because they were not foreseeable and so no duty of care was owed to them. The question was whether a person convicted of a crime was entitled to be indemnified against the consequences of that crime. First, the damages were too remote to be recoverable and, if such actions were to be allowed, it would leave insurers open to indefinite liability for an indefinite duration. Secondly, as a matter of policy, defendants should not have a right to be indemnified against the consequences of their crimes. He was to receive aftercare services in the community under s Act , but his mental condition deteriorated and, two months later, he fatally stabbed a stranger at a London Underground station. He pleaded guilty to manslaughter on the ground of diminished responsibility and was ordered to be detained in a secure hospital. Subsequently, he brought an action against his local health authority for negligence. The health authority applied to strike out the claim as disclosing no cause of action on two grounds. Alternatively, the defendant will not be liable if the damage would, or could on the balance of probabilities , have occurred anyway, regardless of his or her negligence. To understand this, a distinction has to be made between cause and a precondition for the events. He goes to a doctor who negligently makes a superficial examination and pronounces the knee fit. The climber goes on the expedition, which he would not have undertaken if the doctor had told him the true state of his knee. He suffers an injury which is an entirely foreseeable consequence of mountaineering but has nothing to do with his knee. Even though the injury might be reasonably foreseeable, the doctor is not liable. The pilot fell asleep, and a collision occurred. Though the pilot was negligent at the time, he was generally competent. Thus the question for the courts was: Or was the factual precondition superseded by the question as to the competence of the pilot? There is no question that sending the ship to sea is "a cause" of the collision. The legal question is whether it is "the cause". This is a question that the courts treat as objective, addressed by evidence and argument. Although they sent the ship to sea without licensed officers what actually transpired rather than with licensed officers the lawful course , the cause of collision was failing to navigate a safe passage. As to the pilot, his lack of licence did not bear on his general competence. Had the pilot been licensed, he would have been no less likely to sleep. The license would not have awoken him. The breach of duty alleged was confined to advice about the protection afforded by the Policyholders Protection Act to "with-profits" annuities, and this duty was found to be breached by the first instance judge. The claimant would not have chosen the Equitable Life with-profits annuity if he had been given correct advice, but that did not entitle him to recover the loss he had sustained as a result of his acquiring the annuity. The Act would have applied if Equitable Life had become insolvent. That was not the case. So the negligence as pleaded and as found by the judge did not relate to the fact that the terminal bonuses were not guaranteed. Lord Steyn posed the question, "That immediately raises the point that there must be an explanation for the fact that she contracted PDA4. What was the cause of her PDA4? In all cases, the burden of proof is on the claimant to prove the cause as pleaded. This test works well in straightforward situations,

but it proves less successful in establishing causation in more complex situations where a number of actual or potential causes operate either consecutively or concurrently. For example, in *Robinson v Post Office* 1 WLR following an accident at work, the claimant had an anti-tetanus injection. Nine days later, there was an adverse reaction to the serum and brain damage resulted. No matter what tests the doctor might have performed, there would have been no sign of an adverse reaction within a reasonable time see the Bolam Test. Thus, in deciding between sequential contributions to the final result, the court must decide which is the more substantial contribution. Breaking the chain of causation[edit] Main article: Breaking the chain Acts of a third party[edit] Whether the acts of a third party break the chain of causation depends on whether the intervention was foreseeable. The general rule is that the original defendant will be held responsible for harm caused by a third party as a direct result of his or her negligence, provided it was a highly likely consequence. So, for example, where the defendant has control over the third party, or where the third party is faced with a dilemma created by the defendant, the chain of causation is unlikely to be broken and the defendant will normally be liable to the claimant for the damage caused: *Dorset Yacht Co Ltd*. In practice, however, the requirement that the third party intervention will usually break the chain and, at the very least, the liability to pay compensation representing the totality of the loss or damage will be apportioned between the two or more tortfeasors. So, for example, if A injures V, it is foreseeable that an ambulance will be called, that paramedics will lift and carry V, and that there will be a journey back to the hospital. This cycle of intervention is continued in the hospital. None of this activity affecting V would arise "but for" the original negligence so A will remain liable unless and until either an unforeseeable B intervenes e. Acts of the claimant[edit].

4: Causation (law) - Wikipedia

Causation in English law concerns the legal tests of remoteness, causation and foreseeability in the tort of negligence. It is also relevant for English criminal law and English contract law. In the English law of negligence, causation proves a direct link between the defendant's negligence and the claimant's loss and damage.

Print Overview Hair loss can affect just your scalp or your entire body. It can be the result of heredity, hormonal changes, medical conditions or medications. Baldness typically refers to excessive hair loss from your scalp. Hereditary hair loss with age is the most common cause of baldness. Some people prefer to let their hair loss run its course untreated and unhidden. Others may cover it up with hairstyles, makeup, hats or scarves. And still others choose one of the treatments available to prevent further hair loss and to restore growth. Before pursuing hair loss treatment, talk with your doctor about the cause of your hair loss and treatment options. Symptoms Male-pattern baldness Male-pattern baldness Male-pattern baldness typically appears first at the hairline or top of the head. It can progress to partial or complete baldness. Female-pattern baldness Female-pattern baldness Female-pattern baldness typically starts with scalp hairs becoming progressively finer and shorter as you age. Many women first experience hair thinning and hair loss where they part their hair and on the top-central portion of the head. Patchy hair loss alopecia areata Patchy hair loss alopecia areata In the type of patchy hair loss known as alopecia areata, hair loss occurs suddenly and usually starts with one or more circular bald patches that may overlap. Traction alopecia Traction alopecia Hair loss can occur if you wear pigtails, braids or cornrows, or use tight hair rollers. This is called traction alopecia. It can come on suddenly or gradually and affect just your scalp or your whole body. Some types of hair loss are temporary, and others are permanent. Signs and symptoms of hair loss may include: Gradual thinning on top of head. This is the most common type of hair loss, affecting both men and women as they age. In men, hair often begins to recede from the forehead in a line that resembles the letter M. Women typically retain the hairline on the forehead but have a broadening of the part in their hair. Circular or patchy bald spots. Some people experience smooth, coin-sized bald spots. This type of hair loss usually affects just the scalp, but it sometimes also occurs in beards or eyebrows. In some cases, your skin may become itchy or painful before the hair falls out. Sudden loosening of hair. A physical or emotional shock can cause hair to loosen. Handfuls of hair may come out when combing or washing your hair or even after gentle tugging. This type of hair loss usually causes overall hair thinning and not bald patches. Some conditions and medical treatments, such as chemotherapy for cancer, can result in the loss of hair all over your body. The hair usually grows back. Patches of scaling that spread over the scalp. This is a sign of ringworm. It may be accompanied by broken hair, redness, swelling and, at times, oozing. When to see a doctor See your doctor if your child or you are distressed by hair loss and want to pursue treatment. Sudden hair loss can signal an underlying medical condition that requires treatment. Hair loss occurs when this cycle of hair growth and shedding is disrupted or when the hair follicle is destroyed and replaced with scar tissue. Hair loss is typically related to one or more of the following factors: The most common cause of hair loss is a hereditary condition called male-pattern baldness or female-pattern baldness. It usually occurs gradually with aging and in predictable patterns — a receding hairline and bald spots in men and thinning hair in women. Hormonal changes and medical conditions. A variety of conditions can cause permanent or temporary hair loss, including hormonal changes due to pregnancy, childbirth, menopause and thyroid problems. Medical conditions include alopecia areata al-o-PEE-she-uh ar-e-A-tuh , which causes patchy hair loss, scalp infections such as ringworm and a hair-pulling disorder called trichotillomania trik-o-til-o-MAY-nee-uh. Hair loss can be a side effect of certain drugs, such as those used for cancer, arthritis, depression, heart problems, gout and high blood pressure. Radiation therapy to the head. The hair may not grow back the same as it was before. A very stressful event. Many people experience a general thinning of hair several months after a physical or emotional shock. This type of hair loss is temporary. Certain hairstyles and treatments. Excessive hairstyling or hairstyles that pull your hair tight, such as pigtails or cornrows, can cause a type of hair loss called traction alopecia. Hot oil hair treatments and permanents can cause inflammation of hair follicles that leads to hair loss. If scarring occurs,

hair loss could be permanent. Risk factors A number of factors can increase your risk of hair loss, including: This type of hair loss is not preventable. These tips may help you avoid preventable types of hair loss: Avoid tight hairstyles, such as braids, buns or ponytails. Avoid compulsively twisting, rubbing or pulling your hair. Treat your hair gently when washing and brushing. A wide-toothed comb may help prevent pulling out hair. Avoid harsh treatments such as hot rollers, curling irons, hot oil treatments and permanents. Avoid medications and supplements that could cause hair loss. Protect your hair from sunlight and other sources of ultraviolet light. Some studies show an association between smoking and baldness in men. If you are being treated with chemotherapy, ask your doctor about a cooling cap. This cap can reduce your risk of losing hair during chemotherapy.

5: Loss Causation | Lawcorporations Wiki | FANDOM powered by Wikia

The term proximate cause is somewhat misleading because it has little to do with proximity or causation. Proximate cause limits the scope of liability to those injuries that bear some reasonable relationship to the risk created by the defendant.

Background concepts[edit] Legal systems more or less try to uphold the notions of fairness and justice. If a state is going to penalize a person or require that person pay compensation to another for losses incurred, liability is imposed according to the idea that those who injure others should take responsibility for their actions. Although some parts of any legal system will have qualities of strict liability, in which the mens rea is immaterial to the result and subsequent liability of the actor, most look to establish liability by showing that the defendant was the cause of the particular injury or loss. Even the youngest children quickly learn that, with varying degrees of probability, consequences flow from physical acts and omissions. The more predictable the outcome, the greater the likelihood that the actor caused the injury or loss intentionally. There are many ways in which the law might capture this simple rule of practical experience: However it is phrased, the essence of the degree of fault attributed will lie in the fact that reasonable people try to avoid injuring others, so if harm was foreseeable, there should be liability to the extent that the extent of the harm actually resulting was foreseeable. Relationship between causation and liability[edit] Causation of an event alone is insufficient to create legal liability. Sometimes causation is one part of a multi-stage test for legal liability. For example, for the defendant to be held liable for the tort of negligence, the defendant must have owed the plaintiff a duty of care, breached that duty, by so doing caused damage to the plaintiff, and that damage must not have been too remote. Causation is just one component of the tort. On other occasions, causation is the only requirement for legal liability other than the fact that the outcome is proscribed. For example, in the law of product liability, the courts have come to apply to principle of strict liability: The defendant need not also have been negligent. On still other occasions, causation is irrelevant to legal liability altogether. For example, under a contract of indemnity insurance, the insurer agrees to indemnify the victim for harm not caused by the insurer, but by other parties. Because of the difficulty in establishing causation, it is one area of the law where the case law overlaps significantly with general doctrines of analytic philosophy to do with causation. The two subjects have long been intermingled. Establishing factual causation[edit] The usual method of establishing factual causation is the but-for test. The but for test is a test of necessity. Tally, 15 So, Ala. It is quite sufficient if it facilitated a result that would have transpired without it. However, legal scholars have attempted to make further inroads into what explains these difficult cases. Some scholars have proposed a test of sufficiency instead of a test of necessity. This is known as the NESS test. This arguably gives us a more theoretically satisfying reason to conclude that something was a cause of something else than by appealing to notions of intuition or common sense. For them, there are degrees of causal contribution. A member of the NESS set is a "causally relevant condition". This is elevated into a "cause" where it is a deliberate human intervention, or an abnormal act in the context. An intermediate position can be occupied by those who "occasion" harm, such as accomplices. Imagine an accomplice to a murder who drives the principal to the scene of the crime. However, the causal contribution is not of the same level and, incidentally, this provides some basis for treating principals and accomplices differently under criminal law. Leon Green and Jane Stapleton are two scholars who take the opposite view. They consider that once something is a "but for" Green or NESS Stapleton condition, that ends the factual inquiry altogether, and anything further is a question of policy. Establishing legal causation[edit] Notwithstanding the fact that causation may be established in the above situations, the law often intervenes and says that it will nevertheless not hold the defendant liable because in the circumstances the defendant is not to be understood, in a legal sense, as having caused the loss. In the United States, this is known as the doctrine of proximate cause. Proximate cause The but-for test is factual causation and often gives us the right answer to causal problems, but sometimes not. Two difficulties are immediately obvious. The first is that under the but-for test, almost anything is a cause. But for the victim of a crime missing the bus, he or she would not have been at the site of the crime and hence the crime would not have

occurred. This often does not matter in the case where cause is only one element of liability, as the remote actor will most likely not have committed the other elements of the test. The legally liable cause is the one closest to or most proximate to the injury. This is known as the Proximate Cause rule. However, this situation can arise in strict liability situations. Intervening cause[edit] Imagine the following. A critically injures B. As B is wheeled to an ambulance, she is struck by lightning. She would not have been struck if she had not been injured in the first place. The effect of the principle may be stated simply: But if the new act breaks the chain, the liability of the initial actor stops at that point, and the new actor, if human, will be liable for all that flows from his or her contribution. Note, however, that this does not apply if the Eggshell skull rule is used. This is an element of Legal Cause. Tice Rule[edit] The other problem is that of overdetermination. Each shot on its own would have been sufficient to cause the damage. But on the but-for test, this leads us to the counterintuitive position that neither shot caused the injury. However, courts have held that in order to prevent each of the defendants avoiding liability for lack of actual cause, it is necessary to hold both of them responsible, See *Summers v. Tice*, 33 Cal. This is known, simply, as the *Summers v. Tice* rule. This is two negligences contributing to a single cause, as distinguished from two separate negligences contributing to two successive or separate causes. These are "concurrent actual causes". In such cases, courts have held both defendants liable for their negligent acts. A leaves truck parked in the middle of the road at night with its lights off. B fails to notice it in time and plows into it, where it could have been avoided, except for want of negligence, causing damage to both vehicles. Both parties were negligent. An actor is liable for the foreseeable, but not the unforeseeable, consequences of his or her act. For example, it is foreseeable that if I shoot someone on a beach and they are immobilized, they may drown in a rising tide rather than from the trauma of the gunshot wound or from loss of blood. However it is not generally speaking foreseeable that they will be struck by lightning and killed by that event. This type of causal foreseeability is to be distinguished from foreseeability of extent or kind of injury, which is a question of remoteness of damage, not causation. There is no *novus actus interveniens*. However, I may not be held liable if that damage is not of a type foreseeable as arising from my negligence. If Neal punched Matt in the jaw, it is foreseeable that Matt will suffer a bodily injury that he will need to go to the hospital for. Other relevant considerations[edit] Because causation in the law is a complex amalgam of fact and policy, other doctrines are also important, such as foreseeability and risk. Foreseeability tests[edit] Some aspects of the physical world are so inevitable that it is always reasonable to impute knowledge of their incidence. So if A abandons B on a beach, A must be taken to foresee that the tide comes in and goes out. But the mere fact that B subsequently drowns is not enough. A court would have to consider where the body was left and what level of injury A believed that B had suffered. If B was left in a position that any reasonable person would consider safe but a storm surge caused extensive flooding throughout the area, this might be a *novus actus*. That B was further injured by an event within a foreseen class does not of itself require a court to hold that every incident falling within that class is a natural link in the chain. Only those causes that are reasonably foreseeable fit naturally into the chain. So if A had heard a weather forecast predicting a storm, the drowning will be a natural outcome. But if this was an event like a flash flood, an entirely unpredictable event, it will be a *novus actus*. If A honestly believes that B is only slightly injured and so could move himself out of danger without difficulty, how fair is it to say that he ought to have foreseen? The test is what the reasonable person would have known and foreseen, given what A had done. It is the function of any court to evaluate behaviour. A defendant cannot evade responsibility through a form of wilful blindness. Fault lies not only in what a person actually believes, but also in failing to understand what the vast majority of other people would have understood. Hence, the test is hybrid, looking both at what the defendant actually knew and foresaw. In cases involving the partitioning of damages between multiple defendants, each will be liable to the extent that their contribution foreseeably produced the loss. Risk[edit] Sometimes the reverse situation to a *novus actus* occurs, i. *Abbott Laboratories, P.* The manufacturer of the particular medication that caused the injury could not be ascertained for certain. The defendant was held liable because of the amount of risk it contributed to the occasioning of the harm. However, it does show that legal notions of causation are a complex mixture of factual causes and ideas of public policy relating to the availability of legal remedies. In *R v Miller* [1992] UKHL 6, the House of Lords said that a person who puts a person in a dangerous

position, in that case a fire, will be criminally liable if he does not adequately rectify the situation. Evidence proving causation[edit] To be acceptable, any rule of law must be capable of being applied consistently, thus a definition of the criteria for this qualitative analysis must be supplied. Let us assume a purely factual analysis as a starting point. A injures B and leaves him lying in the road. C is a driver who fails to see B on the road and by running over him, contributes to the cause of his death. Roads are, by their nature, used by vehicles and it is clearly foreseeable that a person left lying on the road is at risk of being further injured by an inattentive driver.

6: Causation | Practical Law

The basic and broad causes of loss forms are named perils forms; they provide coverage for loss from only the particular causes that are listed in the policy as covered. The special causes of loss form is an all risks form; it provides coverage for loss from any cause except those that are specifically excluded.

7: Causation in English law - Wikipedia

We have discussed on a number of occasions the issue of causation when there are multiple causes of loss, some covered and some not covered. Most jurisdictions apply what is known as the efficient proximate cause analysis with a minority of jurisdictions applying the concurrent causation analysis, both of which are explained on our blog here.

8: Loss Causation Law and Legal Definition | USLegal, Inc.

Causes of loss forms establish and define the causes of loss (or perils) for which coverage is provided. The special causes of loss form (CP 10 30) provides what is referred to as all risks coverage: coverage for loss from any cause except those that are specifically excluded.

9: Loss of Appetite: Causes + 6 Natural Remedies - Dr. Axe

Causation is the "causal relationship between conduct and result". In other words, causation provides a means of connecting conduct with a resulting effect, typically.

Edge of obsession *megan crane Americas major wars: crusaders, critics, and scholars, 1775-1972. Crash and burn*
Every case is different Josephine hart damage The neuropsychology of self discipline study guide Robert j wieland
books Importance of system analysis and design Probability models for economic decisions The Indian Bureau Garfields
Book of Jokes and Riddles Gotham Central, Vol. 2 Sambhog thi samadhi taraf by osho Medical research for hire II.
PRINCIPLES IN THE USE OF HEAT 2-5 2 The Midwestern country cookbook Jungian psychodrama: from theoretical to
creative roots Maurizio Gasseau and Wilma Scategni Community formation and livelihood How can you set the stage for
reading? Discrimination, equality and fairness in employment Negotiating (Longman Business English Skills) The
On-Time, On-Target Manager CD Fossil sponges and other organic remains from the Quebec Group at Little Metis
Instant Notes in Medicinal Chemistry Batch tiff to Focus on quantum mechanics Handbook of New Guinea birds
Encyclopedia of American crime Working with the Finder. Bridges of Madison County Movie Television Tie Wooden toy
car plans Contemporary news reporting Psychonline 2004 Activation Booklet Earth (Make it Work! Science
(Make-It-Work) Census of population of Northern Ireland, 1951. Award winning annual report Post Mortem Journal The
Breadmakers Saga Patricia cornwell books Le voyage de sa vie chapter 1-6