

What happened at the Leeds "Time Stomp" show brings up important legal questions about responsibility, negligence, and the effects of mental injury. As the person who planned the event, Barry Bottle may be responsible for Sarah, Jack, Mary, and Janice's injuries. This study looks at academic literature, case law, and business tools to figure out how much Barry is likely to be responsible. The rules about mental harm, breach of duty, and causation are the most important things to think about. Carelessness because of not taking enough care. The duty of care that Barry put on festivalgoers is an important part of proving responsibility. The case of *Donoghue v. Stevenson* (1932) AC 562 set up the "neighbour principle," which says that people should not do things that could easily hurt others. As the event planner, Barry was in charge of making sure that everyone who was there was safe. This meant getting around obvious dangers like fires that weren't working and worries about crowd control. In *Caparo Industries v. Dickman* (1990) 2 AC 605, the three parts of the duty of care test were laid out. These include how likely it is that someone will get hurt, how close the people involved are, and whether it makes sense, is fair, or is the right thing to do to enforce a task. A bad fireworks show could make people scared, and Barry, as the event planner, was very close to the people watching. In addition, it talks about Barry's failure to follow the company's safety rules. Being careless and having a duty, Barry broke his duty when he did not act with the level of care that a reasonable event manager would have. The case of *Bolton v. Stone* (1951) AC 850 shows that the standard of care looks at both how likely it is that someone will get hurt and how bad that harm will be. Even though pyrotechnics are not used very often, they can do a lot of damage, like burns and injuries to large groups of people. To lower these risks, the right safety standards should have been put in place. Robin Ammon's 2010 book, *Sports Facility Management: Organising Events and Mitigating Risks*, says that being ready for emergencies and having good crowd control methods are very important. Barry hasn't done his job by making a complete plan for getting everyone out of the building. These differences were the main reason for the chaos and deaths in the stampede, especially Sarah's serious injuries and Jack, Mary, and Janice's mental problems. Just what caused it, and who was to blame? There needs to be proof that Barry's breach caused the damage. We use the "but-for" test that was set up in *Barnett v. Chelsea & Kensington Hospital* (1969). The accidents would not have happened if Barry had not been careful around the crowd and fireworks. *Page v. Smith* (1996) AC 155 also says that expected harm is enough to prove

guilt in cases of mental impairment, even if there is no physical pain. Negative effects on mental health and more victims when it comes to charges of psychological harm, like what Jack, Mary, and Janice went through, English law is very different. The rules for future victim claims are set out in the case of *Alcock v. Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police* (1991) 1 AC 310. It says that there must be strong emotional ties, closeness to the event, and a clear sense of danger. Both Mary and Janice met these requirements. Mary quickly helped Sarah while Janice watched what happened next. *Recovery of Damages for Psychological Injury*, a book written by Kay Wheat in 2002, looks at how courts decide cases concerning psychological harm. By today's legal standards, their claims are believed because it is known that worry can make both Mary's generalised anxiety disorder and Janice's major depression worse. Take care of psychological stress and lessen its effects. The actions of rescuers like Bob had psychological effects that eventually led to people going crazy and drinking too much. This makes it even more important to change the Act. The 2016 VSC 354 case *Honsi v. Honsi* looks at the rights of people who put their own safety at risk to help others. Unfortunately, the law does not protect rescues enough, as Bob's story shows. "Long-term Psychological Outcomes of Workers after Occupational Injury," a 2014 work by Lin, looks at how stress can cause long-lasting mental damage. This shows how important strong support systems are. Anderson's (2020) paper, "Peer Support and Crisis-Focused Interventions," says that getting help from peers right away can lessen the effects of trauma in the long run. This is the rule that risk management at events should follow. James Wilson's *Philosophy for Public Health and Public Policy* (2021) says that people who plan events should help spectators who are hurting physically or mentally because of those events. For claims of psychological harm, better protections: Alcock says that not enough people meet the standards for secondary victims. People who have been through a lot of mental trauma, like Janice and Mary, should be included in these criteria, even if they already meet all of the other requirements. This would make things more fair. Better safety rules for rescue workers: changing the law would respect rescue workers like Bob and make things easier for people who are mentally ill. The study by Napier and Wheat (2002) gives us a reason to think that rescues should be seen as the main victims. People who were hurt at the "Time Stomp" event may eventually take Barry Bottle to court to demand compensation. The well-known ideas of occupiers' liability and carelessness are what this is based on. Despite this, there

are major problems with the current legal system, as shown by the fact that cases involving psychiatric injuries are rare and rescues are not protected. For victims of physical or mental abuse to get the justice and respect they deserve, the system needs to change.

References:

Donoghue v. Stevenson (1932)

Caparo Industries v. Dickman (1990)

Napier and Wheat (2002)

Bolton v. Stone (1951)

Barnett v. Chelsea & Kensington Hospital (1969)

Alcock v. Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police (1991)

Honsi v. Honsi (2016)

Napier and Wheat (2002)