

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW
MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 4 | Issue 3

2021

© 2021 International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlmh.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com>)

This Article is brought to you for “free” and “open access” by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of any suggestion or complaint, please contact Gyan@vidhiaagaz.com.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication at **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript at submission@ijlmh.com.

Case Analysis of Quinn v Leathem

ADITYA SINGH¹ AND SAUMYA SINGH THAKUR²

ABSTRACT

Quinn v Leathem [1901] AC 495, is a case on economic tort and is an important case historically for British labour law. It concerns the tort of "conspiracy to injure." The case was a significant departure from previous practices, and was reversed by the Trade Disputes Act 1906. This short paper presents the facts and judgment of Quinn v Leathem and its outcome in the environment. Furthermore it also states the economic evaluation of the case. In this case Quinn's appeal was dismissed because the Court determined that his conspiracy to unjustly and deliberately convince Leathem's own workers and customers to stop working for/buying from him was actionable only if damage was proven. The case conveys that while people can gather lawfully (even if it harms others' interests), it becomes illegal if the gathering is exclusively for the purpose of inflicting harm to another.

Any deliberately committed infringement of someone's legal rights (whether contractual, tortious, or otherwise) with no explanation or justification is liable in tort.

Keywords: Conspiracy; inducing breach of contract; trade union, economic

I. INTRODUCTION

In the case of Quinn v. Leathem case found a "conspiracy to damage" violation. Two characters were involved in the case, Quinn (defendant) and Leathem (plaintiff). Conspiracy law is also known in part as "financial damage." The advantage of an economic default is the possibility of taking action when there is no relationship between the plaintiff and the defendant, so a contract or negligent action is excluded.

There are four elements to a conspiracy:

1. A combination or agreement of two or more people;
2. The purpose of the player's injury;
3. On the basis of what combination or agreement and for what purpose certain actions were taken;

¹ Author is a student at Kirit .P. Mehta School of Law, Mumbai, India

² Author is a student at Kirit .P. Mehta School of Law, Mumbai, India

4. Damages to the applicant.

The conspiracies are as follows:

1. Unlawful conspiracy: conspiracy in which the participants unite and commit unlawful acts (both in criminal and civil law);
2. Legal conspiracy: A set of actions that are not in themselves illegal, but are committed solely to the detriment of the applicant, since the conspiracy is illegal.

However, the difference between them is briefly explained in Lord Bridge *Lonrho plc v. Fayed* [1992]:

"If the conspirators prefer to seek out the plaintiff and actually harm him, but do nothing that is questionable, if a person does, their concerted action to achieve their illegal purpose is the law, both abnormal and non-existent." Reasons for the illegal and provocative behavior of your activities. However, if the conspirators intentionally harmed the applicant and used illegal means to do so, they have no protection to show that their main objective was to promote or protect their interests; Suffice it to say that the means used were illegal. "

II. CASE STUDY: QUINN V LEATHEM

Quinn v Leatham [1901] UKHL 2, a historical case of financial crimes linked to the history of labour law in Great Britain. The case concerns the "plot wound" of the crime. This case had a significant impact, allowing the old practice to be abandoned and subsequently amended by the Conflict Act of 1906.

The union, formerly known as the Belfast Journeymen Butcher and Union Assistant, wants to strike a closed trade deal against Leatham Butcher's company in Lisburn. They contacted one of their clients, Andrew Munce, not to do business with Leatham until his staff joined the union at work. Munch is told to do whatever he wants or else Munch will hit his crew. Andrew has been buying beef for 20 years, although there is no written contract to do so and none of the workers will go on strike (contract termination).

Leatham suffered serious losses, was injured and a conspiracy case was filed. Lord Justice Fitzgerald told the jury that the important question was whether the accused's primary objective was to harm the plaintiff. The jury found the plaintiff's allegations to be valid and awarded him £200 in damages.

III. PLAYERS IN THE CASE

QUINN:

Quinn is the treasurer of the Belfast Butchers Association and the defendant in that case. Quinn wants to close a deal against Leathem's carnage in Lisburn. He urged Andrew Munce, a Leathem client, not to do business with him until his employees joined the union and also told Munce that if he didn't do what they wanted, they would call his employees in. strike. Subsequently, Leathem filed a complaint against the union for conspiracy. According to the judge's instructions, the jury must decide what Quinn and her colleague official's main motive was for harming Leathem's interests. During the investigation, the jury uncovered a malicious conspiracy between Quinn and other BBA officers. Subsequently, the Irish Court of Appeal upheld his opinion. After the verdict, Quinn (alone) appealed and argued that a violation of a legal right had to be proven against her when conduct had been proven regarding actions taken regardless of motive and conspiracy. In other words, you have stated that an act by itself cannot give rise to an action until the claimed actions have a malicious motive.

LEATHM:

Butcher Leathem had workers who were not from the Belfast Butchers Association (BBA). After the difficulties of the union, he asked his employees to join the union. The BBA, whose treasurer was Quinn, pressured Leathem client Andrew Munce and also called one of his employees. Leathem was the plaintiff in the previous case. Leathem filed a conspiracy lawsuit against the union treasurer, suffering heavy losses in his business. His claim was correct and he was later paid £ 200 in damages.

Andrew Munce:

Andrew Munce was one of Leathem's customer and was his customer for almost twenty years but there had been no written contract about it. He was the person who was asked by the trade union to not trade with Leathem until and unless his laborers have joined the trade union. He was asked to follow their commands or else he would face a strike from his own laborers. Eventually he had to agree to the commands and was saved from a mass strikeout of contract from his employees.

IV. SET OF ACTIONS

Facts

Leathem owner of a butcher shop in Lisburn, had employees who were not part of Belfast Journeymen Butcher's and Assistant's Association (BBA). After facing some difficulties from the trade union, he asked his employees to join the trade union. The BBA, for whom Quinn was the treasurer, put pressure on a customer (Andrew Munce) not to trade with Leathem until

and unless his employees have joined the trade union. Quinn told Munce to follow his commands or else he will call out one of his own employees.

Issue

Based on the judge's instructions, the jury will decide if Quinn and his assistant are the main cause of the problem with Leathem. The jury's investigation uncovered a conspiracy between Quinn and other BBA officials. The case was then tried by the Irish Court of Appeal. As a result of the case, Quinn (himself) complained and argued that he still had to oppose the violation of the law, which had been proven in practice despite the intention and the harmful intent of these acts. In other words, they claim that the practice itself will not be possible until the desired behavior occurs.

Held

By dismissing Quinn's appeal, the court found him and Quinn guilty of conspiracy theories, injustice and prejudice, which led Leathem's employees and customers to stop working or doing business. of purchases because of it, and was considered evidence of a violation. Even if people have adhered to the law (although this may harm the interests of others), an organization will be illegal if it is intended only for harmful purposes that harm another person. The Code of Criminal Procedure may refer to any type of violation (whether contractual, criminal or otherwise) known and does not provide any explanation or justification to the defendant.

V. OUTCOME IN THE ENVIRONMENT

The case (Quinn v. Leathem) created a legal response to increase union activism. This case is one of the main reasons for the birth of Great Britain Labour Party. Parliament subsequently repealed the deal with the Labour Disputes Act of 1906, following the forthcoming general elections.

In this case, Hohfield criticized the thinking of Lord Lindley and discussed the types of rights, freedoms and obligations. In his view, the Lord's Palace judgment was based on the presumption that the plaintiff (Leathem) was entitled to operate without further intervention by a third party. He explained that Leathem could do this, so Quinn and the other directors of BBA didn't have to take action against Leathem or any of his clients.

It is remarkable that Baron Christopher Palles, known as a master of tort law while still leading proceedings in the Irish Supreme Court, had a different view than most of his colleagues thought. His findings were in favour of the defendant (Quinn) and he asserted that the defendant's actions were completely legal. According to the analysis of the precedent of the

head of the baron, the request that the entrepreneur deals with only with clients who contact the association and the request made by one or more people, no. The House of Lords acknowledged that this argument had a certain "inflexible logic", but refused to take it into account.

VI. JUDGEMENT PASSED

The judgement is the divided into three facts of the case:

1. What plaintiff's rights were;
2. What the defendant's conduct was in this case;
3. Whether defendant's conduct infringed the plaintiff's rights.

The plaintiff's rights are as follows:

- Plaintiff have liberty to earn his own living within a condition that he prohibits from violating some special laws or infringing others rights of liberty.
- Plaintiff have liberty to deal with individuals who are willing to trade with him.
- Liberty is a right prescribed by law and is in the correspondence of the general duty of each individual to exercise it freely within the conjunction of the almighty law.
- A person's liberty to deal with an individual is of no importance until and unless that person has a free will to deal with him.
- If their liberty to deal is infringed and the deal being infringed due to it, the person affected by this have a right to sue that person infringing his rights. But if such interference is viewed justifiable within the overview of law then there is no point to seek redressal from the court. If this interference is wrongful and malicious, where the intention is to cause damage to the person, then such acts are credited to be unlawful.

1. Quinn with other two defendants were the officers of the trade union named as Belfast Butcher's Association (BBA). The jury in its investigation came to a conclusion that the defendants maliciously induced the plaintiff's customers to not trade with him. The jury in its findings came to knowledge about the defendant inducing the laborers to leave or to terminate their contracts with the plaintiff. They even threatened the plaintiff (Leathem) to discharge some of his laborers who were not a part of the trade union or else they would call out his laborers who are a part of the trade union. The defendant's behavior was the most culpable, when the plaintiff offered to pay fees for the non-union laborers, he employed in his shop to let them join the trade union. Even this effort from the plaintiff didn't satisfied the defendants.

This case is the exact opposite case of what the House has to consider in *Allen v Flood*. This case had seen no controversy between the plaintiff and his laborers. None of his laborers wanted to terminate their contracts with him. Whereas, the plaintiff didn't had controversy with his customers. The defendants didn't have any witness to prove their actions, thus they had no justification for their conduct against the plaintiff. Giving due regards to the case it might be said that the said action of the defendant may be favoring the laborers in the trade union, but none of them came in favor of the defendants. None, I think, said the verdict will not properly warranted by the evidence of the case. So, the judge, purposely said nothing about the black list, as he tried to understand the case considering that the evidence did not connect with the appellant (defendant) in that list. This black list was, in the judge opinion, a very important feature of this case.

2. The question remaining consists of defendant's conduct infringing the plaintiff's right of liberty giving him a cause for action against the defendant. In the judge opinion the conduct of the defendant did infringed the plaintiff's rights. The defendant went a further step higher, by dictating the plaintiff by inducing his workers not to work for him and his customers not to trade with him, this act confirms the act of conspiracy against the plaintiff and proves that the plaintiff's claim of the case was correct. Henceforth, the defendant was claimed to be liable for the loss or injury caused to the plaintiff. Thus, the judge affirmed to the judgement of the Irish High Court and the decision of compensation being paid to the defendant was re confirmed by the House of Lords judgement in the case of *Quinn v Leathem* [1901] UKHL 2.

VII. ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF THE CASE

The case evaluated Leathem's considerable loss in business due to Quinn's inducing his customers and workers from buying or working for him. Quinn wanted Leathem's workers to join the Belfast Butcher's Association (BBA). For this purpose, he induced one of his customer's known as Andrew Munce. Quinn instructed Munce to follow his commands or else he would call one his workers and force a strike against him (breaking the contract). Munce had to follow Quinn's command and stopped trading with Leathem. This was the case with other customers as well as they stopped purchasing meat from Leathem's shop. Leathem faced considerable losses and moved to court for compensation against Quinn in the charges of Conspiracy.

During the case proceedings in the Irish High Court the judge questioned the defendant's (Quinn) dominative motive to injure the plaintiff (Leathem). The judge instructed the jury to investigate the motive and tell their findings of the case. During the investigation, the jury

found Quinn malicious and held him liable for the charges put against him for injuring Leathem's interests. The court in its judgement awarded Leathem with £200 damages as way to compensate his losses and later affirmed its decision when Quinn applied for a new trial in the Queen's Bench Division in the Irish Court of Appeal as his appeal was rejected by majority. The case was later moved to another court which is famously known as the House of Lords.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The following case is a landmark case for both English tort law and British labour law. The case had several impacts on trade union and its working and it also changed the labour laws in the country afterwards. The case featured two person's Quinn (treasurer of Belfast Butcher's Association) and Leathem (Owner of a butcher shop in Lisburn). Quinn was the defendant in the case whereas Leathem was the plaintiff. Quinn wanted Leathem's laborers to join their trade union and also wanted to enforce a closed shop agreement against his business. For this purpose, he met with one of Leathem's customer (Andrew Munce) in Belfast. Quinn told Munce not to trade with Leathem until and unless his laborers join Belfast Journeymen Butcher's and Assistant's Association (BBA). If Munce didn't followed Quinn's command he would face a strike from his own laborers and his laborers might terminate their contracts with him which would have meant losses for his business. Due to Quinn inducing Leathem's customer and laborers from buying or working for him he faced considerable losses in his business, which forced him to action against Quinn by filing a case against Quinn under the following tort of conspiracy.

During the case hearing in the Irish High Court, the judge instructed the jury and asked a crucial question about the defendant's dominant motive to injure the plaintiff. In their investigation, the jury found that the defendant malicious and conspirative and awarded Leathem £200 damages a way to compensate his loss in the business. Quinn appealed this judgement alone. His application for a new trial in Queen's Bench Division in the Irish High Court was rejected by a majority and the decision was affirmed by Irish Court of Appeal, this case was now proceeded to House of Lords. During the hearing of the case, Chief Baron Christopher Palles had differing views from the majority of his colleagues. In his views Quinn actions were perfectly legal but his argument was admitted by the court but the court declined to follow his argument and Quinn was held liable in this case.

IX. REFERENCES

- Everything.explained. today. 2021. Quinn v Leatham explained. [online] Available at: <https://everything.explained.today/Quinn_v_Leatham/> [Accessed 15 March 2021].
- Scribd.com. 2021. [online] <<https://www.scribd.com/document/472453457/FUNDAMENTAL-LEGAL-CONCEPTIONS-AS-APPLIED-IN-JUDICIAL-REASONING-WESLEY-NEWCOMB-HOHFELD-pdf>> [Accessed 15 March 2021].
- Lawteacher.net. 2021. Quinn v Leatham - 1901. [online] Available at: <<https://www.lawteacher.net/cases/quinn-v-leatham.php>> [Accessed 15 March 2021].
- 2021. [online] Available at: <<https://www.inhouselawyer.co.uk/legal-briefing/the-law-of-conspiracy-dirty-tricks-corporate-rivals-and-brand-attacks/>> [Accessed 15 March 2021].
- 2021. [online] Available at: <<https://www.casemine.com/judgement/uk/5a8ff8ca60d03e7f57ecd759>> [Accessed 15 March 2021].
- En.wikipedia.org. 2021. Quinn v Leatham - Wikipedia. [online] Available at: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quinn_v_Leatham> [Accessed 15 March 2021].
