

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA**

**Citation:** Simpson Estate v. Cox, 2006 NSSC 84

**Date:** 20060317

**Docket:** SN 202431

**Registry:** Sydney

**Between:**

Walter Simpson, representative of the  
Estate of Sayde Simpson

Plaintiff

v.

Carolyn Cox

Defendant

---

**LIBRARY HEADING**

---

**Judge:**

The Honourable Justice Frank Edwards

**Heard:**

February 20, 21, and March 10, 2006 in Sydney, Nova Scotia; and March 3, 2006, in Halifax, Nova Scotia

**Subject:**

Car pedestrian fatality, Fatal Injuries Act, R.S., c.163 s.163 s.5(2)(d); Motor Vehicle Act, R.S., c.293, ss. 125 and 248.

**Facts:**

Eighty-one year old pedestrian crossing two lane residential street at night; not in a crosswalk; Defendant driver travelling between 40 - 50 k/ph in a 50 k/ph zone. Claim made by 46 year old son and 6 year old granddaughter.

**Issue:**

Liability for collision; whether the Defendant has rebutted presumption created by s.248 of the *Motor Vehicle Act*; apportionment of liability; assessment of damages.

**Result:** Presumption rebutted; pedestrian 60 percent responsible for accident; Defendant driver 40 percent responsible. Damages: deceased's son entitled to \$10,000.00 for loss of companionship; granddaughter entitled to \$10,000.00 for loss of care, guidance and companionship – awards reduced in accord with apportionment of liability.

**Cases:** *Battiste v. Phelan and Briand* (1985), 66 N.S.R. (2d) 99 (S.C.A.D.)  
*Arab v. Demestihis* [1989] 93 N.S.R. (2d)  
*Keating v Dorey*, [1987] N.S.J. No. 327 (NSSC)  
*MacAskill v. Martell* [1984] 66 N.S.R. (2d) 1 (N.S.S.C.)  
*Baines v. Chabot*, [1984] B.C.J. No. 310 (B.C.S.C.)  
*Petis v Hamilton*, [1971] O.J. No. 758 (Ont. S.C.)  
*Arab v Demestihis* [1989] N.S.J. No. 457 (N.S.S.C.)  
*Downey v Jamine* (1985) 68 NSR (2d) 275 (N.S.S.C.)  
*Guymer v. N.S. (Registrar of Motor vehicles)* [1984] 61 N.S.R. (2d) 325 (N.S.S.C.)  
*Murray Estate et al v. Advocate Contracting Ltd. et al*, (2001), 195 N.S.R. (2d) 313 (N.S.S.C.)  
*Riggs v. Toronto Hospital* [1993] O.J. No. 1884 (O.C.J.)

***THIS INFORMATION SHEET DOES NOT FORM PART OF THE COURT'S DECISION.  
QUOTES MUST BE FROM THE DECISION, NOT THIS LIBRARY SHEET.***