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CONFLICT OF LAWS:
ALAS, CONFUSION STILL REIGNS

RICHARD J. CONVISER*

THE BACKGROUND

More than six years have lapsed since the Illinois Supreme Court decided Wartell v. Formusa.1 In issue there was the law governing interspousal tort immunity. The result: the law of common domicile governs, not the law of the place of the injury.2 Thus, the court chose not to apply the standard vested rights rule, but opted in favor of a modern policy-oriented approach.

Some considered Wartell a watershed in Illinois conflicts law, to wit, the abandonment of the theretofore dominant vested rights approach.3 This interpretation appeared unwarranted.4 If doubts existed, subsequent decisions laid them to rest.

---

1. 34 Ill. 2d 57, 213 N.E.2d 544 (1966).
2. Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Wartell, residents of Illinois, were involved in an automobile accident in Florida. Mrs. Wartell commenced an action in Illinois against her husband's estate alleging wilful and wanton negligence. Florida permits suits between spouses; Illinois, by statute, does not. Illinois law was applied, and the suit dismissed.

The Wartell decision would appear to stand for the rather narrow proposition that questions of interspousal immunity are to be governed by the law of the state of common domicile. But no more. The opinion itself appears to negate a broader interpretation. It states that the law of the place of wrong would "... of course determine whether or not a tort has in fact been committed ..." 34 Ill. 2d at 59, 213 N.E. 2d at 545 [emphasis added].
The ensuing four-year period found the practicing bar mired in the midst of a foggy never-never land. Dicta in *Graham v. General U.S. Grant Post No. 2665* indicated the willingness on the part of the court to adopt the Restatement (Second) of Conflicts "most significant relationship" approach. But one year later, and again by dicta, it indicated approval of the vested rights approach without so much as the briefest mention of either the Restatement (Second) or the earlier *Graham* decision.

Just as it began to appear that confusion would reign supreme, the court handed down its decision in *Ingersoll v. Klein*. It adopted there the Restatement (Second) approach for multi-state tort cases.

---

See also *Graham v. General U.S. Grant Post No. 2665*, 43 Ill. 2d 1, 5, 248 N.E.2d 657, 659 (1969), where the Illinois Supreme Court indicated that *Wartell* supports only this narrow proposition. This construction was also apparently adopted by a federal court in *Manos v. Trans World Airlines, Inc.*, 295 F. Supp. 1166 (N.D. Ill. 1968), although the language in this decision, after an initial strong statement to this effect, equivocated somewhat.

5. 43 Ill. 2d 1, 248 N.E.2d 657 (1969).

6. In *Graham*, the supreme court considered whether Illinois' dramshop statute should be given extraterritorial effect. The court analyzed this issue in "most significant relationship" terms only to render it *dictum* by concluding that this matter should not be resolved by a judicially-applied conflicts analysis, but rather was a matter for the legislature to resolve.

7. *Marchlik v. Coronet Insurance Co.*, 40 Ill. 2d 327, 239 N.E.2d 799 (1968). *Marchlik* involved application of a Wisconsin direct action statute against Illinois insurers. After concluding that such statutes are generally a substantive matter to be governed by the *lex loci*—in this case Wisconsin—the court refused application of Wisconsin law on public policy grounds.

At least one author construed *Marchlik* as a reversion to the vested rights approach. See 64 Nw. U.L. Rev. at 843. This conclusion, however, would appear supportable only if one broadly interprets *Wartell*. As indicated above, this would be inappropriate. See notes 3-4 and accompanying text. Rather that decision would have been inapplicable in *Marchlik* because it is limited to interspousal suits. As such, the *Marchlik* decision was potentially in keeping with the then prevailing Illinois rule.


10. *Ingersoll* involved application of a wrongful death statute. Even though the injuries causing death allegedly occurred in Iowa, the court applied Illinois law, finding that it as the forum state and domicile of both parties to the action, had a
THE PROBLEM

Ingersoll clearly helped clarify matters. Unfortunately, the clarification was incomplete. Should the holding there be confined to multi-state tort cases? Or is it to have broader application? The opinion could support either conclusion.11

A YEAR OF NON-RESOLUTION

Resolution of this problem was, without doubt, the main task confronting Illinois courts last year. The task remains. If anything, two decisions handed down subsequently have served to increase the uncertainty faced by Illinois practitioners.

The first, Klondike Helicopters Ltd. v. Fairchild Hiller Corp.,12 was decided by a federal court.18 The action was brought for damages resulting from the crash of a helicopter manufactured by the defendant and purchased by plaintiff. Plaintiff’s complaint sounded both in tort and contract.14

Specifically in issue was whether the causes of action would survive the Illinois borrowing statute. The effect of such statutes is to bar actions if they run afoul of either of two statutes of limitation: (1) the forum’s statute, or (2) the statute of another state or territory.13 Clearly, the court’s main focus was the quest for a meaningful resolution of conflicts tort issues. But, in support of its analysis, it quoted heavily from Babcock v. Jackson, 12 N.Y.2d 473, 191 N.E.2d 279, 240 N.Y.S.2d 743 (1963) and Griffith v. United Air Lines, Inc., 416 Pa. 1, 203 A.2d 796 (1964). The quoted language and the authorities cited therein level an attack not only on the lex loci delicti in specific, but on the vested rights approach in general.

11. Clearly, the court’s main focus was the quest for a meaningful resolution of conflicts tort issues. But, in support of its analysis, it quoted heavily from Babcock v. Jackson, 12 N.Y.2d 473, 191 N.E.2d 279, 240 N.Y.S.2d 743 (1963) and Griffith v. United Air Lines, Inc., 416 Pa. 1, 203 A.2d 796 (1964). The quoted language and the authorities cited therein level an attack not only on the lex loci delicti in specific, but on the vested rights approach in general.


tory where the cause of action has arisen. The court thus was faced with two fact determinations—where had the tort causes of action arisen and where had the contract causes of action arisen.

The court concluded that tort causes of action arise "where the last act occurred to create liability," viz., where the actual accident occurred. The court held that on facts such as these, contract causes of action arise when the contract is executed and where the article is sold.

The court clearly indicates that Ingersoll and the therein adopted "most significant relationship" test does not control here, for that case did not speak to the issues of where and when a cause of action arose, but rather went to the question of what substantive law should govern it. However, the Klondike decision did not rest here. The court attempted to establish that even if Ingersoll were to gov-


The rationale for borrowing statutes is said to arise by virtue of the forum state's statute which invariably calls for tolling the statute while the defendant is absent from the jurisdiction. In the absence of a borrowing statute this rule would permit actions against a defendant which otherwise might have been barred by the laws of any of the states involved in the controversy. Vernon, supra, at 290-93.


17. 334 F. Supp. at 895. The court here relied upon Hardman v. Helene Curtis Industries, Inc., 48 Ill. App. 2d 42, 198 N.E.2d 681 (1964) and Harris v. American Surety Co., 372 Ill. 361, 24 N.E.2d 42 (1939). Neither case dealt with this problem, and, indeed, it's uncertain that they stand as good authority for this proposition. One leading commentator has stated that Illinois is the "leading advocate" of another approach, namely that the cause of action arises in any jurisdiction where defendant is amenable to process. Ester, 15 U. FLA. L. REV. at 52 and the cases cited therein at nn. 87-89. This position was also apparently accepted in Manos v. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 295 F. Supp. at 1175, n.6. Interestingly enough, even though Klondike relied so heavily on Manos in construing the tort count statute of limitations problems, see note 16, supra, it did not even mention the earlier decision when discussing this problem in regard to the contract counts.
ern, the result would be the same. Although statute of limitation issues are usually resolved by characterizing them as procedural matters governed by forum law, the court, in order to apply a "most significant relationship" analysis, treated the matter as one of substantive law. Notwithstanding the tendency in applying borrowing statutes to disregard the modern conflicts approaches in favor of more traditional rules, the court's dictum is to be welcomed. Borrowing statutes should be treated as substantive, and subjected to a functional conflicts analysis.

The second aspect of this dictum, however, was most unfortunate. The court discussed the Restatement (Second) of Conflicts approach only when it analyzed the tort count. There was no discussion of it whatsoever in the analysis relating to the contract count. This, obviously, would tend to support a conclusion that *Ingersoll* is applicable only to tort issues. But the decision does not say this and, indeed, it is entirely unclear that this was the court's intent. Nonetheless, it served to muddy the waters surrounding the *Ingersoll* interpretation.

---


19. *See* R. WEINTRAUB, COMMENTARY ON THE CONFLICT OF LAWS 50 (1971). The soundness of Professor Weintraub's position is aptly illustrated by the following example from his text: "For example, P and D, both with settled residences in state X, drive together into state Y. D is driving with P as passenger when, because of D's alleged negligence, the automobile leaves the road, strikes a tree, and P is injured. P receives all his medical treatment in state X. X's statute of limitations is one year; that of Y is five years. P sues D in X four years after the accident. Treating the statute of limitations issue as substantive and subjecting it to a full functional choice-of-law analysis, X decides that the policies underlying the X short statute are fully applicable and that no policy of Y would be significantly advanced if suit were permitted. X therefore applies its own statute of limitations and bars suit. This decision by X should be treated as a choice on the merits between X and Y statutes of limitations and should bar suit even in Y if P subsequently brings suit there before the Y five-year statute runs. Assuming that X's functional analysis is correct, Y should also apply the X statute of limitations and bar suit even if suit had not first been brought and barred in X. A decision by the forum to apply its own shorter statute of limitations should not, however, be binding on other states if the forum purports to act only qua forum. This might be the case if, in the preceding hypothetical, Y, the place of injury, had the one-year statute of limitations, X, the residence of both parties, had the five-year statute and suit were originally brought in Y four years after the accident. Y might rationally decide that, because of the danger of fraud and mistake from what it considered a stale claim, Y was not willing to serve as the situs of litigation, although Y should not be concerned if X subsequently elects to permit the action to proceed in X."

The second case "muddying the waters" was People v. Saiken.\(^20\) Defendant, Samuel Saiken, an Illinois resident, was tried for conspiracy to obstruct justice because he helped his son, Joel Saiken, also an Illinois resident, bury the latter's murder victim. Although the murder was committed in Illinois, the "burial ceremony" occurred in Indiana. Subsequently, the son, apparently repenting, informed the Indiana police where the corpse was located. The officer to whom this information was given obtained a search warrant based on his own affidavit setting forth his conversations with the younger Saiken.

Defendant contended the evidence was improperly obtained and, hence, improperly admitted. His contention was based on Indiana law under which warrants predicated upon hearsay information are invalid. Illinois law would not have rendered it invalid.

As to admissibility of the evidence, the supreme court simply stated this to be a procedural matter governed by forum law, \(i.e.,\) Illinois law.\(^21\) However, it characterized the preliminary issue of whether the evidence was wrongfully obtained as a substantive matter,\(^22\) and proceeded to analyze it in "most significant relationship"
Finding that the crime was committed in Illinois, it was being prosecuted there, the defendant was a resident and citizen of Illinois, the great majority of witnesses who would testify at trial were Illinois residents, Indiana had no vital contact with the crime, and that application of Illinois evidentiary law would not offend the comity of interstate relationships between Indiana and Illinois, the court applied Illinois law.\textsuperscript{23}

The result is correct. The problem lies in the language used by the court. It states that the Restatement (Second) approach governs because it has replaced the doctrine of \textit{lex loci delecti} in Illinois.\textsuperscript{24} Unfortunately, this is not a torts case, and \textit{lex loci delecti} has no application. The "substantive" issue involved here is whether evidence had been wrongfully obtained. If one must pigeonhole this into a substantive area, that would probably be the area of constitutional law.\textsuperscript{25} Indeed, query whether there is any neat little substantive law category into which one can tuck this away. Perhaps one would be best served by merely stating that substantive rights are involved, \textit{i.e.}, one's right not to be subjected to improper searches.\textsuperscript{26}

Does \textit{Saiken} stand for the proposition that Restatement (Second) governs all areas of substantive law? The decision is not at all clear on this point. And, as its final "beclouding" act, the court does not even cite its own decision in \textit{Ingersoll}; rather it relies upon the earlier dicta in \textit{Graham v. General U.S. Grant Post No. 2665}.

WHERE TO NOW?

A discussion of "where to" presupposes that one knows the present state of the law. As indicated above, this presupposes too much. In only one area of substantive law—torts—does the Illinois
practitioner face certainty. Here, one no longer looks merely to the place of injury; rather the Restatement (Second) "most significant relationship" test controls.27

The test is two-pronged: both the connecting facts in a given case as well as certain specified policy-oriented principles are to be considered.28 The Restatement (Second) aids in this task by assigning a qualitative value to specific factual contacts in each substantive area. In a tort case, the factual contacts generally regarded as most important are: (1) the place where the injury occurred; (2) the place where the conduct causing the injury occurred; (3) the domicile, residence, nationality, place of incorporation, and place of business of the parties; and (4) the place where the relationship, if any, between the parties is centered.29

In most cases, however, the end result will not differ from that obtained under the former vested rights "place of injury" rule. This is so because the Restatement (Second) makes a still further qualitative fact assessment: it indicates that the law of the place of injury should govern most tort situations unless the application of the other specific contact and/or policy principles clearly indicate that another state bears a more significant relationship to the case.30 In effect, this re-ushers the vested rights approach in again through the back door. But not quite. For even though the result will usually be the same, this need not be the case as the Restatement (Second)

27. See notes 9-10 supra and accompanying text.

28. The basic controlling Restatement section is § 145. The factual contacts are spelled out here in subsection 2 and the policy principles of § 6(2) are incorporated by reference. These policy principles are applicable to all substantive areas of law. They are: (1) the needs of the interstate and international systems; (2) the relevant policies of the forum; (3) the relevant policies of other interested states and the relative interests of those states in the determination of the particular issue; (4) the protection of justified expectations; (5) the basic policies underlying the particular field of law; (6) certainty, predictability and uniformity of result; and (7) ease in the determination and application of the law to be applied. These principles seem to reflect a compromise reached during the drafting of the Restatement (Second) calculated to satisfy at least some desires of the interest analysis proponents. Candidly, however, one wonders whether such generally stated principles will be of any practical value in the resolution of conflicts cases. The doubt is heightened by those decisions handed down to date which have utilized the approach taken in the Restatement (Second). These invariably rely almost in their entirety on a factual contact analysis in reaching a decision.


30. Id., comment f. This would clearly appear to be the approach taken by the court in Ingersoll. See 262 N.E.2d at 595. See also Johnson v. Wood, 6 Ill. App.3d 1015, 286 N.E.2d 637 (1972).
obviously supplies the court with freedom from compulsion of fixed rules, and encourages it to apply the law which it believes to have the strongest claim for application.  

It appears imperative that the court resolve as soon as possible what conflicts approach will govern the other substantive areas of law. Hopefully, this resolution will be in favor of a modern policy oriented approach. Clearly, *Ingersoll* could support this result. 

**Other Matters of Note**

_Wartell v. Formusa Revisited_

_Aurora National Bank v. Anderson*_ found an Illinois court once more focusing on the issue of what law should govern intra-family tort immunity. The case differed from _Wartell_ only insofar as the family relationship involved was one of parent and child.

Marilou Laughlin, an unemancipated minor, was a passenger in a car driven by her mother which was involved in an accident with a second car. The accident occurred in Iowa. The Laughlins were Illinois residents. Suit was brought by Marilou against her mother alleging willful and wanton conduct. Intra-family tort immunity would bar such an action in Iowa, but not in Illinois. The trial court granted summary judgment in favor of the mother. The appellate court reversed the decision, relying heavily on _Wartell_, and concluded that the law of common domicile should control. 

---

31. See Reese, _Conflict of Laws and the Restatement Second_, 28 Law & Con-temp. Prob. 679, 699 (1963), where the author states: “This rule of most significant relationship, at the very least, will not stand in the way of progress. It should aid in inducing the courts to depart from the place of injury rule in situations where this is desirable. And it should make clear to the lawyer and litigant that it can no longer be expected that the place of injury rule will always be applied.”

32. See note 11 _supra_ and accompanying text. The author, however, does not wish to imply that the best approach is necessarily that formulated in the Restatement (Second). It is to be hoped that Illinois courts, in formulating their own “final” choice of law approaches, will at least consider other alternatives.


34. Illinois law permits parent-child suits for wanton and wilful conduct. Mudd v. Matsoukas, 7 Ill. 2d 608, 131 N.E.2d 525 (1956). It is unclear whether Iowa would permit such suits, but, for purposes of this opinion, the court assumed that Iowa policy would not allow such an action, 268 N.E.2d at 553.

35. Counsel for defendant attempted to distinguish _Wartell_ on grounds that the earlier decision involved interspousal immunity whereas a parent-child relationship was involved in the instant case. His contention was based on the fact that Illinois’
Although the court's reliance on *Wartell* appears clearly correct, its analysis of the earlier decision does not. It is cited for the proposition that such controversies are best resolved by characterizing the problem as one of family law. This appears to be an improper reading of *Wartell*. Characterization of the issue there was in tort. Indeed, the very Restatement section relied upon both in *Wartell* and *Aurora National Bank* is to be found in the torts chapter and concerns tort immunities. As a practical matter, even if characterized in tort, the result would be precisely the same, a fact not overlooked by the court.

But, candidly, the above discussion begs the question. Is it even necessary to resort to a characterization process or strict adherence to Restatement (Second) approach? One would hope not. The courts should simply state that the question of intra-family tort immunity is generally to be governed by the law of common domicile.

Policy regarding interspousal immunity is codified, see Ill. Rev. Stat. ch. 68 (1963), whereas the policy underlying parent-child tort immunity is grounded only in the common law. Happily, the court rejected this argument, 268 N.E.2d at 555.

36. Judge Moran quotes a lengthy passage from *Wartell* which allegedly supports his position, 268 N.E.2d at 553-54 quoting from 34 Ill. 2d at 59, 213 N.E.2d at 545. It does not. Apparently, this conclusion was reached by reliance on some of those decisions cited in the earlier case. Thus, for example, the *Aurora Bank* court quotes heavily from *Emery v. Emery*, 45 Cal. 2d 421, 289 P.2d 218 (1955), a case cited in *Wartell*. The case is typical of those predating widespread application of the modern, policy oriented approaches, i.e., when the rigid, formalistic vested rights approach held sway. Then, characterization as to substantive area of law was a popular, oft-times necessary escape device for avoiding harsh, inequitable results. See W. Reese and M. Rosenberg, *Conflict of Laws* 494-510 (6th ed. 1971). And even then Judge Traynor's sweeping language in *Emery* could probably support more than a mere "characterization" analysis. See Ehrenzweig, *Parental Immunity in the Conflict of Laws: Laws and Reason Versus the Restatement*, 23 U. Chi. L. Rev. 474 (1956); Hancock, *The Rise and Fall of Buckeye v. Buckeye*, 1931-1959: Marital Immunity for Torts in Conflict of Laws, 29 U. Chi. L. Rev. 237, 263 (1962).

37. The court would have been well advised to note some of the other decisions cited in *Wartell*, e.g., Babcock v. Jackson, 12 N.Y.2d 473, 191 N.E.2d 279, 240 N.Y.S.2d 743 (1963), as well as some of the supreme court's later constructions of it in, e.g., *Ingersoll* and *Graham*.

38. The decisions had referred to this section as adopted in Tentative Draft No. 9 of the Restatement (Second) as par. 390g. The present section as finally promulgated, Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws § 169 (1971), differs from the earlier draft insofar as it specifically provides that the law of domicile will not control if another state is more significantly related to parties and transactions in accordance with the general principles governing tort issues as set out in Restatement § 145.

39. The impact, if any, of the change in the finally promulgated Restatement
As a practical matter, whatever road the analysis may take, it seems relatively clear that the Illinois practitioner can now safely rely upon this result.

**MULTISTATE TORTS**

In *Snead v. Forbes,* plaintiff, the former president of a large trucking concern, alleged damage as a result of defamatory comments published in the *Forbes* business magazine. Since the magazine is distributed nationwide, plaintiff allegedly was injured in every state.

The inherent problems are obvious. Theoretically, each state might be a proper forum, and each state's law might be applicable. One would probably produce a literally unintelligible opinion if an attempt were made to try all the transitory causes of action in one suit. Moreover, the cost and harassment potential of such litigation could be staggering. Thus, judicial economy makes it desirable that one jurisdiction's law be selected to govern the litigation.

This result was accomplished in *Snead.* The court applied Illinois law because that was plaintiff's domicile at the time of the alleged defamation. The court, relying on *Ingersoll,* concluded this fact made Illinois the state "most significantly related" to the parties and transaction. The Restatement (Second) assumption, relied upon in *Snead,* is that the place of greatest potential injury to plaintiff's reputation is where plaintiff has lived and worked. This assumption would generally hold true for multi-state defamations. If not, i.e., plaintiff suffers the greatest harm elsewhere, then that state's law should govern rather than the law of the domicile. This, however,
CONFLICT OF LAWS

is nothing more than a question of fact, clearly fitting within the analysis and language of Snead.

The result in Snead is analytically consistent with Illinois' treatment of the analogous "multiple publication" defamation problem. It has adopted the Uniform Single Publication Act. Under its terms, the plaintiff is given but "one cause of action" for a tort "founded upon any single publication." It provides that a judgment in any jurisdiction in this action "shall bar any other action for damages by the same plaintiff against the same defendant founded upon the same publication." Although the Act does not contain any indication as to what law would govern plaintiff's "one cause of action," its language would appear to require an analysis as in Snead.

But one caveat of warning should be added. Potentially, the law of plaintiff's domicile could be relied upon by defendant to shield it from liability without in any significant way advancing a substantive policy of the domicile. This may conflict with interests of other states that might hold the defendant liable for such publications. Thus, for example, if the publication has appeared in very few states, or it is fairly clear on the facts that a cause of action would not exist under the law of only one or very few states, then it is entirely possible that no rational purpose would be served by giving the defendant the benefit of a rule existing in plaintiff's domicile that would relieve it from liability existing under the laws of other

one. Others are available, however. Thus, the law of defendant's domicile, place of incorporation or main publishing office could govern. This approach would obviously make it easy to obtain service on the defendant. It would also often result in the forum court being able to apply its own law. Its principal disadvantage lies in the fact that this state might otherwise bear no relationship to either the defamation or resulting harm. See note, Single Publication Doctrine and Conflicts of Law Problems in Multi-State Libel, 43 ILL. L. REV. 556, 560 (1948); Note, Multi-State Libel and Conflict of Laws, 35 VA. L. REV. 627, 633 (1949). One could apply the law of that state where defendant's acts commencing the alleged defamation occurred. See Ehrenzweig, The Place of Acting in Intentional Multi-State Torts: Law and Reason Versus the Restatement, 36 MINN. L. REV. 1, 34 (1951), where the author proposes that the law of the place of acting govern all intentional torts including defamation. See also Comment, The Choice of Law in Multistate Defamation and Invasion of Privacy: An Unsolved Problem, 60 HARV. L. REV. 941, 946 (1947). Lastly, the forum could simply apply its own law. See Willenbucher v. McCormick, 229 F. Supp. 659 (D. Colo. 1964). Compare Dale System, Inc. v. General Teleradio, Inc., 105 F. Supp. 745, 748 (S.D.N.Y. 1952).

1972] CONFLICT OF LAWS
states having an interest in compensating the plaintiff and in discouraging tortious conduct of this kind within their own jurisdictions.\textsuperscript{45} In short, the search for judicial economy should not be regarded as a definitive, inflexible end-all for such problems.

One should also note that the Snead principles would be applicable to other multi-state torts situations, most importantly those involving invasion of the right of privacy.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{45} An argument to this effect was presented by the plaintiff in Snead, viz., defendant had the benefit of Illinois' innocent construction rule although the state of its principal place of business and most other states would not have accorded it this protection. The court did not find this persuasive. 275 N.E.2d at 749.