



# Starting Research with the Case or Statute You've Been Given

Don't stay up all night. Read a case once and understand it.

Reading a case can seem like reading a foreign language. LexisNexis® has built-in tools that translate what you're reading into something you can understand, helping you digest and analyze a large volume of information efficiently, so you're fully prepared for your professor's cold call in class.

[Start by pulling up a case on Lexis Advance®.](#)

Enter the citation for your case or statute in the red search box. This will retrieve the document.

Top three tools for understanding your case and finding related authority:

[Get your bearings with a Case Summary.](#)

It's like a mini case brief. Read this first for a clear overview of the facts and holdings of the case. Now you'll only need to read the case once to understand it, saving hours of time.

[LexisNexis® Headnotes are shortcuts to what your professor may ask about.](#)

Reading the headnotes will ensure you don't miss the black letter law which will likely be discussed in class. Above each headnote are legal topic tags showing you which area of law that quote is discussing, so you can stay oriented to why the rule is important.

[Educate yourself quickly with Topic Summaries.](#)

LexisNexis has built-in one-page cheat sheets for important legal topics. These provide you with the legal definition, elements, and links to key cases, making them a great addition to your class outlines.

Document: Palsgraf v. Long Island R. Co., 248 N.Y. 339 Actions

SEARCH

Document: Palsgraf v. Long Island R. Co., 248 N.Y. 339

▲ Palsgraf v. Long Island R. Co., 248 N.Y. 339

Copy Citation

Court of Appeals of New York

February 24, 1928, Argued ; May 29, 1928, Decided

No Number in Original

Reporter

248 N.Y. 339 | 162 N.E. 99 | 1928 N.Y. LEXIS 1269 | 59 A.L.R. 1253

Helen Palsgraf, Respondent, v. The Long Island Railroad Company, Appellant

Prior History: Appeal from a judgment of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court in the second judicial department, entered December 16, 1927, affirming a judgment in favor of plaintiff entered upon a verdict.

[Palsgraf v. Long Island R. Co., 222 App. Div. 168](#), reversed.

Disposition: Judgment reversed, etc.

Core Terms

passenger, explosion, railroad, platform, package, proximate cause, injuries, invasion, consequences, proximate, guard, chauffeur, Street, injure, rights, cases, train, fireworks, baby, violation of rights, unreasonably, destructive, vigilance, dropping, exploded, probable, trespass, insured, prudent

Case Summary

Procedural Posture

Defendant railroad appealed a judgment of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court in the Second Judicial Department (New York), which affirmed the trial court's holding that the railroad was responsible for injuries to plaintiff passenger resulting from an explosion.

Overview

The passenger was standing on a platform of the railroad after buying a ticket. A train stopped at the station, and a man ran forward to catch it. When he attempted to board the train in haste, he dropped a package containing fireworks. As a result, the passenger was injured from the subsequent explosion and sought to hold the railroad liable for negligence. Pursuant to a jury verdict, the trial court entered a judgment in favor of the passenger. The appellate court affirmed, and the railroad appealed. Upon final determination, the court reversed the judgment, holding that the passenger failed to prove that the railroad's alleged negligence proximately caused her injuries. Essentially, the court held that under the foreseeability test, it was not reasonable to hold that the railroad's alleged negligence was the cause of the passenger's injuries. Rather, it was the explosion that was the proximate cause, and the railroad could not have reasonably expected such a disaster.

Outcome

The court reversed the judgment of the appellate court and dismissed the complaint.

LexisNexis® Headnotes

Torts > Negligence > General Overview

Torts > Negligence > Proof > General Overview

Torts > ... > Duty > Standards of Care > General Overview

**HN1** Negligence is not actionable unless it involves the invasion of a legally protected interest or the violation of a right. Proof of negligence in the air, so to speak, will not do. Negligence is

Shepard's®

No negative subsequent appellate history

Citing Decisions (1838)

▲ Caution (33)

◆ Positive (63)

● Neutral (180)

ⓘ Cited By (1609)

Other Citing Sources (2003)

Shepardize® this document

About This Document

Topic Summaries

View reports (1)

⌘ Activate Passages

These four tools tell the whole story of a statute:

The screenshot shows the LexisNexis interface for 18 USCS § 3109. A purple callout box labeled 'TABLE OF CONTENTS' points to the left sidebar. Another purple callout box labeled 'ANNOTATIONS' points to the 'Annotations' tab. A third purple callout box labeled 'Jump To' points to the 'Jump To' dropdown menu. A fourth purple callout box labeled 'SHEPARDIZE' points to the 'Shepardize this document' button. The main content area displays the statute title and its text: '§ 3109. Breaking doors or windows for entry or exit'.

Check the [Table of Contents](#) to see how your statute fits within the code.

See what Title or Chapter your statute section is located within, and view surrounding statutes that may be related to the same legal topic to feel confident that you haven't missed any important statutes relevant to your assignment.

See how the courts have interpreted a statute using [Annotations](#).

Once you've read your statute, consult the Annotations to get the full story. Knowing how the courts have interpreted and applied the statutory language will affect how you apply that statute for your assignment.

Case opinions are organized by topic and listed under [Case Notes](#).

Select a topic from the list to see the key cases where courts made a ruling involving your statute.

Uncover the history of a statute's interpretations by [Shepardizing](#)™.

The *Shepard's*® report will show you all cases that have cited to your statute. Seeing how those past cases construed your statute will provide you with evidence of how the statute would likely be applied to your assignment hypothetical.

This section shows a close-up of the 'Annotations' and 'Case Notes' areas. A purple callout box labeled 'CASE NOTES' points to the 'Case Notes' header. Below it, a list of topics is shown: '1. IN GENERAL', '1. Generally', '2. Purpose', '3. Construction, generally', '4. Applicability, generally', and '5. --Warrantless searches'. A purple callout box labeled '1. Generally' points to the first item in the list. Below the list, a snippet of text is shown: 'Violation of "knock-and-announce" rule does not require suppression of all evidence found in search; impermissible manner of entry does not necessarily trigger exclusionary rule. [Hudson v Michigan \(2006\) 547 US 586, 126 S Ct 2159, 165 L Ed 2d 56, 19 FLW Fed S 244, 23 ALR Fed 2d 823.](#)'



Get more research tips at [YouTube.com/LexisNexisLawSchools](https://www.youtube.com/LexisNexisLawSchools) |