

Damnum Sine Injuria

"Damnum Sine Injuria" is a legal maxim that denotes situations where a person suffers harm without any infringement of a legal right.

Key Features

- Latin Term: Means "damage without wrongful act."
- Indicates cases where the damage suffered does not entitle the victim to compensation because no legal right has been violated.
- Often illustrated in competitive business practices that cause economic harm but are not unlawful.

Historical Context

The roots of this doctrine can be traced back to notable historical cases such as the **Gloucester Grammar School Case**. In this case, the establishment of a new, rival grammar school led to lost pupils and revenue for the existing school. However, the court determined that there was no legal remedy for the original school's financial losses, as the competition was lawful and did not infringe any established legal right.

This case set a precedent emphasising that losses incurred due to fair and lawful competition do not warrant legal redress, thereby solidifying the principle that not all economic losses due to another's actions are compensable.

Impact and Current Relevance

This doctrine is vital in distinguishing between legally compensable harms and mere personal or economic losses that the law does not protect. This principle ensures that the legal system does not become overburdened with claims where no actual legal rights have been violated.

Critical Viewpoints

Critics argue that "Damnum Sine Injuria" can sometimes result in perceived injustices, especially in cases where individuals suffer significant losses that feel unjust yet fall outside the scope of legal protection. These viewpoints suggest a need for a better legal framework that can better balance competing

Important Links for Judiciary Free Resources (Click on Each to Open Respective Pages)

Subject Wise Mains PYQ Solution	Essay for Judiciary
Subject Wise Notes	Legal Doctrines
Landmark Judgements	GS Notes
Weekly Current Affair	Subject Wise Prelims PYQ Solution
Free Answer Writing Course	Judgement Writing
Telegram Link	Youtube Link

interests and perhaps offer some form of redress or mediation in situations where the

strict application of the doctrine seems inequitable.

Illustrative Cases

Mogul Steamship Co. v. McGregor Grow & Co.: In this case, several steamship companies formed a combination to exclude the plaintiff from business. The defendants were held not liable because their actions, while competitive and aggressive, did not infringe upon any legal right of the plaintiff.



Mayor of Bradford v. Pickles: In this notable case, the defendant acted out of malice when he sank a shaft on his property, which subsequently discoloured and diminished the water supply percolating to the adjoining land owned by the plaintiff corporation. The House of Lords held that the defendant was not liable because he was exercising his right to use his land as he saw fit, and there was no infringement of the plaintiff's legal rights.

Town Area Committee v. Prabhu Dayal:

The Allahabad High Court ruled that the demolition of buildings illegally constructed by the plaintiff did not constitute "injuria," and therefore, the municipal authorities were not liable.