
MARVIN KATKO VS. EDWARD BRINEY AND BERTHA BRINEY OR KATKO VS. BRINEY (SHOTGUN CASE)¹

Vibha B. Nair, CMR University, School of Legal Studies

BRIEF OF THE CASE:

1. **Citation:** 183 N.W.2d 657 (1971)
2. **Appellant/Petitioner:** Marvin Katko
3. **Respondent:** Edward Briney and Bertha L. Briney
4. **Judgement Date:** February 7, 1971
5. **Court:** Supreme court of Iowa

INTRODUCTION

A tort is any legal wrong for which the law offers redress. Torts offer recompense for losses to people and property brought on by another's negligence. Tort law seeks to return those who have been hurt as a result of another's negligence to the state they were in before the injury.

The French tongue is where the term "tort" first appeared. It is the same as the words "wrong" and "delict" in English and Romanian legislation, respectively. Its origins can be traced back to the Medieval Latin term "tortum," which means "wrong" or "injury" and was itself evolved from the Old Latin word "torquere," which means "to twist." It is an obligation violation that constitutes a legal wrong. A tort occurs when a person's obligation to others is compromised; the person who conducts a tort is known as a tortfeasor, or offender.²

The state has a duty to maintain social security for the well-being of its citizens and to eliminate all forms of chaos from society. Private defence emerged as a result of people realizing they

¹ Katko v. Briney, 183 N.W.2d 657 (Iowa 1971)

² Black's Law Dictionary 1717 (10th ed. 2014).

needed to protect their bodies and property from exterior threats as the socio-economic and political climate of the society changed.

FACTS

In Mahaska County, Iowa, Bertha Briney received an old farmhouse that the Brineys had abandoned for a decade. They boarded up the windows and entries of the farmstead and posted "No Trespassing" signs all over the property. The farmhouse was in a state of ruin and was frequently broken into. Seven miles from the Brineys' farmhouse, in the town of Eddyville, Marvin Katko routinely worked as a petrol station attendant. When Katko first saw the home in 1967, it was surrounded by high weeds; he had been hunting nearby for several years and had assumed it had been abandoned. When Katko and his buddy Marvin McDonough visited the location before July 16, 1967, they discovered several antiquated bottles and fruit jars.

Edward Briney installed a 20-gauge spring-loaded shotgun in the farmhouse and set it up to discharge whenever the door to the north bedroom was opened in order to protect the home from further burglaries. Instead of inflicting a fatal gunshot wound, Bertha recommended aiming the firearm downward to fire at an intruder's legs. The bedroom window was also enclosed with steel by the Brineys.

On July 16, 1967, Katko and McDonough broke into the farmhouse once more with the intention of taking more old fruit jars and old bottles that Katko had mistaken for antiques. The shotgun discharged into Katko's right leg when he set off the trigger mechanism as he entered the bedroom. Katko's leg, including a portion of the tibia, had been blown off in large portions. Katko was only able to leave the home with the aid of McDonough. Katko had to spend 40 days in the hospital due to the severity of the gunshot trauma.

Plaintiff's doctor stated that although an amputation was briefly proposed, the healing process ultimately proved effective. A few weeks after being discharged from the hospital, the petitioner went back to work while using crutches to help him walk. For about a year, he had to keep the hurt limb in a cast, and for another year, he had to wear a unique brace. During this time, he continually experienced discomfort. Plaintiff had an irreversible deformity, tissue loss, and limb shortening, according to undisputed medical evidence. According to the documentation, up until the time of trial, the complainant spent \$710 in medical costs, \$2056.85 in hospital expenses, \$61.80 in orthopedic expenses, and \$750 in lost wages.

ISSUE

1. Whether an owner can use a spring gun that is capable of causing death or severe injury to deter trespassers and criminals from stealing personal property in an abandoned boarded-up farmhouse?
2. Whether the defendants should take reasonable precautions to stop trespassers from entering their land illegally?

JUDGEMENT

Except in situations where human life is in peril or to stop the conduct of violent crimes, the use of spring guns is forbidden. The right to defend one's property with reasonable force is allowed, but it must be exercised without employing any force that could potentially endanger human life or severely injure an individual. This is the norm, despite the fact that the person who received harm was trespassing and breaking the law themselves

Plaintiff claimed he knew he had no right to access the property illegally with the intention of stealing old bottles and fruit jars. He further stated that he had admitted to stealing items worth less than \$20 from an isolated property during the night. He claimed that after serving a 60-day jail term as per the lower court's order, he had been released on parole after paying a \$50 fee plus costs. This was the plaintiff's first legal run-in, aside from some small driving violations

The court established that it was neither rational nor justified to use lethal force against trespassers on a vacant property. If Briney had been at home when the intruder entered, he would have been right in protecting himself with the shotgun. Liability in this specific case cannot be determined by the plaintiff's position as a trespasser.

The Iowa Supreme Court upheld the verdict, ruling that the use of spring guns to defend uninhabited land was illegal. The case supports the idea that even though a landowner has no obligation to keep trespassers safe, he is not allowed to set lethal traps as deterrents because "the law has always placed a higher value upon human safety than upon mere rights in property." As a result, the court ruled in Katko's favor, awarding a decision for \$10,000 for significant damages and \$20,000 in punitive damages.

RATIO DECIDENDI

The court observed that it is unlawful to use lethal force to defend vacant property because the safety of individuals is prioritised over property rights. Only in cases of self-defense is the use of force, including lethal action, acceptable.

ANALYSIS

According to the principle of right to private defence, every person has the right to defend his or her person and property against external threats. The use of power must be reasonable and proportionate, and it must be regulated by legislation. This freedom is constrained by a number of legal limitations. It offers people liberty, but when that freedom is used to perpetrate crimes or when the right to a private defence is used to justify any action that is illegal under the law, the state has the power to take action against offenders

The key issue at hand is whether an owner may use a spring gun that is capable of causing death or severe injury to deter trespassers and criminals from stealing personal property in a vacant boarded-up farmhouse. A landowner does not have the right to use force against someone who is about to enter his property or tamper with his property unless the intrusion poses a serious threat of death or serious bodily harm to them. This is because the value of human life and limb outweighs the interest of a landowner in keeping out those whom he is unwilling to admit thereto.

A landowner cannot do anything tangentially or mechanically that, if he were present, he could not do right away and personally. Therefore, he cannot obtain the right to install a mechanical device whose sole purpose is to cause serious harm or death to those who may intrude in order to protect his property from intrusions that endanger the lives of its occupants or users by giving notice of his intention to use mechanical means to cause harm that he could not cause directly were he present.

A landowner is not allowed to set up his property in such a way that a trespasser will die or suffer severe physical injury. Of course, the owner is free to take action to deter trespassing. If he is present, he may use force to accomplish this, but only insofar as it is deemed adequately required to discourage the trespasser. The possessor would not have the right to use lethal force if the trespass only posed a danger to damage to property even a larceny of property and he

may not set up his property so that such force will be applied mechanically. If he does, he will be responsible for anyone hurt by the weapon, including a criminal

APPLICATION IN INDIA

Private defense is a recognised right that is permitted by the laws of the nation. To preserve basic freedom in the society, every member of the community must be urged to exercise their inherent right to self-defense of their person and property. The Bharathiya Nyaya Sanhitha, 2023 or BNS, which governs criminal law, has sections 35 to 44 that deal with the right to private defence. Sections 35, 36, and 37 deal with the right to protect one's person and property. The right to self-defense is covered in Sections 38, 39, 40, and 44. The ability to protect property is covered by Sections 41, 42, and 43

According to *Section 34* of the BNS, legal violations that are committed in the course of defending one's person or property are not considered criminal offences. That act's use of power must be reasonable and proportional.

The right to a private defence will no longer be accessible if the act is carried out despite the availability of other corrective steps to prevent it and the consequences it may cause.

Guidelines for Citizens' Right to Private Defense were established by the Supreme Court in the case of *Darshan Singh v. State of Punjab*³. It was noted that when faced with a life-threatening situation, a person cannot be expected to behave cowardly and has every right to murder the attacker in self-defense. A law-abiding citizen is not required by the law to act cowardly in the face of an impending unlawful attack. The court ruled:

*“Nothing is more demeaning to the human spirit than fleeing from peril, as this court has frequently noted. Thus, the right to private defence is intended to serve a societal purpose and should be promoted within the permitted parameters.”*⁴

The guidelines laid down are:

- Self-help is the fundamental rule of law.

³ *Darshan Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2010) 2 S.C.C. 333 (India).

⁴ *Id.* 3

- The right to private defence may be used when a person's life is in peril or under attack.
- The right to private defence may also arise from a reasonable fear of harm.
- The individual employing the right must do so with reasonable force.
- The existence of a private defence need not be proven beyond a reasonable doubt by the accused.
- A person has the right to inflict death or other harm on an attacker whenever that person's life is in peril or at risk of being threatened with or experiencing such physical harm.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, an individual has the right to use private protection to protect his or her person and property. Even though there are times when this privilege is abused to commit a crime, the judge must determine whether the act was done in good faith or not based on the specific facts and circumstances of each case. The Court concluded that human protection has always been given a greater priority by the law than basic property rights. The general consensus is that unless the defendant's personal safety is also in danger, there is no privilege to use force that could result in death or severe physical harm in order to ward off an attack on land or property.

Certainly, the owner may take action to ward off trespassers, but only to the extent that is fairly required. Therefore, using spring firearms or other man-killing weapons on a simple trespasser or even a small-time burglar is not justified. They are only protected from those whom the proprietor would be allowed to harm in the same way if he were physically present. Furthermore, the owner does not have the right to use lethal force if the trespass only poses a risk of property damage or larceny.