LII > Wex > prima facie

prima facie

Prima facie is Latin for "at first sight," or "on the face of it."

Prima facie is used in <u>court</u> to indicate that there is sufficient or adequate <u>evidence</u> to support a <u>claim</u>. More simply put, a prima facie case means that the claim being presented to a court has merit, when taken at face value.

A prima facie case is the establishment of a legally required <u>rebuttable presumption</u>. In other words, a prima facie case is a <u>cause of action</u> or <u>defense</u> that is sufficiently established by a <u>party's</u> evidence to justify a verdict in their favor, provided such evidence is not rebutted by the other party.

Prima facie evidence/claims are used in <u>criminal</u> courts, as well as <u>civil</u> courts, most commonly in <u>tort</u> law. In fact, various torts will typically have prima facie cases attached to them. In a prima facie tort claim, the <u>plaintiff</u> first provides evidence that a tort was committed by the <u>defendant</u>, then the <u>burden of proof</u> shifts to the defendant to disprove they committed the tort.

[Last reviewed in January of 2025 by the Wex Definitions Team]

Keywords

- tort law
- criminal law
- evidence
- burden of proof
- trial
- PRIMA FACIE
- Trespass

relevant legislative history. State v. Bower, 442 N.W.2d 438, 1989 N.D. LEXIS 131 (N.D. 1989).

Tortious Interference With Prospective Business Advantage.

Racing simulcast provider and its owner were not entitled to recovery against an em-

ployee for tortiously interfering with their prospective business advantage. The employee did not violate N.D.C.C. §§ 12.1-11-02(1) and 12.1-11-03(1) by offering a statement of his opinion to law enforcement officers. Bala v. Stenehjem, 671 F.Supp.2d 1067, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 111133 (D.N.D. 2009).

DECISIONS UNDER PRIOR LAW

Justified Reliance.

ceeding.

oath or

such a

nt to he

mental

aterial

tion for sary to

ich he

ticity:

ound-

aterial

ing in

rse of

s the

nt is

bility

1 of a

olish-

N.D.

and

are

pecode.

. of

be

nts the

ıg;

A party to a contract, in the absence of knowledge putting him on inquiry, was justified in relying on statements of fact regarding the property involved. Moone v. Martin State Bank, 59 N.D. 352, 230 N.W. 11, 1930 N.D. LEXIS 149 (N.D. 1930).

12.1-11-03. False information or report to law enforcement officers or security officials.

A person is guilty of a class A misdemeanor if that person:

- Gives false information or a false report to a law enforcement officer
 which that person knows to be false, and the information or report may
 interfere with an investigation or may materially mislead a law
 enforcement officer; or
- 2. Falsely reports to a law enforcement officer or other security official the occurrence of a crime of violence or other incident calling for an emergency response when that person knows that the incident did not occur. "Security official" means a public servant responsible for averting or dealing with emergencies involving public safety.

Source: S.L. 1973, ch. 116, § 11; 1999, ch. 121, § 1.

NOTES TO DECISIONS

Tortious Interference With Prospective Business Advantage.

Racing simulcast provider and its owner were not entitled to recovery against an employee for tortiously interfering with their prospective business advantage. The employee did not violate N.D.C.C. §§ 12.1-11-02(1) and 12.1-11-03(1) by offering a statement of his opinion to law enforcement officers. Bala v. Stenehjem, 671 F.Supp.2d 1067, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 111133 (D.N.D. 2009).

12.1-11-04. General provisions.

- 1. Falsification is material under sections 12.1-11-01, 12.1-11-02, and 12.1-11-03 regardless of the admissibility of the statement under rules of evidence, if it could have affected the course or outcome of the official proceeding or the disposition of the matter in which the statement is made. Whether a falsification is material in a given factual situation is a question of law. It is no defense that the declarant mistakenly believed the falsification to be immaterial.
- 2. It is no defense to a prosecution under sections 12.1-11-01 or 12.1-11-02 that the oath or affirmation was administered or taken in an irregular manner or that the declarant was not competent to make the state-