

garratt v dailey ruling

garratt v dailey ruling is a landmark case in tort law that significantly impacts the understanding of intent in battery claims. This ruling centers on the legal determination of whether a defendant's actions were intentional when causing harm to another, even if no harm was meant. The Garratt v. Dailey decision has been widely studied and cited because it clarifies the nuances of intent and liability in personal injury cases. This article explores the background of the case, the court's analysis, and its implications for tort law, particularly in intentional torts like battery. Additionally, the article will discuss how the ruling influences the standards used to assess intent and the broader legal principles established by this important case. Understanding the Garratt v. Dailey ruling is essential for legal professionals, students, and anyone interested in the intricacies of civil liability and intent. The following sections will provide a detailed examination of the case, its facts, legal reasoning, and lasting impact.

- Background of Garratt v. Dailey
- Legal Issues Addressed
- The Court's Decision and Reasoning
- Impact on Intent in Tort Law
- Key Takeaways from the Garratt v. Dailey Ruling

Background of Garratt v. Dailey

The Garratt v. Dailey case arose from a personal injury incident involving Brian Dailey, a young boy, and Ruth Garratt, the plaintiff. The facts revolve around Dailey moving a chair just as Garratt attempted to sit down, causing her to fall and suffer injuries. This seemingly simple event raised complex questions about whether Dailey intended to cause harm or was simply acting without malice. The case was brought before the court to determine whether Dailey's action constituted battery under tort law. The background highlights the challenges courts face when interpreting intent in accidental or ambiguous situations. Understanding the factual matrix of Garratt v. Dailey is crucial to grasp the legal principles applied in the ruling.

Factual Circumstances

On the day of the incident, Brian Dailey moved a lawn chair from where it was positioned. Ruth Garratt, unaware of the chair's movement, attempted to sit down at the previous location, resulting in her fall and subsequent injury. Dailey claimed he did not intend to cause harm but had moved the chair for his own purposes. The dispute centered on whether Dailey had the requisite intent to commit battery, a deliberate harmful or offensive contact, or whether the act was accidental. This fact pattern set the stage for the court's examination of intent and liability.

Procedural History

The case initially proceeded through trial courts before reaching the appellate level. At trial, the court had to consider whether Dailey's mental state satisfied the intent requirement for battery. The appellate court reviewed the lower court's findings, focusing on the legal standards for intent and whether the evidence supported the claim. The ruling from the appellate court provided a clearer articulation of the elements necessary to establish intent in tort cases, especially involving minors.

Legal Issues Addressed

The Garratt v. Dailey ruling primarily addresses the concept of intent in battery claims within tort law. The legal question was whether Dailey's action of moving the chair constituted an intentional act that caused harmful or offensive contact. The ruling also explored the nature of "intent" and whether it requires an aim to cause harm or simply knowledge that harm was substantially certain to result. This distinction is critical in tort law, as it determines liability and the availability of remedies to injured parties.

Definition of Intent in Tort Law

Intent in tort law differs from criminal intent; it requires that the defendant acted with purpose or knowledge that their actions would result in harm. The Garratt v. Dailey case clarified that intent can be satisfied if the defendant knew with substantial certainty that their conduct would lead to the harmful contact. This standard is less stringent than requiring a desire to cause harm but more demanding than mere negligence. The ruling helped define how courts assess mental states in civil wrongs.

Battery Elements Clarified

Battery in tort law consists of intentional harmful or offensive contact with another person without consent. The Garratt v. Dailey ruling emphasized that the intent element focuses on the defendant's mental state regarding the contact, not necessarily the harm caused. This means the defendant must have intended the contact itself or knew it was substantially certain to occur. The court's analysis distinguished between intentional torts and accidental injuries, providing guidance on liability assessments.

The Court's Decision and Reasoning

The court ruled in favor of the plaintiff, affirming that Dailey's actions met the intent requirement for battery. The decision was based on the finding that Dailey knew with substantial certainty that moving the chair would cause Garratt to fall. The court reasoned that the intent to cause harmful contact could be inferred from the defendant's awareness of the likely outcome of his actions. This ruling set a precedent for interpreting intent in similar tort cases, especially involving children or individuals with limited capacity.

Substantial Certainty Standard

The court introduced the "substantial certainty" test to determine intent. This standard means that if a defendant acts knowing that harm is almost certain to occur, the act is considered intentional. The ruling underscored that actual desire to harm is not necessary for intent; knowledge of the probable consequences suffices. This principle has been influential in many intentional tort cases, helping courts balance the need for accountability with fairness.

Application to Minors

The ruling also addressed the complexities of applying intent standards to minors. Brian Dailey was a child at the time, raising questions about his ability to form intent. The court held that minors can be held liable for intentional torts if they understand the likely outcomes of their actions. This has important implications for juvenile liability and how courts evaluate mental states of young defendants in tort cases.

Impact on Intent in Tort Law

The Garratt v. Dailey ruling has had a lasting impact on tort law by refining the concept of intent. It has influenced how courts interpret intentional acts, especially in battery and other intentional torts. The ruling emphasizes that knowledge and substantial certainty are key components of intent, expanding the scope of liability beyond explicit desire to harm. This has affected both case law and legal education, shaping doctrines related to intentional conduct.

Broader Legal Implications

Beyond battery, the ruling's intent standard applies to various intentional torts, including assault and false imprisonment. It aids courts in differentiating between intentional wrongdoing and negligence. The Garratt v. Dailey decision also informs jury instructions and legal arguments, ensuring clearer communication of the intent element during trials. Its influence extends across state and federal jurisdictions, contributing to a more uniform approach to intent.

Influence on Civil Liability

The clarification provided by the ruling affects the determination of civil liability in personal injury cases. By establishing that intent can be inferred from substantial certainty, plaintiffs have a stronger basis to prove intentional torts. Conversely, defendants must be mindful that their knowledge of likely consequences can impose liability even without a desire to cause harm. This balance promotes responsibility while safeguarding against unfair punishment for accidents.

Key Takeaways from the Garratt v. Dailey Ruling

The Garratt v. Dailey ruling remains a foundational case in understanding intent in tort law. Its key takeaways include the definition of intent as knowledge of substantial certainty, the application of this standard to minors, and the clarification of battery elements. These principles ensure that courts can fairly assess liability in cases involving intentional harm or contact. The ruling continues to guide legal analysis and judicial decisions in personal injury law.

- Intent can be established by knowledge of substantial certainty, not just desire to harm.
- Minors are capable of forming intent if they understand the likely consequences of their actions.
- Battery requires intentional harmful or offensive contact, with intent referring to the contact itself.
- The ruling helps distinguish intentional torts from negligence.
- It influences civil liability by broadening the scope of accountable conduct.

Frequently Asked Questions

What was the main issue in the Garratt v. Dailey case?

The main issue in Garratt v. Dailey was whether a five-year-old boy, Brian Dailey, was liable for battery when he moved a chair causing Ruth Garratt to fall and injure herself.

What did the court rule in Garratt v. Dailey regarding intent?

The court ruled that intent in battery can be established if the defendant knew with substantial certainty that their action would cause harmful or offensive contact, even if the harm was not intended.

Why is Garratt v. Dailey significant in tort law?

Garratt v. Dailey is significant because it clarified the concept of 'intent' in intentional torts, establishing that knowledge with substantial certainty is sufficient to prove intent.

Did the court consider Brian Dailey's age in the ruling?

While Brian Dailey's age was noted, the court focused on whether he had the

necessary intent, meaning if he knew with substantial certainty the chair would be moved, rather than his age alone determining liability.

What legal principle does Garratt v. Dailey illustrate about battery?

The case illustrates that battery requires intentional contact, and 'intent' can be satisfied by acting with knowledge that harmful or offensive contact is substantially certain to result.

How did Garratt v. Dailey influence future personal injury cases?

It influenced personal injury law by setting a precedent for how intent is determined in cases involving children and intentional torts, emphasizing the defendant's knowledge and foresight.

What facts did the court consider to determine intent in Garratt v. Dailey?

The court considered whether Brian Dailey knew with substantial certainty that moving the chair would cause Garratt to fall, focusing on his awareness and foresight of the consequences.

Is Garratt v. Dailey used as a teaching case in law schools?

Yes, Garratt v. Dailey is commonly used in law schools to teach the concept of intent in tort law, especially in cases involving battery and young defendants.

What was the outcome for the plaintiff in Garratt v. Dailey?

The outcome was that the plaintiff, Ruth Garratt, could potentially recover damages because the court recognized that the defendant's action met the intent requirement for battery.

Additional Resources

1. Intentional Torts and the Garratt v. Dailey Decision

This book offers an in-depth analysis of intentional torts with a special focus on the landmark case Garratt v. Dailey. It explores the nuances of intent in tort law and how this case shaped the understanding of battery and consent. Legal scholars provide commentary on the implications for future tort litigation. The book serves as a comprehensive resource for law students and practitioners alike.

2. The Legacy of Garratt v. Dailey: Understanding Intent in Tort Law

This title delves into the concept of intent as clarified by Garratt v. Dailey. Through case studies and legal interpretations, it examines how courts determine intent in personal injury cases. The book also discusses the broader impact on tort law and the evolving standards of liability. It is an

essential read for those interested in the intersection of psychology and law.

3. *Tort Law Essentials: Lessons from Garratt v. Dailey*

Designed as an introductory text, this book explains the fundamental principles of tort law with Garratt v. Dailey as a pivotal example. It breaks down the facts, ruling, and reasoning of the case in accessible language. Readers gain insight into how intent versus accident is judged in civil cases. The book is useful for students beginning their study of torts.

4. *Case Studies in Battery: Garratt v. Dailey and Beyond*

Focusing specifically on battery claims, this book uses Garratt v. Dailey as a cornerstone case to discuss the elements required to prove battery. It analyzes similar cases to highlight the application of the ruling in various contexts. The text also addresses defenses and the role of consent. Legal practitioners will find practical guidance and precedent analysis within.

5. *Psychological Perspectives on Intent: Revisiting Garratt v. Dailey*

This interdisciplinary book combines legal theory and psychology to explore the concept of intent in Garratt v. Dailey. It discusses how mental state and knowledge impact liability in tort cases. The authors consider how psychological evidence is used in court to support or challenge claims of intent. This book is valuable for both legal professionals and mental health experts.

6. *The Evolution of Tort Liability: From Garratt v. Dailey to Modern Cases*

Tracing the development of tort liability, this book places Garratt v. Dailey within a historical context. It examines how the case influenced subsequent rulings and the formulation of liability standards. The book also discusses legislative changes and contemporary interpretations. It is ideal for readers interested in the progression of tort law over time.

7. *Legal Principles of Intent: Insights from Garratt v. Dailey*

This book provides a detailed discussion on the legal principles of intent, using Garratt v. Dailey as a primary example. It explains the criteria courts use to determine whether an act was intentional or accidental. The book includes comparative analyses with other jurisdictions and highlights differing legal approaches. It is a comprehensive guide for law students specializing in torts.

8. *Understanding Battery and Intent: The Impact of Garratt v. Dailey*

Focusing on the tort of battery, this book explores how Garratt v. Dailey shaped the understanding of intent required for liability. It outlines the case facts, judicial reasoning, and its application in later cases. The text also discusses policy considerations and the balance between protecting individuals and preventing frivolous claims. Practitioners will benefit from its clear explanations and case law summaries.

9. *Intent and Liability in Tort Law: A Study Centered on Garratt v. Dailey*

This scholarly work examines the relationship between intent and liability in tort law, with Garratt v. Dailey as the focal point. It provides thorough legal analysis and critiques of the ruling's impact on tort doctrines. The book also explores theoretical debates and practical outcomes in tort litigation. It is suited for academics and advanced law students seeking deeper understanding.

Garratt V Dailey Ruling

Find other PDF articles:

<https://ns2.kelisto.es/gacor1-14/pdf?dataid=uce72-3520&title=glencoe-algebra-1-practice-problems-answer-key.pdf>

garratt v dailey ruling: Tort Law Keith N. Hylton, 2016-06-06 This book modernizes the traditional tort law textbook by combining in-depth analysis of policy with detailed discussion of legal doctrine.

garratt v dailey ruling: How Would You Rule? Daniel W. Park, 2016-11-01 How Would You Rule is a lighthearted introduction to fundamental concepts of law through strange but true legal cases. Each chapter tells the story of a different case and presents the main arguments of the opposing parties. The twist? Before the ruling of the court is revealed, readers are challenged to put themselves in the shoes—or the robes—of the judges and decide for themselves how they would rule in these cases. After coming up with their own solutions, readers can learn how the actual judges resolved the disputes. The goal is to get readers to think for themselves about what's right and what's wrong, sharpening their own instincts for the reasons and analyses that win arguments.

garratt v dailey ruling: Reference and Information Services Melissa A. Wong, Laura Saunders, 2020-05-04 This revised and updated sixth edition of Reference and Information Services continues the book's rich tradition, covering all phases of reference and information services with less emphasis on print and more emphasis on strategies and scenarios. Reference and Information Services is the go-to textbook for MSLIS and i-School courses on reference services and related topics. It is also a helpful handbook for practitioners. Authors include LIS faculty and professionals who have relevant degrees in their areas and who have published extensively on their topics. The first half of the book provides an overview of reference services and techniques for service provision, including the reference interview, ethics, instruction, reader's advisory, and services to diverse populations including children. This part of the book establishes a foundation of knowledge on reference service and frames each topic with ethical and social justice perspectives. The second part of the book offers an overview of the information life cycle and dissemination of information, followed by an in-depth examination of information sources by type—including dictionaries, encyclopedias, indexes, and abstracts—as well as by broad subject areas including government, statistics and data, health, and legal information. This second section introduces the tools and resources that reference professionals use to provide the services described in the first half of the text.

garratt v dailey ruling: Law and the Information Superhighway Henry H. Perritt, 2001-01-01 New edition of a resource about the information superhighway, more formally known as the National Information Infrastructure (NII) and the infobahn, or Global Information Infrastructure (GII) in Europe. Perritt (law, Illinois Institute of Technology and Chicago-Kent College of Law) presents 15 chapters that deal with the NII as a source of legal

garratt v dailey ruling: Cases and Materials on the Law of Torts Warren Abner Seavey, 1957

garratt v dailey ruling: Washington Court Rules Annotated Washington (State). Courts, 1968

garratt v dailey ruling: Torts and Compensation Dan B. Dobbs, Paul T. Hayden, 2001

garratt v dailey ruling: LAW OF TORTS (PAPER-I) , 2025-04-21 TP LAW SOLVED SERIES For LL.B. [Bachelor of Laws] 3 Years, Second Semester Students of 'University of Lucknow'

garratt v dailey ruling: Thinking Like a Lawyer Colin Seale, 2025-01-31 Critical thinking is the essential tool for ensuring that students fulfill their promise. But, in reality, critical thinking is still a luxury good, and students with the greatest potential are too often challenged the least. This

best-selling book: Introduces a powerful but practical framework to close the critical thinking gap
Gives teachers the tools and knowledge to teach critical thinking to all students Empowers students to tackle 21st-century problems Teaches students how to compete in a rapidly changing global marketplace Colin Seale, a teacher-turned- attorney-turned-education-innovator and founder of thinkLaw, uses his unique experience to introduce a wide variety of concrete instructional strategies and examples that teachers can use in all grade levels. Individual chapters address underachievement, the value of nuance, evidence-based reasoning, social-emotional learning, equitable education, and leveraging families to close the critical thinking gap. In addition to offering examples for Math, Science, ELA, and Social Studies, this timely, updated second edition adds a variety of new examples and applications for Physical Education, Fine Arts, Foreign Language, and Career and Technical Education.

garratt v dailey ruling: Thinking Like a Lawyer Kenneth J. Vandavelde, 2018-04-19 Law students, law professors, and lawyers frequently refer to the process of thinking like a lawyer, but attempts to analyze in any systematic way what is meant by that phrase are rare. In his classic book, Kenneth J. Vandavelde defines this elusive phrase and identifies the techniques involved in thinking like a lawyer. Unlike most legal writings, which are plagued by difficult, virtually incomprehensible language, this book is accessible and clearly written and will help students, professionals, and general readers gain important insight into this well-developed and valuable way of thinking. Updated for a new generation of lawyers, the second edition features a new chapter on contemporary perspectives on legal reasoning. A useful new appendix serves as a survival guide for current and prospective law students and describes how to apply the techniques in the book to excel in law school.

garratt v dailey ruling: Explaining Tort and Crime Matthew Dyson, 2022-07-21 Explains the development of tort law and criminal law in England by reference to other legal systems from 1850-2020.

garratt v dailey ruling: The ^AOxford Introductions to U.S. Law John C.P. Goldberg, Benjamin C. Zipursky, 2010-06-03 Torts - personal injury law - is a fundamental yet controversial part of our legal system. The Oxford Introductions to U.S. Law: Torts provides a clear and comprehensive account of what tort law is, how it works, what it stands to accomplish, and why it is now much-disputed. Professors Goldberg and Zipursky offer both a big-picture orientation to torts and a series of detailed 'maps' by which to make sense of its sub-topics.

garratt v dailey ruling: Cases and Materials on the Law of Torts Page Keeton, Robert E. Keeton, 1971

garratt v dailey ruling: The Common Law Process of Torts Donald Marshall, David S. Weissbrodt, 2003

garratt v dailey ruling: The Torts Process James A. Henderson, Richard N. Pearson, John A. Siliciano, 1999 With its problem approach and student-friendly presentation, THE TORTS PROCESS continues to gain an ever-increasing number of loyal users. Now fully updated and strengthened for its Fifth Edition, this successful casebook remains an effective and engaging resource for the required first-year Torts course. The authors maintain the qualities that have been praised by adopters: A problem approach that challenges student understanding through the use of theoretical and real-life situations A clear and balanced presentation that enables students to understand the overarching structure and organization of tort law better than any other book A lively mix of problems, cases, excerpts, notes, and questions THE TORT PROCESS, Fifth Edition, offers: Revised chapter openers, introductions, and summaries for easier use. More transitional text, new headings drawing attention to key points, and fewer law review notes to help students focus on important topics. Introductory text that explains case selection, and new cases reflecting current legal issues. New hypotheticals. A brief explanation of the nontraditional approach to negligence. Additional examples on causation for more illustrative detail the chapter on negligence now appearing earlier. Economic analysis integrated into the text. Increased coverage of intentional torts. The new Teacher's Manual provides even more guidance on how to use the problem method effectively. It

includes a section on how to use the book to teach torts in one semester, complete with syllabi.

garratt v dailey ruling: Washington Court Rules Annotated , 2009

garratt v dailey ruling: Answering Law Exams--power Think David H. Barber, 1986

garratt v dailey ruling: Torts!, *third edition* Jonathan L. Zittrain, Jordi Weinstock, 2022-03-15 A law school casebook that maps the progression of the law of torts through the language and example of public judicial decisions in a range of cases. A tort is a wrong that a court is prepared to recognize, usually in the form of ordering the transfer of money ("damages") from the wrongdoer to the wronged. The tort system offers recourse for people aggrieved and harmed by the actions of others. By filing a lawsuit, private citizens can demand the attention of alleged wrongdoers to account for what they've done—and of a judge and jury to weigh the claims and set terms of compensation. This book, which can be used as a primary text for a first-year law school torts course, maps the progression of the law of torts through the language and example of public judicial decisions in a range of cases. Taken together, these cases show differing approaches to the problems of defining legal harm and applying those definitions to a messy world. The cases range from alleged assault and battery by "The Schoolboy Kicker" (1891) to the liability of General Motors for "The Crumpling Toe Plate" (1993). Each case is an artifact of its time; students can compare the judges' societal perceptions and moral compasses to those of the current era. This book is part of the Open Casebook series from Harvard Law School Library and MIT Press.

garratt v dailey ruling: Connecticut Circuit Court Reports Connecticut. Circuit Court. Appellate Division, 1969

garratt v dailey ruling: Religious Exemptions Kevin Vallier, Michael E. Weber, 2018

Religious exemptions have a long history in American law, but have become especially controversial over the last several years. The essays in this volume address the moral and philosophical issues that the legal practice of religious exemptions often raises.

Related to garratt v dailey ruling

Homeowners Insurance: Get a Free Quote | Progressive Protect your home and assets with affordable homeowners insurance from Progressive. Get a free, personalized quote today

Compare Home Insurance Quotes: HomeQuote Explorer Compare home insurance quotes instantly with HomeQuote Explorer. See homeowners insurance rates and coverages side by side to find your best option

Mobile & Manufactured Home Insurance | Progressive Cover your mobile or manufactured home with affordable mobile home insurance from Progressive. Quote today and get the protection and peace of mind that comes with insuring

Flood Insurance Quote: Buy Flood Insurance | Progressive Get a Flood Insurance Quote & Buy Online For many homeowners, flood insurance is an essential extra layer of protection. What flood insurance covers A flood insurance policy

Condo Insurance - Get a Free Quote Now | Progressive A condo insurance policy protects what your homeowners association (HOA) doesn't. Get started with a free quote today

Car Insurance: Quick Auto Insurance Quotes | Progressive Get a quick, customized car insurance quote online to compare rates & save money on your auto policy. All it takes is a few minutes to find low-cost coverage

Cheap Home Insurance: Get Affordable Home Insurance Learn how to get cheap home insurance with Progressive. Get an affordable rate on your existing policy or find the cheapest home insurance

Homeowners Insurance in Texas: Get a Quote | Progressive Helping you save on homeowners insurance in Texas There are lots of Progressive discounts on homeowners insurance available, including discounts for quoting in advance, bundling your

Missouri Homeowners Insurance: Get a Quote | Progressive If you need homeowners insurance in Missouri, check out coverages, cost factors, discounts, and options for extra protection

Homeowners Insurance Coverages - Progressive See how homeowners insurance coverages

apply and get details on what homeowners insurance does and doesn't cover

Edebiyat Okulu: Açıklık, Akıcılık, Duruluk, Yalınlık, Doğruluk Dili, süssüz, sanatsız, abartısız, gösterişsiz ve anlaşılır bir biçimde kullanmaya yalınlık denir. Yalın cümlelerde dolambaçlı yollara, edebi sanatlara başvurulmaz

Anlatımın Özellikleri - Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Yalınlık (sadelik), anlatımın süsten (söz sanatları, ağır sözcükler ve özenli uzun cümlelerden) uzak olmasıdır. Karşısı süslülüktür. Çok süslü/ağır anlatımlar için " ağıdalı " ifadesi kullanılır

Yalınlık Nedir? Ne Demek? Duruluk ile Farkları - Bilgi Pal Yalınlık Ne Demek? Yalınlık kelime anlamı olarak karmaşıklıktan uzak olma durumudur. Gereksiz uzatmalar kullanılmadan sade ve öz şekilde anlatımın sağlanmasıdır.

AÇIKLIK, AKICILIK, YALINLIK, DURULUK - TYT TÜRKÇE - AYT Açıklık, akıcılık, yalınlık, duruluk nedir?*Metinde yoruma göre değişmeyen ifadelere yer verilir. Metinden herkes aynı anlamı çıkarır

Yalınlık ne demek? Yalınlık kelimesinin TDK sözlük - Mynet Yalınlık kelimesinin ne demek olduğunu, TDK sözlük anlamı ve kökeni ile birlikte Mynet Sözlük'ten öğrenebilirsiniz

Anlatımın İlkeleri (Açıklık, Duruluk, Yalınlık, Özlülük, Akıcılık ANLATIM İLKELERİ AKICILIK Aktarılabacak düşüncenin, durumun, duygunun özelliğine göre uzun ve kısa cümleleri birbirlerinin arasına yerleştirmek akıcılığı sağlar. Ayrıca yeri geldiğinde,

Yalınlık nedir paragraf - Sorumatik Yalınlık, en basit anlamıyla, bir metnin sade, anlaşılır ve gereksiz ayrıntılardan arındırılmış olmasıdır. Bu kavram, her türlü yazılı veya sözlü metinde geçerlidir ve temel hedef,

Anlatımın Özellikleri (Açıklık, Duruluk, Akıcılık, Yalınlık) Yalınlık Başkalarının ifade tarzına özenmeden, kimseyi taklit etmeden, içten geldiği gibi kelimeleri kullanarak yazmaktır. Anlatımda süse edebi sanatlara başvurmak yalınlığı bozar. Halkın

Yalınlık, Doğallık, Açıklık Konu Anlatımı (Videolu - Kunduz Gençler bugün sizlerle birlikte anlatım niteliklerinden yalınlık, doğallık ve açıklık nedir bunu öğreneceğiz. Hazırsanız gelin hep birlikte bakalım

Yalınlık Nedir İle İlgili Paragraf Örneği - Kompozisyonlar Yalınlık, genellikle sanat ve edebiyat bağlamında sıklıkla karşımıza çıkan bir kavramdır. Bu terim, gereksiz detaylardan kaçınarak asıl konuyu net ve açık bir şekilde ifade

Back to Home: <https://ns2.kelisto.es>