2004 HB 1573 A bill to be entitled

An act relating to street lighting; creating s. 768.1382, F.S.; limiting liability for persons or political subdivisions providing street lights, security lights, or other similar illumination; providing that certain entities do not owe duty to the public to provide, operate, or maintain illumination; providing for application; providing an effective date.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

WHEREAS, the Legislature finds that the majority opinion in Clay Electric v. Johnson was wrongly decided on public policy and legal grounds, and, if the decision remains valid, it will dramatically decrease public safety in Florida, and

WHEREAS, as noted by the dissenting opinion, the majority opinion would place Florida among a small minority of states that would impose liability on a utility to third parties for injuries caused by nonfunctioning street lights, and

WHEREAS, states such as California, Georgia, New Jersey, Louisiana, Maryland, New York, Ohio, Utah, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island have declined to impose a duty on utilities to third parties to maintain street lights, and

WHEREAS, there is no sound public policy that would justify imposing such a duty in Florida on utilities or other persons, corporations, municipalities, or entities, and

WHEREAS, the Legislature finds that if the majority opinion remained law, it is highly likely that the state courts would also impose a duty and liability on homeowners' associations, small businesses, related persons, corporations, municipalities, and other entities to maintain street lights and similar

HB 1573 2004

illumination and the effect of this liability would deter utilities and other persons, corporations, municipalities, and entities from constructing or maintaining street lights and similar illumination for fear of liability to third parties, and

WHEREAS, the Legislature finds that the majority of states follow Justice Cardozo's opinion in H.R. Moch Co. v. Rensselaer Water Co. 159 N.E. 896 (N.Y. 1928) and view street lights as a mere benefit, the deprivation of which does not result in liability, and

WHEREAS, the Legislature also finds that the dissenting opinion properly states the appropriate public policy rationale and proper legal analysis, and

WHEREAS, the Legislature hereby rejects the majority opinion in Clay Electric v. Johnson and adopts the dissenting opinion, and

WHEREAS, the Legislature declares that there shall be no duty on persons, corporations, municipalities, or other entities to maintain street lights or similar illumination for the benefit of third parties, NOW, THEREFORE,

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

Section 1. Section 768.1382, Florida Statutes, is created to read:

768.1382 Limitation on liability for persons or political subdivisions providing street lights, security lights, or other similar illumination; no duty owed to provide, operate, or maintain illumination.—Any person, as defined in s. 1.01, or political subdivision, as defined in s. 1.01, that provides,

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68 69

70

71

72

HB 1573 2004 operates, or maintains street lights, security lights, or other similar illumination shall not be held liable for any civil damages for injury or death affected or caused by the adequacy or failure of illumination of such lights, regardless of whether the adequacy or failure of illumination is alleged or demonstrated to have contributed in any manner to the injury or death. No person, corporation, municipality, political subdivision, or other entity that provides, operates, or maintains a manner of illumination described in this section owes a duty to the public to provide, operate, or maintain the illumination in any manner. Section 2. This act shall take effect upon becoming a law and shall apply to all cases pending or filed on or after the effective date of this act.