

Department of Legislative Services
Maryland General Assembly
2007 Session

FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE

House Bill 110 (Delegate Simmons, *et al.*)
Judiciary

Maryland Comparative Negligence Act

This bill provides that in a negligence lawsuit, the fact that the plaintiff may have been contributorily negligent may not bar recovery by the plaintiff if the negligence of the plaintiff was less than the negligence of the defendant or the combined negligence of all defendants. Any damages awarded to the plaintiff must be diminished in proportion to the amount of negligence attributed to the plaintiff.

The bill does not apply to actions in strict tort liability (typically, product liability cases). The bill may not be applied to any cause of action arising before the bill's October 1, 2007 effective date.

Fiscal Summary

State Effect: Potentially significant increase in tort claim payments and agency premiums. Potential increase in expenditures and revenues for the District Court.

Local Effect: Potentially significant increase in tort claim payments and liability insurance premiums. Potential increase in expenditures and revenues for the circuit courts.

Small Business Effect: Meaningful.

Analysis

Current Law: Contributory negligence on the part of a plaintiff bars recovery by the plaintiff. *See Board of County Commissioner of Garrett County v Bell Atlantic*, 695 A.2d 171 (Md. 1997).

Background: Maryland is one of five jurisdictions, along with Virginia, Alabama, North Carolina, and the District of Columbia, that retains a contributory negligence standard. The majority of states have adopted some form comparative negligence since the 1960s. This bill creates a “50 percent bar” standard, previously adopted by statute in 10 states, and by precedent in 2 states. The General Assembly has considered a switch to this standard in past sessions, most recently in 2002.

Among the 46 states with some form of comparative negligence, nine states do not apply this standard to strict product liability cases, while three apply a modified version.

For more information on contributory and comparative negligence, consult *Negligence Systems: Contributory Negligence, Comparative Fault, and Joint and Several Liability*, published by the Department of Legislative Service in 2004.

State Fiscal Effect: Because the bill would allow suits by plaintiffs who are partially at fault for their damages, it is expected that the number of tort case filings and recoveries by plaintiffs would increase. Consequently, State tort claim payments and expenditures for liability insurance premiums would increase. The State is self-insured for claims made pursuant to the Maryland Tort Claims Act. The Treasurer charges premiums to the various agencies for their shares of the coverage. These premiums are paid with either general funds, federal funds, or special funds depending on the agency. For fiscal 2007, State tort losses are estimated at \$4.0 million, and agency premiums are estimated at \$4.5 million. The Maryland Tort Claims Act generally limits recovery to \$200,000 to a single claimant for injuries arising from a single occurrence.

An increase in the number of case filings would increase the workload of the circuit courts and the District Court. Court-related expenditures would increase if case filings go up significantly. The State pays all expenses of the District Court, as well as the compensation for the judges and clerks’ office employees of the circuit courts. District Court fee revenue, which goes to the State general fund, would also increase to the extent that case filings increase. The filing fee for a civil case in District Court is currently either \$10 or \$20, depending on the size of the case, plus a \$10 surcharge to the Maryland Legal Services Corporation. Various other fees are also payable during the course of litigation, depending on the nature of the filings in a particular case.

The impact of the bill on the judiciary cannot be reliably estimated. The Maryland Chamber of Commerce estimates that the court system could see 1,000 new tort cases per year as a result of a shift to comparative negligence, but the net cost of these new cases, as well as the distribution of this cost between the circuit courts and District Courts is unknown.

Local Fiscal Effect: Tort claim payments by local governments and expenditures by local governments for liability insurance premiums would increase. The Local Government Tort Claims Act limits recovery to \$200,000 per individual claim, and \$500,000 total for multiple claims arising out of the same occurrence. Local governments generally carry liability insurance that covers claims up to these limits.

Expenditures associated with the circuit courts would increase to the extent that case filings increase. The counties and Baltimore City pay most operating and capital expenses of the circuit courts. Circuit court filing fee revenue, which is retained by the local governments, would also increase. The basic filing fee for a civil case in circuit court is \$80, plus a \$25 surcharge for the Maryland Legal Services Corporation. Various other fees are also payable during the course of litigation, depending on the nature of the filings in a particular case.

The impact of the bill on local government finances cannot be reliably estimated.

Small Business Effect: Small businesses could be adversely affected by this bill because it increases the liability exposure of defendants. Liability insurance premiums for small businesses would increase, and small business defendants could be required to pay more damages awards out of corporate funds in the absence of applicable insurance coverage. Conversely, as a plaintiff, a small business could benefit from the bill in that recovery would not be barred in cases in which the business is up to 50% at fault. The adverse effect of the bill would probably outweigh the positive effect for small businesses, however, because plaintiffs in tort actions are usually individuals.

Small law firms would benefit in that the bill would increase the number of viable lawsuits from which attorney's fees could be obtained.

Additional Information

Prior Introductions: SB 872 of 2002, a similar bill, was introduced but no further action was taken. SB 483 of 2001, a similar bill, received an unfavorable report in the Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee.

Cross File: SB 267 (Senator Lenett) – Judicial Proceedings.

Information Source(s): Judiciary (Administrative Office of the Courts), State Treasurer's Office, Maryland Chamber of Commerce, National Conference of State Legislatures, Department of Legislative Services

Fiscal Note History: First Reader - February 5, 2007
nas/jr

Analysis by: Nicholas M. Goedert

Direct Inquiries to:
(410) 946-5510
(301) 970-5510