## 1 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES - FLOOR VERSION STATE OF OKLAHOMA 2 3 2nd Session of the 56th Legislature (2018) 4 ENGROSSED SENATE BILL NO. 1136 By: Daniels of the Senate 5 and 6 Downing of the House 7 8 9 [ product liability - joint tortfeasor liability affirmative defense - codification - effective date | 10 11 12 BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA: 13 SECTION 1. AMENDATORY 23 O.S. 2011, Section 15, is amended to read as follows: 14 Section 15. A. In any civil action based on fault and not 15 16 arising out of contract, or any product liability action as defined in Section 2 of this act, the liability for damages caused by two or 17 more persons, corporations or legal entities shall be several only 18 and a joint tortfeasor shall be liable only for the amount of 19 20 damages allocated to that tortfeasor. This section shall not apply to actions brought by or on 21 behalf of the state. 22 C. The provisions of this section shall apply to all civil 23 actions based on fault and not arising out of contract that accrue 24

- 1 on or after November 1, 2011. The provisions of this section shall
- 2 apply to all product liability actions that accrue on or after
- 3 | November 1, 2018.
- 4 | SECTION 2. NEW LAW A new section of law to be codified
- 5 | in the Oklahoma Statutes as Section 57.05 of Title 76, unless there
- 6 | is created a duplication in numbering, reads as follows:
- 7 A. As used in this section:
- 8 1. "Claimant" means a party seeking relief, including a
- 9 plaintiff, counterclaimant, or cross-claimant. Where the action
- 10 seeks to recover for damages to or for a deceased person, the term
- 11 "claimant" shall include the decedent as well as the party or
- 12 parties bringing the action seeking relief;
- 2. "Manufacturer" means a person, corporation or other legal
- 14 | entity that is a designer, formulator, constructor, rebuilder,
- 15 | fabricator, producer, compounder, processor, or assembler of any
- 16 product or any component part thereof and who places the product or
- 17 any component part thereof in the stream of commerce;
- 18 3. "Product liability action" means any civil action for
- 19 recovery of damages brought against a manufacturer or seller of a
- 20 product, regardless of the substantive legal theory or theories upon
- 21 | which the action is brought, for or on account of personal injury,
- 22 death, or property damage allegedly caused by or resulting from the
- 23 manufacture, construction, design, formula, installation, assembly,
- 24 | testing, packaging, labeling, or sale of any product, or the failure

to warn or protect against a danger or hazard in the use, misuse, or unintended use of any product, or the failure to provide proper instructions for the use of any product;

- 4. "Safer alternative design" means a product design other than the one actually used that:
  - a. in reasonable probability would have prevented or significantly reduced the risk of the personal injury, property damage, or death without substantially impairing the product's utility, and
  - b. was economically and technologically feasible at the time the product left the control of the manufacturer or seller by the application of existing or reasonably achievable scientific knowledge; and
- 5. "Seller" means a person, corporation or other legal entity that is engaged in the business of distributing or otherwise placing, for any commercial purpose, in the stream of commerce for use or consumption a product or any component part thereof.
- B. In any product liability action, the liability or fault of any person, corporation, or other legal entity that was a proximate or direct cause of the claimant's damages shall be an affirmative defense that shall diminish the amount of the claimant's recovery in proportion to each such entity's assessed liability or fault.

23

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

- C. No product liability action shall be commenced or maintained against a seller for harm caused to the claimant by the product unless the claimant proves by a preponderance of evidence that:
- 1. The seller actually exercised substantial control over some aspect of the manufacture, construction, design, formula, installation, assembly, testing, packaging, labeling, warnings and instructions of the product that was a proximate cause of the damages for which recovery is sought;
- 2. The seller altered, modified or installed the product after it left the manufacturer's possession, and the alteration, modification or installation was not authorized or requested by the manufacturer, was not performed in compliance with the directions or specifications of the manufacturer, and was a direct cause of the damages for which the claimant seeks recovery;
- 3. The seller failed to exercise reasonable care with regard to the assembly, maintenance, service, or repair of the product at issue, or in conveying to the claimant the manufacturer's labels, warnings, or instructions, and such failure was a proximate cause of the damages for which the claimant seeks recovery;
- 4. The seller made an express factual representation regarding the product independent of any express warranty made by a manufacturer regarding the product, such product failed to conform to the seller's independent express warranty, the claimant relied on the express factual representation, and the failure of the product

- to conform to the seller's independent express warranty was a proximate cause of the damages for which claimant seeks recovery;
- 5. The manufacturer cannot be identified, despite a good faith exercise of due diligence to identify the manufacturer of the product;
- 6. Personal jurisdiction over the manufacturer cannot be obtained in this state; or
- 7. The seller had actual knowledge that the product contained a defect at the time the seller placed the product into the stream of commerce, and that known defect was a proximate cause of the damages for which the claimant seeks recovery.
- D. In any product liability action, it shall be an affirmative defense barring recovery if the manufacturer or seller proves by a preponderance of the evidence that the proximate cause of the claimant's damages was a use or consumption of the product that was for a purpose, in a manner, or in an activity other than that which was reasonably foreseeable or was contrary to any express instructions or warnings appearing on, accompanying, or attached to the product or on its original container or wrapping, if the intended consumer knew or with the exercise of reasonable and diligent care should have known of such instructions or warnings.
- E. In a products liability action in which a claimant alleges a design defect, the burden is on the claimant to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that there was a safer alternative

1	design and that the design defect alleged by the claimant was a
2	proximate cause of the claimant's damages. This subsection shall
3	not be construed to restrict the courts of this state in developing
4	the common law with respect to any product which is not subject to
5	the provisions of this section.
6	F. Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude or
7	eliminate any common law affirmative defense to product liability
8	actions recognized by the courts of this state.
9	SECTION 3. This act shall become effective November 1, 2018.
10	
11	COMMITTEE REPORT BY: COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, dated 04/11/2018 - DO PASS, As Amended.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	