



7.13.04

# Plaintiff Trespasser Could Not Recover Under the Michigan Dog Bite Statute

By James A. Swaim

In Lieding v. Blackledge, the Michigan Court of Appeals affirmed summary disposition of Plaintiff's statutory, common law, and attractive nuisance claims arising out of a dog bite incident.

Plaintiff was a seven-year-old child who was playing on Defendants' property. She had never been on the property before and had never seen Defendants' dog. The dog broke away from a leash and bit Plaintiff on the back. Plaintiff's lawsuit alleged liability under the Michigan dog bite statute (MCL 287.351), common law, and attractive nuisance. The trial court granted summary disposition in favor of the Defendants on all counts.

The Michigan dog bite statute creates almost strict liability for dog owners. Provocation is an available defense and a Plaintiff must have been on public property or lawfully on private property in order to recover. In this case, the Plaintiff admittedly did not have express permission to enter the property. Additionally, since she had never been there before and had never seen the dog, there was no evidence to support she had implied permission to be on Defendants' property.

# **SECREST WARDLE NOTES:**

A person must be on public property or lawfully on private property in order to seek recovery under the Michigan dog bite statute. A trespasser is not entitled to recovery under the statute.

## CONTINUED...

A common-law action requires proof that the owner or keeper of the animal knew or should have known of its vicious nature. The undisputed evidence supported the dog had never behaved in an aggressive manner before and had never bitten or attacked any other individual.

Plaintiff's attractive nuisance claim was dismissed because there was no evidence Defendants knew or should have known a child would be likely to trespass or that the dog would present an unreasonable risk of death or serious bodily harm.

# CONTACT US

## Farmington Hills

30903 Northwestern Highway, P.O. Box 3040 Farmington Hills, MI 48333-3040 Tel: 248-851-9500 Fax: 248-851-2158

#### Mt. Clemens

94 Macomb Place, Mt. Clemens, MI 48043-5651 Tel: 586-465-7180 Fax: 586-465-0673

#### Lansing

6639 Centurion Drive, Ste. 130, Lansing, MI 48917 Tel: 517-886-1224 Fax: 517-886-9284

#### Grand Rapids

1550 East Beltline, S.E., Ste. 305, Grand Rapids, MI 49506-4361 Tel: 616-285-0143 Fax: 616-285-0145

#### Champaign, IL

2919 Crossing Court, Ste. 11, Champaign, IL 61822-6183 Tel: 217-378-8002 Fax: 217-378-8003

#### www.secrestwardle.com



Copyright 2004 Secrest, Wardle, Lynch, Hampton, Truex and Morley, P.C.

This newsletter is published for the purpose of providing information and does not constitute legal advice and should not be considered as such. This newsletter or any portion of this newsletter is not to be distributed or copied without the express written consent of Secrest Wardle.

# CONTRIBUTORS

Premises Liability Practice Group Leader Mark F. Masters

#### Editor

Carina Carlesimo

We welcome your questions and comments.

## OTHER MATERIALS

If you would like to be on the distribution list for Boundaries, or for newsletters pertaining to any of our other practice groups, please contact Secrest Wardle Marketing at ccarlesimo@secrestwardle.com, or 248-539-2850.

#### Other newsletters include:

Blueprints – Mapping legal solutions for the construction industry
Industry Line – Managing the hazards of environmental toxic and tort litigation
No-Fault Newsline – A road map for motor vehicle insurers and owners
On the Job – Tracking developments in employment law
On the Beat – Responding to litigation affecting law enforcement
Landowners' Alert – Defense strategies for property owners and managers
Community Watch – Breaking developments in governmental litigation
State of the Art – Exploring the changing face of product liability