

60-4905. Same; premises owner liability. The following apply to all civil actions for silica or asbestos claims brought against a premises owner to recover damages or other relief for exposure to silica or asbestos on the premises owner's property: (a) No premises owner shall be liable for any injury to any individual resulting from silica or asbestos exposure unless such individual's alleged exposure occurred while the individual was at or near the premises owner's property.

(b) If exposure to silica or asbestos is alleged to have occurred before January 1, 1972, it is presumed that a premises owner knew that this state had adopted safe levels of exposure for silica or asbestos and that products containing silica or asbestos were used on its property only at levels below those safe levels of exposure. To rebut this presumption, the plaintiff must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the premises owner knew or should have known that the premises were unreasonably dangerous to invitees and the premises owner allowed that condition to persist.

(c) (1) A premises owner that hired a contractor to perform the type of work at the premises owner's property that the contractor was qualified to perform cannot be liable for any injury to any individual resulting from silica or asbestos exposure caused by any of the contractor's employees or agents on the premises owner's property unless the premises owner directed the activity that resulted in the injury or gave or denied permission for the critical acts that led to the individual's injury or knowingly allowed a dangerous condition caused by the contractor to persist.

(2) If exposure to silica or asbestos is alleged to have occurred after January 1, 1972, a premises owner shall not be liable for any injury to any individual resulting from that exposure caused by a contractor's employee or agent on the premises owner's property unless the plaintiff establishes the premises owner's violation of an established safety standard that was in effect at the time of the exposure and that the alleged violation was in the plaintiff's breathing zone and was the proximate cause of the plaintiff's medical condition.

History: L. 2006, ch. 196, § 5; July 1.