

QUARTERLY

THE OHIO ASSOCIATION FOR JUSTICE

OAJ members touch on key issues, recent decisions, and legislative changes affecting different areas of practice.

Pending in the Supreme Court

Carter v. Reese, Supreme Court Case No. 2015-0108 (Ct. App. Butler Cty., 2014-Ohio-5395)

Wallace v. Golden Comb, Supreme Court Case No. 2014-0064 (Ct. App. Cuyahoga Cty., 2013-Ohio-5320)

Antoon v. Cleveland Clinic Foundation, Supreme Court Case No. 2015-0468 (Ct. App. Cuyahoga Cty., 2015-Ohio-421)

Ohio Bur. of Workers' Comp. v. McKinley, Supreme Court Case No. 2014-0795 (Ct. App. Columbiana Cty., 2014-Ohio-1397)

Link v. Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co., Supreme Court Case No. 2015-0132 (Ct. App. Cuyahoga Cty., 2014-Ohio-5432)

State, ex rel. Ohio Presbyterian Retirement Services, Inc. v. Industrial Commission and Sherry Redwine, Supreme Court Case No. 2015-1074 (Ct. App. Franklin Cty., 2015-Ohio-2122)

2015 Winter Convention December 3-4



Cleveland

What's Inside

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Announcements | Family Law |
| Products Liability | Insurance Law |
| Workers' Compensation | Consumer Law |
| Medical Negligence | Trucking Safety |
| Federal Courts | Mass Torts |
| Business Torts | Ab Initio |
| | Employment Law |

www.OAJjustice.org



Ohio Association for JUSTICE

Quarterly
October 2015

Editor: Michael S. Miller
Chief Operating Officer: Jason Porter
Executive Director: John Van Doorn
Director of Education & Media: Ali Caulkins
Membership Coordinator: Erin Dawley

Executive Board:
President: Frank Gallucci
President-Elect: Paul Grieco
Vice President: Rich Brian
Treasurer: Sean Harris
Secretary: Ellen McCarthy

Our Office:

Ohio Association for Justice
655 Metro Place South
Metro V, Suite 140
Dublin, Ohio 43017
Phone: (614) 341-6800
Fax: (614) 341-6810

If you are interested in writing an article for
The Quarterly, please contact:

Michael S. Miller, Esq.
Volkema Thomas Miller & Scott, LPA
300 E. Broad St., Suite 190
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 221-4400
MMiller@vt-law.com

or Contact Ali Caulkins at AlisonC@OAJus-
tice.org

If you are interested in advertising in The
Quarterly please contact Ali Caulkins at
AlisonC@OAJjustice.org

Visit OAJ online at
www.OAJjustice.org



ADVOCATES CIRCLE

The Foremost Class of Membership for Law Firms

- | | |
|---|--|
| Arthur O'Neil Mertz Michel &
Brown Co., LPA
Defiance, OH | Lowe Eklund Wakefield
Cleveland, OH |
| Barkan, Meizlish, Handelman, Goodin,
DeRose, Wentz LLP
Columbus, OH | Meyer Wilson Co., LPA
Columbus, OH |
| Bordas & Bordas
Wheeling, WV | Murray & Murray Co., LPA
Sandusky, OH |
| Caravona & Berg, LLC
Cleveland, OH | Nager Romaine & Schneiberg Co., LPA
Cleveland, OH |
| Cecil & Geiser, LLP
Columbus, OH | Nurenberg, Paris, Heller &
McCarthy Co., LPA
Cleveland, OH |
| Daniel Goetz, Esq.
Cleveland, OH | O'Connor Acciani & Levy, LPA
Cincinnati, OH |
| E.J. Leizerman & Associates, LLC
Toledo, OH | Oliver Law Offices
Columbus, OH |
| Elk & Elk Co., LPA
Mayfield Heights, OH | Plevin & Gallucci Co., LPA
Cleveland, OH |
| Kisling, Nestico & Redick
Akron, OH | Rourke & Blumenthal
Columbus, OH |
| Kitrick, Lewis, & Harris Co., LPA
Columbus, OH | Spangenberg, Shibley & Liber
Cleveland, Ohio |
| Landskroner, Grieco, & Merriman LLC
Cleveland, OH | The Gervelis Law Firm
Canfield, OH |

Thank you to our Friends of OAJ

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Diamond Sponsors | | |
| NFP Structured Settlements | Preferred Capital Funding | FindLaw |
| Platinum Sponsors | | |
| Ringler Associates | Gold Sponsors | Silver Sponsors |
| Leading Technologies | Beacon Rehabilitation
Services, Inc. | Superior Settlements |
| Injured Workers Pharmacy | Key Evidence | SBA Loan Group, LLC |
| Garretson Resolution
Group | Aroluxe Marketing | MedMal Consulting |
| | Robson Forensic, Inc. | Gateway Record Solutions |
| | Authentic3D | Quality Rehab &
Consulting Services |



PROTECTING OHIOANS: AN IMMEDIATE CALL TO AMEND OHIO'S LONG-ARM STATUTE

Edmond J. Mack, Esq., Canton, OH

A Canadian company advertises its cabins to hunting and fishing enthusiasts throughout Ohio. An Ohio family is successfully lured. They travel deep into the Canadian wilderness to enjoy a remote family vacation. A defective propane refrigerator in the cabin emits carbon monoxide. The family is killed in their sleep. Under Ohio's Long-Arm jurisdiction statute,² particularly under the current interpretation of the Sixth Circuit,³ the Canadian company cannot be held responsible in Ohio courts.⁴

It does not have to be this way. The conclusion would likely be different under the long-arm statutes of many other states. This lack of legal recourse applies to Ohio corporations and individuals alike. For the benefit of all Ohioans, both families and companies, Ohio's Long-Arm Statute must be amended. This need is even more pressing in light of recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

A court's personal jurisdiction over a non-resident defendant is limited by due process and permissible only if the forum state has either specific or general jurisdiction over the non-resident.⁵ However, as University of Akron School of Law Professor Bernadette Bollas Genetin recently explained, "the Supreme Court's two most recent opinions on personal jurisdiction usher in a new era in the law of general and specific personal jurisdiction."⁶

As to general jurisdiction, a defendant who maintains "continuous and systematic" contacts with a forum state may be subject to its jurisdiction, even where the conduct complained of did not arise from the continuous and systematic contacts.⁷ However, last term in *Daimler AG v. Bauman*,⁸ the Supreme Court significantly narrowed the scope of general jurisdiction, making it available primarily in an individual's domicile and a corporation's state of incorporation and principal place of business.⁹ Outside of those parameters, general jurisdiction will now be found "only on rare occasions."¹⁰

Holding a non-Ohioan accountable, in large measure, must now depend upon a finding of specific personal jurisdiction. A court's exercise of such jurisdiction comports with due process if the non-resident has "certain minimum contacts" so that the maintenance of the suit does not offend "traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice."¹¹ An important limitation, as the Supreme Court made clear last term in *Walden v. Fiore*, is that

"the defendant's suit-related conduct must create a substantial connection with the forum State."¹² In turn, the cause of action must "relate to" this conduct, though, as noted by Professor Cassandra Burke Robertson of the Case Western Reserve School of Law, the contours of this requirement are still developing.¹³

It is not that simple in Ohio. "Unlike other jurisdictions, Ohio does not have a long-arm statute that reaches to the limits of the Due Process Clause, and the analysis of Ohio's Long-Arm Statute is a particularized inquiry wholly separate from the analysis of Federal Due Process law."¹⁴ Based upon the language of Ohio's Long-Arm statute, the Sixth Circuit in *Brunner v. Hampson* expressly held that this analysis requires that a plaintiff's injuries be "proximately caused" by the defendant's Ohio-related conduct in order to subject the defendant to the jurisdiction of Ohio courts.¹⁵ In the Canadian cabin case above, the family's carbon monoxide asphyxiation was not "proximately caused" by the Ohio advertisements that lured them there. Ohio's courthouse doors were therefore closed. This is true regardless of whether the advertisements were "related to" the family's death, which is all that Due Process requires.

The long-arm statute of every other state in the Sixth Circuit extends to the limits of the Due Process Clause.¹⁶ The inevitable result of the Canadian cabin case may have been much different had the long-arm statute of any one of those states applied.¹⁷ There is no reason for Ohio to be the outlier that it is.

The current state of the law hurts Ohioans and benefits non-Ohioans. The legislative solution to this problem is astoundingly simple.¹⁸ In light of the near elimination of general personal jurisdiction by *Daimler AG v. Bauman*, the need for action by the General Assembly is immediate. This amendment to Ohio's Long-Arm Statute is constituency neutral, as Ohio families and corporations will equally benefit. Ohio's courthouse doors will be open to all Ohioans as far as the Due Process Clause will allow. Outsiders that cause harm to our Ohio families and companies can be held accountable in our Ohio courts. This is absolutely necessary. Action is needed.

Section Articles Continued

...Consumer Law Article continued from Page 13

Endnotes

1. Edmond J. Mack is an attorney at Tzangas Plakas Mannos Ltd. in Canton, Ohio. He focuses his practice on the prosecution and defense of complex litigation in Ohio federal and state courts. Biography: <http://www.lawlion.com/public/attorneys/mack.cfm>
2. R.C. §2307.382.
3. *Brunner v. Hampson*, 441 F.3d 457, 464, 466-67 (6th Cir.2006).
4. This factual scenario is loosely based upon the allegations in *Common v. Green Wilderness Lodge, et al.*, N.D. Ohio No. 5:07CV184. It was settled prior to the court's ruling on the defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction.
5. *Helicopteros Nacionales de Colombia, S.A. v. Hall*, 466 U.S. 408, 414-415 (1984).
6. Bernadette Bollas Genetin, *The Supreme Court's New Approach to Personal Jurisdiction*, 68 SMU L. Rev. 107 (2015).
7. *Helicopteros*, 466 U.S. at 415.
8. 134 S. Ct. 746 (2014).
9. Genetin, 68 SMU L. Rev. at 107.
10. Tanya J. Monestier, *Where Is Home Depot "At Home"?: Daimler v. Bauman and the End of Doing Business Jurisdiction*, 66 Hastings L.J. 233, 236 (2014).
11. *Internatl. Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310, 316 (1945).
12. 134 S. Ct. 1115, 1121 (2014).
13. Charles W. Rhodes and Cassandra Burke Robertson, *Toward a New Equilibrium in Personal Jurisdiction*, 48 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 207, 230 (2014).
14. *Conn v. Zakharov*, 667 F.3d 705, 712 (6th Cir. 2012). See also *Brunner v. Hampson*, 441 F.3d 457, 465 (6th Cir.2006), citing *Goldstein v. Christiansen*, 70 Ohio St.3d 232, 1994-Ohio-229, 638 N.E.2d 541, n. 1.
15. 441 F.3d at 465.
16. *Conn*, 667 F.3d at 712, citing *Dean v. Motel 6 Operating L.P.*, 134 F.3d 1269, 1273 (6th Cir.1998) (noting that because Kentucky's long-arm statute reaches to the limit of the Constitution the only issue is whether jurisdiction "is within the requirements of due process") and *Intera Corp. v. Henderson*, 428 F.3d 605, 616 (6th Cir.2005) (affirming that Tennessee's long-arm statute is "coterminous" with Due Process); *Chrysler Corp. v. Fedders Corp.*, 643 F.2d 1229, 1236 (6th Cir.1981) ("The Michigan statute confers on the state courts the maximum scope of personal jurisdiction permitted by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment").
17. *Cf. Ford v. RDI/Caesars Riverboat Casino, LLC*, 503 F. Supp. 2d 839, 844 (W.D. Ky. 2007); *Nisby v. Barden Mississippi Gaming LLC*, W.D. Tenn. No. 06-2799 MA, 2007 WL 6892326, *5 (Sept. 24, 2007).
18. Replace R.C. §2307.382(C) with: "In addition to the provisions of subsection (A), a court of this state may exercise personal jurisdiction over a nonresident on any basis consistent with the constitution of this state and of the Constitution of the United States." See, e.g., 735 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/2-209 (Illinois); La. Rev. Stat. Ann. 13:3201 (Louisiana).

...Trucking Safety Article continued from Page 15

HOW DOES OAC 4901-5-12 APPLY TO FOR-HIRE AND PRIVATE MOTOR CARRIERS?

ORC 4921.01 (B) defines "For-hire motor carrier" as a person engaged in the business of transporting persons or property by motor vehicle for compensation. This section goes on to exclude certain types of transporters such as taxis, school buses, ambulances, farm equipment, mulch haulers and others. Nowhere does this statute exempt for-hire transportation of waste from PUCO regulation or the FMCSR.

Division (D) of ORC 4923.01 defines "Private motor carrier" as a person who is not a for-hire motor carrier but is engaged in the business of transporting persons or property by motor vehicle. ORC 4923.02 provides exemptions for private motor carriers which are similar to those pertaining to for-hire motor carriers. Nowhere does ORC 4923.02 exempt the private transportation of waste from PUCO regulation or the FMCSR.

For-hire motor carriers hauling exclusively waste by virtue of OAC 4901-5-12 are not required to obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity as required by ORC 4921.03 and therefore are not required to:

- File a complete and accurate application that includes a certification that (a) the person understands and is in compliance with the applicable service, operation, and safety laws of this state and (b) the person meets the (insurance) requirements of ORC 4921.09
- Display a PUCO number
- Pay applicable registration fees and taxes under sections 4921.11 and 4921.19 of the ORC

The PUCO has authority to regulate the safe transportation of waste even though waste transportation is not subject to all of the

regulations established by the Commission. Since the PUCO adopted certain FMCSR as embodied in the CFR, those regulations are enforced by the PUCO. Motor carriers, whether for-hire or private, transporting waste must therefore abide by these safety regulations and as contemplated in OAC 4901-5-12 (D). OAC Chapter 4901:2-5 Safety Standards provides definitions and a detailed listing of these safety regulations. Drivers transporting waste are also not exempt from the obligation requiring the appropriate Commercial Driver License pursuant to 49 CFR 383 and ORC 4506.

EVIDENCE OF REGULATION

The PUCO web site provides the ability to search company names. A search of for-hire motor carriers who are in the business of transporting waste shows Driver/Vehicle Examination Reports. These reports list violations of the FMCSR as applied to both the driver and the vehicle as the vehicles are subject to inspection. Citations are issued citing the CFR number specific to the violation. Fines can be levied upon both drivers and motor carriers. The PUCO then sends letters notifying the trucking company and driver of the violations and any fines assessed to them. These letters are subject to discovery and may also be obtained through a request to the PUCO.

CONCLUSION

While transporters of waste by for-hire motor carriers are not subject to the general regulation of the Public Utilities Commission, they are regulated to provide for the safety of the motoring public. There are no exemptions for private motor carriers hauling waste and they too are required to follow the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations adopted by the Commission and as provided for in OAC Chapter 4901:2-5.