

### State of Misconsin 2011 - 2012 LEGISLATURE



#### **September 2011 Special Session**

## **SENATE BILL 22**

October 18, 2011 – Introduced by Committee on Senate Organization, by request of Governor Scott Walker, Senator Galloway, and Representative Kuglitsch. Referred to Committee on Judiciary, Utilities, Commerce, and Government Operations.

- 1 AN ACT *to create* 895.529 of the statutes; **relating to:** the duty of care owed to
- 2 trespassers.

#### Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

This bill sets forth limits on the civil liability of private property owners to trespassers. Under the bill, a private property owner, including a lawful tenant or other occupant of private property, owes no duty of care to a trespasser on his or her property and may not be found liable for an act or omission relating to a condition on his or her property that causes injury or death to a trespasser, except under certain circumstances. The bill defines a trespasser as anyone who enters onto private property without the express or implied consent of the property owner and sets forth criteria for determining whether the owner gave implied consent to enter onto the property.

Under the bill, a private property owner may be liable for injuries that he or she intentionally causes to a trespasser, unless the private property owner was acting reasonably in self-defense or in the defense of another.

Under the bill, a private property owner may, under certain circumstances, be liable for injuries to a trespasser who is a child. Liability may attach if the child was injured because of an artificial condition on the property that the owner knew or should have known was unreasonably dangerous and knew or should have known

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

a child was likely to trespass near and if other factors indicate that the owner acted unreasonably in failing to prevent harm to the child.

# The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1.	895.529	of	the	statutes	is	created	to	read:
------------	---------	----	-----	----------	----	---------	----	-------

# 2 **895.529** Civil liability limitation; duty of care owed to trespassers. (1) 3 In this section:

- (a) "Private property owner" means an owner, other than a governmental body or nonprofit organization, of property, and includes a lessee, tenant, or other lawful occupant.
- (b) "Property" means real property and buildings, structures, and improvements thereon.
- (c) "Trespasser" means a natural person who enters onto the property of another without the express or implied consent of the private property owner.
- **(2)** Except as provided in sub. (3), a private property owner owes no duty of care to a trespasser on his or her property and may not be found liable for an act or omission relating to a condition on his or her property that causes injury or death to a trespasser.
- (3) A private property owner may be liable for an act or omission relating to a condition on his or her property that causes injury or death to a trespasser under any of the following circumstances:
- (a) The private property owner intentionally caused the injury or death. This paragraph does not apply if the private property owner used reasonable and necessary force for the purpose of self-defense or the defense of others under s.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 939.48 or used reasonable and necessary force for the protection of property under
   s. 939.49.
  - (b) The person injured or killed was a child and all of the following apply:
  - 1. The injury or death was a result of an artificial condition on the property.
  - 2. The private property owner knew or should have known that the artificial condition presented an unreasonable risk of death or serious bodily harm to children.
  - 3. The private property owner knew or should have known that a child or children were likely to trespass at the location of the artificial condition.
  - 4. The child injured or killed did not discover the artificial condition or realize the risk involved with the artificial condition until after the child came within the area made dangerous by the artificial condition.
  - 5. The utility to the private property owner of maintaining the artificial condition and the burden of eliminating the danger were slight as compared to the risk to the injured or killed child.
  - 6. The private property owner failed to exercise reasonable care to eliminate the danger or otherwise protect the injured or killed child.
  - **(4)** In determining whether a person has implied consent to enter onto the property of a private property owner, a trier of fact shall consider all of the circumstances existing at the time the person entered onto the property, including all of the following:
  - (a) Whether the private property owner acquiesced to previous entries by the person or by other persons under similar circumstances.
    - (b) The customary use, if any, of the property by other persons.
  - (c) Whether the private property owner represented to the public that the land may be entered for particular purposes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

	(d)	The	general	arrangement	or	design	of	any	buildings,	structui	res, oi
ir	nprover	nents	on the p	roperty.							
	(5)	This s	section do	oes not create o	r ir	icrease a	any	liabi	lity on the	part of a p	orivate

property owner for circumstances not specified under this section and does not affect any immunity from or defenses to liability available to a private property owner under common law or another statute.

#### **SECTION 2. Initial applicability.**

(1) This act first applies to actions that are filed on the effective date of this subsection.

10 (END)