As Reported by the Senate Civil Justice Committee

125th General Assembly Regular Session 2003-2004

Am. Sub. H. B. No. 342

Representatives Widener, Daniels, Flowers, Schaffer, Schmidt, Setzer,
G. Smith, Widowfield
Senators Hottinger, Stivers, Amstutz

ABILL

Го	amend section 2505.02 and to enact sections	1
	2307.84 to 2307.90, 2307.901, and 2307.902 of the	2
	Revised Code to establish minimum medical	3
	requirements for filing certain silicosis claims	4
	or mixed dust disease claims, to establish	5
	premises liability in relation to those claims, to	6
	specify a plaintiff's burden of proof in tort	7
	actions involving exposure to silica or mixed	8
	dust, and to prescribe the requirements for	9
	shareholder liability for silicosis claims or	10
	mixed dust disease claims under the doctrine of	11
	piercing the corporate veil.	12

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF OHIO:

Section 1. That section 2505.02 be amended and sections	13
2307.84, 2307.85, 2307.86, 2307.87, 2307.88, 2307.89, 2307.90,	14
2307.901, and 2307.902 of the Revised Code be enacted to read as	15
follows:	16
Sec. 2307.84. As used in sections 2307.84 to 2307.90 and	17
2307.901 of the Revised Code:	18

(A) "AMA guides to the evaluation of permanent impairment"	19
means the American medical association's guides to the evaluation	20
of permanent impairment (fifth edition 2000) as may be modified by	21
the American medical association.	22
(B) "Board-certified internist" means a medical doctor who is	23
currently certified by the American board of internal medicine.	24
(C) "Board-certified occupational medicine specialist" means	25
a medical doctor who is currently certified by the American board	26
of preventive medicine in the specialty of occupational medicine.	27
(D) "Board-certified oncologist" means a medical doctor who	28
is currently certified by the American board of internal medicine	29
in the subspecialty of medical oncology.	30
(E) "Board-certified pathologist" means a medical doctor who	31
is currently certified by the American board of pathology.	32
(F) "Board-certified pulmonary specialist" means a medical	33
doctor who is currently certified by the American board of	34
internal medicine in the subspecialty of pulmonary medicine.	35
(G) "Certified B-reader" means an individual qualified as a	36
"final" or "B-reader" as defined in 42 C.F.R. section 37.51(b), as	37
amended.	38
(H) "Civil action" means all suits or claims of a civil	39
nature in a state or federal court, whether cognizable as cases at	40
law or in equity or admiralty. "Civil action" does not include any	41
of the following:	42
(1) A civil action relating to any workers' compensation law;	43
(2) A civil action alleging any claim or demand made against	44
a trust established pursuant to 11 U.S.C. section 524(g);	45
(3) A civil action alleging any claim or demand made against	46
a trust established pursuant to a plan of reorganization confirmed	47
under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.	48

Page 3

and one or more other fibrogenic dusts capable of inducing

(N) "Mixed dust disease claim" means any claim for damages,

losses, indemnification, contribution, or other relief arising out

of, based on, or in any way related to inhalation of, exposure to,

or contact with mixed dust. "Mixed dust disease claim" includes a

claim made by or on behalf of any person who has been exposed to

pulmonary fibrosis if inhaled in sufficient quantity.

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

there is no other more likely explanation for the presence of the

fibrosis.

138

139

Page 7

Am. Sub. H. B. No. 342 As Reported by the Senate Civil Justice Committee	Page 8
industry and an occupation in which, for a substantial portion of	200
a normal work year for that occupation, the exposed person did any	201
of the following:	202
(1) Handled silica;	203
(2) Fabricated silica-containing products so that the person	204
was exposed to silica in the fabrication process;	205
(3) Altered, repaired, or otherwise worked with a	206
silica-containing product in a manner that exposed the person on a	207
regular basis to silica;	208
(4) Worked in close proximity to other workers engaged in any	209
of the activities described in division (CC)(1), (2), or (3) of	210
this section in a manner that exposed the person on a regular	211
basis to silica.	212
(DD) "Substantial occupational exposure to mixed dust" means	213
employment for a cumulative period of at least five years in an	214
industry and an occupation in which, for a substantial portion of	215
a normal work year for that occupation, the exposed person did any	216
of the following:	217
(1) Handled mixed dust;	218
(2) Fabricated mixed dust-containing products so that the	219
person was exposed to mixed dust in the fabrication process;	220
(3) Altered, repaired, or otherwise worked with a mixed	221
dust-containing product in a manner that exposed the person on a	222
regular basis to mixed dust;	223
(4) Worked in close proximity to other workers engaged in any	224
of the activities described in division (DD)(1), (2), or (3) of	225
this section in a manner that exposed the person on a regular	226
basis to mixed dust.	227
(EE) "Tort action" means a civil action for damages for	228
injury, death, or loss to person. "Tort action" includes a product	229

(b) Whether each principal place of employment involved	260
exposures to airborne contaminants, including, but not limited to,	261
silica or other disease causing dusts, that can cause pulmonary	262
impairment and, if that type of exposure is involved, the general	263
nature, duration, and general level of exposure.	264
(2) Evidence verifying that a competent medical authority has	265
taken a detailed medical and smoking history of the exposed	266
person, including a thorough review of the exposed person's past	267
and present medical problems and the most probable causes of those	268
medical problems;	269
(3) A diagnosis by a competent medical authority, based on a	270
medical examination and pulmonary function testing of the exposed	271
person, that both of the following apply to the exposed person:	272
(a) The exposed person has a permanent respiratory impairment	273
rating of at least class 2 as defined by and evaluated pursuant to	274
the AMA guides to the evaluation of permanent impairment.	275
(b) The exposed person has silicosis based at a minimum on	276
radiological or pathological evidence of silicosis.	277
(C) No person shall bring or maintain a tort action alleging	278
that silica caused that person to contract lung cancer if the	279
exposed person is or was also a smoker, in the absence of a	280
prima-facie showing, in the manner described in division (A) of	281
section 2307.87 of the Revised Code, that the exposed person has a	282
physical impairment, that the physical impairment is a result of a	283
medical condition, and that the person's exposure to silica is a	284
substantial contributing factor to the medical condition. That	285
prima-facie showing shall include all of the following minimum	286
requirements:	287
(1) A diagnosis by a competent medical authority that the	288
exposed person has primary lung cancer and that exposure to silica	289
is a substantial contributing factor to that cancer;	290

(2) Evidence that is sufficient to demonstrate that at least	291
ten years have elapsed from the date of the exposed person's first	292
exposure to silica until the date of diagnosis of the exposed	293
person's primary lung cancer. The ten-year latency period	294
described in this division is a rebuttable presumption and the	295
plaintiff has the burden of proof to rebut the presumption.	296
(3) Both of the following:	297
(a) Radiological or pathological evidence of silicosis;	298
(b) Evidence of the exposed person's substantial occupational	299
exposure to silica.	300
(D)(1) No person shall bring or maintain a tort action	301
alleging a silicosis claim based on wrongful death, as described	302
in section 2125.01 of the Revised Code, of an exposed person, in	303
the absence of a prima-facie showing, in the manner described in	304
division (A) of section 2307.87 of the Revised Code, that the	305
death of the exposed person was the result of a physical	306
impairment, that the death and physical impairment were the result	307
of a medical condition, and that the person's exposure to silica	308
was a substantial contributing factor to the medical condition.	309
That prima-facie showing shall include all of the following	310
minimum requirements:	311
(a) A diagnosis by a competent medical authority that	312
exposure to silica was a substantial contributing factor to the	313
death of the exposed person;	314
(b) Evidence that is sufficient to demonstrate that at least	315
ten years have elapsed from the date of the exposed person's first	316
exposure to silica until the date of diagnosis under division	317
(D)(1)(a) of this section or death of the exposed person. The	318
ten-year latency period described in this division is a rebuttable	319
presumption, and the plaintiff has the burden of proof to rebut	320
the presumption.	321

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

division (D)(1)(c) of this section and that the exposed person

lived with the other person for the period of time specified in

person is considered as having satisfied the requirements

section, including pulmonary function testing and diffusing

studies, shall comply with the technical recommendations for

examinations, testing procedures, quality assurance, quality

control, and equipment incorporated in the AMA quides to the

specified in division (D)(1)(c) of this section.

division (CC) of section 2307.84 of the Revised Code, the exposed

(E) Evidence relating to physical impairment under this

evaluation of permanent impairment and reported as set forth in 20

C.F.R. Pt. 404, Subpt. P, App. 1, Part A, Sec. 3.00 E. and F., and

the interpretive standards set forth in the official statement of

(F) All of the following apply to the court's decision on the

(1) The court's decision does not result in any presumption

the American thoracic society entitled "lung function testing:

selection of reference values and interpretive strategies" as

prima-facie showing that meets the requirements of division (B),

published in American review of respiratory disease,

1991:144:1202-1218.

(C), or (D) of this section:

(a) All of the exposed person's principal places of

382

employment and exposures to airborne contaminants;	383
(b) Whether each principal place of employment involved	384
exposures to airborne contaminants, including, but not limited to,	385
mixed dust, that can cause pulmonary impairment and, if that type	386
of exposure is involved, the general nature, duration, and general	387
level of the exposure.	388
(2) Evidence verifying that a competent medical authority has	389
taken a detailed medical and smoking history of the exposed	390
person, including a thorough review of the exposed person's past	391
and present medical problems and the most probable causes of those	392
medical problems;	393
(3) A diagnosis by a competent medical authority, based on a	394
medical examination and pulmonary function testing of the exposed	395
person, that both of the following apply to the exposed person:	396
(a) The exposed person has a permanent respiratory impairment	397
rating of at least class 2 as defined by and evaluated pursuant to	398
the AMA guides to the evaluation of permanent impairment.	399
(b) The exposed person has mixed dust pneumoconiosis, based	400
at a minimum on radiological or pathological evidence of mixed	401
dust pneumoconiosis.	402
(C) No person shall bring or maintain a tort action alleging	403
that mixed dust caused that person to contract lung cancer if the	404
exposed person is or was also a smoker, in the absence of a	405
prima-facie showing, in the manner described in division (A) of	406
section 2307.87 of the Revised Code, that the exposed person has a	407
physical impairment, that the physical impairment is a result of a	408
medical condition, and that the person's exposure to mixed dust is	409
a substantial contributing factor to the medical condition. That	410
prima-facie showing shall include all of the following minimum	411
requirements:	412

(1) A diagnosis by a competent medical authority that the	413
exposed person has primary lung cancer and that exposure to mixed	414
dust is a substantial contributing factor to that cancer;	415
(2) Evidence that is sufficient to demonstrate that at least	416
ten years have elapsed from the date of the exposed person's first	417
exposure to mixed dust until the date of diagnosis of the exposed	418
person's primary lung cancer. The ten-year latency period	419
described in this division is a rebuttable presumption, and the	420
plaintiff has the burden of proof to rebut the presumption.	421
(3) Both of the following:	422
(a) Radiological or pathological evidence of mixed dust	423
pneumoconiosis;	424
(b) Evidence of the exposed person's substantial occupational	425
exposure to mixed dust.	426
(D)(1) No person shall bring or maintain a tort action	427
alleging a mixed dust disease claim based on wrongful death, as	428
described in section 2125.01 of the Revised Code, of an exposed	429
person, in the absence of a prima-facie showing, in the manner	430
described in division (A) of section 2307.87 of the Revised Code,	431
that the death of the exposed person was the result of a physical	432
impairment, that the death and physical impairment were the result	433
of a medical condition, and that the person's exposure to mixed	434
dust was a substantial contributing factor to the medical	435
condition. That prima-facie showing shall include all of the	436
following minimum requirements:	437
(a) A diagnosis by a competent medical authority that	438
exposure to mixed dust was a substantial contributing factor to	439
the death of the exposed person;	440
(b) Evidence that is sufficient to demonstrate that at least	441
ten years have elapsed from the date of the exposed person's first	442

exposure to mixed dust until the date of diagnosis under division
(D)(1)(a) of this section or death of the exposed person. The
ten-year latency period described in this division is a rebuttable
presumption, and the plaintiff has the burden of proof to rebut
the presumption.
(c) Both of the following:
(i) Radiological or pathological evidence of mixed dust
pneumoconiosis;
(ii) Evidence of the exposed person's substantial
occupational exposure to mixed dust.
(2) If a person files a tort action that alleges a mixed dust
disease claim based on wrongful death, as defined in section
2125.01 of the Revised Code, of an exposed person and further
alleges in the action that the death of the exposed person was the
result of living with another person who, if the tort action had
been filed by the other person, would have met the requirements
specified in division (D)(1)(c) of this section and that the
exposed person lived with the other person for the period of time
specified in division (DD) of section 2307.84 of the Revised Code,
the exposed person is considered as having satisfied the
requirements specified in division (D)(1)(c) of this section.
(E) Evidence relating to physical impairment under this
section, including pulmonary function testing and diffusing
studies, shall comply with the technical recommendations for
examinations, testing procedures, quality assurance, quality
control, and equipment incorporated in the AMA guides to the
evaluation of permanent impairment and reported as set forth in 20
C.F.R. Pt. 404, Subpt. P, App. 1, Part A, Sec. 3.00 E. and F., and
the interpretive standards set forth in the official statement of
the American thoracic society entitled "lung function testing:
selection of reference values and interpretive strategies" as

Page 17

whichever is applicable. The defendant has one hundred twenty days	504
from the date the prima-facie evidence of the exposed person's	505
physical impairment is proffered to challenge the adequacy of that	506
prima-facie evidence. If the defendant makes that challenge and	507
uses a physician to do so, the physician must meet the	508
requirements specified in divisions (I)(1), (3), and (4) of	509
section 2307.84 of the Revised Code.	510
(B) If the defendant challenges the adequacy of the	511
prima-facie evidence of the exposed person's physical impairment	512
as provided in division (A) of this section, the court shall	513
determine from all of the evidence submitted whether the proffered	514
prima-facie evidence meets the minimum requirements specified in	515
division (B), (C), or (D) of section 2307.85 or division (B), (C),	516
or (D) of section 2307.86 of the Revised Code, whichever is	517
applicable. The court shall resolve the issue of whether the	518
plaintiff has made the prima-facie showing required by any of	519
those divisions as applicable, by applying the standard for	520
resolving a motion for summary judgment.	521
(C) The court shall administratively dismiss the plaintiff's	522
claim without prejudice upon a finding of failure to make the	523
prima-facie showing required by division (B), (C), or (D) of	524
section 2307.85 or division (B), (C), or (D) of section 2307.86 of	525
the Revised Code, whichever is applicable. The court shall	526
maintain its jurisdiction over any case that is administratively	527
dismissed under this division. Any plaintiff whose case has been	528
administratively dismissed under this division may move to	529
reinstate the plaintiff's case if the plaintiff makes a	530
prima-facie showing that meets the minimum requirements specified	531
in any of those divisions as applicable.	532
(D) This section applies only to tort actions that allege a	533
silicosis claim or a mixed dust disease claim and that are filed	534

564

mixed dust on the premises owner's property:

(A) A premises owner is not liable for any injury to any

individual resulting from silica or mixed dust exposure unless	565
that individual's alleged exposure occurred while the individual	566
was at the premises owner's property.	567
(B) If exposure to silica or mixed dust is alleged to have	568
occurred before January 1, 1972, it is presumed that a premises	569
owner knew that this state had adopted safe levels of exposure for	570
silica or mixed dust and that products containing silica or mixed	571
dust were used on its property only at levels below those safe	572
levels of exposure. To rebut this presumption, the plaintiff must	573
prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the premises owner	574
knew or should have known that the levels of silica or mixed dust	575
in the immediate breathing zone of the plaintiff regularly	576
exceeded the threshold limit values adopted by this state and that	577
the premises owner allowed that condition to persist.	578
(C)(1) A premises owner is presumed to be not liable for any	579
injury to any invitee who was engaged to work with, install, or	580
remove products containing silica or mixed dust on the premises	581
owner's property if the invitee's employer held itself out as	582
qualified to perform the work. To rebut this presumption, the	583
plaintiff must demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that	584
the premises owner had actual knowledge of the potential dangers	585
of the products containing silica or mixed dust at the time of the	586
alleged exposure that was superior to the knowledge of both the	587
invitee and the invitee's employer.	588
(2) A premises owner that hired a contractor before January	589
1, 1972, to perform the type of work at the premises owner's	590
property that the contractor was qualified to perform cannot be	591
liable for any injury to any individual resulting from silica or	592
mixed dust exposure caused by any of the contractor's employees or	593
agents on the premises owner's property unless the premises owner	594
directed the activity that resulted in the injury or gave or	595
denied permission for the critical acts that led to the	596

<pre>individual's injury.</pre>	597
(3) If exposure to silica or mixed dust is alleged to have	598
occurred after January 1, 1972, a premises owner is not liable for	599
any injury to any individual resulting from that exposure caused	600
by a contractor's employee or agent on the premises owner's	601
property unless the plaintiff establishes the premises owner's	602
intentional violation of an established safety standard that was	603
in effect at the time of the exposure and that the alleged	604
violation was in the plaintiff's breathing zone and was the	605
proximate cause of the plaintiff's medical condition.	606
(D) As used in this section:	607
(1) "Threshold limit values" means the maximum allowable	608
concentration of silica, or other dust, set forth in regulation	609
247 of the "regulations for the prevention and control of diseases	610
resulting from exposure to toxic fumes, vapors, mists, gases, and	611
dusts in order to preserve and protect the public health, " as	612
adopted by the public health council of the department of health	613
on January 1, 1947, and set forth by the industrial commission of	614
Ohio in bulletin no. 203, "specific requirements and general	615
safety standards of the industrial commission of Ohio for work	616
shops and factories, chapter XV, ventilation and exhausts,"	617
effective January 3, 1955.	618
(2) "Established safety standard" means that, for the years	619
after 1971, the concentration of silica or mixed dust in the	620
breathing zone of the worker does not exceed the maximum allowable	621
exposure limits for the eight-hour time-weighted average airborne	622
concentration as promulgated by the occupational safety and health	623
administration (OSHA) in effect at the time of the alleged	624
exposure.	625
(3) "Employee" means an individual who performs labor or	626
provides construction services pursuant to a construction	627

(m) The individual's expenses are paid for by the other	657
contracting party.	658
(n) The individual's tools and materials are furnished by the	659
other contracting party.	660
(o) The individual is provided with the facilities used to	661
perform services.	
(p) The individual does not realize a profit or suffer a loss	663
as a result of the services provided.	664
(q) The individual is not performing services for a number of	665
employers at the same time.	666
(r) The individual does not make the same services available	667
to the general public.	668
(s) The other contracting party has a right to discharge the	669
individual.	670
(t) The individual has the right to end the relationship with	671
the other contracting party without incurring liability pursuant	672
to an employment contract or agreement.	673
Sec. 2307.90. (A) Nothing in sections 2307.84 to 2307.90 of	674
the Revised Code is intended to do, and nothing in any of those sections is interpreted to do, either of the following:	675 676
(1) Affect the rights of any party in bankruptcy proceedings;	677
(2) Affect the ability of any person who is able to make a	678
showing that the person satisfies the claim criteria for	679
compensable claims or demands under a trust established pursuant	680
to a plan of reorganization under Chapter 11 of the United States	681
Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. Chapter 11, to make a claim or demand	682
against that trust.	683
(B) Sections 2307.84 to 2307.90 of the Revised Code shall not	684
affect the scope or operation of any workers' compensation law or	685

(2) The proximity of the defendant's silica or mixed dust to	717
the plaintiff when the exposure to the defendant's silica or mixed	718
dust occurred;	719
(3) The frequency and length of the plaintiff's exposure to	720
the defendant's silica or mixed dust;	721
(4) Any factors that mitigated or enhanced the plaintiff's	722
exposure to silica or mixed dust.	723
(C) This section applies only to tort actions that allege any	724
injury or loss to person resulting from exposure to silica or	725
mixed dust and that are brought on or after the effective date of	726
this section.	727
Sec. 2307.902. (A) A holder has no obligation to, and has no	728
liability to, the covered entity or to any person with respect to	729
any obligation or liability of the covered entity in a silicosis	730
claim or a mixed dust disease claim under the doctrine of piercing	731
the corporate veil unless the person seeking to pierce the	732
corporate veil demonstrates all of the following:	733
(1) The holder exerted such control over the covered entity	734
that the covered entity had no separate mind, will, or existence	735
of its own.	736
(2) The holder caused the covered entity to be used for the	737
purpose of perpetrating, and the covered entity perpetrated, an	738
actual fraud on the person seeking to pierce the corporate veil	739
primarily for the direct pecuniary benefit of the holder.	740
(3) The person seeking to pierce the corporate veil sustained	741
an injury or unjust loss as a direct result of the control	742
described in division (A)(1) of this section and the fraud	743
described in division (A)(2) of this section.	744
(B) A court shall not find that the holder exerted such	745
control over the covered entity that the covered entity did not	746

(3) "Covered entity" means a corporation, limited liability	806
company, limited partnership, or any other entity organized under	807
the laws of any jurisdiction, domestic or foreign, in which the	808
shareholders, owners, or members are generally not responsible for	809
the debts and obligations of the entity. Nothing in this section	810
limits or otherwise affects the liabilities imposed on a general	811
partner of a limited partnership.	812
(4) "Holder" means a person who is the holder, beneficial	813
owner, or subscriber of shares or any other ownership interest of	814
a covered entity, a member of a covered entity, or an affiliate of	815
any person who is the holder, beneficial owner, or subscriber of	816
shares or any other ownership interest of a covered entity.	817
(5) "Piercing the corporate veil" means any and all common	818
law doctrines by which a holder may be liable for an obligation or	819
liability of a covered entity on the basis that the holder	820
controlled the covered entity, the holder is or was the alter ego	821
of the covered entity, or the covered entity has been used for the	822
purpose of actual or constructive fraud or as a sham to perpetrate	823
a fraud or any other common law doctrine by which the covered	824
entity is disregarded for purposes of imposing liability on a	825
holder for the debts or obligations of that covered entity.	826
(6) "Person" has the same meaning as in section 1701.01 of	827
the Revised Code.	828
Sec. 2505.02. (A) As used in this section:	829
(1) "Substantial right" means a right that the United States	830
Constitution, the Ohio Constitution, a statute, the common law, or	831
a rule of procedure entitles a person to enforce or protect.	832
(2) "Special proceeding" means an action or proceeding that	833
is specially created by statute and that prior to 1853 was not	834
denoted as an action at law or a suit in equity.	835

(3) "Provisional remedy" means a proceeding ancillary to an	836
action, including, but not limited to, a proceeding for a	837
preliminary injunction, attachment, discovery of privileged	838
matter, or suppression of evidence, or a prima-facie showing	839
pursuant to section 2307.85 or 2307.86 of the Revised Code.	840
(B) An order is a final order that may be reviewed, affirmed,	841
modified, or reversed, with or without retrial, when it is one of	842
the following:	843
(1) An order that affects a substantial right in an action	844
that in effect determines the action and prevents a judgment;	845
(2) An order that affects a substantial right made in a	846
special proceeding or upon a summary application in an action	847
after judgment;	848
(3) An order that vacates or sets aside a judgment or grants	849
a new trial;	850
(4) An order that grants or denies a provisional remedy and	851
to which both of the following apply:	852
(a) The order in effect determines the action with respect to	853
the provisional remedy and prevents a judgment in the action in	854
favor of the appealing party with respect to the provisional	855
remedy.	856
(b) The appealing party would not be afforded a meaningful or	857
effective remedy by an appeal following final judgment as to all	858
proceedings, issues, claims, and parties in the action.	859
(5) An order that determines that an action may or may not be	860
maintained as a class action.	861
(C) When a court issues an order that vacates or sets aside a	862
judgment or grants a new trial, the court, upon the request of	863
either party, shall state in the order the grounds upon which the	864
new trial is granted or the judgment vacated or set aside.	865

893

- (D) This section applies to and governs any action, including 866 an appeal, that is pending in any court on the effective date of 867 this amendment July 22, 1998, and all claims filed or actions 868 commenced on or after the effective date of this amendment July 869 22, 1998, notwithstanding any provision of any prior statute or 870 rule of law of this state. 871 Section 2. That existing section 2505.02 of the Revised Code 872 is hereby repealed. 873 Section 3. (A) As used in this section, "exposed person," 874 "mixed dust," "mixed dust disease claim," "silica," "silicosis 875 claim, " and "substantial contributing factor" have the same 876 meanings as in section 2307.84 of the Revised Code. 877 (B) The General Assembly acknowledges the Court's authority 878 in prescribing rules governing practice and procedure in the 879 courts of this state, as provided by Section 5 of Article IV of 880 the Ohio Constitution. 881 (C) The General Assembly hereby requests the Supreme Court to 882 adopt rules to specify procedures for venue and consolidation of 883 silicosis claims or mixed dust disease claims brought pursuant to 884 sections 2307.84 to 2307.90 of the Revised Code. 885 (D) With respect to procedures for venue in regard to 886 silicosis claims or mixed dust disease claims, the General 887 Assembly hereby requests the Supreme Court to adopt a rule that 888 requires that a silicosis claim or a mixed dust disease claim meet 889 specific nexus requirements, including the requirement that the 890 plaintiff be domiciled in Ohio or that Ohio is the state in which 891
- (E) With respect to procedures for consolidation of silicosis 894 claims or mixed dust disease claims, the General Assembly hereby 895

the plaintiff's exposure to silica or mixed dust is a substantial

contributing factor.

requests the Supreme Court to adopt a rule that permits

896

consolidation of silicosis claims or mixed dust disease claims

only with the consent of all parties, and in absence of that

consent, permits a court to consolidate for trial only those

silicosis claims or mixed dust disease claims that relate to the

same exposed person and members of the exposed person's household.

Section 4. It is the intent of the General Assembly in 902 enacting section 2307.901 of the Revised Code in this act to 903 establish specific factors to be considered when determining 904 whether a particular plaintiff's exposure to a particular 905 defendant's silica or mixed dust was a substantial factor in 906 causing the plaintiff's injury or loss. The consideration of these 907 factors, involving the plaintiff's proximity to the dust exposure, 908 frequency of the exposure, or regularity of the exposure in tort 909 actions involving exposure to silica or mixed dust is consistent 910 with the factors listed by the court in Lohrmann v. Pittsburgh 911 Corning Cor. (4th Cir. 1986), 782 F.2d 1156. The General Assembly, 912 by its enactment of these factors, intends to clarify and define 913 for judges and juries the evidence that is relevant to the common 914 law requirement that the plaintiff must prove proximate causation. 915 The General Assembly recognizes that the language in section 916 2307.091 of the Revised Code, as enacted by this act, is contrary 917 to the language contained in paragraph 2 of the Syllabus of the 918 Ohio Supreme Court in Horton v. Harwick Chemical Corp. (1995), 73 919 Ohio St.3d 679. However, the General Assembly also recognizes that 920 the courts of Ohio prior to the Horton decision generally followed 921 the rationale of the Lohrmann decision in determining whether a 922 plaintiff had submitted any evidence that a particular defendant's 923 product was a substantial cause of the plaintiff's injury in tort 924 actions involving exposure to certain hazardous or toxic 925 substances, and that the Lohrmann factors were of great assistance 926 to the trial courts in the consideration of motions for summary 927

judgment and to juries when deciding issues of proximate	928
causation. The General Assembly further recognizes that a large	929
number of states have adopted the Lohrmann standard. The General	930
Assembly also has held hearings in which medical evidence has been	931
submitted indicating that such a standard is medically appropriate	932
and is scientifically sound public policy.	933

The Lohrmann standard provides litigants, juries, and the 934 courts of Ohio an objective and easily applied standard for 935 determining whether a plaintiff has submitted evidence that is 936 sufficient to sustain the plaintiff's burden of proof as to 937 proximate causation. Where specific evidence of frequency of 938 exposure to, or proximity and length of exposure to, a particular 939 defendant's silica or mixed dust is lacking, summary judgment is 940 appropriate in tort actions involving silica or mixed dust because 941 such a plaintiff lacks any evidence of an essential element that 942 is necessary to prevail. To submit the legal concept of 943 "substantial factor" to a jury in these complex cases without 944 those scientifically valid defining factors would be to invite 945 speculation on the part of juries, something that the General 946 Assembly has determined not to be in the best interests of Ohio 947 and its courts. 948

Section 5. If any item of law that constitutes the whole or 949 part of a section of law contained in this act, or if any 950 application of any item of law that constitutes the whole or part 951 of a section of law contained in this act, is held invalid, the 952 invalidity does not affect other items of law or applications of 953 items of law that can be given effect without the invalid item of 954 law or application. To this end, the items of law of which the 955 sections contained in this act are composed, and their 956 applications, are independent and severable. 957

Section 6. If any item of law that constitutes the whole or

Am. Sub. H. B. No. 342 As Reported by the Senate Civil Justice Committee	Page 33
part of a section of law contained in this act, or if any	959
application of any item of law contained in this act, is held to	960
be preempted by federal law, the preemption of the item of law or	961
its application does not affect other items of law or applications	962
that can be given affect. The items of law of which the sections	963
of this act are composed, and their applications, are independent	964
and severable.	965