

SENATE BILL REPORT

SB 5059

As Reported by Senate Committee On:
Law & Justice, January 26, 2023

Title: An act relating to prejudgment interest.

Brief Description: Concerning prejudgment interest.

Sponsors: Senators Kuderer, Trudeau, Conway, Nobles, Pedersen, Stanford, Valdez and Wellman.

Brief History:

Committee Activity: Law & Justice: 1/24/23, 1/26/23 [DP-WM, DNP, w/oRec].

Brief Summary of Bill

- Modifies the accrual date for interest on tort judgments for tortious conduct of public agencies, individuals, and other entities to the date the cause of action accrues.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LAW & JUSTICE

Majority Report: Do pass and be referred to Committee on Ways & Means.

Signed by Senators Dhingra, Chair; Trudeau, Vice Chair; Kuderer, Pedersen, Salomon and Valdez.

Minority Report: Do not pass.

Signed by Senators McCune, Torres, Wagoner and Wilson, L.

Minority Report: That it be referred without recommendation.

Signed by Senator Padden, Ranking Member.

Staff: Ryan Giannini (786-7285)

This analysis was prepared by non-partisan legislative staff for the use of legislative members in their deliberations. This analysis is not part of the legislation nor does it constitute a statement of legislative intent.

Background: Torts Generally. A tort is a civil wrong in which a plaintiff seeks monetary compensation for harm to the plaintiff's person or property. Tort law includes actions based on negligence, intentional conduct, and strict liability. Damages that may be awarded to an injured plaintiff include both economic damages, such as lost earnings and medical expenses, and noneconomic damages, such as pain and suffering, and emotional distress.

Post-Judgment Interest. Under state law, interest on tort judgments accrues from the date of entry of the judgment at a rate specified in statute. In a case where a court is directed on review to enter judgment on a verdict, or where a judgment entered on a verdict is wholly or partly affirmed on review, interest on the judgment or on that portion of the judgment affirmed dates back and accrues from the date the verdict was rendered.

For the tortious conduct of a public agency, the post-judgment interest rate is 2 percent above the equivalent coupon issue yield of the average bill rate for 26 weeks of treasury bills.

For the tortious conduct of individuals and entities, the post judgment interest rate is 2 percent above the prime rate.

Prejudgment Interest. Prejudgment interest is intended to make a plaintiff whole by compensating for the use value of damages incurred from the time of the loss until the date of judgment.

Summary of Bill: Interest on judgments for tortious conduct of public agencies, individuals, and other entities is modified to run from the date on which the cause of action accrues. This prejudgment interest applies only to arbitration awards and judgments entered following a trial of the matter. All other judgments founded on tortious conduct bear interest from the date of entry.

Interest on judgments for tortious conduct that occurred while a plaintiff was a minor begins to run from the date the action is commenced, or the date the minor turns 18 years old, whichever is earlier, at the same rates as currently provided in statute.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Requested on January 19, 2023.

Creates Committee/Commission/Task Force that includes Legislative members: No.

Effective Date: Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

Staff Summary of Public Testimony: PRO: Currently, our law allows prejudgment interest only in contract cases and does not allow any when someone is hurt or killed by another's negligence. This bill seeks to fix that by adding prejudgment interest from the date

the cause of action occurs which is already allowed in 46 other states. This is a victims rights bill. In many cases, there is no incentive for the defendant and the insurance company to settle. In catastrophic cases, insurance companies know they are going to pay the limits, but rather than doing that, they invest money in interest bearing accounts to lessen their loss at the expense of victims who are frequently harassed by medical bill collectors or are forced to spend down into poverty to qualify for Medicaid to get the medical care they need. This bill holds people, businesses, and public agencies fully accountable when they harm another person. This is a missing piece of the justice system in the state of Washington. This bill will help support clearing court backlogs.

CON: There is a fundamental right for a defendant and plaintiff to have their case heard in front of a jury. To take that away or pressure a defendant to settle is a challenge. This bill will disincentivize speedy settlements. This bill takes away discretion from judges and mandates back interest be paid on damages in situations where it is not needed. Last year, there was language in this bill exempting school districts and public agencies but that is not there this year. The language in this bill does not work for school districts. Nonprofits will have less resources to serve their clients. Nonprofits already have incentives to quickly settle claims. There is a public trust and faith from the community in what they do. Fewer insurers will want to engage with and do business with cities in Washington State. More taxpayer resources will be spent on increasing insurance demands.

OTHER: Please amend this bill to exempt nonprofits from prejudgment interest. Charitable organizations in Washington face increasing demand while costs are rising and contributions are falling. 21 percent of nonprofits in our state and 40 percent of BIPOC-led charities cited insurance costs as a major barrier. Insurance costs are rising an average of 10 to 30 percent annually for nonprofits over the past few years. Increasing this liability will further restrict those organizations' ability to serve. Charities who are already strapped with unique hurdles in the form of contract stipulations such as paying on a reimbursement basis, only providing funding for a portion of the cost of contracted programs, and not paying overhead costs. Exempting nonprofits from an additional costly mandate would help the 25,000 nonprofit organization in Washington State. This bill will take food out of people's mouths; remove opportunity for academic success and workforce development; and keep people unsheltered, unsupported, and without access to basic needs.

Persons Testifying: PRO: Senator Patty Kuderer, Prime Sponsor; Nate Roberts, Washington State Association for Justice; Colleen Durkin Peterson, Washington State Association for Justice; Darrell Cochran, Washington State Association for Justice; Crystal Rutherford, Excelsior Law PLLC.

CON: Tyna Ek, Washington Schools Risk Management Pool; Mike Hoover, Washington State Association of Counties and the Washington State School Directors' Association; Derek Bryan, Washington Counties Risk Pool; Gregory Narver , General Counsel, Seattle Public Schools; Sandy Hayes, Washington State School Directors' Association / Northshore SD; Ron Mabry, Washington State School Directors' Association / Kennewick SD; Cindy

McMullen, Washington State School Directors' Association / Central Valley SD; Kris Tefft, Washington Liability Reform Coalition; Michael Heinisch, Non Profit Insurance Program Board of Directors; Karl JOHANSON, NPIP; Mark Sektnan, APCIA; Sean Graham, Washington State Medical Association (WSMA); Sophina Nunez; Charlie Brown, The Schools Alliance; Robert Christie; Elizabeth Perez, Nonprofit Association of Washington - Equity Ambassador based in Whitman County; Candice Bock, Association of Washington Cities; Anita Waller, Ephrata School District Board of Directors.

OTHER: Anne Anderson, Nonprofit Association of Washington.

Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying: No one.