GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA SESSION 2011

S D

SENATE BILL 435 PROPOSED COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE S435-PCS95098-TG-26

Short Title: C	Livil Pro./Require Certificate of Merit. (Public
Sponsors:	
Referred to:	
	March 29, 2011
	A BILL TO BE ENTITLED
	QUIRING A CERTIFICATE OF MERIT IN CIVIL ACTIONS O
	TION PROCEEDINGS BROUGHT AGAINST A PERSON OR FIRE
	G ARCHITECTURE OR ENGINEERING SERVICES IN THIS STATE.
	sembly of North Carolina enacts:
	TION 1. Subchapter VI of Chapter 1 of the General Statutes is amended by
adding the follo	wing new Article to read:
"Com	"Article 12A.
"§ 1-123.1. Defi	tificate of Merit in Malpractice Claims Against Design Professionals.
	ng definitions shall apply in this Article:
(1)	Claim. – A claim, counterclaim, cross-claim, or third-party claim alleging
(1)	malpractice against a design professional.
(2)	Defendant. – A design professional against whom a claim of malpractice
<u>~~~</u>	asserted.
<u>(3)</u>	Design professional. – A professional engineer licensed pursuant to Chapte
	89C of the General Statutes, an architect licensed pursuant to Chapter 83
	of the General Statutes, or any firm in which the licensed engineer of
	architect practices, including a corporation, professional corporation, limite
	liability corporation, partnership, limited liability partnership, so
	proprietorship, joint venture, or any other business entity.
<u>(4)</u>	Practice of architecture. – As defined by G.S. 83A-1(7).
<u>(5)</u>	Practice of engineering. – As defined by G.S. 89C-3(6).
	tificate of merit in malpractice claims against design professionals.
	claim in a civil action or arbitration proceeding asserting malpractice by onal shall be dismissed unless both of the following conditions are met:
(1)	The pleading asserting the claim specifically asserts that the profession
(1)	services provided by the defendant and all records pertaining to the allege
	negligence that are available to the claimant after reasonable inquiry have
	been reviewed by a licensed professional engineer or licensed architect wh
	holds the same type of professional license and practices in the same area
	practice as the design professional against whom the claim is being brough
	who is willing to testify that the professional services provided by the



5 6

15

16 17

28 29

22

39

40

41

defendant did not comply with the applicable standard of care, and who either is reasonably expected to qualify as an expert witness under G.S. 8C-1, Rule 702, or is a person whom the claimant will seek to have qualified as an expert witness by motion under subsection (b) of this section filed with the pleading; and

The pleading asserting the claim is accompanied by a certificate of merit <u>(2)</u> signed by a licensed professional engineer or licensed architect who holds the same type of professional license and practices in the same area of practice as the design professional against whom the claim is being brought, certifying that the engineer or architect has reviewed the services provided by the defendant and all records provided by the claimant relating to those services, has reviewed the pleading asserting the claim against the defendant, and is willing to testify that the claim of malpractice against the defendant has merit.

The claimant shall provide, at the request of the defendant, proof of compliance with this subsection through up to 10 written interrogatories, the answers to which shall be verified by the expert required under this section. These interrogatories do not count against the interrogatory limit under G.S. 1A-1, Rule 33.

- Upon motion by either party, a resident judge of the superior court in the county or judicial district in which the action or proceeding is pending may allow expert testimony on the appropriate standard of care by a witness who does not meet the requirements of G.S. 8C-1, Rule 702, or of subdivision (a)(2) of this section relating to type of license and area of practice, but who is otherwise qualified as an expert witness, upon a showing by the movant of extraordinary circumstances and a determination by the court that the motion should be allowed to serve the ends of justice.
- Upon motion by the plaintiff prior to the expiration of the applicable statute of limitations, a resident judge of the superior court for a judicial district in which venue for the cause of action is appropriate under G.S. 1-82 or, if no resident judge for that judicial district is physically present in that judicial district, otherwise available, or able or willing to consider the motion, then any presiding judge of the superior court for that judicial district may allow a motion to extend the statute of limitations for a period not to exceed 120 days to file a complaint in an action alleging malpractice by a design professional in order to comply with this section, upon a determination that good cause exists for the granting of the motion and that the ends of justice would be served by an extension.
 - This section shall not apply to a claim for breach of contract or breach of warranty." (d) **SECTION 2.** G.S. 1A-1, Rule 9, is amended by adding a new subsection to read:
- Design Professional Malpractice. Any pleading alleging malpractice by a design professional, as defined by G.S. 1-123.1(3), shall be filed in accordance with Article 12A of Chapter 1 of the General Statutes."

SECTION 3. This act becomes effective October 1, 2011, and applies to actions and proceedings commenced on or after that date.