

# HOUSE BILL No. 4773

May 11, 2005, Introduced by Reps. Byrum, Whitmer, Angerer, Meisner, Miller, Hunter, Sak, Gillard, Dillon, Waters, Accavitti, Gleason, McConico, Clack, Plakas, Anderson, Vagnozzi, Leland, Phillips, Kathleen Law, Bieda, Alma Smith, Spade, Hopgood, Williams, Zelenko, Mayes, Espinoza, Kehrl, Polidori, Bennett, Lemmons, Jr., Gonzales, Donigan, Byrnes, Condino, Brown and Murphy and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled  
"Revised judicature act of 1961,"  
by amending section 2946 (MCL 600.2946), as amended by 1995 PA 249.

## THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT:

1       Sec. 2946. (1) It ~~shall be~~ **IS** admissible as evidence in a  
2 product liability action that the production of the product was in  
3 accordance with the generally recognized and prevailing  
4 nongovernmental standards in existence at the time the specific  
5 unit of the product was sold or delivered by the defendant to the  
6 initial purchaser or user.

7       (2) In a product liability action brought against a  
8 manufacturer or seller for harm allegedly caused by a production

1 defect, the manufacturer or seller is not liable unless the  
2 plaintiff establishes that the product was not reasonably safe at  
3 the time the specific unit of the product left the control of the  
4 manufacturer or seller and that, according to generally accepted  
5 production practices at the time the specific unit of the product  
6 left the control of the manufacturer or seller, a practical and  
7 technically feasible alternative production practice was available  
8 that would have prevented the harm without significantly impairing  
9 the usefulness or desirability of the product to users and without  
10 creating equal or greater risk of harm to others. An alternative  
11 production practice is practical and feasible only if the  
12 technical, medical, or scientific knowledge relating to production  
13 of the product, at the time the specific unit of the product left  
14 the control of the manufacturer or seller, was developed,  
15 available, and capable of use in the production of the product and  
16 was economically feasible for use by the manufacturer. Technical,  
17 medical, or scientific knowledge is not economically feasible for  
18 use by the manufacturer if use of that knowledge in production of  
19 the product would significantly compromise the product's usefulness  
20 or desirability.

21 (3) With regard to the production of a product that is the  
22 subject of a product liability action, evidence of a philosophy,  
23 theory, knowledge, technique, or procedure that is learned, placed  
24 in use, or discontinued after the event resulting in the death of  
25 the person or injury to the person or property, which if learned,  
26 placed in use, or discontinued before the event would have made the  
27 event less likely to occur, is admissible only for the purpose of

1 proving the feasibility of precautions, if controverted, or for  
2 impeachment.

3 (4) In a product liability action brought against a  
4 manufacturer or seller for harm allegedly caused by a product,  
5 there is a rebuttable presumption that the manufacturer or seller  
6 is not liable if, at the time the specific unit of the product was  
7 sold or delivered to the initial purchaser or user, the aspect of  
8 the product that allegedly caused the harm was in compliance with  
9 standards relevant to the event causing the death or injury ~~set~~  
10 ~~forth~~ **CONTAINED** in a federal or state statute or was approved by,  
11 or was in compliance with regulations or standards relevant to the  
12 event causing the death or injury promulgated by, a federal or  
13 state agency responsible for reviewing the safety of the product.  
14 Noncompliance with a standard relevant to the event causing the  
15 death or injury ~~set forth~~ **CONTAINED** in a federal or state statute  
16 or lack of approval by, or noncompliance with regulations or  
17 standards relevant to the event causing the death or injury  
18 promulgated by, a federal or state agency does not raise a  
19 presumption of negligence on the part of a manufacturer or seller.  
20 Evidence of compliance or noncompliance with a regulation or  
21 standard not relevant to the event causing the death or injury is  
22 not admissible.

23 ~~———— (5) In a product liability action against a manufacturer or~~  
24 ~~seller, a product that is a drug is not defective or unreasonably~~  
25 ~~dangerous, and the manufacturer or seller is not liable, if the~~  
26 ~~drug was approved for safety and efficacy by the United States food~~  
27 ~~and drug administration, and the drug and its labeling were in~~

~~compliance with the United States food and drug administration's approval at the time the drug left the control of the manufacturer or seller. However, this subsection does not apply to a drug that is sold in the United States after the effective date of an order of the United States food and drug administration to remove the drug from the market or to withdraw its approval. This subsection does not apply if the defendant at any time before the event that allegedly caused the injury does any of the following:~~

~~—— (a) Intentionally withholds from or misrepresents to the United States food and drug administration information concerning the drug that is required to be submitted under the federal food, drug, and cosmetic act, chapter 675, 52 Stat. 1040, 21 U.S.C. 301 to 321, 331 to 343-2, 344 to 346a, 347, 348 to 353, 355 to 360, 360b to 376, and 378 to 395, and the drug would not have been approved, or the United States food and drug administration would have withdrawn approval for the drug if the information were accurately submitted.~~

~~—— (b) Makes an illegal payment to an official or employee of the United States food and drug administration for the purpose of securing or maintaining approval of the drug.~~