

			FIR	ST F	EGUI	LAR	SES	SION		
	ONE	E HUN	DRED	ANE) ELI	EVEN	гн	LEGISLATU	IRE	
Legisla	tive Do	cumer	nt						No	. 146
S.P. 54								In Senate,	January 11,	1983
Ret ordered			Commi	ttee o	on Juo	diciary	y. Se	ent down for	concurrence	and
					JO	Y J. (O'B	RIEN, Secret	ary of the S	enate
Co	ed by Se sponsors orth an	: Repr	esentai	tive L	ivesa	y of B		swick, Repres k.	sentative Fo	ster
			:	STAI	e of	F MA	INE	:		
	1							CLORD GHTY-THRE	E	
				ion	in (5 0	ict Court f Unfair		
Be it follo		ted b	y the	e Pe	eople	e of	th	e State o	of Maine	as
								¶, as an ended to r		/ PL
								ess the c		
								stices an 16, 1961,		
								ncurrent		hat:
								vil actic		
								000, nor,		
herei	n prov	vided	, equ	uita	ble	rel	ief	is deman	ded of p	ro-
								6651 to		
actio								of marria		
cıal	separa	ation	and	of	prod	ceed:	ıng	ıs under I	itle 19	and

1 original jurisdiction, concurrent with that of the 2 Superior Court, of actions to guiet title to real estate under Title 14, sections 6651 to 6658, and in 3 4 these actions the District Court may grant equitable relief; and original jurisdiction, concurrent with 5 6 that of the Superior Court, for restitution under 7 Title 5, section 213, and in these actions the Dis-8 trict Court may grant equitable relief; and original 9 jurisdiction, concurrent with that of the Superior 10 Court, for breach of implied warranty and covenant of 11 habitability under Title 14, section 6021, and in 12 these actions the District Court may grant equitable 13 relief; and original jurisdiction, concurrent with 14 that of the Superior Court, of actions to quiet title 15 to real estate under Title 36, section 946, and in 16 such actions the District Court may grant equitable 17 relief, of actions to foreclose mortgages under Title 18 14, chapter 713, subchapter VI; and of mental health commitment hearings under Title 34, chapter 191, sub-19 chapter III, and of mental retardation certification 20 21 hearings under Title 34, chapter 229; and of small 22 claims actions under Title 14, chapter 738, and in 23 these actions the District Court may grant equitable This limitation as to damages shall not 24 relief. 25 apply in any action of divorce, annulment or separa-26 tion of marriage or in any action to enforce judgment support or alimony. Actions for divorce, annul-27 of 28 ment or separation may be remanded, upon agreement of 29 the parties, from the Superior Court to the District 30 Court in accordance with rules promulgated by the 31 Supreme Judicial Court. An action so remanded shall remain in the District Court, which shall have exclu-32 33 sive jurisdiction thereafter, subject to the rights 34 of appeal to the Superior Court as to matters of law.

35 Sec. 2. 5 MRSA, §213, sub-§1, as amended by PL 36 1979, c. 451, is further amended to read:

Court action. Any person who purchases or 37 1. 38 leases goods, services or property, real or personal, 39 primarily for personal, family or household purposes 40 and thereby suffers any loss of money or property, real or personal, as a result of the use or employ-41 by another person of a method, act or practice 42 ment declared unlawful by section 207 or by any rule or 43 44 regulation issued under section 207, subsection 2 may bring an action either in the Superior Court for 45

restitution and for such other equitable relief, including an injunction, as the court may deem to be necessary and proper, or in District Court for restitution and such other equitable relief as the court may deem to be necessary and proper. There shall be a right to trial by jury in any action brought in Superior Court under this section.

STATEMENT OF FACT

9 Title 5, section 213 of the so-called Unfair 10 Trade Practices Act allows consumers to seek restitu-11 tion and other appropriate equitable relief for 12 Unfair Trade Practices they feel have been committed 13 against them. This same section also permits the 14 court to award successful consumer litigants their 15 attorney's fees and costs, which is an important 16 incentive for consumers to go forward with a suit. The major problem with this scheme is that these ac-17 18 tions must be brought in Superior Court where a tremendous case backlog exists. It is not uncommon 19 for a consumer to have to wait more than a year to 20 21 have his case heard. Such delay makes the remedy 22 provided by this Act of questionable practical value.

23 This bill allows unfair trade practice actions 24 to also be brought in the District Court, where cases 25 are customarily heard within a few months. The bill does not grant full equitable jurisdiction to the 26 27 District Court, however. Actions seeking injunctive 28 relief, or jury trials, must still be brought in Superior Court. Despite this restriction it is 29 30 expected that the change made by this bill will aid 31 consumers in seeking swifter resolution of their con-32 sumer complaints.

0119120282

33

8