MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the

LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY

at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library

http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied (searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

1 2	FIRST REGULAR SESSION
3 4	ONE HUNDRED AND ELEVENTH LEGISLATURE
5 6	Legislative Document No. 394
7	H.P. 335 House of Representatives, February 1, 1983
8 9	On Motion of Representative Beaulieu of Portland referred to the Committee on Labor. Sent up for concurrence and ordered printed.
10	EDWIN H. PERT, Clerk
10	Presented by Speaker Martin of Eagle Lake. Cosponsors: Representative Tuttle of Sanford, Representative Tammaro of Baileyville and Representative Norton of Biddeford.
11	of Bulley vine and Representative (votton of Buderora.
12 13	STATE OF MAINE
14 15 16	IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD NINETEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THREE
17 18 19	AN ACT to Insure Notice Defense is Based on Prejudice to the Employer.
20 21	Be it enacted by the People of the State of Maine as follows:
22 23 24	39 MRSA §63, as amended by PL 1973, c. 788, §227, is further amended by adding at the end a new paragraph to read:
25 26 27 28 29	The failure of the employee to provide notice as required in this section shall not be a bar to any claim for compensation, unless the employer can prove to the commission that its rights were prejudiced by that failure by the employee to provide notice.

STATEMENT OF FACT

1

2

3

4 5

6 7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17 18

19

20

21 22

current workers' compensation statute allows employers to avoid liability for clear work-related injuries despite the fact, in many cases, its rights were in no way impaired by the employee's failure give notice within the first 30 days of his injury. In many cases, the employer who is provided notice of an injury within 2 or 3 months of its occurrence, is still able to adequately investigate the employee's allegations about the circumstances of his injury. That opportunity to investigate the employee's allegations in a timely manner is the rationale for notice provisions. If the employer is unable to demonstrate that its opportunity to investigate an accident was somehow impaired by the passage of time, it should be barred from utilizing a "loophole" to avoid what is otherwise clear liability. If an employer has changed insurance carriers or can demonstrate in any other manner that its rights have been prejudiced by the employee's failure to give notice, employer would still be allowed the opportunity to use this defense to any claim for compensation.

23 1837011083