

# New Jersey Supreme Court Distinguishes *Luchejko* and Holds Community Association Is Not Immune from Liability for Failure to Clear Ice and Snow from Private Sidewalks

By Ronald L. Perl, Esq., CCAL and Jonathan H. Katz, Esq.

Photos Courtesy CAI-NJ.



(left to right) Jonathan H. Katz, Esq. and Ronald L. Perl, Esq., CCAL, Community Association Group, Hill Wallack LLP

**Jonathan H. Katz, Esq.** is a partner in the Princeton, N.J. office of Hill Wallack LLP and is a member of the firm's Community Associations practice group. He is the former chair of CAI-NJ's Editorial Committee and CAI-Pa/Del. Val's Communications Committee, and he is the current chair of CAI-Pa/Del. Val's New Jersey Regional Council. He is also a member of the New Jersey Supreme Court Special Civil Part Practice Committee and the editor of Hill Wallack's Condo and HOA Law Blog – [www.condolawnj.com](http://www.condolawnj.com).

**Ronald L. Perl, Esq., CCAL** is a partner in the Princeton, N.J. office of Hill Wallack LLP and is partner-in-charge of the firm's Community Associations practice group. A former National President of CAI, he is a member of the National College of Community Association Lawyers, a NJ Super Lawyer, a Commissioner of the Community Association Managers International Certification Board, and has been recognized as a Top Rated Lawyer in Real Estate Law by *The American Lawyer* and *The National Law Journal*. He is co-author, *Construction Defect Litigation - The Community Association's Guide to the Legal Process* and contributing author, *Building Community: Proven Strategies for Turning Homeowners into Neighbors*.

**O**n August 12, 2015, the New Jersey Supreme Court held in *Qian v. Toll Brothers Inc.*, that community associations are *not* immune from liability for their failure to adequately clear snow and ice from sidewalks within the community. The report of this decision in newspapers and by others has caused concern for community associations, since it appears to impose liability that associations did not previously have. However, this Supreme Court ruling is consistent with pre-existing law as it pertains to privately owned community sidewalks. Indeed, the lower court rulings in *Qian* surprised many practitioners and the decision by the Supreme Court was not a surprise.

The key to understanding the *Qian* decision is appreciating the distinction between public and privately owned sidewalks. Typically, community association governing documents provide that the association is specifically responsible for the maintenance, repair and replacement of common elements or common property. This responsibility includes the clearing of snow from common element walkways and sidewalks. If an association is negligent in discharging that responsibility, it is potentially liable to an individual who is injured as the result of that negligence. The most common example is a situation in which a person slips, falls and is injured, allegedly because the snow or ice was not properly cleared from a sidewalk. There are countless claims made on an annual basis alleging this type of negligence.

However, suppose an association consists of one or more buildings which are located on a public sidewalk, not common property? The law in New Jersey has long been that the *commercial* owner of property adjacent to a public sidewalk is liable for injuries to a person injured on that sidewalk as the



© iStockphoto.com

result of the owner's negligence. However, there has been a clear public policy in New Jersey for over thirty years that such liability will not be imposed on residential homeowners whose property fronts on a public sidewalk. In 2011, the New Jersey Supreme Court was faced with deciding whether a condominium association was "commercial" or "residential" in the context of sidewalk


CONTINUES ON PAGE 36.

liability. In a case entitled *Luchejko v. City of Hoboken*, the Court held that associations were immune from liability for the failure to adequately clear snow and ice from an adjacent public sidewalk. The decision discussed the distinction between residential and commercial properties and reasoned that commercial property owners were better suited to treat additional insurance premiums and maintenance expenses as a necessary cost of doing business. The Court found that the association, as a non-profit corporation, was not comparable to a rental property, which is able to generate revenue for the owner from the use of the property. Thus, the Court held that residential homeowners, including condominium associations, would not be liable in such situations unless they create or exacerbate a dangerous condition.

The *Qian* case involved a claim by a resident in an adult residential community who was injured after a slip and fall on ice following a winter storm. Qian sued the association, its developer (who controlled the board), its managing agent and the contractor responsible for snow and ice removal. The

trial court dismissed the claims against the association, developer and managing agent based in part on the decision in *Luchejko*. In an unpublished opinion decided on February 7, 2014, the Appellate Division, New Jersey's intermediate appellate court, agreed with the trial court that the association's sidewalks were the "functional equivalent" of the public sidewalks in *Luchejko*. Accordingly, the Appellate Division determined that the association's duty to maintain common areas of a common interest community does not "equate to a civil tort duty and liability to an injured party."

The problem with the lower court decisions is that Qian fell on an interior, private sidewalk within the community rather than on an adjacent public sidewalk as in *Luchejko*. Qian argued that this distinction, plus the specific maintenance responsibilities spelled out by the association's governing documents and by statute, required the imposition of tort liability. The Appellate Division rejected this reasoning, holding that there is difference between a legal responsibility to act and the imposition of tort liability.



*"The distinguishing point between a public and private sidewalk is who controls the sidewalk, not who uses it."*

ity. In other words, the Appellate Division said that just because the association had a duty to clear the snow, does not mean that it would be responsible to compensate an individual who was injured as the result of its negligent performance.

The Supreme Court disagreed with the lower courts, holding that the residential sidewalk immunity applicable to public sidewalks does not apply to the privately owned sidewalks in a common interest community. The distinguishing point between a public and private sidewalk is who controls the sidewalk, not who uses it. The Court stated that because the New Jersey Condominium Act as well as the association's governing documents in this case spell out a duty to manage and maintain the community's

© iStockphoto.com

**ADP BARLOW INSURANCE**

**DO YOU HAVE QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR INSURANCE ?**  
**COVERAGES ? PREMIUM ? PROPERTY VALUES ?**  
**FLOOD, FIRE, WIND DAMAGE ? CLAIMS ?**

**LET US SHOW YOU HOW WE CAN HELP**  
**"INSURE YOUR PROPERTY" QUESTIONS ARE ANSWERED !**



FOR MORE INFORMATION VISIT US ON WEB AT  
[WWW.ADPBARLOW.COM](http://WWW.ADPBARLOW.COM) OR CONTACT US AT  
[ADPBARLOW@ADPINSURANCE.COM](mailto:ADPBARLOW@ADPINSURANCE.COM)

OFFICES IN:  
**EASTON PA & FLORHAM PARK NJ**  
**(908) 382-6625 (201) 982-7750**

common property, including the sidewalks, the association cannot avoid liability for its potential failure to properly maintain its private sidewalks. [It should be pointed out that the association in the *Qian* case was a homeowners association, not subject to the Condominium Act, but even without the statutory responsibility, the association's governing documents would have provided the necessary duty.] Accordingly, the Supreme Court remanded this case to the trial court to address these and other issues, including the determination as to whether the association was entitled to tort immunity pursuant to *N.J.S.A. 2A:62A-13* and the association's governing documents. ■



**Not a Member?**

**Join Today!**  
**Fill out the membership application on page 39 of this issue!**



# REACH FOR THE STARS

WE MANAGE OUR CUSTOMERS ABOVE & BEYOND

At Executive Property Management, we are light years ahead in our profession. For more than thirty years, we have successfully focused on providing our customers with unrivaled value in areas of financial consulting and reporting, customer service, cost control, technology and integrity.

Let us guide you to a brighter tomorrow.

Leonard Barber, CPA, PCAM, CMCA, *President and CEO*  
 Janice Barber, PCAM, CMCA, *Executive Vice President*



www.epmwebsite.com t / 732.821.3224 f / 732.821.6565  
 4-08 Towne Center Drive North Brunswick, NJ 08902

# Need Service?



**The answer is YES.**

No matter what the question, no matter how tough the task, the answer is always "YES", including our prompt, on-site emergency service. When you need the best service, call the best service company—Rapid Pump & Meter Service Co., Inc.

**SERVICES**

- Turnkey Pump Stations
- Emergency Generators
- Field Service and Repairs
- Equipment Rebuilding
- Preventive Maintenance
- Factory Authorized Service

**PRODUCTS**

- Myers Pumps
- Wilo-EMU Pumps
- Dresser ROOTS Blowers
- All Prime Pumps
- Badger Flow Meters
- Aurora Pumps

**Rapid Pump & Meter Service Co., Inc.** 

**973.345.5600**  
**Committed to 100% Customer Satisfaction**  
**Rapid Response 24 Hour Emergency Service**

www.rapid-service.com | info@servicer.com | 973.345.5600 | PO Box AY | 285 Straight Street, Paterson, NJ 07509