Government Code §815 provides that liability against a public entity must be established through statute, and provides that any statute setting forth an immunity excepts a public entity from liability.

Except as otherwise provided by statute:

(a) A public entity is not liable for an injury, whether such injury arises out of an act or omission of the public entity or a public employee or any other person

(b) The liability of a public entity established by this part (commencing with Section 814) is subject to any immunity of the public entity provided by statute, including this part, and is subject to any defenses that would be available to the public entity if it were a private person.

SCOPE OF IMMUNITIES

Lawsuits Involving . . .

- Dangerous Condition of Public Property
- Police and Correctional Activities
- Fire Protection
- Medical, Hospital, and Public Health Activities
When to invoke?

- Government Tort Claim
- After Filing of Complaint
- After Filing of Answer

When to invoke?

Government Tort Claim

- Benefit: Avoid Cost of Litigation
- Risk: Pleading Around the Immunity

WHEN TO INVOCExE?

Demurrer / Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings

- Benefit: Avoid Further Litigation Costs
- Risk: Plaintiff May Amend Complaint
- Key: Immunity Must Exist On Face Of Complaint
WHICH IMMUNITIES?

Demurrer/Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings

➢ Trail Immunity (§831.4)
➢ Hazardous Recreational Immunity (§831.7)
➢ Natural Condition of Unimproved Public Property Immunity (§831.2)

WHEN TO INVOKE?

Motion for Summary Judgment

➢ Before Discovery Commences
➢ After Initial Discovery
➢ After Completion of Discovery

WHICH IMMUNITIES?

Motion for Summary Judgment

➢ Design Immunity (§830.6)
➢ Signage Immunity (§830.8)
➢ Grading/Road Maintenance (§831.2)
A public entity, public employee, or a grantor of a public easement to a public entity for any of the following purposes, is not liable for an injury caused by a condition of:

(a) Any unpaved road which provides access to fishing, hunting, camping, hiking, riding, including animal and all types of vehicular riding, water sports, recreational or scenic areas and which is not a (1) city street or highway or (2) county, state or federal highway or (3) public street or highway of a joint highway district, boulevard district, bridge and highway district or similar district formed for the improvement or building of public streets or highways.

(b) Any trail used for the above purposes.

(c) Any paved trail, walkway, path, or sidewalk on an easement of way which has been granted to a public entity, which easement provides access to any unimproved property, so long as such public entity shall reasonably attempt to provide adequate warnings of the existence of any condition of the paved trail, walkway, path, or sidewalk which constitutes a hazard to health or safety. Warnings required by this subdivision shall only be required where pathways are paved, and such requirement shall not be construed to be a standard of care for any unpaved pathways or roads.

GOVERNMENT CODE §831.4
TRAIL IMMUNITY

Legislative Intent
Encourage public entities to open their property for public recreational use.

Key Issue
Is the dangerous condition alleged to have existed on a “trail”?
GOVERNMENT CODE §831.4
TRAIL IMMUNITY

Design and use are controlling, not the name.

- Paved pathway through a park determined to fall within the immunity.
- Bikeway was a “trail” even though bikeway was part of public streets and highway.
- Walkway along the oceanfront was a “trail” despite the proximity to a roadway.

GOVERNMENT CODE §831.4
TRAIL IMMUNITY

As long as recreational use exists, it is irrelevant why the plaintiff was using the trail.

GOVERNMENT CODE §831.4
TRAIL IMMUNITY

What Can Be Done Now?

- Formally designate trails or pathways.
What Can Be Done Now?

➢ Require and maintain written agreements for any improvements to trails or pathways.

GOVERNMENT CODE §831.4
TRAIL IMMUNITY

Hazardous recreational activity also means:

(a) Neither a public entity nor a public employee is liable to any person who participates in a hazardous recreational activity, including any person who assists the participant, or to any spectator who knew or reasonably should have known that the hazardous recreational activity created a substantial risk of injury to himself or herself and was voluntarily in the place of risk, or having the ability to do so failed to leave, for any damage or injury to property or persons arising out of that hazardous recreational activity.

(b) As used in this section, hazardous recreational activity means a recreational activity conducted on property of a public entity that creates a substantial, as distinguished from a minor, trivial, or insignificant, risk of injury to a participant or a spectator.
Legislative Intent

Encourage public entities to open their property for public recreational use.

Key Issues:

- Was a hazardous recreational activity involved?

Key Issues:

- Was a hazardous recreational activity involved?
- Does an exception apply?
Involvement of a third party does not preclude immunity.

Plaintiff’s knowledge of any particular risk is irrelevant.

What Can Be Done Now?
- Provide warnings.
**GOVERNMENT CODE §831.7 HAZARDOUS RECREATIONAL IMMUNITY**

**What Can Be Done Now?**
- Provide warnings.
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**GOVERNMENT CODE §831.7 HAZARDOUS RECREATIONAL IMMUNITY**

**What Can Be Done Now?**
- Keep structures and recreational equipment in good repair.
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**GOVERNMENT CODE §831.7 HAZARDOUS RECREATIONAL IMMUNITY**

**What Can Be Done Now?**
- Guard or warn against another hazardous recreational activity that may occur nearby.

![Warning Sign](image3)
What Can Be Done Now?

- Limit specific fees to participate in activities.

GOVERNMENT CODE §831.7
HAZARDOUS RECREATIONAL IMMUNITY

Neither a public entity nor a public employee is liable under this chapter for an injury caused by the plan or design of a construction of, or an improvement to, public property where such plan or design has been approved in advance of the construction or improvement by the legislative body of the public entity or by some other body or employee exercising discretionary authority to give such approval or where such plan or design is prepared in conformity with standards previously so approved, if the trial or appellate court determines that there is any substantial evidence upon the basis of which (a) a reasonable public employee could have adopted the plan or design or the standards therefor or (b) a reasonable legislative body or other body or employee could have approved the plan or design or the standards therefor.

GOVERNMENT CODE §830.6
DESIGN IMMUNITY

Legislative Intent

Prevent a jury from simply reweighing the same factors already considered by the public entity.
A public entity claiming design immunity must establish three elements:

- Causal relationship
- Discretionary approval
- Substantial evidence of reasonableness

**GOVERNMENT CODE § 830.6 DESIGN IMMUNITY**

**Element 1**

*A causal relationship between the plan or design and the accident.*

**Element 2**

*Discretionary approval of the plan or design prior to construction.*
Element 3
Substantial evidence supporting the reasonableness of the plan or design.

GOVERNMENT CODE §830.6
DESIGN IMMUNITY

Loss of Design Immunity
Even if all of the elements are met, design immunity can be lost.

What Can Be Done Now?
➢ Require and maintain agreements with design professionals as to scope of retention.

GOVERNMENT CODE §830.6
DESIGN IMMUNITY
What Can Be Done Now?

- Require and maintain plan design documents.

GOVERNMENT CODE §830.6
DESIGN IMMUNITY

What Can Be Done Now?

- Establish protocol for review of plan documents.

- REVIEWED

GOVERNMENT CODE §830.6
DESIGN IMMUNITY

What Can Be Done Now?

- Establish protocol for final approval of plan documents.

- APPROVED BY
What Can Be Done Now?

- Establish protocol for inspection during construction.

GOVERNMENT CODE §830.6
DESIGN IMMUNITY

What Can Be Done Now?

- Establish protocol for documenting substantial completion of construction.

GOVERNMENT CODE §830.6
DESIGN IMMUNITY

Legislative Intent

Determining and regulating the use of public property is better left to legislative and administrative bodies, rather than to the judiciary.

GOVERNMENT CODE §830.8
SIGNAGE IMMUNITY
Neither a public entity nor a public employee is liable under this chapter for an injury caused by the failure to provide traffic or warning signals, signs, markings or devices described in the Vehicle Code.

GOVERNMENT CODE § 830.8 SIGNAGE IMMUNITY

“Trap” Exception

GOVERNMENT CODE § 830.8 SIGNAGE IMMUNITY

What Can Be Done Now?

- Install Warning Signs
What Can Be Done Now?

- Install Warning Signs

**Government Code § 830.8 Signage Immunity**

**IMMUNITIES – DANGEROUS CONDITION**

- Govt Code §830.6 Plan or Design of Construction of Public Property
- Govt Code §830.8 Traffic or Warning Signal/Signage
- Govt Code §830.9 Nonoperation of Traffic Control Signal
- Govt Code §831 Effect on Use of Street of Weather Conditions
- Govt Code §831.2 Natural Condition of Unimproved Public Property
- Govt Code §831.25 Land Failure of Unimproved Public Property
- Govt Code §831.3 Grading or Road Maintenance
- Govt Code §831.4 Unpaved [or Paved] Road, Trail, Path, Sidewalk
- Govt Code §831.7 Hazardous Recreational Activity
- Govt Code §831.7.5 Actions of Dog in Dog Park
- Govt Code §831.8 Condition of Reservoir, Canal, Conduit, Drain

**IMMUNITIES – POLICE, CORRECTIONAL, FIRE**

**Police and Correctional Activities**

- Govt Code §845 Failure to Establish Police Department, Provide Police Protection, Respond to Burglar Alarm
- Govt Code §845.2 Failure to Provide Prison, Jail, Sufficient Prison Equipment, Personnel
- Govt Code §845.4 Interference with Right of Prisoner to Obtain Judicial Determination or Review of Legality of Confinement
- Govt Code §845.6 Failure to Fornish Medical Care for Prisoner in Custody
- Govt Code §845.8 Paroled or Escaped Prisoner, Escaped Arrested Person, Person Resisting Arrest
- Govt Code §846 Failure to Make Arrest or Retain Arrested Person in Custody

**Fire Protection**

- Govt Code §850 Failure to Establish Fire Department
- Govt Code §850.2 Failure to Provide Fire Department Personnel, Equipment
- Govt Code §850.4 Condition of Fire Protection Equipment, Facilities, Fighting Fires
- Govt Code §850.6 Fire Protection Provided Outside Area Regularly Served
- Govt Code §850.8 Transportation of Person Injured by Fire To Physician or Hospital
**IMMUNITIES – MEDICAL, HOSPITAL, PUBLIC HEALTH**

Govt Code §854.8 Injury to or by Patients of Mental Institution
Govt Code §855.2 Interference with Right of Inmate of Medical Facility to Obtain Judicial Determination or Review of Legality of Confinement
Govt Code §855.4 Decision to Perform or Not to Perform Act to Promote Public Health by Preventing or Controlling Disease Failure to Make Physical or Mental Examination to Determine Presence of Disease or Mental Condition
Govt Code §855.6 Diagnosing or Failing to Diagnose Mental Illness or Addiction
Govt Code §856 Determining Whether to Confine Person for Mental Illness or Addiction; Terms of Confinement
Govt Code §856.2 Injury by or to Escaped Person Confined for Mental Illness or Addiction
Govt Code §856.4 Failure to Admit Person to Public Medical Facility
Govt Code §856.6 Act or Omission by Public Entity, Employee, or Volunteer Participating in Influenza Program of 1976

---
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