

Minnesota leads the country in the number of stray voltage cases landing in courts. Minnesota has seen an increasing number of questionable cases brought to court due to the increase in consultants looking to benefit financially from a lawsuit. How do you believe these issues should be addressed in Minnesota? What qualifications should people who testify on stray voltage cases have?

Gruenhagen: I support tort reform, especially on frivolous lawsuits. I have also been a supporter of loser pay legislation. The state has caps on their liability in a number of areas. I believe the private sector should also have reasonable caps and not unlimited liability to allow trial lawyers to bring frivolous lawsuits with the potential of huge settlements and then extracting a settlement on a questionable case due to the threat of litigation. Minnesota need to have loser pay provisions for their lawsuits and also caps depending on the severity of the liability. Potential stray voltage should first have to go in front of a board of experts to determine the scientific and legal basis before allowing to go forward in the courts.

Lipke: A long time ago a wise judge or attorney pointed out to me that in this country we all are entitled to our day in court so to speak. This does not always seem fair to all parties however the system is the best in the world in most opinions. I would point out here that the consultant doesn't do the suing. The people hire him/her. I believe the qualifications of people testifying on stray voltage cases would come under the perusal of the court.