

LOS ANGELES

# Daily Journal

www.dailyjournal.com

VOL. 126 NO. 003

FRIDAY, JANUARY 4, 2013



Hugh Williams / Special to the Daily Journal

Eliseo Martinez Jr. and his dog, Gunner, who lost a leg after he was shot by Martinez's neighbor.

## Pet owners getting more cash in recent state court decisions

By Emily Green  
Daily Journal Staff Writer

**E**ven the most rational people will say it's hard to put a price tag on your furry best friend. Increasingly, California courts are finding the same. Recent appellate court decisions have significantly expanded the monetary damages pet owners can win if their animals are injured because of veterinarians' negligence or cruel acts by others. Last month, the state Supreme Court declined to review an appellate court ruling allowing a couple to recover emotional distress damages after a neighbor struck their dog with a bat.

garding pets, one that has involved a push and pull among the appellate courts. And basic questions — such as which animals qualify as pets — remain.

“These cases are fact-specific and can really depend on the judge and how serious they take the interests of animals,” said Matthew Liebman, a senior attorney with the Animal Legal Defense Fund in Cotati. Yet there is a shift “toward broader recognition of animals within the legal system,” he said.

The trend could affect millions of people, not to mention countless animals. Thirty-three percent of California households — about 4 million of them — own a dog, according to the American Veterinary Medical Association. Among them: Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye, who purchases supplementary pet insurance from the California Judges Association for the family dog. The average veterinary expenditure per household in 2011 was \$378, according to the association.

The question for the courts is just how much dogs and other animals are legally worth. The Legislature defines domestic pets as a form of personal property, just like other inanimate objects. If that property is damaged, owners generally cannot recover more money than it would take to replace the item. That means pet owners cannot recover more than the market value of their animal if it's injured or killed.

On one side of the debate over pet law are attorneys like Steven H. Haney of Haney Law Group in Los Angeles. He argues that because people have a special bond with their pets, they “warrant a different treatment under the law.” He wants the law

other forms of compensation.

On the other side are attorneys like George M. Wallace of Wallace, Brown & Schwartz in Pasadena. Wallace, who owns several dogs, said, “I love animals as much as anybody.” But he argues that pets, ultimately, “are as easily replaceable as cars are.” He contends that veterinarians should not be liable for expensive health care bills that exceed an animal's market value.

In 2009, the 4th District Court of Appeal ruled that damages can't be based on sentimental attachment as it rejected an appeal for emotional distress recovery from the owner of a Maltese dog that died in the care of a veterinarian.

Allowing such damages, the court said, would elevate pet owners' loss above that of parents of children who are injured or killed. Those parents are largely limited to recovering damages for the child's loss of future earnings — not loss of companionship. Moreover, the court said that permitting plaintiffs to recover emotional distress damages would increase litigation and burden the courts' already limited resources.

Three subsequent appellate court decisions took a more sympathetic approach to pet owners. In 2012, the 2nd District Court of Appeal affirmed a \$50,000 emotional distress award given to a couple whose dog was hit with a baseball bat by a neighbor. The dog had suffered a dislocated knee that cost \$2,600 to fix. Two other state appellate courts ruled that pet owners may be entitled to tens of thousands of dollars they spent saving their animal, money that far exceeded its market value.

# Damages for pet owners debated as judges set a murky standard

Continued from page 1

To date, the recent appellate court decisions appear to establish a standard, albeit murky: Pet owners may recover the amount of money they spend on health care for their injured pet even if that exceeds the market value of the animal. Pet owners also may recover emotional distress damages if their pet was intentionally harmed. But they cannot recover emotional distress damages if their pet was injured due to negligence, such as by a veterinarian.

Animal activists cherish the legal ground they have won in recent years, but the court victories haven't yet translated to monetary payouts.

In a recent interview, Margaret Workman nearly cried talking about her golden retriever, Katie. In 2008, Katie underwent a procedure to remove a small liver lobe. The veterinarian nicked the dog's intestine and left a piece of surgical gauze inside her body, according to the court's decision. Almost immediately, Katie developed internal bleeding and had to have emergency surgery.

When Workman, now 78, confronted the veterinarian who performed the original procedure, he offered to return the \$4,836.16 that he charged, but refused to pay the cost of the emergency surgery — \$37,766.06. The court ruled Workman could seek in damages more than the market value of her dog and remanded the dispute to the trial court to determine the veterinarian's liability. The veterinarian has appealed to the state Supreme Court, and Workman has yet to receive any money.

The same is true for Eliseo Martinez Jr., whose case was consolidated with Workman's. In 2009, Martinez' 2-year-old German shepherd, Gunner, was shot by a neighbor following a longstanding dispute between the men. After the incident, Martinez,

a dock worker who lives outside of Long Beach, spent \$22,000 in medical bills on Gunner, who ultimately lost a leg. The appellate court remanded the dispute to the trial court to determine the neighbor's liability.

"I consider Gunner like my child, like my children, like my wife, like myself," Martinez said. "Especially when he simply did nothing wrong and yet he is suffering now for the rest of his life. There was no way I could let our family pet die. I didn't care what it would cost. I would do anything I had to do to save his life. He's one of my own."

Martinez estimates that he will receive less than half of what he spent on doctor's and lawyer's bills.

Another looming question is who has standing to sue.

"Is every family member residing with the pet a human companion and potential plaintiff? Moreover, what pets would qualify as companion animals? Few would dispute the longstanding bond between humans and dogs, but limiting emotional distress damages to dog owners would affront those who love cats," wrote Justice Richard M. Aronson of the 4th District Court of Appeal in a decision rejecting emotional distress damages for a pet owner.

Even within a single law firm, the question of a pet's value has the power to divide. Attorney Jim P. Mahacek of the Law Offices of Steven R. Young in Costa Mesa, who unsuccessfully appealed the later appellate court decision allowing emotional distress damages, said he loves animals. But he doesn't believe people should be awarded emotional distress damages just because their pet was injured.

"My wife has a cat. I really like dogs. But my emotionalism can't trump what the law ought to be on these issues," Mahacek said.

Mahacek's colleague, Steven R.

Young, has a different take.

"I'm usually standing up and screaming bloody murder because rights are violated and now my office is defending someone who hit a dog with a bat," Young said. "My dogs wouldn't let me come home if they knew about this."

*emily\_green@dailyjournal.com*

## Correction

In a Dec. 26 article, UC Irvine School of Law Dean Erwin Chemerinsky's name was misspelled. The Daily Journal regrets the error.

Los Angeles Daily Journal  
(ISSN:0362-5575)

Established as a daily newspaper in 1888. Official newspaper of the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles.

Published daily except Saturdays, Sundays and New Year's Day, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Day, Presidents' Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day and Christmas Day by Daily Journal Corporation, 915 East First Street, Los Angeles, Calif., 90012. (213) 229-5300.

Periodicals postage paid at Los Angeles, California. Adjudicated a newspaper of general circulation, Los Angeles Superior Court No. 59775 and B-33522. Additionally adjudicated on June 5, 1954, in Case No. 599382.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES:** Three months \$291, six months \$436 one year \$735, student \$399, new admittee \$410, plus applicable sales tax.

**POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to Los Angeles Daily Journal, P.O. Box 54026, Los Angeles, California 90054-0026.

Filings are taken from public records as a convenience for our subscribers and republished without prejudice or liability. The Los Angeles Daily Journal is not responsible for errors and omissions. Under no circumstances will any matter of record be withheld from publication in this paper.

This newspaper does not assume responsibility for the views expressed in published correspondence or contributed notes or articles.

Material published in the Los Angeles Daily Journal is compiled at substantial expense and is for the sole and exclusive use of subscribers. The material may not be republished, resold, or used in any manner, in whole or in part, without the consent of the publisher. Any infringement will be subject of legal redress.

210 Cal.App.4th 384  
Court of Appeal, Second  
District, Division 2, California.

Eliseo MARTINEZ, Jr., et  
al., Plaintiffs and Appellants,

v.

Enrique ROBLEDO, Defendant and Respondent.  
Margaret Workman, Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

Stephen E. Klause et al.,  
Defendants and Respondents.

Nos. B231534, B231545. | Oct. 23, 2012.

#### Synopsis

**Background:** Dog owner brought action against neighbor for negligence and conversion. Another dog owner brought another action against veterinarian for negligence and unfair business practices. The Superior Court, Los Angeles County, Nos. NC042929 and BC415058, Roy L. Paul and Debre Katz Weintraub, JJ., ruled that the measure of damages for injuries to each dog would be limited to the market value of the dogs and entered stipulated judgment awarding \$1,000 in damages to each owner. Owners appealed.

**[Holding:]** The Court of Appeal, Doi Todd, J., held that pet owners may recover reasonable costs of treatment as damages for injury to pet.

Reversed and remanded.

West Headnotes (4)

#### [1] Appeal and Error

↳ On consent, offer, or admission

A judgment entered pursuant to a stipulation is ordinarily not appealable, but an exception exists where consent was given merely to facilitate an appeal and the judgment constitutes a final disposition of all claims.

#### [2] Damages

↳ Injuries to personal property

As damages for injury to a pet, the pet owner may recover the reasonable and necessary costs incurred for the treatment and care of the pet attributable to the injury, even if that amount exceeds the market value of the pet. West's Ann.Cal.Civ.Code § 3333; West's Ann.Cal.Evid. Code § 823.

#### [3] Animals

↳ Protective and anti-cruelty regulation in general

Under the Penal Code, an owner has an affirmative duty to properly care for an animal. West's Ann.Cal.Penal Code § 597.1(a).

#### [4] Damages

↳ Injuries to animals

When a pet owner presents evidence of the costs incurred for the treatment and care of a pet as evidence of damages for an injury to the pet, the defendant may present evidence showing the costs were unreasonable under the circumstances. West's Ann.Cal.Civ.Code § 3333; West's Ann.Cal.Evid. Code § 823.

*See 6 Witkin, Summary of Cal. Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, § 1718 et seq.*

#### Attorneys and Law Firms

\*\*922 Haney Torbett; Haney, Roderick, Torbett & Arnold and Steven H. Haney for Plaintiffs and Appellants.

Veatch Carlson, Mark A. Weinstein and Peter H. Crossin, Los Angeles, for Defendant and Respondent Enrique Robledo.

**Martinez v. Robledo, 210 Cal.App.4th 384 (2012)**

147 Cal.Rptr.3d 921, 12 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 12,045, 2012 Daily Journal D.A.R. 14,708

Wallace, Brown & Schwarts and George M. Wallace for Defendants and Respondents Stephen E. Klause and Arcadia Small Animal Hospital.

Animal Legal Defense Fund, Matthew Liebman; Caldwell Leslie & Proctor and David Zaft, Los Angeles, as Amicus Curiae on behalf of Plaintiffs and Appellants.

**Opinion**

DOITODD, J.

\*386 The consolidated appeals in these two cases present the same legal issue: What is the measure of damages for the wrongful injury of a pet? We hold that a pet owner is not limited to the market value of the pet and may recover the reasonable and necessary costs incurred for the treatment and care of the pet attributable to the injury. Accordingly, we reverse the stipulated judgments and remand the cases for further proceedings.

**FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

The plaintiffs in both cases are represented by the same attorneys, but the parties and facts are otherwise unrelated.

Eliseo Martinez, Jr., individually and as guardian ad litem for minors Eliseo Martinez III and Russell Eric Martinez, and Arlene Gonzalez (collectively Martinez) alleged the following: On the morning of February 5, 2009, Martinez's family dog, Gunner, a two-year-old German Shepherd, got loose from his yard and entered the property next door belonging to respondent Enrique Robledo. At the time, the neighbors were involved in a dispute over a hedge and were not on good terms. Gunner and Robledo's dog began \*387 barking at each other, but were separated by a gate and incapable of physical contact. \*\*923 Robledo shot and wounded Gunner. The veterinarian later had to amputate Gunner's right rear leg. Martinez sued Robledo for negligence and conversion, seeking recovery of \$20,789.81 in veterinarian bills in addition to punitive damages.<sup>1</sup>

Margaret Workman alleged the following: In December 2008 she took Katie, her nine-year-old Golden Retriever, to respondent Stephen E. Klause, a veterinarian with respondent Arcadia Small Animal Hospital, for surgery to remove a

small liver lobe. During the procedure, Klause nicked and cut Katie's intestine, causing internal bleeding, and left a piece of surgical gauze inside her body. Klause did not disclose what had happened. Workman was charged \$4,836.16 for the procedure. Almost immediately, Katie began vomiting blood, exhibited signs of pain and developed internal bleeding. Workman took Katie to the Animal Emergency Referral Center for emergency surgery. The center saved Katie's life by stopping the bleeding and removing remnants of the gauze, which had begun to dissolve and cause infections. The center billed Workman \$37,766.06. When Workman confronted Klause, he offered to return the \$4,836.16 she had paid him, but refused to pay for the emergency bills. Workman sued for negligence and unfair business practices (Bus. & Prof.Code, § 17200).

[1] In both cases, respondents filed motions in limine regarding the issue of damages. In Martinez's case, respondent sought to limit evidence of damages to Gunner's market value. In Workman's case, respondents sought to preclude evidence purporting to show that Katie had a "peculiar" or "unique" value. In both cases, after the trial courts had ruled that the measure of damages would be limited to the market value of the dogs, the parties entered into stipulated judgments for the purpose of appealing the damages issue. The parties stipulated that the market value of each dog was \$1,000, that judgments would be entered in favor of appellants in this amount, and that appellants would not seek execution of the judgments while the appeals were pending.<sup>2</sup>

**\*388 DISCUSSION**

**Summary of Contentions**

Appellants contend that pets are and should be treated as fundamentally more significant than mere personal property and that the appropriate measure of damages for an owner whose pet is wrongfully injured should be the reasonable and necessary costs incurred for the pet's care and treatment. They argue that damages should not be limited to the market value of the animal. Appellants rely on Kimes v. Grosser (2011) 195 Cal.App.4th 1556, 126 Cal.Rptr.3d 581 (Kimes) (discussed below) and Civil Code section 3333, which provides: "For the breach of an obligation not arising from contract, the measure of damages, except where otherwise expressly provided by

**Martinez v. Robledo, 210 Cal.App.4th 384 (2012)**

147 Cal.Rptr.3d 921, 12 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 12,045, 2012 Daily Journal D.A.R. 14,708

this code, is the amount which \*\*924 will compensate for all the detriment proximately caused thereby, whether it could have been anticipated or not.”<sup>3</sup>

Respondents contend that because domestic animals are considered the personal property of their owners (Civ.Code, § 655; Pen.Code, § 491 [“Dogs are personal property, and their value is to be ascertained in the same manner as the value of other property”]), the appropriate measure of damages for wrongful injury to a pet should be the same as that for other personal property, as set forth in CACI No. 3903J and the supporting cases. CACI No. 3903J provides that the measure of damages for injury to personal property is either the difference in market value immediately before and after the injury, or the cost of repairs, whichever is less. The instruction also provides that if the property “cannot be completely repaired, the damages are the difference between its value before the harm and its value after the repairs have been made, plus the reasonable cost of making the repairs. The total amount awarded must not exceed the [property]’s value before the harm occurred.” (See also *Smith v. Hill* (1965) 237 Cal.App.2d 374, 388, 47 Cal.Rptr. 49 and *Hand Electronics, Inc. v. Snowline Joint Unified School Dist.* (1994) 21 Cal.App.4th 862, 870, 26 Cal.Rptr.2d 446.)

**Kimes Case**

In *Kimes, supra*, 195 Cal.App.4th 1556, 126 Cal.Rptr.3d 581, which was decided after the appeals were filed here, Division One of the First District was called upon to address the same issue confronting us: What damages can be awarded for the wrongful injury to a pet with little to no market value? (*Id.* at p. 1558, 126 Cal.Rptr.3d 581.) In *Kimes*, the owner of an adopted stray cat sued his neighbors alleging they \*389 willfully shot the cat with a pellet gun. The cat underwent life-saving emergency surgery costing \$6,000, which left the cat partially paralyzed. The cat’s owner incurred an additional \$30,000 in caring for the cat due to the injury, and sought to recover amounts paid for the cat’s care, plus punitive damages. (*Ibid.*) After the trial court granted the defendants’ motions in limine to exclude evidence of the expenses in caring for the cat, the plaintiff dismissed his suit, effectively conceding the cat had no market value that justified the expenses of trial. (*Ibid.*) The appellate court reversed the judgment of dismissal and held that “the owner can recover the costs of care of the pet attributable to the injury if the

costs are found to be reasonable and necessary, and punitive damages if the injury is found to be intentional.” (*Ibid.*)

In reaching its holding and the conclusion that “the rule in CACI No. 3903J has no application in this case to prevent proof of out-of-pocket expenses to save the life of a pet cat,” (*Kimes, supra*, 195 Cal.App.4th at p. 1560, 126 Cal.Rptr.3d 581), the *Kimes* court relied in part on the century-old case of *Willard v. Valley Gas & Fuel Co.* (1915) 171 Cal. 9, 151 P. 286 (*Willard*). In *Willard*, the plaintiff’s home and contents were destroyed by a fire negligently caused by the defendant. Lost in the fire were scrap books and other data used by the plaintiff in his occupation as a writer. (*Id.* at pp. 14–15, 151 P. 286.) Though the property had no market value, the court ruled that the property’s value “ ‘must be ascertained in some other rational way, and from such elements as are attainable.’ ” (*Id.* at p. 16, 151 P. 286.) The court held that the plaintiff could testify \*\*925 regarding the value of the property to him. (*Id.* at p. 15, 151 P. 286.) Numerous cases have followed *Willard*, disapproved on another ground in *Showalter v. Western Pacific R.R. Co.* (1940) 16 Cal.2d 460, 465–467, 106 P.2d 895.

The *Kimes* court stated: “In this case, plaintiff is not plucking a number out of the air for the sentimental value of damaged property; he seeks to present evidence of costs incurred for [the cat’s] care and treatment by virtue of the shooting—a ‘rational way’ of demonstrating a measure of damages apart from the cat’s market value.” (*Kimes, supra*, 195 Cal.App.4th at p. 1561, 126 Cal.Rptr.3d 581.) The *Kimes* court noted that other states have applied a similar measure of damages (citing *Zager v. Dimilia* (N.Y.App.Term., 1988) 138 Misc.2d 448, 524 N.Y.S.2d 968, 970 and *Burgess v. Shampooch Pet Industries, Inc.* (2006) 35 Kan.App.2d 458, 131 P.3d 1248). The court also cited Evidence Code section 823 which provides that “ ‘the value of property for which there is no relevant, comparable market may be determined by any method of valuation that is just and equitable.’ ” (*Kimes, supra*, at pp. 1561–1562, 126 Cal.Rptr.3d 581.)

\*390 The *Kimes* court concluded that under Civil Code section 3333 the “plaintiff may present evidence of the bills incurred to save the cat’s life and is entitled to recover the reasonable and necessary costs caused by someone who wrongfully injured the cat. Defendants are entitled to present evidence why the costs were unreasonable under the circumstances,” and that in addition to the reasonable costs

**Martinez v. Robledo, 210 Cal.App.4th 384 (2012)**

147 Cal.Rptr.3d 921, 12 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 12,045, 2012 Daily Journal D.A.R. 14,708

of care occasioned by the shooting the “ plaintiff can recover punitive damages on a showing that the shooting was willful.” (*Kimes, supra*, 195 Cal.App.4th at p. 1563, 126 Cal.Rptr.3d 581.)

**Analysis**

Respondents argue that *Kimes* was wrongfully decided because it did not adhere to the traditional measure of damages for injury to personal property, and urge us not to follow it. Additionally, they seek to distinguish *Kimes* by pointing out that the cat in *Kimes* had little to no market value, whereas the parties here stipulated that Gunner and Katie each had a market value of \$1,000. We note that this stipulated value was agreed upon solely for the purpose of taking an appeal.

[2] We find *Kimes* persuasive. There can be little doubt that most pets have minimal to no market value, particularly elderly pets. As amicus notes, while people typically place substantial value on their *own* animal companions, as evidenced by the large sums of money spent on food, medical care, toys, boarding and grooming, etc., there is generally no market for *other people's* pets. (See *Burgess v. Shampoooch Pet Industries, Inc., supra*, 35 Kan.App.2d at p. 464, 131 P.3d 1248 [“unlike other types of personal property, there are no true marketplaces that routinely deal in the buying and selling of previously owned pet dogs”]; *Van Patten v. City of Binghamton* (N.D.N.Y.2001) 137 F.Supp.2d 98, 104–105 [“pets are distinguishable from what we normally consider as personal property .... there is no such thing as replacement”].) We agree that the determination of a pet's value cannot be made solely by looking to the marketplace. If the rule were otherwise, an injured animal's owner would bear most or all of the costs for the medical care required to treat the injury caused by a tortfeasor, while the tortfeasor's liability for such costs would in most cases be minimal, no matter how horrific the wrongdoer's conduct or how gross the negligence of a veterinarian or other animal professional.

**\*926** Moreover, allowing a pet owner to recover the reasonable costs of the care and treatment of an injured pet reflects the basic purpose of tort law, which is to make plaintiffs whole, or to approximate wholeness to the greatest extent judicially possible. (See, e.g., **\*391** *6 Witkin, Summary of Cal. Law* (10th Ed.2005) Torts, § 1548, p. 1022, “In tort actions, damages are normally awarded for

the purpose of compensating the plaintiff for injury suffered, i.e., restoring the plaintiff as nearly as possible to his or her former position, or giving some pecuniary equivalent.”) Notably, since *Kimes* was published, the Judicial Council has clarified that CACI No. 3903J has no application in circumstances such as these: “Do not give this instruction if the property had no monetary value either before or after injury.” (Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions (December 2011) CACI No. 3903J, Directions for Use (citing *Kimes*.)

Respondents argue that “[t]o permit animal owners—or at least the owners of otherwise ‘valueless’ animals—to effectively dictate a value by their unilateral choice concerning the amount they are willing to spend for veterinary care is to treat animals as *sui generis*, as fundamentally different from any other sort of personal property.” But the law already treats animals differently from other forms of personal property. For example, 48 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, classify some form of animal cruelty as a felony. (See <http://aldf.org/article.php?id=261>, U.S. Jurisdictions With and Without Felony Animal Cruelty Provisions.) By contrast, the law generally does not treat the abuse or intentional destruction of other forms of one's own property as a crime. State and federal pet evacuation legislation enacted in the wake of Hurricane Katrina also acknowledges the value of animal companions to their human families by providing assistance for the evacuation and temporary shelter of pets in times of emergency or disaster. (See The Federal Pets Evacuation and Transportation Standards Act of 2006 (PETS), Pub.L. No. 109–308, § 1, 120 Stat. 1725 (42 U.S.C. § 5121) and The Louisiana Pet Evacuation Bill, 2006 La. Acts 615 (codified at La.Rev.Stat. Ann. §§ 29:726(E)(20)–(21), 729(E)(13)–(14), 733.1.) As amicus states, “These laws reflect the widespread socially-accepted significance of animals and their connection with people, and demonstrate that our legal system recognizes that animals are a unique kind of property.” In addition to the out-of-state cases cited in *Kimes*, appellants and amicus cite numerous other foreign cases that support awarding owners damages for injured pets in excess of the pet's value. <sup>4</sup>

**\*392** [3] In California, the Legislature has recognized since 1872 that animals are special, sentient beings, because unlike other forms of property, animals feel pain, suffer and

**Martinez v. Robledo, 210 Cal.App.4th 384 (2012)**

147 Cal.Rptr.3d 921, 12 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 12,045, 2012 Daily Journal D.A.R. 14,708

die. Civil Code section 3340 provides **\*\*927** that “[f]or wrongful injuries to animals being subjects of property, committed willfully or by gross negligence, in disregard of humanity, exemplary damages may be given.” Laws criminalizing animal abuse underscore the Legislature’s view that animals are a distinct and specially protected form of property. Penal Code section 597, subdivision (a) provides that “every person who maliciously and intentionally maims, mutilates, tortures, or wounds a living animal, or maliciously and intentionally kills an animal, is guilty of a crime.” Under Penal Code section 597.1, subdivision (a), every owner “of any animal who permits the animal to be in any building, enclosure, lane, street, square, or lot of any city, county, city and county, or judicial district without proper care and attention is guilty of a misdemeanor.” Thus, an owner has an affirmative duty to properly care for an animal. There are dozens of other laws criminalizing the mistreatment of animals.<sup>5</sup>

Given the Legislature’s historical solicitude for the proper care and treatment of animals, and the array of criminal penalties for the mistreatment of animals, as well as the reality that animals are living creatures, the usual standard of recovery for damaged personal property—market value—is inadequate when applied to injured pets.

[4] We agree with the *Kimes* court that allowing an injured pet’s owner to recover the reasonable and necessary costs incurred in the treatment and care for the animal attributable to the injury is a rational and appropriate measure of damages. Such evidence is admissible under Civil Code section 3333 as proof of a plaintiff’s compensable damages. And a defendant may present evidence showing the costs were unreasonable under the circumstances.

**\*393 DISPOSITION**

The stipulated judgments are reversed and the cases remanded for further proceedings in accordance with the views expressed herein. The parties to bear their own costs on appeal.

We concur: BOREN, P.J., and ASHMANN–GERST, J.

**Parallel Citations**

210 Cal.App.4th 384, 12 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 12,045, 2012 Daily Journal D.A.R. 14,708

**Footnotes**

- 1 Robledo claims he acted in self defense when Gunner charged at him. In reply, Eliseo Martinez asserts that he and his wife were criminally charged and tried for having a vicious dog but were acquitted. These facts, however, are irrelevant for purposes of this appeal and we do not address them.
- 2 A judgment entered pursuant to a stipulation is ordinarily not appealable, but an exception exists where consent was given merely to facilitate an appeal and the judgment constitutes a final disposition of all claims. (*Tudor Ranches, Inc. v. State Comp. Ins. Fund* (1998) 65 Cal.App.4th 1422, 1430, 77 Cal.Rptr.2d 574.) Additionally, while a particular amount of damages is an issue of fact, the proper measure of damages is a question of law subject to de novo review. (*Toscano v. Greene Music* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 685, 691, 21 Cal.Rptr.3d 732.)
- 3 Appellants are not seeking to recover damages for sentimental value or loss of companionship, only economic damages in the form of veterinarian bills that exceed their pet’s market value.
- 4 (See, e.g., *La Porte v. Associated Independents, Inc.* (Fla.1964) 163 So.2d 267, 269 [“we feel that the affection of a master for his dog is a very real thing and that the malicious destruction of the pet provides an element of damage for which the owner should recover, irrespective of the value of the animal...”]; *Brown v. Swindell* (La.Ct.App.1967) 198 So.2d 432, 434 [“The trial court awarded the plaintiff the sum of \$96.00 which he had actually expended in having the animal treated by a veterinarian, and the record adequately supports this award”]; *Morgan v. Patin* (La.Ct.App.1950) 47 So.2d 91, 93 [“There is no doubt that the veterinarian fee of \$13.00 is due”]; *Kaiser v. United States* (D.D.C.1991) 761 F.Supp. 150, 156 [“The Court finds that, as a result of Miller’s negligence, plaintiffs suffered a loss of property in the amount of [veterinarian bills of] \$1,786.50”]; *Leith v. Frost* (Ill.Ct.App.2008) 387 Ill.App.3d 430, 437, 326 Ill.Dec. 418, 899 N.E.2d 635 [awarding owner of injured dog \$4,784 in veterinarian bills].)
- 5 For example, it is a crime to: overload, overwork, torment or beat any animal, or deprive it of water, food, shelter and protection (Pen.Code, § 597, subd. (b)); transport an animal in “a cruel or inhumane manner” (Pen.Code, § 597a); use animals in fights, for



**Martínez v. Robledo, 210 Cal.App.4th 384 (2012)**

147 Cal.Rptr.3d 921, 12 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 12,045, 2012 Daily Journal D.A.R. 14,708

amusement or gain (Pen.Code, § 597b); intentionally trip or fell a horse (Pen.Code, § 597g, subd. (b)); willfully abandon any animal (Pen.Code, § 597s, subd. (a)); confine an animal without an adequate exercise area, or use a leash, rope or chain that would entangle or injure the animal (Pen.Code, § 597t); sell a dog younger than eight weeks old (Pen.Code, § 597z, subd. (a)(1)); injure an animal to be sold while it is still living, or confine, hold or display it in a manner that is likely to result in injury or death (Pen.Code, § 597.3, subds.(a)(1) & (2)).

End of Document

© 2012 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.