

A new approach to legal research

Search for legal content easily and efficiently



All Categories



All Jurisdictions/courts



A new approach to legal research

Search for legal content easily and efficiently

Enter an term or phrase

All Jurisdictions/courts ▾

🔍

Explore All Content ^

– Content Type ⓘ 22

↳ Cases ⓘ

– Statues and Legislation ⓘ

↳ Statutory Codes ⓘ

↳ Archived Codes ⓘ

↳ Administrative Codes and Regs ⓘ

↳ Administrative and Agency Materials ⓘ

↳ Arbitration Materials ⓘ

↳ Briefs, Pleadings and Motions ⓘ

+ Content Type ⓘ

+ Federal ⓘ 16



Relevance ▾

Cases

8,773

Statutes & Legislation

8,282

Administrative Materials

1,745

Administrative Codes and Regulations

412

Filters ▮



1. **Finch v. Thurston County**

Supreme Court of Washington | Oct 13, 2016 | 186 Wn. 2d 744

... to the rule of strict liability for a dog bite under RCW 16.08.040(1) is not limited solely to when the handler of a police dog orders the dog to bite someone. Such a restricted view does not take into account the myriad of situations police dogs are trained for, including training to bite in certain circumstances without a direct order. Neither the plain language ... nor the legislative history of the “lawful application of a police dog” exemption supports a narrow interpretation that would restrict the exemption only to dog bites made with a command. [6] Animals Dogs Liability for Attack Strict Liability... because the Wash. Rev. Code § 16.08.040(2) exception for dog bites caused by the “lawful application of a police dog” applied; [2]-Because the dog was being used by a law enforcement agency, was specially trained ... suspect, and was under the control of a handler when the bite occurred, the dog was “lawfully applied” for purposes of the strict liability exception; [3]-“Lawful application” of a police dog means the employment or specific use ...

2. **Priebe v. Nelson**

Supreme Court of California | Aug 28, 2006 | 39 Cal. 4th 1112

... of a pit bull for personal injuries suffered when she was bitten by the dog while it was boarded at the kennel that employed her. A ... defense verdict on her statutory strict liability claim pursuant to the dog bite statute (Civ. Code, § 3342), but granted the technician’s ... defendant pit bull owner for personal injuries suffered when she was bitten by the dog while it was boarded at the kennel that employed her. The ... Four, No. A101630, affirmed the trial court’s judgment, concluding that the dog bite statute did not apply and that the veterinarian’s rule absolved the ... owner of any potential injuries inflicted on the technician by the dog while it was boarded at the kennel. The Supreme Court affirmed ... for injuries sustained from a dog bite or attack while the technician was caring for the owner’s dog boarded at the kennel. The instant court concluded that nothing in ... in those situations where the care, custody, and control of a dog has been entrusted to trained professionals in exchange for compensation, as is the case when a dog is left with a veterinarian for medical treatment, or placed in ...

3. **Robinson v. Legro**

Supreme Court of Colorado | May 27, 2014 | 2014 CO 40

... (2013), governs civil actions against dog owners and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of six exemptions applies. Colorado ’s dog bite statute, section 13-21-124, C.R.S. (2013), governs “civil actions against dog owners” and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of ... six exemptions applies. The ranchers here seek to invoke the “working dog” exemption in ...

4. **Robinson v. Legro**

Supreme Court of Colorado | May 27, 2014 | 2014 CO 40

... (2013), governs civil actions against dog owners and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of six exemptions applies. Colorado ’s dog bite statute, section 13-21-124, C.R.S. (2013), governs “civil actions against dog owners” and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of ... six exemptions applies. The ranchers here seek to invoke the “working dog” exemption in ...



Relevance ▾

Cases

8,773

Statutes & Legislation

8,282

Administrative Materials

1,745

Administrative Codes and Regulations

412

Filters ▮

Focus Search



Court



Timeline



1. **Finch v. Thurston County**

Supreme Court of Washington | Oct 13, 2016 | 186 Wn. 2d 744

... to the rule of strict liability for a dog bite under RCW 16.08.040(1) is not limited solely to when the handler of a police dog orders the dog to bite someone. Such a restricted view does not take into account the myriad of situations police dogs are trained for, including training to bite in certain circumstances without a direct order. Neither the plain language ... nor the legislative history of the “lawful application of a police dog” exemption supports a narrow interpretation that would restrict the exemption only to dog bites made with a command. [6] Animals Dogs Liability for Attack Strict Liability... because the Wash. Rev. Code § 16.08.040(2) exception for dog bites caused by the “lawful application of a police dog” applied; [2]-Because the dog was being used by a law enforcement agency, was specially trained ... suspect, and was under the control of a handler when the bite occurred, the dog was “lawfully applied” for purposes of the strict liability exception; [3]-“Lawful application” of a police dog means the employment or specific use ...

2. **Priebe v. Nelson**

Supreme Court of California | Aug 28, 2006 | 39 Cal. 4th 1112

... of a pit bull for personal injuries suffered when she was bitten by the dog while it was boarded at the kennel that employed her. A ... defense verdict on her statutory strict liability claim pursuant to the dog bite statute (Civ. Code, § 3342), but granted the technician’s ... defendant pit bull owner for personal injuries suffered when she was bitten by the dog while it was boarded at the kennel that employed her. The ... Four, No. A101630, affirmed the trial court’s judgment, concluding that the dog bite statute did not apply and that the veterinarian’s rule absolved the ... owner of any potential injuries inflicted on the technician by the dog while it was boarded at the kennel. The Supreme Court affirmed ... for injuries sustained from a dog bite or attack while the technician was caring for the owner’s dog boarded at the kennel. The instant court concluded that nothing in ... in those situations where the care, custody, and control of a dog has been entrusted to trained professionals in exchange for compensation, as is the case when a dog is left with a veterinarian for medical treatment, or placed in ...

3. **Robinson v. Legro**

Supreme Court of Colorado | May 27, 2014 | 2014 CO 40

... (2013), governs civil actions against dog owners and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of six exemptions applies. Colorado ’s dog bite statute, section 13-21-124, C.R.S. (2013), governs “civil actions against dog owners” and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of ... six exemptions applies. The ranchers here seek to invoke the “working dog” exemption in ...

4. **Robinson v. Legro**

Supreme Court of Colorado | May 27, 2014 | 2014 CO 40



Relevance ▾

Cases

8,773

Statutes & Legislation

8,282

Administrative Materials

1,745

Administrative Codes and Regulations

412

Filters ▾

Focus Search



1. **Finch v. Thurston County**

Supreme Court of Washington | Oct 13, 2016

... to the rule of strict liability for a dog bite u
bite someone. Such a restricted view does
certain circumstances without a direct orde
exemption supports a narrow interpretation
for Attack Strict Liability... ... because the Wa
applied; [2]-Because the dog was being use
handler when the bite occurred, the dog wa
means the employment or specific use ...

2. **Priebe v. Nelson**

Supreme Court of California | Aug 28, 2006

... of a pit bull for personal injuries suffered v
verdict on her statutory strict liability claim p
bull owner for personal injuries suffered wh
A101630, affirmed the trial court’s judgment,
owner of any potential injuries inflicted on th
injuries sustained from a dog bite or attack v
that nothing in in those situations where
compensation, as is the case when a dog is left with a veterinarian for medical treatment, or placed in ...

3. **Robinson v. Legro**

Supreme Court of Colorado | May 27, 2014 | 2014 CO 40

... (2013), governs civil actions against dog owners and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of six exemptions applies. Colorado ’s dog bite statute, section 13-21-124, C.R.S. (2013), governs “civil actions against dog owners” and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of six exemptions applies. The ranchers here seek to invoke the “working dog” exemption in ...

4. **Robinson v. Legro**

Supreme Court of Colorado | May 27, 2014 | 2014 CO 40

Court



☐ Federal

2,218

+ ☐ US Supreme Court

5

+ ☐ 1st Circuit

52

+ ☐ 2nd Circuit

172

+ ☐ 3rd Circuit

161

+ ☐ 4th Circuit

189

+ ☐ 5th Circuit

264

+ ☐ 6th Circuit

+ ☐ 7th Circuit

✓ [View More](#)

☐ State Courts

6,247

+ ☐ Alabama

58

+ ☐ Alaska

17

+ ☐ Arizona

63

+ ☐ Arkansas

34

+ ☐ California

649

+ ☐ Colorado

77

+ ☐ Connecticut

535

✓ [View More](#)

Timeline



he handler of a police dog orders the dog to
dogs are trained for, including training to bite in
history of the “lawful application of a police dog”
made with a command. [6] Animals Dogs Liability
caused by the “lawful application of a police dog”
d suspect, and was under the control of a
exception; [3]-“Lawful application” of a police dog

l at the kennel that employed her. A defense
out granted the technician’s defendant pit
the kennel that employed her. The Four, No.
nd that the veterinarian’s rule absolved the
kennel. The Supreme Court affirmed for
boarded at the kennel. The instant court concluded
trusted to trained professionals in exchange for



Relevance ▾

Cases

8,773

Statutes & Legislation

8,282

Administrative Materials

1,745

Administrative Codes and Regulations

412

Filters ▾

Focus Search



1. **Finch v. Thurston County**

Supreme Court of Washington | Oct 13, 2016

... to the rule of strict liability for a dog bite u
bite someone. Such a restricted view does
certain circumstances without a direct orde
exemption supports a narrow interpretation
for Attack Strict Liability... ... because the Wa
applied; [2]-Because the dog was being use
handler when the bite occurred, the dog wa
means the employment or specific use ...

2. **Priebe v. Nelson**

Supreme Court of California | Aug 28, 2006

... of a pit bull for personal injuries suffered v
verdict on her statutory strict liability claim p
bull owner for personal injuries suffered wh
A101630, affirmed the trial court’s judgment,
owner of any potential injuries inflicted on th
injuries sustained from a dog bite or attack
that nothing in in those situations where
compensation, as is the case when a dog is left with a veterinarian for medical treatment, or placed in ...

3. **Robinson v. Legro**

Supreme Court of Colorado | May 27, 2014 | 2014 CO 40

... (2013), governs civil actions against dog owners and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of six exemptions applies. Colorado’s dog bite statute, section 13-21-124, C.R.S. (2013), governs “civil actions against dog owners” and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of ... six exemptions applies. The ranchers here seek to invoke the “working dog” exemption in ...

4. **Robinson v. Legro**

Supreme Court of Colorado | May 27, 2014 | 2014 CO 40

Court



Federal

2,229

+ US Supreme Court

5

+ 1st Circuit

53

+ 2nd Circuit

174

+ 3rd Circuit

160

+ 4th Circuit

191

+ 5th Circuit

162

+ 6th Circuit

191

+ 7th Circuit

188

+ 8th Circuit

154

– 9th Circuit

529

9th Circuit + Court of Appeal

78

– 9th Circuit + US District Courts

447

US District Alaska

4

US District Arizona

34

– US District California

313

Central District California

82

District California

2

East District California

92

North District California

93

Timeline



he handler of a police dog orders the dog to
dogs are trained for, including training to bite in
history of the “lawful application of a police dog”
made with a command. [6] Animals Dogs Liability
caused by the “lawful application of a police dog”
d suspect, and was under the control of a
exception; [3]-“Lawful application” of a police dog

l at the kennel that employed her. A defense
out granted the technician’s defendant pit
the kennel that employed her. The Four, No.
nd that the veterinarian’s rule absolved the
kennel. The Supreme Court affirmed for
boarded at the kennel. The instant court concluded
trusted to trained professionals in exchange for



Relevance ▾

Cases

8,773

Statutes & Legislation

8,282

Administrative Materials

1,745

Administrative Codes and Regulations

412

Filters ▾

Focus Search



1. **Finch v. Thurston County**

Supreme Court of Washington | Oct 13, 2016

... to the rule of strict liability for a dog bite u
bite someone. Such a restricted view does
certain circumstances without a direct orde
exemption supports a narrow interpretation
for Attack Strict Liability... ... because the Wa
applied; [2]-Because the dog was being use
handler when the bite occurred, the dog wa
means the employment or specific use ...

2. **Priebe v. Nelson**

Supreme Court of California | Aug 28, 2006

... of a pit bull for personal injuries suffered v
verdict on her statutory strict liability claim p
bull owner for personal injuries suffered wh
A101630, affirmed the trial court’s judgment,
owner of any potential injuries inflicted on th
injuries sustained from a dog bite or attack v
that nothing in in those situations where
compensation, as is the case when a dog is left with a veterinarian for medical treatment, or placed in ...

3. **Robinson v. Legro**

Supreme Court of Colorado | May 27, 2014 | 2014 CO 40

... (2013), governs civil actions against dog owners and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of six exemptions applies. Colorado ’s dog bite statute, section 13-21-124, C.R.S. (2013), governs “civil actions against dog owners” and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of six exemptions applies. The ranchers here seek to invoke the “working dog” exemption in ...

4. **Robinson v. Legro**

Supreme Court of Colorado | May 27, 2014 | 2014 CO 40

Court



- ☒ District California 2
- ☐ East District California 92
- ☐ North District California 93
- ☐ South District California 44

- + ☐ 10th Circuit 140
- + ☐ 11th Circuit 226
- + ☐ D.C Circuit 29
- + ☐ Fed Circuit 16
- + ☐ U.S. Circuit Courts (1789-1911) 3
- + ☐ U.S. Tax Court 2
- + ☐ Military Justice 6

[View Less](#)

☐ **State Courts** 6,237

- + ☐ Alabama 58
- + ☐ Alaska 17
- + ☐ Arizona 61
- + ☐ Arkansas 34
- + ☐ California 649

[View More](#)

Timeline



he handler of a police dog orders the dog to
dogs are trained for, including training to bite in
history of the “lawful application of a police dog”
made with a command. [6] Animals Dogs Liability
caused by the “lawful application of a police dog”
d suspect, and was under the control of a
exception; [3]-“Lawful application” of a police dog

l at the kennel that employed her. A defense
out granted the technician’s defendant pit
the kennel that employed her. The Four, No.
nd that the veterinarian’s rule absolved the
kennel. The Supreme Court affirmed for
boarded at the kennel. The instant court concluded
trusted to trained professionals in exchange for



Relevance ▾

Cases

8,773

Statutes & Legislation

8,282

Administrative Materials

1,745

Administrative Codes and Regulations

412

Filters ▮

Focus Search



Court ▾

Timeline ▾

dog bite ✕

US Supreme Court ✕

9th Circuit ✕

District California ✕

sample ✕

Clear



1. **Finch v. Thurston County**

Supreme Court of Washington | Oct 13, 2016 | 186 Wn. 2d 744

... to the rule of strict liability for a dog bite under RCW 16.08.040(1) is not limited solely to when the handler of a police dog orders the dog to bite someone. Such a restricted view does not take into account the myriad of situations police dogs are trained for, including training to bite in certain circumstances without a direct order. Neither the plain language ... nor the legislative history of the “lawful application of a police dog” exemption supports a narrow interpretation that would restrict the exemption only to dog bites made with a command. [6] Animals Dogs Liability for Attack Strict Liability... because the Wash. Rev. Code § 16.08.040(2) exception for dog bites caused by the “lawful application of a police dog” applied; [2]-Because the dog was being used by a law enforcement agency, was specially trained ... suspect, and was under the control of a handler when the bite occurred, the dog was “lawfully applied” for purposes of the strict liability exception; [3]-“Lawful application” of a police dog means the employment or specific use ...

2. **Priebe v. Nelson**

Supreme Court of California | Aug 28, 2006 | 39 Cal. 4th 1112

... of a pit bull for personal injuries suffered when she was bitten by the dog while it was boarded at the kennel that employed her. A ... defense verdict on her statutory strict liability claim pursuant to the dog bite statute (Civ. Code, § 3342), but granted the technician’s ... defendant pit bull owner for personal injuries suffered when she was bitten by the dog while it was boarded at the kennel that employed her. The ... Four, No. A101630, affirmed the trial court’s judgment, concluding that the dog bite statute did not apply and that the veterinarian’s rule absolved the ... owner of any potential injuries inflicted on the technician by the dog while it was boarded at the kennel. The Supreme Court affirmed ... for injuries sustained from a dog bite or attack while the technician was caring for the owner’s dog boarded at the kennel. The instant court concluded that nothing in ... in those situations where the care, custody, and control of a dog has been entrusted to trained professionals in exchange for compensation, as is the case when a dog is left with a veterinarian for medical treatment, or placed in ...

3. **Robinson v. Legro**

Supreme Court of Colorado | May 27, 2014 | 2014 CO 40

... (2013), governs civil actions against dog owners and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of six exemptions applies. Colorado ’s dog bite statute, section 13-21-124, C.R.S. (2013), governs “civil actions against dog owners” and imposes strict liability on a dog owner whose dog causes serious bodily injury or death unless at least one of ... six exemptions applies. The ranchers here seek to invoke the “working dog” exemption in ...



Search Document



Go to



Page

Page #



All terms

552



42 USCS § 2000e, Part 1 of 2

Current through Public Law 116-91, approved December 19, 2019.

United States Code Service > TITLE 42. THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE (Chs. 1 — 161) > CHAPTER 21. CIVIL RIGHTS (§§ 1981 — 2000h-6) > EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES (§§ 2000e — 2000e-17)

§ 2000e. Definitions

For the purposes of this title [42 USCS §§ 2000e et seq.]—

(a) The term “person” includes one or more individuals, governments, governmental agencies, political subdivisions, labor unions, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, mutual companies, joint-stock companies, trusts, unincorporated organizations, trustees, trustees in cases under title 11, United States Code, or receivers.

(b) The term “employer” means a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce who has fifteen or more employees for each working day in each of twenty or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, and any agent of such a person, but such term does not include (1) the United States, a corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States, an Indian tribe, or any department or agency of the District of Columbia subject by statute to procedures of the competitive service (as defined in section 2102 of title 5 of the United States Code), or (2) a bonafide private membership club (other than a labor organization) which is exempt from taxation under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 [26 USCS § 501(c)] except that during the first year after the date of enactment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 [enacted March 24, 1972], persons having fewer than twenty-five employees (and their agents) shall not be considered employers.

(c) The term “employment agency” means any person regularly undertaking with or without compensation to procure employees for an employer or to procure for employees opportunities to work for an employer and includes an agent of such a person.

(d) The term “labor organization” means a labor organization engaged in an industry affecting commerce, and any agent of such an organization, and includes any organization of any kind, any agency, or employee representation committee, group, association, or plan so engaged in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment, and any conference, general committee, joint or system board, or joint council so engaged which is subordinate to a national or international labor organization.

(e) A labor organization shall be deemed to be engaged in an industry affecting commerce if (1) it maintains or operates a hiring hall or hiring office which procures employees for an employer or procures for employees opportunities to work for an employer, or (2) the number of its members (or, where it is a labor organization composed of other labor organizations or their representatives, if the aggregate number of the members of such other labor organization) is (A) twenty-five or more during the first year after the date of enactment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 [enacted March 24, 1972], or (B) fifteen or more thereafter, and such labor organization—

(1) is the certified representative of employees under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, or the Railway Labor Act, as amended;

(2) although not certified, is a national or international labor organization or a local labor organization recognized or acting as the representative of employees of an employer or employers engaged in an industry affecting commerce; or

(3) has chartered a local labor organization or subsidiary body which is representing or actively seeking to



Colorado Supreme Court

- ❑ 1. **Pulte Home Corp. v. Countryside Cmty. Ass’n**, 382 P.3d 821, 2016 Colo. LEXIS 978, 2016 CO 64 ⚠

... (internal quotation marks omitted). Finally, Standards of Review, De Novo Review Legislation, Interpretation HN4 An appellate court reviews questions of statutory interpretation de novo. we review questions of statutory interpretation de novo as well. Robinson v. Legro , 2014 CO 40 , ¶ 10 , 325 P.3d 1053 , 1056 . Legislation, Interpretation HN5 In interpreting a statute, a court looks to the entire statutory scheme to give consistent, harmonious, and sensible effect to all parts and applies ...

Court

Colo.

Date

September 26, 2016

- ❑ 2. **Ryan Ranch Cmty. Ass’n v. Kelly**, 380 P.3d 137, 2016 Colo. LEXIS 975, 2016 CO 65

... The meaning and effect of statutory provisions and whether those provisions conflict with covenants and other recorded instruments are questions of law that the court reviews de novo. The meaning and effect of statutory provisions and whether those provisions conflict with covenants and other recorded instruments are questions of law that we review de novo. See Robinson v. Legro , 2014 CO 40 , ¶ 10 , 325 P.3d 1053 , 1056 . III. Analysis The issue in this case is whether the Kelley Lots were ...

Court

Colo.

Date

September 26, 2016

- ❑ 3. **People v. Graves**, 368 P.3d 317, 2016 Colo. LEXIS 196, 2016 CO 15

... 988 P.2d at 634 . In so doing, we interpret words and phrases used in statues according to their generally accepted meaning. Id. In addition, we examine particular statutory language in the context of the statute as a whole. Robinson v. Legro , 2014 CO 40 , ¶ 18 , 325 P.3d 1053 , 1057 . The public indecency statute provides: Sex Crimes, Indecent Exposure HN12 See Colo. Rev. Stat. § 18-7-301(1) (2015). (1) Any person who performs any of the following in a public place or where the conduct ...

Court

Colo.

Date

February 29, 2016

Colorado Court of Appeals

- ❑ 4. **People ex rel. B.F.**, 2020 Colo. App. LEXIS 468 ☹

... . The nonmoving party is entitled to the benefit of all favorable inferences reasonably drawn from the undisputed facts, and all doubts must be resolved against the moving party. Brodeur v. Am. Home Assurance Co. , 169 P.3d 139 , 146 (Colo. 2007) . We review the juvenile court’s grant of summary judgment de novo. Robinson v. Legro , 325 P.3d 1053 , 2014 CO 40 , ¶ 10 . B. No Material Facts in Dispute The Department argues that its evidence meets the statutory requirements for adjudication ...

Court

Colo.

Date

February 13, 2020