

[Bond Case Briefs](#)

Municipal Finance Law Since 1971

EMINENT DOMAIN - NEBRASKA

[Strode v. City of Ashland](#)

Supreme Court of Nebraska - October 28, 2016 - 295 Neb. 44 - 886 N.W.2d 293

Husband and wife landowners brought action against city and county, alleging zoning regulation inverse condemnation and alleging that bridge load limit constituted a taking.

The District Court dismissed husband's inverse condemnation claims as time barred, and granted summary judgment for city and county. Landowners appealed.

The Supreme Court of Nebraska held that:

- As a matter of first impression, cause of action for inverse condemnation based on a regulatory taking begins to accrue when the injured party has the right to institute and maintain a lawsuit due to a city's infringement, or an attempt at infringement, of a landowner's legal rights in the property;
- City's letter to landowners providing notice of nonconforming use and the city's intention to institute legal action began running of 10-year statute of limitations on husband landowner's cause of action for inverse condemnation;
- Statute of limitations on wife landowner's separate claim for inverse condemnation began to run on date husband received letter from city; and
- Load limit on bridge to property did not constitute a "regulatory taking."

In the context of a regulatory taking, a cause of action for inverse condemnation begins to accrue when the injured party has the right to institute and maintain a lawsuit due to a city's infringement, or an attempt at infringement, of a landowner's legal rights in the property.

At the latest, city's letter to landowners providing notice of nonconforming use and the city's intention to institute legal action if landowners did not conform their use began running of 10-year statute of limitations on cause of action for inverse condemnation, as city's actions had an adverse economic impact on the landowners' right to use the property in the commercial manner that they wished.

Statute of limitations on wife landowner's separate claim for inverse condemnation began to run on date husband received letter from city providing notice of nonconforming use and the city's intention to institute legal action if landowners did not conform their use, rather than any date on which wife received actual notice of land use ordinance affecting the property, as letter constituted an infringement or attempted infringement on wife's right to use the property as she wished and gave rise to her right to institute and maintain a lawsuit.

Load limit on bridge to property did not constitute a "regulatory taking"; while load limit restricted landowner to using either semitrailer trucks that weighed less for access across the bridge or trucks of a limited height for access through railroad underpass, restriction was not an injury different in kind than injury to the general public, bridge limit did not decrease the economic value of the property, and bridge limit, which was posted prior to landowners' purchase of the property, did not

interfere with any reasonable investment-backed expectations.

Copyright © 2026 Bond Case Briefs | bondcasebriefs.com