

Bond Case Briefs

Municipal Finance Law Since 1971

EMINENT DOMAIN - INDIANA

Duke Energy Indiana, LLC v. Bellwether Properties, LLC

Court of Appeals of Indiana - August 3, 2022 - N.E.3d - 2022 WL 3050699

Landowner brought action against electrical utility, asserting claim for inverse condemnation based on increase of required clearance around electrical lines, which increase extended clearance requirement beyond size of utility's easement to maintain such lines on landowner's property.

Utility filed motion to dismiss, asserting that landowner's claim was barred by six-year statute of limitations. The Circuit Court, Monroe County, Michael Hoff, J., granted utility's motion. Landowner appealed. The Court of Appeals reversed and remanded. Utility sought transfer, which was granted. The Supreme Court reversed. On remand, the Circuit Court denied electrical utility's motion for summary judgment. Electrical utility filed an interlocutory appeal.

The Court of Appeals held that:

- Electrical utility's alleged taking was regulatory, not physical, and
- Electrical utility's enforcement of horizontal clearance regulations did not constitute as a compensable regulatory taking.

Electrical utility's alleged taking, if valid, was regulatory in nature, rather than physical, after utility told landowner that it either had to redesign or move a proposed warehouse on its property based on utility's enforcement of horizontal clearance regulations, which increased extended clearance requirement beyond size of utility's easement to maintain electrical lines on landowner's property; utility's predecessor was the entity that installed transmission lines on landowner's property, and enactment of clearance requirement did not result in utility to physically intrude or require landowner to allow another entity to access property, but rather, placed limits on landowners' power to build on small portion of its land.

Electrical utility's enforcement of horizontal clearance regulations, which increased utility's clearance requirements and went beyond size of utility's easement to maintain electrical lines on landowner's property, did not constitute as a compensable regulatory taking after utility notified landowner that it either had redesign or move its proposed warehouse to comply with clearance regulations; impact of utility's enforcement of clearance regulations was minimal, enforcement did not interfere with landowner's reasonable investment-backed expectations of the land, and landowner could have reasonably avoided dispute by discovering clearance requirements prior to purchasing the land or when its architect designed its proposed warehouse.