WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2009 10:00 A.M.

NO. 2

#25034

RANDALL F. MASAD and LORI J. MASAD,

Plaintiffs and Appellants,

vs.

DOUG WEBER, BOB KUEMPER, DENNIS BLOCK, DARYL SLYKHUIS, OWEN SPURREL, ROBERT RAE, TOM LINNEWEBER, BARB BOLDT, KRISTIN JENSEN, JEREMY ROLAND, RANDY FLICK JEFF BAKER, DARIN YOUNG, LAUREL PAULSON, DAVID LENTSCH, JODI WIESE, BRAD WOODWARD, LARRY WEINS, JORGENE WILLIAMS, SANDY WECHSLER, TROY PONTO, CHUCK GILSON, HARLAN TJEERDSMA, SHERRY O'CONNOR, NANCY CHRISTIANSEN, AARON MACH, KIRK GREENWOOD, BILL VANDERWOUDE, ANGELA HAWKEY, SAVELLA OLESEN, PAUL KURLE, JARED BROESDER, RYAN FETERL, RICK LESLIE, CHAD STRAATMEYER, CRYSTAL VAN VOOREN, DAROLD DIEDE, JODI STETTNICHS, AND JOHN DOE DEFENDANTS 1 - 10, Defendants and Appellees.

Mr. Michael J. Schaffer Mr. Paul H. Linde Schaffer Law Office, Prof., LLC 412 West 9th Street #1 Sioux Falls SD 57104-3602 Ph 274-6760 (FOR APPELLANTS)

Mr. James E. Moore Mr. James A. Power Woods, Fuller, Shultz & Smith PC 300 South Phillips Ave Suite 300 PO Box 5027 Sioux Falls SD 57117 PH: 336-3890

The Honorable Stuart L. Tiede Second Judicial Circuit Minnehaha County (FOR APPELLEES)

(CIV 07-246)

25034

STATEMENT OF LEGAL ISSUES

- 1. Whether the trial court erred in determining that the Masads' negligence claim was barred by SDCL § 3-21-8 and SDCL § 3-21-9(5).
 - A. SDCL § 3-21-8
 - B. SDCL § 3-21-9(5)

The trial court determined the Masads' negligence claim was barred by SDCL § 3-21-8 and SDCL § 3-21-9(5).

SDCL § 3-21-8. SDCL § 3-21-9.

Burhenn v. Dennis Supply Co., 2004 SD 91, 685 N.W.2d 778.

- 2. Whether the trial court erred in determining that the application of SDCL § 3-21-8 and SDCL § 3-21-9(5) to bar the Masads' claim did not violate the South Dakota Constitution.
 - A. Open Courts
 - B. Equal Protection
 - C. Due Process

The trial court determined that the application of SDCL § 3-21-8 and SDCL § 3-21-9(5) to bar the Masads' claim did not violate the South Dakota Constitution.

Kyllo v. Panzer, 535 N.W.2d 896 (S.D. 1995).

Oien v. City of Sioux Falls, 393 N.W.2d 286 (S.D. 1986).

Lyons v. Lederle Laboratories, 440 N.W.2d 769 (S.D. 1989).

Ex rel. Knowles v. United States, 1996 SD 10, 544 N.W.2d 183.

3. Whether the trial court erred in determining, as a matter of law, that Randy was not a third party beneficiary of the contract between Catering by Marlins, Inc. and the State.

The trial court concluded that Randy was not a third party beneficiary of the contract between Catering by Marlins, Inc. and the State.

Sisney v. Reisch, 2008 SD 72, 754 N.W.2d 813. SDCL § 53-2-6.

Trouten v. Heritage Mut. Ins. Co., 2001 S.D. 106, 632 N.W.2d 856. Kotchina v. Luna Park Housing Corp., 815 N.Y.S.2d 594 (N.Y. App. Div. 2006).