

Recent Trends in Retail Premises Liability

January 21, 2026

Media Contact

Erica Gianetti

Marketing & Communications Supervisor

erica.gianetti@mgclaw.com

An ever-evolving area of litigation, retail premises liability has seen ongoing developments towards liberal jury verdicts and adaptation of tools by defense counsel and claims handlers in response. Following is a discussion of trends and recent case law in Tennessee and nationwide.

In 2025, we have seen landmark rulings clarifying retailer and premises owners' responsibilities in Tennessee, and on a national scale, social inflation continues to present challenges for insurers, attorneys and retailers. In January of this year, the Tennessee Supreme Court upheld a \$2,000,000.00 award to an injured tenant for a slip and fall related to microbial growth on a pedestrian bridge at a Nashville-area apartment complex. Reaffirming the constructive notice standard of *Blair v. West Town Mal* (130 S.W.3d 761, 2004), the Court confirmed that property owners are liable for a hazard which constitutes a "general or continuing condition." Here, the landlord's practice of annual pressure washing to address a hazard of this type sufficed to establish they were on constructive notice of the hazard and that they breached the duty owed to their invitees, including Plaintiff. The importance of regular and documented maintenance is highlighted by this ruling, and is consistent with Tennessee law. For further, please see *Trentham v. Mid-America Apartments, LP* (Tenn. Jan. 8, 2025).

Conversely, absence of notice of prior incidents will insulate a retailer where, for example, the hazard or risk is unknown, even where a plaintiff attempts to prove negligence of a potentially safer modification for a subject condition. In *Ellis v. Snookums Steakhouse, LLC* (Tenn. Ct. App., Mar. 11, 2025). A restaurant guest sued after an outdoor bench she sat on "flipped or tilted from end to end." Plaintiff argued that the bench was defective because it lacked a back panel, despite having bolts on which such a panel would fasten. The Court upheld summary judgment and noted that the Plaintiff essentially argued that negligence be inferred simply because the fact that the bench "did not operate as the plaintiff anticipated when she sat on it." The fact that the Plaintiff was injured was not enough to show that a hazard existed, and the absence of any such prior incidents supported the retailer's notice defenses.

Tennessee courts affirm that a retailer can be liable for injuries that occur in a parking area adjacent to its premises where the retailer has sufficient control of the parking area, even where the parking lot is owned by another party or parties. In *Jones v. Earth Fare, Inc.* (Tenn. Ct. App. Apr. 15, 2020), even though a grocery store's lease assigned maintenance of the parking lot to the landlord, the Court found that the store repeatedly intervened to clean up spills, without notifying the landlord, and thereby, had "assumed a duty to maintain the parking lot in the area where the incident occurred."

To minimize liability in Tennessee, retailers should:

- pressure-washing records, spill response times, etc. will better equip defending against negligence claims and will help balance an ever-growing liberal landscape.
2. **Monitor Recurring Conditions:** slip zones (entrances during rain), walking structures, aisles near refrigerators.
 3. **Utilize Clear Signage:** warning customers of hazards like wet floors, etc. to support open-and-obviousness in defense strategy and to reduce or insulate from fault by shifting fault to the plaintiff (Tennessee is a modified comparative fault jurisdiction with a 49% rule).
 4. **Control vs. Ownership:** where a retailer wishes to avoid liability for incidents occurring in adjacent areas (i.e. parking) they should require the owner of the adjacent area to maintain their control, rather than undertaking maintenance etc. themselves.'

As recently as July 18, 2025, a Nashville federal court jury awarded a Plaintiff over \$3,000,000.00, finding Walmart liable for an injury caused by a store pickup cart pushed by a store associate, relating a labral tear and ultimately, a CRPS diagnosis. Tennessee's statutory damages caps (\$750,000.00 for non-economics) serve to insulate from the full exposure here, but the volatility of juries in cases of this type is consistent with national trends.

4. Decide the total amount of damages sustained by the Plaintiff. Do not reduce these damages by any percentage of fault you may have assigned to plaintiff. It is the responsibility of the judge, after presenting your verdict, to reduce the damages you award, if any, by the percentage of fault assigned to plaintiff. What amount of damages, if any, do you find was sustained by Plaintiff, John M. Hester?

(Check all that apply to the plaintiff's injuries.)

John M. Hester:

1. Any past damages for each of the following types of damages:

(A) Medical and other costs of health care: \$84,749

(B) Other economic damages: \$29,295 and

(C) Non-economic damages: \$200,000 and

2. Any future damages and the periods over which they will accrue for each of the following types of damages:

(A) Medical and other costs of health care: \$175,000

(B) Other economic damages: \$42,612 and

(C) Non-economic damages: \$2,300,000

The calculation of all future medical care and other costs of health care and future non-economic losses must reflect the costs and costs during the period of time the plaintiff will receive these costs and losses. All such calculations of future losses shall be adjusted to reflect any present value.

TOTAL DAMAGES John M. Hester: \$3,331,655

Case 1:25-cv-00060 Document 95 Filed 07/18/25 Page 2 of 3 PageID #: 730

John M. Hester

TOTAL DAMAGES John M. Hester: \$1,000,000



On a wider view, retail injury claims management nationwide is seeing the following trends: the persistence of social inflation and nuclear verdicts, tighter underwriting, sublimits and exposures/exclusions, as well as the increased use of AI for efficiency.

Industry publications confirm that an approximately 7% rate of social inflation significantly outpaces economic inflation in a post-pandemic judicial environment, with large jury awards i.e. over \$10mm "nuclear" verdicts, and even "thermonuclear" verdicts over \$100mm, increasing regularly. With these trends, annually rising premises claims are, unsurprisingly, disquieting to most business owners and policyholders.

As discussed above with a focus on Tennessee trends, we recommend that retailers and property owners across the country adopt and strictly enforce their documentation rules, increase training on these policies, and strengthen their incident responses. These efforts will support more effective handling of unavoidable claims and limit the accumulation of costs associated with defense.

Questions? Click [here](#) to contact an MGC attorney.

This legal update is published as a service to our clients and friends. It is intended to provide general information and does not constitute legal advice regarding any specific situation. Past success does not indicate likelihood of success in any future legal representation. You may not reproduce, distribute, sell or republish this legal update, or the information contained therein, without prior written content. This legal update is for personal use only.