

## Anabella Mayorga

---

**From:** Steven Seay <seay89@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 4, 2025 10:20 AM  
**To:** House Judiciary Committee  
**Subject:** OPPOSED - H. 5926 - Noneconomic Damages for Pets

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

To the Committee:

I am **strongly opposed** to H. 5926 - Noneconomic Damages for Pets.

There is little doubt that pets are held in exceedingly high esteem throughout modern American society. Providing for the recovery of non-economic damages in cases involving injury to a pet may sound like a good idea that simply reflects the value people place on their pets. However, allowing non-economic damages in such cases will likely result in many harmful, unintentional consequences for pet owners and their pets.

Non-economic damages are traditionally only allowed in cases involving the close family of **people** who have died or who have been severely injured. Awarding these damages in cases involving pets would effectively change the legal status of pets as property and would ultimately hamstring the ability of owners, veterinarians, and government agencies to protect and care for pets.

Moreover, it is the goal of animal rights activists to give animals the same rights and privileges as people by changing the legal classification of animals from property to "legal beings." Allowing non-economic damages in cases involving pets would be an incremental step toward that goal.

I am also concerned that the bill's broad definition of "caretaker" means that anyone who comes in contact with a companion animal—kennels, groomers, dog walkers, pet sitters, etc.—would be liable for non-economic damages.

I am **strongly opposed** to this bill.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my position.

Steven Seay  
101 Blackamore Ave.  
Cranston, RI