## Supreme Court of Florida

No. 70,818

ORLANDO DIAZ, Petitioner,

vs.

4

3

CURTISS-WRIGHT CORP., Respondent.

[January 28, 1988]

OVERTON, J.

We accepted jurisdiction in <u>Curtiss-Wright Corp. v. Diaz</u>, 507 So. 2d 1197 (Fla. 3d DCA 1987), to answer the following three certified questions of great public importance:

- I. Should the legislative amendment of Section 95.031(2), Florida Statutes (1983), abolishing the statute of repose in product liability actions, be construed to operate retrospectively as to a cause of action which accrued before the effective date of the amendment?
- II. If not, should the decision of <u>Pullum v. Cincinnati.</u>
  <u>Inc.</u>, 476 So. 2d 657 (Fla. 1985), <u>appeal dismissed</u>,
  <u>U.S.</u>, 106 S. Ct. 1626, 90 L. Ed. 2d 174 (1986), which overruled <u>Battilla v. Allis Chalmers</u>
  <u>Mfg. Co.</u>, 392 So. 2d 874 (Fla. 1980), apply so as to bar a cause of action that accrued after the <u>Battilla</u> decision but before the <u>Pullum</u> decision?
- III. In the event that the court construes the legislative amendment abolishing the statute of repose in product liability cases to operate retrospectively as to a cause of action which accrued before the effective date of the amendment, or in the event that the court decides that <u>Pullum</u> does not bar a cause of action, as here, that accrued after the <u>Battilla</u> decision, does Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.540(b) permit a court to relieve a party from a final judgment grounded on <u>Pullum</u>?

507 So. 2d at 1199. We have jurisdiction. Art. V, § 3(b)(4), Fla. Const. Since we accepted jurisdiction, we answered the first question in the negative and the second question in the affirmative in <u>Melendez v. Dreis &</u> Krump Manufacturing Co., 515 So. 2d 735 (Fla. 1987). Our answers to the first two certified questions make it unnecessary to answer the third.

We approve the decision below on the authority of Melendez.

It is so ordered.

•••

McDONALD, C.J., and EHRLICH, SHAW, BARKETT, GRIMES and KOGAN, JJ., Concur

NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES TO FILE REHEARING MOTION AND, IF FILED, DETERMINED.

Application for Review of the Decision of the District Court of Appeal - Certified Great Public Importance 200

Third District - Case No. 87-128

ч **р** 

R. Fred Lewis of Magill & Lewis, P.A., Miami, Florida, for Petitioner

Robin Thompson of Kimbrell & Hamann, P.A., Miami, Florida, for Respondent