

SLIDES	NOTES
<p>A LET'S GET ORGANIZED</p> <p>WHAT I EXPECT FROM YOU ATTENDANCE PREPARATION</p> <p>WHAT YOU CAN EXPECT FROM ME ATTENDANCE PREPARATION RESPECT</p>	
<p>B GETTING ORGANIZED</p> <p>SEATING CHART GETTING TO KNOW YOU</p>	
<p>C THESE DAMN SLIDES</p> <p>A LEARNING AID DON'T USE THEM AS A CRUTCH!</p>	
<p>D WWW.TRAVISLAWOFFICE.COM WEBSITE WILL HAVE SLIDE/NOTES POSTED AFTER EACH CLASS</p>	
<p>OTHER MATERIALS:</p> <p>NOW: OKLAHOMA LAW SUPPLEMENT WILL GIVE OKLAHOMA LAW ON WHAT IS IN THE CASE BOOK</p> <p>THIS HAS BEEN E-MAILED TO YOU</p> <p>LATER: THE LAST CLASS OR SO WILL BE OVER UNINSURED AND UNDERINSURED MOTORIST COVERAGE</p> <p>WE WILL POST ON THE WEBSITE A SET OF CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION MATERIAL FOR YOU TO USE FOR THIS CLASS OR CLASSES</p>	

SLIDES	NOTES
Chapter 1 A Introduction 1 FUNCTION OF INSURANCE: RISK TRANSFER RISK POOLING RISK ALLOCATION	
Chapter 1 B Imperfect Formation 2 - ADVERSE SELECTION- “SICKIES” BUY INSURANCE WELL PEOPLE DON’T	
-MORAL HAZARD- 3 INSURED MAY CAUSE LOSS INSURED MAY NOT PREVENT LOSS	
Chapter 1 B 1 Breach of Warranty 4 WARRANTIES - BUT NEITHER COURTS NOR LEGISLATURES LIKE THEM	
<u>VLASTOS v. SUMITOMO F. & M. (pg 8)</u> 5 POLICY HAS WARRANTY THIRD FLOOR IS OCCUPIED BY JANITOR	
<u>VLASTOS v. SUMITOMO F. & M.</u> 6 LOSS, INCLUDING DEATHS OCCUR FROM FIRE	
<u>VLASTOS v. SUMITOMO F. & M.</u> 7 TURNS OUT THIRD FLOOR WAS BOTH LIVING QUARTERS FOR THE JANITOR AND A MESSAGE PARLOR	
<u>VLASTOS v. SUMITOMO F. & M.</u> 8 ARGUABLY, THE MESSAGE PARLOR INCREASES THE RISK SO COMPANY DENIES COVERAGE BASED ON BREACH WARRANTY	
<u>VLASTOS v. SUMITOMO F. & M.</u> 9 DOES WARRANTY MEAN FLOOR IS OCCUPIED ONLY BY JANITOR OR INCLUDES OCCUPANCY BY JANITOR?	

SLIDES	NOTES
<p><u>VLASTOS v. SUMITOMO F. & M.</u> 10 HELD: -AMBIGUOUS AND AMBIGUITY WILL BE CONSTRUED AGAINST INS. CO.</p>	
<p><u>VLASTOS v. SUMITOMO F. & M.</u> 11 COURTS DON'T LIKE WARRANTIES AND WILL WORK HARD TO AVOID LETTING THEM VOID POLICIES</p>	
<p>WARRANTIES GREW UP IN ADMIRALTY 12 LAW WHERE THEY WERE NECESSARY</p>	
<p>SHIPS WERE INSURED, SAILED OFF AND 13 WERE NEVER SEEN AGAIN</p>	
<p>INSURANCE COMPANIES HAD TO BE 14 ASSURED THEY WERE INSURING WHAT THEY THOUGHT THEY WERE</p>	
<p>WARRANTIES DON'T WORK WELL IN 15 MODERN CONTEXTS</p>	
<p>MANY STATES HAVE STATUTES LIKE 16 OKLAHOMA'S 36 O.S. § 3609: STATEMENTS IN APPLICATIONS DEEMED TO BE REPRESENTATIONS AND NOT WARRANTIES</p>	
<p>DIFFERENCE: WARRANTIES 17 AUTOMATICALLY VOID POLICY REPRESENTATIONS DO NOT</p>	
<p>§ 3609: SAYS REPRESENTATIONS ARE 18 A DEFENSE ONLY IF THEY ARE FRAUDULENT <u>AND</u> MATERIAL (ALTHOUGH CASES SAY MUST BE BOTH)</p>	
<p>Ch 1B 2 Misrepresentation</p>	
<p><u>NEILL V. NATIONWIDE MUT. FIRE INS.</u> 19 <u>CO.</u> (pg. 19)</p>	

SLIDES	NOTES
<u>NEILL V. NATIONWIDE</u> 20 INSURED SAYS HE ACCURATELY ANSWERED ALL AGENT'S QUESTIONS	
<u>NEILL V. NATIONWIDE</u> 21 AGENT INACCURATELY FILLED OUT APPLICATION TO OMIT PRIOR LOSSES (3)	
<u>NEILL V. NATIONWIDE</u> 22 THREE AND A HALF YEARS LATER, HOME BURNS	
<u>NEILL V. NATIONWIDE</u> 23 INSURANCE COMPANY DENIES CLAIM BASED ON MISREPRESENTATION; TRIAL COURT GRANTS INS. CO. SUMMARY JUDGMENT	
<u>NEILL V. NATIONWIDE</u> 24 HELD: REVERSED; JURY QUESTION WHETHER INSURED OR AGENT WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FALSE ANSWER	
<u>NEILL V. NATIONWIDE</u> 25 RULE: WHERE INSURED SAYS HE GAVE CORRECT ANSWERS AND AGENT WROTE THEM DOWN WRONG, THERE WILL BE A FACT QUESTION WHICH PRECLUDES S.J.	
OKLAHOMA ADOPTS SAME RULE: 26 <u>MASS. MUT. V. ALLEN AND COMM. NAT.</u> <u>LIFE INS. CO. V. GRAHAM (SUPPLEMENT)</u>	
N. 3 Pg. 23: OKLAHOMA HAS STATUTE 27 LIKE THIS THAT APPLICATION IS NOT ADMISSIBLE UNLESS COPY ATTACHED TO POLICY	
<u>MACKENZIE v. PRUDENTIAL</u> (pg 26) 28 INSURED DEVELOPS HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE AFTER APPLICATION BUT BEFORE POLICY IS DELIVERED	

SLIDES	NOTES
<p><u>MACKENZIE v. PRUDENTIAL</u> 29 APPLICATION PROVIDED INSURED HAD TO BE IN THE SAME HEALTH AT DELIVERY FOR POLICY TO BE EFFECTIVE</p>	
<p><u>MACKENZIE v. PRUDENTIAL</u> 30 HELD: APPLICANT HAD DUTY TO REVEAL INFORMATION HE KNEW WAS MATERIAL</p>	
<p><u>MACKENZIE v. PRUDENTIAL</u> 31 ATYPICAL CASE - MOST COURTS WILL NOT FOLLOW IT</p>	
<p>Ch 2 A 2 Ambiguity</p>	
<p><u>VARGAS v. INA</u> (pg. 37) 32 DOCTOR BUYS AVIATION POLICY WHICH PROVIDES COVERAGE "WITHIN THE U.S."</p>	
<p><u>VARGAS v. INA</u> 33 CRASHES AIRPLANE WHILE ENROUTE FROM MAINLAND U.S. TO PUERTO RICO BY WAY OF HAITI</p>	
<p><u>VARGAS v. INA</u> 34 COMPANY DENIES COVERAGE BECAUSE OUTSIDE OF U.S.</p>	
<p><u>VARGAS v. INA</u> 35 HELD: SUMMARY JUDGEMENT FOR INS. CO. REVERSED</p>	
<p><u>VARGAS v. INA</u> 36 TWO POSSIBLE INTERPRETATIONS OF "WITHIN" US. TWO PERMISSIBLE CONSTRUCTIONS = AMBIGUITY CONSTRUED AGAINST INS. CO.</p>	
<p><u>WORLD TRADE CENTER PROPERTIES LLC V. HARTFORD FIRE INS. CO.</u> (pg. 42) 37</p>	

SLIDES	NOTES
<u>WORLD TRADE CENTER V. HARTFORD</u> 38 TWO AIRPLANES STRIKE TWO TOWERS OF WORLD TRADE CENTER ON 9/11 AS PART OF A SINGLE TERRORIST PLOT	
<u>WORLD TRADE CENTER V. HARTFORD</u> 39 QUESTION: IS IT ONE OR TWO “OCCURRENCES” SO AS TO TRIGGER ONE OR TWO POLICY LIMITS	
<u>WORLD TRADE CENTER V. HARTFORD</u> 40 HELD: A FACT QUESTION FOR JURY	
<u>WORLD TRADE CENTER V. HARTFORD</u> 41 UNUSUAL CASE IN THAT INSURANCE CO. ARGUES FOR A FINDING OF AMBIGUITY	
<u>WORLD TRADE CENTER V. HARTFORD</u> 42 WHY WOULD THEY DO THAT? INS. CO HAD SO MUCH EXTRINSIC EVIDENCE ON ITS SIDE IT THOUGHT IT COULD OVERCOME USUAL RULE OF AMBIGUITY BEING RESOLVED AGAINST INS. CO.	
<u>WORLD TRADE CENTER V. HARTFORD</u> 43 INSUREDS WON BY CONVINCING JURY THERE WERE TWO “OCCURRENCES”	
<u>WORLD TRADE CENTER V. HARTFORD</u> 44 NOT USUAL RULE, WHICH IS THAT A SINGLE CAUSE GIVES RISE TO ONE OCCURRENCE EVEN IF SEPARATE RESULTS	
<u>WORLD TRADE CENTER V. HARTFORD</u> 45 NOTICE THIS WAS THE DECISION AS TO THE POLICY WHICH HAD NO DEFINITION OF “OCCURRENCE” AND WHICH DID NOT INCORPORATE THE BINDER FORM WHICH DID	

SLIDES	NOTES
Ch 2 A 3 Reasonable Expectations	
<u>ATWOOD V HARTFORD A. & I. (pg. 50)</u> 46	
<u>ATWOOD V HARTFORD</u> 47 ELECTRICIAN HAD LIABILITY POLICY WHICH EXCLUDED “COMPLETED OPERATIONS”	
<u>ATWOOD V HARTFORD</u> 48 CHILD DIES NIGHT AFTER ELECTRICIAN INSTALLED THERMOSTAT DUE TO DEFECT IN THERMOSTAT	
<u>ATWOOD V HARTFORD</u> 49 HELD: COMPLETED OPERATIONS EXCLUSION VIOLATES REASONABLE EXPECTATION	
<u>ATWOOD V HARTFORD</u> 50 THERE WILL BE COVERAGE EVEN THOUGH STRICT LANGUAGE OF POLICY WOULD INDICATE NO COVERAGE	
<u>ATWATER v. WESTERN NATIONAL (pg. 55)</u> 51	
<u>ATWATER v. WESTERN NATIONAL</u> 52 POLICY REQUIRES “EVIDENCE OF FORCIBLE ENTRY” FOR BURGLARY COVERAGE	
<u>ATWATER v. WESTERN NATIONAL</u> 53 BURGLARS LEAVE NO VISIBLE SIGN BUT CLEARLY WAS A BURGLARY	
<u>ATWATER v. WESTERN NATIONAL</u> 54 HELD: REASONABLE EXPECTATION DOCTRINE PROVIDES COVERAGE - NORMAL INSURED WOULDN’T EXPECT EXCLUSION	
<u>ATWATER v. WESTERN NATIONAL</u> 55 COURT REJECTS “EVIDENTIARY CONDITION” RATIONALE	

SLIDES	NOTES
<u>ATWATER v. WESTERN NATIONAL</u> 56 BROADER APPLICATION OF REASONABLE EXPECTATION RULE - DOESN'T REQUIRE AMBIGUITY BURIED OR TECHNICAL LANGUAGE	
<u>ATWATER v. WESTERN NATIONAL</u> 57 OKLAHOMA IS MORE CONSERVATIVE <u>MAX TRUE</u> CASE REQUIRES AMBIGUITY OR BURIED OR TECHNICAL LANGUAGE	
OKLAHOMA RULE - 58 <u>MAX TRUE PLASTERING CO.</u> - AMBIGUOUS - BURIED - TECHNICAL	