

SLIDES	NOTES
Ch 2 B 1 Agent's Authority 59 <u>ELMER TALLANT AGENCY v. BAILEY</u> (pg 64)	
<u>ELMER TALLANT AGENCY v. BAILEY</u> 60 AGENT BINDS COVERAGE DESPITE EXPRESS CONTRACT NOT TO	
<u>ELMER TALLANT AGENCY v. BAILEY</u> 61 WHILE BINDER IS IN EFFECT, AN EMPLOYEE IS INJURED, CAUSING A WORKERS' COMPENSATION CLAIM	
<u>ELMER TALLANT AGENCY v. BAILEY</u> 62 INSURED SUES FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT WHO HAS TO PAY CLAIM	
<u>ELMER TALLANT AGENCY v. BAILEY</u> 63 HELD: APPARENT AUTHORITY BINDS INS. CO. EVEN IF NOT NAMED TO INSURED SO INS CO MUST PAY	
<u>ELMER TALLANT AGENCY v. BAILEY</u> 64 HOWEVER, AGENT HAS TO INDEMNIFY INSURANCE COMPANY	
<u>ELMER TALLANT AGENCY v. BAILEY</u> 65 BROKERS - REPRESENT INSUREDS AGENTS - REPRESENT INS COMPANIES	
<u>ELMER TALLANT AGENCY v. BAILEY</u> 66 IN OKLAHOMA - DEEMING STATUTE MAKES BROKERS INSURANCE COMPANY'S AGENT	
<u>ELMER TALLANT AGENCY v. BAILEY</u> 67 WHAT INDEMNIFICATION DOES THE AGENT OWE WHEN AGENT HAD AUTHORITY BUT DOESN'T PLACE COVERAGE	
<u>ELMER TALLANT AGENCY v. BAILEY</u> 68 INSURANCE COMPANY GETS ONLY PREMIUM	

<u>SLIDES</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
Ch. 2 B 2 Fraud Waiver and Estoppel	
<u>WOLINETZ V. BERKSHIRE LIFE INS. COMPANY</u> (pg 68)	69
<u>WOLINETZ V. BERKSHIRE</u> LIFE INSURANCE INSURED SUED LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY FOR FRAUDULENTLY SELLING HIM “VANISHING PREMIUM” INSURANCE	70
<u>WOLINETZ V. BERKSHIRE</u> AGENT TELLS HIM POLICY WILL “CARRY ITSELF” SO HE DOESN’T HAVE TO PAY PREMIUMS AFTER 14 YEARS	71
<u>WOLINETZ V. BERKSHIRE</u> DOESN’T WORK OUT THAT WAY, APPARENTLY DUE TO DECREASED INTEREST EARNINGS AND ADVERSE BUSINESS CLIMATE	72
<u>WOLINETZ V. BERKSHIRE</u> TRIAL COURT SUSTAINS SUMMARY JUDGMENT FOR INS. CO. BASED ON STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS	73
<u>WOLINETZ V. BERKSHIRE</u> INS. CO. SAYS (AND TRIAL COURT HELD) INSURED KNEW OR SHOULD HAVE KNOWN FACTS LONG ENOUGH AGO STATUTE RAN	74
<u>WOLINETZ V. BERKSHIRE</u> HELD: REVERSED	75
<u>WOLINETZ V. BERKSHIRE</u> WHETHER INSURED KNEW OR SHOULD HAVE KNOWN IS A JURY QUESTION	76

<u>SLIDES</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<u>WOLINETZ V. BERKSHIRE</u> 77 FACT HE KNEW THE POLICY WAS NOT DOING AS WELL AS HOPED WAS NOT ENOUGH	
<u>WOLINETZ V. BERKSHIRE</u> 78 COMPANY TOLD HIM REASON THE POLICY WASN'T BUILDING ENOUGH CASH VALUE TO PAY PREMIUM WAS DUE TO BUSINESS CONDITIONS, NOT FRAUD BY COMPANY	
<u>WOLINETZ V. BERKSHIRE</u> 79 BECAUSE THE COMPANY TOLD HIM THERE WERE OTHER REASONS THAN ITS FRAUD FOR THE POLICY NOT HAVING SUFFICIENT VALUE, IT WAS ESTOPPED TO CLAIM THAT	
<u>ROSETH v. ST. PAUL</u> (pg 74) 80	
<u>ROSETH v. ST. PAUL</u> 81 INSURED TELLS ADJUSTER HE HAS ALL RISK POLICY ACTUALLY HAS ONLY MORTALITY COVERAGE	
<u>ROSETH v. ST. PAUL</u> 82 ADJUSTER DOESN'T CORRECT HIM SAYS: "MITIGATE LOSS" INSURED SELLS INJURED CATTLE AT A LOSS	
<u>ROSETH v. ST. PAUL</u> 83 TURNS OUT HE HAS NO COVERAGE ON CATTLE SO HE BEARS A LOSS FOR THE SALE	
<u>ROSETH v. ST. PAUL</u> 84 CLAIMS INSURANCE CO. IS ESTOPPED TO NOW CLAIM IT HAS ONLY MORTALITY COVERAGE	

SLIDES	NOTES
<u>ROSETH v. ST. PAUL</u> HELD: NO ESTOPPEL	85
<u>ROSETH v. ST. PAUL</u> CANNOT CREATE COVERAGE BY ESTOPPEL (MAJORITY RULE), BASED ON POST CONTRACT CONDUCT (MINORITY RULE) (BUT DON'T YOU BELIEVE IT!!)	86
<u>ROSETH v. ST. PAUL</u> COURTS DO IT ALL THE TIME; APPLY THE "RULE" ONLY WHEN THEY WANT TO FIND NO ESTOPPEL	87
NOTE: GOOD DEFINITION OF ESTOPPEL IN <u>ALLEN v. ALLEN</u> (IN SUPPLEMENT) (p. 5)	88
WAIVER - VOLUNTARY RELINQUISHMENT OF A KNOWN RIGHT	89
ESTOPPEL - CONDUCT MAKING IT INEQUITABLE FOR INSURANCE CO. TO TAKE A PARTICULAR POSITION	90
Ch 2 B 3 Group Insurance and Erisa	
GROUP INSURANCE OFFERS SOME ADVANTAGES:	91
(1) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS ARE LOWER	92
ENTITY SPONSORING THE GROUP PLAN (EMPLOYER OR ORGANIZATION) ALREADY DOES A LOT OF THE RECORD KEEPING	93
INSURANCE COMPANY BEARS LESS COST ADMINISTERING GROUP	94

SLIDES	NOTES
(2) UNDERWRITING IS IMPROVED 95	
WHEN INSURANCE COMPANY WRITES GROUP, ALL MEMBERS ARE WELL ENOUGH TO WORK OR TO OTHERWISE PARTICIPATE 96	
IF A LARGE ENOUGH PERCENTAGE PARTICIPATE, INSURANCE COMPANY MAY NOT NEED TO UNDERWRITE AT ALL 97	
GROUP HEALTH COVERAGE BECAME A BIG DEAL DURING AND AFTER WWII AS EMPLOYERS OFFERED HEALTH INS. AS A FRINGE BENEFIT TO SECURE WORKERS 98	
AFTER WWII, THE GOVERNMENT HAS ENCOURAGED EMPLOYERS TO PROVIDE HEALTH INSURANCE AS A WAY TO FORESTALL HAVING TO FINANCE UNIVERSAL HEALTH COVERAGE 99	
EMPLOYER DEDUCTS THE COST BUT THE EMPLOYEE DOESN'T HAVE TO PAY TAX ON THE PREMIUM OR THE BENEFIT 100	
GOVERNMENT HAS FURTHER TRIED TO ENCOURAGE OFFERING HEALTH INS. BY PROTECTING EMPLOYER HEALTH PLANS FROM SUITS AND CLAIMS BY ERISA 101	
ERISA = EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT 102	
ORIGINALLY INTENDED TO PREVENT ENRON TYPES OF DEBACLES, IT NOW EXTENDS TO ANY EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PROGRAM 103	

SLIDES	NOTES
LOT'S OF FLAWS IN ERISA - (1) ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS STANDARD ON APPEALS	104
(2) ERISA PRE-EMPTION EMPLOYEE LOSES PROTECTION A LOT OF INSURANCE LAWS (29 USC § 1144)	105
ERISA PRE-EMPTION FEDERAL LAW REPLACES STATE LAW	106
SAVING - STATE INS LAW NOT PRE-EMPTED BUT ONLY IF THE PLAN IS AN INSURED PLAN	107
DEEMING - SELF-INSURED PLAN NOT "DEEMED" TO BE INSURANCE	108
ERISA	109
PURPOSE OF ERISA HAS BECOME TO DENY EMPLOYEES BENEFITS NEEDS TO BE REPEALED	
SEE HANDOUT "THE 800 LB. GORILLA" SEE ALSO Pg. 20 OF SUPPLEMENT: "INSURANCE - BAD FAITH - ERISA PRE-EMPTS OKLAHOMA BAD FAITH CLAIM"	110
GROUP POLICIES ARE DIFFERENT IN THAT INDIVIDUAL INSURED GETS ONLY A CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE, POLICY STAYS WITH EMPLOYER OR OTHER GROUP	111
QUESTION ARISES: WHAT IF THE POLICY TAKES AWAY COVERAGE THE CERTIFICATE LEADS INSURED TO BELIEVE SHE WILL HAVE	112

SLIDES	NOTES
RULE DIFFERS FROM STATE TO STATE (Pg. 82)	113
OKLAHOMA RULE: <u>MARTIN V. OKL. FARMERS UNION</u> , 622 P.2D 1078 (OKLA. 1981), <u>EVANS V. LINCOLN INCOME LIFE</u> , 585 P.2D 407 (OKLA.APP. 1978): RESTRICTION ON COVERAGE VALID ONLY IF IN CERTIFICATE, NOT JUST MASTER PLAN.	114
OTHER PROBLEM WITH GROUP INSURANCE	115
WHAT IF EMPLOYER OR OTHER ENTITY SPONSORING GROUP SCREWS UP? IS THE COMPANY BOUND?	116
<u>PAULSON v. WESTERN LIFE</u> (pg 79 - In Text)	117
<u>PAULSON v. WESTERN LIFE</u> EMPLOYER MISINFORMS EMPLOYEE WHEN HE MUST ENROLL	118
<u>PAULSON v. WESTERN LIFE</u> QUESTION: IS EMPLOYER INSURANCE CO'S AGENT SO INS. CO IS BOUND? HELD: YES	119
<u>PAULSON v. WESTERN LIFE</u> WHAT ABOUT THE DEEMING STATUTE?	120
<u>PAULSON v. WESTERN LIFE</u> OKLA RULE: COVERAGE RESTRICTION IN MASTER POLICY IS NOT ENOUGH CERTIFICATE CONTROLS	121

SLIDES	NOTES
Ch 2 C Public Policy	
<u>HARTFORD v. POWELL</u> (Pg 83) 122	
<u>HARTFORD v. POWELL</u> 123 INSURED DRIVER SUED FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES AFTER WRECK	
<u>HARTFORD v. POWELL</u> 124 EMPLOYER'S INSURANCE COMPANY WANTS DECLARATORY JUDGMENT THAT COVERAGE WOULD VIOLATE TEXAS PUBLIC POLICY	
<u>HARTFORD v. POWELL</u> 125 HELD: LIABILITY COVERAGE OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES VIOLATES TEXAS PUBLIC POLICY	
<u>HARTFORD v. POWELL</u> 126 INDEMNIFYING INSURED FOR HIS OWN WRONG DEFEATS PURPOSE OF PUNITIVES	
<u>HARTFORD v. POWELL</u> 127 COURT NOTES TEXAS HAS HELD PUNITIVES HAVE NO COMPENSATORY ELEMENT AND ARE PURELY TO PUNISH	
<u>HARTFORD v. POWELL</u> 128 IF YOU INDEMNIFY INSURED, INSURED IS NOT PUNISHED	
<u>HARTFORD v. POWELL</u> 129 RATHER, THE LOSS FALLS ON ALL INSUREDS OF COMPANY WHO PAY PREMIUMS	
<u>FIRST BANK v. TRANSAMERICA</u> (Pg 90) 130	
<u>FIRST BANK v. TRANSAMERICA</u> 131 BANK GETS SUED FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES FOR WRONGFUL REPOSSESSION PRACTICES	

SLIDES	NOTES
<u>FIRST BANK v. TRANSAMERICA</u> INSURED SEEKS DECLARATION THAT PUNITIVE DAMAGES ARE COVERED	132
<u>FIRST BANK v. TRANSAMERICA</u> HELD: COVERAGE OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES DOES NOT VIOLATE MONTANA PUBLIC POLICY	133
<u>FIRST BANK v. TRANSAMERICA</u> COURTS RULE BOTH WAYS WITH NO CLEAR MAJORITY RULE	134
<u>FIRST BANK v. TRANSAMERICA</u> PUNITIVE DAMAGE COVERAGE	135
<u>FIRST BANK v. TRANSAMERICA</u> OKLAHOMA RULE : <u>DAYTON-HUDSON v.</u> <u>AMERICAN MUTUAL</u> PUNITIVE COVERAGE FOR VICARIOUS LIABILITY ONLY	136
<u>FIRST BANK v. TRANSAMERICA</u> CLOSELY RELATED: COVERAGE OF INTENTIONAL WRONG VIOLATES PUBLIC POLICY	137
<u>STRICKLAND v. GULF LIFE</u> (pg 98)	138
<u>STRICKLAND v. GULF LIFE</u> POLICY PAYS FOR LOSS OF LIMB ONLY IF AMPUTATED IN 90 DAYS	139
<u>STRICKLAND v. GULF LIFE</u> INSURED HAS INJURY AND DOCTORS ARE UNCERTAIN AT 90 DAY POINT WHETHER LEG CAN BE SAVED	140
<u>STRICKLAND v. GULF LIFE</u> DOCTORS REMOVE LEG AFTER 118 DAYS	141

<u>SLIDES</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<u>STRICKLAND v. GULF LIFE</u> HELD: SUMMARY JUDGMENT FOR INSURANCE COMPANY REVERSED	142
<u>STRICKLAND v. GULF LIFE</u> POLICY PROVISION REQUIRING MEDICAL DECISIONS CONTRARY TO GOOD MEDICAL PRACTICE MAY VIOLATE PUBLIC POLICY	143
<u>STRICKLAND v. GULF LIFE</u> NOTE: DOES NOT HOLD TIME PROVISIONS VIOLATE PUBLIC POLICY AND ARE VOID	144
<u>STRICKLAND v. GULF LIFE</u> CASE ILLUSTRATES WHAT GOOD LAWYERING CAN DO	145
NOTE WE ARE SKIPPING CHAPTER 3 DEALING WITH REGULATION - TOO MUCH READING FOR A 2 HOUR COURSE SKIP TO PAGE 172	146
Ch 4 Fire & Property Insurance	
POLICY PARTS:	147
* DECLARATIONS PAGE (DEC SHEET)	
* JACKET	
* ENDORSEMENTS	
ALL RISK (OPEN PERIL) COVERAGE -	148
COVERS ALL RISKS NOT EXCLUDED SPECIFIED RISK COVERAGE (NAMED PERIL) - COVERS ONLY NAMED RISKS	

SLIDES	NOTES
Ch 4 B Insurable Interest	
<u>GOSSETT v. FARMERS INS. CO.</u> (pg 197)	149
<u>GOSSETT v. FARMERS INS. CO.</u> PLAINTIFFS INSURE HOUSE THEY ARE TRYING TO BUY TAKE POSSESSION – MAKE IMPROVEMENTS HOUSE BURNS	150
<u>GOSSETT v. FARMERS INS. CO.</u> HELD: INSURABLE INTEREST IS LIMITED TO IMPROVEMENTS MADE	151
<u>GOSSETT v. FARMERS INS. CO.</u> AWFUL DECISION SOMEONE INVOLVED IS OUT VALUE OF PROPERTY	152
<u>GOSSETT v. FARMERS INS. CO.</u> CONTRAST: <u>DELK V. MARKEL AMERICAN INS. CO.</u> , 2003 OK 88, 81 P.3d 629: OWNER OF LESS THAN FULL INTEREST IN PROPERTY COULD INSURE & RECOVER FULL VALUE, SUBJECT TO HOLDING IN TRUST FOR CO-TENANTS	153
<u>GOSSETT v. FARMERS INS. CO.</u> INSURANCE COMPANY GETS A WINDFALL – COLLECTS PREMIUM FOR WHOLE PROPERTY – PAYS LESS	154
<u>GOSSETT v. FARMERS INS. CO.</u> TESTS FOR INSURABLE INTEREST (p.202 n. 2) LEGAL OR EQUITABLE INTEREST FACTUAL EXPECTANCY CONTRACT RIGHT LEGAL LIABILITY	155

SLIDES	NOTES
<p><u>SNETHEN v. OKLA. STATE UNION</u> 156 (N.3 Pg. 203)</p> <p>GOOD FAITH PURCHASER OF STOLEN PROPERTY HAS INSURABLE INTEREST ADOPTS “FACTUAL EXPECTATION” TEST</p> <p>REASONS FOR INSURABLE INTEREST: 157</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * PREVENT “GAMBLING” TRANSACTIONS * AVOID MORAL HAZARD * ASSURE INDEMNITY <p>WHEN INSURABLE INTEREST MUST EXIST: 158 PROPERTY INSURANCE - TIME OF LOSS LIFE INSURANCE - INCEPTION OF COVERAGE</p> <p>COMMON LAW RULE: 159 IF NO INSURABLE INTEREST, INSURANCE COMPANY DOESN’T PAY</p> <p>RULE IS MODIFIED IN OKLAHOMA AS TO SOME TYPES OF COVERAGE - 160 36 O.S. § 3604(B) (Pg. 12 of Supplement)</p> <p>Ch 4 C Trigger and Occurrence Issues</p> <p>POLICIES COVER “PHYSICAL INJURY” TO “TANGIBLE PROPERTY” 151</p> <p>WHAT ABOUT SOFTWARE? 162 MOST CASES SAY IT IS COVERED SOME POLICIES OFFER SPECIFIC COVERAGE FOR COMPUTER DATA</p> <p>PROGRESSIVELY OCCURRING LOSSES 163 DIFFERENT RULES FOR FIGURING WHICH OF SEVERAL SEQUENTIAL POLICIES COVER</p>	

SLIDES	NOTES
HOW MANY "OCCURRENCES" 164 SIMILAR TO WORLD TRADE CENTER CASE FROM LAST CLASS	
PROPERTY INSURANCE, UNLIKE 165 LIABILITY INSURANCE DOES NOT HAVE AN ANNUAL AGGREGATE LIMIT SO MAY BE MORE THAN 1 LOSS	
Ch 4 D Business Interruption Coverage	
<u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 166 <u>FIRE AND MARINE INS. CO. (Pg 205)</u>	
<u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 167 ANOTHER CASE OUT OF WORLD TRADE CENTER DISASTER	
<u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 168 STORE IN RETAIL CONCOURSE OF WTC HAD BUSINESS INTERRUPTION COVERAGE	
<u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 169 INS. CO. PAID \$9 MILLION + BUT NOW CLAIMS NO BUSINESS INTERRUPTION COVERAGE	
<u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 170 DISPUTE INVOLVES RESTORATION AND RECOVERY PERIOD DURING WHICH BUSINESS INTERRUPTION COVERAGE MUST BE PAID	
<u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 171 INSURANCE COMPANY CLAIMED NO COVERAGE BECAUSE THE INSURED OWNED ONLY A DRUG STORE AND NOT THE WORLD TRADE CENTER ITSELF	

<u>SLIDES</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<p><u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 172 COURT REJECTS THAT POSITION INSURED OWNED A LEASEHOLD INTEREST IN THE DESTROYED PROPERTY</p>	
<p><u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 173 INSURANCE COMPANY ALSO CLAIMED NO RECOVERY DUE BECAUSE INSURED WAS A CHAIN STORE AND OTHER STORES IN OTHER LOCATIONS CONTINUED TO OPERATE</p>	
<p><u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 174 COURT REJECTS THAT AS NOT A SENSIBLE INTERPRETATION OF THE POLICY</p>	
<p><u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 175 INSURED CLAIMED IT WAS ENTITLED TO BUSINESS INTERRUPTION UNTIL WTC WAS RECONSTRUCTED</p>	
<p><u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 176 COURT REJECTS THAT SAYING TIME IS THE REASONABLE TIME TO RECONSTRUCT THE STORE, NOT THE WHOLE WTC</p>	
<p><u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 177 “LOSS OF MARKET” CLAUSE DOES NOT PREVENT RECOVERY WHERE THERE IS A PHYSICAL LOSS TO INSURED</p>	
<p><u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 178 RATHER “LOSS OF MARKET” EXCLUSION SAYS NO COVERAGE WHERE INSURED’S PROPERTY IS NOT DAMAGED BUT THERE IS LOSS OF BUSINESS DUE TO OTHER DAMAGE</p>	

SLIDES	NOTES
<p><u>DUANE READE, INC. V. ST. PAUL</u> 179 EXAMPLE IS OKLAHOMA CASE <u>SOUTHERN HOSPITALITY V. ZURICH</u>, 393 F.3d 1137 (10th Cir. 2004) (NOT IN SUPPLEMENT-DISTRICT CRT DECISION AT N.1 P. 210)</p>	
<p><u>SOUTHERN HOSPITALITY CLAIMED</u> 180 BUSINESS INTERRUPTION TO HOTELS ALL OVER COUNTRY BECAUSE OF THE AIRLINE SHUTDOWN ON 9/11</p>	
<p>COURT HELD NO SUCH COVERAGE WAS AVAILABLE BECAUSE THERE WAS NO PHYSICAL DAMAGE TO THE INSURED'S PROPERTY</p>	181
<p><u>DUANE READE, INC.</u> IS IN BOOK JUST TO ILLUSTRATE PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN BUSINESS INTERRUPTION COVERAGE</p>	182