

The Continuing Representation Doctrine Does Not Apply to Fraud Allegations

December 29, 2017

In *Messmer v. KDK Fin. Serv. Inc.*, an individual action involving alleged fraud in connection with the sale and surrender of deferred annuities to a senior, the Indiana Court of Appeals refused to extend the doctrine of continuous representation to cases involving fraud and brokers of financial services. The plaintiff, an elderly purchaser of five annuity products, alleged that defendants – agents and marketing organizations (the issuers were not parties to the action) – were liable for fraud because they did not advise her of the charges she would face when surrendering her annuities. Plaintiff Messmer, who had filed her complaint approximately nine months after the expiration of the six-year statute of limitations applicable to her fraud claims, attempted to refute the defendants' contention that her claims were time-barred by arguing that the statute of limitations was tolled by application of the continuous representation doctrine. The court disagreed. In its September 14 ruling affirming the trial court's grant of the defendants' summary judgment motion, the appellate court recognized that the continuous representation doctrine provides that the applicable statute of limitations does not commence until the end of a professional's representation of a client in the same matter in which the alleged malpractice occurred. Explaining that the purpose of the rule is to allow representatives an opportunity to remedy their errors, the court also recognized that although the doctrine has been applied to accountants and lawyers, no state has applied it to the financial services industry. Ultimately, contrasting such claims with those for fraud, the court held that the doctrine is "simply incompatible" with cases alleging fraud because it is not reasonable for a client to continue to maintain confidence in the professional's good faith after a fraud is discovered; rather, the client, upon discovery of the fraud, is required to investigate and assess the facts. The court also affirmed the trial court's grant of summary judgment for the defendants regarding the plaintiff's claim for constructive fraud, predicated on the defendants' alleged breach of fiduciary duty that left her without an "understanding of the effect of the surrender," as to one of the five annuities. As the court recognized, the plaintiff's deposition testimony revealed she could not recall the details necessary to

establish the "groundwork for a fraud contention," *e.g.*, "what she was told, by whom, and when." The court also cited evidence that the plaintiff had actual knowledge of the surrender charges.

Related Practices

[Life, Annuity, and Retirement Litigation](#)

Related Industries

[Life, Annuity, and Retirement Solutions](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.