

# Life Insurer's Early Dispositive Motion Achieves Narrowed Fraud Claim in COI Suit

December 19, 2018

A recent decision by a federal district court in Maryland further illustrates the elusive nature of early dismissal of claims in far-reaching suits challenging the cost of insurance rate increases – even when some success is achieved via the rejection of underlying theories of liability. In *Rich v. William Penn Life Insurance Company of New York*, the plaintiff brought putative class breach of contract and fraud claims against William Penn arising from a COI rate increase announced in 2015 on certain universal life policies.

The gist of the fraud claim is that the COI rate increase was implemented to address alleged financial difficulties the insurer had been suffering for years, and that the insurer had misrepresented or failed to disclose these facts to policyholders before the announcement of the change in rates. Plaintiff alleged that he would have stopped paying premiums had the true nature of the defendant's financial condition been revealed. He also alleged that the insurer had used reinsurance transactions to disguise its financial instability.

In a September 25 ruling on its motion to dismiss the fraud claim, the district court rejected William Penn's arguments that the plaintiff lacked standing, New York's six-year statute of limitations barred the claim, and the elements of fraud were insufficiently alleged. However, with regard to its argument that the fraud claim was barred by New York's source of duty and economic loss rules, the insurer narrowed the scope of the claim. According to the plaintiff, there were three sources of William Penn's misrepresentations and omissions about its financial condition: the COI rate increase notification letter, the policy statements issued to putative class members, and the defendant's corporate reports and website.

The court dismissed the allegations predicated on the notification letter under both the source of duty and economic loss rules, because the alleged damages were the same as those sought in the breach of contract claim, and the "source of the duty" breached was the policy, not the notification

letter. However, relying heavily on *Dickman v. Banner Life Insurance Company*, a previous decision in the same court on similar claims alleged against the defendant's parent corporation, the court refused to dismiss the fraud claim to the extent it was based on policy statements and William Penn's corporate reports and website. The court found that there was a plausible separate tort duty to avoid misrepresenting information in policy statements, which was not tied to the policy terms. Additionally, the court determined that the allegations relating to the corporate reports and website were analogous to a fraud-in-the-inducement claim, which would not be barred by either the source of duty or economic loss rule.

## Authored By



Brooke Patterson

## Related Practices

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

## 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.