

Court Holds Insured vs. Insured Exclusion Unambiguous, Precluding Coverage

April 07, 2016



The “insured v. insured”

exclusion in insurance policies omits from coverage claims based on suits brought by one insured against another. The question of whether or not the insured v. insured exclusion applies to preclude coverage – a frequently occurring D&O insurance coverage issue – was addressed in a Florida appellate court decision on April 4, which both distinguished an earlier decision and rejected arguments of ambiguity. In *Durant v. James and Progressive Casualty Insurance Company*, a case of first impression in the Florida courts, Carlton Fields attorneys created Florida law upholding the applicability of the insured v. insured exclusion to a claim by a former director of the insured, who sued the insured’s officer, in the director’s separate capacity as a shareholder. Plaintiff Durant relied on *Rigby v. Underwriters at Lloyd’s, London*, for his position that the claim should be covered as it was brought under his personal capacity unrelated to his former director position. The court disagreed, noting that his status as an insured resulted from his status as a past director. The case also interprets the employee claim exception to that exclusion, citing a Florida Statute that a director is not an employee of a company. Based on the plain language of the policy, the court rejected arguments holding the exclusion to be ambiguous. Shareholder Peter Webster, who represented the insurer in the proceeding along with shareholder Patricia Thompson, examined the court’s

interpretation and application of the D&O policy's insured v. insured exclusion in a guest blog post published on *The D&O Diary*, a national blog focused on D&O liability issues. **Read: [Court Holds Insured vs. Insured Exclusion Unambiguous, Precluding Coverage](#)** *This originally appeared in the [D&O Diary](#) on April 7, 2016.*

Authored By



Peter D. Webster

Related Practices

[Appellate & Trial Support](#)

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

©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.