

Choice of Law Can Influence STOLI Outcomes

December 01, 2013

The determination of which state's law governs in STOLI disputes often influences the outcome of the case. One guestion that divides courts is what type of misrepresentation justifies rescission. In entering judgment for the insurer after trial, the District of Minnesota recently found that misrepresentations about the insured's net worth were material in PHL Variable Ins. Co. v. 2008 Christa Joseph Irrevocable Trust. The court found the test for materiality in Minnesota was not whether it increased the risk of loss, but whether it substantially influenced the insurer's decision to provide coverage. The statements about the insured's net worth were "gross misrepresentations" that were material to PHL's decision to issue the Policy" and as such entitled the insurer to both rescind the policy and to retain the premiums paid. Another question as to which state laws can widely differ is whether an incontestability provision will bar a declaratory judgment action brought after the period to seek a policy declared void ab initio has expired. The Southern District of Florida recently weighed in on this issue, diverging from the majority view and finding that the public policy underlying the incontestability statute weighed in favor of barring a challenge to the policy. In Pruco Life Ins. Co. v. U.S. Bank, the court opined that the purpose of the statute – to provide the insured with certainty while providing the insurer with a limited opportunity to discover fraud – would be furthered by its ruling. These cases reflect the obvious: that beyond the issue of the statutory and common laws of the various states on STOLI differing so greatly, there remains a fair amount of uncertainty within jurisdictions regarding STOLI law interpretation and application that makes predicting the outcome of such cases a continuing challenge.

©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.