

# Sixth Circuit Holds No Disgorgement of Profits Based on Wrongfully Denied ERISA Disability Benefits

June 15, 2015

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting *en banc*, recently decided a closely-watched case regarding the scope of "other appropriate equitable relief" under ERISA Section 502(a)(3). In *Rochow v. LINA*, the court held that plaintiff Rochow, a high-level insurance executive, was made whole through his recovery, under ERISA Section 502(a)(1)(B), of wrongfully denied long-term disability benefits, attorney's fees, and the possibility of obtaining pre-judgment interest. Consequently, it vacated the district court's multimillion dollar "disgorgement of profits" award under Section 502(a)(3) as a "duplicative recovery" not permitted under ERISA. The *en banc* court rejected plaintiff's argument that the denial of benefits and a continued withholding of those benefits, yielding defendant profits, constituted separate injuries, and held that plaintiff was improperly "repackaging" his claim for benefits under Section 502(a)(1)(B) by seeking further relief under Section 502(a)(3). Further, citing *Varity Corp. v. Howe*, the court held that plaintiff could only obtain "other appropriate equitable relief" under Section 502(a)(3) where there was no other adequate remedy under ERISA, and that Section 502(a)(1)(B) provided remedies adequate to redress plaintiff's injuries. Had the *en banc* court sided with the plaintiff, the impact on employee benefit plans and their sponsors, as well as administrators operating in the ERISA-governed space, could have been profound. Because this and related issues on the question of available remedies under ERISA are among the most hotly litigated ERISA issues currently in the courts, *Rochow* is likely to be a frequently cited case in the area. Carlton Fields submitted an *amicus* brief on behalf of several trade associations in support of LINA in the *en banc* proceeding.

# Related Practices

[Financial Services Regulatory](#)

[Labor & Employment](#)

©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.