

Ninth Circuit Finds Bonus Indexed Annuity Delivers Exactly What was Promised

June 15, 2015

Observing that it "delivered precisely what it promised," the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals recently affirmed summary judgment for an insurer in a case alleging violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) and state consumer fraud laws related to its sale of annuities. In *Eller v. EquiTrust Life Insurance Co.*, the purchaser of a bonus indexed annuity brought a putative class action alleging that the insurer engaged in fraud and challenging the annuity's premium bonus, the use of a "market value adjustment," and the insurer's alleged attempt to evade state nonforfeiture laws through its application of maturity dates. The annuities at issue used "index credits," which would increase the value of an individual's account based on changes in a market index like the S&P 500. Additionally, a market value adjustment, also based on an external index, might be applied upon the early withdrawal of funds or surrender of the annuity, resulting in a positive or negative adjustment of the account's value. Finally, the annuity included a bonus feature through which the account was credited with a bonus consisting of 10 percent of premiums paid during the first year. The court first disposed of plaintiff's claim that the premium bonus was fraudulent, determining that "a seller generally has no duty to disclose internal pricing policies or its method for valuing what it sells." **Because the insurer owed no fiduciary or statutory duty to the plaintiff, it had no obligation to disclose that an annuity with a bonus feature might have lower index credits than alternative products.** Additionally, since the plaintiff received exactly what he was promised, the bonus was not illusory, nor had the insurance company made any affirmative misrepresentations. The court dismissed plaintiff's state law claims alleging violations of consumer fraud statutes and unjust enrichment for the same reasons. The court further rejected plaintiff's claim that the formula for the market value adjustment, which would increase downward adjustments and decrease upward adjustments, was not properly disclosed in the marketing materials. It noted that the insurer "meticulously explain[ed]" the market value adjustment and how it was applied. The court also disagreed with plaintiff's position that the company's policy of providing relief from the annuity's fixed maturity date at an individual's request converted the annuity into one

with an optional maturity date that must comply with specific provisions of the state nonforfeiture law.

Related Practices

[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.