

New York High Court: Insurer May Not Rely on Policy Exclusions If It Breaches Duty to Defend

The New York Court of Appeals, applying New York law, has held that, where an insurer breaches its duty to defend, the insurer “may not later rely on policy exclusions to escape its duty to indemnify the insured for a judgment” *K2 Invest. Group, LLC v. Am. Guar. & Liab. Ins. Co.*, 2013 WL 2475869 (N.Y. June 11, 2013). The court also held that the lower court properly dismissed claims alleging bad faith for failing to accept a demand within limits prior to the entry of the default judgment.

The insurer issued to a law firm a professional liability policy with a \$2 million aggregate and per claim limit of liability. Plaintiffs in the underlying action made loans to a real estate investment company. A lawyer associated with the insured law firm was also a member of the real estate investment company. Plaintiffs alleged that the lawyer, acting as their attorney, failed to record mortgages in plaintiffs’ favor to secure their loans. The real estate investment company subsequently became insolvent and never made payments on the unsecured loans. Plaintiffs sued the lawyer and made a settlement demand of \$450,000. The insurer denied coverage for the underlying litigation and settlement demand based on policy exclusions for claims arising out of the insured’s capacity or status as a director or officer of a business enterprise and for claims arising out of alleged acts or omissions of the insured for any business enterprise in which the insured had a controlling interest. The lawyer failed to appear in the litigation, and a default judgment in excess of the policy limits was entered against him. The lawyer then assigned his claims against the carrier, including bad faith claims, to plaintiffs. In the resulting declaratory judgment action, the trial court found that the insurer breached its duty to defend, and the intermediate appellate court affirmed,

holding that the exclusions relied upon by the insurer were inapplicable.

On appeal, the New York high court affirmed. In so doing, the court determined that the underlying complaint “unmistakably [pled] a claim for legal malpractice” within the scope of coverage of the policy. Accordingly, the court noted that it would not reach the issue of whether the exclusions relied upon by the insurer applied to bar coverage, because, where it is “quite clear” that the insurer breached its duty to defend, “by breaching its duty to defend [the insurer] lost its right to rely on these exclusions in litigation over its indemnity obligation.” Additionally, relying on *Lang v. Hanover Insurance Co.*, 820 N.E.2d 855 (N.Y. 2004), the court stated that an insurer disclaiming coverage “is well advised to seek a declaratory judgment concerning the duty to defend or indemnify the purported insured [because if] it disclaims and declines to defend in the underlying lawsuit without doing so, it takes the risk that the injured party will obtain a judgment against the purported insured and then seek payment.” The court explained that “an insurance company that has disclaimed its duty to defend ‘may litigate only the validity of its disclaimer.’ If the disclaimer is found bad, the insurance company must indemnify its insured for the resulting judgment, even if policy exclusions would otherwise have negated the duty to indemnify.”

The court explained that “[t]his rule will give insurers an incentive to defend the cases they are bound by law to defend, and thus to give insureds the full benefit of their bargain.” The court noted, however, that there may be exceptions to this rule, citing as an example a scenario in which an

[continued on page 2](#)

New York High Court: Insurer May Not Rely on Policy Exclusions If It Breaches Duty to Defend
continued from page 1

insured's conduct was intentional such that public policy could prohibit the insurability of intentional wrongdoing.

The court also held that the lower courts properly dismissed the bad faith claims against the insurer. In this regard, the court stated that “[a]n insurer’s rejection of a settlement offer for less than the full amount of its policy does not by itself establish the insurer’s bad faith, even when the insured later suffers a judgment greater than the policy limit.” The court further noted that the plaintiffs failed to

allege any facts that evidenced bad faith on the part of the insurer.

The decision is available [here](#). ■

For more information, please contact:

Jason P. Cronic
202.719.7175
jcronic@wileyrein.com

Parker J. Lavin
202.719.7367
plavin@wileyrein.com

Professional Liability Attorneys

Kimberly A. Ashmore	202.719.7326	kashmore@wileyrein.com
Matthew W. Beato	202.719.7518	mbeato@wileyrein.com
Edward R. Brown	202.719.7580	erbrown@wileyrein.com
Mary E. Borja	202.719.4252	mborja@wileyrein.com
Jason P. Cronic	202.719.7175	jcronic@wileyrein.com
M. Addison Dent Draper	202.719.7574	adraper@wileyrein.com
Cara Tseng Duffield	202.719.7407	cduffield@wileyrein.com
Benjamin C. Eggert	202.719.7336	beggert@wileyrein.com
Milad Emam	202.719.7509	memam@wileyrein.com
Dale E. Hausman	202.719.7005	dhausman@wileyrein.com
John E. Howell	202.719.7047	jhowell@wileyrein.com
Peter J. Jenkins	202.719.7136	pjenkins@wileyrein.com
Leland H. Jones, IV	202.719.7178	lhjones@wileyrein.com
Parker J. Lavin	202.719.7367	plavin@wileyrein.com
Charles C. Lemley	202.719.7354	clemley@wileyrein.com
Mary Catherine Martin	202.719.7161	mmartin@wileyrein.com
Kimberly M. Melvin	202.719.7403	kmelvin@wileyrein.com
Jason O'Brien	202.719.7464	jobrien@wileyrein.com
Leslie A. Platt	202.719.3174	lplatt@wileyrein.com
Marc E. Rindner	202.719.7486	mrindner@wileyrein.com
Kenneth E. Ryan	202.719.7028	kryan@wileyrein.com
Gary P. Seligman	202.719.3587	gseligman@wileyrein.com
Richard A. Simpson	202.719.7314	rsimpson@wileyrein.com
William E. Smith	202.719.7350	wsmith@wileyrein.com
Daniel J. Standish	202.719.7130	dstandish@wileyrein.com
Karen L. Toto	202.719.7152	ktoto@wileyrein.com
Sandra Tvarian Stevens	202.719.3229	sstevens@wileyrein.com
David H. Topol	202.719.7214	dtopol@wileyrein.com
Jennifer A. Williams	202.719.7566	jawilliams@wileyrein.com

To update your contact information or to cancel your subscription to this newsletter, visit: www.wileyrein.com/?NLS=1

This is a publication of Wiley Rein LLP, intended to provide general news about recent legal developments and should not be construed as providing legal advice or legal opinions. You should consult an attorney for any specific legal questions.

Wiley Rein LLP Offices:
1776 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006
202.719.7000

7925 Jones Branch Drive
McLean, VA 22102
703.905.2800