



October 2015

CURRENTS: Keeping in Tow with Maritime Legal Updates

from Benesch's Transportation & Logistics Practice Group

Marine Insurance Coverage—The *Uberrimae Fidei* Defense and Reliance as a Necessary Factor



Stephanie S. Penninger



Brittany L. Shaw

On August 20, 2015, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit ruled that demonstrating reliance is required to void a marine insurance policy under the *uberrimae fidei* defense. In doing so, the court reversed the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota-Minneapolis' summary judgment award in favor of the marine insurer, St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company ("SPF&M"), being able to void a marine insurance policy under the *uberrimae fidei* defense. *St. Paul. Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Abhe & Svoboda, Inc.*, 798 F.3d 715, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 14671 (8th Cir. Aug. 20, 2015). In this case, Abhe & Svoboda, Inc. ("Abhe"), an industrial painting contractor, leased a "dumb" barge, used as a stationary platform, to complete work on a bridge in Rhode Island. Abhe was required by the leasing company to have a professional surveyor assess the barge's condition. A surveyor required by the barge leasing company indicated the existence of pinholes in the deck and that the barge's under-deck tanks were not

watertight from one another. After the survey, Abhe anchored the barge, loaded equipment, and began the several month project. Also, Abhe applied for and obtained a marine policy from SPF&M. Instead of SPF&M requesting that Abhe complete an application for insurance, it accepted an application Abhe had used for a different insurance application from May 2010. Abhe did not send SPF&M a copy of the barge's survey, and SPF&M did not survey any of Abhe's marine equipment, although it was entitled to do so under the marine insurance policy.

When Abhe's barge sank during a severe nor'easter in October 2011, the Coast Guard ordered the barge to be removed from the bottom of the Narragansett Bay. Abhe made a claim under its packaged ocean marine insurance policy for the wreck removal coverage, specifically under the Protection and Indemnity Policy. However, SPF&M denied the request for wreck removal coverage, citing that Abhe's policy was void under the *uberrimae fidei* ("utmost good faith") doctrine. SPF&M claimed that before it issued the package marine insurance policy, Abhe had not provided a copy of the November 2010 survey performed on the leased barge, and, therefore, its policy was void.

The *uberrimae fidei* doctrine requires both parties to a marine insurance contract to "accord each other the highest degree of good faith," and the insured to disclose to the insurer all known circumstances that materially affect

the risk being insured." *Knight v. U.S. Fire Ins. Co.*, 804 F.2d 9, 13 (2d Cir. 1986). This is because the insured is in the best position to know of any facts that may be material to the risk. *Id.* Here, Abhe argued that SPF&M was incorrectly awarded summary judgment because the District Court had failed to consider whether Abhe's omission of the survey had induced SPF&M to issue Abhe's marine policy, and the actual reliance element of *uberrimae fidei*. In considering the parties' arguments, the Eighth Circuit was persuaded by the principal case addressing the issue, *Puritan Insurance Co. v. Eagle Steamship Co. S.A.*, 779 F.2d 866 (2d Cir. 1985), in which the court held that reliance was a necessary element of the *uberrimae fidei* defense. The Eighth Circuit agreed with the Second Circuit that not only is the insured obligated to disclose all material facts to the insurer, regardless of whether the insurer makes a specific inquiry, reliance is a necessary element of the *uberrimae fidei* analysis, and omitting it "would create a moral hazard on the part of marine insurers." *St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 14671, at *11.

The Eighth Circuit noted that not all circuits explicitly recognize reliance as an element of *uberrimae fidei*. Nonetheless, several circuit courts use a subjective test for materiality that asks whether the insurer, in fact, would have found the omitted information material. The Eighth Circuit further recognized that

(continued)

including the reliance factor as part of the test is consistent with general contract law principles, under which a misrepresentation, by omission, requires the misrepresentation to have induced the harmed party to enter into the contract. The Eighth Circuit then concluded that under either test, SPF&M had the burden to show that Abhe's misrepresentation induced SPF&M to underwrite the risk. However, it did not find that SPF&M had provided sufficient evidence to show its reliance, and, therefore, reversed the summary judgment finding in favor of SPF&M, and remanded the case back to District Court for further findings.

In light of the Eighth Circuit's explicit finding that reliance is a necessary element to the *uberrimae fidei* analysis, insurers should take note that, when attempting to void a marine insurance policy for an insured's failure to disclose material facts, depending on the jurisdiction, the insurer may also have to prove that those omitted facts induced the insurer to underwrite the risk at issue. Insurers should now take the extra step and be able to prove that had its underwriters known the veracity of a material fact, they would not have issued the policy.

For additional information, please contact:

STEPHANIE S. PENNINGER at spenninger@beneschlaw.com or (317) 685-6188

BRITTANY L. SHAW at bshaw@beneschlaw.com or (317) 685-6118

STEPHANIE S. PENNINGER is Chair of Benesch's Maritime Transportation focus area. Her experience includes representing motor carriers, third party logistics providers, ocean transportation intermediaries, national shippers, large private fleets and water carriers in the domestic, non-contiguous trade lanes concerning transportation and logistics matters, including: providing counseling concerning maritime and admiralty law issues and regulatory compliance, handling maritime casualty matters, drafting ocean transportation service agreements and prosecuting and defending freight charge disputes and cargo claims for loss, damage or delay.

Ms. Penninger works out of the firm's Indianapolis office, and is an active member in numerous transportation and logistics industry groups and organizations.

BRITTANY L. SHAW is an associate in the firm's General Practice Group. Her practice focuses on working with clients in the Transportation & Logistics field as well as dealing with matters involving Real Estate.

Ms. Shaw works out of the firm's Indianapolis office, and is also certified in civil mediation.

Additional Information

For additional information, please contact:

Transportation & Logistics Practice Group

Michael J. Barrie at (302) 442-7068 or mbarrie@beneschlaw.com
Marc S. Blubaugh at (614) 223-9382 or mblubaugh@beneschlaw.com
Tamar Gontovnik at (216) 363-4658 or tgontovnik@beneschlaw.com
Matthew D. Gurbach at (216) 363-4413 or mgurbach@beneschlaw.com
James M. Hill at (216) 363-4444 or jhill@beneschlaw.com
Jennifer R. Hoover at (302) 442-7006 or jhoover@beneschlaw.com
J. Allen Jones III at (614) 223-9323 or ajones@beneschlaw.com
Thomas B. Kern at (614) 223-9369 or tkern@beneschlaw.com
Peter N. Kirsanow at (216) 363-4481 or pkirsanow@beneschlaw.com
David M. Krueger at (216) 363-4683 or dkrueger@beneschlaw.com
Christopher J. Lalak at (216) 363-4557 or clalak@beneschlaw.com
Tamara L. Maynard at (614) 223-9378 or tmaynard@beneschlaw.com
Andi M. Metzel at (317) 685-6159 or ametzel@beneschlaw.com
Kelly E. Mulrane at (614) 223-9318 or kmulrane@beneschlaw.com
Lianzhong Pan at (86 21) 3222-0388 or lpian@beneschlaw.com
Martha J. Payne at (541) 764-2859 or mpayne@beneschlaw.com
Stephanie S. Penninger at (317) 685-6188 or spenninger@beneschlaw.com
Richard A. Plewacki at (216) 363-4159 or rplewacki@beneschlaw.com
Peter K. Shelton at (216) 363-4169 or pshelton@beneschlaw.com
Clare R. Taft at (216) 363-4435 or ctaft@beneschlaw.com
Katie Tesner at (614) 223-9359 or ktesner@beneschlaw.com
Eric L. Zalud at (216) 363-4178 or ezalud@beneschlaw.com

www.beneschlaw.com

As a reminder, this Advisory is being sent to draw your attention to issues and is not to replace legal counseling.

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE: TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY THE IRS, WE INFORM YOU THAT, UNLESS EXPRESSLY STATED OTHERWISE, ANY U.S. FEDERAL TAX ADVICE CONTAINED IN THIS COMMUNICATION (INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS NOT INTENDED OR WRITTEN TO BE USED, AND CANNOT BE USED, FOR THE PURPOSE OF (i) AVOIDING PENALTIES UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, OR (ii) PROMOTING, MARKETING OR RECOMMENDING TO ANOTHER PARTY ANY TRANSACTION OR MATTER ADDRESSED HEREIN.