The Breath of An Insurer’s Duty to Defend

By Kirk Peach

In Gray v. Zurich Ins. Co., 65 Cal. 2d 426 (1966), the California Supreme Court addressed the issue of the scope of the duty to defend. It held that an insurer must defend a suit that “contains or potentially contains within its causes of action all matters which give rise to the potential liability of the insured.” As the court explained, the duty arises when the carrier “receives notice of a suit which shows a potential liability to pay damages on the part of its insured.”

Under California’s Insurance Frauds Prevention Act Section 1871.7, large payments can be awarded to insurers who report fraudulent claims made to private insurance companies, and the very insurance companies that are victims of insurance fraud can recover up to 50 percent of hefty civil penalties imposed on the fraudsters.
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It is well-known that under the Federal False Claims Act, whistleblowers who report fraud and abuse in the government’s programs can recover large awards. This monetary incentive has led many to become whistle-blowers. It is less well-known that in California, insurance companies can also be whistleblowers for lost funds made to them. Under California’s Insurance Frauds Prevention Act (IFPA), large payment can be awarded to insurers who report fraud and abuse by other insurers. In the last few years, insurance companies and the very companies that are victims of insurance fraud have recovered over 50 percent of hefty civil penalties imposed on the fraudsters.

Shawn Hansen is a partner and Practice Leader of the Anti-Markup Group at Stamboulis & Partners. He is licensed to practice law in California.

Ezekiel Rauscher is an associate in the litigation practice of Stamboulis & Partners. He is licensed to practice law in California.
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