

The Insurance Act 2015: an outline of the main changes

Rhys Clift, Partner, Hill Dickinson LLP

HILL DICKINSON





APPLICATION AND IMPLICATIONS?



Will the contract you use to cover maritime and transport risks be impacted by reform to English insurance contract law?







OUTLINE

- Path to reform
- Placement
- Warranties and other conditions
- Fraudulent insurance claims
- Damages, a new remedy
- Contracting out
- Conclusions







Marine Insurance Act, 1906

- Twelve year project
- ➤ A codification of the law, developed by Judiciary (over about 150 years)
- Originally designed to apply to marine insurance business only





Insurance Act 2015

- ➤ Ten year project (following at least 30 years of discussions/proposals)
- Radical.
- First attempt by Legislature to amend the law (rather than evolution in hands of Judiciary)
- Designed to apply to all classes of insurance (marine and non-marine), variations, reinsurance and retrocessions

Enterprise Act 2016

- > Radical.
- > A wholly new remedy







- Joint Law Commission Review 2006. Products:-
 - 7. Consumer Insurance (Disclosure and Representations) Act, 2012 (a driver for change)
 - 2. Insurance Act, 2015 (incepted 12th August 2016), principally for business insurance, marine and non marine (and reinsurance)
 - > 3. Enterprise Act, 2016 (incepts 4th May 2017)
- Likely effect(s)?





- Four main changes:-
 - ➤ 1. Amendment to the law on Placement (duties and remedies)
 - 2. Amendment to the law on Warranties and other terms
 - > 3. Amendment to the law on Fraudulent claims
 - 4. Amendment to the law on Damages
- But note: contracting out (in some respects)
- And note: amendment of the Third Parties (Rights Against Insurers Act 2010 – but not for today)
- Talk focusses on business insurance
- Summary?: Changes said to be largely insured/member friendly. But are they?





- Is burden on insureds on placement now lighter?
 Much is familiar (but avoidance rare anyway?)
- Old duty: onerous
 - ➤ Insured must disclose every material circumstance which is known by the insured, or which ought to be known by him (actual and constructive knowledge)
- New Duty: to make fair presentation of the risk (DFP)
 - Disclosure made in a manner "reasonably clear and accessible to a prudent insurer" (no data dumping)
 - Material representations of facts: substantially correct
 - Material representations of expectation or belief: good faith







- What disclosure is now required?
 - Disclosure must be of every material circumstances which the insured knows or ought to know (same as before)

Or

- "failing that, disclosure which gives the insurer sufficient information to put a prudent insurer on notice that it needs to make further enquiries for the purpose of revealing those material circumstances"
- ➤ Balance on placement has clearly shifted against insurers. This places a new burden **on insurers**







- An aside from the Joint Law Commission:
- "We think it would be helpful for insurers, brokers and policyholder bodies to work together to develop guidance and protocols setting out what a standard presentation of the risk should include in particular circumstances about what should be disclosed, to put flesh on the bones of this structure"
- Unlikely?







- No need to disclose circumstances which, in the absence of enquiry
 - Diminish the risk
 - > The insurer knows
 - > The insurer ought to know
 - > The insurer is presumed to know
 - Are something as to which the insurer waives information







- What does the insured know? Deeper?
 - Actual knowledge (what he knows) and
 - ➤ **New**: that which "should reasonably have been revealed by a **reasonable search** of information available to the insured"
- But what is reasonable? (search is required for info held within the insured's organisation or by any other person).
- A new and potentially burdensome obligation for insureds







- Insured: Whose knowledge? Wider?
 - Previously test was knowledge of senior management of insured (alter ego, controlling mind)
 - Now: Individuals who are part of the insured's senior management (those who play a significant role in making decisions about how the insured's activities are managed and organised); and
 - ➤ Individuals who are responsible for the **insured's insurance** (one who participates in the process of procuring insured's insurance), and
 - Brokers (except that coming to brokers through confidential third party source (if genuinely confidential)



PLACEMENT: REMEDIES



- Insurers remedies for breach of DFP are now less severe, in some cases (so avoidance now more likely?)
- Now two classes of breach: either deliberate or reckless, or neither deliberate or reckless
- Deliberate or reckless breach?
 - Avoid the contract, refuse to pay all claims, keep premium (old law)
- Neither deliberate or reckless?
 - If, but for the breach, the insurer would not have entered the contract at all
 - > Avoid the contract, refuse all claims, return premium





PLACEMENT: REMEDIES



- Where breach of DFP neither deliberate or reckless
- Radical new remedy: if, but for the breach, the insurer would have entered the contract on different terms, contract is treated as if those different terms applied
 - Scope for dispute? Proof?
- Radical new remedy: if insurer would have charged higher premium, insurer can proportionately reduce the amount it pays
 - Scope for dispute? Proof?





First: "Basis clauses":

Provisions that convert representations or information in proposal forms into warranties (considered harsh and unjust). Abolished.

Second: automatic discharge and suspensive terms:

- Failure to comply strictly and literally with terms of warranty resulted in automatic discharge of liability. Later compliance or remedy to the breach; irrelevant. (Considered harsh and unjust)
- ➤ Now, suspensory terms. No liability if loss occurs before a breach of warranty is remedied (unless warranty has ceased to apply, new law makes compliance unlawful or insurer waives breach).
- > Cover reinstated when insured remedies breach
- (If the breach is capable of remedy (some breaches incapable of remedy))







- What counts as remedying the breach?
- If warranty is no longer breached; or
- If warranty (typically) requires:-
 - Something to be done/not done by an ascertainable time
 - A condition to be fulfilled
 - Something to be/is not to be the case
- ... if this is complied with, nonetheless breach is remedies if risk becomes "essentially the same as that originally contemplated by the parties"
- What does that mean? Likely uncertainty and huge scope for dispute







- Third: Where there are terms (express or implied), other than terms defining the risk as a whole, where compliance would tend to reduce risk of loss:
- Of a particular kind
- At a particular location, or
- At a particular time
- If loss occurs, and term not complied with, insurer may not exclude, limit or discharge liability, if <u>insured can</u> prove that breach could not
- Have increased the risk of the loss that:
- Actually occurred
- In the circumstances in which it occurred







- This latter is not limited to warranties
- Also applies to conditions precedent and exclusions
- Problems, for example:
- Likely to be complex to apply
- What will be terms defining risk as whole?
- How will this provision work with new "suspension" provision?





FRAUDULENT INSURANCE CLAIMS



- Amendments largely to clarify the law (old law said to be confused and contradictory)
- Now
- No liability to pay the fraudulent claim/can recover sums already paid
- Can by notice treat contract as terminated from the date of the fraud
- No need to return the premium
- Claims pre-fraud still covered
- For group insurance, fraud by a person covered by, but not party to, the contract gives insurers the right to terminate as against the fraudster only





DAMAGES FOR LATE PAYMENT



- Damages for late payment
- Radical: A wholly new remedy (cf damages previously irrecoverable). Compensatory not punitive.
- Requires insurers to pay claims within a reasonable time (including time to investigate and assess claim)
- What is reasonable? Depends on all circumstances, including the size and complexity of the claim, regulatory compliance issues etc.





DAMAGES FOR LATE PAYMENT



- **No action:** if the insurer *merely denies claim* or *disputes quantum* (alone); but conduct in handling the claim will be relevant to deciding if the term has been breached
- One year time bar (counting for the date of payment of the claim)
- Contract out? Yes, but only for business insurance, if not deliberate/ reckless
- Effect: An explosion of disputes and litigation?





CONTRACTING OUT: DISADVANTAGEOUS TERMS



- Permissible (business insurance) in respect of some obligations
 - New DFP including new remedies
 - New rules on warranties (not basis clauses)
 - New right to damages for late payment (unless deliberate/reckless)

Provided

- Transparency: Insurers must take sufficient steps to draw disadvantageous terms to attention of customer/insured, before the contract or variation is made
- > Clarity: terms are clear and unambiguous





CONCLUSIONS



- What must underwriters, brokers and insureds do:
 - Review guidance to insureds
 - Review placing procedures
 - Review internal procedures (searching) within companies (insureds)
 - > Review underwriting and claims guidelines
 - Amend the proposal forms
 - Review contracts/policy wordings



CONCLUSIONS



- Placement duties: modest changes, avoidance was in any event rare, but new uncertainties
- Placement remedies: significant and a welcome change
- Warranties: basis clauses, a welcome change
- Warranties: otherwise good in parts, but likely difficulties
- Fraudulent claims: clarifies the law
- Damages on late claims: a recipe for litigation
- Contracting out: certain P&I Clubs have contracted out (but not of new placing remedies). Who (if any) will follow?







HILL DICKINSON