



Client Alert

July 2011

WWM Wins Summary Judgment in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida

WWM attorneys Robert Conlon, Jim Kienzle and Mark Schmidt won summary judgment on behalf of WWM's client, a professional liability insurance carrier, in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida. WWM's client declined coverage for a third-party claimant's lawsuit against the insured law firm on the bases that the allegations: did not fall within the scope of coverage provided by the policy's Insuring Agreement; and, were also barred by an exclusion. The insured filed a declaratory judgment action against WWM's client in Florida state court alleging that the client breached the insurance contract by declining coverage for the claim. WWM successfully removed the matter to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida and thereafter filed its motion for summary judgment arguing the two coverage defenses. The insured firm filed a cross-motion for summary judgment.

Judge Mary Scriven, in her 14-page Order, found that there was no allegation in the underlying complaint that the insured law firm rendered services as an attorney to any party to the underlying action. To the contrary, Judge Scriven noted that the underlying complaint repeatedly stated that the insured was acting as an "unlicensed broker" and/or violated Section 475.41 of the Florida Statutes by collecting a commission without a license. Thus, Judge Scriven held that: "the underlying complaint cannot be fairly read to involve 'services rendered to others in [the Insured's] capacity as a lawyer' or acts 'arising out of the conduct of [the Insured's] profession as a lawyer,' such that the acts would qualify as professional services under the policy." Because the Court found that the policy does not provide coverage for the underlying lawsuit, it declined to rule on the applicability of the relevant policy exclusion.

Judge Scriven granted the client's motion for summary judgment, denied the insured's cross-motion and directed the clerk to enter judgment in the client's favor declaring that: (1) the policy provides no coverage for the matters alleged in the underlying lawsuit; (2) the client did not, and does not, have a duty to defend the underlying lawsuit; and, (3) the client does not have a duty to indemnify the insured for any loss resulting from the matters alleged in the underlying lawsuit. *Rissman, Barrett, Hurt, Donahue & McClain, P.A. v. Westport Insurance Corporation*, No. 6:10-cv-00898-MSS-GJK (M.D.Fla. July 19, 2011).

Links

Visit Walker Wilcox Matousek LLP on the web.

www.wwmlawyers.com

Questions? Contact us.

rconolon@wwmlawyers.com

jkienzle@wwmlawyers.com

mschmidt@wwmlawyers.com

Walker Wilcox Matousek LLP

Chicago Office

225 West Washington Street
Suite 2400
Chicago, IL 60606
Ph. 312-244-6700
Fx. 312-244-6800

Houston Office

South Tower Pennzoil Place
711 Louisiana Street
Suite 3100
Houston, TX 77002
Ph. 713-654-8001
Fx. 713-654-8818

About Walker Wilcox Matousek LLP

Walker Wilcox Matousek LLP concentrates on sophisticated insurance and reinsurance, complex commercial disputes, including counseling, alternative dispute resolution, litigation, and trial. Prior to establishing their own firm, the founders of WWM were partners in one of the nation's largest and most prestigious insurance law firms.

Along with in-depth expertise, WWM provides attentive and efficient service in a collegial environment. WWM has been selected by many discerning clients, ranging from individuals to global enterprises, to represent their interests nationwide.

[We invite you to contact us to learn more about our experience and how we can assist you.](#)