

Nos. 07-15326, 07-15356, 07-15541

**IN THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

AMERICAN COLOR GRAPHICS, INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellee-Cross-Appellant,

vs.

TRAVELERS PROPERTY CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant-Appellant-Cross-Appellee.

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California, Oakland Division
Case No. CV-04-03518-SBA
Hon. Sandra Brown Armstrong, Presiding

OPENING BRIEF OF APPELLANT

TRAVELERS PROPERTY CASUALTY COMPANY OF AMERICA

David C. Capell, No. 114691
Angie M. Bickel, No. 220065
GORDON & REES LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 986-5900
Facsimile: (415) 986-8054

Paul E. B. Glad, No. 79045
Sean McEneaney, No. 169105
SONNENSCHN NATH &
ROSENTHAL LLP
525 Market Street, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 882-5000
Facsimile: (415) 882-0300

Attorneys for Appellant
TRAVELERS PROPERTY CASUALTY COMPANY OF AMERICA

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
(FED. R. APP. P. 26.1)

Travelers Property Casualty Company of America is a wholly owned subsidiary of The Phoenix Insurance Company, which in turn is a wholly owned subsidiary of The Travelers Indemnity Company. The Travelers Indemnity Company is a wholly owned subsidiary of Travelers Insurance Group Holdings, Inc., which in turn is a wholly owned subsidiary of Travelers Property Casualty Corp. Travelers Property Casualty Corp. is a wholly owned subsidiary of The Travelers Companies, Inc.

No individual or corporation owns 10% or more of the stock of The Travelers Companies, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT	1
II. ISSUES PRESENTED	1
III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS	4
A. ACG's Workers' Compensation Policy	4
B. Statement of Factual Background	5
1. Travelers Paid to Defend and Settle Custodio's Claim	6
a. Custodio Claimed She Was Injured at Work.....	6
b. ACG Reported the Claim to Travelers and Travelers Investigated.....	7
c. Travelers Continued to Investigate.....	9
C. ACG Expressed Its Satisfaction with Travelers' Handling and Resolution of the Custodio Claim	12
D. Statement of Procedural History and Damage Award	13
1. The District Court Denied Travelers' Motion for Summary Judgment	13
2. The District Court Permitted ACG to Seek Nominal Damages for Breach of Contract and Submitted Bad Faith to the Jury	13
3. The Jury Awarded Tort, Contract and Punitive Damages	14
4. ACG Moved for Its Attorneys' Fees Post-Trial Pursuant to <i>Brandt</i> and California Civil Code Section 1717	15
V. TRAVELERS SEEKS REVERSAL	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
VI. ARGUMENT.....	17
A. The Trial Court Erred in Treating ACG’s Damages as Tort Damages Instead of Contract Damages.....	17
1. A Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing Is Implied in Every Contract	18
2. Tort Liability for Breach of the Implied Covenant in Insurance Departs from the Traditional Distinction Between Contract and Tort Remedies.....	19
a. The Law Distinguishes Between the Remedies Available in Tort and Contract Based on Their Fundamentally Divergent Objectives	19
b. The Law Limits the Tort of Bad Faith to Protecting Against Wrongful Denial of Defense or Indemnity	20
3. The California Supreme Court Has Consistently Refused to Extend the Exception to Allow Tort Liability for a Breach of the Implied Covenant	21
4. Absent that “Economic Dilemma,” the Insurance Exception Has Only Been Applied Where the Insured’s Premiums Inexorably Increased Due to State Regulations No Longer in Effect	24
5. ACG Is Only Entitled to and Was Only Awarded Contract Damages for Travelers’ Breach of the Implied Covenant	27
B. The Evidence Does Not Support an Award of \$140,000.....	29
1. The Evidence Shows the “Monies Paid” Were Not <i>Caused</i> by Travelers’ Breach of the Duty to Investigate	29

