

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

RESPONSE AND REPLY 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
SONNENSCHNEIN 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. ACG PRESENTS A SMOKESCREEN AND IGNORES FACTS | 2 |
| III. TRAVELERS ACKNOWLEDGES AN <i>IMPLIED</i> DUTY TO INVESTIGATE | 4 |
| IV. ACG FAILS TO JUSTIFY IMPOSITION OF TORT REMEDIES | 5 |
| V. STATE FUND'S <i>AMICUS</i> BRIEF OFFERS AN IMPORTANT PERSPECTIVE | 8 |
| VI. THE RECORD DOES NOT SUPPORT \$140,000 | 9 |
| A. ACG Does Not Identify Payments Totaling \$140,000 | 9 |
| B. Travelers Did Not Waive Its Right to Argue the Record Fails to Support \$140,000 | 11 |
| C. The Record Does Not Show Travelers' Breach of the Duty to Investigate Caused ACG Harm | 13 |
| VII. ACG'S CHOICE OF THEORIES OF RECOVERY DID NOT CHANGE THE NATURE OF ACG'S <i>CONTRACTUAL</i> DAMAGES | 16 |
| VIII. THE RECORD DOES NOT SUPPORT PUNITIVE DAMAGES..... | 17 |
| A. ACG Does Not Dispute Tort Relief Is Necessary to Obtain Punitive Damages..... | 17 |
| B. ACG Does Not Identify Malice, Oppression or Fraud | 18 |
| 1. The Only Relevant Conduct Is the Conduct that Caused the Harm Proven at Trial..... | 18 |
| 2. Travelers Did Not Investigate the Custodio Claim with Malice..... | 20 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 3. There Is No “Oppression” Here Because There Is No Evidence ACG Faced a Threat to Its Existence or Financial Stability | 23 |
| 4. There Is No Evidence of Fraud | 24 |
| C. A 10:1 Ratio Here Exceeds Constitutional Limits | 25 |
| 1. The District Court Correctly Found a “Low Level of Reprehensibility” | 26 |
| a. There Is No Evidence ACG Was “Financially Vulnerable” | 27 |
| b. Travelers’ Investigation of the Custodio Claim Is an “Isolated Incident” | 28 |
| c. The Harm Shown at Trial Was Not the Result of “Intentional Malice, Trickery, or Deceit” | 29 |
| 2. A \$140,000 Award Is Substantial and Does Not Justify a Higher Ratio | 29 |
| D. The District Court Wrongly Relied on Travelers’ Financial Condition, of Which There Is No Evidence | 30 |
| E. The Correct Ratio Here is 1:1 | 31 |
| IX. ACG IS NOT ENTITLED TO ITS ATTORNEYS’ FEES PURSUANT TO <i>BRANDT</i> | 34 |
| A. <i>Brandt</i> Does Not Apply Because ACG’s Fees Were Not Determined by the Jury and the Parties Did Not Stipulate Otherwise | 34 |
| B. ACG Is Not Entitled to Its Fees and Costs Incurred on Appeal Under <i>Brandt</i> | 39 |

