

Collaboration Among Insurers on Responses to COVID-19

by Thomas F. Bush

A FREEBORN & PETERS LLP CLIENT ALERT

The unprecedented challenges that COVID-19 presents to insurers will lead many to seek consultation and collaboration with other insurers facing the same challenges. Some may hesitate, out of a concern for the risks of an antitrust violation.

To address that concern, we offer the following guidelines for insurers subject to the antitrust laws of the United States.



Petitioning the Government

Many regulators and legislators are actively considering measures to assist policyholders seeking coverage for losses arising from the pandemic. Such measures range from applying public pressure on insurers to pay claims that are subject to coverage defenses to adopting new laws and regulations that expand the coverage under existing policies. Insurers need to engage with law makers, regulators and other public officials on these measures and understand that collaboration with other insurers will strengthen their position.

This form of collaboration should not raise antitrust risks. Under a doctrine known as “Noerr Pennington,” actions undertaken to influence government bodies and officials are deemed outside of the scope of the antitrust laws, even if the actions have the effect of harming competition. The collaboration must, however, be undertaken with the intention of influencing a governmental decision. If the goal is to obtain an advantage that does not depend on the governmental decision, for example by burdening a competitor with the cost and distraction of a regulatory investigation, and favorable action by the government is not an actual objective, the protection of Noerr-Pennington is lost.

Collaboration on Claims

Insurers often wish to collaborate on claims, particularly where they co-insure the same risks, through information sharing and occasionally by joint decisions on paying claims. Policyholders occasionally regard such collaboration as anticompetitive collusion, but the conduct has not led to antitrust liability in the past and should not in the future.

Cooperation among competitors will raise potential antitrust liability when its purpose or effect is to restrain competition, usually in the form of higher prices or lower output. By the time that a claim is presented for payment, the competitive process has been completed. The premium, coverage and other terms of the policy have been set. Whether a claim is paid, and for how much, is determined by the policy, not by competition among insurers.

Insurers have encountered antitrust issues when their collaboration on claims expands to affect the premium or terms for renewal or new coverage. So long as the communications and the collaboration is limited to claims under covers already bound and terms already set, the insurers should not face a serious antitrust risk.



Antitrust Immunity

A federal statute, known as the McCarran-Ferguson Act, provides insurers with immunity from antitrust laws, but the immunity is subject to some significant limitations. First, the immunity is applicable only to the “business of insurance,” a term that the courts have interpreted narrowly. Not every activity carried out by an insurance company is immune. Second, the immunity is only from federal antitrust laws. Almost all of the states have their counterparts to the federal antitrust laws, and many of the states provide either much narrower or no immunity for insurance activities. Third, insurers domiciled outside of the United States offering surplus lines coverage might not benefit from the immunity, depending upon the circumstances of the claim.

Due to these limitations, prudent insurers do not rely on the immunity of the McCarran-Ferguson Act for the purpose of ensuring compliance with the antitrust laws, except in specific cases where antitrust counsel determines that the immunity is clearly applicable. The immunity might prove to be valuable to an insurer facing an antitrust claim or subject to a government investigation, but an insurer seeking to avoid antitrust litigation and investigations should conduct itself as if no immunity is available.

If you have questions, please contact Thomas Bush and stay tuned for more developments on [Freeborn’s COVID-19 webpage](#).

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Thomas F. Bush

Partner

Chicago Office
(312) 360-6837

tbush@freeborn.com

Tom has extensive experience in complex litigation involving antitrust, insurance and reinsurance matters, and, in particular, has been very actively involved in the representation of significant lawsuits and arbitrations for global reinsurers in disputes arising from large scale losses. Tom also represents and counsels insurance companies and investment firms on antitrust compliance and on competition issues arising in mergers and acquisitions.

140+ Attorneys. 5 Offices.

Freeborn & Peters LLP is a full-service law firm with international capabilities and offices in Chicago, Ill.; New York, Ny; Richmond, Va.; Springfield, Ill.; and Tampa, Fla. Freeborn is always looking ahead and seeking to find better ways to serve its clients. It takes a proactive approach to ensure its clients are more informed, prepared and able to achieve greater success – not just now, but also in the future. While the firm serves clients across a very broad range of sectors, it has also pioneered an interdisciplinary approach that serves the specific needs of targeted industries.

Freeborn's major achievements in litigation are reflective of the firm's significant growth over the last several years and its established reputation as a Litigation Powerhouse®. Freeborn has one of the largest litigation departments among full-service firms of its size – currently with more than 90 litigators, which represents about two-thirds of the firm's lawyers.

Freeborn is a firm that genuinely lives up to its core values of integrity, effectiveness, teamwork, caring and commitment, and embodies them through high standards of client service and responsive action. Its lawyers build close and lasting relationships with clients and are driven to help them achieve their legal and business objectives.

For more information visit: www.freeborn.com

CHICAGO

311 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 360-6000
(312) 360-6520 fax

NEW YORK

230 Park Avenue
Suite 630
New York, NY 10169
(212) 218-8760
(212) 218-8761 fax

SPRINGFIELD

217 East Monroe Street
Suite 202
Springfield, IL 62701
(217) 535-1060
(217) 535-1069 fax

RICHMOND

901 East Byrd Street
Suite 950
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 644-1300
(804) 644-1354 fax

TAMPA

1 Tampa City Center
201 North Franklin Street
Suite 3550
Tampa, FL 33602
(813) 488-2920

Disclaimer: This publication is made available for educational purposes only, as well as to provide general information about the law, not specific legal advice. It does not establish an attorney/client relationship between you and Freeborn & Peters LLP, and should not be used as a substitute for competent legal advice from a licensed professional in your state.

© 2020 Freeborn & Peters LLP. All rights reserved. Permission is granted to copy and forward all articles and text as long as proper attribution to Freeborn & Peters LLP is provided and this copyright statement is reproduced.