

# DOCHERTY V SECRETARY OF STATE FOR BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND SKILLS [2018] CSOH 25 – WHICH INSURER RESPONDS?

Richard Livingston 22.5.18

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham www.kingschambers.com

## Question



 If the Courts are going to concentrate on when symptoms emerge as being the time when symptoms are deemed to have been suffered, does this present an opportunity to Defendants to argue that the policy in place at the time of exposure is not "triggered"?

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham www.kingschambers.com



- Is Docherty inconsistent with the Supreme Court's approach in Durham v BAI (Run Off) Ltd [2012] UKSC 14 (the "Trigger" litigation).
- Trigger inhalation of asbestos not an injury

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham www.kingschambers (in) @kings-chambers www.kingschambers.com

Lord	Mance	in	Triaaer



 The courts should: "avoid over-concentration on the meaning of single words and phrases viewed in isolation and look at the insurance contracts more broadly"

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham Www.kingschambers.com

#### 5 features of the *Trigger* policies



- They required injury to be sustained (or disease to be contracted) during a period of employment;
- There was a very close link between the number of employees employed during each period of insurance and the level of premium payable. This suggested that the insurer's risk was undertaken in respect of activities occurring during that period;
  There was a potential gap in cover if an employee was exposed to a substance in year one, but by the time the effects became manifest.
- There was a potential gap in cover if an employee was exposed to a substance in year one, but by the time the effects became manifest he was no longer employed by the policyholder (the "black hole" argument;

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham





- As a result, employers would be vulnerable to any decision by insurers not to renew following discovery of past instances of negligent exposure;
- In some cases, the policies contained territorial exclusions which excluded employees who were working abroad when their injuries were "sustained" or "contracted", creating another potential gap in cover.

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham Wings\_chambers (in) Wkings-chambers
 Www.kingschambers.com



- Lord Mance "The natural inference to draw from the references to being engaged in the employer's services and in work forming part of the employer's business is that it was envisaged that the accident or disease would and should arise out of such service and work, rather than merely occurring during it".
- The effect of the decision is to reinstate the previous market practice of paying mesothelioma claims on the basis that EL policies respond to the culpable exposure of an employee to asbestos during the period of insurance.
- · Policies are, therefore, triggered on ingestion

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham



## **BUT** ....



 Docherty runs contrary to the prevailing insurance market practice of taking the relevant jurisdiction as the place of exposure rather than the place of manifestation of the disease

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham



## Which policy triggers?



- If the Inner House were to uphold Lord Tyre the real concern arises that Defendants will seek to contend that the policy which should trigger is the policy in force at the time of the onset of symptoms.
- Argument may not assist insurers in mesothelioma or asbestosis cases.
- Position with diffuse pleural thickening "DPT" is far less clear
- No Fairchild exception extends to DPT

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham www.kingschambers (in) @kings-chambers www.kingschambers.com

### DPT - Divisible or Indivisible?



- Conventionally seen as divisible
- Arguable, however, that the pathogenesis is so uncertain that insurers could properly argue that:
  - a. The responsive policy is that in place when the victim's symptoms materialise; or, alternatively,
  - b. It is wholly unknown which, if any, of the policies should respond to an historic DPT claim.

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham

Wkings\_chambers
 Www.kingschambers.com

# Features of DPT and their relevance to the arguments – case for <u>in</u>divisibility



- Latency period 20-40 years
- Whether or to what extent there is a dose response relationship is unclear.
- Usually follows a benign pleural effusion
- Differential diagnoses are wide ranging
- Usually requires relatively high fibre counts

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham www.kingschambers.com

## Impact upon the "Bradford-Hill" criteria



If the pathogensis of DPT is so uncertain, might it be argued by an insurer, as a primary position, that DPT cannot be safely attributed to asbestos <u>in any</u> given case?

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham

www.kingschambers.com

#### Bradford-Hill Criteria

- KINGS CHAMBERS
- (1) Strength: Size of effect in a study;
- (2) Consistency;
- (3) Specificity;
- (4) Temporality;
- (5) Biological Gradient;
- (6) Plausibility;
- (7) Coherence;
- (8) Experiment
- (9) Analogy

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham



#### Conclusions



- Still sufficient evidence of causal relationship between DPT and asbestos exposure.
- Docherty likely to concern the London Market
- Nevertheless, if *Docherty* can be distinguished, it may well be deployed by insurers in the future who wish to argue that:
  - a. Owing to the uncertainty surrounding the pathogenesis of DPT; and
  - Given that there is now authority for the proposition that the relevant jurisdiction is not, necessarily, where the exposure took place;
  - c. The policy that should respond to any historic DPT claim is that in force at the time of onset.

Kings Chambers Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham Wkings\_chambers (in) Wkings-chambers
 www.kingschambers.com