

CLIFFORD CHANCE

SUPREME COURT'S APPLICATION OF CAUSATION PRINCIPLES HAS WIDE IMPLICATIONS

Covid-19 test case judgment brings clarity but policyholders and insurers will still have to grapple with many complexities.

**By Kengyi Kwek (Associate) and
Baljit Rai (Senior Associate)**

On January 15, 2021 the Supreme Court handed down its judgment in the appeal against the test case brought by the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) about business interruption insurance coverage for insureds that have suffered loss because of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Last September the High Court ruled cover was available under most of the 21 sample business interruption policy wordings considered. This decision was appealed against by insurers and the FCA (along with the intervening Hiscox Action Group). Permission was granted for the appeal to “leapfrog” the Court of Appeal and be heard directly by the Supreme Court over the course of a four-day hearing in November 2020.

The Supreme Court has now substantially allowed the appeals of the FCA and interveners on certain grounds upon which they did not succeed at first instance, while unanimously dismissing the insurers’ appeals.

The net result is that all of the insuring clauses in issue on appeal provide cover for business interruption caused by the Covid-19 pandemic and trends clauses do not operate to significantly reduce the indemnity available in the manner contended for by insurers.

Notwithstanding the similar overall outcome, the judges’ reasoning diverges significantly from that of those in the court below - most notably, their application of causation principles will have wider implications for the market beyond the scope of business interruption insurance.

Key takeaways

- The Supreme Court adopted a narrower approach to when cover was triggered under various clauses, but found another route to cover via its application of causation principles. Its findings confirm in the insurance context, if a loss stems from multiple concurrent causes, satisfaction of the “but for” test is not essential before an event can be regarded as a proximate cause.
- When calculating loss, insurers cannot argue an insured’s losses should be reduced because, but for the insured event, revenue would have been reduced by other (uninsured) perils, provided the insured and uninsured perils arise from the same underlying fortuity.

- Similarly, when considering pre-trigger losses, only circumstances that are wholly unrelated to Covid-19 should be reflected when adjusting for trends in the context of calculating an indemnity under an applicable business interruption policy.
- Where public authority intervention is a policy trigger, such intervention does not need to have the force of law. If a particular instruction was expressed in mandatory terms and in a sufficiently clear context such that it enabled a reasonable person to understand what compliance entailed and that said compliance was required without the need for legal powers, it may amount to a qualifying “restriction” or “action”.
- There is an “inability to use” insured premises if: i) premises are unable to be used for a discrete part of a policyholder's business activities; or ii) a discrete part of the premises is unable to be used for business activities.

The judgment brings clarity for many critical coverage questions relating to business interruption insurance, but policyholders and insurers may still have to grapple with complexities relating to heads of cover and the application of retentions and limits to determine the quantum of recoverable loss.

Nevertheless, the FCA's Dear CEO letter of January 22, 2021 makes it clear the regulator expects insurers to proceed with making payments and it will be monitoring this.

Insurers should also be mindful that further delays may expose them to the risk of additional claims for damages from policyholders under the Enterprise Act 2016.

C L I F F O R D C H A N C E

CONTACTS



Kengyi Kwek
Associate
T: +44 20 7006 1633
E: kengyi.kwek@cliffordchance.com



Baljit Rai
Senior Associate
T: +44 20 7006 8714
E: baljit.ra@cliffordchance.com

This publication does not necessarily deal with every important topic or cover every aspect of the topics with which it deals. It is not designed to provide legal or other advice.

www.cliffordchance.com

Clifford Chance, 10 Upper Bank Street, London, E14 5JJ

© Clifford Chance 2021

Clifford Chance LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC323571

Registered office: 10 Upper Bank Street, London, E14 5JJ

We use the word 'partner' to refer to a member of Clifford Chance LLP, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications

If you do not wish to receive further information from Clifford Chance about events or legal developments which we believe may be of interest to you, please either send an email to nomorecontact@cliffordchance.com or by post at Clifford Chance LLP, 10 Upper Bank Street, Canary Wharf, London E14 5JJ

Abu Dhabi • Amsterdam • Barcelona • Beijing • Brussels • Bucharest • Casablanca • Delhi • Dubai • Düsseldorf • Frankfurt • Hong Kong • Istanbul • London • Luxembourg • Madrid • Milan • Moscow • Munich • Newcastle • New York • Paris • Perth • Prague • Rome • São Paulo • Seoul • Shanghai • Singapore • Sydney • Tokyo • Warsaw • Washington, D.C.

Clifford Chance has a co-operation agreement with Abuhimed Alsheikh Alhagbani Law Firm in Riyadh.

Clifford Chance has a best friends relationship with Redcliffe Partners in Ukraine.