

FIDELITY AND SURETY

June 2014

IN THIS ISSUE

Searching for a “lifeline” in Surety basic principles should the Surety become insolvent.

SURETY BONDS

A BASIC PRIMER AND THE INSOLVENCY TWIST




ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Carl Anthony Maio, Esquire, is a Partner at the law firm of Fox Rothschild LLP, whose principal office is in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Carl is Chair of the Corporate Insurance Practice Group where he emphasizes in Reinsurance Arbitrations, Corporate Insurance Merger and Acquisition, Licensure, Regulatory Compliance, Demutualizations, and represents clients nationally and internationally. Carl has been practicing law forty-one years and enjoys the honor of being a continuous member of IADC for the past thirty-one years. Having served as Chair, Vice Chair and Program Chair for many IADC standing and substantive committees, Carl has authored many articles published by the IADC, inclusive of: committee newsletters; the *Defense Counsel Journal*; and, has often times been a presenter at IADC Midyear Meetings, Annual Meetings, and Special Presentations. Carl is admitted to practice in Pennsylvania, Maryland, District of Columbia, and the International Court of Justice. He is *AV Preeminent* rated by Martindale-Hubbell, and has been recognized for multiple years as a Pennsylvania Super Lawyer. He can be reached at camaio@foxrothschild.com.

ABOUT THE COMMITTEE

The Fidelity and Surety Committee serves all members who represent fidelity and surety carriers. Committee members publish newsletters and journal articles, including an annual update of recent developments in the law. Learn more about the Committee at www.iadclaw.org. To contribute a newsletter article, contact:



Samuel J. Arena, Jr.
Vice Chair of Newsletters
Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP
sarena@stradley.com

The International Association of Defense Counsel serves a distinguished, invitation-only membership of corporate and insurance defense lawyers. The IADC dedicates itself to enhancing the development of skills, professionalism and camaraderie in the practice of law in order to serve and benefit the civil justice system, the legal profession, society and our members.

w: www.iadclaw.org p: 312.368.1494 f: 312.368.1854 e: mmaisel@iadclaw.org

Much has been written about the effects of the economy upon the construction industry. This Newsletter will focus upon a unique perspective applicable to the surety context. Commercial and sometimes residential construction compels the necessity for a contractor to obtain a surety bond to guarantee performance leading to the successful conclusion of a construction project. Upon that occasion, a general contractor will obtain a surety bond from an authorized underwriter.

In basic terms, a surety bond is a contract under which one party (surety) guarantees the performance of certain obligations of the second party (principal) to a third party (obligee). Generally in the commercial context and more specifically for public entity projects construction contractors provide the project owner, for which they are performing operations, with a bond guaranteeing that it will complete the project by a specified date set forth in the construction contract in accordance with all plans and specifications. Usually one or more in any combination of the following three types of bonds are underwritten to secure the contractor's performance. The American Institute of Architects (AIA) is the most common source of standard construction contracts and bond forms defining the responsibilities of contracting parties with respect to indemnification in the purchase of insurance coverage. In this context, this Newsletter will not address contractor's all risk insurance or contractor's professional liability insurance. Nor will this Newsletter speculate upon the liability of a producer who places a bond with an underwriter whose financial strength rating is less than "secure".

Three types of bonds are most common.

1. Bid Bond. Issued in conjunction with construction bidding processes. This bond acts as a guarantee that, if awarded the contract based on the bid submitted, the contractor will enter into a contract to perform the work at the price quoted. If the contractor declines to enter into a contract to perform the work at the agreed upon price, the bid bond will reimburse the obligee (owner) the difference between the defaulting contractor's bid and the next lowest bid, up to the penal sum of the bond.
2. Performance Bond. This bond guarantees that the contractor will perform the work in accordance with the construction contract. The purpose is to protect the owner from financial loss up to the penal sum limit of the bond should the contractor fail to fulfill its contractual obligations.
3. Payment Bond. This last bond form guarantees that suppliers and subcontractors will be paid for materials and labor furnished to the contractor. A project owner generally insists upon a payment bond that upon completion, the project is free of contractor mechanic's liens.

An essential part of the surety's underwriting process is the preparation and execution of a General Agreement of Indemnity (GAI). The GAI is akin to a personal indemnification guaranty. In short, this is a two party contract between the surety and the principal (contractor) that if the principal fails to perform the surety may prosecute a civil action against the principal in the event the

surety becomes obligated to pay a portion or all of the penal sum of the bond. Most GAI's provide the surety with measures to protect itself from a decaying situation. Three basic rights are contained within the GAI:

1. Collateral Security;
2. Inspection of the Principal and Indemnitor's financial books and records; and
3. Settlement of claims without the approval of the principal.

One of the economic consequences that has become all too apparent, in circumstances when a contractor defaults, is usually because of the poor financial condition of the contractor. Efforts to exercise the surety's rights pursuant to the GAI has more frequently resulted as a recognized consequence in this economy, that being the insolvency of the contractor. If the surety underwriter has an adverse selection book of business, the likelihood is over time the surety will find itself in hazardous financial condition because it has not been able to recoup losses from the personal GAI. In part, this is what has happened to two sureties fairly recently:

- a. First Sealord Surety, Inc., a Pennsylvania domiciled surety; and
- b. Centennial Insurance Company, domiciled in New York.

Recognizing that other business of insurance factors may have played a role in the ultimate financial condition of both companies, be that as it may, each were ordered into liquidation by the respective insurance departments having financial condition oversight. When that unfortunate event happens, a liquidator is appointed to manage the runoff of the insolvent estate. Complicating the issue, is that some states do not recognize surety as a

line of business eligible for Guaranty Fund protection. Looking back at the types and nature of bonds described earlier in this Newsletter, one can see that if the surety is declared insolvent, further complicated by a jurisdiction which does not permit a Guaranty Fund claim, then obligees, project owners, and even the principal are adversely affected and subject to risk.

Upon that occurrence, legal intervention to investigate whether or not the surety has reinsurance may prove prudent. Reinsurance, by way of treaty or agreement, is where an insurance company including a surety, transfers risk to another insurance company called a "reinsurer". Therefore, a reinsurer, in consideration of a premium paid by the surety in this example, agrees to indemnify the reinsured for part or all of the liability assumed by the ceding company. The legal focus will concentrate upon a careful investigation of the treaty provisions in the reinsurance contract specifically looking for a "cut through" endorsement. This endorsement is a provision in the reinsurance contract that sets forth how the reinsurer will pay any loss covered by the reinsurance contract directly to the insured when the surety is insolvent. This provision is sometimes called an Assumption Endorsement and may also contain drop down properties. However, not all state court decisions uniformly agree upon the propriety of drop down principles.

In conclusion, the lawyer and law firm experienced in undertaking construction law and surety law matters can perform the requisite due diligence and risk management to evaluate a reinsurance agreement to determine if any of the parties may seek direct relief from the reinsurer, when a surety is declared insolvent.



PAST COMMITTEE NEWSLETTERS

Visit the Committee's newsletter archive online at www.iadclaw.org to read other articles published by the Committee. Prior articles include:

MAY 2014

Enforcement of Jurisdiction/Venue Provisions of Indemnity Agreements
Steven Weinberg

APRIL 2014

Enforcing Forum Selection Clauses after *Atlantic Marine*
G. Steven Ruprecht and Diane Hastings Lewis

MARCH 2014

Bad News for Construction Insurers Might be Good News for Sureties
David W. Kash and Bruce Kahn

NOVEMBER 2013

Getting to Zero: A Method of Projecting Losses on Your Client's Next Surety Claim
David W. Kash, Bruce Kahn and Steve Leach

AUGUST 2013

Davis-Bacon Act: Subcontractor's Obligation to Pay Prevailing Wages
G. Steven Ruprecht

JULY 2013

Can a Contractor Implead the State in an Action Brought Against it by its Subcontractor?
Charles "Bud" Herman

FEBRUARY 2013

Getting to Zero Through a Great Takeover Agreement
Bruce Kahn and David Kash

OCTOBER 2012

Pay-if-Paid Clauses Valid in Indiana Says the Seventh Circuit
Steven J. Strawbridge and Cade Laverty

JULY 2012

Recent Decision by the United States Supreme Court Dealing with the Statute of Repose
Charles "Bud" Herman