K.O. Underground	Construction, Inc. et al v. Admiral Risk Insurance Services	, Inc. et al
1	Brandt L. Wolkin, Esq., SBN 112220 Dawn A. Silberstein, Esq., SBN 167936	
2	WOLKIN · CURRAN, LLP 555 Montgomery Street, Suite 1100	
3	San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: (415) 982-9390	
4	Facsimile: (415) 982-4328	
5	Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Complainant, ADMIRAL RISK INSURANCE SERVICES dba	
6	ADMIRAL INSURANCE COMPANY	
7		TENLOTE COLUMN
8	UNITED STATES DIS	
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT	
10	K.O. UNDERGROUND CONSTRUCTION, INC., a California corporation, KAREN M. OGANDO,	Case No.: 3:13-cv-03878-RS
11	an individual; and JOSEPH E. OGANDO, an individual,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSE D] ORDER FOR
12	Plaintiffs,	LEAVE TO FILE THIRD- PARTY COMPLAINT
13	v.	
14	ADMIRAL RISK INSURANCE SERVICES.	
15	INC., a Delaware corporation, dba ADMIRAL INSURANCE COMPANY, INC.; ARCH	
16	SPECIALTY INSURANCE AGENCY, INC., a Missouri corporation, dba ARCH SPECIALTY	
17	INSURANCE COMPANY; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive;	
18	Defendants.	
19	ADMIRAL RISK INSURANCE SERVICES. INC., a Delaware corporation, dba ADMIRAL	
20	INSURANCE COMPANY, INC.,	
21	Cross-Complainant,	
22 23	v. ARCH SPECIALTY INSURANCE AGENCY,	
23	INC., a Missouri corporation, dba ARCH SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, and	
25	ROES 1 through 50, inclusive; Cross-Defendants.	
26	C1055-Detendants.	
27		
28		
20	1.	
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR LEAVE FILE THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT	TO CASE NO.: 3:13-CV-03878-RS
		Dookst

Doc. 17

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR LEAVE TO

FILE THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Defendant and Cross-Claimant ADMIRAL RISK INSURANCE SERVICES, INC.,		
ba ADMIRAL INSURANCE COMPANY, INC., is granted leave to file and serve the		
Third-Party Complaint of Admiral Risk Insurance Services dba Admiral Insurance		
Company Against Fireman's Fund Insurance Company for: (1) Declaratory Relief Re Duty		
To Defend; (2) Declaratory Relief Re Duty To Indemnify; (3) Equitable Contribution Re		
Defense Costs; (4) Equitable Contribution Re Indemnity; And (5) Subrogation, attached		
hereto as Exhibit A.		
IT IS SO ORDERED.		

Dated: _11/7/13 ____

The Honorable Judge Richard Seeborg, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CASE NO.: 3:13-CV-03878-RS

Relled

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

- 1						
1	Brandt L. Wolkin, Esq., SBN 112220 Dawn A. Silberstein, Esq., SBN 167936					
2	WOLKIN · CURRAN, LLP 555 Montgomery Street, Suite 1100					
3	San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: (415) 982-9390					
4	Facsimile: (415) 982-4328					
5	Attorneys for Defendant, Cross-Complainant and Third-Party Claimant ADMIRAL RISK INSURANCE SERVICES dba ADMIRAL INSURANCE COMPANY					
6	SERVICES dua ADMIRAL INSURANCE COMPAI	N1				
7	UNITED STATES DIS	STRICT COURT				
8	NORTHERN DISTRICT					
9						
10	K.O. UNDERGROUND CONSTRUCTION, INC., a California corporation, KAREN M. OGANDO,	Case No.: 3:13-cv-03878-RS				
11	an individual; and JOSEPH E. OGANDO, an individual,	THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT OF ADMIRAL RISK				
12	Plaintiffs,	INSURANCE SERVICES dba ADMIRAL INSURANCE				
13	v.	COMPANY AGAINST FIREMAN'S FUND INSURANCE				
14	ADMIRAL RISK INSURANCE SERVICES.	COMPANY FOR:				
15	INC., a Delaware corporation, dba ADMIRAL	(1) DECLARATORY RELIEF				
16	INSURANCE COMPANY, INC.; ARCH SPECIALTY INSURANCE AGENCY, INC., a	RE DUTY TO DEFEND; (2) DECLARATORY RELIEF				
17	Missouri corporation, dba ARCH SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY; and DOES 1 through	RE DUTY TO INDEMNIFY; (3) EQUITABLE				
18	100, inclusive;	CONTRIBUTION RE DEFENSE COSTS;				
19	Defendants.	(4) EQUITABLE CONTRIBUTION RE				
20		INDEMNITY; and (5) SUBROGATION				
21	ADMIRAL RISK INSURANCE SERVICES.					
22	INC., a Delaware corporation, dba ADMIRAL INSURANCE COMPANY, INC.,					
23	Cross-Complainant,					
24	V.					
25	ARCH SPECIALTY INSURANCE AGENCY,					
26	INC., a Missouri corporation, dba ARCH SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, and					
27	ROES 1 through 50, inclusive; Cross-Defendants.					
28						

1	ADMIRAL RISK INSURANCE SERVICES, INC., a Delaware corporation, dba ADMIRAL INSURANCE COMPANY, INC.,		
2			
3	Third-Party-Complainant,		
4	V.		
5	FIREMAN'S FUND INSURANCE COMPANY, a California corporation, and MOES 1 through 50,		
6	inclusive; Third-Party Defendants.		
7			
8	Third-party complainant ADMIRAL RISK INSURANCE SERVICES dba		
9	ADMIRAL INSURANCE COMPANY ("Admiral" or "Third-Party Claimant") is informed		
10	and believes, and based on such information and belief alleges as its Third-Party Complaint		
11	against Third Party Defendants, as follows:		
12	FEDERAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE		
13	1. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this third-party complaint		
14	under 28 U.S.C. section 1367, because the claims are related to the original claim against		
15	Admiral and form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States		
16	Constitution. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Third-Party Defendant FIREMAN'S		
17	FUND INSURANCE COMPANY ("Fireman's") because its principal place of business is		
18	in Novato, California.		
19	2. This Court has original jurisdiction over this action because, pursuant to 28		
20	U.S.C. section 1332, there is complete diversity of citizenship between the plaintiff and		
21	defendants in the original claim, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.		
22	3. Defendant and cross-defendant ARCH SPECIALTY INSURANCE		
23	AGENCY, INC. ("Arch"), removed the original complaint to the Northern District by notice		
24	dated August 20, 2013.		
25	4. Venue is proper in the Northern District of California, because a substantial		
26	part of the events and omissions giving rise to Admiral's claims and the claims of the		
27	Plaintiff occurred in Napa County, California. Further, Third-Party Claimant is informed		
28	and believes that the policies of insurance at issue herein were placed by a broker located in 2.		

the county of Alameda in the State of California, and all premiums for said polices were paid in the county of Alameda.

PARTIES

- 5. Third-Party Claimant Admiral is a corporation organized, incorporated and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in Cherry Hill, New Jersey. Admiral is, and at all times mentioned herein was, qualified and authorized to transact business as a surety in the State of California.
- 6. Third-Party Defendant Fireman's, is, and at all times mentioned in herein was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in Novato, California.
- 7. The true names and capacities of the fictitiously named Third-Party
 Defendants MOES 1 through 50 are unknown to Admiral at this time. Admiral will, with
 leave of Court, amend this Third-Party Complaint to set forth the true names and capacities
 of such fictitiously named Third-Party Defendants when they have been ascertained. Each
 of the fictitiously named Third-Party Defendants is responsible in some manner for the acts,
 occurrences and damages hereinafter alleged.
- 8. As used herein, the term "Third-Party Defendants" shall include, jointly and severally, each of the named third-party defendants, including Fireman's and each of the MOES.
- 9. As used herein, the term "Plaintiffs" shall include K.O. UNDERGROUND CONSTRUCTION, INC., a California corporation; Karen M. Ogando, an individual; and Joseph E. Ogando, an individual.
- 10. At all times mentioned in this Third-Party Complaint, each of the Third-Party Defendants was the agent, servant, employee, representative, subsidiary, affiliate, partner, member, or associate of one or more of the other Third-Party Defendants, and all of the things alleged to have been done by Third-Party Defendants were done in the course and scope of that relationship and with the knowledge and consent of their principals, employers, owners, superiors, affiliates, masters, parent corporations, partners, members, associates or

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

representatives, except as is otherwise specifically alleged within this Third-Party Complaint.

THE POLICIES

- 11. Third-Party Claimant insured plaintiff, K.O. UNDERGROUND CONSTRUCTION, INC. ("KO"), for those sums which KO should become liable to pay as damages because of "bodily injury" or "property damage" to which this insurance applied under commercial general liability policy numbers A02AG3549-01, effective 5/6/2002 to 5/6/2003 and A03AG16997-02, effective 5/6/2003 to 5/6/2004 ("Admiral Policies").
- 12. Admiral is informed and believes that Defendant and Cross-Defendant Arch insured the Plaintiffs and/or KO for those sums which KO should become liable to pay as damages because of "bodily injury" or "property damage" to which this insurance applies under commercial general liability policy numbers 39PCGL001463, effective 5/6/2004 to 5/6/2005 and 39CGL02165-00, effective 5/6/2005 to 5/6/2006 ("Arch Policies").
- 13. Admiral is informed and believes that Third-Party Defendant Fireman's insured the Plaintiffs and/or KO for those sums which KO should become liable to pay as damages because of "bodily injury" or "property damage" to which this insurance applies under commercial general liability policy numbers: LIC000033, effective 5/6/2006 to 5/6/2007; LIC000168, effective 5/6/2007 to 5/6/2008; LIC1000361, effective 5/6/2008 to 5/6/2009; LIC1000517, effective 5/6/2009 to 5/6/2010; and LIC1000620, effective 5/6/2010 to 5/6/2011.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

14. On July 10, 2013, Plaintiffs filed the original complaint in this action for breach of insurance contract [duty to defend], breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, negligence and declaratory relief against defendant and Third-Party Claimant, Admiral, and against defendant and cross-defendant Arch arising out of the alleged failure of both insurers to reimburse Plaintiffs for sums paid to their personal counsel in defense of an underlying construction defect action entitled Olympus-Calistoga, LLC, et al. v. Taisei ///

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

22

23

21

24 25

26

27

28

///

Construction Corp., et al., Napa County Superior Court case number 26-40553 and the related cross-action ("Underlying Action").

- 15. In their original complaint, Plaintiffs allege that the Underlying Action was a construction defect action filed on December 27, 2007 by Olympus-Calistoga, LLC, and two other Olympus entities (collectively "Olympus"), against Taisei Construction Corporation ("Taisei") in Napa County Superior Court alleging, inter alia, claims for property damage, bodily injury and loss of use, including lost rents, arising out of the negligent construction of a resort and spa in Napa County consisting of six owner's lodges, 46 guest lodges, a spa, a restaurant, a wine cave and a gym (the "Project"). As part of the Underlying Action, Taisei cross-claimed against various sub-contractors, including KO, alleging that they were responsible, in whole or in part, for the damages alleged in the underlying construction defect complaint.
- 16. Third-Party Claimant is informed and believes that KO supplied and fused gas pipes for the Project on a time-and-materials basis, with invoices dating from September of 2003 to September of 2005. The final Notice of Completion for the Project was dated May 24, 2004.
- Third-Party Claimant is informed and believes that KO tendered its defense 17. in the Underlying Action to Admiral's surplus lines broker on or about November 3, 2010. A notice of claim was then forwarded to Admiral on or about November 10, 2010.
- 18. Third-Party Claimant agreed to defend KO in the Underlying Action under a full reservation of rights. Admiral incurred \$119,594.23 in defense KO in the Underlying Action and paid \$25,000 settlement of the claims against KO.
- 19. In addition to the above sums expended in defense and indemnity of KO by Admiral, Plaintiffs are claiming a right to reimbursement of an additional \$209,451.67 in attorney fees and costs incurred in defense of the Underlying Action, as well as other compensatory damages as alleged in Plaintiffs' original action.

26. Since an actual and present controversy now exists between Admiral and Third-Party Defendants concerning their duty to defend KO in the Underlying Action, a judicial determination is necessary and appropriate under the circumstances.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Declaratory Relief Against All Third-Party Defendants Re Duty to Indemnify)

- 27. Admiral re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 26 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 28. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Admiral and Third-Party Defendants concerning their respective rights, duties and obligations, arising from the terms, provisions, conditions and exclusions set forth in the Admiral Policies and Third-Party Defendants' policies with respect to the coverage owed to KO toward its indemnity in the Underlying Action.
- 29. Admiral is informed and believes and based thereon contends that Third-Party Defendants owe an obligation to indemnify KO against its liability for damages in the Underlying Action. Based upon information and belief, Cross-Defendants deny such an obligation.
- 30. Admiral seeks a judicial determination that Third-Party Defendants owe a duty to indemnify KO from the claims and damages asserted in the Underlying Action.
- 31. Since an actual and present controversy now exists between Admiral and Third-Party Defendants concerning their duty to indemnify KO, a judicial determination is necessary and appropriate under the circumstances.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Equitable Contribution Against All Third-Party Defendants Re Defense Costs)

- 32. Admiral re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 31 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 33. Admiral is informed and believes and thereon alleges that KO qualifies as an insured under Third-Party Defendants' policies and that the allegations asserted in the Underlying Action create a potential for coverage establishing a duty to defend.

///

- 34. Third-Party Defendants have improperly denied any obligation to defend KO.
- 35. Admiral paid defense fees and costs in connection with Admiral's defense of KO in the Underlying Action in excess of its equitable share.
- 36. Admiral is entitled to reimbursement for an equitable share of the defense costs which have been and will be incurred by Admiral in connection with the Underlying Action and which should have been paid by Third-Party Defendants.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Equitable Contribution Against All Third-Party Defendants Re Indemnity)

- 37. Admiral re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 36 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 38. Third-Party Defendants, and each of them, are obligated to indemnify KO for liability for property damage in the Underlying Action resulting from work performed on the Project by KO, referenced above.
- 39. Third-Party Defendants, and each of them, have an obligation to contribute to the indemnity of KO on an equitable basis in connection with the Underlying Action. Third-Party Defendants, and each of them, are therefore obligated, under principles of equity, to reimburse Admiral for the indemnity amount Admiral inequitably incurred on behalf of KO in the Underlying Action as a result Third-Party Defendants' failure to contribute their equitable share.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Equitable Subrogation Against All Third-Party Defendants)

- 40. Admiral re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 39 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 41. As an alternative to the allegations in the Third and Fourth Causes of Action stated above, Admiral alleges that it is entitled to equitable subrogation from Third-Party Defendants.

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

- 42. Admiral is informed and believes, as explained above, that the work performed by KO out of which the claims of the Underlying Action arise was completed in or about September of 2005 and that the underlying project was not substantially complete until in or around May 24, 2004, after the expiration of the Admiral Policies on May 6, 2004. As such, there was no potential that any damage arising out of KO's completed operations occurred during the Admiral Policies' period. Hence, there is no potential for coverage under the insuring agreements of the Admiral Policies and Admiral had no duty to indemnify or defend KO under the terms of the Admiral Policies.
- 43. Third-Party Claimant is informed and believes that all of the property damage arising out of KO's completed operations necessarily took place during the effective dates of the Arch Policies and the Fireman's Policies. Hence, Arch and Fireman's owed a duty to defend and indemnify KO in the Underlying Action under the insuring agreements of their respective policies.
- 44. As Fireman's owed a duty to defend and indemnify KO in the Underlying Action, based on subrogation, Admiral is placed in the position of KO and is therefore allowed recovery from Third-Party Defendants who are legally responsible to KO for the defense fees and costs and indemnity Admiral has paid for KO's defense in the Underlying Action, because Admiral has paid a debt for which Third-Party Defendants are presently liable, and, in equity, should be discharged by Third-Party Defendants.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Admiral prays for relief and judgment against Third-Party Defendants as follows:

- 1. For a judicial determination on the First Cause of Action that Third-Party Defendants owed a duty under their respective policies to defend KO from the claims asserted against it in the Underlying Action;
- 2. For a judicial determination on the Second Cause of Action that Third-Party Defendants owed a duty under their respective policies to indemnify KO in the Underlying Action:

1	3.	On the Third Cause of Action, for an award in monetary damages owed by		
2	Third-Party	Third-Party Defendants based on their share of the fees, costs and expenses Admira		
3	incurred in connection with the defense of KO in the Underlying Action, the amount of			
4	which is to be determined at trial;			
5	4.	On the Fourth Cause of Action, for an award in monetary damages owed by		
6	Third-Party	Third-Party Defendants based on their share of the indemnity paid by Admiral in connection		
7	with the defense of KO in the Underlying Action, the amount of which is to be determined			
8	at trial;			
9	5.	On the Fifth Cause of Action, for an award in monetary damages owed by		
10	Third-Party	Defendants consisting of the fees, costs and expenses Admiral incurred in		
11	connection with the defense of KO in the Underlying Action, the amount of which is to be			
12	determined a	at trial;		
13	6.	For other general damages according to proof;		
14	7.	For pre and post-judgment interest as provided by law;		
15	8.	For costs of suit herein; and		
16	9.	For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper. WOLKIN · CURRAN, LLP		
17	Dated: Nov	ember 7, 2013 /s/ Dawn A. Silberstein		
18		By:		
19		Brandt L. Wolkin		
20		Dawn A. Silberstein		
21		Attorneys for Defendant, Cross- Complainant and Third-Party Claimant		
22		ADMIRAL RISK INSURÂNCE SERVICES dba ADMIRAL		
23		INSURANCE COMPANY		
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				