	Case 3:19-cv-06025-RBL Docume	ent 39	Filed 03/30/2	0 Page 1 of 45	
1			The Hono	rable Ronald B. L	eighton
2 3					
4					
5					
6					
7 8	UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DIS AT TA	TRICT	OF WASHING	GTON	
9	WILLIAM T. WHITMAN, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	NO. 3	3:19-cv-06025-]	RBL	
10 11	Plaintiffs,	COM		E INSURANCE WER TO SECONE)
12	VS.	AME	NDED COMPI	LAINT	
13 14	STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, an Illinois corporation,				
15	Defendant.				
16	<u>DEFENDANT STATE FARM LIFE INSURA</u> AMENDED CLASS A				<u>OND</u>
17	Defendant State Farm Life Insurance Company (hereinafter "State Farm") hereby			hereby	
18	responds and answers the allegations of Plaintiff's putative Class Action Second Amended			mended	
19	Complaint. Except as expressly admitted in	this Aı	nswer below, S	State Farm denies	all the
20	Plaintiff's allegations.				
21	INTRODUCTION				
22	1. This is a class action to recover amounts that Defendant charged and collected			ollected	
23 24	from Plaintiff and life insurance policy owners in excess of amounts authorized by the express			express	
25	terms of their policies. Plaintiff's claims an	nd thos	e of the prop	oosed class memb	ers are
	STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv- 06025-RBL	- 1 -	Mine One G Suite 701 Pi Seatt	erson es Convention Place	

exclusively supported by the explicit provisions of their life insurance policies and are not derived from any alleged conversations had, or documents reviewed, at the time of sale.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for certification of a class under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.

2. The terms of Plaintiff's life insurance policy provide for an "Account Value" consisting of monies held in trust by Defendant for Plaintiff. Over the course of several years, Defendant deducted monies from Plaintiff's Account Value in breach of his policy's terms.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.

3. Defendant is contractually bound to deduct only those charges explicitly identified and authorized by the terms of its life insurance policies, which are fully integrated agreements. Defendant deducts charges from the Account Values of Plaintiff and the proposed class members in excess of amounts specifically permitted by their life insurance policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.

4. Defendant has caused material harm to Plaintiff and the proposed class members by improperly draining monies they accumulated in the Account Values of their policies. Every unauthorized dollar taken from policy owners is one less dollar on which policy owners earn interest and one less dollar that can be: applied to pay future premiums; used to increase the death benefit; used as collateral for policy loans; or withdrawn as cash.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.

5. Plaintiff brings this case as a class action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure23, individually and as a representative of the following (the "Class): All persons who own or

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988 owned a universal life policy issued by State Farm on its policy form 94030 in the State of Washington.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff purports to bring this case as a class action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, but denies that the case meets the requirements for certification of a class and otherwise denies these allegations.

PARTIES

6. Plaintiff William T. Whitman is an individual and resident of the State of New Hampshire.

ANSWER: State Farm admits these allegations.

7. Defendant State Farm Life Insurance Company is a life insurance company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Illinois, and maintains its principal place of business in Bloomington, Illinois.

ANSWER: State Farm admits these allegations.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Court has jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d) because this is a class action with diversity of citizenship between parties and the matter in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and the proposed Class contains more than 100 members. Plaintiff's claims are meaningfully connected to Washington because he purchased his policy from Defendant in Tacoma, Washington. Plaintiff continuously resided and worked in Washington while making premium payments to Defendant from January 2001 through September 2010. The Plaintiff's policy bears a policy form number associated with the state of Washington and the underlying policy form was approved for sale in

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039

Case 3:19-cv-06025-RBL Document 39 Filed 03/30/20 Page 4 of 45

the state of Washington by its Office of the Insurance Commissioner. Defendant purposefully directed its activities toward Washington and Washington residents and availed itself of the privilege of conducting business in Washington by: registering with the Office of the Insurance Commissioner of the state of Washington in 1930; maintaining the state of Washington's authorization to transact insurance business in the state from the time of its registration through the present; and soliciting Washington residents, including Plaintiff, to purchase insurance policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies that this action is appropriate for certification as a class action, denies that the amount in controversy for any individual claim exceeds \$5,000,000, but admits that it registered itself with the Washington Office of the Insurance Commissioner in 1930 and has maintained this registration through present day; admits that Plaintiff purchased the policy at issue in Tacoma, Washington as a Washington resident, and does not contest this Court's jurisdiction at this time, as it pertains to the named Plaintiff. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Defendant is a resident of this District and a substantial portion of the events giving rise to Plaintiff's causes of action occurred in this District in that, in 2001, Plaintiff was a resident of this District, visited Defendant's agent in this District, signed the application for life insurance in this District, made the initial premium payments from this District, and established the contract with Defendant while he was a resident in this District.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff was a resident of this District, visited a State Farm independent-contractor agent in this District, signed the application for life insurance in this District, and made the initial premium payments in this District. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 9 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

10. Plaintiff purchased from Defendant a flexible premium adjustable insurance policy bearing the policy number LF-1853-4088, and a policy date of January 16, 2001, with an initial basic amount of \$500,000. A true and accurate copy of Plaintiff's policy (the "Policy") is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff purchased a flexible premium adjustable whole life insurance policy bearing the policy number LF-1853-4088, and a policy date of January 16, 2001 with an initial basic amount of \$500,000. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 10 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

11. Plaintiff has always been both the "owner" and "insured" under the Policy.

ANSWER: State Farm admits these allegations.

12. Defendant is the effective and liable insurer of the Policy.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that it is the insurer of the Policy. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 12 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

25

The Policy is a valid and enforceable contract between Plaintiff and Defendant. 13.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

ANSWER: State Farm admits these allegations.

"The [P]olicy is the entire contract," and it consists of "the Basic Plan, any 14. amendments, endorsements, and riders, and a copy of the application." Ex. A at p. 11.

ANSWER: State Farm admits the quoted language is an excerpt of a provision of the Policy issued to Plaintiff titled "The Contract," under a section headed "General Provisions." Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 14 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint because they attempt to excerpt one portion of the Policy for consideration outside of the context of the Policy as a whole.

15. The terms of the Policy are not subject to individual negotiation and are materially the same for all policy owners. They cannot be altered by an agent's representations at the time of sale.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.

16. The Policy provides that, "[o]nly an officer has the right to change this policy. No agent has the authority to change the policy or to waive any of its terms. All endorsements, amendments, and riders must be signed by an officer to be valid." Ex. A at p. 11.

ANSWER: State Farm admits the quoted language is an excerpt of a provision of the Policy issued to Plaintiff titled "The Contract," under a section headed "General Provisions." Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 16 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint because they attempt to excerpt one portion of the Policy for consideration outside of the context of the Policy as a whole.

25

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

17. Defendant administered and currently administers all aspects of the Policy, and all policies that fall within the Class definition set forth above (together, the "Policies"), including collecting premiums, and setting, assessing and deducting policy charges.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that it collected premiums and set, assessed, and deducted Policy charges according to the terms of the Policy and that the premiums and charges are shown to Plaintiff on his annual notices. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations in Paragraph 17 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

18. In addition to a death benefit, the Policies provide policy owners a savings, or interest-bearing, component that is identified in the Policies as the "Account Value."

ANSWER: State Farm admits that the Policy contains an "Account Value" that is defined in the Policy and admits that the Policy contains a death benefit. State Farm denies any allegation inconsistent with the Policy terms. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 18 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

19. Generally speaking, premium dollars are deposited into the Account Value, from which Defendant deducts those monthly charges authorized by the terms of the Policies. The Account Value earns interest as provided by the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm admits the Policy establishes the definition of "Account Value" and the authorized deductions in the Policy. State Farm further admits that the

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039

Account Value can earn interest as authorized by the Policy. State Farm denies any allegation inconsistent with the Policy terms. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 19 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

20. The money that makes up the Account Value is the property of the policy owner and is held in trust by Defendant.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that the Account Value of the Policy is administered according to the terms of the contract. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 20 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

21. Under the express terms of the Policies, a "premium expense charge" is taken from each premium payment in the amount of 5% of each premium paid. Ex. A at p. 3.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that the Policy authorizes a premium expense charge as described in this paragraph. State Farm denies any allegation inconsistent with the Policy terms and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The Account Value is equal to 95% of the initial premium less the monthly

21 22 deduction for the first policy month, and thereafter: 23

The account value on any deduction date after the policy date is the account value on the prior deduction date:

25

(1) plus 95% of any premiums received since the prior deduction date,

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 8 -

Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039

22.

	Case 3:19-cv-06025-RBL Document 39 Filed 03/30/20 Page 9 of 45		
1	(2) less the deduction for the cost of insurance for any increase in Basic		
2	Amount and the monthly charges for any riders that became effective		
	since the prior deduction date,(3) less any withdrawals since the prior deduction date,		
3	(4) less the current monthly deduction,(5) plus any dividend paid and added to the account value on the current		
4	deduction date, and		
5	(6) plus any interest accrued since the prior deduction date. The account value on any other date is the account value on the prior deduction		
6	date:		
7	(1) plus 95% of any premiums received since the prior deduction date,(2) less the deduction for the cost of insurance for any increase in Basic		
8	Amount and the monthly charges for any riders that became effective since the prior deduction date,		
9	(3) less any withdrawals since the prior deduction date, and		
10	(4) plus any interest accrued since the prior deduction date.		
11	Ex. A at p. 9.		
12	ANSWER: State Farm admits that the Policy defines Account Value as described in		
13	this paragraph. State Farm denies any allegation inconsistent with the Policy terms. Except		
14	as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 22 of		
15	Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.		
16			
17	23. The "Policy Date" is "[t]he effective date of this Policy," and the "Deduction		
18	Date" is "[t]he policy date and each monthly anniversary of the policy date." Ex. A at p. 5.		
19	Therefore, the Deduction Date under Plaintiff's Policy is the 16 th of each month. Ex. A. at p. 3.		
20	ANSWER: State Farm admits that the Policy defines "Policy Date" as "[t]he		
21	effective date of this Policy" and defines "Deduction Date" as "[t]he policy date and each		
22	monthly anniversary of the policy date." State Farm further admits that the Deduction		
23	Date under Plaintiff's Policy is the 16th of each month. State Farm denies any allegation		
24	Date under Frammin's Foncy is the four of each month. State Farm demes any anegation		
25			
	STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE Betts COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND Mines		

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

inconsistent with the Policy terms. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 23 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint

24. Defendant may access and withdraw funds from the Account Value only as expressly authorized by the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that the Policy defines how charges may be assessed and deducted from the Account Value. State Farm denies any allegation inconsistent with the Policy terms. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 24 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

25. The Policies expressly define the specific charges that Defendant may assess and deduct from a given policy owner's premium payments and the accumulated Account Value. Defendant may deduct only those charges allowed by the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff's Policy defines how charges may be assessed and deducted from the Account Value and premium payments and that all charges and deductions on the Policy are shown to Plaintiff on his annual notices. State Farm denies any allegation inconsistent with the Policy terms. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 25 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

26. The Policies authorize Defendant to take a "Monthly Deduction" from the policy owner's Account Value each month. Ex. A at p. 9.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 10 -

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff's Policy authorizes Defendant to take a "Monthly Deduction" from Plaintiff's Account Value each month and the deduction is shown to Plaintiff on his annual notices. State Farm denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 26 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

27. The Policies expressly define the Monthly Deduction as follows:

Monthly Deduction. This deduction is made each month, whether or not premiums are paid, as long as the cash surrender value is enough to cover that monthly deduction. Each deduction includes:

- (1) the cost of insurance,
- (2) the monthly charges for any riders, and

(3) the monthly expense charge.

13 Ex. A at p. 9.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

ANSWER: State Farm admits that the Policy defines how charges may be assessed and deducted from the Account Value and premium payments and the deductions are shown to Plaintiff on his annual notices. State Farm denies any allegation inconsistent with the Policy terms. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 27 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

28. The Policies state that the monthly expense charge ("Expense Charge") is \$5.00.

Ex. A at p. 3.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

1	ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff's policy has a monthly expense charge		
2	of \$5.00. See Ex. 1. State Farm denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 28 of		
3	Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the		
4	requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.		
5			
6			
7	Insurance" ("Cost of Insurance Charge") is determined and calculated:		
8	Cost of Insurance. This cost is calculated each month. The cost is determined separately for the Initial Basic Amount and each increase in Basic Amount.		
9			
10	The cost of insurance is the monthly cost of insurance times the difference between (1) and (2), where:		
11	(1) is the amount of insurance on the deduction date at the start of the month divided by 1.0032737, and		
12	(2) is the account value on the deduction date at the start of the month before the cost		
13	of insurance and the monthly charge for any waiver of monthly deduction benefit rider are deducted.		
14	Until the account value exceeds the Initial Basic Amount, the account value is part of the Initial Basic Amount. Once the account value exceeds that amount, if there have been any		
15	increases in Basic Amount, the excess will be part of the increases in order in which the increases occurred.		
16	Ex. A at p. 10.		
17			
18	ANSWER: State Farm admits that the Policy contains the quoted terms. State Farm		
19	denies any allegation inconsistent with the Policy terms. Except as expressly admitted, State		
20	Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 29 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint		
21	and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under		
22	Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.		
23			
24			
25			
	STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv- 06025-RBL- 12 -Betts 		

30. The Policies specify the factors Defendant may use to determine "Monthly Cost

of Insurance Rates," which are used to calculate the Cost of Insurance Charges that are deducted

from the Account Value each month:

Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates. These rates for each policy year are based on the Insured's age on the policy anniversary, sex, and applicable rate class. A rate class will be determined for the Initial Basic Amount and for each increase. The rates shown on page 4 are the maximum monthly cost of insurance rates for the Initial Basic Amount. Maximum monthly cost of insurance rates will be provided for each increase in the Basic Amount. We can charge rates lower than those shown. Such rates can be adjusted for projected changes in mortality but cannot exceed the maximum monthly cost of insurance rates. Such adjustments cannot be made more than once a calendar year.

Ex. A at p. 10.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

ANSWER: State Farm admits that the Policy contains the quoted terms. State Farm denies any allegation inconsistent with the Policy terms. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 30 of the Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

31. Defendant admits that a rate "based on" factors explicitly identified in the Policies must be determined using only those factors identified and no other unidentified factors. *See Alleman v. State Farm Life Ins. Co.*, 334 F. Appx. 470, 472 (3rd Cir. 2009) (affirming summary judgment in State Farm's favor and rejecting plaintiff insured's argument that a provision in the life insurance policy stating a charge would be "*based on the Insured's age last birthday and sex*" should be read to include other undisclosed factors, because "[b]y the plain language of

25

24

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL these policies, it is clear that the insureds' age and sex are the only mortality factors relevant to the rate") (emphasis added).

ANSWER: Paragraph 31 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint contains legal conclusions that do not require a response. To the extent a response is required, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 31 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

32. Thus, under the explicit terms of the Policies, Defendant is authorized to determine Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates for each policy year using only the Insured's age, sex, applicable rate class, and projected changes in mortality. Ex. A. at p. 10.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that the Policy contains a paragraph titled "Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates" and the following sentence is contained within the paragraph: "These rates for each policy year are based on the Insured's age on the policy anniversary, sex, and applicable rate class." Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 32 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

33. Policy year, age, sex, and rate class are factors commonly used within the life insurance industry to determine the mortality expectations of an insured or group or class of insureds.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that age and sex are factors that relate to mortality expectations. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 33 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

34. By specifically identifying Cost of Insurance Rates as based on policy year, age, sex, and rate class, Defendant agrees that mortality expectations determine the Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates under the Policies, as confirmed by the additional provision that "[s]uch rates can be adjusted for projected changes in mortality." Ex. A at p. 10.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil **Procedure.**

35. Given the language of the Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates provision in the Policies, and its context in the Policies as a whole, no reasonable layperson would expect that the Policies permitted Defendant to use any factor it wanted to determine Cost of Insurance Rates for the Policies. A reasonable layperson would instead read policy year, age, sex, and rate class, in combination with the contractual limitation that rates can only be adjusted for "projected changes" in mortality," to mean that only mortality expectations are used to determine Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates for the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil **Procedure.**

36. The Policies authorize Defendant to make periodic deductions from policy owners' Account Values including, specifically, Cost of Insurance Charges that are calculated using rates that Defendant must determine based on specified factors, and that can be adjusted for projected changes in mortality.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039

ANSWER: State Farm admits that it is authorized to make periodic deductions from the Account Value as permitted by the Policy. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 36 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

37. The Policies also disclose a premium expense charge set at a fixed percentage of five percent of each premium payment made. The Policies further disclose a separate, monthly expense charge within the Monthly Deduction that Defendant set at a fixed amount of \$5.00 per month.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff's Policy has a premium expense charge of 5 percent of each premium payment and a monthly expense charge of \$5.00 but denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 37 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. State Farm specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

38. Although the Policies authorize Defendant to use only certain, specified factors in determining Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates, Defendant uses other factors, not authorized by the Policies, when determining those rates, including, without limitation:

1

2

3

a. Expense experience;

- b. Persistency;
- c. Taxes;
 - d. Profit;
 - e. Investment Earnings;

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

Capital and reserve requirements, and f.

Other unspecified factors. g.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil **Procedure.**

39. By loading these factors into Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates, Defendant knowingly causes those rates to be higher than what is explicitly authorized by the Policies and, as a result, withdraws Cost of Insurance Charges from policy owner Account Values in amounts greater than what is permitted by the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil **Procedure.**

40. By loading unauthorized factors in Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates, Defendant repeatedly and continuously breaches the Policies and impermissibly inflates those rates.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil **Procedure.**

41. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's breaches, Plaintiff and the Class have been damaged, and those damages are continuing in nature in that Defendant deducted and will continue to deduct unauthorized Cost of Insurance Charges from policy owners' Account Values.

25

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

42. By loading expense factors in Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates, Defendant repeatedly and continuously breaches the Policies by impermissibly deducting from the Account Values of Plaintiff and the Class amounts in excess of the fixed expense charges expressly authorized by the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

43. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's breaches, Plaintiff and the Class have been damaged and those damages are continuing in nature in that Defendant has deducted and will continue to deduct expenses, including without limitation, maintenance, administrative, and other expenses, from the Account Values of Plaintiff and the Class in amounts not authorized by the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

44. The nature of Defendant's conduct is such that Plaintiff and each member of the Class would be unaware that Defendant was engaging in wrongdoing by taking inflated charges and improper amounts from their Account Values. Defendant possesses the actuarial information and equations underlying the computation of rates and charges for the Policies. The Monthly

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

1

Cost of Insurance Rates used to calculate the monthly Cost of Insurance Charges are not disclosed to policy owners, nor are the components or factors that comprise those rates. Even if they were, Plaintiff and the Class would lack the knowledge, experience, and training to reasonably ascertain how Defendant calculated the rates and charges.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

45. Defendant was aware that Plaintiff and each member of the Class did not know about the improper deductions because of Defendant's superior knowledge of the aforementioned computations. Defendant sent Plaintiff annual statements that identified each month's Cost of Insurance Charge while affirmatively concealing the factors Defendant used to calculate the Cost of Insurance Rates. Despite reasonable diligence on his part, Plaintiff was kept ignorant by Defendant of the factual bases for these claims for relief. Defendant's withholding of material facts concealed these claims and tolled all applicable statutes of limitation.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

46. Plaintiff reasonably relied to his detriment on Defendant's fraudulent concealment of its misconduct and material omission of the factors actually used to calculate the deductions from his Account Value. As a result of such concealment, Plaintiff did not believe that it was necessary to file a lawsuit. Plaintiff did not discover, and exercising reasonable diligence could not have discovered, the facts establishing Defendant's continuing breaches or the harm caused

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 19 -

thereby. Plaintiff did not learn of Defendant's continuing breaches of the Policy supporting his claim until approximately May 2019, when he engaged counsel.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil **Procedure.**

47. Defendant is estopped from asserting a statute of limitations defense. Defendant's conduct in failing to disclose the true factors it used—and continues to use— to calculate the Cost of Insurance Rates misled Plaintiff and prevented him from learning the factual bases for these claims for relief. Plaintiff proceeded diligently to file suit once he discovered the need to proceed. Defendant's continuing breach of the Policy is ongoing.

1

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

48. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, individually and as a representative of the following Class: All persons who own or owned a universal life policy issued by State Farm on its policy form 94030 in the State of Washington.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff purports to bring this case as a class action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 but denies that this case meets the requirements for certification of a class. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 48 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

49. Excluded from the Class is the Defendant, any entity in which the Defendant has a controlling interest, any of the officers, directors, or employees of the Defendant, the legal representatives, heirs, successors, and assigns of the Defendant, anyone employed with

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 20 -

Plaintiff's counsel's firms, any Judge to whom this case is assigned, and the Judge's immediate family. Excluded from the Class is any policy that explicitly discloses all of the factors Defendant uses to calculate its rates and charges.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff purports to bring this case as a class action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 but denies that this case meets the requirements for certification of a class. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 49 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

50. Plaintiff's claims satisfy the numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy, and superiority requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a), and the requirements for class treatment under Rules 23(b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(3).

A

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.

51. The numerosity requirement is satisfied because there are thousands of Class members who are geographically dispersed, making joinder impracticable, and the disposition of Class member claims in a single action will provide a substantial benefit to all parties and to the Court.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.

52. Class members are ascertainable from information and records in Defendant's possession, custody, or control. Notice of this action can therefore be readily provided to the Class, via first class mail or other appropriate means, using information contained in Defendant's records.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

53. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class, because the express terms of the Policies purchased from Defendant by Plaintiff and proposed Class members contain identical limitations on the amounts Defendant can charge under the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.

54. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the Class because he is a member of the Class and his interests are aligned with, and do not conflict with, the interests of those he seeks to represent. The interests of the Class members will be fairly and adequately protected by Plaintiff and his counsel, who have extensive experience prosecuting complex class litigation.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.

55. There are questions of fact and law common to the Class that predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. The questions of law and fact common to the Class arising from Defendant's actions include, without limitation, the following:

- a. Whether Defendant is permitted by the Policies to determine its Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates using factors other than those specified in the Policies;
- b. Whether Defendant added, included, or relied on factors not specified in the Policies when determining the Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates used to calculate Cost of Insurance Charges or deductions for the Policies;
- c. Whether Defendant added, included, or relied on factors unrelated to its mortality expectations in determining Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates that the Policies provide are "based on" specified mortality factors and no other specified factors;

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

d. Whe	ther Defendant is permitted by the Policies to charge expense amounts to	
	the Defendant is permitted by the Poheres to charge expense amounts to	
policy owners in excess of the amounts disclosed in the Policies;		
e. Whether Defendant charged amounts in excess of those specifically authorized by		
the F	Policies;	
f. Whe	ther Defendant breached the terms of the Policies;	
	ther Defendant converted Class members' property;	
h. Whe	ther Defendant's conduct was an unfair or deceptive trade practice;	
i. Whether Defendant's misconduct affects the public interest;		
j. Whe	ther the Class were injured and sustained damages as a result of Defendant's	
wron	gful conduct;	
k. Whe	ther the Class is entitled to damages, restitution, and/or other relief as a	
reme	dy for Defendant's conduct; and	
l. Whe	ther the Class is entitled to declaratory relief stating the proper construction	
and/o	or interpretation of the Policies.	
ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.		
56. The	questions set forth above predominate over any questions affecting only	
individual persons, and a class action is superior to all other available means of fair and efficient		
adjudication of the	plaims of Plaintiff and Class members. The injury suffered by each individual	
adjudication of the claims of Plaintiff and Class members. The injury suffered by each individual		
Class member is relatively small in comparison to the burden and expense of individual		
prosecution of these claims. Even if Class members could afford to pursue individual litigation,		
the court system could not. Individualized litigation would risk inconsistent or contradictory		
judgments while increasing the delay and expense to all parties, and to the judicial system, from		
COMPANY'S ANSV AMENDED COMPL 06025-RBL	VER TO SECOND AINT – NO. 3:19-cv- - 23 - Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988	
	e. When the P f. When g. When h. When i. When j. When j. When j. When wrow k. When reme l. Start reme l. Start reme l. Start reme reme l. Start reme reme l. Start reme reme reme reme reme reme l. Start reme reme reme reme reme reme reme re	

1	the complex legal and factual issues presented here. By contrast, the class action device presents		
2	far fewer management difficulties, and provides the benefits of single adjudication, an economy		
3	of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.		
4	ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.		
5	57. Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to Plaintiff		
6 7	and Class members, making final injunctive relief and declaratory relief appropriate with respect		
8	to the Class as a whole.		
9	ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations.		
10	COUNT I: BREACH OF CONTRACT		
11	(Cost of Insurance Charge)		
12	58. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated by reference as if fully alleged herein.		
13	ANSWER: State Farm incorporates and restates by reference its responses to all		
14	preceding allegations.		
15	59. Plaintiff and the Class purchased life insurance policies—defined herein as the		
16	Policies—from Defendant.		
17 18	ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff purchased the Policy. Except as		
19	expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 59 of		
20	Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the		
21	requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.		
22	60. The Policies are valid and enforceable contracts between the Defendant and		
23	Plaintiff and Class members.		
24			
25	Dotto		
	STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - NO. 3:19-cv- 06025-RBLBetts Patterson Mines one Convention Place 		
	1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039 (206) 292-9988		

ANSWER: State Farm admits that the Policy is valid and enforceable. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 60 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

61. Plaintiff and the Class members substantially performed their obligations under the terms of the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff has substantially performed his obligations under the Policy. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 61 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

62. By determining Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates inconsistent with the terms of the Policies and loading unauthorized factors in Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates, Defendant impermissibly caused and continues to cause those rates to be higher than what is explicitly authorized by the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

63. Because Defendant calculates Cost of Insurance Charges inconsistent with the terms of the Policies, including using Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates that are higher than those authorized by the Policies, Defendant deducted Cost of Insurance Charges from the Account Values of Plaintiff and the Class in amounts greater than those authorized by their policies.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039

1

2

64. Defendant's practice of deducting charges in amounts not authorized by the Policies constitutes a breach of the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

65. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's ongoing and continuing breach, Plaintiff and the Class have sustained damages that are continuing in nature in an amount to be determined at trial.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

<u>COUNT II: BREACH OF CONTRACT</u> (Expense Charge)

66. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated by reference as if fully alleged herein. ANSWER: State Farm incorporates and restates by reference its responses to all preceding allegations.

67. By loading Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates with undisclosed and unauthorized expenses, Defendant impermissibly deducts expenses from the Account Values of Plaintiff and the Class in amounts in excess of the fixed expense charges expressly authorized by the Policies.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

1

2

68. By deducting unauthorized expense charges from the Account Values of Plaintiff and the Class, Defendant has breached the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

69. As direct and proximate result of Defendant's ongoing and continuing breach, Plaintiff and the Class have sustained damages that are continuing in nature in an amount to be determined at trial.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

COUNT III: CONVERSION

The preceding paragraphs are incorporated by reference as if fully alleged herein.
 ANSWER: State Farm incorporates and restates by reference its responses to all preceding allegations.

71. Plaintiff and the Class had a property interest in the funds Defendant deducted from their Account Values in excess of the amounts permitted by the terms of the Policies.

24 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039

Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

72. Defendant intentionally and substantially interfered with that property interest. By deducting Cost of Insurance Charges and expense charges in unauthorized amounts from the Account Values of Plaintiff and the Class, Defendant assumed and exercised ownership over, and misappropriated or misapplied, specific funds placed in the custody of Defendant for the benefit of Plaintiff and the Class members, without authorization or consent and in hostility to the rights of Plaintiff and Class members.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

73. Defendant continues to retain these funds unlawfully. At no time did Plaintiff or any Class member consent to such wrongful retention of funds by Defendant.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

74. Defendant's wrongful exercise of control over the personal property of Plaintiff and Class members constitutes conversion.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil

Procedure.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL 75. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff and the Class have been damaged, and these damages are continuing in nature.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

76. Although requiring expert testimony, the amounts of unauthorized Cost of Insurance Charges and expense charges Defendant took from Plaintiff and the Class are capable of determination, to an identified sum, by comparing Plaintiff's actual Cost of Insurance Charge each month to a Cost of Insurance Charge computed using a Monthly Cost of Insurance Rate determined using only the mortality factors provided for in the Policy.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

77. Defendant intended to cause damage to the Plaintiff and the Class by deducting more from their Account Values than was authorized by the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

78. By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to recover from Defendant all damages and costs permitted by law, including all amounts Defendant wrongfully converted.

25

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

COUNT IV: VIOLATION OF THE WASHINGTON CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

79. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated by reference as if fully alleged herein. ANSWER: State Farm incorporates and restates by reference its responses to all preceding allegations.

80. Defendant engaged in unfair and deceptive acts or practices by deducting unauthorized expense charges from the Account Values of Plaintiff and Class Members. Defendant further engaged in unfair or deceptive acts or practices by materially failing to disclose and concealing from Plaintiff and Class Members the factors used to calculate Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates and the basis for the amounts deducted from their Account Values as Cost of Insurance Charges. Defendant alone, and not Plaintiff and Class Members, possesses the actuarial information and equations underlying the computation of rates and charges for the Policies, such that Plaintiff and Class Members were unaware of Defendants unfair and deceptive acts and practices.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

81. Defendant provides life insurance in Washington. Defendant's unfair and deceptive acts or practices therefore occurred in trade or commerce as part of its business operations.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 30 -

ANSWER: State Farm admits that it provides life insurance in Washington. State Farm denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 81 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

82. Defendant's unfair and deceptive acts and practices impact the public interest. Washington regulates the insurance industry and deems misconduct by licensed insurers to affect the public interest. Moreover, Defendant's conduct applies uniformly to individuals obtaining life insurance policies from Defendant and if action is not taken, Defendant will continue to commit such wrongful acts against present and future insureds.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Washington regulates the insurance industry in the State of Washington. State Farm denies all remaining allegations in Paragraph 82 of the Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

83. Plaintiff and Class Members have been injured by Defendant's unfair and deceptive acts or practices. Plaintiff and Class Members have a property interest in their Account Values and the funds wrongfully deducted by Defendant. Defendant's wrongful conduct injured that property by reducing its value and depriving Plaintiff and Class Members of interest payments that would otherwise have accrued. This injury was caused by Defendant's deductions of Cost of Insurance Charges and expense charges in unauthorized amounts and material omissions regarding the calculation of these deductions.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039

84. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendant their actual damages, treble damages, costs, and attorneys' fees.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

COUNT V: DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

85. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated by reference as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: State Farm incorporates and restates by reference its responses to all preceding allegations.

86. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Plaintiff and the Class, on the one hand, and Defendant, on the other, concerning the respective rights and duties of the parties under the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

87. Plaintiff contends that Defendant breached and continues to breach the Policies in the following respects:

24

25

a. By using unauthorized and undisclosed factors to compute the Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates under the Policies, Defendant impermissibly increased Monthly Cost

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 32 -

of Insurance Rates for the Policies and, as a result, withdraws Cost of Insurance Charges from the Account Values of Plaintiff and the Class in amounts greater than those authorized by the Policies; and

b. By inflating Monthly Cost of Insurance Rates under the Policies with expense factors, including without limitation, maintenance, administrative, and other expense factors, that are not disclosed as being used to determine those rates, Defendant impermissibly deducted expense charges from the Account Values of Plaintiff and the Class in amounts in excess of the fixed expense charges expressly authorized by the Policies.

ANSWER: State Farm denies these allegations and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

88. Plaintiff therefore seeks a declaration of the parties' respective rights and duties under the Policies and requests the Court to declare the aforementioned conduct of Defendant as unlawful and in material breach of the Policies so that future controversies may be avoided.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff seeks a declaration of the parties' rights and duties under the Policy. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 88 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

89. Pursuant to a declaration of the parties' respective rights and duties under the Policies, Plaintiff further seeks an injunction: (1) temporarily, preliminarily, and permanently

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 33 -

enjoining Defendant from continuing to engage in conduct in breach of the Policies, and from continuing to collect unlawfully inflated charges in violation of the Policies; and (2) ordering Defendant to comply with terms of the Policies in regards to its assessment of charges against Plaintiff and Class members' Account Values.

ANSWER: State Farm admits that Plaintiff seeks an injunction. Except as expressly admitted, State Farm denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 89 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and specifically denies that this case meets the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

FIRST DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims and the claims of all members of the putative class are barred, in whole or in part, by the applicable statutes of limitations. Plaintiff's life insurance policy was issued in January 2001, more than 18 years before he filed his Complaint, and he cannot adequately demonstrate any fraudulent concealment by State Farm or other facts that would toll the running of the applicable statute of limitation. All owners of life insurance issued on Form 94030 purchased their policies on or before June 30, 2004, more than 15 years before the Plaintiff filed his Complaint. By virtue of the life insurance contract and the communications between the Plaintiff and members of the putative class over the years of policy ownership, Plaintiff and all members of the putative class had adequate actual or constructive knowledge to trigger the limitations period so that the applicable statutes of limitation have now expired.

SECOND DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of estoppel. Plaintiff received the entire benefit of the bargain and cannot now mount a claim for breach.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 34 -

Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039

THIRD DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, due to Plaintiff's own actions, negligence or legal fault.

FOURTH DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of waiver, including without limitation the voluntary payment doctrine.

FIFTH DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by his failure to mitigate damages, if any.

SIXTH DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the filed rate doctrine.

SEVENTH DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of laches because Plaintiff waited many years to bring the claims in this action and State Farm is prejudiced and disadvantaged by this undue delay.

EIGHTH DEFENSE

Claims of the putative class are barred by or otherwise did not survive the surrender or termination of the policy.

<u>NINTH DEFENSE</u>

Claims of the putative class are barred by or otherwise did not survive either the death of the owner of the policies or the death of the insured.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 35 -

Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

<u>TENTH DEFENSE</u>

Plaintiff's and the class's claims are barred in whole or in part by the doctrines of payment, accord and satisfaction, recoupment, set-off, and/or election of remedies.

ELEVENTH DEFENSE

The breach of contract claims of any class member who did not pay a premium for the alleged coverage for which they seek to recover payment fail for lack of consideration.

TWELFTH DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' request for treble damages violates State Farm's right to procedural and substantive due process, violates State Farm's right to protection from excessive fines, violates the guarantees against undue burdens upon commerce, and denies State Farm equal protection under the United States Constitution and the Washington Constitution. The prayer for punitive damages recovery should therefore be stricken.

THIRTEENTH DEFENSE

The Complaint, and each purported cause of action alleged therein, is barred by the conduct, actions and inactions of Plaintiff, and/or the persons on whose behalf he purports to bring this action, under the doctrine of ratification.

FOURTEENTH DEFENSE

The Complaint's prayers for equitable relief are barred because Plaintiff, and the persons on whose behalf Plaintiff purports to bring this action, has or have adequate remedies at law.

FIFTEENTH DEFENSE

With respect to the claims of Plaintiff and/or the putative class, the terms and conditions imposed with respect to the insurance that is the subject of the Complaint complied with all

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 36 -

1

2

applicable statutes, regulations, and/or filed rates and policy forms. To the extent that the causes of action advanced in the Complaint challenge the terms contained in policy forms accepted for those terms and conditions, such claims are barred as a matter of law, since among other things, all such claims seek to obtain a contact term other than the filed and accepted forms.

SIXTEENTH DEFENSE

The claims advanced in the Complaint by Plaintiff, and/or the persons on whose behalf he purports to bring this action, insofar as they relate to alleged conduct that is subject to the regulatory jurisdiction of one or more regulatory or administrative agencies or bodies, are subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of those regulatory or administrative agencies under the doctrines of primary and/or exclusive jurisdiction. Alternatively, such claims are barred by the absence of any private right of action with regard to conduct submitted to the discretion of a regulatory or administrative agency or body.

SEVENTEENTH DEFENSE

The Complaint and each and every claim for relief are barred by the Parol Evidence Rule, which precludes the claimants from varying the written terms of the policies.

EIGHTEENTH DEFENSE

State Farm alleges that the adjudication of the claims of the putative class through purported classwide proof violates State Farm's right to due process of law and right to trial by jury guaranteed by the United States and Washington Constitutions.

NINETEENTH DEFENSE

The claims and/or damages of Plaintiffs and the alleged putative class may be barred, in whole or in part, by the terms, conditions, limitations, and exclusions contained within their respective policies and/or by public policy or express provision of law.

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 37 -

Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039

TWENTIETH DEFENSE

The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which any relief can be granted.

TWENTY-FIRST DEFENSE

Plaintiff and some or all members of the putative class lack standing to bring some or all of the claims set forth in the Complaint because they have not suffered any injury in fact.

TWENTY-SECOND DEFENSE

Plaintiff has failed to state a claim for relief for conversion because, among other things, the only source of duty alleged arises from the life insurance policy with State Farm and the economic loss doctrine bars recovery of the purely economic damages alleged. Plaintiff does not have a property interest or other interest in the policy account value that arises from any source other than the contract that is legally sufficient to support a claim for conversion.

TWENTY-THIRD DEFENSE

Plaintiff cannot assert untimely claims based on fraudulent concealment as alleged in the Complaint as State Farm had no duty to disclose the conduct of which Plaintiff complains and State Farm had no intent to deceive Plaintiff or any other policyholder.

TWENTY-FOURTH DEFENSE

Plaintiff cannot untimely assert claims based on fraudulent concealment as alleged in the Complaint because Plaintiff has not alleged fraud with the particularity required by Rule 9(b) of the Rules of Civil Procedure.

TWENTY-FIFTH DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel.

TWENTY-SIXTH DEFENSE

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

- 38 -

Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

Plaintiff has failed to state a claim for relief for conversion because, among other things, a claim for conversion cannot be based on an alleged overcharge.

TWENTY-SEVENTH DEFENSE

Some of the putative class members have released the claims set forth in the Amended Complaint.

TWENTY-EIGHTH DEFENSE

As Plaintiff and the putative class members' claims for conversion are based on the same alleged conduct as Plaintiff's and the putative class members' breach of contract claims, Plaintiff and the putative class members cannot recover under both.

TWENTY-NINTH DEFENSE

Some or all of Plaintiff's claims and the claims of the persons he purports to represent are barred by the express provisions of those persons' respective insurance contracts, which authorize each of the deductions about which Plaintiff complains.

THIRTIETH DEFENSE

Plaintiff, and the other persons he purports to represent, suffered no damages by reason of any act or omission of Defendant.

THIRTY-FIRST DEFENSE

Plaintiff has failed to state a claim for relief under Washington's Consumer Protection Act because he has failed to allege and cannot establish that the alleged actions of State Farm "had the capacity to deceive a substantial portion of the public." *See* WPI 310.08 (7th Ed.).

THIRTY-SECOND DEFENSE

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL

1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039

1	Plaintiff has failed to state a claim for relief under Washington's Consumer Protection		
2	Act because the alleged acts of State Farm are reasonable in relation to the development and		
3	preservation of business and are further not injurious to the public interest. See WPI 310.02 (7th		
4	Ed.)		
5	RESERVATION OF OTHER DEFENSES		
6			
7	State Farm is informed and believes that it may have other defenses of which it is		
8	presently unaware. State Farm reserves the right to allege additional defenses upon discovery of		
9	additional facts during the course of discovery.		
10	REQUEST FOR RELIEF		
11	Wherefore, State Farm denies that Plaintiff is entitled to any of the relief he seeks,		
12	whether on behalf of himself or a putative class, and prays for judgment as follows:		
13	1. That Plaintiff take nothing by his Complaint;		
14	2. That the Court dismiss, with prejudice, Plaintiff's Amended Complaint,		
15	and award State Farm its recoverable costs; and		
16	3. That the Court award State Farm such other and further relief as it may		
17	deem just and proper.		
18	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
19 State Farm Life hereby demands a trial by jury of all issues so triable.			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE Betts COMPANY'S ANSWED TO SECOND Minos		
	COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv- 06025-RBL - 40 - Mines Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988		

DATED this 30th day of March, 2020.

BETTS, PATTERSON & MINES, P.S.

By /s Joseph D. Hampton By /s Kara A. Tredway Joseph D. Hampton, WSBA #15297 Kara A. Tredway, WSBA #44984 Betts, Patterson & Mines, P.S. One Convention Place, Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle WA 98101-3927 Telephone: (206) 292-9988 Facsimile: (206) 343-7053 E-mail: jhampton@bpmlaw.com E-mail: ktredway@bpmlaw.com STINSON LLP By /s Todd Noteboom, pro hac vice Todd Noteboom, pro hac vice Stinson LLP 50 South Sixth Street, Suite 2600 Minneapolis, MN 55402 Telephone: 612-335-1894 E mail: todd.noteboom@stinson.com STINSON LLP By /s Jeremy A. Root, pro hac vice Jeremy A. Root, pro hac vice Stinson LLP 50 South Sixth Street, Suite 2600 Minneapolis, MN 55402 Telephone: 612-335-1894 E mail: jeremy.root@stinson.com

STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv-06025-RBL Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

ALSTON & BIRD

By /s Cari Dawson, pro hac vice By /s Tiffany Powers, pro hac vice 4 Cari Dawson, pro hac vice Tiffany Powers, pro hac vice Alston & Bird 6 One Atlantic Center 1201 West Peachtree Street, Suite 4900 Atlanta, GA 30309-3424 Telephone: 404-881-7000 Fax: 404-881-7777 tiffany.powers@alston.com E mail: cari.dawson@alston.com E mail: Attorneys for Defendant State Farm Life Insurance Company 12 14 16 18 19 20 24 Betts STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE Patterson Mines One Convention Place COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND - 42 -AMENDED COMPLAINT - NO. 3:19-cv-Suite 1400 701 Pike Street 06025-RBL Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

17

21

22

23

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
2	I, Joseph D. Hampton, hereby certify that on March 30, 2020, I electronically filed t		
3	following:		
4	• State Farm Life Insurance Company's Answer To Second Amended Complaint; and		
5	Certificate of Service;		
6 7	with the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the		
, 8	following:		
9	<u>Counsel for Plaintiff Whitman</u> : Kim D. Stephens		o <mark>r Plaintiff Whitman</mark> : irger, <i>pro hac vice</i>
10	Rebecca Luise Solomon Tousley Brain Stephens	Joseph M Miller Sch	Feierabend, <i>pro hac vice</i>
11	1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2200 Seattle, WA 98101	4520 Mair	n Street, Suite 1570 ty, MO 64111
12	206-682-5600 E-mail: kstephens@tousley.com		chirger@millerschirger.com eierabend@millerschirger.com
13	E-mail: rsolomon@tousley.com		
14	<u>Counsel for Plaintiff Whitman</u> : Ethan M Lange, <i>pro hac vice</i>		o <mark>r Plaintiff Whitman</mark> : Basser, <i>pro hac vice</i>
15	Matthew W. Lytle, <i>pro hac vice</i> Norman E. Siegel, <i>pro hac vice</i>	Barrack R	odos & Bacine oadway, Suite 900
16	Lindsay T. Perkins, <i>pro hac vice</i> Stueve Siegel Hanson	San Diego	, CA 92101 passer@barrack.com
17	460 Nichols Road, Suite 200 Kansas City, MO 64112	L'inuit. St	
18	E-mail: lange@stuevesiegel.com		
19	E-mail: mlytle@millerschirger.com E-mail: siegel@stuevesiegel.com E-mail: perkins@stuevesiegel.com		
20	E-mail. perkins@stuevesiegei.com		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv- 06025-RBL	- 43 -	Betts Patterson Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

1	Counsel for Plaintiff Whitman:	
2	Joseph Gentile Sarraf Gentile LLP	
3	401 Park Avenue South, 10th Floor New York, NY 10016	
4	E-mail: joseph@sarrafgentile.com	
5	Ronan Sarraf Sarraf Gentile LLP	
6 7	10 Bond Street, Suite 212 Great Neck, New York 11021 E-mail: ronen@sarrafgentile.com	
8		
9	Dated this 30th day of March, 2020.	
10		BETTS, PATTERSON & MINES, P.S.
11		By /s Joseph D. Hampton
12		By /s Kara A. Tredway
13		Joseph D. Hampton, WSBA #15297 Kara A. Tredway, WSBA #44984
		Betts, Patterson & Mines, P.S.
14		One Convention Place, Suite 1400 701 Pike Street
15		Seattle WA 98101-3927
16		Telephone: (206) 292-9988 Facsimile: (206) 343-7053
17		E-mail: jhampton@bpmlaw.com E-mail: ktredway@bpmlaw.com
18		E-man. Kuedway@opiniaw.com
19		STINSON LLP
20		
21		By /s Todd A. Noteboom (pro hac vice)
22		Todd A. Noteboom, <i>pro hac vice</i> Stinson LLP
		50 South Sixth Street, Suite 2600
23		Minneapolis, MN 55402 Telephone: 612-335-1894
24		E mail: todd.noteboom@stinson.com
25		
	STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – NO. 3:19-cv- 06025-RBL	- 44 - Mines One Convention Place Suite 1400 701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (206) 292-9988

1		STINSON LLP
2		
3		By <u>/s Jeremy A. Root (pro hac vice)</u> Jeremy A. Root, pro hac vice
4		Stinson LLP
		230 W. McCarty Street
5		Jefferson City, MO 65101 Telephone: 573-636-6263
6		E mail: jeremy.root@stinson.com
7		
8		ALSTON & BIRD
9		
10		By /s Tiffany Powers (pro hac vice)
		By <u>/s Cari K. Dawson (pro hac vice)</u> Tiffany Powers, pro hac vice
11		Cari K. Dawson, pro hac vice
12		Alston & Bird One Atlantic Center
13		1201 West Peachtree Street, Suite 4900
14		Atlanta, GA 30309-3424
		Telephone: 404-881-7000 E-mail: tiffany.powers@alston.com
15		E-mail: cari.dawson@alston.com
16		
17		Attorneys for Defendant State Farm Life
18		Insurance Company
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
23		Betts
	STATE FARM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO SECOND	Patterson Mines
	AMENDED COMPLAINT - NO. 3:19-cv-	- 45 - One Convention Place Suite 1400
	06025-RBL	701 Pike Street Seattle, Washington 98101-3927 (2021) 2022 0929
	1554387.doc/033020 1350/8544-0039	(206) 292-9988