Rex Palmer
ATTORNEYS INC., P.C.
301 W Spruce
Missoula, MT 59802
(406) 728-4514
ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONERS

IN THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION COURT OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

Robert Flynn and) WCC No. 2000-0222		
Carl Miller, Individually and on Behalf of Others Similarly Situated, Petitioners, v.	PETITIONERS' BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO AIG INSURERS MOTION TO DISMISS		
Montana State Fund, Respondent/Insurer, and)))		
Liberty Northwest Insurance Company, Intervenor.)))		

Fifteen insurers ("AIG Insurers") have submitted their motion to dismiss. Docket #719. Petitioners object to dismissal and submit this brief in opposition to the motion.

AIG Insurers seek dismissal based on an affidavit which fails to comply with both the form and substance prescribed by the Court. The form and substance prescribed by the Court are not optional. A non-conforming affidavit does not satisfy the criteria to establish the basis for dismissal or to trigger discovery.

The non-conforming affidavit is not a basis for dismissal nor does it trigger discovery.

On December 6, 2005, this Court introduced a process by which an insurer could, by affidavit, seek to initiate dismissal from common fund matters. Docket #390, attached as Exhibit "A". This process has worked well for dozens of insurers. The Court's common fund website demonstrates the particulars of numerous affidavits followed by stipulated dismissal or by discovery and subsequent stipulated dismissal.

The process introduced by the Court requires the insurer to submit an affidavit in specified form which provides five separate elements of substantiative information to initiate potential dismissal. See Ex. A. The five elements are as follows:

- 1. Name of affiant;
- 2. A statement of affiant's position with the named insurer;
- 3. A statement of affiant's authority to speak on behalf of and bind the named insurer;
- 4. A statement under oath that the affiant has reviewed the named insurer's records and that based upon the affiant's review, the named insurer should be dismissed based upon any or all of the four specific reasons:
 - The named insurer never wrote workers' compensation insurance in Montana;
 - The named insurer does not have any Montana claims;
 - The named insurer has no claimants meeting the Court's criteria <u>as set forth in the summons;</u>
 - The named insurer was or is in the liquidation during the period in question set forth in the amended summons.
- 5. At statement of the named insurer's understanding of what will happen if there is no discovery within ninety days and if Petitioners do not object at some time after ninety days.

The affidavit at issue fails to comply with the form and substance prescribed by the Court. See Affidavit, docket #714, attached as Exhibit "B".

First, the affidavit identifies only one insurer not fifteen. Consequently, the affidavit fails to make any claim whatever concerning fourteen of the

fifteen insurers seeking dismissal. It fails to identify the affiant's position with fourteen of the insurers seeking dismissal (element 2) and it fails to provide a statement of the affiant's authority to speak on behalf of and bind fourteen of the insurers seeking dismissal (element 3). Likewise, the affidavit fails to provide a statement that the affiant reviewed records of even one insurer (element 4). Not even one. Perhaps most important, the affiant fails to mention any of the four specific reasons for dismissal required in the form affidavit, (element 4). The opposite is true. The affidavit actually confirms that the insurer:

- wrote workers' compensation insurance in Montana,
- had Montana claims¹, and
- has at least two claimants entitled to Flynn/Miller benefits.

Finally, the affidavit fails to provide a statement of its understanding of what will happen if there is no discovery within ninety days and if Petitioner's do not object some time after ninety days, (element 5). Not a word about element 5. This is important. Without this, Petitioners and the Court would have no reason to expect that any insurer would ever in the wildest stretch of imagination expect dismissal by filing an affidavit so singularly non-compliant with the Court's required form. Much less fourteen insurers not even named in the affidavit.

As noted above, none of the above five elements are optional.

The affidavit process introduced by the Court in 2005 has a specific purpose. The process expedites dismissal of certain insurers. The expedited process only applies if the insurer strictly complies with the form and substance of the affidavit required by the Court. If an insurer strictly complies with the form and substance of the affidavit required by the Court, then the affidavit triggers an initial discovery deadline and permits an insurer to seek dismissal outside the process required by the Court's regular rules for resolving disputes. If an insurer fails to strictly comply with the form and substance of the affidavit required by the Court then it fails to trigger an initial

¹The discovery responses of AIG Property Casualty state that it had 7145 workers' compensation claims in Montana, that 1593 were total disability claims and that it has taken social security offset on some of these claims.

discovery deadline and the insurer is not entitled to dismissal outside the Court's regular rules. Here the affidavit fails utterly to comply with either the form or substance prescribed by the Court. Instead, the affidavit proves that the insurer owes money which it has not paid.

Here, AIG Insurer's motion to dismiss should be denied. The motion relies on a special affidavit process which AIG Insurers have failed to satisfy.

AIG Insurers can either proceed under the Court's regular rules and file a new motion to dismiss if they believe they should be dismissed while simultaneously admitting they owe money. Alternately, AIG Insurers can file a new affidavit or affidavits if they believe that they can satisfy the form and substance of the Court's special affidavit process.

DATED this 20th day of January, 2015

Rex Palmer

ATTORNEYS INC., P.C.

301 W Spruce

Missoula, MT 59802

(406) 728-4514

ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONERS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 20th Day of January 2015, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served upon the following by U.S. mail, hand-delivery, Federal Express, facsimile or email:

Steven W. Jennings	{ }	CM/ECF
Crowley Fleck PLLP	{X}	U.S. Mail
PO Box 2529	{ }	Hand Delivered
Billings, MT 59103-2529	{ }	Federal Express
	{ }	Facsimile
	{ }	Fmail

MEMO

TO:

Counsel and All Parties of Record in All Common Fund Matters

FROM:

Workers' Compensation Court

RE:

Affidavit

DATE:

December 6, 2005

Affidavit

Attached is a blank form affidavit. If any insurer, self-insured, or guaranty association believes it should be dismissed from any of the common fund matters, you are directed to complete the affidavit and return it to the Workers' Compensation Court. If none of the enumerated reasons apply, you must prepare a separate affidavit for the Court's review.

JB

DEC - 6 2005

OFFICE OF WORKER'S COMPENSATION JUDGE HELENA, MONTANA

EXHIBIT A 1.53

IN THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION COURT OF THE STATE OF MONTANA WCC No. Petitioner VS. Respondent/Insurer. **AFFIDAVIT** STATE OF _______) : SS. County of ______ ¶1 | _____ (NAME), being first duly sworn upon oath, depose and say: 12 | (NAME), am the (POSITION) of (NAME OF INSURER OR SELF-INSURER). ____ (POSITION) of _ In my capacity as ___ (NAME OF INSURER OR SELF-INSURER), I am authorized to make the statements set forth in this affidavit on behalf of ______ (NAME OF INSURER OR SELF-INSURER) and to bind ______ (NAME OF INSURER OR SELF-INSURER) by these statements.

After a review of our records, I swear under oath that ____

(NAME OF INSURER OR SELF-INSURER) should be dismissed from the above-

entitled action for any or all of the following reasons (check any or all that apply):

Ex A 87 2053

	(NAME OF INSUREI	R OR SELF
	INSURER) has never written workers' compensation the state of Montana;	on insurance i
	(NAME OF INSURER INSURER) does not have any Montana claims;	R OR SELF
	INSURER) has no claimants meeting the Court's matter as set forth in the summons;	R OR SELF criteria in this
	(NAME OF INSURER INSURER) was or is in liquidation during the period forth in the amended summons served upon me.	R OR SELF- in question se
may conduct discovered the foregoing states of INSURER OR second on the sworn of Insurer and Insurer or Insure	that the Montana Workers' Compensation Court may om the date of filing this affidavit within which counsel if very and investigation for the limited purpose of provincement(s) made by me on behalf of	for Petitioner[s] g or disproving (NAME
	(Name)
	(Title)	
Signed and sv	worn to before me this day of	, 200
(0541)	Notary Public for the State ofResiding at:	
(SEAL)	My Commission Expires:	
Affidavit - Page 2		

Ex'A'BJ 3083

IN THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION COURT OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

WCC No. 2000 - 0222

ROBERT FLYNN and CARL MILLER, Individually and on Behalf of Others Similarly Situated,

Petitioners

VS.

MONTANA STATE FUND,

Respondent/Insurer,

FLED

FEB 1 8 2014

OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION JUDGE HELENA, MONTANA

and

LIBERTY NORTHWEST INSURANCE CORPORATION,

intervenor.

AFFIDAVIT

State of Oregon

:SS

County of Multnomah

- 1. I. Tathay McNeilly, Being first duly sworn upon oath, depose and say:
- 2. I, Tathay McNeilly, am the Assistant Vice President for Workers' Compensation Primary Claims for AIG Property Casualty Inc.
- 3. In my capacity as Assistant Vice President for Workers' Compensation Primary Claims for AIG Property Casualty Inc I am authorized to make the statements set forth in this affidavit on behalf of AIG Property Casualty Inc and to bind AIG Property Casualty Inc by these statements.
- 4. I have reviewed the Summons, the Notice of Claim of Attorney Fee Lien, and the Amended Notice of Attorneys Lien filed in the above captioned matter (the "Flynn case" or "Flynn"). Pursuant to the criteria set forth in those pleadings, and as further clarified in the cases entitled Flynn v. State Compensation Ins. Fund, 2002 MT 279, 312 Mont. 410, 60 P.3d 397; Flynn v. Montana State Fund, 2008 MT 394, 347 Mont. 146, 197 P.3d 1007; and Flynn v. Montana State Fund, 2011 MT 300, 363 Mont. 55, 267 P.3d 23; there are two claimants covered under workers compensation insurance policies issued by AIG Property Casualty Inc who appear to fall within the scope of the Flynn common fund and the attorney fee

EXHIBIT B

DOCKET ITEM NO. 114

BF

lien asserted by the Petitioner's counsel in *Flynn*. The relevant information for these claimants are:

A. Name:

Barbara Ehman

Claim Number:

073-803397

Date of Injury:

12/25/1984

Based upon my search of the claim files, Ms. Ehman was identified as a potential claimant meeting the criteria for a *Flynn* claimant. Ms. Ehman was contacted and provided documentation establishing that she had incurred \$3,430.59 in attorney's fees in order to obtain Social Security Disability Benefits.

On 2/4/2014, AIG Property Casualty Inc, at my direction, sent Ms. Ehman a check in the amount of \$1,029.18 which represents one-half of her attorneys fees incurred minus 40% (\$686.12) thereof withheld for the attorney fee lien asserted by counsel for Petitioner, Rex Palmer, pursuant to the *Amended Notice of Attorneys Lien* filed in this action on January 2, 2004.

AIG Property Casualty Inc is prepared to pay the withheld 40% (\$686.12) either to Mr. Palmer or to Ms. Ehman, as the Court shall direct.

B. Name:

Shawn Heidrick

Claim Number:

071-069776

Date of Injury:

2/19/2001

Based upon my search of the claim files, Mr. Heidrick was identified as a potential claimant meeting the criteria for a Flynn claimant. Mr. Heidrick was contacted and provided documentation establishing that he had incurred \$5,300 in attorney's fees in order to obtain Social Security Disability Benefits.

On 2/4/2014, AIG Property Casualty Inc, at my direction, sent Mr. Heidrick a check in the amount of \$1,987.50 which represents one-half of his attorney's fees minus 25% (\$662.50) thereof withheld for the attorney fee lien asserted by counsel for Petitioner, Rex Palmer, pursuant to the Amended Notice of Attorneys Lien filed in this action on January 2, 2004.

AIG Property Casualty Inc. is prepared to pay the withheld 25% (\$662.50) either to Mr. Palmer or to Mr. Heidrick as the Court shall direct.

5. Other than Ms. Ehman and Mr. Heidrick, AIG Property Casualty Inc has no claimants meeting the *Flynn* criteria as set forth in the *Summons*.

Ex'B' 87 2.53

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is correct.
 Dated this 12th day of February, 2014.

Tathay McNeilly

Assistant Vice President for Workers' Compensation Primary Claims for AIG Property Casualty Inc

Signed and sworn to before me this ______, 201

(Signature of Notary)

(Typed, stamped or printed Name of Notary)

(NOTARIAL SEAL)

Notary Public for the State of Cook
Residing at William William My commission expires 3-13-15

OFFICIAL SEAL
DAWN LEE PATZ
NOTARY PUBLIC-OREGON
COMMISSION NO. 456529
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MARCH 13, 2015