

PRACTICE

INSURANCE COVERAGE

Commercial General Liability

PARTNERS

CHRISTOPHER E. KOZAK
SEAN M. HIRSCHTEN
THAO NGUYEN
JOHN D. MORIARTY
GREGORY M. GOTWALD
JONATHAN P. EMENHISER
DANIEL P. CORY
JEFFREY D. CLAFLIN
CHRISTOPHER J. BRAUN
TONYA J. BOND
ANDREA K. TOWNSEND
JOANNE R. SOMMERS
RYAN T. LEAGRE
COLIN E. CONNOR
JEFFREY D. FEATHERSTUN

ASSOCIATES

CHRISTOPHER E. KOZAK

OF COUNSEL

PETER M. RACHER
GEORGE M. PLEWS
JEFFREY A. TOWNSEND
F. RONALDS ("RON")

OVERVIEW

The CGL policy is usually the backbone of a company's coverage program. We review, assess, and litigate general liability policies daily. The firm handles all aspects of these policies and has helped developed much of the law in Indiana concerning these policies over the past decades. It does not matter the type of policy: historic or current, form or "manuscript," occurrence based or claims-made, we have handled it.

EXPERIENCE

- *Indiana Restorative Dentistry, P.C., v. Laven Ins. Agency*, 27 N.E.3d 260 (Ind. 2015) (holding that an insurance agent can be liable to a policyholder for a breach of contract and a tort and addressing when a special relationship with an insurance agent exists requiring the agent to advise the policyholder)
- *Thomson Inc. v. XL Ins. Am., Inc.*, 22 N.E.3d 809 (Ind. Ct. App. 2014) ("known loss" doctrine only bars coverage when policyholder has actual, subjective knowledge that a loss has occurred or is certain to occur; knowledge of contamination, prior to strict liability statute's enactment, did not bar coverage).
- *Thomson Inc. v. Ins. Co. of N. Am.*, 11 N.E.3d 982 (Ind. Ct. App. 2014) (policyholder's payment of defense costs when insurer has wrongfully denied coverage raises presumption costs were reasonable and necessary).
- *Steinberger v. Cont'l Cas. Co.*, No.: 1:11-cv-01524-TWP-TAB, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1337 (S.D. Ind. Jan. 4, 2013) (finding long term care policy terms "Benefit Period" and "Period of Care" ambiguous and holding that insurer must provide long term care coverage for successive four-year Benefit Periods)
- *State Auto. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Flexdar, Inc.,* 964 N.E.2d 845 (Ind. 2012) (finding the "absolute" pollution exclusion ambiguous and unenforceable)

©2026 Plews Shadley Racher & Braun LLP. All Rights Reserved.

WALKER

ANGELA M. GREEN

PARALEGALS

CHRISTOPHER C. NATALI

- *City of South Bend v. Century Indem. Co.*, 821 N.E.2d 5 (Ind. Ct. App. 2005) (declaratory action against insurers of polluter not a "direct action")
- *PSI Energy, Inc. v. Home Ins. Co.*, 801 N.E. 2d 705 (Ind. Ct. App. 2004) (addressing the ability to pursue future cleanup claims against excess insurers, late notice, lost policies, subjective "expected and intended" to cause pollution standard, "injury-in-fact" trigger)
- *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Dana Corp. (Dana II)*, 759 N.E.2d 1049 (Ind. 2001) (finding an "all sums" allocation of environmental damage spanning multiple policy periods, inapplicability of owned property exclusion to cleanup claims, and an "injury-in-fact" trigger)
- *Employers Ins. of Wausau v. Recticel Foam Corp.*, 716 N.E.2d 1015 (Ind. Ct. App. 1999) (addressing *forum non conveniens* and choice-of-law issues in the insurance context);
- *Travelers Indem. Co. v. Summit Corp. of Am.*, 715 N.E.2d 926 (Ind. Ct. App. 1999) (addressing choice-of-law for multiple sites, "personal injury" coverage for environmental claims, governmental demands are "suits," cleanup costs as "damages," and the interpretation of pollution exclusions)
- *Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. v. Dana Corp. (Dana I)*, 690 N.E.2d 285 (Ind. Ct. App. 1997) (finding governmental regulators' demands are "suits" and cleanup costs as "damages")
- *Am. States Ins. Co. v. Kiger*, 662 N.E.2d 945 (Ind. 1996) (addressing the inapplicability of "sudden and accidental" and "absolute" pollution exclusions)

©2026 Plews Shadley Racher & Braun LLP. All Rights Reserved.