MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the

LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY

at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library

http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied (searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)



L.D. 1853

DATE: 4-14-04

(Filing No. H-908)

Reproduced and distributed under the direction of the Clerk of the House.

STATE OF MAINE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 121ST LEGISLATURE SECOND SPECIAL SESSION

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S.P. 692, L.D. 1853, Bill, "An Act To Amend the Laws Relating to Property Insurance"

Amend the amendment in Part A by striking out all of sections 8 and 9 and inserting in their place the following:

'Sec. A-8. 24-A MRSA §3051, as amended by PL 1979, c. 347, §12, is further amended to read:

§3051. Notice of intent

No <u>An</u> insurer shall <u>may not</u> fail to renew a policy except by notice to the insured as provided in this subchapter. A notice of intention not to renew shall <u>is</u> not be effective unless received by the named insured at least 30 days prior to the expiration date of the policy. A post-office-department <u>post office</u> certificate of mailing to the named insured at his <u>the insured's</u> last known address shall-be <u>is</u> conclusive proof of receipt on the 3rd calendar day after mailing. The reason shall <u>must</u> accompany the notice of intent not to renew, together with notification of the right to apply for a hearing before the Superintendent of Insurance within 30 days as provided.

The reason or reasons for the intended nonrenewal action shall must accompany the notice of intent not to renew and the reason or reasons shall must be explicit. Explanations such as "underwriting reasons," "underwriting experience," "loss record," "location of risk," "credit report" and similar insurance terms are not by themselves acceptable explanations of an insurer's intended nonrenewal of a policy insuring property of the kind

Page 1-LR2725(4)



б

10

16

18

20

22

24

26

28

30

32

34

36

38

40

42

44

46

48

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S.P. 692, L.D. 1853

defined in section 3048. The reason for nonrenewal shall must be a good faith reason fationally and related to the insurability of the property or a ground for cancellation pursuant to section 3049.

This section shall does not apply:

- 8 1. If the insurer has manifested its willingness to renew; $\frac{or}{}$
- 2. If the insured fails to pay any premium due or any advance premium required by the insurer for renewal.
- Sec. A-9. 24-A MRSA §3054, as amended by PL 1989, c. 172, §8, is further amended to read:

§3054. Hearing before Superintendent of Insurance

Any \underline{A} named insured who has received a statement of reason for cancellation, or of reason for an insurer's intent not to renew a policy, may, within 30 days of the receipt of a statement of reason, request a hearing before the Superintendent of Insurance. The purpose of this hearing shall-be is limited to establishing the existence of the proof or evidence used by the insurer in its reason for cancellation or intent not to renew. The burden of proof of the reason for cancellation or intent not to renew shall-be-upen is on the insurer. If an insurer's reason for nonrenewal is not based on a ground for cancellation permitted under section 3049, the insurer must provide proof or evidence that the reason for nonrenewal is a good faith reason and related to the insurability of the property. A statement from the insurer that the risk does not meet the insurer's underwriting guidelines alone is not considered sufficient proof or evidence. The superintendent shall adopt rules for carrying out this section. The superintendent shall-have the authority-te may order the policy to continue in effect both pending and, if the superintendent finds in favor of the insured, subsequent to a hearing. If the superintendent finds in favor of the insurer at a hearing, the superintendent may order the policy to remain in force for 14 days to allow the insured to obtain other coverage.'

SUMMARY

Under the provisions of the Maine Property Insurance Cancellation Control Act, current law, as reflected in Committee Amendment "A," requires that an insurer base its decision to nonrenew an insurance policy subject to the Act on one or more good faith reasons "rationally related" to the insurability of

Page 2-LR2725(4)

HOUSE AMENDMENT



HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S.P. 692, L.D. 1853

the property. In the recent decision, <u>York Ins. Co. of Maine Inc. v. Supt. of Ins.</u>, 2004 ME 45, April 7, 2004, the Law Court interpreted the term "rationally related" in discussing what standard should be applied to determine whether an insurance company has met its burden of proof to establish that its decision to nonrenew a homeowner's insurance policy was rationally related to the insurability of the property. In the <u>York</u> decision, the Law Court concluded that the Legislature intended "rationally related" to mean that the insurance company need only prove "a reasonably conceivable state of facts that could provide a rational basis" for the company's nonrenewal decision.

This amendment strikes the word "rationally" to clarify legislative intent that a reason for nonrenewal must be related to the insurability of the property. The purpose of this amendment is to clarify the appropriate standard to apply in determining whether an insurance company's decision to nonrenew a homeowner's insurance policy complies with the law. The change in language is intended to maintain the Bureau of Insurance's ability to exercise its statutory authority in hearings to determine when an insurance company has established the existence of proof or evidence for its reason for nonrenewal. Without the amendment, the recent York decision may be construed to provide insurers with a lower standard upon which to establish their burden of proof for nonrenewal decisions.

The amendment is not intended to affect the application of the remainder of the Law Court's analysis in <u>York</u>, including its conclusion that an insurance company's decision not to renew a homeowner's insurance policy is not per se irrational because it was not supported by empirical data.

SPONSORED BY:

(Representative O'NEIL)

TOWN: Saco

Page 3-LR2725(4)