

The Risk and Reward of Life Insurance

February 06, 2020

No Recovery for Paying Premiums in Excess of Policy Face Amount

Since we last reported on *Goostree v. Liberty National Life Insurance Co.* in the October 2019 issue of *Expect Focus – Life, Annuity, and Retirement Solutions*, the court granted the defendant’s motion to dismiss all counts of the plaintiffs’ complaint.

The plaintiffs alleged that the insurer targeted undereducated and unsophisticated consumers to induce them to buy insurance policies it knew required premiums that would exceed the face amount of the policies. The plaintiffs asserted various individual and class action claims for, inter alia, breach of contract; breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; conversion; unjust enrichment; and negligence.

The court concluded that each of the plaintiffs’ claims was deficient. Rather than pleading any cognizable claims, each count merely highlighted the nature of life insurance, which the court described as “a gamble” for both parties. The insurance company gambles that the insured will live long enough so that the company can collect premiums sufficient to cover the amount of the policy and potentially more. The insured gambles that he or she will not outlive the “break-even point” for the insurance companies.

Here, the court concluded that the plaintiffs gambled and lost, holding that the plaintiffs could not allege wrongdoing simply because they paid more premiums than the face amount of their policies. As the court explained, the insurance company assumes an increased risk in the early years of a life insurance policy so that, as an insured ages past the break-even point, the insured subsidizes the increased risk that comes from the insurance company’s younger clients, who may die before they pay sufficient premiums to cover the face amount. “For both parties, life insurance is a gamble,” the court noted. The court concluded that the plaintiffs could not now allege a cause of action merely because they lost their “bet” and lived well into their 80s, still paying premiums on their policies. The court, accordingly, dismissed the case in its entirety with prejudice.

Related Practices

[Life, Annuity, and Retirement Litigation](#)
[Financial Services Regulatory](#)

Related Industries

[Securities & Investment Companies](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our [Contact Us](#) form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.