

OXFORD

INSURANCE AND  
THE LAW OF  
OBLIGATIONS

ROB MERKIN  
JENNY STEELE

# Insurance and the Law of Obligations

ROB MERKIN AND JENNY STEELE



---

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© R. Merkin and J. Steele 2013

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2013

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Crown copyright material is reproduced under Class Licence  
Number C01P0000148 with the permission of OPSI  
and the Queen's Printer for Scotland

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013937232

ISBN 978-0-19-964574-9

Printed in Great Britain by  
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and  
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials  
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

# INSURANCE AND THE LAW OF OBLIGATIONS

## Foreword

We are all bound by the laws of obligations one way or another. They are the un-noted attendants to our everyday activities such as buying a new washing-machine, driving the car to work, operating a bank account or cultivating a hedge as boundary to the garden. Law students will, after a moment's thought, point out how these activities involve the laws of contract, tort, trusts, land law and, even, criminal law. At the same time, perhaps without us realising it, insurance has now become central to life in the Western world. We take out life insurance, motor insurance, household insurance (which, like motor insurance, includes liability insurance), insurance against the cost of repairing goods (like the washing machine), travel insurance, personal accident insurance and payment protection insurance. In the business world, insurance against loss or liability can be found for any activity engaged in under the sun.

Yet the two legal worlds, that of the laws of obligations and that of the law of insurance, have always remained strangely apart. Thus, the received view of the law was that matters concerning insurance cover should be ignored when considering who the claimant is or his right to substantial damages or whether the defendant was being funded by an insurer. The fact that the claimant was actually a subrogated insurer and the defence was being maintained by the defendant's liability insurer have traditionally been treated as the unacknowledged elephants in the court room.

And the academic study of the laws of obligations and of insurance have maintained this curious divide. Insurance law is, traditionally, seen as something esoteric, an "add-on" to the general study of the laws of obligations and a subject that might be examined as an optional extra after the basics of the laws of obligations have been mastered.

This book is a trail-blazer because it challenges all these traditional attitudes and approaches. It demonstrates that insurance is central to the laws of obligations and how it has moulded the development of the common law of contract and tort in particular. So the authors ask such fundamental issues as how insurance has influenced the development of the law of tort, quite apart from the vexed questions raised by mesothelioma and asbestosis cases; how it has influenced the development of contractual obligations, particularly in business areas such as development and construction and oil and gas where, often, there are multi-parties all having insurance of various forms. The authors ask the pertinent question: is our attitude to the interpretation of commercial contracts and to tortious liability actually influenced by the knowledge of where and how the parties are covered by insurance; and if it is, is it not time this was acknowledged frankly?

The authors also analyse how the presence of insurance has fundamentally effected the evolution of both the practice and the substance of litigation. It is easy to forget that in many commercial cases it is an insurer who sues (in the name of the claimant) by right of subrogation and the defendant's case is actually being conducted by its liability insurer because the law has always insisted that be disregarded. The authors ask

whether it is time that we recognise the central position that insurance takes in the way legal disputes are decided.

In one single volume the authors enable the reader to understand the philosophical basis of the law of insurance, the key practical aspects of insurance and re-insurance and, through a broad based analysis of different topics, where and how insurance and the law of insurance is now an intrinsic part of our laws of obligations. This book should be read by all scholars and practitioners who are concerned with the laws of obligations, insurance or both. It will shake them out of their insularity, make them question some of their pre-conceptions and provide much material for new debate and argument.

It might even make the judges have a rethink and some might say "about time too"!

Sir Richard Aikens  
Lord Justice of Appeal



## Preface

Ask any practising lawyer to describe the role of insurance in her or his professional activities, and the almost inevitable response will be: 'Pervasive'. The lawyer must have liability insurance just to participate in the profession, and it is important to monitor potential third-party claims so that they can be notified to insurers and so that information can be gathered for renewal negotiations. Everyday conveyancing requires the purchaser to be protected by insurance against the risk of destruction between contract and conveyance, and if funding is to be obtained from a mortgagee then there will be a demand for insurance protection over the secured property given that it is likely to be the borrower's major asset. Establishing a family trust entails obtaining professional indemnity insurance for the trustees, and setting up a company—whether family or multinational—entails obtaining directors' and officers' liability insurance for present and future incumbents. A personal injury victim will almost inevitably be seeking to recover any award of damages from the liability insurers of the tortfeasor, and it may be necessary to make immediate contact with those insurers to make sure that they are aware of the proceedings as well as ascertaining from the victim whether he or she has insurance funding for the litigation. Other victims seeking to recover damages for property or financial losses will be advised that it may only be worth pursuing a defendant who is insured, and in many such cases the victim will have first-party insurers who will pay losses and then seek to recoup their outlay by subrogation proceedings. Moving to the world of commercial transactions—sales, construction, licensing and the rest—contract negotiations inevitably involve agreement between the parties on the allocation of risks, who is to bear them, and who is to insure against them. The lawyer, in the same way as any other person tendering for work, may well have to satisfy the other party that there is adequate liability insurance in place to cover risk of loss.

All of these matters are about risk. If a party faces the risk of injury or loss, insurance will be taken out by way of protection. If a party is at risk of inflicting harm, insurance will be obtained to fund any award of damages. If the parties are entering a contractual relationship, they will determine where risks lie. The desire either to shift risk, or to protect against it where it cannot be shifted, is shared by most. The law of obligations, embracing both contract and tort, has to be seen in this context.

If it is the case that litigation is conducted or funded by insurers, damages are generally paid by insurers, and the very incidence of liability is underpinned by insurance, why is it also the case that the relevance of insurance is ignored, and indeed often denied, in analyses of the law of obligations? Academic orthodoxy, to begin with a focus on tort law, has the starting point that tort liability (or non-liability) is dictated by personal responsibility, and that the duty and standard of care, and indeed causation, in any one case have to be determined by principle and not by wider distributive notions. If that is right for tort, then it follows that contract liability should be determined in the same way. Insurance, therefore, is a personal decision and is the mechanism for enforcement and the spreading of loss throughout society rather than the driver of

liability. The fortuitous presence or absence of insurance therefore tells us nothing about how legal principle should be developed.

This book argues that the orthodox approach should be reappraised. We suggest that an entirely different vision is possible if the starting point is relational. All contracts to a greater or lesser extent encompass risk allocation, and such allocation, varying with the degree of the contract's complexity, rests upon explicit insuring duties or implicit understandings as to how insurance is to be arranged. Of course risk allocation is not perfect, and the unforeseen is inevitable, but the agreed or assumed incidence of insurance may inform the court in ascertaining the objective intentions of the parties. Moving from there to tort, we then suggest that tort liabilities are relational to a far greater extent than has been recognized. Professional negligence claims, actions against suppliers or contractors and employment injuries all spring from contracts. Actions against neighbours, local authorities, medical practitioners and road users are, to a lesser and less obvious extent, also relational. It is only rarely that a novel situation, calling for the application of principle or legal policy in the absence of a familiar or agreed risk allocation, arises. Our analysis of insurance thus extends from the accepted distributional role to the equally significant but under-analysed relational role.

It may be appreciated that our analysis differs in one fundamental respect from much of what has gone before, and that is that we regard legal principle not as an overarching imposition of personal responsibility but, in many relationships, as a default mechanism. If the parties can agree which of them should bear a risk, and they act accordingly, then as long as there are no public policy considerations and no harm is inflicted on third parties there is no reason for high principle to intervene and to reverse their arrangements (particularly where it thereby allows a particular party, often an insurer, to subvert those arrangements). Other, social mechanisms with an influence on the allocation of risks are also sometimes in play. If particular activities raise familiar hazards (such as employing or driving), insurance may, as a matter of public policy, be demanded by the state. In the case of driving, the form of that insurance has been closely defined. We are of the view that the academic focus on the exceptional rather than the mundane distorts the portrayal of the significance of insurance in and to the law of obligations. That point has been made before in relation to the mass of cases which never reach court and are dealt with instead through routine settlement processes heavily influenced by insurance and insurers. Here we extend the point, in relation to the shaping of litigation and of legal doctrine.

The most fundamental objection to the doctrinal relevance of insurance perhaps stems from a fear that the ability of a person to insure, rather than legal principle and notions of personal responsibility, will thereby come to determine whether that person owes or is owed a duty or enhanced standard of care. We suggest that this objection has no part to play where the incidence of established risks has been agreed or understood: if the legal system regularly trumps those arrangements or understandings, the response will be that both potential claimants and potential defendants will have to insure, thereby unnecessarily increasing the cost of their activities. Our suggestion is, therefore, that once risks have been ascertained (by agreement or by law), the allocation arrangements (backed by insurance) adopted to deal with them should be honoured and not disregarded. Looking at that allocation explains a lot about the outcome of



contract and tort cases. But to bring insurance out from the shadows may assist understanding of legal principles in a range of other ways, also. Certainly, it should assist in understanding the way that claims are framed—yet the framing of claims has been promoted within formalist approaches as an expression of the pure bipartite (or bipolar) relationship between two parties. It will also draw more attention to the boundaries of acceptable risk-shifting and loss-spreading, and therefore to different aspects of the idea of ‘responsibility’, such as wrongdoing which goes beyond mere negligence, or breaches of duty which constitute personal rather than vicarious liability. The implications of these factors for the very shape of the law have been underemphasized, because the habitual insurance of more routine risks and shortcomings (including vicariously) has also been neglected.

This book focuses on risk allocation, and also upon the role of insurance in spreading loss from the risks as allocated. It is not a treatise on insurance law, but rather a discussion of why insurance matters to obligations lawyers and why disregarding insurance removes our understanding of a key element in how the law actually works, and how its principles are developed and deployed. As we were writing, developments in the law seemed to us to sustain our view. In particular, the prolonged development of mesothelioma litigation, the dispute as to whether expert witnesses should have immunity from suit, and the enhanced focus on the operation of compulsory motor insurance, all gave us the opportunity to extend our analysis to matters of current concern. At the end of the day, we also hope that our analysis will help to equip obligations lawyers to make their own distinct contribution to the study of insurance as an important social institution.

We owe thanks to a number of individuals and organizations. Jenny owes a large debt of thanks to the Leverhulme Trust, whose funding through a Major Research Fellowship on ‘Liability, Insurance, and Society’ has secured the necessary research leave in which to develop the ideas in this book, and to York Law School for its support. We have had the help of a large number of colleagues in getting the book to completion. In the closing stages, Charlie Bishop gave us invaluable assistance in the preparation of the manuscript. Before that, various of the chapters were read in draft form and we benefited immeasurably from comments received from an almost embarrassing number of people. Though none should be held responsible for emerging arguments, many thanks are due to Kit Barker, Jill Poole, Paula Giliker, Bob Lee, James Goudkamp, Matt Dyson, Malcolm Clarke, Andrew Tettenborn, Paul Mitchell, Jamie Lee, Phillip Morgan, TT Arvind, and Carol Forrest, for their help and generosity in this respect. Meixian Song provided valuable research assistance on the history of workers’ compensation. We would also like to thank the team at Oxford University Press, particularly Natasha Flemming and Emma Brady, for keeping this project on track so professionally at a very busy time. And, finally, we would like to thank our families. Jenny is grateful as ever to Adrian, Joe, and Theo for sharing valuable time with another book, and Rob is similarly grateful to Barbara for her accustomed forbearance.

## *List of Abbreviations*

ABI	Association of British Insurers
AIDA	International Association of Insurance Law
AIG	American International Group, Inc
APIL	Association of Personal Injury Lawyers
ART	Alternative Risk Transfer
ATE	After the Event
BIA	British Insurers Association
BTE	Before the Event
CFA	Conditional Fee Agreement
CJEU	Court of Justice of the European Union
CLC	International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage 1992
COBS	Conduct of Business Sourcebook
CP	Consultation Paper
CPR	Civil Procedure Rules
CRU	Compensation Recovery Unit (of the DWP)
D&O	Directors and Officers
DWP	Department for Work and Pensions
ECGD	Export Credit and Guarantee Department
EIB	Employers Insurance Bureau
EIL	Environmental Impact/Impairment Liability
EL	Employers' Liability
EQC	Earthquake Commission
ERISA	Employee Retirement Income Security Act 1974
FCA	Financial Conduct Authority
FOS	Financial Ombudsman Scheme
FSA	Financial Services Authority
FSCS	Financial Services Compensation Scheme
FSMA 2000	Financial Services and Markets Act 2000
GFC	Global Financial Crisis
GIBKR	General Insurance Broker
GISC	General Insurance Standards Council
HRA	Human Rights Act 1998
IBRC	Insurance Brokers Registration Council
ICOBS	Insurance Conduct of Business Sourcebook
INSPRU	Prudential Sourcebook for Insurers
IOB	Insurance Ombudsman Bureau
IUA	Insurance Underwriting Association
JCT	Joint Contracts Tribunal
LC	Law Commission
LCCD	Law Commission Consultation Document
LCCP	Law Commission Consultation Paper
LCIP	Law Commission Issue Paper
LEI	Legal Expenses Insurance
LMX	London Market Excess

MASS	Motor Accident Solicitors Society
MIB	Motor Insurers' Bureau
MII	Mortgagees' Interest Insurance
MMI	Municipal Mutual Insurance
OFT	Office of Fair Trading
ORSA	Own Risk and Solvency Assessment
P&I	Protection and Indemnity
PL	Public Liability
PPI	Payment Protection Insurance
PRA	Prudential Regulatory Authority
PRIN	Principles for Business
QOCS	Qualified One-way Costs Shifting
RDC	Running-Down Clause
RTA	Road Traffic Act
SPE	Special Purpose Entity
SRP	Supervisory Review Process
SSA	Social Sciences Association
SUP	Supervision
TNA	The National Archives
URDG	Uniform Rules on Demand Guarantee

# Contents

<i>Table of Cases</i>	xiv
<i>Table of Statutes</i>	xxxiv
<i>Table of Statutory Instruments</i>	xxxviii
<i>Table of EU Legislation</i>	xxxix
<i>Table of International Agreements</i>	xl
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xli

## PART 1 ESSENTIALS

<b>1. Introduction: Insurance in the Law of Obligations</b>	3
1.1 Our Aim	3
1.2 Insurance and Risk	5
1.3 Challenges	6
1.4 Obligations	10
1.5 Structure	13
<b>2. Characterizing Insurance</b>	17
2.1 Introduction: Actuarial or Relational?	17
2.2 In Search of the Nature of Insurance	25
2.3 Insurance and Responsibility	30
2.4 Uncertainty and Speculation	31
2.5 Conclusions	34
<b>3. Insurance Contracts and Insurance Market</b>	37
3.1 Introduction	37
3.2 When is a Contract One of Insurance?	38
3.3 Principles of Insurance Contract Law: an Introduction	44
3.4 The Development of Risks and the Market for Insurance	56
3.5 Liability Insurance and Liability	63
3.6 Does Liability Influence Liability Insurance?	73
3.7 Conclusions	76
<b>4. Regulatory Dimensions</b>	77
4.1 Introduction and Significance	77
4.2 Regulating the Insurance Activity	78
4.3 Protecting Policyholders: the Public Law Approach	87
4.4 Conclusions	93

## PART 2 OPERATION

<b>5. Subrogation</b>	97
5.1 Introduction	97
5.2 The Issues Illustrated	102

5.3 The Basis of Insurer Subrogation	106
5.4 Operation and Limits	115
5.5 Exclusion of Life and Personal Injury Policies	118
5.6 Reflections on Risk Allocation and Loss Distribution	128
5.7 Conclusions	136
<b>6. Loss-Spreading</b>	139
6.1 Introduction	139
6.2 Some Misconceptions About Loss-Spreading	139
6.3 Contribution Between Insurers	141
6.4 Reinsurance	146
6.5 Riot Damages: Market or Community Loss-Bearing?	157
6.6 State and Market	159
<b>7. Allocation of Risk in Voluntary Arrangements</b>	163
7.1 Introduction: Contracting and Insurance	163
7.2 Common Concerns	168
7.3 Insuring Against the Risk of Insolvency	170
7.4 Risk Allocation and Insurance in Contracts	176
7.5 Risk Allocation and Defective Performance	179
7.6 Construction Contracts: a Case Study	194
7.7 Conclusions	201
<b>8. Allocation of Risk and Tort Law</b>	203
8.1 Introduction	203
8.2 Overview: Tort Reasoning and Risk Allocation	212
8.3 'Contractual Matrix' Cases: Tort and Party Risk Structure	217
8.4 Advice	228
8.5 Public Authorities and Risk Allocation	235
8.6 Duties to Employees	247
8.7 Conclusions: Duties, Remedies, and Risks	250
<b>9. Compulsory Liability Insurance</b>	251
9.1 Introduction	251
9.2 Significance and Extent	256
9.3 Compulsory Insurance for Motor Vehicles	261
9.4 Compulsory Employers' Liability Insurance	280
9.5 Conclusions	297

### PART 3 APPLICATIONS

<b>10. Vicarious Liability</b>	301
10.1 Introduction	301
10.2 Nature and Boundaries	304
10.3 Risk Allocation and Loss-Spreading	310
10.4 Loss-Spreading and Insurance in Vicarious Liability	318
10.5 Vicarious Liability and Contractual Structure	323
10.6 Insurance and Vicarious Liability: Conclusions	328



<b>11. Insurance and Illegal Conduct</b>	<b>329</b>
11.1 Introduction	329
11.2 Principles Governing Illegality	331
11.3 Claims Against Policyholders	339
11.4 Claims Against Insurers	347
11.5 Conclusions	360
<b>12. The Asbestos Litigation</b>	<b>363</b>
12.1 The Issues	363
12.2 Establishing Liability in Tort	365
12.3 Insurance Coverage	367
12.4 Claims Against and Between Insurers	376
12.5 Conclusions	381
<b>13. Insurance in Litigation</b>	<b>383</b>
13.1 Insurance and the Shaping of Litigation	383
13.2 Funding Litigation	386
13.3 Defending Litigation by Liability Insurance	393
13.4 Liability Insurance as a Means of Enforcing Judgments	395
13.5 Concluding Thoughts	405
<b>Index</b>	<b>407</b>

# Table of Cases

A v Hoare and other appeals [2008] UKHL 6; [2008] 2 WLR 311 .....	215, 321
AA Mutual Insurance Co Ltd, Re [2004] EWHC 2430 (Ch); [2004] All ER (D) 34 (Dec).....	40
Ace Insurance Ltd v Metropolitan Electrical Appliance Manufacturers Co Ltd [2009] HKCFI 1132 .....	394
Ackman and Scher v Policyholders Protection Board [1993] 2 WLR 479 .....	81
Adams v Andrews [1964] 2 QB 347.....	275
Adams v Lindsell (1818) 1 B & Ald 681.....	177
Aegis Electrical and Gas International Services Co Ltd v Continental Casualty Co [2007] EWHC 1762 (Comm); [2008] Lloyd's Rep IR17 .....	154
AES-3c & Maritza East 1 EOOD v Credit Agricole Corporate and Investment Bank [2011] EWHC 123 (TCC); [2011] All ER (D) 30 (Feb).....	188
AG v Dulghieru [2009] EWHC 225 (QB); [2009] All ER (D) 194 (Feb) .....	348
AIG Group UK Ltd v The Ethniki [1999] Lloyd's Rep IR 221 .....	151
Aiken v Stewart Wrightson Ltd [1995] 1 WLR 1281.....	84, 85
Ailsa Craig Fishing Co Ltd v Malvern Fishing Co Ltd [1983] 1 WLR 964 .....	192
Aioi Nissay Dowa Insurance Co Ltd v Heraldglen Ltd [2013] EWHC 154 (Comm); [2013] All ER (D) 102 (Feb).....	72, 376
Albert Life, Re (1871) LR 14 Eq 72 .....	79
Alexander and Another v Tredegar Iron & Coal Co Ltd [1945] AC 286; [1945] 2 All ER 275 .....	282
Alfred McAlpine v BAI (Run-off) Ltd [2000] 1 Lloyd's Rep 437 .....	401
Allen v London Guarantee and Accident Co Ltd (1912) 28 TLR 254.....	71
Allied Dunbar Assurance plc, Re [2005] EWHC 28 (Ch); [2005] All ER (D) 129 (Jan).....	82
Allobrogia Steamship Corporation, Re [1979] 1 Lloyd's Rep 190 .....	42, 400
Aluminium Industrie Vaassen BV v Rompalpa Aluminium [1976] 1 WLR 676 .....	171
Amaca Pty Ltd v McGrath [2011] NSWSC 90.....	150
American Centennial Insurance Co v INSCO Ltd [1996] LRLR 407 .....	72
American Surety Co of New York v Wrightson (1910) 103 LT 663 .....	145
Amoi Electronics Co Ltd v Kin Cheung Transportation (Hong Kong) Co Ltd [2010] HKDC 31 .....	185
Anns v Merton [1978] AC 728.....	213, 235, 237
Appledore Ferguson Shipbuilders Ltd v Stone Vickers Ltd [1992] 2 Lloyd's Rep 578 .....	200
Arab Bank plc v Zurich Insurance Co [1999] Lloyd's Rep IR 262.....	173
Arbitration between Coleman's Depositories Ltd and the Life and Health Assurance Association, Re An [1907] 2 KB 798 .....	75
Argo Systems FZE v Liberty Insurance (Pte) [2011] EWHC 301 (Comm); [2011] 2 Lloyd's Rep 61 .....	178
Arkansas Department of Health and Human Services c Ahlborn 547 US 268 (2006) .....	126
Arkin v Borchard Lines Ltd [2005] EWCA Civ 655; [2005] 1 WLR 3055 .....	384
Arthur J S Hall & Co v Simons [2002] 1 AC 615; [2000] 3 WLR 543 .....	179
Ashmore v Society of Lloyd's (No 2) [1992] 2 Lloyd's Rep 620 .....	85
Ashton v Turner [1981] 1 QB 137; [1980] 3 WLR 736 .....	344
Ashworth v Peterborough United Football Club [2002] EWHC 9004 (Costs).....	389
Ashworth v Stanwix (1860) 3 E & E 701 .....	307
Aspen Insurance UK Ltd v Pectel Ltd [2008] EWHC 2804 (Comm); [2009] Lloyd's Rep IR 440 ...	75
Assicurazioni Generali SpA v CGU International Insurance plc [2004] EWCA Civ 429; [2004] Lloyd's Rep IR 457.....	153, 154
Associated Japanese Bank (International) Ltd v Credit du Nord [1989] 1 WLR 255 .....	177

AstraZeneca Insurance Company Ltd v XL Insurance (Bermuda) Ltd [2013]	
EWHC 349 (Comm); [2013] All ER (D) 08 (Mar) .....	49, 152, 395
Auckland District Law Society v DA Constable Syndicate 386 (2010) 16 ANZ	
Insurance Cases 61 .....	394
Austin v Zurich General Accident & Liability Insurance Co Ltd [1945] KB 250;	
[1945] 1 All ER 316 .....	143
Auty v NCB [1985] 1 WLR 784 .....	128
Avandero (UK) Ltd v National Transit Insurance Co Ltd [1984] 2 Lloyd's Rep 613 .....	401
AXA General Insurance Ltd v HM Advocate [2011] UKSC 46; [2011] 3 WLR 871 .....	365
Axa Insurance Co v Gottlieb [2005] EWCA Civ 112; [2005] Lloyd's Rep IR 369 .....	54
Axa Insurance Ltd v Akhter & Darby Solicitors [2009] EWCA Civ 1166; [2010]	
1 WLR 1662 .....	388
Axa Reinsurance (UK) plc v Field [1996] 3 All ER 517; [1996] 1 WLR 1026 .....	72, 149
Axa Sun Life Services plc v Campbell Martin Ltd [2011] EWCA Civ 133; [2011]	
2 Lloyd's Rep 1 .....	191
AXN v Worboys [2012] EWHC 1730 (QB); [2012] All ER (D) 212 (Jun) .....	270, 353, 359
Bacardi-Martini Beverages Ltd v Thomas Hardy Packaging [2002] EWCA Civ 549;	
[2002] 2 All ER (Comm) 335 .....	193
Baker v Black Sea [1998] UKHL 18; [1998] 1 WLR 974 .....	151
Ball v Street [2005] EWCA Civ 76 .....	205
Ballast plc, Re St Paul Travellers Insurance Co Ltd v Dargan [2006] EWHC 3189 (Ch);	
[2007] Lloyd's Rep IR 742 .....	117, 118
Balmoral Group Ltd v Borealis (UK) Ltd [2006] 2 Lloyd's Rep 629 .....	193
Bank of Nova Scotia v Hellenic Mutual War Risks Association (Bermuda) Ltd [1988]	
1 Lloyd's Rep 514 .....	98
Bank of Nova Scotia v Hellenic Mutual War Risks Association (Bermuda) Ltd,	
The Good Luck, [1992] 1 AC 233 .....	171
Banque Bruxelles Lambert v Eagle Star [1997] AC 141 .....	214
Banque Financière de la Cité v Parc Battersea (Ltd) [1999] 1 AC 221 .....	107, 108
Barker v Corus [2006] UKHL 20; [2006] 2 AC 572 .....	363–4, 365, 366, 367, 374, 375, 376, 377, 379, 381, 382
Barnes v Nunnery Colliery Co Ltd [1912] AC 44 .....	289
Barr v Biffa Waste Services Ltd [2009] EWHC 1033 (TCC); [2010] Lloyd's Rep IR 428 .....	389
Barrett v Kemp Brothers [1904] 1 KB 517 .....	287
Bartoline v Royal & Sun Alliance Ins Plc [2006] EWHC 3598 (QB); [2007]	
Lloyd's Rep IR 423 .....	61
Bartonshill Coal Co v Reid (1958) 3 Macq 266 .....	282
Bazley v Curry (1999) 2 SCR 534 .....	306
Beacon Insurance Co Ltd v Langdale [1939] 4 All ER 204 .....	394
Beazley Underwriting Ltd v Travelers Companies Inc [2011] EWHC 1520 (Comm);	
[2012] Lloyd's Rep IR 78 .....	73, 179, 270
Bedford Insurance Co Ltd v Instituto de Resseguros do Brasil [1985] QB 966 .....	81
Bedfordshire Police Authority v Constable [2008] EWHC 1375 (Comm); [2009]	
Lloyd's Rep IR 39 .....	158, 159
Bee v Jenson (No 2) [2007] EWCA Civ 923; [2008] Lloyd's Rep IR 221 .....	117
Beresford v Royal Exchange Assurance Co [1938] AC 586; [1938] 2 All ER 602 .....	330, 337
Berrimans Rose Thompson Young [1996] LRLR 426 .....	85
Berry v Ashtead Plant Hire Co Ltd [2011] EWCA Civ 1304 .....	249
Bishop v Pentland (1827) 7 B & C 219 .....	65
Bist v London and South Western Railway [1907] AC 209 .....	289
Blatchford v Staddon [1927] AC 461 .....	288
Bosfinger v Kingsway Group [2009] HCA 44 .....	101

Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council v Municipal Mutual Insurance Ltd [2006]	
EWCA Civ 50; [2006] 1 WLR 1492 .....	69, 145, 236, 369–70, 371, 372, 373
Bonner v Cox Dedicated Corporate Member Ltd [2005] EWCA Civ 1512; [2006]	
2 Lloyd's Rep 152 .....	151
Booth v White 2003, unreported .....	262
Boral Resources (Qld) Pty Ltd v Pyke [1992] 2 Qd R 25 .....	135
Bourton v Beauchamp [1920] AC 1001 .....	289
Bovis Construction Ltd v Commercial Union Assurance [2001] Lloyd's	
Rep IR 321 .....	111, 144, 145
Bovis Lend Lease v Saillard Fuller and Partners (2001) 77 Con LR 134 .....	144
BP Exploration Operating Co Ltd v Kvaerner Oilfield Products Ltd [2004]	
EWHC 999 (Comm); [2005] 1 Lloyd's Rep 307 .....	200
Bradburn v Great Western Railway (1874) LR 10 Ex 1 .....	98, 121, 122, 123, 124
Bradley v Eagle Star Insurance Co [1989] AC 957; [1989] 2 WLR 568 .....	397, 401
Bradley and Essex and Suffolk Accident Indemnity Society, Re [1912] 1 KB 415 .....	75
Bramley Moore, The [1964] 2 WLR 259; [1963] 2 Lloyd's Rep 429 .....	66
Bretton v Hancock [2005] EWCA Civ 404; [2005] Lloyd's Rep IR 454 .....	268
Bridge v Grand Junction Railway Co (1838) 3 M & W 245 .....	314
Bristol Alliance Ltd Partnership v Williams [2011] EWHC 1657 (QB); [2012]	
Lloyd's Rep IR 285 .....	352
Brit Syndicates Ltd v Italaudit SpA [2008] UKHL 18; [2008] Lloyd's Rep IR 601 .....	173
British Arab Commercial Bank plc v Bank of Communications [2011] EWHC 281	
(Comm); [2011] 1 Lloyd's Rep 664 .....	189
British Credit Trust Holdings v UK Insurance Ltd [2003] EWHC 2404 (Comm);	
[2004] 1 All ER (Comm) 444 .....	175
British Eagle International Air Lines Ltd v Compagnie Nationale Air France [1975]	
1 WLR 758 .....	170
British Telecommunication plc v James Thomson & Sons Ltd [1999] 1 WLR 9 .....	226, 227, 228
British Waterways v Royal & Sun Alliance Insurance plc [2012] EWHC 460	
(Comm) ); [2012] Lloyd's Rep IR 562 .....	45, 269, 270
Britvic Soft Drinks v Messer UK Ltd [2002] EWCA Civ 548; [2002] 2 All ER	
(Comm) 321 .....	193
Broderick v London County Council [1908] 2 KB 807 .....	288
Brooks v Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis [2005] UKHL 24; [2005]	
1 WLR 1495 .....	220
Brown v KMR Services Ltd [1995] 2 Lloyd's Rep 513 .....	84
Brown v Roberts [1965] 1 QB 1 .....	267
Brown-Quinn v Equity Syndicate Management Ltd [2012] EWCA Civ 1633 .....	387
Bunney v Burns Anderson plc [2007] EWHC 1240 (Ch); [2008] Lloyd's Rep IR 198 .....	89
Burr v Theatre Royal, Drury Lane Ltd [1907] 1 KB 544 .....	282
Bush v Steinman (1799) 1 B & P 404 .....	311, 312
Busk v Royal Exchange Assurance Co (1818) 2 B & Ald 73 .....	65
Butterfield v Forrester (1809) 11 East 60 .....	314
Butters v BBC Worldwide Ltd [2009] EWHC 1954 (Ch) .....	177
Cakebread v Hopping Brothers [1947] KB 641 .....	335
Caledonia North Sea Ltd v British Telecommunications Plc, [2002] UKHL 4; [2002]	
1 Lloyd's Rep 553 .....	102, 103, 104–5, 112, 114, 115, 131, 183, 204, 324
Callaghan v Dominion Insurance Co [1997] 2 Lloyd's Rep 541 .....	41
Callery v Gray [2002] UKHL 28; [2002] 1 WLR 2000 .....	389
Callery v Gray (No 2) [2001] EWCA Civ 1246; [2001] 1 WLR 2142 .....	389