

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

MARIO D. CHORAK, DMD, P.S., individually
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

HARTFORD CASUALTY INSURANCE
COMPANY,

Defendant.

No.

COMPLAINT-CLASS ACTION

JURY DEMAND

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff, MARIO D. CHORAK, DMD, P.S. (“CHORAK”), individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated members of the defined national class (the “Class Members”), by and through the undersigned attorneys, brings this class action against Defendant Hartford Casualty Insurance Company (“Hartford” or “Defendant”) and alleges as follows based on personal knowledge and information and belief:

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d), because at least one Class member is of diverse citizenship

1 from Defendant, there are 100 or more Class members nationwide, and the aggregate amount in
2 controversy exceeds \$5,000,000. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state
3 law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

4 2. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(3) because the
5 Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant, a substantial portion the alleged wrongdoing
6 occurred in this District and the state of Washington, and Defendant has sufficient contacts with
7 this District and the state of Washington.

8 3. Venue is proper in the Western District of Washington pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
9 § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims at
10 issue in this Complaint arose in this District. Plaintiff's businesses are located in Seattle, King
11 County. This action is therefore appropriately filed in the Seattle Division because a substantial
12 portion of the events giving rise to this lawsuit arose in King County.

13 **III. PARTIES**

14 4. Plaintiff, Mario D. Chorak, DMD, P.S., is an orthodontic business with locations
15 at 14300 SE Petrovitsky Road, Renton, Washington, and 3022 78th Avenue SE, Mercer Island,
16 Washington.

17 5. Defendant Hartford Casualty Insurance Company is an insurance carrier
18 incorporated and domiciled in the State of Indiana, with its principal place of business in
19 Hartford, Connecticut.

20 **IV. NATURE OF THE CASE**

21 6. Due to COVID-19 and a state-ordered mandated closure, Plaintiff cannot provide
22 dental orthodontic services. Plaintiff intended to rely on its business insurance to keep its
23 business as a going concern. This lawsuit is filed to ensure that Plaintiff and other similarly-
24
25
26

1 situated policyholders receive the insurance benefits to which they are entitled and for which
2 they paid.

3 7. Defendant Hartford issued one or more insurance policies to Plaintiff, including
4 Spectrum Business Owners Policy and related endorsements, insuring Plaintiff's property and
5 business practice and other coverages, with effective dates of June 27, 2019 to June 27, 2020.

6 8. Plaintiff's business property includes property owned and/or leased by Plaintiff
7 and used for general business purposes for the specific purpose of dental orthodontics and other
8 business activities.

9 9. Defendant Hartford's insurance policy issued to Plaintiff promises to pay
10 Plaintiff for "direct physical loss of or physical damage to" to covered property.

11 10. Defendant Hartford's insurance policy issued to Plaintiff includes Business
12 Income Coverage, Extra Expense Coverage, Extended Business Income Coverage and Civil
13 Authority Coverage.

14 11. Plaintiff paid all premiums for the coverage when due.

15 12. On or about January 2020, the United States of America saw its first cases of
16 persons infected by COVID-19, which has been designated a worldwide pandemic.

17 13. In light of this pandemic, Washington Governor Jay Inslee issued certain
18 proclamations and orders affecting many persons and businesses in Washington, whether
19 infected with COVID-19 or not, requiring certain public health precautions. Among other
20 things, Governor Inslee's "Stay Home, Stay Healthy" order required the closure of all non-
21 essential businesses, including Plaintiff's business.

22 14. By order of Governor Inslee, orthodontists including Plaintiff were prohibited
23 from practicing orthodontics but for urgent and emergency procedures.
24

1 15. Plaintiff's property sustained direct physical loss and/or damage related to
2 COVID-19 and/or the proclamations and orders.

3 16. Plaintiff's property will continue to sustain direct physical loss or damage
4 covered by the Hartford policy or policies, including but not limited to business interruption,
5 extra expense, interruption by civil authority, and other expenses.

6 17. Plaintiff's property cannot be used for its intended purposes.

7
8 18. As a result of the above, Plaintiff has experienced and will experience loss
9 covered by the Hartford policy or policies.

10 19. Upon information and belief, Hartford has denied or will deny all similar claims
11 for coverage.

12 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

13 20. This matter is brought by Plaintiff on behalf of itself and those similarly situated,
14 under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(b)(1), 23(b)(2), and 23(b)(3).

15 21. The Classes that Plaintiff seeks to represent are defined at this time as:

16
17 A. ***Business Income Breach of Contract Class:*** All persons and entities in
18 the United States insured under a Hartford policy with Business Income Coverage who
19 suffered a suspension of their practice at the covered premises related to COVID-19
20 and/or orders issued by Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or other civil authorities
21 and whose Business Income claim was denied by Hartford.

22 B. ***Business Income Declaratory Relief Class:*** All persons and entities in
23 the United States insured under a Hartford policy with Business Income Coverage who
24 suffered a suspension of their practice at the covered premises related to COVID-19
25 and/or orders issued by Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or other civil authorities.
26

1 C. ***Extended Business Income Breach of Contract Class:*** All persons and
2 entities in the United States insured under a Hartford policy with Extended Business
3 Income Coverage who suffered a suspension of their business at the covered premises
4 related to COVID-19 and/or orders issued by Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or
5 other civil authorities and whose Extended Business Income claim was denied by
6 Hartford.

7 D. ***Extended Business Income Declaratory Relief Class:*** All persons and
8 entities in the United States insured under a Hartford policy with Extended Business
9 Income Coverage who suffered a suspension of their business at the covered premises
10 related to COVID-19 and/or orders issued by Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or
11 other civil authorities.
12

13 E. ***Extra Expense Breach of Contract Class:*** All persons and entities in the
14 United States insured under a Hartford policy with Extra Expense Coverage who sought
15 to minimize losses from the suspension of their business at the covered premises in
16 connection with COVID-19 and/or orders issued by Governor Inslee, other Governors,
17 and/or other civil authorities and whose Extra Expense claim was denied by Hartford.
18

19 F. ***Extra Expense Declaratory Relief Class:*** All persons and entities in the
20 United States insured under a Hartford policy with Extra Expense Coverage who sought
21 to minimize losses from the suspension of their business at the covered premises in
22 connection with COVID-19 and/or orders issued by Governor Inslee, other Governors,
23 and/or other civil authorities.
24

25 G. ***Civil Authority Breach of Contract Class:*** All persons and entities in the
26 United States insured under a Hartford policy with Civil Authority Coverage who

1 suffered a suspension of their practice and/or extra expense at the covered premises
2 related to COVID-19 and/or orders issued by Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or
3 other civil authorities and whose Civil Authority claim was denied by Hartford.

4 H. **Civil Authority Declaratory Relief Class:** All persons and entities in the
5 United States insured under a Hartford policy with Civil Authority Coverage who
6 suffered a suspension of their practice at the covered premises related to COVID-19
7 and/or orders issued by Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or other civil authorities.
8

9 22. Excluded from the Classes are Defendant's officers, directors, and employees;
10 the judicial officers and associated court staff assigned to this case; and the immediate family
11 members of such officers and staff. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the Class definitions
12 based on information obtained in discovery.

13 23. This action may properly be maintained on behalf of each proposed Class under
14 the criteria of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

15 24. **Numerosity:** The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all
16 members would be impractical. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the proposed Class
17 contains thousands of members. The precise number of class members can be ascertained
18 through discovery, which will include Defendant's records of policyholders.
19

20 25. **Commonality and Predominance:** Common questions of law and fact
21 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Common
22 questions include, but are not limited to, the following:
23

24 A. Whether the class members suffered covered losses based on common
25 policies issued to members of the Class;
26

1 B. Whether Hartford acted in a manner common to the class and wrongfully
2 denied claims for coverage relating to COVID-19 and/or orders issued by Governor
3 Inslee, other Governors, and/or other civil authorities;

4 C. Whether Business Income Coverage in Hartford's policies of insurance
5 applies to a suspension of practice relating to COVID-19 and/or orders issued by
6 Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or other civil authorities;

7 D. Whether Extended Business Income Coverage in Hartford's policies of
8 insurance applies to a suspension of practice relating to COVID-19 and/or orders issued
9 by Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or other civil authorities;

10 E. Whether Extra Expense Coverage in Hartford's policies of insurance
11 applies to efforts to minimize a loss at the covered premises relating to COVID-19
12 and/or orders issued by Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or other civil authorities;

13 F. Whether Civil Authority Coverage in Hartford's policies of insurance
14 applies to a suspension of practice relating to COVID-19 and/or orders issued by
15 Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or civil authorities;

16 G. Whether Hartford has breached its contracts of insurance through a
17 blanket denial of all claims based on business interruption, income loss or closures
18 related to COVID-19 and/or orders issued by Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or
19 other civil authorities;

20 H. Whether, because of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff and the class
21 members have suffered damages; and if so, the appropriate amount thereof; and
22
23
24
25
26

1 I. Whether, because of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff and the class
2 members are entitled to equitable and declaratory relief, and if so, the nature of such
3 relief.

4 26. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the
5 classes. Plaintiff and all the members of the classes have been injured by the same wrongful
6 practices of Defendant. Plaintiff's claims arise from the same practices and course of conduct
7 that give rise to the claims of the members of the Class and are based on the same legal theories.

8 27. **Adequacy:** Plaintiff will fully and adequately assert and protect the interests of
9 the classes and has retained class counsel who are experienced and qualified in prosecuting class
10 actions. Neither Plaintiff nor its attorneys have any interests contrary to or in conflict with the
11 Class.

12 28. **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(1), the Risk of Inconsistent or**
13 **Varying Adjudications and Impairment to Other Class Members' Interests:** Plaintiff seeks
14 adjudication as to the interpretation, and resultant scope, of Defendant's policies, which are
15 common to all members of the class. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members
16 of the classes would risk inconsistent or varying interpretations of those policy terms and create
17 inconsistent standards of conduct for Defendant. The policy interpretations sought by Plaintiff
18 could also impair the ability of absent class members to protect their interests.

19 29. **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2), Declaratory and Injunctive Relief:**
20 Defendant acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to Plaintiff and other
21 members of the proposed classes making injunctive relief and declaratory relief appropriate on a
22 classwide basis.
23
24
25
26

1 30. **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3), Superiority:** A class action is
2 superior to all other available methods of the fair and efficient adjudication of this lawsuit.
3 While the aggregate damages sustained by the classes are likely to be in the millions of dollars,
4 the individual damages incurred by each class member may be too small to warrant the expense
5 of individual suits. Individual litigation creates a risk of inconsistent and/or contradictory
6 decisions and the court system would be unduly burdened by individual litigation of such cases.
7 A class action would result in a unified adjudication, with the benefits of economies of scale and
8 supervision by a single court.
9

10 **VI. CAUSES OF ACTION**

11 **Count One—Declaratory Judgment**

12 *(Brought on behalf of the Business Income Coverage Declaratory Relief Class,*
13 *Extended Business Income Declaratory Relief Class, Civil Authority Declaratory Relief Class,*
14 *and Extra Expense Declaratory Relief Class)*

15 31. Previous paragraphs alleged are incorporated herein.

16 32. This is a cause of action for declaratory judgment pursuant to the Declaratory
17 Judgment Act, codified at 28 U.S.C. § 2201.

18 33. Plaintiff Chorak brings this cause of action on behalf of the Business Income
19 Coverage Declaratory Relief Class, Extended Business Income Declaratory Relief Class, Civil
20 Authority Declaratory Relief Class, and Extra Expense Declaratory Relief Class.

21 34. Plaintiff Chorak seeks a declaratory judgment declaring that Plaintiff Chorak and
22 class members' losses and expenses resulting from the interruption of their business are covered
23 by the Policy.

24 35. Plaintiff Chorak seeks a declaratory judgment declaring that Hartford is
25 responsible for timely and fully paying all such claims.
26

1
2
3 **Count Two—Breach of Contract**

4 *(Brought on behalf of the Business Income Coverage Breach of Contract Class,*
5 *Extended Business Income Breach of Contract Class, Civil Authority Breach of*
6 *Contract Class, and Extra Expense Breach of Contract Class)*

7 36. Previous paragraphs alleged are incorporated herein.

8 37. Plaintiff Chorak brings this cause of action on behalf of the Business Income
9 Coverage Breach of Contract Class, Extended Business Income Breach of Contract Class, Civil
10 Authority Breach of Contract Class, and Extra Expense Breach of Contract Class.

11 38. The Policy is a contract under which Plaintiff Chorak and the class paid
12 premiums to Hartford in exchange for Hartford's promise to pay plaintiff and the class for all
13 claims covered by the Policy.

14 39. Plaintiff Chorak has paid its insurance premiums.

15 40. Plaintiff submitted a claim to Hartford for the direct physical loss or damage to
16 Plaintiff's property covered under the Hartford policy related to COVID-19 and/or the
17 proclamations and orders; Hartford denied Plaintiff's claim for coverage. On information and
18 belief, Hartford has denied coverage for other similarly situated policyholders.

19 41. Denying coverage for the claim is a breach of the insurance contract.

20 42. Plaintiff Chorak is harmed by the breach of the insurance contract by Hartford.

21
22 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

23 1. A declaratory judgment that the policy or policies cover Plaintiff's losses and
24 expenses resulting from the interruption of the Plaintiff's business related to COVID-19 and/or
25 orders issued by Governor Inslee, other Governors, and/or other authorities.
26

KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.

By: s/ Amy Williams-Derry

By: s/ Lynn L. Sarko

By: s/ Ian S. Birk

By: s/ Gretchen Freeman Cappio

By: s/ Irene M. Hecht

By: s/ Maureen Falecki

Amy Williams-Derry, WSBA#28711

Lynn L. Sarko, WSBA #16569

Ian S. Birk, WSBA #31431

Gretchen Freeman Cappio, WSBA #29576

Irene M. Hecht, WSBA #11063

Maureen Falecki, WSBA#18569

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200

Seattle, WA 98101

Telephone: (206) 623-1900

Fax: (206) 623-3384

Email: awilliams-derry@kellerrohrback.com

Email: lsarko@kellerrohrback.com

Email: ibirk@kellerrohrback.com

Email: gcappio@kellerrohrback.com

Email: ihecht@kellerrohrback.com

Email: mfalecki@kellerrohrback.com

By: s/ Alison Chase

Alison Chase, *pro hac vice forthcoming*

801 Garden Street, Suite 301

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Telephone: (805) 456-1496

Fax: (805) 456-1497

Email: achase@kellerrohrback.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

4812-7213-5354, v. 1