

FILED
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

JUL 22 2020

JILL FANKHAUSER, Clerk
PORTAGE COUNTY, OH

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
PORTAGE COUNTY, OHIO**

FAMILY TACOS, LLC
627 Meredith Lane
Cuyahoga Falls, OH 44223

Plaintiff

-vs-

AUTO OWNERS INSURANCE COMPANY
6101 Anacabri Blvd.
Lansing MI, 48917

ALSO SERVE:
Michael Meadows
P.O. Box 740312
Cincinnati, OH 45274

Defendant

CASE NO.

2020CV00486

JUDGE:

PLAINTIFF'S CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT

Jury Demand Endorsed Hereon

JUDGE BECKY L. DOHERTY

Now comes Plaintiff, Family Tacos, LLC ("Plaintiff"), by and through its undersigned counsel, for its Class Action Complaint against Auto Owners Insurance Company ("Defendant"), and as grounds therefore alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff is a duly formed Limited Liability Company under Ohio law with its principal place of business located at 627 Meredith Lane, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio 44223. Plaintiff operates two restaurants in Portage County: Fresco Mexican Grill and Salsa Bar, 100 East Erie, Suite 112, Kent, Ohio 44240 and The Hub, 1074 Risman Drive, Kent, Ohio 44243.
2. Defendant is a large national property and casualty insurer, with its principal place of business in Lansing, Michigan and sells insurance in Ohio. It is an insurance company authorized to do business in the State of Ohio and elsewhere.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This Honorable Court has jurisdiction over the parties and this dispute, including for declaratory relief, pursuant to Ohio Revised Code § 2307.382, *et seq.*, Ohio Revised Code § 2721.02, *et seq.* and Rule 57 of the Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure.

4. An actual controversy between Plaintiff and Defendant exists within the meaning of Ohio Revised Code § 2721.02, *et seq.* regarding whether Defendant has a duty to provide Plaintiff coverage and indemnity for, among other things, business income loss pursuant to the terms and conditions of the Defendant policy of insurance, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, as more particularly described below.

5. The Ohio General Assembly specifically provided in Ohio Revised Code § 2721.14 that "*Sections 2721.01 to 2721.15, inclusive, of the Revised Code shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate their general purpose to make the law of this state uniform with the law of those states which enact similar sections***.*"

6. Venue is proper in Portage County, Ohio under Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure 3(C)(3), 3(C)(6), and 3(F), and Ohio Revised Code § 2721.14 because Defendant conducted significant activities giving rise to Plaintiff's Claims for relief in Portage County, because a significant part of Plaintiff's claims for relief arose in Portage County, and because the declaratory relief requested herein is uniform with the laws of those states that enacted similar provisions, and wherein some Class Members reside.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

THE INSURANCE CONTRACT

7. At all relevant times, Defendant insured Plaintiff under a commercial business owner policy, bearing policy number 144603-05956970 ("Policy"). The certified Policy is in the

possession of Defendant, and while not attached hereto because it is voluminous, it is incorporated herein by reference.

8. Under the Policy, Plaintiff agreed to make premium payments to Defendant in exchange for Defendant's promise to indemnify Plaintiff for losses including, but not limited to, business income loss at their commercial property location ("Property").

9. The Policy is currently in full effect, providing property, business personal property, business income and extra expense, and additional coverages for the effective period, which includes January 1, 2020 to the present.

10. Plaintiff faithfully paid policy premiums to Defendant, specifically to provide additional coverage for "Business Income and Extra Expense Coverage" in the event of business closures by order of Civil Authority.

11. Under the Policy, insurance is extended to apply to the actual loss of business income sustained and the actual, necessary and reasonable extra expenses incurred when access to the Property is specifically prohibited by order of Civil Authority as the direct result of a covered loss to property in the immediate area of Plaintiff Property. The covered physical loss includes, without limitation, loss of use.

12. COVID-19's actual or suspected physical presence at or in the vicinity of Plaintiff Property prevent Plaintiff from making full use of the Property, especially in cases where the business must close in part or in full. Under the terms and condition of the Policy, this kind of loss constitutes a physical loss to the Property in that there has been a loss of use of the Property. Moreover, the COVID-19 virus is a "physical" thing, not an abstract fear. For example, restaurants, such as Plaintiff, forced to close due to COVID-19 in or near the restaurants have suffered a "physical loss" of use of their Property, with resulting business interruption loss.

13. Under the terms and conditions of the subject Policy, physical loss does not mean and/or require tangible "physical damage."

14. The Policy is an "all-risk" policy, in so far as it provides that a covered cause of loss under the policy means direct physical loss of or damage to the property unless the loss is specifically excluded or limited in the Policy. Here, no specific exclusion applies to reasonably justify the denial of Plaintiff' claims.

15. Based upon information and belief, Defendant has accepted the policy premiums with no intention of providing any coverage under the Policy's Business Income, Extra-Expense or Civil Authority Coverage Sections due to a loss and/or shutdown from a pandemic, i.e. the COVID-19 pandemic.

THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

16. The global COVID-19 pandemic has physically impacted both public and private property and physical spaces around the world, as well as the right of the general public to gather and utilize retail business locations. The pandemic has been exacerbated by the fact that the deadly COVID-19 physically infects and stays on surfaces of objects or materials, "fomites," for up to twenty-eight days. The scientific community in the United States and indeed, across the world, including the World Health Organization ("WHO"), has recognized that COVID- 19 is a cause of real physical loss and damage.

17. Indeed, a number of countries such as China, Italy, France, and Spain have required the fumigation of public areas prior to allowing them to re-open. A recent scientific study printed in the New England Journal of Medicine explains that the virus is detectable for up to three hours in aerosols, up to four hours on copper, up to 24 hours on cardboard boxes, and up to three days

on plastic and stainless steel.¹ Notably, the most potent form of the virus is not airborne but rather present on physical surfaces.

18. While the Policy was in force, Plaintiff sustained a loss due to coronavirus, also referred to as "COVID-19", and the Civil Authority orders issued by the Governor of Ohio that have addressed the state and nationwide spread of the coronavirus, i.e. pandemic.

19. In late 2019 and early 2020, an outbreak of respiratory illness caused by a novel COVID-19 started to infect humans across the globe. On March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization ("WHO") declared the COVID-19 outbreak a pandemic (i.e. a global outbreak of disease).

20. On January 31, 2020, under §319 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C.247d), the Secretary of Health and Human Services ("HHS") declared a public health emergency in response to COVID-19.

21. On March 11, 2020, the WHO announced that COVID-19 outbreak represented a pandemic.

22. On March 13, 2020 the President of the United States of America, Donald J. Trump, issued the Proclamation on Declaring a National Emergency Concerning the Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Outbreak ("Proclamation"), proclaiming the COVID-19 outbreak constituted a national emergency in the United States, beginning March 1, 2020.

23. Various states, including the State of Ohio, have issued and implemented mandatory Stay-At-Home Orders,² requiring business such as Plaintiff to shut down, thus

¹ See Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1, New England Journal of Medicine (March 17, 2020), available at <https://www.nejm.org/doi/pdf/10.1056/NEJMc2004973?articleTools=true>.

² At one point in time, all but nine (9) states had mandatory stay-at-home orders. Some of these orders have been modified; some remain in effect.

suffering a loss of use of their Properties, and resulting in substantial loss of business income. On March 29, 2020 President Donald J. Trump announced the extension of his Administration's social distancing guidelines until April 30, 2020.

24. On March 15, 2020, Ohio, like the majority of other states, restricted food and beverage sales to carry-out and delivery only, with no onsite consumption permitted. The stated goal of this order was to slow the pandemic by minimizing in-person interaction "in an environment with a multitude of hard surfaces." The order reiterated that "It may be possible that individuals can get COVID-19 by touching a surface or object that has the virus on it and then touching their own mouth, nose or eyes." Also that:

Previously studied human coronaviruses (including SARS, which is very closely related to COVID-19) can survive on paper, wood, glass, plastic up to 4-5 days. *Persistence of coronaviruses on inanimate surfaces and their inactivation with biocidal agents*. The Journal of Hospital Infection, March 2020, Volume 104, Issue 3, Pages 246-251.

25. Effective March 23rd, 2020, Ohio Civil Authority ordered Ohio residents to stay at home and ordered all non-essential businesses in Ohio to cease all activities. Plaintiff do not qualify as Essential Businesses, and so had to cease retail operations.

26. Coronavirus and the pandemic cause direct physical loss and property damages. COVID-19 and the Pandemic are physically impacting public and private property in Ohio and throughout the country. The executive orders issued by the Governor of Ohio, and the majority of other State Governors, in response to the pandemic have caused direct physical loss of Plaintiff and Class Members' properties.

27. After Plaintiff ceased operations and shut its business by order of the State of Ohio and Portage County, it made a claim with Defendant under the Policy's commercial/business income coverage. Defendant acknowledged the claim, assigning it claim number 300-

0090816-2020. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff anticipates that Defendant will deny the claim in the near future.

28. As of May 31, 2020, Ohio had 33,073 confirmed cases of coronavirus. Of these, 325 were reported in Portage County. Coronavirus has killed at least 2,155 people in Ohio as of the date of this filing; at least 57 from Portage County.

29. Based on the prevalence of the virus in northeast Ohio, it is probable that Plaintiff sustained direct physical loss of or damage due to the presence of coronavirus, and has unquestionably sustained direct physical loss as the result of the pandemic and/or civil authority orders issued by the Governor of Ohio.

30. Any effort by Defendant to deny the reality that the Coronavirus causes physical loss of or damage to property would constitute a false and potentially fraudulent misrepresentation that could endanger policyholders, such as Plaintiff, and the public.

31. Nonetheless, upon information and belief, Defendant intends to deny Plaintiff's Claims for business income loss, extra expense, and civil authority coverage.

32. On at least one occasion prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, Defendant used exclusionary language that specifically excluded loss or damage as a result of a pandemic.

33. Insurers, including Defendant, also had actual and express knowledge of specific coverage forms that specifically exclude losses related to pandemics and/or SARS, but Defendant failed to use those coverage forms, and Plaintiff did not contract for those coverage forms, regarding coverage under the subject Policy."

34. Had Defendant intended to exclude claims for the COVID-19 pandemic made under the subject Policy(s), it would have, and could have, included the express exclusionary language used in the past to deny claims, which specifically included the term "pandemic" and

“SARS,” but Defendant failed to do so related to the Plaintiff herein and Class Members.

35. COVID-19 is a Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome ("SARS"), and the WHO has officially named COVID-19 as SARS-CoV-2.

36. Upon information and belief, under the coverage forms at issue, Defendant will base its denial on exclusions that are not applicable to a pandemic.

37. Defendant knowingly, purposely and intentionally plans to use inapplicable exclusions to deny claims for Business Interruption, Extra Expense and Civil Authority claims related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

38. Defendant had at its disposal contractual language that specifically excluded pandemics and SARS but did not include those policy exclusions in the subject Policy(s), yet wrongfully denied claims for those very reasons.

39. Defendant has actual knowledge of the different meanings between pandemic, SARS, Virus, Bacteria and Contamination, by way of its use of those terms in previous cases and policies utilizing those different terms, and wrongfully and intentionally used the terms "virus" and "bacteria," among others, to exclude Plaintiff and Class Members' claims when, in fact, Plaintiff and Class Members' claims are, as admitted by Defendant, related to a pandemic - which is not expressly excluded in the subject policy(s).

40. Alternatively, the terms and conditions of coverage and exclusionary language relied upon by Defendant to deny Plaintiff's and Class Members' coverage under the Policy(s) related to the COVID-19 pandemic are ambiguous and, therefore, must be construed strictly against Defendant and in favor of Plaintiff and the Class Members.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

41. Plaintiff hereby restates the allegations and averments contained in the

preceding paragraphs of this Complaint, as if fully rewritten herein, and further states as follows:

42. **Class Definition(s):** In accordance with Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23, Plaintiff bring this action individually and on behalf of similarly situated persons and entities. In this action Plaintiff seek certification of (1) a nationwide Declaratory Relief Class pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23(b)(2), (2) a nationwide Restitution/Monetary Relief Sub-Class pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23(b)(3), (3) an Ohio State Sub-Class for Insurance Bad Faith pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23(b)(3) and 23(c)(5). This Class and Sub-Classes are defined as follows:³

- a. ***Declaratory Relief Class (Count I):*** All individuals and entities throughout the United States who, from January 1, 2020 to the present have been insured by Commercial and/or Business Owner Policies issued by Defendant and denied Business Income loss, Extra Expense and/or Civil Authority coverage due to COVID-19;
- b. ***Restitution/Monetary Relief Sub-Class (Counts I, II):*** All individuals and entities throughout the United States who from January 1, 2020 to the present have been insured by Commercial and/or Business Owner Policies issued by Defendant and denied Business Income, Extra Expense and/or Civil Authority coverage due to COVID-19; and;
- c. ***Ohio State Bad Faith Sub-Class (Counts I, II and III):*** All individuals and entities throughout the State of Ohio who from January 1, 2020 to the present

³ Alternatively, Plaintiff seek class certification pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23(c)(4) for each Class.

have been insured by Commercial and/or Business Owner Policies issued by Defendant and denied, in bad faith, Business Income, Extra Expense and/or Civil Authority coverage due to COVID-19.

43. Excluded from the Class are Defendant's employees, officers, directors, legal representatives, successors, and assigns; any entity in which Defendant has a controlling interest; any Judge to whom the litigation is assigned; all members of the Judge's family; and all persons who timely and validly request exclusion from the Class. Plaintiff reserve the right to modify the Class Definition(s) throughout the course of this litigation to conform with the evidence and facts as they develop.

44. This action has been brought as a class action, and may properly be maintained, pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23(b)(1), (2) and (3) of the Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure and case law thereunder and, alternatively Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23(c)(4).

45. **Numerosity:** Plaintiff do not know the exact number of the Members of the Class(es) because such information is in the exclusive control of Defendant. Due to the nature of the trade and commerce involved, however, Plaintiff believe that Class Members number at least in the many thousands and possibly millions and are sufficiently numerous and geographically dispersed throughout the United States of America, and State of Ohio, so that joinder of all Class Members is impracticable.

46. **Typicality:** The Plaintiff's claims are typical of the Class Members' claims. Like other Class Members, Plaintiff is an insured of Defendant who purchased a Policy of Insurance and sought coverage and indemnification thereunder for Business Income loss, Extra Expense and Civil Authority coverage due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and was summarily

denied the requested coverage by Defendant under the same, or substantially same, coverage forms.

47. **Adequacy:** Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class Members. Plaintiff's interests are aligned with the Class Members that Plaintiff seek to represent, and Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in complex class action litigation and insurance law, and who have previously been appointed lead and/or co-lead class action counsel in several previous class action matters. Plaintiff does not have any conflicts of interest with any Class Members that would impair or impede its ability to fully and adequately represent such Class Members.

48. **Commonality:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all Class Members and predominate over any questions solely affecting individual Class Members, including but not limited to:

- a. Whether Defendant has systematically refused and/or failed to find coverage and indemnify for Business Income loss, Extra Expense, and Civil Authority due to the COVID-19 pandemic;
- b. Whether Defendant systematically notified Plaintiff and Class Members by way of a denial letter (substantially similar to the Form Denial Letter attached hereto as Exhibit A) that Defendant would refuse on a prospective basis to provide coverage and pay benefits in the amounts of the policy(s) limit of liability for Business Income loss, Extra Expense, and Civil Authority, as defined in the policy, due to the COVID-19 pandemic;
- c. Whether the Form Denial Letter was an anticipatory repudiation of certain

obligations arising under the Policy for indemnification for business loss income;

- d. Whether Defendant used inapplicable exclusions to deny coverage;
- e. Whether the pandemic resulted in a physical loss under the Defendant Policy;
- f. Whether loss of use and/or utilization of Plaintiff' and Class Members' businesses is a direct physical loss under the Defendant Policy;
- g. Whether the relevant terms and conditions of the Defendant Policy are ambiguous;
- h. Whether Class Members are entitled to declaratory and/or injunctive relief requiring Defendant to honor claims for Business Income loss, Extra Expense, and Civil Authority due to the COVID-19 pandemic in an amount determined by the policy limits of liability for future claims;
- i. Whether Defendant breached its contract with Plaintiff and the Class Members;
- j. Whether Defendant breached the implied duty of good faith and fair dealing, thus damaging Plaintiff and Class Members;
- k. Whether, and to what extent, the conduct of Defendant caused injury to Plaintiff and Members of the Class, and, if so, the appropriate measure of damages.
- l. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to injunctive and/or equitable relief as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct;
- m. The proper form of equitable and injunctive relief;
- n. Whether Defendant acted an engaged in bad faith as to the Ohio Sub-Class Members

49. **Class.** **Risk of Inconsistent or Varying Adjudications For the Declaratory Relief**

Certification pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23(b)(2), (b)(3), and/or 23(c)(4) is proper for the Classes defined above because the maintenance of separate actions by individual members of the Classes would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to interpretations of uniform policy terms and obligations that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendant as the party opposing the class. Furthermore, certification under Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23(b)(2), (b)(3) and/or 23(c)(4) is proper because adjudications with respect to individual

50. Class Members would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other Class Members not a party to the adjudication or would substantially impair or impede their abilities to protect their interests. In addition, the Defendant, as the party opposing the Classes, has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Classes, thereby making relief appropriate with respect to the Class as a whole.

51. **Superiority and Predominance For The Restitution/Monetary Relief Sub-Class.** While Plaintiff specifically states that certification pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23(b)(2) is proper by itself for this entire action because monetary damages in the form of restitution is merely incidental to the declaratory and injunctive relief sought, Plaintiff alternatively allege that certification of the Restitution/Monetary Relief Class and the Ohio State Sub-Class defined above is likewise proper under Ohio R Civ P. 23(b)(3). Specifically, common issues of fact and law as set forth above predominate over any individual issues that may exist. Furthermore, a Class Action is superior to other available methods for a fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because joinder of all members of the class is impractical, and adjudication of this action as a Class is properly manageable. The interests of judicial economy favor adjudication of the claims

alleged herein on a Class basis rather than an individual basis, especially where, as here, the amount of damages for each claim is small compared to the burden and expense that would be incurred if each claim was litigated individually.

52. Further, and in the alternative, Ohio. R. Civ. Proc. 23(c)(4) permits an action to be maintained as a class action with respect to only particular issues, and the common questions of law and fact set forth above raise issues which are appropriate for class treatment pursuant to Ohio. R. Civ. Proc. 23(c)(4).

COUNT ONE
DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

53. Plaintiff hereby restates the allegations and averments contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint, as if fully rewritten herein, and further states as follows:

54. There is a genuine dispute and actual controversy, over which this Honorable Court has jurisdiction, between Plaintiff, the Class Members, and Defendant concerning their respective rights, duties and obligations for which Plaintiff and the Class Members desire a declaration of rights and obligations under Defendant's Policy. Pursuant to Ohio's Declaratory Judgment statute and all other uniform state declaratory judgment statutes and laws in which Plaintiff and Class Members reside, this Honorable Court may declare the rights, obligations and legal relations of any interested party seeking such declaration, whether or not further relief is or could be sought.

55. Since there is a dispute about whether or not Plaintiff and the Class Members have coverage under Defendant's policy for the loss sustained and to be incurred in the future, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to declaratory relief from this Court pursuant to Ohio Civil Rule 57 and R.C. §2721.01 to 2721.15, and the uniform state declaratory judgment statutes and

laws in which the Class Members reside.

56. Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to a declaration including, but not limited to, that:

- a. Plaintiff and the Class Members sustained direct physical loss or damage as a result of the coronavirus pandemic;
- b. Physical loss under the policy does not require tangible physical damage;
- c. Loss of use and/or utilization of Plaintiff' and Class Members' businesses constitutes a direct physical loss under the Defendant Policy;
- d. COVID-19 is a covered cause of loss under the Policy;
- e. The losses incurred by Plaintiff and the Class Members as a result of the executive orders issued by the Governor of Ohio and the Governors of the States wherein the Class Members reside are covered losses under the Policy;
- f. The prohibition (and/or significant limitation) of access to Property as Ordered by the Civil Authority Orders, constitutes a prohibition to the insureds' Property(s);
- g. The Civil Authority Orders trigger coverage because the Policy does not include an exclusion for a viral pandemic;
- h. The Policy provides coverage to Plaintiff and Class Members for any current and future civil authority closures of commercial buildings due to physical loss of or damage to property from COVID-19 under the Civil Authority coverage parameters and the Policy(s) provides business income coverage in the event COVID-19 has caused a loss or damage at the

- insureds' Property(s) or immediate area of the insureds' Property(s);
- i. The Civil Authority Orders constitute a prohibition of access to the insureds' Property(s) by a Civil Authority as defined in the Policy(s);
 - j. Defendant has not and cannot prove the application of any exclusion or limitation;
 - k. Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to coverage for its Business Income loss and Extra Expense resulting from coronavirus;
 - l. Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to coverage for loss due to the actions of Ohio's civil authorities, and the civil authorities wherein the Class Members reside;
 - m. Plaintiff and the Class Members have coverage for any substantially similar civil authority order in the future that limits or restricts the public's access to Plaintiff's and Class Members' business establishments and
 - n. Any other issue that may arise during the course of litigation that is a proper issue on which to grant declaratory relief.

57. Plaintiff prays for any further relief the Court deems proper, including attorney fees, interest and costs as allowed by law or in the exercise of the Court's equitable jurisdiction.

COUNT II

BREACH OF CONTRACT

58. Plaintiff hereby restates the allegations and averments contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint, as if fully rewritten herein, and further states as follows:

59. Plaintiff and Class Members, and Defendant, entered into a valid and enforceable insurance contract.

60. Plaintiff and Class Members gave valuable consideration in the form of premium payments in exchange for the promise of insurance coverage in the event of, among other things, loss of business income.

61. Defendant had an affirmative duty to comply with terms and conditions of the Policy and find coverage wherever possible under the Policy and indemnify Plaintiff and the Class Members for their losses sustained and recoverable under the terms and conditions of the policy. Plaintiff and Class Members made a claim for loss of Business Income, Extra- Expense and Civil Authority arising from the pandemic, interruption by civil authority and prohibited ingress and loss of use and/or utilization of Plaintiff' and Class Members' businesses.

62. Defendant breached the insurance contract by denying coverage for Plaintiff' and Class Members' loss, which was due to a covered and foreseeable peril not subject to any exclusion.

63. Plaintiff and Class Members complied with all of their obligations under the insurance contracts.

64. Plaintiff and Class Members have been injured and suffered financial harm as a result of Defendant's breach of the insurance contract.

65. In addition, in breaching the contract, Defendant has violated its implied duty to act in good faith and fair dealing with Plaintiff and the Class Members.

66. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's breach of contract, Plaintiff and the Class Members have incurred substantial and ongoing monetary damages in excess of \$25,000.00.

COUNT III

BREACH OF COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING (BAD FAITH)

67. Plaintiff hereby restates the allegations and averments contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint, as if fully rewritten herein, and further states as follows:

68. Ohio law recognizes the independent tort of bad faith in the context of the insured/insurer relationship.

69. Defendant's conduct has breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing implicit to the policy of insurance.

70. Ohio law provides that an insurer's lack of good faith is equivalent to bad faith.

71. Plaintiff and the Ohio Bad Faith Sub-Class Members are all insureds of Defendant in the State of Ohio.

72. Defendant failed and refused to make an adequate investigation or any investigation regarding Plaintiff' and Sub-Class Members' claims which, among other things, has caused a severe delay in full indemnification of Plaintiff' and Sub-Class Members' claims, and providing all benefits that Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members are entitled to under the policy(s), which has severely prejudiced and damaged the Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members, and has further resulted in Defendant withholding all recoverable benefits due under the Policy(s).

73. Defendant refused and continues to refuse to give any reasonable interpretation to the provisions in the Policy(s) or any reasonable application of such provisions to Plaintiff' and Sub- Class Members' claims and has acted to protect its own financial interests therein at the expense of and detriment to Plaintiff' and Sub-Class Members' rights.

74. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members any reasonable or justifiable basis for denying Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members' claims.

75. Defendant misrepresented the Policy(s) terms and conditions to Plaintiff and the Sub- Class Members including, and without limitation, attempting to use an inapplicable exclusion, i.e. the virus/bacteria exclusion in a knowingly and malicious attempt to avoid paying Plaintiff and the Sub-Class Members all benefits they are entitled to under the Policy(s).

76. Defendant, knowing that Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members were incompetent, inexperienced and unable to act to protect their interests, that such benefits were justly due, and that such benefits were necessary to pay Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members necessities of their use of the Premises, nevertheless have deprived Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members of such benefits.

77. Defendant's refusal to properly investigate, adjust, handle, process and/or pay benefits due Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members compelled Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members to, among other things, engage counsel and to initiate litigation to recover such benefits.

78. Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendant intends to and will continue to delay, deny, and withhold, in bad faith, benefits due Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members unless and until compelled to pay such benefits by final judgment of this Honorable Court.

79. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members have sustained substantial compensable losses, including benefits withheld, and economic losses, such as attorney's fees, out of pocket expenses, loss of business income, personal property loss, out-of-pocket costs and expenses, diminution in value of the insurance policy, and have suffered embarrassment and humiliation and severe mental and emotional distress and discomfort, all to Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members' detriment and damage in amounts not fully ascertained, but in excess of \$25,000, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court.

80. Further, at all material times and in doing things alleged herein, Defendant acted

oppressively, maliciously and with a conscious disregard of Plaintiff' and Sub-Class Members' rights, with the intention of benefitting Defendant financially and with the intention of causing or recklessly disregarding the probability of causing, injury and emotional distress to Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members, Defendant has refused and continues to refuse to pay all benefits due Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members and, further, has unjustifiably and/or intentionally failed to properly investigate, adjust, process, handle and pay Plaintiff' and Sub-Class Members' claims resulting in a significant and unjustifiable delay in resolving Plaintiff' and Sub-Class Members' claims under the terms and conditions of the Policy(s). In so doing, Defendant did vex, annoy, injure, and harass Plaintiff and Sub-Class Members so as to justify the assessment of punitive and exemplary damages against Defendant.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully request of this Honorable Court the following relief, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated:

a. An Order certifying the proposed Declaratory Relief Class herein pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23(B)(2), and appointing Plaintiff and its counsel of record to represent the Class(es);

b. That the court certify the Declaratory Relief Class as a class action pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. 23(B)(2) as defined above, and, at such time thereafter as the Court deems proper, then certify the Restitution/Monetary Relief Sub-Class and the Ohio State Bad Faith Sub-Class as a class action pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. 23(B)(3) and/or 23(C)(4) as defined above; award the Class Members monetary recovery in excess of \$25,000; and appoint Plaintiff and their counsel of record to represent the Class(es);

c. In the alternative, an Order certifying the proposed Classes pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. Proc. 23(C)(4); award the Class Members monetary recovery in excess of \$25,000, and appoint Plaintiff and its counsel of record to represent the Class(es);

d. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;

e. Punitive damages, costs and attorney fees where applicable and in the event the Ohio State Bad Faith Sub-Class is certified as a Class Action;

f. Plaintiff costs of suit, including, without limitation, its attorney's fees, expert fees, and actual incurred and costs; and

g. Such other further relief, at law or in equity, as the Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Pursuant to Ohio Civil Rule 38, Plaintiff requests a jury trial of all issues alleged herein.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Thomas J Connick
Thomas J. Connick (0070527)
CONNICK LAW, LLC
25550 Chagrin Blvd., Suite 101
Beachwood OH 44122
PH: 216-364-0512 / FX: 216-609-3446
Email: tconnick@connicklawllc.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff