



INSURANCE COVERAGE AND ALLOCATION ISSUES CONFERENCE

The Union League of Philadelphia | May 13, 2026

BAD FAITH



Matthew F. Boyer, Esq.
*Freeman Mathis & Gary LLP
Atlanta, GA*



Courtney Koch
*Head of Excess and Healthcare
Claims, Tokio Marine HCC
New York, NY*



Myles D. Morrison, Esq.
*Ruggeri Parks Weinberg LLP
Washington, DC*

Bad Faith

Introduction & Roadmap



- Nuclear Verdicts 
- Time-Limited Demands 
- Avoiding Bad Faith 
- Compressed or Insufficient Limits and Settlement Creep 

Bad Faith

Nuclear Verdicts



- What is a Nuclear Verdict?
- Thermonuclear?
- Rising Severity
 - Median Top 50 U.S. Verdicts has risen steadily since 2014 (exception during COVID – 2020-2022).
 - **\$27.7M (2014)**
 - **\$98.15M (2024)** – [slight dip in 2025 to \$76.9M]





Bad Faith

Nuclear Verdicts - Example

- *Johnson v. Prairie Farms Dairy, Inc.*, 2017-L-1562 (Mad. Cty. Ill, Cir. Ct.)
 - Verdict?
 - \$5 million - \$25 million
 - \$25 million - \$50 million
 - \$50 million - \$100 million
 - **\$241 Million**



Bad Faith

Nuclear Verdicts – Claim Handling & Settlement Strategy



Impact of Nuclear Verdicts: Claims Handling

- **Identify** “could this pierce the limits?” early – and **revisit** often
- Retain trial-capable counsel early when warranted – not just when suit is filed
- **Early** damages work-up + realistic valuation
- **Document** the evaluation and decisions rationale



Bad Faith

Time-Limited Demands



The Landscape

- Early policy-limits demands are increasing
- Short deadlines + incomplete information force “triage” evaluation
- In a nuclear verdict world, failure-to-settle exposure is magnified





Bad Faith

Time-Limited Demands

The Practical Playbook



- Claim handling is under the microscope
- Early assessment & action
 - **Notify** the insured
 - **Identify** what is needed to evaluate and **Request** in writing
 - **Assess:** liability clarity, damages trajectory, venue/jury risk
 - **Seek extensions** – when necessary and able – document asks/responses
 - **Clean claim file** – record of evaluation + basis for decision



Bad Faith

Common Traps

- **Not enough info** to evaluate yet 
- **Interpleader** will protect us 
- **No demand** means no duty or exposure 
- **Insured isn't pushing** to settle 
- **Plenty of limits** (insured money not at risk) 
- **There are coverage issues / punitives** 
- **Appeal will fix** an excess verdict 



Bad Faith

Nuclear Verdicts, Bad Faith & Coverage Towers

Compressed / Fragmented Towers → Settlement Creep

- Loss Cost Inflation → reduced capacity / smaller slices
- More Carriers → harder coordination on strategy + value
- Dynamics drive “settlement creep”

What Carriers Can Do - (Resist Creep + Reduce Exposure)

- Assess and Triage early – Revisit Often
- Disciplined TLD Process – Engage Counsel Early - Document Evaluation and Rationale
- Communicate with Insured early and often – Document advice, instructions
- Coordinate the Tower – (shared assumptions, cadence, escalation)

Bad Faith

Nuclear Verdicts, Bad Faith & Coverage Towers



Questions?