



Defence + Indemnity

Field Law Insurance Group

SUBSCRIBE

FORWARD

CONTACT

WEBSITE

INSURANCE ISSUES

The SEF 44 Endorsement is not a standalone policy and exclusions in the underlying policy apply to it such that a claimant passenger of a stolen vehicle is not entitled to benefits if he/she did not know nor ought to have known that the vehicle was stolen.

<u>Cardinal v Alberta Motor Association Insurance Company</u>, [2018] S.C.C.R No. 129 refusing lv. to app.; 2018, ABCA 69; rev'g 2017 ABQB 487

FACTS AND ISSUES:

The insurer, AMA, issued a standard Alberta automobile policy to the policyholder including both SPF no. 1 and SEF 44 coverage. The policyholder's daughter was injured while riding as a passenger in an automobile that was being operated without the consent of the owner.

AMA sought summary dismissal of the claim for coverage. At issue was whether the daughter was entitled to recover under her mother's SEF 44 if she was unaware that the vehicle was stolen. AMA relied on an exclusion in the auto policy to which the mother's SEF 44 was an endorsement, which exclusion provided as follows:

CONSENT OF OWNER

No person shall be entitled to indemnity or payment under this Policy who is an occupant of any automobile which is being used without the consent of the owner thereof.

The Court of Queen's Bench dismissed the insurer's summary dismissal application, relying on recent Ontario Court of Appeal legislative amendments. The Court of Appeal reversed this decision and found in favour of AMA on the basis that the SEF 44 was not a stand-alone policy but an endorsement to the SPF no. 1 and that the Consent of Owner provision of the SPF no. 1 applied to the claim under the SEF 44. The Court of Appeal further held that the fact that the daughter did not know that the driver was using the automobile without the consent of its owner did not affect this result. Both the Queen's Bench and Court of Appeal decisions were briefed in the February 2018 edition of **Defence** + **Indemnity**.

The insured sought leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

HELD: For the Insurer; leave to appeal dismissed.

Calgary

400 - 444 7 AVE SW Calgary AB T2P 0X8 **T** 403-260-8500 **F** 403-264-7084 1-877-260-6515

Edmonton

2500 - 10175 101 ST NW Edmonton AB T5J 0H3 **T** 780-423-3003 **F** 780-428-9329 1-800-222-6479

Yellowknife

601 - 4920 52 ST Yellowknife NT X1A 3T1 **T** 867-920-4542 **F** 867-873-4790 1-800-753-1294

© 2018 Field LLP. All rights reserved.

Information made available in this publication is for informational purposes only. It is NOT LEGAL ADVICE and should not be perceived as legal advice. You must not rely upon this information in making any decision or taking (or choosing not to take) any action. This information does not replace professional legal advice – and must not be used to replace or delay seeking professional legal advice. Any views expressed in this site are those of the authors and not the law firm of Field LLP. The act of accessing, printing or reading this publication or downloading any of the content does not create a solicitor-client relationship, and any unsolicited information or communications sent to the authors or Field LLP (by any means) is not protected by solicitor-client privilege.

"Field Law", the logo and "Because Clarity Matters" are registered trademarks of Field LLP. "Field Law" is a registered trade name of Field LLP."

Manage Preferences

