21STCV08218

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Mel Red Recana

Electronically FILED by Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles on 03/03/2021 07:29 AM Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court, by M. Barel, Deputy Clerk

1			
2	KPasich@PasichLLP.com Anamay M. Carmel (SBN 298080)		
3	ACarmel@PasichLLP.com		
4	PASICH LLP 10880 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2000		
5	Los Angeles, California 90024		
	Telephone: (424) 313-7860 Facsimile: (424) 313-7890		
6			
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
8			
9		IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	FOR THE COUNTY	OF LOS ANGELES	
11			
12	TUNASHOE TOURS, INC.,	Case No. 218TCV08218	
13	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR:	
14	vs.	1. BREACH OF CONTRACT;	
15 16	CERTAIN UNDERWRITERS AT LLOYD'S LONDON, UNDERWRITING AS W.R. BERKLEY SYNDICATE 1967, and DOES 1	2. TORTIOUS BREACH OF THE IMPLIED COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING; AND	
17	through 10,	3. DECLARATORY RELIEF	
18	Defendants.		
19		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
20	Plaintiff Tunashoe Tours, Inc. ("Tunashoe	e") brings this action against defendants Certain	
21	Underwriters at Lloyd's, London, underwriting a	s W.R. Berkley Syndicate 1967 ("WRB") and	
22	alleges as follows:		
23	NATURE OF THE ACTION		
24	1. This matter arises out of the neces	sary cancellation of The Chicks' (formerly	
25	known as Dixie Chicks) 2020 North American G	aslighter tour (the "Tour"), and WRB's breach	
26	and bad faith conduct in connection with its oblig	gation to insure the Tour. The Tour was to have	
27	coincided with the release of The Chicks' first stu	udio album in 14 years, Gaslighter. However,	
28	because of orders of civil authorities closing cond	cert venues and instructing people to "stay home"	
	COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		

due to the outbreak of the virus SARS-CoV-2, the Tour was cancelled. Because North American
 indoor arena concert touring was rendered impossible during the balance of 2020 (and, according
 to medical authorities, likely through 2021), the Tour could not commercially or reasonably be
 rescheduled.

2. As is common in the music industry, Tunashoe, The Chicks' touring company, had
purchased insurance to protect it in the event that the Tour was cancelled. Tunashoe submitted a
claim for its losses to its 14 insurers under Non-Appearance and Cancellation insurance policies.
This dispute is with only one of them: WRB. WRB has not paid its policy limits for Tunashoe's
losses. Instead, WRB took unreasonable legal positions in direct conflict with specificallynegotiated contractual language, and engaged in a ten-month campaign of repeated irrelevant
questions and stall tactics.

3. WRB's purported "investigation" into Tunashoe's claim, its delay, and its failure to
pay its share of Tunashoe's loss are a breach of its insurance policies, are contrary to insurance
industry custom and practice, and constitute a breach of the implied covenant of good faith and
fair dealing. Therefore, Tunashoe brings this lawsuit to obtain the benefits due under the policies
and for other damages.

17

PASICH.

THE PARTIES

4. Tunashoe is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Los
Angeles, CA. Tunashoe produces The Chicks' tours. The Chicks are a popular American band
that has won 13 Grammy® awards. At the time they were scheduled to commence their 2020 *Gaslighter* tour, they had sold more than 33,000,000 albums worldwide. The Chicks lend their
voices to, and otherwise support, causes true to their own beliefs, such as the Human Rights
Campaign, Planned Parenthood, Proclaim Justice and HeadCount, and are known by their
audience for social and political activism.

5. Tunashoe is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that WRB is a
syndicate of underwriters that underwrite and transact insurance business in the London market.
WRB subscribed to the Policy and is obligated under the Policy to provide the insurance afforded

28

.

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1	by the Policy. Tunashoe is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that WRB transacts		
2	business and sells insurance covering risks in the City and County of Los Angeles.		
3	6. WRB is managed by W.R. Berkley Syndicate Management Limited ("the		
4	Managing Agent"), also known as W/R/B Underwriting. Tunashoe is informed and believes, and		
5	on that basis alleges, that WRB authorized the Managing Agent to act on its behalf and to bind it.		
6	7. WRB holds itself out as being extremely sophisticated and knowledgeable in		
7	insuring against event cancellation losses, and in investigating the risks it is insuring. Tunashoe		
8	also is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that WRB participates in a wide range of		
9	event cancellation insurance programs and hold themselves out as being knowledgeable,		
10	experienced, reliable, willing to insure, and capable of insuring, musical tours against the risks of		
11	event cancellation. Indeed, the Managing Agent proclaims on its website:		
12	A trusted and valued name within the Contingency market, we bring yest experience and knowledge to what we do, consistently delivering		
13	Contingency classes focus on Event Cancellation and Non-		
14			
15	production companies. ¹		
16	8. Tunashoe is ignorant of the true names and capacities, whether individual,		
17	associate, partnership, corporate, or otherwise, of the defendants fictitiously designated herein as		
18	Does 1 through 10, and therefore sues those defendants by these fictitious names. Tunashoe will		
19	seek leave of court to amend this complaint when the true names and capacities of these		
20	fictitiously designated defendants have been ascertained. Tunashoe is informed and believes, and		
21	on that basis alleges, that Does 1 through 10, in some way unknown to Tunashoe, have		
22	underwritten or provided insurance coverage to it, or are otherwise responsible for losses alleged		
23	herein, and that Does 1 through 10 are authorized to, and do, transact insurance business in the		
24	State of California and the County of Los Angeles.		
25			
26			
27			
28	¹ <u>https://wrbunderwriting.com/products/crisis-management/contingency/</u> .		
	3 COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
I			

4	plained the rout. To do so, the Chick's signed 0.5. and Canadian tour contracts with Live Nation		
5	Entertainment, Inc. (the "Tour Agreement"). Per the Tour Agreement, Live Nation obtained the		
6	exclusive right to promote the Tour.		
7	10. The Tour was to begin on June 6, 2020 in Las Vegas, Nevada, at the MGM Grand		
8	Garden Arena. Tunashoe scheduled 48 performances at North American arenas over the		
9	following three months.		
10	11. The likelihood of success of the Tour was reinforced by the fact that Tour would		
11	immediately follow the release of Gaslighter, The Chicks' first studio album in over 14 years.		
12	This provided a potent marketing tool of combined "ticket/new album" bundles to support the sale		
13	of tickets to the Tour.		
14	12. As part of its planning efforts, and as required by the Tour Agreement, Tunashoe		
15	purchased insurance, including the policies at issue here, to cover losses in the event that the Tour		
16	could not go forward as planned.		
17	THE POLICIES		
18	13. WRB is one of a group of syndicates and insurers in the London market that		
19	subscribed to Tunashoe's Contingency Non-Appearance and Cancellation policies. The insurance		
20	program includes a primary layer, Policy No. B0391BR2008400 (the "Primary Policy") and five		
21	excess layers, all designed to function together but specified in layers to designate order and		
22	amount of payment among the 14 subscribing syndicates and insurance companies (collectively,		
23	"Underwriters"). The excess policies to which WRB subscribes (the "Policies") are:		
24	• Policy No. B0391BR2008401 (1st Layer);		
25	• Policy No. B0391BR2008403 (3rd Layer);		
26	• Policy No. B0391BR2008404 (4th Layer); and		
27	• Policy No. B0391BR2008405 (5th Layer).		
28	The excess policies contain the same material terms as the Primary Policy. Before subscribing to		
	4		
	COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		

1

THE TOUR

2 9. After years of planning and work, the Gaslighter album was scheduled to be 3 released on May 1, 2020. In conjunction with the release of Gaslighter, The Chicks and Tunashoe 4 planned the Tour. To do so, The Chicks signed U.S. and Canadian tour contracts with Live Nation and selling the Policies to Tunashoe, WRB engaged in, or had reasonable opportunities to engage
 in, extensive underwriting investigation, and had a reasonable opportunity, and the obligation, to
 become familiar and knowledgeable with the risk it was insuring against. Tunashoe is informed
 and believes, and on that basis alleges, that WRB has copies of the Policies.

5 14. The Policies were in effect from January 20, 2020, to September 18, 2020. They
6 provide insurance of "Up to \$40,400,000 representing 80% 'To Pay' of Gross Guarantee of USD
7 50,500,000" should the Tour be "necessarily Cancelled, Abandoned, Postponed, Interrupted or
8 Relocated" as a result of any reason not excluded. Policies, Risk Details (as amended).

9 15. The Policies obligate WRB "to pay the Assured the percentage of the Gross
10 Guarantee(s) specified in the Policy Schedule, and to indemnify the Assured for 100% of
11 Additional Costs, as set out in clauses 1.1 (as amended) and 1.2 of the attached policy wording,
12 should any Insured Performance(s) or Event(s) specified in the Schedule be necessarily Cancelled,
13 Abandoned, Postponed, Interrupted or Relocated." *Id.*

14 16. Tunashoe is the "Assured" under the Policies. The Policies state that the Insured
15 Performances are "Dixie Chicks – 48 Shows in North America between 06 June 2020 and 17
16 September 2020"). The Policies name the "Insured Persons" as the "Dixie Chicks being Martie
17 Erwin Maguire, Emily Erwin Robison and Natalie Maines." *Id.* They state that the "Covered
18 Perils" are "death," "accident and illness," "unavoidable travel delay," "venue damage," "adverse
19 weather," "national mourning," and "other perils." *Id.*

17. The Policies' insuring clauses state:

Subject to the terms, conditions, limitations and exclusions contained herein or endorsed hereon, this Insurance is to pay the Assured the percentage of the Gross Guarantee(s) specified in the Policy Schedule should any Insured Performance(s) or Event(s) specified in the Tour Schedule be necessarily Cancelled, Abandoned, Postponed, Interrupted or Relocated. Provided that:

(1.1.1) the necessary Cancellation, Abandonment, Postponement, Interruption, Curtailment or Relocation is caused by a peril described in 2.1 to 2.7 below and

(1.1.2) such Insured Peril is beyond the control of:

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

5
COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1	(i) the Assured and (ii) each and every Insured Person;			
2 3	(1.1.3) the circumstances giving rise to the loss first occurs during the Period of Insurance stated in the Schedule.			
4	Id. § 1.1 (as ar	nended).		
5	18.	The covered perils include "ANY OTHER PERIL not listed in section 2.1 to 2.6		
6	and not specifi	ically limited or excluded elsewhere." Id. § 2.7.		
7	19.	The Policies further state:		
8		It is a condition precedent to the liability of the Insurers that the		
9	Performance(s) or Event(s) to another time in order to avoid or			
10				
11	<i>Id.</i> § 4.6 (as amended). Section 4.6 of the Policies was amended by Underwriters during the			
12	underwriting process of the Policies. Prior to that amendment, the provision did not contain the			
13	words "comm	ercially and reasonably."		
14	20.	WRB is severally liable for the following limits of liability it has underwritten:		
15		• 8% of the 1st layer (limits of \$2,424,000 in excess of \$1,616,000)		
16		• 20% of the 3rd layer (limits of \$8,080,000 in excess of \$8,080,000)		
17		• 19.512% of the 4th layer (limits of \$8,080,000 in excess of \$8,080,000);		
18		and		
19		• 20% of the 5th layer (limits of \$16,160,000 in excess of \$24,240,000).		
20	Thus, WRB is obligated to pay \$6,618,513.84.			
21		UNDERWRITERS' BREACHES AND BAD FAITH CONDUCT		
22	21.	The first reported evidence of SARS-CoV-2 was detected in or around December		
23	2019 in Wuhan, the capital city of the Hubei Province in China. The World Health Organization			
24	has named the virus and resulting disease:			
25	Official names have been announced for the virus responsible for COVID-19 (previously known as "2019 novel coronavirus") and the			
26		disease it causes. The official names are:		
27		Disease coronavirus disease		
28		(COVID-19)		
		6 COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
I	1			

Virus severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).²

1

2

3 22. Since then, SARS-CoV-2 has spread throughout the world, prompting the World
4 Health Organization to declare a global pandemic.

5 23. In March 2020, in response to the worldwide spread of SARS-CoV-2, civil
authorities throughout the United States began issuing orders that required citizens to stay at
home, prohibited large gatherings, and mandated the continued closure of all non-essential inperson businesses (collectively, the "Closure Orders").³ Throughout the pandemic, the Center for
Disease Control has repeatedly stated that the activity with the highest risk of transmission of
SARS-CoV-2 are large indoor gatherings such as concerts.⁴

11 24. The disruption of the concert industry by SARS-CoV-2 and the events associated with its spread has evolved over time.⁵ As of the filing of this complaint, it appears highly 12 13 unlikely that the spread of SARS-CoV-2 will sufficiently subside and herd immunity will be 14 established to allow concerts and other live events to resume in 2021. Estimates of when this will 15 occur are further complicated by variants of the virus that are already spreading in the United 16 States.⁶ Given the planning and logistics required to mount a major national tour, it simply is impossible for Tunashoe and The Chicks to reschedule the Tour for 2021-even with their 2020 17 18 album serving as a lynchpin for any rescheduled Tour in 2021.

19 25. As a result of the Closure Orders and the incontrovertible health and safety risk
20 posed by the proliferation and spread of SARS-CoV-2, Tunashoe was forced to cancel the Tour on
21 April 21, 2020.

- 22
- 23 https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-2019)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it
 25 *See, e.g.*, The Council of State Governments, *COVID-19 Resources for State Leaders*, https://web.csg.org/covid19/executive-orders/ (listing most U.S. Closure orders by state).

28 ⁶ See, e.g., <u>https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/02/20/us/us-herd-immunity-covid.html;</u> https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/transmission/variant-cases.html

^{26 &}lt;sup>4</sup> See, e.g., <u>https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/large-events/considerations-for-events-gatherings.html</u>

^{27 &}lt;sup>5</sup> See, e.g., <u>https://liveforlivemusic.com/news/covid-19-concert-cancellation-tracking/</u>.

1 26. Tunashoe timely provided notice of Tunashoe's loss to WRB on April 28, 2020. 27. 2 On May 20, 2020, nearly a month later, WRB acknowledged the notice of loss 3 through Underwriters' third-party claims adjustor, Hyperion Adjusters Limited. 4 28. On June 12, 2020, after numerous inquiries regarding the status of WRB's 5 coverage determination, Hyperion passed on a request from WRB and the other subscribing 6 syndicates for the first time: "Essentially, Underwriters current request is to why this Insured tour 7 cannot be postponed/rescheduled in accordance with Condition 4.6." 8 29. On July 1, 2020, the insurance broker involved in procuring the Policies explained 9 to the Underwriters, including WRB, that it was not commercially possible or reasonably possible 10 to rearrange the Tour for the following reasons: 11 The Tour Agreement was "limited specifically to the 2020 Tour and it is 12 clear the financial terms would not be able to be replicated for a 2021 tour"; 13 The Tour was designed to coincide with The Chicks' first new studio album 14 in 14 years called Gaslighter; 15 The release of the Gaslighter album "could not be delayed"; and 16 The impact of the Tour occurring simultaneously with *Gaslighter* could not 17 be replicated. 18 30. Despite the detailed explanation, Underwriters, including WRB, again asked about 19 the ability to reschedule the Tour, this time insisting that they hear directly from Tunashoe. 20 31. On July 16, 2020, the Chicks' manager wrote to Underwriters, confirming that the 21 July 1, 2020, response from the broker accurately reflected the response of Tunashoe. 22 32. In response, the Underwriters again requested that Tunashoe explain why it could 23 not reschedule the Tour. The Underwriters requested that the claims adjustor speak directly with 24 the Chicks' manager on the phone. That telephone call took place on August 28, 2020. 25 33. On September 21, 2020, the representative of the lead syndicate subscribing to the Policies wrote to Hyperion, stating: 26 27 Having considered [Hyperion]'s comments regarding the possibility of rescheduling following the telephone call with [the broker] and the 28 bands management, I can confirm that Talbot consider that the Policy 8 COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

responds and that full reserves should be entered on the 5 layers that we lead.

Obviously you will seek comments from all the other CAP's via the normal channels but I can confirm that they are all aware of Talbot's position and have seen [Hyperion]'s comments mentioned above.

34. Despite the position taken by the lead syndicate, WRB continued to be an outlier.

35. On October 15, 2020, on WRB's behalf, Hyperion again wrote to Tunashoe, indicating that WRB did not like the explanation that had already been provided three times

before, and, for the fourth time, inquired about the possibility of rescheduling the Tour. WRB requested that the Chicks "make formal inquiries with other promotors with the ability to stage a 2021 tour." Additionally, WRB asked whether the "Chicks explored the possibility of whether any of the cancelled 2020 shows can be rescheduled to open air festivals/venues in 2021." Hyperion also stated that WRB wanted to know whether the "Chicks evaluated the option for The Chicks to perform live streaming concerts to a paying audience." However, none of those options, even if possible, practical, and reasonable, would constitute rearranged Insured Performances

because of the differences in timing, in venues, and in support from Live Nation and attendees.

36. On November 15, 2020, counsel for Tunashoe responded, again reiterating the 16 numerous factors that precluded the commercially and reasonably possible rescheduling of the 17 Tour. He stated that (i) a later tour would have no album release coinciding that would drive 18 ticket sales; (ii) a later tour would therefore be "relegated to smaller venues, be less commercially 19 successful, and correspondingly be irrevocably damaging to the band's reputation and the band 20 members' careers"; and (iii) given the ongoing spread of SARS-CoV-2, it was too uncertain to 21 rely on any notion of performances occurring in 2021. He further wrote that WRB's suggestion in 22 the October 15, 2020, e-mail that the Chicks perform at open air festivals or put on a paid 23 livestreaming event would only exacerbate, rather than diminish, any loss. He also responded that 24 any "obligation to rearrange" could not "be extended indefinitely into the future in order to allow 25 Underwriters to claim that proceeds from any future show or tour could be applied to 'diminish 26 the loss' arising from a Cancelled show, and therefore the Assured's claim need never be paid as 27 there is always the expectation that the loss will be diminished by future shows or tours."

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1

37. On November 23, 2020, counsel for WRB wrote to Tunashoe. Again, WRB took 2 the position that Tunashoe had not answered its questions about the possibility of rescheduling the 3 Tour. Instead of following up on Tunashoe's responses, WRB simply cut and pasted the questions 4 from Hyperion's October 15, 2020, e-mail into the letter, now asking them for the fifth time. 5 Additionally, WRB questioned why Tunashoe could not enter into a separate tour agreement with a promoter other than Live Nation for a 2021 tour. WRB also pointed out that "multiple highlevel artists have rearranged their cancelled 2020 stadium tours for 2021," that "other prominent artists have successfully performed live streamed concerts in 2020," and questioned again why The Chicks could not also do so. WRB asked Tunashoe to provide "any projections or estimates as to how rearranged 2020 Events could perform if staged in 2021" and "correspondence with Live Nation regarding the possibility of Live Nation promoting a 2021 tour for the Chicks."

38. On December 15, 2020, counsel for Tunashoe responded. With respect to a projected revenue of a 2021 tour, he stated, "There are no such revenue projections possible or appropriate, as a 2021 tour comprised of the shows re-scheduled at the indoor venues comprising 15 the Insured Performances is not commercially or reasonably possible." Further, he stated that an 16 agreement with a different promoter would "constitute a breach of the [Tour Agreement]." With 17 respect to live streamed concerts, he stated that "virtual concerts are unquestionably not a re-18 scheduling of the particular live-audience shows, at the particular venues, comprising the Insured 19 Performances, as set forth in the Policies."

39. 20 On January 14, 2021, counsel for WRB and counsel for Tunashoe had a telephone 21 conversation. During that conversation, counsel for WRB asked for the sixth time questions about 22 Tunashoe's ability to reschedule the Tour. Tunashoe's counsel repeated the responses Tunashoe 23 had previously given a number of times, and also requested that WRB narrow its requests for 24 information to only those that were essential and relevant to its coverage investigation.

25 40. On February 12, 2021, counsel for WRB again wrote to Tunashoe, referring to the January 2021 telephone call between them. Despite counsel's earlier request, WRB's counsel 26 27 repeated yet again the questions WRB had previously asked, now for the seventh time.

28

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

 2 not commercially or reasonably possible to rearrange the Insured performances, stating: 3 • "Your repeated requests for non-existent written communications are nothing more than a bad- faith effort to create false issues regarding Insured's cooperation "; 6 • "The Insured cannot in any event rearrange the Insured Performances another promoter"; 8 • Open air festivals "do not qualify as a rearrangement of the Insured 		
 4 nothing more than a bad- faith effort to create false issues regarding 5 Insured's cooperation "; 6 • "The Insured cannot in any event rearrange the Insured Performances another promoter"; 		
 5 Insured's cooperation "; 6 • "The Insured cannot in any event rearrange the Insured Performances another promoter"; 		
 6 "The Insured cannot in any event rearrange the Insured Performances another promoter"; 		
7 another promoter";		
8 Open air festivals "do not qualify as a rearrangement of the Insured	iues":	
	ues":	
9 Performances, which were to be at the listed specific indoor arena ve	,	
10 • A live-stream performance "is no more a rearranging of the Insured		
11 Performances than would be requiring the Insured to hold car washes	to pay	
12 down W/R/B's financial obligation"; and		
• "A North American arena tour in support of a major new album by a	major	
14 recording artist is a very expensive enterprise to mount, and is dependent	lent	
15 upon the attendance of the projected audience in the scheduled venue	S.	
16This was, and has continued at all relevant times to be impossible."		
1742. Despite the fact that it is not commercially and reasonably possible to rearran	ge the	
18 Insured Performances and that no terms or exclusions in the Policies apply to bar coverage,	WRB	
19 has refused to acknowledge that it is obligated to pay its share of the loss, let alone actually	pay its	
20 share of the loss. WRB has failed to pay its share even though it knows that it stands alone	among	
21 Underwriters in taking this position.		
22 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION		
(Breach of Contract Against WRB)		
2443.Tunashoe realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 42 a	ove.	
25 44. To the extent not waived or otherwise excused, Tunashoe has complied with	all	
26 terms and conditions precedent contained in the Policies. Therefore, Tunashoe is entitled to	all	
benefits of insurance provided by the Policies.		
28		
11 COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		

45. WRB breached its duties under the Policies by refusing to acknowledge that
 Tunashoe's loss is insured and by failing and fusing to pay the amount owing to Tunashoe under
 the Policies.

4 46. As a direct and proximate result of WRB's breaches, Tunashoe has sustained, and
5 continues to sustain, substantial damages for which WRB are liable, in the amount of
6 \$6,618,513.84. Tunashoe also is entitled to interest on its damages at the legal rate.

7 8

23

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Tortious Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing Against WRB)

9 47. Tunashoe realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 42, 44, and
10 45 above.

48. Implied in the Policies is a covenant that WRB would act in good faith and deal
fairly with Tunashoe, that WRB would do nothing to interfere with the right of Tunashoe to
receive benefits due under the Policies, and that WRB would give at least the same level of
consideration to the interests of Tunashoe as it gave its own interests.

49. WRB also had a duty under the Policies, the law, and insurance industry custom,
practice, and standards to conduct a prompt, thorough, and reasonable investigation, including as
to all bases that might support Tunashoe's claims for insurance coverage.

18 50. Instead of complying with these duties, WRB acted in bad faith by, among other19 things:

20	a.	failing to conduct a full, thorough, and reasonable investigation of
21		Tunashoe's claim for insurance coverage;
22	b.	ignoring Tunashoe's answers to the questions it posed and repeating those

questions multiple times even though Tunashoe had answered them;

c. wrongfully and unreasonably disputing that it was not commercially and
reasonably possible for Tunashoe to rearrange the Tour, instead insisting
that The Chicks undertake other activities that could damage their
reputations, could interfere with future tour possibilities, could jeopardize
the health of the members of The Chicks, their band and crew, and audience

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1		members (if any) and were, in no sense, rearrangements of the Insured
2		Performances;
3	d.	wrongfully and unreasonably asserting reservations of its right to disclaim
4		coverage that WRB knew, or should have known, are not supported by, and
5		in fact are contrary to, the terms of the Policies, the law, insurance industry
6		custom and practice, and the facts;
7	e.	ignoring the intent behind the Policies and Tunashoe's reasonable
8		expectation of coverage;
9	f.	based on information and belief, using its purported investigation in an
10		attempt to delay paying what it owed or in an effort to force Tunashoe to
11		accept less than the amount to which it is legally entitled;
12	g.	based on information and belief, repeatedly demanding irrelevant
13		information in an attempt to concoct a defense to coverage;
14	h.	ignoring publicly known information regarding the fact that concerts and
15		tours (let alone tours of the magnitude of the Tour) will not resume in 2021,
16		given the current state of the pandemic;
17	i.	failing to fully inquire into the bases that might support coverage for
18		Tunashoe's claim;
19	j.	unreasonably failing and refusing to honor its promises and representations
20		in the Policies it issued to Tunashoe;
21	k.	failing to acknowledge Tunashoe's claim within 15 days of receipt of
22		Tunashoe's claim in violation of 10 California Code of Regulations
23		§ 2965.5(b);
24	1.	failing to provide Tunashoe with a notification every 30 days that it needed
25		additional time to conclude its investigation and/or specify what additional
26		information WRB required in order to make its determination and state any
27		continuing reasons for its inability to make a determination, thereby
28		violating 10 California Code of Regulations § 2695.7(c)(1);
	 	13 COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
		COMI LAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURT TRIAL

m. giving greater consideration to its own interests than it gave to the interests of Tunashoe; and

n. otherwise acting as alleged above.

4 51. In breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, WRB did the
5 things and committed the acts alleged above for the purpose of consciously withholding from
6 Tunashoe the rights and benefits to which it is and are entitled under the Policies.

7 52. WRB's actions are inconsistent with the reasonable expectations of Tunashoe, are
8 contrary to established industry custom and practice, are contrary to legal requirements, are
9 contrary to the express terms of the Policies, and constitute bad faith.

10 53. As a direct and proximate result of WRB's actions, Tunashoe has been damaged in
11 an amount exceeding the Court's jurisdictional limits. Also, pursuant to *Brandt v. Superior Court*,
12 37 Cal. 3d 813 (1985), Tunashoe is entitled to recover all attorneys' fees it reasonably incurred,
13 and continues to incur, in the efforts to obtain the benefits due under the Policies that WRB have
14 withheld, and are withholding, in bad faith. Tunashoe is entitled to interest at the maximum legal
15 rate.

16 54. Tunashoe is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that WRB, acting
17 through one or more of its officers, directors, or other corporate employees with substantial
18 independent and discretionary authority over significant aspects of its business, performed,
19 authorized, or ratified the bad faith conduct alleged above.

55. 20 WRB's conduct is despicable and has been done with a conscious disregard of the 21 rights of Tunashoe, constituting oppression, fraud, or malice. WRB engaged in a series of acts 22 designed to deny Tunashoe the benefits due under the Policies. Specifically, WRB, by acting as 23 alleged above, in light of information, facts, and relevant law to the contrary, consciously 24 disregarded Tunashoe's respective rights and forced Tunashoe to incur substantial financial losses, 25 thereby inflicting substantial financial damage on Tunashoe. WRB ignored Tunashoe's interests 26 and concerns with the requisite intent to injure within the meaning of California Civil Code 27 section 3294. Therefore, Tunashoe is entitled to recover punitive damages from WRB in an

28

1

2

3

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

.

1	amount sufficient to punish and make an example of WRB and to deter similar conduct in the		
2	future.		
3	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION		
4	(Declaratory Relief Against Does 1 through 10)		
5	56. Tunashoe realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 42 above.		
6	57. Tunashoe contends it is entitled to insurance coverage for the losses it has suffered		
7	as a result of the cancellation of the Tour. Tunashoe is informed and believes, and on that basis		
8	alleges, that Does 1 through 10 dispute that Tunashoe is entitled to such coverage. Therefore, an		
9	actual and justiciable controversy exists between Tunashoe and Does 1 through 10 concerning the		
10	matters alleged herein.		
11	58. Tunashoe therefore seeks a judicial declaration as to the duties of Does 1 through		
12	10 and confirming that Tunashoe's contentions, as stated above, are correct. A declaration is		
13	necessary in order that the parties' dispute may be resolved and that they may be aware of their		
14	respective rights and duties.		
15	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
16	WHEREFORE, Tunashoe prays for relief as follows:		
17	ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION		
18	1. For damages according to proof at the time of trial, plus interest;		
19	ON THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION		
20	2. For damages according to proof at the time of trial, including reasonable attorneys'		
21	fees incurred in obtaining the benefits due under the Policy, plus interest; and		
22	3. For punitive damages in an amount to be determined at the time of trial;		
23	ON THE THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION		
24	4. For a declaration in accord with Tunashoe's contentions stated above;		
25	ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION:		
26	5. For the costs of this lawsuit; and		
27			
28			
	15 COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		

1	1 6. For such other, further, or differe	ent relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
2	2 DATED: March 3, 2021 PAS	ICH LLP
3	3 By: S	Amcen
4	4 Anar	nay M. Carmel
5	5 Attor	rneys for Plaintiff
6	6	
7	7	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13 14		
14		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20	D	
21	1	
22	2	
23	3	
24	4	
25	5	
26	6	
27		
28	8	17
	COMPLAINT AND DE	16 mand for jury trial

1	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
2	Tunashoe Tours, Inc. hereby demands a trial by jury in this action.	
3	Dated: March 3, 2021 PASICH LLP	
4	Amcent	
5	By: Anamay M. Carmel	
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
-	17	
	COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	_