UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

MAR 26 1999

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

No. 98-36054

NATIONAL WARRANTY INSURANCE COMPANY, RRG
(a Risk Retention Group),
Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

MIKE GREENFIELD, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS OF THE STATE OF OREGON,
Defendant-Appellant

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
AT CIVIL ACTION CV-97-1654-ST

BRIEF OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT-APPELLANT

Ross S. Myers
National Association of Insurance Commissioners
120 W. 12th Street, Suite 1100
Kansas City, Missouri, 64105
Phone (816) 889-4460
Fax (816) 374-7185

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES 2

INTEREST OF THE NAIC 4

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION 7

STATEMENT OF ISSUES 7

STATEMENT OF FACTS 7

STANDARD OF REVIEW 7

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 8

ARGUMENT 9

BACKGROUND 9

I. THE FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY EXCEPTION TO THE LIABILITY RISK RETENTION ACT OF 1986 SHOULD CLEARLY APPLY BECAUSE THE STATE OF OREGON HAS REQUIRED A DEMONSTRATION OF FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, A LICENSE OR PERMIT IS REQUIRED AND CONSUMERS ARE AT RISK IF THE STATE IS PROHIBITED FROM IMPOSING SUCH REQUIREMENTS. 11

II. OREGON'S REQUIREMENT THAT ANY REIMBURSEMENT INSURANCE POLICY BE ISSUED BY AN AUTHORIZED INSURER DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST RISK RETENTION GROUPS BECAUSE THE REQUIREMENT IS NOT DIRECTED TO RISK RETENTION GROUPS AND IS NOT LIMITED TO RISK RETENTION GROUPS. 16

CONCLUSION 20

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULES 21

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Charter Risk Retention Group Ins. Co. v. Rolka,
796 F. Supp. 154 (M.D. Pa. 1992) 19

Garage Services and Equip. Dealers Liability Ass'n of Am., Inc. v. Homes,
867 F. Supp. 1301, 1307 (E.D. Ky. 1994) 19

Home Warranty Corp. v. Elliott,
572 F. Supp. 1059, 1066 (D. Del. 1983), *modified,*
585 F. Supp. 443 (D. Del. 1984) 11

Mears Transp. Group v. Florida,
34 F.3d 1013, 1018 (11th Cir. 1994), cert. den. 115 S.Ct. 1960 (1995) 13

National Risk Retention Ass'n v. Brown,
927 F. Supp. 195, 200 (M.D. La. 1996) 19

National Warranty Ins. Co., RRG v. Greenfield,
24 F. Supp.2d 1096, 1108-1109 (D. Or. 1998) 15, 16, 17

Nebraska v. Charter Risk Retention Group,
Docket 489, Page 245, slip op. (D.Ct. Neb., Lancaster Cty. Nov 25, 1992) 19

Ophthalmic Mutual Ins. Co. v. Musser,
143 F.3d 1062, 1068 (7th Cir. 1998) 5, 13

STATUTES

Liability Risk Retention Act of 1986,
15 U.S.C. §§ 3901-3906 (1981, as amended 1986) 5, 20

McCarran-Ferguson Act,
15 U.S.C. § 1011, et seq. 4

15 U.S.C. § 3901(a)(4)(G) 15

15 U.S.C. §§ 3901(a)(4)(C)(ii) 10

15 U.S.C. § 3902(a)(1)(I) 12, 14

15 U.S.C. § 3902(a)(2) 12

15 U.S.C. § 3905(d) 11, 18

Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.267(1) 15

Or. R. Stat. § 646.273 (1995) 14

Or. Rev. Stat. § 731.066 (1967) 16

Or. Rev. Stat. § 742.390 (1995) 6

OTHER AUTHORITIES

132 Cong. Rec. S15446-01 (*daily ed*. Oct. 6, 1986)
(Statement of Sen. Gorton) 10

H.R. Rep. No. 865, 99th Cong., 2d Sess. 7,
reprinted in 1986 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 5303, 5304 9

Model Risk Retention Act,
NAIC, Model Laws, Regulations and Guidelines, Vol. IV, p. 705 (1991) 5

Service Contracts Model Act,
NAIC, Model Laws, Regulations and Guidelines, Vol. IV, p. 685 (1995) 6

INTEREST OF THE NAIC

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) is a non-profit, unincorporated association established in 1871, whose membership consists of the principal insurance regulatory officials of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the territories and insular possessions of the United States.

In submitting this brief, the NAIC seeks to demonstrate its interest in this proceeding and to fulfill the mission of the NAIC, as set out in its Constitution, to:

> ...assist state insurance regulators, individually and collectively, in serving the public interest in achieving the following fundamental insurance regulatory goals in a responsive, efficient and cost-effective manner, consistent with the wishes of its members:
>
> 1. Protect the public interest, promote competitive markets and facilitate the fair and equitable treatment of insurance consumers;
> 2. Promote the reliability, solvency, and financial solidity of insurance institutions; and
> 3. Support and improve State regulation of insurance.

The interest of the NAIC in this matter arises out of the regulatory responsibility vested in each insurance regulator (commissioner) to see that all laws respecting insurance companies and the types of policies offered for sale in his or her State are executed faithfully. The commissioners of the various States are charged with the responsibility of regulating the business of insurance within their jurisdictions pursuant to the McCarran-Ferguson Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1011, *et seq.*, and State insurance laws.

The members of the NAIC formed the Risk Retention Working Group in December, 1986 in response to the passage of the Liability Risk Retention Act of 1986, 15 U.S.C. §§ 3901-3906 (1981, as amended 1986). The group drafted and the NAIC adopted the Model Risk Retention Act (the Model Act). *NAIC Model Laws, Regulations and Guidelines*, Vol. IV, p. 705 (1991). Since then, every state in the country has enacted the Model Act or similar legislation. The Model Act sets out the specific state requirements risk retention groups must meet in chartering states and non-chartering states, as authorized by the Liability Risk Retention Act (LRRA). Uniform registration forms for risk retention groups and purchasing groups were developed by the NAIC and are presently used by more than thirty (30) states.

Since the passage of the LRRA in 1986, every member of the NAIC has been very concerned with regulation of risk retention groups. The NAIC submits that the District Court's decision in the case at bar is at war with all three of the NAIC's regulatory goals. The decision defeats the ability of individual states to defend the consumer as was so clearly intended by Congress. "Indeed, legislative history from the day the Senate passed the LRRA reveals that Congress specifically intended to preserve for states the right to exclude non-domestic RRGs on the basis of financial responsibility." *Ophthalmic Mutual Ins. Co. v. Musser,* 143 F.3d 1062, 1068 (7th Cir. 1998).

The NAIC also adopted the Service Contracts Model Act in 1995. *NAIC Model Laws, Regulations and Guidelines,* Vol. IV, p. 685 (1995). The law is essentially identical to the Oregon Service Contract Law. This model law, or similar or related legislation, has been adopted by approximately twenty-seven (27) states. Like the Oregon statute, this model requires that each provider of a service contract "[I]nsure all service contracts under a reimbursement insurance policy issued by an insurer authorized to transact insurance in this state...." It also provides for exceptions to this requirement, including the option of maintaining a net worth of "$100 million." Like the Oregon statute, the Model Act requires that the reimbursement insurer be directly liable to the consumer upon default of the seller of the reimbursement policy. Or. Rev. Stat. § 742.390 (1995).

The NAIC is concerned that, if the District Court decision is upheld by this Honorable Court, various and sundry risk retention groups, either chartered in a state or in a foreign country, will be free to sell service contract policies directly to the public throughout the country with the dealer or seller of consumer goods as a mere strawman or *de facto* commissioned broker.

The NAIC asks that this Honorable Court of Appeals reverse the decision of the District Court. The members of the NAIC believe this would be consistent with statutory law and common law and is in the best interest of insurance consumers, to whom commissioners are charged by both State and Federal law to protect.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

Amicus Curiae adopts the Statement of Jurisdiction for this matter as presented by the Defendant-Appellant.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

Amicus Curiae adopts the Statement of Issues for this matter as presented by the Defendant-Appellant.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Amicus Curiae adopts the Statement of Facts for this matter as presented by the Defendant-Appellant.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Amicus Curiae adopts the Standard of Review for this matter as presented by the Defendant-Appellant.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The members of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners are vitally concerned that consumers not be harmed by the entry of risk retention groups into insurance areas that the States, through the exercise of their duty to protect their citizens, have determined should be covered by financial responsibility laws. The NAIC believes the clear intent of Congress and the plain meaning of the statutory language dictate that States have the right to prohibit risk retention groups from issuing insurance policies for coverages required under financial responsibility laws and that states are not discriminating against risk retention groups when these consumer protection requirements are imposed.

ARGUMENT

Background

Plaintiff National Warranty Insurance Company, RRG (NWIC), and *Amicus Curiae* National Risk Retention Association (NRRA) both devoted significant argument to the history, background and purpose of the Product Liability Risk Retention Act of 1981 (PLRRA) and the Liability Risk Retention Act of 1986 (LRRA) in their briefs before the District Court. To the extent that such argument is used to justify Plaintiff's desire to sell a reimbursement insurance policy in satisfaction of a state financial responsibility requirement, the argument should be examined.

The legislative history is clear as to the purpose of the financial responsibility exception to the preemption of state regulation by the LRRA. "The 1986 Act was designed to meet both the need for a nationwide solution to the problems experienced by businesses seeking liability coverage and the need for meaningful consumer protection." H.R. Rep. No. 865, 99th Cong., 2d Sess. 7, *reprinted in* 1986 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 5303, 5304. "[R]equirements of financial responsibility are usually the result of a State's concern about third parties who might be injured by the insured's activities.... Such laws would continue to be valid notwithstanding the fact that they might preclude participation

in an out-of-State risk retention group for the purpose of meeting the requirement." 132 CONG. REC. S15446-01 (*daily ed.* Oct. 6, 1986) (Statement of Sen. Gorton).

Congress' concern over the impact on the consumer was noted in a case interpreting the PLRRA relied on by the Plaintiff. "The legislative history of the RRA indicates that one of the major underlying premises of the Act was that risk retention groups would be providing insurance only to its own members and not to members of the general public. This premise led Congress to conclude that it was safe to deprive non-chartering states of virtually all authority to supervise risk retention groups." *Home Warranty Corp. v. Elliott*, 572 F. Supp. 1059, 1066 (D. Del. 1983), *modified*, 585 F. Supp. 443 (D. Del. 1984).[1]

Nowhere in the Act or in its legislative history was there any mention of a nationwide crisis in the optional warranty insurance and service contract market. These are not the product liability, negligence and other tort liabilities that Congress intended to assist businesses in addressing when it passed the Liability

---

[1] The Delaware District Court in this case also raised the very real question of whether purely contractual liability, which is the type of liability being insured in the case at bar, "which goes beyond that which would otherwise be imposed by negligence, implied warranty, or strict liability law" is even authorized to be insured by a RRG. *Home Warranty Corp.,* 572 F. Supp. at 1068 (footnote 17). In a later opinion in the same proceeding the District Court noted "Both sides agree that if a risk retention group issues coverage which is not incidental to, and an integral part of, product liability or completed operations insurance, that coverage would be subject to regulation by the states." *Home Warranty Corp.*, 585 F. Supp. at 446 (footnote 6). This limitation is still applicable to Plaintiff because of 15 U.S.C. §§ 3901(a)(4)(C)(ii).

Risk Retention Act. On Page 6 of its Petition, Plaintiff alleges it writes insurance covering only "product liability and completed operations." *Amicus* disagrees. Service contract reimbursement policies are clearly for contractual liability, as defined by the court in *Home Warranty*. *Home Warranty Corp.,* 585 F. Supp. at 446 (footnote 6).

To the extent that Plaintiff uses the tort liability insurance crisis of the 1980s to justify the selling of a contractual liability product in 1999, Plaintiff is wrong.

I. THE FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY EXCEPTION TO THE LIABILITY RISK RETENTION ACT OF 1986 SHOULD CLEARLY APPLY BECAUSE THE STATE OF OREGON HAS REQUIRED A DEMONSTRATION OF FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, A LICENSE OR PERMIT IS REQUIRED AND CONSUMERS ARE AT RISK IF THE STATE IS PROHIBITED FROM IMPOSING SUCH REQUIREMENTS.

There are many situations where a state, in the exercise of its police power, imposes a financial responsibility requirement in order to protect its citizens from financial harm. Congress, in passing the Liability Risk Retention Act of 1986, clearly understood this, recognized this very important duty of the states, and made full allowance for this duty by including 15 U.S.C. § 3905(d) in the Act.

Financial responsibility requirements are imposed on entities who engage in particular activities to make absolutely certain that there is a pool of funds that others can look to should they be injured as a result of those activities. These

requirements serve the public interest by preventing or mitigating financial injury to a state's citizens. To allow risk retention groups to sell insurance policies in fulfillment of such requirements defeats the very purpose of these requirements. Risk retention groups are not ordinarily subject to non-chartering state insurance department examinations, audits, and restrictions on asset transfers, they are not required to meet more than one state's minimum capitalization and reserve requirements, they are not subject to non-chartering states' market conduct examinations, policy form or premium rate approvals, they are not subject to certain restrictions on investment of reserve and surplus funds, their management varies in experience and competency and they do not belong to insolvency guaranty associations.[2] Their policies may have widely varying coverages, exclusions, conditions, technical clauses and other differences in policy language that do not meet a non-chartering state's minimum requirements. It was because of this that "Congress specifically excepted from the Act's preemption provisions those state laws aimed at assuring the financial responsibility of entities subject to state, county, and city licensure laws. By so doing, Congress evidenced its intent to preserve for the states the authority to utilize financial responsibility laws to

[2] It is likely that licensed insurance companies belonging to guaranty associations would strongly oppose such membership since they are assessed in case of any insolvency. Regardless, it appears that a state is absolutely prohibited from allowing a RRG to join a guaranty association even if a RRG wished to do so. 15 U.S.C. §§ 3902(a)(1)(I) & 3902(a)(2).

protect the public." *Mears Transp. Group v. Florida,* 34 F.3d 1013, 1018 (11th Cir. 1994), *cert. den.* 115 S.Ct. 1960 (1995). *Accord*, *Ophthalmic* at 1068.

Oregon's Service Contract Law was enacted in recognition of the fact that optional service contracts and warranties being sold to consumers were simply not being honored because the sellers were going out of business or outright breaching them. It is clearly a consumer protection law. It is ironic then that Plaintiff National Warranty Insurance Company (NWIC), stated "[I]n addition, if NWIC becomes insolvent, its members, who are automobile dealers, are the ones at risk…."[3] Oregon passed the statute not to protect the dealers (who make substantial commissions from the sale of these contracts), but the consumers who in that past have been consistently victimized in the service contract area and are the ones at risk. The funds represented by the insurance policies are supposed to benefit the consumers, not the dealers. The risk to consumers is even more apparent when it is recognized that, if a risk retention group is allowed to sell its policy in fulfillment of this financial responsibility requirement, only the dealer and not the consumer sees this federally mandated warning:

---

[3] Page 22 of Response to Defendant Kerry Barnett's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment by Plaintiff National Warranty Insurance Company, RRG.

NOTICE

> This policy is issued by your risk retention group. Your risk retention group may not be subject to all of the insurance laws and regulations of your State. State insurance insolvency guaranty funds are not available for your risk retention group.

15 U.S.C. § 3902(a)(1)(I).

Many consumers may not purchase a service contract if this risk retention group insurance policy notice were placed in their service contract or optional warranty in the "10 point type" required by law. Yet, under Oregon law, NWIC would in fact be bound directly to the consumer since the seller of the service contract (the dealer and obligor) is the reimbursement insurer's agent in dealing with the consumer. "(1) An obligor is considered to be the agent of the insurer that issued the reimbursement insurance policy…." Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.273 (1995). The consumer would in fact be insured by a risk retention group without having any way of knowing this or receiving the federally mandated warning.

Magistrate Judge Stewart recognized the unique nature of service contracts and their similarity to insurance when she stated:

> [D]espite these statutory provisions differentiating service contracts from insurance, the fact remains that service contracts are nothing more than a form of insurance against a specific type of loss…. The obligor promises to indemnify the consumer for this loss…. In contrast, an obligor of a service contract is analogous to a seller of insurance, while a reimbursement insurer, such as NWIC, is analogous to a reinsurer…. From that perspective, any attempt by a state to prevent RRGs as a class from engaging in that liability insurance business is preempted by the LRRA.

National Warranty Ins. Co., RRG v. Greenfield, 24 F. Supp.2d 1096, 1108-1109 (D. Or. 1998).

However, it follows then that NWIC would be reinsuring the service contracts, a risk that is illegal for NWIC to underwrite. The LRRA specifically prohibits risk retention groups from entering into any reinsurance agreements with any person or entity except for ***other*** risk retention groups or members of ***other*** risk retention groups.[4] This again only makes too clear the consumer risk that is created if Oregon is not allowed to restrict reimbursement insurance policies to authorized insurers.[5]

---

[4] "risk retention group" means any corporation or other limited liability association —

> (G) whose activities do not include the provision of insurance other than–
>
> > (i) liability insurance for assuming and spreading all or any portion of the similar or related liability exposure of its group members; and
> >
> > (ii) reinsurance with respect to the similar or related liability exposure of any ***other*** risk retention group (or any member of such ***other*** group) which is engaged in businesses or activities so that such group (or member) meets the requirement described in subparagraph (F) for membership in the risk retention group which provides such reinsurance....

15 U.S.C. § 3901(a)(4)(G) (emphasis added).

[5] Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.267(1) states in part "The term 'service contract' does not include insurance policies issued by insurers *under* the Insurance Code, or maintenance agreements." If these are insurance policies issued not under the Insurance Code but under the Service Contract Law, NWIC would clearly be selling an illegal reinsurance agreement.

II. OREGON'S REQUIREMENT THAT ANY REIMBURSEMENT INSURANCE POLICY BE ISSUED BY AN AUTHORIZED INSURER DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST RISK RETENTION GROUPS BECAUSE THE REQUIREMENT IS NOT DIRECTED TO RISK RETENTION GROUPS AND IS NOT LIMITED TO RISK RETENTION GROUPS.

Risk retention groups are completely legal and operate freely in Oregon. They can and do offer their members in the State of Oregon insurance for the entire field of liability as authorized by the LRRA. NWIC can certainly sell the broad range of other products it offers in the State of Oregon. It offers many types of liability insurance to automobile dealers which do not involve service contracts sold to Oregon's consumers. NWIC is equally free to obtain a certificate of authority and become an authorized insurer in accordance with Or. Rev. Stat. § 731.066 (1967). Oregon's requirement that only an authorized insurer sell service contract reimbursement policies does not focus on or even mention risk retention groups. The Act also prohibits insurance companies that may be licensed in other states but not Oregon from selling such policies (and who are not risk retention groups) and it restricts companies with a net worth of less than $100 million from selling service contracts without reimbursement insurance.

The District Court opinion suggested that the State of Oregon can avoid an accusation of discrimination by setting up a state-run facility similar to a state-run workers' compensation program. *National Warranty Ins. Co., RRG*, 24 F. Supp.2d

at 1105. This would of course entail the creation of a new state agency, devotion of significant state funding and mandatory participation by all businesses wishing to sell service contracts. The very narrow need filled by service contracts surely does not seem to justify such an extraordinary remedy.

The District Court also suggested, and the Plaintiff urged,[6] that the State of Oregon create "a neutral standard for qualifying insurers participating in a financial responsibility program, such as one relating to minimum net worth…." *National Warranty Ins. Co., RRG,* 24 F. Supp. 2d at 1108. The inherent fault in such a proposal is its creation of two systems for licensing or approving insurance companies. It is respectfully submitted that a "neutral standard" for qualifying insurers, the state statutory licensing procedure, already exists in the State of Oregon and the fact is that the Plaintiff does not meet that standard. Minimum net worth, as suggested by Judge Stewart, standing alone, is of no value in determining the solvency or stability of any insurance company. The process for measuring and determining the quality of assets, liabilities, reserves, surplus, reinsurance recoverables, management abilities, restrictions on asset transfers, compliance with reporting requirements and restrictions on entering new markets is not appropriate

---

[6] Plaintiff urged so on p. 24 of its Brief in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, p. 10 of its Reply brief and page 18 of its Response brief.

to abbreviate or short circuit solely to accommodate a risk retention group's desire to sell service contract reimbursement insurance.

Plaintiff on Page 24 of its Response to Defendant Kerry Barnett's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, filed with the District Court, argued that it is simply wrong to discriminate against unlicensed insurers in favor of licensed insurers. Setting aside the fact that Congress expressly gave permission to the States to "exclude insurance coverage obtained from...a risk retention group...." (15 U.S.C. § 3905(d)), this type of argument is analogous to arguing that it is wrong to prohibit unlicensed medical doctors from practicing medicine while allowing licensed medical doctors to do so. Some unlicensed doctors conceivably will have better skills and practice better medicine that some licensed doctors. However, common sense dictates that the public will be harmed if unlicensed doctors can practice medicine. Plaintiff is by analogy arguing that a separate procedure should be set up to allow unlicensed doctors to practice medicine. This defeats the very purpose of the licensing procedure, which in both cases is to protect the general public.

As the Eleventh Circuit noted in *Mear*s, unless the discrimination is directed to or aimed at RRGs, it should not be considered discrimination against RRGs. To read the statute otherwise is to read it out of existence. In discussing *Mears*, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky stated:

> The Eleventh Circuit, reversing the district court, determined that the Florida statute was precisely the type of state law Congress expressly exempted from the preemption provisions of the Liability Risk Retention Act. Further, the court found no evidence of discrimination. The undersigned likewise finds that like the Kentucky regulation, KAR 30:010, § 1, is precisely the type of financial responsibility law that Congress expressly exempted from preemption in 15 U.S.C. § 3905(d); additionally, there is no evidence of discrimination against Garage Service or any other purchasing group.

Garage Services and Equip. Dealers Liability Ass'n of Am., Inc. v. Homes, 867 F. Supp. 1301, 1307 (E.D. Ky. 1994). *Accord, National Risk Retention Ass'n v. Brown*, 927 F. Supp. 195, 200 (M.D. La. 1996) ("Section 3905(d) is properly applied in that situation to limit the reach of the LRRA to prohibit the state from discriminating against the prospective licensee if it offers insurance coverage from a risk-retention group as its proof of financial responsibility.").

Plaintiff cited *Charter Risk Retention Group Ins. Co. v. Rolka*, 796 F. Supp. 154 (M.D. Pa. 1992) despite that group's subsequent history. The risk retention group in question was put into receivership less than two weeks after that district court handed down its opinion. The insureds and claimants of that risk retention group were not protected by a state guaranty association. *Nebraska v. Charter Risk Retention Group*, Docket 489, Page 245, slip op. (D.Ct. Neb., Lancaster Cty. Nov 25, 1992). Oregon's consumers deserve better.

CONCLUSION

In construing the meaning and purpose of the various provisions of the Liability Risk Retention Act of 1986, the members of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, the nation's oldest association of state government officials, firmly believe that the Congressional intent to protect the general public should guide this Honorable Court. Thus, the NAIC asks that the decision of the United States District Court in the case at bar be reversed and that this Honorable Court issue its Order holding that the State of Oregon is permitted to require that service contract reimbursement policies only be issued by licensed insurance companies. This would be consistent with statutory and common law and is in the best interest of insurance consumers, whom the members of the NAIC are charged by both State and Federal law to protect.

Respectfully submitted,



Ross S. Myers, Senior Counsel
Missouri Bar No. 31968
Kansas Supreme Court No. 13623
National Association of Insurance Commissioners
120 W. 12th Street, Suite 1100
Kansas City, Missouri 64105
Phone (816) 889-4460
Fax (816) 374-7185

ATTORNEY FOR *AMICUS CURIAE*

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULES

The undersigned hereby certifies that he is admitted to the Court in accordance with Circuit Rule 46-1.2 (1998). The undersigned further certifies that, in accordance with FRAP 32, the attached brief uses proportionately spaced Times New Roman 14 point type and has a total word count of 4523.



Ross S. Myers
National Association of Insurance Commissioners
120 W. 12th Street, Suite 1100
Kansas City, Missouri 64105
Phone (816) 889-4460
Fax (816) 374-7185

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, Ross S. Myers, certify that two copies of the *Brief of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners as Amicus Curiae in Support of Defendant-Appellant* were served by first-class U.S. mail, postage prepaid, to each of the following on this 25th day of March, 1999:

Attorney for Defendants-Appellants

Denise Fjordbeck, Assistant Attorney General
Appellate Division
Oregon Department of Justice
1162 Court Street NE
Salem, OR 97310

Attorney for Plaintiffs-Appellees

James N. Westwood, Attorney at Law
Miller, Nash, Wiener, et al.
111 S.W. 5th Avenue
Suite 3500
Portland, OR 97204



Ross S. Myers
National Association of Insurance Commissioners
120 W. 12th Street, Suite 1100
Kansas City, Missouri 64105
Phone (816) 889-4460
Fax (816) 374-7185