Note: This chart contains generic references to "UTPA" and "UCSPA;" those references refer to a state's unfair insurance trade practices act and unfair insurance claims settlement practices act, respectively, regardless of its actual title. Further, for purposes of this chart, "first party private right of action" refers to an action brought by the insured and "third party private right of action" refers to an action brought by a third party claimant.

The date following each state indicates the last time information for the state was reviewed/changed.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
AL (8/23)	§ 27-12-24	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	Farlow v. Union Cent. Life Ins. Co., 874 F.2d 791 (11th Cir. 1989): no private right of action under UTPA for UCSPs. Overruled by: Morstein v. Nat'l Ins. Services, Inc., 93 F.3d 715 (1996).
	Chavers v. Nat'l Sec. Fire & Cas. Co., 405 So.2d 1 (Ala. 1981).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	Insurers' intentional misconduct may create a cause of action.
	Dickey v. Ala. Farm Bureau Mut. Ins. Co., 447 So.2d 693 (Ala. 1984).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		"Bad faith refusal" tort requires insurance contract between parties.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
AK (8/23)	§ 21.36.125	UCSPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	Private right of action neither created nor implied.
	State Farm Fire & Cas. Co. v. Nicholson, 777 P.2d 1152 (Alaska 1989).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	First party right of action against insurer for breach of good faith duty and fair dealing sounds in tort because of special relationship between insurer and insured.
	O.K. Lumber Co. v. Providence Wash. Ins. Co., 759 P.2d 523 (Alaska 1988).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		Duty of good faith runs only to insured but insured may assign claim to a third party claimant.
	Ennen v. Integon, 268 P.3d 277 (Alaska 2012).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		Incidental beneficiaries, such as a tort victim, cannot enforce the insurance contract against the insurer.

			PERMITS FIRST	PERMITS THIRD		
STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
AZ (8/23)	§ 20-461	UCSPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	No intent to create private right of action.
	§ 20-3153	Claims settlement health (not including HMOs)	Yes, by statute.	No, by statute.	Private action	Timely payment of health claims—insurer liable for damages if knew or should have known of lack of reasonable basis for delay or denial in payment.
	Noble v. Nat'l Am. Life Ins. Co., 624 P.2d 866 (Ariz. 1981).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	When insurer unreasonably and in bad faith withholds payment of insured's claim, insurer is subject to liability in tort.
	Leal v. Allstate Ins. Co., 17 P.3d 95 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2000).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		No private right of action for third party claimants.
AR (8/23)	§§ 23-66-202; 23-66-206	UTPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	Not intended to establish or extinguish private right of action; UCSPs defined.
	Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Broadway Arms Corp., 664 S.W.2d 463 (Ark. 1984).	Common law bad faith tort claim			Private action	Insurer may incur liability for tort of intentional bad faith against insured.
	Bell v. Kansas City Fire & Marine Ins. Co., 616 F. Supp. 1305 (D.C. Ark. 1985) (applying Oklahoma law).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.		Arkansas courts would probably not recognize third party tort claim, but Oklahoma law controls in this case.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
CA (8/23)	Ins. Code § 790.03	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	Moradi-Shalal v. Firemen's Fund Ins. Cos., 758 P.2d 58 (Cal. 1988); no private right of action, but other theories may be available.
	Gruenberg v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co., 510 P.2d 1032 (Cal. 1973); Crisci v. Sec. Ins. Co., 426 P.2d 173 (Cal. 1967); Fletcher v. Western Nat'l Life Ins. Co., 89 Cal. Rptr. 78 (Cal Ct. App. 1970).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	When the case sounds in tort, insurance code does not restrict recovery under contract principals.
	Murphy v. Allstate Ins. Co., 553 P.2d 584 (Cal. 1976).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		Neither third party beneficiary doctrine nor financial responsibility law warrants granting injured claimant right to recover from insurer for breach of duty to settle.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
CO (8/23)	§§ 10-3-1104(1)(h); 10-3-1114	UTPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	No private cause of action.
	§§ 6-1-105; 6-1-113(1)	Consumer protection statute	Yes, by statute.		Private action	Showpiece Homes Corp. v. Assurance Co. of Am., 38 P.3d 47 (Colo. 2001): bad faith claims settlement actionable under Colorado Consumer Protection Statute.
	Farmers Group, Inc. v. Trimble, 691 P.2d 1138 (Colo. 1984).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	Insurer's affirmative act of unreasonably refusing to pay a claim and failing to act in good faith forms the basis for liability in tort.
	Schnacker v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 843 P.2d 102 (Colo. Ct. App. 1992).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		Injured third party may not maintain a cause of action for bad faith breach of an insurance contract against a tortfeasor's insurer.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
CT (8/23)	§§ 42-110b; 42-110g; 38a-816(6)	UTPA; CUIPA (Connecticut Unfair Insurance Practices Act)	Yes, by statute under UTPA.	No, by judicial interpretation.  Carford v. Empire  Fire & Marine Ins.  Co., 891 A.2d 55  (Conn. App. 2006).	Private action or administrative	DeRossi v. Nat'l Loss Mgmt., 328 F. Supp. 2d 283 (D. Conn. 2004): Private cause of action under UTPA may be brought for violation of CUIPA. Mead v. Burns, 509 A.2d 11 (Conn. 1986): Violation of CUIPA requires such alleged unfair acts to occur with such frequency to indicate general business practice.
	Buckman v. People Express, Inc., 530 A.2d 596 (Conn. 1987).	Common law duty of good faith	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	Court recognizes an independent cause of action in tort arising from an insurer's common law duty of good faith.
	Alexander v. W.F. Shuck Petroleum Co., 2009 WL 2783587 (Conn. Super. Ct. 2009).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		Only insured may enforce implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

	Ī	Ī	DEDIKITA DIDAT			1
STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
DE (8/23)	18 Del.C. § 2304; 18 Del. Admin. Code § 902-1.0	UTPA (statute); UCSPA (regulation)	Not addressed in statute or regulation.	Not addressed in statute or regulation.	Administrative	Statutory and regulatory scheme contemplate administrative remedies.
	Tackett v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Ins. Co., 653 A.2d 254 (Del. 1995).	Common law bad faith tort claim	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Private cause of action	Delaware views bad faith claim practices as sounding in contract rather than tort. A plaintiff seeking to establish a claim of bad faith in a first party insuredinsurer contractual relationship must show that the insurer lacked reasonable justification in delaying or refusing payment of a claim.
DC (8/23)	§ 31-2231.02	UTPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	Expressly no private cause of action.
	Choharis v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co., 961 A.2d 1080 (D.C. Ct. App. 2008).	Common law bad faith tort claim	No, by judicial determination.			No independent tort for bad faith settlement practice.
	Messina v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co., 998 F.2d 2 (D.C. Cir. 1993).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial determination.		Tort of bad faith refusal to pay necessarily requires contractual relationship.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
FL (8/23)	§ 624.155	UCSPA	Yes, by statute.	Yes, by statute.	Damages; court costs, attorneys' fees, punitive damages possible.	Statute does not distinguish between first party and third party actions. One seeking remedy under this statute must post costs of discovery to be awarded to insurer if no punitive damages awarded.
	Opperman v. Nationwide Mut. Fire Ins. Co., 515 So.2d 263 (Fla. App. 5th Dist. 1987).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	
	Thompson v. Commercial Union Ins. Co. of N.Y., 250 So.2d 259 (Fla. 1971).	Common law bad faith tort claim		Yes, by judicial interpretation.	Private action	The rule in Florida now is that the third party beneficiary of a contract is the real party in interest and may prosecute an action on it in his own name as the real party in interest.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
GA (8/23)	§§ 33-4-6; 33-4-7 §§ 33-6-30 to 33-6-37	Claims settlement  UCSPA	Yes, by statute.  No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Private action: able to recover loss, additional penalty of up to \$5000 or not more than 50% of the liability of the insurer for the loss, whichever is greater, and attorney fees. Administrative	Legal action for bad faith failure to pay claims within 60 days of payment demand.
	Metropolitan Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Crump, 513 S.E.2d 33 (Ga. Ct. App. 1999).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Private action	Insurer's duty to use ordinary care and good faith in handling claim arises out of insurer's relationship with insured.

	T	T				1
STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
HI (8/23)	§§ 431:13-103 to 431:13-108.	UTPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	Remedies are exclusively for commissioner.
	Best Place, Inc. v. Penn Am. Ins. Co., 920 P.2d 334 (Hawaii 1996).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	
	Simmons v. Puu, 94 P.3d 667 (Hawaii 2004); Hough v. Pacific Ins. Co., 927 P.2d 858 (Hawaii 1996).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		Insured could assign tort claim to third party which would allow third party recovery in private action.
ID (8/23)	§§ 41-1329 to 41-1329A	UCSPA	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative – penalty not to exceed \$10,000.	Simper v. Farm Bureau Mut. Ins. Co., 974 P.2d 1100 (Idaho 1999); UCSPA does not provide a private right of action for insured.
	White v. Unigard Mut. Ins. Co., 730 P.2d 1014 (Idaho 1986).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	There exists a common law tort action for an insurer's bad faith in settling the first party claims of its insured.
	Idaho State Ins. Fund v. Van Tine, 980 P.2d 566 (Idaho 1999).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation	Private action	Bad faith tort claims for unfair settlement practices can only be brought by first party insured.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
IL (8/23)	215 ILCS 5/154.5 to 5/155	Improper claims statute	No, by statute.  Van Vleck v. Ohio Cas. Ins. Co., 471 N.E.2d 925 (Ill. Ct. App. 3rd 1984); Bageanis v. Am. Bankers Life Assurance of Fla., 783 F. Supp. 1141 (N.D. Ill. 1992).	No, by statute.	Administrative	No private right of action but statute provides enhanced penalties to be added to private action if unfair practices shown. Courts have held that this statute, while not in itself actionable, does operate to pre-empt other tort claims of bad faith in claims settlement.
	815 ILCS 505/1	Consumer fraud statute; P.I.A. Mich. City, Inc. v. Nat'l Porges Radiator Corp., 789 F. Supp. 1421 (N.D. Ill. 1992).	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Standing to sue under consumer fraud statute not limited to consumer.
	Cramer v. Ins. Exch. Agency, 675 N.E.2d 897 (Ill. 1996).	Common law bad faith tort claim	No, by judicial interpretation.			Extra-contractual remedies for bad faith settlement are recoverable through statutory penalties of 215 ILCS 5/155.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
IN (8/23)	§§ 27-4-1-1 to 27-4-1-18	UCSPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	
	Erie Ins. Co. v. Hickman, 622 N.E.2d 515 (Ind. 1993).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	
	State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co. v. Estep, 873 N.E.2d 1021 (Ind. 2007).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		Duty of good faith and the resulting cause of action for that breach arise out of the insurance contract between insured and insurer.
IA (8/23)	§ 507B.4	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	No private cause of action created by this statute; <i>Bates v. Allied Mut. Ins. Co.</i> , 467 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1991).
	Dolan v. Aid Ins. Co., 431 N.W.2d 790 (Iowa 1988).	Common law bad faith	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	
	Bates v. Allied Mut. Ins. Co., 467 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1991).	Common law bad faith		No, by judicial interpretation.		Tort victim, as a third party claimant, cannot compel insurer to settle claim in good faith.
KS (8/23)	§ 40-2404	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.	Not addressed in statute.	Administrative	Bonnell v. Bank of Am., 284 F. Supp. 2d 1284 (D. Kan. 2003).
	Spencer v. Aetna Life & Cas. Ins. Co., 611 P.2d 149 (Kan. 1980).	Common law bad faith tort claim	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.		Must be contract action; tort of bad faith not recognized.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
KY (8/23)	§§ 304.12-230; 446.070	UCSPA	Yes, by statute through judicial interpretation.	Yes, by statute through judicial interpretation.	Private action, administrative	State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Reeder, 763 S.W.2d 116 (Ky. 1988). §§ 304.12-230 and 446.070 work together to create statutory bad faith claim.
LA (8/23)	§ 22:1821	Claims payment—health (including HMOs)	Yes, by statute.	No, by statute.	Financial penalties, including attorney fees.	Grants jurisdiction to courts in insured's parish for cases involving failure to pay claims.
	§§ 22:1961 to 22:1973	UTPA	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	Yes, by judicial interpretation; Theriot v. Midlands Risk Ins. Co., 694 So.2d 184 (La. 1997). Language in Theriot was dicta, and third party claimants do not have a right of action under § 22:1973(B)(5). Paul v. Allstate Ins. Co., 720 So.2d 1251 (La. Ct. App. 1998).	Administrative; private action by judicial interpretation.	Insurer has duty to settle claims with insured and/or third party; French Market Plaza Corp. v. Sequoia Ins. Co., 480 F. Supp. 821 (E.D. La. 1979).

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
ME (8/23)	24-A M.R.S.A. § 2164-D	UCSPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	Not to be construed to create or imply a private right of action.
	24-A M.R.S.A. § 2436	Claims settlement	Not applicable	Not applicable	Statute allows for recovery of attorney fees and interest on any overdue claims.	Depositors Trust Co. v. Farm Family Life Ins. Co., 445 A.2d 1014 (Me. 1982): no application to life claims.
	24-A M.R.S.A. § 2436-A	Claims settlement	Yes, by statute.	No, by statute.	Damages, costs, attorneys' fees, interest	No application to WC claims. Court specifically rejected bad faith tort claim for unfair claim settlement.
	Marquis v. Farm Family Mut. Ins. Co., 628 A.2d 644 (Me. 1993).	Common law bad faith tort claim	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.		
MD (8/23)	Ins. § 27-1001	UCSPA	Yes, by statute.	Ambiguous	Private action to recover under policy.	If it is shown that the insurer did not act in good faith the insurer may be liable for interest and attorney fees.
	Schaefer v. Aetna Life & Cas. Co., 910 F. Supp. 1095 (D. Md. 1996).	Common law bad faith	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.		Tort of bad faith for failure to settle is not recognized in Maryland.
MA (8/23)	M.G.L.A. 93A § 9; M.G.L.A. 176D §§ 1 to 14	Consumer protection statute; UCSPA	Yes, by statute.	Yes, by statute.	Damages and other equitable relief.	Grants private right of action for violations of UCSP provisions.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
MI (8/23)	§ 500.2003	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	Michigan's UTPA does not create a private cause of action; <i>Nat'l</i> <i>Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Arioli</i> , 941 F. Supp. 646 (E.D. Mich. 1996).
	§ 500.2006	Claims payment statute	No, by judicial interpretation, but see note 1; Young v. Michigan Ins. Co., 362 N.W.2d 844 (Mich. App. 1985) (insurer's bad faith refusal to settle claim against the insured by third party which exposes the insured to excess liability is actionable).	No, by judicial interpretation, but see note.	Administrative; private action for interest penalties.	Through this statute claimant can recover interest penalty when suing on insurance policy.
	§ 445.911; Smith v. Globe Life Ins. Co., 597 N.W.2d 28 (Mich. 1999).	Consumer protection statute	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	Private action by judicial interpretation of statute.	Allows private actions against insurer under consumer protection statute for violations of insurance code.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
MN (8/23)	§§ 72A.20 to 72A.201  Morris v. Am. Family Mut. Ins. Co., 386 N.W.2d 233 (Minn. 1986).	UTPA, UCSPA  Common law bad faith tort claim	No, by judicial interpretation.  No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.  No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	There is no private right of action under Minnesota's Unfair Claims Practices Act, rather UCPA is enforced by commissioner and attorney general; <i>Elder v. Allstate Ins. Co.</i> , 341 F. Supp. 2d 1095 (D. Minn. 2004). Commissioner need not show general business practice to take action.  Courts in MN do not recognize bad faith tort.  An insurer may be liable for failing to exercise "good faith" in handling third party claims against an insured. <i>Short v. Dairyland Ins. Co.</i> , 334 N.W.2d 384 (Minn. 1983).

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
MS (8/23)	§§ 83-5-33; 83-5-35	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.  Watson v. First  Commonwealth Life Ins. Co., 686 F. Supp. 153 (S.D. Miss. 1988).	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	UTPA does not include UCSPs, but allows commissioner to act upon undefined UTPAs.
	Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. McKneely, 862 So.2d 530 (Miss. 2003).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	No private right of action to be implied from general prohibition against unfair trade practices.  Bad faith tort is available when insurer does not provide an arguable or legitimate basis for denying a claim or a willful and malicious reason behind the denial.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
MO (8/23)	§ 375.420	Claims settlement	Yes, by statute.	Yes, by statute.	Action for loss plus penalties.	
	§§ 375.1000 to 375.1018	UCSPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	USCPA does not allow a private right of action; <i>Stark Liquidation Co. v. Florists' Mut. Ins. Co.</i> , 243 S.W.3d 385 (Mo. Ct. App. 2007).
	Duncan v. Andrew Cnty. Mut. Ins. Co., 665 S.W.2d 13 (Mo. Ct. App. 1983); Zumwalt v. Utilities Ins. Co., 228 S.W.2d 750 (Mo. 1950).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation, but see note.	No, implied by case law.	Private action	In Missouri, an insured can sue insurer for tort of bad faith failure to settle based on failure to settle a third party claim but not for failure to settle a direct claim by the insured.
MT (8/23)	§ 33-18-242	UCSPA	Yes, by statute.	Yes, by statute with restrictions.	Private action	Independent private right of action for violating certain provisions.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
NE (8/23)	§§ 44-1536 to 44-1544; 210 Neb. Admin. Code §§ 60-001 to 60-013; 210 Neb. Admin. Code §§ 61-001 to 61-011	UCSPA	No	No	Administrative	Regulations clarify original intent that statute and regulations not be construed to create or imply private right of action.
	LeRette v. Am. Med. Sec. Inc., 705 N.W.2d 41 (Neb. 2005).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	Available both for insurers refusal to settle with third party and failure to settle with insured.
	J.B. Contracting Svcs., Inc. v. Universal Sur. Co., 624 N.W.2d 13 (Neb. 2001).	Common law bad faith tort claim		Unresolved under Nebraska law.		
NV (8/23)	§ 686A.310	UCSPA	Yes, by statute.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Damages	Insurer liable to insured for damages for violation of UCSA.
	Guaranty Nat'l Ins. Co. v. Potter, 912 P.2d 267 (Nev. 1996).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	
	Gunny v. Allstate Ins. Co., 830 P.2d 1335 (Nev. 1992); Vignola v. Gilman, 804 F. Supp. 2d 1072, (D. Nev. 2011).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		A contractual relationship is required to assert a claim of bad faith unless a third party is a specific intended beneficiary to the insurance contract or alleges it relied to its detriment on representations made by the insurer.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
NH (8/23)	§ 407:12	Claims settlement - fire	Yes, by statute.	No, by statute.	Civil action	May commence if loss not paid 60 days after receipt of proof of loss.
	§§ 417:4; 417:19	UTPA	Yes, by statute.	Yes, by statute.	Civil action for damages	Civil action may be brought following commissioner's determination that insurer has violated UTPA.
NJ (8/23)	N.J.S.A. 17:29B-1 to 17:29B-15	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	UCSPs defined.
			Pickett v. Lloyd's, 621 A.2d 445 (N.J. 1993).			No private cause of action.
	N.J.A.C. 11:2-17.1 to 11:2-17.15	UCSPA	No, by judicial interpretation.  ProCentury Ins. Co. v. Harbor House Club Condo. Assoc., 652 F. Supp. 2d. 552 (D.N.J. 2009).	Statute implies administrative remedy.	Administrative	Provides for commissioner investigation and resultant penalties for persistent unfair claims practices.
	Pickett v. Lloyd's, 621 A.2d 445 (N.J. 1993); Rova Farms Resort, Inc. v. Investors Ins. Co. of Am., 323 A.2d 495 (N.J. 1974).	Common law bad faith tort claim	No, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	NJ views bad faith first party claims as sounding more of contract than of tort and therefore, no extra-contractual damages are available. In third party claims an insurer can be liable for amounts over policy limit for breach of the fiduciary agreement.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
NM (8/23)	§§ 59A-16-20; 59A-16-30	UCSPA	Yes, by statute; Dydek v. Dydek, 288 P.3d 872 (N.M. Ct. App. 2012).	Yes, by statute; Hovet v. Allstate Ins. Co., 135 NM 397 (N.M. 2004).  No third party claim against insurers providing nonmandatory excess liability insurance coverage. Jolley v. Assoc. Elec. & Gas Ins. Servs. Ltd., 237 P.3d 738 (N.M. 2010).	Damages and costs; attorneys' fees possible.	Relief is in addition to remedies otherwise available under common law and other statutes. Third party claimant can file action against insurer only after underlying litigation is completed. Insurers failing to settle claims are liable in insured's bad faith action for the judgment against insured in excess of policy limits.
	Sloan v. State Farm Ins. Co., 135 N.M. 106 (N.M. 2004).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	Insurer liable in tort where reasons for denying or delaying payment to insured are frivolous or unfounded.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
NY (8/23)	Ins. Law §§ 109; 2601	UCSPA	No, by judicial interpretation.  New York Univ. v. Cont'l Ins. Co., 662 N.E.2d 763 (N.Y. 1995).	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	UCSPs defined.  No private right of action.
	New York Univ. v. Cont'l Ins. Co., 662 N.E.2d 763 (N.Y. 1995).	Common law bad faith tort claim	No, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	New York does not recognize a bad faith independent tort and therefore only standard breach of contract claims would be available for bad faith refusal to settle.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
NC (8/23)	§ 58-63-15	UTPA	Yes, by judicial interpretation.  Martini v.  Companion Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co., 679 S.E.2d 156 (N.C. App. Ct. 2009) (reversed on other grounds).	No, by judicial interpretation. Wilson v. Wilson, 468 S.E.2d 495 (N.C. 1996).	Administrative; private action by judicial interpretation.	UTPA does not create a private cause of action but any violation gives rise to a private cause of action under the consumer protection statute without the additional necessity of proving frequency of the unfair practice.
	Dailey v. Integon Gen. Ins. Corp., 331 S.E.2d 148 (N.C. 1985).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	Yes, by judicial interpretation, but limited to third party beneficiaries. Other cases suggest that this may be a unique result and that third party private actions will not be allowed (see reasoning under <i>Wilson</i> above).	Private action	Third party beneficiary has contractual privity.
	Murray v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co., 472 S.E.2d 358 (N.C. App. 1996).	Common law bad faith tort claim		·	Private action	Injured third party considered intended beneficiary to liability insurance contract.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
ND (8/23)	§ 26.1-04-03	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	UCSPs defined.
			Dvorak v. Am. Family Mut. Ins. Co., 508 N.W.2d 329 (N.D. 1993); Volk v. Wis. Mortg. Assurance Co., 474 N.W.2d 40 (N.D. 1991).			Declines to hold that private right of action created, but might be possible if plaintiff shows conduct with such frequency as to indicate general business practice.
	Dvorak v. Am. Family Mut. Ins. Co., 508 N.W.2d 329 (N.D. 1993); Smith v. Am. Family Mut. Ins. Co., 294 N.W.2d 751 (N.D. 1980).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation – duty of good faith is owed to insured not to third party claimants.	Private action	

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
OH (8/23)	§ 3901.21	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.  Strack v. Westfield, 515 N.E.2d 1005 (Ohio Ct. App. 1985).	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	Statute does not create implied cause of action in favor of insureds.
	OAC 3901-1-07; 3901-1-54	UCSPA; claims settlement	No, by statute. Ohio DOI rules do not create private cause of action and are not a bad faith standard. Furr v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins., 716 N.E.2d 250 (Ohio Ct. App. 1998).	No, by statute.	Administrative	Uniform minimum standards for dispensing of claims; nothing shall be construed to create or imply a cause of action.
	Hoskins v. Aetna Life Ins. Co., 452 N.E.2d 1315 (Ohio 1983); Zoppo v. Homestead Ins. Co., 644 N.E.2d 397 (Ohio 1994); Motorists Mut. Ins. Co. v. Said, 590 N.E.2d 1228 (Ohio 1992) (overruled on other grounds by Zoppo); Furr v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 716 N.E.2d 250 (Ohio Ct. App. 1998).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	Yes, by judicial interpretation. Legal duty of good faith imposed by law on insurer applies with equal force to insurer's settlement of third party claims against its insured as it does to those claims brought by insured himself or herself.	Compensatory damages, including attorney fees, flowing from insurer's bad faith conduct and caused by insurer's breach.	Insurer has duty of good faith to insured and a bad faith refusal to settle gives rise to a claim in tort. Finding of bad faith does not automatically entitle an insured to punitive damages; rather, such an award requires a finding of malice where refusal to pay claim is not predicated upon circumstances that furnish reasonable justification.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
OK (8/23)	36 Okl.St.Ann. §§ 1250.1 to 1250.16	UCSPA	No, by judicial interpretation.  Walker v. Chouteau Lime Co., 849 P.2d 1085 (Okla. 1993).	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	No private right of action through UCSPA.
	Boling v. New Amsterdam Cas. Co., 173 Okla. 160 (1935).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	
	McWhirter v. Fire Ins. Exch., Inc., 878 P.2d 1056 (Okla. 1994).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		The duty arises from the contractual relationship between the insurer and the insured. Third parties are not in the contract. Absent a contractual or statutory relationship, there is no duty.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
OR (8/23)	§ 746.230	UTPA, UCSPA	No, by judicial interpretation. Richardson v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am., 984 P.2d 917 (Or. Ct. App. 1999).	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	UCSPs defined
	Georgetown Realty, Inc. v. Home Ins. Co, 831 P.2d 7 (Or. 1992); Farris v. U.S. Fid. & Guar. Co., 587 P.2d 1015 (Or. 1978).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.			Violations of statute are not independently actionable. If a defendant negligently breaches, the injured party may bring a claim for negligence if the defendant is subject to a standard of care independent of the contract.
	Stahl v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co., 977 F.2d 591 (9th Cir. 1992).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.		

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
PA (8/23)	40 Pa. Stat. Ann. §§ 1171.1 to 1171.14	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	Harrison v. Nationwide Mut. Fire Ins. Co., 580 F. Supp 133 (E.D. Pa. 1983); no private right of action.
	42 Pa. Stat. Ann. § 8371	Bad faith judgment statute	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation; Strutz v. State Farm Mut. Ins. Co., 609 A.2d 569 (Pa. Super. 1992) (however, third party beneficiaries may have standing).	Private action	If insurer acted in bad faith towards insured then punitive damages, compensatory damages, and interest are available under private cause of action. Bad faith claims under this statute are expressly preempted by ERISA. <i>Haase v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.</i> , 198 F. Supp 3d 412 (E.D. Pa. 2016).
	73 P.S. 201-1 to 201-9.3	Consumer protection statute	Yes, by judicial interpretation, but see note.	Yes, by judicial interpretation, but see note.	Private action	Requires misfeasance for private right of action. Nonfeasance is not actionable under consumer protection statute. <i>Nordi v. Keystone Health Plan West Inc.</i> , 989 A.2d 376 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2010).
PR (8/23)	26 L.P.R.A. §§ 2716a; 2735	Unfair claim adjustment practices or actions	Statute implies administrative remedy.	Not addressed	Administrative	
	Event Producers, Inc. v. Tyser & Co., 854 F. Supp. 35 (D.P.R. 1993), aff'd, 37 F.3d 1484 (1st Cir. P.R. 1994).	Common law bad faith	Yes, by judicial interpretation, see note.	Not addressed	Private action	Insureds cannot maintain bad faith action where record contained no allegations of conscious wrongdoing and insurers had reasonable basis for denying claim.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
RI (8/23)	§ 9-1-50	Claims settlement	Yes, by statute.	Ambiguous	Punitive damages, interest, other penalties	Allows private cause of action where settled claims not paid within 30 days from claimant's release.
	§ 9-1-33	Civil procedure	Yes, by statute.	No, by statute.	Compensatory and punitive damages, attorney fees	Insured may take action against insurer for wrongful and bad faith refusal to pay or settle claim.
	§§ 27-9.1-1 to 27-9.1-9	UCSPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	UCSPs defined; nothing shall be construed to create or imply a private cause of action.
	Bibeault v. Hanover Ins. Co., 417 A.2d 313 (R.I. 1980).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action: compensatory and punitive damages; attorney's fees only by contract or statute.	Bad faith refusal to pay a claim can give rise to an independent tort.
	Auclair v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co., 505 A.2d 431 (R.I. 1986).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		Duty of good faith owed to insured and not third party claimant.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
SC (8/23)	§§ 38-59-10 to 38-59-50	UCSPA—health, surety, marine, title	No, by judicial interpretation; Ocean Winds Council of Co- Owners v. Auto Owners Ins. Co., 241 F. Supp. 2d 572 (D. S.C. 2002).	No, by judicial interpretation; <i>Masterclean, Inc. v. Star Ins. Co.</i> , 556 S.E.2d 371 (S.C. 2001).	Administrative	No private right of action.
	Tadlock Painting Co. v. Md. Cas. Co., 473 S.E.2d 52 (S.C. 1996).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	
	Gaskins v. Southern Farm Bureau Cas. Ins. Co., 541 S.E.2d 269 (S.C. Ct. App. 2000).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
SD (8/23)	§§ 58-33-67; 58-33-69	UTPA	No, by statute. Anderson v. Western Nat'l Mut. Ins. Co., 857 F. Supp. 2d 896 (D.S.D. 2012).	No, by statute.	Administrative	No private right of action exists under § 58-33-67 for a bad faith settlement claim by an insured against an insurer. An insurer's violation of the UTPA provision that is focused on the adoption of reasonable standards to provide for the timely investigation of claims does not prove either prong of the South Dakota bad faith test.
	§ 58-33-46.1	UTPA	Yes, by statute. Signature Dev., LLC v. Mid-Continent Cas. Co., 2012 WL 4321322 (D.S.D. Sept. 18, 2012).	Yes, by statute.	Private action	Any person injured by any prohibited practices in UTPA can bring an action to recover consequential and actual damages as well as attorney's fees.
	Anderson v. Western Nat'l Mut. Ins. Co., 857 F. Supp. 2d 896 (D.S.D. 2012).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.			The tort of bad faith in South Dakota focuses on whether or not the insurer had a reasonable basis for denying benefits under the policy and whether the insurer knew or recklessly disregarded the lack of a reasonable basis in denying the claim.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
TN (8/23)	§§ 56-8-101 to 56-8-113	UTPA and UCSPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	UCSPs defined; sole enforcement authority to commissioner; private right of action may not be maintained.
	§ 56-7-105	Claims settlement; bad faith	Yes, by judicial interpretation. Stooksbury v. Am. Nat'l Prop. & Cas. Co., 126 S.W.3d 505 (Tenn. Ct. App. 2003).	Not addressed	Loss, interest, financial penalty, attorneys' fees	Contemplates legal action for refusal to pay claims within 60 days of demand.
	§ 47-18-101	Consumer protection statute	Yes, by judicial interpretation.  Myint v. Allstate Ins. Co., 970 S.W.2d 920 (Tenn. 1998).	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	Private action with ability to recover actual damages, penalties, attorneys' fees, and court costs.	Statute provides private right of action for any unfair or deceptive practices affecting the conduct of any trade or commerce.
TX (8/23)	I.C. §§ 541.151 to 541.162	UTPA	Yes, by statute.	Yes, by statute.	Private action with availability to recover actual damages, penalties, costs, and attorneys' fees.	Any individual injured by enumerated unfair trade practice, which includes unfair claims settlement practices, may bring private cause of action to recover damages.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
UT (8/23)	§§ 31A-26-301 to 31A-26-310	UCSPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	No private right of action created.
	Ammerman v. Farmer's Ins. Exch., 430 P.2d 576 (Utah 1967); Beck v. Farmer's Ins. Exch., 701 P.2d 795 (Utah 1985); Billings v. Union Bankers Ins. Co., 918 P.2d 461 (Utah 1996).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	Bad faith refusal claim in third party settlement is tort but not in first party because of nature of fiduciary agreement. However, damages available in first party claim, though viewed as breach of contract, are allowed to include consequential damages unlike typical contract recovery.
	Sperry v. Sperry, 990 P.2d 381 (Utah 1999).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		
VT (8/23)	8 V.S.A. §§ 4721 to 4726	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.  Wilder v. Aetna Life & Cas. Co., 433  A.2d 309 (Vt. 1981).	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	No private right of action created under UTPA or consumer fraud statute.
	Bushey v. Allstate Ins. Co., 670 A.2d 807 (Vt. 1995).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.		Private action	
	Larocque v. State Farm Ins. Co., 660 A.2d 286 (Vt. 1995).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.	Private action	

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
VI (8/23)	No provision					
VA (8/23)	§ 38.2-510	UCSPA	No, by statute.	No, by statute.	Administrative	No private cause of action created by UCSPA.
	§ 38.2-209	General insurance provisions	Yes, by statute.	No, by statute.	Private action	Insured may sue to determine coverage under a policy and if it is shown that the claim was unreasonably or in bad faith denied plaintiff can be awarded attorneys' fees.
	TIG Ins. Co. v. Alfa Laval, Inc., 2008 WL 639894 (E.D. Va. March 5, 2008); A&E Supply Co. Inc. v. Nationwide Mut. Fire Ins. Co., 798 F.2d 669 (4th Cir. 1986).	Common law bad faith tort claim	No, by judicial interpretation. Unsettled by Virginia courts but federal courts have predicted that the Virginia Supreme Court would not recognize a bad faith tort claim but rather a breach of contract claim.		Private action	Proof of independent, willful tort beyond mere breach of duty imposed by contract is required for punitive damages. <i>Kamlar Corp. v. Haley</i> , 299 S.E.2d 514 (Va. 1983).
	Levine v. Selective Ins. Co. of Am., 462 S.E.2d 81 (Va. 1995).	Common law bad faith tort claim		No, by judicial interpretation.		Third party beneficiaries may recover from an insurer through contract.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
WA (6/23)	§§ 19.86.020; 19.86.090	Consumer protection statute	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	Yes, by statute.	Private action with recovery of damages, costs, attorneys' fees, and penalties available.	
	§ 48.30.010	UTPA	Yes, through consumer protection statute; <i>Indus. Indem. Co. of the Nw., Inc. v. Kallevig,</i> 792 P.2d 520 (Wash. 1990).			
WV (8/23)	§§ 33-11-1 to 33-11-10	UTPA, UCSPA	Yes, by judicial interpretation; Poling v. Motorists Mut. Ins. Co., 450 S.E.2d 635 (W.V. 1994).	Yes, by judicial interpretation only under UTPA.	Administrative; private action by judicial interpretation.	Private right of action allowed for violations of UCSP provisions of UTPA.

STATE	CITATION	SOURCE	PERMITS FIRST PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	PERMITS THIRD PARTY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION	MEANS OF REMEDY	NOTES
WI (8/23)	Wis. Adm. Code § Ins. 6.11	UCSPA	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	Kranzush v. Badger State Mut. Cas. Co., 307 N.W.2d 256 (Wis. 1981); no private right of action.
	Kranzush v. Badger State Mut. Cas. Co., 307 N.W.2d 256 (Wis. 1981).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.		
WY (8/23)	§ 26-13-124	UTPA	No, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Administrative	No indication of intent to create private cause of action. <i>Herrig v. Herrig</i> , 844 P.2d 487 (Wyo. 1992).
	§ 26-15-124	Claims settlement	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	Yes, by judicial interpretation, but only after claim reduced to judgment or settlement.	Loss, interest, attorneys' fees	Herrig v. Herrig, 844 P.2d 487 (Wyo. 1992).
	Herrig v. Herrig, 844 P.2d 487 (Wyo. 1992).	Common law bad faith tort claim	Yes, by judicial interpretation.	No, by judicial interpretation.	Private action	

This chart does not constitute a formal legal opinion by the NAIC staff on the provisions of state law and should not be relied upon as such. Every effort has been made to provide correct and accurate summaries to assist the reader in targeting useful information. For further details, the statutes and regulations cited should be consulted. The NAIC attempts to provide current information; however, readers should consult state law for additional adoptions.