

The Court of Appeal: The liability of the life insurance broker is not limited to the framework of the contractual relationship

■ BENJAMIN POIRIER

The facts of the *Roy v. Lefebvre* case

On June 25, 2014, the Superior Court¹ allowed the action of an insured against a life insurance broker and his firm. The context of the subscription of the insurance policy is somewhat unusual and deserves explanations. In 1992, the purchaser of an immovable property undertook to pay part of the purchase price through the subscription of an insurance policy (the "Policy") on the life of the seller for the benefit of the estate of the seller. The purchaser undertook to pay the premiums by subscribing to an annuity contract with the insurer, which included the payment of the premiums for the first year. The insurance broker represented to his client and to the seller that the annuity contract would pay for all the premiums since they would be paid for the subsequent years from the accumulation fund of the policy, on the basis of an estimated annual return of 7.8%.

On August 19, 2008, the purchaser notified the seller that the funds accumulated were insufficient to pay the premiums. On June 3, 2009, the purchaser notified the seller that if the insurance premiums were not paid for the next three years, the Policy would lapse. Although formally put on notice by the seller, the purchaser of the immovable and the insurance broker neglected to take the necessary means to ensure that the premiums would be paid. On August 19, 2011, the seller instituted proceedings against the purchaser, the insurance broker and the brokerage firm. The purchaser instituted warranty proceedings against the broker and the firm. Starting on June 25, 2013, the seller had no alternative but to personally assume the payment of the premiums to maintain the Policy in force.

The decision of the trial court


The Superior Court noted that the insurance product proposed by the broker did not meet the needs of his client. Indeed, the broker had sold a "prepaid" Policy, not a "fully paid up" Policy on which no further premiums were payable. The prepaid Policy entailed risks since the payment process for the premiums from the annual estimated return of the accumulation fund of the Policy was not adequately explained to the client. The broker was held liable to his client, the purchaser of the immovable, because he had erroneously represented that only the premiums of the first year had to be paid at the time of the subscription of the policy and that all the subsequent premiums would be paid for with the returns from the annuity contract. The broker, thus, failed to discharge his duty to inform and to advise his client.

As for the extracontractual liability (tort) of the insurance broker toward the seller of the immovable property, the trial judge relied on the principles of the Supreme Court decision *Bank of Montreal v. Bail Ltée*² to conclude that the broker had failed in his obligation to act in good faith and adequately inform a third party. In fact, the broker clearly understood the objectives sought by the third party. The broker was fully aware of the business agreement entered into between the third party and his client, but nonetheless failed to discharge his duty to inform and, in so doing, committed an extracontractual fault for which he ought to be held liable.

The purchaser of the immovable, the broker and his firm were condemned to pay to the plaintiff an amount of \$1,200,010 representing the value of the insurance coverage on his life. The broker and his firm were also condemned to indemnify the purchaser for any amount due in the principal action.

¹ *Robinson c. Lefebvre*, 2014 QCCS 3045 (CanLII).

² *Montréal v. Bail Limitée*, [1992] 2 S.C.R. 554.



The judgment of the Court of Appeal: The extracontractual liability of the life insurance broker

The Court of Appeal upheld the trial decision on the issue of the extracontractual liability of the broker and his firm toward the third party. The Court of Appeal seems to send a clear message to life insurance brokers whereby they are bound by a duty to inform and a duty of good faith beyond the framework of the contractual relationship and must necessarily consider the interests and rights of a third party when selling an insurance product.

BENJAMIN POIRIER

514 877-2989

bpoirier@lavery.ca

YOU CAN CONTACT THE MEMBERS OF THE INSURANCE GROUP WITH ANY QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS NEWSLETTER.

ANNE BÉLANGER	abelanger@lavery.ca	514 877-3091
FRÉDÉRIC BÉLANGER	fredbelanger@lavery.ca	418 266-3096
JÉRÔME BÉLANGER	jebelanger@lavery.ca	514 877-3012
CLAUDIA BÉRUBÉ	cberube@lavery.ca	819 346-3661
DOMINIC BOISVERT	dboisvert@lavery.ca	514 878-5493
FRÉDÉRIC BRETON	fbreton@lavery.ca	819 346-7506
MYRIAM BRIXI	mbixi@lavery.ca	514 878-5449
MARIE-CLAUDE CANTIN	mccantin@lavery.ca	514 877-3006
GENÉVIÈVE CHAMBERLAND	gchamberland@lavery.ca	819 346-2562
LOUIS CHARETTE	lcharette@lavery.ca	514 877-2946
MARIKA COUTURE-HOULE	mcouturehoule@lavery.ca	819 346-0340
ALEXANDRA DUBÉ-LORRAIN	adube-lorrain@lavery.ca	514 877-3063
LÉONIE GAGNÉ	lgagne@lavery.ca	514 878-5409
CHERYL GILBERT	cgilbert@lavery.ca	819 346-2207
JULIE GRONDIN	jgrondin@lavery.ca	514 877-2957
JEAN HÉBERT	jhebert@lavery.ca	514 877-2926
JONATHAN LACOSTE-JOBIN	jlacostejobin@lavery.ca	514 877-3042
MAUDE LAFORTUNE-BÉLAIR	mlafortunebelair@lavery.ca	514 877-3077
BERNARD LAROCQUE	blarocque@lavery.ca	514 877-3043
CLAUDE LAROSE	clarose@lavery.ca	418 266-3062
ROBERT W. MASON	rwmason@lavery.ca	514 877-3000
MARTIN PICHETTE	mpichette@lavery.ca	514 877-3032
BENJAMIN POIRIER	bpoirier@lavery.ca	514 877-2989
MARIE-HÉLÈNE RIVERIN	mhriverin@lavery.ca	418 266-3082
IAN ROSE	irose@lavery.ca	514 877-2947
JEAN SAINT-ONGE, AD. E.	jsaintonge@lavery.ca	514 877-2938
MAUDE ST-GEORGES	mstgeorges@lavery.ca	514 878-5642
VIRGINIE SIMARD	vsimard@lavery.ca	514 877-2931
EVELYNE VERRIER	everrier@lavery.ca	514 877-3075

© All rights reserved 2016 ► LAVERY, DE BILLY, L.L.P. ► LAWYERS

Pour recevoir notre bulletin en français, veuillez envoyer un courriel à info@lavery.ca.

This bulletin provides our clients with general comments on recent legal developments. The texts are not legal opinions. Readers should not act solely on the information contained herein.