

## Appellate Court rules on cyber breach class action coverage dispute

March 18, 2021

On March 15, 2021, the Ontario Court of Appeal released its decision in [Family and Children's Services of Lanark, Leeds and Grenville v. Co-operators General Insurance Company](#). This proceeding arose out of three separate applications dealing with the duty to defend, which were heard together.

Family and Children's Services of Lanark, Leeds and Grenville (FCS) claimed that it was hacked in April 2016, and confidential reports were allegedly leaked onto two Facebook pages. Prior to this incident, FCS had hired Laridae Communications (Laridae) to refresh and review the FCS website. FCS and Laridae were both insured by Co-operators General Insurance Company (Co-operators). Following these alleged unintended disclosure incidents, a class proceeding was commenced against FCS seeking damages of \$75 million. FCS also brought a third-party claim against Laridae.

Co-operators denied coverage to both FCS and Laridae, based on exclusion clauses in the policies, which excluded claims arising from the distribution or display of data by means of an internet website. FCS and Laridae claimed Co-operators had a duty to defend their interests in the class action and began applications. Co-operators brought a separate application for an order that it had no duty to defend Laridae in the class action.

The application judge found that she could not interpret the exclusion clauses at the application because it was a novel interpretive issue and required a full record. **However, she still concluded that the exclusion clauses did not exclude Co-operator's duty to defend either FCS or Laridae.** She further held that neither FCS nor Laridae had any reporting obligations to Co-operators, due to a conflict of interest between the two insureds and the insurer.

There were three issues on appeal: (1) whether the duty to defend could be denied on application; (2) whether Co-operators had a duty to defend; and (3) whether, if Co-operators had a duty to defend, it would have the right to participate in the defence.

On the first issue, the Court of Appeal disagreed that the matter could not be dealt with by way of an application. According to the Appellate Court, there were no material facts in issue requiring a trial, as this was a simple matter of contract interpretation.

On the second issue, the Court of Appeal was critical of the application judge’s analysis of the duty to defend. The Court of Appeal held that Co-operators owed no duty to defend either FCS or Laridae because the exclusion clauses at issue were unambiguous and the claims asserted by the applicants were covered by the clear language of the exclusion clauses. Further, the court found that the policies at issue were not intended to insure against all risks and clearly articulated what was covered and not covered.

While the third issue on appeal did not require review given the court’s ruling, the court commented that the onus is always on the insured to establish a reasonable apprehension of conflict of interest on the part of the insurer.

While this decision affirms the importance of contract interpretation principles on a coverage dispute, the decision is a reminder that the principle of contra proferentem has no application where the language of the policy is found to be clear and unambiguous.

By

[T. Kirk Boyd](#), [Edona C. Vila](#), [Christine Kucey](#)

Expertise

[Disputes](#), [Cybersecurity](#), [Privacy & Data Protection](#), [Insurance Claim Defence](#)

---

## **BLG | Canada’s Law Firm**

As the largest, truly full-service Canadian law firm, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP (BLG) delivers practical legal advice for domestic and international clients across more practices and industries than any Canadian firm. With over 725 lawyers, intellectual property agents and other professionals, BLG serves the legal needs of businesses and institutions across Canada and beyond – from M&A and capital markets, to disputes, financing, and trademark & patent registration.

[blg.com](http://blg.com)

### **BLG Offices**

#### **Calgary**

Centennial Place, East Tower  
520 3rd Avenue S.W.  
Calgary, AB, Canada  
T2P 0R3

T 403.232.9500  
F 403.266.1395

#### **Montréal**

1000 De La Gauchetière Street West  
Suite 900  
Montréal, QC, Canada  
H3B 5H4

T 514.954.2555  
F 514.879.9015

#### **Ottawa**

World Exchange Plaza  
100 Queen Street  
Ottawa, ON, Canada  
K1P 1J9

T 613.237.5160  
F 613.230.8842

#### **Toronto**

Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower  
22 Adelaide Street West  
Toronto, ON, Canada  
M5H 4E3

T 416.367.6000  
F 416.367.6749

#### **Vancouver**

1200 Waterfront Centre  
200 Burrard Street  
Vancouver, BC, Canada  
V7X 1T2

T 604.687.5744  
F 604.687.1415

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to constitute legal advice, a complete statement of the law, or an opinion on any subject. No one should act upon it or refrain from acting without a thorough examination of the law after the facts of a specific situation are considered. You are urged to consult your legal adviser in cases of specific questions or concerns. BLG does not warrant or guarantee the accuracy, currency or completeness of this publication. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior written permission of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. If this publication was sent to you by BLG and you do not wish to receive further publications from BLG, you may ask to remove your contact information from our mailing lists by emailing [unsubscribe@blg.com](mailto:unsubscribe@blg.com) or manage your subscription preferences at [blg.com/MyPreferences](http://blg.com/MyPreferences). If you feel you have received this message in error please contact [communications@blg.com](mailto:communications@blg.com). BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at [blg.com/en/privacy](http://blg.com/en/privacy).

© 2024 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.