DOI: 10.47669/ERD-1-2025

Eurasia Research Digest 1/2025

THE MISSING INSURED AND THE INNOCENT JUDGMENT CREDITOR: RECALIBRATING COOPERATION-CLAUSE FORFEITURE

Diana GRIGORYAN*

ABSTRACT

When a liability insured disappears or refuses to cooperate, the insurer may lose access to testimony, documents, factual explanations, or defenses that matter to the underlying action. California therefore recognizes cooperation clauses as legitimate contractual protections. But California also rejects automatic forfeiture: the insurer must show material breach, reasonable diligence, and substantial prejudice. This Essay argues that the cooperation-clause defense is best understood as a causal doctrine rather than a formal one. The central inquiry should be what the insurer actually lost because of the insured's noncooperation and whether there was a substantial likelihood that cooperation would have produced a materially better result. That framework becomes especially important when the practical consequence falls on an injured judgment creditor who neither caused nor could prevent the insured's breach. Drawing on Campbell, Billington, Miller, Hall, Martin, and related California authorities, the Essay develops a seven-part framework that separates breach, materiality, diligence, causation, and prejudice, while preserving legitimate insurer defenses and preventing speculative noncooperation from becoming an automatic bar to compensation.

INTRODUCTION

An injured plaintiff may do everything the civil justice system

*

requiresinvestigate the claim, file suit, establish liability, prove damages, and obtain a judgment and still discover that the judgment is only the beginning of the fight. When liability insurance is involved, a new obstacle may arise after liability has already been adjudicated: the insured cannot be located, refuses to communicate with the carrier, fails to assist defense counsel, or simply disappears. The insurer may then invoke the policy's cooperation clause and contend that the insured's conduct relieves it of an obligation to satisfy the judgment.[1]

The insurer's concern is legitimate. Liability carriers frequently depend on insureds for firsthand factual information, testimony, documents, identification of witnesses, and assistance in investigating and defending claims. California law accordingly recognizes that a material breach of a cooperation clause may support a coverage defense.[2] But noncooperation alone is not enough. The insurer must establish substantial prejudice, and California places that burden on the insurer.[3]

That distinction is especially important when the ultimate economic consequence falls on an injured judgment creditor who neither caused the insured's noncooperation nor possessed any meaningful ability to prevent it. The decisive question should therefore not be simply whether the insured failed to cooperate. It should be what the insurer actually lost because of that failure, whether the insurer acted reasonably to obtain the cooperation it now characterizes as indispensable, and whether there was a substantial likelihood that the result would have been different had cooperation occurred.

This Essay argues that California's cooperation-clause doctrine is best understood as a doctrine of causal and proportionate forfeiture. The policy condition remains enforceable, but the consequence of breach should track the impairment the breach actually caused. That approach protects insurers where the missing insured truly deprives the defense of material evidence or a viable theory, while preventing "failure to cooperate" from becoming a label that automatically extinguishes otherwise applicable liability coverage.

The argument proceeds in four parts. Part I explains why cooperation clauses protect legitimate insurer interests but why breach and prejudice must remain analytically separate. Part II examines California's modern doctrine through Campbell, Billington, Miller, Hall, and Martin. Part III focuses on the judgment creditor's distinct position and the evidentiary asymmetry created when the insurer controls the claims file and the proof relevant to prejudice. Part IV proposes a seven-part framework for cooperation-clause disputes that ties contractual consequence to evidence, diligence, causation, and actual harm.

I. COOPERATION AS A FUNCTIONAL CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION

A cooperation requirement is not a meaningless technicality. Liability policies typically give the insurer substantial responsibility for investigation, settlement, and defense. Those responsibilities may be difficult or impossible to perform effectively without assistance from the person who was present at the underlying event and may possess unique information about how it occurred. Cooperation provisions may therefore require the insured to provide statements, identify witnesses, produce documents, assist in settlement, attend depositions, and appear at hearings or trial.[4]

California courts have long recognized the legitimacy of those obligations. O'Morrow v. Borad treated cooperation as part of the insured's contractual responsibilities in connection with the insurer's defense.[5] Earlier cases likewise recognized that deliberate concealment, false statements, or willful obstruction may seriously impair an insurer's ability to investigate or defend. Margellini v. Pacific Automobile Insurance Co., for example, involved repeated withholding or misrepresentation of material information despite the insurer's efforts to investigate.[6]

Those cases demonstrate why a cooperation clause matters. An insurer should not be forced to defend blindfolded when the insured possesses material firsthand information and intentionally prevents access to it. Yet the legitimacy of the contractual obligation does not establish the consequence of every breach. The modern doctrine asks two distinct questions: first, whether there was a material breach; and second, whether the breach substantially prejudiced the insurer. Proof of the first does not automatically establish the second.

That separation is critical. If breach alone were sufficient, the adjective "substantial" would do almost no work. Any missed call, unavailable deposition, incomplete response, or failure to appear could potentially be recast as a total forfeiture. A prejudice requirement instead keeps the remedy connected to the purpose of the condition. The insured must cooperate because cooperation protects the defense. The insurer may rely on a breach when the breach materially damages that defense.

II. FROM BREACH TO PREJUDICE: CALIFORNIA'S MODERN RULE

A. Campbell and the Rejection of Presumed Prejudice

The modern California rule begins with Campbell v. Allstate Insurance Co. Injured plaintiffs obtained a default judgment against the insured and later sought recovery from the liability carrier. The insurer relied on the insured's failure to cooperate. The California Supreme Court held that breach of the cooperation clause was not a valid defense unless the insurer was substantially prejudiced, and it placed the burden of proving that prejudice on the insurer.[7]

That allocation is not arbitrary. The insurer generally possesses the information necessary to explain what cooperation it requested, what investigative opportunities were lost, which witnesses or documents became unavailable, what defenses it considered, and how the insured's absence affected trial strategy. Requiring the insurer to prove prejudice aligns the burden with access to the relevant evidence.

Campbell also rejected the older tendency to presume prejudice merely from serious noncooperation.[8] The doctrinal shift transformed the defense from a formal inquiry into a causal one. The insurer may still prove breach, but it must also demonstrate why the breach mattered.

B. Billington and the Missing Link of Causation

Billington v. Interinsurance Exchange of Southern California made the causal requirement more explicit. The court accepted that the insured had breached the cooperation clause, but that did not resolve the coverage dispute. At a minimum, the insurer had to show that absent the breach there was a substantial likelihood that the trier of fact would have reached a result favorable to the insured.[9]

The standard is demanding for a reason. Almost any losing defendant can imagine additional testimony or evidence that might have improved the case. If hypothetical usefulness were enough, substantial prejudice would collapse into possibility. Billington instead requires a connection between the insured's noncooperation and the actual outcome.

Compare two statements. "Our insured failed to appear at trial" establishes absence. "Our insured was the only witness capable of establishing a specific exculpatory fact, and without that testimony we could not present a defense that had a substantial likelihood of succeeding" attempts to establish prejudice. The difference is the move from status to consequence.

C. Miller: Diligence, Materiality, and the Limits of Absence

State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. Miller demonstrates that a prejudice requirement is not hostile to cooperation clauses. The court recognized that an insurer may rely on noncooperation where the clause applies, the insurer exercised reasonable diligence to obtain cooperation, and the insurer suffered substantial prejudice because cooperation was withheld.[10]

The diligence showing in Miller was substantial. The insured had deserted the military and concealed his whereabouts. The insurer hired a private investigator, checked credit and motor vehicle sources, contacted the insured's parents and the Army, and pursued multiple avenues to locate him.[11]

Those efforts mattered because an insurer should not be permitted to characterize a person as "noncooperative" after only superficial attempts at contact.

Yet Miller also illustrates the limits of absence as proof. Evidence that the insured's presence or testimony was "material and necessary" did not automatically establish the substantial prejudice required by Billington.[12] The question remained whether the missing cooperation probably affected the result in a materially favorable way.

D. Hall: When the Insurer Can Prove Prejudice

A balanced account must acknowledge cases in which the insurer satisfies the rule. Hall v. Travelers Insurance Companies is especially important. The insured failed to assist the insurer before trial and did not appear to contest liability. After the injured plaintiff obtained judgment, the plaintiff sought satisfaction from the carrier. The Court of Appeal reaffirmed that substantial prejudice was necessary, but concluded that the evidentiary record supported the insurer.[13]

The record suggested that the insured may have possessed a meaningful liability defense. A highway patrol officer's testimony indicated that the insured had the right of way, while the carrier had been unable to obtain the insured's meaningful participation in developing and presenting that defense.[14] Hall therefore illustrates what a successful cooperation defense should look like: not a conclusory assertion that the insured disappeared, but evidence linking the absence to a potentially successful defense.

Hall also strengthens the legitimacy of a prejudice-centered doctrine. A rule is more credible when it explains when either side should prevail. The governing principle is not that an innocent third party must always recover, nor that any contractual breach automatically eliminates coverage. It is that the insurer may prevail when it proves that material noncooperation actually deprived it of a defense with a substantial likelihood of changing the result.

E. Martin: Prejudice Cannot Be Decided in the Abstract

United Services Automobile Association v. Martin reinforces the dependence of prejudice on the actual course of the underlying litigation. The insurer sought declaratory relief based on alleged noncooperation while the tort action was still pending. The Court of Appeal reasoned that prejudice could not logically be assessed while the outcome remained unresolved and the consequences of the insured's conduct were uncertain.[15]

The timing point reflects a broader principle. A cooperation defense cannot be evaluated entirely in the abstract. The court must examine what liability evidence ultimately existed, which defenses remained available, what information the insured uniquely could have supplied, and whether that information probably would have produced a materially different result.

III. "THE INSURED DISAPPEARED" IS NOT A LEGAL CONCLUSION

The phrase "the insured disappeared" can describe radically different factual situations. Treating those situations alike obscures the causal inquiry required by California law.

At one extreme is deliberate obstruction: the insured conceals material facts, destroys evidence, refuses repeated requests to testify, gives false information, and intentionally makes himself unavailable. Such conduct may materially compromise the defense and can support a cooperation-clause defense if the insurer proves the resulting prejudice.

A different case involves an insured who initially cooperates fully. Suppose the insured gives a detailed recorded statement, provides documents, identifies witnesses, answers discovery, and participates in deposition before later becoming unavailable. The absence may still matter, particularly at trial, but the carrier should identify what material defense or evidence disappeared with the insured rather than equating later unavailability with total noncooperation.

Still another case involves limited insurer effort. If the carrier sends a small number of letters to an outdated address and then declares the insured noncooperative, the diligence inquiry may become decisive. California's doctrine requires genuine efforts to obtain participation before the carrier can rely on the insured's failure as a forfeiture defense.[16]

Objective evidence can also reduce the materiality of the insured's absence. Police reports, video footage, photographs, independent witnesses, physical evidence, admissions, or other contemporaneous materials may establish the relevant facts without the insured. In such a case, the insurer may have difficulty showing that the insured's presence probably would have changed the result.

By contrast, if the insured is the only person capable of establishing a viable defense—such as a unique account of consent, comparative fault, permission, or another material factual issue—the causal link becomes much stronger. The cases should therefore turn on evidence, not labels.

IV. REASONABLE DILIGENCE AS A CONDITION OF FORFEITURE

An insurer cannot fairly rely on an insured's disappearance without examining its own efforts to secure cooperation. Billington and Miller both treat diligence as part of the equation.[17] That requirement prevents the carrier from manufacturing prejudice through passivity.

Reasonable diligence is contextual rather than mechanical. Relevant questions include how many attempts were made, what methods were used, over what period the efforts continued, whether known alternative addresses were investigated, whether telephone and electronic communication were attempted, whether defense counsel independently sought contact, whether appropriate relatives or other sources were approached, whether an investigator was retained when the stakes justified it, and whether the insured was clearly advised that failure to cooperate could jeopardize coverage.

The standard should not impose an unlimited search obligation. Insurers are not required to pursue every imaginable lead indefinitely. But when the carrier later contends that the insured's participation was indispensable, the record should show a genuine and proportionate effort to obtain that participation.

Diligence also bears on causation. If information could reasonably have been obtained through an available source but the insurer did not pursue it, the resulting deficiency may not be attributable entirely to the insured's breach. The prejudice analysis should isolate the harm caused by noncooperation from harm caused by the insurer's own investigative choices.

V. THE INNOCENT JUDGMENT CREDITOR AND THE ATTRIBUTION PROBLEM

The cooperation defense becomes institutionally significant when the practical source of payment is liability insurance and the person seeking payment is an injured judgment creditor. California Insurance Code section 11580(b)(2) permits a qualifying judgment creditor to proceed against the insurer after judgment, subject to the policy's terms and limitations.[18] The statute does not erase legitimate coverage defenses. But it makes visible the unusual allocation of consequences that can arise from a cooperation breach.

The claimant typically cannot force the insured to communicate with the insurer, assist defense counsel, attend deposition, appear at trial, provide records, or respond to coverage correspondence. Yet if the insured's breach automatically eliminates coverage, the economic consequence may fall on the claimant who had no ability to prevent the breach.

The claimant's innocence does not create insurance coverage where none existed and does not enlarge the policy's substantive grant. That limitation is important. A judgment creditor should not obtain greater contractual rights merely because the insured is absent. But where the risk is otherwise covered and the asserted defense rests on a post-loss cooperation condition, the claimant's lack of control strengthens the justification for requiring proof of actual prejudice rather than automatic forfeiture.

This is the attribution problem at the center of the doctrine: one person breaches, a second party invokes the breach, and a third party may bear the practical loss. A prejudice requirement does not eliminate contractual responsibility. It ensures that the consequence imposed on the coverage relationship corresponds to the actual impairment produced by the insured's conduct.

VI. EVIDENTIARY ASYMMETRY IN THE POST-JUDGMENT COVERAGE DISPUTE

The judgment creditor often begins the coverage dispute with substantially less information than the insurer. The carrier may possess claims notes, correspondence with the insured, telephone logs, investigative reports, recorded statements, witness assessments, defense evaluations, efforts to locate the insured, and internal documents identifying potential defenses. The claimant may initially possess little more than a denial stating "failure to cooperate."

This creates an evidentiary asymmetry. A claimant cannot meaningfully test substantial prejudice without knowing what cooperation was requested, what information the carrier already possessed, what evidence allegedly became unavailable, and why the insurer believes that missing information probably would have changed the result.

Targeted discovery is therefore central to a rigorous prejudice inquiry. The goal is not unrestricted access to every aspect of the claims file irrespective of privilege or relevance. It is to convert prejudice from an adjective into a series of testable factual propositions.

Four categories are especially important. First, the insurer's efforts: what did the carrier actually do to communicate with or locate the insured? Second, information already possessed: did the insurer already have the insured's account, police materials, photographs, witness information, deposition testimony, or other evidence adequate to evaluate liability? Third, the allegedly lost defense: what precise defense or evidence became unavailable? Fourth, causation: how did the insured's absence cause that loss, and why was there a substantial likelihood of a more favorable outcome had cooperation occurred?

The same structure can narrow disputes over privilege and proportionality. If the insurer asserts a specific lost defense, discovery can focus on the factual basis for that defense, the information allegedly missing, the attempts to obtain it, and the claimed effect on the underlying result. The doctrine works best when both the coverage theory and the discovery responding to it are concrete.

VII. LIABILITY INSURANCE, TORT JUDGMENTS, AND THE PRACTICAL MEANING OF COMPENSATION

The cooperation-clause dispute exposes a broader characteristic of liability insurance. Insurance is a private contractual relationship, but its effects extend beyond the insurer and insured. It finances defense, influences settlement, affects litigation strategy, and often determines whether a tort judgment produces meaningful compensation.

Insurance scholarship has long examined that institutional interaction. Kenneth S. Abraham has described the development of liability insurance and tort liability as historically intertwined, while Tom Baker has examined the ways liability insurance shapes tort law in practice.[19] Those observations do not justify disregarding policy language.

They do explain why post-loss conditions can have consequences extending beyond bilateral contract enforcement.

When a cooperation defense eliminates the only realistic source of recovery after liability has already been adjudicated, the doctrine affects the practical effectiveness of the civil judgment. That does not mean courts should privilege compensation over every contractual limitation. It means courts should distinguish limitations that define the risk insured from post-loss conditions whose purpose is to protect the carrier's ability to handle a covered claim.

A substantial-prejudice rule performs that distinction. It protects the carrier against actual impairment while reducing the possibility that a technical or causally irrelevant breach will extinguish the practical value of an adjudicated obligation. In that sense, the doctrine operates at the intersection of contract enforcement and the compensation function of liability insurance.

VIII. A SEVEN-PART FRAMEWORK FOR COOPERATION-CLAUSE CASES

California's authorities suggest a disciplined sequence for cooperation-clause disputes. The framework should prevent courts from compressing conduct, breach, diligence, and prejudice into the single phrase "failure to cooperate."

First, identify the contractual obligation. What exactly did the cooperation clause require? Courts should begin with the text and function of the policy condition actually invoked.

Second, identify the breach. What did the insured fail or refuse to do? The conduct should be described specifically rather than through a generalized characterization of noncooperation.

Third, determine materiality. Was the missing cooperation genuinely important to investigation, settlement, or defense? A missed obligation can be real without being consequential.

Fourth, examine insurer diligence. Did the carrier make reasonable efforts to obtain the cooperation? The strength of a forfeiture defense should depend in part on whether the insurer genuinely pursued the participation it later describes as indispensable.

Fifth, identify the lost evidence or defense. What precisely became unavailable because of the breach? The insurer should point to a witness, fact, document, theory, procedural opportunity, or other material component of the defense.

Sixth, establish causation and substantial prejudice. Was there a substantial likelihood that the missing cooperation would have produced a more favorable result? This is the Billington inquiry and the doctrinal center of the framework.

Seventh, separate evidence from speculation. Is the asserted prejudice supported by record evidence, or does it rest only on the proposition that the insurer "could have defended better" with greater cooperation? The latter may be intuitively plausible, but substantial prejudice requires more.

The framework can be expressed sequentially: conduct → breach → materiality → diligence → lost defense or evidence → causation → substantial prejudice → contractual consequence. Each step disciplines the next. An insured may breach without causing prejudice. An insurer may experience litigation difficulty without proving that the breach caused the difficulty. And an unfavorable result does not itself establish that cooperation probably would have produced a favorable one.

IX. WHAT SHOULD COUNT AS STRONG EVIDENCE FOR EITHER SIDE

Evidence supporting the insurer may include proof that the insured was the only witness capable of presenting a viable liability defense; evidence that critical testimony disappeared because of the insured's refusal to participate; documentation of diligent but unsuccessful attempts to secure cooperation; proof that the insured concealed or falsified material facts; evidence that noncooperation prevented discovery necessary to establish an affirmative defense; or a factual showing that the lost defense had a substantial likelihood of producing a more favorable result. Hall demonstrates that such evidence can satisfy the doctrine.[20]

Evidence supporting the judgment creditor may include proof that the insurer already possessed the insured's complete account; that the insured participated substantially before becoming unavailable; that liability was established through independent objective evidence; that the carrier cannot identify a meaningful lost defense; that the missing testimony would have been cumulative; that the insurer's own investigation undermined the defense it now claims was lost; or that the asserted prejudice depends on speculation rather than evidence. Miller demonstrates why the insured's mere absence may be insufficient.[21]

Neither category should be treated mechanically. The decisive inquiry remains causal: what difference did the breach make? That question is simple to state but appropriately demanding to answer.

X. RECALIBRATING FORFEITURE AROUND ACTUAL HARM

Cooperation-clause cases become confused when several distinct concepts are compressed into a single conclusion. The better approach treats the clause as enforceable, treats breach as legally meaningful, and then separately evaluates whether forfeiture is justified by the harm caused.

Automatic forfeiture risks giving the insurer a remedy disconnected from the contractual purpose of cooperation. If the carrier already had the necessary information, possessed the available defenses, acted through defense counsel, and cannot identify any material difference the insured's participation probably would have made, the loss of coverage may exceed the impairment caused by the breach.

The opposite extreme is equally problematic. A claimant-centered doctrine cannot assume that absence never matters. Where an insured intentionally obstructs the defense, deprives the carrier of unique exculpatory testimony, prevents development of a viable defense, or causes a litigation result that cooperation likely would have avoided, the carrier has suffered the very harm the cooperation clause was designed to prevent.

The proper balance is therefore neither automatic forfeiture nor automatic recovery. It is consequence tied to actual harm. That principle respects the insurance contract, requires the insurer to act reasonably, protects judgment creditors against speculative defenses, and gives courts a structured way to distinguish genuine impairment from technical noncompliance.

CONCLUSION

When an insured disappears, the insurer may face a genuine and serious impairment of its ability to defend. California law properly recognizes cooperation clauses as enforceable and permits substantial noncooperation to defeat coverage in appropriate circumstances, even when an injured judgment creditor ultimately bears the economic consequence.

But California also rejects automatic forfeiture. Campbell requires substantial prejudice and places the burden on the insurer. Billington requires more than hypothetical harm and demands a substantial likelihood of a favorable difference in outcome. Miller makes insurer diligence part of the analysis and demonstrates why absence alone may not be enough. Hall shows that an insurer can prevail where the record links noncooperation to a meaningful defense. Martin illustrates why prejudice must be evaluated in relation to what actually occurred in the underlying litigation.

Together, these authorities support a balanced rule: the insured's disappearance should not automatically defeat coverage, but neither should the innocence of the judgment creditor erase a legitimate cooperation defense. The decisive question is whether the insurer can prove that a material breach, despite reasonable efforts to secure cooperation, actually impaired the defense and created a substantial likelihood of a materially different result.

That inquiry protects the insurer when noncooperation truly matters. It protects the judgment creditor when "noncooperation" is merely a label attached to speculative prejudice. And it keeps the legal consequence of breach connected to the actual harm the cooperation clause exists to prevent.

REFERENCES

1. See Campbell v. Allstate Ins. Co., 60 Cal. 2d 303, 305–07 (1963); State Farm Fire & Cas. Co. v. Miller, 5 Cal. App. 3d 837, 840–43 (1970).

2. See O'Morrow v. Borad, 27 Cal. 2d 794, 800 (1946); Margellini v. Pac. Auto. Ins. Co., 33 Cal. App. 2d 93, 98–101 (1939).

3. Campbell, 60 Cal. 2d at 305–07; Billington v. Interinsurance Exch. of S. Cal., 71 Cal. 2d 728, 737–38 (1969).

4. See, e.g., United Servs. Auto. Ass'n v. Martin, 120 Cal. App. 3d 963, 966 n.1 (1981) (reproducing cooperation language requiring assistance in settlement, litigation, evidence gathering, and attendance at hearings and trials).

5. 27 Cal. 2d at 800.

6. 33 Cal. App. 2d at 98–101.

7. Campbell, 60 Cal. 2d at 305–06.

8. Id. at 306–07; see also Billington, 71 Cal. 2d at 737 (explaining Campbell's rejection of presumed prejudice).

9. Billington, 71 Cal. 2d at 737–38.

10. Miller, 5 Cal. App. 3d at 840–41.

11. Id. at 841–42.

12. Id. at 842–43.

13. Hall v. Travelers Ins. Cos., 15 Cal. App. 3d 304, 307–10 (1971).

14. Id. at 309–10.

15. Martin, 120 Cal. App. 3d at 966–67.

16. See Billington, 71 Cal. 2d at 744; Miller, 5 Cal. App. 3d at 840–42.

17. Billington, 71 Cal. 2d at 744; Miller, 5 Cal. App. 3d at 841–42.

18. Cal. Ins. Code § 11580(b)(2).

19. See generally Kenneth S. Abraham, The Liability Century: Insurance and Tort Law from the Progressive Era to 9/11 (Harvard Univ. Press 2008); Tom Baker, Liability Insurance as Tort Regulation: Six Ways That Liability Insurance Shapes Tort Law in Action, 12 Conn. Ins. L.J. 1 (2005–2006).

20. Hall, 15 Cal. App. 3d at 309–10.

21. Miller, 5 Cal. App. 3d at 842–43.