IHRPD RESEARCH PAPERS 1/2023 IHRPD*RP*

https://doi.org/10.47669/IHRDP-1-2023

From Judgment to Recovery: Procedural Default, Evidentiary Asymmetry and the Limits of Third-Party Insurance Compensation

Diana GRIGORYAN*

A California-centered framework for evaluating notice, cooperation, prejudice, and post-judgment insurance defenses

Abstract. A tort judgment determines liability, but it does not always deliver compensation. Where liability insurance is the practical source of recovery, an injured judgment creditor may encounter a second layer of litigation concerning notice, cooperation, policy conditions, and the insurer's claimed prejudice. This Article argues that the soundest way to evaluate those disputes is not through automatic forfeiture, but through a causation-and-prejudice inquiry that asks what the insured's procedural breach actually changed. California doctrine provides an especially useful foundation. Its cooperation-clause cases require substantial prejudice and place the burden on the insurer; its notice-prejudice doctrine likewise resists forfeiture untethered from material harm. The Article further identifies an often-overlooked evidentiary problem: the insurer commonly controls the very records needed to test its assertion of prejudice. It proposes a six-part framework designed to protect legitimate insurer interests while reducing the risk that technical defaults by an insured will extinguish the practical value of a judgment obtained by an innocent third party.

Keywords: liability insurance; judgment creditors; cooperation clauses; notice-prejudice; evidentiary asymmetry; California Insurance Code § 11580

Introduction

A civil judgment is ordinarily treated as the point at which a disputed claim becomes an adjudicated legal obligation. For an injured

* Attorney at Law, Legal Researcher.

third party, however, a judgment may resolve liability without resolving recovery. When liability insurance is expected to fund the obligation, the end of the tort action can become the beginning of a separate coverage dispute involving notice, cooperation, evidentiary access, and the enforceability of policy conditions.

That second dispute matters because the person who bears its economic consequences often did not cause the alleged contractual breach. The injured claimant did not select the policy, negotiate its conditions, control the insured's communications with the carrier, or decide whether the insured would attend a deposition, respond to letters, preserve evidence, or appear at trial. Yet a successful post-loss policy defense can deprive that claimant of the practical value of an otherwise valid judgment.

The central issue is therefore not whether policy conditions should be ignored. They should not. Notice and cooperation requirements serve legitimate functions: they protect the insurer's ability to investigate, defend, evaluate settlement, and guard against collusion or fraud. The harder question is when a breach of such a condition should justify complete forfeiture as against an injured judgment creditor. California law supplies an important answer: breach and prejudice are distinct inquiries, and a cooperation-clause defense ordinarily requires substantial prejudice rather than technical noncompliance alone.

This Article develops that principle into a broader framework for third-party compensation. It first distinguishes tort liability from insurance recovery, then examines California's direct-action structure under Insurance Code section 11580, the development of the substantial-prejudice requirement, the distinction between actual and hypothetical prejudice, and the evidentiary asymmetry that complicates proof. It

concludes with a six-part analytical model centered on materiality, insurer diligence, causation, evidentiary access, and proportionality.

I. Liability and Recovery Are Separate Legal Events

The relationship between tort liability and insurance liability is neither automatic nor conceptually identical. In the underlying action, the claimant seeks to establish that the defendant is legally responsible for injury or loss. Insurance coverage, by contrast, arises from a separate contractual relationship between insurer and insured. The policy may contain limits, exclusions, conditions, notice provisions, and cooperation obligations that become relevant only after liability has been established.

California Insurance Code section 11580 recognizes both sides of that distinction. It requires liability policies issued or delivered in California, within the statute's scope, to contain a provision permitting an action against the insurer by a person who has obtained a qualifying judgment against the insured. The judgment creditor therefore receives a statutory route to policy proceeds, but the action remains an action on the policy and is subject to defenses that are legally available under the contract.

The result is a two-stage structure: injury and liability litigation first; coverage and enforcement litigation second. From an institutional perspective, that structure protects the insurer from being compelled to indemnify losses outside the coverage it agreed to provide. From the claimant's perspective, however, each additional procedural stage creates cost, delay, uncertainty, and informational disadvantage.

II. The Judgment Creditor's Distinct Position

Section 11580(b)(2) gives the injured judgment creditor a legally recognized position in the insurance relationship after judgment. California decisions have described the creditor's rights as derivative of the insured's policy rights while also recognizing the creditor as a statutory beneficiary entitled to sue the insurer directly once the statutory prerequisites are satisfied.

This dual position generates the central allocation problem. The creditor may enforce the policy but ordinarily had no ability to ensure the insured's compliance with post-loss duties. If the insured fails to give timely notice or refuses to cooperate, who should bear the consequence—the insurer, the insured, or the injured third party? A rule that automatically attributes every insured default to the claimant risks making compensation depend on conduct the claimant could neither direct nor prevent. A rule that ignores serious noncooperation, however, would improperly deprive the insurer of contractual protections necessary to defend claims. The law therefore needs an intermediate principle.

III. Cooperation Clauses: Breach Does Not End the Inquiry

Cooperation clauses are common and legitimate. They can require the insured to provide information, assist with investigation, attend proceedings, preserve evidence, identify witnesses, and participate in the defense. A deliberate refusal to perform those duties can seriously impair the insurer.

Early California cases treated certain forms of noncooperation harshly. In Margellini v. Pacific Automobile Insurance Co., the court confronted willful misconduct and accepted a presumption-of-prejudice approach in that setting. That aspect of the doctrine did not survive intact. In Campbell v. Allstate Insurance Co., the California Supreme Court

rejected automatic forfeiture and held that an insurer relying on breach of a cooperation clause must establish substantial prejudice; the burden of proving that prejudice rests on the insurer.

Campbell is important not merely as a coverage rule but as a rule about proof. It asks the party invoking forfeiture to identify the concrete harm caused by the breach. That allocation is sensible because the insurer is ordinarily best positioned to identify the investigation it lost, the witness it could not interview, the defense it could not develop, the deadline it missed, or the settlement opportunity it could not pursue.

IV. Billington and the Rejection of Speculative Prejudice

The California Supreme Court sharpened the analysis in Billington v. Interinsurance Exchange of Southern California. The Court rejected the idea that an insurer can satisfy the substantial-prejudice requirement merely by showing that a defense might have been available or that a factfinder could theoretically have reached a more favorable result. Such reasoning collapses substantial prejudice into possibility.

The more demanding inquiry is causal and outcome-oriented. The insurer must connect the insured's noncooperation to a material litigation disadvantage and show a substantial likelihood that the result would have been more favorable absent the breach. The doctrine therefore prevents the phrase "failure to cooperate" from functioning as a self-proving conclusion.

A serious cooperation-clause analysis should ask:

What cooperation did the insurer request, and was the request reasonable and material?

What precisely did the insured fail to provide or do?

What reasonable efforts did the insurer make to obtain the insured's participation?

What evidence, defense, investigation opportunity, procedural right, or settlement opportunity was actually lost?

How did the loss result from the insured's breach rather than from independent weaknesses in the defense?

Is there a substantial basis to conclude that the missing cooperation would probably have affected the result?

V. Notice, Consent, and the Prejudice Principle

California's notice-prejudice doctrine reflects a related principle: a procedural condition designed to protect an insurer should not automatically produce forfeiture where the insurer's protected interests were not materially impaired. Timely notice serves obvious purposes. It enables investigation while evidence is fresh, permits participation in the defense, facilitates meaningful settlement evaluation, and limits the risk of fraud or inflated claims.

But lateness and prejudice are not identical. California decisions generally require the insurer to connect delayed notice to substantial prejudice before using the delay as a basis for forfeiture. In Pitzer College v. Indian Harbor Insurance Co., the California Supreme Court described the notice-prejudice rule as a fundamental public policy of the state. Pitzer should be used carefully, however: its specific treatment of consent provisions turned on the distinction between first-party and third-party coverage. Its broader significance here is the Court's reaffirmation of the prejudice principle, not a universal rule that every policy condition in every liability policy is subject to identical treatment.

For third-party judgment creditors, the logic of prejudice is particularly important because they ordinarily cannot control when the insured reports the occurrence, forwards suit papers, answers the carrier, appears for testimony, or preserves evidence. A rule of automatic forfeiture can therefore transfer the financial consequence of the insured's procedural default to a person who was powerless to prevent it.

VI. Actual Prejudice Versus Hypothetical Prejudice

The distinction between actual and hypothetical prejudice is the analytical center of the problem. An insurer may plausibly say, "Had we known earlier, we might have investigated differently." But the proposition establishes a lost possibility, not necessarily a material impairment.

A prejudice-centered inquiry instead asks:

Which witness became unavailable, and what material testimony was lost?

What physical or documentary evidence disappeared?

What defense could no longer be asserted?

What discovery or procedural deadline was irretrievably lost?

What settlement opportunity was foreclosed?

What part of the damages or liability case could no longer be meaningfully contested?

Why is there a substantial likelihood that the missing opportunity would have changed the outcome?

This is consistent with the line of California authority following Campbell and Billington. Northwestern Title Security Co. v. Flack emphasized that a mere possibility of prejudice is insufficient, while Hall v. Travelers Insurance Companies recognized that a policy-condition

defense against a judgment creditor requires substantial prejudice and places the burden on the insurer. The cases point toward a general proposition: a procedural violation should be judged by what it actually changed.

VII. Evidentiary Asymmetry: The Hidden Procedural Barrier

The prejudice requirement is normatively attractive but procedurally incomplete unless courts also confront the distribution of evidence. The insurer asserting noncooperation or late notice will often possess the materials necessary to establish—or undermine—its own claim of prejudice.

claim notes and diary entries;

correspondence with the insured;

telephone and contact logs;

investigator reports and recorded statements;

reservation-of-rights and coverage letters;

internal assessments of liability and damages;

defense counsel reporting and litigation evaluations;

witness assessments and investigative leads;

settlement evaluations; and

records documenting attempts to secure the insured's cooperation.

The injured claimant may possess none of these materials at the beginning of the coverage action. This produces evidentiary asymmetry: one party asserts a defense based largely on events within its own claims process while the other party must challenge that defense without initial access to the underlying record.

The formal question may be whether coverage remains enforceable. The practical answer can turn on who controls the proof. A prejudice

standard therefore works best when paired with meaningful discovery and sufficient disclosure to permit the judgment creditor to test the insurer's factual assertions. Otherwise, the burden formally assigned to the insurer may be weakened by an informational structure that prevents effective adversarial testing.

VIII. Liability Insurance as an Institution of the Civil Justice System

Liability insurance begins in contract, but its practical role extends beyond the contracting parties. It finances defense, shapes settlement behavior, determines the collectability of judgments, and distributes the economic consequences of accidents. A post-judgment coverage defense therefore does more than allocate money between insurer and insured; it can determine whether an adjudicated tort obligation has any economic meaning.

Recognizing that institutional role does not justify rewriting insurance contracts. It does justify careful examination of defenses that operate through procedural conditions rather than through the substantive boundaries of the covered risk. There is an important distinction between saying, "This loss was never within the policy's coverage," and saying, "This otherwise covered loss is forfeited because a post-loss condition was breached." The latter raises a stronger question about materiality and causation.

IX. The Restatement Perspective: Materiality, Purpose, and Proportionality

The Restatement of the Law, Liability Insurance reflects a modern effort to organize liability-insurance doctrine around the purposes served

by policy conditions and the consequences of breach. Although a Restatement is not binding merely because it is published, its analytical method is useful: technical noncompliance should be distinguished from material impairment of an insurer's legitimate contractual interests.

That approach is compatible with California's substantial-prejudice jurisprudence. The core question is not whether compliance was perfect. It is whether the breach materially compromised the insurer's ability to receive the protection the condition was designed to provide.

X. The Innocent Third Party and the Problem of Attribution

Third-party disputes reveal an unusual separation between wrongdoing and consequence. If an insured deliberately conceals evidence, refuses to participate, or disappears, the conduct is attributable to the insured. Yet if coverage is forfeited, the economic consequence may fall most heavily on the injured claimant.

The claimant ordinarily:

did not select the insurer or negotiate the policy;

did not agree to the cooperation or notice provisions;

did not receive the carrier's requests to the insured;

could not compel the insured to respond to the carrier;

could not control when notice was given; and

may not discover the coverage problem until substantial litigation has already occurred.

The prejudice requirement addresses this mismatch without eliminating contractual responsibility. It permits forfeiture when the insured's breach actually damages the insurer's protected interests, but resists extending the consequences of breach to an innocent third party when no material impairment is demonstrated.

XI. California's Direct-Action Structure and the Second Litigation Problem

California Insurance Code section 11580(b)(2) supplies the statutory bridge between an underlying judgment and the liability policy. But that bridge does not erase the contractual nature of the coverage action. Cases such as San Diego Housing Commission v. Industrial Indemnity Co. and Clemmer v. Hartford Insurance Co. illustrate that post-judgment proceedings can involve policy interpretation, coverage defenses, preclusion principles, and the judgment creditor's derivative rights.

This explains why the post-judgment proceeding should not be described as mere collection. It is a second adjudicative stage. In difficult cases, the claimant can litigate liability through judgment and then litigate again over whether insurance will respond. Where the second action turns on procedural defaults beyond the claimant's control, the legitimacy of the outcome depends heavily on whether the asserted defense is tied to real rather than conjectural prejudice.

XII. Limits: Genuine Noncooperation Must Still Matter

A claimant-protective framework is credible only if it takes insurer prejudice seriously. There are circumstances in which noncooperation can be severe and outcome-determinative. An insured may conceal a critical witness, fabricate facts, destroy evidence, disappear before trial, refuse to participate in a viable defense, enter a collusive arrangement, or deprive the insurer of a meaningful opportunity to contest liability or damages.

Those cases are not technical defaults. They involve conduct capable of undermining the defense the insurer contracted to provide. The appropriate legal response is therefore not an absolute rule favoring the

claimant, but a causation-and-prejudice rule: protect the insurer when the breach actually compromises the defense; protect the claimant when forfeiture would rest on formal noncompliance disconnected from material harm.

XIII. A Six-Part Framework for Post-Loss Procedural Defenses

1. Material breach. Identify the exact contractual duty and determine whether the insured's conduct constituted a substantial, not merely technical, breach.

2. Reasonable insurer diligence. Require evidence of meaningful efforts by the insurer to obtain notice, information, participation, or cooperation before treating the insured as unavailable or noncooperative.

3. Concrete prejudice. Require the insurer to identify the specific evidence, defense, procedural opportunity, investigation, or settlement advantage lost because of the breach.

4. Causal connection. Separate prejudice caused by the breach from weaknesses that already existed in the liability or damages defense. A poor defense does not become a prejudiced defense merely because the insured also failed to cooperate.

5. Evidentiary access. Where the insurer controls the claim records necessary to evaluate prejudice, permit discovery and disclosure sufficient for meaningful testing of the asserted defense.

6. Proportionality. Ask whether complete forfeiture bears a reasonable relationship to the demonstrated impairment. The more attenuated the harm, the weaker the justification for extinguishing the practical value of a third party's judgment.

The framework does not guarantee coverage, dilute legitimate exclusions, or excuse intentional obstruction. Its purpose is narrower: to

ensure that post-loss procedural defenses are evaluated with the rigor appropriate to a rule capable of converting an adjudicated tort obligation into an uncollectible judgment.

XIV. Systemic Significance

These disputes arise case by case, but their effects accumulate across the civil justice system. Repeated secondary litigation after liability has already been established can increase judicial expenditure, expand discovery and motion practice, delay compensation, produce inconsistent outcomes, raise transaction costs, and place additional pressure on claimants to compromise valid judgments.

The problem is therefore not only doctrinal. It is institutional. Procedure determines whether substantive rights can be realized. When the enforceability of a judgment turns on post-loss defaults beyond the claimant's control, and when the evidence needed to test those defaults is concentrated in the insurer's files, the legal system must ensure that forfeiture depends on demonstrated impairment rather than on labels.

Conclusion

A tort judgment resolves legal responsibility, but liability insurance often determines whether that responsibility will be translated into compensation. The path from judgment to recovery can be disrupted by late notice, an absent insured, a cooperation dispute, inaccessible evidence, or a post-judgment coverage defense arising from events the injured claimant did not control.

Insurers must retain the ability to enforce policy conditions that genuinely protect their capacity to investigate and defend. But enforcement should remain connected to the purpose of those conditions. California's

substantial-prejudice cases provide a principled method for maintaining that connection: identify the breach, place the burden on the insurer invoking forfeiture, reject speculative prejudice, require causation, and examine what the breach actually changed.

The most useful question is therefore not simply, "Was a policy condition breached?" It is, "What material consequence did the breach cause?" When the insurer can establish concrete impairment, enforcement protects a legitimate contractual interest. When it cannot, denying compensation risks turning procedure from a mechanism that protects substantive rights into an independent obstacle to their realization. That distinction matters not only to insurers and individual claimants, but to the credibility and effectiveness of civil adjudication itself.

Selected Authorities and References

Cal. Ins. Code § 11580(b)(2).

Campbell v. Allstate Ins. Co., 60 Cal. 2d 303, 305–07, 384 P.2d 155, 32 Cal. Rptr. 827 (1963).

Billington v. Interinsurance Exch. of S. Cal., 71 Cal. 2d 728, 737–39, 456 P.2d 982, 79 Cal. Rptr. 326 (1969).

Margellini v. Pac. Auto. Ins. Co., 33 Cal. App. 2d 93, 91 P.2d 136 (1939), disapproved in relevant part by Campbell, 60 Cal. 2d at 307.

Northwestern Title Sec. Co. v. Flack, 6 Cal. App. 3d 134, 85 Cal. Rptr. 693 (1970).

Hall v. Travelers Ins. Cos., 15 Cal. App. 3d 304, 93 Cal. Rptr. 159 (1971).

Pitzer Coll. v. Indian Harbor Ins. Co., 8 Cal. 5th 93, 447 P.3d 669, 251 Cal. Rptr. 3d 701 (2019).

Clemmer v. Hartford Ins. Co., 22 Cal. 3d 865, 587 P.2d 1098, 151 Cal. Rptr. 285 (1978).

San Diego Hous. Comm'n v. Indus. Indem. Co., 95 Cal. App. 4th 669, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 103 (2002).

Restatement of the Law, Liability Insurance (Am. L. Inst. 2019).