https://doi.org/10.47669/IHRPD-3-2026

Technical Forfeiture and Third-Party Compensation: Recalibrating California's Notice-Prejudice Rule

Diana GRIGORYAN[1]

Introduction

Liability insurance notice provisions perform an important contractual function. Prompt notice gives an insurer a fair opportunity to investigate an accident, preserve evidence, evaluate liability, participate in settlement, and control or assist in the defense. But the existence of that legitimate function does not answer a different question: what consequence should follow when notice is late but the delay has caused no demonstrable harm?

California's notice-prejudice rule answers that question by separating breach from consequence. Delayed notice does not ordinarily defeat coverage merely because it violates a policy condition. Instead, the insurer must establish actual and substantial prejudice attributable to the delay. The rule is not an indulgence toward noncompliance. It is a causal principle. It asks whether the delay impaired the interests the notice requirement exists to protect.

That distinction becomes especially important in third-party liability cases. The insured controls whether and when the carrier receives notice. An injured claimant ordinarily does not. Yet if late notice automatically eliminated coverage, the practical cost of the insured's procedural failure could be shifted to the person least able to prevent it: the third-party victim. California's approach resists that result without erasing legitimate insurer protections. The insurer remains entitled to relief when delayed notice actually destroys evidence, eliminates a defense, forecloses a realistic

[1] Diana Grigoryan is a legal professional with approximately nineteen years of experience in insurance law, civil litigation, constitutional and administrative litigation, procedural fairness, and access-to-justice matters. She has been licensed as an attorney in the Republic of Armenia since 2007 and holds an LL.M. in Trial Advocacy from Chicago-Kent College of Law.

settlement opportunity, or otherwise materially worsens the insurer's position.

This Essay argues that the notice-prejudice rule should be understood as a doctrine of calibrated forfeiture. It should protect insurers against genuine impairment while preventing technical noncompliance from becoming an independent escape from otherwise applicable coverage. That conception is especially important when liability insurance operates not only as a private contract but also as part of the practical machinery through which tort judgments are translated into compensation.

The analysis proceeds in four stages. First, it explains the contractual logic of notice and the development of California's prejudice requirement. Second, it identifies the evidentiary and causal showing that should separate actual prejudice from speculation. Third, it examines the special position of third-party claimants and the asymmetry they face when the relevant evidence sits inside the insurer's claims file. Finally, it proposes a structured framework for courts and litigants that preserves legitimate insurer interests while keeping forfeiture tied to real harm.

I. Notice as a Functional Contractual Obligation

A notice provision is not merely administrative. Its purpose is functional. In the immediate aftermath of an accident, the factual record is unstable. Witness memories fade; vehicles are repaired or destroyed; surveillance recordings may be overwritten; physical conditions may change; records may disappear; and settlement opportunities may expire. Early notice allows the insurer to intervene while those sources remain available.

That opportunity can matter in several ways. The insurer may inspect vehicles or property, interview witnesses, preserve photographs and electronic data, retain experts, evaluate comparative fault, review medical or economic damages, obtain the insured's account, investigate defenses, and participate in settlement negotiations. In a litigated matter, timely notice may also allow the insurer to retain counsel before defaults or other procedural consequences arise.

But the function of a contractual obligation also identifies the appropriate remedy for its breach. If the notice requirement exists to protect

investigation, settlement, and defense interests, the central question should be whether delayed notice actually impaired those interests. A rule of automatic forfeiture treats chronology as sufficient: notice was late, therefore coverage is lost. A prejudice rule asks the more difficult and more defensible question: what did the delay change?

California has long rejected the proposition that delay alone necessarily establishes prejudice. In Abrams v. American Fidelity & Casualty Co., the California Supreme Court refused to treat a substantial delay as prejudicial as a matter of law and instead emphasized the facts of the particular case. Later, in Campbell v. Allstate Insurance Co., the court again recognized that an insurer relying on breach of a notice or cooperation obligation must demonstrate prejudice rather than merely point to noncompliance.

This approach prevents the notice condition from becoming detached from its contractual purpose. The insurer receives the protection for which the condition was designed: protection against material impairment. The insured, and in some cases a third-party claimant, is protected against forfeiture where the insurer's substantive position has not materially changed.

II. Pitzer College and the Modern California Rule

The California Supreme Court's modern articulation of the doctrine appears in Pitzer College v. Indian Harbor Insurance Co. There, the court described the notice-prejudice rule as requiring an insurer to establish that delayed notice substantially prejudiced its ability to investigate and negotiate payment of the claim. The court rejected presumed prejudice and emphasized actual impairment.

The most important feature of Pitzer is its insistence on causation. It is not enough for the insurer to show that earlier notice would have been preferable. Nor is it enough to identify some lost opportunity in the abstract. The insurer must connect the delay to a material disadvantage and, in the third-party setting, show a substantial likelihood that timely notice would have produced a better result — for example, by permitting a lower settlement or reducing or eliminating liability.

That formulation matters because many assertions of prejudice are counterfactual. An insurer necessarily must ask what it could have done had notice arrived earlier. But a counterfactual can be disciplined by evidence or left at the level of conjecture. The notice-prejudice rule demands the former.

Suppose an insurer says that, with timely notice, it would have conducted an earlier investigation. That assertion identifies a missed opportunity, but not necessarily prejudice. The relevant questions are more concrete. What evidence was available earlier but unavailable later? What would that evidence likely have shown? Which defense was lost? Which settlement opportunity expired? Which litigation position deteriorated? And why was the deterioration caused by delayed notice rather than by the underlying facts of the accident or some independent event?

Pitzer also placed the rule on a broader doctrinal foundation by characterizing California's notice-prejudice rule as a fundamental public policy in the choice-of-law context. The significance of that characterization is not that insurance conditions are unimportant. It is that California views forfeiture without prejudice as inconsistent with the state's deeper policy concerning the relationship between technical breach and substantive loss of insurance protection.

III. From Hypothetical Disadvantage to Actual Prejudice

The central challenge in late-notice litigation is distinguishing actual prejudice from the possibility that the insurer might have preferred earlier participation. That distinction should be evaluated through evidence of lost capacity.

A useful starting point is to identify what became unavailable during the period of delay. Did an eyewitness disappear? Did a witness's memory materially deteriorate? Was a vehicle repaired before inspection? Was physical evidence destroyed? Was surveillance footage overwritten? Did a dispositive defense become unavailable? Did a default occur? Did a procedural deadline expire? Did a realistic settlement opportunity lapse? Did the insurer's financial exposure materially increase in a way earlier participation probably would have avoided?

These questions move the analysis from chronology to consequence.

Hanover Insurance Co. v. Carroll illustrates the point. There, the insurer argued that delayed notice deprived it of an earlier investigation. But significant contemporaneous evidence had been preserved, including law-enforcement information, photographs, and documentation of vehicle damage. The court refused to treat the lost opportunity to investigate earlier as sufficient by itself. The important inquiry was what meaningful evidence had actually been lost.

The difference can be illustrated with two otherwise similar cases. Imagine that each involves a seven-month delay. In the first, the police report remains available, both vehicles were extensively photographed, independent witnesses can still be located, electronic evidence has been preserved, the insured remains available for interview, and no settlement or litigation deadline has expired. The delay is substantial, but the insurer may struggle to identify a concrete impairment.

In the second case, the same seven months produce very different consequences: the vehicles are destroyed; the only independent witness dies; nearby surveillance footage is overwritten; the accident scene materially changes; the insured becomes unavailable; and a reasonable time-limited settlement demand expires. The duration of delay is identical, but its legal significance is not. What matters is what was lost because of the delay.

This causation-centered analysis also prevents hindsight from substituting for proof. After an adverse verdict or large settlement, it may be tempting to infer that earlier insurer involvement necessarily would have improved the outcome. But the relevant question is not whether a better result is imaginable. It is whether the evidence supports a substantial likelihood that timely notice would have changed the result in a material way.

IV. Lost Settlement Opportunities and Outcome-Based Prejudice

One of the strongest forms of actual prejudice may arise when delayed notice causes the insurer to miss a meaningful opportunity to settle. Settlement is not merely an administrative convenience. In liability

insurance, the ability to evaluate and resolve a claim before exposure escalates can be central to the insurer's contractual position.

Consider a claimant who makes a reasonable demand within policy limits while the insurer remains unaware of the claim because the insured failed to provide notice. The demand expires. The matter then proceeds to a judgment substantially above the amount at which it could plausibly have been resolved. In that setting, the insurer has a much stronger prejudice argument than in a case where nothing consequential occurred during the delay.

Even then, causation should remain explicit. The insurer should identify evidence showing that a genuine settlement opportunity existed, that timely notice would have allowed the carrier to evaluate it, that there was a substantial likelihood the matter could have been resolved more favorably, and that the opportunity disappeared because notice was delayed.

This is consistent with the outcome-oriented reasoning reflected in Pitzer and Safeco Insurance Co. of America v. Parks. The prejudice inquiry is not satisfied by showing merely that the insurer lost time. It asks whether the delay materially altered what the insurer could achieve.

The same logic should apply to allegedly lost defenses. If the insurer contends that a defense became unavailable, it should identify the defense, the evidence necessary to support it, when that evidence was lost, and why timely notice probably would have preserved it. A generic statement that an earlier investigation might have uncovered something useful does not establish substantial prejudice.

V. The Third-Party Claimant and the Attribution Problem

The notice-prejudice doctrine acquires a different dimension when liability coverage is the practical source of compensation for an injured third party. The injured claimant ordinarily has no contractual relationship with the insurer at the time notice is due and no control over the insured's compliance with policy conditions.

The claimant cannot force the insured to identify the correct carrier, locate the policy, notify the insurer, transmit litigation papers, respond to correspondence, cooperate with counsel, or comply with contractual

deadlines. Nevertheless, if the legal consequence of the insured's failure is automatic forfeiture, the economic loss may ultimately fall on the claimant.

California Insurance Code section 11580(b)(2) reflects the practical importance of liability insurance to judgment enforcement by permitting a qualifying judgment creditor to proceed against the insurer on the policy, subject to the policy's terms and limitations. The statute does not erase valid coverage defenses. But it underscores a structural reality: a third-party claimant may later be litigating the consequences of a contractual breach committed entirely by the insured.

This is an attribution problem. The insured delays; the insurer asserts a defense; the claimant may lose the practical source of recovery. The claimant's innocence cannot create coverage that never existed, nor should it invalidate a contractual limitation that defines the scope of the risk actually insured. But where coverage otherwise exists and the asserted defense is a post-loss procedural breach, the claimant's lack of control strengthens the justification for requiring a concrete showing of prejudice.

The distinction is between contractual protection and punishment. Notice provisions protect insurer interests in investigation, defense, and settlement. They should not operate as punitive devices by imposing complete forfeiture for a breach that caused no material impairment — particularly when the practical burden of that forfeiture falls on a nonbreaching third party.

The third-party context therefore exposes why the notice-prejudice rule is more than a technical doctrine of insurance contract interpretation. It determines whether procedural noncompliance inside the insurer-insured relationship can extinguish the practical value of an adjudicated tort obligation. That is a question about the architecture of compensation as much as about contract.

VI. Liability Insurance as Part of the Tort System

The broader significance of the notice-prejudice rule becomes clearer when liability insurance is understood as part of the institutional structure of tort law. Scholars have long observed that insurance affects whether

claims are pursued, how they are defended, the availability of settlement, litigation strategy, and the practical payment of judgments.

Tom Baker has described liability insurance as a form of tort regulation in action. Kenneth Abraham has similarly documented the historical interdependence between liability insurance and tort liability. Kenneth Abraham and Lance Liebman have urged analysis of tort compensation alongside private and social insurance rather than in doctrinal isolation.

That perspective helps explain why rules governing notice have effects outside the bilateral insurer-insured relationship. A liability judgment is a legal determination of responsibility, but insurance often determines whether that judgment produces meaningful compensation. A coverage defense based on late notice may therefore affect the functioning of the tort system itself.

This does not mean that third-party compensation should override the insurance contract. The insurer's bargain matters. Nor does public policy justify converting liability insurance into unlimited protection untethered from policy terms. The point is narrower: where the policy covers the risk and the dispute concerns a post-loss notice condition, the consequence of breach should be proportionate to the impairment the breach caused.

A prejudice requirement serves that function. It preserves the insurer's legitimate contractual protection without allowing technical noncompliance to produce a windfall unrelated to actual harm. In this sense, the doctrine allocates the cost of procedural failure according to consequence rather than formalism.

VII. The Important Boundary: Claims-Made and Claims-Made-and-Reported Policies

A balanced account must recognize that notice does not perform the same function in every policy. The prejudice principle is strongest when notice is a post-loss condition designed to facilitate investigation, defense, and settlement. It becomes more difficult when timely reporting is part of the coverage grant itself.

Occurrence policies ordinarily attach coverage to an event occurring during the policy period. Notice follows the event and serves claims-handling functions. By contrast, claims-made and especially claims-made-

and-reported policies may use reporting during a defined period as part of the temporal boundary of the risk the insurer agreed to cover.

Slater v. Lawyers' Mutual Insurance Co. illustrates this distinction. Claims-made coverage was developed in part to allow insurers to define and limit exposure to claims made or reported within a specified period. Applying an ordinary notice-prejudice rule to extend that reporting period may do more than excuse a breached condition; it may alter the scope of coverage itself.

The Restatement of the Law of Liability Insurance similarly distinguishes ordinary notice obligations from reporting requirements that define claims-made-and-reported coverage. That distinction is essential to keeping the prejudice doctrine principled.

Accordingly, the first question in any late-notice dispute should be structural: what function does the reporting requirement perform in this policy? If the requirement facilitates investigation of a covered occurrence, prejudice analysis is appropriate. If timely reporting defines whether the claim falls within the temporal grant of coverage, applying the doctrine may rewrite rather than enforce the bargain.

This boundary also strengthens, rather than weakens, the argument for a prejudice rule in ordinary occurrence-based liability coverage. It demonstrates that courts can protect against technical forfeiture without ignoring genuine coverage limitations.

VIII. Evidentiary Asymmetry and the Problem of Proof

Although the insurer bears the burden of showing prejudice under California's rule, the practical information necessary to evaluate that defense is often concentrated in the insurer's possession. This creates an evidentiary asymmetry, especially for third-party claimants.

The insurer's claims file may reveal when notice was first received, what investigation followed, what evidence remained available, what evidence was allegedly lost, which defenses were considered, whether settlement opportunities existed, how reserves or evaluations changed, and

how the carrier believed the delay affected the matter. The claimant may initially possess little or none of that information.

A prejudice doctrine can become weak in practice if courts accept generalized declarations that earlier notice would have been useful while claimants lack access to the materials necessary to test those assertions. The solution is not to presume an absence of prejudice. It is to require specificity and permit targeted discovery into the causal chain asserted by the carrier.

The central discovery question should be straightforward: what specifically could the insurer probably have done with timely notice that it could no longer do when notice was actually received?

That question can be broken into several inquiries: When did the insurer first learn of the occurrence, claim, or lawsuit? What investigation did it perform after receiving notice? Which witnesses, documents, physical evidence, or electronic records were no longer available? What defense does the insurer contend it lost? Was there a concrete settlement opportunity that expired? How did delayed notice, rather than another circumstance, cause the alleged loss? Why was there a substantial likelihood that timely notice would have produced a materially better result?

These questions convert prejudice from a conclusion into a provable proposition. They also improve judicial efficiency because they focus discovery on the elements that matter rather than allowing a sprawling inquiry into every hypothetical step an insurer might have taken.

IX. A Six-Part Framework for Late-Notice Disputes

Courts and litigants would benefit from a disciplined sequence that separates policy interpretation, breach, causation, and prejudice.

First, identify the policy structure. Is the policy occurrence-based, claims-made, or claims-made-and-reported? This determines whether notice is primarily a claims-handling condition or part of the coverage trigger.

Second, identify the contractual notice obligation. What notice was required, by whom, in what form, and within what period? The analysis should begin with the contract actually written.

Third, determine the extent and circumstances of delay. How long was notice delayed, why did the delay occur, and what happened during that period? Duration may be relevant, but it is not dispositive.

Fourth, identify the concrete loss. What evidence, defense, settlement opportunity, procedural right, or strategic option became unavailable? The insurer should define the impairment with specificity.

Fifth, establish causation. Did delayed notice cause the identified loss, or would the loss have occurred anyway? A prejudice rule should not convert correlation into causation.

Sixth, determine substantiality. Was there a substantial likelihood that timely notice would have allowed the insurer to obtain a materially better outcome — by improving the defense, preserving evidence, reducing liability, or achieving a more favorable settlement?

This framework respects both sides of the insurance relationship. The insurer is not required to prove a hypothetical alternate universe with mathematical certainty. But it must establish more than the possibility that earlier involvement might have helped. The claimant or insured, in turn, cannot defeat a legitimate notice defense merely by characterizing a real loss as speculative.

The framework also offers a practical advantage: it forces the parties to litigate the reason notice matters, rather than treating lateness as a substitute for analysis.

X. What Should Count as Strong Evidence of Prejudice

Evidence of substantial prejudice should ordinarily identify a concrete loss and explain its significance.

For example, an insurer may have a strong showing where delayed notice caused the destruction or alteration of critical physical evidence; the disappearance of a material witness; the loss of surveillance or electronic evidence; the inability to inspect a vehicle or accident scene; the loss of a viable dispositive defense; entry of an avoidable default; expiration of a realistic settlement opportunity; loss of a procedural right; or a materially greater exposure that timely participation probably would have reduced.

But the existence of a lost item does not end the inquiry. Materiality matters. A destroyed vehicle may be highly prejudicial if its condition is central to liability and no reliable substitute exists. It may be far less significant if detailed photographs, measurements, expert inspections, telemetry, video, and other contemporaneous evidence preserve every material fact.

Likewise, the loss of a witness matters in proportion to the witness's likely contribution. If the witness was the only neutral observer of disputed events, unavailability may be consequential. If the testimony would merely duplicate objective evidence, the prejudice may be minimal.

Settlement evidence requires similar discipline. The insurer should not be allowed to rely on the abstract proposition that cases are generally easier to settle earlier. It should identify a genuine opportunity, explain how timely notice would have allowed meaningful evaluation and response, and show why the delay caused that opportunity to disappear.

These requirements do not make prejudice impossible to prove. They make it evidentiary.

XI. What Should Count Against a Finding of Prejudice

The opposite showing is equally important. Evidence may undermine substantial prejudice where witnesses remained available; physical evidence was preserved; photographs, recordings, police reports, or other contemporaneous materials adequately documented the event; the insurer conducted a meaningful investigation after receiving notice; no important litigation deadline was lost; no realistic settlement opportunity expired; liability rested on objective evidence unaffected by delay; or the insurer cannot identify any defense timely notice probably would have preserved.

Hanover is instructive because it rejects the idea that a missed earlier investigation is automatically prejudicial when substantial evidence remains available. The principle should apply more generally. Courts should ask whether the post-notice record allowed the insurer to reconstruct the material facts with sufficient reliability.

The burden should not demand proof that the late-notified insurer was placed in exactly the same position it would have occupied with immediate

notice. Some informational disadvantage may be inevitable whenever time passes. The doctrine requires substantial prejudice, not perfect equivalence.

This distinction is important to avoid two opposite errors. A standard that treats any lost opportunity as prejudice would collapse back into automatic forfeiture. A standard that demands certainty about the precise monetary effect of every lost opportunity would make the doctrine unrealistically difficult to apply. The proper inquiry is whether the evidence shows material impairment and a substantial likelihood of a better result with timely notice.

XII. Recalibrating Forfeiture Around Actual Harm

California's notice-prejudice rule is best understood as a proportionality principle in insurance contract enforcement. The rule does not excuse contractual breach because deadlines are unimportant. It insists that the remedy for breach bear a relationship to the harm produced.

That relationship matters most where the consequence is complete forfeiture of liability coverage. Insurance contracts routinely contain conditions, exclusions, and limitations, and courts appropriately enforce provisions that define the risk the insurer agreed to assume. But a post-loss procedural obligation is different from a limitation defining the existence or temporal scope of coverage.

When the insured violates a notice condition yet the insurer remains able to investigate, defend, and settle on substantially the same footing, complete forfeiture can create a mismatch between breach and consequence. The insurer receives more than protection against the harm notice was designed to prevent; it receives release from an otherwise covered obligation without corresponding impairment.

The prejudice requirement corrects that mismatch. It places the burden on the party asserting forfeiture to show why the breach materially changed its position. This is particularly appropriate because the relevant evidence is often within the carrier's control.

At the same time, the doctrine must preserve meaningful protection for insurers. An eighteen-month delay followed by destroyed evidence,

unavailable witnesses, expired settlement opportunities, or an unreviewed default is not a technicality. Where the delay genuinely compromises the insurer's contractual interests, the prejudice rule should permit the insurer to rely on the breach.

The proper balance is therefore neither automatic forfeiture nor automatic forgiveness. It is consequence tied to actual harm.

Conclusion

Timely notice matters because it protects legitimate insurer interests in investigation, preservation of evidence, settlement, and defense. But lateness and prejudice are not synonymous.

California's cases reflect a consistent principle. Abrams rejected the assumption that delay alone necessarily establishes prejudice. Campbell recognized that breach of notice-related obligations requires a showing of prejudice. Hanover demonstrated why speculation about what an earlier investigation might have uncovered is insufficient when meaningful evidence remains available. Pitzer placed the doctrine on especially firm ground by treating the notice-prejudice rule as a fundamental California public policy and requiring actual, substantial, causally connected impairment.

The doctrine should remain demanding in both directions. Insurers should not lose legitimate protection when delay destroys evidence, eliminates defenses, forecloses settlement, or materially increases exposure. But insureds and third-party claimants should not lose otherwise applicable coverage merely because a deadline was missed when the insurer cannot show that the delay mattered.

For third-party claimants, the distinction is especially consequential. They ordinarily cannot control the insured's compliance, yet they may bear the economic cost of forfeiture. A prejudice requirement does not create coverage for them. It simply ensures that a procedural breach committed by another person does not defeat compensation unless the breach actually impaired the insurer.

The most coherent rule is therefore a calibrated one: identify the policy structure, identify the notice obligation, isolate the concrete loss, establish causation, and determine whether timely notice probably would have

produced a materially better result. That framework respects contract, protects insurer interests, reduces technical forfeiture, and keeps liability insurance connected to its practical role in the civil justice system.

References

1. Pitzer Coll. v. Indian Harbor Ins. Co., 8 Cal. 5th 93, 102–05 (2019).

2. Campbell v. Allstate Ins. Co., 60 Cal. 2d 303, 306–07 (1963).

3. Abrams v. Am. Fid. & Cas. Co., 32 Cal. 2d 233, 237–39 (1948).

4. Pitzer Coll., 8 Cal. 5th at 104–05.

5. Id. at 102–06.

6. Safeco Ins. Co. of Am. v. Parks, 170 Cal. App. 4th 992, 1004 (2009).

7. Hanover Ins. Co. v. Carroll, 241 Cal. App. 2d 558, 567–69 (1966).

8. Cal. Ins. Code § 11580(b)(2).

9. Tom Baker, Liability Insurance as Tort Regulation: Six Ways That Liability Insurance Shapes Tort Law in Action, 12 Conn. Ins. L.J. 1, 3–13 (2005).

10. Kenneth S. Abraham, The Liability Century: Insurance and Tort Law from the Progressive Era to 9/11 1–12 (Harvard Univ. Press 2008).

11. Kenneth S. Abraham & Lance Liebman, Private Insurance, Social Insurance, and Tort Reform: Toward a New Vision of Compensation for Illness and Injury, 93 Colum. L. Rev. 75, 75–81 (1993).

12. Slater v. Lawyers' Mut. Ins. Co., 227 Cal. App. 3d 1415, 1422–24 (1991).

13. Restatement of the Law of Liability Insurance § 35 (Am. L. Inst. 2019).