### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

BRIANA SIEGAL, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	)	
Plaintiff,	) )	
v.	)	Case No. 1:20-cv-04306
GEICO CASUALTY COMPANY, GEICO INDEMNITY COMPANY, and GEICO GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY,	) ) ) )	Hon. Sharon J. Coleman
Defendants.	)	

### GEICO'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Lisa T. Scruggs (#6256650) Ronald M. Lepinskas (#6216428) DUANE MORRIS LLP 190 South LaSalle, Suite 3600 Chicago, IL 60603 <u>ltscruggs@duanemorris.com</u> rmlepinskas@duanemorris.com

Damon N. Vocke DUANE MORRIS LLP 1540 Broadway New York, NY 10036-4086 <u>dnvocke@duanemorris.com</u>

DOCKET

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## Page

Intro	duction	1	
The C	Compla	int's Allegations	
Argu	ment		
I.	The Claim for Breach of Contract Should Be Dismissed6		
	A.	The "Changes" Section Imposes a Duty on Plaintiff, Not on GEICO7	
	B.	Plaintiff Does Not Allege That Her Representations in Applying for Insurance Were Incorrect or Changed	
	C.	Plaintiff's Hindsight Perspective Is Unfair on Its Face	
II.	The '	'Frustration of Purpose' Claim Should Be Dismissed10	
III.	The l	ICFA Claim for Deception Should Be Dismissed11	
	А.	There Was No False or Deceptive Statement	
	В.	A Reasonable Policyholder Would Expect The Advertised 15% Discount 13	
	C.	Plaintiff Does Not Allege Materiality14	
	D.	Plaintiff Does Not Allege Damage	
IV.	The l	ICFA Unfairness Claim Should Also Be Dismissed16	
	A.	There Was No Deceptive or False Statement	
	B.	No Statute or Law Was Allegedly Violated 16	
	C.	Plaintiff Has Had a Ready Alternative17	
V.	The U	Unjust Enrichment Claim Should Also Be Dismissed	
	A.	It Falls Along With the ICFA Claims	
	B.	The Insurance Policy Preempts the Unjust Enrichment Claim	
VI.	GEIC	CO Indemnity and GEICO General Insurance Should Be Dismissed19	
Conc	lusion .		

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Federal Cases** 

DOCKET

7-Eleven, Inc. v. Shakti Chicago, Inc., 2019 WL 3387001 (N.D. Ill. July 26, 2019)	8
Abramov v. Home Depot, Inc., 2018 WL 1252105 (N.D. Ill. March 12, 2018)	.14, 18
Batson v. Live Nation Entertainment, Inc., 746 F.3d 827 (7th Cir. 2014)	17
Bauer v. Travelers Home & Marine Ins. Co., No. 3:15-CV-348-CLS, 2017 WL 264460 (N.D. Ala. Jan. 20, 2017)	7
Baxter Healthcare Corp. v. OR Concepts, Inc., 69 F.3d 785 (7th Cir. 1995)	7
Bell Atlantic Corp., et al. v. Twombly, et al., 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	9
Bober v. Glaxo Wellcome PLC, 246 F.3d 934 (7th Cir. 2001)	12
Davis v. G.N. Mortg. Corp., 396 F.3d 869 (7th Cir. 2005)	12
Fair Isaac Corporation v. Trans Union, 2019 WL 1436018 (N.D. Ill. March 30, 2019)	8
Galanis v. Starbucks Corporation, 2016 WL 6037962 (N.D. II. Oct. 14 2016)	14
Killeen v. McDonald's Corporation, 317 F. Supp. 3d 1012 (N.D. Ill. 2018)	13
Kim v. Carter's Inc., 598 F.3d 362 (7th Cir. 2010)	15
Marchetti v. Chicago Title Insurance Co., 2015 WL 196222 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 14, 2015)	17
Orgone Capital III, LLC v. Daubenspeck, 912 F.3d 1039 (7th Cir. 2019)	6, 11
Siegel v. Shell Oil Co, 612 F.3d 932 (7th Cir. 2010)	16
Springfield Oil Drilling Corp. v. Weiss, 2003 WL 22025006 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 28, 2003)	11
Toulon v. Continental Casualty, 877 F.3d 725 (7th Cir. 2017)12,	, 15, 19
U.S. v. Southwestern Elec. Co-op., Inc., 869 F.2d 310 (7th Cir. 1989)	10
Ware v. Samsung Electronics America Inc., 2019 WL 2341399 (N.D. Ill. June 3, 2019)	16-17
Washington v. Hyatt Hotels Corp., 2020 WL 3058118 (N.D. Ill. June 9, 2020)	. 16-18

**A L A R M** Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

## Case: 1:20-cv-04306 Document #: 23 Filed: 10/15/20 Page 4 of 25 PageID #:306

## **State Cases**

Corbin v. Allstate Corp., 140 N.E.3d 810 (5th Dist. 2019)
DOD Techs. v. Mesirow Ins. Servs., Inc., 381 Ill. App. 3d 1042 (1st App. 2008)15
Greer ex rel Peterson v. Naklicki, 877 A.3d 298 (N.J. App. Div. 2005)7
Stoffel v. United Farm Family Mut. Ins. Co., 900 N.E.2d 828 (Ind. Ct. App. 2009)7
State Statutes
Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act § 505/211
Rules
Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)1

Defendants GEICO Casualty Company, GEICO Indemnity Company and GEICO General Insurance Company (collectively, "GEICO"), by and through its attorneys Duane Morris LLP, respectfully moves this Honorable Court, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), for dismissal of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint with prejudice and, in support thereof, state as follows:

#### INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff has auto insurance through GEICO Casualty Company. During the pandemic, GEICO advised that it would give its policyholders a "15% discount on new and renewal policies." (Cmplnt,  $\P$  4.) Plaintiff renewed her policy with GEICO in the midst of the pandemic for the period beginning June 1, 2020, and received this discount. Plaintiff has not alleged that GEICO violated any statutory mandate. Instead, Plaintiff now contends that a 15% discount over a sixmonth period, which continues for policies issued or renewed through Oct. 7, 2020, is inadequate. Plaintiff argues that the purported inadequacy breached her insurance policy (Count I), frustrated the purpose of her policy (Count II), violated the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act (Counts III and IV), and unjustly enriched GEICO (Count V). Plaintiff also seeks to certify a class of GEICO policyholders for the same claims.

The Complaint should be dismissed because it fails to state a claim as a matter of law. GEICO did not breach any term of the insurance policy, and it provided full transparency to Plaintiff on her discount. GEICO voluntarily provided this discount to its policyholders for future policy periods, and was not obliged to provide the discount for prior policy periods. GEICO was under no contractual, statutory, or regulatory duty to make any "giveback" at all.

Furthermore, GEICO never made a false or deceptive statement about the Giveback Program. It offered and gave a 15% discount, and provided a "Giveback Estimator" for

## DOCKET A L A R M



# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## **Real-Time Litigation Alerts**



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## **Advanced Docket Research**



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## **Analytics At Your Fingertips**



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.