

## Limitation Period Reconsidered For Failure to Appropriately Insure

28 mars 2018

In the recently released decision of Henry v Thyssenkrupp Elevator (Canada) Limited, 2018 ONSC 1659, the Superior Court provided some clarity regarding the appropriate limitation period for claims based on a party's failure to obtain the required insurance. The Henry decision runs contrary to the recently released Brookstreet v Economical decision by the same Court, which BLG previously reported on in our bulletin.

The underlying action in Henry dealt with a claim for injuries sustained by the plaintiff while exiting an elevator, which was alleged to have been improperly levelled at the floor. The elevator was located in the residential apartment building of the defendant owner, which was managed by the defendant property management company (the “principals”). The plaintiff sued the principals as well as the elevator maintenance contractor. While the maintenance contractor had obtained insurance coverage benefiting the property owner, it did not do so for the property manager, in breach of its contractual obligations pursuant to a maintenance agreement entered into amongst all the defendants.

The maintenance agreement required certificates of insurance to be delivered to the principals prior to the commencement of the term of the contract. It also required that the contractor bear the cost of any deductible in the insurance policy, which carried a self-retention limit of USD \$250,000 (“SIR”). The existence of the SIR effectively meant that all insureds under the policy would have to self-insure up to the SIR limit before the insurance policy would apply. Accordingly, the threshold issue on the motion was whether the SIR was a deductible for the purposes of the policy. The Court found, in line with previous jurisprudence from the Ontario Court of Appeal, that the SIR was effectively a deductible, which the maintenance agreement dictated ought to be paid by the contractor.

Next, the Court dealt with the request by the principals for a declaration that the contractor was in breach of the maintenance contract by failing to add them both as **additional insureds under the maintenance contractor’s policy of insurance**, and a declaration that it defend both principals and pay their defense costs incurred to date and ongoing. It was argued that these breaches of contract represented a claim for contribution and indemnity for which the limitation period did not begin to run until the

Statement of Claim had been served, pursuant to s. 18 of the Limitations Act, S.O. 2002 C. 24 (the “Limitations Act”).

In addressing the demand for a defense by the principals, a review of the pleadings led the Court to find the true nature of the claim to relate to elevator maintenance and, **therefore, all claims fell within coverage under the contractor’s policy of insurance.** However, the Court went on to consider whether the principals were time barred in **requesting a defence from the contractor. The contractor, relying on the recent decision of Brookstreet v Economical, argued that the claim was time-barred, as the limitation period began to run when the principals ought to have reasonably inquired whether the contractor obtained appropriate coverage pursuant to the contract.**

**The Court rejected the contractor’s reliance on Brookstreet and held that the Ontario Court of Appeal’s decision in Canaccord Corp v. Roscoe was dispositive of this issue.** The Court noted that the policy was first provided to the principals in August 2016 (the underlying accident occurred in May 2014), despite the contract requiring delivery of a copy of the policy prior to the commencement of the term of the contract, which was dated May 1, 2010. Although the principals’ claim was framed as a breach of contract claim, the Court found that the nature of the claim was still one of contribution and indemnity, and thus subject to section 18, and not section 5, of the Limitations Act. **Citing the Court of Appeal’s decision in Canaccord Corp., which was not considered in Brookstreet, the Court held that contribution and indemnity claims were governed by a two year limitation period notwithstanding the underlying legal theory, “whether the right to contribution and indemnity arises in respect of a tort or otherwise.” The Court held that the principals’ claim against the contractor was not time-barred and ordered that the contractor pay past and future defence costs.**

This decision confirms that a breach of contract claim against the contractor, for failure to insure or failure to obtain appropriate coverage, is in essence, a claim for contribution and indemnity. The two-year limitation period for such a claim begins to run from the date of service of the Statement of Claim. Defendants asserting such claims ought to specifically plead breach of contract as part of their cross claim against their co-defendants, along with pleading reliance on the applicable insurance requirement and the defence and indemnity provisions of the contract.

**Par**

[Edona C. Vila, George R. Wray](#)

**Services**

[Contestation de réclamations d’assurance](#)

## BLG | Vos avocats au Canada

Borden Ladner Gervais S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L. (BLG) est le plus grand cabinet d'avocats canadien véritablement multiservices. À ce titre, il offre des conseils juridiques pratiques à des clients d'ici et d'ailleurs dans plus de domaines et de secteurs que tout autre cabinet canadien. Comptant plus de 725 avocats, agents de propriété intellectuelle et autres professionnels, BLG répond aux besoins juridiques d'entreprises et d'institutions au pays comme à l'étranger pour ce qui touche les fusions et acquisitions, les marchés financiers, les différends et le financement ou encore l'enregistrement de brevets et de marques de commerce.

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

### Bureaux BLG

#### Calgary

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

T 403.232.9500  
F 403.266.1395

#### Ottawa

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

T 613.237.5160  
F 613.230.8842

#### Vancouver

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

T 604.687.5744  
F 604.687.1415

#### Montréal

1000, rue De La Gauchetière Ouest  
Suite 900  
Montréal, QC, Canada  
H3B 5H4

T 514.954.2555  
F 514.879.9015

#### Toronto

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

T 416.367.6000  
F 416.367.6749

Les présents renseignements sont de nature générale et ne sauraient constituer un avis juridique, ni un énoncé complet de la législation pertinente, ni un avis sur un quelconque sujet. Personne ne devrait agir ou s'abstenir d'agir sur la foi de ceux-ci sans procéder à un examen approfondi du droit après avoir soupesé les faits d'une situation précise. Nous vous recommandons de consulter votre conseiller juridique si vous avez des questions ou des préoccupations particulières. BLG ne garantit aucunement que la teneur de cette publication est exacte, à jour ou complète. Aucune partie de cette publication ne peut être reproduite sans l'autorisation écrite de Borden Ladner Gervais S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L. Si BLG vous a envoyé cette publication et que vous ne souhaitez plus la recevoir, vous pouvez demander à faire supprimer vos coordonnées de nos listes d'envoi en communiquant avec nous par courriel à [desabonnement@blg.com](mailto:desabonnement@blg.com) ou en modifiant vos préférences d'abonnement dans [blg.com/fr/about-us/subscribe](http://blg.com/fr/about-us/subscribe). Si vous pensez avoir reçu le présent message par erreur, veuillez nous écrire à [communications@blg.com](mailto:communications@blg.com). Pour consulter la politique de confidentialité de BLG relativement aux publications, rendez-vous sur [blg.com/fr/ProtectionDesRenseignementsPersonnels](http://blg.com/fr/ProtectionDesRenseignementsPersonnels).

© 2025 Borden Ladner Gervais S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L. Borden Ladner Gervais est une société à responsabilité limitée de l'Ontario.