

Alberta court decision highlights insurance defence lawyer obligations to insureds

26 juin 2020

Recently, the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench provided guidance to defence lawyers on their obligations to report to and take instructions from insurers and insureds in *Kostic v Thom*, 2020 ABQB 324. In addition, the Court identified potential conflicts of interest that may arise when a lawyer is retained by an insurer to act for an insured.

Facts

The Plaintiff and her employer were defendants in an action that made a number of allegations, including negligence and fraud (the Original Action). The Original Action triggered partial coverage for both the Plaintiff and her employer under the employer's Professional Liability policy (the Policy). The Policy set out that the insurer, in the insured's name and behalf, had the right and duty to investigate, defend and conduct settlement negotiations, but it agreed that it would not settle any claim without the consent of the insured.

The insurer appointed counsel to defend the Plaintiff and her employer in the Original Action. The Plaintiff alleged the lawyer retained by the insurer was negligent, thus giving rise to the litigation in question.

Early in the Original Action, the Plaintiff raised the possibility of seeking a summary dismissal with the lawyer. The lawyer held the opinion that there was no real chance of succeeding in a summary dismissal application at that stage of the litigation. The Plaintiff was aware of this opinion and did not push the matter further at that time.

Several years later, the Plaintiff instructed the lawyer to have the claims made against her dismissed. The lawyer advised the Plaintiff that he could not follow her instructions as the insurer had the sole right to instruct counsel and, even with the passage of time, he held his opinion that the summary dismissal application would likely not succeed.

Later, the claimant in the Original Action made an offer of discontinuance on a without costs basis (the Offer). The insurer and employer consented to the Offer, but the Plaintiff did not. The lawyer ultimately withdrew as counsel for the Plaintiff due to this disagreement.

Decision

The Court in *Kostic* found that the lawyer misunderstood the nature of his role as defence counsel. Although he was retained through the insurer, the lawyer's clients in the Original Action were the insureds, the Plaintiff's employer and the Plaintiff herself. The lawyer was obliged to take instructions from the Plaintiff, unless those instructions put him in a position of conflict between the Plaintiff, her employer and/or the insurer. The Court held that the lawyer's misunderstanding of the nature of his role as counsel for the Plaintiff resulted in her receiving poor communication. The reporting letters sent to the insurer as the Action proceeded should have been copied to the Plaintiff and the Plaintiff should have been made more aware of the defence strategy.

The Court ultimately dismissed the Plaintiff's claim against the lawyer and found there was no evidence of a conflict of interest until divergent instructions were given by the Plaintiff respecting the Offer. At that time, the lawyer properly withdrew as counsel for the Plaintiff. The Court held that the prior disagreement on bringing a summary dismissal application was a mere disagreement with respect to litigation strategy, which did not amount to a conflict of interest. If it did, the insurer's right to control the defence stipulated in the Policy would be effectively meaningless.

Implications

Kostic serves as a reminder of the obligations an insurance defence lawyer has to insureds. Defence counsel should be aware of their obligations to both the insurer and insured in these situations. In this sense, *Kostic* is not "ground-breaking". Where *Kostic* is of greater assistance is in its commentary respecting communication obligations. While insurers may have control of the defence of an action, it is clear that there must be communication with insureds to an extent that would permit the insured to understand strategic decisions. Whether this understanding is to be held to a subjective or objective standard is unclear from the ruling. We would assume it would have to be objective, albeit counsel would be well served to cater to her audience. At a minimum, it would seem prudent for defence counsel to report to the insured as frequently as her reports to the insurer. Finally, *Kostic* provides helpful clarification on when a conflict of interest might arise in these circumstances. It seems very reasonable to find, as the Court did, that counsel would need to remove herself where there is a material divergence of views on key strategic decisions such that there is a reasonable apprehension of a conflict between the interests of the insurer and the insured. Imposing such an obligation at an earlier stage would make it very difficult, if not impossible, for counsel to represent both the insured and insurer.

Par

[Patrick Heinsen, Sarah Makson, Amal Jabar](#)

Services

[Litiges](#)

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 800 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

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 ou en modifiant vos préférences d'abonnement dans blg.com/fr/about-us/subscribe. Si vous pensez avoir reçu le présent message par erreur, veuillez nous écrire à communications@blg.com. Pour consulter la politique de confidentialité de BLG relativement aux publications, rendez-vous sur blg.com/fr/ProtectionDesRenseignementsPersonnels.

© 2026 Borden Ladner Gervais S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L. Borden Ladner Gervais est une société à responsabilité limitée de l'Ontario.