

SB 167 2022 MIA Pre-Filed Testimony Final.pdf

Uploaded by: Kathleen Birrane

Position: FAV

LARRY HOGAN
Governor

BOYD K. RUTHERFORD
Lt. Governor



Maryland

INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

200 St. Paul Place, Suite 2700, Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Direct Dial: 410-468-2471 Fax: 410-468-2020

Email: kathleen.birrane@maryland.gov

www.insurance.maryland.gov

KATHLEEN A. BIRrane
Commissioner

GREGORY M. DERWART
Deputy Commissioner

TESTIMONY OF
THE
MARYLAND INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION
BEFORE THE
SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

JANUARY 19, 2022

SENATE BILL 167 – INSURANCE - CLAIM PAYMENT - CLARIFICATION

POSITION: SUPPORT

Thank you for the opportunity to provide written comments regarding Senate Bill 167.

SB 167 amends §§4-113 and 27-305 of the Insurance Article to clarify that if the Maryland Insurance Administration (MIA) finds that an insurance company, a nonprofit health service plan, or a health maintenance organization (collectively known as carriers) has violated state law by failing to pay a claim or otherwise fulfill its contractual obligations, the remedies available to the MIA include the authority to require that company to pay the claim or fulfill its contractual obligation to the insured. The bill also authorizes the MIA Commissioner, on finding a violation of unfair claim settlement practices, to require a carrier to provide a payment that has been denied improperly.

The current statutory law states that the MIA may require a carrier to “make restitution” to a claimant who has suffered “financial injury” because of the violation. Certain carriers have taken the position that the payment of a claim is not “restitution,” unless the policyholder advanced the claim payment out of pocket. Under this reading of “restitution,” only a consumer who had the financial ability to pay for the amount denied and can provide proof of that payment is entitled to relief. If the claimant did not make a payment, or has lost the receipt, carriers have argued that they are not obligated to make the payment that was denied. This reading of the law would allow a carrier to benefit from its unlawful underpayment or denial of claims.

Currently, §§15-10A-04 and 15-10D-03 of the Insurance Article specifically state that if a violation is related to an adverse decision or coverage decision the MIA has authority to require

that a carrier fulfill its contractual obligations; provide health care services or payments that have been denied improperly; or take appropriate measures to restore its ability to provide health care services or payments that are provided under a contract. SB 167 seeks to make similar changes to the language in §§4-113 and 27-305 to have the same intended effect as the current language in §§15-10A-04 and 15-10D-03 to hold carriers responsible.

As an example, the MIA completed a lengthy and detailed market conduct investigation that revealed that reimbursement for certain mental health service claims were improperly and unlawfully reduced by 30%. The investigation addressed many claims that spanned the course of several years. The carrier argued that it was only required to correct its error and pay the 30% that was improperly withheld if the policyholder had actually paid the full provider charge (including the 30%) to the provider. In their view, if the provider accepted the improperly reduced charge and did not require the patient to pay the difference, neither the policyholder nor the provider was entitled to payment of the proper claim amount and the company was entitled to pocket the difference. According to the carrier, while the policyholder or provider might prevail and be entitled to damages in a lawsuit, the authority of the MIA is more limited. The MIA rejected this argument. Regardless of whether the policyholder paid the extra 30%, the policyholder's contract and Maryland law required the carrier to pay the 30%, so the amount was owed to the claimant. If the MIA had accepted this argument, the MIA's only recourse would have been to increase the administrative penalty against the carrier, which would not make the claimant whole. The MIA negotiated a consent agreement with the carrier, but the MIA's effort to obtain a favorable resolution for the consumers was significantly delayed, because the carrier refused to back down from its position for several months. SB 167 would validate the MIA's reading of the current statutes and preclude this argument in the future.

This issue does not arise solely in the context of health claims. For example, property and casualty insurance carriers have questioned the authority of the MIA to order payment of attorneys' fees to a policyholder where the MIA found that the insurer's ultimate denial of the claim was not arbitrary and capricious, but that the carrier breached its contract by failing to pay defense costs. The duty to defend is broader than the duty to indemnify and is a separate contractual obligation under the policy. A refusal to defend may be arbitrary and capricious, thereby violating §27-303, which prohibits a carrier from refusing to pay a claim for an arbitrary or capricious reason.

It is important to note that SB 167 does not address or alter what constitutes a violation of the Insurance Article and does not address or alter the standard of review. It simply clarifies that when a breach occurs that is a violation of the Insurance Article, the remedies available to the MIA Commissioner include requiring the carrier to fulfill its obligations in accordance with their insureds' contracts and applicable law. SB 167 only clarifies the Commissioner's existing authority, so there should be no substantive impact to industry and consumers, other than allowing certain disputes to be resolved more promptly without unnecessary delays over negotiations with carriers or the need to wait for the dispute to be settled at a hearing. SB 167, if enacted, will provide direct relief to the consumer rather than simply having the Commissioner impose higher monetary penalties on the carrier.

In closing, for the reasons explained above, the MIA supports SB 167, and urges the Committee to give it a favorable report as an important consumer protection.

OAG CPD_FAV_SB0167.pdf

Uploaded by: Patricia O'Connor

Position: FAV

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General

ELIZABETH F. HARRIS
Chief Deputy Attorney General

CAROLYN QUATTROCKI
Deputy Attorney General

Writer's Direct Email:
poconnor@oag.state.md.us



WILLIAM D. GRUHN
Chief
Consumer Protection Division

Writer's Direct Fax No.
(410) 576-6571

Writer's Direct Dial No.
(410) 576-6515

STATE OF MARYLAND
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
CONSUMER PROTECTION DIVISION

January 17, 2022

To: The Honorable Delores G. Kelley
Chair, Finance Committee

From: The Office of the Attorney General's Consumer Protection Division

Re: Senate Bill 167 (Maryland Insurance Administration - Enforcement Authority - Payment of Claims): Support

The Office of the Attorney General's Consumer Protection Division supports Senate Bill 167, a departmental bill by the Maryland Insurance Administration (MIA) that expressly authorizes the Insurance Commissioner to require an insurer to fulfill the holder's contractual obligations or pay a certain claim instead of, or in addition to, suspending or revoking the certificate. The bill also expressly authorizes the Insurance Commissioner, on a finding of a violation of provisions of law, to require a health care insurer to make a payment that has been improperly denied due to the health care insurer's improper denial of a claim. Clarifying and adding to the MIA's enforcement authority would help consumers receive the full value of their insurance.

We ask the committee to give the bill a favorable report.

cc: Sponsor

sb 167_IAB_UNF.pdf

Uploaded by: Bryson Popham

Position: UNF

Bryson F. Popham, P.A.

Bryson F. Popham, Esq.

191 Main Street
Suite 310
Annapolis, MD 21401
www.papalaw.com

410-268-6871 (Telephone)
443-458-0444 (Facsimile)

January 19, 2022

The Honorable Delores G. Kelley
Chair, Senate Finance Committee
3 East, Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: Senate Bill 167 - Maryland Insurance Administration - Enforcement Authority - Payment of Claims
UNFAVORABLE

Dear Chair Kelley, Senator Young and Members of the Senate Finance Committee,

Our client, the Insurance Agents and Brokers of Maryland (IA&B), is a trade association comprised of nearly 200 independent agencies, employing between 1,000 and 2,000 licensed Maryland insurance producers, which are located in and doing business throughout the State of Maryland and surrounding states.

IA&B wishes to register its opposition to Senate Bill 167.

IA&B acknowledges and supports the role of the Maryland Insurance Administration (MIA) in enforcing the provisions of the Maryland Insurance Article. IA&B members provide counsel and support to their insureds, when appropriate, and seeks the assistance of the MIA when compliance issues arise.

The Association believes that SB 167 would move the Agency into the uncharted territory of claims handling for typical property and casualty insurance claims. We believe that such participation by the MIA is not necessary. For example, Maryland has, for many years, enforced the provisions of the Unfair Claims Settlement Practices Act. In addition, the Agency is often called upon to rule on whether certain insurer practices may violate other provisions of the Insurance Article. These provisions, together with MIA enforcement actions, provide ample protection to Maryland insurance consumers on claims issues, and regulatory authority in this area does not need to be expanded.

For these reasons, IA&B respectfully requests an unfavorable report on SB 167.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,



Bryson F. Popham

cc: Members of the Senate Finance Committee

SB 167_UNF_MAMIC.pdf

Uploaded by: Bryson Popham

Position: UNF

Bryson F. Popham, P.A.

Bryson F. Popham, Esq.

191 Main Street
Suite 310
Annapolis, MD 21401
www.papalaw.com

410-268-6871 (Telephone)
443-458-0444 (Facsimile)

January 19, 2022

The Honorable Delores G. Kelley
3 East, Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: Senate Bill 167 - Maryland Insurance Administration - Enforcement Authority - Payment of Claims –
UNFAVORABLE

Dear Chair Kelley and Members of the Senate Finance Committee

I am writing on behalf of the Maryland Association of Mutual Insurance Companies (MAMIC) in opposition to SB 167-
Maryland Insurance Administration - Enforcement Authority - Payment of Claims.

MAMIC is comprised of 12 mutual insurance companies that are headquartered both in Maryland and in neighboring states. Together, MAMIC members offer a wide variety of homeowners and other insurance products, both personal and commercial, for thousands of Maryland citizens. The adjudication of claims is a critically important component of the insurance transaction, and MAMIC is deeply concerned at the additional powers granted under this legislation to the Insurance Administration that may interfere with this process.

SB 167, we note, is quite similar to SB 272, which was introduced during the 2021 legislative session. Then, as now, nearly unanimous opposition from property and casualty insurers and producers caused the bill to be held without action in the Senate Finance Committee. While SB 167 differs slightly from SB 272, if enacted, it would result in an unprecedented participation by the regulator in the claims adjustment process. We have seen no examples of any property or casualty claim that would necessitate enactment of this legislation as a remedial measure.

MAMIC members are not in a position to offer amendments at this time that would address their concerns; however, one possibility may be the exclusion of property and casualty claims from the scope of the bill. We are not suggesting this amendment, although the factual predicate for SB 272 last year was a claim dispute brought by health care providers under a health insurance policy. We note that the handling of health insurance claims is different in many respects from the handling of property and casualty claims. We offer these comments for consideration by the Finance Committee.

Nevertheless, MAMIC wishes to be clear that we oppose SB 167 as drafted. We are willing to discuss amendments with both the Committee and the regulator if that is your desire.

Very truly yours,



Bryson F. Popham

cc: Members of the Senate Finance Committee