



Association of Trial Lawyers of America

HELP	ABOUT US	FIND LAWYER	ATLA MART	GET PASSW
SEARCH	DIRECTORY	LINKS	ATLA STAFF	HOME

MEMBERSHIP

EXCHANGE ONLINE

EDUCATION

CONVENTIONS

FOUNDATIONS

PRACTICE GROUPS

PUBLIC EDUCATION

LEGISLATION

IN THE COURTS

PUBLICATIONS

DISCUSSION FORUMS

ABSTRACT:

DECLARATION OF AMY GIROD ZUNIGA

I, Amy Girod Zuniga, declare as follows.

1. I am an adult over the age of 18 and am not a party to this action. I have personal knowledge of all of the following, and if called as a witness I could and would testify competently to the truth thereof.
2. I am a former employee of State Farm Fire and Casualty Co. and State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. (collectively, "State Farm" or "the Company"). I was employed there from 1988 through mid-1996, and in fact separated during the pendency of the Taylor litigation. Since August of 1994, I worked first in the Automobile Company's so-called "SAC" unit ("Suits Against the Company" unit) and then in the Fire Company's SAC unit. Later these units were renamed, "Litigation Units." My most recent job title before separation from the Company was Claims Specialist. My responsibilities included evaluating bad faith suits brought against the Company by insureds, responding to discovery and monitoring litigation. I did so in connection with the Taylor litigation.
3. In this capacity, I am aware that there were many other State Farm claims arising out of the Northridge earthquake like the Taylors' involving unauthorized signatures by State Farm agents or agency employees on applications omitting earthquake coverage. At the time of the Taylor claim, the Company was well aware that this was a problem. As a matter of practice, the Company would pay these claims, if it believed that the forgery issue would be brought to light and proven by the insured. Because of the forgery issue in the Taylor case, if the case was not dismissed on summary judgement, it was my impression that the claim was going to be reconsidered. However, we were waiting to see if we could save money on the Taylor claim by having summary judgement granted, and as part of that plan I was instructed not to provide certain relevant information at my depositions.
4. Specifically, my supervisor in the SAC unit, Vanessa Gudelj, and her supervisor, John Poptanich, put pressure on me to withhold the existence of documents memorializing certain State Farm claims handling guidelines from plaintiffs' counsel Bernie Bernheim at my deposition, which they believed, if revealed, would defeat summary judgement and ultimately lead to payment of the Taylors' claim. They pressured me into not revealing the existence of claims handling documents which established guidelines under which claims like the Taylors were to be handled. These included a three ring binder called "CATHR Management Information and Memos Manual" used and maintained by Claim Superintendent Tinga Nicholson who was the Claim Superintendent that denied the Taylors' claim. It was responsive to the Taylors' discovery request and we simply chose not to produce it. Similarly, Ms. Nicholson had prepared a breakdown of earthquake claims in her unit (the SHU unit - see below) by

[Copyright](#)

[Terms and conditions of use.](#)

DECLARATION OF AMY GIROD ZUNIGA

I, Amy Girod Zuniga, declare as follows:

1. I am an adult over the age of 18 and am not a party to this action. I have personal knowledge of all of the following, and if called as a witness I could and would testify competently to the truth thereof.
2. I am a former employee of State Farm Fire and Casualty Co. and State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. (collectively, "State Farm" or the "Company"). I was employed there from 1988 through mid-1996, and in fact separated during the pendency of the Taylor litigation. Since August of 1994, I worked first in the Automobile Company's so-called "SAC" unit ("Suits Against the Company" unit) and then in the Fire Company's SAC unit. Later these units were renamed, "Litigation Units." My most recent job title before separation from the Company was Claims Specialist. My responsibilities included evaluating bad faith suits brought against the Company by insureds, responding to discovery and monitoring litigation. I did so in connection with the Taylor litigation.
3. Mr. John Poptanich, Divisional Claim Superintendent, was head of my Litigation Unit in part of 1995 and 1996. Michael Coy Kendall, Divisional Claim Superintendent, was his predecessor. There was also a Costa Mesa Litigation Unit. Its personnel included Ralph Carlino, Dana Dillabough, Diane Andrikos, Dave Capirillo. There was also a General Claim Litigation Unit headed by Jim Stark. Its members included Mary Ann Ridgeway, who observed me in the first session of my deposition and Mary Bowman.
4. I have reviewed many of the papers and declarations which State Farm submitted in support of its summary judgement motion and opposition to plaintiffs' motion for leave to amend.
5. While I was working on the Taylor case at the State Farm SAC unit, Mr. Richard Churik, the operator of the Automatic Insertion Machine ("AIM") and others at State Farm made statements to me which are inconsistent with much of what is contained in State Farm's papers and declarations.
6. I made a number of inspections of the AIM system with its operator Richard Churik, with underwriting superintendent Charles G. "Glenn" Hook, with attorney G. Arthur Meneses of the law firm of Berger, Kahn, et al, and with a consultant named Don Winslow. Mr. Winslow was making a film about the AIM for use in the Taylor case, and was advising us in how we could present the AIM to a jury in such a way as to maximize its strengths and gloss over or hide its weaknesses.
7. Mr. Churik verbally explained the workings of the automatic insertion machine to Mr. Meneses, Mr. Winslow and me. Mr. Churik explained that after the machine has stopped due to a failure to pick up a stuffer, the operator can override and restart even if the operator has not manually corrected the problem. Mr. Winslow and I discussed the fact that if an operator became frustrated with the repeated failure of one of the bins to function correctly, he could simply ignore the problem and allow incorrectly stuffed envelopes to be mailed out. Mr. Winslow and I agreed that in reality the machine was only as good as the operators working it, and that this was a problem we would have to address in making the film. I worked on "cleaning

up" the mail room crew for the film.

8. Mr. Winslow and I observed the machine for an extended period of time on several occasions. We observed the machine stopping numerous times due to some malfunction. In fact, I would go so far as to say that I observed this occurring regularly.

9. Near the machine, Mr. Winslow and I observed a square receptacle resembling a square bucket in which were a bunch of crumpled up mailer-type documents. They were covered in splotches of red ink, for some reason. I asked Mr. Winslow if this bucket of crumpled up insurance documents concerned him at all, and he replied, in substance, "We won't take a picture of that."

10. Posted on one of the walls is a large sign, stating in substance: "DO NOT LEAVE PREMIUM NOTICES ON THE FLOOR." I understood this to be evidence that someone had been leaving important insurance documents lying around on the floor of the room housing the AIM system. I discussed this matter with Mr. Winslow because it concerned me. He responded that we take only close-up shots of the machine operating so that the sign would not appear in the film.

11. I am myself a State Farm homeowners policyholder. I told Mr. Meneses that I, personally, had received not once, but on two separate occasions, renewal certificates belonging to another policyholder which had somehow been inadvertently stuffed into envelopes with my own renewal certificates. This caused me concern. Mr. Meneses did not respond.

12. A State Farm unit called "Administrative Services" has a manual for operation of the AIM called a "service text, ." which contains a section or sections pertaining to the AIM system, dated July 1993. It was responsive to the Taylors' request for production. Mr. Meneses and I discussed whether to produce it to plaintiffs' counsel Bernie Bernheim. We decided not to identify it or produce it. Mr. Churik had informed us that he had not been in compliance with procedures in the "service text" pertaining to maintenance of the "control sheets." The "control sheets" were daily documentation pertaining to the particular runs made by the AIM system. If there was more than one control sheet for a particular day, that would show that a "re-run" had to be performed, indicating that there was a mistake in the original run. Mr. Churik told me that the failure to maintain the control sheets as set forth in the service text was a mistake. I was concerned that if this mistake got out, it would undermine the credibility of the AIM system. Mr. Meneses voiced the same concern to me. We decided not to identify or produce the service text, and instead to keep its existence from plaintiffs' counsel.

13. I noted that in his declaration, State Farm underwriting superintendent Charles "Glenn" Hook relied on State Farm PDQ computer screen printouts for his testimony that offers and notifications were mailed to the mailing address on the policy. These PDQ screens require special training to read and interpret. Based on my training in interpreting these PDQ screens, and on my review of the exhibits filed in support and opposition the motion for summary judgement, it is clear to me that the PDQ screen printouts for the early 1990s on which Mr. Hook relied were materially inaccurate.

14. In my review of the exhibits, I saw that none of the declarations pages for the Stoneridge policy contained a warning that there was no earthquake coverage, other than one created during litigation by Mr. Hook for the 1993-1994 policy period. This is contradictory to statements Mr. Hook made to me prior to my separation from the Company. Mr. Hook told me that a homeowners declaration page for a policy where there is no earthquake coverage is supposed to have a warning under the Company's business practices.

15. I was repeatedly told by my supervisor Claim Superintendent Vanessa Gudelj never to use the word "forgery" in connection with the forgeries of the signatures of State Farm insureds by State Farm agents and agency employees. She told me to always use the term "unauthorized signature" instead, whenever discussing this subject. I and some of the other SAC unit personnel referred to the word "forgery" as the "F-word."

16. John Bishop is one of the Company's senior executives at the corporate headquarters in Bloomington, Illinois. His title is Senior Claim Consultant. During 1996, he regularly participated in telephone conference calls pertaining to the Taylors. Sandra Hobbs is a long-time employee of State Farm agent Harry Gelpar. During Ms. Hobbs' deposition, I had a very lengthy cellular phone conference call with Mr. Bishop. Also participating in the call was my supervisor Vanessa Gudelj, and her supervisor John Poptanich. No outside attorneys participated in this call, and in fact Mr. Meneses later expressed to me the sentiment that he was concerned that he had not been invited.

17. During this call, Mr. Bishop stated that State Farm witnesses should not admit that forgeries happen, unless and until they are compelled to do so by Court order. Mr. Bishop asked us whether we think that the Company will ultimately have to admit that this happens. Mr. Bishop went on to state that we have to decide how to tell our story should the Company be compelled to admit that it has knowledge of the "unauthorized signatures." He said we should try to make this practice look like a "service."

18. There is an insurance company called American Home which provides errors and omissions coverage for State Farm's agents. There are certain circumstances in which a law suit naming a State Farm agent is tendered to American Home for a defense and indemnification. At one point, I questioned whether the Taylors' suit naming Mr. Gelpar should be tendered to American Home. I was told that there was no point to doing so, because American Home would not accept the tender in State Farm agent forgery cases. I was told that the reason for this was that American Home took the position that State Farm had ample notice of conduct of this type by its agents, and that State Farm had taken no meaningful steps to correct the problem. Therefore, American Home's position was that State Farm had ratified and authorized the agents' conduct, so that State Farm was responsible for claims arising out of this type of conduct. American Home took the position that State Farm, not American Home, should therefore be responsible for paying these kinds of claims.

19. I was aware of the existence of a number of documents pertaining to the Company's practices and procedures regarding signatures and the taking of applications by agents which were never produced to plaintiffs in the Taylor case. There is a series of documents called "communiques" which are sent by the Company to agents. These are produced by the Education and

Training Department. There was an entire "communique binder" which was maintained by Ms. Marci Chairenza of the Education and Training Department. Before Ms. Chairenza, it was maintained by Ms. Lenore Hatzenbiler, who now works in public affairs. This binder contains an index. Among the communiques which may be relevant to the Taylor case but which have never been produced are "Signatures on New Applications - Personal & Commercial," 92-45-F, d. August 25, 1992; "Earthquake Offer Update," 91-14-F, d. March 19, 1991; and "Earthquake Offer," 92-60-F, d. December 17, 1992. I have heard that there are other policy and procedure documents sent to agents by the Company called "green sheets."

20. In discovery, the Taylors requested that the Company produce its claims manuals. The Company calls its claims manuals, "Operations Guides." The Operations Guides produced to the Taylors were not a complete set of the Operations Guides, nor even a complete set of the Operations Guides pertaining to the handling of earthquake claims. Rather, plaintiffs were given a carefully created packet from which material had been removed. The material removed included the index. The tactic behind producing this "created packet" of Operations Guides was to give plaintiffs something containing no damaging information, but which was voluminous enough to distract their attorneys.

21. David Tannenbaum is a Company employee who works in a unit formerly called "the Discovery Unit," whose task is to locate and produce documents and other information in response to discovery requests. This unit is located in Bloomington and is headed by Ms. Chris Lynch.

22. I was informed by David Tannenbaum that identical, screened packets of Operations Guides were to be produced in all earthquake cases in response to discovery requests which asked in substance for "all policies and procedures regarding earthquake claims handling," regardless of the specifics of the particular facts of the case, and that is what I did. In fact, I do not recall any earthquake case in which I produced anything in the way of policies and procedures other than the created packet described above. Not producing the index, for example, would greatly limit the ability of plaintiffs to request other relevant operations guides.

23. Prior to my deposition, I was specifically instructed by my supervisor, Vanessa Gudelj, not under any circumstances to "give up" the name of David Tannenbaum to plaintiffs' counsel Bernie Bernheim, nor to reveal Mr. Tannenbaum's role. I received the same instructions with regard to Mr. Tannenbaum's colleague, Mr. Tim Crouthamel, who also worked at the corporate headquarters in Bloomington, Illinois.

24. I produced lengthy memoranda analyzing the discovery requests made by the Taylors through their counsel, Bernie Bernheim. I forwarded these memoranda to the Discovery Unit.

25. In discovery responses, the Taylors asked State Farm to identify the dates on which AIM system runs had to be repeated due to errors. State Farm informed the Taylors that there is no such documentation kept. This is not entirely accurate, in that there are records kept of the postage which is placed on the envelopes. An unusually high amount of postage for a particular date would indicate that an AIM run had to be repeated. I discussed this with Mr. G. Arthur Meneses of Berger, Kahn, et al, and he dismissed it.

26. The Taylors brought a Colonial Life discovery motion, which was never heard due to the granting of State Farm's summary judgement motion and the denial of plaintiffs' motion for leave to file a third amended complaint. This motion sought among other documents, all Special Handling Unit claims files arising out of the Northridge earthquake, and all claims files handled by Tinga Nicholson, Dale Henderson, and Toni Hotzel arising out of the Northridge earthquake.

27. There were about 2000 SHU files. They were inventoried on a PC by claims superintendent Tinga Nicholson. My understanding is that these were primarily kept at the Lindero office. Some may have been sent to "the pit," which is a claims file storage facility in Newbury Park. In *Shekhter v. State Farm*, a Los Angeles superior court case, I participated in a team which had to review hundreds of claims files for production pursuant to a Colonial Life motion and court order.

28. The Company has a computer program on its system called "Search Express" for locating documents. Search terms can be inputted to generate lists of responsive documents, in a fashion similar to the Internet.

29. At the second session of my deposition, the subject of my separation from State Farm came up. I took a break with G. Arthur Meneses of Berger, Kahn, et al., whom the Company had appointed to represent me in the second session of my deposition. During the break, I told Mr. Meneses that I felt he had a conflict of interest in representing both me personally and my former employer at this deposition. I told him that I intended to fire him as a result. He called my former supervisor, Vanessa Gudelj, and had a lengthy telephone conversation with her. After his conversation, he returned with a written script which Ms. Gudelj had prepared for me to use in answering deposition questions. Mr. Meneses was apologetic in communicating this to me. I did not feel it was appropriate for me to respond to deposition questions with "answers" memorized from a written script. Moreover, what was in the script was not the truth. We returned to the deposition room, and I had resolved to testify to the truth. When the deposition resumed, Mr. Bernheim asked if I felt uncomfortable discussing the subject of my separation from State Farm. I said that I did, and he moved to another topic.

30. Giving me this written script to follow at my deposition was typical of the practices and procedures I observed at the Company in connection with the preparation of Company witnesses for deposition. As part of my duties at the SAC unit, I participated in the preparation of many witnesses for deposition.

31. The Company routinely retained professional witness consultants to prepare State Farm employees for giving testimony at deposition and at trial. Over the years, these consultants have Mr. Steve Herzberg and Mr. Don Winslow. Typically, such consultants would spend many hours training witnesses on how to give up as little information as possible at deposition. Witnesses were trained to answer questions as literally as possible. An example that was commonly used in training witnesses was the question, "Where is your car parked right now?" During preparation, the witness would initially offer an answer like, "In the parking lot downstairs." The witness would then be told, in substance, that this was an incorrect answer because the witness was assuming that the car had not been stolen, or towed away, or otherwise moved since the time the witness had last seen his or her car. The witness would be told that the only correct

answer to this question was, therefore, "I do not know." Other tactics that were provided to the witness for use in deposition included not looking directly at the examiner, since eye contact would tend to facilitate meaningful communication and the giving of information. Witnesses were taught not to answer a question with a "yes" or "no," to minimize the likelihood of giving a truly responsive answer. A yes or no does not give "wiggle room" to change the answer at a later time. Witnesses were taught to pretend not to understand the initial deposition admonition, to throw off the insureds' attorney. The entire point of this training was to make it as difficult as possible for the insureds' attorney to learn any meaningful information about the Company, its practices or the insureds' claim.

32. At trial, the Company's witness tactics are different. Consultants like Mr. Herzberg and Mr. Winslow trained the Company's witnesses to act completely differently for the jury trial than at deposition. Witnesses were trained to appear helpful and polite, and to drop the evasive tactics used to keep information from being disclosed at deposition.

33. Don Winslow prepared underwriting superintendent Charles G. "Glenn" Hook for his deposition taken by plaintiffs' counsel Bernie Bernheim in the Taylor case. I referred to Mr. Winslow as a "spin doctor," because he was talented at helping us mold a witness' story on a particular topic so that it would become the story we wanted to tell. In Mr. Hooks' case, the story we wanted to tell was about the supposed infallibility of the Company's system for complying with statutory earthquake offers and notifications. As was sometimes the case in the Company's witness preparation sessions which I participated in, many people attended the Hook session and added their input into how the witness was going to tell the story. The Hook deposition prep was attended at various times by, among others: Costa Mesa SAC unit claims superintendent Diane Andrikos, Melody Caplan, AIM operator Richard Churik, John Poptanich, myself, and spin doctor Don Winslow.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 25th day of September, 1996 at Ojai, California.

Amy Girod Zuniga

Bernie Bernheim (SB #144319)
Kick & Bernheim
201 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 700
Los Angeles, California 90012
(213)975-1588

Lawyers for Plaintiffs
Roderick Taylor and Krista Taylor

SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

RODERICK TAYLOR, an individual; and)	CASE NO.:BC 119992
KRISTA TAYLOR, an individual)	
Plaintiffs,)	(Case assigned to
)	Charles McCoy for
)	
vs.)	DECLARATION OF AM
)	ZUNIGA IN SUPPORT
)	PLAINTIFFS' MOTIO
)	RECONSIDERATION
STATE FARM FIRE AND CASUALTY)	
COMPANY, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	DATE: , 1996
)	TIME: 8:30 AM
)	DEPT.: 24
_____)	
-)	
AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS)	TRIAL DATE: Dec.
_____)	
-)	

DECLARATION OF AMY ZUNIGA

I, Amy Girod Zuniga, declare and state as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this action. I make this declaration in opposition to the Motion for Summary Judgment and could and would competently testify to the facts set forth herein if called as a witness.

2. I am a former employee of State Farm Fire & Casualty Company and State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company (collectively, "State Farm" or "the Company"). I was employed there from 1988 through mid-1996. Since August of 1994, I worked first in the automobile company's so-called "SAC" unit. These units were later renamed "litigation units." My responsibilities included evaluating bad faith suits brought against the company by insureds, responding to discovery, monitoring litigation, interviewing witnesses, assisting in the preparation of witnesses for deposition, reviewing pleadings, responding to inquiries as to how State Farm's policies were to interpreted as well as responding to general questions which were raised regarding State Farm's response to a particular situation. Prior to my assignment to the SAC unit, I worked as a claims specialist and claims representative in automobile related claims.

3. As a result of my work with State Farm I became familiar with the procedures and practices of State Farm, the company policies and approaches of State Farm to particular types of litigation, including litigation arising out of automobile accidents which involved bodily injury. I also became familiar with the methods of training and materials provided to claims representatives by State Farm. Finally, as a result of reviewing literally thousands of State Farm files and of my knowledge of the procedures at State Farm, I have knowledge and understanding of what documents and materials are to be included in State Farm files.

THE CLAIMS FILE AND ATTORNEY'S FILE

4. I have reviewed the documents bates stamped LSSF 0001 through 0909. The first page of said documents is a cover letter from attorney representing State Farm (Syna N. Dennis at Atkins & Evans) which states that the enclosure constitutes the "claims file" in connection with both the accident of November, 1993 a the accident of February, 1995.

5. Her statement was false. The materials provided were incomplete. Portions of what was expected to be included in the claims file were not produced and in the documents produced there was reference to documents in the claim file which were not included. No list of any items that were privileged was provided. (I am advised that State Farm contends nothing was withheld.) The response to the Request for Production seeking claim files specified that the claim file would be produced. This response was false.
6. I have also reviewed the deposition of Chris Arnold, claims superintendent, which was taken in this matter. That transcript reveals that Mr. Arnold acknowledged that the entire claims file had not been provided and that counsel for State Farm agreed to obtain and provide the remainder of the claims file.
7. I have been provided with documents that have been bates stamped LSSFS 0001-392 which were purportedly produced as the remainder of the claim file on or about October 28, 1996.
8. I have also been provided with a copy of the "attorney's file" produced by State Farm bates stamped KF 1-517.
9. Having reviewed the documents bates stamped LSSF, those bates stamped LSSFS and those bates stamped KF 1-517, based upon my knowledge of the practices and procedures of State Farm the following items were not produced and have never been identified by State Farm as being part of the claims file or attorney's file. These items were clearly called for by the first Request for Production of Documents submitted by the plaintiff in this matter.
 - a. A key letter (1/31/95) to Mr. Rowell (LS1050) from the Representative was not in the claims file, nor in the attorney's file (although a draft from Bartholme office was included).
 - b. Even assuming these claims were classified as a "low impact"/"low damager" claims, there should have been evaluations in the file. There were none.
 - c. The "coverage card" on the first loss which was included created until July, 1995 (it should have been created when the file was transferred to the bodily unit in January). The progress reports show that Mr. Arnold repeatedly checked box stating "reserves adequate" which he could not have done unless a coverage card was opened earlier. This earlier card has not been produced.
 - d. The following records are not included in either the claim file or the attorneys file.
 - i. The Allstate Insurance Company records, produced on October 4, 1995 (194 pages).
 - ii. The Leon H. Brooks records, produced on October 18, 1995 (108 pages).
 - iii. The records of Bi-Coastal Payroll Services, produced on September 28, 1995.
 - iv. The records of Dr. Howard Aaron Aronow produced on October 4, 1995 (20 pages).

v. The records of Transamerica Insurance Group produced in 1995 (505 pages).

10. These documents should have been included in one or both files. The documentation regarding claims handling does not appear complete, and entries in the attorney's bills reflecting conversations with claim's people are not reflected in the claims file.

11. Additionally, after agreeing to a Stipulation and Order Re: Confidentiality which was provided to me by plaintiff's counsel, I reviewed the documents which have been bates stamped SFCM 0001-0094. According to the Stipulation and Protective Order these are all portions of the claims manual and/or claims handling procedures documents which are responsive to the Request for Production of Documents submitted by the plaintiff, Request No. 1, Item No. 2. State Farm did not identify any portion that was not produced (as required by the stipulation).

12. Based on my own personal knowledge, State Farm's response to the Request for Production is false and materially incomplete.

13. State Farm maintains extremely detailed "Claims Procedures Guides" comprised of thousands of pages dealing specifically with individual coverages under automobile policies and claims handling procedures with respect to each claim. State Farm also maintains a smaller document called the "Auto Claims Manual" which, in most cases, is more general in approach.

14. Although both these documents were requested, State Farm has only produced two portions of the "Auto Claims Manual" and has neither produced nor identified other portions of the "Auto Claims Manual" which are applicable to Mrs. Stolar's claims. In particular, the uninsured/underinsured motorists section of the Auto Claims Manual has not been produced. Additionally, the miscellaneous section of the Auto Claims Manual referred to in the bodily injury section dealing with "first call" settlements (which was apparently attempted with respect to the February, 1995 accident by Ann Spratt) was not produced. State Farm has not produced nor identified any portion of the Claims Procedures Guide which is applicable to Mrs. Stolar's claims.

HIDING OTHER DOCUMENTS

15. Further, in connection with my retention as an expert witness in this case, I have reviewed the deposition transcript of Chris Arnold and have determined that said witness misrepresented, either intentionally or inadvertently, the existence of certain documents. Specifically, I am aware that State Farm generates and maintains lists of law firms that were generally used for outside counsel. Mr. Arnold denied the existence of such a list. There are two such lists, an accepted group of attorneys for first party claims and an accepted group of attorneys for third party claims. Claims representatives have to be certified in writing that claims representatives have been certified as reviewing the Uniform Claims Practices Act and regulations promulgated thereunder. State Farm keeps these records and Mr. Arnold as a superintendent, knows this.

16. Further, Additionally, Mr. Arnold did not identify any Suits Against Company State Farm representatives as being present when he was prepared for his testimony. According to well established policy, a representative of the SAC unit must be

present when he is prepared for testimony.

17. Based upon my review of the portions of the claims files I have reviewed (LSSF 1-909, LSSFS 1-302, and the depositions of certain of the Claims Representatives, I have concluded as follows:

- a. Per a State Farm policy adopted in approximately 1993 in the region, no offer was to be made on the November, 1993 date. It was apparently classified as a "minor-impact" or "low damager" case.
- b. This categorization was unreasonable since State Farm knew there was almost \$3,000.00 in property damage from this continued use of the curb side eye ball estimate as the Stoliar's was also unreasonable because State Farm knew the vehicle had sustained in excess of \$1,000.00 in property damage.
- c. Even the use of the actual repair and amount of property damage to the insured's vehicle alone as a basis for determining whether a case was a "minor impact" or "low damager" was unreasonable since in my experience as a claims representative the amount of total damage and repairs performed on both vehicles is a much more reliable indicator of the severity of the collision.

THE COMPANY "LOW DAMAGER" POLICY

18. By company policy "minor impact"/"low damager" claims were not to be settled. Instead they were to be "fully litigated" and every effort was to be made to make it financially unfeasible for the insured to obtain any benefits regardless of whether liability was clear or not. The company policy was to "fully litigate" such claims by:

- i. retaining "outside" counsel rather than attempt to settle the claims;
- ii. instructing outside counsel commence formal discovery;
- iii. retaining biomechanical experts and accident reconstruction cases;
- iv. instructing outside counsel subpoena records instead of authorizations to obtain medical and employment records;
- v. taking depositions of the claimant/insured, even a voluntarily given a recorded statement; and
- vi. forcing the insured/claimant to undergo so-called "independent" doctors the company was confident would give reports favorable to the claimant/insured.

19. I was told of this policy when I was a bodily injury negotiator by Superintendent Elizabeth Haines in approximately 1993. Haines instructed me to immediately implement this policy and instructed others to do so as well in my presence. Ms. Haines instructed me to "broadcast" this unwillingness to settle and desire to litigate "low damager" claims to all plaintiffs attorneys offices I dealt with. Ms. Haines told me this policy was being implemented on a regionwide basis.

20. During this conversation and others Ms. Haines and Angelo Mazza (Divisional Claim Manager, now two levels above Mr. Arnold in the chain of command) communicated the "low damager" policy to

me and others in my presence.

21. The stated goal and purpose of the "low damager" policy was to make it unprofitable, too expensive and costly, for plaintiff's attorneys to handle "low damager" cases, even those in which liability was clear. As explained to me, the results of the policy were intended to be a short-term increase in legal fees for the company but a significant long term decrease in benefits payments once the plaintiffs bar became aware that handling "low damager" cases would be too costly and unprofitable. From both personal experience and from what I have been told at State Farm, this policy was extremely effective. When I left the comply in August of 1996 the "low damager" policy was still in effect.

THE HANDLING OF THE STOLIAR CLAIMS

22. I have been provided and have reviewed the following materials at the request of Mr. Rowell:

- a. I have been provided with copies of the portions of the claims file transmitted to Mr. Rowell on August 30, 1996, stamped LSSF 1-909. I have also been provided with copies portions of the claims file transmitted to Mr. Rowell with letter of enclosed dated October 23, 1996 from Robert P. A of the law firm of Ropers, Majeski, Kahn and Bently, bates stamped LSSFS1-382.
- b. I have reviewed the records of American Data Med copied fro Transamerica Insurance Group at the request of State Farm comprising 505 pages which bear a declaration indicating th custodian of records produced said records on October 25, 1 American Data Med.
- c. I have reviewed the records of Howard Aaron Aronow obtained by American Data Med on or about October 4, 1995 according American Data Med declaration submitted therewith.
- d. I have reviewed the records of Dr. Lee Sadja obtained by American Data Med pursuant to declaration on October 4, 1995.
- e. I have reviewed the records of Charles Wexler obtained from office by American Data Med pursuant to subpoena per declara June 2, 1995.
- f. I have reviewed the records of Bi-Coastal Payroll Services obtained from the custodian of records at Bi-Coastal Payrol Services pursuant to a declaration on September 28, 1995.
- g. I have reviewed the records of Dr. Leon Brooks obtained fr his offices by American Data Med pursuant to declaration on October 18, 1995.
- h. I have reviewed the records of Allstate Insurance Company obtained by American Data Med from the Woodland Hills offic pursuant to declaration on May 30, 1995.
- i. I have reviewed the records of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation from Gerald B. Rosenberg, M.D. obtained by American Data Med on or about October 23, 1996.
- j. I have reviewed the deposition of Richard A. Lonie taken in this matter on September 20, 1996.

- k. I have reviewed the deposition of Seyed Roghani taken on September 17, 1996 in this matter.
- l. I have reviewed the deposition of Cathy D. Wright taken in this matter on October 2, 1996.
- m. I have reviewed the deposition of Christopher O'Neal Arnold taken in this matter on October 18, 1996, volume 1.
- n. I have reviewed volume 1 of the deposition of Traci M. Bell taken in this matter on September 20, 1996 and volume taken in this matter on October 2, 1996.
- o. I have reviewed the deposition of Richard Scott Smith taken in this matter on September 17, 1996.
- p. I have reviewed the deposition of John D. Rowell and the exhibits attached thereto taken on August 15, 1996 (volume
- q. I have reviewed the deposition of John D. Rowell taken September 6, 1996 (volume 2).
- r. I have reviewed the deposition of Robert Tessier, Esq. taken in this matter on October 14, 1996.
- s. I have reviewed the deposition of Ann Gilmartin Spratt taken in this matter on September 18, 1996.
- t. I have reviewed the State Farm attorneys filed together with the privilege log indicating three pages of documents considered to be privileged and have been withheld and bated stamped KF 1-517 (KF 399-397 were identified as privileged not produced and I have not reviewed those documents).
- u. I have reviewed the deposition of Dr. Lee Sadjja, M.D. taken in this matter on and October 15, 1996.
- v. I have reviewed the deposition of Jerome Lewis, Ph.D. taken in this matter on October 8, 1996.
- w. I have reviewed the deposition of D. Martin Bennet, M.D. taken in this matter on October 7, 1996.
- x. I have reviewed the deposition of Dr. Louis Vazquez, M.D. taken in this matter on October 10, 1996.
- y. I have reviewed the deposition of Dr. Martin Levine, M.D., taken in this matter on October 25, 1996.

23. The materials that I have reviewed are the type of materials customarily relied upon by claims representatives, insurance comp personnel including those in a supervisory capacity in evaluating performance of their claims representatives and the appropriate handling of claims by their company. This type of evaluation was functions in the State Farm SAC unit. The following subparagraph paragraph of my declaration represent my conclusions and opinions the review referred to in the preceding paragraph:

- a. On November 22, 1993 Linda Stoliar was involved in an auto accident. She was traveling on Benedict Canyon Road in She when she stopped because a vehicle was backing into the r her. After she stopped, she was rear-ended by David Camer Stoliar was driving a 1989 Honda Wagovan Mr. Cameron was d pick-up. At the time of the impact Mr. Cameron was trying

speed of 35-40 miles per hour.

- b. Linda Stoliar's vehicle was repaired for \$1,014.00 by For Honda. (A shop recommended by Mr. Cameron's insurance co addition to body work, the repair required four hours of Mr. Cameron's vehicle was also damaged in the accident. H \$500.00 (the deductible) and his insurance company, Allstate, paid approximately \$1,400.00 for the r Initially, Linda sought treatment from Dr. Martin Bennett neck pain and right shoulder pain. She was examined and x of the cervical spine which showed loss of normal cervica the neutral lateral position, changes consistent with reg musculoligamentous spasm. The x-rays were negative for fr dislocation. X-rays of the right shoulder were negative f dislocation as well. Conservative treatment was prescribe conservative treatment did not resolve the symptoms so Dr recommended an MRI of the cervical spine due to Linda's persistent pain and headaches.
- c. On December 14, 1993 Mrs. Stoliar had an MRI of the cervi spine which showed that there was a 3 millimeter left of subligamentous herniation at C5-C6 indenting the anterior cal sac. Dr. Bennett has opined that this herniation was the auto accident. On May 16, 1994 she had an MRI of the out intercranial bleeding as she still had prolonged head released on July 7, 1994 by Dr. Bennett who stated as fol "The prognosis remains guarded due to the fact that the p headaches and neck pain for the rest of her life and that of musculoligamentous sprains and strains can, in a signi of people, show patterns of remission and exacerbations o period of time."
- d. Mr. Cameron's carrier (Allstate) conceded responsibility reimbursed Linda Stoliar for the property damage to her v after the accident, Richard Lonie, the State Farm Claims handling the claims, determined that Mr. Cameron was 100% that Linda Stoliar was 0% at fault and communicated that her on the same day. According to the Allstate records, determined that Mr. Cameron was 100% at fault and communi Mr. Cameron. Before any claim was made, State Farm sought a signed authorization to copy Linda Stoliar's medical an December 3, 1993. A review of the files of Linda Stoliar's treating doctors show that State Farm nev authorization to copy or obtain any medical records until when it was used to obtain a copy of Dr. Bennet's records records were copied with this authorization.
- e. The diagnosis of Mrs. Stoliar's health care providers was right shoulder sprain, right sided radiculopathy, cervical subligamentous disc herniation and post traumatic headache result of the November 22, 1993 accident. Mrs. Stoliar inc total of \$14,448.29 in medical specials.
- f. Mrs. Stoliar's State Farm auto policy provided that State was to pay \$10,000.00 of medical payments regardless of fa summer of 1994, having paid less than the \$10,000.00 provi policy, State Farm commenced denying payment of doctors bi to it. by Linda Stoliar's healthcare providers. No reason these denials.
- g. Subsequently, in January of 1995 State Farm acknowledged b letter that it knew that the \$10,000.00 medical payments c had not been exhausted. Still, State Farm did not pay the medical expenses. It was not until written demand was mad

plaintiff's counsel in March of 1995 that State Farm final the remainder of the \$10,000.00 medical payments coverage owing. At no time did State Farm ever advise that any medical records submitted was considered by it to be unnecessary, unreasonable, or unrelated to the November, 1993 accident.

- h. Between the date of the accident and January of 1995, State Farm copied no medical records of plaintiff, consulted with no physician regarding plaintiff's condition and had absolutely no basis for denying payment benefits. Other than obtaining the medical records in January of 1995, and the records provided by Mr. Rowell in January 1995 and again in March of 1995, State Farm did not obtain medical records on Mrs. Stoliar until after it had settled in September 1995.
- i. After she had been released by Dr. Bennett from treatment following her first accident, on February 7, 1995 Linda Stoliar was involved in a second accident. While driving on a highway, she stopped at an intersection where she was struck in an off-set rear-end collision by a car being driven by Jared Tobman. Although the collision caused minimal damage to the Stoliar vehicle, because it was an off-center impact, the Stoliar vehicle was spun about and she experienced increased neck and back pain. Mrs. Stoliar sought medical treatment from Dr. Bennett again. According to the State Farm claims file, following this accident she incurred over \$6,900.00 in medical expenses. One of the expenses incurred by Mrs. Stoliar was a MRI of the thoracic spine by Dr. Bennett which was conducted in March of 1995 after her condition remained unresolved from conservative treatment. The bill for the MRI of the second accident. The bill for the MRI was submitted to State Farm which refused to pay it. After refusing to pay this bill and those of Linda Stoliar's doctor, Martin Bennett, State Farm Claims Representative, Ann Spratt, contacted Dr. Bennett, who were incurred as a result of the accident of February, 1995. Still, State Farm refused to pay for the MRI until it occurred on April 19, 1995. State Farm then advised it was going to submit the MRI to a doctor to determine whether it was reasonable and necessary. However, State Farm never asked the doctor selected, Dr. Martin Levine, to review the medical records to determine whether or not the charge for the MRI treatment with respect to the MRI was appropriate. At his deposition, Dr. Levine testified that the charge and the treatment was appropriate. Nonetheless, State Farm refused to pay for the MRI until October 1995 and then only on condition that Linda Stoliar settle her claim for \$1,000.00.
- j. State Farm claims never to have evaluated either of Mrs. Stoliar's claims before September 14, 1995. However, State Farm determined that the driver was 100% at fault with respect to both claims and did not offer anything to settle either claim until September of 1995 when it offered its policy limits of \$10,000.00 with respect to the 1993 claim and October, 1995 when it agreed to pay the MRI \$1,000.00 of uninsured motorist benefits with respect to the 1995 claim.
- k. The failure of State Farm to evaluate either of these claims during this time period was a direct result of a company policy that was implemented in approximately 1993. This policy was applied to this case because of the fact that the State Farm appraisal of the damage to the Stoliar vehicle was less than \$500.00, even though State Farm knew that the actual damage to the vehicle exceeded \$1,000.00. Pursuant to the terms of the company policy a "minor impact" or "low damager" designation was applied to cases where the amount of property damage to the insured was "minimal" (usually \$500.00 or less). When a case was so categorized, State Farm would take a "hard ball" position regardless of the merits and would refuse to make any reasonable settlement offer and force the insured to formal arbitration or litigation. In addition, in order to

claims for plaintiffs as costly as possible, State Farm wo attorney to employ formal discovery devices, retain biomec and accident reconstructionists in all of these "low damag

1. This policy was coupled with a company directive that the representative personnel were to advise all counsel that S settle these cases and would "fully litigate" them. As ind evidence submitted herewith the goal and stated purpose of policy, which was disseminated amongst the legal community direction by the claims representatives and other persons State Farm, was to discourage the presentation of such cla to discourage attorneys from representing claimants on the impact"/"low damager" claims by making it virtually financ a claimant in such a case to obtain representation. This c policy had its desired long term effect.
- m. According to the State Farm superintendent in charge of th which handled the Stoliar claim, the claim representative claim were well aware that they had an obligation under th and their policy of insurance, to attempt to effectuate fa prompt settlements. However, as a result of Mrs. Stoliar's classified as "minor impact"/"low damager" no effort was m this case or make any offer or even evaluate the case unti middle of September of 1995 almost two years after the ini seven months after the second accident. Further, because t accident was classified as a "minor impact"/"low damager" was ever made to evaluate it and no effort was ever made w settlement, even though over \$6,900.00 in medical expenses Stoliar as a result of the second accident.
- n. Thus, liability was clear, and that State Farm had concede the treatment (with the exception of the MRI of March 1995 necessary and related to each accident (by paying the medi Nonetheless, State Farm claims that no evaluation was made extended until September 1995. Any reasonable Claims Repre bound by the "low damager" policy would conclude the claim UIM benefits exceeded the policy limits. Further, in my op the refusal to attempt to settle "low damager" cases in a prompt manner was a deliberate company policy arbitrarily region-wide basis without regard to the merits of individu
- o. Additionally, because of plaintiff's psychiatric history an condition, according to her treating mental health care pro conduct on this file was much more destructive, contributin deterioration of plaintiff, suicide attempts and psychiatri during 1995.

I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the St California, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 11th day of November, 1996 at Glendale, California.

Amy Girod Zuniga, Declarant

(1) In a signed statement by Mr. Cameron dated December 6, 1993, contained in the State Farm claims file, Mr. Cameron admitted that he was traveling at 35 miles per hour befor accident.

(2) This was a curb-side "eyeball" appraisal by a State Farm empl