

AN A.S. PRATT PUBLICATION

JUNE 2017

VOL. 3 • NO. 6

PRATT'S  
**GOVERNMENT  
CONTRACTING  
LAW**  
REPORT



**EDITOR'S NOTE: RIDDLE ME THIS**

Steven A. Meyerowitz

**THE LATEST CLUE TO SOLVING THE  
MAROPAKIS RIDDLE: THE AFFIRMATIVE  
DEFENSE OF OFFSET**

Justin M. Ganderson and Kevin T. Barnett

**HOW A CLINTON-ERA LAW HELPED  
THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION REDUCE  
REGULATIONS ON GOVERNMENT  
CONTRACTORS**

Justin A. Chiarodo and Philip E. Beshara

**THE BUY AMERICAN-HIRE AMERICAN  
EXECUTIVE ORDER: THERE WILL BE  
DEVILS IN THE DETAILS WHEN BUYING  
AMERICAN**

Alexander W. Major and Lillian M. Mezynski

**HOW IS YOUR DOMESTIC PREFERENCE  
COMPLIANCE? PRESIDENT TRUMP  
SIGNALS MORE SCRUTINY OF "BUY  
AMERICAN, HIRE AMERICAN" PRACTICES**

Justin A. Chiarodo, Stephanie M. Harden, and  
Philip E. Beshara

**FOURTH CIRCUIT LEAVES UNDISTURBED  
A DISTRICT COURT DECISION AGAINST  
THE USE OF STATISTICAL SAMPLING, AND  
HOLDS THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS  
THE UNFETTERED POWER TO VETO FCA  
SETTLEMENTS**

Jesse A. Witten and Jenna M. Poligo

**FIFTH CIRCUIT AFFIRMS TIMELINESS OF  
AKA CLAIMS ADDED TO GOVERNMENT'S  
FCA COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION**

Patrick M. Hagan and Michelle Tupper Butler

**CIRCUIT COURTS LIMIT REACH OF  
FEDERAL FALSE CLAIMS ACT IN TWO  
DEFENSE CONTRACTOR CASES**

Jesse A. Witten, Barry Gross, and  
Elizabeth L. Coyne

**RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SECTION  
1603 GRANT LITIGATION**

Timothy L. Jacobs, Laura Ellen Jones,  
David S. Lowman, Jr., and Hilary B. Lefko

**GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS BEWARE:  
FAILING TO PROVIDE NOTICE TO YOUR  
INSURER BEFORE SETTLING MAY DOOM  
YOUR CHANCE OF RECOVERY**

Jocelyn Knoll, Katie Pfeifer, and  
Kathryn Johnson

# PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT

---

VOLUME 3

NUMBER 6

JUNE 2017

---

**Editor's Note: Riddle Me This**

Steven A. Meyerowitz

195

**The Latest Clue to Solving the *Maropakis* Riddle: The Affirmative Defense of Offset**

Justin M. Ganderson and Kevin T. Barnett

198

**How a Clinton-Era Law Helped the Trump Administration Reduce Regulations on Government Contractors**

Justin A. Chiarodo and Philip E. Beshara

202

**The Buy American-Hire American Executive Order: There Will Be Devils in the Details When Buying American**

Alexander W. Major and Lillian M. Mezynski

205

**How Is Your Domestic Preference Compliance? President Trump Signals More Scrutiny of "Buy American, Hire American" Practices**

Justin A. Chiarodo, Stephanie M. Harden, and Philip E. Beshara

210

**Fourth Circuit Leaves Undisturbed a District Court Decision Against the Use of Statistical Sampling, and Holds that the United States Has the Unfettered Power to Veto FCA Settlements**

Jesse A. Witten and Jenna M. Poligo

214

**Fifth Circuit Affirms Timeliness of AKA Claims Added to Government's FCA Complaint in Intervention**

Patrick M. Hagan and Michelle Tupper Butler

217

**Circuit Courts Limit Reach of Federal False Claims Act in Two Defense Contractor Cases**

Jesse A. Witten, Barry Gross, and Elizabeth L. Coyne

220

**Recent Developments in Section 1603 Grant Litigation**

Timothy L. Jacobs, Laura Ellen Jones, David S. Lowman, Jr., and Hilary B. Lefko

224

**Government Contractors Beware: Failing to Provide Notice to Your Insurer Before Settling May Doom Your Chance of Recovery**

Jocelyn Knoll, Katie Pfeifer, and Kathryn Johnson

230

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Heidi A. Litman at ..... 516-771-2169  
Email: ..... heidi.a.litman@lexisnexus.com  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3385  
Fax Number ..... (800) 828-8341  
Customer Service Website ..... <http://www.lexisnexus.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (937) 247-0293

---

Library of Congress Card Number:

ISBN: 978-1-6328-2705-0 (print)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Michelle E. Litteken, GAO Holds NASA Exceeded Its Discretion in Protest of FSS Task Order, 1 PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT 30 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2017 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

*An A.S. Pratt® Publication*

Editorial Office  
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862  
[www.lexisnexus.com](http://www.lexisnexus.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

# *Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors*

---

**EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ**

*President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

**EDITOR**

**VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS**

*Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

**BOARD OF EDITORS**

**MARY BETH BOSCO**

*Partner, Holland & Knight LLP*

**DARWIN A. HINDMAN III**

*Shareholder, Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC*

**J. ANDREW HOWARD**

*Partner, Alston & Bird LLP*

**KYLE R. JEFCOAT**

*Counsel, Latham & Watkins LLP*

**JOHN E. JENSEN**

*Partner, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP*

**DISMAS LOCARIA**

*Partner, Venable LLP*

**MARCIA G. MADSEN**

*Partner, Mayer Brown LLP*

**KEVIN P. MULLEN**

*Partner, Morrison & Foerster LLP*

**VINCENT J. NAPOLEON**

*Partner, Nixon Peabody LLP*

**STUART W. TURNER**

*Counsel, Arnold & Porter LLP*

**WALTER A.I. WILSON**

*Senior Partner, Polsinelli PC*

PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT is published twelve times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright 2017 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, please access [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com) or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For subscription information and customer service, call 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 718.224.2258. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to government contractors, attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, and senior business executives. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Avenue, New Providence, NJ 07974.

# Government Contractors Beware: Failing to Provide Notice to Your Insurer Before Settling May Doom Your Chance of Recovery

*By Jocelyn Knoll, Katie Pfeifer, and Kathryn Johnson\**

*Many states have adopted a “notice-prejudice” rule, at least where the notice required is not a condition precedent to insurance coverage. While such rules may be helpful in overcoming potentially late notice of a claim, a recent Colorado Supreme Court decision signals that a settling party should not rely on the same rule in instances where it decides to settle a claim without first providing notice to the insurer. The authors of this article discuss the decision.*

The Colorado Supreme Court recently issued a decision in *Travelers Prop. Cas. Co. v. Stresscon Co.*<sup>1</sup> *Stresscon*, a subcontracting concrete company, entered into a settlement agreement—without providing notice to its commercial general liability insurance carrier, Travelers—with Stresscon’s general contractor, relating to a serious construction accident. Stresscon later sought indemnification from Travelers.

In a 4-3 decision, the court held that its earlier adoption of a “notice-prejudice” rule in *Friedland v. Travelers Indemnity Co.* did not overrule prior “no-voluntary-payments” jurisprudence, and declined to extend the reasoning in *Friedland* to Stresscon’s voluntary settlement payment.

## **BACKGROUND**

Colorado first adopted a “notice-prejudice” rule in uninsured motorist case in 2001.<sup>2</sup> Under the rule, if a preliminary determination shows that contractually-required notice of a claim by an insured to its insurer was untimely and the delay unreasonable, the insurer has the burden of demonstrating by a preponderance of the evidence that its significant interests were prejudiced by the delayed notice.

---

\* Jocelyn Knoll, a partner at Dorsey & Whitney LLP and chairperson of the firm’s Construction and Design Group, has a national construction and energy law practice. Katie Pfeifer is of counsel at the firm representing clients in all types of complex commercial litigation. Kathryn Johnson is an associate at the firm representing clients in cases before federal and state courts and in arbitration. The authors may be reached at knoll.jocelyn@dorsey.com, pfeifer.katie@dorsey.com, and johnson.kate@dorsey.com, respectively.

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.courts.state.co.us/userfiles/file/Court\\_Probation/Supreme\\_Court/Opinions/2013/13SC815.pdf](https://www.courts.state.co.us/userfiles/file/Court_Probation/Supreme_Court/Opinions/2013/13SC815.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> See *Clementi v. Nationwide Mut. Fire Ins. Co.*, 16 P.3d 223 (Colo. 2001).

In 2005, the Colorado Supreme Court extended the “notice-prejudice” rule to liability policies.<sup>3</sup> *Friedland* also established that the insured’s failure to give notice of a claim until after settlement is unreasonable as a matter of law, as it deprives the insurer of the opportunity to investigate a claim, present legitimate defenses, and participate in settlement negotiations, and the failure gives rise to a rebuttable presumption of prejudice. The court did not address, however, the effect of a voluntary payments clause on the analysis.

### **STRESSCON’S CLAIM AND THE APPEAL**

In July 2007, one construction worker was killed and another seriously injured when a partially-erected building collapsed on them; the collapse was caused by Stresscon’s subcontractor. The general contractor, Mortenson, asserted a claim against Stresscon for contract damages caused by project delays as a result of the accident.

Stresscon informed Travelers of the claim, and Travelers sent two reservation-of-rights letters to Stresscon. Travelers subsequently sent a letter to Mortenson, denying that Stresscon was liable for the delays. Stresscon and Mortenson then engaged in settlement negotiations and ultimately settled the dispute, without providing any notice to Travelers. Thirteen months later, Stresscon sued Travelers; this was the first notice Travelers had of the settlement.

At trial, the jury found that Travelers unreasonably denied Stresscon’s claim and that Travelers had not been prejudiced by the settlement, awarding \$546,899 in damages.

On appeal, Travelers asserted that the “notice-prejudice” rule does not apply to breaches of “no-voluntary-payments” clauses, and, alternatively, that insurers are prejudiced as a matter of law whenever an insured settles with a third party claimant before the third party has filed suit.

The Colorado Court of Appeals disagreed, holding that the “notice-prejudice rule” applies not only to “notice-of-claim” clauses, but also to “consent-to-settle” and “no-voluntary-payments” clauses. The court reasoned, among other things, that the policy considerations were similar to those at issue in *Clementi* and *Friedland* and that “forfeiting insurance benefits when the insurer has not suffered any prejudice would be a disproportionate penalty and provide the insurer a windfall based on a technical violation of the policy.”

### **THE COLORADO SUPREME COURT’S DECISION**

The Colorado Supreme Court reversed, holding that the “notice-prejudice” rule in *Friedland* did not overrule existing “no-voluntary-payments” jurispru-

---

<sup>3</sup> See *Friedland v. Travelers Indem. Co.*, 105 P.3d 639 (Colo. 2005).

dence, and declining to extend the “notice-prejudice” reasoning to voluntary payments made in the face of a “no-voluntary-payments” clause. The court concluded that the “no-voluntary-payments” clause was a fundamental term defining the limits or extent of coverage. Unlike the notice requirements in *Clementi* and *Friedland*, the “no-voluntary-payments” clause does not impose a duty on the insured to do anything, nor does it impose a duty to refrain from doing something. Instead, it defines voluntary payments made without consent as uncovered expenses not borne by the insurer.

Moreover, the court reasoned that voluntarily making a payment, assuming an obligation, or incurring an expense requires affirmative and voluntary action on the part of the insured. The enforcement of such a provision cannot be characterized as an insurer reaping a windfall by invoking a technicality, and depriving an insurer of its choice to defend or settle a claim has practical implications for the risks that insurers take on and the premiums that insureds pay.

Finally, the court asserted that an insured has additional remedies under Colorado law if an insurer unreasonably delays or denies payment of a claim; however, those remedies do not include effectively expanding coverage beyond the express terms of an insurance policy by engaging in self-help. An insured may also protect itself under Colorado law by assigning to a third-party claimant any claim it may have against an insurer for breach of the duty of good faith and fair dealing.

The court ultimately concluded that extension of the “notice-prejudice” rule to “no-voluntary-payments” or “no-settlement” provisions would “deny insurers the ability to contract for the right to defend against third-party claims or negotiate settlements in the first instance. Public policy demands no such restriction on the right to contract.”

## DISCUSSION

Many states have adopted a “notice-prejudice” rule, at least where the notice required is not a condition precedent to coverage. While such rules may be helpful in overcoming potentially late notice *of a claim*, the Colorado Supreme Court’s decision signals that a settling party should not rely on the same rule in instances where it decides to settle a claim without first providing notice to the insurer. In such instances it is better to ask first, rather than litigate later.