	Case 2:20-cv-05159 Document 1 Filed 06/1	.0/20 Page 1 of 20 Page ID #:1		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	David M. Birka-White (State Bar No. 857 dbw@birka-white.com BIRKA-WHITE LAW OFFICES 178 E. Prospect Avenue Danville, CA 94526 Telephone: (925) 362-9999 Facsimile: (925) 362-9970 [Additional Counsel Listed on Signature I Attorneys for Plaintiff ROUNDIN3RD SPORTS BAR LLC	21)		
9				
10	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT		
11	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
12	WESTERN DIVISION			
13				
14	ROUNDIN3RD SPORTS BAR LLC,	Case No. 2:20-cv-5159		
15 16	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT		
10				
17	V.	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED		
10	THE HARTFORD and SENTINEL			
20	INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED,			
21	Defendants.			
22				
23	Plaintiff Roundin3rd Sports Bar LLC ("Plaintiff") brings this Complaint			
24	against Defendants The Hartford and Sent	against Defendants The Hartford and Sentinel Insurance Company, Limited		
25	("Defendants") and, upon information and belief, alleges as follows:			
26	NATURE O	F THE CASE		
27	1. This is a civil action seeking	declaratory relief arising from Plaintiff's		
28	contracts of insurance with Defendants.			
Birka-White Law Offices 178 E. Prospect Avenue Danville, CA 94526 (925) 362-9999	- 1 - COMPLAINT	Case No.: 2:20-cv-5159		

COMPLA	INT
--------	-----

- In light of the Coronavirus global pandemic and state and local orders
   mandating that all non-essential in store businesses must shut down on March 16,
   2020, Plaintiff's restaurant has suffered business loss.
- 4 3. Plaintiff's insurance policies provide coverage for all non-excluded
  5 business losses, and thus provide coverage here.

4. As a result, Plaintiff is entitled to declaratory relief that its business is
covered for all business losses that have been incurred in an amount greater than
\$150,000.00.

9

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 1332, because there is complete diversity of citizenship between Plaintiff
and Defendants. Plaintiff has suffered business losses at each restaurant in an amount
greater than \$150,000.00. The amount in controversy necessary for diversity
jurisdiction over a declaratory judgment action is measured by the value of those
business losses. *Id.* § 1332(a).

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants. Defendants have
 engaged in substantial business in this District, including the formation of the Policies
 underlying Plaintiff's claims, and Defendants have therefore personally availed
 themselves of jurisdiction in this District.

7. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2)
because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff's claims
occurred in this District, including the formation of the Policies underlying Plaintiff's
claims.

PARTIES

24

# 8. Plaintiff is a limited liability company that owns and operates a restaurant, Roundin3rd Sports Bar, located 4133 E Anaheim Street, Long Beach, CA 90804. Plaintiff is owned by Patrick Malone, Geoffery Rau, and Susan Hartert, who are all citizens of California.

Birka-White Law Offices 178 E. Prospect Avenue Danville, CA 94526 (925) 362-9999

Case No.: 2:20-cv-5159

9. Defendant The Hartford ("Hartford") is an insurance carrier that
 provides business interruption insurance to Plaintiff. Defendant Hartford is
 headquartered at One Hartford Plaza, Hartford, Connecticut 06155. Defendant
 Hartford is a citizen of Connecticut.

10. Defendant Sentinel Insurance Company, Limited ("Sentinel") is an
insurance company affiliated with Hartford that insured Plaintiff for business
interruption insurance. Defendant Sentinel is headquartered at One Hartford Plaza,
Hartford, Connecticut 06155. Defendant Sentinel is a citizen of Connecticut.

9

# **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10

# I. Insurance Coverage

11 11. At all relevant times, Defendants issued a policy to Plaintiff to cover
business interruption loss from November 1, 2019 until November 1, 2020 for its
restaurant at 4133 E Anaheim Street, Long Beach, CA 90804 (the "Insured
Property"). The policy number is 57 SBA BM3684. This policy was intended to
cover losses to business interruption. *See* Declaration, attached hereto as Exhibit 1
(the "Policy").

17 12. The Policy is currently in full effect in providing, among other things,
18 personal property, business income and extra expense, contamination coverage and
19 additional coverage.

13. Plaintiff submitted a claim for a date of loss pursuant to its Policy
seeking coverage under this policy. Defendants rejected Plaintiff's claim for
coverage for business loss and business interruption and other claims, contending, *inter alia*, that Plaintiff did not suffer physical damage to its property directly and
stating other reasons why Plaintiff purportedly is not entitled to coverage for the
losses and damages. Defendants also claimed the Policy does not cover losses due to
the Virus Exclusion Clause.

27 14. Plaintiff faithfully paid policy premiums to Defendants, specifically to
28 provide, among other things, additional coverages in the event of business

interruption or closures by order of Civil Authority and for business loss for property
 damage.

15. Under the Policy, insurance is extended to apply to the actual loss of business income sustained and the actual, necessary and reasonable extra expenses incurred when access to the Insured Property is specifically prohibited by order of civil authority as the direct result of a covered cause of loss to property in the immediate area of Plaintiff's Insured Property. This additional coverage is identified as coverage under "Civil Authority."

9 16. The Policy is an all-risk policy, insofar as it provides that covered causes
10 of loss under the policy means coverage for all covered losses, including but not
11 limited to direct physical loss or direct physical damage, unless the loss is specifically
12 excluded or limited in the Policy.

17. The Policy also covers for damages resulting from business interruption
when there is property damage. The exclusion for viruses does not apply to this
pandemic. The Policy does not identify any exclusions for a pandemic.

18. Based on information and belief, Defendants have accepted the policy
premiums with no intention of providing any coverage for business losses or the Civil
Authority extension due to a loss and shutdown and property damage.

19

# II. The Coronavirus Pandemic

19. The scientific community, and those personally affected by the virus,
recognize the Coronavirus as a cause of real physical loss and damage. It is clear that
contamination of the Insured Property would be a direct physical loss requiring
remediation to clean the surfaces of the business.

24 20. The virus that causes COVID-19 remains stable and transmittable in
25 aerosols for up to three hours, up to four hours on copper, up to 24 hours on
26 cardboard and up to two to three days on plastic and stainless steel. *See*27 <u>https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/new-coronavirus-stable-hours-</u>
28 <u>surfaces</u> (last visited April 9, 2020).

The CDC has issued a guidance that gatherings of more than 10 people
 must not occur. People in congregate environments, which are places where people
 live, eat, and sleep in close proximity, face increased danger of contracting COVID 19.

22. The global Coronavirus pandemic is exacerbated by the fact that the deadly virus physically infects and stays on surfaces of objects or materials, "fomites," for up to twenty-eight (28) days.

8 23. China, Italy, France, and Spain have implemented the cleaning and 9 fumigating of public areas prior to allowing them to re-open publicly due to the 10 intrusion of microbials.

11

5

6

7

# III. Civil Authority

12 24. On March 4, 2020, the State of California declared a State of Emergency
13 for the entire state of California as a result of COVID-19.

14 25. On March 11, 2020, the State of California set restrictions on large15 gatherings.

16 26. On March 16, 2020, the State of California prohibited all gatherings
17 regardless of size. This order effectively shut down all non-essential businesses.

27. On March 17, 2020, the State of California issued a stay at home order
that all non-essential workers must stay at home as a result of COVID-19. This order
has been extended indefinitely.

21

28. On May 29, 2020, Plaintiff's business was able to begin re-opening.

22 29. Plaintiff's business was unable to operate due to the stay-at-home orders
23 for public safety issued by the State of California (the "Orders"). Plaintiff has
24 submitted a claim to its insurance carriers related to such losses, but Defendants
25 denied Plaintiff's claims.

30. Further, on April 10, 2020, President Trump seemed to support
insurance coverage for business loss like that suffered by the Plaintiff.

28

	Case 2:20-cv-05159 Document 1 Filed 06/10/20 Page 6 of 20 Page ID #:6
1	REPORTER: Mr. President may I ask you about credit and debt as well. Many American individuals, families,
2	have had to tap their credit cards during this period of time. And businesses have had to draw down their credit
3	lines. Are you concerned Mr. President that that may hobble the U.S. economy, all of that debt number one?
4	And number two, would you suggest to credit card companies to reduce their fees during this time?
5	PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well it's something that we've
6	already suggested, we're talking to them. Business interruption insurance, I'd like to see these insurance
7	companies—you know you have people that have paid.
8	When I was in private I had business interruption. When my business was interrupted through a hurricane or what was the U'd have business where I had it I
9	whatever it may be, I'd have business where I had it, I didn't always have it, sometimes I had it, sometimes, I
10	had a lot of different companies. But if I had it I'd expect to be paid. You have people. I speak mostly to the
11	restaurateurs, where they have a restaurant, they've been paying for 25, 30, 35 years, business interruption.
12	They've never needed it. All of a sudden they need it. And I'm very good at reading language. I did very well in
13	these subjects, OK. And I don't see the word pandemic mentioned. Now in some cases it is, it's an exclusion. But
14	in a lot of cases I don't see it. I don't see it referenced. And they don't want to pay up. I would like to see the
15	insurance companies pay if they need to pay, if it's fair.
	And they know what's fair, and I know what's fair, I can tell you very quickly. But business interruption insurance,
16	that's getting a lot money to a lot of people. And they've been paying for years, sometimes they just started paying,
17	but you have people that have never asked for business interruption insurance, and they've been paying a lot of money for a lot of years for the privilege of having it, and then when they finally need it, the insurance
18	money for a lot of years for the privilege of having it, and then when they finally need it, the insurance
19	company says 'we're not going to give it.' We can't let that happen.
20	
21	See <u>https://youtu.be/_cMeG5C9TjU (</u> last visited on April 17, 2020).
22	31. The President is articulating a few core points:
23	a. Business interruption is a common type of insurance.
24	b. Businesses pay in premiums for this coverage and should reasonably
25	expect they'll receive the benefit of the coverage.
26	c. This pandemic should be covered unless there is a specific exclusion
27	for pandemics.
28	d. If insurers deny coverage, they would be acting in bad faith.
Birka-White Law Offices 178 E. Prospect Avenue Danville, CA 94526 (925) 362-9999	- 6 - Case No.: 2:20-cv-5159
() JU2 ////	COMPLAINT

1 32. These Orders and proclamations, as they relate to the closure of all "non-2 life- sustaining businesses," evidence an awareness on the part of both state and local 3 governments that COVID-19 causes damage to property. This is particularly true in 4 places where business is conducted, such as Plaintiff's, as the requisite contact and 5 interaction causes a heightened risk of the property becoming contaminated.

6

## IV. Impact on Plaintiff

7 33. As a result of the Orders referenced herein, Plaintiff shut its doors to its
8 restaurant.

9 34. Plaintiff's business loss occurred when the State of California issues its
10 order on March 16, 2020 banning any gatherings at an establishment.

35. Prior to March 16, 2020, Plaintiff's business was open. Plaintiff's
Insured Property is not a closed environment, and because people – staff, customers,
community members, and others – constantly cycle in and out, there is an everpresent risk that the Insured Property is contaminated and would continue to be
contaminated.

36. Businesses like Plaintiff's are more susceptible to being or becoming
contaminated, as both respiratory droplets and fomites are more likely to be retained
on the Insured Property and remain for far longer as compared to a facility with openair ventilation.

37. Plaintiff's Insured Property is also highly susceptible to rapid person-toproperty transmission of the virus, and vice-versa, because the service nature of the
business places staff and customers in close proximity to the property and to one
another and because the nature of the business exposes people to high levels of
respiratory droplets and fomites being released into the air of the property.

38. The virus is physically impacting Plaintiff. Any effort by Defendants to
deny the reality that the virus causes physical loss and damage would constitute a
false and potentially fraudulent misrepresentation that could endanger Plaintiff and
the public.

1	39. A declaratory judgment determining that the coverage provided under		
2	the Policy exists and is necessary so as to prevent Plaintiff from being left without		
3	vital coverage acquired to ensure the survival of the business due to the shutdown		
4	caused by the civil authorities' response. As a result of these Orders, Plaintiff has		
5	incurred, and continues to incur, among other things, a substantial loss of business		
6	income and additional expenses covered under the Policy.		
7	CAUSE OF ACTION		
8	DECLARATORY RELIEF		
9	40. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference into this cause of		
10	action each and every allegation set forth in each and every paragraph of this		
11	Complaint.		
12	41. The Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), provides that in		
13	"a case of actual controversy within its jurisdiction any court of the United		
14	States may declare the rights and other legal relations of any interested party		
15	seeking such declaration, whether or not further relief is or could be sought." 28		
16	U.S.C. § 2201(a).		
17	42. An actual controversy has arisen between Plaintiff and Defendants as to		
18	the rights, duties, responsibilities and obligations of the parties under the Policy in		
19	that Plaintiff contends and, on information and belief, Defendants dispute and deny		
20	that:		
21	a. The Orders constitute a prohibition of access to Plaintiff's Insured		
22	Property;		
23	b. The prohibition of access by the Orders has specifically prohibited		
24	access as defined in the Policy;		
25	c. The Policy's Exclusion of Loss Due to Virus or Bacteria does not		
26	apply to the business losses incurred by Plaintiff here. These		
27	exclusions do not apply to the pandemic;		
28	d. The Orders trigger coverage;		
Birka-White Law Offices 178 E. Prospect Avenue Danville, CA 94526 (925) 362-9999	- 8 - Case No.: 2:20-cv-5159		
	COMPLAINT		

1	e. The Policy provides coverage to Plaintiff for any current and future		
2	civil authority closures of business in California due to physical		
2			
	loss/or damage directly or indirectly from the Coronavirus under the		
4	Civil Authority coverage parameters. The Policy does not exclude		
5	coverage for the pandemic;		
6	f. The Policy provides business income coverage in the event that		
7	Coronavirus has directly or indirectly caused a loss or damage at the		
8	Insured Property or immediate area of the Insured Property; and		
9	g. Resolution of the duties, responsibilities and obligations of the		
10	parties is necessary as no adequate remedy at law exists and a		
11	declaration of the Court is needed to resolve the dispute and		
12	controversy.		
13	43. Plaintiff seeks a Declaratory Judgment to determine whether the Orders		
14	constitute a prohibition of access to Plaintiff's Insured Property as Civil Authority as		
15	defined in the Policy.		
16	44. Plaintiff further seeks a Declaratory Judgment to affirm that the Orders		
17	trigger coverage.		
18	45. Plaintiff further seeks a Declaratory Judgment to affirm that the Policy		
19	provides coverage to Plaintiff for any current and future Civil Authority closures of		
20	businesses in the State of California due to physical loss or damage from the		
21	Coronavirus and that the Policy provides business income coverage in the event that		
22	Coronavirus has caused a loss or damage at the Insured Property.		
23	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
24	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for a judgment against Defendants as follows:		
25	a. For a declaration that the Orders constitute a prohibition of access to		
26	Plaintiff's Insured Property.		
27 28	b. For a declaration that the prohibition of access by the Orders is specifically prohibited access as defined in the Policy.		
LO Birka-White Law Offices 178 E. Prospect Avenue	- 9 - Case No · 2·20-cv-5159		
Danville, CA 94526 (925) 362-9999	-9- Case No.: 2:20-cv-5159 COMPLAINT		

Ģ	ase 2:20-cv-05159 Document 1	Filed 06/10/20 Page 10 of 20 Page ID #:10		
1	c. For a declarat	ion that the Orders trigger coverage under the Policy.		
2	d. For a declarat	ion that Policy provides coverage to Plaintiff for any		
3	current, future	and continued civil authority closures of businesses in		
4	California due to physical loss or damage directly or indirectly from the Coronavirus under the Civil Authority coverage parameters.			
5	e. For a declaration that the Policy provides business income coverage			
6		at Coronavirus has directly or indirectly caused a loss		
7	or damage at	Plaintiff's Insured Property or the immediate area of		
8	Plaintiff's Insured Property.			
9	f. For such other	relief as the Court may deem proper.		
10	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED			
11	Plaintiff hereby demand	Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury.		
12				
13	Dated: June 10, 2020	Respectfully submitted,		
14		/s/ David M. Birka-White		
15		David M. Birka-White (State Bar No. 85721)		
16		dbw@birka-white.com		
17	BIRKA-WHITE LAW OFFICES			
18	178 E. Prospect Avenue			
19	Danville, CA 94526 Telephone: (925) 362-9999			
	Facsimile: (925) 362-9970			
20		Amold Lovin Esc. (Do Don No. 02280)		
21		Arnold Levin, Esq. (Pa. Bar No. 02280) Laurence Berman, Esq. (Pa. Bar No. 26965)		
22	Frederick Longer, Esq. (Pa. Bar No. 46653)			
23	Daniel Levin, Esq. (Pa. Bar No. 80013)			
24	<b>LEVIN SEDRAN &amp; BERMAN LLP</b> 510 Walnut Street, Suite 500			
25	Philadelphia, PA 19106-3697			
26		Telephone: (215) 592-1500		
		Facsimile: (215) 592-4663		
27		alevin@lfsblaw.com flonger@lfsblaw.com		
28 Rinka White Law Offices		dlevin@lfsblaw.com		
Birka-White Law Offices 178 E. Prospect Avenue Danville, CA 94526 (925) 362-9999		- 10 - Case No.: 2:20-cv-5159		
	COMPLAINT			

1		
2		Richard M. Golomb, Esq. (PA Bar No: 42845)
3		Kenneth J. Grunfeld, Esq. (PA Bar No: 84121) GOLOMB & HONIK, P.C.
4	1	835 Market Street, Suite 2900
5		Philadelphia, PA 19103
6		Telephone: (215) 985-9177 Facsimile: (215) 985-4169
	r	golomb@golombhonik.com
7	k	grunfeld@golombhonik.com
8	A	Aaron Rihn, Esq. (PA Bar No: 85752)
9	F	<b>ROBERT PEIRCE &amp; ASSOCIATES</b>
10		707 Grant Street, Suite 125
11		Pittsburgh, PA 15219
		Telephone: (412) 281-7229 Facsimile: (412) 281-4229
12		urihn@peircelaw.com
13		
14	V	W. Daniel "Dee" Miles, III
15		Ala. Bar ID:7656M75W)
		Rachel N. Boyd (Ala. Bar ID: 6320342)
16		Paul W. Evans (AL Bar ID: 9270Z18F)
17		BEASLEY, ALLEN, CROW, METHVIN, PORTIS & MILES, P.C.
18		P.O. Box 4160
		Montgomery, AL 36103
19		Telephone: (334) 269-2343
20		Facsimile: (334) 954-7555
21	d	lee.miles@beasleyallen.com
22	0	Counsel for Plaintiff
23		
24		
25		
26		
20		
28		
Birka-White Law Offices 178 E. Prospect Avenue		11 - Case No.: 2:20-cv-5159
Danville, CA 94526 (925) 362-9999		11 - Case No.: 2:20-cv-5159

Case 2:20-cv-05159 Document 1 Filed 06/10/20 Page 12 of 20 Page ID #:12

# EXHIBIT 1

This Spectfurn Policy Consists of the Declarations, Colorage Forns, Compton Policy Conditions and any
 other Forms and Endorsements issued to be a part of the Policy. This insurance is provided by the stock
 insurance company of The Hartford Insurance Group shown below.

SBA

**INSURER:** SENTINEL INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED ONE HARTFORD PLAZA, HARTFORD, CT 06155 COMPANY CODE: A

Policy Number: 57 SBA BM3684 DX



#### SPECTRUM POLICY DECLARATIONS

Named Insured and Mailing Address:ROUNDIN3RD SPORTS BAR LLC(No., Street, Town, State, Zip Code)DBA ROUNDIN3RD SPORTS BAR4133 E ANAHEIM STLONG BEACHCA 90804

Policy Period:From11/01/19To11/01/20365DAYS12:01 a.m., Standard time at your mailing address shown above.Exception: 12 noon in New Hampshire.

Name of Agent/Broker: GUARDUS INS SVCS INC/PHS Code: 141519

Previous Policy Number: NEW

Named Insured is: LIMITED LIAB CORP

Audit Period: ANNUAL

Type of Property Coverage: SPECIAL

**Insurance Provided:** In return for the payment of the premium and subject to all of the terms of this policy, we agree with you to provide insurance as stated in this policy.

#### TOTAL ANNUAL PREMIUM IS:

\$7,007

IN RECOGNITION OF THE MULTIPLE COVERAGES INSURED WITH THE HARTFORD, YOUR POLICY PREMIUM INCLUDES AN ACCOUNT CREDIT.

Sugan J. Castaneda

Countersigned by

Authorized Representative

10/31/19 Date

#### Case 2:20-cv-05159 Document 1 Filed 06/10/20 Page 14 of 20 Page ID #:14

#### SPECTRUM POLICY DECLARATIONS (Continued)

POLICY NUMBER: 57 SBA BM3684

Location(s), Building(s), Business of Named Insured and Schedule of Coverages for Premises as designated by Number below.

Location: 001 Building: 001

4133 E ANAHEIM ST LONG BEACH CA 90804

#### **Description of Business:**

RESTAURANT - FULL SERVICE (WAITER/WAITRESS)

**Deductible:** \$ 2,500 PER OCCURRENCE

#### BUILDING AND BUSINESS PERSONAL PROPERTY LIMITS OF INSURANCE

BUILDING

NO COVERAGE

<b>BUSINESS PERSONAL</b>	. PROPERTY
--------------------------	------------

REPLACEMENT COST	\$	150,000
------------------	----	---------

PERSONAL PROPERTY OF OTHERS

REPLACEMENT COST	NO	COVERAGE
MONEY AND SECURITIES		
INSIDE THE PREMISES OUTSIDE THE PREMISES	\$ \$	10,000 10,000

#### SPECTRUM POLICY DECLARATIONS (Continued)

POLICY NUMBER: 57 SBA BM3684

Location(s), Building(s), Business of Named Insured and Schedule of Coverages for Premises as designated by Number below.

Location: 001 Building: 001

#### PROPERTY OPTIONAL COVERAGES APPLICABLE LIMITS OF INSURANCE TO THIS LOCATION

RESTAURANT STRETCH FORM: SS 04 11 THIS FORM INCLUDES MANY ADDITIONAL COVERAGES AND EXTENSIONS OF COVERAGES. A SUMMARY OF THE COVERAGE LIMITS IS ATTACHED.

LIMITED FUNGI, BACTERIA OR VIRUS \$ 50,000 COVERAGE: FORM SS 40 93 THIS IS THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF INSURANCE FOR THIS COVERAGE, SUBJECT TO ALL PROPERTY LIMITS FOUND ELSEWHERE ON THIS DECLARATION. INCLUDING BUSINESS INCOME AND EXTRA EXPENSE COVERAGE FOR: 30 DAYS

#### SPECTRUM POLICY DECLARATIONS (Continued)

POLICY NUMBER: 57 SBA BM3684

#### PROPERTY OPTIONAL COVERAGES APPLICABLE LIMITS OF INSURANCE TO ALL LOCATIONS

BUSINESS INCOME AND EXTRA EXPENSE COVERAGE COVERAGE INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING COVERAGE EXTENSIONS:	12 MONTHS ACTUAL LOSS SUSTAINED
ACTION OF CIVIL AUTHORITY:	30 DAYS
EXTENDED BUSINESS INCOME:	30 CONSECUTIVE DAYS

- EQUIPMENT BREAKDOWN COVERAGE DEDUCTIBLE: \$5,000 FORM: SS 40 65 COVERAGE FOR DIRECT PHYSICAL LOSS DUE TO: MECHANICAL BREAKDOWN, ARTIFICIALLY GENERATED CURRENT AND STEAM EXPLOSION
- THIS ADDITIONAL COVERAGE INCLUDESTHE FOLLOWING EXTENSIONSHAZARDOUS SUBSTANCESHAZARDOUS SUBSTANCESHAZARDOUS SUBSTANCESHAZARDOUS SUBSTANCESHAZARDOUS SUBSTANCESHAZARDOUS SUBSTANCESHECHANICAL BREAKDOWN COVERAGE ONLYAPPLIES WHEN BUILDING OR BUSINESSPERSONAL PROPERTY IS SELECTED ONTHE POLICYIDENTITY RECOVERY COVERAGE\$ 15,000FORM SS 41 12
- FOOD CONTAMINATION COVERAGE \$ 10,000 FORM SS 41 32

# SPECTROM POLIC Pole LARATIONS (Continued)/20 Page 17 of 20 Page ID #:17

POLICY NUMBER: 57 SBA BM3684

BUSINESS LIABILITY	LIMITS OF INSURANCE
LIABILITY AND MEDICAL EXPENSES	\$1,000,000
MEDICAL EXPENSES - ANY ONE PERSON	\$5,000
PERSONAL AND ADVERTISING INJURY	\$1,000,000
DAMAGES TO PREMISES RENTED TO YOU ANY ONE PREMISES	\$1,000,000
AGGREGATE LIMITS PRODUCTS-COMPLETED OPERATIONS	\$2,000,000
GENERAL AGGREGATE	\$2,000,000
BUSINESS LIABILITY OPTIONAL COVERAGES	
HIRED/NON-OWNED AUTO LIABILITY	\$1,000,000
CYBERFLEX COVERAGE FORM SS 40 26	

#### SPECTRUM POLICY DECLARATIONS (Continued) POLICY NUMBER: 57 SBA BM3684

BUSINESS LIABILITY OPTIONAL COVERAGES LIMITS OF INSURANCE (Continued)

UNMANNED AIRCRAFT LIABILITY IS EXCLUDED SEE FORM: SS 42 06 SPECTRUM POLICY DECLARATIONS (Continued)

POLICY NUMBER: 57 SBA BM3684

#### Form Numbers of Forms and Endorsements that apply:

SS 00 01 03	14 SS 00	05 10 08	SS 00 07 07 05	SS 00 08 04 05
SS 00 38 04	04 SS 00	45 12 06	SS 00 60 09 15	SS 00 61 07 19
SS 00 64 09	16 SS 84	04 10 15	SS 01 21 03 17	SS 42 06 03 17
SS 04 11 09	07 SS 04	19 04 09	SS 04 22 07 05	SS 04 30 07 05
SS 04 38 09	09 SS 04	39 07 05	SS 04 41 03 18	SS 04 42 03 17
SS 04 44 07	05 SS 04	45 07 05	SS 04 46 09 14	SS 04 47 04 09
SS 04 80 03	00 SS 04	86 03 00	SS 40 18 07 05	SS 40 26 03 17
SS 40 65 07	05 SS 40	93 07 05	SS 41 12 12 17	SS 41 32 09 06
SS 41 51 10	09 SS 41	63 06 11	IH 10 01 09 86	SS 05 10 03 00
SS 05 47 09	15 SS 50	57 04 05	SS 51 11 03 17	SS 50 19 01 15
IH 99 40 04	09 IH 99	41 04 09	SS 83 76 01 15	SS 89 93 07 16

#### SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS:

A service fee of \$ 7.00 is charged for each installment when your premium is paid in installments. The service fee is \$ 5.00 per withdrawal when you select an electronic fund transfer payment plan. The service fee will be added to the premium amount shown on your premium billing statement.