

**CIGNA CORPORATION AND CIGNA PENSION
PLAN, Petitioners, v. JANICE C. AMARA, GISELA
R. BRODERICK, ANNETTE S. GLANZ,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated, Respondents.**

Year: 2009

Court: U.S. Supreme Court

Case Number: 09-804

UP weighed in along with three other organizations to advance the position that where there is a conflict between plan documents, the one that favors plan participants should control, or, in the alternative, SPD documents. Participants should not be obliged to establish detrimental reliance, likely harm, or anything beyond a clear conflict between two plan documents. UP's brief was written pro bono by Ellen Doyle and Richard Payne of the Pittsburgh, PA firm of Stember Feinstein Doyle Payne & Cordes, LLC with input from Pasadena-based UP advisor Ron Dean.

The information presented in this publication is for general informational purposes and is not a substitute for legal advice. If you have a specific legal issue or problem, United Policyholders recommends that you consult with an attorney. Guidance on hiring professional help can be found in the "Find Help" section of www.uphelp.org. United Policyholders does not sell insurance or certify, endorse or warrant any of the insurance products, vendors, or professionals identified on our website.

Source:

<https://uphelp.org/amicus-briefs/cigna-corporation-and-cigna-pension-plan-petitioners-v-janice-c-amara-gisela-r-broderick-anne-tte-s-glanz-individually-and-on-behalf-of-all-others-similarly-situated-respondents/> Date: July 27, 2024