

Opry Mills Mall Limited Partnership et al v. Arch Insurance Company et al

Year: 2018

Court: Tennessee Supreme Court

Case Number: M 2016 01763-SC-R11-CV

The rules of insurance policy interpretation in the States of Tennessee and Indiana are well-settled law and should continue to preserve policyholders' reasonable expectations of coverage. Ambiguous policy wording should be construed in favor of coverage.

This brief was prepared pro bono by Marshall Gilinsky and Arthur Armstrong of Anderson Kill, P.C. and by Amy Farrar of Farrar Wright

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/opry-mills-mall-limited-partnership-et-al-v-arch-insurance-company-et-al/> Date: April