

Supreme Court of Canada: Spotlight on promissory estoppel in insurance

December 02, 2021

In *Trial Lawyers Association of British Columbia v Royal & Sun Alliance*, 2021 SCC 47, the Supreme Court of Canada (the Court) considered, and subsequently rejected, the application of promissory estoppel against an insurer who denied coverage following the discovery of a policy breach. As put simply by the Court, the insurer must have knowledge of the facts demonstrating a breach in order to be bound by any promise to provide coverage.

What you need to know

- The insured (SD) died in a motorcycle accident.
- JB and another claimant were injured in this accident and started two lawsuits.
- Royal & Sun Alliance (RSA), defended SD's estate in the two lawsuits.
- In the insurance context, estoppel often arises when an insurer takes initial steps to be consistent with coverage and then denies coverage because of the insured's breach of a policy or ineligibility for insurance.
- The Court's decision emphasizes that actual knowledge of the facts is key with respect to policy breaches.

Background

Three years after the accident and over one year into the litigation, RSA learned that SD had consumed alcohol before the accident, putting him in breach of his insurance policy. RSA immediately ceased defending SD's estate and denied coverage. This reduced SD's policy from the limits of \$1,000,000 to the statutory minimum coverage of \$200,000. The actions proceeded to trial, resulting in a judgment against SD's estate and JB, and a judgment for JB on his cross-claim against SD's estate.

In enforcing his judgment against SD's estate, JB rejected RSA's position that its exposure was only \$200,000. JB then sought a declaration of entitlement to recover judgment against RSA on the basis that RSA waived SD's breach or was estopped from denying coverage to his estate.

The trial judge granted the declaration and found that RSA had waived its right to deny full coverage by failing to take an off-coverage position earlier and by providing a defence to SD's estate. Given this finding, the trial judge did not consider the estoppel argument.

RSA appealed. In granting the appeal, the Court of Appeal found that at the applicable time, Ontario's *Insurance Act* precluded recognition of waiver by conduct. With respect to estoppel, RSA had lacked knowledge of SD's policy breach when it initially provided him with a defence. Furthermore, there was no prejudice to the insured in this case, as the only evidence at trial was that even if RSA had invoked the policy breach earlier, the defence would not have been any different.

JB sought to appeal the Court of Appeal's decision; however, JB subsequently settled with RSA and discontinued the appeal. The Trial Lawyers Association of British Columbia therefore asked and was permitted to be substituted as the appellant.

The decision

The Court dismissed the appeal.

The appellant conceded, and the Court agreed, that waiver by conduct was precluded by Ontario's *Insurance Act* at the relevant time. Accordingly, the issue was whether RSA was estopped from denying coverage because it responded to the claims against SD's estate after it discovered evidence of his policy breach.

The Court reiterated that the party relying on the doctrine of promissory estoppel must establish that the other party has made a promise or assurance, by words or conduct, which was intended to affect their legal relationship and to be acted on. Furthermore, the promisee must establish that, in reliance on the promise, he acted on it or in some way changed his position.

The defence therefore requires that:

1. The parties be in a legal relationship at the time of the promise or assurance;
2. The promise or assurance be intended to affect that relationship and to be acted on; and
3. The other party in fact relied on the promise or assurance.

In this case, the Court found that the estoppel argument must fail because RSA gave no promise or assurance intended to affect its legal relationship with JB. Additionally, and most importantly, RSA lacked knowledge at the time it provided a defence to SD's estate of SD having breached the policy by consuming alcohol. This, in the Court's view, was fatal to the appellant's position.

The Court went on to say RSA was under a duty to SD to investigate the claim against him "fairly", in a "balanced and reasonable manner". Indeed, the Court reiterated that it had previously sought to "temper" the incentives of insurers in order to protect the interest of insureds, who are vulnerable when insurers act with "wilful tunnel vision" to look for policy breaches. Additionally, the Court emphasized that RSA was under no

additional duty to JB to investigate policy breaches and the duty to investigate fairly, in a balanced and reasonable manner, is only owed to the insured, not to third parties.

Takeaways

The Court commented that if RSA had known of the fact that demonstrated SD's breach (specifically, that he had consumed alcohol prior to the accident), but had failed to appreciate the legal significance of that fact (specifically that this amounted to a breach of the policy), then perhaps knowledge of that legal significance could have been imputed to RSA. However, this was not the situation before the Court.

This decision therefore serves as a reminder that what the insurer knew at the time coverage was afforded will likely be one of, if not the most important, determinative factors if coverage is later denied.

For more information on the SCC's decision in *Trial Lawyers Association of British Columbia v Royal & Sun Alliance*, 2021 SCC 47, or promissory estoppel in the insurance context, please reach out to any of the authors or key contacts listed below.

By

[Natalie D. Kolos](#), [Samantha Bonanno](#)

Expertise

[Disputes](#)

BLG | Canada's Law Firm

As the largest, truly full-service Canadian law firm, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP (BLG) delivers practical legal advice for domestic and international clients across more practices and industries than any Canadian firm. With over 800 lawyers, intellectual property agents and other professionals, BLG serves the legal needs of businesses and institutions across Canada and beyond – from M&A and capital markets, to disputes, financing, and trademark & patent registration.

blg.com

BLG Offices

Calgary

Centennial Place, East Tower
520 3rd Avenue S.W.
Calgary, AB, Canada
T2P 0R3

T 403.232.9500
F 403.266.1395

Ottawa

World Exchange Plaza
100 Queen Street
Ottawa, ON, Canada
K1P 1J9

T 613.237.5160
F 613.230.8842

Vancouver

1200 Waterfront Centre
200 Burrard Street
Vancouver, BC, Canada
V7X 1T2

T 604.687.5744
F 604.687.1415

Montréal

1000 De La Gauchetière Street West
Suite 900
Montréal, QC, Canada
H3B 5H4

T 514.954.2555
F 514.879.9015

Toronto

Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower
22 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, ON, Canada
M5H 4E3

T 416.367.6000
F 416.367.6749

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to constitute legal advice, a complete statement of the law, or an opinion on any subject. No one should act upon it or refrain from acting without a thorough examination of the law after the facts of a specific situation are considered. You are urged to consult your legal adviser in cases of specific questions or concerns. BLG does not warrant or guarantee the accuracy, currency or completeness of this publication. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior written permission of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. If this publication was sent to you by BLG and you do not wish to receive further publications from BLG, you may ask to remove your contact information from our mailing lists by emailing unsubscribe@blg.com or manage your subscription preferences at blg.com/MyPreferences. If you feel you have received this message in error please contact communications@blg.com. BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at blg.com/en/privacy.

© 2026 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.