

STATE FARM LOSES ANOTHER JURY VERDICT TO FORMER AGENTS

A jury in the case of **State Farm vs. Pyorre-Wier (Case# SCV234700)** brought in another victory for former agents Rich Pyorre and John Wier on Wednesday, Oct 28, 2009, in the Sonoma County Courthouse in Santa Rosa, CA.

The jury found favor for Pyorre and Wier by decided they owed nothing to State Farm. State Farm was suing Pyorre for \$559,348.77 and Wier for \$524,399.65, or \$1,083,748.42 (a total which included interest) for the defense costs State Farm had to pay because of the litigation State Farm had filed against them.

State Farm originally filed suit against Pyorre and Wier in 1999 claiming they had taken trade secrets. Pyorre and Wier filed a claim under their BOPP Policy with State Farm for their defense. State Farm then paid the defense costs without a reservation of rights for reimbursement. However, two and a half years later, and 5 days before trial, State Farm filed their reservation for reimbursement. State Farm knew this was going to be a long (six to seven weeks) and expensive (approximately \$6 Million) trial. State Farm attempted to use this reimbursement as a weapon against Pyorre and Wier since the jury in the original trial awarded Pyorre and

Wier \$12,600,000 and nothing for State Farm. However, State Farm got the judge to throw out the jury verdict and order a new trial which is now pending but then filed yet another litigation against Pyorre and Wier asking them to pay back \$1,083,748.42.

The jury heard testimony over a period of 8 days and then went to deliberation on Wednesday, Oct 28th, and returned a verdict in approximately one hour and forty minutes saying that neither Pyorre nor Wier owed State Farm anything.

After the jurors were released, they told the attorneys and Pyorre and Wier that they were appalled at State Farm's actions and believed State Farm had committed bad faith and was harassing the former agents because they had dared to stand up for their rights.

State Farm quit paying for the defense costs in 2003 but continued to proceed with both litigations in Mendocino and Sonoma Counties. It became obvious to the jurors that this was about State Farm wanting to *punish the former agents in any way they could* rather than doing a good deed, as State Farm attorneys attempted to make it seem.