UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

--000--

MAI NHIA THAO, individually and on behalf of a class of others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

No. 2:09-C-1158-LA

VS.

MIDLAND NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendants.

/

Deposition of
ROBERT E. WILCOX
Tuesday, March 13, 2012

Reported by:
KIMBERLEE SCHROEDER, CSR, RPR, CCRR
License No. 11414

```
1
                              APPEARANCES
 2
 3
      For the Plaintiffs:
 4
          STUEVE, SIEGEL, HANSON, LLP
          By:
               RICK PAUL
 5
               LEE ANDERSON
               Attorneys at Law
 6
          460 Nichols Road
          Suite 200
 7
          Kansas City, Missouri 64112
          Ph: 816-714-7106
 8
          E-mail: paul@stuevesiegel.com
                    lee@stuevesigel.com
 9
10
      For the Defendant:
11
          REED SMITH, LLP
          By: WILLIAM H. HIGGINS
12
              Attorney at Law
          101 Second Street
13
          Suite 1800
          San Francisco, California 94105
14
          Ph: 415-659-4787
          E-mail: whiggins@reedsmith.com
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

MR. PAUL. Q. I just want to make sure, when you say "limitation," would that include -- if the word expenses were in there, is that what you're meaning when you say the word "limitation"?

MR. HIGGINS: Objection. Vague.

THE WITNESS: If the language specifically, for example, excluded expenses, that would be a limitation language in the absence of language to that effect, then there would be, again, the only limitation based on the statutory maximum.

MR. PAUL: Q. Let me ask the other side of that then. Are you familiar with any policies, universal life policies that include a COI rate provision that says it is based on and among other elements, includes expenses?

MR. HIGGINS: Objection. Vaque.

THE WITNESS: I may have, but I don't recall specifically.

MR. PAUL: Q. Going back to this first bullet point on page 4 where you say, "Midland may use different tables of cost-of-insurance rates for different UL products," did Midland in fact use different tables of cost-of-insurance rates for each of the products at issue in this case?

A. I can't say that they're mutually exclusive,

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc. (800) 745-1101

2012 0313 - LC - Thao v. Midland National - Document 66-1 -Deposition of Robert E. Wilcox - 09-cv-1158 -BonkNote - 9p

1 again so we're clear. 2 MR. HIGGINS: You might want to. 3 MR. PAUL: Q. So hypothetical, same policy 4 form, one product, maybe I should say same product. 5 Α. Okay. 6 Same five characteristics. Ο. 7 Α. Yes. 8 Two different people, they are going to have Q. 9 the same cost-of-insurance charge; is that right? 10 MR. HIGGINS: Objection. Vague and incomplete 11 hypothetical. 12 THE WITNESS: Given the complexity of the 13 issue, probably any hypothetical would be incomplete, 14 but in general, if that were to vary between individuals 15 that had those same five characteristics, there would be 16 a discrimination issue that insurance regulators would 17 have a problem with. 18 MR. PAUL: Q. Okay. All right. Looking down 19 the further sentence, page 4 of your declaration, you 20 say, "The remedy proposed by the plaintiff..." 21 What is your understanding of the remedy 22 proposed by the plaintiff in this case? 23 MR. HIGGINS: I'm sorry. Where are you? 24 MR. PAUL: Fourth line on the first bullet 25 point, paragraph 4.

or virtually identical to paragraph 7.8 in this contract.

- Q. Okay. What part of that paragraph 7.8 do you see as authorizing Midland to make a change in premium load, expense charge, or interest rate if the add-on were changed to zero?
- A. The first sentence, "We may declare cost-of-insurance rates, expense amount, premium loads and interest rates that differ from those stated in the policy."
- Q. Okay. Is the second sentence of paragraph 7.8 a limitation on that in any way in your view?
- A. I think it is. It says that, "The changes in the cost-of-insurance rates, expense amounts, premium loads and interest rates will be based upon changes in future expectations for such elements as investment earnings, mortality, persistency and expenses."
- Q. Would you anticipate that Midland's future expectations for any of the elements of investment earnings, mortality, persistency or expenses would change as a result of taking the add-on to zero?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Which one?
- A. Probably all of them. But certainly
 persistency is likely to change because policyholders

are now looking at a contract that is different from what they expected to have, and the way in which they respond to that will to some extent be a result of the changes in benefits that result from a change in the cost-of-insurance rate.

But also, it will vary based on their ability to make changes. They -- I mentioned before someone who is now uninsurable, and so even though they may wish to terminate their contract as a result of this change, they would pay a heavy penalty for doing so because they couldn't go out and buy a policy to replace it.

So persistency would change. If you change persistency, mortality is going to change. And certainly if you -- if you go through the process of doing this, Midland will incur additional expenses.

They would have to estimate how significant those would be. My guess is they would be significant expenses as a result of administering the change and addressing the policyholder communications that it would generate. So that one would change.

The investment earnings, probably ought to separate that between investment earnings and investment rates, but the actual crediting rate is likely to change. It may be that the -- it's highly likely that future cash flows will be different. And that is likely

1 where there have been industry practices that have been 2 unlawful? 3 MR. HIGGINS: Objection. Vaque. 4 I can't think of one right now. THE WITNESS: 5 MR. PAUL: Q. During your tenure as insurance 6 commissioner, did you ever see issues come up that you 7 had to address within your department that you thought 8 needed to be changed, either from a regulatory 9 perspective or a consumer protection standpoint that was 10 industry practice? 11 Α. Yes, but that's different from the question you 12 asked me before. 13 Q. I understand. Do you recall the vanishing 14 premium litigation? 15 Α. Very well. 16 Would you agree that the sales practices that 17 were used in the vanishing premium -- in selling those 18 policies was problematic? 19 MR. HIGGINS: Objection. Vague. 20 THE WITNESS: In a limited number of cases, 21 that was true. But again, that's a different question 22 than you asked before. Problematic is not the same as 23 unlawful. 24 MR. PAUL: Q. Do you not believe that the 25 sales practices used -- that were at issue in the

vanishing premium issue were unlawful? 1 2 MR. HIGGINS: Objection. Vague. 3 THE WITNESS: There may have been a few instances where it was unlawful. In general, it was 4 5 not. 6 MR. PAUL: O. You understand that there were 7 widespread -- let me strike that. 8 There were a lot of settlements with a lot of 9 insurance companies over vanishing sales premiums 10 tactics; correct? 11 Ά. Yes. What about the modal premium litigation? Are 12 13 you familiar with that? 14 Ά. Yes. 15 Q. You understand that were Court judgments condemning that practice at issue in that litigation? 16 17 MR. HIGGINS: Objection. Vague. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: Those were very limited 18 19 geographically, those instances that I'm aware of where 20 the Court ruled it was contrary. And the position of insurance regulators relative to those cases was 21 22 contrary to the Court decisions. 23 They felt that the Courts erred in those 24 conclusions regarding modal premiums. 25 MR. PAUL: Q. In that regard, let's deal with

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc. (800) 745-1101

2012 0313 - LC - Thao v. Midland National - Document 66-1 -Deposition of Robert E. Wilcox - 09-cv-1158 -BonkNote - 9p

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, KIMBERLEE SCHROEDER, CSR 11414, duly authorized to administer oaths pursuant to Section 30(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, hereby certify that the witness in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the within-entitled cause; that said deposition was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of the said witness was reported by me and thereafter transcribed by me and that the witness was given an opportunity to read and correct said deposition and to subscribe the same.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said cause of action, nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said cause of action.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 16th day of March, 2012.

22 KIMBERLEE SCHROEDER, CSR, RPR, CCRR
License No. 11414