

# MISSOURI LAWYERS WEEKLY

www.molawyersweekly.com



Wednesday, December 12, 2007

Lawyers Weekly, Inc.

[Try 3 Free](#) | [Subscriber Services](#) | [Our Newspapers](#) | [Other Products](#) | [Advertise](#) | [Help](#)

Upgrade to **The BlackBerry® Curve™ 8310** now with GPS  
STARTS AT **\$199.99**

Get Yours Now ▶

at&t

From the February 12, 2007 Missouri Lawyers Weekly.

<a href="#">VIEW Full-text Opinion FREE</a>	<a href="#">Order a REPRINT of this Story</a>	
---	---	--

## Opinion Digest

### Insurance

#### Life Insurance - Competing Claims - Substantial Compliance Doctrine

Where an insurer filed an interpleader action to resolve competing claims to a life insurance policy, the district court did not err in holding that the named beneficiary was entitled to the policy because the decedent's efforts to change the policy beneficiary did not meet the requirements for application of the substantial-compliance doctrine.

ADVERTISEMENT

Judgment is affirmed.

*Prudential Insurance Company of America v. Kamrath* (MLW No. 55358) (9 pages) (U.S. Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit, Bowman, J.)  
Appealed from U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Missouri, Jackson, J. (Matthew J. Padberg, St. Louis, Mo., argued for appellant) (Stephen F. Graunt, Rolla, Mo., argued for appellee; David L. Steelman appeared on the brief).

Click [here](#) for the full text of the decision.

© 2007 Lawyers Weekly Inc., All Rights Reserved.

<a href="#">VIEW Full-text Opinion FREE</a>	<a href="#">Order a REPRINT of this Story</a>	
---	---	--



[User Agreement For Subscriber-Only Online Benefits](#) | [Help](#) | [Our Privacy Policy](#)  
Send any questions or comments to [comments@lawyersweekly.com](mailto:comments@lawyersweekly.com)

**Subscriber Services:** 1-800-451-9998 **Technical Support:** 1-800-444-5297 ext. 8156