



Sample Expert Report

Claims-Handling and Estimating Expert Report - Adapted Public Demonstration

Client	: Retaining Counsel
Matter	: Sample Property Owner v. Carrier (first-party property claim)
Date of Loss	: Sample Loss Date
Policy Number	: Sample Policy
Claim Number	: Sample Claim
Loss Location	: Sample Loss Location
Report Date	: Sample Report Date

About this sample. This public demonstration has been adapted from completed expert work. Names, dates, amounts, document identifiers, chronology, and matter-specific facts have been removed or generalized to protect confidentiality. The analytical method, professional limitations, and representative issue framing have been preserved. This sample does not reproduce the facts or conclusions of any particular matter.

Assignment

I have been retained by Retaining Counsel as a claims-handling and estimating expert in connection with a first-party property claim under the Carrier's policy (Sample Policy), Sample Claim, arising from a water-related loss at Sample Loss Location.

My assignment is to examine the documented handling of the claim, the estimates and payments generated during that handling, and the documentation and communications of record, and to state opinions within the field of property claims adjusting and estimating.

Scope and Limits of Assignment

My opinions are limited to property claims adjusting, claims handling, estimating, repair scope and methodology, payment analysis, and the adequacy of the supporting claim documentation. I do not offer a legal opinion concerning coverage, liability, damages entitlement, or the amount contractually or legally owed under the policy. I may, however, quantify estimate differences, evaluate repair scope and pricing, reconcile payments and deductions, and state whether the amounts, calculations, allocations, and explanations used during the adjustment are supported by the claim file.

I do not offer independent engineering, structural-design, indoor-environmental, industrial-hygiene, laboratory, or medical opinions. I may rely upon and evaluate technical findings contained in the claim file for claims-handling and estimating purposes, but I do not independently diagnose environmental conditions, determine health effects, or offer specialized scientific or engineering causation opinions.

Materials Reviewed

The materials made available and reviewed for this assignment, subject to the limitations described below, included the following:

- The Carrier's substantial claim-file production, including claim notes, activity entries, estimates, payment information, correspondence, coverage and denial letters, investigative materials, and the privilege and redaction log.
- The policyholders' Bates-numbered production, including correspondence, estimates, photographs, invoices, policyholder communications, contractor materials, and payment documents.
- The policy declarations, forms, endorsements, and other policy materials made available for review.
- The pleadings, disclosures, discovery responses, and other litigation documents provided by Retaining Counsel.
- The Carrier's successive estimate versions and post-closure estimate export.
- The estimates and proposals prepared by the rebuild contractor, the public adjusting firm, and other claim participants identified in the claim file.
- The Carrier's payment ledger, payment letters, check advices, estimate-payment calculations, and temporary-accommodation payment information.
- Communications among the policyholders, the Carrier, contractors, public adjusters, independent adjusters, and other claim participants.
- Industry references, including the Xactware publication "Overhead and Profit" and the Verisk "Pricing Methodology Summary."

Review Method and Claim-File Limitations

The claim file contained text-searchable documents, image-only documents, duplicate copies, partially legible handwriting, and redacted or withheld material. Duplicate documents and repeated page images were identified and compared so that the same substantive material was not treated as multiple independent sources.

Handwritten material was considered where legible.

I reviewed the claim file as a whole and applied the review method appropriate to the document at issue: organizing the documents, comparing duplicate and related documents, reconciling estimates and payments against the payment records, and substantively analyzing the materials bearing on the opinions stated in the report. My opinions are based on the claim file and other materials available as of the report date. I reserve the right to supplement or amend my opinions if additional claim-file materials, native estimate files, deposition testimony, expert reports, or other material information becomes available.

General Claim Background

The reviewed materials reflected multiple estimate versions, repair and mitigation payments, contractor and public-adjuster submissions, inspections, claim closures and reopenings, and temporary-accommodation activity. The analysis compared those materials chronologically and by stated purpose without assuming that differently labeled amounts were additive or correctly classified.

The detailed chronology, transaction amounts, and payment sequence developed in the working report are not reproduced in this public demonstration. The sections below describe the analytical method applied to those records and the categories of issues the method surfaced.

Representative Estimate-Version Analysis

Estimate analysis proceeds version by version. Each carrier estimate version is compared with its predecessors for scope consistency, subtotal continuity, overhead-and-profit treatment, and the documentation supporting any change. Where a carrier estimate adopts a contractor's figure as a single lump-sum line item, the estimate documents the amount adopted, but it does not by itself demonstrate an independent, line-level scope determination, and it does not allow a reader to identify which repair work was included or excluded.

In the reviewed materials, successive estimate versions treated overhead and profit inconsistently without a documented explanation, and questions raised within the carrier's own estimate review, including a line item assigned to an apparently inconsistent room or scope category and questions about concealed damage beneath finish materials, were not documented as resolved. A post-closure estimate export contained separately priced components whose relationship, whether additive, alternative, or superseding, was not explained, and the file did not document the export's disposition or transmission.

Estimate differences must not be treated as additive without overlap controls. Overlapping scope between versions, between contractors, and between repair and mitigation categories is identified and removed before any difference is characterized, and differences driven by scope and repair method are distinguished from differences driven by measured dimensions. Documentary comparison alone does not resolve every technical scope question; native estimate files, historical measurements, or another discipline may be required.

Representative Payment-Reconciliation Methodology

Payment analysis reconciles each transaction across every record that describes it: the carrier ledger, the payment letter, the check advice, and the prior-payment fields of the estimates. The stated purpose is taken from the carrier's own written descriptions, not from a ledger coverage code alone, and no record label is treated as conclusive when the records conflict. The table below summarizes the methodology applied to each record type.

Record Type	Review Question	Analytical Control	Limitation
Carrier ledger	What was booked or credited, and to which exposure and coverage?	Reconcile each ledger entry to the corresponding payment letter, check advice, and estimate.	Ledger coverage codes may conflict with other records and are not treated as conclusive classification.

Record Type	Review Question	Analytical Control	Limitation
Payment letter	Does the stated calculation reproduce and explain the amount paid?	Recompute the letter's arithmetic; compare its stated estimate basis to the estimate of record.	A letter may misstate its own basis; in the reviewed materials one letter's arithmetic closed only when the correct estimate amount was substituted.
Check advice	What coverage and purpose labels accompany the instrument?	Compare advice labels against the ledger posting and the letter description for the same instrument.	Conflicting labels leave classification undetermined without additional transaction-level records.
Estimate prior-payment field	Which prior payments were credited against the estimate, and on what allocation?	Trace each credited amount to a ledger entry and payment letter; test for repair versus mitigation mixing.	Credits may combine differently classified payments without a documented allocation.
Mortgagee or vendor payment	Who had practical access to the funds, and what releases were required?	Identify payees, endorsement requirements, and any lender or vendor release documentation.	Carrier system status does not independently prove receipt, negotiation, lender release, vendor payment, or practical access.
Temporary-accommodation ledger	What was approved, continued, and terminated, and on what documented basis?	Compare approvals, extensions, and the termination rationale with the delay attributions in the file.	Absent a repair-time, habitability, or occupancy analysis, the basis for termination may be undocumented.

In the reviewed materials, this reconciliation surfaced inconsistent coverage classifications between check advices and the ledger, a payment letter that misstated the estimate on which its calculation was based, and inconsistent amounts and descriptions for one mitigation-related transaction. Where the records conflicted, the analysis carried the conflict forward as a documented limitation rather than resolving it by assumption.

Representative Findings

The following representative findings are framed categorically. Each describes the analytical method applied and the limitation observed, without reproducing the sequence, amounts, or particular facts of the underlying matter. The working report states its findings with full record citations; those citations are omitted here.

Representative Finding 1, Estimate and scope documentation. A lump-sum estimate line adopting a contractor figure documents the amount adopted but not an independent, line-level scope determination. In the reviewed materials, internally raised scope questions, including a line item assigned to an apparently inconsistent room or scope category, were not documented as resolved, and overhead-and-profit treatment changed between estimate versions without documented explanation. The method tests whether each estimate version permits an auditable scope determination; where it does not, the documentation gap is itself the finding.

Representative Finding 2, Payment reconciliation and classification. Reconciling each transaction across ledger, letter, advice, and estimate records tests whether the file explains what was paid, for what scope, and under which coverage. In the reviewed materials, one payment letter misstated the estimate on which its calculation was based, the records contained inconsistent amounts and descriptions for one mitigation-related transaction, and coverage labels conflicted between record types. Conflicts of that kind leave classification subject to a coding limitation until transaction-level detail resolves them.

Representative Finding 3, Communication and claim-file continuity. Carrier statements are tested against the contemporaneous materials available to the carrier when the statements were made. In the reviewed materials, a carrier statement concerning the status of completed work conflicted with later contractor and inspection materials, and a post-closure account of an inspection conflicted with the carrier's own inspection narrative. The file also identified multiple handling adjusters, a carrier acknowledgment that reassignments caused delay and confusion, an extended activity-log gap, and a communication-continuity question involving a carrier-designated communication channel after handler reassignment. Continuity of a carrier-designated channel is a carrier-controlled function.

Representative Finding 4, Investigation documentation and limitations. The adequacy of an investigation is assessed from what the file documents, not from assumptions about what occurred. In the reviewed materials, the carrier's own inspection narrative recorded that the full extent of damage could not be determined without removing finish materials, and a reported property condition outside the visible repair area was not documented as inspected; the materials reviewed did not include the specialized assessment necessary to determine its nature or extent. I do not independently diagnose environmental or concealed conditions; the opinion is limited to the adequacy of the documented investigation.

Representative Finding 5, Temporary-accommodation documentation. Termination of temporary-accommodation benefits is tested against the documented basis for the termination. In the reviewed materials, the file contained conflicting delay attributions and lacked a repair-time, habitability, occupancy, or allocation analysis supporting complete termination. I do not decide whether additional benefits were legally payable; the opinion is that the basis for complete termination was not documented in the materials reviewed.

Information That Could Materially Affect the Opinions

The opinions are based on the claim file and other materials made available through the report date. I reserve the right to supplement or amend my opinions if additional claim-file materials, native estimate files, deposition testimony, expert reports, or other material information becomes available.

The professional limitations stated above are integral to the analysis: no legal opinion is offered on coverage, liability, or entitlement; no independent engineering or environmental diagnosis is offered; carrier system status does not independently prove receipt, negotiation, lender release, vendor payment, or practical access; and estimate differences must not be treated as additive without overlap controls.

Signature, Disclosures, and Attachments

The working report is accompanied by a signature page, curriculum vitae, disclosures, and an attachment set including analytical exhibits and source reproductions. Those materials, together with all record citations, are omitted from this public demonstration.