

1968

Judith H. Dienes and Dianne D. Mcmain v. Safeco  
Life Insurance Company, A Washington  
Corporation : Respondent's Petition For Rehearing  
and Supporting Brief

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu\\_sc2](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2)

Original Brief submitted to the Utah Supreme Court; funding for digitization provided by the Institute of Museum and Library Services through the Library Services and Technology Act, administered by the Utah State Library, and sponsored by the S.J. Quinney Law Library; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors.Hanson & Baldwin; Attorneys for Defendant and Respondent

---

**Recommended Citation**

Petition for Rehearing, *Dienes v. Safeco*, No. 11048 (1968).  
[https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu\\_sc2/3330](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2/3330)

This Petition for Rehearing is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Supreme Court Briefs (1965 –) by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu](mailto:hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu).

---

IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE  
STATE OF UTAH

---

JUDITH H. DIENES and  
DIANNE D. McMAIN,

*Plaintiffs and Appellants*

SAFECO LIFE INSURANCE  
COMPANY, a Washington  
corporation,

*Defendant and Appellee*

RESPONDENT'S PETITION  
AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT

---

MULLINER, PRINCE & MANGUM  
MAX K. MANGUM  
206 El Paso Natural Gas Building  
Salt Lake City, Utah

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Appellants*

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
RESPONDENT'S PETITION FOR REHEARING .....	1
ARGUMENT	
POINT I.	
THE PLAINTIFFS' THEORY OF THE CASE WAS PRESENTED TO THE JURY IN UNAMBIGUOUS LANGUAGE .....	3
POINT II.	
THE COURT IN RENDERING ITS OPINION FAILED TO SUSTAIN THE JURY'S VERDICT EVEN THOUGH THERE WAS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT IT .....	5
CONCLUSION .....	9

## CASES CITED

<i>Brereton vs. Dixon</i> , 443 P.2d 3, 20 Utah 2d 64 (1967) .....	6, 7
<i>Browning vs. Equitable Life Assurance Society</i> , 94 Utah 532, 72 P.2d 1060 .....	8
<i>Macshara vs. Garfield</i> , 20 Utah 2d 152, 434 P.2d 756 .....	4
<i>Ostertag vs. LaMont</i> , 9 Utah 2d 130, 339 P.2d 1022 .....	4
<i>Schweitzer vs. Stone</i> , 371 P.2d 201, 13 Utah 2d 199 .....	7
<i>Warner vs. United States Mutual Accident Association</i> , 32 P. 696, 8 Utah 431 .....	7
<i>Woodhouse vs. Johnson</i> , 436 P.2d 442, 20 Utah 2d 210 (1968) .....	6, 7

## STATUTE CITED

Rule 49 U.R.C.P. ....	7
-----------------------	---

IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE  
STATE OF UTAH

---

JUDITH H. DIENES and  
DIANNE D. McMAIN,

*Plaintiffs and Appellants,*

vs.

SAFECO LIFE INSURANCE  
COMPANY, a Washington  
corporation,

*Defendant and Respondent.*

Case No.  
11048

---

RESPONDENT'S PETITION FOR  
REHEARING AND SUPPORTING BRIEF

---

Defendant and Respondent, Safeco Life Insurance Company, a Washington corporation, by and through its counsel of record and pursuant to Rule 76(e), U.R.C.P., respectfully Petitions this Honorable Court for a rehearing in the above-entitled cause upon the ground that the decision rendered by the Court June 10, 1968 is in error in holding that the Plaintiffs' theory of the case was not presented to the jury and in failing to sustain the jury verdict when there is sufficient evidence to support it.

WHEREFORE, Respondent requests that a re-

hearing be granted and that the Court re-examine the law and evidence and affirm the trial court judgment entered on the jury verdict.

HANSON & BALDWIN

By\_\_\_\_\_

*Attorneys for  
Defendant and Respondent*

702 Kearns Building  
Salt Lake City, Utah