

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Admiral Insurance Company v. Comly Road Holdings, LLC, et al.

No. No. 25-279-KSM, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (December 17, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania denied Defendants’ motion to dismiss Admiral Insurance Company’s interpleader action. The Court entered declaratory judgment that a \$100,000 AB Sublimit was the maximum coverage available under the identified policy for two underlying suits and enjoined Defendants from future claims that Admiral improperly paid the policy limits, subject to the interpleaded res.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karen Spencer Marston
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	December 17, 2025
DOCKET	No. 25-279-KSM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought an interpleader action under 28 U.S.C. § 1335. Defendants Comly Road Holdings, LLC, and Roman Jamera moved to dismiss, and the court denied the motion after oral argument. The court entered declaratory and injunctive relief concerning the interpleaded insurance proceeds.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- interpleader
- injunctions
- declaratory judgment
- insurance
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

- insurance
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Defendants' motion to dismiss Admiral's interpleader action should be granted.

2. Whether Admiral was entitled to a declaration that the \$100,000 AB Sublimit was the maximum coverage available under Policy CA000045657-01 for both the Corona and Pedraza-Zayas suits.
3. Whether the court could enjoin future claims affecting the interpleaded insurance proceeds under 28 U.S.C. § 2361.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion to dismiss was denied.
2. The \$100,000 AB Sublimit is the maximum coverage available under Admiral Policy CA000045657-01 for both the Corona and Pedraza-Zayas suits, limited to the interpleaded res for the June 12, 2022 through June 12, 2023 policy period.
3. All defendants were enjoined under 28 U.S.C. § 2361 from future claims that Admiral improperly paid the limits of Policy CA000045657-01, with the injunction limited to the interpleaded res.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Admiral is entitled to declaratory judgment that the \$100,000 AB Sublimit is the maximum coverage available under Admiral Policy CA000045657-01 for both the Corona and Pedraza-Zayas Suits.” (Order ¶ 2)

“All Defendants to this case are enjoined under 28 U.S.C. § 2361 from all future claims that Admiral improperly paid the limits of Admiral Policy CA000045657-01.” (Order ¶ 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Admiral issued Policy CA000045657-01 and sought interpleader relief concerning the available insurance coverage for the Corona and Pedraza-Zayas suits. The dispute concerned whether the policy's \$100,000 AB Sublimit constituted the maximum coverage available for both suits. The court limited its declaratory and injunctive relief to the interpleaded res associated with the June 12, 2022 through June 12, 2023 policy period.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Admiral Insurance Company filed an interpleader complaint concerning competing claims to insurance coverage under Admiral Policy CA000045657-01. Defendants Comly Road Holdings, LLC, and Roman Jamera moved to dismiss. Following oral argument on October 23, 2025, the court denied the motion, entered judgment for Admiral, declared that the \$100,000 AB Sublimit was the maximum coverage available for the specified suits, and enjoined future claims challenging Admiral's payment of the policy limits, subject to the limitation that the relief concerned only the interpleaded res for the June 12, 2022 through June 12, 2023 policy period.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- N.J. Sports Prods. v. Don King Prods., Inc., 15 F. Supp. 2d 534, 545 (D.N.J. 1998)
- Provident Mut. Life Ins. Co. of Phila. v. Ehrlich, 508 F.2d 129 (3d Cir. 1975)

OPINION

Admiral Insurance Company v. Comly Road Holdings, LLC, et al.

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
ADMIRAL INSURANCE COMPANY, CIVIL ACTION
Plaintiff,
NO. 25-279-KSM

v. COMLY ROAD HOLDINGS, LLC, et al., Defendants.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 17th day of December, 2025, upon consideration of Plaintiff Admiral Insurance Company's interpleader complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1335 (Doc. No. 1), Defendants Comly Road Holdings, LLC, and Roman Jamera's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 40), and Plaintiff's opposition brief (Doc. No. 44); following oral argument on October 23, 2025 (Doc. No. 57); and for the reasons explained in the accompanying Memorandum, it is ORDERED as follows:

1. The Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 40) is DENIED.
2. Judgment is ENTERED in favor of Plaintiff. Admiral is entitled to declaratory judgment that the \$100,000 AB Sublimit is the maximum coverage available under Admiral Policy CA000045657-01 for both the Corona and Pedraza-Zayas Suits.¹ 1 The Court limits the declaratory judgment to the interpleaded res covering policy period June 12, 2022, through June 12, 2023. See *N.J. Sports Prods. v. Don King Prods., Inc.*, 15 F. Supp. 2d 534, 545 (D.N.J. 1998) ("Section 2361 authorizes a district court to enter an order restraining all claimants from instituting a proceeding in any state or federal court affecting the interpleaded res.") (citing *Provident Mut. Life Ins. Co. of Phila. v. Ehrlich*, 508 F.2d 129 (3d Cir. 1975)) (emphasis added).
3. All Defendants to this case are enjoined under 28 U.S.C. § 2361 from all future claims that Admiral improperly paid the limits of Admiral Policy CA000045657-01.² IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Karen Spencer Marston KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, J. 2 This injunction, like the declaratory judgment, is limited to the interpleaded res.