

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Alexandria Division**

PROTECTION STRATEGIES, INC.,  Plaintiff,  -v-  STARR INDEMNITY & LIABILITY CO.,  Defendant.	Civil Action No. 1:13-CV-00763
---	--------------------------------

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff Starr Indemnity's Motion to Amend or Alter Judgment (Dkt. No. 115). Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant Protection Strategies has opposed Starr's Motion (Dkt. No. 118), and Starr has replied in support of its motion (Dkt. No. 119). The Court has reviewed the pleadings in this case and received Starr's waiver of oral argument (Dkt. No. 117), and now grants Starr's motion.

The parties agree that the principal owed to Starr is \$846,483.34, representing the total amount Starr has paid to Protection Strategies. The parties also agree that Starr is owed post-judgment interest at the federal statutory rate, calculated under 28 U.S.C. § 1961 and accruing from the date of this Order. However, the parties disagree over whether prejudgment interest is due in this case, and if it is due, the date on which it began accruing.

The Court finds that although Protection Strategies correctly notes in its Brief that a *bona fide* legal dispute existed in this case, such a dispute does not preclude the award of prejudgment interest under Virginia law. *See, e.g., Gill v. Rollins Protective Servs. Co.*, 836 F.2d 194, 199 (4th Cir. 1987) (holding that there is no "bona fide legal dispute" exception to Virginia's prejudgment interest statute); *Cont'l Ins. Co. v. City of Va. Beach*, 908 F. Supp. 341, 349 (E.D. Va. 1995) ("[D]enial of prejudgment interest [in cases in which there is a *bona fide* legal dispute] is not

