

ERRATA

In Volume 64, No. 2, *Maine Law Review* author David Sorensen reported that the Law Court in 2011 rejected Anthem's appeal of a rate review decision by Maine's Superintendent of Insurance as moot. In its appeal, Anthem argued that it was being forced to cross-subsidize its insurance products and that the 0% profit and risk margin allowed by the Superintendent was unconstitutionally confiscatory. More recently, the Law Court decided the merits of a similar rate review case, *Anthem v. Superintendent*, 2012 ME 21, in February 2012, rejecting Anthem's cross-subsidization argument and finding that a 1% profit and risk margin is not unconstitutionally confiscatory. The expedited review, however, did not present an opportunity for the court to reconsider its application of exceptions to the mootness doctrine.