gone further and found that the remaining UM coverage of $300,000 stacked under the Virginia Farm Bureau policy to afford plaintiffs a total of $850,000 of UM coverage.

ASSIGNMENT OF CROSS-ERROR

The trial court erred in failing to find plaintiffs entitled to the stacking of UM coverage as to all three vehicles insured under the Virginia Farm Bureau policy, thereby denying plaintiffs $300,000 of UM coverage under the Virginia Farm Bureau policy.

QUESTION PRESENTED ON CROSS-ERROR

Whether in the case of an ambiguity in the limit of liability provisions as to UM coverage in a multi-vehicle policy, a court may correctly conclude that partial stacking of UM coverages occurs?

ARGUMENT ON CROSS-ERROR

Neither Goodville nor its significant predecessors, Cunningham, supra, and Lipscombe, supra, allow for the partial remedy fashioned by the trial court in this case. As plaintiffs' preceding argument in this brief demonstrates, the remedy for an ambiguity in the limit of liability provisions as to UM coverage in a multi-vehicle automobile insurance policy is the stacking of the UM coverages applicable to all vehicles under the policy. Both Virginia Farm Bureau and the trial court acknowledged the ambiguity