To: To the Michigan Court of Appeals

From: Members of the Michigan Legislature

Date: May 27, 2021

**Re:** Ellen M. Andary, Philip Krueger, & Eisenhower Center, v. USAA Casualty Insurance Company and Citizens Insurance Company of America

We, the undersigned lawmakers, sign this memo to express our strongly held belief that the attendant care limitations and the 55% fee schedule provisions of the recently enacted auto no-fault insurance reforms (Public Act 21 of 2019: MCL 500.3157(7) and (10)) should not be retroactively applied to accident victims who purchased insurance policies and sustained bodily injury prior to the enactment of this legislation.

As you know, this retroactivity question is presently pending in the Michigan Court of Appeals in the above-referenced legal case (Andary litigation).

Our colleagues, State Representatives Julie Brixie and Andrea Schroeder, are in the process of filing an amici curiae brief asking the Michigan Court of Appeals to rule that these specific provisions of the new no-fault law should not be given retroactive application. We support our colleagues' efforts to seek amici curiae status in this important case and agree with their position regarding the retroactivity issue. We support their efforts for the following reasons:

- 1. We do not believe the Legislature intended for MCL 500.3157(7) and (10) to be applied retroactively. Many of us voted on this legislation understanding that MCL 500.3157(7) and (10) would only be applied prospectively. Moreover, because there does not appear to be any specific language in this legislation which clearly states a legislative intent to apply these provisions retroactively to previously injured victims, we believe these provisions are presumed to have only prospective application.
- 2. We believe retroactive application of these provisions would be a violation of plaintiffs' legal rights, including but not limited to, the Contracts Clause of the Michigan Constitution (e.g., Const 1963, art 1, § 10) and case law preserving the sanctity of private contracts.
- 3. We believe that retroactive application of these specific provisions of the new no-fault law would be fundamentally unfair to survivors of catastrophic auto accidents, such as Ms. Andary and Mr. Krueger (i.e., the plaintiffs in this case). That is true for the thousands of other residents across our state who will lose valuable insurance benefits they have under automobile insurance policies they purchased and entered into many years ago, thereby materially altering their contracts of insurance.

Information that appears on the website of the Michigan Catastrophic Claims Association (MCCA), <u>which can be accessed by clicking here</u>, reflects that there are over 18,000 patients who were injured years ago whose care is funded by the MCCA. Nearly every one of these residents and their families would be severely impacted by retroactive application of these reforms.

Many of those catastrophically injured patients have, for years, been receiving attendant care rendered by family members and friends for many hours every day. If the 56 hour weekly attendant care limitations set forth in MCL 500.3157(10) are retroactively applied to those patients, their critically important daily care will be significantly disrupted.

Moreover, the retroactive application of the fee schedule provisions set forth in MCL 500.3157(7) will cause a number of medical provider businesses to either close their doors or otherwise discontinue services to those patients who sustained severe injuries many years ago. Therefore, such application will likely have a significant impact on an important part of Michigan's healthcare economy and seriously impact access to necessary care.

A number of those medical businesses render commercially provided in-home attendant care to auto accident victims who do not have family members who can render such care. Therefore, the closure of such businesses, coupled with the limitations on family provided attendant care, could create a dangerous shortage of critical in-home attendant care services for the patients who are most in need.

*In writing this memo we wish to emphasize the urgency of the current situation.* The provisions dealing with attendant care and the 55% fee schedule will be put into effect by insurance companies on July 1, 2021. If those provisions are retroactively applied to victims injured before enactment of these provisions, a chaotic situation could rapidly develop. Many medical provider businesses are likely to close, catastrophically injured persons will suffer a significant disruption in their daily care, hundreds of jobs (or more) are likely to be lost, and our courts could be flooded with lawsuits seeking relief from the harsh consequences of retroactively applying these benefit reductions to Michigan citizens.

Therefore, we strongly urge the Michigan Appellate Courts to review these issues, pursuant to the amicus brief filed on behalf of the plaintiffs in the Andary litigation, as they are of great importance to the citizens of the State of Michigan.

Sincerely,

Julie Brixie State Representative 69<sup>th</sup> District

Winnie Brinks State Senator 29<sup>th</sup> District

Phil Green <sup>1</sup> State Representative 84<sup>th</sup> District

WARDI

Andrea Schroeder State Representative 43<sup>rd</sup> District

27<sup>th</sup> District

Jim Ananich Senate Democratic Leader

Julie Rogers

Julie Rogers State Representative 60<sup>th</sup> District

Jim Runestad State Senator 15<sup>th</sup> District

Donna Lasinski House Democratic Leader 52<sup>nd</sup> District

Cynthia A. Johnson State Representative 5<sup>th</sup> District

Steph a. Young

Stephanie A. Young State Representative 8<sup>th</sup> District

alah anthony

Sarah Anthony State Representative 68<sup>th</sup> District

Jenisha Gance

Tenisha Yancey State Representative 1<sup>st</sup> District

uchel

Rachel Hood State Representative 76<sup>th</sup> District



Mary Cavanagh State Representative 10<sup>th</sup> District

Lez ble

Regina Weiss State Representative 27<sup>th</sup> District

TMAS Amos O'Neal

State Representative 95<sup>th</sup> District

on

Lori Stone State Representative 28<sup>th</sup> District

Jim Ellison State Representative 26<sup>th</sup> District

Sherry Gay-Dagnogo Fmr. State Representative 8<sup>th</sup> District

Bill Sowerb

Bill Sowerby State Representative 31<sup>st</sup> District

Mm Bert

Wendell Byrd Fmr. State Representative 3<sup>rd</sup> District

unett Vanija /

LaTanya Garrett Fmr. State Representative 5<sup>th</sup> District

Curtis Hertel, Jr. State Senator 23<sup>rd</sup> District

Paul Wojno State Senator 9<sup>th</sup> District

Alma

Padma Kuppa <sup>*V*</sup> State Representative 41<sup>st</sup> District

Che & Hope

Kara Hope State Representative 67<sup>th</sup> District

ara a. Clemente

Cara Clemente State Representative 14<sup>th</sup> District

ousi

Yousef Rabhi State Representative 53<sup>rd</sup> District

Robert Wittenberg Fmr. State Representative 27<sup>th</sup> District

Nate Shannon State Representative 25<sup>th</sup> District

onnie D. Peterson

Ronnie Peterson State Representative 54<sup>th</sup> District

m

Tim Sneller State Representative 50<sup>th</sup> District

David LaGrand State Representative 75<sup>th</sup> District

In Chicken

John Chirkun Fmr. State Representative 22<sup>nd</sup> District

Tullio Liberati State Representative 13<sup>th</sup> District

Frank Liberati Fmr. State Representative 13<sup>th</sup> District

evel

Jewell Jones State Representative 11<sup>th</sup> District

months

Samantha Steckloff State Representative 37<sup>th</sup> District

Abe Aiyash State Representative 4<sup>th</sup> District

Rånjeev Puri State Representative 21<sup>st</sup> District

Thi

Darrin Camilleri State Representative 23<sup>rd</sup> District

J im a. d. ima

Jim Haadsma State Representative 62<sup>nd</sup> District

1

Kevin Coleman State Representative 16<sup>th</sup> District

Shri Thanedar<sup>1</sup> State Representative 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Erika Geiss State Senator 6<sup>th</sup> District

Helena Scott State Representative 7<sup>th</sup> District

Abdullah Hammoud State Representative 15<sup>th</sup> District

Unul M

Mallory McMorrow State Senator 13<sup>th</sup> District

agan MALK

Kristy Pagan Fmr. State Representative 21<sup>st</sup> District

nen Mos

Jeremy Moss State Senator 11<sup>th</sup> District

Bullook TI

Marshall Bullock, II State Senator 4<sup>th</sup> District

Doug Wozniak State Representative 36<sup>th</sup> District

Chris Greig Fmr. House Democratic Leader 37<sup>th</sup> District

Vanessa Guerra Fmr. State Representative 95<sup>th</sup> District

1081

Rosemary Bayer State Senator 12<sup>th</sup> District

Christine Morse State Representative 61<sup>st</sup> District

Jeff Irwin State Senator 18<sup>th</sup> District

Sean McCann State Senator 20<sup>th</sup> District

Sylvia A. Santana State Senator 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Betty you Alwarder

Betty Jean Alexander State Senator 5<sup>th</sup> District

Cynthia RY

Cynthia Neeley State Representative 34<sup>th</sup> District

Dayna Polehanki State Senator 7<sup>th</sup> District

Stéve Marino <sup>(</sup> State Representative 24<sup>th</sup> District

lley

Jon Hoadley Fmr. State Representative 60<sup>th</sup> District

Stephanie Chang State Senator 1<sup>st</sup> District

sotte Neil

Robert Bezotte () State Representative 47<sup>th</sup> District

Lui

Alex Garza State Representative 37<sup>th</sup> District

Men

Rebekah Warren Fmr. State Representative 55<sup>th</sup> District

/Felicia Brabec State Representative 55<sup>th</sup> District

Sheldon Neeley Fmr. State Representative 34<sup>th</sup> District

Brian K. Clde

Brian K. Elder Fmr. State Representative 96<sup>th</sup> District

Howe

Gary Howell State Representative 82<sup>nd</sup> District

Kelly Breen State Representative 38<sup>th</sup> District