

Federal Court Further Limits "Allowable Expenses" Under Michigan No-Fault Scheme

By Brandy Kuretich

In a case pending in the Eastern District of Michigan, Judge Lawrence Zatkoff recently expanded the limitations of no-fault benefits insurance companies are required to pay. *Peabody v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co.*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 546 (2006). Based on the prior analysis of *Griffith v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co.*, the court found claims for room and board, utilities, phone service, cellular phone service, internet access, and cleaning to be non-allowable benefits.

In Griffith, a 2005 decision of the Michigan Supreme Court, the plaintiff claimed that defendant insurance company owed personal protection insurance benefits for the cost of food. However, the Michigan Supreme Court held that food was not an allowable expense under the Michigan No-Fault Act and, therefore, the insurance company did not have to reimburse plaintiff for the cost of food. The Michigan Supreme Court's holding was based on the language of MCL § 500.3107(1)(a) which defines an "allowable expense" as "all reasonable charges incurred for reasonably necessary products, services and accommodations for an injured person's care, recovery, or rehabilitation." Care, recovery, or rehabilitation expenses have to be necessary for the treatment of injuries sustained in the automobile accident. Since the plaintiff did not require a special diet different from that of an uninjured person, his food expenses did not qualify as an "allowable expense."

In *Peabody*, plaintiff's daughter, Jennifer Peabody, had suffered from a closed head injury resulting in mental incapacitation following a car accident in 1987. State Farm paid monthly rent of \$ 575 while Jennifer lived in a rehabilitation center. After six years, Jennifer was moved to a private home bought by her parents, with a monthly rent of \$ 1,500. When State Farm refused to raise their monthly payments, her parents brought suit under the no-fault act claiming that they owed uncompensated portions of room and board, plus monthly payments for utilities, phone service, cellular phone service, internet access, and cleaning.

SECREST WARDLE NOTES:

This case is a victory for insurance companies in that it continues to restrict the amount of benefits payable under Michigan's No-Fault Statute. It is important to note that as a federal case, it has no precedental value over how Michigan courts can and may rule. However, as is clearly stated by Judge Zatkoff, the Michigan Supreme Court envisioned this type of situation and, if the test they applied in *Griffith* is applied objectively, results similar to that obtained in this case should be forthcoming. *Secrest Wardle is proud to have defended State Farm in this victory*.

CONTINUED...

The court found that plaintiff could not show that the alleged room and board and other living expenses were related to Jennifer's care, recovery or rehabilitation. The claimed expenses were simply ordinary living expenses that Jennifer would incur regardless of her injury. Therefore, the expenses were not "allowable expenses" and were not compensable under *Griffith*. In fact, Judge Zatkoff's opinion states that this is exactly the type of situation envisioned by the Court in *Griffith*.

The analysis from *Griffith* was correctly applied by the court to include ordinary living expenses other than just food. According to Judge Lawrence Zatkoff, expenses for room and board, as well as other utilities, are not compensable under the No-Fault Act because they do not qualify as "allowable expenses." To qualify as an "allowable expense," the expense must be one that is necessary for the injured person's care, recovery, or rehabilitation from injuries related to the subject motor vehicle accident. Since Jennifer's parents could not show that these ordinary living expenses were related to her injuries arising out of the motor vehicle accident, summary judgment in favor of State Farm, the no-fault insurer, was appropriate.

CONTACT US

Farmington Hills

30903 Northwestern Highway, P.O. Box 3040 Farmington Hills, MI 48333-3040 Tel: 248-851-9500 Fax: 248-851-2158

Mt. Clemens

94 Macomb Place, Mt. Clemens, MI 48043-5651 Tel: 586-465-7180 Fax: 586-465-0673

Lansing

6639 Centurion Drive, Ste. 130, Lansing, MI 48917 Tel: 517-886-1224 Fax: 517-886-9284

Grand Rapids

2025 East Beltline, S.E., Ste. 209, Grand Rapids, MI 49546 Tel: 616-285-0143 Fax: 616-285-0145

Champaign, IL

2919 Crossing Court, Ste. 11, Champaign, IL 61822-6183 Tel: 217-378-8002 Fax: 217-378-8003

www.secrestwardle.com



Copyright 2006 Secrest, Wardle, Lynch, Hampton, Truex and Morley, P.C.

This newsletter is published for the purpose of providing information and does not constitute legal advice and should not be considered as such. This newsletter or any portion of this newsletter is not to be distributed or copied without the express written consent of Secrest Wardle.

CONTRIBUTORS

Insurance Coverage Practice Group Chair Jennifer N. Pahre

Editor

Carina Nelson We welcome your questions and comments.

OTHER MATERIALS

If you would like to be on the distribution list for Safeguards, or for newsletters pertaining to any of our other practice groups, please contact Secrest Wardle Marketing at **cnelson@secrestwardle.com**, or **248-539-2850**.

Other newsletters include:

Benchmarks – Navigating the hazards of legal malpractice
Blueprints – Mapping legal solutions for the construction industry
Boundaries – A guide for property owners and insurers in a litigious society
Community Watch – Breaking developments in governmental litigation
Contingencies – A guide for dealing with catastrophic property loss
Fair Use – Protecting ideas in a competitive world
In the Margin – Charting legal trends affecting businesses
Industry Line – Managing the hazards of environmental toxic tort litigation
Landowners' Alert – Defense strategies for property owners and managers
No-Fault Newsline – A road map for motor vehicle insurers and owners
On the Beat – Responding to litigation affecting law enforcement
On the Job – Tracking developments in employment law
State of the Art – Exploring the changing face of product liability
Structures – A framework for defending architects and engineers
Vital Signs – Diagnosing the changing state of medical malpractice and nursing home liability