STATE OF MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

Before the Director of Insurance and Financial Services

Department of Insurance and Financial Services,

Petitioner

٧

Case No.: 15-963-L Docket No.: 15-040103-B

Andrew L. Briggs Retirement Strategies, Inc.,

Respondent

For the Petitioner:

Christopher L. Kerr (P57131)
Michigan Department of Attorney General
Corporate Oversight Division
P.O. Box 30736
Lansing, MI 48909

Email: <u>KerrC2@michigan.gov</u> Phone: (517) 335-7632 Eav: (517) 335-6755

Fax: (517) 335-6755

For the Respondent:

David B. Timmis (P40539)
David Q. Houbeck (P77002)
Vandeveer Garzia, PC
840 W. Long Lake Road, Ste. 600
Troy, MI 48098
Email: dtimmis@vgpclaw.com

dhoubeck@vgpclaw.com

Phone: (248) 312-2800 Fax: (248-879-0042

Issued and entered
this 121 day of November 2019
by Randall S. Gregg
Senior Deputy Director

FINAL DECISION

On March 5, 2019, Administrative Law Judge Thomas A. Halick (Judge Halick) issued an Amended Order Granting Petitioner's Motion to Dismiss. On September 17, 2019, Judge Halick issued an Order Denying Respondent's Request for Entry of Second Amended Orders.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ORDERED that this case is dismissed with prejudice.

Randall S. Gregg Senior Deputy Director

STATE OF MICHIGAN MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM

IN THE MATTER OF:

Docket No.: 15-040103

Department of Insurance and Financial

Case No.:

15-963-L

Services.

Department of

Agency: Insurance and Financial

Services

Petitioner

Andrew L. Briggs Retirement Strategies, Inc.,

Respondent

Case Type: DIFS-Insurance

Filing Type: Sanction

Issued and entered this 5th day of March 2019 by: Thomas A. Halick Administrative Law Judge

AMENDED ORDER GRANTING PETITIONER'S MOTION TO DISMISS

On January 11, 2019, an order was entered Granting Petitioners' Motion to Dismiss.

On February 7, 2019, Respondent filed a Motion to Amend Order Granting Petitioner's Motion to Dismiss in DIFS CASE NUMBER 15-963-1 (MAHS DOCKET No. 15-040103) AND CASE NUMBER 16-9771-1 (MAHS DOCKET NO. 16-013298), which dismissed the matter without prejudice. Respondent asserts that the by stipulation of the parties the January 11, 2019 Order of dismissal should state that the matter is dismissed with prejudice.

As of March 1, 2019, Petitioners have not filed a response or otherwise opposed the Motion.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, that the hearing in the above-captioned matter is dismissed with prejudice. Accordingly, we have removed this case from our formal hearing docket and are closing the file.

Thomas A. Halick

Administrative Law Judge