

**STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Before the Director of the Department of Insurance and Financial Services

In the matter of:

Megan Gray
System ID No. 0805346

Enforcement Case No. 18-15274

Respondent.

Issued and entered
on June 10, 2019
by Teri L. Morante
Chief Deputy Director

INTERIM ORDER FOLLOWING FAILURE TO RESPOND

Based upon the files and records of the Department of Insurance and Financial Services (DIFS) in this matter, the Chief Deputy Director finds and concludes that:

1. The Chief Deputy Director has jurisdiction and authority to issue this Order during this proceeding to examine the accounts, records, documents, and transactions pertaining to an insurance agent, surplus lines agent, general agent, adjuster, public adjuster, or counselor pursuant to Section 249(a) of the Michigan Insurance Code of 1956 (Code), MCL 500.249(a).
2. All required notices have been issued in this case, and the notices and service thereof were appropriate and lawful in all respects.
3. All applicable provisions of the APA have been met.
4. At all relevant times, Respondent Megan Gray (System ID No. 0805346) (Respondent) was a licensed resident insurance producer, with qualifications in life and accident and health. Respondent has been licensed since April 3, 2017.
5. On or about August 24, 2017, DIFS Analyst mailed a copy of a consumer complaint to Respondent, at the business address on file, along with a request for a response to the complaint. Respondent was requested to respond within 21 days, which was on September 14, 2017. Respondent did not respond.
6. On or about October 18, 2017, DIFS Analyst mailed a Notice of Opportunity to Show Compliance (NOSC) to Respondent, at the business address on file. Respondent was directed to respond to the complaint and explain why she did not previously respond. Respondent was directed to respond by October 25, 2017.
7. Respondent did not respond to the October 18, 2017, NOSC.

8. On or about November 3, 2017, DIFS Analyst mailed a second NOSC to Respondent, in which Respondent was directed to respond to the complaint and explain why she did not previously respond. Respondent was directed to respond by November 10, 2017. The second NOSC was mailed to Respondent's residential address on file.
9. Respondent did not respond to the November 3, 2017, NOSC.
10. None of the mail sent to Respondent's addresses has been returned by the postal service as undeliverable.
11. On December 8, 2017, DIFS Analyst sent an e-mail to Respondent's e-mail address on file with DIFS. The e-mail included a third NOSC, in which Respondent was directed to respond to the complaint and explain why she did not previously respond. Respondent was directed to respond by December 15, 2017.
12. Respondent did not respond to the December 8, 2017, e-mail.
13. On January 7, 2018, DIFS Analyst received a notification that the December 8, 2017, e-mail to Respondent had expired.
14. On May 8, 2018, DIFS Analyst attempted to reach Respondent by telephone, using the telephone number on file for Respondent. There was no answer, and DIFS Analyst left a voicemail.
15. On May 15, 2018, DIFS Analyst again attempted to reach Respondent by telephone at the same number. There was no answer, and DIFS Analyst left another voicemail.
16. DIFS Analyst never received any response to the voicemails left at the telephone number on file for Respondent.
17. On June 15, 2018, DIFS Analyst attempted to reach Respondent at an alternate telephone number in Respondent's file. A woman answered, but stated that her name was not Megan Gray and there was no one by that name at that telephone number.
18. Despite repeated attempts by DIFS staff through all available means to contact Respondent through the addresses, e-mail, and telephone numbers provided to DIFS, Respondent has failed to respond.
19. On August 22, 2018, a NOSC was sent to Respondent at the business and residential addresses on file for the Respondent. This NOSC asserted that Respondent had violated the Insurance Code through her failure to produce requested documents or respond to questions by DIFS investigators.
20. Respondent did not respond in any way to the August 22, 2018, NOSC.

21. On March 22, 2019, an Administrative Complaint was filed by DIFS against Respondent seeking to assess license sanctions for failing to provide documents to DIFS, and for failing to respond to DIFS investigators. Respondent was given until April 15, 2019, to respond to the complaint and a hearing was scheduled for June 20, 2019.
22. A copy of the Administrative Complaint was mailed by first class mail to Respondent at the addresses on file on March 25, 2019.
23. Respondent did not respond to the complaint by the April 15, 2019, deadline, and the mail was not returned as undeliverable. The June 20, 2019, hearing was cancelled after Respondent failed to respond.
24. Despite repeated requests, Respondent has failed to provide any documents to DIFS, and thereby has obstructed, interfered with, and/or otherwise prevented DIFS from examining records relating to their insurance business, as it is authorized to do in Section 249 of the Insurance Code, MCL 500.249.
25. By violating Section 249, Respondent has provided justification for sanctions, pursuant to Section 1239(b) of the Code, MCL 500.1239(b).
26. Based upon the actions listed above, Respondent has committed acts that provide justification for the Director to order the payment of a civil fine, to cease and desist from further violations of the Code, the refund of any overcharges, that restitution be made to cover losses, damages or other harm attributed to Respondent's violation or violations of the Code, and/or other licensing sanctions up to and including revocation of licensure.

Now therefore, based upon the findings stated above and the facts surrounding this case, **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

27. Respondent shall immediately **cease and desist** from further violations of the Code, including but not limited to Section 249, and to produce the requested documents and respond to DIFS inquiries within 30 days of the date of this Order.
28. Failure to provide requested documents and respond to DIFS inquiries within 30 days shall result in the **revocation** of all licenses or registrations held by Respondent.
29. Respondent shall pay a civil fine of **\$250**.
30. Failure to pay the civil fine as set forth above within 30 days of the invoice date shall result in the fee increasing to **\$500.00** and a **revocation** of all licenses or registrations held by Respondent.

31. The Chief Deputy Director retains jurisdiction over the matters contained herein and has the authority to issue such further order(s) as shall be deemed just, necessary, and appropriate in accordance with the Code. Failure to abide by the terms and provisions of the Stipulation to Entry of Order and this Order may result in the commencement of additional proceedings.



Teri L. Morante
Chief Deputy Director