STATE OF MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS

AR THERAPY SERVICES, INC.,	UNPUBLISHED June 14, 2016
Plaintiff,	Julie 14, 2010
and	
FARM BUREAU MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF MICHIGAN,	
Defendant/Third-Party Plaintiff-Appellee,	
v	No. 322339
PROGRESSIVE MARATHON INSURANCE COMPANY,	Oakland Circuit Court LC No. 2014-138769-AV
Third-Party Defendant-Appellant,	
and	
DOMINIQUE WILLIAMS	
Third-Party Defendant.	
Before: SAWYER, P.J., and BECKERING and BOONSTRA, JJ.	
BECKERING, J. (concurring).	
I concur in the majority opinion because I am bor Sentinel Ins Co, Mich App; NW2d (2016) however, I would conclude that our Supreme Court's decist 547; 817 NW2d 562 (2012), which dealt with contractually the easily ascertainable rule, does not adversely impact the). Were I not bound by that ruling, ion in <i>Titan Ins Co v Hyten</i> , 491 Mich y-based, excess liability coverage and

to statutorily mandated no-fault personal injury protection (PIP) benefits. As such, I would affirm the circuit court's ruling (which affirmed the district court's ruling) that Progressive Marathon Insurance Company may not rescind its insurance policy that was in place at the time

of the accident at issue and covered first-party PIP benefits for Christopher Carmichael, as he was injured while a passenger in an automobile insured by Progressive.

/s/ Jane M. Beckering