IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM	*	BEFORE EMILY DANEKER,			
OF JOY HART,	*	AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE			
CLAIMANT	*	OF THE MARYLAND OFFICE			
AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME	*	OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS			
IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND	*	OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-20-03265			
FOR THE ALLEGED ACTS OR	*	MHIC No.: 19 (90) 1270			
OMISSIONS OF MONICA STANLEY,	*				
T/A TRIPLE A PAVING &	*				
SEALCOATING,	*				
RESPONDENT	*				

PROPOSED DECISION

STATEMENT OF THE CASE
ISSUES
SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT
DISCUSSION
PROPOSED CONCLUSION OF LAW
RECOMMENDED ORDER

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On August 23, 2019, the Maryland Home Improvement Commission (MHIC) received a claim filed by Joy Hart (Claimant) seeking reimbursement from the Maryland Home Improvement Guaranty Fund (Fund) for \$6,000.00 in actual losses allegedly sustained as a result of the acts or omissions of contractor Monica Stanley, trading as Triple A Paving & Sealcoating (Respondent). Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 through 8-411 (2015). On January 21,

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Business Regulation article of the Annotated Code of Maryland are to the 2015 Replacement Volume.

an eral geyrel area i State the traces of the party of the contract mosandaku obomilika bila THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY. · (1) "是有效的"的 (1) 1000 Tinggar to Singar Car · Daniel Service Control 的复数医生物 医水杨二氏病

共享 医角膜结膜病 计二十字 589.0 | 039.7781.035

a berirona (2016), e devid un Macamório, pré de estables per la régió (100,00 majores de constit Spot govern with made of connection in the first constitution of contract) and he will be only riskess and Vincentia attitistical kensati ikensa di kensa di apita yedik mili (ili 1871). Ang ar autoni ana giberit griffen in in it dit gelike it die engre der spelbere der der in die eine engliede in der in die engliede in de

of Expansion of Experiences to be bed the comment of the first of the comment of

and the state of t

o an de Angle (New Yorking Sept. 19

[&]quot;被数据的。"他说:"我走。"

2020, the MHIC forwarded the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing.

On June 10, 2020, I held the requested hearing by telephone.² Bus. Reg. § 8-407(e); see also Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 28.02.01.20B(1)(a). Nicholas Sokolow, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Labor (Department), represented the Fund. The Claimant represented herself.

The contested case provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Department's hearing regulations, and the Rules of Procedure of the OAH govern procedure in this case. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 through 10-226 (2014 & Supp. 2019); COMAR 09.01.03; COMAR 28.02.01.

ISSUES

- 1. Did the Claimant sustain an actual loss compensable by the Fund as a result of the Respondent's acts or omissions?
 - 2. If so, what is the amount of the compensable loss?

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

Exhibits

I admitted the following exhibits on the Claimant's behalf:

Clmt. Ex. 1 - Photograph of driveway, undated

Clmt. Ex. 2 - Photograph of driveway and District Concrete truck, undated

Clmt. Ex. 3 - Photograph of driveway, with men and dogs, undated

Clmt. Ex. 5 - Photograph of driveway apron, undated

Clmt. Ex. 6

A-C - Photographs of closeup areas of concrete driveway, undated

² Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, in-person hearings were not then being held at the OAH.

Clmt. Ex. 7 - Letter from the MHIC to Claimant, May 9, 2019

Clmt. Ex. 8 - MHIC Complaint Form, April 3, 2019

Clmt. Ex. 9 - Claimant's canceled checks, numbers 1240 (May 30, 2017), 1574 (May 30, 2017), and 1578 (June 24, 2017)

Additionally, the Claimant submitted a photograph of her driveway, with a pickup truck, showing its structure prior to the work at issue. The photograph, which was marked for identification as Claimant Exhibit 4, was not accepted into the evidentiary record, but a copy is retained with the file for purposes of any judicial review. COMAR 28.02.01.22C.

I admitted the following exhibit on the Respondent's behalf:

Resp. Ex. 1 - Letter from Respondent to Whom it May Concern, June 5, 2020

I admitted the following exhibits on behalf of the Fund:

Fund Ex. 1 - Notice of Hearing, February 10, 2020

Fund Ex. 2 - Email from the OAH to Claimant, Respondent, and Mr. Sokolow, June 8, 2020

Fund Ex. 3 - MHIC Hearing Order, January 15, 2020

Fund Ex. 4 - Home Improvement Claim Form, August 23, 2019

Fund Ex. 5 - Department ID Registration and License History, June 8, 2020

Fund Ex. 6 - Letter from the OAH to the Parties, June 3, 2020

Testimony

The Claimant testified in her own behalf.

Ms. Stanley testified on behalf of the Respondent.

No other witnesses testified at the hearing.

						•
				1 to 1		
			-			
		i i nyani Qi	i Spilles.	and arrest in		
		e with the days.	erre erre	以自動鐵矿。	着"大人"的"快车"。	
		() - Alfger (18 3 0) () () () () ()	eli (n. 1900 m.) Porosi (n. 190		Cloke and B	
And German Called	પ્ રાજ્ યનાં પૈતાના કેટ હતુ	po jeski kom česti mesi.	ज्हां है है जिल्हा		E Transfer	
्राची हेक्षा सम्बद्धाः	in the legal (Argen) gov	etypet poet		to set perpetui.	वर्षे अवस्थित्य ह	
और दूर्वकृत कर्म होतुष्टिक						
	erank kalegori.	s indulate si	y a . Sept.	e de la companya de La companya de la companya de l	Artico est	
		स्तु को ४० स अर्थे का				
	าน ผู้รับประวัติ	. '		•		
	Series Series	udio ordinario un orogani	·		•	•
•						
TETTE A PERMIT	•	÷				
		GAN TO WHEELE		´ :		en e
		lights a sport par				
	. Despetient on de la c					
		ia roitat, oit		\$49.43 3 6000 ; + 1		
			· s · o os s s o gerio de e	Pirromagraj <mark>i</mark> nili	ozere elikali. Ali	
				in de mantella. Se fint e fintation	•	
•				ing and a single section of the sect	•	
		. "			· ·	

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT

I find the following facts by a preponderance of the evidence:

- 1. At all relevant times, the Respondent was a licensed home improvement contractor under MHIC license number 01-67243.
- 2. At all relevant times, the Claimant has owned and resided at a home on Frenchton Place (Residence) in Gaithersburg, Maryland; she does not own any other property.
- 3. The Claimant desired to replace the driveway at the Residence, as the driveway was designed with a hump at the bottom, just prior to the street, and her car often bottomed out when going over the hump.
- 4. On or about May 30, 2017, the Claimant entered into an oral contract with the Respondent to entirely remove and replace her driveway with a new concrete driveway.
 - 5. The Claimant paid the Respondent at total of \$6,000.00, as follows:

Check no. 1240 (May 30, 2017) \$2,000.00

Check no. 1574 (May 30, 2017) \$1,250.00

Check no. 1578 (June 24, 2017) \$2,750.00

- 6. In June 2017, the Respondent removed the Claimant's entire driveway. They removed the old driveway, replaced the foundation, and installed a new concrete driveway and apron (that portion that bridges the street and the drive, along the sidewalk).
 - 7. The Claimant waited ten to twelve days before driving on the driveway.
- 8. In October 2017, the Claimant noticed the cement was crumbling in the area where she parks her car. A few days later she noticed more extensive crumbling. The Claimant contacted the Respondent.

是1.5%的自身是有效。1.5%的是1.6%的

The state of the state of the particular of the state of	work i	1
्या । विकास स्थापना कार्यक्षित के प्राप्तिक विकास के किस्ता के लिए हैं कि किस सम्बाधक स्थापन के स्थापन के स्था स्थापन स्थापन के स्थापना के स्थापन के स	da bir A.	
The state of the s	Dittis el	Mile of Miles of the
rollimoni er saani ale Estimologiaan keesterii 200 is, si mees	Projection (.E.
ATT TO THE PERSON WATER OF TO THE MESS (Section 2013) I Section 1	sipeth(son	Like in Millionia II
्रिक्त भरोत् व्यवस्था दे <mark>ण अ</mark> भिन्न वर्षी स्त्री हाणण नेस्व राष्ट्रस्य संस्था करा विस्तान स्त्रीतात्रा	in Defi	, ø .
The minimum of the contract of		sum bunker
	Description	o programa
कर्ण में वाम किन्द्र देशक के र िवाक करने के कार्य कर देशकी है। जिस्से देश के कार्य के किस्से	dere . O.	; i
The second of the comparison was a subject to the second of the second o		- वर्षाः स्टब्स् - वर्षाः स्टब्स्
्राच्या । विकास क्षेत्र का विकास क्षेत्र	NO AT	<u>.</u>
	m diano	
1990 The translation of the first section of the fi	्रक्षपुरुष्याः -	en ge
Description of the second second second is a finished by a particle of the second seco	ese itáit la	(unit i nyeg jer
the state of the s		podędo) na sąc
. १५६४७ - १० अमे पूर्व असे, इसे १०१५७६ । १८५ - १९ ७५२ । १९ ४४५ । १८ ४५५	13:30	
्रिक्षक अर्थे को मुख्यों के अने के इक्षण संभ्यत अर्थ है है कि भी के समय से के लिए है कि 		:: : ::: : :::::::::::::::::::::::::::

and distributed to graditionary graved that occurs to size using a fine a part of the property effects and a con-

- 9. The Respondent inspected the driveway but advised the Claimant to wait to repair it until after winter.
- 10. Sometime between May and July 2018, the Respondent returned to the Residence and replaced the lower half of the driveway, including the apron.
- 11. In September 2018, the Claimant noticed the cement on the driveway, on and in the vicinity of the apron, was crumbling and rocks and pebbles were coming up from the foundation under the cement. She contacted the Respondent about the problem.
- 12. In the spring of 2019, the Respondent returned and replaced the apron and the area immediately above it.
- 13. In October 2019, the Claimant again noticed that the cement in the apron area was crumbling and telephoned the Respondent.
- 14. The Respondent did not return the Claimant's call and did not return to look at her driveway.
 - 15. Replacing the apron area would cost approximately \$1,000.00.
- 16. The Claimant is not related to the Respondent, is not an officer or employee of the Respondent, and is not related to an officer or employee of the Respondent.
 - 17. The Claimant has not filed any other claims related to the Respondent's work.

DISCUSSION

Applicable Law

The Maryland General Assembly created the Fund to provide an available pool of money from which homeowners could seek relief for losses sustained at the hands of incompetent or unscrupulous home improvement contractors. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 to 8-411. A homeowner is authorized to "recover compensation from the Fund for an actual loss that results

u militares, la migraturi la propertira de la compositione de la composition del composition de la com

The object of the second of th

AND CONTRACT TO MAIN MAIN COMPANY OF THE CONTRACT OF THE CONTR

province to the company of the compa

(1) In the second of the contract of the co

to protection and the contract of the contract

and the control of the control of

from an act or omission by a licensed contractor " *Id.* § 8-405(a); *see also* COMAR 09.08.03.03B(2). The governing statute defines "actual loss" as "the costs of restoration, repair, replacement, or completion that arise from an unworkmanlike, inadequate, or incomplete home improvement." Bus. Reg. § 8-401.

At a hearing on a claim, the claimant has the burden of proof. Bus. Reg. § 8–407(e)(1); COMAR 09.08.03.03A(3). The claimant's burden is by a preponderance of the evidence. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 10-217 (2014). To prove something by a "preponderance of the evidence" means "to prove that something is more likely so than not so[,]" when all of the evidence is considered. Coleman v. Anne Arundel Cty. Police Dep't, 369 Md. 108, 125 n.16 (2002). For the reasons explained below, I find that the Claimant has proven eligibility for compensation from the Fund.

The Evidence

There was no dispute that the Respondent is a licensed home improvement contractor and the Claimant paid the Respondent \$6,000.00 for replacement of the concrete driveway at the Residence with a new concrete driveway. The Respondent agreed that after its initial work, it replaced the portions of the driveway on two different occasions in order to remedy crumbling concrete in the driveway.

The Claimant noted that she was initially pleased with the Respondent's work, but testified that each time, after a few months, the concrete in the driveway began to crumble and flake. She supported her testimony with photographs depicting the problem. The Claimant photographs show that, even after two attempted repairs, the concrete continued to crumble in the apron area of the driveway. In terms of the cause of the crumbling, the Claimant testified that, in connection with the most recent incident of crumbling, the winter in her area was mild

isomer, and colomics and by the force appreciated to the color of the color of traders into traders and the color of traders into traders and the color of traders and the color of the col

en andernament entire entire en elajarantes ara principal en entre proprincipal en el sine e sidence. No contage ou en esta en esta en el se el se en el se el

Four block out

The Clarman politicists and proposed to the proposed and a proposed and a first the control of the proposed and the control of the proposed and a first the control of the proposed and the control of the proposed and the control of the proposed and the control of the control o

the fragment name after a comminative number of the distributed as a majoral distributed that the distributed of the fragment of the distributed o

and no road chemicals or salt had been applied. She also noted that none of her neighbors were experiencing a similar problem with their concrete driveways. The Claimant noted that she spoke to a work associate, who she explained is a contractor, and he suggested that the concrete may not have been the correct consistency, 35-40 psi. He did not see the driveway in person and his suggestion was based on the Claimant's description.

The Claimant explained that she would like to have the apron corrected and clarified in her closing argument that her claim, though originally for \$6,000.00, was limited to the cost to replace the apron, which she contended was \$1,100.00.3 The Claimant has not repaired or replaced the apron since the concrete began to crumble for a third time, and she did not submit any estimate for the cost of that work. She testified, however, that her work associate had opined that it would cost about \$1,100.00 to replace the driveway apron. The Claimant did not have a written estimate from that contractor, she did not identify him, she did not testify as to his experience (if any) working with concrete, and she did not indicate if he was licensed by the MHIC.

Ms. Stanley, the MHIC licensee, testified for the Respondent. Ms. Stanley explained that the Respondent had never before had a problem like this, and it had already replaced portions of the Claimant's driveway twice following its initial work; she noted that the company ultimately lost money on the job. Ms. Stanley explained that she had not heard of any other problems with the consistency of the concrete. She agreed, however, on cross-examination by the Fund, that a driveway would be reasonably expected to be free from cracking or crumbling. The Respondent did not refute the Claimant's testimony that she contacted the company a third time about crumbling concrete in the driveway. Ms. Stanley denied that the Respondent was at fault and

³ COMAR 09.08.03.02C(2) (allowing amendment of claim where it will not prejudice the contractor).

entre de la companya de la companya

The control of the co

religion listera, qui mai appenda l'escribita a l'adament del como como religionare en predomentario di como del como de

⁻ Alwa Harris, the File out Mye take.

o o diligia colo ordini ingilandi kilo <mark>nag</mark>ira o partiko angulisara

posited that snowplows or road salt may be to blame. On cross-examination, Ms. Stanley first testified that repairing the apron area of the driveway would cost about \$2,000, she then hedged her testimony and stated it might be as little as \$1,000, and she then back tracked and asserted that she was not sure what the cost would be.

<u>Analysis</u>

The testimony of record establishes, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the Respondent performed an unworkmanlike home improvement. The Claimant's testimony and pictures established the concrete in the driveway was crumbling, and that the crumbling began within a few months of the Respondent's work. The Respondent acknowledged that this should not ordinarily occur. Although the Respondent suggested that the crumbling could have been caused by a snowplow or road salt, the Claimant was clear that the weather was mild and there was not a snow that required a plow or road salt in her area. Moreover, the Claimant testified that she observed the most recent incident of crumbling in September 2019—which would have been well in advance of when winter weather is typically experienced in Maryland.⁴ The Respondent, an MHIC licensee engaged in paving and contracting, did not offer any other viable explanation for the crumbling concrete. In light of the timing of the defect, the lack of a plausible alternative cause, and the admission that the crumbling should not ordinarily occur, I find that the Claimant has established that the Respondent performed an unworkmanlike home improvement. Cf. Peterson v. Underwood, 258 Md. 9, 17-18 (1970) ("When the claimed negligent act and the injury are in close physical or temporal conjunction, absent a different explanation, common experience permits an inference of a cause-effect relationship.").

⁴ It is common knowledge that in this area of the world, summer ends every year between September 21 and September 24.

In terms of the amount of the Claimant's actual loss, the Claimant's own information—which consisted of a verbal estimate by an unidentified contractor who had not visited the site, was insufficient on its own to establish the cost to repair or replace the Respondent's work.

Nonetheless, I considered the testimony from Ms. Stanley that the work would likely cost between \$1,000.00 and \$2,000.00. As noted above, Ms. Stanley is the licensee for a business holding itself out as a paving company, and the Respondent had worked on the Claimant's driveway on three occasions. Although Ms. Stanley quite quickly attempted to back away from this estimate, based on her manner of testifying, her retraction seemed to be a result of her somewhat belated recognition that the testimony was against the Respondent's interests. I conclude \$1,000.00 is a reasonable cost to repair or replace the concrete apron.

MHIC's regulations provide three formulas to measure an award from the Fund, depending on the status of the contract work. The Claimant explained that she wants to have the apron replaced. Accordingly, the following formula appropriately measures the Claimant's actual loss:

If the contractor did work according to the contract and the claimant has solicited or is soliciting another contractor to complete the contract, the claimant's actual loss shall be the amounts the claimant has paid to or on behalf of the contractor under the original contract, added to any reasonable amounts the claimant has paid or will be required to pay another contractor to repair poor work done by the original contractor under the original contract and complete the original contract, less the original contract price. If the Commission determines that the original contract price is too unrealistically low-or high to provide a proper basis for measuring actual loss, the Commission may adjust its measurement accordingly.

COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(c). In applying this formula, I also consider that the Fund may not compensate a claimant for consequential or punitive damages, personal injury, attorney fees, court costs, or interest. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(3); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(1).

e post no crisco que o l'appareir fill des gra<mark>g</mark>i figni i de l'egocció i l'est le compositi<mark>do prie</mark>go di ath cather than a split it of the actual of the standing of split things in the His topic of the termination of man of them. In the blood imperiors on the contraction will be to be the common in both the end and the angles of Higgar shaper of a compression of the second section of the second grown by the contract of the second grown by the contract of the second grown by the contract of the contract re la como a ser especializa de la especializada e vera la companya de la Maria de color de la companya de en a Matilin not ha di sate di Listing di sengga di shti than ye an Lamping tingge she sitteri it shekiya sa ay and a page of a fermester. This has been been about a real to transfer for our case and many or well नाम किसी कर कर के द्वार करने देवा करने देवा कर के <mark>पहले हुए हैं में महिला के हैं है कि है कि देवा के देवा है</mark> कर to a description of expect artistics is the speciment of the built of the section of the contract of tem of an extremation of the second mass are also be arrested by their first product. and the spirate of the contract of the contrac na so i a man ang kamban dagan kataban dagan kataban salah an na dabah a man na man ka na mili gadah ें प्रतानेत के ते कुल्प किनेतान होंकों ने पत्र होता. संस्थान प्रदेश की से द्यार को पूर्व कर कर है जेन्साने कर क 3000 - 100 B

and the chiefe of the few house he will a translation of a control problem on with a a a l'Altre et autres accioniste de l'Appliche de description est (les apriles), que a glimbales d of the late of the state of र प्राप्तीय वर्षक्र या वर्षा हो। या वस्तुका क्षा वर्षकी १८ वी १ जय कराउँ । व कराव के हु रोप स्रोतसम्बद्धा जिल्लाहरी हुए करावे । ज्युतिस्कृति वर्षका याच्यी साहायस्वर्य वारा राज्यसम्बद्धान सम्बद्धा and record application of the region and all moves and the contribution of the contrib git ungelegen gag bereicht in Stadt ein bie generalt eine gebeilen.

activities files files exist inditación elle l'indices de les files files en la p**ESE Eux 9** SUCO-ALC ACC and the little of the framewall randomly to their to have a larger rate of the fifth our larger SOFT IN TO DAY OF THE FOUNDING TO PARTY IN THE SOFT IN THE TO BE TO BE FOUND AND A SOFT OF THE SOFT OF

าใหม่ใหม่อยใหม่เหมือนใหม่เลยให้

The Claimant's actual loss is computed as follows:

\$6,000.00 paid to the Respondent

+ \$1,000.00 to repair the Respondent's work

\$7,000.00 total paid and to be paid by Claimant

- \$6,000.00 original Contract price

\$1,000.00 actual loss

The actual loss of \$1,000.00 does not exceed the amount the Claimant paid to the Respondent and does not exceed the statutory cap on recovery from the Fund. Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(1), (5); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(4), D(2)(a). There are no statutory impediments to the claim. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-405(c), (d), (f), and (g). I thus find that the Claimant is eligible to receive compensation from the Fund in the amount of \$1,000.00, which is the entire amount of her actual loss.

PROPOSED CONCLUSION OF LAW

I conclude that the Claimant has sustained an actual and compensable loss of \$1,000.00 as a result of the Respondent's acts or omissions and is entitled to recover that amount from the Fund. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401, 8-405 (2015); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(c).

RECOMMENDED ORDER

I RECOMMEND that the Maryland Home Improvement Commission:

ORDER that the Maryland Home Improvement Guaranty Fund award the Claimant \$1,000.00; and

ORDER that the Respondent is ineligible for a Maryland Home Improvement

Commission license until the Respondent reimburses the Guaranty Fund for all monies disbursed under this Order, plus annual interest of ten percent (10%) as set by the Maryland Home

Improvement Commission;⁵ and

⁵ See Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-410(a)(1)(iii) (2015); COMAR 09.08.01.20.

अन्य के सम्बद्ध <mark>भागत अभिनेत्र के प्र</mark>िक्त को किन प्राप्त के के भिन्न कर किन है।

ាមមិលសាក្សាស្រ្តាស្រ្តាស់ វេធិសាស

tante de la company de la comp

क्षी क्षित्रका है । बाहित

અજે ફેંગ માટે માં ભાગો હતાં મુખ્યાના માટે પ્રાપ્ત કરો છે. તે પ્રાપ્ત કરાય માટે માટે છે છે. તે માટે માટે માટે મ

र विकास का क्षेत्रक के दिन के होते । यह दे कुछ मुख्य है, क्षेत्रक है में के किया के अपने का स्वाप्त का का का क

भागता है जिस क्षेत्रक जीता के का के निर्माण है। जिस्सीकार अनुष्ठा सूच्या पूर्व का राज व्यक्तियान करावा राजु सेवार करेंगे

that the will be the section and a section of the s

त्र प्रत्य स्थित के बोक्सी के हिन्दी है। प्रत्यात कर सम्बद्धात के किस के की स्थान सम्बद्धात करते. के किस कर की के स

Market St.

and the second of the control of the second of the second

ेस माँ छोगा होने हैं के देख रिन ए एउंचे भाग थिए । यह में बुद्धिने केन्स्य, हुमायन हो खुनेकुल सनस्तर

CONTRACTOR OF THE SECTION (SECTION OF SECTIONS OF SECTION ASSESSMENT AND SECTION OF SECT

्रमाद्रिको के प्रकार के राज हाराने जा माहार्य कर । अस्ते जे सन्तारी के <mark>साम</mark> हाराने क्षेत्र हाराने के स्वरूप के हार

त्यान पत्र महिलाही है की देश है देशकर ने विकोध नवह नव पत्र पत्र पत्र पत्र है के देश देश के देश है है है के अनु

Library Company

र्वे दिन्द्रियो अधिक्षा एक मार्क्षिका

at the are consisted materials by the result

Control of the contro

erebusien bigger eigenschappin

रेण राष्ट्रभावाके हे के अपन होता है। तमकी महत्त्व का पुराद्वेद का

ORDER that the records and publications of the Maryland Home Improvement

Commission reflect this decision.

August 4, 2020
Date Decision Issued



ED/cj #186886 anniferior agree come to be the first of the consequence of the company of the company of the first section isologist entre estaction di ACCEPTAGE FOR THE SECOND ्रिके क्षेत्रकार है। इस क्षेत्रकार है। इस्तिकार है है। इसके क्षेत्रकार है।

PROPOSED ORDER

WHEREFORE, this 4th day of September, 2020, Panel B of the Maryland Home Improvement Commission approves the Recommended Order of the Administrative Law Judge and unless any parties files with the Commission within twenty (20) days of this date written exceptions and/or a request to present arguments, then this Proposed Order will become final at the end of the twenty (20) day period. By law the parties then have an additional thirty (30) day period during which they may file an appeal to Circuit Court.

<u>Joseph Tunney</u>

Joseph Tunney Chairman Panel B MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION

which is always a great the first of the section of ૧૯૬ શકાર સામેજીના પૂર્ણ સુરાવાના કરવા છે. ૧૯૬૦ લાકોલ કામકો <mark>૦ ૧૯૬૬ મામના ફુક્કારો સોકો સામે કરો કર્યા</mark>ના na interpretation of the configuration of the contribution of the property of the configuration of the configurati representation and property and all fight their metric professions of the transport of the fight that the respective Enter the state of the part of the contract of La arriga en en arriga de la composição de

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM OF JOY HART AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND FOR THE ACTS OR OMISSIONS OF MONICA STANLEY T/A TRIPLE A PAVING & SEALCOATING

* MARYLAND HOME

IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION

MHIC CASE NO. 19(90)1270

* OAH CASE NO. LABOR-HIC-

* 02-20-03265

TING *

FINAL ORDER

This matter was originally heard before an Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") of the Office of Administrative Hearings ("OAH") on June 10, 2020. Following the evidentiary hearing, the ALJ issued a Proposed Decision on August 4, 2020, concluding that the homeowner, Joy Hart ("Claimant") suffered an actual loss of \$1,000.00 as a result of the acts or omissions of Monica Stanley t/a Triple A Paving & Sealcoating ("Contractor"). *ALJ Proposed Decision* pp. 8-10. In a Proposed Order dated August 4, 2020, the Maryland Home Improvement Commission ("MHIC" or "Commission") affirmed the Proposed Decision of the ALJ to grant an award from the Home Improvement Guaranty Fund. The Claimant subsequently filed exceptions to the MHIC Proposed Order.

On November 19, 2020, a three-member panel ("Panel") of the MHIC held a remote hearing on the exceptions filed in this matter. The Claimant and Contractor participated without counsel. Assistant Attorney General Justin Dunbar appeared at the exceptions hearing on behalf of the Guaranty Fund. The Commission entered the following preliminary exhibits as part of the record of the exceptions hearing without objection: 1) September 14, 2020 hearing notice; 2) September 4, 2020 transmittal letter, ALJ Proposed Decision, and MHIC Proposed Order; 3) Contractor's exceptions; 4) November 9, 2020 virtual hearing notice. Neither the Claimant nor the Contractor produced a copy of the transcript of the hearing before the ALJ. Therefore, the Panel's review of the record was limited to the preliminary exhibits for the exceptions hearing, the

AND LOTE OF LARGE SHEET AND AND APPEAL OF

The main relative to the control of the control of

The supplier of a constant of the supplier of

OAH Proposed Decision, and the exhibits submitted at the OAH hearing. COMAR 09.01.03.09(G) - (I).

The claim in this proceeding relates to an oral contract between the parties for the replacement of the driveway at the Claimant's home. The ALJ found that the Contractor's performance under the contract was unworkmanlike because a section of the driveway installed by the Contractor repeatedly crumbled. *ALJ's Proposed Decision* p. 8.

On exception, the Contractor said that she disagreed with the amount of the award because she was experiencing financial difficulties. AAG Dunbar argued that the ALJ erred in concluding that the Claimant proved that she suffered an actual loss in the amount of \$1,000.00 because the ALJ relied on the testimony of the Contractor regarding the cost to correct the deficient work.

The Commission finds no error with the ALJ's proposed decision. The Commission finds the Contractor's testimony that the cost of repairing the Claimant's driveway would be between \$1,000.00 and \$2,000.00 to be reliable evidence and, based on that testimony, finds that the cost to correct the Contractor's inadequate work is \$1,000.00. In addition, the Claimant's hearsay testimony that a contractor told her that repairing her driveway would cost approximately \$1,100.00 corroborates the Contractor's testimony.

Having considered the parties' arguments, the evidence contained in the record, and the ALJ's Recommended Decision, it is this 2nd day of December 2020, **ORDERED**:

- A. That the Findings of Fact of the Administrative Law Judge are AFFIRMED;
- B. That the Conclusions of Law of the Administrative Law Judge are AFFIRMED;
- C. That the Proposed Decision and Recommended Order of the Administrative Law Judge is AFFIRMED;
- D. That the Maryland Home Improvement Guaranty Fund shall award the Claimant

the interesting to the contract of the section of the contract of the section of the contract of the contract

The chart is the property of a strict in an one of the state of the the line is the first of the chart is the chart of the

All a contractions the Commission while the particles that is a particle and the design of the committee.

All a contractions the contractions and the particles of the contraction and the contraction of the contraction of

to the property of the propert

And the state of t

is the the time there is not a pro- street, which are that about and the

\$1,000.00;

E. That the Contractor is ineligible for a Maryland Home Improvement Commission license until the Contractor reimburses the Guaranty Fund for all monies disbursed under this Order, plus annual interest of ten percent as set by the Commission;

F. That the records and publications of the Maryland Home Improvement Commission shall reflect this decision; and

G. Any party has thirty (30) days from the date of this Final Order to appeal this decision to Circuit Court.

Jean White

Chairperson –Panel
Maryland Home Improvement
Commission

on y strang, and the little control of the stranger mer vijam sambumi solvom i pravi bati movadali gabim od nivi vydejamiti sabima - (portalitiente (Dentitie) (est analíta est filledes esta significações e figuralistic the proceedings the consumprising of the about Confirmation of the himselvenion with the con-The seal of the specific territors Charles (inc.) i graniska – iku ajši stali ราคาร์ (ว. ระจาก วิ.