IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM	*	BEFORE MICHELLE W. COLE,
OF STEVE FANGMANN,	*	AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
CLAIMANT	*	OF THE MARYLAND OFFICE
AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME	*	OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND	*	
FOR THE ALLEGED ACTS OR	*	
OMISSIONS OF CHRISTOPHER	*	
TOLEMAN, T/A AROCON ROOFING	*	OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-22-24312
& CONSTRUCTION,	*	MHIC No.: 20 (75) 566

PROPOSED DECISION

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On August 1, 2022, Steve Fangmann (Claimant) filed a claim (Claim) with the Maryland Home Improvement Commission (MHIC)¹ Guaranty Fund (Fund) for reimbursement of \$10,381.49 for actual losses allegedly suffered as a result of a home improvement contract with Christopher Toleman, trading as Arocon Roofing & Construction (Respondent). Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 to -411 (2015 & Supp. 2022).² On August 30, 2022, the MHIC issued

RESPONDENT

¹ The MHIC is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor.

² Unless otherwise noted, all references to the Business Regulation Article are to the 2015 Replacement Volume of the Maryland Annotated Code.

W - LENGTH STORM STATE LOT FOLK TO AN AUGUST AND AN AUGUST AND AN AUGUST AND AUGUST AND

THE HISTORY THE STANDARD OF THE STANDARD .

MIN THE TELEPHONE OF LESSON AND THE PARTY OF THE PARTY OF

COLESIAN THE ARTOGOT WOOTHER * DARWIN LABOR OF PARTY.

Section of the sectio

ko reputa dagenoan

TANKAL PRINCE OF THE CASE OF TAKEN OF THE STREET OF THE STREET OF TAKEN OF

STEAD THE TO PERMIT

man Will repaire

There improvement Complete and Character from Alberta and Character from Al

a static. To improve a static and institute a static and institute and in the static and institute and in the static and institute and institu

a Hearing Order on the Claim. On September 8, 2022, the MHIC forwarded the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing.

On January 12, 2023, I held a remote hearing by videoconference. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-407(a), 8-312; Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 28.02.01.20B(1)(b). Jonathan Phillips, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Labor (Department), represented the Fund. The Claimant represented himself.

The contested case provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Department's hearing regulations, and the Rules of Procedure of the OAH govern procedure. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 through 10-226 (2021); 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 an inadequate, unworkmanlike or incomplete home improvement by the Respondent?
 - 2. If so, what is the amount of the compensable loss?

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

Exhibits

I admitted fifty-two exhibits on behalf of the Claimant, three exhibits on behalf of the Respondent and four exhibits on behalf of the Fund. All exhibits are listed in the Appendix attached to this decision.

Testimony

The Claimant testified on his own behalf and did not present other witnesses.

The Respondent testified on his own behalf and presented the testimony of Adam Nefferdorf, his business partner and consultant on the Claimant's home improvement.

The Fund did not present any witness testimony.

The rate Coder and Colored Constitution of a 2022, the Million Street and a first of the constitution of t

AT A STATE OF THE STATE OF THE

The contests execution in the Adequition Process and the Contest of the Contest o

8.11(2)

Dig Cigna a state on an extensive concrete state of the s

atildir I

on all the me of the small, tremid I mit to Links now on the small, it is thought I

the side of the small, the side of the side of the side of the small that the side of the

The Casima in the Casima was been also being the Casima to the Casima to

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- 1. At all times relevant to the subject of this hearing, the Respondent was a licensed home improvement contractor under the MHIC.
- 2. On May 17, 2018, the Claimant and the Respondent entered into a contract (Contract) to repair and replace the roof of the Claimant's home and to install a new basement door and screen door.
- 3. The original agreed-upon Contract price was \$10,708.00, which the Claimant paid in full. (Cl. Ex. 2).
 - 4. The Respondent agreed to perform the following work under the Contract:
 - Tarp and protect all landscaping, driveways, decks, railings, and walkways to protect against tear off debris
 - O Customer to remove personal belongings from the job site prior to project commencement
 - o Customer to protect valuables in attic prior to project commencement
 - Remove one layer of existing roofing material including felt paper, flashings, and drip edge if applicable
 - Inspect the roof deck and repair/replace any rotten sheathing or plank boards. Includes 2 sheets of plywood
 - o 4x8 ½ CDX plywood and ½ OSB replacement cost is \$60/sheet
 - o 4x8 7/16 OSB replacement cost is \$60/sheet
 - o #2 Grade 1x6 plank board replacement cost is \$6/linear
 - o Sheathing other than specified above will be billed at \$75/man hour
 - Re-nail the roof deck if applicable
 - Install two new Broan bath fan vents to ventilate moisture filled air from the bath fans out the roof
 - Install new aluminum drip edge to the roof perimeter (eaves and rakes)
 - Install Owens Corning Weatherlock Mat moisture guard to all eaves, valleys, chimneys, walls, and applicable roof penetrations
 - Install Owens Corning ProArmor synthetic underlayment to the roof deck
 - Install new Owens Corning asphalt starter shingles on all eaves and rakes
 - Install new Owens Corning Lifetime architectural asphalt shingles overtop of the roofing underlayment
 - Install new step flashing and apron metal to all roof to wall interfaces
 - Install new counter flashing to brick walls
 - o Metal will be cut into the mortar joint
 - Install new plumbing pipe flashings with repair collars

memobiospecifical bits member of the Pass Angularity

is a 2 SOC 0.78 Contract to the contract of th Birelius bil

the charge provided and testing of bear a trade loans and t

and the contract of the design of the contract of the contract

Cur with the medical policy and property of the party of

of the marks game I well ables in a pick a pilot to grapes as the Acmore no liver of a lang month of materials of all the

A Secretary of the second seco

and the first the first of the second and the first open and the state of the second and the second second and the second second and the second secon

all intend corporagion out of sale-gir. I whim let The new little grants have taken a feather than the latter drame.

end outes involved and of some street of the Unvestigation and the street street and the street of all surely

ja de dange imitari dan emita a kata o kumwa.

alle Ellera, of later He of Laters process have gradied Laters

- Install new lifetime HVAC pipe roof flashings
- Install new Owens Corning Vent Sure rigid ridge vent with Owens Corning ProEdge ridge cap shingles to all ridge lines
- Caulk all roof flashings with high density roofing cement
- Clean up and dispose of all job related debris

(Cl. Ex. 1).

- 5. Under the Contract, the costs associated with the door installations were as follows:
- * Labor Pricing for door and screen door install: Install customer provided door and casing \$975.00/each; Install customer provided screen door \$375.00/each (Cl. Ex. 1).
 - 6. On October 22, 2018, the Respondent installed the roof.
- 7. The Respondent's employee recorded incorrect measurements for the basement door and provided them to the Claimant, who used the measurements to order the basement door.
- 8. The cost for the basement door that was installed at the Claimant's home by the Respondent was \$588.49.
- 9. On January 10, 2019, the Respondent installed the basement door and screen door. A visible gap between the basement door and the ground remained when the Respondent stopped working at the Claimant's property. The screen door would not remain closed and did not latch. The Respondent added a piece of wood to the door frame because the latch for the screen door did not function.
- 10. On January 11, 2019, the Claimant contacted the Respondent and reported the gap under the basement door. The Respondent's employee and the Claimant discussed contacting Home Depot regarding replacing the existing door. However, no actions were taken to correct the problem.

28 to the sale of the second of the second second of the second second of the second o

10.5 Response to the property of the party o

A Company and Settlettin Landon and Salar R. D.C. Streets Co. O.

to the last the property of the common temperature of the party of the

On I was a fire the state of th

area, was an in the surprise ordered with bear such transaction of the streets. And of the contract

The property with the property of the property

to the state of the control of the c

then the state of the substitution of the substitution and a state of the burger and the

10-10-1

- 11. On August 22, 2019, following a rainstorm, the Claimant observed water flowing from the ceiling and light fixtures on multiple floors of his home. At that time, he contacted the Respondent to report a leak in the roof.
- 12. On August 24, 2019, the Respondent inspected the roof and reported that the following work had been completed:
 - Inspected roof in the area of the leak in [the Claimant's] home
 - Removed the shingles and underlayment in this area
 - No noticeable water damage to the plywood underneath
 - Crew found [one] nail that did not look to be sealed. Crew resealed the nail head
 - Crew replaced the shingles and underlayment in this area

(Cl. Ex. 21).³

- 13. The Respondent returned to the Claimant's home on August 27, 2019 and noted that the following work had been completed:
 - Inspected roof in the area of the leak in [the Claimant's] home
 - Removed the shingles and underlayment in this area
 - No noticeable water damage to the plywood underneath.
 - Crew found [one] nail that did not look to be sealed. Crew resealed the nail head
 - Crew replaced the shingles and underlayment in this area
 - One piece of plywood was broken around the ridge vent area, due to the removal of the ridge vent
 - Step flashing was removed around the dormer area
 - New ice and water shield and step flashing was installed
 - The crew did not find any noticeable issues that would cause the roof to continue to leak

(Cl. Ex. 22).

14. On September 10, 2019, the Respondent sent two letters to the Claimant describing the work completed on August 24 and 27, 2019.

³ The Claimant reported that no work was completed on August 24, 2019: that the Respondent's workers only placed a tarp on the roof.

association transporter base extractes on the letters and

page and the TC and A do among the mine I half a being a concept of the control o

Inspired the second transport the leader of the second to second the second to second

A pack was may petitional follows and only a pack of the season and a season and a

The evident name whose and are incoming with last me the last and are the last are

(cliffs attack

The Court of the Season of the State of the

the section of the compatibility of the section of

- 15. There has not been any visible leaks or additional water damage since the Respondent performed work on August 27, 2019.
- 16. On an unknown date, the Claimant contacted the Respondent's insurance carrier and reported damage to the interior of his home resulting from the roof leak.
- 17. The Respondent informed his insurance carrier that he would settle the claim for damages "out of pocket." The Respondent's insurance carrier informed the Claimant of this intention.
- 18. On September 20, 2019, Mr. Neffordorf came to the Appellant's home to inspect the interior of the Claimant's home and informed the Claimant that he believed the damage was caused by condensation.
- 19. As of the date of the hearing, the Respondent has not paid any amount towards the costs incurred by the Claimant to repair damage to the interior of his home following the August 2019 water damage.
- 20. On an unknown date, the Claimant removed drywall, including portions of drywall covered in what appeared to be mold and replaced it with new drywall. He finished and repainted the replaced drywall.

DISCUSSION

The Claimant has the burden of proving the validity of the Claim by a preponderance of the evidence. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-407(e)(1); Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 10-217; COMAR 09.08.03.03A(3). To prove a claim by a preponderance of the evidence means to show that it is "more likely so than not so" when all the evidence is considered. Coleman v. Anne Arundel Cnty. Police Dep't, 369 Md. 108, 125 n.16 (2002).

An owner may recover compensation from the Fund "for an actual loss that results from an act or omission by a licensed contractor." Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-405(a) (Supp.

and a ministrative imposition is exhalt-supplying model on an imposi-

"The second state of the Control Control of the State of

and property decrees a distributer for of his home required from the received about 1971.

and grant and of the State of t

the state of the s

10. As a sedite of the issump, the Europe plond in Short and the state of the state

De se estanove de la completa del completa de la completa del completa de la completa del la c

olisto ir

The state of the second control of the virial and analysis of the second control of the

A Brief Make I proper of the Control of the Control

2022); see also COMAR 09.08.03.03B(2) ("The Fund may only compensate claimants for actual losses . . . incurred as a result of misconduct by a licensed contractor."). "[A]ctual loss' means the costs of restoration, repair, replacement, or completion that arise from an unworkmanlike, inadequate, or incomplete home improvement." Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-401. For the following reasons, I find that the Claimant has proven eligibility for compensation.

Actual Loss - Prima Facie Impediments

By statute, certain claimants are excluded from recovering from the Fund altogether. In this case, there are no such statutory impediments to the Claimant's recovery. The claim was timely filed, there is no pending court claim for the same loss, and the Claimant did not recover the alleged losses from any other source. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg §§ 8-405(g), 8-408(b)(1) (2015 & Supp. 2022). The Claimant resides in the home that is the subject of the claim or does not own more than three dwellings. *Id.* § 8-405(f)(2) (Supp. 2022). The parties did not enter into a valid agreement to submit their disputes to arbitration. *Id.* §§ 8-405(c), 8-408(b)(3) (2015 & Supp. 2022). The Claimant is not a relative, employee, officer, or partner of the Respondent, and is not related to any employee, officer, or partner of the Respondent. *Id.* § 8-405(f)(1) (Supp. 2022). The Claimant did not unreasonably reject good faith efforts by the Respondent to resolve the claim. *Id.* § 8-405(d) (Supp. 2022).

Actual Loss - Unworkmanlike, Inadequate, or Incomplete Home Improvement by the Respondent

The Claimant presented evidence showing that he entered into the Contract with the Respondent to repair and replace the roof on his home and to install a basement door and screen door. He argues that the Respondent failed to remove all rotten wood from the roof, which resulted in a leak that caused significant damage to the interior of his home. He also reported a large gap under the basement door which allowed the elements and outdoor creatures to enter the home. He reported paying the Contract price in full when the Respondent completed the work

Treatment of the second state of the second st

By sounce that daine to an excluded from exceeding local 1 es son the legislation of the contraction of the state of the contraction of the contract all beliefing stokenes site after the same families on a state to be a large 100 Parith Provide the Province of the American Medit Confederation State (Page St. Te-1000 applies of State Charles and State of the International Control of the Indiana. and I applied many the first of the second son made some contain 15 KM - 1 E/I all the sale trained and antique of their discrete place of the sale of the sa 1 all the committee committees are distributed in a committee of a CLADA or published 18.8 tal analyting to the station relative and has little and collecting over all testings in a station. reference - Datas Table Eld Schol Install are franchiscon por it, Indicated the Section 1990.

selection of the select

ing, and the many of the bings of a contract of the contract o

under the Contract. At that time, he observed a gap under the basement door, which he reported to the Respondent. He explained that he discussed this problem with the Respondent, but that the Respondent did nothing to correct this problem. He also described damage to the interior of his home resulting from a leak in August 2019. He stated that he reported this problem to the Respondent and the Respondent's insurance carrier, and that the Respondent performed additional work on the roof and promised to pay for the water damage out of pocket. The Claimant stated that one of the Respondent's employees told him that they replaced a metal backsplash and rotten wood during the August 2019 work. However, when Mr. Neffordorf came to inspect the damage to the interior of the home, he informed the Claimant that there was no roof leak and that condensation caused the damage. Ultimately, the Claimant removed damaged drywall and paid another contractor to assist him with replacing the drywall and painting. He asks to be compensated for the costs associated with this loss.

Basement Door and Screen Door

When the Respondent stopped working at the Claimant's property, there was a large gap under the basement door and the screen door did not properly latch. Both parties agreed that the installation of the basement door was unworkmanlike and inadequate. Through testimony and photographs, the Claimant has established an actual loss as a result of an unworkmanlike and inadequate home improvement of the basement door and screen door. I thus find that the Claimant is eligible for compensation from the Fund based on the Respondent's unworkmanlike and inadequate home improvement of the basement door and screen door.

Roof

Within one year of the roof home improvement by the Respondent, the Claimant's home sustained significant water damage from a leak that began in the area of the roof and continued through the lower floors of the home. The Claimant presented photographs showing the state of

to be commended in the state of to a bespondent. It esphined for he discussed this probate talk for Re-Market Barrier the fit to be est did a wife to contain problems. He also described in 0.00 d isotopic or half before the 1919 in age 4 right from \$1 paints as made and 1000 Remove less and the 1 spondent - against contract and the last rocal and the body against review of his way of leading the head town is an inevertance by the ll or ti dali ladi trodicilet alevoliginare koonoc e il calche are dadriberen confessi deal and To be as shed a Chair Citi Second on great house than his designment to (special size uniting, to that take it of the house, he leadened the Character and an except of the aid with the aid it was an and bear and right of a count her dealth pro-Street Hill - Arthri the CL - All Rech. differentializate (this Chini television of metagonia) increasing land bear on

to offered a language from the

The same and a set of the set of

8-19

Within one of all the randomic interpretability the Scapendictic et al. 1 and 1 and

the home improvement during the work performed by the Respondent in August 2019 and after repairs were made to the interior of the home. He stated that one of the workers who performed work in August 2019 told him that they replaced a metal backsplash and rotten wood. The Respondent disputed this contention, and reported that the roof home improvement was sound and that the leak resulted from moisture and condensation caused by poor insulation in the attic.

The Claimant did not offer expert testimony regarding standard practices in the home improvement field or on the competence of the Respondent's work. Rather, he relied on photographs that were taken during the August 2019 work and information that he was provided by an unnamed employee who worked for the Respondent, indicating that the Respondent removed rotten wood and a metal backsplash during the 2019 roof repair. This individual was not called to testify at the hearing. Absent expert testimony on this point, I must rely on my evaluation of the photographs and testimony. Based on this evidence, I find that the Claimant has not sustained his burden on this issue.

From the perspective of an individual with no experience in roof repairs, I noted some flaws in the appearance of the wood in the Claimant's photographs. Moreover, the photograph of the metal piece that the Claimant reports was removed from the roof during the August 2019 work shows wear and rust. However, there was no expert testimony to explain whether these observations are any indication of poor workmanship or error by the Respondent, and I am unable to make any conclusion regarding the cause of the leak.

Further, while Mr. Neffordorf appears to have specialized knowledge in this area, I had significant concerns regarding his testimony, and did not place great weight on his opinions regarding the cause of the leak and subsequent damage. He denied any responsibility for the damages to the Claimant's property and gave self-serving explanations regarding the Claimant's

the bound of the second of the second process of the second of the secon

belle or a see or as the common of the Respondence with the see of the see of

documentario de la compansión de la comp

The transfer of the first terminal district property and the special content water to the second of the special water and the special content water and the special content to the special content terminal content to the special co

evidence. He denied being aware of the gap under the basement door even though the gap is clearly visible in the photographs taken by the Respondent after the home improvement work was completed, and the evidence shows that the Claimant contacted the Respondent one day after the work was completed to report the problem with the door. He also denied seeing the metal piece that the Claimant reported was removed from the roof. He reported that the interior damage was a result of the initial roof leak prior to the Respondent's home improvement work in 2018 and that the condensation over time caused the damage. This explanation is illogical considering the photographs and the timing of repairs. He reported observing certain damage when he initially negotiated the Contract with the Claimant, yet had no specific recollection regarding his subsequent inspection of the property except that he recalled seeing condensation, which he explained was reflected in photographs presented at the hearing. There was no testimony regarding where this was observed. He acknowledged informing the Respondent's insurance carrier that the Respondent would pay the claim "out of pocket," but gave no more detail regarding the reason why he would make such an assertion and then refuse to make any payment.

In weighing opposing testimony, I find the evidence to be equally weighted in support of the parties' contentions regarding the quality of the home improvement and the cause of the 2019 leak. As such, I cannot conclude by a preponderance of the evidence that the Claimant sustained an actual loss as the result of an unworkmanlike, inadequate or incomplete home improvement of the Claimant's roof by the Respondent. The Claimant has not established eligibility for compensation on this issue.

⁴ Under the Contract, the Respondent agreed to install ventilation to prevent moisture accumulation from the bathroom, and would have been responsible for correcting this problem depending on the location.

a except out and and computation of the grant in the state of the stat the property of the state of th the bad to be seen the control of th Status Harborel diventalism after pattern of all bladge state in water in the 100 to be the control of the based from the washing and the control of The same of the product of the contract of the the trace of the trace of the state of the s con efficiency that choice soughts are a control required. Attachment to the control of the a company of the comp ate of b Cacott and as it appears in to good and but a topic of the residence of a substance tribuest and the hydrogenic international of a projective and only of to the company of the third appropriate of the restaurance of the second Ac 000 1 1 100 of the second state of the parties of the state of the st the street and restriction of the street of the street and street of the State 1 com-

To be quest to use an interest of companies or recent for an expense, and the second of the second o

The following of the Control of the

Compensation

Having found eligibility for compensation, I must determine the amount of the Claimant's actual loss and the amount, if any, that the Claimant is entitled to recover. 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) (Supp. 2022); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(1). MHIC's regulations provide three formulas to measure a claimant's actual loss, depending on the status of the contract work:

1

- (a) If the contractor abandoned the contract without doing any work, the claimant's actual loss shall be the amount which the claimant paid to the contractor under the contract.
- (b) If the contractor did work according to the contract and the claimant is not soliciting another contractor to complete the contract, the claimant's actual loss shall be the amount which the claimant paid to the original contractor less the value of any materials or services provided by the contractor.
- (c) 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)(a)-(c). However, none of the following three regulatory formulas is appropriate in this case.

The Respondent did not abandon the contract without doing any work, so that formula is inapplicable. COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(a). The Claimant paid the total amount due under the Contract plus the cost of the door that was purchased using the incorrect measurements provided by the Respondent. It is unclear how this matter will be resolved regarding replacing the two doors and completing installation. As such, I do not find the formulas under subsections (b) and (c) to be applicable to this circumstance. COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(b); COMAR

putting buying

The state of the s

(a) If recenting I seem denote the contract without (details in has the many to eath that a through point and the later of the artiful many of de la compresentation de la company de la compresentation de la company must an lighter thank on our passers to complete the contests the clinic are therefore without languagements sait that I majoran on sell large and of the manner solder unitarious show bits provide the 11 (6) 1 186 and the solid and company to the solid sol are instring over the common to the first and reference to the contract of the od a la construir de la constanta de la consta the base to come letter to not return to the charles disemental and III. active travers is linguist, and self-son, applicing unthat the end of consecution posts and countestimed by lone and see that and the state of the Containing and the State of the stat

the community of the second se

Cold of the Cold State of the Cold of the

09.08.03.03B(3)(c). Accordingly, I find the appropriate measure of the Claimant's compensable actual loss to be the cost to replace and install the two doors as reflected in the Contract and Home Depot receipt: (Cost of installation of basement door) \$975.00 + (Cost of installation of screen door) \$375.00 + (Cost of replacement basement door) \$588.49 = \$1,938.49.

Effective July 1, 2022, a claimant's recovery is capped at \$30,000.00 for acts or omissions of one contractor, and a claimant may not recover more than the amount paid to the contractor against whom the claim is filed.⁵ Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(1), (5) (Supp. 2022); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(4). In this case, the Claimant's actual loss is less than the amount paid to the Respondent and less than \$30,000.00. Therefore, the Claimant is entitled to recover his actual loss of \$1,938.49.

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I conclude that the Claimant has sustained an actual and compensable loss of \$1,938.49 as a result of the Respondent's acts or omissions. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401, 8-405 (2015 & Supp. 2022); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3). I further conclude that the Claimant is entitled to recover that amount from the Fund. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(1), (5) (2015 & Supp. 2022); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3); COMAR 09.08.03.03D(2)(a).

RECOMMENDED ORDER

I RECOMMEND that the Maryland Home Improvement Commission:

ORDER that the Maryland Home Improvement Guaranty Fund award the Claimant \$1,938.49; and

⁵ On or after July 1, 2022, the increased cap is applicable to any claim regardless of when the home improvement contract was executed, the claim was filed, or the hearing was held. See Landsman v. MHIC, 154 Md. App. 241, 255 (2002) (explaining that the right to compensation from the Fund is a "creature of statute," these rights are subject to change at the "whim of the legislature," and "[a]mendments to such rights are not bound by the usual presumption against retrospective application").

the Part to surface and for any parties of the state of the state of the surface of the second season and other and the second and the state of t Like the Mark (mobiles exceed to proposed in to to 9) IP 100,057 in hopping disposers a february at 2000.

s and produced and see control seed of the control of the continue of the children of the continue of the continu 20 (1) COMPRESSOR DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PA and manufactured and the control of 1

and continued the little per burder on reading relationship of abolitions as an early of the Res. onderthready or outs done Mid. Code And. Pare No. 29 Low Sumpages College to 0803.0386 in Clarifica conductor for the and E-4 5 light Ruff and both bid being the Begut 5 1-3 die

and the property of the proper The state of the Manda Character and the Charact 5 XXX

The state of the s tent visualismistra illustrationi mitro di in empresa di citamica di compania di compania

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; and

ORDER that the records and publications of the Maryland Home Improvement Commission reflect this decision.

April 11, 2023
Date Decision Issued

Michelle W. Cole Administrative Law Judge

Michelle W. Cole

MWC/dim #204457

⁶ See Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-410(a)(1)(iii) (2015); COMAR 09.08.01.20.

the fine of the state of the st

OTTORERS I The reson is and publication of the Maryland Mary of the Same power and the Maryland Mary of the Maryland Mar

on and the state of the state o

PROPOSED ORDER

WHEREFORE, this 24th day of May, 2023, 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.

Joseph Tunney

Joseph Tunney Chairman Panel B MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION ASSESS CHOMONICAL

the state of the s

201220000