IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM

* BEFORE ERIN H. CANCIENNE,

OF SCOTT ROYSTON,

* 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 PAUL JOHNSON,

T/A COMMSERV, LLC,

* OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-22-00465

PROPOSED DECISION

MHIC No.: 21 (75) 420

RESPONDENT

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 March 3, 2021, Scott Royston (Claimant) filed a claim (Claim) with the Maryland Home Improvement Commission (MHIC) Guaranty Fund (Fund), under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor (Department), for reimbursement of \$32,846.87 for actual losses allegedly suffered as a result of a home improvement contract with Paul Johnson, trading as Commserv, LLC (Respondent). Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 to -411 (2015). On December 6, 2021,

¹ Unless otherwise noted, all references hereinafter to the Business Regulation Article are to the 2015 Replacement Volume of the Maryland Annotated Code.

Congression of a community of the and the state of the state of or or the second of the second - NO CO CAR MARKET AND AND Mark Lind of the section 2. Sagra (Sec. 1881) 1 (1994) 1 (1994) 图的区域 强大的 探点 r de la regiona de la companio de l yan kara san ka kabaran karan karan ka kabaran karan kar the active proceedings are great solutionary or with the creater of a content of little care of the port and the second of the first term of the second of the got and an experience of the contract of a conthe MHIC issued a Hearing Order on the Claim. On December 16, 2021, the MHIC forwarded the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing.

On February 16, 2022, and March 10, 2022, I held a hearing at the OAH in Hunt Valley, Maryland.² Bus. Reg. §§ 8-407(a), 8-312. Justin Dunbar, Assistant Attorney General, Department, represented the Fund. Robert Westra, Esquire, represented the Claimant, who was present. The Respondent 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); Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 09.01.03; and 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 offered by the Claimant:

- Clmt. Ex. 1 Contract between the Respondent and the Claimant (Outdoor Contract), January 2, 2020
- Clmt. Ex. 2 Cashier's Check from the Claimant to the Respondent, December 26, 2019
- Clmt. Ex. 3 Contract between the Respondent and the Claimant (Indoor Contract), April 24, 2020

Clmt. Ex. 4 - Not offered.

² On February 16, 2022, no witnesses testified, and no exhibits were admitted. After opening instructions, the Respondent requested a brief postponement to continue negotiations with the Claimant. The other parties consented to the postponement and all parties agreed to continue the hearing to March 10, 2022.

the was furthern by the color of the transfer of the than the field of a Land the state of a state of the following of the state o Andrew Committee and the state of the state Consideration of the property of the control of the The control of the control of principle and the first of the control of the contr The California of the Californ Place and the control of the control er i describber i trophes <mark>ann</mark> pri i tri a till della i della triba at l'Arrado i i della trada della magni pri i di Participation of the residence of the property of the participation of t Secretary Care and Control of the Co This is the safe of the contract The compared the comparison of the conon which the contract of the same of . A service of the se The State of State and September 19 and State of the State of State of the State of and glading with the first sale of the and the first sale of the s

> ide a la compositio de la composition La composition de la

Clmt. Ex. 5 - Photographs of the Claimant's backyard, Fall 2020³

Clmt. Ex. 6 - Photograph of the Claimant's backyard, January 9, 2022

Clmt. Ex. 7 - Letter from Vincenzo Culotta, Esq. to the Respondent, September 9, 2020⁴

Clmt. Ex. 8 - Petition Hearing Application Packet, July 19, 2021⁵

Clmt. Ex. 9 - Zoning Review, Hearing Checklist, revised May 5, 2016

Clmt. Ex. 10 - Manilla Folder from Baltimore County Zoning Office, undated

Clmt. Ex. 11 - Email from Robert Westra, Esq. to the Respondent, October 5, 2020

Clmt. Ex. 12 - Letters and Emails from Robert Westra, Esq. to the Respondent with proofs of service, May 27, 2021

The Respondent did not offer any exhibits.

I admitted the following exhibits offered by the Fund:

Fund Ex. 1 - Notice of Hearing, January 11, 2022⁶

Fund Ex. 2 - Hearing Order, December 6, 2021

Fund Ex. 3 - Home Improvement Claim Form, February 19, 2021

Fund Ex. 4 - Letter From MHIC to the Respondent, March 5, 2021

Fund Ex. 5 - License History for the Respondent, February 14, 2022

Testimony

The Claimant testified and presented the testimony of the Respondent and Rosalie "Roz"

Johnson, zoning planner for Baltimore County.

The Respondent did not present any witnesses.⁷

³ The Claimant did not know the specific date that these pictures were taken.

⁴ The date on this letter was typed September 9, 2020, but scratched through and a date of August 26, 2020. For purposes of the exhibit list, the typed date of the letter will be used.

This packet includes the cover letter rejecting the submittal with red markings on the submittal packet to note deficiencies in the submittal. The document contains multiple copies of some, but not all of the documents.

This notice is for the original hearing date of February 16, 2022, but has handwritten notations regarding the

postponement and the new hearing date of March 10, 2022.

The Claimant called the Respondent as a witness during the Claimant's prima facie case.

March and paint the fact that the first arms to be a continued by a of the commence of the contract of the contrac to the selected give the decision was been at the degree on the second of the contract of the second Petro Cores Bagarago, apra insula insula in insulation in the Cores of the Cores is that the tend of the contract of the contra Control Translation (C. F. C. P.) ou cultura de la travera de la caración del caración de la caració เลยเลียก (การเครียน) การเกี่ยว แต่กลุ่มสุดการ (การ Service that in the control of the first in the transport of the transport of the i Company with the second of the second and the first of the gas of the first and the same of a Short again, it is the Castronistics group exists to be publication in The common professor and the control of the control am granding a special grand The second of th erre de l'un la libera de l'autre de la libera de l'estre de la levière de la levière de la libera de la libera La la liberation de l'autre de l'autre de la liberation de la liberation de la liberation de la liberation de

.

gurage region and the current, it is explained in the co

The Fund did not present any witnesses.

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 MHIC license number 01-110209.
- 2. At all relevant times, the Claimant owned and resided in a single-family home on Hillsleigh Court in Nottingham, Maryland (the residence).
- 3. On January 2, 2020, the Claimant and the Respondent entered into a contract for a large project at the residence's backyard (Outdoor Contract), including installing three multi-level decks, three pergolas, three fire pits, four fire columns, one gazebo, one bench swing, one four person hot tub, a ten foot L-shaped outdoor kitchen, and a picket-type railing and steps with a concrete slab.
 - 4. The original agreed-upon Outdoor Contract price was \$123,900.00.
- 5. The Outdoor Contract stated that work would begin within thirty to forty-five days after the construction documents and permits were approved and issued.
- 6. The Outdoor Contract stated the project would be substantially completed within 120-150 days after the start of construction.
- 7. The Outdoor Contract required all disputes between the Respondent and the Claimant arising out of the contract to be submitted for resolution by binding arbitration. Clmt. Ex. 1, p. 4.
- 8. On December 26, 2019, the Claimant paid the Respondent \$41,300.00 as a deposit for the Outdoor Contract.

taline to have the constant of groups at the constant in the second

n namen og skriver flagt skriver prinsk skriver i konstrukter og skriver og skriver og skriver og skriver og s I skriver og skriver o

a en la comita de la persona de Partiren e anticapa a escabilita de la petal al activación de la comita de la c

The state of the s

The property of profession and property and the first section of the property of the section of

na nga kalang dia mga <mark>andalah</mark> mban jalah saka anga ang kalana mga bakalid at dikana ay ma

The second secon

ing the state of t

an am an de la seconda de la seconda especiale de la gradición de la propertión de la seconda de la seconda de La seconda de la gradia de la seconda de

- 9. On April 24, 2020, the Claimant and the Respondent entered into a contract for the Respondent to paint the entire interior of the Claimant's home (Indoor Contract) for a total cost of \$8,449.00.
- 10. The Indoor Contract was successfully completed and is not part of the Claimant's allegations against the Respondent.
- 11. The Claimant did not pay the Respondent anything directly for the Indoor Contract.
- 12. Instead of having the Claimant pay directly for the Indoor Contract, the Respondent deducted this amount from the deposit for the Outdoor Contract.⁸
- 13. After deducting the cost of the Indoor Contract, the remaining balance of the Outdoor Contract deposit was \$32,851.00.
- 14. In or around June 2020, the Respondent filed a Petition Application to obtain a variance to the zoning requirements for the Outdoor Contract.
- 15. The Baltimore County Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections returned the Petition Application as not sufficient or not meeting all requirements.⁹
- 16. After the Petition Application was returned, no further submissions were sent to the Baltimore County Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections.
- 17. After the Petition Application was returned, the Respondent did not contact the Baltimore County Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections, to discuss resubmitting or correcting his submission.

⁸ This was testified to by the Claimant, and was contained in Claimant's Exhibit 7.

⁹ The date of this decision is unclear. A cover letter for Claimant's Exhibit 8 is dated July 19, 2021 and indicates that the submission is insufficient or does not meet all the requirements. However, the testimony of Ms. Johnson indicated that submissions are processed within a few weeks, and a sticky note attached to the manila folder from the zoning office indicates "sent email w[ith] revision comments 7/1/2020." Regardless of the date, there was no dispute that the submission was rejected and that no further efforts were made to correct the submission after the rejection.

and the first the second of th grand for the control of the first control of the first approximation of the control of the cont BERT TENNED A DESCRIPTION OF THE STATE OF TH properties and the state of the The second of th and the same of The Administration of the School of the Scho The same of the second control of the second Because section of the section of th grand to the transfer for two more income in the confidence of the grand of the strength of the the second and the second seco and the first of the control of the ing the real processor with the fine agency area. It is given that it is the first of the contract of the first of the contract of the contrac and the state of t Action of the paragraph of the property of the

- 18. On October 5, 2020, the Claimant, through his counsel, requested that the Respondent confer to schedule a mediation.
- 19. On May 27, 2021, the Claimant, through his counsel, requested the Respondent confer to schedule an arbitration.
- 20. The Respondent did not respond to either the request to schedule a mediation, or an arbitration.

DISCUSSION

The Claimant has the burden of proving the validity of the Claim by a preponderance of the evidence. Bus. Reg. § 8-407(e)(1); Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 10-217 (2021); 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." Bus. Reg. § 8-405(a); 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." Bus. Reg. § 8-401. For the following reasons, I find that the Claimant has proven eligibility for compensation.

There is no dispute that the Claimant and the Respondent entered into the Outdoor Contract in January 2020 and that the Claimant, paid the respondent \$41,300.00 as a deposit for this Outdoor Contract. (Clmt. Exs. 1 and 2). The Outdoor Contact included installing multilevel decks, pergolas, fire pits, fire columns, a gazebo, a bench swing, a four-person hot tub, a ten-foot L shaped outdoor kitchen, and a picket-type railing and steps with a concrete slab. The

and the state of t

total contract price for the Outdoor Contract was \$123,900.00. According to the Claimant, the Respondent's first step would be getting the permit. However, from January through the middle of March 2020, the Respondent did not obtain a permit for the Outdoor Contract.

After the middle of March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic caused several places to close. According to the Claimant, the Respondent told him that the courts were not open, and that the Respondent could not do anything to obtain the permit. The Respondent testified that he submitted a petition for variance in June 2020 approximately. The Respondent testified that the courts were closed and that he was prevented from filing the petition sooner. The Respondent further testified that he spent approximately 100 hours between communications between the zoning office for the county and the landscape architect. Ms. Rosalie Johnson, of the Baltimore County Zoning Office, testified that while the building for her office was closed to the public for a portion of the pandemic, her office was accepting and processing applications throughout the entire pandemic. She stated that the typical time to process a submission is six weeks. Ms. Johnson reviewed the zoning application packet filed by the Respondent, and she is the one who made all the red marks to show deficiencies in that submission. She testified that after rejecting the submission, she does not remember having any additional communications with the Respondent, or receiving any further submissions from the Respondent. No evidence of any additional submission was offered or admitted into evidence at the hearing.

While waiting for the Respondent to obtain a permit for the Outdoor Contract, the Claimant and the Respondent entered into a contract for the Respondent to paint the interior of the residence. (Clmt. Ex. 3.) The Indoor Contract costs \$8,449.00. The Respondent completed all of the work under the Indoor Contract to the Claimant's satisfaction. Instead of giving the Respondent an additional payment, the Claimant allowed the Respondent to deduct the Indoor

¹⁰ There was no testimony provided as to who hired the landscape architect, nor the name of this individual.

and the straightful for the straight and an earlier of word of the first and have been active There is a gregor to the fit of the complete of fining all a trapper places in the fit of the content. analysis i and reliable the forest of sharte constitution, seems that a significant Additional process of the process of aut. Der griter der Ausgebrung aus mit en gataben in der bereichtlegt vorreicht er na na tradición de l'embagness misse si en se entreballade que la proposición de carecternes con a nation of the section of the secti return of all authorizing religion to being the state of the best of the contract of the contr ren in riche, se second en rody eso wirth second that les esteixe any link, or that become in arreste to . konnecije – Ogre Tanke krat<mark>a</mark>nsenačia Hanattičan e**gaze**nad ektare gjaren konsultogije er<mark>ia,.....</mark> radice i i i i significativa di pravimente di cara di sala di cara di the contraction of the contract of the contrac and the speciment of the model benefits given as been been been been as as as as seen as . The first of the first of the first point of the first gar kan kan dan melalah dan dipertahan dan beradah dipertahan dipertahan dipertahan dipertahan dipertahan diper and the first of t en tre det tribe to be trape de stred elle trape que d'en les entrages d'entre en rive delle de en estado a como en 1700 de entre en Contractiva de Contractiva de 1700 de 1700 de 1700 de contractiva de c and the state of the first of the first of the first of the state of t er i de la la recola de la referencia de la constanta de la companya de la companya de la companya de la compa

the first of the second second

Contract price from the deposit for the Outdoor Contract. This left an Outdoor Project deposit balance of \$32,851.00.

The Claimant asked the Respondent for a refund of the remaining balance of his deposit for the Outdoor Contract, if the courts were not open by July 1, 2020. The Claimant testified that the Respondent had not ordered any materials by that date because the Respondent was waiting for the permit. No work was ever performed in the backyard of the residence under the Outdoor Contract. The Respondent did not refund the \$32,851.00 to the Claimant.

Except for the testimony regarding whether or not the zoning office was closed for any period during the COVID 19 pandemic, the facts regarding the Outdoor Contract and the lack of progress on the Outdoor Contract are consistent. The parties agree that there was a contract, a deposit was paid for that contract, a zoning variance had not been obtained, a permit for the work was not issued, and there was no work performed in the residence's back yard.

I find Ms. Johnson's testimony credible that the zoning office was accepting and processing submittals throughout the entire pandemic, and further, I find her testimony credible that after the initial packet was rejected, the Respondent did not submit any additional information or otherwise attempt to resubmit the original packet. There was no evidence that Ms. Johnson had a reason to favor either the Claimant or the Respondent in this case. Ms. Johnson had personal knowledge of her office's operation and no apparent motive to misrepresent her office's operations during the pandemic. The Respondent did not provide any documentation that confirmed the zoning office was closed, or to refute Ms. Johnson's testimony.

The next question is whether the Respondent abandoned the project or the Claimant cancelled the contract. The Outdoor Contract was signed on January 2, 2020. The Outdoor Contract stated that work would begin within thirty to forty-five days after the construction

and material and the or and the first of a larger to the contract of a street of a larger than the contract of the in de l'altre de la cate de la company d Suit in the second of the seco a anticological francisco de la compania de la com and the state of t region in the course of the paper with the second region in the element of the element of the paper will be set in the course of Annang sett begin en hal de kali stag a harre stad bet a stag at the last till his basis here here h na vice i namel si migerime na i javanina na estima propina na majerim si name erini en unity discourse da tilu en acció desirio dicina e as Stage of the Africa grant community the contract of the second of the contract community of the first of the many material and accommission of the Carlo de la como de la composição de la man at the bridge to get bein and the caption of the first and a And the first of the second of garan ang intang diagraph sa kanasan dia tang kalawaran dia kanasan dia kanasan baran kanasan dia kanasan dia and the state of t en la latin de la companya de la co The Property of the State of th and the first term of the appropriate to the property of the contract of the c of line, it is the first the control of the control A figure to the second contract and were there is the contract of the figure of

documents and permits are approved and issued. The Outdoor Contract stated the project would be substantially completed within 120-150 days after the start of construction. However, by July 2020 (over 180 days after the Outdoor Contract was executed and the Outdoor Deposit was paid), no zoning variance had been obtained, no permit had been issued, and no work had started for the Outdoor Contract. And further, the only submission regarding the zoning variance was woefully inadequate missing several pertinent details, including not being drawn to scale, and not showing the proposed improvements at all. Therefore, I find that the Respondent abandoned the project prior to the Claimant demanding a refund of his deposit.

Further, while the Outdoor Contract required the parties resolve any disputes arising out of the contract through arbitration, I find that the Respondent did not respond to the Claimant's attempts to proceed with either mediation or arbitration. Under COMAR 09.08.03.02E (2), when a contract requires that all contract disputes be submitted to binding arbitration, the claimant can "[p]rovide evidence to the Commission that the claimant has made good faith efforts to bring the dispute to binding arbitration which the contractor has either rejected or not responded to." The Claimant provided two communications from his counsel on October 5, 2020 and May 27, 2021 requesting the Respondent participate in either mediation or arbitration. Clmt. Ex. 11 and 12. The Claimant further testified that the Respondent did not respond to either of these letters. Therefore, I find that the Claimant has provided sufficient evidence of good faith efforts to bring the dispute to binding arbitration and the Respondent has not responded to those efforts.

I thus find that the Claimant is eligible for compensation from the Fund.

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. Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(3); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(1). MHIC's regulations

haller massij in kasa e had sizm hosteadas argustika un fastuli the second of th e e tribula de la compansión Carry the egg of the Carry Server 192 and Adequate Control of the Later and Congress and I represent the agriculture transfer and the contract of the contract and and the second of the first of the second of italijus kiralis kirali<mark>s problem karibera ligili kiralis kar</mark>iba berik kiralis kiralis baruk karibi reken k Appendix of the Applied Institute and Applied to Appendix and the Appendix of Lesson de la feuil de la callangua de la lagration de la receiva de en ang anger ner neksawa yang pangkasa neranggang 200 menganggangan nerang di inggang 100 mengangan sebagai ke ating 1970, in a company of the endergo, 1982, at Sept. 34, be size of Asia Carlo Se and the first of the contraction of the first of the first of the first of the first section of the first of resonante la compacta de la compacta del compacta de la compacta del compacta de la compacta del la compacta de la compacta del la compacta de la compacta d and the contract of the contra Let at 1, The 1 I have been considered as the property of the control of the cont en pris de la companya del companya del companya de la companya de eggs, le les areación pelos pelos escentros citas cubições política los de como cabillos escentros I reflected to the particular to the common of the control of the Bad a mark i sama minaka ara 1 da makata bada y no ser it is the first of the second common to the second common to the second common to the second common to to the same in the same of the same and the r de la partir de la fille de la figura de la figura de la fille de la fille de la fille de la fille de la fil i se Mantere de la le cui

provide three formulas to measure a claimant's actual loss, depending on the status of the contract work.

The Respondent abandoned the Contract without doing any work. While the Respondent asserts that he spent approximately one hundred hours working on the zoning issues and with a landscape architect, I do not find that credible. The submission for a zoning variance prepared by the Respondent was minimal at best and was not sufficient to receive that variance (as explained above). The Respondent did not submit any additional submissions, did not obtain the zoning variance and did not obtain a permit. Therefore, I do not find that the Respondent performed any work of value for the Outdoor Contract. In addition, the Outdoor Contract did not provide for the Respondent to receive any compensation for attempting to obtain, or actually obtaining a zoning variance or a permit prior to starting construction work at the residence.

Accordingly, the following formula appropriately measures the Claimant's actual loss: "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." COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(a). The Claimant paid the Respondent \$41,300.00 for a deposit for the Outdoor Contract. The Respondent accepted a portion of that deposit (\$8,449.00) to pay for the Indoor Contract. Therefore, the Claimant suffered an actual loss of \$32,851.00 (\$41,300.00 - \$8,449.00).

The Business Regulation Article caps a claimant's recovery at \$20,000.00 for acts or omissions of one contractor and provides that a claimant may not recover more than the amount paid to the contractor against whom the claim is filed. Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(1), (5); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(4), D(2)(a). In this case, the Claimant's actual loss of \$32,851.00 exceeds \$20,000.00. Therefore, the Claimant's recovery is limited to \$20,000.00. Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(1); COMAR 09.08.03.03D(2)(a).

and the same of the contract of the same of the contract of th endrom organism general see of elementario de francisco de la colonia de la colonia de la colonia de agrecia v og kjelen virir i krije i se i se site sil i kir gran førre ser for skeren silvaner stander. Dete kil and the comprehensive of the street of the s and the first of the first of the contract of the first o - Foreign de page (1866) e d'italiant la servició anabración e el como el como colo anabra (1 orthografice in 1980, and a graph of the Control of Application for the contract of the contract o the propagation of the first state of the propagation and the propagation of the state of the st de la companya de la companya di manganta de la companya de la companya de la companya de la companya de la co ov. Wieter in the English englisher in the control flag in the proof of the control of the contr Brook of the factor and the factor of the fa A STATE OF THE STA gradien de Bekel in der begrockeligt der eine der die einsp The first term of the second o The Sungit of the late of the \$ 《\$P\$\$ 1 * Park and the first that the property of the control of

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I conclude that the Claimant has sustained an actual and compensable loss of \$32,851.00 as a result of the Respondent's acts or omissions. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401, 8-405 (2015); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(a). I further conclude that the Claimant is entitled to recover \$20,000.00 from the Fund. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(1); 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 \$20,000.00; 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; 11 and

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

May 25, 2022
Date Decision Issued

Frin H. Cancienne

Erin H. Cancienne

Administrative Law Judge

EHC/da #198092

¹¹ See Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-410(a)(1)(iii) (2015); COMAR 09.08.01.20.

megling and the leading of the contracting the wavelength and the contraction of the contraction of Secretary of the second second to the second of the second 最后的1000mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm,100mm A SECTION OF THE THE SECTION OF THE BERNELLAND And a Cappanion of the Holds Bridge Services est ell famous leur opposition i agrande a proposition anno le communication de la com le series of the arty of constitution and the series of th , and the figure of the first o and the service of the property of the service of t The Market was to the Course when the contract of the contr La Carlo Barrer Carrier Jan Hora 🐎

PROPOSED ORDER

WHEREFORE, this 20th day of July, 2022, 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>I Jean White</u>

I Jean White Panel B MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION and the first of a second contract of the sec en la companya de la The company of the contract of the may be a some a service of