IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM	* BEFORE RICHARD O'CONNOR,
OF PAMELA WHITE,	* ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE,
CLAIMANT	* THE MARYLAND OFFICE
AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME	* OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND	*
FOR THE ALLEGED ACTS OR	*
OMISSIONS OF RASHURN	*
HARRISON, T/A B&B	*
CONSTRUCTION,	* OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-22-24338
RESPONDENT	* MHIC No.: 22 (75) 1060

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 June 13, 2022, Pamela White (Claimant) filed a claim with the Maryland Home Improvement Commission (MHIC)¹ Guaranty Fund (Fund) for reimbursement of \$96,685.34 for actual losses allegedly suffered as a result of a home improvement contract with Rashurn Harrison, trading as B&B Construction (Respondent). Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 to -411 (2015 & Supp. 2022).²

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

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

BULLA DO PREPIABLE DE AMARES DE

THE VALUE OF STREET,

TV MIAJO

ASADSPILE SERVICA VOROSER

CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF

FOR THULALL MINEASON SOR

OWLESSOR O SERVICE

HARRISON, L. BEEL

CONSTRBICIPAN

THE SECTION

40.00000 03201030

45 A BENGA SHOTTER .

IN STRUCK PROPERTY OF WAR

CHEMATICALASCERS

THE STREET WAS A SECOND

HEROBELL SAMEAN *

THE RESERVE NAMED OF STREET

1 300

telebroid (Lamb allefest)

SCORE BOX

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

ADPOINT OF THE ENDING OF FACE.

LECONOMIC CONTROL STORY OF THE COLUMN AND ADDRESS OF THE COLUMN AND AD

AND THE CASE

On type 1 - 1022, Feer Left into (Chiristen) Thedelplain with the Territorial Control

Improvement Con. dission Odd (One aptyloud (Final) thereindered an of Tel. o.

and think approximate the following the following a second surface of the second surface.

Marriago, trading a B&B Const union (Keighiden), Mariage Ann in Reg 1 1824

-111 (2015 & 5 (g) 2022) F

The Millianusdam introduction of the Communitarities of Labor (Department).

Littless colors (see six a...)) references to the But does Regulation Arrials are to the EC.

On August 30, 2022, the MHIC issued a Hearing Order on the Claim and, on September 8, 2022, forwarded the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing.

On January 10, 2023, I held a hearing at the OAH in Hunt Valley, Maryland. Bus. Reg. §§ 8-407(a), 8-312. Catherine Villareale, Assistant Attorney General, represented the Fund. The Claimant and the Respondent both participated without representation.

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; COMAR 28.02.01.

ISSUES

- 1. Did the Claimant sustain an actual loss compensable by the Fund because 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 into evidence the following exhibits offered by the Claimant:³

- Clt. Ex. 1. Construction Contract, February 17, 2021; letter from Disaster Services, Inc., to the Claimant, March 1, 2021; copy of the Respondent's MHIC license, expiration date September 3, 2021; Request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification, February 25, 2021.
- Clt. Ex. 2. Copy of a check for \$27,728.45 from Dovenmuehle Mortgage, Inc., to the Claimant and the Respondent, March 2, 2021.
- Clt. Ex. 3. Eight photographs of the subject property, March 14, 2021.

³ The Claimant produced a 250-page record from the MHIC's proceedings relating to her complaint against the Respondent but did not offer all the pages as exhibits. The pages not offered remain in the file as part of the administrative record.

On America of Section 1910 In the Description of Section Section 1910 In the Community of Section 1 and, a respective

Med I draw to I both musical annual America, Assista Control of Santada

The representative distribution of the Administrative University of the Administrative University of the Administrative Opening of the Opening of the Administrative Opening of the Openin the on mercu UAO athis without in a walled the appropriate for 1012 Ibill 1115 State cooking 10-2 1 shropin 1 [-3.20/(20.2)] (20.2) (20.2) (10.2) [-3.2]

also Doubled the distinguism will be be described by the distance of con election Contract, Debruies 19, 2021, Terre Drum Descri IN standardent still to your /1000 J. o. bidylander 1990 5,000 and summer 2 (102 learned to the system of the system and the

Logical distribution of the \$237 TARMS from December 15 or \$25 TARMS from the contraction of the second contraction of the la de

Fig. alastonespik biblik arbjestgroperfyk March-14, 2018.

mplate deam and a public state of 15 page 150 page that the most been appeared to a survey recently with all of the state of the second control and the second seco

- Clt. Ex. 4. Work Order Update with thumbnail photographs from Safeguard Properties, April 7, 2021.
- Clt. Ex. 5. Copy of a check for \$27,728.45 from Dovenmuehle Mortgage, Inc., to the Claimant and the Respondent, April 8, 2021.
- Clt. Ex. 6. Four photographs of the subject property, May 4 and May 20, 2021.
- Clt. Ex. 7. Work Order Update with thumbnail photographs from Safeguard Properties, May 27, 2021.
- Clt. Ex. 8. Copy of a check for \$8,332.34 from Dovenmuehle Mortgage, Inc., to the Claimant and the Respondent, June 8, 2021; Code Violation Notice and Order, July 11, 2021; Environmental Citation(s) and Order, July 7, 2021; copies of two photographs of the subject property, July 7, 2021.
- Clt. Ex. 9. Two photographs of the subject property, August 16, 2021; Payment Confirmation, September 3, 2021; Payment Confirmation, October 12, 2021.
- Clt. Ex. 10. Email from the Claimant to the Respondent, January 31, 2022; chart of telephone calls from the Claimant to the Respondent, September 28, 2021 to January 26, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 11. Email from the Claimant to the Respondent, February 3, 2022; letter from the Claimant to the Respondent, February 3, 2022 (three copies); email from Allstate Insurance to the Claimant, February 3, 2022; certified mail receipt, February 3, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 12. Seven photographs of the subject property, February 9, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 13. Environmental Control Board Hearing Officer's decision February 10, 2022; Environmental Fine, February 15, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 14. Emails between the Claimant and the Respondent, February 16 to February 28, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 15. Permit search results, February 17, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 16. List of rent payments, April 2021 to March 2022; additional copies of the emails in Clt. Ex. 14; Payment Confirmation, March 2, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 17. Work Order Update with thumbnail photographs from Safeguard Properties, March 3, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 18. Home Check Consult Inspection report, March 5, 2022.

The Born Control of the KAV, 128, 45 from Doyermontals Mindge as the For abstraction or the subject account, May 4 and Mar-Chefor U. Fasa with Gittenbrook photographic from high our all their als May of a check to profit is 1.34 from Dominimal to Make a to 11. 20.1.1 servicentu ental Citationia de Malera Marcallet. ilw apotents in of the subject property. August 1812 Mil . a. Inviellère, èleptemine 3, 60 Mai Proposor. Confirmation has a from the Chambers at the Respondent, January 3 Lef-Republic (Louisi voids Respondent, Statum-leville on care (which latered Palentry) 2012, confined and III R seamfel official the subject property. February 9 IIII Ambierosh a sectific and distributed between the

Bir and the of married matematical happendam beginning and the second of the second of

for the area in the state of th

Let 12 V V V zd till ben bled topolengttgatede, lingstendt discount gest all view vil zd till

1000

1.307.76 1 .36

Chi Lise (S. 1 la el Charlè Coly autobramoçado magreo, Mangado, 2022).

- Clt. Ex. 19. Text messages between the Claimant and the Respondent, March 15 and March 16, 2022; certified mail receipt March 18, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 20. Letter from the Claimant to the Respondent, March 16, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 21. Twenty-three photographs of the subject property, March 16, 2022; email from the Claimant to the Respondent, March 18, 2022; email from the Claimant to lossmitproxy@yourmortgageonline.com, March 25, 2022; Order from the MHIC to the Respondent, March 30, 2022; emails between the MHIC and the Claimant, May 11, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 22. Lease Agreement, April 1, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 23. Proposal from Wright's Construction Company, Inc., April 3, 2022.
- Clt. Ex. 24. Proposal from Metropolitan Multifamily Group, June 7, 2022.

I admitted into evidence the following exhibits offered by the Respondent:

- Resp. Ex. 1. Water bill, May 16, 2022.
- Resp. Ex. 2. Copy of a check from the Respondent to Carlos Epps for \$4,000.00, date cut off, printed March 15, 2022.
- Resp. Ex. 3. The Respondent's business checking account statements, February 27, 2021 to July 30, 2021; photograph of the subject property, undated; Certificate of Liability Insurance, September 9, 2021; Permit number COM2021-57601, March 12, 2021.
- Resp. Ex. 4. The Respondent's response to MHIC Complaint No. 1060-2022, June 1, 2022.

I admitted into evidence the following exhibits offered by the Fund:

- GF Ex. 1. Letter from the MHIC to the Respondent, June 16, 2022.
- GF Ex. 2. Home Improvement Claim Form, received June 13, 2022.
- GF Ex. 3. Hearing Order, August 30, 2022.
- GF Ex. 4. Notice of Hearing, October 20, 2022.
- GF Ex. 5. The Respondent's licensing history with the MHIC, January 9, 2023.

Testimony

The Claimant testified and did not present other witnesses. The Respondent testified and did not present other witnesses. The Fund presented no testimony.

Te fee 19 - Te xt. asiages beginn the Chitemat and the lighter patient in the Chite and Text of the Alexandrian for the Chite and revelop Make 19, 2022.

1 (c.15-20 - Lane compliant is the Responded Morch 16, 2 [1]

The State of the state of the second property of the second secon

Current St. Low vernelining Ageit L. 1022.

1 in Sc. 23 Prog. alubom Water Switch Comprosition Comprosition Applic 20-

CLE Sa. 24. Prep. of from Networkles Ministigates Straig Stone Spirit

I natricial it is evaluated that following exhabits and examples of a local time.

Surprise Loc L. Wat mill, May rec 2022.

Nasy Liv I Cup of a shipty rum the Respondent to Carlon Eppe Set 16, 19-31, March 16, 1922.

e sportier i en sportier 's estate processe de la company de la company

Shift in the State of the Commission of the second of the

is alimined it consistence persistance in building pripried by the English

(i) by J. J. Letti. Brogerthick, U.C. in the Mespersdoor, Jungslef, 2522

(rith) Lor imperventables loggi, received June 13, 4921.

14 Apr. 30 Pen of Dragon Separation 2022.

Great has of dames Opping 26, 2022.

1F.S. 5. Toe exposition is incapated triangle with the MeIIC, June 1, 214

adjoint le

in a contract the contract of the contract of the free contract of the believes and the contract of the contra

anomination on happen on board tell [] assention with trace of to 1 of the

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 01-114830.
- 2. The Respondent is a co-owner of B&B Construction, together with her exhusband, Craig Biggers.
 - 3. The Claimant owns the subject property, 79 South Morley Street, Baltimore.
- 4. On or about December 31, 2019, an electrical fire severely damaged the subject property.
- 5. On February 17, 2021, the Claimant and the Respondent entered into a contract to demolish and remove the entire interior of the subject property and completely restore the interior, including framing, electrical, fixtures, drywall, plumbing, HVAC, ⁴ cabinets, countertops, doors, flooring, paint, and trim.
- 6. The contract required the Respondent to clean up dust and debris and obtain all necessary permits.
 - 7. The contract price was \$115,000.00.
- 8. At some point, the Respondent noticed that the roof of the property was leaking and proposed to install a new roof for \$12,000.00.
- 9. The Claimant paid the Respondent \$63,789.24 under the contract; the last payment was on June 8, 2021.⁵

⁴ HVAC is an abbreviation for heating, ventilation, and air conditioning.

⁵ The payments were in the form of checks issued by Dovenmuehle Mortgage, Inc. (Dovenmuehle), and made out to the Claimant and the Respondent.

I find the file of the stage of the evidence:

As a file of the stage of the stage of the evidence:

I have an accordance ander Maj Cilicans manifes of the 1443 in

The respondences a co-covernor file of Construction, there is visit for a late that the construction, there is visit for a late that the construction there is visit for a late that the construction there is visit for a late that the construction there is visit for a late that the construction there is visit for a late that the construction the construction that the construction that

I the second Market Second property of South Money and Line 12 of the Second Se

conclisis arithmen e the emiramentation of the wild parameters and out to be emiral and the second of the second out to be emiral out to the second out to t

High out stand instantion and a teabquigated bone or towns. If I

into any group ad hull parent that the copy contract the second that the region are

P. The Indianal cast distribution Society Society on the second society of the second so

H VorC is an abbrevia on for boreing verifining, and already the later.

The positions would be breaked to the later by Deverminable blooms.

- 10. The Respondent started the demolition work in March 2021 and completely gutted the interior of the home.
 - 11. The Respondent did not clean up or haul away all debris.
- 12. The Respondent obtained a permit for the demolition but not for any of the restoration work, such as plumbing, electrical, or HVAC.
- 13. During 2021, the Respondent did some framing in the property and installed some electrical work and duct work for HVAC.
- 14. The Respondent did essentially no work on the project after mid-2021, leaving the subject property uninhabitable.
- 15. Until February of 2022, the Respondent continued to insist that work was ongoing and said that the plumbing would be completed by February 2022.
- 16. The City of Baltimore cited and fined the Claimant because construction debris and trash were left in the yard.
 - 17. The Claimant terminated the contract on March 16, 2022.
- 18. As of that date, framing and electrical work were incomplete, and no drywall, plumbing, HVAC, cabinets, countertops, doors, flooring, paint, or trim had been installed.
- 19. The framing and electrical work done by the Respondent is unworkmanlike and must be removed and replaced.
- 20. Wright's Construction Company, Inc. (Wright's) proposed to complete the contract, including removal of the Respondent's faulty work, for \$182,000.00.
- 21. The Wright's proposal included replacing all windows, which was not part of the contract with the Respondent.

10. The specient size the toposition work in Markh 20 kg. if can feet out in intuitive a rections

endon lia vites knel to the molecular bin anaborage (a.1).

12. The implication of things a people for this description but not made with

DAVISION to work so marginarion, electrical, and ACC.

13 Drait - 2003, the Desputidential stage from the proper that is said - come

14. The expendent to assentially no work on the proportion of Eller 1 place

r, uldahidad um ylaunma taujureri

the Unit Schumer of 2022, the Phage continued to be independent and a continued to Unit

and said that the pile thing while be composed by Hebring 2022.

to I a typical same city and the Claiman bearing and the Claiman bearing and the Claiman bearing to

If ye arthurst term unsted the commerce National 46, 20, 20, 20.

Lis. As a start date, filtering and algorithm was representation and the draw of the plant of the property of the plant of

then till a return visit and managed and another through the galant coll (. 2.1

must no romovou as traphismal.

20 1 Wri, CaConst Line Company, Ing. (WidgitCa) proposed y com 1 (Ch.

cattend, including - maybull of the Baspandant's faulty spekit, 150 \$182.101.

21. Tre 'digit's and real real real real and an analysis of the state of the state

Lesbarg of edition appro-

- 22. Metropolitan Multifamily Group (Metropolitan) proposed to complete the contract, including removal of the Respondent's faulty work, for \$157,896.10.
- 23. Metropolitan's proposal included replacing the roof for \$20,000.00, which was not part of the contract with the Respondent.⁶
- 24. The Respondent paid \$4,000.00 to Carlos Epps, which was not applied to the Claimant's water bill.
 - 25. The Claimant has not engaged another contractor to complete the contract.

DISCUSSION

The Claimant has the burden of proving the validity of her 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.

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) (Supp. 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." Bus. Reg. § 8-401. 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) (Supp. 2022); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(1). For the following reasons, I find that the Claimant has proven eligibility for compensation.

⁶ At least, it was not included in the original \$115,000.00. The evidence does not reveal whether the Claimant accepted the Respondent's later proposal to replace the roof for \$12,000.00.

22. - Mer apaliten Mindardly tarrup (Manupolites) probability on a second

congress, including a constant in the Reago stept a Juniter washing for \$4.57, \$4x, 10.

Compart of the contact with the designation

24. The Learningert Just 54,000.00 referror toget, which wip to Light 180.11 show

25. The Claiment has not tenging at another contraduction of the legislation of the

MULESCOST

The Clares wheether the Code Arm. Streether the Code Arm. Streether the Code and the mode to the Code and the end of the Code Arm. Streether the Code Arm. Streether the Code Arm. Streether the Code Arm. Streether the code and the code and

An owner of the second from the Paul Stocker on them. In the second of t

COMAR, 09 95 05 3H(D) CI is fined may conferently circums to option of a structure of the cost of the

As team, it she me fill toded in the depletion 114,000,00,00,000 and an endine adjust and configuration that Seam are filled properly also are the configuration of the State and the st

The Respondent was a licensed home improvement contractor at the time she entered into the contract with the Claimant. The genesis of the contract was somewhat mysterious. The Respondent testified that Carlos Epps seemed to be functioning as the Claimant's agent or middleman – she said that he first contacted her about the renovation shortly after the fire, but then she did not hear anything from him for almost a year. The Respondent met Mr. Epps at a restaurant in early 2021, where he showed her the Claimant's water bill for the subject property, which was over \$8,000.00. According to the Respondent, Mr. Epps proposed that the Claimant would award her the contract to renovate the subject property if the Respondent paid the water bill. Mr. Epps had a check for \$27,728.45 with him. The Respondent agreed to pay \$4,000.00, which she did, Mr. Epps handed her the check, and the Respondent began the renovation.

The Claimant testified that Mr. Epps was not her agent and that she did not authorize him to collect any money from the Respondent. She stated that she let Mr. Epps handle the payment checks "for convenience" and that he referred to the \$4,000.00 as a referral fee. The Claimant testified that the \$4,000.00 was not given to her to apply to the water bill, and she is still fighting with Baltimore City about that bill.

The evidence suggests that the shadowy Mr. Epps swindled both the Claimant and the Respondent. He extorted money from the Respondent by telling her she would win the Claimant's contract if she paid the water bill. The Respondent gave Mr. Epps \$4,000.00 with the understanding that it would go to the Claimant – essentially a \$4,000.00 discount on the contract price. But Mr. Epps kept the money and the Claimant received nothing.

The foregoing has no relevance to the claim at issue here but is a useful explanation of how the contract came to be agreed upon. There is no doubt, based on the evidence, that the Respondent stayed on the job for a year and accomplished almost nothing except to demolish the damaged interior of the subject property.

The first of the contract of the contract of the contract was according to the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract was contract of the co

The Cianum contribed are than Spreading and introgen and along the contribution of the

The evicon suggests continued and one in the large spindles but of land them the Respondent for each manage of the Respondent hyselfting her shows a void the Charge of the Respondent gave Mr. of the Charge of the Respondent gave Mr. of the Charge of the Charge of the Charge of the Charge of the Respondent gave Mr. of the Mr. of the Mr. of the Mr. of the Charge of the Charge of the Mr. of the Mr.

de la participa de la company de la company

By statute, certain claimants are excluded from recovering from the Fund. 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. Bus. Reg §§ 8-405(g), 8-408(b)(1) (2015 & Supp. 2022). The Claimant resided in the home before the fire and does not own more than three dwellings.

Id. § 8-405(f)(2) (Supp. 2022). The parties did not agree 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 Respondent performed unworkmanlike, inadequate, and incomplete home improvements to the subject property. The payments to the Respondent came from Dovenmuehle, which apparently holds the mortgage on the property. Allstate Insurance may also have been involved, but the evidence does not establish this as a fact.

The evidence does establish that the Respondent did not fulfill her obligations under the contract in two ways. First, she abandoned the project after completing the demolition and doing some very minor interior work. Second, the renovation work the Respondent did perform, i.e., framing, electrical, and ductwork, is inadequate and must be removed.

The Claimant's photographs of the subject property, taken every few months between March 2021 and March 2022, show almost no progress after the initial demolition. The interior of the home remained barren, with debris strewn in some areas. Around late spring to summer of 2021, some framing and wiring appeared in the photographs, but nothing was done after this.

By state to such a serior of continuous and their recovering free or an action of feet there are no such such as the continuous file of t

and the second of the property property of the property of the property of the state of the second o

The roll is a strong of the continue of the property after and many of the strong of t

March 2021 and M. sh 2022, ab we show that progress siting the plant of the major of the burnes served in the photographs, but world by a side of the 2021, some notice and within apparent in the photographs, but world by a side of the original content of the side of the

The Claimant does not seem to have energetically pursued the Respondent about completing the contract until early 2022. At that point, in response to the Claimant's inquiries, the Respondent replied that two different plumbing subcontractors had stolen money and fixtures intended for the job, as an explanation of why it was taking so long. The Respondent promised that plumbing would be completed in February 2022, but no plumbing work was ever done.

According to a work order update from Safeguard Properties⁷ dated March 3, 2022, the renovation was ten percent complete at that time.

The Respondent testified that she performed work under the contract until it was terminated and stated that it was "unfortunate" that she was unable to complete it. She did not specifically cast any blame upon others for her failures, but did mention the thefts by the plumbers and delays by the electrical and HVAC subcontractors. The Respondent also testified that she told the Claimant that she needed a further advance of money to continue with the work, but by that time she had already received \$63,789.24 from the Claimant and accomplished very little.

As to the adequacy of the Respondent's work, the Claimant did not produce any witness, expert or otherwise, to testify how the work was defective. The proposals from Wright's and Metropolitan both indicate that the Respondent's work must be completely replaced, but that is not unusual when a second contractor is engaged to finish a project that another contractor began. However, Home Check inspected the property on March 5, 2022. Home Check's report calls the framing "incomplete, unprofessional, and improperly supported" and noted "missing fasteners, missing hardware, improper notching of materials, inconsistent rise on the stair and over spanned framing members" throughout the home. Clt. Ex. 18. Home Check does not seem to have any stake in the renovation, and I give considerable weight to its findings.

⁷ Safeguard Properties sent progress reports to Dovenmuehle regularly.

Prince Chairm does not seem to have comparing in temporal facilities of the Chairman of the Ch

The Rest of the state of the state performed working the control was the second and the second and the second seco

As no transfer as a manife to she was defective. The period of model are shown as otherwise a manife to she was defective. The period of model and our manifests of the shear disease here disease here disease here disease as a second contractive of the shear and disease as a second contractive of the shear and disease as a second contractive of the shear and disease as a second contractive of the shear and disease as a second contractive of the shear and disease as a second contractive of the shear and disease as a shear and the shear and the

i Sa equipe C. Son etc. — at grigina signific Description in the regularity

Considering the Home Check report and the Wright's and Metropolitan proposals, I find by a preponderance of the evidence that the interior work done by the Respondent is inadequate and unworkmanlike and must be removed.

I thus find that the Claimant is eligible for compensation from the Fund. I shall determine the amount of the Claimant's actual loss and the amount, if any, that the Claimant is entitled to recover. MHIC's regulations provide three formulas to measure a claimant's actual loss, depending on the status of the contract work. The Respondent performed some work under the contract, and the Claimant intends to retain other contractors to complete and remedy that work. 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).

The Claimant obtained proposals from two contractors, Wright's and Metropolitan. The latter was the lower bid, at \$157,896.10, but included \$20,000.00 for replacing the roof, which was not part of the Respondent's contract. Removing that \$20,000.00 from the proposal yields the following calculation of the actual loss under the above regulation:

\$63,789.24 paid to the Respondent under the contract; plus +\frac{137,896.10}{137,896.10} Metropolitan proposal to complete the contract; equals \$201,685.34 minus -\frac{115,000.00}{15,000.00} the original contract price; equals \$86,685.34 actual loss.

Considering the Human County reports and the Weight's abdolfed up. Hair Light of the State of th

100

100

If the contract of work recording to the contract and the solicities or applications and the solicities of the contract of the

COMPLETENCE SECREC

The Claum Analysis from two configurations which is a fall of the control of the

S63,782.34 and to the the apprehens and a steer capables of 137,520.15 detections or open a complete state comment; expending a change of the comment of the

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.⁸ Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(1), (5) (Supp. 2022); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(4). In this case, the Claimant's actual loss of \$86,685.34 exceeds both \$30,000.00 and the amount paid to the Respondent. Therefore, the Claimant's recovery is capped at \$30,000.00.

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I conclude that the Claimant has sustained an actual loss of \$86,685.34 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)(c). I further conclude that the Claimant is entitled to recover \$30,000.00 from the Fund. Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(1), (5) (Supp. 2022); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(4).

RECOMMENDED ORDER

I RECOMMEND that the Maryland Home Improvement Commission:

ORDER that the Maryland Home Improvement Guaranty Fund award the Claimant \$30,000.00; 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;⁹ and

⁸ 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").

⁹ See Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-410(a)(1)(iii) (2015); COMAR 09.08.01.20.

of the street of one companies of the companies that the street ender the land by Do ali Edicini (1) (1) (1) (1) and all in the line of the literation of a continue of a continue of a continue 10/19 0.00 and the distribution of the Character is second beautiful for the control of the

If spondant saids a caninal one il tall tall application of the Basic State of the Said of seve as a district ed Barriel School and a place of the College College and the College College and the College College and the College College and the College a

strong and the thirt the Man had been small than the strong and th Official in the Maryland Home Improvement Camery Francisco

OHOER da de Respondents innigétates adder de 1980 HO 1070 Commercian license until the Respondent resimilarity the Country Fund to hadan Bila Cata ya kamati in kata atau kata argamata ki Bila Ma Hillia Ma Hillia Ma Hillia Ma

pilleto acitanga reidagen canisaa apun ga ibenapoleria. 🕮 Tylid ada mata 🖰 film in recording A was ablanced granter to the film flow milities. Also have no receive a in the markets and bounded not be appropriated the first training of the first of t and the "wife of the "wife of the contract of

ORDER that the records and publications of the Maryland Home Improvement

Commission reflect this decision.

April 6, 2023
Date Decision Issued

Richard O'Connor

Richard O'Connor Administrative Law Judge

ROC/sh #204284 ORES to appear on an appearing the Maryland Man. opini energian

poh!

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.

<u>Joseph Tunney</u>

Joseph Tunney Chairman Panel B MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION PHOP OFFICE OFFICE

of HERL 1: Whi, this is "they opinion at the december of both of the classical and being a superior of the state of the st