IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM

* BEFORE NICOLAS ORECHWA,

OF PATRICIA ELLINGWOOD,

* ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

CLAIMANT

* THE MARYLAND OFFICE

AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME

OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND

FOR THE ALLEGED ACTS OR

OMISSIONS OF JOHN KRAUSE,

T/A JOHN KRAUSE

OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-22-01057

CONSTRUCTION INC.

* MHIC No.: 21 (75) 1111

RESPONDENT

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 18, 2021, Patricia Ellingwood (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 \$4,168.00 for actual losses allegedly suffered as a result of a home improvement contract with John Krause, trading as John Krause Construction Inc. (Respondent). Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg.

er of analysis systems 全国大大学的大学,1985年中国大学大学、大学、1985年,1986年 CARL OF TWARF OF EAST OFF The state of the second of the The state of the s entrology and the state of the first of the state of the The light of the second separation of the control of the light of the Harry to the first the territory of a time and the contract the

§§ 8-401 to -411 (2015). On December 28, 2021, the MHIC issued a Hearing Order on the Claim. On January 4, 2022, the MHIC forwarded the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing.

On March 22, 2022, I held a hearing via the Webex online platform. Bus. Reg. §§ 8-407(a), 8-312; Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 28.02.01.20B(1)(b). Justin Dunbar, Assistant Attorney General, Department, represented the Fund. The Claimant represented herself. 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); 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

Exhibits²

I admitted the following exhibits offered by the Claimant:

Clmt. Ex. 1a - Photographs numbered 1 through 10;

Clmt. Ex. 1b - Documents consisting of:

- OAH Hearing Notice, January 26, 2022, no page number;
- The Claimant's timeline of events, undated, pp. 1-2;
- Emails, pp. 3-14;
- MHIC Order, June 23, 2021, pg. 15;

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

² At the hearing, the Fund advised it did not receive copies of either the Claimant's or the Respondent's exhibits. I gave the Claimant and the Respondent five days to provide the Fund their exhibits. I then gave the Fund five days thereafter to submit any objections to the admissibility of the Claimant's and Respondent's exhibits. The Fund lodged no objections.

CONTROL OF THE CONTROL OF THE WAY The state of the s $||x_{t}|| \leq t^{-1} + 2\pi i (1+\epsilon)$ which is known that $|x_{t}| \leq 2\pi i (1+\epsilon)$ In the English of the Company of the C in the city of the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of the city of and the first of the state of t The course of the second of the course of th in granger to the first form of the day. gert er skring dave i began et skrive ist. of a larger of the property of the first of garan da garan da kamatakan disertakan da kamatakan da kamatakan da kamatakan da kamatakan da kamatakan da kam Baran da kamatakan an salah di kebelak di keberanjak kebesah di kebesah di bandara kebesah di kebesah di berbana di kebesah di kebesah di berbana di kebesah di

- Letter from the Respondent to the MHIC, July 2, 2021, pg. 16;
- Contract between the Claimant and the Respondent, January 22, 2021, pp. 17-19;
- The Respondent's MHIC Licensing Permit, undated, pg. 20;
- Certificate of Liability Insurance, date illegible, pg. 21;
- Estimate from the Respondent, October 12, 2020, pg. 22;
- Estimate from Gary Myers, undated, pg. 23;
- Home Improvement Claim Form, undated, pg. 24;
- MHIC Complaint Form, June 3, 2021, pp. 25-26;
- Unsigned Contract from the Respondent, January 22, 2021, pp. 27-28;
- Receipt for the Claimant's payment to the Respondent of \$2,331.00, January 25, 2021, pg. 29;
- PNC Bank Online Confirmation of the Claimant's payment to the Respondent of \$2,333.00, March 30, 2021, pg. 30.

Clmt. Ex. 1c - Photographs numbered 1 through 4.

I admitted the following exhibit offered by the Respondent:

Resp. Ex. 1 - Fifty-six pages of documents consisting of the following:

- Cover letter, March 8, 2022, pg. 1;
- OAH Hearing Notice, January 26, 2022, pg. 2;
- MHIC Hearing Order, December 28, 2021, pp. 3-5;
- OAH Hearing Information Sheet, undated, pp. 6-8;
- MHIC Order to Respond, June 23, 2021, pg. 9;
- Complaint Form, June 16, 2021, pp. 10-11;
- The Claimant's Order of Events, undated, pp. 12-13;
- Unsigned Contract, January 22, 2021, pp. 14-15;
- Receipt, January 25, 2021, pg. 16;
- Emails, various dates, pp. 17-34;
- The Respondent's MHIC Licensing Information, January 22, 2021, pp. 35-37;
- The Respondent's letter to the MHIC, July 2, 2021, pp. 38-39;
- Signed Contract between the parties, January 22, 2021, pp. 40-45;
- Certificate of Insurance, undated, pp. 46-47;
- The Respondent's MHIC License Certificate, undated, pp. 48-49;
- Letter from the MHIC to the Respondent, August 31, 2021, pp. 50-51;
- Claim Form with date stamped page, August 18, 2021, pp. 52-55;
- Letter from the Respondent to the MHIC, September 14, 2021, pg. 56.

I admitted the following exhibits offered by the Fund:

- Fund Ex. 1 OAH Hearing Notice, January 26, 2022;
- Fund Ex. 2 Hearing Order, December 28, 2021;
- Fund Ex. 3 Claim Form, August 18, 2021;

I de transfer and the contract of the contract THE NEW COST OF STREET STREET And the state of the property of the second and the property of the contract of the contra to the profit of view of contribution of its to a surject that is the second to and the complete problems of the contraction Section of the section of the Section

- Fund Ex. 4 Letter from the MHIC to the Respondent, August 31, 2021;
- Fund Ex. 5 The Respondent's MHIC Licensing History, undated.

Testimony

The Claimant testified and presented the testimony of Gary Myers (Myers).

The Respondent testified and did not present other witnesses.

The Fund presented no testimony.

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 01-5545471.
- 2. On January 22, 2021, the Claimant and the Respondent entered into a contract (Contract) to remove and install concrete near the Claimant's pool to allow water to drain away from the Claimant's home's foundation, install a french drain near the Claimant's home's foundation and replace an existing strip drain.
 - 3. The original agreed-upon Contract price was \$6,995.00.
 - 4. The Claimant paid the Respondent the following amounts on the following dates:
 - \$2,331.00 on January 25, 2021;
 - \$2,333.00 on March 29, 2021.
- 5. The Respondent commenced work on March 23, 2021 and completed work on April 11, 2021.
- 6. The Respondent did not adequately level the concrete he poured and it does not allow water to drain properly. The Respondent improperly installed a drain near the Claimant's deck. The Respondent did not properly finish the poured concrete.

galagan Angarin di dalam sebesah di kecamatan sebagai dalam dalam sebagai dalam sebagai dalam sebagai dalam se and the control of the participation of the control and the second of the control of the radio a recentario i specifica e e e estable A COLOR DE CONTRA C in the control of the company of the control of the en de la militar de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la co The Both to the property of the particle was respective states to the late of the property of the form of the section \mathcal{F}_{i}

- 7. The Claimant contacted the Respondent several times and requested he inspect the work. The Respondent never appeared at the Claimant's residence to inspect the work.
 - 8. It will cost the Claimant \$6,500.00 to fix the Respondent's work.

DISCUSSION

The Positions of the Parties

The Claimant has a pool in her backyard. When she noticed the concrete slab between her house and the pool beginning to sink, she contacted the Respondent to fix the issue. The Respondent dispatched an associate named Troy who told the Claimant remedying the problem would require digging up 165 square feet of concrete, installing a french drain, installing a new four-inch strip drain and repouring the concrete. The Claimant signed a Contract for the work and paid the Respondent a deposit of \$2,331.00. The Respondent³ began work on March 23, 2021. On March 29, 2021, the Claimant made a second payment of \$2,333.00. On April 11, 2021, the Respondent advised the Claimant of the job's completion.

On April 12, 2022, the Claimant called the Respondent's office manager Shirley to express "concerns" about the Respondent's work. In particular, the Claimant noticed the Respondent failed to smoothly finish the concrete and failed to lay the concrete at the proper level to allow water to run into the drains. Shirley promised to have Troy call the Claimant. When Troy did not call the Claimant, the Claimant followed up with Shirley three times. After still receiving no response, on May 4, 2021, the Claimant called Shirley, terminated the Respondent and advised she would make no further payments. The Claimant memorialized that conversation with a written termination letter. Although the Claimant subsequently corresponded with the Respondent several times, the Respondent never inspected the work.

³ The Respondent John Krause did not actually perform the work, his employees did. However, for the sake of simplicity I will use Respondent when referring to his workers collectively.

real way the wife of the first of the second of the second State to be to be been small as in the final to the to the second of The first of the first of the second contraction of the second contrac Contracting the first particular contracting the second section of the second section of the second section of and the second of the contract of the second y ny taona na ao amin'ny taona ao amin'ny taona mandritry no ao amin'ny taona 2008–2014. Ilay kaominina dia kaominina mpikambana ao amin'ny taona 2014. and the second of the second **强截**, 100 克利克 150 € 1 The grand of the grand the constitution of the second of the constitution of the second of the secon on, report of the court will be provided with the fill of

Live of the engine of the control of

Fig. 1 Berry Street # 1 de 4.

The Claimant then contacted Myers for a second opinion. Myers has a degree in architecture from the University of Maryland and has been a contractor⁴ for about fifty years. Myers personally inspected the Respondent's work and took pictures (Clmt. 1c). Myers characterized the Respondent's craftsmanship as "just a conglomeration of bad work." The concrete around a drain requires a quarter inch per foot fall. The concrete the Respondent laid had only a sixteenth inch per foot fall. The Respondent failed to install an expansion joint at the house and water cannot drain because the Respondent installed the deck drain higher than the concrete. As a result, water will then enter under the concrete and erode the Claimant's retaining wall. In addition, the Respondent "broom finished" the concrete making it so rough it is "just terrible" and hurts a person's bare feet. Myers opined the Respondent should have trowel finished the concrete. A contractor cannot raise the concrete so it properly drains water and no caulking prevents water from seeping into the ground. Myers concluded the only way to remedy the Claimant's situation is to "tear it up and do it again." Myers provided the Claimant with a verbal estimate of \$6,500.00 to redo the Respondent's work. However, Myers has not yet commenced the work.

The Respondent provided little defense to the Claimant's case. He testified he never visited the job site and being overbooked with other customers prevented him from meeting with the Claimant. A few months prior to the hearing, Troy suffered a fatal heart attack outside an MVA⁶ branch office and was thus unavailable to testify. The Respondent agreed the two puddles of water in the concrete and the failure to caulk the joint failed to meet "industry standards." However, he disputed the quarter inch per foot standard Myers cited for the slope of the concrete. The Respondent testified he knew of no code provisions obligating that degree of

⁴ Myers has an MHIC license. (Clmt. Ex. 1b pg. 23.)

⁶ The Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration.

⁵ The Claimant never moved to qualify Myers as an expert. However, neither the Respondent nor the Fund objected to his opinion testimony. I shall address the weight I afford his opinions below.

rainte de la companya esta de la compania d The first of the consequence for the control of the feetend religious from the feetend of the control of the co and the second second section is the contract of the contract of the second section of the second section is a tal value on the following of the last agreement to be a proper at the contract of the contrac en aktivati in i i 🛊 na godan të kativa e a kë Porti (përde kojetati dhe de e mediti. on the section of the section of the insurance of the spectrality, acquest as for borner to . e di dividad la como di la companione de la como de la companione re fill a la forma de rema de mar de la forma de la forma de la fill de la forma de la constituir de la forma de l The Property of the Section 1985 and Themselves For the Conference of the Section 1985 and th and the first of the contract of the second of the contract of is a consistent of the set of the constraint of The last reflect of the control of t and the second control of the second control ukiya neka masa da ka ka ka ƙasar mara sa ka ƙasar na jingara ka mara ka ja masa green to have their latter on the manner of the contract of th

Appelle in a water for it is a second of the product of the produc

en de la prima de la companya de la

The first of the second of the

in the entropy of the first term of the entropy of

slope. He further explained his workers most likely did not install an expansion joint up to the house due to the presence of a drain nearby. With regard to the broom finish, the Respondent testified he saw nothing "too rough" in the pictures and denied the broom finish would hurt a person's feet.

The Respondent felt the Claimant overreacted by cancelling the contract. Had she given him more time, he believes he could have fixed the errors his workers made. However, he conceded culpability for "not the greatest customer service" since the Claimant needed to contact his office repeatedly to set up a meeting (which never happened). The Respondent attributed this shortcoming to a rush of work due to the pandemic. The Respondent believed the Claimant exhibited patience. However, if she had shown more patience he could have "made things right for her."

Analysis

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 Cty. 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.

The second of th and the companies of th and the second and th the second of th and the control of the on the section of the Chairman at the material terms of the first of the section Some the state of the second state of the second state of the second sec in a state of the second control of the second of the seco in the second of e de la companya de l The second of the second secon organism and the company of the sign factor of the contract of the second and the contract of the second contrac The bulk of the case hinged upon the testimony of Myers and the Respondent. I found Myers's testimony more persuasive than the Respondent's testimony. Unlike the Respondent, Myers actually visited the job site and personally inspected the Respondent's work. While one could argue Myers's bias due to his oral contract with the Claimant, I found his conclusions sound. Through his testimony, Myers exhibited a strong command of his craft. He explained the pictures in evidence in detail and how the pictures supported his conclusions. He provided technically proficient explanations for his conclusions. The pictures themselves support Myers's testimony. For example, one picture shows a level placed on the concrete. The reading on the level confirms the concrete has barely, if any, slope. (Clmt. Ex. 1a, Picture 3.)

The Respondent candidly agreed with some conclusions Myers reached (e.g. the Respondent did not properly level the concrete causing water to pool). However, he failed to provide support for the conclusions with which he disagreed. For example, while he stated he disagreed with Myers's conclusion that the finish on the concrete would hurt a person's feet, he had no basis upon which to reach that conclusion since he never visited the site.

Balancing the Claimant's evidence versus the Respondent's I find the Claimant met her burden that the Respondent completed its work under the Contract in an unworkmanlike manner.

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

to Tarresta. The course of the form of the course of the c Single in a side of applications, also a provide to be in it in a section of their and the second of the second o However the control of the property of the second second of the control of the co Horacan distance of the compact of the process of the process of the compact of t Life to the second of the second weeks to the earliest executions. The state of the s and a contract the state of the first of the state of the The state of the control of the cont The second of the second of the second of the The first of the contract of the first of th The second secon en de la completa de The second of th

The Respondent performed some work under the Contract, and the Claimant intends to retain Myers, an MHIC licensed contractor, to complete or 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 paid the Respondent \$4,664.00⁷ under the Contract. The Claimant will need to pay Myers \$6,500.00 to repair the Respondent's work. That total, \$11,164.00, minus the original contract price of \$6,995.00, renders the Claimant's actual loss \$4,169.00.8

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 is less than the amount paid to the Respondent and less than \$20,000.00. Therefore, the Claimant is entitled to recover her actual loss of \$4,169.00.

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I conclude that the Claimant has sustained an actual and compensable loss of \$4,169.00 as a result of the Respondent's acts or omissions. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg.

⁷ \$2,331.00 + \$2,333.00 = \$4,664.00

⁸ While the Claim form states an actual loss of \$4,168.00, I find the one dollar increase the actual calculation yields de minimis.

restricted to the first terminal and the first terminal contraction of the contraction of and the first that the constitution of the property of the control of the constitution er og grader i The state of the contract of t The first that the state of the figuro (in the paragraphic and in provincial entrol of the time of the content of [Bounder] 17 [Popular State Color State to an are the second to be a second to the s The section of the section of the or All Colors to the first section of the Colors to 1114 3

§§ 8-401, 8-405 (2015); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(c). I further conclude that the Claimant is entitled to recover \$4,169.00 from the Fund. *Id*.

RECOMMENDED ORDER

I **RECOMMEND** that the Maryland Home Improvement Commission:

ORDER that the Maryland Home Improvement Guaranty Fund award the Claimant \$4,169.00; 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

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

June 10, 2022
Date Decision Issued

Nicolas Orechwa Administrative Law Judge

Nicolas Orechwa

NO/at #198780

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

entry to the on in the sample of a few or the same to be The first of the continuous and its enterior in the lease of in second the first of the second of th and the state of t ontarija in ta**ski, risch**, chara _parakaj sin verdan.

PROPOSED ORDER

WHEREFORE, this 2nd day of August, 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.

Joseph Tunney

Joseph Tunney Chairman Panel B MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION

¥ April 18 Committee of the Committee of t AND WALLSAND