

**IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM** \* **BEFORE WILLIS GUNTHER BAKER,**  
**OF WILLIAM R. HALL,** \* **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 STEPHEN PATRICK** \*  
**SNYDER,<sup>1</sup>** \* **OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-21-00670**  
**T/A ALL STATE HOME** \* **MHIC No.: 19 (90) 1457**  
**IMPROVEMENT CO., INC.,** \*  
**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 November 14, 2019, William Hall (Claimant) filed a claim (Claim) with the Maryland Home Improvement Commission (MHIC) Guaranty Fund (Fund), under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor (Department),<sup>2</sup> for reimbursement of \$9,100.00 in actual losses allegedly suffered as a result of a home improvement contract with Stephen Patrick

---

<sup>1</sup> The Fund Claim and OAH documents have used "Steven" but the MHIC Licensing information shows the Respondent's name as "Stephen."  
<sup>2</sup> On July 1, 2019, the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation became the Department of Labor.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY  
5800 S. DICKINSON DRIVE  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637  
TEL: 773/936-3100  
WWW: WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

RESEARCH ASSISTANT  
SARAH J. HARRIS  
1000 S. DICKINSON DRIVE  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637  
TEL: 773/936-3100  
WWW: WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

RESEARCH ASSISTANT  
SARAH J. HARRIS  
1000 S. DICKINSON DRIVE  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637  
TEL: 773/936-3100  
WWW: WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

Snyder, trading as All State Home Improvement Co., Inc. (Respondent). Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 through 8-411 (2015).<sup>3</sup> On December 29, 2020, the MHIC forwarded the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing.

I held a remote hearing via the Webex platform on February 19, 2021 from the OAH in Hunt Valley, Maryland. Bus. Reg. §§ 8-407(a), 8-312; Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 28.02.01.20B. Hope Sachs, Assistant Attorney General, Department, represented the Fund. The Claimant represented himself.

After waiting at least fifteen minutes for the Respondent or the Respondent's representative to appear, I proceeded with the hearing. Applicable law permits me to proceed with a hearing in a party's absence if that party fails to attend after receiving proper notice. COMAR 28.02.01.23A. On January 14, 2021, the OAH provided a Notice of Hearing (Notice) to the Respondent by United States mail to the Respondent's address on record with the OAH. COMAR 09.08.03.03A(2); COMAR 28.02.01.05C(1). The Notice stated that a hearing was scheduled for February 19, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., via Webex. The Notice further advised the Respondent that failure to attend the hearing might result in "a decision against you."

The United States Postal Service (USPS) did not return the Notice to the OAH. The USPS did return the green certified mail receipt indicating that it had delivered the Notice on January 22, 2021 to the Respondent's address of record but did not attempt signature due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Respondent did not notify the OAH of any change of mailing address. COMAR 28.02.01.03E. The Respondent made no request for postponement prior to the date of the hearing. COMAR 28.02.01.16. I determined that the Respondent received proper notice, and I proceeded to hear the captioned matter. COMAR 28.02.01.05A, C.

---

<sup>3</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all references hereinafter to the Business Regulation Article are to the 2015 Replacement Volume of the Maryland Annotated Code.

Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is arranged in several paragraphs and is difficult to decipher due to low contrast and blurring.

The contested case provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Department's hearing regulations, and the Rules of Procedure of the OAH govern procedure in this case. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 through 10-226 (2014 & Supp. 2020); 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 on the Claimant's behalf:

- Clmt. Ex. 1 - Contract for new front porch at Claimant's residence (Contract), November 6, 2017
- Clmt. Ex. 2 - Better Business Bureau Complaint Activity, March 18, 2019 to May 13, 2019
- Clmt. Ex. 3 - Bank Statements with cancelled checks, November 2017
- Clmt. Ex. 4 - Emails between the parties, July 2018 and June 2019

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

- Fund Ex. 1 - Notice of Remote Hearing, January 14, 2021, and Hearing Order
- Fund Ex. 2 - MHIC Licensing Information of the Respondent
- Fund Ex. 3 - MHIC Notice to the Respondent of the Complaint attaching the Claim Form, November 21, 2019

The Respondent did not offer any exhibits.

#### Testimony

The Claimant testified and did not present other witnesses. Neither the Respondent nor the Fund presented any testimony.

... ..  
... ..  
... ..

CHAPTER

... ..  
... ..

SECTION

... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..

## 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.
2. On November 6, 2017, the Claimant and the Respondent entered into a contract to construct a new front porch on the Claimant's home (Contract).
3. The original agreed-upon Contract price was \$27,500.00.
4. On November 6, 2017, the Claimant paid the Respondent a deposit of \$9,100.00.
5. The Respondent was also building a back screened deck at the Claimant's home and was to begin the Contract when the other work was completed.
6. The back deck project was not substantially complete until September 2018. The Respondent needed to complete trash and material removal and fix a roof leak on the back deck, which never occurred.
7. There were issues with the Respondent acquiring the necessary permits to begin the Contract so the Claimant had to take on the issue himself with Anne Arundel County.
8. The Respondent had some personal issues which he blamed for the delay, but also had unexplained delays with the start of the Contract.
9. The Contract was never started and the Claimant demanded a refund of the deposit, which he has not received.
10. The Claimant filed a complaint with the Better Business Bureau (BBB) on March 18, 2019. The Respondent responded to the BBB on April 8, 2019 that he would complete the

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the integrity of the financial system and for the ability to detect and prevent fraud.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze data. It describes the use of statistical techniques to identify trends and anomalies in the data, and the importance of using reliable sources of information.

3. The third part of the document discusses the role of the auditor in the process. It explains that the auditor's primary responsibility is to provide an independent and objective assessment of the financial statements, and to ensure that they are prepared in accordance with the applicable accounting standards.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the importance of communication in the audit process. It explains that the auditor must maintain open and effective communication with the client throughout the audit, and must be able to clearly and concisely communicate the results of the audit.

5. The fifth part of the document discusses the importance of the audit report. It explains that the audit report is the final product of the audit process, and that it provides the client with the information they need to make informed decisions about the financial statements.

6. The sixth part of the document discusses the importance of the audit process in the overall financial system. It explains that the audit process is a critical component of the financial system, and that it helps to ensure the integrity and reliability of the financial statements.

7. The seventh part of the document discusses the importance of the audit process in the context of the global financial system. It explains that the audit process is a key element of the global financial system, and that it helps to ensure the stability and integrity of the global financial system.

8. The eighth part of the document discusses the importance of the audit process in the context of the digital economy. It explains that the audit process is a key element of the digital economy, and that it helps to ensure the integrity and reliability of the digital economy.

9. The ninth part of the document discusses the importance of the audit process in the context of the future of the financial system. It explains that the audit process is a key element of the future of the financial system, and that it helps to ensure the stability and integrity of the future of the financial system.

10. The tenth part of the document discusses the importance of the audit process in the context of the overall financial system. It explains that the audit process is a key element of the overall financial system, and that it helps to ensure the integrity and reliability of the overall financial system.

issues related to the back screened deck promptly and would complete the front porch within sixty days or would refund the Claimant's deposit.

11. The Respondent did not complete the back screened deck issues and never started the Contract.

### DISCUSSION

In this case, 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 (2014); 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 Respondent was a licensed home improvement contractor at the time he entered the Contract with the Claimant. The Respondent performed unworkmanlike, inadequate, or incomplete home improvements at the Claimant's home because no work was ever done. The Respondent and the Claimant entered the Contract in November 2017 and the Claimant provided the required deposit, but the Respondent never started work. He continued to promise he would start the work but gave months and months of excuses instead.



The Claimant tried for a year and a half to get the Respondent to do the work or refund his deposit. The Respondent did neither. Therefore, I find that the Respondent performed an inadequate and incomplete home improvement at the Claimant's home. 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 provide three formulas to measure a claimant's actual loss, depending on the status of the contract work.

In this case, the Respondent abandoned the Contract without doing any work. 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 a deposit of \$9,100.00. The Respondent did not do any work, so the Claimant's actual loss is \$9,100.00.

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 is the amount paid to the Respondent, which is less than \$20,000.00. Therefore, the Claimant is entitled to recover his actual loss of \$9,100.00.

The first part of the report is a general  
 introduction to the subject of the  
 study. It is followed by a description  
 of the methods used in the study.  
 The results of the study are then  
 presented in a series of tables and  
 figures. The final part of the report  
 is a discussion of the results and  
 their implications.

The first part of the report is a general  
 introduction to the subject of the  
 study. It is followed by a description  
 of the methods used in the study.  
 The results of the study are then  
 presented in a series of tables and  
 figures. The final part of the report  
 is a discussion of the results and  
 their implications.

**PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

I conclude that the Claimant has sustained an actual and compensable loss of \$9,100.00 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 that amount from the Fund. Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(1), (5); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(4), D(2)(a).

**RECOMMENDED ORDER**

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

**ORDER** that the Maryland Home Improvement Guaranty Fund award the Claimant \$9,100.00; 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;<sup>4</sup> and

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

**CONFIDENTIAL**

April 26, 2021  
Date Decision Issued

Willis Gunther Baker  
Administrative Law Judge

WGB/emh  
#191770

<sup>4</sup> See Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-410(a)(1)(iii) (2015); COMAR 09.08.01.20.

Faint, illegible text at the top of the page, possibly a header or introductory paragraph.

Second block of faint, illegible text, continuing the document's content.

Third block of faint, illegible text, appearing as a separate section or paragraph.

Fourth block of faint, illegible text, possibly containing a signature or a specific reference.

Fifth block of faint, illegible text at the bottom of the page, possibly a footer or concluding remarks.

**PROPOSED ORDER**

***WHEREFORE, this 10<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2021, 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.***

***Lauren Lake***

***Lauren Lake***

***Panel B***

***MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT  
COMMISSION***

