IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM	* BEFORE PATRICK E. MAHER,
OF KARYN SENKER,	* ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE,
CLAIMANT	* THE MARYLAND OFFICE
AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME	* OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND	*
FOR THE ALLEGED ACTS OR	*
OMISSIONS OF DAVID A.	*
MARROCCO,	* OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-21-24218
T/A MARROCCO'S STAMPED	* MHIC No.: 20 (90) 182
CONCRETE, 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 December 28, 2020, Karyn Senker (Claimant) filed a claim with the Maryland Home Improvement Commission (MHIC) Guaranty Fund (Fund), under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor (Department), for reimbursement of \$4,225.19 in actual losses allegedly suffered as a result of a home improvement contract with David Marrocco, trading as Marrocco's Stamped Concrete, Inc. (Respondent). Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 through 8-411

r jung grad jung terling <mark>kalan</mark>an di kacamatan kalip jung terling terling berada kalang kalang kalang berada k Company of the Compan and the fact of the second time and the second the second to the second the s per transfer the transfer and the transfer to the contract of (2015). On October 15, 2021, the MHIC forwarded the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing.

I held a hearing on January 19, 2021, at the OAH in Hunt Valley, Maryland. *Id.* §§ 8-407(a), 8-312. John Hart, Assistant Attorney General, Department, represented the Fund and appeared via the Webex videoconferencing platform. Daniel Donlick, Esquire, represented the Claimant, who were both present at the OAH. The Respondent did not appear for the hearing. After waiting twenty minutes for the Respondent or his 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. Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 28.02.01.23A.

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 (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?

2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all references to the Business Regulation Article are to the 2015 Replacement Volume of the Maryland Annotated Code.

radiation television of the forest transfer and appearing the factors of the contract of the contract of the factors of the fa gastrosienie rei urbana place bar nei teken einer teiligt een uit en een gereen een een een een en een aratelj The Barton Control of the last was at the Carton and the Carton an · Tennings and the contract of and the state of t and the state of t When how then they are good Settle objects to the constant

## SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

### **Exhibits**

I admitted the following exhibits into evidence for the Claimant:

- Clmt. Ex. 1. Proposal between the Claimant and the Respondent, May 28, 2019.
- Clmt. Ex. 2A. Photograph of the dive rock.<sup>2</sup>
- Clmt. Ex. 2B. Photograph of the dive rock.
- Clmt. Ex. 3A. Photograph of pavers.
- Clmt. Ex. 3B. Photograph of pavers.
- Clmt. Ex. 4. Photograph of pooling water.
- Clmt. Ex. 5 Photograph of miscellaneous construction debris in the Claimant's yard.
- Clmt. Ex. 6 Photograph of the construction site with pavers.
- Clmt. Ex. 7. Invoice from Paradigm Contracting, LLC., July 22, 2019.
- Clmt. Ex. 8. Photograph of pavers
- Clmt. Ex. 9. Photograph of pavers.
- Clmt. Ex. 10 Invoices from B. Kelly Enterprises, Inc., August 22, 2019, October 1, 2019, and November 1, 2019; copies of eight checks paid to B. Kelly Enterprises, Inc.
- Clmt. Ex. 11. Home Improvement Claim Form, December 21, 2020.

I admitted the following exhibits into evidence for the Fund:

- Fund Ex. 1. Notice of Hearing, October 25, 2021.
- Fund Ex. 2. Hearing Order, September 29, 2021.
- Fund Ex. 3. Letter from the MHIC to the Respondent, January 20, 2021; Home Improvement Claim Form, December 21, 2021.
- Fund Ex. 4. The Respondent's licensing history with the MHIC, January 18, 2022.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The dive rock is also referred to as a dive stone and a jump rock in testimony and exhibits.

	• •			
	. •			
	•			
	•			
	•	.		
	• . ,	,		and the stage of t
			ti dia 1900 menganakan d <b>ari ar</b> ah 1900	
			•	1
			The state of the second of the	
•	•			
•				
			•	
		·		
•		.	<i>:</i>	
	•		•	
	•		•	
	·			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
		1		of American Company
				· · ·
•			And a second to the Many of	in the end of the second of the
			The factors in the second	
			•	
	•			
	•			·
•		ľ	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			•	
		ŀ		
•				
		1		
	· .	·		·
		1		
		[.		
	·			
		1	•	
				And the second
	this take the little to the li		of the field acquired to be of a	The second of th
. •				
			·.	
•		•		a de la Co
`		- 1		
•		<i>₹.</i> [		:
		-	_	
		-		,
		*:,		
	1 - 1			
		- 1		
	·			•
•				
•	.	1	·	l l

### **Testimony**

The Claimant testified and did not present other witnesses.

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 01-47709. The Respondent's license expires on May 25, 2022.
- 2. The Respondent operated under the trade name Marrocco's Stamped Concrete, Inc.
- 3. On May 28, 2019, the Claimant and the Respondent entered into a contract for the Respondent to install pavers, deck drainage pipes, and a dive rock for the Claimant's swimming pool at the Claimant's home in Forest Hill, Maryland (Contract).
- 4. The Contract price, including a subsequent change order, was for \$26,061.00.<sup>3</sup>
- 5. The Claimant paid the Respondent \$26,061.00 under the Contract and the subsequent change order.
  - 6. The Respondent completed the work in July 2019.
- 7. The Respondent did not properly install the pavers around the pool resulting in gaps between the pavers and an uneven surface.

4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The original contract was for \$25,511.00. A change order in the amount of \$500.00 was subsequently added to purchase additional fill dirt for the project.

in the in the section of the participation and even a factors decreased in William of the form of the material articles and the dalikanen kultur - dun dan Amerikan in julia -THE COUNTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE WAY Compared to the state of the second sections trainer, to entre in the trainer and the state of t

- 8. The Respondent did not properly install the dive rock in the pool area, resulting in an unsafe condition and therefore making the dive rock unusable for its intended purpose.
- 9. The Respondent left trash, concrete pieces, and debris in the construction area that was supposed to have been incorporated into the dirt that was used in the backfill around the pool area.
- 10. The Respondent did not properly install the drainage pipes in the pool area, causing an accumulation of water on the Claimant's property after rain events.
- 11. The Claimant paid the Respondent \$850.00 for the purchase and installation of the dive rock.
- 12. The Claimant paid Paradigm Contractors, LLC. \$400.00 to remove the dive rock from the pool area to the adjacent garden area.
- 13. The Claimant entered into an agreement with B. Kelly Enterprises, Inc., to perform landscaping work in the pool area and to repair the unworkmanlike and incomplete work by the Respondent.
- 14. On or about July 23, 2019, B. Kelly Enterprises, Inc., submitted to Claimant invoice #1568 in the amount of \$6,617.35, of which \$695.19 was attributable to repair of the unworkmanlike and incomplete work by the Respondent.
- 15. On or about October 1, 2019, B. Kelly Enterprises, Inc. submitted to Claimant invoice # 1603 in the amount of \$1,529.18, to repair the unworkmanlike and incomplete work of the Respondent.
- 16. The total amount paid by the Claimant to B. Kelly Enterprises, Inc., to repair the unworkmanlike and incomplete work by the Respondent was \$2,224.37.

Marches Sir Hand of Englishing and the same of the sir The process of the second of t agegrands the segling through the structure of the first control of the control of the control of the control of The state of the state of the state of the state of grandeljas ar ar stationer et experiencias para and the following state of and the second of the second o en a care a service and in the contract of the service and Carry Co. Carry 122 300 . 2300 .

### **DISCUSSION**

## The Respondent's Failure to Appear

Section 8-312 of the Business Regulation Article, entitled "Hearings," states, in pertinent part, as follows:

- (a) Except as otherwise provided in § 10-226 of the State Government Article, before the Commission takes any final action under § 8-311 of this subtitle, or if requested under § 8-620(c) of this title, it shall give the person against whom the action is contemplated an opportunity for a hearing before the Commission or, as provided under § 8-313 of this subtitle, a hearing board.
- (b) The Commission shall give notice and hold the hearing in accordance with Title 10, Subtitle 2 of the State Government Article.
- (d) The hearing notice to be given to the person shall be sent at least 10 days before the hearing by certified mail to the business address of the licensee on record with the Commission.
- (h) If, after due notice, the person against whom the action is contemplated does not appear, nevertheless the Commission may hear and determine the matter.
  Bus. Reg. § 8-312.

Although the above statute applies to disciplinary proceedings against licensees, the MHIC uses the same procedures for hearings involving claims against the Fund, such as this case. *Id.* § 8-407(a). These procedures ensure, as much as possible, that a contractor against whom a claim is filed is made aware of the date, time, and place of the hearing.

On October 26, 2021, the OAH mailed a Notice of Hearing by both first-class mail and by certified mail to the Respondent's home and trade address in Severn, Maryland.<sup>4</sup> The Return Receipt, PS Form 3811 (Return Receipt) that accompanied the certified mailing was returned to the OAH on November 1, 2021. The Return Receipt indicated that delivery of the Notice of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The Respondent's home and business address listed with the Commission are identical.

The state of the s a programme and the second in entrepting year on it is set i Long through the transfer of the e e la landi. A CAN PER ELECT ENTER DATE OF THE and them The last of the time of the first of the second section is a second second second second second second second The same of the control of the contr programme to the state of the second of the state of the La ser di was in a la familia di anticolori di conservato de la conservato Selection to A Secretaria de la compansión de la comp I have a got went to be to past of your profession and a survey of

Hearing was acknowledged by a signature in the signature block on October 28, 2021.<sup>5</sup> In addition, the Notice of Hearing that was sent by first class mail was not returned to the OAH.

I find that the OAH provided "due notice" to the Respondent under Business Regulation section 8-312(h), and I held the hearing in the Respondent's absence.

### The Merits of the Claim

The Claimant has the burden of proving the validity of the Claim by a preponderance of the evidence. *Id.* § 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 Respondent was a licensed home improvement contractor at the time he entered into the contract with the Claimant. (GF Ex. 4). The parties executed the contract on May 28, 2019. The Respondent did work on the Contract and completed the installation of the pavers around the pool area, installed drainage pipes for the purpose of allowing water to flow away from the pool, and installed a dive rock by the pool in July 2019. The Claimant paid the full Contract price in several installments.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The signature was illegible and the section block to print the name of the recipient was left blank.

			હ
			•
		*	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	aproper i se mile a revi la patenze a se se e	·	
	entropies, a libert par official		
	्री प्रमुख्या हो सम्बद्धा । जाती हो प्रमुख्या है	•	
	•		
,		·	
	e la Politico el la composito de la composito		
•			
		turetakou jeditor	•
		r i sa kata da gabaran	
		er en 1991 en jaroin en en en	
, in the second second of		actor of William Research	r <sup>1</sup>
		o program in Albanda Albanda (1995)	
		ing to the <b>S</b> amual Section S	and the second second
		i jejsopa katolija.	
		e de la companya de l	

I find the Respondent performed inadequate and unworkmanlike home improvements with respect to the installation of the pavers and the drainage system and the placement of the dive rock. The Claimant was able to articulate the issues that arose from the Respondent's work in an organized manner and supported the claims with photographs. She identified each issue and presented invoices and proof of receipt of payment for the described remedial repairs that were necessary as a result of the Respondent's shoddy work. The invoices provided detail in varying degrees to support the Claimant's explanation of the defects found in the Respondent's work. The Claimant requested reimbursement in the amount of \$4,421.61 from the Fund.

It was the Fund's position that the Claimant has proven her eligibility for an award from the Fund. However, the Fund disagreed with the appropriateness of some of the claims for reimbursement submitted by the Claimant. The Fund recommended reimbursement in the amount of \$2,624.37.

For the reasons stated below, I find that the Claimant has met her burden to prove eligibility for an award from the Fund, but not in the amount claimed. For the sake of clarity, I will address the disputed claims in the order presented at the hearing.

#### The Dive Rock

In lieu of a diving board, the Claimant purchased a large slab of stone, a dive rock, which would serve as a platform to jump or dive into the deep end of the pool. According to the Contract, the cost to purchase and install the dive rock was \$850.00. (Clmt. Ex. 1). The Respondent did not install the dive rock at the edge of the pool as required, but instead placed it beyond the coping.<sup>6</sup> The dive rock was placed over one foot from the edge of the pool, making it unsafe to jump or dive from the rock into the pool. (Clmt. Exs. 2A & 2B). This rendered the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Coping is the foot long wide stone border that surrounds the pool.

en la companya de la The Control of the Market State State State Control of the State S and considerable in the Aria State Case of the Section of the Sect and the first of the second of gill og det kalendar for for for the second of the second over the survey of the survey The state of the state of Les Frances (1986) and the second of the sec The state of the s 字的 "我没有<mark>你们看</mark>你,要我们就的人,我就会说,这样的人。" State Control of the State Con garage en de Arriva

dive rock unusable for its intended purpose. I find that the Respondent improperly installed the dive rock.

The Claimant testified that once she determined that the dive rock was improperly installed, she decided not to attempt to properly re-install the dive rock in the pool area and instead had it moved to the adjacent garden area.

The Claimant sought compensation from the Fund in the amount of \$1,250.00, for the faulty installation and subsequent removal of the dive rock. The claim included \$850.00 which represented the contract price for the purchase and installation of the dive rock, (Cl Ex. 1), and \$400.00 paid to Paradigm Contracting, LLC., to remove the dive rock from the pool area and place it in the adjacent garden area. (Clmt. Ex. 7).

The Fund countered that although it agreed that the dive rock was improperly installed, the Fund should not be responsible for reimbursement of the purchase price of the dive rock as it remained on the property in the garden area of the pool. The Fund suggested that the appropriate reimbursement should be the \$400.00 cost paid to Paradigm Contracting LLC., to move the dive rock from the pool area to the adjacent garden area.

I find that the Fund should not be responsible for the cost of the dive rock when the Claimant decided to forego the proper installation of the dive rock and instead placed the dive rock in the garden area. In theory, the Claimant may eventually decide to have the dive rock properly installed at the edge of the pool. It would not be appropriate for the Fund to be responsible for the cost of the dive rock while it remains on the Claimant's property. Although I recognize the dive rock is not currently on the property for its intended use, the reason is that the Claimant decided to abandon the project.

I do find however, that the Claimant is entitled to reimbursement for the faulty installation of the dive rock. Unfortunately, the purchase and installation of the dive rock were

Captalately and their and the second of the second o the first of the second second to the second of the second and the state of t the second of th grander de grande de la <mark>dispe</mark>sa de la como de la familia de la como de <mark>la pe</mark>rcolonia de la como and the second of the second o The second of th lagger to the first term of the second control of the control of and the second of the second o the second of the protection of the property of the contraction of the the state of the s the second contract to the contract of the second states and the second contract to the second secon programme to the contract of t The second secon .....

not separated out in the contract. (Clmt. Ex 1). Paradigm Contracting, LLC., submitted an invoice in the amount of \$400.00 to remove the dive rock. Therefore, I apply the cost to remove the rock as the determining factor in calculating the cost of the installation. Accordingly, with respect to the \$850.00 cost for the purchase and installation of the dive rock, I would recommend that \$450.00 be assessed to the purchase price of the dive rock, and \$400.00 be assessed to the installation.

I conclude that it is appropriate to recommend that the Fund reimburse the Claimant a total amount of \$800.00 for the faulty installation and subsequent removal of the dive rock.

Fill Dirt

The Claimant sought reimbursement from the Fund of the \$550.00 additional expense that was added to the original contract for fill dirt to be used to grade the pool area. The Claimant believed that the cost of the fill dirt should have been part of the original contract.

The Fund countered that the Claimant agreed to and subsequently paid for the change to the original contract price. The Fund further argued that an agreed upon change order that is subsequently disputed is not a matter contemplated for reimbursement by the Guaranty Fund and that it was a matter to be resolved at the time the additional cost was incurred.

I agree with the Fund that a change order that is agreed upon and paid for, even if it was reluctantly done or subsequently disputed, is not a matter contemplated by the statute. The Fund may only compensate claimants for actual losses, which is defined as the costs of restoration, replacement, or completion that arise from an unworkmanlike, inadequate or incomplete home improvement. See Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401, 405(a). I do not find the change to the contract because more fill dirt was needed than was originally expected is an actual loss as defined in the statute. Accordingly, I have not included the \$550.00 cost for the fill dirt in my calculation of the recommended award by the Fund.

		·
		1
TENERAL CONTRACTOR		and the same of the sales
Table are more pro-		
		nie i go jet i
		l
ja vilo est 11 Vilo est 11		
•	•	
•	· ·	
		*
<b>\</b>		
		l .
		Part of Proper Independ
ा । इ.स.च. स्ट्रीसङ्घ्या द्वारा देश		West Company
	en en en mental de demante pli sente de	
		Maria See Lee Lee Lee Appellance
		only with the expense that you have a more

Invoice #1568

The Claimant submitted invoice #1568 from B. Kelly Enterprises, Inc., in the amount of \$6,717.35. (Clmt. Ex. 10). The Claimant averred that \$1,092.43 of the invoice was attributable to repair of the shoddy work completed by the Respondent.

The Fund countered that there are three separate line-item costs in the invoice in the amounts of \$50.00, \$67.24, and \$280.00, respectively, for a total of \$397.24, that are essentially identical to charges in subsequent invoices submitted by B. Kelly Enterprises, Inc. to the Claimant. The Fund opined that either the Claimant had been double charged or that the invoices were cumulative in nature as the work progressed. Regardless, the Fund argued that it should not be responsible for reimbursement of identical charges. Accordingly, the Fund would recommend that the amount to reimburse the Claimant for costs incurred from the faulty work of the Respondent in invoice #1568 would be \$695.19, broken down as follows:

\$1,092.43 Claimant's assertion

- \$ 397.24 Less the duplicative charges

\$ 695.19 Recommended reimbursement by the Fund

The Claimant conceded that the \$280.00 charge in line sixteen of invoice #1568 appeared identical to line four of invoice #1603. The Claimant sought to distinguish the other two charges from the ones found on the other invoice without much success.

I conclude that the charges submitted in the amount of \$50.00 in line eleven and \$67.14 in line thirteen of invoice #1568 are substantially similar to the work described in line three of invoice #1603, and the Claimant has not met her burden to show this is a separate and recoverable cost. Notwithstanding whether the Claimant paid the invoice, duplicate costs should not be counted twice for the purposes of reimbursement to the Claimant. As will be shown below, the costs associated with invoice #1603 are recommended to be awarded in full, so the charges for work done in invoice #1568 that I find to be duplicative will not be included in the

a jaroja ja sala kara da o compression de la compressión del compressión de la compressión Here were the second of the second of graphs to the content of the content o grand and a second 化工业品或量量,是基础设施的工作的。 自然的人 医皮肤 医皮肤 化二烷 The control of the second of the control of the con The second secon John Commenced in the reports to the company of the contract of the Complete State of the Carte Stat A SQUARE SECTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER that is a first of the common that has been as been a first of the rang ang ang ang pagitaga nagat na atom anagat na katawas at sa ka A Proposition and the second of the second of the second  calculation of any potential award from the Fund. I will recommend \$695.19 as an award by the Fund for costs incurred in invoice #1568.

#### *Invoice* #1603

The Claimant submitted invoice #1603 from B. Kelly Enterprises, Inc., in the amount of \$1,529.18. (Clmt. Ex. 10). The Claimant averred that the entire invoice amount was attributable to repair the shoddy work completed by the Respondent.

The Fund agreed that the costs associated with this invoice are related to the repair of the faulty work by the Respondent and should be considered in the calculation for a recommended award from the Fund.

#### *Invoice* #1612

The Claimant submitted invoice #1612 from B. Kelly Enterprises, Inc., in the amount of \$1,446.01. (Clmt. Ex. 10). The Claimant initially averred that the \$1,426.13 of the invoice amount was attributable to repair of the inadequate work completed by the Respondent. In response to questions during the hearing, the Claimant acknowledged that much of the work in the invoice was for landscaping work that was not associated with the faulty work done by the Respondent. The Claimant credibly testified that she was not sure about whether to submit this invoice for reimbursement as there was arguably some work in the invoice that was attributable to the faulty or incomplete work of the Respondent, but it was not separated out from the unrelated landscaping work. She further stated the Fund's investigator suggested that she add the invoice and that counsel for the Fund would review the matter.

Counsel for the Claimant subsequently argued that it would be appropriate to apportion one half of the invoice to the repair of the incomplete or inadequate work of the Respondent. I decline to do so. It is the Claimant's burden to prove actual losses sustained from the unworkmanlike or inadequate work of the Respondent and it is impossible to distinguish or

La la company de 99. g # 111 estable to the control of the contro it is the contract of the cont The second section of the second second second second Same a region of the term of the rest of t and the second of the second o inequal (12) garati e Balan da Kabana da ka rando de la compania trata a antico de la Maria de la Maria de Maria en in de la companya elle om tropiet et kind francische geweister in der der bestelle der bestelle der bestelle der bestelle der be And the second of the and the second of the first the second of th Server of the se that the transfer of the trans 

separate the costs for unrelated landscaping work that is included in this invoice with any repair work attributable to the Respondent's shoddy work. The Claimant to her credit did not seek to add this invoice amount in her calculations for reimbursement as she was apparently unsure of whether it was a viable claim. I address the invoice for the sake of completeness as it was included in Claimant's Exhibit 10 and counsel argued for reimbursement in closing argument.

Accordingly, based on the evidence presented, I 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; none of which the Claimant is seeking in this case. Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(3); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(1).

I recommend the following award by the Fund

Invoice # 1568	\$ 695.19
Invoice #1603	+ \$1,529.18
Install/Remove Dive Rock	+\$ 800.00
Total Award	\$3,024.37

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

The Respondent performed work under the contract, and the Claimant retained another contractor to repair 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

ရွေးရှိရေးများနှစ်များသည်။ ကြို့ကျား မြန်မာ့ လေ့သို့ အကေရာင် များသူ့နှာ မေးကို ကြို့သည်။ မေးလေ့ မေးသည်။ and the angle where the factor of the state The part of the first of the fi Some of the secret and the control of the control o The property of the property of the water of the contract of t and the second of the control of the second esse la companya de la colonia The figure of the first production of the The state of the s Karana Lipana (\* 148) - Karana Karana (Lipana 177) nedicke i transfer . At a company to the the market of the state was the contract of the Lip is present supplied to the large time to , eagle ( ) — ( ) 

proper basis for measuring actual loss, the Commission may adjust its measurement accordingly.

COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(c). The calculation is as follows:

\$26,061.00 paid to the Respondent; plus
+3.024.37 proposal to complete the contract; equals
\$29,085.37 less
-26,061.00 the original contract price; equals
\$3.024.37 actual loss.

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). 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 \$3,024.37.

### PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I conclude that the Claimant has sustained an actual and compensable loss of \$3,024.37 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)(c). I further conclude that the Claimant is entitled to recover that amount from the Fund.

#### RECOMMENDED ORDER

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

ORDER that the Maryland Home Improvement Guaranty Fund award the Claimant \$3,024.37; and

ORDER that the Respondent be ineligible for a Maryland Home Improvement

Commission license until the Respondent reimburses the Guaranty Fund for all monies disbursed

An a title and legal can be n symilati <mark>est in her skullitan mad senggelladir. Taka</mark> kelebahan The second second is the second secon and the control of th The first of the first of the second of the and the second of the second o and the Artistan Compagner I a file to the and the second contraction of the second con the side of a company of the control of the side of the control of the company of the contract of e en grafi <mark>en l</mark>e af ordor e**s** servico en escrete

under this Order, plus annual interest of ten percent (10%) as set by the Maryland Home Improvement Commission;<sup>7</sup> and

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

April 8, 2022
Date Decision Issued

Patrick E. Maher Administrative Law Judge

Patrick Maker

PEM/emh #197626

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-410(a)(1)(iii) (2015); COMAR 09.08.01.20.

# PROPOSED ORDER

WHEREFORE, this 13th day of June, 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.

Lauren Lake

Lauren Lake
Panel B
MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT
COMMISSION

