

<p>IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM</p> <p>OF WALTER ASK,</p> <p>CLAIMANT</p> <p>AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME</p> <p>IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND.</p> <p>FOR THE ALLEGED ACTS OR</p> <p>OMISSIONS OF KYLE HARRIS,</p> <p>T/A MARYLAND PROPERTY</p> <p>RENOVATIONS, LLC.</p> <p>RESPONDENT</p>	<p>* BEFORE ALECIA FRISBY TROUT,</p> <p>* AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE</p> <p>* OF THE MARYLAND OFFICE</p> <p>* OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS</p> <p>* OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-21-25225</p> <p>* MHIC No.: 21 (75) 887</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p>
--	--

* * * * *

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 July 1, 2021, Walter Ask (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 \$13,500.00 for actual losses allegedly suffered as a result of a home improvement contract with Kyle Harris, trading as Maryland Property Renovations, LLC. (Respondent).¹ On October 22, 2021, the MHIC issued a

¹ Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 to 411 (2015). Unless otherwise noted, all references hereinafter to the Business Regulation Article are to the 2015 Replacement Volume of the Maryland Annotated Code.

1	1000	1000	1000
2	2000	2000	2000
3	3000	3000	3000
4	4000	4000	4000
5	5000	5000	5000
6	6000	6000	6000
7	7000	7000	7000
8	8000	8000	8000
9	9000	9000	9000
10	10000	10000	10000
11	11000	11000	11000
12	12000	12000	12000
13	13000	13000	13000
14	14000	14000	14000
15	15000	15000	15000
16	16000	16000	16000
17	17000	17000	17000
18	18000	18000	18000
19	19000	19000	19000
20	20000	20000	20000
21	21000	21000	21000
22	22000	22000	22000
23	23000	23000	23000
24	24000	24000	24000
25	25000	25000	25000
26	26000	26000	26000
27	27000	27000	27000
28	28000	28000	28000
29	29000	29000	29000
30	30000	30000	30000
31	31000	31000	31000
32	32000	32000	32000
33	33000	33000	33000
34	34000	34000	34000
35	35000	35000	35000
36	36000	36000	36000
37	37000	37000	37000
38	38000	38000	38000
39	39000	39000	39000
40	40000	40000	40000
41	41000	41000	41000
42	42000	42000	42000
43	43000	43000	43000
44	44000	44000	44000
45	45000	45000	45000
46	46000	46000	46000
47	47000	47000	47000
48	48000	48000	48000
49	49000	49000	49000
50	50000	50000	50000

Hearing Order on the Claim. On November 2, 2021, the MHIC forwarded the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing.

On November 4, 2021, the OAH provided a Notice of Hearing (Notice) to the Respondent by certified United States mail delivery to the Respondent's address on record with the OAH. The Notice stated that a hearing was scheduled for February 9, 2022, at 10:00 a.m., at the OAH office in Rockville, Maryland.

On February 9, 2022, I held the hearing as scheduled. The Claimant was present and represented by Elizabeth Morris, Esq. The Respondent was present *pro se*. Nicholas Sokolow, Assistant Attorney General, Department, represented the Fund.

The contested case provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Department's hearing regulations, and the Rules of Procedure of the OAH govern procedure.²

ISSUES

1. Did the Claimant sustain an actual loss compensable by the Fund as a result of the Respondent's acts or omissions?
2. If so, what is the amount of the compensable loss?

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

Exhibits

I admitted the following exhibits offered by the Claimant:

- CL Ex. 1 Service Contract, December 1, 2020
- CL Ex. 2 Photograph, bathroom floor, January 27, 2021
- CL Ex. 3 Letter from the Respondent to the Claimant, received January 29, 2021
- CL Ex. 4 Invoice, December 2, 2020
- CL Ex. 5 Email from the Respondent to the Claimant, February 5, 2021

² Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 through 10-226 (2021); COMAR 09.01.03; and COMAR 28.02.01.

1	1000	1000	1000
2	1000	1000	1000
3	1000	1000	1000
4	1000	1000	1000
5	1000	1000	1000
6	1000	1000	1000
7	1000	1000	1000
8	1000	1000	1000
9	1000	1000	1000
10	1000	1000	1000
11	1000	1000	1000
12	1000	1000	1000
13	1000	1000	1000
14	1000	1000	1000
15	1000	1000	1000
16	1000	1000	1000
17	1000	1000	1000
18	1000	1000	1000
19	1000	1000	1000
20	1000	1000	1000
21	1000	1000	1000
22	1000	1000	1000
23	1000	1000	1000
24	1000	1000	1000
25	1000	1000	1000
26	1000	1000	1000
27	1000	1000	1000
28	1000	1000	1000
29	1000	1000	1000
30	1000	1000	1000
31	1000	1000	1000
32	1000	1000	1000
33	1000	1000	1000
34	1000	1000	1000
35	1000	1000	1000
36	1000	1000	1000
37	1000	1000	1000
38	1000	1000	1000
39	1000	1000	1000
40	1000	1000	1000
41	1000	1000	1000
42	1000	1000	1000
43	1000	1000	1000
44	1000	1000	1000
45	1000	1000	1000
46	1000	1000	1000
47	1000	1000	1000
48	1000	1000	1000
49	1000	1000	1000
50	1000	1000	1000
51	1000	1000	1000
52	1000	1000	1000
53	1000	1000	1000
54	1000	1000	1000
55	1000	1000	1000
56	1000	1000	1000
57	1000	1000	1000
58	1000	1000	1000
59	1000	1000	1000
60	1000	1000	1000
61	1000	1000	1000
62	1000	1000	1000
63	1000	1000	1000
64	1000	1000	1000
65	1000	1000	1000
66	1000	1000	1000
67	1000	1000	1000
68	1000	1000	1000
69	1000	1000	1000
70	1000	1000	1000
71	1000	1000	1000
72	1000	1000	1000
73	1000	1000	1000
74	1000	1000	1000
75	1000	1000	1000
76	1000	1000	1000
77	1000	1000	1000
78	1000	1000	1000
79	1000	1000	1000
80	1000	1000	1000
81	1000	1000	1000
82	1000	1000	1000
83	1000	1000	1000
84	1000	1000	1000
85	1000	1000	1000
86	1000	1000	1000
87	1000	1000	1000
88	1000	1000	1000
89	1000	1000	1000
90	1000	1000	1000
91	1000	1000	1000
92	1000	1000	1000
93	1000	1000	1000
94	1000	1000	1000
95	1000	1000	1000
96	1000	1000	1000
97	1000	1000	1000
98	1000	1000	1000
99	1000	1000	1000
100	1000	1000	1000

- CL Ex. 6 Email from the Claimant to the Respondent, February 5, 2021
- CL Ex. 7 Email from the Respondent to the Claimant, February 5, 2021
- CL Ex. 8 Letter from the Respondent to the Claimant, received February 15, 2021
- CL Ex. 9 Letter from the Claimant's counsel to the Respondent, February 23, 2021
- CL Ex. 10 Specifications and Estimates, David's Remodeling Services, LLC, March 8, 2021

I admitted the following exhibits offered by the MHIC Fund:

- RESP Ex. 1 *not admitted*
- RESP Ex. 2 Email chain between the Claimant, the Respondent and Elizabeth Chan, November 24 30, 2020

I admitted the following exhibits offered by the Fund:

- MHIC Ex. 1 Hearing Order, October 22, 2021
- MHIC Ex. 2 Notice of Hearing, November 4, 2021
- MHIC Ex. 3 Letter from the MHIC to the Respondent, July 9, 2021; Home Improvement Claim Form, June 21, 2021
- MHIC Ex. 4 Department I.D. Registration and Licensing History, January 24, 2022

Testimony

The Claimant testified on his own behalf.

The Respondent did not testify or offer any 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 numbers 01-116114 and 05-135991.
2. At all relevant times, the Claimant was the owner of a home located on Jacobs Garden Road in Frederick, Maryland (Property), which is his personal residence.

Faint, illegible text arranged in approximately 15 horizontal lines across the page. The text is too light to transcribe accurately.

3. The Claimant does not own any other residences or dwelling places.
4. On December 1, 2020, the Claimant and the Respondent entered into a contract to construct a basement mother-in-law suite in the Property (Contract).
5. The original agreed-upon Contract price was \$33,000.00, to be paid as follows:
 - \$13,500.00 due at contract signing;
 - \$19,500.00 due on completion of the work.
6. On December 1, 2020, the Claimant paid the Respondent \$13,500.00.
7. The project was to start on January 11, 2021 and be completed by February 12, 2021.
8. On or about January 27, 2021, the Respondent provided two employees who did minimal work at the Property. The Respondent's employees worked for four hours and performed preliminary work in the bathroom in preparation for plumbing work. The requisite plumbing permit was not in place at the time this work was completed.
9. The Respondent did not perform any additional work at the Property.
10. On January 29, 2021, the Claimant received a letter from the Respondent. In the letter, the Respondent stated that he was "formally cancelling our current contract." The Respondent provided an invoice for \$9,290.00 with the letter.
11. The Claimant hired David's Remodeling Services, LLC (David's) to do the work described in the Contract. The Claimant paid David's \$38,500.00 and David's completed the work, including completing the unpermitted plumbing preparation work that the Respondent's employees started.
12. The Claimant is not an officer or employee of the Respondent, related to the Respondent, or related to an officer or employee of the Respondent.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

13. The Claimant has no other pending claims related to this matter and has not otherwise recovered for any losses connected to the Claim.

DISCUSSION

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

In this case, the Claimant has the burden of proving the validity of the Claim by a preponderance of the evidence.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.⁴

A claimant may recover compensation from the Fund “for an actual loss that results from an act or omission by a licensed contractor”⁵ “[A]ctual loss’ means the costs of restoration, repair, replacement, or completion that arise from an unworkmanlike, inadequate, or incomplete home improvement.”⁶ The Fund may not compensate a claimant for consequential or punitive damages, personal injury, attorney fees, court costs, or interest.⁷

Certain claimants are excluded from recovering from the Fund altogether. In this regard, a claimant must prove that: (a) the claimant resides in the home as to which the claim is made, or owns no more than three residences or dwelling places; (b) the claimant is not an employee, officer, or partner of the contractor; or the spouse or other immediate relative of the contractor or the contractor’s employees, officers or partners; (c) the work at issue did not involve new home construction; (d) the claimant did not unreasonably reject the contractor’s good faith effort to resolve the claim; (e) the claimant complied with any contractual arbitration clause before seeking compensation from the Fund; (f) there is no pending claim for the same loss in any court of competent jurisdiction and the claimant did not recover for the actual loss from any source;

³ Bus. Reg. § 8-407(e)(1); Md. Code Ann., State Gov’t § 10-217 (2014); COMAR 09.08.03.03A(3).

⁴ *Coleman v. Anne Arundel Cty. Police Dep’t*, 369 Md. 108, 125 n.16 (2002).

⁵ 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.”).

⁶ Bus. Reg. § 8-401.

⁷ Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(3); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(1).

Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is organized into several paragraphs and appears to contain technical or administrative information. Some words are difficult to discern but may include terms like "reference", "document", "file", and "information".

and (g) the claimant filed the claim with the MHIC within three years of the date the claimant knew, or with reasonable diligence should have known, of the loss or damage.⁸

The undisputed evidence in this case establishes that the Respondent was a licensed home improvement contractor at the time he entered into the Contract with the Claimant and, there are no *prima facie* impediments barring the Claimant from recovering from the Fund. *Id.* For the following reasons, I find that the Claimant has proven eligibility for compensation.

THE MERITS OF THIS CASE

The facts of this case are undisputed. The Respondent was a licensed contractor at the time he entered into the Contract with the Claimant to construct a mother-in-law suite in their basement. The Contract price was \$33,000.00 and was supposed to be completed in one month between January 11, 2021 and February 12, 2021. The Respondent did not start work on January 11, 2021. On January 27, 2021, two employees of the Respondent arrived at the Property unannounced. The employees worked two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon and dug a small hole in the basement, exposing a portion of a pipe. The Respondent did not acquire the requisite plumbing permit prior to doing that work. Neither the Respondent nor any employees of the Respondent returned to the Property to perform work. On January 29, 2021, the Respondent cancelled the Contract by letter. The Claimant hired David's to construct the mother-in-law suite in the basement. The Claimant paid David's \$38,500.00 and David's completed the work. The Respondent did not offer any evidence or testimony to dispute these facts.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the Respondent performed incomplete, inadequate, and unworkmanlike home improvements. I thus find that the Claimant is eligible for compensation from the Fund. The Fund agrees.

⁸ Bus. Reg. §§ 8-405(c), (d), (f), and (g), 8-408(b)(1); Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-101(g)(3)(i) (Supp. 2020).

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

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.

MHIC's regulations provide three formulas to measure a claimant's actual loss, depending on the status of the contract work. The first formula is applicable when a contractor abandons the contract without performing any work.⁹ In this case, the Respondent performed some work, but because that work has not been given value, this formula is the most applicable.

The Respondent performed some work under the Contract, and the Claimant hired another Contractor to complete or remedy that work. The Fund argued that it would apply the third formula. Given the minimal nature of work performed by the Respondent, and the fact that even that task was unpermitted and incomplete, \$13,500.00 is the amount owed by the Respondent to the Claimant.

The Respondent did not make an argument about the value of the work completed at the Property on January 27, 2021. The Claimant provided evidence showing that David's had to do all of the work included in the original Contract and therefore, the Fund argued, and I agree, that there be no value ascribed to the unpermitted work completed on January 27, 2021.

Therefore, I recommend that the Claimant's actual loss be calculated as follows:

\$13,500.00	paid to and on behalf of the Respondent under the Contract
-	\$ 0.00 the value of materials and services provided by the Respondent
\$13,500.00	recommended 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.¹⁰ In this case, the Claimant's actual loss is

⁹ COMAR 09.08.02.03(a).

¹⁰ Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(1), (5); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(4), D(2)(a).

both less than \$20,000.00 and not more than the amount paid to the Respondent. Therefore, the Claimant is entitled to recover his actual loss of \$13,500.00.

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I conclude that the Claimant has sustained an actual and compensable loss of \$13,500.00 as a result of the Respondent's acts or omissions.¹¹ 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 \$13,500.00; 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 as set by the Maryland Home Improvement Commission;¹² and

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

Alecia Frisby Trout

May 3, 2022
Date Decision Issued

Alecia Frisby Trout
Administrative Law Judge

AFT/at
#197964

¹¹ Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401, 8-405 (2015); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3).
¹² See Bus. Reg. § 8-410(a)(1)(iii) (2015); COMAR 09.08.01.20.

1945

1946

1947

1948

1949

1950

1951

1952

1953

1954

1955

1956

1957

1958

1959

1960

1961

1962

1963

1964

1965

PROPOSED ORDER

WHEREFORE, this 20th day of July, 2022, Panel B of the Maryland Home Improvement Commission approves the Recommended Order of the Administrative Law Judge and unless any parties files with the Commission within twenty (20) days of this date written exceptions and/or a request to present arguments, then this Proposed Order will become final at the end of the twenty (20) day period. By law the parties then have an additional thirty (30) day period during which they may file an appeal to Circuit Court.

J Jean White

I Jean White

Panel B

***MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT
COMMISSION***

MEMORANDUM

TO : SAC, [illegible]

FROM : [illegible]

SUBJECT: [illegible]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible text]

[illegible signature]

[illegible name]

[illegible title]