IN THE MATTER OF	* BEFORE LATONYA B. DARGAN,
THE CLAIM OF	* AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDG
NATALIA BASSFORD,	* OF THE MARYLAND OFFICE
CLAIMANT	* OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
AGAINST THE MARYLAND	*
HOME IMPROVEMENT	. *
COMMISSION GUARANTY FUND	*
FOR THE ACTS OR OMISSIONS OF	*
RONNIE CANTER,	*
t/a E & C CONSTRUCTION,	* OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-19-39698
RESPONDENT	* MHIC No.: 19 (90) 394

#### PROPOSED DECISION

STATEMENT OF THE CASE
ISSUE
SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE
FINDINGS OF FACT
DISCUSSION
CONCLUSION OF LAW
RECOMMENDED ORDER

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On February 10, 2019, Natalia Bassford (Claimant) filed a claim for reimbursement (Claim) with the Maryland Home Improvement Commission (MHIC) Guaranty Fund (Fund) for actual monetary losses allegedly sustained as a result of the acts or omissions of Ronnie Canter, t/a E & C Construction (Respondent), a licensed home improvement contractor. Md. Code Ann.,

THE RESIDENCE OF A SECOND SECO

# 

to successful fraction of the first particular of the second of the second of the first of the second of the condition of the first of the condition of the con

Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 through 8-411 (2015). By order dated November 18, 2019, the MHIC directed that the Claimants have a hearing to establish eligibility for an award from the Fund. On November 21, 2019, the MHIC transmitted the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH).

On October 15, 2020, I conducted a remote hearing via video-conference on the Google Meet platform under Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 28.02.01.20B. The Claimant represented herself. The Respondent represented himself. Justin Dunbar, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Labor, represented the Fund.

The contested case provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Department of Labor's hearing regulations, and the Rules of Procedure of the OAH govern procedure. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 through 10-226 (2014 & Supp. 2020); COMAR 09.01.03 and 28.02.01.

## **ISSUES**

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

## SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE<sup>2</sup>

## **Exhibits**

I admitted the following exhibits for the Claimant:

Photograph, Section of the Roof, August 12, 2018 CL #1: Photograph, Front of the Property, August 12, 2018

CL #2: Estimate, Allied Remodeling, August 27, 2020 CL #3:

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> At the time of the hearing, neither the Claimant nor the Respondent had submitted their documentary evidence to the OAH prior to the hearing. I ordered the parties to file any exhibits admitted during the hearing with me no later than October 21, 2020. The Claimant filed her exhibits on October 21, 2020. The Respondent did not offer any exhibits.

	* *		•	
San	and the grotering		् च्याद्वाद्वादक्षात्रकात्रकात्रकात्रकात्रकात्रकात्रकात्रक	
जिल्लाकार्यो अने ज्ञानी सम्बन्ध के समित्र		•		
englis is with my gittle (Type)				
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	N. S. S. F.
न्द्रीय संबद्ध कुर्वित के किस्तु कर में उन्हें के क्रिकेट		al a freewalf .	.0195 (1) 10 h	
Complete Complete Company (1997)		<b>\</b>	•	
	·		ি গেইকুটা ভালাক্যকু ভ	
rance our Albeit die Argrese		i i		
· 1994 Continues, early 17 a fo	:1	1		
, Level (1974) i 119 EA Select (1984) (1974)				
		. '		
i de film og sil med get ellergen.		. A Transfer of the second of	ena M. Novakena (1911)	
Šeic	o site papasa		•	n aku dasi dak
,				
* <del></del>				
	dridusi (Sec.)	was Danker		
Sec. (	File objects god		en lish od, oblice Total or total	•
21일 :		an Calaba and A		
		Territor Section of Earth		

Construction from Annial factorization and including the poly problem in the conference of an artist contraction of the contrac The second secon

CL #4:

Exclusive Lifetime Labor Warranty, Allied Remodeling, print date

October 14, 2020

CL #5:

Cancelled check, April 13, 2018

CL #6:

Contract, E & C Contracting, April 11, 2018

I admitted the following exhibits for the Fund:

**FUND #1:** 

Notice of Remote Hearing, August 28, 2020

**FUND #2:** 

MHIC Hearing Order, November 18, 2019

FUND #3:

The MHIC's Letter to the Respondent, March 11, 2019, with attached

Home Improvement Claim Form, February 10, 2019

**FUND #4:** 

The Respondent's MHIC Licensing History, print date October 13, 2020

The Respondent did not submit exhibits.

#### Testimony

The Claimant testified and did not present other witnesses. The Respondent testified and did not present other witnesses. The Fund did not present witnesses.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

I find the following facts by a preponderance of the evidence:

- 1. At all relevant times, the Respondent was a licensed contractor.
- 2. In or about December 2017, the Claimant and Respondent initially negotiated for the Respondent to perform home improvement work at a residential property owned by the Claimant<sup>3</sup> in Davidsonville, Maryland (the Property).
- 3. The Claimant and the Respondent entered into an additional contract (Contract) on or about April 11, 2018. Under the Contract, the Respondent was to perform the following projects at the Property:
  - Demolish and remove old deck
  - Install a new 16' x 16' deck with treated wood
  - Supply labor and materials for the replacement deck
  - Tear off and remove old roof
  - Install new 3-tab shingles and tar paper for new roof.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Claimant's nephew resides at the Property.

			٤
्राच्याचीयात् अस्तिस्यात् हेन्	n Military and market of	Hera Chable grad to	
	i Mangant fra Bandawa patrobas	e (vertiliës raares) – septime	•
		epenseus al Indepens	<b>.</b>
	S. 30 Edin <b>a</b> re gystein		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Sa A Chadacabaa (gal Cachacabayi a ba	roficial a communication of communication of the co	• ( •
	n developitation 1915 p. Broad 1987	o companies de la companies de La companies de la companies d	
	i Singalah	and the graph of the second	*
			• •
i the field the colored property of the property	antipatria inpina eja		
	gregory by the Mon	vice <b>scurs</b> in the invitation of the	
			·
i nastaviti.	ila te puli e <b>nac</b> e		
in a sectorible of Moreover as		นที่เกิดตระกับ ยีคว้าง การการการการการการการการการการการการการก	
i i sa minga i sultwo y begen i francis serv	•		
		natif (Philesiss Classical)	
Faces, to other accordance of the configuration in	•		
	Hit pod i rapovej i seko		
		te de la periodición de la properción de la completa del la completa de la completa del la completa de la completa del la completa	
	n otribe (M.		
		a tak Taloria da para da	
	grigi i takki kirigsi dikesi T		
	∰r. S	and the state of t	•
			• .

- 4. Under the Contract, the cost for the roof work was \$8,200.00 and the cost for the deck work was \$4,200.00.4
- 5. Under the Contract, the removal and replacement of any rotted wood in the roof's understructure would be an additional cost.
  - 6. The Claimant paid the Respondent \$12,400.00 on April 13, 2018.
- 7. The Respondent began the roof work at the Property on or about April 13, 2018 and completed the work within approximately two days.
- 8. The Respondent did not install a drip edge along the portion of the roof that met the gutters of the Property. As a result, during periods of rainfall, water infiltrated under the roof shingles and reached the wood substructure.
- 9. At the beginning of August 2018, the Claimant's nephew climbed up to the roof of the Property to clean the gutters. At that time, he noticed several shingles were not properly attached to the roof substructure and certain sections of the plywood that comprised the substructure were rotted and wavy. The nephew took photographs and notified the Claimant.
- 10. On or about August 7, 2018, the Claimant contacted the Respondent and requested that he return to the Property, inspect, and if necessary, correct the issues with the roof.
- 11. The Respondent made an appointment to come to the Property on August 7, 2018, but he did not show for the appointment. The Claimant contacted the Respondent later that same day via email to inquire why he missed the appointment and to ask if it was possible to reschedule. The Respondent did not respond to the email. The Claimant attempted to contact the Respondent again on or about August 10 and 12, 2018, but he did not respond to her messages.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The deck work is not in dispute.

and the many of the CM COSCO and a strong to the title of any of the strong to early growing.

1.76.002/AF2/2007 1/2 in Audi

at the color of the property of the following the following the following of the control of the colors.

And has able to a so having a commencement

。2008年1月日本中央中央中央企業中的企業。

THE SECTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE SECTION WAS ASSESSED.

d più tento vive periology da atribit, i danno acti transiquar a cess

and the transaction of the specific of the specific terms of the party of the specific terms of terms of the specific terms of the specific terms of the s

Then there were to result to be the fifth the lip liberting amounts and the confidence with the provide action

harr sin rage freinger gerleich ihr abeit die Areit aus ergen in beriegig seit ihr

The boding in the second of bodies the second of the secon

ado Do Hagaron de al Succión interfés de condición paren de l'endercaga que fore destinga de adobse o

तास स्थल व तार अर्थेस्ट व संस्ती वेस्त । से तार स्थल स्थल प्रकेश प्रकेश स्थल स्थलित विकास विकास विकास विकास व

Leasench conservation terrection in the fact that the property was tendered to the conservation of the con

dels diffilm could deligentes grade due la correttation place di difference de estimación

The Managagaist of the antitype difference of the Capital State of Managagaist, 1918.

The alternative of Military proper hurders up to be problemated in the control of the archive also were

raspura artineramente finicatafica agli i difer la esta ra carribbartaga discreta e locato degli concentento

ा प्राप्त के पेन कर हो अने कर राज्य है के हैं कि होते हैं जिए होते हैं है के स्वराध के के के के कि कि स्वराध क

magagaramili serupa miatatabaranten erigen e

comes fruit in the interest past and the stands of the lifeties of the frage of the configuration his contract

.... 301335

ทรงดูต่อ ทำกลดู อย่ากระบบ <mark>เมื่อ ระไ</mark>ที่ก็

- 12. The Claimant eventually contracted with Allied Remodeling of Central MD, Inc. (Allied) for Allied to inspect the roof and, where necessary, make repairs.
  - 13. Allied performed the following work on the roof:
    - Removed and disposed of one layer of existing roofing
    - Removed, disposed of, and replaced any damaged or rotted sections of the roof's wooden substructure
    - Inspected and replaced damaged sheathing
    - Furnished and installed shingles and matching ridge caps to all roofing areas
    - Installed drip edge.
- 14. The Claimant paid \$9,659.00 to Allied for the repairs to the roof. As of the date of the hearing, the Claimant has not experienced any further issues with the roof.

### **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.

There is no dispute that at all relevant times, the Respondent was a licensed home improvement contractor. The Claimant does not have any relationship with the Respondent that operates as a legal impediment to her receiving an award from the Fund. Bus. Reg.

Tarried to postaline all paste of the consequence of an extra material constitution of company allowers and resource and a phonon by the company of the parties of z – fielik karak karak karak karak karak bojiti, and lest position is larger at manifes belong the larger gave of spain The bookers of the organization in the confidence of the second contract of the file of the confidence of the contract of the minter ich erbritz aben privince to a second library and second and the three that a company of the particular contract that had been been and the common and according to the formation of the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of The form of the Contain place to prove the containing the party of the containing gram of an including the tradition of the company of the Colonial April 2000 and the colonial and the coloni restore, comission and in completion expension, is referred to the completion of presented in the following the completion of the completi าย ราย สาร์สเป็น เกิดสมโดยรวม ที่ กามหมาใหม่ เรื่อว่า ราย การศาสตร์ เอก ระที่ การสมโดยีไม่สาระสุริส ซาล์ก็เอก เกิดส ready the property of the second of the contract of the property of the property of the contract of the contra To rest the serious free or one the second of expension to the real of the serious of cases to respond to the c

to fine to a comparable of the control of the contr

villa com la Civilla (Tableska 1920 diglacia) ala socia) kasisi jeni ilinika ilinika ilinika

านเกิดเดือน เดิดเดือน เป็นเป็น เลือน เป็น เลือน เดิดเลือน เดิดเลือน เลือน เป็นเป็นเป็น เป็นเป็นเป็นเป็นเป็นเป็

a, Marati II ilia wakajiga alami wajipi una una kangabadi 19 kijinda anjarina ma ili salah anda

"一"我没有看点。

transport of the contribution of the contribut

§ 8-405(f)(1). The remaining question, then, is whether the Claimant is entitled to such an award. Based on the evidence, I find that she is.

The Claimant presented evidence demonstrating that the scope of the Contract included the Respondent performing work on the Property's roof. The Contract specifies that if, upon removing the roof overlay, there were any areas of the roof that were rotted, there would be additional cost for the Respondent to perform replacement or repair of the understructure. (CL #6.) I draw the reasonable inference that the Claimant agreed to this specification, as she reviewed and signed the Contract. The Claimant testified that within four months of the completion of the Respondent's work, deficiencies were noted with the roof. Specifically, in early August 2018, her nephew observed the shingles near the gutters had lifted from the wooden substructure and the plywood of the substructure was wet and rotted in certain areas. (CL #1 and #2). The Claimant contacted the Respondent and asked him to come back to the Property to inspect roof, determine the source of the problem and, where necessary, repair it. According to the Claimant, the Respondent agreed to perform an inspection, then failed to do so and stopped communicating with her. As a result, she was forced to hire another contractor to make the roof repairs.

The Respondent explained that he did not install a drip edge when he replaced the roof because to do so would have required removing the gutters and then re-installing them once the drip edge was in place. The Respondent conceded that he did not advise the Claimant of this possibility; he simply did not install a drip edge. The Respondent further argued that the areas of rotted plywood were located in the substructure of the fascia boards rather than the roof substructure, and the fascia boards and their substructure were not part of the Contract. The

en de la la la companya de la compan

The Common and the Common of t

The second continued to the second second continued to the second continued to the second sec

Claimant, on the other hand, produced photographs which demonstrated that the damaged areas of plywood were part of the roof's substructure. (CL #1 and #2.)

I am not persuaded by the Respondent's assertion that the areas containing rotted plywood were not part of the roof. The photographs produced by the Claimant clearly demonstrate damage to both the new roof shingles and to the wood substructure beneath the roof shingles. I am, frankly, stymied by the Respondent's failure to notify the Claimant that if she wanted a drip edge, it would require the removal and subsequent re-installation of the gutters. Even as a layperson looking at the photographs, it seems abundantly clear to me that a drip edge was required at the junction where the roof met the gutters. The Respondent appears to have installed an incomplete roof product and, as a result, there was water incursion to the wooden substructure which ultimately caused obvious, visible damage. This is unworkmanlike conduct. The appropriate step under the Contract would have been to alert the Claimant of the issue, quote her the additional cost associated with the removal and subsequent re-installation of the gutters, and, if the Claimant agreed, perform the repair. When the Claimant contacted the Respondent and asked him to return to the Property to inspect and fix the problem areas of the roof, she was acting in a manner that was consistent with the Contract and giving the Respondent the opportunity to correct his questionable workmanship. As a result of the Respondent's refusal to return to the Property, the Claimant had to hire another contractor to inspect and repair the roof. The Claimant paid \$9,659.00 for the repairs. I find the Claimant is eligible for an award from the Fund as a result of the Respondent's unworkmanlike home improvement.

Having found eligibility for compensation, I must now 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

error in a la set traditional decrease de registration de la colonial de la colon

The provide and the real policy of any or the real policy of the party of the real provide and the real provides and the real provid

entere de la company de la company de la fina de la fin

To the contribution of the

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 performed some work under the Contract, and the Claimants retained other contractors to complete or remedy that work. Accordingly, the following formula appropriately measures the Claimants' 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).

Using the above formula, I calculate the Claimants' actual monetary loss as follows:

Amount paid to the Respondent + Amount paid to correct or complete the work	\$ 12,400.00 <sup>5</sup> \$ 9,659.00 <sup>6</sup> \$ 22,059.00
- Amount of original contract	<u>\$ 12,400.00</u>
Amount of actual loss	\$ 9,659.00

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). Here, although the Claimant paid \$9,659.00 to have the Respondent's

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> CL Ex. 6.

<sup>6</sup> CL Ex. 4

The state of the control of the state of the

H. (00.43.)

The statement of the included in the statement of the sta

The second second to the second secon

on the distributed place that are a section of the control of the

The control of the second of the second control of the second of the sec

work corrected, she paid the Respondent \$8,200.00 for the roof work. Accordingly, I recommend an award in the amount of \$8,200.00 from the Fund.

#### PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the Proposed Findings of Fact and Discussion, I conclude as a matter of law that the Claimant sustained an actual and compensable loss of \$9,659.00 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)(c). I further conclude that the Claimant is entitled to recover \$8,200.00 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 \$8,200.00; 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>7</sup> and

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

January 12, 2021
Date Decision Issued

LBD/da #189906



Latonya B. Dargan Administrative Law Judge

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

t grigation cate where increasing the wigation is not any through a partial and give the The control of the second of t MESS LIST A FLORIDA EL PAR ne la central de la ciencia de la compania de la constitución de la co radio galgoro aran (1994). Parioporo realiza te como ligarise los sectiones de concidenciani il sete o alt The state of the s in the first office of the first of the firs Compared the compared to the c oradizživova je premesk<mark>ovi</mark>m ilotoko o terforacije <mark>belgastjecije</mark> i staveje i og or o esso del l'esso especialisme l'inferresett un estimation i casti des l'estàma e desgrippi l'italià A Por Barrier

man decrete di comme la graffichi e prit espirationi di lugi concesso agia miditari. 1970 ingelischeis eigen eigen von begeit **geg**annt bet er name inn bezeiten kannt zu zu en gegen ein gegen verm is a maga dalah jiran pelenjah salah d<mark>e</mark>rah meganag padah angkalah berampada daj pelenjah dalah sebega Thair Thicain i in is 15 seus tha ceasais alor . Was to among built care at the configuration in the series of the series of the series of the series of

า ค.ศ. ได้ดังว่า "กัด การส์ที่เหตุ สหพระกำอนสารได้

s estres à primilia de la

Bandala and mail ball

ASBEST (1990年) 1997年(1943年) g g William A garak Arting di greek f

## PROPOSED ORDER

WHEREFORE, this 17th day of March, 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.

<u>Joseph Tunney</u>

Joseph Tunney Chairman Panel B MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION

pyriden oa Production and the state of the first and the state of the The first of the control of the cont न्या के प्राप्त है। एक प्रतिक के प्राप्त के प्रतिकार के लिए है। इस के लिए हैं है Proposition to the second of the contract of t rang ng pang nagang kanang galawah sa pangsah naka tahun kalang ang panggalah sa panggalah sa a prison je bije krija prije nastaje produktara prije prije prije prije i kije i kije prije in prije CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF THE