IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM	* BEFORE RICHARD O'CONNOR,
OF TERRY AND RONALD JENKINS,1	* ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE,
CLAIMANTS	* THE MARYLAND OFFICE
AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME	* OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND	*
FOR THE ALLEGED ACTS OR	*
OMISSIONS OF GREGORY STOTTS.	*

OMISSIONS OF GREGORY STOTTS, *

T/A GRELLIS CONSTRUCTION, * OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-19-34291

LLC, * MHIC No.: 19 (05) 736

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 March 7, 2019, Terry and Ronald Jenkins (Claimants) filed a claim with the Maryland Home Improvement Commission (MHIC) Guaranty Fund (Fund), under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor (Department),² for reimbursement of \$12,200.00 in actual losses allegedly suffered as a result of a home improvement contract with Gregory Stott, trading as Grellis

¹ Terry Jenkins signed the Claim Form. The Hearing Order and Transmittal name the claimant as Ronald Jenkins. The Jenkinses are husband and wife and are joint claimants herein.

² On July 1, 2019, the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation became the Department of Labor.

			•	
				ere kaj projektiva kaj kaj kaj kaj kaj kaj kaj kaj kaj ka
			a Comment	
				Remarks 1
		4 <u>1</u> 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
		·		
		e de la companya de		
			9034.5	
			•	
The first will also a religion of the place of the construction of		ให้เกี่ยวสามารถ ก็ได้เกี่ยวสุดที่ก็ก็ เพื่อใส่ทำให้ได้ที่ได้ เป็นได้เกี่ยวก็ พระสะสตร์ สหราชสา		
The first will state a spirit state in the constraint of the const				
And the second state of the second state of the second sec			• :	
Agricultura de l'action de l'action de la companie	Starting to militable validation of the interest	land term have been be	tak ila ja	
A LANGE A LANGE A LANGE OF THE SECOND CONTRACTOR AND A SECOND CONTRACTOR OF THE SECOND CONTRACTOR AND A LANGE OF THE SECON	out Course high through the spine of the course		7	
La description de la completa del completa de la completa del completa de la completa del la completa de la completa del la completa de la completa de la completa del la completa de la completa del la complet				
alterative section of the section of the state of the section of t	i Albania e de la litte da la cista de la	ig composition of the	17731 - 4.717	Brand Pina and Sandarah
alterative section of the section of the state of the section of t				
		lates for wear, a size, in	a sa a sa ta sa a sa a sa a sa a sa a s	រំ ដូច ស្គាស់ខ្លាំ ១០៩៤០ <i>រ</i> ៀវ១៤៤៤៤
	्राच्या (च्या प्रदेशी के प्राप्तान के पूर्व प्रदेश के आपके प्रदेशी के प्रदेशकार्य) के अन्य स्थापन		A (m) 2 1	myaxifi di Silangia 1995

Construction, LLC (Respondent). Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 through 8-411 (2015).³
On October 21, 2019, the MHIC forwarded the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings
(OAH) for a hearing. Hearings scheduled for April 6, 2020 and October 23, 2020 were cancelled because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

I held a hearing on December 15, 2020 by videoconference. Bus. Reg. §§ 8-407(a), 8-312; Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 28.02.01.20B(1)(b). Nicholas C. Sokolow, Assistant Attorney General, Department, represented the Fund. The Claimants participated without representation. Anthony M. Shore, Esquire, represented the Respondent, who was present.

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 Claimants 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 into evidence on the Claimants' behalf:4

1. Contract, dated March 3, 2018, signed March 19, 2018.

³ All references to the Business Regulation Article are to the 2015 Replacement Volume of the Maryland Annotated Code.

⁴ The Claimants attached cover sheets to most of their exhibits labeling them as "Appendix 1," etc. However, not all the exhibits had cover sheets, so the numbers given as appendices do not exactly correspond to the exhibit numbers stated here.

			•		
er e			mat Ar	14.32- 3.5	prika ing pakalawa di
		2.0			
Grand Company Oxford			The state of the	na gyzika-	el foreigno e logico (A.C.)
					e un julio propins
	. *				
	1	· ·			read was as partir in all the
en german komunika komu nika di kabupaten per Pendangan komunikan di kemendan kemendan kemendan kemendan berapat berapat berapat berapat berapat berapat ber Pendangan berapat berapa				i ve las i	may Water production was
ी क्षाना १९५५ को सुर्वे कुछ है। दे	sairtheologica e. D		f y je j		estivities telicosts cest
		· .			
	1		•		
			•		
्री अस्तर अस्तर असे विकास			្រ វិថីទីពួក	age die	
		, .	€ 47 •		m ki shiritsin tegapaki jak
	Pare Hills				1. 大 州 1.
The lagitue of			e La Transporta		
	· ·		•		
in a second grown at 20 h. The subsection of the second of					Stration in the Space Arc. Supplemental Arc. Supplemental Arc. (1997)
. එස් අති නම් දැන්නේ නියානම්දීම -	to digeneral to		on Henrich Line		proprieda fect diction of well of the control of th
			•		
				·	

- 2. Unsigned contract, March 3, 2018.
- 3. Another copy of the signed contract, mostly illegible.
- 4. Copy of a check for \$11,000.00, March 19, 2018.
- 5. Architectural drawing, April 17, 2018; emails between the Claimants and the Respondent, April 23 to 27, 2018.
- 6. Prince George's County Permit Application, May 1, 2018; Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission On-Line Permits Tracking System entry, November 14, 2018.
- 7. Emails between the Claimants and the Respondent, April 23 to May 14, 2018; Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission Permit Review Section comments, May 15, 2018.
- 8. Emails between the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Respondent, May 15 and 21, 2018; blank Homeowner Minor Amendment Checklist.
- 9. Text messages between the Claimants and the Respondent, May 22 to 29, 2018.
- 10. Emails between the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Respondent, June 7 and 21, 2018.
- 11. Copy of a check for \$1,200.00, June 15, 2018.
- 12. MHIC complaint, undated.
- 13. Text messages between the Claimants and the Respondent, June 29, 2018.
- 14. Emails between the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Respondent, July 11 to August 9, 2018.
- 15. Emails between the Claimants and the Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board, November 1 to 5, 2018; emails between the Respondent and the Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board, July 24, 2018.
- 16. Email from the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission to the Respondent, September 5, 2018; example of a lot coverage calculation.
- 17. Emails among the Claimants, the Respondent, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and Jim LaPier, July 18 to September 29, 2018.
- 18. Text messages between the Claimants and the Respondent, dates illegible.

					1 N
		100 mg/100 mg/1000 mg/ Marin mg/1000	The state of		
	\$ \frac{1}{2}		17 (1844 T.C)		• 4.4 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
 		to the will be		jamij kurimejskima 14. oktober industrije	
en gold herroft (f. 1. s.) George Lagranger (A. A. 1. s.)					
ละได้ของโดยสะเคยาวันสำรัฐ เพราะได้ เรื่อง เลยายน					, <u>E</u>
ALE DAR	yek. Ayşeler y			od ogo ern mod	•
est is reproductive of the	१८६० व्यक्ति सम्बद्धाः १			il ses med directors fi the of the promotive fi	
					•
				g desirence Colon d	
9765 0	a kata asat baya	hi ak to agostol			
And a représentation de la constant de la const	•				
en en 1990 en 1994 en En 1994 en 199	i uktorjit i i i i i i i i ktoria fetirati. I				
in soil acidille acet Legal is selli des l				Start Bartonia	• .
		i dear designation (). Ed was singulares (6)			
ं है। इस्ति प्रस्ति किसी, <u>इसे हैं किसी</u> हैंकि		produce desirente de la constanta de la consta			
ted forti	resignation of	្សា ខ្លាំ ៩ ខេត្តសំនៅ			24.
•			ŀ	•	
				· · · · ·	

- 19. Email from the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission to the Claimants, November 2, 2018.
- 20. Email from the Claimants to the Respondent, November 2, 2018.
- 21. Text messages between the Claimants and the Respondent, October 25 to November 9, 2018.
- 22. Email from the Better Business Bureau to the Claimants, November 14, 2018.

I admitted the following exhibits into evidence on the Respondent's behalf:

- 1. Emails between the Claimants and the Respondent, January 9 and 11, 2019.
- 2. Email from the Respondent to the Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board, November 16, 2018; email from the Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board to the Respondent, December 18, 2018; email that appears to be from the Respondent to the Claimants, date illegible.
- 3. Email from the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission to the Respondent, November 27, 2018, with attached list of documents required.

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

- 1. Notice of Hearing, November 5, 2020.
- 2. Hearing Order, October 17, 2019.
- 3. Home Improvement Claim Form, received March 7, 2019; letter from the MHIC to the Respondent, March 20, 2019.
- 4. The Respondent's licensing history with the MHIC, March 10, 2020.

Testimony

Ronald Jenkins testified on behalf of the Claimants.

The Respondent testified.

The Fund presented no testimony.

					•
					• •
n 20 bil 2009, man s		Markette e et fanneaue		f wat en die frachbi wert maar en die	
•					÷
		ကို နောင်းရေး ကျောင်းကျာများ။ 		វិទ្ធិ មន្ត្រីប្រខេត្ត។ •	· in.
in the second of the second of the second	AND ARTURE SEA	Talling Assuming	line je	e da geranda a s	
				3503	
en in de la seconda de la seco	projektori	District of party of the ext	ud de	្រ ស្រី (៥៧ឆ្នាំ សូមស)	er er Frans
				•	
		កែកស្ន ់ ពីការ សិក សិក នៃ ។ .		हार्ग विक्ति अधितास स्टिब्स्ट्री 	•
A STATE OF THE STA	led viscone	အေးဆွေးခဲ့သော သေးအပြီးမ ေ			
	gardal a, i	মাজেনি বিভাগ (চন্ট্ৰ) তথ্য			
า เก็บบาย เหมือนที่ผู้เป็นเมื					•
in the second of				rad akudati iyar 1967 ja n gi ta	•
		lasti Libra y teodrak Ingligika jeng Kalisa			• •
	ad albayet orly in		1. 14.	Marie Triber III.	
		ili Life (1) Life (1) Santa	100 mil	Carrier of the Alle	
	. • .				
			्राष्ट्रसम्ब		:
eren Herikanik		eser lass das filtres	i	property of some	<i>.</i>
478		နိုင်ဆောင်မေးနှင့် မေးနှင့် နေ	d palls		
					Wind Committee
			•		1991 to 1
	250	articulius Britan	i i i	k a valadit in me	
				septiments of	
			1		
	,		1 1 1 1 1 1 1	does yn historik a 1900.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
					•
					•
					•
	Ι .	1	1 .	1	

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 01-102832 (personal) and 05-134418 (corporate).
- 2. On March 19, 2018, the Claimants and the Respondent entered into a contract to construct a screened porch and an open brick paver patio at the Claimants' residence. The contract stated that work would begin on May 1, 2018 and would be completed by June 17, 2018.
- 3. The contract stated that the Respondent would obtain approval for the project from the homeowners' association and secure building and electrical permits.
 - 4. The original contract price was \$33,500.00.
 - 5. On March 19, 2018, the Claimants paid the Respondent \$11,000.00.
- 6. Aniisha White was the Respondent's employee who handled most of the administrative functions for the Respondent, including obtaining permits and approvals.
- 7. The Respondent needed to obtain approval from the Balk Hills Village
 Architectural Review Board before beginning work on the project.
- 8. The Respondent submitted an application to the Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board on or about July 24, 2018.
- 9. The Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board informed the Respondent on July 24, 2018 that the application was incomplete and would need to be resubmitted with additional information.
 - 10. The Respondent resubmitted the application on or about November 16, 2018.

			·		
			* ~ 3	. ·	•
	romotively.	ng an di Del ega ya gili sa a sili Ta	, et justings	Najarja	
e e prosedencje istalistice			jaker Liti	fijika ku in in	
en en la			n, 134, fi n	en englen b	2000
				(April 4)	
		Har grant Sylvenia I	.07-4	4.4 (d)	•
en de la companya de La companya de la co		e, kare seka a egi	- A + 2 - 12 - 12.	10 7 - 4 . Ali	egykethy i r
grafia – Santa and Arieland	un vi jir ve sa	the My shedge			
्राप्ताः स्थानम् । स्थानम् । स्थानम् । स्थानम् ।	is alogical temp	ings kingpi (Carl) 1513.		dus ex of .	
	n istipayly on		dis co	r iga a i	
					į. Ž
n (1997) No de 1990 (1997)	Kg, seemblin≢ der beig	Ngjerje se je za jezik	- dr @).i	empe die	
en e	જ્જારે કૃષ્ણા જિલ્લો હુ				
	in orași estatică de la constant de La constant de la co		ំ សំទេ		ja ligi sasabe
	ruli edrou et be	orio di Gyan de la Right Alex	As a mo		
	· ·	in description of the		•	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		en er er Historia er	e exten		
					one ⊈aya ana ‡a
en de la proposición de la composición	jágsej és gyetlet a ás	•			•
•		r i de grandigadan dasar.			
gart of a year or going the		រស់ស្នាំង ខេត្តសាសសង្	1		
					•
•					

- 11. The Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board approved the project on December 18, 2018.
- 12. The Respondent submitted a permit application to the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement on May 1, 2018.
- 13. The Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement works in conjunction with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), which must also approve building permits.
- 14. The architectural drawings submitted with the permit application showed a setback from the property line of fifteen feet, but the Balk Hills Village Comprehensive Design Plan requires setbacks of twenty feet.
- 15. On May 21, 2018, the M-NCPPC informed the Respondent that a Homeowner Minor Amendment application would be required for the project because of the setback discrepancy and provided the Respondent with a blank checklist and a copy of the applicable section of the county code.
- 16. On or about May 22, 2018, the Respondent asked the Claimants to pay \$2,500.00 to cover the additional paperwork associated with the permitting process.
 - 17. On June 15, 2018, the Claimants paid the Respondent \$1,200.00.
- 18. On or about June 6, 2018, the Respondent provided additional documents to the M-NCPPC. The M-NCPPC still considered the application incomplete.
- 19. On or about June 20, 2018, the Respondent provided additional documents to the M-NCPPC.
- 20. On July 18, 2018, the M-NCPPC informed the Respondent that the project could not be permitted as a Homeowner Minor Amendment. Instead, the application would require a

្រែក ក្រោយ ១វ៉ាក់ប្រ កប្រ	as brook (*)	r Thrustaghduic char	Tracijas	ut en
				na na 186 an
्राप्त्रकेषु वर्गात्र क्षुकार । इक्कार्य इक्कार्यकार		rig hermet i dahkada. Amaritat Iomora dah		
		and the second		
•	•			a prove assista isti
!	• • •			
		n handi silve gabesi di Andream mehan silv		द्राप्ता अस्ताः । । । । । द्राप्ताः । । । । । । । । । । । । । । । । । । ।
			} ·	Andrew Andrew Albert
normon part a their selections	100			
				ng ing play along digit. Danggaryan nga pagaha
	n sin istika	and the Second of the Second		englis as the later to the
in the state of th	Neda Legiski jan		e Section 1840	
			1	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	1	aliggaleyaha 1800. Spreggalikati 2000.	1 '	
	i te		İ	
- All symbol material surrogation	ajioti na ma			
A Commence of the Commence of	weers to the	i Karantan kanalan kanal		De Brief in
o na misura da la serie de la compansión d La compansión de la compa	, w		}	
		,		

Detailed Site Plan (DSP), many more documents, an application fee of \$500.00, and approval at a meeting of the Prince George's County Planning Board.

- 21. On or about August 3, 2018, the M-NCPPC gave the Respondent detailed instructions and forms for filing a DSP.
- 22. Sometime before September 5, 2018, the Respondent submitted an updated DSP to the M-NCPPC.
- 23. On September 5, 2018, the M-NCPPC informed the Respondent that the DSP was still incomplete because it did not state the total percentage of the Claimants' lot that would be covered by improvements and driveways.
 - 24. The Respondent did not submit a completed DSP to the M-NCPPC.
- 25. The Respondent did not keep the Claimants informed of the problems he was having with the M-NCPPC.
- 26. In October 2018, the Respondent told the Claimants that work on their project would begin on October 29, 2018. The start date was subsequently pushed back to October 31, then November 8, 2018. At that time, the Respondent did not have approval from the Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board or a permit from the M-NCPPC.
- 27. On November 1, 2018, the Claimants learned that the Respondent had not obtained the required approval and permits.
- 28. On November 2, 2018, the Claimants demanded a refund of the \$12,200.00 they had paid the Respondent.
- 29. The Respondent agreed to provide the refund. Over the next several days, Ms. White assured the Claimants by text message that the refund check had been mailed and would arrive shortly.

a figure of the state of the second		est ottografi i som til ottografi	The state of the s	ra direction
			n lateral like	e garanes
isalia eti malyona (2) yan			E Apple to	
		OM e bak	The second occur	and the following
Sign to declar to the control of the		the state of the state	od komencijski	
			1.00	
Light Red Tour Sweet Edward particip	a jakon kalin etin		strong Nichtlin	
n en aban in et mein en gring d	sili targadhi issan jila	s Years stay of the	la ex ercic	engs domin
		उन्हें कि	्रो क ्षासम्बद्धाः	falkom (ab)
. 18 . 18 . 18 . 18 . 18 . 18 . 18 . 18 .		the state of the s	m end Spell	
un el denna el se ott fan el s	Astronom Same aga	tijania Palini	a. serti ta i	
			DHONES	erin jakon
का विकास के किया किया किया किया किया किया किया किया			K halageria i	
e national constitution of	andr orderal probability			
godina del karolin era di karolin del karolin del	ha galleggien		14 SEC 3 8 8 13.	MARTIN COL
		mpiga twin 11.	in sanishe	## ogsaf
का १६० दे अक्टोबक्ट का की खंडा	auri) ben kini reuser		dieselico	ŽŽ.
			sit kaja sir uržija i	់ ភាពស្វែក ស្វែក
a jelandaju i i salitu kejar	c before the province			
			Padyout 1919	er bist or
		and the area		
to energy delication of the sign	r d'a Secreta Bija (pale	e Miller Control	ha reto is sub-ir	भा षेत्रकृत । विकास
				क्षा के किस्सी है पूजा -

- 30. No check ever arrived, and the Respondent did not refund any of the Claimants' \$12,200.00 payment.
- 31. On January 9, 2019, the Respondent asked the Claimants to sign a completed M-NCPPC permit application.
- 32. On January 11, 2019, the Respondent told the Claimants that he was willing to complete the project as stated in the contract.

DISCUSSION

The Claimants have the burden of proving the validity of their 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. I find that the Claimants have proven eligibility for compensation.

The Respondent received \$12,200.00 from the Claimants and did not perform any of the work specified in the contract. The reason for the non-performance was that the Respondent was unable to get the required permit from the M-NCPPC and made very little effort to obtain approval from the Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
· from in Verblands et al	ch process had	a copyright (district)		
	•			
of Helphania in the	art to see the	Big takk propality		
			andique descriptions	
riek Litalieus het hat h		rise iguali naksat		
		Variable of the second		
	- 1 - 1	Mintel Compo Hall College of Safe		
The contract of the second	o de gribiado.	ed gawangia cala	ja jaka <mark>ja</mark> nen <mark>i</mark> jareni	
		1.4		
સું ક લાઈ, તરેલા વૈફેલ્પાર જ	8 \$1 1 1 11] 8	de la	in the second of	
na mesani aya, e waya	ing anglas	i de Serikin e epis di s		
			16 JAN 198 DE DESERVE SERVE	
	ng nghi kasaki	ng militi nalitari.	Martinets (Martinet vol. 4)	
n an Tropana	ga r degakir	Nowselve មេឃុំ (២០)		
e describer i la compania de per	Les par Paris			
ing. Control of the control of the c	Hiteory of the William	r Berther Algunia	ark regriss Hikubara eren i Aurus	
	a tika ali		gyr as Marketti onen ryderid	
	•			
	on eller		and the base result in the	
visi i procesor i i mi meta e	n neg Ang	स्तर्भ कार की करोड़ेका है। -	Thoras years of the second of	
	gerie annigal			
	ोटकार्ट्राष्ट्रकार्थ	l 18 fi de de Machen Agric		
	•	.		

The contract called for work to begin on May 1, 2018, but the Respondent did not submit the application for a building permit to the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement until that same date. The application to the Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board did not go in until July 24, 2018. The Architectural Review Board immediately told the Respondent that the application was incomplete and needed to be resubmitted with additional information. The Respondent did not resubmit the application until November 16, 2018, well after the Claimants had demanded a refund because nothing had been done on their project.

The Respondent's bigger problem was with M-NCPPC. The Balk Hills Village

Comprehensive Design Plan requires setbacks of twenty feet, meaning that any structure on a lot must be at least twenty feet from the property line. The plans for the Claimants' screened porch show that at part of the porch is within fifteen feet of the property line. The author of the plans (apparently Jim LaPier of IMPACT Designs, LLC) and the Respondent did not account for the setback requirement when designing the project.

The Respondent was already behind schedule when he submitted the permit application to the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement. Then on May 21, 2018, the M-NCPPC told the Respondent that he would have to apply for a Homeowner Minor Amendment to get the project approved. However, after the Respondent filed additional information in June 2018, it turned out that a Homeowner Minor Amendment would be insufficient and that the Respondent would have to go through the lengthy DSP process to try to obtain approval from the M-NCPPC and the Planning Board. The M-NCPPC informed the Respondent of this on July 18, 2018 and provided instructions for the DSP.

ni har isan dikum yang dalam salah di Buda di Santa yang di di kangan di di kang di kang salah kang salah yang and the second of the second of the second of the second second of the s and the second of the second section of the second second in the second section is the second section of the second second section is the second section of the second section in the second section is the second section of the second section in the second section is the second section of the second section in the second section is the second section of the second section in the second section is the second section of the section is the second section of the section is the second section of the section is the section of the sec The state of the s The Mouth County of the trainings are to construct the wife and May define the วิรัช เดิด 20 เพียง เลยู 6 เพื่อ เพื่อ ครั้ง เมื่อ พระสมบัติ (1) เดิด เพื่อ เพื่อ เพื่อเกิด (1) เพื่อเลย เพื่อ re el la lagadecimació de la critera de la caració de critera la caración de la companión de la companión de l region because i and the second second to the second s enera que vera coma que a el gará e reparte de los sar altre a lobración de lama en el carda de a lamber en especial Charles than to be found that the country of the speciment of the second the country of the second the country ကျန်းကျွန်းကိုမှ လေးမသေးမေရှိ ကြည်မြို့သည် လူ့လည်းကိုမော်လူကိုရီမဟတ် မောက် မြည်များကို သို့သိများမှုသည် ကျောင်းများမှု မြို့နေ restructival in the field confunction of him (i.e.) any to a \$100 to \$10 miles and in the conand the first of the control of the referencia en el composito de la facilita de la composition della and the agricultural participation of the control o en e est i sittigga karettari 🖟 ali sittigarettari 1.00 (2) 医大力 1.00 (2) (2) (2) Transfer to the figure and a see to be for the see the problem per compare it. o national by a by a but in the contract of the ra filipa e securi una forma della disensamba della della forma i lettari disenti che disensi. I ာမွာ မောက် လေးများပြင်မှာ မြန်များပြန်း မရွားလျှင်းနှာ မောက်သော ပြုများသည်။ သောဗေနှုပ်သည် ကောင်းကြန်များပ of acciding to the contract of the first and the first of the contract of of the Thursday the color of the color

Emails between the M-NCPPC and the Respondent make clear that Ms. White was unable to submit a properly completed DSP application. The Respondent provided more documentation in August 2018, but as of September 5, 2018, the M-NCPPC still considered the application incomplete because at least one necessary element was missing, a calculation of the percentage of the Claimants' lot that would be under roof (or devoted to driveways and parking) once the project was complete. Nothing in the evidence shows that this information was ever provided, and the M-NCPPC never issued a permit for the project.

Equally lacking from the evidence is anything indicating that the Respondent kept the Claimants informed of his problems with the M-NCPPC or explaining why their project had not yet begun. On May 22, 2018, the Respondent asked the Claimants to pay \$2,500.00 to compensate for additional paperwork. It is unclear whether this payment was to be an addition to the contract price or an advance on the next draw. In any event, the Claimants paid \$1,200.00 on June 15, 2018.

The documents in evidence show the next written communication with the Claimants as September 29, 2018, when the Claimants asked Ms. White: "What's the next step now that the final drawing has been provided!" [sic]. This indicates that as of that date, the Respondent had told the Claimants that the "final drawing" had been submitted to the M-NCPPC. Emails between Ms. White, Mr. LaPier, and the Respondent on August 23 and 24, 2018 refer to "Instructions for Filing a Detailed Site Plan," but these seem to be follow-up on the instructions that the M-NCPPC had provided.

What is certain is that as of September 5, 2018, the M-NCPPC did not consider the Respondent's application complete, yet the Respondent told the Claimants that the final drawing

⁵ The contract called for the next payment of \$11,000.00 to be made when construction began.

				·	
•					
•					
arki e go ^{ki}		and the		1. 4.1.1	e a celebration in the
्र १८८० व्यक्तिकृतिसम्बद्धाः			kan melangan	A am se	ngsaladi gambi
	as republic	en estra	gradua karanen ekoa.	1 € 1 11	, estimates established
	in eghtir kalling.		eleman ka libera sadi	roi éne.	
r Till state og state Till state og state		Try make	indian un en allai Palan		e moonene een
			ng charach tha ag tar Tagairt		
ora Davids i	perjumané sa mang	e Section of the Control	ngiriyara s el s pecificat liga		get be subscipt
· Algebraiche		agar en S	i Ngjarga <mark>eta jak</mark> ara.	12 44	e consensity describe
			g. Da lan lanen illigi sagi	ir C.	in the t emperature
		region de la companya		erijā.	atternalism opposit
en egittig erre	o e significant		to the second of the second	a. 5. 6. 6.	ar isaloutratea (f)
					·
। তাল স্কুছ্যুমাইলোকে বিভিন্ন ।	English out only	atter ja en l	i Navoses (<mark>va posto</mark>)	Jakitan in	kangan a ng at te
i Lagranda esta		hy districtly			er de Sjal de Ledour de
			ranado juação as sujo		
		9 4 1, 43 <i>t</i> ,		100	eri androning profess
174.a.			nata est grafficado	arad.	
				radio (1)	
an terdida				\$1 to 31	हारे अनुसरकार हो। यह हो तह ।
janako kaj		este oli 1,0	niteggali neetsek nit	. Sign	
			•		
	The state of the s			1000	e pagi 20 Manji langan 19 ki to ili
		•	·		

had been submitted. In fact, the Respondent never provided the lot coverage calculations that, perhaps, would have finalized the application. Yet in October 2018, the Respondent still assured the Claimants that work would start momentarily, telling them in a text message: "We will be starting Oct 29th." In response to the Claimants' inquiry about homeowners' association approval, the Respondent texted: "Everything is straight..." At the same time, the Respondent indicated that he was awaiting receipt of the approval package from the county, which was not true. Nor had he obtained approval from the Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board.

When work did not start as promised, the Claimants inquired about the status of project to the Balk Hills Village Architectural Review Board and the M-NCPPC, quickly learning that neither application had ever been completed.

On November 2, 2018, the Claimants emailed the Respondent that their "patience has run out," cancelled the contract, and requested a refund of the \$12,200.00 they had paid. On November 5, 2018, the Respondent texted: "We received your call your check was mailed from our main office you will receive it in two business days." Over the next week, the Respondent continued to assure the Claimants that the check was in the mail, but no check was ever actually sent, and the Respondent did not refund any money.

The Respondent then contacted the Claimants by email on January 9, 2019, asking them to "sign off on major amendment application." On January 11, 2019, he told the Claimants that he was willing to finish the job as stated in the contract if the M-NCPPC application was approved. The Claimants responded that the Respondent had never told them that a major amendment was required and that they were not interested in continuing the contract.

At the hearing, the Respondent testified that the delay in the M-NCPPC permit was caused by the Claimants' refusal to sign the completed M-NCPPC application. He stated that he

	₩ :			
om lizeren mener	mer had some		Ω÷s ist	er of the process and the first
Amprophis Protonic swip		ကြောင်းကြောင့် ကြောနေသည်။ ကြောကြောင့် ကြောနေသည်	vir justi	
a Hillion - Mari Lugar Alexa		pictal (spirite uniornic)		
40,54,502,61, 0.13	ore procedures a	tings to occurre the	的原理	ora di Ariani. Jir ik
राज्य बहुमाना होते हुन्हें, हुबहुन्हें हैं।	tom plane	ideje je zakovenje: Rođenje si zakovenje:	Turk did.	त्वानेक्षणी सुन्दिकको हो १५८ है है
र १ इसम् क्लेमिन ५ ध्याम ा	en en begyt			under er die Wilderhald
A Annual teacher (1800)	on Bayers (III)	ingigi i Alma più meno.		
unita en la media de Ro	,			
ชายโดยรูปกายประชาณได้เรียก และ		to the many projects to		the opposite of the first of many
	e e e			to deally a to his detections
'				. I magget st. 13
		ide est. Trada e		ette (tall 1 de mas 1,6 c.
				4 449 (C.100) 11 Companies
	,			Legislande de la distribuição
Species our grantes		· · ·		tame manager of lamager to the
		1	1	tinings. The second
n destrigação (PTS) (P. d.) T			•	
	· ·	1		
• *		•	1	reitinger in Hertiewa (1) The control of the contro
•				escriptos a los de debenarações
•		च्युक्तास्य स्थापना स्थापना स्थापना स्थापना स्थापना स्थापना स्थापन		ter levice of \$1 mane introduced
	•		·	

first asked the Claimants to sign in October or November 2018 but was unsure when the application had been completed. He did not produce any documentation of a request to sign before the email of January 9, 2019.

The Respondent further testified that he did not know that the M-NCPPC needed a "major amendment" (actually a DSP) until "months" after he applied for a permit. The date of that revelation was July 18, 2018, so the Respondent's testimony on this point is technically true but is misleading because in the ensuing months he did not seem to have the expertise to give the M-NCPPC the information it required, instead providing documents piecemeal and never submitting everything that was needed for approval.

Additionally, the Respondent certainly did not keep the Claimants apprised of his difficulties with the M-NCPPC. There is no evidence of any discussion with the Claimants about why approval was taking so long, the problem with the setback, or the possibility of revising the project to comply with the Balk Hills Village Comprehensive Design Plan. In October, the Respondent was still telling the Claimants that work would start that month, even though he knew that was not possible.

On the issue of the delay being due to the Claimants' failure to sign the M-NCPPC application, I do not find the Respondent's testimony credible. Nothing in the emails and text messages indicates that the Respondent asked the Claimants to sign anything before January 9, 2019. Mr. Jenkins vigorously denied ever being asked to sign an application. The Claimants obtained all the emailed communications between the Respondent and the M-NCPPC, and nothing therein shows that the application was awaiting the homeowners' signatures. The Respondent's testimony on this point is a fabricated excuse for his own failures.

the mail was the second to the treat and the cities to research a first and the mail of the above the contract of r agin ra waggan bila di kuru gagajah gilan wakan gilan bila eti beri biga bila sestilik kuruwa sijiri. How a go land to the good and an o transpart of the North Control of the Property of the public of the section of the section of the section of ora oscilo dimina coministino di entitali i comatali di malle di di a gioritari il comunicipi. Il ren egite kenjenik sil krimy si 🖰 da gena melen bila dyan gensi da a bir 📗 selikji bilik dawa enisariwa menj e val. 1. april 1921. Miller of milled eval in all Malace gris and all all face is all manifes in a l Commission and the Commercial of the ordering and formation of the Commission of the Like particular to the property to the effect of the early the exof the few records within 190 records the profession of the correspondence of the contract of का बने १५० जा महीति अस्त केंग्राची को की कहा है। असे के असे की आहे होता हो । विशेष की केंग्राची की मिल ंक्ष्म हो क्षेत्र करते हैं अस्ति <mark>प्रकार के तो प्रकार के लेकिन की करते हैं हैं</mark> के लिए के किस के किस कर के किस ह one chart mant car their , repared equilibrate or the research est planting of the first of the second of the second of the second of the first of the second of the second of Table of the state The Control of the with the time of the control of ana tikung dipung dipang pilakang salifatan ing penggana mangalah timba tipika masila da mita agaga of graph all their strandered for a particular for the first transfer and the first transfer to be consequent. and the state of the section of the property of the section of the jika – oto ilijikissiki olika <mark>kasi gangang</mark> oleh <mark>sati aratenga</mark>t menjadi indibidi di basak ana ili dibeki di k over opposite tug die en litterje galiken of domanika. Hole oet om vergde pit seil og den en en de la militaria de la companya d

Section 8-405(d) of the Business Regulation Article states that the MHIC may reject a claim if it finds that the homeowner rejected good faith efforts by the contractor to resolve the claim. As stated previously, the Respondent indicated a willingness to complete the contract on January 11, 2019. The Claimants rejected this offer because they felt that the Respondent had not been honest with them about the status of the permit application, the approval of the homeowners' association, or the start date of the work.

I find the that Claimants' unwillingness to continue to work with the Respondent is reasonable. The evidence is clear that until November 1, 2018, the Claimants were in the dark as to the status of their project and were still being told that it would begin at any moment. In other words, the Respondent had been untruthful with them for months while the permit process languished. When the Claimants realized this, they filed a complaint with the MHIC. The Respondent's emails of January 9 and 11, 2019, were merely attempts to deflect blame, not good faith efforts to resolve the situation.

I thus find that the Claimants are eligible for compensation from the Fund. I must next determine the amount of the Claimants' actual loss and the amount, if any, that the Claimants are 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). The 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

		•	
		ud tell	Children (1995)
	e de Proposition de la composition della composi	1 8 MD. 35.	Code reproduction of the production
a de la meroparti, eller _a , elle millen digerie.	or i sambar on Forence Par	in verigi	Andrews of Landing Bill Consider
and the system with some and confidence	្រុមមើ្យបំរែង ស្តី២០ ស្នា 📆		AN CHT PENCH years
នុស្សមក ខ្លួនទេក (១០១៨) ខ្លួននេ ំន ន	Appropriate sets to alter	i di an	Party Children (No. 14) and
			a fiction is incomparable.
en subtyrne fir the local talk first	aith a moan a lifter		x Distance Security
ายไร้เทอกรู้และได้ จะเหมืองคลับแล้วได้เรียกระ	(4.1. 1.1. 1.1. 1.1. 1.1. 1.1. 1.1. 1.1.		cherilland out of the elementary
and the second of the second s			
of the section of the section is a second of the			
			Commission belief
- วองเลาอยาเ อส ายสาราชสีกับ (ราชสาย - หวัดส	ra mew Riff , A coe		in the parameter of the property of the control of
		u liga ka	ed with a mitalian six
. Alle de tra alle de la constante de la const	de receive e		Britishing of Borton (1986)
		<u> </u>	
្រុំ ខ្លាំង មាន ខ្លាំង	<mark>ાઇલા કાર્યમાં લે</mark> ફાલનો હોંદી?		
	a o ns d'interaction		di enjerim engelijk
सुरकारी स्वार्केट्स <mark>रेक्ट</mark> दक्त विस्तरकार		e For Qu	
o de till i står fordansk akkalikalik vod sa	e production in the second	**************************************	productions of publications
- militar i di ligicia di Santaria - <mark>Santaria di Sada</mark> ria di		This : 1999.	
			•

amount which the claimant paid to the contractor under the contract." COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(a). The amount paid to the Respondent under this contract was \$12,200.00.

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 Claimants' actual loss is not more than the amount paid to the Respondent and less than \$20,000.00. Therefore, the Claimants are entitled to recover their actual loss of \$12,200.00.

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I conclude that the Claimants have sustained an actual and compensable loss of \$12,200.00 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 Claimants are 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 Claimants \$12,200.00; 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 under this Order, plus annual interest of ten percent (10%) as set by the Maryland Home

Improvement Commission; and

⁶ See Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-410(a)(1)(iii) (2015); COMAR 09.08.01.20.

	3. 4			
#ACTOR	sometrige and a	eriene ikulotte en et 1900e Karana		स्तिक्षा स्था अस्ति । स्टब्स्ट स्टब्स् इतिहास स्थापन
- প্রতিবাহী ক্রেড পুরুষ	ne, etc. i n e ig 1 3 s	rika (j. 1. juni 1. juni)		gi garen zeniari
and of the second		(1.00%)(१ <mark>३) च</mark> ्चे हे श्रीकेतर	Paradysj.	Social designation of the second
er er kiril, te e a et m _e are de	e as il briggine r	entime adjustance	usu jeti.	enie o ografia i etinicijno
Jani Wingin Dafe	tes (confide	dia to mist et er		propagation of the propagation
The map of the Constitution of	kaj ne Albani	rizologia de la	on of a	
्रक्षासम्ब ्धाः स्टब्स् । स्टब्स् स्टब्स्स क		indian september	- 4 580	andre i depart de la Step
			-00,50f	alite the growth that agence
ंत, वसर्व चृंदिक्ष मुख	side kan kemar	n dan Sepa i dan bas	કહીં મહેંચીટે જ્યાં	entropial cores.
. 1985 v. 2004 1806 v		COMP TO LOOK TO CARDON (S)	a - c	$(H_{i}, \mathcal{C}_{i}, \mathcal{C}_{i}) = (H_{i}, \mathcal{C}_{i}, \mathcal{C}_{i})$
* (a) * (40 a) *			r y pa si	
		igai sebuat	ruittious.	क्रिक्टिक एक का लोके के किए हैं। भ
	1977# 1 877 1724 • •			
s <u>as</u> and as		tal outpole of the second	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	merap State (Fr
i dase territir i de la comisti de la comisti	1771 YA 1841 (C.)	eragyar Ledin Hillian	t lymrago	Product Company of the Company of th
	•			, s. 1980, tyse.
ov respectation		sign digitars of total	g N	mily product # man
in a tribung yang kang ka	มณ์ งมน ์สาดสติด	i advirti plaa sugara		ses persent a confessor de central de
y jako kanangan da s	9 (2.38) (1) P	11 750 TO 14 H . 10 . 88 T		
			Post Special	Cimero (Table Lect.) year o
		:		
		BACOT YOURS PAPER WHITE		artina ar , was Sheeks ^{ch}
		*		•
	l			

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

March 10, 2021
Date Decision Issued

Richard O'Connor

Administrative Law Judge

Richard O'Connor

ROC/kdp #190902

_ ·	1			
				•
	40.	ndistribution description		
en e		Maria de la constanta de la co		
			i,	
	1			in the contract of the contrac
ting the second of the second				
		127.4		
				•
			. *	
		•		
	A State of the second			
		•		
		•		
	·	1	•	
			•	
			.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	•			
			·	
	**		,	
	•			
•				
	•			
				. • .
				•
•				
				•

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM OF TERRY AND RONALD JENKINS AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND FOR THE ACTS OR OMISSIONS OF GREGORY STOTTS AND GRELLIS CONSTRUCTION, LLC MARYLAND HOME

IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION

* MHIC CASE NO. 19(05)736

* OAH CASE NO. LABOR-HIC-

* 02-19-34291

* * * * * *

FINAL ORDER

This matter was originally heard before an Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") of the Office of Administrative Hearings ("OAH") on December 15, 2020. Following the evidentiary hearing, the ALJ issued a Proposed Decision on March 10, 2021, concluding that the homeowners, Terry and Ronald Jenkins ("Claimants") suffered an actual loss of \$12,200.00 as a result of the acts or omissions of Gregory Stotts and Grellis Construction, LLC ("Contractor"). *ALJ Proposed Decision* pp. 13-14. In a Proposed Order dated June 23, 2021, the Maryland Home Improvement Commission ("MHIC" or "Commission") affirmed the Proposed Decision of the ALJ to grant an award from the Home Improvement Guaranty Fund. The Contractor subsequently filed exceptions to the MHIC Proposed Order.

On September 16, 2021, a three-member panel ("Panel") of the MHIC held a remote hearing on the exceptions filed in this matter. Ronald Jenkins participated without counsel. Anthony Shore, Esq., represented the Contractor. Assistant Attorney General Justin Dunbar appeared at the exceptions hearing on behalf of the Guaranty Fund. The Commission entered the following preliminary exhibits as part of the record of the exceptions hearing without objection:

1) hearing notice; 2) transmittal letter, ALJ Proposed Decision, and MHIC Proposed Order; and
3) Contractor's exceptions. Neither the Claimant nor the Contractor produced a copy of the transcript of the hearing before the ALJ. Therefore, the Panel's review of the record was limited to the preliminary exhibits for the exceptions hearing, the OAH Proposed Decision, and the

BARTAR AL GALLERATATIA DIRONING GATTAGAR BE e Hilliand Confiden and the Attraction of the care of the contract on the treation will galley retails which but the tipe of the collection has been been being the co and the state of the policy of the second and which of infinite costs to take a finite of the second and the later of the second of the second of the contract of the co at operation that is a compact faithful and it is improved to sufficient to the activity of supported to the contract of The light on the proof than it is a state of the light of tanin ninga sabupaten sibab <mark>kise</mark>lija kaga di <mark>sati b</mark>endalifan sati pan inga di sati biran di sati kan di r sang siyar ing terkering it sekilari sali sekilari di Marka Marka ta sa salah salah salah salah bilasa milas Combal Company Company and the were the first the color of the 776 at 1.00 ask 60 The state of the state of the product the post of the state of was a shet by the same a root of and the set of market and in the first reine ordenn en stempoliko <mark>in jiber ingest sel</mark> med kingin uzuluan in obdiveljat godu**je**rhiris obrazopat r rang salah di dikempelangah sebagai kemerakan kebenasah sebagai dalah kemperangan merengan salah s grant for the comparison of the second of the comparison of the co representation of the second នាស្ថិត ភាពនេះ ស្រី នៅខ្លួន នៃសាស នៃ មើនកន្លែងសាធានរិកសិក្សា នេះ នេះ នៅសាសនេះ នៅពេលនៅលើ ម un una perconale de la companya de l will be the first the composition of the state of the composition of t

exhibits admitted as evidence at the OAH hearing. COMAR 09.01.03.09(G) - (I).

The claim in this proceeding relates to a contract between the parties for the construction of a patio and screened porch at the Claimants' home. The ALJ found that the Contractor abandoned the project without performing any work. *ALJ's Proposed Decision* p. 13.

On exception, the Contractor argued that the ALJ erred in finding that the Contractor abandoned the Claimants' project because the finding was not supported by substantial evidence. The Contractor argued that the project was delayed because the project was not consistent with the applicable setback requirements and required a more extensive permit review by the Prince George's County Planning Department of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission ("M-NCPPC") than anticipated, that the Contractor was in a serious automobile accident, that the contract did not provide that time was of the essence, and that the ALJ's finding of abandonment was based on the Contractor's failure to communicate with the Claimants about the project, but that the contract did not require the Contractor to communicate with the Claimants, and the Claimants knew about the status of the project because they communicated directly with M-NCPPC.

The Commission finds no error with the ALJ's findings. Regarding the permit review process, the record does demonstrate that the scope of review necessary to obtain the permits for the project escalated after the Contractor applied for a permit, first to a Homeowner's Minor Amendment and then to a Detailed Site Plan revision requiring additional documentation, approval from the Claimants' Homeowner's Association, and a hearing and approval by the full M-NCPPC. However, the record reveals that the Contractor learned on July 11, 2018, that the project was not eligible for a Minor Amendment and that a revision to the applicable Detailed Site Plan would be necessary, which required additional documentation and a hearing, and that on November 1, 2018,

	Variable Control			
			. .	
				,
			্রভাগের	នាល ខណ្ឌ មានមានវាធ្យា ខ្លាំលើម៉ាស្រែក នា 🦠 💽
	All says for the con-	rento e el marsillo de	(AMPA)	
modern in the air such		di. Madra V	. <u>I.</u> 24	kana in shajato in
ma , supremi		e sina rejiggeren	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	e regiona altributado e
unium, si in englacit ye his	i pessi (14	अर्थिक के. जिस <mark>्सीम</mark> ्स अर्थ		ing in the second of the secon
	otravere las en i			, version 🦫 i de la comparada.
er e se reasi, was processed	Bragoria Agrad			i garnisatooxiii.
t sognis i bijal kraljenjeta	an Ademoral o	विकास के हुँचे भी को निर्माणकार । जन्म		तिका अंद्रिक्तात्व अतिकास्तिक स्टब्स् इतिकासिका
หู เรียกผู้ที่ในหลุดการที่ได้กระ		ende region togram	er/ in	Hall Meant's Singtonia
ទាស់ ខេត្ត ១ ខេត្ត ។ ការបា ន អ្នក ខេត្ត	्र ४ । एक श्रुमार् ५ (y. Garana ka		of Tale for eo uth side of
i, ilizabetak, mu ndara	in sensitive	i Britan fritaren arben bilan Sala	1 2 3 4 11	Park Symmet Limburg
e digitalis en la	ggarnagriguter and V	roger (1955) soci		al congruenche sudo
Carry County Carlo	Hallow Toolby	eri a fi ni na ka ina hi	•	office later and rights
ing it is a free to be a second record		en en ara esta en ara en el	1 to see	and the agree of Many field
5. 19. 4.2 4 55 9.8 6 48		ki e a zelek	1.00.11	Makes per sell
्या सम्बद्धाना व्यक्ति । देश	in the state of th	elegiste dibitation de	or to the N	
govištik iz sepretji nameliti p	di compres	oli el <mark>ligga</mark> socioles.	- 7.32 · 3	Liber Grand Designation (1997)
log a special to sugarific	grafi ^{lit} eras prosition	yay kuan da Kija Ro Ka		The figure of the second of th
	e more e <mark>s go</mark> n me	antina i Alastin iso		
	the control of the li		e de la laca	a section of the section
and the supplied of the Same.				to the first of the state of th
general and the Exercise Control of the Control of	i januaris b	1. a.15. (1.1.)	1 1 10000	

the Claimants contacted M-NCPPC and discovered (1) that a Detailed Site Plan revision was required, (2) that the Contractor had not submitted the documentation necessary for M-NCPPC to review the application and had not communicated with M-NCPPC since September 5, 2018, when M-NCPPC notified the Contractor that the application was incomplete. In addition, on November 1, 2018, M-NCPPC provided the Claimants' with email correspondence between M-NCPPC and the Contractor that revealed to the Claimants that the Contractor was aware of the need for a Detailed Site Plan revision since July 11, 2018, but had not notified them and that the Contractor had lied to them about the status of the permit application, as the Contractor had promised them that the application was "straight" and that work would start on the project on October 29, 2018. (OAH Hearing Claimants' Exhibit 18.) Also on November 1, 2018, the Claimants contacted their homeowner's association and learned that it had notified the Contractor on July 24, 2018, that the application for the HOA's approval of the project was incomplete and that it had never heard from the Contractor again. Finally, again on November 1, 2018, the Claimants, armed with the information obtained from the HOA and M-NCPPC, contacted the Contractor, whose employee advised them for the first time that a Detailed Site Plan revision was required but also lied to them and said that the Contractor had already obtained the necessary approvals from the HOA and M-NCPPC.

Because, as of November 1, 2018, the Contractor had not attempted to correct the shortcomings of the HOA application since it was notified that it was deficient on July 24, 2018, and had not attempted to correct the shortcomings of the M-NCPPC application since it was notified that it was deficient on September 5, 2018, the Commission finds that the Contractor had abandoned the Claimants' project. In addition, the fact that the Contractor, when confronted by the Claimants regarding the abandonment, responded by promising to refund the Claimant's

and the second respect to the blanck, are referred type by the filters to be to be an element to be referred to POTENTIAL REPORTED TO THE EXPENSE OF A PARTIE OF THE PARTIES. and a set of the explanation local. I will also all the above alternations are of a facilities considerate and sections Belager Bleck in Microsoft in the property of the Militarian and the light of the Contract of and the Congress of the complete and the contract of the Congress of the Congr and the event a first and the said of the end of the first of the said of the grapismo di trasticio di Misso da di Apolitica e godina, modificio di Greto, de aprile di giva di agrica di di more than the management sets on any history of their parts of the property season built in - 38 A. H. S. 1920 - A. A. Barrell and Assault and Article Assault and Article Assault and Assault and Assault refrance and resistant states of the first of the continue of the first of the firs and and the North Control of the state of th rest to I have to solve and ten statement our representation of some state it is all the andronous outcome presignated in such that of the medican and out of the fig. outcomes, in our plants and adigentification of a present problem in the execution of the first comparing the figure of the matter of mest, the control of a profession is eigen a state of the state option for the second configuration and the following And the first of the property of the control of the

The state of the second state of the content of the state
payment further demonstrates to the Commission that the Contractor had abandoned the project.

(OAH Hearing Claimants' Exhibit 21.)

The Commission is not persuaded by the Contractor's argument that its efforts to obtain the HOA and M-NCPPC approvals of the project after the Claimant's asserted abandonment, requested a refund, and filed a complaint with MHIC demonstrate that it had not abandoned the project. Specifically, the Contractor cites its January 9, 2019, email to the Claimants asking them to sign the M-NCPPC application and its January 11, 2019, email to the Claimants stating that it wanted to perform the contracted work (OAH Hearing Respondent's Exhibit 2) as proof that the Contractor did not abandon the project. This email, which the Contractor sent two months after the Claimants advised the Contractor that they had deemed it to have abandoned their contract and the Contractor had promised to refund the Claimant's payment, almost two months after the Claimant filed complaints with MHIC and the Better Business Bureau, and four months after M-NCPPC notified the Contractor that its application was incomplete, does not convince the Commission that the Contractor did not abandon the project. Rather, like the ALJ, the Commission finds that the Contractor's correspondence with the Claimant's in January 2019 was intended to create the impression that the Claimants were responsible for the Contractor's failure to perform the contract and did not constitute a good faith effort to resolve their claim by performing the contract or demonstrate that the Contractor had not abandoned the project. Moreover, even if the Contractor's actions following the Claimant's notice of abandonment constituted a good faith effort to resolve the claim by performing the contract, the Commission finds that the Claimants were reasonable to reject the Contractor's efforts because the Contractor had repeatedly lied to the Claimants about the status of their project and their refund and neglected their project for months before the Claimants filed a complaint.

rangery out beganisted and in terms of the same of the contraction of the light contraction and affiliations are Collins of molecular garden DAO. there is apalle a liber bromer are to reply you when he wish, and make the Larger Court February is now a 12 year after the properties of water at the first of the court at ser linge Leiter des families authorises com la 1988 d'in termétrée sons tiermétres des épops l'antropes. n se in Cure-Ceange and Me Road Carlos (1992), Williams in Colonia in Archaell (1997), and Classical Classical al more plans a commonal Drans address of the first of proper and local company of the first company of the form namination design (Statemark Statemark Statemark Statemark Statemark Statemark Statemark Statemark Statemark Statemark et a salman amini seas ag antao da afonasti tinaseana filiti. Luon, la sapamini, de docin è cana se ad of the source of the control of the property of the property of the property of the color of the t fact the late and the fact the property of the print of the print of the property and a construction of the Markater consignation asserts applicate may all the little to the consideration of the constant and the court and the company of the contract of the court of the cour eromon, alle at del Archiedte an elle sedimentalismente in technique medicilitage medicilitage ac to the second that there is not an abilities and an engineer that there is not and The first of multiple of company () which is fall magaze, above more less than being such a second only such a ng i grinadikanggi at at an ing ing proper pilani grinan na na kadasi. I an ing tara pang-ang tar ad Harris Maria (1975). Edding and Maria (1986) and Maria (1986) and Maria (1986) and particular after any page their region of the continues of the continue of the continue of the continue of the continues of the contin demontral reference de 30 autopo autor el proposición de encontrato por el comente de ser la comente de coment ารที่ และวิจที่ พร<mark>าวสาราส และ และ</mark> พราวารที่ พระวิจที่ พระวิจที่ พระวิจที่ พระวิจที่ พระวิจที่ พระวิจที่ พระวิจที The top of the first to be before the second of the second of the first to be the second of the second of the contract of the second of the se grant for his care in the constant of

Regarding the Contractor's argument that the absence of a time is of the essence provision in the Claimants' contract precludes a finding of abandonment, first, the Commission notes that the contract is illegible, so it is unclear whether it includes such a provision or not. Second, assuming, *arguendo*, that there is not a time is of the essence clause, the Commission finds that Contractor's failure to correct the deficiencies in the HOA approval application from July 24, 2018, through November 1, 2018, or to correct the deficiencies in the M-NCPPC application from September 5, 2018, through November 1, 2018, constitute abandonment of the project.

Regarding the Contractor's argument that the fact that he was in two automobile accidents rendered the ALJ's finding that he abandoned the Claimants' project erroneous, the only evidence in the record of the automobile accidents is in a January 11, 2019, email from Gregory Stotts to the Claimants where Mr. Stotts says, "I was in 2 crazy car accidents and wasn't able to be [sic] work as closely with you as I would've liked." The Commission does not find this to be persuasive evidence that the Contractor did not abandon the contract.

The Contractor also made numerous factual allegations in its written exceptions, but they were either unsupported by the record or irrelevant or both.

Having considered the parties' arguments, the evidence contained in the record, and the ALJ's Recommended Decision, it is this 15th day of October, **ORDERED**:

- A. That the Findings of Fact of the Administrative Law Judge are AFFIRMED;
- B. That the Conclusions of Law of the Administrative Law Judge are AFFIRMED;
- C. That the Proposed Decision and Recommended Order of the Administrative Law Judge is

 AFFIRMED;
- D. That the Claimant is awarded \$12,200.00 from the Maryland Home Improvement Guaranty Fund;

•					
	Tambén sa la sun <mark>des</mark> no 1984 e	s en plante	ria wili in Latering .	. Programme	क के का अनुसर्वे अ ल्ड ा करें
	nak ison makasanga	- Included the second	t grains a significant de		and the state of t
	to reak the to be seen	हरू है है जिस्सा क्षेत्र है	nu di mandora di s		ining althor average as with
	er er sin sør der sig i stor	al roman rom		y et ent	ு உட்டு வ ுகுள்ளார் இ வ ்குட்க
	्रात्री को लक्ष्मी का अनुस्ता		Esta di nonvasio (†)		ne ette og som et et et et e
	ustra a alemante (1994)		n Trokerek daer in		langung balg a am De Le
	Society of	ies irrosmulari.	empletros de tidi. Nive s		Per to the Ray in Last.
	or a week declared	n magan ga salah		is same.	
	•				
	or and passed with				er legetie en gewone de die
•	etjalog og en ende kjælikki L			39:195	The stable of the Page 1
	्रता २५७ <u>२५ अ</u> क्षा च्यावन स्थिति केष्ट्राची स				and the state of t
		 			
	The Million of Johnson				•
•		1	•	-	THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY.
	សម្រាប់ មិនស្វាស់ ស្រាប់ ក្រៅថ្ងៃ របស់ មិន ក្រុ				
		1	en kungtur (de 1909) 19 Februari	1	e frem de presenta de la filologia. Transportante de la filologia
			r to a community of the		
	ing the state of t		•		
•					n de la companya de l
	Vanada karakarakan dari karakara dari karakara dari karakara dari karakara dari karakara dari karakara dari ka	e 6. Jan 1851	i dealathaileachtair		
	•				
	•		•		
•					
•				-	
•					

- E. That the Contractor shall remain ineligible for a Maryland Home Improvement Commission license until the Contractor reimburses the Guaranty Fund for all monies disbursed under this Order plus annual interest of at least ten percent (10%) as set by the Commission, Md Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-410(a)(1)(iii), 8-411(a);
- F. That the records and publications of the Maryland Home Improvement Commission shall reflect this decision; and
- G. Any party has thirty (30) days from the date of this Final Order to appeal this decision to Circuit Court.

Bruce QuackenbushChairperson – Panel
Maryland Home Improvement
Commission

			,	
				<u>.</u>
	With the Army	e dilipitati di uso di	4.4	
	erikari 194	r New arrows and	est that	of see to the
ang gala na ang kabilana an	l .			
	,		i	
		·		
i jene si kesa kanasa			- 1	
	•			Mitsh Marsan to Communication
i de la companya de l	najelo kari (Torri	de britarios se com		Benny Comment All
	•			e nga europe i
diservice di Linux son description and				
			·	
	<u> </u>			
			·	
			•	
	• 1			
			•	
				• •
			•	
		, .		
. :]			-	

PROPOSED ORDER

WHEREFORE, this 2nd 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.

Joseph Tunney

Joseph Tunney Chairman Panel B MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION

