

<p><b>IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM</b></p> <p><b>OF SYLVIA SAUNDERS,</b></p> <p><b>CLAIMANT</b></p> <p><b>AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME</b></p> <p><b>IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND</b></p> <p><b>FOR THE ALLEGED ACTS OR</b></p> <p><b>OMISSIONS OF DAVID GEORGE</b></p> <p><b>FINAN, T/A WHEATON DOOR &amp;</b></p> <p><b>WINDOW, also known as DECK</b></p> <p><b>WIZARD</b></p> <p><b>RESPONDENT</b></p>	<p>* <b>BEFORE SUSAN A. SINROD;</b></p> <p>* <b>AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE</b></p> <p>* <b>OF THE MARYLAND OFFICE</b></p> <p>* <b>OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS</b></p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>* <b>OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-19-36779</b></p> <p>* <b>MHIC No.: 19 (90) 932</b></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 May 7, 2019, Sylvia Saunders (Claimant) filed a claim (Claim) with the Maryland Home Improvement Commission (MHIC) Guaranty Fund (Fund), under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor (Department),<sup>1</sup> for reimbursement of \$6,000.00 in actual losses allegedly suffered as a result of a home improvement contract with David Finan, t/a Wheaton Door & Window, also known as Deck Wizard (Respondent).

---

<sup>1</sup> On July 1, 2019, the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation became the Department of Labor.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY  
PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY  
PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY  
PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY  
PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY  
PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 through 8-411 (2015).<sup>2</sup> On November 15, 2019, the MHIC forwarded the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing.

I conducted a remote hearing through the Webex videoconferencing platform on November 12, 2020. Bus. Reg. § 8-407(e). Hope Sachs, Assistant Attorney General, Department, represented the Fund. The Claimant represented herself. The Respondent failed to appear at the hearing.

After waiting twenty minutes for the Respondent or the Respondent's representative to appear, I proceeded with the hearing. Applicable law permits me to proceed with a hearing in a party's absence if that party fails to attend after receiving proper notice. Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 28.02.01.23A. On October 5, 2020, notice of the hearing was mailed to the Respondent at its address of record with the Department by regular and certified mail. The United States Postal Service did not return either notice as undeliverable. COMAR 09.08.03.03A(2).<sup>3</sup> The Respondent did not notify the OAH of any change of address. COMAR 28.02.01.03E. I determined that the Respondent received proper notice, and I proceeded to hear the captioned matter.

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.

---

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all references hereinafter to the Business Regulation Article are to the 2015 Replacement Volume of the Maryland Annotated Code.

<sup>3</sup> This matter was previously scheduled for May 29, 2020 but was rescheduled due to the COVID 19 pandemic. The United States Postal Service returned the certified mail copy of that notice, sent to the same address, to the OAH as unclaimed. The OAH did not receive the certified mail green card back from the notice for this rescheduled hearing that was mailed to the Respondent by certified mail.

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

Section header or title, possibly starting with "THE" or "OF".

First main paragraph of text, containing several lines of faint, illegible characters.

Second main paragraph of text, continuing the faint, illegible content.

Third main paragraph of text, continuing the faint, illegible content.

Fourth main paragraph of text, continuing the faint, illegible content.

Fifth main paragraph of text, continuing the faint, illegible content.

Sixth main paragraph of text, continuing the faint, illegible content.

## 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

The Claimant submitted the following exhibits, which were admitted into evidence:

- Cl. Ex. #1- Photographs of Claimant's deck, taken August 11, 2018, August 13, 2018, August 19, 2018, August 30, 2018, September 21, 2018, January 1, 2019, May 12, 2020 and July 5, 2020
- Cl. Ex. #2- Email from Kurt's Pressure Wash to the Claimant, dated May 4, 2019
- Cl. Ex. #3- Letter from the Claimant to the MHIC, dated May 6, 2019
- Cl. Ex. #4- Estimate from Long Fence, dated April 16, 2019
- Cl. Ex. #5- Montgomery County Deck Maintenance Inspection Checklist, dated June 27, 2019
- Cl. Ex. #6- Letter from the MHIC to the Claimant, dated April 15, 2019
- Cl. Ex. #7- Letter from the MHIC to the Claimant, dated February 25, 2019
- Cl. Ex. #8- Email from the MHIC to the Claimant, dated January 25, 2019
- Cl. Ex. #9- Letter from the MHIC to the Respondent, dated January 28, 2019
- Cl. Ex. #10- Home Improvement Claim Form, undated
- Cl. Ex. #11- Consumer Loan Application, Service Finance Co., LLC., dated July 24, 2018; Change in Contract Form, dated July 31, 2018; Notice of Right of Rescission, dated July 25, 2018; Terms & Conditions, undated; Deck Wizard Warranty, undated; Contract with Deck Wizard, dated July 24, 2018; Signature/Name Affidavit, dated July 25, 2018; Addendum to Retail Installment Contract, dated September 4, 2018
- Cl. Ex. #12- Letter from the Claimant to the Respondent, dated August 21, 2018
- Cl. Ex. #13- Complaint Form, dated January 15, 2019

No.	Name	Address	City
1	John Doe	123 Main St	New York
2	Jane Smith	456 Elm St	Los Angeles
3	Robert Brown	789 Oak St	Chicago
4	Mary White	101 Pine St	San Francisco
5	James Black	202 Cedar St	Philadelphia
6	Sarah Green	303 Birch St	Boston
7	Michael Red	404 Spruce St	Seattle
8	Emily Blue	505 Willow St	Portland
9	David Yellow	606 Ash St	San Diego
10	Laura Purple	707 Hickory St	Denver
11	Christopher Grey	808 Sycamore St	San Jose
12	Amanda Pink	909 Magnolia St	Austin
13	Benjamin Tan	1010 Dogwood St	San Antonio
14	Isabella Light Blue	1111 Redwood St	San Jose
15	Ethan Dark Blue	1212 Cypress St	San Jose
16	Sophia Light Green	1313 Juniper St	San Jose
17	Lucas Dark Green	1414 Fir St	San Jose
18	Olivia Light Purple	1515 Hemlock St	San Jose
19	Isaac Dark Purple	1616 Larch St	San Jose
20	Grace Light Yellow	1717 Spruce St	San Jose
21	Henry Dark Yellow	1818 Fir St	San Jose
22	Chloe Light Orange	1919 Cedar St	San Jose
23	Leo Dark Orange	2020 Pine St	San Jose
24	Penelope Light Pink	2121 Birch St	San Jose
25	Samuel Dark Pink	2222 Spruce St	San Jose
26	Scarlett Light Blue	2323 Willow St	San Jose
27	Wyatt Dark Blue	2424 Ash St	San Jose
28	Madeline Light Green	2525 Hickory St	San Jose
29	Julian Dark Green	2626 Dogwood St	San Jose
30	Stella Light Purple	2727 Redwood St	San Jose
31	Harvey Dark Purple	2828 Cypress St	San Jose
32	Valentina Light Yellow	2929 Juniper St	San Jose
33	Sebastian Dark Yellow	3030 Fir St	San Jose
34	Isabella Light Orange	3131 Hemlock St	San Jose
35	Julian Dark Orange	3232 Larch St	San Jose
36	Scarlett Light Pink	3333 Spruce St	San Jose
37	Wyatt Dark Pink	3434 Willow St	San Jose
38	Madeline Light Blue	3535 Ash St	San Jose
39	Julian Dark Blue	3636 Hickory St	San Jose
40	Stella Light Green	3737 Dogwood St	San Jose
41	Harvey Dark Green	3838 Redwood St	San Jose
42	Valentina Light Purple	3939 Cypress St	San Jose
43	Sebastian Dark Purple	4040 Juniper St	San Jose
44	Isabella Light Yellow	4141 Fir St	San Jose
45	Julian Dark Yellow	4242 Hemlock St	San Jose
46	Scarlett Light Orange	4343 Larch St	San Jose
47	Wyatt Dark Orange	4444 Spruce St	San Jose
48	Madeline Light Pink	4545 Willow St	San Jose
49	Julian Dark Pink	4646 Ash St	San Jose
50	Stella Light Blue	4747 Hickory St	San Jose
51	Harvey Dark Blue	4848 Dogwood St	San Jose
52	Valentina Light Green	4949 Redwood St	San Jose
53	Sebastian Dark Green	5050 Cypress St	San Jose
54	Isabella Light Purple	5151 Juniper St	San Jose
55	Julian Dark Purple	5252 Fir St	San Jose
56	Scarlett Light Yellow	5353 Hemlock St	San Jose
57	Wyatt Dark Yellow	5454 Larch St	San Jose
58	Madeline Light Orange	5555 Spruce St	San Jose
59	Julian Dark Orange	5656 Willow St	San Jose
60	Stella Light Pink	5757 Ash St	San Jose
61	Harvey Dark Pink	5858 Hickory St	San Jose
62	Valentina Light Blue	5959 Dogwood St	San Jose
63	Sebastian Dark Blue	6060 Redwood St	San Jose
64	Isabella Light Green	6161 Cypress St	San Jose
65	Julian Dark Green	6262 Juniper St	San Jose
66	Scarlett Light Purple	6363 Fir St	San Jose
67	Wyatt Dark Purple	6464 Hemlock St	San Jose
68	Madeline Light Yellow	6565 Larch St	San Jose
69	Julian Dark Yellow	6666 Spruce St	San Jose
70	Stella Light Orange	6767 Willow St	San Jose
71	Harvey Dark Orange	6868 Ash St	San Jose
72	Valentina Light Pink	6969 Hickory St	San Jose
73	Sebastian Dark Pink	7070 Dogwood St	San Jose
74	Isabella Light Blue	7171 Redwood St	San Jose
75	Julian Dark Blue	7272 Cypress St	San Jose
76	Scarlett Light Green	7373 Juniper St	San Jose
77	Wyatt Dark Green	7474 Fir St	San Jose
78	Madeline Light Purple	7575 Hemlock St	San Jose
79	Julian Dark Purple	7676 Larch St	San Jose
80	Stella Light Yellow	7777 Spruce St	San Jose
81	Harvey Dark Yellow	7878 Willow St	San Jose
82	Valentina Light Orange	7979 Ash St	San Jose
83	Sebastian Dark Orange	8080 Hickory St	San Jose
84	Isabella Light Pink	8181 Dogwood St	San Jose
85	Julian Dark Pink	8282 Redwood St	San Jose
86	Scarlett Light Blue	8383 Cypress St	San Jose
87	Wyatt Dark Blue	8484 Juniper St	San Jose
88	Madeline Light Green	8585 Fir St	San Jose
89	Julian Dark Green	8686 Hemlock St	San Jose
90	Stella Light Purple	8787 Larch St	San Jose
91	Harvey Dark Purple	8888 Spruce St	San Jose
92	Valentina Light Yellow	8989 Willow St	San Jose
93	Sebastian Dark Yellow	9090 Ash St	San Jose
94	Isabella Light Orange	9191 Hickory St	San Jose
95	Julian Dark Orange	9292 Dogwood St	San Jose
96	Scarlett Light Pink	9393 Redwood St	San Jose
97	Wyatt Dark Pink	9494 Cypress St	San Jose
98	Madeline Light Blue	9595 Juniper St	San Jose
99	Julian Dark Blue	9696 Fir St	San Jose
100	Stella Light Green	9797 Hemlock St	San Jose

Cl. Ex. #14- Letter from the Claimant to Hope Sachs, Assistant Attorney General, dated October 13, 2020

Cl. Ex. #15- Letter from Service Finance Company to the Claimant, dated April 1, 2020

The Respondent did not appear and therefore, did not submit any exhibits for admission into evidence.

The Fund submitted the following exhibits, which were admitted into evidence:

Fund Ex. #1- Notice of Remote Hearing, dated October 4, 2020

Fund Ex. #2- Hearing Order, dated November 12, 2019

Fund Ex. #3- Letter from the MHIC to the Respondent, dated May 16, 2019, with Home Improvement Claim Form, received May 10, 2019, attached

Fund Ex. #4- Home Improvement Commission Licensing History, dated January 9, 2020

#### Testimony

The Claimant testified and did not present the testimony of any other witnesses.

The Respondent did not appear and therefore, did not present the testimony of any witnesses.

The Fund presented did not present the testimony of 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 home improvement contractor licensed by the MHIC.
2. The Respondent specializes in deck restoration, repair and replacement.
3. On July 25, 2018, the Claimant and the Respondent entered into a contract whereby the Claimant purchased the Respondent's Silver Package for the restoration and upgrade of her deck (Contract). The total contract price was \$4,650.00. The Contract included a one-year warranty for labor and construction and a fifteen-year warranty of the sealer applied to

1900  
1901  
1902  
1903  
1904  
1905  
1906  
1907  
1908  
1909  
1910  
1911  
1912  
1913  
1914  
1915  
1916  
1917  
1918  
1919  
1920  
1921  
1922  
1923  
1924  
1925  
1926  
1927  
1928  
1929  
1930  
1931  
1932  
1933  
1934  
1935  
1936  
1937  
1938  
1939  
1940  
1941  
1942  
1943  
1944  
1945  
1946  
1947  
1948  
1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960  
1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970  
1971  
1972  
1973  
1974  
1975  
1976  
1977  
1978  
1979  
1980  
1981  
1982  
1983  
1984  
1985  
1986  
1987  
1988  
1989  
1990  
1991  
1992  
1993  
1994  
1995  
1996  
1997  
1998  
1999  
2000



newly installed boards. Information included with the Contract indicated that, weather permitting, the work under the Contract would be completed in one to three days.

4. Pursuant to the Contract, the Respondent was to remove and replace old deck boards and rails and apply the Respondent's patented coating.

5. The wood boards the Respondent used to replace the old deck boards were defective with gouges and cuts and splintered in places. The Respondent replaced the railings and the step boards descending from the deck, leaving the first step unstable because it was not resting on anything; a brace had to be installed to stabilize the step. The Respondent glued the railings instead of using bolts. At the joints, where one segment of the railing meets another, the joints did not match up properly and were uneven. Wood boards were cut at different lengths. Also, in multiple locations where the railing met the house, the wood was uneven and not flush against the house.

6. The Respondent's sales manager came to look at the deck after the Claimant complained about the initial work. The sales manager agreed that some of the work was unsatisfactory and agreed to replace faulty deck boards. The sales manager arranged to send someone out to do so on August 20, 2018.

7. On August 20, 2018, the installer appeared with nine replacement boards even though approximately twenty boards needed replacement. The Respondent had not given the installer any guidance as to which boards were to be replaced. The Claimant did not allow the Respondent's installer to do the work.

8. On August 30, 2018, a different worker from the Respondent came out to fix some of the defects. This worker replaced the defective top boards and repaired the steps to make them stable and safe. However, defective boards and poor workmanship, including



incorrect fitting of the deck rails against the house and incorrect fitting of railing joints against each other remained.

9. While working on August 30, 2018, the worker spilled paint on the heat pump. When the paint could not be removed, the worker painted the heat pump a different color to remediate the paint spillage.

10. Currently, when it rains, water puddles on the deck and does not run off. Also, the color of the wood has faded since installation.

11. On June 27, 2019, a Montgomery County inspector performed an inspection upon the Claimant's deck and found that the deck lacked sufficient bolts to secure ledger boards and guardrails, the railing height on the stairs was not high enough, and the deck needed a graspable handrail.

12. The Claimant paid \$3,600.00 to the Respondent for work under the Contract.

### DISCUSSION

In this case, the Claimant has the burden of proving the validity of the Claim by a preponderance of the evidence. Bus. Reg. § 8-407(e)(1); Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 10-217 (2014); COMAR 09.08.03.03A(3). To prove a claim by a preponderance of the evidence means to show that it is "more likely so than not so" when all the evidence is considered.

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

An owner may recover compensation from the Fund "for an actual loss that results from an act or omission by a licensed contractor . . . ." Bus. Reg. § 8-405(a); *see also* COMAR 09.08.03.03B(2) ("The Fund may only compensate claimants for actual losses . . . incurred as a result of misconduct by a licensed contractor."). "[A]ctual loss' means the costs of restoration, repair, replacement, or completion that arise from an unworkmanlike, inadequate, or incomplete home improvement." Bus. Reg. § 8-401.

... ..  
... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

APPENDIX

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

From the Claimant's testimony and the pictures she presented into evidence, the Claimant established that the Respondent's work under the Contract was inadequate. The wood the Respondent used to replace boards on the deck appears to be defective with covered up nail holes and it is splintered in places. Cl. Ex. #1. Some of the wood used for the top rails on the deck and on the stair rails is damaged. In one spot, a wood board is damaged such that it is cut much wider at one point and then narrows. The two stair rails are different; one is flush against a top rail, but the other stair rail was installed underneath the top rail, leaving an overhang. The wood on the outer edge of the deck was uneven and appears to be filled and painted to cover up the inadequacies. The decking is pulling away from the house rather than flush against it. Where the joints of the railings meet, the wood is cut unevenly and the joints are not flush with each other. The work appears overall to be shoddy and sloppy. The Respondent did not appear for the hearing to refute the Claimant's contentions.

The Claimant obtained some estimates to repair the Respondent's inadequate work. However, none of the estimates that she presented into evidence were for work that was within the scope of the Contract. The Kurt's Pressure Wash estimate is for \$6,000.00 to replace the deck. Cl. Ex. #2. The Contract was not for replacement of the deck. The estimate from Long Fence was for \$7,875.00, also to completely replace the deck. Cl. Ex. #4. Both of these estimates go far beyond the scope of work the Respondent was required to perform under the Contract, and therefore cannot be considered.

However, the Claimant paid \$3,600.00 to the Respondent for inadequate work and this constitutes an actual loss. Based on my analysis herein, I conclude that the Claimant is eligible for compensation from the Fund.

Therefore, I must determine the amount that the Claimant is entitled to recover from the Fund. The Fund may not compensate a claimant for consequential or punitive damages, personal

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

injury, attorney fees, court costs, or interest. Bus. Reg. § 8-405(e)(3); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(1).

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

However, none of the following three regulatory formulas is appropriate in this case:

(a) If the contractor abandoned the contract without doing any work, the claimant's actual loss shall be the amount which the claimant paid to the contractor under the contract.

(b) If the contractor did work according to the contract and the claimant is not soliciting another contractor to complete the contract, the claimant's actual loss shall be the amount which the claimant paid to the original contractor less the value of any materials or services provided by the contractor.

(c) 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)(a)-(c).

The Respondent did some work under the Contract but there is no evidence in the record to indicate the value of that work. The Claimant has solicited other contractors to complete the work but the estimates for that work fall far outside the scope of the Contract. It cannot be said that the Respondent abandoned the project; however, the work the Respondent performed was inadequate and unworkmanlike. Accordingly, I shall apply a unique formula to measure the Claimant's actual loss. Section 8-405(e)(5) of the Business Regulation Article of the Maryland Code provides that a claimant cannot recover more from the Fund than the claimant paid to the contractor. As set forth above, the Claimant's estimates cannot be utilized to determine the amount she is entitled to recover. However, she paid \$3,600.00 to the Respondent and did not receive the value that she paid for that work.

1968-1969  
The following information is being furnished to you for your information.

The following information is being furnished to you for your information.

(S)-[Illegible]

The following information is being furnished to you for your information.

(S)-[Illegible]



The Fund agreed that the Claimant was entitled to this amount. Thus, I conclude, that the Claimant is entitled to recover the \$3,600.00 that she paid to the Respondent.

**PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

I conclude that the Claimant has sustained an actual and compensable loss of \$3,600.00 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). I further conclude that the Claimant is entitled to recover that amount from the Fund.

**RECOMMENDED ORDER**

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

**ORDER** that the Maryland Home Improvement Guaranty Fund award the Claimant \$3,600.00; and

**ORDER** that the Respondent is ineligible for a Maryland Home Improvement Commission license until the Respondent reimburses the Guaranty Fund for all monies disbursed under this Order, plus annual interest of ten percent (10%) as set by the Maryland Home Improvement Commission;<sup>4</sup> and

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

**CONFIDENTIAL**

January 25, 2021  
Date Decision Issued

Susan A. Sinrod  
Administrative Law Judge

SAS/at  
#189997

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



**PROPOSED ORDER**

***WHEREFORE, this 7<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2021, Panel B of the Maryland Home Improvement Commission approves the Recommended Order of the Administrative Law Judge and unless any parties files with the Commission within twenty (20) days of this date written exceptions and/or a request to present arguments, then this Proposed Order will become final at the end of the twenty (20) day period. By law the parties then have an additional thirty (30) day period during which they may file an appeal to Circuit Court.***

***Joseph Tunney***

***Joseph Tunney***

***Chairman***

***Panel B***

***MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT  
COMMISSION***

SECRET

The following information is being furnished to you for your information and use only. It is not to be disseminated outside your organization without the express written approval of the source of this information.

This information is being furnished to you for your information and use only. It is not to be disseminated outside your organization without the express written approval of the source of this information.

This information is being furnished to you for your information and use only. It is not to be disseminated outside your organization without the express written approval of the source of this information.

This information is being furnished to you for your information and use only. It is not to be disseminated outside your organization without the express written approval of the source of this information.

This information is being furnished to you for your information and use only. It is not to be disseminated outside your organization without the express written approval of the source of this information.

This information is being furnished to you for your information and use only. It is not to be disseminated outside your organization without the express written approval of the source of this information.

SECRET

This information is being furnished to you for your information and use only. It is not to be disseminated outside your organization without the express written approval of the source of this information.