IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM	*	BEFORE SYEETAH HAMPTON-EL,
OF DAVID SCHREINER,	*	AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
CLAIMANT	ŧ	OF THE MARYLAND OFFICE
AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME	*	OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND	*	
FOR THE ALLEGED ACTS OR	*	
OMISSIONS OF CHRISTOPHER	*	
AYERS,	. *	OAH No.: LABOR-HIC-02-20-24228
T/A C. M. AYERS ENTERPRISES,	*	MHIC No.: 20 (75) 272
LLC,	*	
RESPONDENT	*	

REVISED PROPOSED DECISION¹

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 October 18, 2019, David Schreiner (Claimant) filed a claim (Claim) with the Maryland Home Improvement Commission (MHIC) Guaranty Fund (Fund), under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor (Department),² for reimbursement of \$4,885.00 in actual losses allegedly suffered as a result of a home improvement contract with Christopher Ayres,

¹ COMAR 28.02.01.27C provides that a final decision may be revised at any time on the judge's own initiative due to a clerical mistake. The Decision issued on February 9, 2021 with an incorrect MHIC No. This Revised Decision is issued to correct that clerical mistake.

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

THE REPORT OF THE PARTY AND ADDRESS. o de ligitação de la serio de la figura en o CONTROL PROMITOR WASHINGTON COLUMN アルウク 大学 名・富さ 智力は4 カロとの経 a Luker sike ba SALANS TO BE SUING A TURN U.S. **等**运行 医乳球管肠道 TO STAND WITH THE STAND OF THE STAND WAITED 在WILL 以近代的 TATE OF PT 第三进步。10万多个网络10万千万 WASTERN DE LES SERVICES the original properties and the properties of th and the increase of the figure of the state of the first of the contract of the state of the sta of the or who will be the the problem of the configuration of the config ာနှင့်နှင့် မေရိက ၁၉၀ အသည် အည်း သို့မှုအတွင် အားမေရီ အောင်မေ (၁၉၉၂) မေရိက် မြောက်စေ မေရာရှိပ်သည့်မြေးများပြီး အမေရိ

riger planet, to est riger ment occessed, delicter consumers and section on particles of installed the Consumer of the section of the temperation of the order of the consequence of the right of the right of the gr

y a meralikan geraktagan salah sergengan kara lain berataga dan malarah basah kalan kalan kabuat debagai basah

Boulitario pagazo di Azondon (velabore) di

trading as C. M. Ayres Enterprises, LLC (Respondent). Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401 through 8-411 (2015).³ On November 2, 2020, the MHIC forwarded the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing.

I held a hearing on December 7, 2020 at the OAH. Bus. Reg. § 8-407(c)(1). Justin S. Dunbar, Assistant Attorney General, Department, represented the Fund. The Claimant represented himself. The Respondent represented himself.

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); Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 09.01.03; and COMAR 28.02.01.

ISSUES

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

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

Exhibits

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

Fund Ex. 1 - Notice of Hearing, dated November 9, 2020

Fund Ex. 2 - MHIC Hearing Order, dated October 28, 2020

Fund Ex. 3 - MHIC Claim Form, dated October 18, 2019

Fund Ex. 4 - Licensing Record for the Respondent, dated December 7, 2020

I admitted the following exhibits on the Claimant's behalf:

Clmt. Ex. 1 - Estimate from the Respondent, dated November 9, 2017

³ Unless otherwise noted, all references hereinafter to the Business Regulation Article are to the 2015 Replacement Volume of the Maryland Annotated Code.

, for a second first come about Mar Harabergueria talah Marabergueria a Jestine () (1 (1 (1 (1 (1))) Spilitse (1) Spilitse (1) Spilitse (1) and the control of the property of the property of the second of the control of t relication and the relication of the second control of the second frequency of the second of the second of the and and representation of the Contact with the enging the regular participation of the first property and the first participation of the ा एक के बेटले हैं के कार्यों के कार्यों के कार्यों के किस के किस के कार्यों के किस के कार्यों के किस के किस के managaran, termang mengan berandi mengan berang beberah diang termah diang termah diang berandi ang mengan ber ALEG STEERSLESS ISSUES TO STEER STEERS TO SHOOM TO A ada de alementes o compaño dals qui serbera as confluenda los masseras serberal tras entra Conflicta (Alt. Caretinament Careta alimat serre the of rid depression of the control of the interior The test and the second of principal of the second The the bridge described and the second of the second The last two said the second of the second s and the state of the same that the state of 不知道,他是本的恐怕的。其他的是是第一个一个工作的重要的一种一个工作。 Parton to be the compared to the property of the compared to t TO THE CONTRACTOR SECTION AND ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPERTY OF TH

1 - 2**.3 ลูญ** และหลุ่งสำรับ (1 - และไฟ**น**เกร ? (คลามมา) (ค.ศ. พ.ศ. 60)

- Clmt. Ex. 2 Two Copies of a Sketch of the Claimant's Driveway, undated
- Clmt. Ex. 3 Picture of Driveway, undated
- Clmt. Ex. 4 Letter from Arborare Tree Experts, Inc. to the Claimant, dated December 4, 2020
- Clmt. Ex. 5 Estimate from David Olinger Asphalt Paving and Sealing, dated June 14, 2019
- Clmt. Ex. 6 Written Summary from the Claimant and his wife, dated August 30, 2019
- Clmt. Ex. 7 Emails between the Claimant and Respondent, various dates
- Clmt. Ex. 8 Letter from George C. Davis, Esquire to the Respondent, dated May 13, 2019
- Clmt. Ex. 9 Picture of Driveway after Repairs, undated
- Clmt. Ex. 10 Picture of Driveway after Repairs, undated
- Clmt. Ex. 11 Picture of New Paving on Driveway, undated
- Clmt. Ex. 12 Picture of Driveway after the Respondent but before Mr. Olinger, undated
- Clmt. Ex. 13 Picture of Driveway after the Respondent but before Mr. Olinger, undated
- Clmt. Ex. 14 Picture of Driveway after Repairs, undated
- Clmt. Ex. 15 Picture of Driveway Near the Gate, undated
- Clmt. Ex. 16 Email from Mr. Olinger to the Claimant, dated November 30, 2020
- Clmt. Ex. 17 Copy of \$8,200.00 check from the Claimant to the Respondent, dated October 16, 2018

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

- Resp. Ex. 1 Copy of Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-605
- Resp. Ex. 2 Invoice from Maryland Paving, October 16, 2018
- Resp. Ex. 3 Not Admitted⁴

⁴ Although I did not admit Respondent's exhibit 3, I did retain the exhibit. "All exhibits marked for identification, whether or not offered in evidence and, if offered, whether or not admitted, shall be retained for purposes of judicial review." COMAR 28.02.01.22C. I did not consider the exhibit in this decision.

granger in groupe for the parties of the residence of the re-इ.स्क्री द्वेत हैं। इ.स.केसी राजारे । जि. का अपने होती हैं। हार The content also that the same particle on the Ref. I see that has self-्रामा क्षेत्रपात है के बहुबराध्यम् । बहुबर्ग क्षाप्रकारिक कृष्ट्राम् वर्गा विकास अभिनेत्रमा व्यवस्थ राज्य कर् nemerica de la compresención de contracto de Chinal Shi da - Brancias e Sent-e () de se se digazo, en equi ्रा स्टब्स्ट केट क्षुत्र । इ.स.च्याचन ए.चेन्स्ट स्टब्स्ट व्याप्त क्षेत्र इत विदेशन केरहा विदेश । afglange og kappag, gggades i Kapa ara gesendel framagrif akatt gjatteri mes et g िक्र भाष्ट्रिक प्रति । ई. काम १८ १८ वर के प्रति । एक एक एक एक एक प्रति । एक क्षेत्रक (कुर्मा, है कर्मा कामक ए grandigit is est elements were trivial conservation to be Community of the property of the community of the communi gran gar je sija ne sajaja se bilenak sahara masaha CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE WAY A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER Control of British for the first man and been been a self-the ्राका है। यह र ऋबु वह प्रक्रमण भी योग एक दार्थ मध्य भारतीय है। इस यह राजे में स्टार्थ अध्य रा प्रशासन है है। इस व किसारों में किस का नहीं कि प्रतिकार है है। के किस राज सर्वा निकार क्रमाना से उन्हें है Granger, de figierra proportione especial description profesional descriptions of the grant contraction of the grant cont The capture of the control of the co

ক্ষাৰ্থনা, প্ৰচেল্ডাৰ প্ৰজে সংগ্ৰিক কৰিব লগতে স্থান সমূহক কিছিল। আনহাতিৰ লগতে অনুসাৰ কৰ্মিক সমূহক সংক্ষা চাৰ সমূহ যে এক সামান্ত্ৰিক সমূহক <mark>সমূহক ক্ষাৰ্থনাতি</mark> ক্ষাৰ্থনাতি স্থানিক স ું તે મોત્ર ઉપયુ મુખ્ય કોંદ એક પાર્ટ તેમાં અને કે એક ફાયો કે કાળમો લાગ કરવા છે. તે હોંડો મેળપોલામાં જોઈ પાણ પાને છે છે છે.

Testimony

The Claimant testified and presented the testimony of Elizabeth "Yancey" Carey, the Claimant's wife.

The Respondent testified and presented the testimony of McKinley Ayres, the Respondent's son.

The Fund 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 licensed home improvement contractor under MHIC license number 132630.
- 2. The Claimant and his wife reside at a home located in Baltimore County, Maryland. (Property). The Property is owned by the Claimant's wife, Elizabeth Carey.
- 3. On November 9, 2017, the Claimant and the Respondent entered into a contract to "prep and blacktop 6922 sq. ft. of driveway, 2.5 inches compacted, remove, fill, and compact [two] stumps." (Contract). (Clmt. Ex. 1). The Contract did not list a start or end date.
- 4. The Contract included a hand-drawn sketch of the areas to be paved and included measurements taken by the Claimant. The measurements totaled 6,922 sq. ft. to be paved by the Respondent.
 - 5. The original agreed-upon Contract price was \$12,470.20.
- 6. On August 15, 2018, the Claimant paid Arborare Tree Experts, Inc to remove a tree in preparation for the driveway paving.

and the second of the second o

Description of the formal column to the following the section of t

ina sa cabacido

Consequents of the administration of the long service. The both of the

TO A SEE BUT THE CONTROL OF THE

ा... अब नेतन्त्रीय हो है एक कहाने कर पहला है है के बहुत हुई में महीत्र है है

्रे क्रांक्र होता रहेत स्वकृतिक है क्षेत्र विकास है व्यक्ति है व्यक्ति है व्यक्ति का विकास है है है

Control of the property of the property of the control of the cont

Level to the contribution of accompanies to a relating the last to be a partial of the contribution of the

The special space which states and a course and growing a last and applicant. (School of the continued to

स्तु ते अस्तरकातः मनुष्ठितसम्बद्धाः अस्तुम्बद्धाः अस्तिहास्य स्ति । द्वाराम् । शितृक्षेत्रकारको । सन्

results and being 1900 and place. And therefore the training to the contract of the contract of the contract of

Leave the first series of the contact was of the first of the series of the first o

Berkersen in Taes so at his engage with the letter broken in the topic section is a first the first

रात्र विकास के प्राप्त के कार्य के किया के किया के किया के कार को है। यह की होता की की कार्य के कार का का का क

क्षा के विकास के जाने हैं है जिसके हैं कि जाने हैं

A whole to the first the first of the first

· 表面/mg (中心治疗) 建闭线 (数10) (10) (10)

- 7. On September 10, 2018, the Claimant paid the Respondent a deposit of \$4,200.00 and on October 16, 2018, the Claimant paid the Respondent \$8,200.00 for a total of \$12,400.00. The Respondent agreed that the Claimant paid him in full.⁵
- 8. In October 2018, the Respondent paid Maryland Paving \$7,486.41 for paving materials to pave 6,922 sq. ft. of Property.
- 9. On October 16, 2018, the Claimant immediately noticed that the pavement did not cover all of the stone as agreed in the Contract.
 - 10. The Respondent did not pave the 6,922 sq. ft as agreed in the Contract.
- 11. In November 2018, the Respondent returned to the Property as requested by the Claimant.
- 12. On June 14, 2019, the Claimant hired David Olinger to complete the paving. Mr. Olinger paved 980 sq. ft. for a price of \$4,885.00.

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,

⁵ Neither the Respondent nor the Claimant provided additional information regarding why the Contract was paid in full at a price of \$12,400.00 versus the original Contract price of \$12,470.20.

ele de la company de la Chemina de Chemina de Chemina de Chemina de la company de la c	कारण के प्रतिकृतिकारण के अस्तिकार प्रतिकृतिकारण के	gen en generale en de desta grant per en la desta de la grant de l
		े अस्ति कार्यु क्रिकेन प्रकारित होत्या अस्ति । १८०८ वर्षे
		ละแบบ กรุง คือเก็กรูปเป็นสามากก็คนเห็นรับใน จ
	rimigraphyciture in gyddai	
eg la conjunt datal l'este, et r	radiojais jargėjai gra	ารู อากุ ได้เกิด เกิดเหตุกรัก ก็ เกาะเลยนะ เ กิดการ
to often self of the open profession	April 1995 April 19	प्रात्म सम्बद्धां क्रिक्ट प्रेस् स्वयं क्रिक्ट प्रेस
िल्बे स्थारी एक्ट्री एक्ट्रीकी प्राप्तिक		प्रकार है हैं है
्रेश्व असुन्ति विद्युष्ट <mark>अस्तिकारम्</mark>	person way ye	British is to the second of th
parties of the property	i si geografi ga dijak	
्राष्ट्रकारीय विकास के प्राप्त के कि		
120 - 120 - 120 arriver 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120	n gewert ja	ल्याम् किन्निके से प्रवेद्योगियुक्तस्योगिकेयुक्ति । १९७७ ।
A SHAPPER SHAPE		
14 January		นากมาก และ ในหรือสาวคามก็ก็การครุ สมาชิก
इ.च. स्थापन		disk in all specific properties
ं दर्शके प्राप्ता प्रतिकार ने लेखना प्रदानीय है।		
The state of the s		escretor El reconsignation participation consideration
्या वर्षाच्या । वर्षे ११ पुर स्वेता ११ स्		
ार्थः । क्षेत्रकृतिहरू सूर्वे हिर्देश सूर्वे हिर्देश	en greboter of high	ता रहे होता है के अंध त है। है हुई के हैं हुई के बेंबह कर
man in the algorithm of the content of	20139 141	
		Park Set to the production of the control of the co
Y English sunfact.		ng taong ataungan continen, dinggraphic

repair, replacement, or completion that arise from an unworkmanlike, inadequate, or incomplete home improvement." Bus. Reg. § 8-401. For the following reasons, I find that the Claimant has proven eligibility for compensation.

The Claimant testified he entered into a Contract with the Respondent to pave 6,922 sq. ft of driveway at the Property and paid a deposit of \$4,200.00. The Claimant testified he lives with his wife at this Property, but it is solely owned by her. The Claimant explained he is a schoolteacher and knew the Respondent since the Respondent is the father of a student in the Claimant's class. Upon meeting with the Respondent, the Claimant said he told the Respondent, "wherever you see stone, we want pavement." He explained that his wife drives a school bus and a horse trailer, and they required a driveway with room for both large items and their motor vehicles. During the initial meeting, the Claimant measured the driveway and provided the measurements to the Respondent. The measurements were inserted on a sketch. In preparation for the paving, the Claimant testified he hired Arborare Tree Experts, Inc to remove a tree. The Claimant explained that the Respondent started a little later than originally scheduled because of the wet summer and other pavement jobs rescheduled. A few days before the beginning of the pavement job, the Respondent met with the Claimant and his wife at the Property to review the areas to be paved.

At the conclusion of the Contract, the Claimant paid the remaining \$8,200.00 and gave the workers a tip for the work. However, once the workers left, the Claimant testified he walked the driveway and noticed that the pavement did not cover all of the stone as agreed. The Claimant called the Respondent, but he did not get any response. Finally, in November 2018, the Respondent came out to the Property to meet with the Claimant about the issues. The Claimant testified that the Respondent agreed that the pavement did not cover the stone as agreed. Further, the Respondent measured all of the missing areas and agreed to prepare an estimate to pave the

The state of the s

The company of the second of the second cases of the condition of the cond

bulliament institute commission of the commission of the commission of the commission in the commission of the commissio

areas that were not paved; the Respondent told the Claimant that the cost for this paving would be in addition to the amount the Claimant had already paid and that the Claimant's job would be the first one he did in the Spring. The Claimant testified that after the November 2018 meeting with the Respondent, he saw him in Pennsylvania and reminded him about the Spring job. However, the Claimant said when Spring came, the Respondent did not return to the Property. As a result, the Claimant hired an attorney to send a letter to the Respondent. The Claimant said that after the letter, the Respondent came to the Property and agreed to complete the paving of the driveway.

The Claimant testified that the Respondent ultimately decided not to finish paving the driveway. The Claimant hired David Olinger for \$4,885.00 to finish the incomplete work performed by the Respondent.

Elizabeth Carey, the Claimant's wife and Property owner testified on behalf of the Claimant. Ms. Carey testified that she is a school bus driver and needed a wider driveway at the Property. Therefore, she agreed with the Claimant that the Respondent would pave wherever there was stone. She explained that on the day of the paving, the Respondent went back and forth with her about increasing the driveway width. The Respondent told her that the wider driveway with a jagged edge versus a straight line would look bad and that he did not have enough base. Ms. Carey testified that she did not agree with the Respondent but could not stay and debate it further as she had to get to work. However, she did recall telling the Respondent that there would a change to the sketch, specifically the area near the barn. Ms. Carey agreed with the Claimant that the Respondent did not pave the driveway as agreed.

She recalled the meeting with Mr. Olinger who explained that the Property had existing stone but required additional base to properly complete the job. Ms. Carey recalled that the Respondent did not bring additional stone base to add to the stone already on-site.

of the performability of market to finance of the population of complete the first of the continuous and section ra date un projection capable galacinate dina de la constata den decimiente de demandra de la capacidade y le sec hand a fear and the contract of the contract o and the first of the account of the first and the first of the first of the second of the substitution of the gines en seinogen aus son Parisein regulaires plant plans gabe pariseixet la unia il mingera a più There are this defile this merger at the second of a tree of the constant of the contract field for a file and the Transport and the constituting that was problem in the constitution of the constitutio Tayaya sa iriyo sa rah giran a dahari ri Mitti basi marajiran pilitu indanggara anto þit baghnar anninglasi), a til and the control of th a sela da el algebra el especial de la composición de la composición de la composición de la composición de la reservative and builties water by graft has also after a till old graft describe the expression of the migricular in the application of the analysis of the expression of the contraction of la ja oli la vi la litti interpresa la la luta colletta i lati la la filologia e la casti que ti luva la grafi Special and beginning to make on, which is all the ground and the college of the basis of the college of the

The second of the companies of the compa

The Respondent testified that he has owned his business since 2007 and has six employees. Before opening his business, he gained paving experience while working for another company. He testified that he determined the square feet by measuring the length and width, calculating the area, and placing the resulting information on the sketch created by the Claimant. Based on the sketch and the 6,922 sq. ft. measurements, the Respondent determined the Contract price. He explained that the job would take two days; one day to prep and the second day to lay the blacktop or pave the areas.

The Respondent noted that on the morning of October 16, 2018 he, his son, and a helper arrived at the Property. The Respondent had his son knock on the door to get Ms. Carey to review the existing edges of the stone driveway and the proposal. He stated that Ms. Carey insisted on changes to the sketch and as a result he "laid down the sketch" and followed the direction of Ms. Carey in establishing the width of the driveway. The Respondent denied pressuring Ms. Carey to make a change, namely, making the edge straight not jagged. He did not dispute that the sketch noted a fourteen-foot-wide area and he instead paved an eleven-foot area. In addition, he did not dispute that the sketch noted a fifty-foot-wide area and he instead paved a thirty-nine-foot space. The Respondent explained the differences occurred because of the changes imposed by the owner of the property, Ms. Carey. The Respondent also testified that he did not bring additional base or stone with him, because based on the sketch, the Property had more than enough on-site.

The Respondent testified he purchased enough blacktop from Maryland Paving to complete the job for 6,922 sq. ft. based on the sketch. He explained that at the end of the day, the Claimant returned home from work, said the job looked good, and paid the Contract balance, and tipped the workers. At some point after completion of the work, the Respondent stated that the Claimant called and complained that the pavement did not go to the edge of the stone as

ेश राज्यसम्बद्धाः वर्गाचन । वस्तर्याः स्त

Territoria de la media qui a Martin del partino de la figira de la compositoria de la martina de la martina del ुरात्मुक्त , कार्र क्रान्यक्षेत्रक प्रकारिक में क्रिकेट क्रिकेट क्रिकेट प्रकार पाल किसी क्रिकेट एक के अन्यक्रि Silver Course (1881 to Liber)

ale to be visited on the control of the region of a set of the first and the second of meligen an indices deligence, a page grave in decina ed semilar. I consider the endador is negative क्तिक विद्याल करें के किए कर हो। अन्तर कि विद्याल कि कर्तिक हुआ के किए किए किए किए किए किए हैं कि किए के किए क together to extrapolic engile the object of original original becomes only the origin to a mercinal document. ्र हु दूर बंद देखानेक रहा एर्ट्स क्वांता राज्य हिंदा हु एस्ट्री का तार कार्य संदूष्ट निर्देश किया है है । अस्य

regest vice consectation and comparts of the process of the section of the consecution of The second second second with the second second second second second second second second second ान हो सम्बद्धान के किल्लाका मुन्ते के किन्नों हो अपनित्र अवस्थान हो है। है है कि किन्नों के किन्नों के किन्नों में अपने का उस में में देवा है। वह भेगी जो का में में मूं देव है के में मूं मूं मूं महिन्द में के में महिन्द में The section of the se and a trust, are been a tight and their successive to be broad road. I see a description at most and por el espati per meneral e perceptado parte que liberar en la configuración en la continuación de la contin e de brevetet bede frankrafisk frankrafisk britarijen fan brog er et 🖟 🗆 rege fra een afret dên bij fan

Land to the tend of the state of Applicate to the country of the country were all interests with a chance to great the country of graveling which will be you appropriately at dot on the plane to their continuous field in their sort දැන්දීම් සොහා අතුනු දැය වී ක්රියන්න ක්රීම්ක (ක්රීම්කාකතා මින්දාලන වැන්දාලන යි. ය. කිරීම ක්රීම් මෙන්දාම විශේ English to the expectation of page of the control of the control of the control of the control of

agreed. The Respondent replied that he paved to the lines as determined by Ms. Carey on the morning of the job. He testified that initially he agreed to address any issues but changed his mind as the Claimant and his wife became nasty toward him and continued to increase the scope of issues to be addressed. Beyond describing the Claimant and his wife as "never happy" he did not explain how the scope of issues changed or increased.

As a result of the changes, the Respondent testified that he did not install 6,922 sq. ft of blacktop. He testified he did not measure the areas when left, but knew it was less than 6,922 sq. ft. as agreed in the Contract because of the changes by Ms. Carey. As for the work performed by Mr. Olinger, the Respondent noted he observed the patch work performed by Mr. Olinger. He explained driving and seeing the driveway seams installed on each side of the longer part of the driveway. He did not deny that the seams included areas he originally agreed to pave. He testified that the Mr. Olinger widened the driveway and he believed Mr. Olinger added base or stone, but he admitted he did not measure the space. The Respondent agreed that the Mr. Olinger charged a reasonable price of \$4,855.00 or \$4.98 per sq. ft. for the 980 sq. ft. he paved.

McKinley Ayres, the Respondent's son testified on behalf of his father. He testified that he has worked with his father since age sixteen. In this case, he recalled knocking on the door to get Ms. Carey to go over the job with his father. He recalled Ms. Carey directing the location of the string and paint used to determine the perimeter of the driveway.

Based on the evidence presented, I find that the Claimant has met his burden to show that the Respondent completed incomplete work. The Claimant and the Respondent agreed that the Contract provided that the driveway at the Property would be 6,922 sq. ft and the same measurements were outlined on the sketch. The Respondent agreed that he used the sketch and measurements to purchase blacktop from Maryland Paving and based his price on the square

The large contents to preside the content of the co

and the control of the state of

And the state of the first transmission of t

The state of the second second

The later with a come the character of species and several to the companies of the companie

to a copyright for the context of problems and promption and promption of the context of the con

footage. The Respondent and the Claimant agree that the Respondent did not pave pursuant to the sketch and dimensions noted.

The Respondent argued that he deviated from the sketch at the direction of the owner, Ms. Carey, pursuant to section 8-605 of the Business Regulations Article. Section 8-605 of the Business Regulation Article applies to abandonment of and the failure to perform a contract and in this case, I do not find that the Respondent abandoned the Contract. However, I do find that the Respondent failed to perform the Contract and performed incomplete work as he did not pave to the specifications of the sketch and the required 6,922 sq. ft.

There is no dispute that the Respondent was a licensed home improvement contractor at the time he entered into the Contract with the Claimant. The Respondent performed unworkmanlike, inadequate, or incomplete home improvements. The Respondent acknowledged that he deviated from the sketch and the measured spaces and width of the driveway. Section 101(k) of the Business Regulations Article defined owner as "a homeowner, tenant, or other person who buys, contracts for, orders, or is entitled to a home improvement." In this case, the owner included the Claimant as the person who initially contracted with the Respondent and Ms. Carey the Property owner. The reason offered by the Respondent to deviate from the Contract is an excuse. I find that the Respondent did not provide credible testimony regarding his interaction with Ms. Carey and the changes made to the dimensions. I find it more likely than not that the Respondent pressured Ms. Carey to hurriedly agree to changes as she prepared to leave for work. I find that the Respondent made a poor decision to interact with Ms. Carey on the morning of since he had been to the property on multiple occasions, walked the driveway, and had a sketch with specific measurements. Further, the Claimant and Ms. Carey provided consistent testimony that where there was stone, they wanted it to be paved and that spaced totaled 6,922 sq. ft. I do not believe the testimony of the Respondent that he did not have remaining blacktop after

ाक्षेत्रक, १९८९ क्षा क्षा कार्यक्रमण्या पूर्वतम क्रिकेसमञ्जूष्टिम इत्यादक एक विद्यालयों १ कार्यक्रमण्या द्वारा rach winder parat, under each pris besoming indicate can be, in the compile case a local section of त्र कृत है के एक विकास कर कर का कि कि निर्देश है , इसके एक में स्थान कर है कि का सुनित्र कर कर के ले का है कि ा तर्वाद्रों के कुर्बेद करेंद्र कर कार्य विवर्धन । असे विवर्धने के कार कार्य के किया के विवर्धन के विवर्धन के ्र क्षित्र क्षण्य एक विकास के समित कर हाते । इस्ति होता हो सामान क्षण का का का का का अपने का का का का का का का त्ती अर्थनाचेन्द्रवृक्षात्रकात वर्षेत्र (क्ष.) त्राव्यक्ष किल्ला क्षेत्रकार किल्ला क्षेत्रकार किल्ला क्षेत्रकार रक्षांद्रित का हो एको नाने दूरक प्रमुखेलीका चलुना के एक समारक्षांत्र है । इसिये में कुए का किए एक बार है । का एक प र्क है। है के बेर्क्क के बेर्क मार्टिक के विकास है के देव के किया के के बेर्क की है जाना सकता है के मान की है an man prattier than a Water are a top a pure an action to a talk any approach on the transfer a selection topa िक्रमात अनुस्क कृतिका पर वर्षक्षिका हुन। पार्वका प्रताके व्हान्त्र हुन हुन कि पुरस्कित क्रमार्थित हुने कही तमाना **छात** THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE P particle and a group protessor buy no milesters to a fact the inflation of the protest of the particle. त्यात्रको हो प्रकार के इंग्रेट से से अपने प्रकार के अपने प्रक्रिय है। इस के अपने के अपने के अपने के अपने के सि and the company of the second company of the second of the company of the second of the second of the company of the second of the second of the company of the second of the

THE PERSON OF TH

finishing the driveway. There is just no way that he ordered enough blacktop from Maryland Paving to pave 6,922 sq. ft of space, not pave that space, and not have leftover blacktop.

I find that the Claimant and his wife provided credible testimony as compared to the Respondent and his son regarding the ultimate changes to the Contract. I believe the testimony of the Claimant and his wife that they wanted all the stone covered with pavement and that amounted to 6,922 sq. ft. I find that the Respondent's son provided consistent testimony with that of his father, which failed to truly explain why they had any contact with Ms. Carey causing ultimate changes in the agreed upon Contract terms and provided sketch. In addition, even with the changes, I do not understand how the Respondent left the driveway incomplete yet allegedly did not have remaining blacktop. The testimony is inconsistent with the evidence presented, namely the invoice from Maryland Paving. I find it hard to believe that Ms. Carey or the Claimant intended the Respondent to leave the driveway incomplete such that another contractor would ultimately have to come and complete the remaining 980 sq. ft.

The Respondent contracted with the Claimant to pave the driveway to specific dimensions and failed to complete the job. After the Respondent declined to return and complete the job, the Claimant hired David Olinger for \$4,885.00. Based on the testimony and the before and after pictures, I find that the Mr. Olinger did not go beyond the original Contract. In fact, Mr. Olinger only paved the remaining areas left unpaved by the Respondent; specifically, 980 sq. ft.

I thus find that the Claimant is eligible for compensation from the Fund. Having found eligibility for compensation I must determine the amount of the Claimant's actual loss and the amount, if any, that the Claimant is entitled to recover. The Fund may not compensate a claimant for consequential or punitive damages, personal injury, attorney fees, court costs, or

le manigera de del delibro de gradido de la combinidad ha e en la pripala depresada qualidade e el cilia de l कार्यका है। के मुख्य है। पूर्व एक एक एक एक कि कार्यका एक किया किया है। अपने के बाद के महिल्ला के कि कार्य के म हर्म<mark>के भ</mark>रता केल होता र तह करिक भागीक्ता है अरण को एउटल एक एक र करा हम्मण है होना से उत्तर हो ।

्रो अस्तु स्वाप्तात के प्रतान काकृत एक है हुए। क्षेत्रक क्षेत्रक को <mark>वर्षा</mark> के हुई है । हुए।

के निर्माण के प्रकार के कार के का कार्य के कार कार्य के किए के किए के किए के किए एक किए के किए के किए किए के क

properties the therefore the self-course will ever to be the fact of the properties of the following

The Things of the control the control to a single control to the figure that we will be controlled the con-त्यात्र कृति त्या के हे कृति त्या कुंका हिते क्रिकेट सुक्त कर <mark>महित क्रिकेट क्रिकेट म</mark>हिता है। या क्रिकेट प्रकार State that I would be supposed in the state of the paper. Here is the contribution of the state राजिका ने अंदर अनुसूर्व के प्रदेश है । इसके के अनुस्तान के देश है है । इसके अनुसर्व के स्वराध के देश के अनुस्तान है ।

ggangmil tu gaughan sekulas anna siligisetten kathatipa epigis ettiation e

g Enclarigns group of grant consider an anno grains and the first school of computal considers, where the cons where it is not considered the property of the property of the property of the constraint of the const पुरुष करता हुन के बार्च हुनुवर्ष के वाहरता है। इस इस इस बारिस के हिन्द कर है अपने अने अने अने अने का देवारों के प्राप्त है। galgari, gantagigaggalikut kangangtigaggana Hilippat magagari ganggan and the profession of the control of and the complete of the contract of the contra हित्स कर क्षित्रक के कार का अने किया किया किया का का अपने का का कार का का का का का किया के का का का का का का क

्रापद्र सुष्ट कृष्ट हो स्वरूप्ता । ५,०० स्वरूप्ता वारत्य बहे जिल्लाहरू महिल्लाक के उन्हें के प्रवास के प्रवास para arang dangganggan ng mini kan arang salis apa ing minapa pangka talih jagga salih pinapabin, m

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 Claimant retained another contractor to complete or remedy that work. Accordingly, the following formula appropriately measures the Claimant's actual loss:

If the contractor did work according to the contract and the claimant has solicited or is soliciting another contractor to complete the contract, the claimant's actual loss shall be the amounts the claimant has paid to or on behalf of the contractor under the original contract, added to any reasonable amounts the claimant has paid or will be required to pay another contractor to repair poor work done by the original contractor under the original contract and complete the original contract, less the original contract price. If the Commission determines that the original contract price is too unrealistically low or high to provide a proper basis for measuring actual loss, the Commission may adjust its measurement accordingly.

COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(c).

The Claimant paid the Respondent \$12,400.00 for the original Contract and paid \$4,885.00 to Mr. Olinger to complete the original Contract. The agreed-upon Contract price between the Claimant and the Respondent was \$12,470.20. The Respondent agreed that upon receipt of the \$12,400.00, the Claimant paid him in full.

Calculation:

Amount paid to the Respondent:

\$12,400.00

Amount paid to the new contractor: + \$4.885.00

Minus the Original Contract Price: - \$12,470.20

Total:

\$4,814.80

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 Claimant's actual loss is less than the amount paid to

The control of the co The content of the content of the state of the state of the content of the conten The state of the contraction of the state of r is dissolved to the splentistic of the state of the sta The water of the defect of the paper of the paper deduced The property of the property decides to be publicated to the temperature of the estamende perde genegative distanciarendo el comenzación de la legacidad de alla contratad de ्राह्म कि है। अस्तर का विद्यार अपने सुनावानी कि उस एक कि अब अंतर के कि क्षेत्र के स्थान of grant of the contract of the holder than a relation of the state of the contract of the con The control of the co There is no week and the confidence and some of the training in addition of the a popular de la primera de la companya de la compa कर्त रूपार्थिक पूजार अस्तर ने क्षेत्र के लिए असी हुसूबार कि जान है से उद्भावित हुँ से स्वेक्स का क्षेत्र से का i ne reside big industri Englished partiets again a gigal was trad principal partiet and an interest partiet was been been able to the o the proceed marketing section of properties where we are four arranged and section to the n and so things and the confidence of I there are group 10 as particular that is a second n by A on the and we distributed organishes semested extending the contract which 141 121 no especialistic in the first greater in the ments trages sintral field a special can be seen as application, and are provinced that their plantages below the set of the province of the best of the college THE SECOND SECURITION OF SECURITIES AND ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF

they are also as the existing earlies and extension for asserble to haders yet for each at the se-

the Respondent and less than \$20,000.00. Therefore, the Claimant is entitled to recover his actual loss of \$4,814.80.

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I conclude that the Claimant has sustained an actual and compensable loss of \$4,814.80 as a result of the Respondent's acts or omissions. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-401, 8-405 (2015); COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(C). I further conclude that the Claimant is entitled to recover that amount from the Fund.

RECOMMENDED ORDER

I RECOMMEND that the Maryland Home Improvement Commission:

ORDER that the Maryland Home Improvement Guaranty Fund award the Claimant \$4,184.80; 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;⁶ and

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

April 7, 2021

Date Decision Issued

CONFIDENTIAL

Syeetah Hampton-EL Administrative Law Judge

SAH/cj #191434

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

			•	\$
्रम् एक ्रव्या स्थ ित्यम् । स्थाप	other control of the control	e ento establista	Spread stables of	i Mikosopolikorik
				ili de la compania del compania del compania de la compania del compania del compania de la compania del compani
Parking the sector server sort	bi lainak bir amadi.	dela completa		e Maria Cylinddig
ीतक के अपने के दूरी प्रमुख कार संबंध	galejská brá ek	্ত্ৰীটাই চিচাৰে পাছৰ ক্ৰম	in a state of the si	រំបែក ដូចជា នេះ វ
n en er op holdlingst engelskilder				
े अस्तिकार है है।		Shringer of	The Constitution	
The second transmission of the	inent) i cuntori		ergellersti miss	
				inger i de la company
inge kan aga ka midle	इ.स् र क्षेत्री हो स्टी होत्	kyluri awi	terjeski i i lite 4	
Survey (Serve Lighter Helica Charger)		refer to deposit	A State Tours	i Maria Lagrando Maria Lagrando
ราชาชาร์ สินาธิสต์ <mark>สติร</mark> าชาชาร์ สิรุ			er de grand provide et	
			ar Maratifet	
e proposition and a second to	and skill although	diga ggiri	ล้าวการเสารณ์)แล้วผู้	
				e Spalie of Model
				The Mark Brown
e de la companya de La companya de la co				
				20 14.
			:	
				garaga sa sa ma Kadapatanja sa D

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.

<u>Joseph Tunney</u>

Joseph Tunney
Chairman
Panel B
MARYLAND HOME IMPROVEMENT
COMMISSION

tilo og karaling skriger fra skriger i	
and the control of the second	The state of the second
	•
्र १५ । वित्रकृता एक विक्रिक्त के अधिक के स्वर्थ के	
The second of th	
la de la	
	A Charles and A Charles William and A Land
	The legit of the philipse
	,
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	