



4-13-2011

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY vs.
One Thousand Eight Hundred Twelve and no/100
Dollars in U.S. Currency VIN NO., Seized From:
Jason L. Turner, Date of Seizure: 4/9/2010,
Claimant: Jason Turner, Lien Holder:

Follow this and additional works at: http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_lawopinions

 Part of the [Administrative Law Commons](#)

This Initial Order by the Administrative Judges of the Administrative Procedures Division, Tennessee Department of State, is a public document made available by the College of Law Library, and the Tennessee Department of State, Administrative Procedures Division. For more information about this public document, please contact administrative.procedures@tn.gov

**BEFORE THE COMMISSIONER OF THE
TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY**

IN THE MATTER OF:

**TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF
SAFETY**

v.

**One Thousand Eight Hundred Twelve
and no/100 Dollars in U.S. Currency**

VIN NO.:

Seized From: Jason L. Turner

Date of Seizure: 4/9/2010

Claimant: Jason Turner

Lien Holder:

**DOCKET NO: 19.01-112032J
(D.O.S. Case No. K4204)**

INITIAL DEFAULT ORDER

This matter was heard in Nashville, Tennessee, on April 13, 2011, before Margaret R. Robertson, Administrative Law Judge, assigned by the Secretary of State, and sitting for the Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Safety. Orvil Orr, Staff Attorney for the Department of Safety, represented the State.

The subject of this hearing was the proposed forfeiture of the subject property for its alleged use in violation of T.C.A. §53-11-201 et seq. and §40-33-201 et seq.

Jason Turner, Claimant, did not appear at the hearing. The State therefore moved for an initial **default** and dismissal of the case. The motion was **granted** based upon the following findings of fact and conclusions of law.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claimant was sent notice of the hearing by certified mail at his address of record. The envelope bearing the notice was returned by the US Post Office to the department of safety marked “returned to sender, not deliverable as addressed, unable to forward.” Claimant has not provided the Department of Safety with any change of address, and the Department has no knowledge how to reach him other than the address he had previously given.

2. Claimant failed to appear on the day of the hearing. Nor did an attorney appear on Claimant’s behalf.

3. The State had its witnesses available and was ready to go forward to prove its case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ANALYSIS

1. Department of Safety Rule 1340-2-2-.17(1) provides, in relevant part:

- (d) No default shall be entered against a claimant for failure to attend except upon proof, by the filing of the return receipt card, that the Legal Division has given notice of hearing.
- (e) Upon default by a party, an administrative judge may enter either an initial default order or an order for an uncontested proceeding.

2. Department of Safety Rule 1340-2-2-.17(2) states, in relevant part:


Upon a default by a claimant, a claimant’s claim shall be stricken by initial default order.

3. The State's motion for default being granted, it is therefore **ordered** that Claimant's **claim be stricken**. The claim being stricken, it is as if no claim had ever been filed, which constructively evokes T.C.A. §40-33-206(c). That section states: "If a claim . . . is not filed with the applicable agency within the time specified . . . the seized property shall be forfeited and disposed of as provided by law."

This Initial Order entered and effective this 29th day of April, 2011.

Margaret R. Robertson
Administrative Judge

Filed in the Administrative Procedures Division, Office of the Secretary of State,
this 29th day of April, 2011.



Thomas G. Stovall, Director
Administrative Procedures Division