



University of Tennessee, Knoxville
**Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative
Exchange**

Tennessee Department of State, Opinions from the
Administrative Procedures Division

Law

3-21-2006

\$1,613.28 in U.S. Currency, Seized From: Teresa
Ann Carroll, Date of Seizure: May 18, 2005,
Claimant: Teresa Ann Carroll

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:

**\$1,613.28 in U.S. Currency
Seized From: Teresa Ann Carroll
Date of Seizure: May 18, 2005
Claimant: Teresa Ann Carroll**

**DOCKET NO: 19.01-090232J
(D.O.S. Case No. E2264)**

INITIAL DEFAULT ORDER

This matter was heard in Chattanooga, Tennessee, before Ann M. Johnson, Administrative Judge assigned by the Secretary of State, Administrative Procedures Division, sitting for the Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Safety. Mr. Will Lundy, Staff Attorney for the Tennessee Department of Safety, represented the State. The Claimant was not present and was not represented by legal counsel.

The subject of this hearing was the proposed forfeiture of U.S. currency based on allegations that its possession and/or receipt by the Claimant was in violation of the Tennessee Drug Control Act. Upon the Claimant's failure to appear at the hearing, counsel for the State made an oral motion for an order finding the Claimant to be in default, pursuant to TCA § 4-5-309. Upon full consideration of the evidence received at the hearing and the entire record in this case, the State's motion was granted. The Claimant was found to be in default, and the claim filed in this matter was stricken, as supported by the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Claimant's property was seized pursuant to law, resulting in the issuance of a Property Forfeiture Warrant. The Claimant filed a claim seeking the return of the currency, and requesting that a hearing be scheduled to consider that claim.

2. The claim was scheduled for hearing on March 21, 2006, and the Claimant was notified of the hearing time and location by certified mail. EXHIBIT 1. The notice was sent and delivered to the address provided by the Claimant.

3. The Claimant did not appear at the hearing, the second or subsequent setting of the case. Based on the Claimant's failure to appear, the State made an oral motion for the entry of an Order of Default.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW and ANALYSIS

1. Tennessee Code Annotated § 4-5-309(a) provides that "if a party fails to attend or participate in a pre-hearing conference, hearing or other stage of a contested case, the administrative judge . . . may hold the party in default" An order holding an absent party in default at the second or subsequent setting of a forfeiture hearing is authorized by Rule 1340-2-2-.17(1)(a), TENN. COMP. R. & REGS., *Rules of Procedure for Asset Forfeiture Hearings*.

2. A claim must include "[t]he address where claimant will accept mail." Rule 1340-2-2-.07(4)(a)1(ii).

3. According to Rule 1340-2-2-.11(2), the Department of Safety is entitled to rely upon the address of record in providing notice to a claimant:

In serving a "Notice of Hearing," the Legal Division shall rely upon the addresses of record as given by a claimant or by claimant's counsel. Proof of service per Rule 1340-2-2-.03(4) to the addresses of record shall establish a

rebuttable presumption that claimant or claimant's counsel received notice of the hearing date.

(Emphasis added.)

4. Rule 1340-2-2-.11(3) provides as follows:

Notice of hearing for a second or subsequent setting of the hearing will be by certified mail, return receipt requested. **The return receipt card may be filed with the Legal Division and serve as a record of notification.**

(Emphasis added.)

5. Rule 1340-2-2-.17(1) contains the following provision:

(d) No default shall be entered against a claimant for failure to attend [the hearing] except upon proof by the filing of the return receipt card, that the legal division has given notice of the hearing per Rule 1340-2-2-.11(3).

(e) Upon default by a party, an administrative judge may enter either an initial default order or an order for an uncontested proceeding . . .

6. Rule 1340-2-2-.17(2)(b) specifies possible results when a claimant is held

in default:

Upon a default by a claimant, a **claimant's claim shall be stricken by initial default order**, or, if the agency requests, the agency may proceed uncontested.

(Emphasis added.)

7. The legal impact of striking a claim is to render the claim void *ab initio*, as though it had never been filed.¹ Failure to file a claim results in the forfeiture of the property for disposition as provided by law. *See*, Tennessee Code Annotated § 40-33-206(c).

8. In accordance with the law, as set forth above, it is determined that the State's motion is well-taken. The Department notified the Claimant according to the rules cited above, as shown by the certified return receipt. The Claimant failed to appear at the hearing to pursue her claim. Pursuant to the cited authority, the Claimant is hereby found to be in default.

¹ The effect of striking a pleading "is to posture the action as if [that pleading] had never been made." *See, INVST Financial Group, Inc. v. Chem-Nuclear Systems, Inc.*, 815 F.2d 391, 404 (6th Cir. 1987).

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that the Claimant's claim is stricken from the record, and dismissed. The Claimant's interest in the subject property is Ordered forfeited to the seizing agency for disposition as specified by law.

This Initial Order entered and effective this 27th day of April 2006.

Ann M. Johnson
Administrative Judge

Filed in the Administrative Procedures Division, Office of the Secretary of State, this 27th day of April 2006.



Charles C. Sullivan, II, Director
Administrative Procedures Division