



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

---

Tennessee Department of State, Opinions from the  
Administrative Procedures Division

Law

---

2-3-2009

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY, vs,  
\$1,939.00 in U.S. Currency, Seized From: Jonathan  
Hudson, Date of Seizure: July 2, 2008, Claimant:  
Jonathan Hudson, Lien Holder: None, Seizing  
Agency: Knoxville P. D.

Follow this and additional works at: [http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_lawopinions](http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_lawopinions)

---

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](mailto:administrative.procedures@tn.gov)

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF  
SAFETY**

vs

**\$1,939.00 in U.S. Currency**

**Seized From: Jonathan Hudson**

**Date of Seizure: July 2, 2008**

**Claimant: Jonathan Hudson**

**Lien Holder: None**

**Seizing Agency: Knoxville P. D.**

**DOCKET NO: 19.01-101748J**

**(D.O.S. Case No. H5575)**

**INITIAL DEFAULT ORDER**

This matter was heard in [Knoxville](#), Tennessee, on [February 3, 2009](#), before J. Randall LaFevor, Administrative Law Judge, assigned by the Secretary of State, and sitting for the Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Safety. [Ms. Nina Harris](#), Staff Attorney for the Department of Safety, represented the Seizing Agency.

This hearing was convened to consider the proposed forfeiture of the subject property pursuant to T.C.A. §53-11-201 *et seq.*, §55-10-401 *et seq.*, §55-50-504 and/or §40-33-201, *et seq.*

The Claimant, did not appear at the hearing, either in person or through legal counsel. 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. The Claimant was sent notice of the hearing by certified mail at [his](#) address of record. [See Hearing Exhibit #1, establishing proper notice or reasonable efforts.]
2. The Claimant failed to appear on the day of the hearing. Nor did an attorney appear on the Claimant's behalf.
3. The State's witnesses were available and 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 the Claimant’s **claim is stricken from the record**. 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.”

**Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the seized property is forfeited to the Seizing Agency, the [Knoxville Police Department](#).**

This Initial Order entered and effective this 27th day of February, 2009.

---

J. Randall LaFevor, Administrative Judge

Filed in the Administrative Procedures Division, Office of the Secretary of State, this 27th day of February, 2009.



---

Thomas G. Stovall, Director  
Administrative Procedures Division