



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

Tennessee Department of State, Opinions from the
Administrative Procedures Division

Law

September 2014

Casey Bonner vs. Safety

Follow this and additional works at: 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

**BEFORE THE COMMISSIONER OF THE
TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY AND HOMELAND SECURITY**

IN THE MATTER OF:

**Casey (P6589) Bonner
2005 Mitsubish Galant
V.I.N. 4A3AB76S55E028061
Seized From: Philip L. Bonner
Date of Seizure: February 28, 2014
Claimant: Casey Bonner
Lien Holder: N/A**

DOCKET NO: 19.05-127223J

INITIAL DEFAULT ORDER

This matter was heard in Memphis, Tennessee, on August 5, 2014, before Joyce Carter-Ball, Administrative Law Judge, assigned by the Secretary of State, and sitting for the Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Safety. Joe Bartlett, 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. §55-50-504 and 40-33-201 et seq.

The Claimant did not appear at the hearing, either in person or through legal counsel. Counsel for the Department made an oral motion pursuant to T.C.A. §4-5-309, requesting that the Claimant be held in default. The motion was granted based upon 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 property, and requested that a hearing be scheduled to consider that claim.
2. The Claimant was sent notice of the hearing by certified mail at her address of record.
3. The Claimant failed to appear on the day of the hearing, August 5, 2014.
4. The State's witnesses were available and ready to go forward to prove their case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ANALYSIS

1. Department of Safety Rule 1340-2-2-.11(2) provides, in relevant part:

The Department of Safety is entitled to rely upon the address of record in providing notice to a claimant.

2. 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.

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

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

4. 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."

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the subject vehicle be **forfeited to the Seizing Agency**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

This Initial Order entered and effective this _____ day of _____ 2014.

Joyce Carter-Ball,
Administrative Law Judge

Filed in the Administrative Procedures Division, Office of the Secretary of State,
this _____ day of _____ 2014.



J. Richard Collier, Director
Administrative Procedures Division