



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

Tennessee Department of State, Opinions from the
Administrative Procedures Division

Law

February 2015

Ernesto Hernandex 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**

IN THE MATTER OF:

**TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT
OF SAFETY**

vs.

**One 1998 Chevrolet GK1 Truck
VIN: 2GCEK19R7W1216884
Seized From: David R. Baena
Date of Seizure: 6/15/2014
Claimant(s): Ernesto Hernandez
Lienholder: None Filed**

**DOCKET # 19.05-129206J
DOS # P9817, P9819**

INITIAL DEFAULT ORDER

This matter was heard in Memphis, Tennessee, on November 4, 2014, before Michael Begley, Administrative Law Judge, assigned by the Secretary of State, and sitting for the Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Safety. Mr. Andre Thomas, Staff Attorney for the Department of Safety, represented the State on behalf of the Seizing Agency.

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

Claimant did not appear at the hearing, either in person or through legal counsel. The State therefore moved for a Default Order and dismissal of the case. The motion was granted based upon the following findings of fact and conclusions of law.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Notice of the hearing was sent to the Claimant's address of record via certified mail documentation, establishing completed notification or reasonable efforts.
2. The Claimant failed to appear on the day of the hearing, and no attorney appeared on the Claimant's behalf.
3. The State's witnesses were available and ready to proceed when the case was called.

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. Having granted the State's motion for default, Rule 1340-2-2-.17(2) requires that Claimant's claim be stricken from the record. Once a claim is 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 Claimant is found to be in default, the claim is stricken from the record, and Claimant's interest in the subject property is forfeited to the Seizing Agency.

This Initial Order entered and effective this _____ day of _____ 2015.

Michael Begley, Administrative Judge

Filed in the Administrative Procedures Division, Office of the Secretary of State, this _____ day of _____ 2015.



J. Richard Collier, Director
Administrative Procedures Division