

**PRELIMINARY  
MINUTES**

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL CLAIMS AGAINST THE STATE**

Monday, January 4, 2016  
Room 118-N—Statehouse

**Committee Members Present**

Representative James Todd, Chairperson  
Senator Dan Kerschen, Vice-chairperson  
Senator Terry Bruce  
Senator David Haley  
Representative Mike Houser  
Representative Craig McPherson

**Committee Members Absent**

Representative Kathy Wolfe Moore

**Staff Present**

Cindy Lash, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Natalie Teemer-Washington, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Dylan Dear, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Daniel Yoza, Office of Revisor of Statutes  
Deb Burns, Committee Assistant

**Conferees**

Libby Snider, Kansas Department of Corrections  
Brian Bina, McPherson County  
Sarah Washburn, Kansas Highway Patrol  
Arlen Siegfried, Board of Tax Appeals  
Mike Leitch, University of Kansas  
Jerry Chatam  
Carl Hazzard

**Morning Session**

Chairperson Todd called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

*Senator Kerschen moved to approve the December 2, 2015, minutes; Representative Houser seconded the motion; the motion carried.*

Motor Fuel Tax Refunds for FY 2016 were submitted by Teri Agnew, Kansas Department of Revenue (Attachment 1). *Senator Bruce moved to approve; Senator Kerschen seconded the motion; the motion carried.*

Dylan Dear provided an overview of the Sexually Violent Predator Expense Fund and the process by which those claims are brought to the Joint Committee on Special Claims Against the State. (Attachment 2).

## **HEARINGS FROM EL DORADO CORRECTIONAL FACILITY**

### **Claim No. 6717, Claimant, Vernon J. Amos #55009**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to property loss in the amount of \$127.00**

Claimant stated his property was packed out by facility staff when he was placed in Segregation and later moved to another facility. When he received his property one year later he discovered there were items missing, including personal family photographs. He claims facility staff is at fault for not keeping proper inventory as required by facility policy.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated investigation determined the Claimant is entitled to compensation (minus depreciation), but not for claimed items that he never purchased. Departmental policy provides that the established value limit for photographs is zero. The Department recommends this claim be approved in the amount of \$5.17.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6717 be allowed in the amount of \$5.17. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

### **Claim No. 6730, Claimant, Jeoloni Emon Daniels #103144**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to property loss in the amount of \$185.00**

Claimant stated he lost his incentive level, his television was confiscated and he was transferred to another facility. When he asked for return of his television he was told it had been lost. He filed a facility property claim that was returned to him with no action taken citing his claim not being filed within the one year time limit established by policy. After he had purchased a replacement television he was told the television in question had been found. He seeks reimbursement for the cost of the replacement television.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated it may be argued that the Claimant should be compensated because he would not have purchased a second television if he had known that the first one was found, Claimant forfeited his rights to the television when he gave it to another inmate without permission. He still has ownership of the original television and is not entitled to compensation. The Department recommends this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6730 be denied. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

**Claim No. 6734, Claimant, Ricky Redford #43834**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Inadequate Medical Care/Negligence in the amount of \$75,000.00**

Claimant stated while incarcerated he suffered from a chronic sinus infection that was continually misdiagnosed by the Department's contract health care provider, resulting in a rare bacteria that caused various infections which led to surgery due to an infection to his big toe. He claims inadequate medical care, negligence, gross negligence and deliberate indifference to his medical needs.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated Claimant did not provide evidence to clearly establish the care provided was negligent on the part of any Department staff. The Department recommends that this claim be dismissed without prejudice under Rule 2 so the Claimant may exhaust all legal and administrative remedies available to him.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6734 be dismissed without prejudice. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

**Claim No. 6736, Claimant, Tyron James #77522**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Property Loss in the amount of \$70.46**

Claimant stated he was transferred to another facility and when he was allowed his property days later he discovered several items were missing. After he filed a facility property claim some of his items showed up but other items were still unaccounted for: padlock, dictionary, chessboard, fan and ice chest. He filed a second facility property claim for the unaccounted items and it was denied.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated it has been established that the items in question were purchased by the Claimant and he should be compensated for the loss minus depreciation, with the exception of the dictionary as it was seized due to a discipline infraction. The Departments recommends that this claim be approved in the amount of \$17.69

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6736 be allowed in the amount of \$17.69. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

**Claim No. 6738, Claimant, Walter Marchel #78455**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Property Loss in the amount of \$11.26**

Claimant stated when he purchased his television he was told by facility staff to keep the protective box it came in for property identification in the event he needed to send it out for repair. He claims staff unlawfully disposed of it.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated the Claimant's allegation that staff seized the box is unsubstantiated, but even so, it does not appear that such seizure would amount to negligence on the part of facility staff. The Department recommends that this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6738 be denied.*  
(See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")

## **HEARINGS**

**Claim No. 6742, Claimant, County of McPherson**

**v. Respondent, State of Kansas Sexually Violent Predator Program (program)  
due to Reimbursement of Fees Incurred Defending Sexually Violent Predator Cases in  
the amount of \$37,400.79**

Claimant filed with the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) for reimbursement of sexually violent predator expenses relating to the defense of sexually violent predator cases in the amount of \$40,760.88. The OAG paid the county \$4,280.45, the balance remaining in the program, and directed the county to its statutory remedy to file a claim against the state for the balance.

**Respondent, Program  
represented by Willie Prescott, Legislative Liaison, Office of Attorney General (OAG)**

Respondent stated after the Claimant was reimbursed \$4,280.45, the program was exhausted of funds. No funding is currently available and the recommendation of the OAG would be that the statute is followed.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6742 be allowed in the amount of \$37,400.79.* (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")

**Claim No. 6745, Claimant, Board of Butler County, Kansas, Commissioners**  
**v. Respondent, State of Kansas Sexually Violent Predator Program (program)**  
**due to Reimbursement of Fees Incurred Defending Sexually Violent Predator Cases in**  
**the amount of \$24,017.43**

Claimant filed with the OAG for reimbursement of sexually violent predator expenses relating to the defense of sexually violent predator cases in the amount of \$24,017.43. The OAG's response was the program was depleted of funds and recommended the county follow statute by submitting a claim to the Committee.

**Respondent, Program**  
**represented by Willie Prescott, Legislative Liaison, Office of Attorney General (OAG)**

Respondent stated the program funds were depleted prior to this claim and the OAG recommendation is to follow statute.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6745 be allowed in the amount of \$24,017.43. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

## **HEARING ON THE RECORD**

**Claim No. 6735, Claimant, Barbara Reese**  
**v. Respondent, Kansas Highway Patrol (KHP)**  
**due to Return of Seized Cash in the amount of \$17,660.00**

Staff Natalie Teemer-Washington summarized the claim: Claimant was the driver of a car when she was pulled over by a KHP officer and the passenger was arrested pursuant to an outstanding warrant. The vehicle was searched and the Claimant's cash was seized for suspected drug trafficking. She claims ownership of the claimed property was from her licensed used car dealership and the loss was caused by the illegal acts of the KHP officer.

**Respondent, KHP**  
**represented by Sarah Washburn, Staff Attorney, KHP**

Respondent stated the claimed property was forfeited to the federal government. The Claimant's misdirected attempts to recover her loss through district court resulted in her being instructed to seek restitution from the federal government for which it appears she has not done. The KHP recommends that the claim be denied under Rule 2.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6735 be denied. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

## **HEARING FROM ELLSWORTH CORRECTIONAL FACILITY**

### **Claim No. 6741, Claimant, Patrick Angelo, Jr. #57615**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Property Loss in the amount of \$480.00**

Claimant stated he was told he was being transferred to another facility, to pack his belongings and take them to Property. While there he was told he could not take his books and he would either need to send them out or have a family member pick them up. He stated that he wanted his son to pick them up. He was not provided the appropriate papers to sign indicating his choice nor did he receive an inventory receipt of his property. His son reported he did retrieve property that did not include the property claimed. He claims staff was negligent in following policy.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated all available documentation indicates that a single box of property was packed and placed in the visiting area to be picked up by Claimant's designated visitor. Because it can't be substantiated the claimed items were missing from the box, the Department recommends that this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6741 be denied.*  
(See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")

## **HEARINGS FROM HUTCHINSON CORRECTIONAL FACILITY**

### **Claim No. 6704, Claimant, Antonio Hinojos #101524**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Property Loss in the amount of \$18.00**

Claimant stated the inventory sheet staff completed during pack out his property when he was sent to Segregation did not include 12 magazines. He claims the magazines were lost or thrown away while in staff possession.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated an inventory sheet two weeks prior to the alleged loss and the inventory sheet on the date in question indicate Claimant had eight magazines in his possession. As such, the alleged loss cannot be substantiated and the Department recommends that this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6704 be denied.  
(See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

**Claim No. 6737, Claimant, Charles Denmark-Wagner #93947**  
**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)**  
**due to Property Loss in the amount of \$20.00**

Claimant stated he placed his earbuds on top of a legal box before he left his cell for lunch. When he returned his legal box had been confiscated and the earbuds were missing.

**Respondent, Department**  
**represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated investigation confirmed Claimant had purchased the claimed property and when staff entered the cell to remove cardboard that was blocking the view into the cell they did not see the earbuds. After a search of the cell the claimed property was not found. Because it could not be confirmed that the claimed property was in the cell when staff entered, the Department recommends that this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6737 be allowed.  
(See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

**Claim No. 6749, Claimant, Davett Smith II #78435**  
**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)**  
**due to Property Loss in the amount of \$255.17**

Claimant stated he lost his level and during a shakedown an officer removed his television, earphones, MP3 player and a set of sweats to the unit team office. He was later told all items had been lost and his property claim was denied citing claim was not submitted in the proper time frame defined by policy.

**Respondent, Department**  
**represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated investigation determined the items claimed were purchased by the Claimant and the property claimed was mishandled by staff. The Department recommends that this claim be allowed in the depreciated amount of \$199.35.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6749 be allowed in the amount of \$199.35. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

## **HEARINGS**

### **Claim No. 6744, Claimant, J. W. Chatam & Associates, Inc.**

**v. Respondent, Kansas Court of Tax Appeals/Board of Tax Appeals (Board)  
due to Payment of Legal Fees in the amount of \$137,358.32**

Claimant stated his company went before the Court of Tax Appeals concerning various client property “tied up” for which his claims were repeatedly met with bias and prejudice and the Court acting outside its statutory authority. He claims he was forced by the Court to file with the Court of Appeals and was granted a reversal. He seeks reimbursement of legal costs he incurred in the appeals process.

**Respondent, Board  
represented by Arlen Siegfried, Executive Director, Board**

Respondent stated as there is no specific statutory provision authorizing the award of attorney fees to litigants who obtain a reversal of a Kansas government agency decision on appeal, the Board recommends that this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6744 be denied.*  
(See section captioned “Committee Action and Recommendation.”)

### **Claim No. 6746, Claimant, Carl Hazzard.**

**v. Respondent, University of Kansas (KU)  
due to Property Damage in the amount of \$644.88**

Claimant stated the rear bumper of his vehicle was damaged by a mower operated by KU Facilities Maintenance while it was parked in his assigned employee parking spot during work. He filed a claim for property damage with KU Facilities Maintenance that was denied. The Claimant provided a video clip of the alleged incident.

**Respondent, KU  
represented by Michael Leitch, General Counsel, KU**

Respondent stated review of the video tape Claimant provided does not indicate the vehicle had been struck, and affidavits of the two employees mowing at the time of the alleged incident indicate denial in striking the vehicle. Investigation supports the conclusion that there was no negligence on the part of KU in this matter and recommends that this claim be denied without prejudice under Rule 2.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6746 be denied without prejudice under Rule 2.* (See section captioned “Committee Action and Recommendation.”)



## HEARINGS FROM LANSING CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

### **Claim No. 6703, Claimant, Michael Fitzsimmons #107843**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Personal Injury in the amount of \$300,000.00**

Claimant stated he suffered injury to his leg and lower back when an automated cell house door was closed by facility staff while he was attempting to walk through it. He claims staff operating the door failed to warn him that the door was about to close. The injuries caused him to lose his job in the facility and he seeks loss of wages. His facility claim was denied.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated the alleged incident was not witnessed by any staff but it appears the Claimant must have attempted to pass through the doorway while it was in motion. Medical records indicate he was treated and improved. Policy states inmates are not entitled to compensation for the loss of future wages. Claimant was unable to prove staff negligence and the Department recommends that this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6703 be denied.*  
(See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")

### **Claim No. 6709, Claimant, Andrew Zeiner #72623**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Property Loss in the amount of \$117.36**

Claimant stated some of his property went missing after staff failed to secure his property when he was cuffed and moved to Segregation. He claims it was determined through an investigation by the Department that this loss occurred as a result of negligence by staff. He was offered reduced compensation to his Facility Property Claim which he refused to accept.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated investigation revealed several of the claimed items were not listed on the inventory from Claimant's transfer to Segregation and it could not be established that they were among his belongings when his property was packed out. The inventory sheet was signed by the Claimant without noting any discrepancies. Though payment was initially recommended, it appears from subsequent inventory that these items were in Claimant's possession. The Department recommends that this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6709 be denied.*  
(See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")

**Claim No. 6711, Claimant, Andrew Zeiner #72623**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Property Loss in the amount of \$85.59**

Claimant stated some of his property went missing and his watch was broken after staff failed to secure his property when he was cuffed and moved to Segregation. He filed a facility property claim and refused an offer for reimbursement of the depreciated value of the claimed broken watch. He claims it was determined through an investigation by the Department that this loss occurred as a result of negligence by staff.

**Respondent, Department**

**represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated investigation revealed several of the claimed items were not listed on the inventory from Claimant's transfer to Segregation and it could not be established that they were among his belongings when his property was packed out. The inventory sheet was signed by the Claimant who noted his claimed watch appeared broken. Payment was offered for the depreciated cost of the watch which Claimant refused to accept. The Department recommends that this claim be allowed in the amount of \$41.56.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6711 be allowed in the amount of \$41.56. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

**Claim No. 6710, Claimant, Terry Bowen #71399**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Property Loss in the amount of \$267.78**

Claimant stated some of his property was missing when he returned from Administrative Segregation. After not receiving a decision on his facility property claim he filed this claim. He was then offered reimbursement at a discounted sum which he accepted, and he requested withdrawal of this claim. Later he learned the award was applied to his outstanding debt, for which he was unaware could be done, which led to him refile this claim. He feels lied to by the Department and only wants a television.

**Respondent, Department**

**represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated Claimant agreed to a settlement for which payment was made. Though he is not happy that the funds were offset to cover his restitution, the same thing would have occurred if no settlement had been reached and he had recovered through this claims process which would amount to double recovery, for which he is not eligible. The Department recommends that this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6710 be denied. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

**Claim No. 6733, Claimant, Derek Anderson #33497**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Personal Injury in the amount of \$10,000.00**

Claimant stated he suffered a back injury when the chair he was sitting in at the facility library collapsed under him. He later learned there had been previous episodes of chairs collapsing due to tampering by other inmates. He filed a facility claim for staff failure to remove the faulty chair and it was denied.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated it is not clear that the cause of Claimant's fall was an altered chair. Staff had made a good faith effort to remove all altered chairs and did not believe any remained. Staff negligence cannot be substantiated and the Department recommends that this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6733 be denied.*  
(See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")

**Claim No. 6739, Claimant, Nicholas Florentin #98591**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Property Loss in the amount of \$400.00**

Claimant stated he did not receive all of his electronics and tennis shoes when he was allowed his property that was being held in Property. He alleges staff negligence by not securing his property while in facility possession. An officer filled out the facility property claim form on his behalf. That claim was denied due to a claimed amount not being written on the form.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated Claimant signed two property inventory sheets, without noting any discrepancies, after pack-out of his property by staff. Based on available documentation, it appears that all of his property was accounted for and received by him. As such, his alleged loss cannot be substantiated, and the Department recommends that this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6739 be dismissed without prejudice.* (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")

**Claim No. 6740, Claimant, Jose Morales #71954**

**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Property Loss in the amount of \$70.28**

Claimant stated he was moved to the infirmary and from there to segregation when his property was packed out by facility staff. When his property was returned to him he discovered

several items were missing. His facility property claim was denied due to unsubstantiated evidence.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated Claimant's property was inventoried by staff when he was moved to clinic but he was not provided a copy of the listing due to his illness. All of his property was accounted for and some was held due to health conditions. The Department recommends if the claim is not denied, it should be limited to a maximum of \$50.28 since the claim for the loss of eyeglasses was satisfied through the agency health authority.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6740 be allowed in the amount of \$50.28. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

**Claim No. 6747, Claimant, Michael Dashun Wilkins #108849  
v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Property Loss in the amount of \$153.99**

Claimant stated he was given permission to exit a cell that he had been placed in to go find the showers when a fight broke out. He fought back when he was struck and wound up in Segregation. He claims inmates stole his property before the cell doors were closed during the altercation.

**Respondent, Department  
represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated the facility investigator reviewed video of the altercation and determined that no one entered the Claimant's cell before the door was closed. Review of relevant inventory forms conclude Claimant noted items missing. Some of the missing items were located and returned to him. The Department recommends that this claim be approved in the maximum amount of \$105.33.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6747 be allowed in the amount of \$105.33. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

**Claim No. 6748, Claimant, Jason Kenneth #107311  
v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)  
due to Personal Injury in the amount of \$2,000.00**

Claimant stated he was placed in a cell with no light causing him to bump into a sharp corner injuring his toe which became infected. He claims he was placed in a situation risking unreasonable harm and suffered further harassing actions by facility staff.

**Respondent, Department**  
**represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated Claimant's facility claim is still pending and recommends it be dismissed without prejudice under Rule 2 or be carried over for consideration at a later hearing to allow completion of the proper administrative review.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6748 be carried over. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

## **HEARING**

**Claim No. 6743, Claimant, Dominic Geniuk**  
**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)**  
**due to Reimbursement of Legal Fees in the amount of \$2,047.50**

Claimant stated he seeks reimbursement for attorney fees incurred from his appeal before the Kansas Civil Service Board of a 2-day suspension imposed by his employer.

**Respondent, Department**  
**represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated Claimant made the decision to hire legal counsel and it is not inequitable that he should bear his own costs. The Agreed Order of Dismissal that was signed by the parties and filed with the Civil Service Board, states the matter was dismissed "with each party to bear their own costs." The Department recommends that this claim be denied.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6743 be denied. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

## **HEARING FROM PARSONS STATE HOSPITAL AND TRAINING CENTER**

**Claim No. 6731, Claimant, Donald Rhyne**  
**v. Respondent, Larned State Hospital (LSH)**  
**due to Property Loss in the amount of \$2,200.00**

Claimant stated while at LSH he was in the process of ordering a laptop computer. He sent \$500.00 home for his family to purchase a refurbished version for him but instead, his father-in-law increase those funds to purchase a new laptop and had it sent to the Claimant. He claims the computer was confiscated for not having permission to purchase it and was reportedly place in a secure room. When he transferred out of LSH he was told the computer was missing and it has never been returned to him. He seeks compensation for the loss of property.

**Respondent, LSH**  
**represented by Brenda West-Hagerman, Legal Counsel, LSH**

Respondent stated LSH confirms Claimant was authorized to purchase and have in his possession a laptop computer and accessories. LSH recommends the claimed amount should be denied as the Claimant provided no proof the missing property holds the claimed value but suggests replacement values of either: \$207.24 for a refurbished computer; or \$636.23 for a new product and accessories of similar value.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6731 be allowed in the amount of \$636.23. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

**WITHDRAWAL**

**Claim No. 6729, Claimant, Jose Santos Vega #96546**  
**v. Respondent, Department of Corrections (Department)**  
**due to Property Loss in the amount of \$311.08**

Claimant withdrew the claim having reached a settlement with the Department.

**Respondent, Department**  
**represented by Libby Snider, Legal Counsel, Department**

Respondent stated settlement documentation had not been finalized at the time of this hearing.

*Following discussion, the Joint Committee recommended Claim No. 6729 be dismissed without prejudice. (See section captioned "Committee Action and Recommendation.")*

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Prepared by Deb Burns  
Edited by Cindy Lash, Dylan Dear,  
and Natalie Teemer-Washington

Approved by the Committee on:

---

(Date)