



**Office of Appeals
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D.C. 20410-0001**

In the Matter of:

JAMES SANDERS, JR.,

Petitioner

HUDOA No. 10-M-NY-LL121
Claim No. 7-708539400B

James Sanders, Jr.
2874 Higdor Road
Holly Springs, MS 38635

Pro Se

Julia Murray, Esq.
U.S. Department of Housing and
Urban Development
Office of Assistant General Counsel
For New York/New Jersey Field Offices
26 Federal Plaza, Room 3237
New York, NY 10278

For the Secretary

DECISION AND ORDER

Petitioner was notified that, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. §§ 3716 and 3720A, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") intended to seek administrative offset of any federal payments due to Petitioner in satisfaction of a delinquent and legally enforceable debt allegedly owed to HUD.

On April 1, 2010, Petitioner filed a request for a hearing concerning the existence, amount or enforceability of the debt allegedly owed to HUD. The administrative judges of this Office have been designated to conduct a hearing to determine whether the debt allegedly owed to HUD is legally enforceable. 24 C.F.R. §§ 17.152 and 17.153. As a result of Petitioner's hearing request, referral of the debt to the U.S. Department of the Treasury for administrative offset was temporarily stayed by this Office on April 5, 2010.

Discussion

Petitioner does not deny the existence or delinquency of the debt that is the subject of this proceeding, but Petitioner contends that the alleged debt is unenforceable because Petitioner is “unable to take care of financ[ial] business d[ue] to his handicap.” (Petitioner’s Request for Hearing, filed April 1, 2010.) Petitioner’s “wife took care of all the business. Mrs. Sanders passed in Dec[ember] of 2003.” (*Id.*) Petitioner’s sister writes on his behalf that she now “look[s] after him” because he has “a hearing proble[m]” and “can’t talk well enough to understand him on a phone.” (*Id.*)

On two separate occasions, this Office ordered Petitioner to file documentary evidence to prove that the debt in this case is not enforceable or not past due. (Notice of Docketing, Order and Stay of Referral, dated April 5, 2010; Order, dated August 8, 2010.) The August 8th Order stated, “Failure to comply with this Order may result in a decision based upon the documents in the record of this proceeding.” Petitioner failed to respond to all two Orders.

Petitioner has, therefore, not met his burden to prove that the debt in this case is not past due or legally enforceable. In the absence of documentary evidence to support Petitioner’s position, I find the debt that is the subject of this proceeding to be legally enforceable against Petitioner as set forth in the Notice of Intent to Collect by Treasury Offset.

ORDER

For the reasons set forth above, I find the debt that is the subject of this proceeding to be legally enforceable against Petitioner in the amount claimed by the Secretary. The Order imposing the stay of referral of this matter to the U.S. Department of the Treasury for administrative offset is **VACATED**. It is

ORDERED that the Secretary is authorized to refer this matter to the U.S. Department of the Treasury for administrative offset of any federal payment due Petitioner.



H. Alexander Manuel
Administrative Judge

October 8, 2010