

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

In the Matter of:

Greg Bliss,

Petitioner

\_\_\_\_\_

Greg Bliss 6607 Curtis Road Colleyville, TX 76034-7248

James W. Webster, Esq.
US Department of Housing and
Urban Development
Office of Regional Counsel
for Midwest Field Offices
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60604

HUDOA No.

11-H-CH-AWG149

Claim No.

721006783

Pro se

For the Secretary

## **RULING ON SECRETARY'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

Petitioner filed a timely request to present evidence that an alleged past-due, legally enforceable debt of Petitioner to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") should not be collected by the Secretary by means of administrative wage garnishment. Pursuant to 24 C.F.R. §§ 17.170, 20.4(b), and 31 C.F.R. § 285.11(f), the administrative judges of the HUD Office of Appeals are authorized to determine whether certain debts exist and are legally enforceable and whether they can be collected by means of administrative wage garnishment. As a result of Petitioner's request, referral of the debt to the U.S. Department of the Treasury was temporarily stayed by this Court. (Notice of Docketing, Order, and Stay of Referral, dated September 28, 2011.)

On October 13, 2011, a Motion to Dismiss was filed on behalf of the Secretary advising this Court that "Petitioner has provided the Secretary will [sic] sufficient documentation demonstrating that he has been the victim of identity theft and is not legally obligated to repay the debt the Secretary is seeking to collect." The Secretary further states "Petitioner demonstrated that, he would have been fourteen years old at the time the debt was originated and did not enter into a federally insured contract." The Secretary finally states that he "has no intention of pursuing wage garnishment or initiating any other action to collect this debt from Petitioner."

Therefore, upon due consideration, the Secretary's Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED**. It is hereby

**ORDERED** that the Secretary shall not seek to collect the claimed debt of Petitioner by means of administrative wage garnishment because the Secretary has determined that Petitioner is not legally obligated to repay the debt the Secretary is seeking to collect.

This matter is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

Vanessa L. Hall

Administrative Judge

October 14, 2011