## State of New Jersey

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

### FINAL DECISION

OAL DKT. NO. HEA 07643-14

# NEW JERSEY HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENT ASSISTANCE AUTHORITY,

Petitioner,

v.

### **RASHON GRANGER**

Respondent.

Richard W. Kreig, Esq., appearing for petitioner (attorneys)

Rashon Granger, pro se,

Record Closed: July 9, 2014

Decided: July 10, 2014

BEFORE **KIMBERLY A. MOSS**, ALJ:

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Respondent, Rashon Granger (Granger or respondent), applied for and was granted a student loan for the purpose of paying tuition. He failed to make the proper installment payments when they became due and defaulted. Petitioner, the New Jersey Higher Education Student Assistance Authority (NJHESAA) was the guarantor of the loan and subsequently purchased it from the lender. NJHESAA seeks an order directing the employer of Granger to deduct from his wages, an amount equal to fifteen percent of his disposable wages and to remit this amount to petitioner until such time as

#### OAL DKT. NO. HEA 07643-14

respondent's student loan has been repaid. See 20 <u>U.S.C.A.</u> 1095a(a), 34 C.F.R. 682.410(b)(9)(i)(A) (2003).

Respondent acknowledges acquiring the loan and failing to make payments as required. However he asserts that he could not complete his educational program and that when he acquired this loan that he had a condition that prevented him from meeting state requirements for performing the occupation for which he received training at school.

On or about January 29, 2014, NJHESAA issued a Notice of Administrative Wage Garnishment to respondent. Respondent filed a timely appeal to the Notice of Administrative Wage Garnishment. The matter was transmitted to the Office of Administrative Law on June 16, 2014. Respondent requested a telephone hearing. The hearing was held on July 9, 2014. I closed the record at that time.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the testimony of Granger, the affidavit of Janice Seitz, Program Officer with the NJHESAA and the testimony of Neal Ginsberg as well as the enclosures submitted therewith—that is, a copy of the loan application executed by petitioner, a copy of the voluntary monthly repayment arrangement and the computer information documenting the loan history, including interest accrued, I make the following **FINDINGS OF FACT:** 

- On or about April 21, 2004, respondent executed a master promissory note for a guaranteed student loan for the purpose of paying tuition to Gibbs College. As a result thereof JP Morgan Chase Bank disbursed the sum of \$6,625.00
- Pursuant to the terms of the promissory notes, monthly payments became due and owing.

2

- 3. Respondent defaulted on the aforesaid student loans by failing to make the required payments.
- 4. Petitioner is the state agency in New Jersey designated as a guarantor agency for federal and state funded student loans.
- 5. As a result of the default of respondent, petitioner was required to honor its guarantee.
- At the time petitioner acquired the loan, on July 13, 2006, the amount of \$7,111.67 remained due and owing.
- 7. Pursuant to the terms of the loan, interest has continued to accrue.
- 8. On or about January 29, 2014, petitioner, acting pursuant to 20 <u>U.S.C.A.</u> 1095(a) (a) <u>et seq</u>. and 34 <u>C.F.R.</u> 682.410(b)(9)(i)(A), issued a Notice of Administrative Wage Garnishment directing that fifteen percent of respondent's disposable wages be remitted to petitioner until such time as the respondent's student loans have been repaid.
- Respondent filed a timely appeal of NJHESAA's Notice of Administrative Wage Garnishment.
- 10. The amount of \$4,674.13 is presently due and owing.
- 11. Respondent testified that he was incarcerated on March 29, 2005 for a period of two weeks. Upon his release from custody his loan was withdrawn.
- 12. Respondent provided no evidence that the Gibbs College closed.
- 13. Respondent provided no evidence that he had a criminal conviction prior to receiving the loan. He did not state that his incarceration prevented him from performing the occupation for which he received training at Gibbs

College. He did not state that his two week incarceration resulted from a criminal conviction.

#### LEGAL ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

NJHESAA is a state-designated agency responsible for administration of the loan guarantee program for federal and state funded student loans. <u>N.J.A.C.</u> 9A:10-1.4. After purchasing an overdue loan from a lender, NJHESAA may collect the debt by appropriate means, including garnishment of wages. The debtor is entitled to request an administrative hearing before an independent hearing officer prior to issuance of a garnishment order. 20 <u>U.S.C.A.</u> 1095a(a). Federal regulations allow the borrower to dispute the existence or amount of the loan, 34 <u>C.F.R.</u> 34.14(b), to demonstrate financial hardship, 34 <u>C.F.R.</u> 34.14(c), or to raise various defenses based on discharge of the underlying debt, 34 <u>C.F.R.</u> 682.402.

A guaranty agency "may garnish the disposable pay of an individual to collect the amount owed by the individual, if he or she is not currently making required repayment under a repayment agreement," provided, however, that the individual be granted an opportunity for a hearing conducted by an independent hearing official such as an Administrative Law Judge. 20 <u>U.S.C.A.</u> 1095a(a)(5). A guaranty agency is a nonprofit organization or state agency, such as NJHESAA, that "has an agreement with the United States Secretary of the Department of Education to administer a loan guarantee program[.]" <u>N.J.A.C.</u> 9A:10-1.3(a). New Jersey statutes and regulations require the NJHESAA to purchase certain defaulted student loans and permit NJHESAA to seek garnishment of wages as one method of repayment. <u>N.J.S.A.</u> 18A:71C-6; <u>N.J.A.C.</u> 9A:10-1.14.

When a lender submits a claim for purchase by NJHESAA of a defaulted loan, NJHESAA first determines the legitimacy of the claim for purchase by NJHESAA of a defaulted loan and ensures that all federal and state requirements for default aversion have been followed. If NJHESAA determines that "due diligence" has been met and

4

purchases the loan from the lender, NJHESAA then seeks to collect on the debt. N.J.A.C. 9A:10-1.4(b) (7) & (8); N.J.A.C. 9A:10-1.14(b).

Initially, NJHESAA bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the competent, relevant and credible evidence the existence and amount of the debt. 34 <u>C.F.R.</u> §34.14(c) and (d); <u>In re Polk</u>, 90 <u>N.J.</u> 550 (1982); <u>Atkinson v. Parsekian</u>, 37 <u>N.J.</u> 143 (1962. Here, NJHESAA produced adequate documentation establishing the existence of the debt and the amount currently in default. Since petitioner has sustained its burden of proof, respondent must demonstrate, by a preponderance of the evidence that either the debt does not exist, the amount is incorrect or that the loan should be discharged. 34 <u>C.F.R.</u> 34.14. Granger seeks to avoid collection by pleading he could not complete his educational program and that he had a condition that prevented him from meeting state requirements for performing the occupation for which he received training at school.

Respondent has not provided any evidence that Gibbs College closed. Respondent states that he was incarcerated on March 29, 2005, however he received the loan in 2004. His incarceration occurred after he began his classes at Gibbs College and after he received the loan. He did not state that he was convicted of a crime or offense as a result of his two week incarceration.

Based on the facts adduced and the legal citations referred to above, I **CONCLUDE** that petitioner has met its burden to prove the existence and the amount of the claimed debt, and that repayment thereof is in default. Respondent has failed to prove that Gibbs College has closed and that when he acquired the loan that he had a condition that prevented him from meeting state requirements for performing the occupation for which he received training at school.

## <u>ORDER</u>

5

OAL DKT. NO. HEA 07643-14

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the total amount due and owing by respondent shall be the subject of a wage garnishment in an amount not to exceed 15% of respondent's disposable wages.

This decision is final pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 682.410(b)(9)(i)(N) (2010).

July 10, 2014

DATE

KIMBERLY A. MOSS, ALJ

Date Mailed to Parties: ljb

## **EXHIBITS**

## For Petitioner

P-1 Agency Documents

## For Respondent

None