BEFORE THE OFFICE OF STATE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS STATE OF GEORGIA

NICKLOS D DUNAWAY, Petitioner,	: : Docket No.: OSAH-CSS-SDCFS-13415	51.47.Berry
retitioner,		31-47-1
v.	: Agency Reference No.: 100022658	FILED
DHS, DIVISION OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES, Respondent.		OCT 2 2013
INIT	IAL DECISION	att of Color
I.	Introduction	Hazel Jackson, Legal Assista
In response to Respondent's action to offset Petitioner's Fede		
II. F	Findings of Fact	
Petitioner is the obligor of a child support obligation establishe and any modifications, if any, of such an order. (Testimony o		as a copy of such an order
	2.	
The Final Judgment and Decree was issued January 7, 2005, we not a per child order, but an order that, at the time, included the been excluded from the Order; however, Petitioner still must parenever been modified as it concerns the amount of weekly child	ree children. Since that time, one child has eman by \$115.00 per week according to the Final Judgm	cipated and one child has
	3.	
Attached to the Final Judgment and Decree is a copy of a Conte 26, 2004. The last page of the Final Judgment and Decree adjudgment a	mpt Order, dated October 26, 2004, and an Arres	
	4.	
Petitioner owes child support arrears of \$52,681.09 as of Aug affidavit, as well as all payments that Petitioner has not made. total payments received have been \$4,818.91, which includes t Agent Parker; Respondent Exhibit(s) 2 and 3).	Since the case with the Respondent was opened w	ith DCSS in Georgia, the
	5.	
The custodial parent has assigned the child support rights to Rewas made. (Testimony of Agent Parker; Respondent Exhibit(e time a request for offset
	6.	
Although Petitioner has recently made a request for a review an order, as established in 2005. The review and modification pro	d modification, there has been no modification o	
	7.	
Petitioner argued and disagreed with the arrears balance due support case. Petitioner does not believe he should have to pay been excluded. (Testimony of Petitioner)	to the "fraud" he believes the custodial parent ha	
been excluded. (Testimony of Fetitioner)		
Page 1 of 2	Vol	Page

 $P: \label{eq:css.duaway.Niklos.SDCFS.affmd..doc} 4/13/05$

III. Conclusions of Law

1.

Respondent has the burden of proof in this matter. OSAH Rule 7(1). The evidentiary standard is preponderance of the evidence presented. OSAH Rule 21(4).

2.

Federal law authorizes State agencies charged with child support matters to intercept federal income tax refunds for child support arrears and to apply such funds to arrears due through the end of a tax year at issue. 42 U.S.C.S. § 664; 45 CFR § 303.72. Federal offset is authorized on a welfare case if there is an arrears due of at least \$150.00 and is authorized on a non-welfare case if there is an arrears due of at least \$500.00. Id.

3.

In the present case, Respondent has established by a preponderance of the evidence that it has met the requirements for the offset of the Federal income tax refund, and Petitioner has done nothing, and presented no evidence, to refute Respondent's proof.

Accordingly,

IV. Decision

Respondent's offset of Petitioner's Federal income tax refund is **AFFIRMED**. Respondent is authorized to retain the tax offset to the extent that child support arrears remain due.

so ordered, this <u>and</u> day of <u>October</u> 2013.

BARBARA A. BROWN Administrative Law Judge

Vol _____ Page ____