

The Department agrees that contractors used to prepare recommendations should be trained to properly analyze debtor objections. However, because contractor analyses of those objections are clearly no more than recommendations to Department staff and have no binding effect whatever on the debtor, we see no need to include language in the regulations to characterize contractor analyses.

Debtors have the right, under these regulations, to avoid garnishment by entering a voluntary repayment agreement. The Department uses its collection contractors to negotiate repayment terms with those debtors sent notice of garnishment who wish to repay voluntarily. Collection contractors have a financial interest in recovery, whether by garnishment or by voluntary payment, and the Department does not use them to prepare recommended analysis for a hearing on any objection, including hardship objections. These regulations ensure a hearing by a designated Department official for any debtor who does not agree to repay voluntarily and has requested a hearing.

Changes: None.

Comment: A commenter opined that the regulations should adopt guidelines and training procedures for any Department staff designated to conduct hearings of debtor objections. The commenter urged that the regulations should require the Department to provide debtors a list of hearing officials available for review of their objections so that they may object to those they consider unqualified or biased.

Discussion: Any decision issued by the Department on debtor objections to garnishment is subject to judicial review under Administrative Procedure Act (APA). The Department has a strong interest in seeing that Department staff who conduct hearings do so in conformance with applicable substantive and procedural law. Therefore, the Department sees little value in adding generalized language to this part that would purport to govern its own internal training procedures.

The commenter points to no administrative or judicial tribunal that allows debtors to select the individual to hear their cases, and shows no good reason to adopt that course in this part. The commenter urged that this would permit a debtor to reject a particular individual who the debtor considers biased against the debtor. A debtor who objects to a hearing official as biased, can object as part of the hearing process to that individual serving as hearing official.⁵ Hearings under this part are not subject to 5 U.S.C. 556, which requires the agency to consider and include in the administrative record its ruling on any objection to a proposed hearing official. However, the Department must meet that test, because it must consider and rule on any objection raised by the debtor, including an objection that the hearing

official is biased. That determination, and any claim that a decision was the result of bias by the hearing official, may be tested on judicial review.

No Department hearing official benefits financially from the outcome of a hearing, and Federal ethics rules prohibit a hearing official from participating in a matter in which the individual has a financial interest. 5 CFR 2635.402(a). The Department therefore sees no need to add provisions to these regulations offering debtors a choice of hearing officials as a remedy for speculation that some Department official may harbor bias against a particular debtor.

Changes: None.

Content of Decision; Basis of Decision on Evidence Considered at Hearing (§ 34.17)

Comment: A commenter stated that regulations should require that hearing decisions be based only on evidence presented at the hearing and should clearly state the grounds for denial of an objection.

Discussion: Section 34.17 of the proposed rule provided that the decision would include the hearing official's conclusions and reasoning for each objection presented. We agree that the decision must rest on evidence presented in the hearing, but that hearing process is informal and may extend beyond the actual oral hearing. The regulations do not bar debtors from presenting in oral hearings objections not raised in the request for hearing, and do not require debtors who seek oral hearings to disclose all the evidence on which they will rely to support an objection. Because new objections and evidence first presented by the debtor during an oral hearing may require the Department to obtain further evidence in order to evaluate, the hearing official may leave the record open both for the Department and for the debtor. We may need to obtain additional evidence to respond to objections and evidence submitted by a debtor in either an oral or paper hearing.

To ensure that evidence we may obtain after the notice is sent is fairly considered in the hearing process, the debtor must have an opportunity to examine and respond to that evidence before the hearing official makes his or her decision. Therefore, if we intend to consider evidence that was not included in our records of the debt that were available for inspection prior to the hearing, the hearing official will consider that evidence only after we notify the debtor, make that evidence available to the debtor, and provide a reasonable period for rebuttal evidence and argument by the debtor.

The proposed regulations did not address the situation in which the debtor learns after filing the request for hearing that specific relevant evidence is available, and wishes to submit that evidence and have it considered in the proceeding. We believe that the debtor should have the opportunity to do so, if that evidence can be promptly acquired and produced. To ensure that this opportunity does not unduly delay completion of the hearing and issuance of the decision, it is reasonable to expect the debtor to make a specific request that the record be held open for consideration of such evidence, and to describe in that request what the evidence is, and why it is relevant.

The proposed regulations did not address situations in which a debtor requests access to records, and then seeks to submit evidence and objection based on a review of our records of the debt, or seeks—but is denied—an oral hearing at which he or she would offer evidence and objections. Department regulations for the Treasury Offset Program assure a debtor who seeks access to Department debt records with reasonable diligence—within 20 days of the date of the notice of proposed offset—an extended deadline for presenting evidence and argument opposing the offset. 34 CFR 30.33(d). A similar assurance is appropriate in these proceedings. Finally, the regulations can clarify that a debtor who intended to present evidence and objection at an oral hearing should have an opportunity to submit both in written form if that request for an oral hearing is denied.

The time provided for submission of evidence and objections not included in the request for hearing may vary depending on the situation. We believe that this period should ordinarily be at least seven business days, but could in particular circumstances be shorter, or, as resources may permit, longer. In any event, the particular deadline applicable in each situation should be communicated to the debtor.

Changes: Section 34.17 is modified to provide that the decision rests on evidence in the hearing record, and includes a description of the evidence considered in making that decision. Section 34.13 is modified to add a new paragraph (d) to state the instances in which the hearing official will accept evidence and argument not included in the request for hearing or presented during an oral hearing. Section 34.13(d)(4)(i) provides that if the debtor requests access to records within 20 days of the date of the notice, the debtor may submit evidence and objection for a limited time after we provide the requested records. Section 34.13(d)(4)(ii) and (c) provide that if we obtain and intend to have considered in the hearing process evidence that was not included in the records that were available for inspection by the debtor when notice was sent, we first notify the debtor regarding the new evidence, make this evidence available to the debtor, and provide a reasonable period for rebuttal evidence and argument. Section 34.13(d)(4)(iii) provides for a brief extension of time, upon request, for a debtor to submit specifically-identified evidence not previously presented, and to raise an objection based on that evidence. Section 34.13(d)(4)(iv) provides an opportunity to submit evidence and argument after a request for an oral hearing is denied.

Comment: A commenter urged that the regulations require that information about reconsideration and appeal rights be included in the decision, and that this information be displayed in the decision in large bold letters.

Discussion: The regulations now state that the garnishment hearing decision is final agency action for purposes of the judicial review under the APA. We have no administrative appeal procedures for garnishment decisions, and therefore no administrative appeal rights to explain in the

⁵ Grounds for disqualification in proceedings under this part would include those applicable to Federal court proceedings; as pertinent here, Federal law requires disqualification of a judge in a Federal court proceeding who has personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts. 28 U.S.C. 455(b)(1).