

Jean Camp  
School of Informatics and Computing  
901 E 10<sup>th</sup> Street  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, IN 47404

Dear Oversight Organization,

I write to inform you that it is necessary to remove the license of Andrew Mason (#HI01300002) due to willful destruction in a home he was to visually inspect, fraud in claiming he observed things that were not possible, and a willingness to write a biased and falsified report as a response to my complaint to his employer. I write about an inspection of 414 East First Street.

This is a specific instance of an inspection in Bloomington, IN. I document the damage and fraud here carefully. However, I also note but cannot document that his name was volunteered without promoting by more than one real estate professional when I complained of my experience.

I also note that this impinges the business model of Sherlock Homes as a neutral party. It appears they have abandoned all pretense of neutrality but instead actively advocate for home buyers even when doing so requires actually damaging the home.

First, to the fact that the inspector dragged insulation out of the crawlspace, tracked it around the home, and pulled other insulation away from the wall. I assume he did this to test for asbestos because I can think of no other reason. I have photos documenting this, and he agrees that he did so but offers a physically impossible explanation.

Second, he filled my tub with water during city water work, knowing there was city water work, and left the tub dirty.

Third, to the fact that he pulled fabric wiring out of its place, so that it became visible, in order to note that it was there. The materials were in the rafters in the basement. Only visible wiring was removed when the house was rewired. He was able to spot some wiring then jerked it down. The white paint on the photo below shows that the wires were pulled out and down.

Fourth, he broke a light fixture by pulling down on it.

Fifth, he reported false information knowing that he had not checked it. Specifically, he reported that the gutters were blocked except the gutter have covers. He reported that the two fireplaces connected to one flue. They did not. The inspector also made these that0 were not only incorrect, but also physically impossible for him to verify as he had no ladder.

Finally, after I contacted them and expressed concern that my report would result in an unduly harsh report, I received no feedback. And in fact the final report contained false claims.

I now address each of these in order and with documentation.

First, the issue of insulation. The inspector pulled insulation from the floor accessible through a small hatchway, and tracked the insulation all around the upstairs. In addition to tracking it around the house, the left insulation in the garbage can. He pulled insulation away from the wall as well as spreading the original insulation around the upstairs of the house. Figure 1A shows the insulation before the inspector grubbed and tore in the material of the home. Figure 1C shows the insulation when I returned. It shows the trashcan where he left some of the insulation as well. Pulling insulation out and spreading it around a house is not reasonable behavior.

It was surprising and disgusting to have to come home and vacuum my entire upstairs as the hallways and my bedroom were strewn with insulation.



1A Insulation Before Inspection  
(provided by Sherlock Homes in email)



1B Additional insulation photo showing  
undisturbed insulation (provided by Sherlock  
Homes in email)

	
<p>1C Insulation as left by Sherlock Holmes (uncontested when provided to Sherlock Homes)</p>	<p>1D Trash Can as left by Sherlock Homes (uncontested when provided to Sherlock Homes)</p>

Here is the exchange between myself and Sherlock Holmes:

Jeff & L. Jean Camp,  
 We apologize that this issue has come up, certainly it is not our intent to leave the home with insulation on the floor or in any other condition than what it is found. I have attached a couple of pictures from the inspection. The inspector viewed the attic from the access only. The knee wall attic area was viewed from the access. The upper attic was viewed from the access. The upper attic access opening lacked adequate curbing to prevent insulation from coming down onto the floor, this by no means is an excuse. The inspector indicated that insulation did come down and filled the back of his shirt. He cleaned up the insulation and put it in the trash can you sent a picture of. If there was other insulation or debris that was not cleaned up- it was on accident & we do apologize. Given the invasive nature of doing home inspections we do our best to leave the home in the condition found. After nearly 40 years in the business this issue does not come up very often & is not a reason to stop using our services. We sincerely apologize to all parties involved.

Daniel J. Killion

Notice that the picture is of insulation in Figure 1A is horizontal and it is physically impossible for it to fall. The door is a vertical door, next to the floor in the bathroom. It could not have fallen.

In Figure 1B the inspection company shows that the inspector removed the wooden

cover, and placed it on top of the loose insulation. I believe the inspectors assertion that when he drug the wooden cover over the loosed inspection, some of it fell. I also believe that placing that cover on top of the inspection and knocking the insulation down is not part of a visual inspection. However, this pales beneath actually tearing insulation away from the wall, and grubbing in the insulation as shown in Figure 1C, which is what I arrived home to. The trash can in Figure 1D was in the master bath. It was in the smaller bathroom with the small hatch (in 1A and 1D) when the inspector arrived. Pictures on pages 13 and 14 on the inspection report are the same as these photos.

Second consider the plumbing. Five houses away the road was completely blocked, and the city was engaged in work on the water main. Because of this I waited to meet the inspector and offered to reschedule for the next day. Figure 1B shows the water announcement. The trucks were clearly visible.

Because the road to five houses up was completely blocked and the workers were could be visually seen working on the water main, so that the house was under a boil water requirement I had asked, "Do you really want to do this today?". I pointed out the work on the water main and noted that he would have to forego inspecting the operation of the plumbing.

The water notification hanging on the door is shown in Fig 2B.

The inspector insisted on doing the inspection as scheduled. When I returned I found the following filth in my tub, shown in Figure 2A. In addition, on the inspection report you can see he filled the Jacuzzi tub with polluted water, apparently ran the Jacuzzi, and then left the dirt in the tub.

Page 32 shows that he claims this was "rusty" water despite my identifying the city water work, and his refusal to reschedule. On Page 32 of the report, not only did he fill the tub with filthy water after he observed the water pressure decreasing (Pages 29 and 30), then nothing, he included a picture of my befouled tub in the report. This is not only unprofessional; it is also disgusting. I perceived the inclusion of this disturbing picture as punitive because I had complained about the state of my home.

In addition he reported on Page 29 he reported that the plumbing fixtures were not in good working order, and that the basement kitchen water did not flow. It did not flow because there was no water to the house. Not only were the water trucks visible, but I informed him to his face of this fact and offered to rescheduled. I did so in a collegial matter because at that point I considered him a neutral party.



2A Filth left in the tub after running unclean water.



2B The City of Bloomington water notice on the day of the inspection.

On Page 30 he reported that the kitchen sink sprayer would not work. He noted it was due to installation when it was in fact due to low water pressure. Again, there was low water pressure because the city was observably working on the water main.

Choosing to inspect a house and befoul it with dirty water throughout only makes sense if the goal is to damage the house in the interest of the buyers.

Which brings us to the third issue, of the wiring. On page 40 he notes that there is fabric covered wiring present within the home. The bonded contractor who updated the wiring in 2011 removed all visible wires. There was white paint on the wires Andrew located in the basement. The inspector reached into the ceiling and pulled down these fabric covered wires thus creating a violation, which he then cited. You can clearly see the wiring pulled down in Figure 3 below. To do this, he would have had to stand on a step stool, reach up, and physically grab the wiring.



Figure 3: Obsolete wiring pulled from rafters to create a code violation.

Again, grabbing, yanking, pulling, grubbing, and otherwise disturbing a home are not part of the inspection process. The inspection should be visual.

There are three ways to know that the inspector grabbed and pulled down the wiring, if my word and evidence of his other behaviors here are not adequate. First, a bonded contractor did the electrical work. I did not work myself. So it would have been to code meaning all visible wires removed. Thus these wires would have been barely visible, to have avoided removal. Second, no one would sell a house with such wiring hanging down. Third, and this is irrefutably shown in Figure 3, the white paint shows that the wiring was up in the rafters in the ceiling, and painted when the rafters were painted. Clearly the photo shows that the wiring was pulled out to visibility when the white paint was applied and the black visible part was not painted.

And fourth, he forcefully broke a light fixture.

On page 41 he notes that a light fixture is hanging by wires. It was an operational light fixture. Someone during the inspection must have pulled down on this light fixture. Given his other behaviors, it is reasonable to assume it was the inspector. He broke the light fixture and then noted it was broken. **A home inspection is not supposed to be a stress test.** It is supposed to be a visual test. It is absolutely true that I did not, and arguably can not, secure everything to the level that a grown man cannot jerk it loose. However, this should not be the standard. In general, if a man takes a light and jerks downward the screws holding it in place will give. Then it is indeed hanging by the wires. I was required to repair that after the inspector forcefully broke it.

In terms of false information the report also included the following.

On page 47 Safety Issue: The Smoke Detectors appear to be over 10 years old. The National Fire Protection Association recommends replacing Smoke Detectors over 10 years old. You should consider replacing the smoke detectors.

All the wiring was replace in 2011. They were not previously wired in to the fabric-covered original system, obviously, as such systems did not include fire detectors.

In addition he stated that the gutters were blocked and required that the be cleaned as part of the response.

He had no ladder. The front and the side of the house are shown in Figures 4A and 4B below. The gutters have had gutter covers, which cover all the gutters, installed in 2011. In 2014, the gutters were replaced with new siding and covers newly installed. While it is generally safe to claim that gutters are blocked and request cleaning as part of inspection, this is fraud on his part. He could not have inspected them without a ladder.



My response to Sherlock Homes was as follows.

I realize that complaining to you about this will harm the value of my home, and possibly end the sale. Few people would complain to you given the power you have in this situation. So I hope that you understand the reason I am doing this is because since I moved to Bloomington Sherlock Homes has been the known high quality standard for inspection in Bloomington. I have **no** sense that you want to treat anyone in an unfair and disrespectful manner. This does not mean that you have complete knowledge of what every person does in the field.

I have contacted you privately because of that reputation.

The photo you attached, photo 2298 shows undisturbed insulation on the floor so it would be physically impossible for it to fall on anyone. I attach a photo of the insulation when I returned home, and then cleaned my house.

I have bought and sold very few houses, I readily admit. But I really did not expect to come home to this.

Sherlock Homes never responded to the comment. Specifically, the company never indicated that my concern about punitive responses by that company were unwarranted. And in fact when the report arrived it included false claims I include here, as well as boldly documenting the damage done to my home by Andrew Mason.

I believe that this is an admission on their part that the factually incorrect components of the inspections report were intended to be punitive in response to my complaint.

Because Andrew Mason (#HI01300002) damaged my home, and committed fraud in a report is necessary that his license as a home inspector be revoked. He cannot be trusted not to damage a home. His reports document the damage done as well as including false information and speculation. He should not remain an inspector.

Please follow up with the results of your investigation of this matter.

My thanks-

L Jean Camp