

**From:** Danny Varat <DannyVarat@scstatehouse.gov>  
**To:** Kevin L. BryantKevinBryant@scstatehouse.gov  
**Date:** 5/18/2017 10:31:13 AM  
**Subject:** DSS

---

Mr. and Mrs. King did not have prior authorization in writing to use the grant money in the manner that they used it. They did not notify DSS that they were selling the facilities, and DSS is requiring the Kings to return \$5515 between the two facilities. Currently, it looks like the Kings have agreed the return the \$5515 to DSS but sent a release of liability stating in summary that the Kings were fully released from liability if the checks returning the money are accepted.

Keep in mind that provider refers to the operator and physical location combination, not just the physical location. Thus the change of ownership violated the grant.

You need to stay as far away from the legal aspects of the situation. Stick to "I can't get involved in the decision making of the agency, I can only facilitate communications."

There are several potential issues that may still arise. If DSS rejects the release language then the conflict between them is likely not over. Further, there is likely to be conflict between the Kings and the Nelsons for the money that was recouped by DSS against services rendered by the Nelsons.