## CCASE:

SOL (MSHA) V. T&F SAND & GRAVEL, REEDY COAL KINKAID STONE, KEYSTONE COAL, PENN. ELECTRIC SHANNOPIN MINING, JIM WALATERS, MID-CONTINENT TARMAC CA, EASTSIDE ROCK, AND ISLAND CREEK

DDATE: 19940223 TTEXT:

## February 23, 1994

SECRETARY OF LABOR MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION	: : :				
v.	:				
T & F SAND & GRAVEL, INC.	:	Docket	Nos.	CENT	91-215-M
REEDY COAL COMPANY, INC.	:			KENT	92-303
KINKAID STONE CO.	:			LAKE	92-199-M
KEYSTONE COAL MINING CORP.	:			PENN	91-960
PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC CO.	:			PENN	91-1011
KEYSTONE COAL MINING CORP.	:			PENN	91-1015
KEYSTONE COAL MINING CORP.	:			PENN	91-1017
KEYSTONE COAL MINING CORP.	:			PENN	91-1340
SHANNOPIN MINING CO.	:			PENN	92-385
JIM WALTER RESOURCES, INC.	:			SE 92	2-79
JIM WALTER RESOURCES, INC.	:			SE 92	2-208
MID-CONTINENT RESOURCES, INC.	:			WEST	90-383
TARMAC CALIFORNIA, INC.	:			WEST	91-498-M
EASTSIDE ROCK PRODUCTS	:			WEST	92-318-M
CONSOLIDATION COAL CO.	:			WEVA	91-139
ISLAND CREEK COAL CO.	:			WEVA	91-1231
CONSOLIDATION COAL CO.	:			WEVA	92-325

BEFORE: Holen, Chairman; Backley and Doyle, Commissioners

## ORDER

## BY THE COMMISSION:

In these civil penalty proceedings arising under the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, 30 U.S.C. 801 et seq. (1988)("Mine Act"), the Secretary of Labor proposed penalties for citations issued to the mine operators listed above ("Operators"). In each proceeding, the presiding administrative law judge, in accordance with the Commission's decision in Drummond Co., Inc., 14 FMSHRC 661 (May 1992), remanded the proposed penalties to the Secretary for recalculation. Under Drummond, penalties were to be recalculated in accordance with the Secretary's regulations at 30 C.F.R. Part 100 without reference to or use of the "excessive history" provisions contained in his Program Policy Letter No. P90-III-4 (May 29, 1990).

On January 14, 1994, the Secretary filed with the Commission an Amended Motion to Reinstate Civil Penalty Proceeding ("Motion to Reinstate") in each proceeding. The Secretary asserts that each proceeding was "incorrectly remanded back to the Secretary since the case did not involve the issue of excessive history." The Secretary asks that these cases be reinstated to the Commission's active docket and that the Operators be granted the right to request hearings. No opposition has been received.

The judges' jurisdiction in these matters terminated when their Orders of Remand and Dismissal were issued. Commission Procedural Rule 69(b), 58 Fed. Reg. 12158, 12171 (March 3, 1993), to be codified at 29 C.F.R. 2700.69(b) (1993). Under the Mine Act and the Commission's procedura rules, relief from a judge's decision may be sought by filing a petition for discretionary review within 30 days of a decision's issuance. 30 U.S.C. 823(d)(2); 29 C.F.R. 2700.70(a). The Secretary did not file timely petitions for discretionary review within the 30-day period and the Commission did not sua sponte direct review of these cases. Thus, the judges' orders dismissing these proceedings became final decisions of the Commission 40 days after their issuance. 30 U.S.C. 823(d)(1). Under these circumstances, we deem the Motions to Reinstate to be requests for relief from final Commission decisions incorporating late-filed petitions for discretionary review. See, e.g., Island Creek Coal Co., 15 FMSHRC 962, 963 (June 1993).

1 Pursuant to section 113(c) of the Mine Act, 30 U.S.C. 823 (c), we have designated ourselves as a panel of three members to exercise the powers of the Commission.

excessive history policy and, therefore, may have been improperly remanded to the Secretary under Drummond.

Accordingly, we reopen these proceedings and remand them to the Chief Administrative Law Judge. He shall reinstate them if he determines that they were improperly remanded to the Secretary.

Arlene Holen, Chairman

Richard V. Backley, Commissioner

Joyce A. Doyle, Commissioner