FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

601 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, NW SUITE 9500 WASHINGTON, DC 20001

June 17, 2009

SECRETARY OF LABOR, : MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH : ADMINISTRATION (MSHA) :

Docket No. LAKE 2009-271-M

v. : A.C. No. 33-01695-165924

:

MORAINE MATERIALS COMPANY

BEFORE: Duffy, Chairman; Jordan, Young, and Cohen, Commissioners

ORDER

BY THE COMMISSION:

This matter arises under the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, 30 U.S.C. § 801 et seq. (2006) ("Mine Act"). On February 3, 2009, the Commission received from Moraine Materials Company ("Moraine") a motion by counsel to reopen a penalty assessment that had become a final order of the Commission pursuant to section 105(a) of the Mine Act, 30 U.S.C. § 815(a).

Under section 105(a) of the Mine Act, an operator who wishes to contest a proposed penalty must notify the Secretary of Labor no later than 30 days after receiving the proposed penalty assessment. If the operator fails to notify the Secretary, the proposed penalty assessment is deemed a final order of the Commission. 30 U.S.C. § 815(a).

However, we have held that in appropriate circumstances, we possess jurisdiction to reopen uncontested assessments that have become final Commission orders under section 105(a). *Jim Walter Res., Inc.*, 15 FMSHRC 782, 786-89 (May 1993) ("*JWR*"). In evaluating requests to reopen final section 105(a) orders, the Commission has found guidance in Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure under which, for example, a party could be entitled to relief from a final order of the Commission on the basis of mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 2700.1(b) ("the Commission and its Judges shall be guided so far as practicable by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure"); *JWR*, 15 FMSHRC at 787. We have also observed that default is a harsh remedy and that, if the defaulting party can make a showing of good cause for a failure to timely respond, the case may be reopened and appropriate proceedings on the merits permitted. *See Coal Prep. Servs., Inc.*, 17 FMSHRC 1529, 1530 (Sept. 1995).

Moraine states that the penalty assessment is for a citation that it timely contested pursuant to section 105(d) of the Mine Act. 30 U.S.C. § 815(d). Moraine explains that it failed to later contest the penalty assessment because its counsel mistook the assessment for a duplicate of another assessment in a related case, an assessment which counsel did contest. The Secretary states that she does not oppose the reopening of the proposed penalty assessment.

Having reviewed Moraine's request and the Secretary's response, in the interests of justice, we hereby reopen this matter and remand it to the Chief Administrative Law Judge for further proceedings pursuant to the Mine Act and the Commission's Procedural Rules, 29 C.F.R. Part 2700. Accordingly, consistent with Rule 28, the Secretary shall file a petition for assessment of penalty within 45 days of the date of this order. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 2700.28.

Michael F	. Duffy, Chairman	
Mary Lu .	ordan, Commissioner	
٠		
Michael (Young, Commissioner	
Dalamt E	Cohen, Jr., Commissioner	

Distribution:

Diana Schroeher, Esq. Law Office of Adele L. Abrams, P.C. 4740 Corridor Place, Suite D Beltsville, MD 20705

W. Christian Schumann, Esq.Office of the SolicitorU.S. Department of Labor1100 Wilson Blvd., Room 2220Arlington, VA 22209-2296

Myra James, Chief Office of Civil Penalty Compliance, MSHA U.S. Dept. Of Labor 1100 Wilson Blvd., 25th Floor Arlington, VA 22209-3939

Chief Administrative Law Judge Robert J. Lesnick Federal Mine Safety & Health Review Commission 601 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., Suite 9500 Washington, D.C. 20001-2021