

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

601 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, NW

SUITE 9500

WASHINGTON, DC 20001

August 2, 2006

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| SECRETARY OF LABOR, | : | |
| MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH | : | |
| ADMINISTRATION (MSHA) | : | Docket No. CENT 2006-196-M |
| | : | A.C. No. 14-01484-79826 |
| v. | : | |
| | : | |
| HOLLIDAY SAND AND GRAVEL | : | |
| COMPANY | : | |

BEFORE: Duffy, Chairman; Jordan, Suboleski, and Young, 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. (2000) (“Mine Act”). On July 12, 2006, the Commission received from Holliday Sand and Gravel Company (“Holliday”) a letter requesting that the Commission reopen a penalty assessment that became 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).

On February 8, 2006, the Department of Labor’s Mine Safety and Health Administration (“MSHA”) sent to Holliday the proposed penalty assessment at issue. The company asserts that it telephoned Ron Pennington (presumably an MSHA official) and was told to write on the bill that the two relevant citations were in the process of being contested. Holliday states that it did so, but that MSHA’s Civil Penalty Compliance Office told the company that the paperwork was not received. The operator asserts that, after it received a bill in May 2006, it again sent the bill back, advising the compliance office that it was contesting the citations. The Secretary of Labor states that she does not oppose Holliday’s request for relief.

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 inadvertence or mistake. *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).

Having reviewed Holliday’s request, in the interests of justice, we remand this matter to the Chief Administrative Law Judge for a determination of whether good cause exists for Holliday’s apparent failure to timely contest the penalty proposal and whether relief from the final order should be granted. If it is determined that such relief is appropriate, this case shall proceed pursuant to the Mine Act and the Commission’s Procedural Rules, 29 C.F.R. Part 2700.

Michael F. Duffy, Chairman

Mary Lu Jordan, Commissioner

Stanley C. Suboleski, Commissioner

Michael G. Young, Commissioner

Distribution

Millie Nelson, Safety Office
Holliday Sand & Gravel
9660 Legler Road
Lenexa, KS 66219

W. Christian Schumann, Esq.
Office of the Solicitor
U.S. Department of Labor
1100 Wilson Blvd., 22nd Floor
Arlington, VA 22209

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