

**FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION**

601 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, NW

SUITE 9500

WASHINGTON, DC 20001

April 4, 2008

SECRETARY OF LABOR,	:	
MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH	:	
ADMINISTRATION (MSHA)	:	Docket No. LAKE 2008-60-M
	:	A.C. No. 21-00071-128120
v.	:	
	:	
PEDERSON BROTHERS, INC.	:	

BEFORE: Duffy, Chairman; Jordan 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 November 20, 2007, the Commission received from Pederson Brothers, Inc. (“Pederson”) a motion by counsel seeking 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).

On December 5, 2006, the Department of Labor’s Mine Safety and Health Administration (“MSHA”) issued a citation to Pederson. On October 3, 2007, as a result of the citation, MSHA issued a proposed assessment of \$838. Pederson states that the proposed assessment was forwarded to its counsel, who was traveling at the time the assessment was received at her office. Pederson further states that counsel’s office staff, through clerical error, placed the proposed assessment in the wrong file and that counsel did not discover the error until November 14, 2007. Pederson states that it had always intended to contest the citation and penalty. The Secretary does not oppose the request to reopen the proposed assessment.

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 Pederson’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 Pederson’s 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

---

Michael G. Young, Commissioner

Distribution:

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

W. Christian Schumann, Esq.  
Office of the Solicitor  
U.S. Department of Labor  
1100 Wilson Blvd., 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Arlington, VA 22209-2296

Myra James, Chief  
Office of Civil Penalty Compliance, MSHA  
U.S. Department 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