

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

601 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, NW

SUITE 9500

WASHINGTON, DC 20001

November 30, 2006

SECRETARY OF LABOR,	:	
MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH	:	
ADMINISTRATION (MSHA)	:	
	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. PENN 2007-30
	:	A.C. No. 36-02945-90937
SHAMOKIN FILLER CO., 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 1, 2006, the Commission received from Shamokin Filler Company, Inc. (“Shamokin”) a letter 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).

The Department of Labor’s Mine Safety and Health Administration (“MSHA”) issued a proposed penalty assessment, A.C. No. 36-02945-90937, to Shamokin for several citations that Shamokin received in April 2006. Shamokin states that it promptly mailed to MSHA its contest of the proposed penalty assessment, that it received no response, and that now the case is closed. The Secretary responds that she has no record that the penalty contest form was received by MSHA’s Civil Penalty Compliance Office, but that she has no basis for questioning that the form was sent. Consequently, the Secretary states that she does not oppose Shamokin’s request to reopen the penalty 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 Shamokin’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 Shamokin’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

Patrick A. Mack
Shamokin Filler Company, Inc.
Venn Access Road
P.O. Box 568
Shamokin, PA 17872

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

Myra James, Chief
Office of Civil Penalty Compliance, MSHA
U.S. Department of Labor,
1100 Wilson Blvd., 25th 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