UNITED STATES OF AMERICA OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

SECRETARY OF LABOR,	:	
Complainant,	:	
v.	•	Docket No. 96-1523
BEDLAM BRASS CORPORATION,	:	
Respondent.	:	
	:	

Appearances:

Susan B. Jacobs, Esq. U.S. Department of Labor Mr. Dick Grabowsky, Pres. Bedlam Brass Corporation

For the Complainant

For the Respondent

Before: Chief Judge Irving Sommer

DECISION AND ORDER

This is a proceeding under section 10(c) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, 29 U.S.C. sec. 651-678 (the Act) to determine whether the Respondent Bedlam Brass Corporation (Bedlam) filed a timely notice of contest of the citations and penalty proposed by the Secretary for alleged violations of the Act. A hearing was held on the Secretary's motion to dismiss the Respondent's notice of contest. Both parties filed a post hearing brief.

BACKGROUND

The citations setting forth the alleged violations and the accompanying notification of proposed penalty was issued by certified mail on July 18, 1996 and received by Bedlam on July 22,

1996. Pursuant to section 10(a) of the Act, 29 U.S.C., sec. 659(a), Bedlam was required to notify the Secretary of any intent to contest within 15 working days of receipt of the citations and notification of proposed penalties, or August 12, 1996. In the absence of a timely contest, the citation and proposed penalties would be deemed a final judgment of the Commission by operation of law. Sec. 10(a) of the act. In a letter dated August 22, 1996 and received by the OSHA regional office on August 23, 1996 the Respondent listed the compliance repairs it had made, and even in this letter did not state it was filing a contest to either the citations or penalties.

DISCUSSION

The record plainly shows that Bedlam did not file a notice of contest as to the citations and proposed penalties within the 15 day working period. His letter which, which in any event was out of the filing period merely called attention to his compliance efforts. Bedlam apparently was of the impression that making the necessary cure of the violations would be sufficient. An otherwise untimely notice of contest may be accepted where the delay in filing was caused by deception on the part of the Secretary to follow proper procedures. An employer is entitled to relief under Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 60(b)(1) if it demonstrates that the Commissions' final order was entered as a result of ``mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect'' or under Rule 60(b)(6) for such mitigating circumstances as absence, illness, or a disability which prevents a party from protecting his interests. See Branciforte Builders, Inc., 9 BNA OSHC 2113, 1981 CCH OSHD, par. 25,591(No. 80-1920,1981). Here, there is no showing that the Secretary acted improperly or that the factors mentioned in Rule 60(b)(6) are present. The citation was not ambiguous. It admonishes that the 15-day deadline for contesting violations and/or penalties is critical. Under a paragraph titled ``Right to Contest'' is the statement that ``Unless you inform the Area Director in writing that you intend to

contest the citations(s) and/or proposed penalty(ies) within 15 working days after receipt, the citation(s) and the proposed penalty(ies) will become a final order of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission and may not be reviewed by any court or agency."Moreover, the form begins by the warning that ``You must abate the violations referred to in this Citation by the dates listed and pay the penalties proposed, unless within fifteen working days (excluding weekends and Federal holidays) from your receipt of this Citation and Notification of Penalty you mail a notice of contest to the U.S. Department of Labor Area Office at the address shown above." The OSHA 3000 booklet which accompanied the citations similarly echoed this advice. Bedlam had clear and ample notice of the need to contest within 15 working days. Its president, Mr. Grabowsky is responsible for failure to carefully read and act upon the unambiguous instructions accompanying the citations. *Acrom Construction Servs., Inc.* 15 BNA OSHC 1123. Simple negligence will not provide entitlement to relief. *E.K.Construction Co.*, 15 BNA OSHC 1165-6.

While I am sympathetic to the Respondent's plight, I have no alternative but to hold it responsible for failing to file in a timely manner. Its mistake was neither excusable nor justified by any misconduct or misleading on the part of the Secretary.

ORDER

The Secretary's motion to dismiss is granted, and the citations and notification of penalties is AFFIRMED in all respects.

IRVING SOMMER Chief Judge.