

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

One Lafayette Centre 1120 20th Street, N.W. — 9th Floor Washington, DC 20036-3419

> FAX: COM (202) 606-5050 FTS (202) 606-5050

SECRETARY OF LABOR,

Complainant,

**v** .

Docket No. 92-1204

NORTH BERGEN ANIMAL HOSPITAL,

Respondent.

#### **ORDER**

On May 17, 1993, North Bergen Animal Hospital (North Bergen) filed a notice of withdrawal in the above-captioned case. The Commission acknowledges receipt of North Bergen's notice of withdrawal. There being no matters remaining before the Commission for adjudication, the administrative law judge's decision affirming the citations and proposed penalties is the final order of the Commission.

Edwin G. Foulke, Jr.

Montaga

Chairman

Velma Montoya Commissioner

Dated May 25, 1993

### NOTICE OF ORDER

The attached Order by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission was issued and served on the following on May 25, 1993.

Daniel J. Mick, Esq. Counsel for Regional Trial Litigation Office of the Solicitor, USDOL 200 Constitution Ave., N.W. Room S4004 Washington, D.C. 20210

Patricia Rodenhausen, Esq. Regional Solicitor Office of the Solicitor, U.S. DOL 201 Varick St., Room 707 New York, NY 10014

Dr. Gerald M. Buchoff, Director North Bergen Animal Hospital 9018 Kennedy Boulevard North Bergen, NJ 07047

Irving Sommer
Administrative Law Judge
Occupational Safety and Health
Review Commission
One Lafayette Centre
1120 20th Street, N. W. - 9th
Washington, D. C. 20036-3419

FOR THE COMMISSION

Ray H. Darling, Jr. Executive Secretary



# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION 1825 K STREET N.W. 4TH FLOOR

WASHINGTON D.C. 20006-1246

FAX: COM (202) 634-4008 FTS 634-4008

SECRETARY OF LABOR Complainant,

V.

NORTH BERGEN ANIMAL HOSPITAL Respondent.

OSHRC DOCKET NO. 92-1204

## NOTICE OF DOCKETING OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S DECISION

The Administrative Law Judge's Report in the above referenced case was docketed with the Commission on July 1, 1992. The decision of the Judge will become a final order of the Commission on July 31, 1992 unless a Commission member directs review of the decision on or before that date. ANY PARTY DESIRING REVIEW OF THE JUDGE'S DECISION BY THE COMMISSION MUST FILE A PETITION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW. Any such petition should be received by the Executive Secretary on or before July 21, 1992 in order to permit sufficient time for its review. See Commission Rule 91, 29 C.F.R. 2200.91.

All further pleadings or communications regarding this case shall be addressed to:

Executive Secretary
Occupational Safety and Health
Review Commission
1825 K St. N.W., Room 401
Washington, D.C. 20006-1246

Petitioning parties shall also mail a copy to:

Daniel J. Mick, Esq. Counsel for Regional Trial Litigation Office of the Solicitor, U.S. DOL Room S4004 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20210

If a Direction for Review is issued by the Commission, then the Counsel for Regional Trial Litigation will represent the Department of Labor. Any party having questions about review rights may contact the Commission's Executive Secretary or call (202) 634-7950.

FOR THE COMMISSION

Date: July 1, 1992

Ray H./Darling, Jr.

Executive Secretary

DOCKET NO. 92-1204 NOTICE IS GIVEN TO THE FOLLOWING:

Daniel J. Mick, Esq. Counsel for Regional Trial Litigation Office of the Solicitor, U.S. DOL Room S4004 200 Constitution Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20210

Patricia Rodenhausen, Esq. Regional Solicitor Office of the Solicitor, U.S. DOL 201 Varick, Room 707 New York, NY 10014

Dr. Gerald M. Buchoff North Bergen Animal Hospital 9018 Kennedy Boulevard North Bergen, NJ 07047

Irving Sommer
Chief Administrative Law Judge
Occupational Safety and Health
Review Commission
Room 417/A
1825 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006 1246



## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

1825 K STREET N.W. 4TH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20006-1246

> FAX: COM (202) 634-4008 FTS 634-4008

SECRETARY OF LABOR,

Complainant,

v.

Docket No. 92-1204

NORTH BERGEN ANIMAL HOSPITAL, and its successors,

Respondent.

### **ORDER**

By motion dated May 12, 1992, the Secretary moves to dismiss the Respondent's Notice of Contest as not being timely filed under Section 10 of the Act. The Respondent filed a letter in opposition.

The record demonstrates that two citations and notification of proposed penalties were issued to the Respondent on March 6, 1992, and received on March 7, 1992. Under Section 10(a) of the Act, 29 U.S.C. 659(a), an employer must notify the Secretary that it intends to contest the citations or proposed penalties within fifteen (15) working days of its receipt. The Respondent had until March 30, 1992 to file its Notice of Contest, but did not do so, filing a letter dated April 10, 1992 stating, "I know that it is late, but I just became aware of the same this afternoon. They were apparently received by my Saturday receptionist and placed in a pile with solicitation mail in my office. "In a later letter explaining the situation Respondent states, "She placed it in a pile with junk (solicitation) mail on the shelf next to my desk. It was not in its envelope as my receptionists are accustomed to opening the mail before bringing it to my desk. We are a small office and I tend to leave my junk mail pile for several weeks at a time. "

There is no evidence that the delay in filing was caused by "the Secretary's deception or failure to follow proper procedures." Atlantic Marine, Inc. v. OSAHRC and Dunlop, 524 F2d 476 (5th Cir 1975). The Respondent's failure to file its Notice of Contest in a timely fashion was due to its own carelessness and negligence. The Commission has held that employers whose improper business procedures has led to failure to file on a timely basis are not entitled to relief. See Louisiana-Pacific Corp., 13 BNA OSHC 2020, 1987-1990 CCH OSHD ¶ 28,409 (No. 86-1266, 1989); Stroudsbourg Dyeing & Finishing Co., 13 BNA OSHC 2058, 1987-1990 CCH OSHD ¶ 28433 (No. 88-1830, 1989). The office procedure of Respondent, a going business should provide daily scrutiny of all incoming mail. The reason advanced by the Respondent for its failure to file in a timely manner do not constitute "excusable neglect" within Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 60(b).

Accordingly, the Secretary's motion to dismiss the Notice of Contest is granted. The Secretary's citations and proposed penalties are AFFIRMED in all respects.

IRVING SOMMER

Judge

DATED:

JUL 1 1992 Washington, D.C.