

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

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

SECRETARY OF LABOR,

Complainant,

v. : OSHRC Docket No. 95-1767

HUDSON WOOD RECYCLING, INC.,

Respondent.

ORDER

On March 5, 1996, Administrative Law Judge Richard DeBenedetto issued an order to show cause to the Respondent for failure to comply with the judge's E-Z Trial pre-hearing teleconference order of January 24, 1996, and with Commission Rule 6, 29 C.F.R. § 2200.6, which requires each party to inform the Commission and the other parties of its current address and telephone number. Having not received a response to the show cause order, which was sent by certified mail, the judge issued an order on April 23, 1996,¹ dismissing the Respondent's notice of contest, affirming the Secretary's two-item citation, and assessing the proposed penalties.

1996 OSHRC No. 21

¹The judge noted in this order that the show cause order sent by certified mail was returned to the judge's office "following three unsuccessful attempts by the postal service to accomplish delivery."

On May 6, 1996, Mr. Jeff Beatty filed a petition for discretionary review on behalf of Hudson Wood Recycling, Inc., claiming that "I have never had any employees." The Respondent had raised this claim earlier in a hand-written letter sent to the Commission's Executive Secretary following the notice of docketing of the case, in which Mr. Beatty stated that "Hudson Wood Recycling is not an operating business yet. I have never had any employees."²

In alleging that it is not an employer because it has "never had any employees," the Respondent raises a question of statutory jurisdiction, see sections 3(5) and 5(a) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, 29 U.S.C. §§ 652(5) and 654(a). An issue of jurisdiction can be raised at any time during Commission proceedings. *See Willamette Iron & Steel Co.*, 9 BNA OSHC 1900, 1904, 1981 CCH OSHD ¶25,427, p. 31,699 (No. 76-1201, 1981); Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). This does not mean that a party raising a jurisdictional question does not have to follow the applicable rules of procedure. For example, if a party raising the jurisdictional issue as a defense refuses to provide the information relevant to the Commission's determination of the jurisdictional issue, it will be deemed to be in default on the issue. *Cf. Tropicana Products, Inc.*, 122 NLRB 121, 43 LRRM 1077 (1958) (National Labor Relations Board found jurisdiction where employer refused to cooperate in production of evidence on jurisdictional issue).

We do not condone Respondent's failure to comply with the judge's teleconference order and Commission Rule 6 or its failure to respond to the judge's show cause order, and we find that by those failures the Respondent has waived its right to contest the merits of the citation. However, given that the Respondent is raising an issue of statutory jurisdiction, we are willing to give the Respondent yet another opportunity to present evidence on the jurisdictional question. Therefore, we remand this case to the judge to re-issue the show cause order. If the Respondent once again fails to respond to the order, it will be held in

²The Secretary does not oppose the petition for review here.

default on the jurisdictional issue and the citation items affirmed and a \$1200 penalty assessed for each item. The Respondent will then have no further opportunity to challenge the jurisdiction in this case. See Ins. Corp. of Ireland v. Compagnie des Bauxites, 456 U.S. 694, 702 n.9 (1982) (decision on subject-matter jurisdiction will be res judicata on that issue in any further proceedings). If the judge deems there to be a sufficient reply to the show cause order, he will conduct further proceedings in the case, affording the parties an opportunity to introduce evidence on the jurisdictional issue and making the necessary findings of fact and conclusions of law on that issue.³ If the judge finds that jurisdiction exists, then the citation items shall be affirmed because, as noted above, the Respondent has waived its right to contest the merits of the citation, based on the Respondent's failure to comply with the judge's teleconference order and Commission Rule 6 and its failure to respond to the judge's order to show cause issued on March 5, 1996.

It is so ordered.

Stuart E. Weisberg
Chairman

Velma Montoya Commissioner

Daniel Guttman Commissioner

Date: June 6, 1996

³Given the limitations on discovery under E-Z Trial, the judge may want to consider discontinuance of E-Z Trial in this particular case. See Commission Rule 204(a), 29 C.F.R § 2200.204(a).



United States of America OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

1120 20th Street, N.W., Ninth Floor Washington, DC 20036-3419

Office of Executive Secretary	Phone: (202) 606-5400 Fax: (202) 606-5050
SECRETARY OF LABOR,	
Complainant,	: :
v.	OSHRC Docket No. 95-1767
HUDSON WOOD RECYCLING, INC.,	: :
Respondent.	· :

NOTICE OF COMMISSION ORDER AND REMAND

The attached order and remand by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission was issued on June 6, 1996.

FOR THE COMMISSION

Date: June 6, 1996

Ray H. Darling, Jr. Executive Secretary

NOTICE IS GIVEN TO THE FOLLOWING:

Daniel J. Mick Office of the Solicitor, U.S. DOL Room S4004 200 Constitution Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20210

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

Jeff Beatty Hudson Wood Recycling, Inc. 147 Union Tpk. Hudson, NY 12534

Richard DeBenedetto
Administrative Law Judge
Occupational Safety and Health
Review Commission
Room 420
McCormack Post Office and Courthouse
Boston, MA 02109-4501



United States of America OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

1120 20th Street, N.W., Ninth Floor Washington, DC 20036-3419

> Phone: (202) 606-5400 Fax: (202) 606-5050

SECRETARY OF LABOR

Complainant,

v.

HUDSON WOOD RECYCLING, INC. Respondent.

OSHRC DOCKET NO. 95-1767

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 April 26, 1996. The decision of the Judge will become a final order of the Commission on May 28, 1996 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 May 16, 1996 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 1120 20th St. N.W., Suite 980 Washington, D.C. 20036-3419

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) 606-5400.

FOR THE COMMISSION

Ray H Darling, Jr. Executive Secretary

Date: April 26, 1996

DOCKET NO. 95-1767 NOTICE IS GIVEN TO THE FOLLOWING:

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

John Beatty Hudson Wood Recycling, Inc. 147 Union Turnpike Hudson, NY 12534

Richard DeBenedetto Administrative Law Judge Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission McCormack Post Offic and Courthouse, Room 420 Boston, MA 02109 4501

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

SECRETARY OF LABOR

Complainant

OSHRC DOCKET NO. 95-1767

v.

:

HUDSON WOOD RECYCLING, INC.

:

Respondent

ORDER

On March 5, 1996, an order was entered directing Hudson Wood Recycling, Inc. (Hudson) to show cause by March 22, 1996, why its notice of contest should not be dismissed for failure to comply with certain specified rules of procedures of the Commission.

The March 5, 1996, order was sent to Hudson by certified mail which was returned to this office by the postal service following three unsuccessful attempts by the postal service to accomplish delivery. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the two-item citation issued on October 20, 1995, is affirmed and a penalty of \$1200 is assessed for each of the two items described in the citation.

RICHARD DeBENEDETTO

Judge, OSHRC

Dated:

April 23, 1996

Boston, Massachusetts