

CCASE:  
SOL (MSHA) V. C.J. LANGENFELDER & SON  
DDATE:  
19830715  
TTEXT:

Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission  
Office of Administrative Law Judges

SECRETARY OF LABOR,  
MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH  
ADMINISTRATION (MSHA),  
PETITIONER

CIVIL PENALTY PROCEEDING

Docket No. VA 83-7  
A.C. No. 44-0404856-03501-I37

v.

Buchanan No. 1 Mine

C. J. LANGENFELDER & SON,  
INC.,  
RESPONDENT

DENIAL OF SETTLEMENT

ORDER TO SUBMIT INFORMATION

In accordance with what apparently now is becoming standard practice, the Solicitor has filed a motion for settlement in the amount of \$240 for the 12 violations involved in this matter. This motion is predicated solely upon section 100.4 of the regulations of the Mine Safety and Health Administration, 30 C.F.R. 100.4 which provides for the assessment of a \$20 single penalty for a violation MSHA believes is not reasonably likely to result in a reasonably serious injury or illness. I have reviewed the 12 violations. They were issued for a variety of conditions including inoperative automatic warning device, lack of a suitable fire extinguisher and inoperative lights.

I am unable to approve the motion for settlement on the basis of the present record. In my opinion \$20 is a nominal penalty which indicates a lack of gravity. I have been told nothing about gravity, negligence or any of the other statutory factors which would enable me to make an informed judgment as to proper penalty amounts. The fact the operator has paid the \$240 cannot preclude the Commission from acting in accordance with the governing statute.

Section 100.4 is not binding upon this Commission. Indeed, it is not even relevant. The Act makes very clear that penalty proceedings before the Commission are de novo. The Commission itself recently recognized that it is not bound by penalty assessment regulations adopted by the Secretary but rather that in a proceeding before the Commission the amount of the penalty to be assessed is a de novo

~1272

determination based upon the six statutory criteria specified in section 110(i) of the Act and the information relevant thereto developed in the course of the adjudicative proceeding. Sellersburg Stone Company, 5 FMSHRC 287 (March 1983). Indeed, if this were not so, the Commission would be nothing but a rubber stamp for the Secretary.

The fact that MSHA may have determined that these violations are not "significant and substantial" as that term presently is defined by the Commission, is not determinative or even relevant in these proceedings. I agree with Administrative Law Judge Broderick that whether a cited violation is checked as significant and substantial is per se irrelevant to the determination of the appropriate penalty to be assessed. United States Steel Mining Co., Inc., 5 FMSHRC 934 (May 1983), PDR granted June 22, 1983.

Regardless of the Secretary's regulations, once this Commission's jurisdiction attaches we have our own statutory responsibilities to fulfill and discharge. This can only be done on the basis of an adequate record.

ORDER

In light of the foregoing, it is Ordered that the Solicitor's motion for settlement be Denied.

It is further Ordered that within 30 days from the date of this order the Solicitor file information adequate for me to determine whether the proposed penalties are justified and settlement warranted. Otherwise, this case will be assigned and set down for hearing on the merits.

Paul Merlin  
Chief Administrative Law Judge