

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
601 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., Suite 9500
Washington, DC 20001

April 30, 2007

ROY G. PETERSON,	:	DISCRIMINATION PROCEEDING
Complainant	:	
	:	Docket No. CENT 2007-45-DM
v.	:	SC-MD 2006-12
	:	
ALCOA WORLD ALUMINA ATLANTIC,	:	Bayer Aluminum Plant
Respondent	:	Mine ID 41-00320

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This case is before me based on a discrimination complaint filed with this Commission pursuant to section 105(c)(3) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, as amended, § 815(c)(3) (the Act). The complaint was filed by Roy G. Peterson against Alcoa World Alumina Atlantic (Alcoa). Peterson’s complaint, initially filed on September 1, 2006, with the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA), concerns the company’s refusal to place him on light duty on several occasions that occurred after several job related injuries in 2002 and 2004. In addition, Peterson complains about tools that he alleges were taken while he was on medical leave during this period. Finally, Peterson complains about the billing of his private insurance for treatment for a job related eye irritation that he sustained in June 2006. Peterson’s complaint does not allege that he engaged in any protected safety related activities.

MSHA advised Peterson that its investigation failed to reveal any violation of section 105(c) of the Mine Act. Shortly thereafter, on November 2, 2006, Peterson filed his discrimination complaint with this Commission. After several delays caused by Alcoa’s failure to respond to Peterson’s complaint, this matter was assigned to me on April 20, 2007.

Alcoa replied to Peterson’s complaint on April 12, 2007. Alcoa seeks dismissal of Peterson’s complaint because Peterson has failed to allege any activities protected by the Mine Act that allegedly motivated the actions he complains of concerning his medical treatment and/or the loss of his tools.

The following statutory and case law framework is applicable in a discrimination proceeding. Section 105(c)(1) of the Mine Act provides, in pertinent part:

No person shall discharge or in any manner discriminate against . . . any miner . . . because such miner . . . has filed or made a complaint under or related to this Act, including a complaint notifying the operator or the operator’s agent . . . of an alleged danger or safety or health violation in a coal or other mine

30 U.S.C. § 815(c)(1). Section 105(c)(2), 30 U.S.C. § 815(c)(2) requires a miner who believes he was the victim of discrimination to file a complaint within 60 days of the date of the alleged discrimination.

Peterson has the burden of proving a *prima facie* case of discrimination. In order to establish a *prima facie* case, Peterson must establish that he engaged in protected activity, and that the aggrieved action was motivated, in some part, by that protected activity. *See Sec'y of Labor o/b/o Pasula v. Consolidation Coal Co.*, 2 FMSHRC 2786, 2797-2800 (October 1980) *rev'd on other grounds sub nom. Consolidation Coal Co. v. Marshall*, 663 F.2d 1211 (3d Cir. 1981); *Sec'y of Labor o/b/o Robinette v. United Castle Coal Co.*, 3 FMSHRC 803, 817-18 (April 1981).

Alcoa may rebut a *prima facie* case by demonstrating, either that no protected activity occurred, or that the adverse action complained of by Peterson was not motivated in any part by protected activity. *Robinette*, 3 FMSHRC at 818 n.20. Alcoa may also affirmatively defend against a *prima facie* case by establishing that it would have taken the adverse actions complained of even if the protected activity had not occurred. *See also Jim Walter Resources*, 920 F.2d at 750, *citing with approval Eastern Associated Coal Corp. v. FMSHRC*, 813 F.2d 639, 642 (4th Cir. 1987); *Donovan v. Stafford Constr. Co.*, 732 F.2d 954, 958-59 (D.C. Cir. 1984); *Boich v. FMSHRC*, 719 F.2d 194, 195-96 (6th Cir. 1983) (specifically approving the Commission's *Pasula-Robinette* test).

In order to determine if Peterson, considering the facts most favorable to him, has stated a cause of action under the Mine Act, a telephone conference was conducted with Peterson and Alcoa's counsel on April 25, 2007. Peterson stated he was 61 years old and that he had worked for Alcoa as a mechanic for 31½ years. After a medical leave due to a job related shoulder injury, Peterson returned to work in August 2004 until he voluntarily retired on February 1, 2007. During the course of the telephone conference, I explained to Peterson that worker's compensation issues, and union issues such as reimbursement for his lost equipment, do not give rise to Mine Act jurisdiction.

Notwithstanding its untimeliness, although Peterson complained that the company's refusal to offer him light duty after his injuries in 2002 and 2004 was arbitrary because it had provided light duty to others under similar circumstances, he did not claim the company's decision was motivated by protected activity. Similarly, Peterson did not contend that either the loss of his tools, or his worker's compensation dispute concerning his eye condition, was in any way connected to any protected activity. In short, Peterson failed to allege any conduct by Alcoa that violated the anti-discrimination provisions of section 105(c) of the Mine Act.

ORDER

In view of the above, as Peterson has not identified any protected activity that serves as the basis for his complaint, **IT IS ORDERED** that Peterson **SHOW CAUSE, in writing**, why his discrimination complaint should not be dismissed. Specifically, Peterson should provide the following information:

- 1) State, with specificity, the protected activity that serves as the basis for your complaint. If you are alleging that you communicated safety related concerns to Alcoa supervisory personnel, state the names and job titles of such personnel, and provide a detailed summary of the safety related communications, including the date and time of such communications.
- (2) State, with specificity, the adverse actions you are complaining of, the dates of the adverse actions, and specify the dates and details of the protected activity, if any, that you allege motivated each of the adverse actions complained of.
- (3) State why you believe your complaint should not be dismissed as untimely because it was not filed within 60 days of the actions that you are complaining of.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Peterson provide the above information **within twenty-one (21) days of this Order**. Peterson may provide any other information he deems relevant. Failure to provide a timely response will result in the dismissal of Peterson's complaint with prejudice. Alcoa **shall have fourteen (14) days to reply** to Peterson's response to this Order to Show Cause.

Jerald Feldman
Administrative Law Judge
(202) 434-9967

Distribution: (Certified Mail)

Roy G. Peterson, P.O. Box 332, Port Lavaca, TX 77979

Kevin Carter, Esq., Alcoa Corporate Center, 201 Isabella Street, at 7th Street Bridge,
Pittsburgh, PA 15212-5858

/mh