

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
BEFORE THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

In re:) AWA Docket No. 02-0014
)
David Finch, d/b/a Wild Iowa,)
)
Respondent) **Decision and Order**

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

William R. DeHaven, Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, United States Department of Agriculture [hereinafter Complainant], instituted this disciplinary administrative proceeding by filing a Complaint on April 12, 2002. Complainant instituted the proceeding under the Animal Welfare Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. §§ 2131-2159) [hereinafter the Animal Welfare Act]; the regulations and standards issued under the Animal Welfare Act (9 C.F.R. §§ 1.1-3.142) [hereinafter the Regulations and Standards]; and the Rules of Practice Governing Formal Adjudicatory Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary Under Various Statutes (7 C.F.R. §§ 1.130-.151) [hereinafter the Rules of Practice].

Complainant alleges that: (1) on August 8 and 9, 2000, David Finch, d/b/a Wild Iowa [hereinafter Respondent], willfully violated section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. § 2140) and sections 2.40 and 2.75(b)(1) of the Regulations (9 C.F.R. §§ 2.40,

.75(b)(1)); and (2) on August 31, 1998, Respondent willfully violated section 2.100(a) of the Regulations (9 C.F.R. § 2.100(a)) and sections 3.125(a), 3.127(c), 3.129(a), 3.130, and 3.131(a) and (c) of the Standards (9 C.F.R. §§ 3.125(a), .127(c), .129(a), .130, .131(a), (c)) (Compl. ¶ II).

The Hearing Clerk served Respondent with the Complaint, the Rules of Practice, and a service letter on April 19, 2002.¹ Respondent failed to answer the Complaint within 20 days after service, as required by section 1.136(a) of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)). On May 20, 2002, the Hearing Clerk sent Respondent a letter informing him that his answer to the Complaint had not been received within the time required in the Rules of Practice.²

On July 1, 2002, in accordance with section 1.139 of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.139), Complainant filed a Motion for Adoption of Proposed Decision and Order [hereinafter Motion for Default Decision] and a proposed Decision and Order Upon Admission of Facts By Reason of Default [hereinafter Proposed Default Decision]. The Hearing Clerk served Respondent with Complainant's Motion for Default Decision, Complainant's Proposed Default Decision, and a service letter on July 11,

¹United States Postal Service Domestic Return Receipt for Article Number 7099 3400 0014 4584 7922.

²Letter dated May 20, 2002, from Joyce A. Dawson, Hearing Clerk, to Respondent.

2002.³ On August 6, 2002, Respondent filed an Answer in which he denied the allegations in paragraph II of the Complaint.

On August 9, 2002, pursuant to section 1.139 of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.139), Chief Administrative Law Judge James W. Hunt [hereinafter the Chief ALJ] issued a Decision and Order Upon Admission of Facts By Reason of Default [hereinafter Initial Decision and Order]: (1) concluding that Respondent willfully violated the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards as alleged in the Complaint; (2) directing Respondent to cease and desist from violating the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards; (3) assessing Respondent a \$4,000 civil penalty; and (4) permanently disqualifying Respondent from obtaining an Animal Welfare Act license.

The Hearing Clerk served Respondent with the Initial Decision and Order on August 17, 2002.⁴ On September 17, 2002, Respondent appealed to the Judicial Officer. Complainant failed to file a response to Respondent's appeal petition within 20 days after service, as required by section 1.145(b) of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.145(b)). On October 15, 2002, the Hearing Clerk transmitted the record to the Judicial Officer for consideration and decision.

³United States Postal Service Domestic Return Receipt for Article Number 7000 1670 0011 8982 8309.

⁴United States Postal Service Domestic Return Receipt for Article Number 7000 1670 0011 8982 8194.

Based upon a careful consideration of the record, I agree with the Chief ALJ s Initial Decision and Order. Therefore, pursuant to section 1.145(i) of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.145(i)), I adopt, with minor modifications, the Initial Decision and Order as the final Decision and Order. Additional conclusions by the Judicial Officer follow the Chief ALJ s Conclusions, as restated.

APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY PROVISIONS

7 U.S.C.:

TITLE 7 AGRICULTURE

.....

CHAPTER 54 TRANSPORTATION, SALE, AND HANDLING OF CERTAIN ANIMALS

§ 2131. Congressional statement of policy

The Congress finds that animals and activities which are regulated under this chapter are either in interstate or foreign commerce or substantially affect such commerce or the free flow thereof, and that regulation of animals and activities as provided in this chapter is necessary to prevent and eliminate burdens upon such commerce and to effectively regulate such commerce, in order

- (1) to insure that animals intended for use in research facilities or for exhibition purposes or for use as pets are provided humane care and treatment;
- (2) to assure the humane treatment of animals during transportation in commerce; and
- (3) to protect the owners of animals from the theft of their animals by preventing the sale or use of animals which have been stolen.

The Congress further finds that it is essential to regulate, as provided in this chapter, the transportation, purchase, sale, housing, care, handling, and

treatment of animals by carriers or by persons or organizations engaged in using them for research or experimental purposes or for exhibition purposes or holding them for sale as pets or for any such purpose or use.

§ 2132. Definitions

When used in this chapter

. . . .

(h) The term *exhibitor* means any person (public or private) exhibiting any animals, which were purchased in commerce or the intended distribution of which affects commerce, or which will affect commerce, to the public for compensation, as determined by the Secretary, and such term includes carnivals, circuses, and zoos exhibiting such animals whether operated for profit or not; but such term excludes retail pet stores, organizations sponsoring and all persons participating in State and country fairs, livestock shows, rodeos, purebred dog and cat shows, and any other fairs or exhibitions intended to advance agricultural arts and sciences, as may be determined by the Secretary[.]

§ 2140. Recordkeeping by dealers, exhibitors, research facilities, intermediate handlers, and carriers

Dealers and exhibitors shall make and retain for such reasonable period of time as the Secretary may prescribe, such records with respect to the purchase, sale, transportation, identification, and previous ownership of animals as the Secretary may prescribe.

§ 2146. Administration and enforcement by Secretary

(a) Investigations and inspections

The Secretary shall make such investigations or inspections as he deems necessary to determine whether any dealer, exhibitor, intermediate handler, carrier, research facility, or operator of an auction sale subject to section 2142 of this title, has violated or is violating any provision of this chapter or any regulation or standard issued thereunder, and for such purposes, the Secretary shall, at all reasonable times, have access to the places of business and the facilities, animals, and those records required to be kept pursuant to section 2140 of this title of any such dealer, exhibitor,

intermediate handler, carrier, research facility, or operator of an auction sale.

§ 2149. Violations by licensees

(a) Temporary license suspension; notice and hearing; revocation

If the Secretary has reason to believe that any person licensed as a dealer, exhibitor, or operator of an auction sale subject to section 2142 of this title, has violated or is violating any provision of this chapter, or any of the rules or regulations or standards promulgated by the Secretary hereunder, he may suspend such person's license temporarily, but not to exceed 21 days, and after notice and opportunity for hearing, may suspend for such additional period as he may specify, or revoke such license, if such violation is determined to have occurred.

(b) Civil penalties for violation of any section, etc.; separate offenses; notice and hearing; appeal; considerations in assessing penalty; compromise of penalty; civil action by Attorney General for failure to pay penalty; district court jurisdiction; failure to obey cease and desist order

Any dealer, exhibitor, research facility, intermediate handler, carrier, or operator of an auction sale subject to section 2142 of this title, that violates any provision of this chapter, or any rule, regulation, or standard promulgated by the Secretary thereunder, may be assessed a civil penalty by the Secretary of not more than \$2,500 for each such violation, and the Secretary may also make an order that such person shall cease and desist from continuing such violation. Each violation and each day during which a violation continues shall be a separate offense. No penalty shall be assessed or cease and desist order issued unless such person is given notice and opportunity for a hearing with respect to the alleged violation, and the order of the Secretary assessing a penalty and making a cease and desist order shall be final and conclusive unless the affected person files an appeal from the Secretary's order with the appropriate United States Court of Appeals. The Secretary shall give due consideration to the appropriateness of the penalty with respect to the size of the business of the person involved, the gravity of the violation, the person's good faith, and the history of previous violations. . . .

(c) Appeal of final order by aggrieved person; limitations; exclusive jurisdiction of United States Courts of Appeals

Any dealer, exhibitor, research facility, intermediate handler, carrier, or operator of an auction sale subject to section 2142 of this title, aggrieved by a final order of the Secretary issued pursuant to this section may, within 60 days after entry of such an order, seek review of such order in the appropriate United States Court of Appeals in accordance with the provisions of sections 2341, 2343 through 2350 of title 28, and such court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to enjoin, set aside, suspend (in whole or in part), or to determine the validity of the Secretary's order.

§ 2151. Rules and regulations

The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such rules, regulations, and orders as he may deem necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this chapter.

7 U.S.C. §§ 2131, 2132(h), 2140, 2146(a), 2149(a)-(c), 2151.

28 U.S.C.:

TITLE 28 JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

....

PART VI PARTICULAR PROCEEDINGS

....

CHAPTER 163 FINES, PENALTIES AND FORFEITURES

§ 2461. Mode of recovery

....

FEDERAL CIVIL PENALTIES INFLATION ADJUSTMENT

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990 .

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) FINDINGS. The Congress finds that

(1) the power of Federal agencies to impose civil monetary penalties for violations of Federal law and regulations plays an important role in deterring violations and furthering the policy goals embodied in such laws and regulations;

(2) the impact of many civil monetary penalties has been and is diminished due to the effect of inflation;

(3) by reducing the impact of civil monetary penalties, inflation has weakened the deterrent effect of such penalties; and

(4) the Federal Government does not maintain comprehensive, detailed accounting of the efforts of Federal agencies to assess and collect civil monetary penalties.

(b) PURPOSE The purpose of this Act is to establish a mechanism that shall

- (1) allow for regular adjustment for inflation of civil monetary penalties;
- (2) maintain the deterrent effect of civil monetary penalties and promote compliance with the law; and
- (3) improve the collection by the Federal Government of civil monetary penalties.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For purposes of this Act, the term

- (1) **agency** means an Executive agency as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code, and includes the United States Postal Service;
- (2) **civil monetary penalty** means any penalty, fine, or other sanction that
 - (A)(i) is for a specific monetary amount as provided by Federal law; or
 - (ii) has a maximum amount provided for by Federal law; and
 - (B) is assessed or enforced by an agency pursuant to Federal law; and
 - (C) is assessed or enforced pursuant to an administrative proceeding or a civil action in the Federal courts; and
- (3) **Consumer Price Index** means the Consumer Price Index for all-urban consumers published by the Department of Labor.

CIVIL MONETARY PENALTY INFLATION ADJUSTMENT REPORTS

SEC. 4. The head of each agency shall, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 [Apr. 26, 1996], and at least once every 4 years thereafter

- (1) by regulation adjust each civil monetary penalty provided by law within the jurisdiction of the Federal agency, except for any penalty (including any addition to tax and additional amount) under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 [26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.], the Tariff Act of 1930 [19 U.S.C. 1202 et seq.], the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 [29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.], or the Social Security

Act [42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.], by the inflation adjustment described under section 5 of this Act; and

- (2) publish each such regulation in the Federal Register.

COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS OF CIVIL
MONETARY PENALTIES

SEC. 5. (a) ADJUSTMENT. The inflation adjustment under section 4 shall be determined by increasing the maximum civil monetary penalty or the range of minimum and maximum civil monetary penalties, as applicable, for each civil monetary penalty by the cost-of-living adjustment. Any increase determined under this subsection shall be rounded to the nearest

- (1) multiple of \$10 in the case of penalties less than or equal to \$100;
- (2) multiple of \$100 in the case of penalties greater than \$100 but less than or equal to \$1,000;
- (3) multiple of \$1,000 in the case of penalties greater than \$1,000 but less than or equal to \$10,000;
- (4) multiple of \$5,000 in the case of penalties greater than \$10,000 but less than or equal to \$100,000;
- (5) multiple of \$10,000 in the case of penalties greater than \$100,000 but less than or equal to \$200,000; and
- (6) multiple of \$25,000 in the case of penalties greater than \$200,000.

(b) DEFINITION. For purposes of subsection (a), the term *cost-of-living adjustment* means the percentage (if any) for each civil monetary penalty by which

- (1) the Consumer Price Index for the month of June of the calendar year preceding the adjustment, exceeds
- (2) the Consumer Price Index for the month of June of the calendar year in which the amount of such civil monetary penalty was last set or adjusted pursuant to law.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 6. Any increase under this Act in a civil monetary penalty shall apply only to violations which occur after the date the increase takes effect.

LIMITATION ON INITIAL ADJUSTMENT. The first adjustment of a civil monetary penalty . . . may not exceed 10 percent of such penalty.

7 C.F.R.:

TITLE 7 AGRICULTURE

SUBTITLE A OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

....

PART 3 DEBT MANAGEMENT

....

SUBPART E ADJUSTED CIVIL MONETARY PENALTIES

§ 3.91 Adjusted civil monetary penalties.

(a) *In general.* The Secretary will adjust the civil monetary penalties, listed in paragraph (b), to take account of inflation at least once every 4 years as required by the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990 (Pub. L. No. 101-410), as amended by the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 (Pub. L. No. 104-134).

(b) *Penalties*

(2) *Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.* . . .

(v) Civil penalty for a violation of Animal Welfare Act, codified at 7 U.S.C. 2149(b), has a maximum of \$2,750; and knowing failure to obey a cease and desist order has a civil penalty of \$1,650.

7 C.F.R. § 3.91(a), (b)(2)(v).

9 C.F.R.:

TITLE 9 ANIMALS AND ANIMAL PRODUCTS

**CHAPTER I ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

SUBCHAPTER A ANIMAL WELFARE

PART 1 DEFINITION OF TERMS

§ 1.1 Definitions.

For the purposes of this subchapter, unless the context otherwise requires, the following terms shall have the meanings assigned to them in this section. The singular form shall also signify the plural and the masculine form shall also signify the feminine. Words undefined in the following paragraphs shall have the meaning attributed to them in general usage as reflected by definitions in a standard dictionary.

.....

Exhibitor means any person (public or private) exhibiting any animals, which were purchased in commerce or the intended distribution of which affects commerce, or will affect commerce, to the public for compensation, as determined by the Secretary. This term includes carnivals, circuses, animal acts, zoos, and educational exhibits, exhibiting such animals whether operated for profit or not. This term excludes retail pet stores, horse and dog races, organizations sponsoring and all persons participating in State and county fairs, livestock shows, rodeos, field trials, coursing events, purebred dog and cat shows and any other fairs or exhibitions intended to advance agricultural arts and sciences as may be determined by the Secretary.

PART 2 REGULATIONS

.....

SUBPART D ATTENDING VETERINARIAN AND ADEQUATE VETERINARY CARE

§ 2.40 Attending veterinarian and adequate veterinary care (dealers and exhibitors).

(a) Each dealer or exhibitor shall have an attending veterinarian who shall provide adequate veterinary care to its animals in compliance with this section.

(1) Each dealer and exhibitor shall employ an attending veterinarian under formal arrangements. In the case of a part-time attending veterinarian or consultant arrangements, the formal arrangements shall include a written program of veterinary care and regularly scheduled visits to the premises of the dealer or exhibitor; and

(2) Each dealer and exhibitor shall assure that the attending veterinarian has appropriate authority to ensure the provision of adequate veterinary care and to oversee the adequacy of other aspects of animal care and use.

(b) Each dealer or exhibitor shall establish and maintain programs of adequate veterinary care that include:

(1) The availability of appropriate facilities, personnel, equipment, and services to comply with the provisions of this subchapter;

(2) The use of appropriate methods to prevent, control, diagnose, and treat diseases and injuries, and the availability of emergency, weekend, and holiday care;

(3) Daily observation of all animals to assess their health and well-being; *Provided, however,* That daily observation of animals may be accomplished by someone other than the attending veterinarian; and *Provided, further,* That a mechanism of direct and frequent communication is required so that timely and accurate information on problems of animal health, behavior, and well-being is conveyed to the attending veterinarian;

(4) Adequate guidance to personnel involved in the care and use of animals regarding handling, immobilization, anesthesia, analgesia, tranquilization, and euthanasia; and

(5) Adequate pre-procedural and post-procedural care in accordance with established veterinary medical and nursing procedures.

SUBPART G RECORDS

§ 2.75 Records: Dealers and exhibitors.

. . . .

(b)(1) Every dealer other than operators of auction sales and brokers to whom animals are consigned, and exhibitor shall make, keep, and maintain records or forms which fully and correctly disclose the following information concerning animals other than dogs and cats, purchased or otherwise acquired, owned, held, leased, or otherwise in his or her possession or under his or her control, or which is transported, sold, euthanized, or otherwise disposed of by that dealer or exhibitor. The records shall include any offspring born of any animal while in his or her possession or under his or her control.

- (i) The name and address of the person from whom the animals were purchased or otherwise acquired;
- (ii) The USDA license or registration number of the person if he or she is licensed or registered under the Act;
- (iii) The vehicle license number and state, and the driver's license number and state of the person, if he or she is not licensed or registered under the Act;
- (iv) The name and address of the person to whom the animal was sold or given;
- (v) The date of purchase, acquisition, sale, or disposal of the animal(s);
- (vi) The species of the animal(s); and
- (vii) The number of the animals in the shipment.

SUBPART H COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS AND HOLDING PERIOD

§ 2.100 Compliance with standards.

(a) Each dealer, exhibitor, operator of an auction sale, and intermediate handler shall comply in all respects with the regulations set forth in part 2 and the standards set forth in part 3 of this subchapter for the humane handling, care, treatment, housing, and transportation of animals.

PART 3 STANDARDS

. . . .

SUBPART F SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE HUMANE HANDLING, CARE, TREATMENT, AND TRANSPORTATION OF WARMBLOODED ANIMALS OTHER THAN DOGS, CATS, RABBITS, HAMSTERS, GUINEA PIGS, NONHUMAN PRIMATES, AND MARINE MAMMALS

FACILITIES AND OPERATING STANDARDS

§ 3.125 Facilities, general.

(a) *Structural strength.* The facility must be constructed of such material and of such strength as appropriate for the animals involved. The indoor and outdoor housing facilities shall be structurally sound and shall be maintained in good repair to protect the animals from injury and to contain the animals.

§ 3.127 Facilities, outdoor.

. . . .

(c) *Drainage.* A suitable method shall be provided to rapidly eliminate excess water. The method of drainage shall comply with applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations relating to pollution control or the protection of the environment.

ANIMAL HEALTH AND HUSBANDRY STANDARDS

§ 3.129 Feeding.

(a) The food shall be wholesome, palatable, and free from contamination and of sufficient quantity and nutritive value to maintain all animals in good health. The diet shall be prepared with consideration for the age, species, condition, size, and type of the animal. Animals shall be fed at least once a day except as dictated by hibernation, veterinary treatment, normal fasts, or other professionally accepted practices.

§ 3.130 Watering.

If potable water is not accessible to the animals at all times, it must be provided as often as necessary for the health and comfort of the animal. Frequency of watering shall consider age, species, condition, size, and type of the animal. All water receptacles shall be kept clean and sanitary.

§ 3.131 Sanitation.

(a) *Cleaning of enclosures.* Excreta shall be removed from primary enclosures as often as necessary to prevent contamination of the animals contained therein and to minimize disease hazards and to reduce odors. When enclosures are cleaned by hosing or flushing, adequate measures shall be taken to protect the animals confined in such enclosures from being directly sprayed with the stream of water or wetted involuntarily.

....

(c) *Housekeeping.* Premises (buildings and grounds) shall be kept clean and in good repair in order to protect the animals from injury and to facilitate the prescribed husbandry practices set forth in this subpart. Accumulations of trash shall be placed in designated areas and cleared as necessary to protect the health of the animals.

9 C.F.R. §§ 1.1; 2.40, .75(b)(1), .100(a); 3.125(a) .127(c), .129(a), .130, .131(a), (c).

**CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE S
INITIAL DECISION AND ORDER
(AS RESTATED)**

Preliminary Statement

Complainant instituted this proceeding under the Animal Welfare Act by filing a Complaint alleging that Respondent willfully violated the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards. The Hearing Clerk served a copy of the Complaint and the Rules of Practice on Respondent by certified mail. Respondent signed for the certified mailing on April 19, 2002. The mailing informed Respondent that he must file an answer

pursuant to the Rules of Practice and that failure to answer any allegation in the Complaint would constitute an admission of that allegation.

Respondent failed to file an answer within the time prescribed in the Rules of Practice, and the material facts alleged in the Complaint, which are deemed to be admitted by Respondent's failure to file a timely answer, are adopted and set forth in this Decision and Order as Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

This Decision and Order, therefore, is issued pursuant to section 1.139 of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.139).

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

I

A. Respondent is an individual doing business as Wild Iowa whose mailing address is 720 E. Elm, Sigourney, Iowa 52591.

B. Respondent, at all times material to this proceeding, was licensed and operating as an exhibitor as defined in the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations.

II

A. On August 8 and 9, 2000, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service inspected Respondent's premises and found Respondent had failed to maintain programs of disease control and prevention, euthanasia, and adequate veterinary care under the supervision and assistance of a doctor of veterinary medicine and failed to provide

veterinary care to animals in need of care, in willful violation of section 2.40 of the Regulations (9 C.F.R. § 2.40).

B. On August 8 and 9, 2000, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service inspected Respondent s premises and records and found Respondent had failed to maintain complete records showing the acquisition, disposition, and identification of animals, in willful violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. § 2140) and section 2.75(b)(1) of the Regulations (9 C.F.R. § 2.75(b)(1)).

C. On August 31, 1998, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service inspected Respondent s facility and found the following willful violations of section 2.100(a) of the Regulations (9 C.F.R. § 2.100(a)) and the Standards:

1. Respondent failed to provide facilities for Respondent s animals that were structurally sound so as to protect the animals from injury, to contain the animals, and to restrict the entrance of other animals, because the facility was not constructed in a manner appropriate for the animals involved, in that the facility lacked a suitable perimeter fence or equivalent safeguards necessary for the safe containment of dangerous, carnivorous wild animals, in willful violation of section 3.125(a) of the Standards (9 C.F.R. § 3.125(a));

2. Respondent failed to provide a suitable method to rapidly eliminate excess water from outdoor housing facilities for animals, in willful violation of section 3.127(c) of the Standards (9 C.F.R. § 3.127(c));

3. Respondent failed to provide animals with wholesome and uncontaminated food, in willful violation of section 3.129(a) of the Standards (9 C.F.R. § 3.129(a));
4. Respondent failed to keep water receptacles clean and sanitary, in willful violation of section 3.130 of the Standards (9 C.F.R. § 3.130);
5. Respondent failed to keep primary enclosures clean, in willful violation of section 3.131(a) of the Standards (9 C.F.R. § 3.131(a)); and
6. Respondent failed to keep the premises clean and in good repair and free of accumulations of trash, in willful violation of section 3.131(c) of the Standards (9 C.F.R. § 3.131(c)).

Conclusions

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction in this matter.
2. The Order issued in this Decision and Order, *infra*, is authorized by the Animal Welfare Act and warranted under the circumstances.

ADDITIONAL CONCLUSIONS BY THE JUDICIAL OFFICER

The Hearing Clerk served Respondent with the Initial Decision and Order on August 17, 2002.⁵ On September 17, 2002, 31 days after service, Respondent filed an appeal petition. Section 1.145(a) of the Rules of Practice provides that an appeal must be filed within 30 days after service of an administrative law judge's decision, as follows:

⁵See note 4.

§ 1.145 Appeal to Judicial Officer.

(a) *Filing of petition.* Within 30 days after receiving service of the Judge s decision, a party who disagrees with the decision, or any part thereof, or any ruling by the Judge or any alleged deprivation of rights, may appeal such decision to the Judicial Officer by filing an appeal petition with the Hearing Clerk.

7 C.F.R. § 1.145(a).

Respondent s late-filed appeal could be denied. However, section 1.139 of the Rules of Practice provides that an administrative law judge s default decision becomes final 35 days after service of the default decision, as follows:

§ 1.139 Procedure upon failure to file an answer or admission of facts.

. . . Where the decision as proposed by complainant is entered, such decision shall become final and effective without further proceedings 35 days after the date of service thereof upon the respondent, unless there is an appeal to the Judicial Officer by a party to the proceeding pursuant to § 1.145.

7 C.F.R. § 1.139.

Thus, in accordance with section 1.139 of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.139), a default decision does not become final and effective until 5 days after the 30-day appeal time has elapsed. This provision was placed in the Rules of Practice so that if an appeal is inadvertently filed up to 4 days late, *e.g.*, because of a delay in the mail system, an extension of time could be granted by the Judicial Officer for the filing of a late appeal.⁶

⁶*In re Scamcorp, Inc.*, 55 Agric. Dec. 1395, 1405-06 (1996) (Ruling on Respondent s Motion to Reconsider Ruling Denying Motion to Dismiss Appeal); *In re* (continued...)

The Judicial Officer has jurisdiction to hear an appeal petition filed after the 30-day appeal time has elapsed but before the administrative law judge's decision becomes final.

The Chief ALJ's Initial Decision and Order had not become final on September 17, 2002, when Respondent filed his appeal petition. The postmark on the envelope containing Respondent's appeal petition indicates that Respondent mailed the appeal petition from Sigourney, Iowa, on September 10, 2002. Under these circumstances, I grant Respondent a 1-day extension of time for filing his appeal.⁷

⁶(...continued)

Sandra L. Reid, 55 Agric. Dec. 996, 999-1000 (1996); *In re Rinella's Wholesale, Inc.*, 44 Agric. Dec. 1234, 1236 (1985) (Order Denying Pet. for Recons.); *In re William T. Powell*, 44 Agric. Dec. 1220, 1222 (1985) (Order Denying Late Appeal); *In re Palmer G. Hulings*, 44 Agric. Dec. 298, 300-01 (1985) (Order Denying Late Appeal), *appeal dismissed*, No. 85-1220 (10th Cir. Aug. 16, 1985); *In re Toscony Provision Co.*, 43 Agric. Dec. 1106, 1108 (1984) (Order Denying Late Appeal), *aff d*, No. 81-1729 (D.N.J. Mar. 11, 1985) (court reviewed merits notwithstanding late administrative appeal), *aff d*, 782 F.2d 1031 (3d Cir. 1986) (unpublished); *In re Henry S. Shatkin*, 34 Agric. Dec. 296, 315 (1975) (Order Granting Motion to Withdraw Appeal).

⁷Had the Chief ALJ's Initial Decision and Order become final prior to Respondent's filing an appeal, the Judicial Officer would not have had jurisdiction to consider Respondent's appeal. See *In re Samuel K. Angel*, 61 Agric. Dec. ____ (Apr. 24, 2002) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 3 days after the initial decision and order became final); *In re Paul Eugenio*, 60 Agric. Dec. 676 (2001) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 1 day after the initial decision and order became final); *In re Harold P. Kafka*, 58 Agric. Dec. 357 (1999) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 15 days after the initial decision and order became final), *aff d per curiam*, 259 F.3d 716 (3d Cir. 2001) (Table); *In re Kevin Ackerman*, 58 Agric. Dec. 340 (1999) (dismissing Kevin Ackerman's appeal petition filed 1 day after the initial decision and order became final); *In re Severin Peterson*, 57 Agric. Dec. 1304 (1998) (dismissing the applicant's appeal petition filed 23 days after the initial decision and order became final); *In re Queen City Farms, Inc.*, 57 Agric. Dec. 813 (1998) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 58 days after the initial decision and order became final); *In re Gail* (continued...)

⁷(...continued)

Davis, 56 Agric. Dec. 373 (1997) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 41 days after the initial decision and order became final); *In re Field Market Produce, Inc.*, 55 Agric. Dec. 1418 (1996) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 8 days after the initial decision and order became effective); *In re Ow Duk Kwon*, 55 Agric. Dec. 78 (1996) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 35 days after the initial decision and order became effective); *In re New York Primate Center, Inc.*, 53 Agric. Dec. 529 (1994) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 2 days after the initial decision and order became final); *In re K. Lester*, 52 Agric. Dec. 332 (1993) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 14 days after the initial decision and order became final and effective); *In re Amril L. Carrington*, 52 Agric. Dec. 331 (1993) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 7 days after the initial decision and order became final and effective); *In re Teofilo Benicta*, 52 Agric. Dec. 321 (1993) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 6 days after the initial decision and order became final and effective); *In re Newark Produce Distributors, Inc.*, 51 Agric. Dec. 955 (1992) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed after the initial decision and order became final and effective); *In re Laura May Kurjan*, 51 Agric. Dec. 438 (1992) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed after the initial decision and order became final); *In re Kermit Breed*, 50 Agric. Dec. 675 (1991) (dismissing the respondent's late-filed appeal petition); *In re Bihari Lall*, 49 Agric. Dec. 896 (1990) (stating the respondent's appeal petition, filed after the initial decision became final, must be dismissed because it was not timely filed); *In re Dale Haley*, 48 Agric. Dec. 1072 (1989) (stating the respondent's appeal petition, filed after the initial decision became final and effective, must be dismissed because it was not timely filed); *In re Mary Fran Hamilton*, 45 Agric. Dec. 2395 (1986) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed with the Hearing Clerk on the day the initial decision and order had become final and effective); *In re Bushelle Cattle Co.*, 45 Agric. Dec. 1131 (1986) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 2 days after the initial decision and order became final and effective); *In re William T. Powell*, 44 Agric. Dec. 1220 (1985) (stating it has consistently been held that, under the Rules of Practice, the Judicial Officer has no jurisdiction to hear an appeal after the initial decision and order becomes final); *In re Toscony Provision Co., Inc.*, 43 Agric. Dec. 1106 (1984) (stating the Judicial Officer has no jurisdiction to hear an appeal that is filed after the initial decision becomes final), *aff d*, No. 81-1729 (D.N.J. Mar. 11, 1985) (court reviewed merits notwithstanding late administrative appeal), *aff d*, 782 F.2d 1031 (3d Cir. 1986) (unpublished); *In re Dock Case Brokerage Co.*, 42 Agric. Dec. 1950 (1983) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed 5 days after the initial decision and order became final); *In re Veg-Pro*

(continued...)

Thus, I deem Respondent's appeal petition filed September 17, 2002, to have been timely filed.

Respondent denies the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards alleged in the Complaint and found by the Chief ALJ in the Initial Decision and Order (Appeal Pet.).

Respondent's denials come too late to be considered. Respondent is deemed, for purposes of this proceeding, to have admitted the allegations in the Complaint because he failed to answer the Complaint within 20 days after the Hearing Clerk served him with the Complaint.

⁷(...continued)

Distributors, 42 Agric. Dec. 1173 (1983) (denying the respondent's appeal petition filed 1 day after the default decision and order became final); *In re Samuel Simon Petro*, 42 Agric. Dec. 921 (1983) (stating the Judicial Officer has no jurisdiction to hear an appeal that is filed after the initial decision and order becomes final and effective); *In re Yankee Brokerage, Inc.*, 42 Agric. Dec. 427 (1983) (dismissing the respondent's appeal petition filed on the day the initial decision became effective); *In re Charles Brink*, 41 Agric. Dec. 2146 (1982) (stating the Judicial Officer has no jurisdiction to consider the respondent's appeal dated before the initial decision and order became final, but not filed until 4 days after the initial decision and order became final and effective), *reconsideration denied*, 41 Agric. Dec. 2147 (1982); *In re Mel's Produce, Inc.*, 40 Agric. Dec. 792 (1981) (stating since the respondent's petition for reconsideration was not filed within 35 days after service of the default decision, the default decision became final and neither the administrative law judge nor the Judicial Officer has jurisdiction to consider the respondent's petition); *In re Animal Research Center of Massachusetts, Inc.*, 38 Agric. Dec. 379 (1978) (stating failure to file an appeal petition before the effective date of the initial decision is jurisdictional); *In re Willie Cook*, 39 Agric. Dec. 116 (1978) (stating it is the consistent policy of the United States Department of Agriculture not to consider appeals filed more than 35 days after service of the initial decision).

The Hearing Clerk served Respondent with the Complaint, the Rules of Practice, and the Hearing Clerk's April 12, 2002, service letter on April 19, 2002.⁸ Sections 1.136(a), 1.136(c), 1.139, and 1.141(a) of the Rules of Practice clearly state the time within which an answer must be filed and the consequences of failing to file a timely answer, as follows:

§ 1.136 Answer.

(a) *Filing and service.* Within 20 days after the service of the complaint . . . , the respondent shall file with the Hearing Clerk an answer signed by the respondent or the attorney of record in the proceeding

. . . .

(c) *Default.* Failure to file an answer within the time provided under § 1.136(a) shall be deemed, for purposes of the proceeding, an admission of the allegations in the Complaint, and failure to deny or otherwise respond to an allegation of the Complaint shall be deemed, for purposes of the proceeding, an admission of said allegation, unless the parties have agreed to a consent decision pursuant to § 1.138.

§ 1.139 Procedure upon failure to file an answer or admission of facts.

The failure to file an answer, or the admission by the answer of all the material allegations of fact contained in the complaint, shall constitute a waiver of hearing. Upon such admission or failure to file, complainant shall file a proposed decision, along with a motion for the adoption thereof, both of which shall be served upon the respondent by the Hearing Clerk. Within 20 days after service of such motion and proposed decision, the respondent may file with the Hearing Clerk objections thereto. If the Judge finds that meritorious objections have been filed, complainant's Motion shall be denied with supporting reasons. If meritorious objections are not filed, the Judge shall issue a decision without further procedure or hearing.

⁸See note 1.

§ 1.141 Procedure for hearing.

(a) *Request for hearing.* Any party may request a hearing on the facts by including such request in the complaint or answer, or by a separate request, in writing, filed with the Hearing Clerk within the time in which an answer may be filed Failure to request a hearing within the time allowed for the filing of the answer shall constitute a waiver of such hearing.

7 C.F.R. §§ 1.136(a), (c), .139, .141(a).

Moreover, the Complaint clearly informs Respondent of the consequences of failing to file a timely answer, as follows:

The respondent shall file an answer with the Hearing Clerk, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250-9200, in accordance with the Rules of Practice governing proceedings under the Act (7 C.F.R. § 1.130 et seq.). Failure to file an answer shall constitute an admission of all the material allegations of this complaint.

Compl. at 3.

Similarly, the Hearing Clerk informed Respondent in the April 12, 2002, service letter that a timely answer must be filed pursuant to the Rules of Practice and that failure to file a timely answer to any allegation in the Complaint would constitute an admission of that allegation, as follows:

April 12, 2002

Mr. David Finch d/b/a
Wild Iowa
720 E. Elm
Sigourney, Iowa 52591

Dear Mr. Finch:

Subject: In re: David Finch d/b/a Wild Iowa - Respondent
AWA Docket No. 02-0014

Enclosed is a copy of a Complaint, which has been filed with this office under the Animal Welfare Act, as amended.

Also enclosed is a copy of the Rules of Practice which govern the conduct of these proceedings. You should familiarize yourself with the rules in that the comments which follow are not a substitute for their exact requirements.

The rules specify that you may represent yourself personally or by an attorney of record. Unless an attorney files an appearance in your behalf, it shall be presumed that you have elected to represent yourself personally. Most importantly, you have 20 days from the receipt of this letter to file with the Hearing Clerk an original and four copies of your written and signed answer to the complaint. It is necessary that your answer set forth any defense you wish to assert, and to specifically admit, deny or explain each allegation of the complaint. Your answer may include a request for an oral hearing. Failure to file an answer or filing an answer which does not deny the material allegations of the complaint, shall constitute an admission of those allegations and a waiver of your right to an oral hearing. In the event this proceeding does go to hearing, the hearing shall be formal in nature and will be held and the case decided by an Administrative Law Judge on the basis of exhibits received in evidence and sworn testimony subject to cross-examination.

You must notify us of any future address changes. Failure to do so may result in a judgment being entered against you without your knowledge. We also need your present and future telephone number [sic].

Your answer, as well as any motions or requests that you may hereafter wish to file in this proceeding should be submitted in quadruplicate to the Hearing Clerk, OALJ, Room 1081, South Building, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250-9200.

Questions you may have respecting the possible settlement of this case should be directed to the attorney whose name and telephone number appears [sic] on the last page of the complaint.

Sincerely,

/s/

Joyce A. Dawson
Hearing Clerk

On May 20, 2002, the Hearing Clerk sent a letter to Respondent informing him that his answer to the Complaint had not been received within the time required in the Rules of Practice.⁹ On July 1, 2002, in accordance with section 1.139 of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.139), Complainant filed Complainant s Motion for Default Decision and Complainant s Proposed Default Decision. The Hearing Clerk served Respondent with Complainant s Motion for Default Decision, Complainant s Proposed Default Decision, and a service letter on July 11, 2002.¹⁰ On August 6, 2002, Respondent filed an Answer in which he denied the allegations in paragraph II of the Complaint.

Although, on rare occasions, default decisions have been set aside for good cause shown or where the complainant states that the complainant does not object to setting

⁹See note 2.

¹⁰See note 3.

aside the default decision,¹¹ generally there is no basis for setting aside a default decision that is based upon a respondent's failure to file a timely answer.¹²

¹¹See *In re Dale Goodale*, 60 Agric. Dec. 670 (2001) (Remand Order) (setting aside the default decision because the administrative law judge adopted apparently inconsistent findings of a dispositive fact in the default decision, and the order in the default decision was not clear); *In re Deora Sewnanan*, 60 Agric. Dec. 688 (2001) (setting aside the default decision because the respondent was not served with the complaint); *In re H. Schnell & Co.*, 57 Agric. Dec. 1722 (1998) (Remand Order) (setting aside the default decision, which was based upon the respondent's statements during two telephone conference calls with the administrative law judge and the complainant's counsel, because the respondent's statements did not constitute a clear admission of the material allegations in the complaint and concluding that the default decision deprived the respondent of its right to due process under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States); *In re Arizona Livestock Auction, Inc.*, 55 Agric. Dec. 1121 (1996) (setting aside the default decision because facts alleged in the complaint and deemed admitted by failure to answer were not sufficient to find a violation of the Packers and Stockyards Act or jurisdiction over the matter by the Secretary of Agriculture); *In re Veg-Pro Distributors*, 42 Agric. Dec. 273 (1983) (Remand Order) (setting aside the default decision because service of the complaint by registered and regular mail was returned as undeliverable, and the respondent's license under the PACA had lapsed before service was attempted), *final decision*, 42 Agric. Dec. 1173 (1983); *In re Vaughn Gallop*, 40 Agric. Dec. 217 (1981) (Order Vacating Default Decision and Remanding Proceeding) (vacating the default decision and remanding the case to the administrative law judge to determine whether just cause exists for permitting late answer), *final decision*, 40 Agric. Dec. 1254 (1981); *In re J. Fleishman & Co.*, 38 Agric. Dec. 789 (1978) (Remand Order) (remanding the proceeding to the administrative law judge for the purpose of receiving evidence because the complainant had no objection to the respondent's motion for remand), *final decision*, 37 Agric. Dec. 1175 (1978); *In re Richard Cain*, 17 Agric. Dec. 985 (1958) (Order Reopening After Default) (setting aside a default decision and accepting a late-filed answer because the complainant did not object to the respondent's motion to reopen after default).

¹²See generally *In re Heartland Kennels, Inc.*, 61 Agric. Dec. ____ (Oct. 8, 2002) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondents filed an answer 3 months 9 days after they were served with the complaint; stating the respondents are deemed, by their failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint); *In re*
(continued...)

¹²(...continued)

Steven Bourk (Decision as to Steven Bourk and Carmella Bourk), 61 Agric. Dec. ____ (Jan. 4, 2002) (holding the default decision was properly issued where Respondent Steven Bourk s first and only filing was 10 months 9 days after he was served with the complaint and Respondent Carmella Bourk s first filing was 5 months 5 days after she was served with the complaint; stating both respondents are deemed, by their failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations alleged in the complaint); *In re Beth Lutz*, 60 Agric. Dec. 53 (2001) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent filed her answer 23 days after she was served with the complaint and 3 days after the respondent s answer was due and holding the respondent is deemed, by her failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Regulations alleged in the complaint); *In re Curtis G. Foley*, 59 Agric. Dec. 581 (2000) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondents filed their answer 6 months 5 days after they were served with the complaint and 5 months 16 days after the respondents answer was due and holding the respondents are deemed, by their failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint); *In re Nancy M. Kutz* (Decision as to Nancy M. Kutz), 58 Agric. Dec. 744 (1999) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent s first filing in the proceeding was 28 days after service of the complaint on the respondent and the filing did not respond to the allegations of the complaint and holding the respondent is deemed, by her failure to file a timely answer and by her failure to deny the allegations of the complaint, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations alleged in the complaint); *In re Anna Mae Noell*, 58 Agric. Dec. 130 (1999) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondents filed an answer 49 days after service of the complaint on the respondents and holding the respondents are deemed, by their failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint), *appeal dismissed sub nom. The Chimp Farm, Inc. v. United States Dep t of Agric.*, No. 00-10608-A (11th Cir. July 20, 2000); *In re Jack D. Stowers*, 57 Agric. Dec. 944 (1998) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent filed his answer 1 year 12 days after service of the complaint on the respondent and holding the respondent is deemed, by his failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint); *In re James J. Everhart*, 56 Agric. Dec. 1400 (1997) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent s first filing was more than 8 months after service of the complaint on the respondent and holding the respondent is deemed, by his failure to file a timely answer, to

(continued...)

¹²(...continued)

have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations alleged in the complaint); *In re John Walker*, 56 Agric. Dec. 350 (1997) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent's first filing was 126 days after service of the complaint on the respondent and holding the respondent is deemed, by his failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint); *In re Mary Meyers*, 56 Agric. Dec. 322 (1997) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent's first filing was 117 days after the respondent's answer was due and holding the respondent is deemed, by her failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint); *In re Dora Hampton*, 56 Agric. Dec. 301 (1997) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent's first filing was 135 days after the respondent's answer was due and holding the respondent is deemed, by her failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint); *In re City of Orange*, 55 Agric. Dec. 1081 (1996) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent's first filing was 70 days after the respondent's answer was due and holding the respondent is deemed, by its failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint); *In re Ronald DeBruin*, 54 Agric. Dec. 876 (1995) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent failed to file an answer and holding the respondent is deemed, by his failure to file an answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint); *In re James Joseph Hickey, Jr.*, 53 Agric. Dec. 1087 (1994) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent failed to file an answer and holding the respondent is deemed, by his failure to file an answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint); *In re Ron Morrow*, 53 Agric. Dec. 144 (1994) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent was given an extension of time until March 22, 1994, to file an answer, but the answer was not received until March 25, 1994, and holding the respondent is deemed, by his failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint), *aff'd per curiam*, 65 F.3d 168 (Table), 1995 WL 523336 (6th Cir. 1995); *In re Dean Daul*, 45 Agric. Dec. 556 (1986) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent failed to file a timely answer and, in his late answer, did not deny the material allegations of the complaint and holding the respondent is deemed, by his failure to file a timely answer and by his failure to deny the allegations in the complaint in
(continued...)

The Rules of Practice provide that an answer must be filed within 20 days after service of the complaint (7 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)). Respondent's first filing in this proceeding was August 6, 2002, 3 months 18 days after the Hearing Clerk served Respondent with the Complaint. Respondent's failure to file a timely answer is deemed, for purposes of this proceeding, an admission of the allegations in the Complaint and constitutes a waiver of hearing (7 C.F.R. §§ 1.136(c), .139, .141(a)).

Accordingly, there are no issues of fact on which a meaningful hearing could be held in this proceeding, and the Chief ALJ properly issued the Initial Decision and Order. Application of the default provisions of the Rules of Practice does not deprive Respondent of his rights under the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.¹³

¹²(...continued)

his late answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations alleged in the complaint); *In re Ronald Jacobson*, 43 Agric. Dec. 780 (1984) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondents failed to file a timely answer and holding the respondents are deemed, by their failure to file a timely answer, to have admitted the violations of the Standards alleged in the complaint); *In re Willard Lambert*, 43 Agric. Dec. 46 (1984) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondent failed to file an answer and holding the respondent is deemed, by his failure to file an answer, to have admitted the violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards alleged in the complaint); *In re Randy & Mary Berhow*, 42 Agric. Dec. 764 (1983) (holding the default decision was properly issued where the respondents failed to file an answer and holding the respondents are deemed, by their failure to file an answer, to have admitted the violations of the Standards alleged in the complaint).

¹³*See United States v. Hulings*, 484 F. Supp. 562, 567-68 (D. Kan. 1980) (concluding that a hearing was not required under the Fifth Amendment to the United

(continued...)

For the foregoing reasons, the following Order should be issued.

ORDER

1. Respondent, his agents, employees, successors, and assigns, directly or through any corporate or other device, shall cease and desist from violating the Animal Welfare Act and the Regulations and Standards, and in particular, shall cease and desist from:

- (a) Failing to store supplies of food so as to adequately protect them against contamination;
- (b) Failing to provide animals with adequate potable water;
- (c) Failing to construct and maintain housing facilities for animals so that the housing facilities are structurally sound and in good repair in order to protect the animals from injury, contain them securely, and restrict other animals from entering;

¹³(...continued)

States Constitution where the respondent was notified that failure to deny the allegations of the complaint would constitute an admission of those allegations under the Rules of Practice and the respondent failed to specifically deny the allegations). *See also Father & Sons Lumber and Building Supplies, Inc. v. NLRB*, 931 F.2d 1093, 1096 (6th Cir. 1991) (stating that due process generally does not entitle parties to an evidentiary hearing where the National Labor Relations Board has properly determined that a default summary judgment is appropriate due to a party's failure to file a timely response); *Kirk v. INS*, 927 F.2d 1106, 1108 (9th Cir. 1991) (rejecting the contention that the administrative law judge erred by issuing a default judgment based on a party's failure to file a timely answer).

(d) Failing to keep the premises clean and in good repair and free of accumulations of trash, junk, waste, and discarded matter, and to control weeds, grasses, and bushes;

(e) Failing to maintain records of the acquisition, disposition, description, and identification of animals, as required; and

(f) Failing to establish and maintain programs of disease control and prevention, euthanasia, and adequate veterinary care under the supervision and assistance of a doctor of veterinary medicine.

The cease and desist provisions of this Order shall become effective on the day after service of this Order on Respondent.

2. Respondent is assessed a \$4,000 civil penalty. The civil penalty shall be paid by a certified check or money order made payable to the Treasurer of the United States and sent to:

Donald A. Tracy
United States Department of Agriculture
Office of the General Counsel
Marketing Division
1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Room 2343-South Building
Washington, DC 20250-1417

Respondent's payment of the \$4,000 civil penalty shall be sent to, and received by, Donald A. Tracy within 60 days after service of this Order on Respondent. Respondent

shall state on the certified check or money order that payment is in reference to AWA Docket No. 02-0014.

3. Respondent is permanently disqualified from obtaining an Animal Welfare Act license.

The Animal Welfare Act license disqualification provision of this Order shall become effective on the day after service of this Order on Respondent.

4. Respondent has the right to seek judicial review of this Order in the appropriate United States Court of Appeals in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §§ 2341, 2343-2350. Such court has exclusive jurisdiction to enjoin, to set aside, to suspend (in whole or in part), or to determine the validity of this Order. Respondent must seek judicial review within 60 days after entry of this Order. 7 U.S.C. § 2149(c). The date of entry of this Order is October 23, 2002.

Done at Washington, DC

October 23, 2002

William G. Jenson
Judicial Officer