

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BEFORE THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

In re: ) AMAA Docket No. 04-0002  
)  
Marvin D. Horne and Laura R. )  
Horne, d/b/a Raisin Valley Farms, )  
a partnership and d/b/a Raisin )  
Valley Farms Marketing )  
Association, a/k/a Raisin Valley )  
Marketing, an unincorporated )  
association )  
)  
and )  
)  
Marvin D. Horne, Laura R. )  
Horne, Don Durbahn, and )  
The Estate of Rena Durbahn, d/b/a )  
Lassen Vineyards, a partnership, )  
)  
Respondents ) **Decision and Order**

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

The Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture [hereinafter the Administrator], instituted this disciplinary proceeding on April 1, 2004, by filing a Complaint alleging that, during crop years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, Marvin D. Horne and Laura R. Horne, d/b/a Raisin Valley Farms, did not comply with the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C.

§§ 601-674) [hereinafter the AMAA], and the federal order regulating the handling of Raisins Produced from Grapes Grown in California (7 C.F.R. pt. 989) [hereinafter the Raisin Order]. On October 25, 2004, the Administrator filed an Amended Complaint which made minor amendments to the Complaint. On August 10, 2005, with permission from Administrative Law Judge Victor W. Palmer [hereinafter the ALJ], the Administrator filed a Second Amended Complaint. In the Second Amended Complaint, the Administrator made amendments to conform the Complaint to the evidence presented at the hearing conducted on February 9-11, 2005, as well as to add Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association, also known as Raisin Valley Marketing, an unincorporated association, and Marvin D. Horne, Laura R. Horne, Don Durbahn, and the Estate of Rena Durbahn, a partnership, d/b/a Lassen Vineyards, as parties to the proceeding.

Under the Raisin Order, handlers<sup>1</sup> who first handle the raisins are required to: (1) obtain inspections of raisins acquired or received (7 C.F.R. § 989.58(d)); (2) hold acquired raisins designated as reserve tonnage for the account of the Raisin

---

<sup>1</sup>The term “handler” means: (a) any processor or packer; (b) any person who places, ships, or continues natural condition raisins in the current of commerce from within the area to any point outside the area; (c) any person who delivers off-grade raisins, other failing raisins or raisin residual material to other than a packer or other than into any eligible non-normal outlet; or (d) any person who blends raisins: *Provided*, That blending shall not cause a person not otherwise a handler to be a handler on account of such blending if he is either: (1) a producer who, in his capacity as a producer, blends raisins entirely of his own production in the course of his usual and customary practices of preparing raisins for delivery to processors, packers, or dehydrators; (2) a person who blends raisins after they have been placed in trade channels by a packer with other such raisins in trade channels; or (3) a dehydrator who, in his capacity as a dehydrator, blends raisins entirely of his own manufacture (7 C.F.R. § 989.15).

Administrative Committee [hereinafter the RAC] (7 C.F.R. §§ 989.66, .166); (3) file accurate reports with the RAC (7 C.F.R. § 989.73); (4) allow access to records to verify the accuracy of the records (7 C.F.R. § 989.77); and (5) pay assessments to the RAC (7 C.F.R. § 989.80).

Marvin D. Horne and the other respondents dispute that they are handlers claiming they never obtained any raisins through purchase or transfer of ownership to any of the business entities that Mr. Horne and his partners operate. Mr. Horne and his partners argue they did not *acquire* raisins within the meaning of the Raisin Order. They further argue they are not subject to the requirements of the Raisin Order because they are farmers/producers who have acted in good faith to advance the stated policy of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. §§ 3001-3006).

The ALJ held an oral hearing in Fresno, California, on February 9-11, 2005 (Tr. I), and May 23, 2006 (Tr. II). Frank Martin, Jr., Office of the General Counsel, United States Department of Agriculture, represented the Administrator during the portion of the hearing conducted on February 9-11, 2005. Babak A. Rastgoufard, Office of the General Counsel, United States Department of Agriculture, joined Mr. Martin during the May 23, 2006, portion of the hearing. David A. Domina and Michael Stumo, DominaLaw Group, Omaha, Nebraska, represented Mr. Horne and the other respondents.

On December 8, 2006, the ALJ issued a Decision and Order in which he found that Marvin D. Horne, Laura R. Horne, Don Durbahn, and Rena Durbahn, now deceased,

acting together as partners doing business as Lassen Vineyards,<sup>2</sup> at all times material to this proceeding, acted as a handler of raisins subject to the inspection, assessment, reporting, verification, and reserve requirements of the Raisin Order. The ALJ further found that Mr. Horne and partners violated the AMAA and the Raisin Order by failing to obtain inspections of acquired incoming raisins, failing to hold requisite tonnages of raisins in reserve, failing to file accurate reports, failing to allow access to their records, and failing to pay requisite assessments.

The ALJ concluded that the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 does not exempt farmers/producers who act as handlers from regulation under federal marketing orders. The ALJ further concluded that the violations by Mr. Horne and partners require the entry of an order directing them to pay the RAC assessments they have failed to pay and to pay the RAC the dollar equivalent of the raisins they failed to hold in reserve. Moreover, the ALJ concluded that the violations were deliberate and were designed to obtain an unfair competitive advantage over other California raisin handlers who were in compliance with the Raisin Order. Pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 608c(14)(B), the ALJ assessed Mr. Horne and partners a \$731,500 civil penalty and ordered payment of \$523,037 for the dollar equivalent of raisins not held in reserve and \$9,389.73 for owed assessments.

---

<sup>2</sup>In this Decision and Order, I refer to these respondents, as well as the partnership Raisin Valley Farms, as “Mr. Horne and partners” unless clarity dictates otherwise.

On January 4, 2007, Marvin D. Horne and Laura R. Horne, d/b/a Raisin Valley Farms, and Marvin D. Horne, Laura R. Horne, and Don Durbahn, a partnership, d/b/a Lassen Vineyards, filed a timely petition for review of the ALJ's Decision and Order and requested oral argument before the Judicial Officer. The request for oral argument before the Judicial Officer, which the Judicial Officer may grant, refuse, or limit (7 C.F.R. § 1.145(d)), is refused because the issues have been fully briefed; thus, oral argument would appear to serve no useful purpose.

## **DECISION**

### **Findings of Fact**

Marvin D. Horne has been a farmer since 1969. Mr. Horne and his wife Laura R. Horne grow Thompson seedless grapes for raisins. Their grape-growing and raisin-producing activities operate under the registered trademark "Raisin Valley Farms." Raisin Valley Farms is one of the largest operations in the California valley where most of the world's raisins are produced (Tr. I at 868-69). Marvin D. Horne and Laura R. Horne also do business as Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association (also known as Raisin Valley Marketing). Both Raisin Valley Farms and Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association have the same business mailing address in Kerman, California. (Tr. I at 873-74.)

During the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 crop years, Marvin D. Horne and Laura R. Horne also operated a partnership with Laura's father, Don Durbahn, and Laura's mother,

Rena Durbahn (now deceased). This partnership did business and continues to do business, as Lassen Vineyards, also in Kerman, California. Prior to 2002, Lassen Vineyards was exclusively a farming partnership that produced Thompson seedless grapes made into raisins (Tr. I at 870). In 2002, Lassen Vineyards started operating raisin packing plant equipment at the Kerman, California, location (Tr. I at 871-73).

In 1998, Marvin D. Horne and Laura R. Horne expressed an interest to the RAC about acting as a handler of California raisins under the Raisin Order (CX 94). In 1999, Marvin D. Horne and Laura R. Horne filed a fictitious name certificate in the Fresno (California) County Clerk's Office in which they adopted the name "Raisin Valley Farms" (CX 95, CX 96). Then, for crop years 2001-2002, 2002-2003, and 2003-2004, Mr. and Mrs. Horne, under the Raisin Valley Farms' name, filed RAC-5 forms, notifying the RAC of their intention to handle raisins as a packer under the Raisin Order (CX 98, CX 100, CX 102). During this time-frame, Mr. Horne served 6 years as an alternate member of the RAC (Tr. I at 175; CX 103, CX 104).

Lassen Vineyards is a partnership formed in 1995 by Marvin D. Horne, Laura R. Horne, Don Durbahn, and the late Rena Durbahn. The partnership was created "to engaged [sic] in farming and any other farming related business." (RX 12 at 1.) The partnership owned land in Kerman, California, where it produced raisins and operated a raisin packing plant. Don Durbahn and Marvin A. Horne, Mr. and Mrs. Marvin D. Horne's son, supervised the packing activities at Lassen Vineyards (Tr. I at 879-80). The

workers who performed the packing activities at Lassen Vineyards were “leased employees” who were leased to Lassen Vineyards by a partnership of Laura R. Horne and Rena Durbahn (Tr. I at 933-34).

In crop years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, Lassen Vineyards operated the packing plant to process (i.e., to stem, sort, clean, grade, and package) California raisins for themselves and, for a fee, for other raisin producers (Tr. I at 962; Tr. II at 25-27). During this time, Lassen Vineyards charged producers 12 cents per pound to pack raisins and \$5 for each pallet upon which the boxed raisins were stacked (Tr. II at 28, 44). The cost for labor and packaging materials was included in the fee charged (Tr. II at 30-31, 44, 48). All raisins packed by Lassen Vineyards in crop years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 were packaged in boxes stamped with the handler number 94-101. That number had been assigned to Marvin D. Horne and Laura R. Horne (Tr. I at 964-65). When questioned, Mr. Horne indicated that the difference between Lassen Vineyards and a toll packer was that the packed product could leave Lassen Vineyards without the farmer being required to pay fees up front (Tr. I at 979).

On numerous occasions, Mr. Horne exchanged communications with the United States Department of Agriculture and the RAC concerning the Raisin Order, including his responsibilities under the Raisin Order (CX 94, CX 105-CX 110; RX 91-RX 103, RX 105-RX 125, RX 127-RX 149). On March 15, 2001, Marvin D. Horne and Laura R. Horne, through their then attorney, wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture and asked

whether the obligations of the Raisin Order regarding volume regulation, quality control, payment of assessments to the RAC, and reporting requirements would apply if Raisin Valley Farms had its raisins “custom packed” by a packer that would not take title to Raisin Valley Farms’ raisins (RX 95). On April 23, 2001, the Deputy Administrator, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, United States Department of Agriculture, explained that under the scenario presented, Raisin Valley Farms would be neither a packer nor a handler, but that the custom packer would be both a packer and a handler. The Deputy Administrator further explained that the custom packer “acquired” the raisins because it obtained physical possession of the raisins at a packing or processing plant. (7 C.F.R. § 989.17.) Furthermore, the custom packer would be “required to meet the order’s obligations regarding volume regulation, quality control, payment of assessments to the Raisin Administrative Committee (RAC), and reporting requirements.” (RX 98.) The Deputy Administrator also provided Mr. Horne with portions of the 1949 proposed rule making and rule making hearing testimony discussing the treatment of this activity under the Raisin Order. The testimony establishes that the Raisin Order was intended to treat such custom packers (also called toll packers) as handlers (RX 98).

In a number of these communications, the Agricultural Marketing Service clearly informed Mr. Horne that his proposed activities would make him a handler subject to the Raisin Order. In a January 18, 2002, letter, Maureen T. Pello, Senior Marketing Specialist in the Fresno, California, Field Office of the Agricultural Marketing Service,



told Mr. Horne that his proposed activities would make him a handler under the Raisin Order.

As we discussed, based upon your description of your proposed activities, you would be considered a handler under the Federal marketing order for California raisins (order). As a handler, you would be required to meet all of the order's regulations regarding volume control, quality control (which includes incoming and outgoing inspection), assessments, and reporting to the Raisin Administrative Committee (RAC).

RX 100. On May 20, 2002, the Administrator responding to an e-mail and a letter sent by Mr. Horne stated:

You indicate in your correspondence that you plan to pack and market your own raisins. Such activities would make you a handler under the order. As a handler, you would be required to meet all of the order's regulations regarding volume control, quality control (incoming and outgoing inspection), assessments, and reporting to the RAC.

RX 101. Marvin D. Horne expressly disregarded the United States Department of Agriculture's interpretations of the terms of the Raisin Order that he requested.

Mr. Horne did not use the custom packing firm to process his raisins, but rather, he elected to establish a family-owned packing operation at Lassen Vineyards where he packed raisins for his family, and, for a fee, Lassen Vineyards packed raisins for other growers (Tr. I at 977-78). Contrary to the advice Mr. Horne received from the United States Department of Agriculture, Lassen Vineyards did not pay any assessments, did not have any incoming inspections performed, did not file accurate reports, and did not hold any raisins in reserve with respect to any of the raisins Lassen Vineyards received from and packed for growers during the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 crop years (Tr. I at 965-73).

During crop years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, Mr. and Mrs. Horne also operated an unincorporated grower association named “Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association.” Mr. and Mrs. Horne created Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association to “attract the market of buyers.” (Tr. I at 876.) Sixty raisin growers were members of Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association (Tr. II at 55). Membership in Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association allowed the raisin growers to market their raisins under the Hornes’ trade name “Raisin Valley Farms” (Tr. I at 874-78).

When a Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association member sold raisins through the Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association, the association collected the purchase price from the buyer and deducted Lassen Vineyards’ fee for the packing services as well as an accounting fee for Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association and a contribution for a fund to protect members from customers who fail to pay. If the sale was negotiated through a broker, Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association deducted a brokerage fee. After all the deductions were taken, Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association remitted the balance to the grower. (Tr. II at 50-52.) Mr. Horne acknowledged that Lassen Vineyards benefitted from the fees it received from Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association members (Tr. II at 52).

When Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association received an order for raisins, Mr. Horne contacted one of the Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association members inquiring if the member would accept the price offered. When Mr. Horne found a grower

willing to accept the order, he told that grower when to bring the raisins to Lassen Vineyards' packing plant to be stemmed, sorted, cleaned, graded, and packaged (Tr. II at 55-57). The buyer picked up the packaged raisins and left a bill of lading. When the buyer paid for the raisins, Mr. Horne deposited the funds into an account. Originally, the funds were deposited into an account in the name of Mr. and Mrs. Horne. Mr. Horne changed the account to one named "Raisin Valley Farms Marketing, LLT." Now, Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association has "a bone fide Association bank account" from which Mr. Horne, for Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association, disburses funds to Lassen Vineyards, the brokers, and the growers. (Tr. II at 58-60.)

On or about August 22, 2002, Marvin Horne, on behalf of Raisin Valley Farms, submitted an inaccurate RAC-1 Form, Weekly Report of Standard Raisin Acquisitions, to the RAC. Mr. Horne reported to the RAC that Raisin Valley Farms did not acquire any California raisins during the week ending August 3, 2002. (CX 62.) However, the record evidence shows that Raisin Valley Farms acquired more than 95,000 pounds of California raisins during this time period (CX 1, CX 2).

From September 5, 2003, to December 2, 2003, Laura Horne and/or Marvin Horne, on behalf of Raisin Valley Farms, submitted 13 inaccurate RAC-1 Forms, Weekly Report of Standard Raisin Acquisitions, to the RAC.<sup>3</sup> The Hornes reported to the RAC

---

<sup>3</sup>Each of the forms has the number "59" written on the upper left of the form. The number "59" is a packer number assigned by RAC for internal control (Tr. I at 189). In addition, each form has "Raisin Valley Farms" shown as the originating fax machine

(continued...)

that they did not acquire any California raisins during this time period (CX 63-CX 75).

However, the record evidence leads to the conclusion that they acquired substantial amounts of California raisins during this time period (CX 3-CX 56).

From August 1, 2003, to November 30, 2003, Marvin Horne, on behalf of Raisin Valley Farms, submitted four inaccurate RAC-20 Forms, Monthly Reports of Free Tonnage Raisin Disposition, to the RAC (CX 76-CX 79). Mr. Horne reported to the RAC that he did not ship or dispose of any California raisins during this time period. However, the record evidence shows that Raisin Valley Farms shipped substantial amounts of California raisins during this time period (CX 3-CX 56, CX 247-CX 273).

During crop year 2002-2003, Marvin Horne, on behalf of Raisin Valley Farms, submitted an inaccurate RAC-50 Form, Inventory of Free Tonnage Standard Quality Raisins on Hand, to the RAC (CX 80). Mr. Horne reported to the RAC that Raisin Valley Farms did not have any California raisin inventories during this time period. However, the record evidence shows Raisin Valley Farms had inventories of California raisins in that Raisin Valley Farms was shipping substantial amounts of California raisins during this time period (CX 82-CX 87).

During crop year 2002-2003, Marvin Horne, on behalf of Raisin Valley Farms, submitted an inaccurate RAC-51 Form, Inventory of Off-Grade Raisins on Hand, to the RAC (CX 81). Mr. Horne reported to the RAC that Raisin Valley Farms did not have any

---

<sup>3</sup>(...continued)  
identifier (CX 63-CX 75).

California raisin inventories during this time period. However, the record evidence shows Raisin Valley Farms had inventories of California raisins in that Raisin Valley Farms was shipping substantial amounts of California raisins during this time period (CX 1, CX 2, CX 81-CX 87).

During crop year 2002-2003, Mr. Horne and partners failed to obtain incoming inspections of California raisins on at least six occasions (CX 82-CX 87; Tr. I at 966-67).<sup>4</sup>

During crop year 2003-2004, Mr. Horne and partners failed to obtain incoming inspections of California raisins on at least 52 occasions (CX 3-CX 54, CX 56; Tr. I at 966-67).

During crop year 2002-2003, Mr. Horne and partners failed to hold in reserve for 294 days approximately 49,350 pounds of California Natural Sun-dried Seedless raisins (CX 82-CX 87, CX 88 at 2, CX 92 at 6). The producer price for raisins was \$394.85 per ton (CX 161 at 3). Therefore, for the 2002-2003 crop year, Mr. Horne and partners failed to pay \$9,742.93 to the RAC for compensation for failing to deliver any reserve raisins to the RAC.

During crop year 2003-2004, Mr. Horne and partners failed to hold in reserve for 298 days approximately 611,159 pounds of California Natural Sun-Dried Seedless raisins

---

<sup>4</sup>The record does not contain direct evidence that Mr. Horne and partners “received” raisins but there is ample evidence that they “packed-out” raisins (CX 82-CX 87). Logic allows me to conclude that raisins cannot be “packed-out” unless they are received. Combine that conclusion with Mr. Horne’s testimony that incoming inspections were not obtained leads to the holding that Mr. Horne and partners violated the Raisin Order by not obtaining incoming inspections on the raisins. (Tr. I at 966-67.)

(CX 3-CX 56, CX 161). The producer price for raisins was \$567 per ton (71 Fed. Reg. 29,565, 29,569 (May 23, 2006)). Therefore, for the 2003-2004 crop year, Mr. Horne and partners failed to pay \$173,263.58 to the RAC for compensation for failing to deliver any reserve raisins to the RAC. For this crop year, the RAC issued two demand letters to the respondents to deliver reserve California raisins or to pay the dollar equivalent (RX 136, RX 137).

During crop year 2002-2003, Mr. Horne and partners failed to pay assessments to the RAC of approximately \$222.60. During crop year 2003-2004, Mr. Horne and partners failed to pay assessments to the RAC of approximately \$5,819.63.

Mr. Horne and partners failed to allow access to their records to the United States Department of Agriculture (CX 154; Tr. I at 422-24).

### **Conclusions of Law**

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction in this matter.
2. On August 3, 2002, the respondents violated section 989.73(b) of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.73(b)) by submitting an inaccurate RAC-1 Form, Weekly Report of Standard Raisin Acquisitions, to the RAC.
3. From August 1, 2003, to November 30, 2003, the respondents violated section 989.73(b) of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.73(b)) by submitting 13 inaccurate RAC-1 Forms, Weekly Reports of Standard Raisin Acquisitions, to the RAC.

4. From August 1, 2003, to November 30, 2003, the respondents violated section 989.73(d) of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.73(d)) by submitting four inaccurate RAC-20 Forms, Monthly Reports of Free Tonnage Raisin Disposition, to the RAC.

5. The respondents violated section 989.73(a) of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.73(a)) by filing an inaccurate RAC-50 Form, Inventory of Free Tonnage Standard Quality Raisins on Hand, to the RAC for crop year 2002-2003.

6. The respondents violated section 989.73(a) of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.73(a)) by filing an inaccurate RAC-51 Form, Inventory of Off-Grade Raisins on Hand, to the RAC for crop year 2002-2003.

7. The respondents violated section 989.58(d) of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.58(d)) by failing to obtain incoming inspections of California raisins on at least six occasions during crop year 2002-2003.

8. The respondents violated section 989.58(d) of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.58(d)) by failing to obtain incoming inspections of California raisins on 52 occasions during crop year 2003-2004.

9. The respondents violated sections 989.66 and 989.166 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. §§ 989.66, .166) by failing to hold in reserve for 294 days approximately 49,350 pounds of California Natural Sun-dried Seedless raisins and by failing to pay to

the RAC \$9,742.93, the dollar equivalent of the California raisins that were not held in reserve for crop year 2002-2003.

10. The respondents violated sections 989.66 and 989.166 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. §§ 989.66, .166) by failing to hold in reserve for 298 days approximately 611,159 pounds of California Natural Sun-Dried Seedless raisins and by failing to pay to the RAC \$173,263.58, the dollar equivalent of the California raisins that were not held in reserve for crop year 2003-2004.

11. The respondents violated section 989.80 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.80) by failing to pay assessments to the RAC of approximately \$222.60 for crop year 2002-2003.

12. The respondents violated section 989.80 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.80) by failing to pay assessments to the RAC of approximately \$5,819.63 for crop year 2003-2004.

13. The respondents violated section 989.77 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.77) by failing to allow access to their records to the United States Department of Agriculture.

### **Discussion**

The handling of California raisins is subject to the requirements of the Raisin Order that resulted from a request of the California raisin industry. The industry made the request to the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the AMAA.



In response to the request for a marketing order, the United States Department of Agriculture held a hearing in Fresno, California, on December 13-16, 1948. Based on the evidence received at the hearing, a decision was issued that recommended the promulgation of the Raisin Order. The recommendation included a rational basis for issuance of the Raisin Order and for its various provisions (14 Fed. Reg. 3083 (June 8, 1949)). Interested parties were given an opportunity to file written exceptions to the recommended decision. Ibid. Upon consideration of the exceptions that were filed and the record evidence presented at the hearing, the Secretary of Agriculture, on July 8, 1949, found that the issuance of the Raisin Order, as set forth in the recommended decision, would effectuate the declared policy of the AMAA and ordered that a referendum be conducted among producers of raisin variety grapes grown in California to determine whether at least two-thirds of them favored its issuance (14 Fed. Reg. 3858, 3868 (July 13, 1949)). The referendum was conducted and the requisite percentage of producers was found to favor the Raisin Order's terms and provisions. Those terms and provisions, as periodically amended through subsequent rulemaking proceedings, were fully applicable and governed the handling of California raisins during the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 crop years when Mr. Horne and partners acted as first handlers of raisins.

Mr. Horne and partners raised 12 issues in their appeal. In issue 12, Mr. Horne and partners contend the ALJ erroneously allowed the Administrator to add parties after the hearing was substantially completed.

Ordinarily, leave to amend should be freely given in the absence of prejudice to the opposing party. *Waits v. Weller*, 653 F.2d 1288, 1290 (9th Cir. 1981), citing *Wyshak v. City National Bank*, 607 F.2d 824, 826 (9th Cir. 1979). However, the issue of amending a complaint by adding an additional party after the initial hearing raises concerns. The decision to amend a complaint is within the discretion of the trial judge, keeping in mind the strong policy in favor of allowing amendment, and considering four factors: (1) bad faith, (2) undue delay, (3) prejudice to the opposing party, and (4) the futility of amendment. *Kaplan v. Rose*, 49 F.3d 1363, 1370 (9th Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 516 U.S. 810 (1995), citing *DCD Programs, Ltd. v. Leighton*, 833 F.2d 183, 186 (9th Cir.1987). Mr. Horne and partners, in their appeal, did not raise bad faith, delay, or futility as reasons for denying the amendments. Therefore, those issues are not before me.

Prejudice is the most important factor when determining if an amendment should be allowed. *Zeneth Radio Corp. v. Hazeltine Research, Inc.*, 401 U.S. 321, 330-31 (1971). The amendment of a complaint should be denied when a party suffers “undue prejudice” because of the amendment. *Chaveriat v. Williams Pipe Line Co.*, 11 F.3d 1420, 1430 (7th Cir. 1993). The determination whether there is sufficient prejudice to justify denying an amendment requires a balancing of the interests of the parties. The balancing

entails an inquiry into the hardship to the moving party if leave to amend is denied, the reasons for the moving party failing to include the material in the original pleading, and the injustice resulting to the party opposing the motion should it be granted.

6 Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller & Mary Kay Kane, Federal Practice and Procedure § 1487 at 621-23 (2d ed. 1990).

For the reasons set forth below, I decline to reverse the ALJ's decision to allow the Administrator to amend the Complaint and add additional parties. First, and foremost, the decision to allow an amendment of a complaint lies within the discretion of the ALJ.

Absent evidence that the ALJ abused that discretion, the decision should stand.

Mr. Horne and partners presented no argument to convince me that the ALJ abused his discretion. Furthermore, my own examination of the record convinces me that the ALJ's decision to allow the Administrator to add parties was correct.

The following transcript passage from Mr. Horne's counsel's opening statement at the hearing on February 9, 2005, shows Mr. Horne was warned about the possibility of the amendment.

MR. DOMINA: Now, I want to return to the entities for just this brief moment. Lasson [sic] Vineyards, the partnership that consists of these two folks and Mrs. Horne's parents, own this pack-line. They own the equipment inside this partnership, a California general partnership Lasson [sic] Vineyards, that partnership is a stranger to this case. Lasson [sic] Vineyards—

ADMINISTRATIVE [LAW] JUDGE PALMER: I might give you a word of warning. I recall some decisions by the Judicial Officer, past decisions, reviewing our decisions, not mine particularly, but saying that

you can amend these complaints as you go along and they may well amend it to include them.

MR. DOMINA: I'm aware of those decisions and I appreciate your comment.

Tr. I at 58-59. Furthermore, in the order authorizing the amendment to the Complaint adding parties, the ALJ made clear that "the new parties will be given the opportunity to present any evidence they believe is necessary to fully defend themselves from the amended complaint's allegations." (August 3, 2005, Order Authorizing Amendment of the Complaint To Conform To the Evidence.) The ALJ held five teleconferences with counsel between February 2006 and the hearing on May 23, 2006. At these teleconferences, the ALJ sorted out evidence, issues, and witness lists, issued subpoenas, and moved the hearing location at the request of Mr. Horne's counsel. On the morning of the hearing, additional off-the-record conferences resolved many of the issues prior to the hearing. On the afternoon of May 23, 2006, the ALJ presided over a hearing. Mr. Horne was the primary witness. At the conclusion of the hearing, there was no claim that the added parties needed more time to present their evidence (Tr. II at 261).

Although Mr. Horne and partners argue that the addition of the new parties should not have been allowed after the initial hearing, they must take significant responsibility for the Administrator's inability to identify all appropriate parties. On May 21, 2004, the ALJ set the date for the hearing as February 8-17, 2005, and ordered an exchange of witness lists, exhibit lists, and copies of exhibits. The ALJ ordered the Administrator to

provide his documents by October 4, 2004. The Administrator filed his documents on September 20, 2004. The order also called for Mr. Horne and partners to provide their documents on November 15, 2004. The ALJ extended that deadline until December 15, 2004. The record does not indicate that Mr. Horne and partners provided the documents in a timely fashion. On January 3, 2005, Mr. Horne was served with a subpoena duces tecum (CX 164) seeking records regarding his raisin operations. In response, Mr. Horne provided hearing exhibits RX 1-RX 152. Mr. Horne admitted he did not fully comply with the subpoena.<sup>5</sup> (Tr. I at 947.) Without Mr. Horne's records, the Administrator's inability to identify all the various intermingled entities involved in Mr. Horne's raisin operations before the initial hearing, is understandable.

Mr. Horne's business structure is confusing at best. There appear to be three main entities, Raisin Valley Farms, Lassen Vineyards, and Raisin Valley Farms Marketing Association. The main problem is that at various times Mr. Horne uses the name "Raisin Valley Farms" for each. Without Mr. Horne's personal knowledge, it is impossible to know which bank account in the name of Raisin Valley Farms is the account for which company. In fact, there was not a bank account in the name of Lassen Vineyards. (Tr. II at 58-60, 123-24.)

---

<sup>5</sup>I note that in November 2002, the Agricultural Marketing Service issued an investigative subpoena seeking Mr. Horne's records (CX 154). Mr. Horne "refuse[d] to produce any records" sought by the investigative subpoena (RX 106; Tr. I at 432).

Raisin Valley Farms is a partnership between Marvin D. Horne and his wife Laura (Tr. I at 868). Mr. Horne grows grapes and makes raisins under the Raisin Valley Farms name. The Raisin Valley Farms name is trademarked. (Tr. I at 869.) Lassen Vineyards is a partnership between Marvin Horne, his wife Laura, and his father-in-law Don Durbahn.<sup>6</sup> (Tr. I at 869-70; RX 12.) Lassen Vineyards began as a farming operation, growing grapes and making raisins, adding a raisin packing facility on its property in 2002 (Tr. I at 870-71).

Another issue raised on appeal is Mr. Horne and partners' position that the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. §§ 3001-3006) exempts them from handler obligations under the Raisin Order because they were attempting to promote the policy of that statute. The ALJ found this argument "patently specious" and I agree. The Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act does not exempt raisin producers from the requirements of the Raisin Order.

Furthermore, the type of activity that the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act sought to encourage was the farmers market where farmer and consumer could come together directly and avoid middlemen. Mr. Horne and partners presented no evidence that their activities, in fact, supported the goals of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act. Mr. Horne and partners sold raisins in wholesale packaging and quantities, frequently to candy makers and other food processors as ingredients for other

---

<sup>6</sup>The partnership also included Laura Horne's mother Rena Durbahn until Mrs. Durbahn passed away.

food products. Mr. Horne showed no connection between his business activities and the goals of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act. Therefore, even if the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act exempted raisin producers from the mandates of the Raisin Order – which it does not – Mr. Horne and partners failed to demonstrate compliance with the goals of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act.

In their appeal, Mr. Horne and partners question the constitutionality of the Raisin Order. First and foremost, I have no authority to judge the constitutionality of the various statutes administered by the United States Department of Agriculture. *Califano v. Sanders*, 430 U.S. 99, 109 (1977) (“Constitutional questions obviously are unsuited to resolution in administrative hearing procedures”); *Robinson v. United States*, 718 F.2d 336, 338 (10th Cir. 1983) (“The agency is an inappropriate forum for determining whether its governing statute is constitutional”). Therefore, Mr. Horne and partners questioning of the constitutionality of the Raisin Order falls on legally deaf ears. I need not point out to Mr. Horne and partners that the Court of Federal Claims recently found the arguments made in this appeal to be unavailing. *Evans v. United States*, 74 Fed. Cl. 554 (2006). The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit affirmed the Court of Federal Claims Decision, 250 F. App’x 231 (2007), and the Supreme Court of the United States denied a petition for certiorari, 128 S. Ct. 1292 (2008). Until the

appropriate court instructs me otherwise, I will treat the Raisin Order as constitutional, as I believe it to be.<sup>7</sup>

The Raisin Order's provisions apply to "handlers" who "first handle" raisins. A "handler" is defined in the raisin marketing order to include "any processor or packer" (7 C.F.R. § 989.15). A "packer" is defined as "any person who, within the area, stems, sorts, cleans, or seeds raisins, grades stemmed raisins, or packages raisins for market as raisins" (7 C.F.R. § 989.14). A handler becomes a "first handler" when he "acquires" raisins, a term specifically and plainly defined by the Raisin Order:

**§ 989.17 Acquire.**

*Acquire* means to have or obtain physical possession of raisins by a handler at his packing or processing plant or at any other established receiving station operated by him: . . . *Provided further*, That the term shall apply only to the handler who first acquires raisins.

7 C.F.R. § 989.17.

The record demonstrates that Mr. Horne and partners, in their operation of the packing house known as Lassen Vineyards, came within each of these definitions during crop years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004. As such, they were required as a handler to:

(1) cause an inspection and certification to be made of all natural condition raisins acquired or received (7 C.F.R. § 989.58(d)); (2) hold in storage all acquired reserve

---

<sup>7</sup>Mr. Horne and partners suggest, at page 29 ¶ 102 of Respondents' Opening Brief On Appeal to Judicial Officer, USDA [hereinafter Respondents' Appeal Brief], that I might consider a "Rule 15(c)" proceeding the appropriate forum in which to address their constitutional argument. I need not address that question because, considering the results of the *Evans* case, conducting a "Rule 15(c)" proceeding would not alter the results.



tonnage as established by the controlling reserve tonnage regulation (7 C.F.R. §§ 989.66, .166); (3) file certified reports showing: inventory, acquisition, and other information required by the RAC to enable it to perform its duties (7 C.F.R. § 989.73); (4) allow the RAC access to inspect the premises, the raisins held, and all records for the purposes of checking and verifying reports filed (7 C.F.R. § 989.77); and (5) pay assessments to the RAC with respect to free tonnage acquired and any reserve tonnage released or sold for use in free tonnage outlets (7 C.F.R. § 989.80).

Mr. Horne and partners' arguments that they did not acquire raisins are unavailing in light of the plain meaning of the language of the Raisin Order defining the term "acquire." Moreover, if there were any ambiguity, the interpretation given by the United States Department of Agriculture both at the time of the issuance of the Raisin Order and in subsequent correspondence with the Hornes, is clear, straightforward, of long-standing, and controlling. *See Barnhart v. Walton*, 535 U.S. 212 (2002); *Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984).

The 1949 recommended decision, which was adopted as part of the Secretary of Agriculture's final decision, explained the language employed and clarified that:

The term "acquire" should mean to obtain possession of raisins by the first handler thereof. The significance of the term "acquire" should be considered in light of the definition of "handler" (and related definitions of "packer" and "processor"), in that the regulatory features of the order would apply to any handler who acquires raisins. Regulation should take place at the point in the marketing channel where a handler first obtains possession of raisins, so that the regulatory provisions of the order concerning the handling of raisins would apply only once to the same raisins. Numerous

ways by which handlers might acquire raisins were proposed for inclusion in the definition of the term, the objective being to make sure that all raisins coming within the scope of handlers' functions were covered and, conversely, to prevent a way being available whereby a portion of the raisins handled in the area would not be covered. Some of the ways by which a handler might obtain possession of raisins include: (i) Receiving them from producers, dehydrators, or others, whether by purchase, contract, or by arrangement for toll packing, or packing for a cash consideration[.]

14 Fed. Reg. 3083, 3086 (June 8, 1949).

This interpretation is consistent with testimony at the hearing conducted to consider the need of the raisin industry for a marketing order and its appropriate terms:

Q Mr. Hoak, suppose a packer stems, cleans, and performs other operations connected with the processing of raisins for a producer and then the producer sells the raisins to another packer. Under this proposal, which person should be required to set the raisins aside?

A The man who performs the packing operation, who is the packer.

Q Mr. Hoak, I believe that you have testified earlier that the term "packer" should include a toll packer. By that do you mean that it should include a person who takes raisins for someone else for a fee?

A That is right.

Q Also, did I understand you to say that that person should be the one who would be required to set aside or establish the pools under the regulatory provisions?

A That is right. He is the man who would be held responsible for setting aside the required amount of raisins.

Q I take it that that man would not have title to any raisins insofar as he is a toll packer; is that correct?

A That is right.

ALJ Decision and Order, App. A.

These excerpts from the recommended decision and the hearing transcript were sent to an attorney representing Mr. and Mrs. Horne on April 23, 2001. Apparently, they believe their personal interpretation of the term “acquire” as used in the Raisin Order should take precedence over the plain language of the Raisin Order and the interpretation of its meaning that was conveyed to them by the United States Department of Agriculture. The decision of Mr. Horne and partners not to follow the United States Department of Agriculture’s interpretative advice, and, instead, to play a kind of shell game with interlocking partnerships and a marketing association to try to conceal their role as first handler, only shows that they acted willfully and intentionally when they decided not to file accurate reports, not to hold raisins in reserve, not to have incoming raisins inspected, not to pay assessments, and not to allow inspection of their records for verification purposes.

In simple terms, Mr. Horne and partners, as a matter of law, acquired raisins, as first handlers, when raisins arrived at the processing/packing facility known as Lassen Vineyards. Their arguments that title to the raisins never transferred from the grower to Mr. Horne and partners under California law is unavailing. California law does not control, the Raisin Order does. Under the Raisin Order, the term “acquire” is a term of art

that does not encompass an ownership interest but rather physical possession. Mr. Horne and partners obtained physical possession of – thus they “acquired” – raisins when a grower brought raisins to the facility.

I also must address Mr. Horne and partners’ position that they did not process the raisins but merely leased equipment to producers who processed their own raisins. The argument defies common sense. Mr. Horne and partners own raisin processing equipment. Growers bring raisins to the facility for processing. The grower pays Mr. Horne and partners for use of the equipment not by the hour or day like most equipment leases but by the pound, i.e., the amount of product processed. That price includes supervision of the equipment by Mr. Horne’s son, whose salary is paid by the partnership. The price also includes other workers who are provided by a different, but interlocking, partnership consisting of two members of the Lassen Vineyards partnership, Mr. Horne’s wife and mother-in-law. In addition, the “lease” price also includes all packing material (on which Mr. Horne’s handler number has been imprinted).

Furthermore, the grower “leasing” the equipment need not stay at the facility during the use of the equipment but can leave the location allowing Lassen Vineyards’ employees to supervise the processing. Mr. Horne and partners can call what they do a “lease” or anything else they might want to call it, but the reality is that Mr. Horne and partners are processing/handling raisins.

Mr. Horne and partners argue the ALJ erred by failing to use a higher standard of proof than preponderance of the evidence (Respondents' Appeal Brief at 32-35).

Reviewing their earlier filings before the ALJ, I found no suggestion to the ALJ that a higher standard of proof should be utilized. Absent such a suggestion to the ALJ, I am reluctant to reverse the ALJ's use of the preponderance of the evidence standard.

However, to satisfy myself that the appropriate standard was applied, I reviewed the argument. I found the argument significantly lacking. While there are proceedings in which a greater standard is appropriate,<sup>8</sup> this proceeding is not one of them. Mr. Horne and partners did not demonstrate that a standard of proof higher than the preponderance of the evidence standard was appropriate. Therefore, I hold that the ALJ's use of the preponderance of the evidence standard was not error.

Mr. Horne and partners also argue the Administrator failed to meet his burden to prove the case by a preponderance of the evidence.<sup>9</sup> I disagree. I do not provide a laundry list of "fact[s] sought to be proved," but I note that I read the entire transcript and

---

<sup>8</sup>See, e.g., *Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745 (1982) (proceeding to terminate parental rights); *Addington v. Texas*, 441 U.S. 418 (1979) (involuntary commitment proceeding); *Woodby v. INS*, 385 U.S. 276 (1966) (deportation).

<sup>9</sup>Preponderance of evidence. Evidence which is of greater weight or more convincing than the evidence which is offered in opposition to it; that is, evidence which as a whole shows that the fact sought to be proved is more probable than not [citation omitted]. With respect to burden of proof in civil actions, means greater weight of evidence, or evidence which is more credible and convincing to the mind. That which best accords with reason and probability.

Black's Law Dictionary 1064 (5th ed. 1979).

examined the evidence. The greater weight of that evidence leaves me with but one conclusion which is that Marvin Horne and partners put in place a scheme to enhance their profitability by avoiding the requirements of the Raisin Order. By so doing, they obtained an unfair competitive advantage over everyone in the raisin industry who complied with the Raisin Order.

The Administrator alleges that Mr. Horne and partners violated section 989.77 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.77) “by failing to allow access to their records to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, even after being served with two subpoenas for such access.” (Second Amended Compl. at 5 ¶ 12.) Mr. Horne and partners deny this allegation stating “[t]here was no evidence of noncompliance with subpoenas, information requests, or failure to fully comply with Government requests for data.” (Respondents’ Appeal Brief at 30 ¶ 104.) The record belies that claim showing that Mr. Horne failed to allow access as required by section 989.77 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.77).

The Raisin Order makes clear that handlers shall provide access to their facilities and records, as follows:

**§ 989.77 Verification of reports and records.**

For the purpose of checking and verifying reports filed by handlers and records prescribed in or pursuant to this amended subpart, the committee, through its duly authorized representatives, shall have access to any handler’s premises during regular business hours and shall be permitted at any such times to inspect such premises and any raisins held by such

handler, and any and all records of the handler with respect to the holding or disposition of raisins by him and promotion and advertising activities conducted by handlers under § 989.53.

7 C.F.R. § 989.77.

On August 29, 2001, Maria Martinez Esguerra, a compliance officer for the Agricultural Marketing Service in the Fresno, California, office, was assigned to investigate whether Mr. Horne was packing and shipping raisins without obtaining inspections (Tr. I at 420). During the course of her investigation, Ms. Esguerra met with Mr. Horne and asked to review his raisin production, acquisition, sales, and disposition records (Tr. I at 421). Mr. Horne told Ms. Esguerra “that he would not release any information without a subpoena.” (Tr. I at 421.)

Ms. Esguerra’s testimony continued:

On May 14 I had prepared a subpoena, a request for a subpoena for the administrator. But my declaration here also stated basically in my conversation or interview with Mr. Horne to which he had admitted to me that he produced and packed organic raisins during the crop years 2000 and 2001.

There were other questions that I had asked, and I’d asked him about if he had packed organic raisins in cellophane bags and he said he did. In fact he even showed us the sizes of those cello packaged raisins.

They were in sizes 16 ounces, 8 ounce and 1.5 ounces. However, he disclosed to, he did - he refused to disclose any more information regarding his sales.

He has raisin production and acquisition records, and sales and dispositions, but again he said he would not release any information without a subpoena.

Following that we had a subpoena prepared, and on November 26 I receive that, and I subsequently served it to Mr. Horne on that same day.

On December 9, I went back to the house of Marvin Horne on Modoc Avenue pursuant to that subpoena, and I asked if I could speak with him and he met me at the door. He told me why he will not produce any records for me to review.

Tr. I at 421-23. Ms. Esguerra was asked: “After you served Mr. Horne with the subpoena, did he produce any records?” She responded: “No, he did not.” (Tr. I at 423-24.)

Ms. Esguerra’s testimony demonstrates that she sought access to Mr. Horne and partners’ records which she is authorized to do under the Raisin Order. Mr. Horne refused unless Ms. Esguerra obtained a subpoena. Even though a subpoena is not required under the Raisin Order, Ms. Esguerra obtained one (CX 154). When she presented the subpoena to Mr. Horne, he still refused to comply with the Raisin Order and give her access to the records. Therefore, I conclude Mr. Horne and partners violated section 989.77 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.77) by refusing to provide Ms. Esguerra access to their records.

There are three components of the Order in this Decision and Order that mandate Mr. Horne and partners make monetary payments as a result of their violations of the Raisin Order. First, the Raisin Order requires a handler, who fails to deliver reserve tonnage, to compensate the RAC, as follows:



**§ 989.166 Reserve tonnage generally.**

....

(c) *Remedy in the event of failure to deliver reserve tonnage raisins.* A handler who fails to deliver to the Committee, upon request, any reserve tonnage raisins in the quantity and quality for which he has become obligated . . . shall compensate the Committee for the amount of the loss resulting from his failure to so deliver.

7 C.F.R. § 989.166(c). This provision of the Raisin Order leaves me no discretion on the matter and requires that I order Mr. Horne and partners to compensate the RAC for the reserve tonnage raisins they failed to deliver to the RAC. The Raisin Order also instructs me as to how to calculate the compensation owed by Mr. Horne and partners to the RAC.

**§ 989.166 Reserve tonnage generally.**

....

(c) *Remedy in the event of failure to deliver reserve tonnage raisins.* . . . The amount of compensation for any shortage of tonnage shall be determined by multiplying the quantity of reserve raisins not delivered by the latest weighted average price per ton received by producers during the particular crop year for free tonnage raisins of the same varietal type or types.

7 C.F.R. § 989.166(c).

For the 2002-2003 crop year, Mr. Horne and partners packed out 98,550 pounds of raisins (CX 82-CX 87). Applying the shrinkage factor (CX 92 at 6) for weight loss during processing, Mr. Horne and partners received 105,000 pounds of raisins in the 2002-2003 crop year. The reserve obligation for the 2002-2003 crop year was 47 percent (CX 88 at 2). Mr. Horne and partners' reserve obligation for that crop year was 49,350 pounds ( $.47 \times 105,000 = 49,350$ ). The producer price for raisins was \$394.85 per

ton (CX 161 at 3). Therefore, for the 2002-2003 crop year, Mr. Horne and partners owe \$9,742.93 to the RAC for compensation for failing to deliver any reserve raisins to RAC (49,350 pounds divided by 2000 pounds per ton = 24.675 tons; 24.675 tons x \$394.85 per ton equals \$9,742.93).

Similarly, for the 2003-2004 crop year, Mr. Horne and partners packed out 1,965,650 pounds of raisins (CX 3-CX 56). These raisins included natural seedless raisins and other varieties. Applying the 2003-2004 shrinkage factor for each variety indicates that Mr. Horne and partners received 2,066,066 pounds of raisins in the 2003-2004 crop year. Of the 2,066,066 pounds of raisins received, 2,037,196 pounds were natural seedless raisins subject to the 30 percent reserve obligation (CX 161). Mr. Horne and partners' reserve obligation for the 2003-2004 crop year was 611,159 pounds ( $.30 \times 2,037,196 = 611,158.8$ ). The producer price for raisins was \$567 per ton (71 Fed. Reg. 29,565, 29,569 (May 23, 2006)).<sup>10</sup> Therefore, for the 2003-2004 crop year, Mr. Horne and partners owe \$173,263.58 to the RAC for

---

<sup>10</sup>The Agricultural Marketing Service calculated the 2003-2004 reserve obligation compensation using a producer price of \$810 per ton. The record citation for this producer price is CX 93, the RAC marketing policy for the 2003-2004 crop year. The RAC marketing policy for the 2003-2004 crop year mentions a "probable price" at \$810 per ton (CX 93 at 4). However, the interim final rule setting the Final Free and Reserve Percentages for the 2005-2006 crop year identifies the producer prices for the 2003-2004 crop year as \$567 (71 Fed. Reg. 29,565, 29,569 (May 23, 2006)). The Administrator's Brief in Opposition to Respondents' Appeal of the ALJ's Decision and Order was filed well after the date the producer prices were published in the Federal Register. The Administrator had an obligation to notify me that the original calculations were erroneous.

compensation for failing to deliver any reserve raisins to the RAC (611,159 pounds divided by 2000 pounds per ton = 305.5795 tons; 305.5795 tons x \$567 per ton equals \$173,263.58).

The Raisin Order requires that each handler contribute to the costs associated with operating the RAC, as follows:

**§ 989.80 Assessments.**

(a) Each handler shall, with respect to free tonnage acquired by him, . . . pay to the committee, upon demand, his pro rata share of the expenses . . . which the Secretary finds will be incurred, as aforesaid, by the committee during each crop year. . . . Such handler's pro rata share of such expenses shall be equal to the ratio between the total free tonnage acquired by such handler . . . during the applicable crop year and the total free tonnage acquired by all handlers . . . during the same crop year.

7 C.F.R. § 989.80(a). The assessment rate was established at \$8 per ton (CX 90).

As noted in this Decision and Order, *supra*, for the 2002-2003 crop year, Mr. Horne and partners received 105,000 pounds of raisins. The reserve obligation for the 2002-2003 crop year was 47 percent, therefore, the free tonnage was 53 percent (CX 88 at 2). Mr. Horne and partners' free tonnage for that crop year was 55,650 pounds (.53 x 105,000 = 55,650). Mr. Horne and partners' assessment obligation for the 2002-2003 crop year is \$222.60 (55,650 pounds divided by 2000 pounds per ton = 27.825 tons; 27.825 tons x \$8 per ton = \$222.60).

The calculation of the assessment for the 2003-2004 crop year is complicated by the multiple varieties processed during that year, including varieties without reserve

requirements. Mr. Horne and partners received 2,066,066 pounds of raisins in the 2003-2004 crop year. Of the 2,066,066 pounds of raisins received, 2,037,196 pounds were natural seedless raisins subject to the 30 percent reserve obligation (CX 161). The free tonnage of natural seedless raisins was 1,426,037.2 pounds ( $.70 \times 2,037,196 = 1,426,037.2$ ). In addition, there were 28,870 pounds of other varieties which were all free tonnage ( $2,066,066 - 2,037,196 = 28,870$ ). Thus, the total free tonnage for the 2003-2004 crop year was 1,454,907.2 pounds. At an assessment rate of \$8 per ton, Mr. Horne and partners' assessment obligation for the 2003-2004 crop year is \$5,819.63 ( $1,454,037.2$  pounds divided by 2000 pounds per ton = 727.4536 tons;  $727.4536$  tons x \$8 per ton = \$5,819.63). The total assessment due to the RAC by Mr. Horne and partners for both crop years is \$6,042.23.<sup>11</sup>

I find it necessary to briefly note that, although the Raisin Order requires payment of the assessment "upon demand" and the record contains no evidence of such demand for the 2002-2003 crop year, my decision ordering payment is appropriate. I conclude Mr. Horne and partners' failure to file accurate forms with the RAC noting the volume of raisins processed incapacitated the RAC ability to make the demand for payment of the assessment. The RAC 1999-2000 Analysis Report states:

---

<sup>11</sup>The Administrator, as the party seeking enforcement of the Raisin Order, should have provided a better road map to calculate both the assessment and compensation for failing to deliver any reserve raisins to the RAC. The Administrator should have provided a specific formula for determining the money owed as well as a record cite where each number utilized in the calculation of the money owed could be located.

The documentation of deliveries, on an individual grower basis, establishes the database on which most other functions are based. This includes: the accountability of all raisin deliveries, responsibility of packers' administrative assessments, packers' reserve pool obligations and the basis upon which the RAC staff distributes reserve pool equity to the grower.

RX 70 at 8. Without the information to determine the amounts of payment, the RAC could not demand the payment. Now that I have calculated the amount of the administrative assessments and reserve pool obligations, those amounts are due and payable.

The AMAA authorizes civil penalties for violations of marketing orders, such as the Raisin Order, issued under the AMAA.

#### **§ 608c. Orders**

....

#### **(14) Violation of order**

....

(B) Any handler subject to an order issued under this section, or any officer, director, agent, or employee of such handler, who violates any provision of such order may be assessed a civil penalty by the Secretary not exceeding \$1,000 for each such violation. Each day during which such violation continues shall be deemed a separate violation. . . . The Secretary may issue an order assessing a civil penalty under this paragraph only after notice and an opportunity for an agency hearing on the record. Such order shall be treated as a final order reviewable in the district courts of the

United States in any district in which the handler subject to the order is an inhabitant, or has the handler's principal place of business. The validity of such order may not be reviewed in an action to collect such civil penalty.

7 U.S.C. § 608c(14)(B) (Supp. V 2005).<sup>12</sup>

In determining the amount of the civil penalty for violations of the Raisin Order, certain factors should be considered including:

nature of the violations, the number of violations, the damage or potential damage to the regulatory program from the type of violations involved here, the amount of profit potentially available to a handler who commits such violations, prior warnings or instructions given to [the violator], and any other circumstances shedding light on the degree of culpability involved.

*In re Onofrio Calabrese*, 51 Agric. Dec. 131, 154-55 (1992), *aff'd sub nom. Balice v. USDA*, No. CV-F-92-5483-GEB (E.D. Cal. July 14, 1998), *printed in* 57 Agric. Dec. 841 (1998), *aff'd*, 203 F.3d 684 (9th Cir. 2000), *reprinted in* 59 Agric. Dec. 1 (2000).

I have reviewed the recommendation of the Administrator regarding a civil penalty. I have examined the factors to be considered for determining the amount of the civil penalty. I examined the actions of Mr. Horne and partners as these actions relate to the factors, including an examination of their tax returns (RX 13) to determine the impact of the violations on the revenue generated by the partners. I find that intentional violations of the Raisin Order's requirements that a handler shall pay assessments, have

---

<sup>12</sup>Pursuant to the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990, as amended (28 U.S.C. § 2461 note), the Secretary of Agriculture, by regulation, adjusted the civil monetary penalty that may be assessed under the AMAA (7 U.S.C. § 608c(14)(B)) for each violation of a marketing order, by increasing the maximum civil penalty from \$1,000 to \$1,100 (7 C.F.R. § 3.91(b)(vii) (2005)).

inspections performed, hold a percentage of the raisins handled in reserve, and file specified reports are serious violations of both the AMAA and the Raisin Order.

Furthermore, I find the violations by Mr. Horne and partners significantly increased the revenue generated by the partnership (RX 13). Therefore, I conclude a significant civil penalty is warranted to deter Mr. Horne and partners, as well as other handlers, from committing similar violations in the future.

As discussed in this Decision and Order, *supra*, I have found that Mr. Horne and partners committed the following violations:

- Twenty violations of section 989.73 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.73) by filing inaccurate reporting forms to the RAC on 20 occasions.
- Fifty-eight violations of section 989.58(d) of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.58(d)) by failing to obtain incoming inspections of raisins on 58 occasions.
- Two violations of section 989.80 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.80) by failing to pay assessments to the RAC in crop year 2002-2003 and crop year 2003-2004.
- Five hundred ninety-two violations of sections 989.66 and 989.166 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. §§ 989.66, .166) by failing to hold raisins in reserve and by failing to pay the RAC the dollar equivalent of the raisins not held in reserve.
- One violation of section 989.77 of the Raisin Order (7 C.F.R. § 989.77) by failing to allow the Agricultural Marketing Service to have access to their records.

The appropriate civil penalties for these violations are: (1) \$300 per violation for filing inaccurate reporting forms, in violation of 7 C.F.R. § 989.73, for a total of

\$6,000; (2) \$300 per violation for the failure to obtain incoming inspections, in violation of 7 C.F.R. § 989.58(d), for a total of \$17,400; (3) \$1,000 for the failure to allow access to records, in violation of 7 C.F.R. § 989.77; (4) \$300 per violation for the failure to pay the assessments, in violation of 7 C.F.R. § 989.80, for a total of \$600; and (5) \$300 per violation for the failure to hold raisins in reserve, in violation of 7 C.F.R. §§ 989.66, .166, for a total of \$177, 600. The total civil penalties assessed against Mr. Horne and partners for violating the Raisin Order in the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 crop years is \$202,600. I conclude that civil penalties in these amounts are sufficient to deter Mr. Horne and partners from continuing to violate the Raisin Order and will deter others from similar future violations.

For the foregoing reasons, the following Order is issued.

### **ORDER**

1. Marvin D. Horne, Laura R. Horne, Don Durbahn, Lassen Vineyards, a partnership, and Raisin Valley Farms, a partnership, jointly and severally, are assessed a \$202,600 civil penalty. The civil penalty shall be paid by certified check or money order made payable to the “Treasurer of the United States” and sent to:

Frank Martin, Jr.  
United States Department of Agriculture  
Office of the General Counsel  
Marketing Division  
Room 2343-South Building  
Washington, DC 20250-1417



Payment of the civil penalty shall be sent to Mr. Martin within 100 days after this Order becomes effective.

2. Marvin D. Horne, Laura R. Horne, Don Durbahn, Lassen Vineyards, a partnership, and Raisin Valley Farms, a partnership, jointly and severally, are ordered to pay to the RAC \$6,042.23 in assessments for crop years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, and \$183,006.51 for the dollar equivalent of the California raisins they failed to hold in reserve for crop years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004. Payments of the \$6,042.23 for owed assessments and of the \$183,006.51 for the dollar equivalent of the California raisins that were not held in reserve shall be sent to the RAC within 100 days after this Order becomes effective.

3. This Order shall become effective on the day after service on Marvin D. Horne, Laura R. Horne, Don Durbahn, Lassen Vineyards, a partnership, and Raisin Valley Farms, a partnership.

**RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW**

Marvin D. Horne, Laura R. Horne, Don Durbahn, Lassen Vineyards, a partnership, and Raisin Valley Farms, a partnership, have the right to obtain review of the Order in this Decision and Order in any district court of the United States in which they are inhabitants or have their principal place of business.<sup>13</sup>

Done at Washington, DC

April 11, 2008

---

William G. Jenson  
Judicial Officer

---

<sup>13</sup>7 U.S.C. § 608c(14)(B).