

AGRICULTURE DECISIONS

Volume 74

Book One

January – June 2015



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURE DECISIONS

Agriculture Decisions is an official publication by the Secretary of Agriculture that consists of decisions and orders issued in adjudicatory proceedings conducted for the Department under various statutes and regulations. Selected court decisions concerning the Department's regulatory programs are also included. The Department is required to publish its rules and regulations in the *Federal Register*; therefore, rules and regulations are not included in *Agriculture Decisions*.

FORMAT

The Office of Administrative Law Judges (OALJ) publishes a comprehensive volume of *Agriculture Decisions* for each calendar year. Two books comprise the annual volume: Book One, which contains the decisions and orders issued from January through June of that year; and Book Two, which contains decisions and orders issued from July through December.

Each *Agriculture Decisions* book is divided into four sections, or "Parts." Part One is organized alphabetically, by statute, and contains general decisions and orders (*i.e.*, all decisions and orders other than those that pertain to the Packers and Stockyards Act or to the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act). Part Two covers decisions and orders relating to the Packers and Stockyards Act. Part Three contains decisions and orders that involve the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, including reparations decisions. Part Four includes an alphabetical list of decisions and orders reported and a subject-matter index.

Parts One, Two, and Three of *Agriculture Decisions* incorporate the following: (1) Initial Decisions issued by the Administrative Law Judges, along with any corresponding appeal decisions by the Judicial Officer; (2) a list of Miscellaneous Orders entered by the Administrative Law Judges and complete texts of any Miscellaneous Orders entered by the Judicial Officer; (3) a list of Default Decisions issued by the Administrative Law Judges; and (4) a list of Consent Decisions. While *Agriculture Decisions* generally does not include full texts of Miscellaneous Orders, Default Decisions, or Consent Decisions, those decisions and orders are available in their entirety, in portable document format (pdf), via the OALJ website: <http://www.dm.usda.gov/oaljdecisions/decision-index.htm>.

PUBLICATION

Beginning with Volume 72 (circa 2013), *Agriculture Decisions* is published exclusively online. Volume 71 (circa 2012) was the final print edition (*i.e.*, "hard copy") of *Agriculture Decisions*.¹ All *Agriculture Decisions* books, including those from older volumes,² are available for electronic download at <http://www.dm.usda.gov/agriculturedecisions>.

¹ Individual softbound copies of Volume 71 are available until supplies are exhausted.

² As of June 2015, Volumes 57 (circa 1998) through 72 (circa 2013) are available on the OALJ website. Volumes 39 (circa 1980) through 56 (circa 1997) have been scanned but, due to privacy concerns, do not yet appear online. The Editor of *Agriculture Decisions* is in the process of redacting personally identifiable information (PII) from these books. Once the appropriate redactions have been completed, Volumes 39 through 56 will be uploaded to the OALJ website.

In addition to uploading *Agriculture Decisions* publications, OALJ also posts “current” decisions and orders, uploading them individually as they are issued. These decisions and orders are displayed in pdf format on the OALJ website and are listed in reverse chronological order. Decisions and orders issued prior to the current year are also available in pdf archives, arranged by calendar year.

Published decisions and orders (*i.e.*, those that appear in *Agriculture Decisions*) may be cited by providing the volume number, page number, and year [*e.g.*, 1 Agric. Dec. 472 (U.S.D.A. 1942)]. Further, decisions and orders posted on the OALJ website may also be cited as primary sources. When citing to a decision or order that appears on the OALJ website but has not yet been published in *Agriculture Decisions*, the docket number and date of decision or order should be included [*e.g.*, *Smith*, Docket No. 15-0123 (U.S.D.A. Oct. 1, 2015)].

CONTACT

For inquiries regarding publication, please contact the Editor of *Agriculture Decisions*.

Editor, *Agriculture Decisions*
Office of Administrative Law Judges
United States Department of Agriculture
Room 1057 South Building
Washington, D.C. 20250-9200

editor.oalj@dm.usda.gov

(t): 202-720-6645

(f): 202-690-0790

AGRICULTURE DECISIONS

Volume 74

Book One

Part One (General)

Pages 1 – 165



THIS IS A COMPILATION OF DECISIONS ISSUED BY THE
SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND THE COURTS
PERTAINING TO STATUTES ADMINISTERED BY THE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

LIST OF DECISIONS REPORTED

JANUARY – JUNE 2015

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

COURT DECISIONS

HORNE v. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.
No. 14-275.
Opinion of the Court 1

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

BURNETTE FOODS, INC.
Docket No. 11-0334.
Decision and Order 31

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

COURT DECISIONS

KOLLMAN v. VILSACK.
No. 8:14-CV-1123-T-23TGW.
Order of the Court 52

ANIMAL LEGAL DEFENSE FUND v. USDA.
No. 14-12260.
Opinion of the Court 57

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

LE ANNE SMITH.
Docket No. 14-0020.
Decision and Order 84

JENNIFER CAUDILL.
Docket No. 13-0186.
Decision and Order 101

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

JUSTIN JENNE.
Docket No. 13-0308.
Decision and Order 118

RANDALL JONES.
Docket No. 13-0053.
Decision and Order 133

--

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

DEER FOREST EXOTIC ANIMAL SANCTUARY, LLC.
Docket No. D-14-0164.
Order of Dismissal 145

LEE MARVIN GREENLY; SANDY GREENLY; CRYSTAL
GREENLY; AND MINNESTOA WILDLIFE CONNECTION, INC.
Docket No. 11-0073.
Miscellaneous Order 145

LEE MARVIN GREENLY.
Docket No. 11-0073.
Miscellaneous Order 148

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

PAUL ROSBERG & KELLY ROSBERG, d/b/a NEBRASKA’S FINEST
MEATS.
Docket Nos. 12-0182; 12-0183.
Miscellaneous Order 150

PAUL ROSBERG & KELLY ROSBERG, d/b/a NEBRASKA’S FINEST
MEATS.
Docket Nos. 12-0182; 12-0183.
Miscellaneous Order 152

PAUL ROSBERG & NEBRASKA’S FINEST MEATS, LLC.
Docket Nos. 14-0094; 14-0095.
Miscellaneous Order 154

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

JUSTIN JENNE.
Docket No. 13-0308.
Miscellaneous Order 156

SHOW, INC.
Docket No. 14-0056.
Order of Dismissal 160

RANDALL JONES.
Docket No. 13-0053.
Miscellaneous Order 170

ORGANIC FOODS PRODUCTION ACT

BOB THOMAS, d/b/a MAGNUM LAND HOLDING.
Docket No. 14-0158.
Order of Dismissal 161

PAUL A. ROSBERG, d/b/a ROSBERG FARM.
Docket No. 12-0216.
Miscellaneous Order 161

SOYBEAN PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND CONSUMER
INFORMATION ACT

J.W. WILLIAMSON GINNERY, INC.
Docket No. 15-0010.
Miscellaneous Order 161

JOHNNY WILLIAMSON, a/k/a JOHN W. WILLIAMSON III.
Docket No. 15-0012.
Miscellaneous Order 161

--

DEFAULT DECISIONS

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

CASEY LUDWIG.
Docket No. 14-0132.
Default Decision and Order 162

ORGANIC FOODS PRODUCTION ACT

EMMANUEL H. COBLENTZ.
Docket No. 15-0049.
Default Decision and Order 162

PLANT PROTECTION ACT

JULIO ALVAREZ, III.
Docket No. 15-0662.
Default Decision and Order 162

--

CONSENT DECISIONS

ANIMAL HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Consent Decisions 163

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

Consent Decisions 163

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Consent Decisions 163

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

Consent Decisions 163

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

Consent Decisions 164

POULTRY PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT

Consent Decisions 165

SOYBEAN PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND CONSUMER
INFORMATION ACT

Consent Decisions 165

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

COURT DECISIONS

HORNE v. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

No. 14-275.

Court Decision.

Decided June 22, 2015.

AMAA – Civil penalties – Eminent domain – Taking – Fifth Amendment – Raisin Administrative Committee – Raisin marketing order – Raisins – Reserve requirement – Property, personal – Property, real.

[Cite as: 135 S. Ct. 2419 (2015)].

Supreme Court of the United States

The Court reversed the Ninth Circuit’s decision, holding that, pursuant to the Fifth Amendment, the Government must pay just compensation when it takes personal property just as it does when taking real property. The Court further held that the Government may not require raisin growers to give up their personal property (i.e., raisins), without granting just compensation, as a condition of selling raisins in interstate commerce. In so holding, the Court found that the Raisin Administrative Committee’s reserve requirement, which mandates that actual raisins be transferred from the growers to the Government, constitutes a physical taking that requires just compensation.

OPINION OF THE COURT

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS DELIVERED THE OPINION OF THE COURT.

Under the United States Department of Agriculture’s California Raisin Marketing Order, a percentage of a grower’s crop must be physically set aside in certain years for the account of the Government, free of charge. The Government then sells, allocates, or otherwise disposes of the raisins in ways it determines are best suited to maintaining an orderly market. The question is whether the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment bars the Government from imposing such a demand on the growers without just compensation.

I

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 authorizes the

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate “marketing orders” to help maintain stable markets for particular agricultural products. The marketing order for raisins requires growers in certain years to give a percentage of their crop to the Government, free of charge. The required allocation is determined by the Raisin Administrative Committee, a Government entity composed largely of growers and others in the raisin business appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. In 2002–2003, this Committee ordered raisin growers to turn over 47 percent of their crop. In 2003–2004, 30 percent.

Growers generally ship their raisins to a raisin “handler,” who physically separates the raisins due the Government (called “reserve raisins”), pays the growers only for the remainder (“free-tonnage raisins”), and packs and sells the free-tonnage raisins. The Raisin Committee acquires title to the reserve raisins that have been set aside, and decides how to dispose of them in its discretion. It sells them in noncompetitive markets, for example to exporters, federal agencies, or foreign governments; donates them to charitable causes; releases them to growers who agree to reduce their raisin production; or disposes of them by “any other means” consistent with the purposes of the raisin program. 7 CFR § 989.67(b)(5) (2015). Proceeds from Committee sales are principally used to subsidize handlers who sell raisins for export (not including the Hornes, who are not raisin exporters). Raisin growers retain an interest in any net proceeds from sales the Raisin Committee makes, after deductions for the export subsidies and the Committee’s administrative expenses. In the years at issue in this case, those proceeds were less than the cost of producing the crop one year, and nothing at all the next.

The Hornes—Marvin Horne, Laura Horne, and their family—are both raisin growers and handlers. They “handled” not only their own raisins but also those produced by other growers, paying those growers in full for all of their raisins, not just the free-tonnage portion. In 2002, the Hornes refused to set aside any raisins for the Government, believing they were not legally bound to do so. The Government sent trucks to the Hornes’ facility at eight o’clock one morning to pick up the raisins, but the Hornes refused entry. App. 31; cf. *post*, at 2442 (SOTOMAYOR, J., dissenting). The Government then assessed against the Hornes a fine equal to the market value of the missing raisins—some \$480,000—as well as an additional civil penalty of just over \$200,000 for disobeying the order to

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

turn them over.

When the Government sought to collect the fine, the Hornes turned to the courts, arguing that the reserve requirement was an unconstitutional taking of their property under the Fifth Amendment. Their case eventually made it to this Court when the Government argued that the lower courts had no jurisdiction to consider the Hornes' constitutional defense to the fine. *Horne v. Department of Agriculture*, 569 U.S. —, 133 S.Ct. 2053, 186 L.Ed.2d 69 (2013) (*Horne I*). We rejected the Government's argument and sent the case back to the Court of Appeals so it could address the Hornes' contention on the merits. *Id.*, at —, 133 S.Ct., at 2063–2064.

On remand, the Ninth Circuit agreed with the Hornes that the validity of the fine rose or fell with the constitutionality of the reserve requirement. 750 F.3d 1128, 1137 (2014). The court then considered whether that requirement was a physical appropriation of property, giving rise to a *per se* taking, or a restriction on a raisin grower's use of his property, properly analyzed under the more flexible and forgiving standard for a regulatory taking. The court rejected the Hornes' argument that the reserve requirement was a *per se* taking, reasoning that "the Takings Clause affords less protection to personal than to real property," and concluding that the Hornes "are not completely divested of their property rights," because growers retain an interest in the proceeds from any sale of reserve raisins by the Raisin Committee. *Id.*, at 1139.

The court instead viewed the reserve requirement as a use restriction, similar to a government condition on the grant of a land use permit. See *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 512 U.S. 374, 114 S.Ct. 2309, 129 L.Ed.2d 304 (1994); *Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n*, 483 U.S. 825, 107 S.Ct. 3141, 97 L.Ed.2d 677 (1987). As in such permit cases, the Court of Appeals explained, the Government here imposed a condition (the reserve requirement) in exchange for a Government benefit (an orderly raisin market). And just as a landowner was free to avoid the government condition by forgoing a permit, so too the Hornes could avoid the reserve requirement by "planting different crops." 750 F.3d, at 1143. Under that analysis, the court found that the reserve requirement was a proportional response to the Government's interest in ensuring an orderly raisin market, and not a taking under the Fifth Amendment.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

We granted certiorari. 574 U.S. —, 135 S.Ct. 1039, 190 L.Ed.2d 907 (2015).

II

The petition for certiorari poses three questions, which we answer in turn.

A.

The first question presented asks “Whether the government’s ‘categorical duty’ under the Fifth Amendment to pay just compensation when it ‘physically takes possession of an interest in property,’ *Arkansas Game & Fish Comm’n v. United States*, — U.S. —, 133 S.Ct. 511, 518, 184 L.Ed.2d 417 (2012), applies only to real property and not to personal property.” The answer is no.

I.

There is no dispute that the “classic taking [is one] in which the government directly appropriates private property for its own use.” *Tahoe–Sierra Preservation Council, Inc. v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency*, 535 U.S. 302, 324, 122 S.Ct. 1465, 152 L.Ed.2d 517 (2002) (brackets and internal quotation marks omitted). Nor is there any dispute that, in the case of real property, such an appropriation is a *per se* taking that requires just compensation. See *Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.*, 458 U.S. 419, 426–435, 102 S.Ct. 3164, 73 L.Ed.2d 868 (1982).

Nothing in the text or history of the Takings Clause, or our precedents, suggests that the rule is any different when it comes to appropriation of personal property. The Government has a categorical duty to pay just compensation when it takes your car, just as when it takes your home.

^[1] The Takings Clause provides: “[N]or shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.” U.S. Const., Amdt. 5. It protects “private property” without any distinction between different types. The principle reflected in the Clause goes back at least 800 years to Magna Carta, which specifically protected agricultural crops from uncompensated takings. Clause 28 of that charter forbade any “constable or other bailiff”

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

from taking “corn or other provisions from any one without immediately tendering money therefor, unless he can have postponement thereof by permission of the seller.” Cl. 28 (1215), in W. McKechnie, *Magna Carta, A Commentary on the Great Charter of King John* 329 (2d ed. 1914).

The colonists brought the principles of Magna Carta with them to the New World, including that charter’s protection against uncompensated takings of personal property. In 1641, for example, Massachusetts adopted its Body of Liberties, prohibiting “mans Cattel or goods of what kinde soever” from being “pressed or taken for any publique use or service, unlesse it be by warrant grounded upon some act of the generall Court, nor without such reasonable prices and hire as the ordinarie rates of the Countrie do afford.” Massachusetts Body of Liberties ¶ 8, in R. Perry, *Sources of Our Liberties* 149 (1978). Virginia allowed the seizure of surplus “live stock, or beef, pork, or bacon” for the military, but only upon “paying or tendering to the owner the price so estimated by the appraisers.” 1777 Va. Acts ch. XII. And South Carolina authorized the seizure of “necessaries” for public use, but provided that “said articles so seized shall be paid for agreeable to the prices such and the like articles sold for on the ninth day of October last.” 1779 S.C. Acts § 4.

Given that background, it is not surprising that early Americans bridled at appropriations of their personal property during the Revolutionary War, at the hands of both sides. John Jay, for example, complained to the New York Legislature about military impressment by the Continental Army of “Horses, Teems, and Carriages,” and voiced his fear that such action by the “little Officers” of the Quartermasters Department might extend to “Blankets, Shoes, and many other articles.” A Hint to the Legislature of the State of New York (1778), in John Jay, *The Making of a Revolutionary* 461–463 (R. Morris ed. 1975) (emphasis deleted). The legislature took the “hint,” passing a law that, among other things, provided for compensation for the impressment of horses and carriages. 1778 N.Y. Laws ch. 29. According to the author of the first treatise on the Constitution, St. George Tucker, the Takings Clause was “probably” adopted in response to “the arbitrary and oppressive mode of obtaining supplies for the army, and other public uses, by impressment, as was too frequently practised during the revolutionary war, without any compensation whatever.” 1 Blackstone’s Commentaries, Editor’s App. 305–306 (1803).

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

Nothing in this history suggests that personal property was any less protected against physical appropriation than real property. As this Court summed up in *James v. Campbell*, 104 U.S. 356, 358, 26 L.Ed. 786 (1882), a case concerning the alleged appropriation of a patent by the Government:

“[A patent] confers upon the patentee an exclusive property in the patented invention which cannot be appropriated or used by the government itself, without just compensation, any more than it can appropriate or use without compensation land which has been patented to a private purchaser.”

Prior to this Court’s decision in *Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Mahon*, 260 U.S. 393, 43 S.Ct. 158, 67 L.Ed. 322 (1922), the Takings Clause was understood to provide protection only against a direct appropriation of property—personal or real. *Pennsylvania Coal* expanded the protection of the Takings Clause, holding that compensation was also required for a “regulatory taking”—a restriction on the use of property that went “too far.” *Id.*, at 415, 43 S.Ct. 158. And in *Penn Central Transp. Co. v. New York City*, 438 U.S. 104, 124, 98 S.Ct. 2646, 57 L.Ed.2d 631 (1978), the Court clarified that the test for how far was “too far” required an “ad hoc” factual inquiry. That inquiry required considering factors such as the economic impact of the regulation, its interference with reasonable investment-backed expectations, and the character of the government action.

Four years after *Penn Central*, however, the Court reaffirmed the rule that a physical appropriation of property gave rise to a *per se* taking, without regard to other factors. In *Loretto*, the Court held that requiring an owner of an apartment building to allow installation of a cable box on her rooftop was a physical taking of real property, for which compensation was required. That was true without regard to the claimed public benefit or the economic impact on the owner. The Court explained that such protection was justified not only by history, but also because “[s]uch an appropriation is perhaps the most serious form of invasion of an owner’s property interests,” depriving the owner of the “the rights to possess, use and dispose of” the property. 458 U.S., at 435, 102 S.Ct. 3164 (internal quotation marks omitted). That reasoning—both with respect to history and logic—is equally applicable to a physical appropriation of personal

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

property.

The Ninth Circuit based its distinction between real and personal property on this Court's discussion in *Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council*, 505 U.S. 1003, 112 S.Ct. 2886, 120 L.Ed.2d 798 (1992), a case involving extensive limitations on the use of shorefront property. 750 F.3d, at 1139–1141. *Lucas* recognized that while an owner of personal property “ought to be aware of the possibility that new regulation might even render his property economically worthless,” such an “implied limitation” was not reasonable in the case of land. 505 U.S., at 1027–1028, 112 S.Ct. 2886.

Lucas, however, was about regulatory takings, not direct appropriations. Whatever *Lucas* had to say about reasonable expectations with regard to regulations, people still do not expect their property, real or personal, to be actually occupied or taken away. Our cases have stressed the “longstanding distinction” between government acquisitions of property and regulations. *Tahoe–Sierra Preservation Council*, 535 U.S., at 323, 122 S.Ct. 1465. The different treatment of real and personal property in a regulatory case suggested by *Lucas* did not alter the established rule of treating direct appropriations of real and personal property alike. See 535 U.S., at 323, 122 S.Ct. 1465. (It is “inappropriate to treat cases involving physical takings as controlling precedents for the evaluation of a claim that there has been a ‘regulatory taking,’ and vice versa” (footnote omitted)).

2.

The reserve requirement imposed by the Raisin Committee is a clear physical taking. Actual raisins are transferred from the growers to the Government. Title to the raisins passes to the Raisin Committee. App. to Pet. for Cert. 179a; Tr. of Oral Arg. 31. The Committee's raisins must be physically segregated from free-tonnage raisins. 7 CFR § 989.66(b)(2). Reserve raisins are sometimes left on the premises of handlers, but they are held “for the account” of the Government. § 989.66(a). The Committee disposes of what become its raisins as it wishes, to promote the purposes of the raisin marketing order.

Raisin growers subject to the reserve requirement thus lose the entire “bundle” of property rights in the appropriated raisins—“the rights to possess, use and dispose of” them, *Loretto*, 458 U.S., at 435, 102 S.Ct.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

3164 (internal quotation marks omitted)—with the exception of the speculative hope that some residual proceeds may be left when the Government is done with the raisins and has deducted the expenses of implementing all aspects of the marketing order. The Government’s “actual taking of possession and control” of the reserve raisins gives rise to a taking as clearly “as if the Government held full title and ownership,” *id.*, at 431, 102 S.Ct. 3164 (internal quotation marks omitted), as it essentially does. The Government’s formal demand that the Hornes turn over a percentage of their raisin crop without charge, for the Government’s control and use, is “of such a unique character that it is a taking without regard to other factors that a court might ordinarily examine.” *Id.*, at 432, 102 S.Ct. 3164.

The Government thinks it “strange” and the dissent “baffling” that the Hornes object to the reserve requirement, when they nonetheless concede that “the government may prohibit the sale of raisins without effecting a per se taking.” Brief for Respondent 35; *post*, at 2443 (SOTOMAYOR, J., dissenting). But that distinction flows naturally from the settled difference in our takings jurisprudence between appropriation and regulation. A physical taking of raisins and a regulatory limit on production may have the same economic impact on a grower. The Constitution, however, is concerned with means as well as ends. The Government has broad powers, but the means it uses to achieve its ends must be “consist[ent] with the letter and spirit of the constitution.” *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 4 Wheat. 316, 421, 4 L.Ed. 579 (1819). As Justice Holmes noted, “a strong public desire to improve the public condition is not enough to warrant achieving the desire by a shorter cut than the constitutional way.” *Pennsylvania Coal*, 260 U.S., at 416, 43 S.Ct. 158.

B.

The second question presented asks “Whether the government may avoid the categorical duty to pay just compensation for a physical taking of property by reserving to the property owner a contingent interest in a portion of the value of the property, set at the government’s discretion.” The answer is no.

The Government and dissent argue that raisins are fungible goods whose only value is in the revenue from their sale. According to the Government,

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

the raisin marketing order leaves that interest with the raisin growers: After selling reserve raisins and deducting expenses and subsidies for exporters, the Raisin Committee returns any net proceeds to the growers. 7 CFR §§ 989.67(d), 989.82, 989.53(a), 989.66(h). The Government contends that because growers are entitled to these net proceeds, they retain the most important property interest in the reserve raisins, so there is no taking in the first place. The dissent agrees, arguing that this possible future revenue means there has been no taking under *Loretto*. See *post*, at 2437 – 2440.

But when there has been a physical appropriation, “we do not ask ... whether it deprives the owner of all economically valuable use” of the item taken. *Tahoe–Sierra Preservation Council*, 535 U.S., at 323, 122 S.Ct. 1465; see *id.*, at 322, 122 S.Ct. 1465 (“When the government physically takes possession of an interest in property for some public purpose, it has a categorical duty to compensate the former owner, regardless of whether the interest that is taken constitutes an entire parcel or merely a part thereof.” (citation omitted)). For example, in *Loretto*, we held that the installation of a cable box on a small corner of *Loretto*’s rooftop was a *per se* taking, even though she could of course still sell and economically benefit from the property. 458 U.S., at 430, 436, 102 S.Ct. 3164. The fact that the growers retain a contingent interest of indeterminate value does not mean there has been no physical taking, particularly since the value of the interest depends on the discretion of the taker, and may be worthless, as it was for one of the two years at issue here.

The dissent points to *Andrus v. Allard*, 444 U.S. 51, 100 S.Ct. 318, 62 L.Ed.2d 210 (1979), noting that the Court found no taking in that case, even though the owners’ artifacts could not be sold at all. *Post*, at 2440. The dissent suggests that the Hornes should be happy, because they might at least get *something* from what had been their raisins. But *Allard* is a very different case. As the dissent recognizes, the owners in that case retained the rights to possess, donate, and devise their property. In finding no taking, the Court emphasized that the Government did not “compel the surrender of the artifacts, and there [was] no physical invasion or restraint upon them.” 444 U.S., at 65–66, 100 S.Ct. 318. Here of course the raisin program requires physical surrender of the raisins and transfer of title, and the growers lose any right to control their disposition.

The Government and dissent again confuse our inquiry concerning *per se*

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

takings with our analysis for regulatory takings. A regulatory restriction on use that does not entirely deprive an owner of property rights may not be a taking under *Penn Central*. That is why, in *PruneYard Shopping Center v. Robins*, 447 U.S. 74, 100 S.Ct. 2035, 64 L.Ed.2d 741 (1980), we held that a law limiting a property owner's right to exclude certain speakers from an already publicly accessible shopping center did not take the owner's property. The owner retained the value of the use of the property as a shopping center largely unimpaired, so the regulation did not go "too far." *Id.*, at 83, 100 S.Ct. 2035 (quoting *Pennsylvania Coal Co.*, 260 U.S., at 415, 43 S.Ct. 158). But once there is a taking, as in the case of a physical appropriation, any payment from the Government in connection with that action goes, at most, to the question of just compensation. See *Suitum v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency*, 520 U.S. 725, 747–748, 117 S.Ct. 1659, 137 L.Ed.2d 980 (1997) (SCALIA, J., concurring in part and concurring in judgment). That is not an issue here: The Hornes did not receive any net proceeds from Raisin Committee sales for the years at issue, because they had not set aside any reserve raisins in those years (and, in any event, there were no net proceeds in one of them).

C.

The third question presented asks "Whether a governmental mandate to relinquish specific, identifiable property as a 'condition' on permission to engage in commerce effects a per se taking." The answer, at least in this case, is yes.

The Government contends that the reserve requirement is not a taking because raisin growers voluntarily choose to participate in the raisin market. According to the Government, if raisin growers don't like it, they can "plant different crops," or "sell their raisin-variety grapes as table grapes or for use in juice or wine." Brief for Respondent 32 (brackets and internal quotation marks omitted).

"Let them sell wine" is probably not much more comforting to the raisin growers than similar retorts have been to others throughout history. In any event, the Government is wrong as a matter of law. In *Loretto*, we rejected the argument that the New York law was not a taking because a landlord could avoid the requirement by ceasing to be a landlord. We held instead that "a landlord's ability to rent his property may not be conditioned on

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

his forfeiting the right to compensation for a physical occupation.” 458 U.S., at 439, n. 17, 102 S.Ct. 3164. As the Court explained, the contrary argument “proves too much”:

“For example, it would allow the government to require a landlord to devote a substantial portion of his building to vending and washing machines, with all profits to be retained by the owners of these services and with no compensation for the deprivation of space. It would even allow the government to requisition a certain number of apartments as permanent government offices.” *Ibid.*

As the Court concluded, property rights “cannot be so easily manipulated.” *Ibid.*

The Government and dissent rely heavily on *Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*, 467 U.S. 986, 104 S.Ct. 2862, 81 L.Ed.2d 815 (1984). There we held that the Environmental Protection Agency could require companies manufacturing pesticides, fungicides, and rodenticides to disclose health, safety, and environmental information about their products as a condition to receiving a permit to sell those products. While such information included trade secrets in which pesticide manufacturers had a property interest, those manufacturers were not subjected to a taking because they received a “valuable Government benefit” in exchange—a license to sell dangerous chemicals. *Id.*, at 1007, 104 S.Ct. 2862; see *Nollan*, 483 U.S., at 834, n. 2, 107 S.Ct. 3141 (discussing *Monsanto*).

The taking here cannot reasonably be characterized as part of a similar voluntary exchange. In one of the years at issue here, the Government insisted that the Hornes turn over 47 percent of their raisin crop, in exchange for the “benefit” of being allowed to sell the remaining 53 percent. The next year, the toll was 30 percent. We have already rejected the idea that *Monsanto* may be extended by regarding basic and familiar uses of property as a “Government benefit” on the same order as a permit to sell hazardous chemicals. See *Nollan*, 483 U.S., at 834, n. 2, 107 S.Ct. 3141 (distinguishing *Monsanto* on the ground that “the right to build on one’s own property—even though its exercise can be subjected to legitimate permitting requirements—cannot remotely be described as a ‘governmental benefit’ ”). Selling produce in interstate commerce, although certainly subject to reasonable government regulation, is

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

similarly not a special governmental benefit that the Government may hold hostage, to be ransomed by the waiver of constitutional protection. Raisins are not dangerous pesticides; they are a healthy snack. A case about conditioning the sale of hazardous substances on disclosure of health, safety, and environmental information related to those hazards is hardly on point.

Leonard & Leonard v. Earle, 279 U.S. 392, 49 S.Ct. 372, 73 L.Ed. 754 (1929), is also readily distinguishable. In that case, the Court upheld a Maryland requirement that oyster packers remit ten percent of the marketable detached oyster shells or their monetary equivalent to the State for the privilege of harvesting the oysters. But the packers did “not deny the power of the State to declare their business a privilege,” and the power of the State to impose a “privilege tax” was “not questioned by counsel.” *Id.*, at 396, 49 S.Ct. 372. The oysters, unlike raisins, were “feræ naturæ” that belonged to the State under state law, and “[n]o individual ha[d] any property rights in them other than such as the state may permit him to acquire.” *Leonard v. Earle*, 155 Md. 252, 258, 141 A. 714, 716 (1928). The oyster packers did not simply seek to sell their property; they sought to appropriate the State’s. Indeed, the Maryland Court of Appeals saw the issue as a question of “a reasonable and fair compensation” from the packers to “the state, as owner of the oysters.” *Id.*, at 259, 141 A., at 717 (internal quotation marks omitted).

Raisins are not like oysters: they are private property—the fruit of the growers’ labor—not “public things subject to the absolute control of the state,” *id.*, at 258, 141 A., at 716. Any physical taking of them for public use must be accompanied by just compensation.

III

The Government correctly points out that a taking does not violate the Fifth Amendment unless there is no just compensation, and argues that the Hornes are free to seek compensation for any taking by bringing a damages action under the Tucker Act in the Court of Federal Claims. See 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1); *Monsanto*, 467 U.S., at 1020, 104 S.Ct. 2862. But we held in *Horne I* that the Hornes may, in their capacity as handlers, raise a takings-based defense to the fine levied against them. We specifically rejected the contention that the Hornes were required to pay the fine and

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

then seek compensation under the Tucker Act. See 569 U.S., at —, 133 S.Ct., at 2063 (“We ... conclude that the [Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act] withdraws Tucker Act jurisdiction over [the Hornes’] takings claim. [The Hornes] (as handlers) have no alternative remedy, and their takings claim was not ‘premature’ when presented to the Ninth Circuit.”).

As noted, the Hornes are both growers and handlers. Their situation is unusual in that, as handlers, they have the full economic interest in the raisins the Government alleges should have been set aside for its account. They own the raisins they grew and are handling for themselves, and they own the raisins they handle for other growers, having paid those growers for all their raisins (not just the free-tonnage amount, as is true with respect to most handlers). See *supra*, at 2424 – 2425; Tr. of Oral Arg. 3–4. The penalty assessed against them as handlers included the dollar equivalent of the raisins they refused to set aside—their raisins. 750 F.3d, at 1135, n. 6; Brief for Petitioners 15. They may challenge the imposition of that fine, and do not have to pay it first and then resort to the Court of Federal Claims.

Finally, the Government briefly argues that if we conclude that the reserve requirement effects a taking, we should remand for the Court of Appeals to calculate “what compensation would have been due if petitioners had complied with the reserve requirement.” Brief for Respondent 55. The Government contends that the calculation must consider what the value of the reserve raisins would have been without the price support program, as well as “other benefits ... from the regulatory program, such as higher consumer demand for raisins spurred by enforcement of quality standards and promotional activities.” *Id.*, at 55–56. Indeed, according to the Government, the Hornes would “likely” have a net gain under this theory. *Id.*, at 56.

The best defense may be a good offense, but the Government cites no support for its hypothetical-based approach, or its notion that general regulatory activity such as enforcement of quality standards can constitute just compensation for a specific physical taking. Instead, our cases have set forth a clear and administrable rule for just compensation: “The Court has repeatedly held that just compensation normally is to be measured by ‘the market value of the property at the time of the taking.’ ” *United States*

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

v. 50 Acres of Land, 469 U.S. 24, 29, 105 S.Ct. 451, 83 L.Ed.2d 376 (1984) (quoting *Olson v. United States*, 292 U.S. 246, 255, 54 S.Ct. 704, 78 L.Ed. 1236 (1934)).

Justice BREYER is concerned that applying this rule in this case will affect provisions concerning whether a condemning authority may deduct special benefits—such as new access to a waterway or highway, or filling in of swampland—from the amount of compensation it seeks to pay a landowner suffering a partial taking. *Post*, at 2435 – 2436 (opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part); see *Bauman v. Ross*, 167 U.S. 548, 17 S.Ct. 966, 42 L.Ed. 270 (1897) (laying out of streets and subdivisions in the District of Columbia). He need not be. Cases of that sort can raise complicated questions involving the exercise of the eminent domain power, but they do not create a generally applicable exception to the usual compensation rule, based on asserted regulatory benefits of the sort at issue here. Nothing in the cases Justice BREYER labels “*Bauman* and its progeny,” *post*, at 2435, suggests otherwise, which may be why the Solicitor General does not cite them.*

* For example, in *United States v. Miller*, 317 U.S. 369, 377, 63 S.Ct. 276, 87 L.Ed. 336 (1943), the Court—in calculating the fair market value of land—discounted an increase in value resulting from speculation “as to what the Government would be compelled to pay as compensation” after the land was earmarked for acquisition. In *United States v. Spontenbarger*, 308 U.S. 256, 265, 60 S.Ct. 225, 84 L.Ed. 230 (1939), the Court determined there was no taking in the first place, when the complaint was merely that a Government flood control plan provided insufficient protection for the claimant’s land. *McCoy v. Union Elevated R. Co.*, 247 U.S. 354, 363, 38 S.Ct. 504, 62 L.Ed. 1156 (1918), similarly involved a claim “for damages to property not actually taken.” So too *Reichelderfer v. Quinn*, 287 U.S. 315, 53 S.Ct. 177, 77 L.Ed. 331 (1932). There the Court held that claimants who had paid a special assessment when Rock Creek Park in Washington, D.C., was created—because the Park increased the value of their property—did not thereby have the right to prevent Congress from altering use of part of the Park for a fire station 38 years later. In *Dohany v. Rogers*, 281 U.S. 362, 50 S.Ct. 299, 74 L.Ed. 904 (1930), the law authorizing the taking did “not permit the offset of benefits for a railroad,” and therefore was “not subject to the objection that it fails to provide adequate compensation ... and is therefore unconstitutional.” *Id.*, at 367, and n. 1, 50 S.Ct. 299 (quoting *Fitzsimmons & Galvin, Inc. v. Rogers*, 243 Mich. 649, 665, 220 N.W. 881, 886 (1928)). And in *Norwood v. Baker*, 172 U.S. 269, 19 S.Ct. 187, 43 L.Ed. 443 (1898), the issue was whether an assessment to pay for improvements exceeded a village’s taxing power. Perhaps farthest afield are the *Regional Rail Reorganization Act Cases*, 419 U.S. 102, 153, 95 S.Ct. 335, 42 L.Ed.2d 320 (1974), which involved valuation questions arising from the Government reorganization of northeast and midwest railroads. The Court in that case held that the legislation at issue was not “merely an eminent domain statute” but instead was enacted “pursuant to the bankruptcy power.” *Id.*, at 151, 153, 95 S.Ct. 335.

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

In any event, this litigation presents no occasion to consider the broader issues discussed by Justice BREYER. The Government has already calculated the amount of just compensation in this case, when it fined the Hornes the fair market value of the raisins: \$483,843.53. 750 F.3d, at 1135, n. 6. The Government cannot now disavow that valuation, see Reply Brief 21–23, and does not suggest that the marketing order affords the Hornes compensation in that amount. There is accordingly no need for a remand; the Hornes should simply be relieved of the obligation to pay the fine and associated civil penalty they were assessed when they resisted the Government’s effort to take their raisins. This case, in litigation for more than a decade, has gone on long enough.

The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is reversed.

It is so ordered.

--

JUSTICE THOMAS, CONCURRING.

I join the Court’s opinion in full. I write separately to offer an additional observation concerning Justice BREYER’s argument that we should remand the case. The Takings Clause prohibits the government from taking private property except “for public use,” even when it offers “just compensation.” U.S. Const., Amdt. 5. That requirement, as originally understood, imposes a meaningful constraint on the power of the state—“the government may take property only if it actually uses or gives the public a legal right to use the property.” *Kelo v. New London*, 545 U.S. 469, 521, 125 S.Ct. 2655, 162 L.Ed.2d 439 (2005) (THOMAS, J., dissenting). It is far from clear that the Raisin Administrative Committee’s conduct meets that standard. It takes the raisins of citizens and, among other things, gives them away or sells them to exporters, foreign importers, and foreign governments. 7 CFR § 989.67(b) (2015). To the extent that the Committee is not taking the raisins “for public use,” having the Court of

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

Appeals calculate “just compensation” in this case would be a fruitless exercise.

--

JUSTICE BREYER, WITH WHOM **JUSTICE GINSBURG** AND **JUSTICE KAGAN** JOIN, CONCURRING IN PART AND DISSENTING IN PART.

I agree with Parts I and II of the Court’s opinion. However, I cannot agree with the Court’s rejection, in Part III, of the Government’s final argument. The Government contends that we should remand the case for a determination of whether any compensation would have been due if the Hornes had complied with the California Raisin Marketing Order’s reserve requirement. In my view, a remand for such a determination is necessary.

The question of just compensation was not presented in the Hornes’ petition for certiorari. It was barely touched on in the briefs. And the courts below did not decide it. At the same time, the case law that I have found indicates that the Government may well be right: The marketing order may afford just compensation for the takings of raisins that it imposes. If that is correct, then the reserve requirement does not violate the Takings Clause.

I

The Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment provides that “private property [shall not] be taken for public use, without just compensation.” The Clause means what it says: It “does not proscribe the taking of property; it proscribes taking *without just compensation*.” *Williamson County Regional Planning Comm’n v. Hamilton Bank of Johnson City*, 473 U.S. 172, 194, 105 S.Ct. 3108, 87 L.Ed.2d 126 (1985) (emphasis added). Under the Clause, a property owner “is entitled to be put in as good a position pecuniarily as if his property had not been taken,” which is to say that “[h]e must be made whole but is not entitled to more.” *Olson v. United States*, 292 U.S. 246, 255, 54 S.Ct. 704, 78 L.Ed. 1236 (1934).

On the record before us, the Hornes have not established that the Government, through the raisin reserve program, takes raisins *without just*

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

compensation. When the Government takes as reserve raisins a percentage of the annual crop, the raisin owners retain the remaining, free-tonnage, raisins. The reserve requirement is intended, at least in part, to enhance the price that free-tonnage raisins will fetch on the open market. See 7 CFR § 989.55 (2015); 7 U.S.C. § 602(1). And any such enhancement matters. This Court’s precedents indicate that, when calculating the just compensation that the Fifth Amendment requires, a court should deduct from the value of the taken (reserve) raisins any enhancement caused by the taking to the value of the remaining (free-tonnage) raisins.

More than a century ago, in *Bauman v. Ross*, 167 U.S. 548, 17 S.Ct. 966, 42 L.Ed. 270 (1897), this Court established an exception to the rule that “just compensation normally is to be measured by ‘the market value of the property at the time of the taking.’ ” *United States v. 50 Acres of Land*, 469 U.S. 24, 29, 105 S.Ct. 451, 83 L.Ed.2d 376 (1984) (quoting *Olson*, *supra*, at 255, 54 S.Ct. 704). We considered in *Bauman* how to calculate just compensation when the Government takes only a portion of a parcel of property:

“[W]hen part only of a parcel of land is taken for a highway, the value of that part is not the sole measure of the compensation or damages to be paid to the owner; but the incidental injury or benefit to the part not taken is also to be considered. When the part not taken is left in such shape or condition, as to be in itself of less value than before, the owner is entitled to additional damages on that account. When, on the other hand, the part which he retains is specially and directly increased in value by the public improvement, the damages to the whole parcel by the appropriation of part of it are lessened.” 167 U.S., at 574, 17 S.Ct. 966.

“The Constitution of the United States,” the Court stated, “contains no express prohibition against considering benefits in estimating the just compensation to be paid for private property taken for the public use.” *Id.*, at 584, 17 S.Ct. 966.

The Court has consistently applied this method for calculating just compensation: It sets off from the value of the portion that was taken the value of any benefits conferred upon the remaining portion of the property.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

See *Regional Rail Reorganization Act Cases*, 419 U.S. 102, 151, 95 S.Ct. 335, 42 L.Ed.2d 320 (1974) (“[C]onsideration other than cash—for example, any special benefits to a property owner’s remaining properties—may be counted in the determination of just compensation” (footnote omitted)); *United States v. Miller*, 317 U.S. 369, 376, 63 S.Ct. 276, 87 L.Ed. 336 (1943) (“[I]f the taking has in fact benefitted the remainder, the benefit may be set off against the value of the land taken”); *United States v. Sponenbarger*, 308 U.S. 256, 266–267, 60 S.Ct. 225, 84 L.Ed. 230 (1939) (“[I]f governmental activities inflict slight damage upon land in one respect and actually confer great benefits when measured in the whole, to compensate the landowner further would be to grant him a special bounty. Such activities in substance take nothing from the landowner”); *Reichelderfer v. Quinn*, 287 U.S. 315, 323, 53 S.Ct. 177, 77 L.Ed. 331 (1932) (“Just compensation ... was awarded if the benefits resulting from the proximity of the improvement [were] set off against the value of the property taken from the same owners”); *Dohany v. Rogers*, 281 U.S. 362, 367–368, 50 S.Ct. 299, 74 L.Ed. 904 (1930) (a statute that “permits deduction of benefits derived from the construction of a highway” from the compensation paid to landowners “afford[s] no basis for anticipating that ... just compensation will be denied”); *Norwood v. Baker*, 172 U.S. 269, 277, 19 S.Ct. 187, 43 L.Ed. 443 (1898) (“Except for [state law], the State could have authorized benefits to be deducted from the actual value of the land taken, without violating the constitutional injunction that compensation be made for private property taken for public use; for the benefits received could be properly regarded as compensation *pro tanto* for the property appropriated to public use”).

The rule applies regardless of whether a taking enhances the value of one property or the value of many properties. That is to say, the Government may “permi[t] consideration of actual benefits—enhancement in market value—flowing directly from a public work, although all in the neighborhood receive like advantages.” *McCoy v. Union Elevated R. Co.*, 247 U.S. 354, 366, 38 S.Ct. 504, 62 L.Ed. 1156 (1918). The Federal Constitution does not distinguish between “special” benefits, which specifically affect the property taken, and “general” benefits, which have a broader impact.

Of course, a State may prefer to guarantee a greater payment to property owners, for instance by establishing a standard for compensation that does

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

not account for general benefits (or for any benefits) afforded to a property owner by a taking. See *id.*, at 365, 38 S.Ct. 504 (describing categories of rules applied in different jurisdictions); Schopflocher, Deduction of Benefits in Determining Compensation or Damages in Eminent Domain, 145 A.L.R. 7, 158–294 (1943) (describing particular rules applied in different jurisdictions). Similarly, “Congress ... has the power to authorize compensation greater than the constitutional minimum.” *50 Acres of Land, supra*, at 30, n. 14, 105 S.Ct. 451 (1984). Thus, Congress, too, may limit the types of benefits to be considered. See, e.g., 33 U.S.C. § 595. But I am unaware of any congressional authorization that would increase beyond the constitutional floor the compensation owed for a taking of the Hornes’ raisins.

If we apply *Bauman* and its progeny to the marketing order’s reserve requirement, “the benefit [to the free-tonnage raisins] may be set off against the value of the [reserve raisins] taken.” *Miller, supra*, at 376, 63 S.Ct. 276. The value of the raisins taken might exceed the value of the benefit conferred. In that case, the reserve requirement effects a taking without just compensation, and the Hornes’ decision not to comply with the requirement was justified. On the other hand, the benefit might equal or exceed the value of the raisins taken. In that case, the California Raisin Marketing Order does not effect a taking without just compensation. See *McCoy, supra*, at 366, 38 S.Ct. 504 (“In such [a] case the owner really loses nothing which he had before; and it may be said with reason, there has been no real injury”); *Brown v. Legal Foundation of Wash.*, 538 U.S. 216, 237, 123 S.Ct. 1406, 155 L.Ed.2d 376 (2003) (“[I]f petitioners’ net loss was zero, the compensation that is due is also zero”). And even the Hornes agree that if the reserve requirement does not effect a taking without just compensation, then they cannot use the Takings Clause to excuse their failure to comply with the marketing order—or to justify their refusal to pay the fine and penalty imposed based on that failure. See Brief for Petitioners 31 (“The constitutionality of the fine rises or falls on the constitutionality of the Marketing Order’s reserve requirement and attendant transfer of reserve raisins” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

II

The majority believes the *Bauman* line of cases most likely does not apply here. It says that those cases do “not create a generally applicable

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

exception to the usual compensation rule, based on asserted regulatory benefits of the sort at issue here.” *Ante*, at 2432. But it is unclear to me what distinguishes this case from those.

It seems unlikely that the majority finds a distinction in the fact that this taking is based on regulatory authority. Cf. *Chrysler Corp. v. Brown*, 441 U.S. 281, 295, 99 S.Ct. 1705, 60 L.Ed.2d 208 (1979) (“It has been established in a variety of contexts that properly promulgated, substantive agency regulations have the force and effect of law” (internal quotation marks omitted)). It similarly seems unlikely that the majority intends to distinguish between takings of real property and takings of personal property, given its recognition that the Takings Clause “protects ‘private property’ without any distinction between different types.” *Ante*, at 2426. It is possible that the majority questions the Government’s argument because of its breadth—the Government argues that “it would be appropriate to consider what value all of the raisins would have had *in the absence of the marketing order*,” and I am unaware of any precedent that allows a court to account for portions of the marketing order that are entirely separate from the reserve requirement. But neither am I aware of any precedent that would distinguish between how the *Bauman* doctrine applies to the reserve requirement itself and how it applies to other types of partial takings.

Ultimately, the majority rejects the Government’s request for a remand because it believes that the Government “does not suggest that the marketing order affords the Hornes compensation” in the amount of the fine that the Government assessed. *Ante*, at 2433. In my view, however, the relevant precedent indicates that the Takings Clause requires compensation in an amount equal to the value of the reserve raisins adjusted to account for the benefits received. And the Government does, indeed, suggest that the marketing order affords just compensation. See Brief for Respondent 56 (“It is likely that when all benefits and alleged losses from the marketing order are calculated, [the Hornes] would have a net *gain* rather than a net loss, given that a central point of the order is to benefit producers”). Further, the Hornes have not demonstrated the contrary. Before granting judgment in favor of the Hornes, a court should address the issue in light of all of the relevant facts and law.

* * *

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

Given the precedents, the parties should provide full briefing on this question. I would remand the case, permitting the lower courts to consider argument on the question of just compensation.

For these reasons, while joining Parts I and II of the Court’s opinion, I respectfully dissent from Part III.

--

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR, DISSENTING.

The Hornes claim, and the Court agrees, that the Raisin Marketing Order, 7 CFR pt. 989 (2015) (hereinafter Order), effects a *per se* taking under our decision in *Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.*, 458 U.S. 419, 102 S.Ct. 3164, 73 L.Ed.2d 868 (1982). But *Loretto* sets a high bar for such claims: It requires that each and every property right be destroyed by governmental action before that action can be said to have effected a *per se* taking. Because the Order does not deprive the Hornes of all of their property rights, it does not effect a *per se* taking. I respectfully dissent from the Court’s contrary holding.

I

Our Takings Clause jurisprudence has generally eschewed “magic formula[s]” and has “recognized few invariable rules.” *Arkansas Game and Fish Comm’n v. United States*, 568 U.S. —, — — —, 133 S.Ct. 511, 518, 184 L.Ed.2d 417 (2012). Most takings cases therefore proceed under the fact-specific balancing test set out in *Penn Central Transp. Co. v. New York City*, 438 U.S. 104, 98 S.Ct. 2646, 57 L.Ed.2d 631 (1978). See *Arkansas Game and Fish Comm’n*, 568 U.S., at —, 133 S.Ct., at 518–519; *Lingle v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc.*, 544 U.S. 528, 538–539, 125 S.Ct. 2074, 161 L.Ed.2d 876 (2005). The Hornes have not made any argument under *Penn Central*. In order to prevail, they therefore must fit their claim into one of the three narrow categories in which we have assessed takings claims more categorically.

In the “special context of land-use exactions,” we have held that “government demands that a landowner dedicate an easement allowing

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

public access to her property as a condition of obtaining a development permit” constitute takings unless the government demonstrates a nexus and rough proportionality between its demand and the impact of the proposed development. *Lingle*, 544 U.S., at 538, 546, 125 S.Ct. 2074; see *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 512 U.S. 374, 386, 391, 114 S.Ct. 2309, 129 L.Ed.2d 304 (1994); *Nollan v. California Coastal Comm’n*, 483 U.S. 825, 837, 107 S.Ct. 3141, 97 L.Ed.2d 677 (1987). We have also held that a regulation that deprives a property owner of “all economically beneficial us[e]” of his or her land is a *per se* taking. *Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council*, 505 U.S. 1003, 1019, 112 S.Ct. 2886, 120 L.Ed.2d 798 (1992) (emphasis in original). The Hornes have not relied on either of these rules in this Court. See Brief for Petitioners 42, 55.

Finally—and this is the argument the Hornes do rely on—we have held that the government effects a *per se* taking when it requires a property owner to suffer a “permanent physical occupation” of his or her property. *Loretto*, 458 U.S., at 426, 102 S.Ct. 3164. In my view, however, *Loretto*—when properly understood—does not encompass the circumstances of this case because it only applies where all property rights have been destroyed by governmental action. Where some property right is retained by the owner, no *per se* taking under *Loretto* has occurred.

This strict rule is apparent from the reasoning in *Loretto* itself. We explained that “[p]roperty rights in a physical thing have been described as the rights ‘to possess, use and dispose of it.’ ” *Id.*, at 435, 102 S.Ct. 3164 (quoting *United States v. General Motors Corp.*, 323 U.S. 373, 378, 65 S.Ct. 357, 89 L.Ed. 311 (1945)). A “permanent physical occupation” of property occurs, we said, when governmental action “destroys *each* of these rights.” 458 U.S., at 435, 102 S.Ct. 3164 (emphasis in original); see *ibid.*, n. 12 (requiring that an owner be “absolutely dispossess[ed]” of rights). When, as we held in *Loretto*, *each* of these rights is destroyed, the government has not simply “take[n] a single ‘strand’ from the ‘bundle’ of property rights”; it has “chop[ped] through the bundle” entirely. *Id.*, at 435, 102 S.Ct. 3164. In the narrow circumstance in which a property owner has suffered this “most serious form of invasion of [his or her] property interests,” a taking can be said to have occurred without any further showing on the property owner’s part. *Ibid.*

By contrast, in the mine run of cases where governmental action impacts

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

property rights in ways that do not chop through the bundle entirely, we have declined to apply *per se* rules and have instead opted for the more nuanced *Penn Central* test. See, e.g., *Hodel v. Irving*, 481 U.S. 704, 107 S.Ct. 2076, 95 L.Ed.2d 668 (1987) (applying *Penn Central* to assess a requirement that title to land within Indian reservations escheat to the tribe upon the landowner's death); *PruneYard Shopping Center v. Robins*, 447 U.S. 74, 82–83, 100 S.Ct. 2035, 64 L.Ed.2d 741 (1980) (engaging in similar analysis where there was “literally ... a ‘taking’ of th[e] right” to exclude); *Kaiser Aetna v. United States*, 444 U.S. 164, 174–180, 100 S.Ct. 383, 62 L.Ed.2d 332 (1979) (applying *Penn Central* to find that the Government's imposition of a servitude requiring public access to a pond was a taking); see also *Loretto*, 458 U.S., at 433–434, 102 S.Ct. 3164 (distinguishing *PruneYard* and *Kaiser Aetna*). Even governmental action that reduces the value of property or that imposes “a significant restriction ... on one means of disposing” of property is not a *per se* taking; in fact, it may not even be a taking at all. *Andrus v. Allard*, 444 U.S. 51, 65–66, 100 S.Ct. 318, 62 L.Ed.2d 210 (1979).

What our jurisprudence thus makes plain is that a claim of a *Loretto* taking is a bold accusation that carries with it a heavy burden. To qualify as a *per se* taking under *Loretto*, the governmental action must be so completely destructive to the property owner's rights—all of them—as to render the ordinary, generally applicable protections of the *Penn Central* framework either a foregone conclusion or unequal to the task. Simply put, the retention of even one property right that is not destroyed is sufficient to defeat a claim of a *per se* taking under *Loretto*.

II

A.

When evaluating the Order under this rubric, it is important to bear two things in mind. The first is that *Loretto* is not concerned with whether the Order is a good idea now, whether it was ever a good idea, or whether it intrudes upon some property rights. The Order may well be an outdated, and by some lights downright silly, regulation. It is also no doubt intrusive. But whatever else one can say about the Order, it is not a *per se* taking if it does not result in the destruction of every property right. The second thing to keep in mind is the need for precision about whose property rights

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

are at issue and about what property is at issue. Here, what is at issue are the Hornes' property rights in the raisins they own and that are subject to the reserve requirement. The Order therefore effects a *per se* taking under *Loretto* if and only if each of the Hornes' property rights in the portion of raisins that the Order designated as reserve has been destroyed. If not, then whatever fate the Order may reach under some other takings test, it is not a *per se* taking.

The Hornes, however, retain at least one meaningful property interest in the reserve raisins: the right to receive some money for their disposition. The Order explicitly provides that raisin producers retain the right to “[t]he net proceeds from the disposition of reserve tonnage raisins,” 7 CFR § 989.66(h), and ensures that reserve raisins will be sold “at prices and in a manner intended to maxim[ize] producer returns,” § 989.67(d)(1). According to the Government, of the 49 crop years for which a reserve pool was operative, producers received equitable distributions of net proceeds from the disposition of reserve raisins in 42. See Letter from Donald B. Verrilli, Jr., Solicitor General, to Scott S. Harris, Clerk of Court (Apr. 29, 2015).

Granted, this equitable distribution may represent less income than what some or all of the reserve raisins could fetch if sold in an unregulated market. In some years, it may even turn out (and has turned out) to represent no net income. But whether and when that occurs turns on market forces for which the Government cannot be blamed and to which all commodities—indeed, all property—are subject. In any event, we have emphasized that “a reduction in the value of property is not necessarily equated with a taking,” *Andrus*, 444 U.S., at 66, 100 S.Ct. 318 that even “a significant restriction ... imposed on one means of disposing” of property is not necessarily a taking, *id.*, at 65, 100 S.Ct. 318 and that not every “‘injury to property by governmental action’ ” amounts to a taking, *PruneYard*, 447 U.S., at 82, 100 S.Ct. 2035. Indeed, we would not have used the word “destroy” in *Loretto* if we meant “damaged” or even “substantially damaged.” I take us at our word: *Loretto*’s strict requirement that all property interests be “destroy[ed]” by governmental action before that action can be called a *per se* taking cannot be satisfied if there remains a property interest that is at most merely damaged. That is the case here; accordingly, no *per se* taking has occurred.

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

Moreover, when, as here, the property at issue is a fungible commodity for sale, the income that the property may yield is the property owner's most central interest. Cf. *Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*, 467 U.S. 986, 1002, 104 S.Ct. 2862, 81 L.Ed.2d 815 (1984) (noting that the "nature" of particular property defines "the extent of the property right therein"). "[A]rticles of commerce," in other words, are "desirable because [they are] convertible into money." *Leonard & Leonard v. Earle*, 279 U.S. 392, 396, 49 S.Ct. 372, 73 L.Ed. 754 (1929). The Hornes do not use the raisins that are subject to the reserve requirement—which are, again, the only raisins that have allegedly been unlawfully taken—by eating them, feeding them to farm animals, or the like. They wish to use those reserve raisins by selling them, and they value those raisins only because they are a means of acquiring money. While the Order infringes upon the amount of that potential income, it does not inexorably eliminate it. Unlike the law in *Loretto*, see 458 U.S., at 436, 102 S.Ct. 3164 the Order therefore cannot be said to have prevented the Hornes from making *any* use of the relevant property.

The conclusion that the Order does not effect a *per se* taking fits comfortably within our precedents. After all, we have observed that even "[r]egulations that bar trade in certain goods" altogether—for example, a ban on the sale of eagle feathers—may survive takings challenges. *Andrus*, 444 U.S., at 67, 100 S.Ct. 318. To be sure, it was important to our decision in *Andrus* that the regulation at issue did not prohibit the possession, donation, or devise of the property. See *id.*, at 66, 100 S.Ct. 318. But as to those feathers the plaintiffs would have liked to sell, the law said they could not be sold at any price—and therefore categorically could not be converted into money. Here, too, the Hornes may do as they wish with the raisins they are not selling. But as to those raisins that they would like to sell, the Order subjects a subset of them to the reserve requirement, which allows for the conversion of reserve raisins into at least *some* money and which is thus *more* generous than the law in *Andrus*. We held that no taking occurred in *Andrus*, so rejecting the Hornes' claim follows *a fortiori*.

We made this principle even clearer in *Lucas*, when we relied on *Andrus* and said that where, as here, "property's only economically productive use is sale or manufacture for sale," a regulation could even "render [that] property economically *worthless*" without effecting a *per se* taking. *Lucas*, 505 U.S., at 1027–1028, 112 S.Ct. 2886 (citing *Andrus*, 444 U.S., at 66–

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

67, 100 S.Ct. 318; emphasis added). The Order does not go nearly that far. It should easily escape our opprobrium, at least where a *per se* takings claim is concerned.

B.

The fact that at least one property right is not destroyed by the Order is alone sufficient to hold that this case does not fall within the narrow confines of *Loretto*. But such a holding is also consistent with another line of cases that, when viewed together, teach that the government may require certain property rights to be given up as a condition of entry into a regulated market without effecting a *per se* taking.

First, in *Leonard & Leonard v. Earle*, 279 U.S. 392, 49 S.Ct. 372, 73 L.Ed. 754, we considered a state law that required those who wished to engage in the business of oyster packing to deliver to the State 10 percent of the empty oyster shells. We rejected the argument that this law effected a taking and held that it was “not materially different” from a tax upon the privilege of doing business in the State. *Id.*, at 396, 49 S.Ct. 372. “[A]s the packer lawfully could be required to pay that sum in money,” we said, “nothing in the Federal Constitution prevents the State from demanding that he give up the same per cent of such shells.” *Ibid.*¹

Next, in *Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*, 467 U.S. 986, 104 S.Ct. 2862, 81 L.Ed.2d 815, we held that no taking occurred when a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act required companies that wished to sell certain pesticides to first submit sensitive data and trade secrets to the Environmental Protection Agency as part of a registration process. Even though the EPA was permitted to publicly disclose some of that submitted data—which would have had the effect of revealing trade secrets, thus substantially diminishing or perhaps even eliminating their value—we reasoned that, like the privilege tax in *Leonard & Leonard*, the disclosure requirement was the price Monsanto had to pay for “ ‘the

¹ The Court attempts to distinguish *Leonard & Leonard* because it involved wild oysters, not raisins. *Ante*, at 2430. That is not an inaccurate factual statement, but I do not find in *Leonard & Leonard* any suggestion that its holding turned on this or any other of the facts to which the Court now points. Indeed, the only citation the Court offers for these allegedly crucial facts is the Maryland Court of Appeals’ opinion, not ours. See *ante*, at 2430.

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

advantage of living and doing business in a civilized community.’ ” 467 U.S., at 1007, 104 S.Ct. 2862 (quoting *Andrus*, 444 U.S., at 67, 100 S.Ct. 318; some internal quotation marks omitted). We offered nary a suggestion that the law at issue could be considered a *per se* taking, and instead recognized that “a voluntary submission of data by an applicant” in exchange for the ability to participate in a regulated market “can hardly be called a taking.” 467 U.S., at 1007, 104 S.Ct. 2862.²

Finally, in *Yee v. Escondido*, 503 U.S. 519, 112 S.Ct. 1522, 118 L.Ed.2d 153 (1992), we addressed a mobile-home park rent-control ordinance that set rents at below-market rates. We held the ordinance did not effect a taking under *Loretto*, even when it was considered in conjunction with other state laws regarding eviction that effectively permitted tenants to remain at will, because it only regulated the terms of market participation. See 503 U.S., at 527–529, 112 S.Ct. 1522.

Understood together, these cases demonstrate that the Government may condition the ability to offer goods in the market on the giving-up of certain property interests without effecting a *per se* taking.³ The Order is

² The Court claims that *Monsanto* is distinguishable for three reasons, none of which hold up. First, it seems, the Court believes the degree of the intrusion on property rights is greater here than in *Monsanto*. See *ante*, at 2430. Maybe, maybe not. But nothing in *Monsanto* suggests this is a relevant question, and the Court points to nothing saying that it is. Second, the Court believes that “[s]elling produce in interstate commerce” is not a government benefit. *Ante*, at 2430. Again, that may be true, but the Hornes are not simply selling raisins in interstate commerce. They are selling raisins in a regulated market at a price artificially inflated by Government action in that market. That is the benefit the Hornes receive, and it does not matter that they “would rather not have” received it. *United States v. Sperry Corp.*, 493 U.S. 52, 62–63, 110 S.Ct. 387, 107 L.Ed.2d 290 (1989). Third, the Court points out that raisins “are not dangerous pesticides; they are a healthy snack.” *Ante*, at 2431. I could not agree more, but nothing in *Monsanto*, or in *Andrus* for that matter, turned on the dangerousness of the commodity at issue.

³ The Court points out that, in a footnote in *Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.*, 458 U.S. 419, 102 S.Ct. 3164, 73 L.Ed.2d 868 (1982), we suggested that it did not matter for takings purposes whether a property owner could avoid an intrusion on her property rights by using her property differently. See *ante*, at 2430 (quoting 458 U.S., at 439, n. 17, 102 S.Ct. 3164). But in *Yee v. Escondido*, 503 U.S. 519, 112 S.Ct. 1522, 118 L.Ed.2d 153 (1992), we clarified that, where a law does not on its face effect a *per se* taking, the voluntariness of a particular use of property or of entry into a particular market is quite relevant. See *id.*, at 531–532, 112 S.Ct. 1522. In other words, only when a law requires the forfeiture of *all* rights in property does it effect a *per se* taking regardless of whether the law could be avoided by a different use of the property. As discussed above, the Order is not such a law.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

a similar regulation. It has no effect whatsoever on raisins that the Hornes grow for their own use. But insofar as the Hornes wish to sell some raisins in a market regulated by the Government and at a price supported by governmental intervention, the Order requires that they give up the right to sell a portion of those raisins at that price and instead accept disposal of them at a lower price. Given that we have held that the Government may impose a price on the privilege of engaging in a particular business without effecting a taking—which is all that the Order does—it follows that the Order at the very least does not run afoul of our *per se* takings jurisprudence. Under a different takings test, one might reach a different conclusion. But the Hornes have advanced only this narrow *per se* takings claim, and that claim fails.

III

The Court's contrary conclusion rests upon two fundamental errors. The first is the Court's breezy assertion that a *per se* taking has occurred because the Hornes "lose the entire 'bundle' of property rights in the appropriated raisins ... with the exception of" the retained interest in the equitable distribution of the proceeds from the disposition of the reserve raisins. *Ante*, at 2427 – 2428. But if there is a property right that has not been lost, as the Court concedes there is, then the Order has *not* destroyed each of the Hornes' rights in the reserve raisins and does *not* effect a *per se* taking. The Court protests that the retained interest is not substantial or certain enough. But while I see more value in that interest than the Court does, the bottom line is that *Loretto* does not distinguish among retained property interests that are substantial or certain enough to count and others that are not.⁴ Nor is it at all clear how the Court's approach will be

⁴ The Court relies on *Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council, Inc. v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency*, 535 U.S. 302, 322, 122 S.Ct. 1465, 152 L.Ed.2d 517 (2002), for the proposition that "[w]hen the government physically takes possession of an interest in property for some public purpose, it has a categorical duty to compensate the former owner, regardless of whether the interest that is taken constitutes an entire parcel or merely a part thereof." *Ante*, at 2429. But all that means is that a *per se* taking may be said to have occurred with respect to the portion of property that has been taken even if other portions of the property have not been taken. This is of no help to the Hornes, or to the Court, because it in no way diminishes a plaintiff's burden to demonstrate a *per se* taking as to the portion of his or her property that he or she claims has been taken—here, the reserve raisins. As to that specific property, a *per se* taking occurs if and only if the *Loretto* conditions are satisfied.

Horne v. Department of Agriculture
74 Agric. Dec. 1

administrable. How, after all, are courts, governments, or individuals supposed to know how much a property owner must be left with before this Court will bless the retained interest as sufficiently meaningful and certain?

One virtue of the *Loretto* test was, at least until today, its clarity. Under *Loretto*, a total destruction of all property rights constitutes a *per se* taking; anything less does not. See 458 U.S., at 441, 102 S.Ct. 3164 (noting the “very narrow” nature of the *Loretto* framework). Among the most significant doctrinal damage that the Court causes is the blurring of this otherwise bright line and the expansion of this otherwise narrow category. By the Court’s lights, perhaps a 95 percent destruction of property rights can be a *per se* taking. Perhaps 90? Perhaps 60, so long as the remaining 40 is viewed by a reviewing court as less than meaningful? And what makes a retained right meaningful enough? One wonders. Indeed, it is not at all clear what test the Court has actually applied. Such confusion would be bad enough in any context, but it is especially pernicious in the area of property rights. Property owners should be assured of where they stand, and the government needs to know how far it can permissibly go without tripping over a categorical rule.

The second overarching error in the Court’s opinion arises from its reliance on what it views as the uniquely physical nature of the taking effected by the Order. This, it says, is why many of the cases having to do with so-called regulatory takings are inapposite. See *ante*, at 2428 – 2430. It is not the case, however, that Government agents acting pursuant to the Order are storming raisin farms in the dark of night to load raisins onto trucks. But see Tr. of Oral Arg. 30 (remarks of ROBERTS, C.J.). The Order simply requires the Hornes to set aside a portion of their raisins—a requirement with which the Hornes refused to comply. See 7 CFR § 989.66(b)(2); Tr. of Oral Arg. 31. And it does so to facilitate two classic regulatory goals. One is the regulatory purpose of limiting the quantity of raisins that can be sold on the market. The other is the regulatory purpose of arranging the orderly disposition of those raisins whose sale would otherwise exceed the cap.

The Hornes and the Court both concede that a cap on the quantity of raisins that the Hornes can sell would not be a *per se* taking. See *ante*, at 2428; Brief for Petitioners 23, 52. The Court’s focus on the physical nature of

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

the intrusion also suggests that merely arranging for the sale of the reserve raisins would not be a *per se* taking. The rub for the Court must therefore be not that the Government is doing these things, but that it is accomplishing them by the altogether understandable requirement that the reserve raisins be physically set aside. I know of no principle, however, providing that if the Government achieves a permissible regulatory end by asking regulated individuals or entities to physically move the property subject to the regulation, it has committed a *per se* taking rather than a potential regulatory taking. After all, in *Monsanto*, the data that the pesticide companies had to turn over to the Government was presumably turned over in some physical form, yet even the Court does not call *Monsanto* a physical takings case. It therefore cannot be that any regulation that involves the slightest physical movement of property is necessarily evaluated as a *per se* taking rather than as a regulatory taking.

The combined effect of these errors is to unsettle an important area of our jurisprudence. Unable to justify its holding under our precedents, the Court resorts to superimposing new limitations on those precedents, stretching the otherwise strict *Loretto* test into an unadministrable one, and deeming regulatory takings jurisprudence irrelevant in some undefined set of cases involving government regulation of property rights. And it does all of this in service of eliminating a type of reserve requirement that is applicable to just a few commodities in the entire country—and that, in any event, commodity producers could vote to terminate if they wished. See Letter from Solicitor General to Clerk of Court (Apr. 29, 2015); 7 U.S.C. § 608c(16)(B); 7 CFR § 989.91(c). This intervention hardly strikes me as worth the cost, but what makes the Court's twisting of the doctrine even more baffling is that it ultimately instructs the Government that it can permissibly achieve its market control goals by imposing a quota without offering raisin producers a way of reaping any return whatsoever on the raisins they cannot sell. I have trouble understanding why anyone would prefer that.

* * *

Because a straightforward application of our precedents reveals that the *Hornes* have not suffered a *per se* taking, I would affirm the judgment of the Ninth Circuit. The Court reaches a contrary conclusion only by expanding our *per se* takings doctrine in a manner that is as unwarranted

Burnette Foods, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 31

as it is vague. I respectfully dissent.

___ * * *

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

In re: BURNETTE FOODS, INC., a Michigan corporation.

Docket No. 11-0334.

Decision and Order.

Filed June 19, 2015.

**AMAA – Canned tart cherries, shelf life of – Cannery – Cherry Industry
Administrative Board – Handler – Optimum supply – Sales constituency – Tart
Cherry Order – Volume restrictions.**

James J. Rosloniec, Esq. for Petitioner.

Sharlene Deskins, Esq. for Respondent.

Initial Decision and Order by Jill S. Clifton, Administrative Law Judge.

Final Decision and Order by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

DECISION AND ORDER

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Burnette Foods, Inc. [Burnette], instituted this proceeding by filing a petition¹ on August 3, 2011. Burnette instituted the proceeding under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. §§ 601-674) [the AMAA]; the federal marketing order regulating the handling of “Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin” (7 C.F.R. pt. 930) [the Tart Cherry Order]; and the Rules of Practice Governing Proceedings on Petitions To Modify or To Be Exempted From Marketing Orders (7 C.F.R. §§ 900.50-.71).

The AMAA provides that a handler subject to an order may file a written petition with the Secretary of Agriculture stating the order, any provision of the order, or any obligation imposed in connection with the order, is not in accordance with law and requesting modification of the

¹ Burnette entitles its petition “Petition by Burnette Foods, Inc. Challenging Application of Federal Marketing Order 930 to Burnette Foods, Inc.” [Petition].

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

order or exemption from the order.² Burnette, a “handler” as that term is defined in the Tart Cherry Order,³ requests modification of, and exemption from, the Tart Cherry Order.⁴

Specifically, Burnette seeks: (1) an order declaring that CherrCo, Inc.,⁵ is a “sales constituency” as that term is defined in the Tart Cherry Order;⁶ (2) an order requiring the appointment of a new Cherry Industry Administrative Board⁷ which complies with the Tart Cherry Order;⁸ (3) an order revising the formula for determining the “optimum supply”⁹ of tart cherries to include cherry products imported into the United States; and (4) an order exempting Burnette from restrictions on the sale of tart cherries [volume restrictions] that Burnette processes into metal cans.¹⁰ On October 3, 2011, the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture [Administrator], filed “Answer of Respondent” requesting denial of the relief sought by Burnette and dismissal of Burnette’s Petition.¹¹

On May 15-22, 2012, Administrative Law Judge Jill S. Clifton [ALJ] conducted a hearing in Grand Rapids, Michigan. James J. Rosloniec, Verity Law, PLC, Grand Rapids, Michigan, represented Burnette. Sharlene A. Deskins, Office of the General Counsel, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, represented the Administrator.¹² Burnette called 14 witnesses and the Administrator called five witnesses.¹³ Burnette introduced into evidence exhibits which

² 7 U.S.C. § 608c(15)(A).

³ 7 C.F.R. § 930.11.

⁴ Pet. ¶ V at 10-11.

⁵ CherrCo, Inc., is an association of cooperatives that meet the requirements of the Capper-Volstead Act (7 U.S.C. §§ 291-292). CherrCo, Inc., engages, on a cooperative basis, in activities in connection with processing, preparing for market, handling, marketing, packing, storing, drying, manufacturing, and selling tart cherries.

⁶ 7 C.F.R. § 930.16.

⁷ 7 C.F.R. § 930.2.

⁸ 7 C.F.R. § 930.20.

⁹ 7 C.F.R. § 930.50(a).

¹⁰ Pet. ¶ V at 10-11.

¹¹ Answer of Resp’t at 8.

¹² On June 6, 2014, Frank Martin, Jr., Office of the General Counsel, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, filed a Notice of Appearance as co-counsel for the Administrator.

¹³ References to the transcript of the May 15-22, 2012 hearing are designated as “Tr.” and the page number.

Burnette Foods, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 31

are identified as “PX” and the exhibit number. The Administrator introduced into evidence exhibits which are identified as “RX” and the exhibit number. In addition, the ALJ took official notice of the rulemaking proceeding which established the Tart Cherry Order and the 1998, 2007, and 2011 rulemaking proceedings which resulted in amendments to the Tart Cherry Order.

On March 18, 2014, after the parties filed post hearing briefs, the ALJ issued a Decision and Order rejecting Burnette’s contentions that: (1) CherrCo, Inc., is a “sales constituency” as that term is defined in 7 C.F.R. § 930.16;¹⁴ (2) the Cherry Industry Administrative Board is controlled by one sales constituency, CherrCo, Inc., in violation of 7 C.F.R. § 930.20(g);¹⁵ and (3) the formula for determining optimum supply of tart cherries is contrary to law because the formula does not include cherry products imported into the United States.¹⁶ However, the ALJ concluded two provisions of the Tart Cherry Order are not in accordance with law: (1) the application of volume restrictions to handlers who process tart cherries into metal cans; and (2) the requirement that handlers, who are not exempt from volume restrictions, absorb the share of volume restrictions that would have been the responsibility of other handlers had those other handlers not been exempt from volume restrictions.¹⁷ The ALJ ordered that: (1) tart cherries delivered from being harvested to a canner and canned with no processing other than canning shall be exempt from volume restrictions; and (2) tart cherry production exempt from volume restrictions must be subtracted from supply for the purpose of calculating restriction percentages.¹⁸

On April 3, 2014, the Administrator filed an appeal petition, followed on June 23, 2014, by Respondent’s Appeal Petition and Brief in Support Thereof [Appeal Brief]. On June 20, 2014, Burnette filed an Appeal Petition, a Brief in Support of Burnette Foods, Inc.’s Appeal Petition [Burnette’s Appeal Brief], and a Request for Oral Argument. On August 14, 2014, Burnette filed a response to the Administrator’s appeal petition, and the Administrator filed a response to Burnette’s appeal

¹⁴ ALJ’s Decision and Order ¶ 13 at 13.

¹⁵ ALJ’s Decision and Order ¶ 14 at 13-14.

¹⁶ ALJ’s Decision and Order ¶ 38 at 21.

¹⁷ ALJ’s Decision and Order ¶ 1A-B at 1-3.

¹⁸ ALJ’s Decision and Order ¶¶ 40-41 at 22.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

petition. On September 3, 2014, Burnette filed a brief rebutting the Administrator's response to Burnette's appeal petition. On September 8, 2014, the Hearing Clerk transmitted the record to the Office of the Judicial Officer for consideration and decision.

DECISION

Burnette's Request for Oral Argument

Burnette's request for oral argument before the Judicial Officer, which the Judicial Officer may grant, refuse, or limit,¹⁹ is refused because Burnette and the Administrator have thoroughly briefed the issues. Thus, oral argument would serve no useful purpose.

Overview of the AMAA and Tart Cherry Order

Congress enacted the AMAA to establish and maintain orderly marketing conditions for agricultural commodities in interstate commerce.²⁰ To achieve orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture, after notice and opportunity for hearing, to issue orders that would regulate the handling of agricultural commodities.²¹

The AMAA provides that any handler subject to an order may seek modification of or exemption from the order.²² A proceeding under 7 U.S.C. § 608c(15)(A) affords a means for adjudicating only whether an order, a provision of an order, or an obligation imposed in connection with an order is not in accordance with law. A proceeding under 7 U.S.C. § 608c(15)(A) is not a forum in which to consider questions of policy, desirability, or effectiveness of order provisions.²³ The burden of proof in

¹⁹ 7 C.F.R. § 900.65(b)(1).

²⁰ 7 U.S.C. § 602(1).

²¹ 7 U.S.C. § 608c(1), (3)-(4).

²² 7 U.S.C. § 608c(15)(A).

²³ *Am. Dried Fruit Co.*, 69 Agric. Dec. 1003, 1011 (U.S.D.A. 2010); *Lion Raisins, Inc.*, 64 Agric. Dec. 11, 22 (U.S.D.A. 2004); *Lamers Dairy, Inc.*, 60 Agric. Dec. 406, 426 (U.S.D.A. 2001), *aff'd*, No. 01-C-890 (E.D. Wis. Mar. 11, 2003), *aff'd*, 379 F.3d 466 (7th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 544 U.S. 904 (2005); *Strebin*, 56 Agric. Dec. 1095, 1133 (U.S.D.A. 1997); *Sunny Hill Farms Dairy Co.*, 26 Agric. Dec. 201, 217 (U.S.D.A. 1967), *aff'd*, 446 F.2d 1124 (8th Cir. 1971), *cert. denied*, 405 U.S. 917 (1972); *Mosby*, 16 Agric.

Burnette Foods, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 31

a proceeding instituted under 7 U.S.C. § 608c(15)(A) rests with the handler seeking modification of or exemption from an order.²⁴

The Secretary of Agriculture issued the Tart Cherry Order pursuant to the AMAA in 1996 after conducting hearings in 1993 and 1995.²⁵ Proponents of the Tart Cherry Order were concerned with the short term variation of the supply of tart cherries caused by climatic factors. Variations in the supply of tart cherries can result in gluts and shortages of tart cherries. When gluts occur, large inventories of tart cherries can decrease prices regardless of the anticipated size of the oncoming year's tart cherry crop. The Tart Cherry Order was designed to reduce the impact of fluctuating inventories of tart cherries by establishing an optimum supply to reduce price fluctuations and enhance and stabilize the tart cherry market.²⁶

The Cherry Industry Administrative Board administers the Tart Cherry Order.²⁷ Membership on the Cherry Industry Administrative Board is determined by geographic districts created by the Tart Cherry Order. District representation is based upon tart cherry production levels in the district and the number of members from each district varies from one member to four members.²⁸ In order to prevent the domination of the Cherry Industry Administrative Board by an entity, the Tart Cherry Order limits the number of Cherry Industry Administrative Board members from one district that can be from, or affiliated with, a single sales constituency, as follows:

§ 930.20 Establishment and membership.

Dec. 1209, 1220 (U.S.D.A. 1957); Roberts Dairy Co., 4 Agric. Dec. 84, 89 (U.S.D.A. 1945); Wright, 2 Agric. Dec. 327 (U.S.D.A. 1943).

²⁴ Am. Dried Fruit Co., 69 Agric. Dec. 1003, 1010 (U.S.D.A. 2010); United W. Grocers, Inc., 63 Agric. Dec. 557, 573 (U.S.D.A. 2004); Stew Leonard's, 59 Agric. Dec. 53, 69 (U.S.D.A. 2000), *aff'd*, 199 F.R.D. 48 (D. Conn. 2001), *printed in* 60 Agric. Dec. 1 (U.S.D.A. 2001), *aff'd*, 32 F. App'x 606 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 537 U.S. 880 (2002); Cal-Almond, Inc., 56 Agric. Dec. 1158, 1219 (U.S.D.A. 1997), *aff'd*, CV-98-05049-REC/SMS (E.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 1998), *printed in* 58 Agric. Dec. 708 (U.S.D.A. 1999), *aff'd*, 192 F.3d 1272 (9th Cir. 1999), *reprinted in* 58 Agric. Dec. 734 (U.S.D.A. 1999), *cert. denied*, 530 U.S. 1213 (2000).

²⁵ 61 Fed. Reg. 49,939 (Sept. 24, 1996).

²⁶ 61 Fed. Reg. 49,940-41 (Sept. 24, 1996).

²⁷ 7 C.F.R. §§ 930.30-.31.

²⁸ 7 C.F.R. § 930.20.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

....

(g) In order to achieve a fair and balanced representation on the Board, and to prevent any one sales constituency from gaining control of the Board, not more than one Board member may be from, or affiliated with, a single sales constituency in those districts having more than one seat on the Board; *Provided*, That this prohibition shall not apply in a district where such a conflict cannot be avoided. There is no prohibition on the number of Board members from differing districts that may be elected from a single sales constituency which may have operations in more than one district. However, as provided in § 930.23, a handler or grower may only nominate Board members and vote in one district.

7 C.F.R. § 930.20(g).

One of the duties of the Cherry Industry Administrative Board is to set the optimum supply level for each crop year.²⁹ The optimum supply represents the desirable volume of tart cherries that should be available for sale in the upcoming crop year.³⁰ The optimum supply formula is a series of mathematical calculations using sales history, inventory, and production data to determine whether a surplus of tart cherries exists and, if a surplus exists, the volume of tart cherries that should be restricted to maintain optimum supply.³¹

If the Cherry Industry Administrative Board establishes restricted percentages, handlers are required to set aside a portion of their tart cherry production. The Tart Cherry Order provides numerous methods by which a handler can comply with volume restrictions. These methods include storing product in inventory reserves, redeeming grower diversion certificates, destroying product, donating product to charitable organizations, donating product for new market development or market expansion, and exporting product to countries other than Canada and

²⁹ 7 C.F.R. § 930.50(a).

³⁰ 77 Fed. Reg. 12,748-49 (Mar. 2, 2012).

³¹ 7 C.F.R. § 930.50.

Burnette Foods, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 31

Mexico.³² The form of the cherries (frozen, canned, dried, or concentrated juice) a handler places in inventory reserve is at the option of the handler.³³

Burnette's Appeal Petition

Burnette raises six issues in its Appeal Petition. These six issues relate to three conclusions by the ALJ to which Burnette assigns error.

First, Burnette contends the ALJ erroneously concluded CherrCo, Inc. is not a "sales constituency" as that term is defined in 7 C.F.R. § 930.16.

The Tart Cherry Order limits the number of members of the Cherry Industry Administrative Board that may be from, or affiliated with, a single sales constituency in those districts having more than one seat on the Cherry Industry Administrative Board.³⁴ CherrCo, Inc. has multiple members on the Cherry Industry Administrative Board and the Cherry Industry Administrative Board would be constituted in violation of 7 C.F.R. § 930.20(g), if CherrCo, Inc. were a sales constituency.

The ALJ concluded CherrCo, Inc. is not a "sales constituency" as that term is defined in 7 C.F.R. § 930.16 and the Cherry Industry Administrative Board is constituted in accordance with the Tart Cherry Order.³⁵ The Tart Cherry Order defines the term "sales constituency" as follows:

§ 930.16 Sales constituency.

Sales constituency means a common marketing organization or brokerage firm or individual representing a group of handlers and growers. An organization which receives consignments of cherries and does not direct where the consigned cherries are sold is not a sales constituency.

7 C.F.R. § 930.16.

³² 7 C.F.R. § 930.159.

³³ 7 C.F.R. § 930.55(b).

³⁴ 7 C.F.R. § 930.20(g).

³⁵ ALJ's Decision and Order ¶ 13 at 13, ¶¶ 30-31 at 17-18.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

The ALJ based her conclusion that CherrCo, Inc. is not a sales constituency on CherrCo, Inc.'s status as a Capper-Volstead cooperative, as follows:

13. If Cherrco [sic] were not a Capper-Volstead cooperative, I might take Burnette's insistence that CherrCo **is** a sales constituency more to heart. But CherrCo **is** a Capper-Volstead cooperative, which necessitates that CherrCo do a lot of management on behalf of its members. I find that CherrCo is **not** a sales constituency. See paragraphs 30 and 31.

* * *

31. . . . As CherrCo manages on behalf of its members, CherrCo exerts control, and the control exerted does not make CherrCo a sales constituency; CherrCo is more correctly characterized as a Capper-Volstead cooperative.

ALJ's Decision and Order ¶ 13 at 13, ¶ 31 at 17-18.

While I find CherrCo, Inc. is a federated Capper-Volstead cooperative, I do not find CherrCo, Inc.'s status as a Capper-Volstead cooperative dispositive of the issue of whether CherrCo, Inc. is a sales constituency. Instead, I conclude CherrCo, Inc. is not a "sales constituency" as that term is defined in 7 C.F.R. § 930.16 because, while CherrCo, Inc. is an organization which receives consignments of tart cherries from member-cooperatives, CherrCo, Inc. does not direct where the consigned tart cherries are sold.

CherrCo, Inc. was created to provide a uniform price structure for its member-cooperatives. CherrCo, Inc. provides a variety of services for its member-cooperatives, including establishment of a minimum price for tart cherries sold by its members, storage of tart cherries, inventory management, and release of tart cherries for shipment to buyers (Tr. at 550-52).

Burnette Foods, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 31

CherrCo, Inc.'s member-cooperatives select their own sales agents (Tr. at 550, 558, 572). The sales agents agree to follow the terms established by CherrCo, Inc. to ensure that all tart cherries sold by CherrCo, Inc.'s member-cooperatives meet CherrCo, Inc.'s minimum conditions for the sale of tart cherries. Once a member-cooperative's sales agent sells tart cherries to a buyer, the sales agent notifies CherrCo, Inc. of the identity of the buyer, the quantity of tart cherries purchased, the price, and other terms of sale (Tr. at 530-48). If the sale meets CherrCo, Inc.'s minimum criteria regarding price and terms, CherrCo, Inc. authorizes release of the tart cherries when the member-cooperative requests release to the member-cooperative's buyer. Thus, each member-cooperative of CherrCo, Inc. directs where its tart cherries are sold and CherrCo, Inc., is not a sales constituency because, while CherrCo, Inc. receives consigned tart cherries from member-cooperatives, CherrCo, Inc. does not direct where the member-cooperatives' tart cherries are sold. Therefore, I reject Burnette's contention that the ALJ's conclusion that CherrCo, Inc. is not a "sales constituency" as defined in 7 C.F.R. § 930.16, is error.

Second, Burnette contends the ALJ erroneously concluded the Cherry Industry Administrative Board is constituted in accordance with the Tart Cherry Order. Burnette's contention that the Cherry Industry Administrative Board is not constituted in accordance with the Tart Cherry Order is based upon Burnette's contention that CherrCo, Inc. is a sales constituency. Specifically, Burnette contends the Cherry Industry Administrative Board has more than one member from, or affiliated with, CherrCo, Inc. in violation of 7 C.F.R. § 930.20(g).

Burnette established, and the Administrator does not dispute, that multiple members of the Cherry Industry Administrative Board are also members of cooperatives that are members of CherrCo, Inc. However, as I reject Burnette's contention that CherrCo, Inc. is a sales constituency, I also reject Burnette's contention that the Cherry Industry Administrative Board, as constituted, violates 7 C.F.R. § 930.20(g).

Third, Burnette contends the ALJ erroneously concluded that imported tart cherry products are not required to be included in the optimum supply formula.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

The Tart Cherry Order provides the method by which optimum supply is determined, as follows:

§ 930.50 Marketing policy.

(a) *Optimum supply.* On or about July 1 of each crop year, the Board shall hold a meeting to review sales data, inventory data, current crop forecasts and market conditions in order to establish an optimum supply level for the crop year. The optimum supply volume shall be calculated as 100 percent of the average sales of the prior three years reduced by average sales that represent dispositions of exempt cherries and restricted percentage cherries qualifying for diversion credit for the same three years, unless the Board determines that it is necessary to recommend otherwise with respect to sales of exempt and restricted percentage cherries, to which shall be added a desirable carryout inventory not to exceed 20 million pounds or such other amount as the Board, with the approval of the Secretary, may establish. This optimum supply volume shall be announced by the Board in accordance with paragraph (h) of this section.

7 C.F.R. § 930.50(a). Nothing in 7 C.F.R. § 930.50(a) requires inclusion of imported tart cherry products in the optimum supply formula and Burnette cites no provision in the AMAA or the Tart Cherry Order requiring that the optimum supply formula include imported tart cherry products. Instead, Burnette asserts the optimum supply formula in 7 C.F.R. § 930.50(a) should be modified to include sales of foreign produced tart cherry products as a matter of policy, as follows:

Although the CIAB cannot provide a single compelling reason for not including sales of foreign produced tart cherry products in the Optimum Supply Formula, the CIAB simply refuses to include them. This results in foreign producers of tart cherry products gaining unrestricted access to the domestic tart cherry marketplace while placing high levels of restrictions upon domestic producers of tart cherry products.

Burnette Foods, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 31

Burnette's Appeal Br. at 14.

A proceeding under 7 U.S.C. § 608c(15)(A) is not a forum in which to consider questions of policy, desirability, or effectiveness of order provisions³⁶ or to introduce evidence relating to the wisdom of order provisions or purporting to show that the petitioner has been damaged or disadvantaged by activities undertaken in accordance with an order.³⁷ Therefore, I reject Burnette's contention that the ALJ's conclusion that imported tart cherry products are not required to be included in the optimum supply formula, is error.

The Administrator's Appeal Petition

The Administrator raises five issues in the Administrator's Appeal Brief. First, the Administrator contends the ALJ erroneously concluded Tart Cherry Order volume restrictions, as applied to canners of tart cherries, are arbitrary and capricious and, consequently, unlawful (Administrator's Appeal Br. ¶ IA at 9-12).

The ALJ ordered modification of the Tart Cherry Order to exempt from volume restrictions tart cherries delivered from being harvested directly to a canner and promptly processed into metal cans with no processing other than canning.³⁸ The ALJ found that requiring canners to meet volume restrictions is arbitrary and capricious and, consequently, unlawful, as follows:

B. It is fiction to state that tart cherries processed into metal cans can be stored and carried over from crop year to crop year. [They **cannot**; the canned tart cherries need to reach the consumer promptly and cannot be maintained in the processor's inventory from crop year to crop year; the "best before" and "best by" date is roughly one year

³⁶ See *supra* note 23.

³⁷ Lamers Dairy, Inc., 60 Agric. Dec. 406, 426 (U.S.D.A. 2001), *aff'd*, No. 01-C-890 (E.D. Wis. Mar. 11, 2003), *aff'd*, 379 F.3d 466 (7th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 544 U.S. 904 (2005); Belridge Packing Corp., 48 Agric. Dec. 16, 46 (U.S.D.A. 1989), *aff'd sub nom.* Farmers Alliance for Improved Regulation (FAIR) v. Madigan, No. 89-0959-RCL, 1991 WL 178117 (D.D.C. Aug. 30, 1991).

³⁸ ALJ's Decision and Order ¶ 40 at 22.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

from harvest.] It would be arbitrary and capricious, and consequently not in accordance with law, to persist in that fiction.

ALJ's Decision and Order ¶ 1B at 2.

The record establishes that the Agricultural Marketing Service and the Cherry Industry Administrative Board have considered and rejected the exemption of canners from volume restrictions and that the Agricultural Marketing Service and the Cherry Industry Administrative Board have a rational basis for rejecting the exemption.

On March 17, 2010, the Agricultural Marketing Service published a proposed rule to establish free and restricted percentages of tart cherries for the 2009-2010 crop year.³⁹ The Agricultural Marketing Service received two comments from persons representing processors of canned tart cherry products. The Agricultural Marketing Service set forth its basis for rejecting an exemption from volume restrictions for canned tart cherry products, as follows:

Two comments were received during the comment period in response to the proposal. The commenters, both representing processors of canned tart cherry products, opposed the increased volume regulation from the preliminary percentages to the final percentages.

....

In response to the commenters, the tart cherry marketing order regulations do not apply to handlers according to the type of cherry products they pack. The order applies to the industry as a whole, regardless of which market segment individual handlers are involved in. The reserve formula under the order is designed to ensure that the aggregate market needs can be met with free percentage cherries and does not differentiate between product types.

75 Fed. Reg. 29,651-52 (May 27, 2010).

³⁹ 75 Fed. Reg. 12,702 (Mar. 17, 2010).

Burnette Foods, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 31

In a letter to the Agricultural Marketing Service, dated June 28, 2011, Burnette requested that the Agricultural Marketing Service either suspend the Tart Cherry Order or exempt the canned segment of the tart cherry industry from the Tart Cherry Order (RX 3). The Agricultural Marketing Service responded stating it would consider a Cherry Industry Administrative Board recommendation to exempt canned tart cherries from the Tart Cherry Order and a measure designed to exempt canners would be presented at the September 15, 2011, Cherry Industry Administrative Board meeting in Grand Rapids, Michigan (RX 4 at 2). Mr. Thomas Facer, chairman of the Cherry Industry Administrative Board, testified that, on July 12, 2011, he had appointed an ad hoc committee to review all aspects of the Tart Cherry Order (Tr. at 1194). Market segmentation was one of the issues considered by the ad hoc committee (Tr. at 1200-01).⁴⁰ At the September 15, 2011, Cherry Industry Administrative Board meeting in Grand Rapids, Michigan, Mr. Ray Rowley, a Cherry Industry Administrative Board member and the chairman of the ad hoc committee to review the Tart Cherry Order, noted that the exemption of canned tart cherries from the Tart Cherry Order had been considered by the ad hoc committee, but that the exemption could not withstand the scrutiny or challenges presented to the ad hoc committee (PX 3 at 9). Mr. Roy Hackert, a Cherry Industry Administrative Board member and a member of the ad hoc committee, testified that the ad hoc committee thoroughly considered the issue of segmenting the canned part of the tart cherry industry and had developed a plan on segmentation, but, ultimately, the ad hoc committee rejected segmentation because segmentation would be difficult to administer and segmentation would be unlikely to be approved by the requisite percentage of industry members in the referendum which would be required to implement segmentation (Tr. at 254-57). Mr. Facer testified that segmentation was rejected because segmentation could only be implemented if the Tart Cherry Order were amended pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding and the Tart Cherry Order could be easily circumvented if segmentation were to be implemented (Tr. at 1200-01).

Market segmentation is an issue that is appropriately considered in the

⁴⁰ The term “market segmentation” refers to the disparate treatment of various segments of the tart cherry industry under the Tart Cherry Order, including segmentation of that part of the tart cherry industry engaged in canning and exemption of that part of the tart cherry industry from volume restrictions.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

context of a formal rulemaking proceeding. The Tart Cherry Order, which is presumed lawful, must be judged on the evidence contained in the formal rulemaking record on which the Secretary of Agriculture based the Tart Cherry Order. If circumstances have changed so that the Tart Cherry Order no longer produces equitable results, the remedy is through an amendatory or termination process—not through a proceeding conducted pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 608c(15)(A).⁴¹ Burnette cannot in this proceeding challenge the policy, desirability, or the effectiveness of the Tart Cherry Order or even introduce evidence relating to the wisdom of the program or purporting to show that Burnette has been damaged or disadvantaged by the lack of an exemption from volume restrictions for canned tart cherry products.⁴² The evidence contained in the formal rulemaking record supports the determination that the Tart Cherry Order should apply to all handlers of tart cherries, including canners. Therefore, I agree with the Administrator’s contention that the ALJ’s conclusion that the Tart Cherry Order volume restrictions, as applied to canners of tart cherries, are arbitrary and capricious and, consequently, unlawful, is error. Accordingly, I do not adopt the ALJ’s Order modifying the Tart Cherry Order to exempt from volume restrictions tart cherries delivered from being harvested directly to a canner and promptly processed into metal cans with no processing other than canning.

Second, the Administrator contends the ALJ erroneously gave credence to evidence relating to the shelf life of canned tart cherries (Administrator’s Appeal Brief ¶ IB at 12-14).

Burnette alleges canned tart cherries have a shorter shelf life than frozen tart cherries making compliance with the Tart Cherry Order volume restrictions more difficult for the canned tart cherry segment of the industry than the frozen tart cherry segment of the industry:

⁴¹ *Sequoia Orange Co., Inc.*, 41 Agric. Dec. 1511, 1522 (U.S.D.A. 1982) (Order Transferring Case), No. 82-2510 (D.D.C. June 14, 1983), *aff’d*, No. CV F 83-269 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 21, 1983). Furthermore, courts have noted that marketing orders are not required to be completely equitable and that an order may cause some resultant damage to a handler without destroying the validity of the order. *See Lamers Dairy, Inc.*, 60 Agric. Dec. 406, 439 (U.S.D.A. 2001), *aff’d*, No. 01-C-890 (E.D. Wis. Mar. 11, 2003), *aff’d*, 379 F.3d 466 (7th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 544 U.S. 904 (2005), citing *United States v. Mills*, 315 F.2d 828 (4th Cir. 1963).

⁴² *See supra* note 37.

Burnette Foods, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 31

Pursuant to the Order the Cherry Industry Administrative Board (“CIAB”) is charged with administering the amount of tart cherries available in the market through a formula prescribed by the provisions of the Order. Depending on the factors used in the formula the CIAB can impose restrictions on handlers, such as Burnette, impeding their ability to sell what they produce. Burnette is one of the few handlers of tart cherries that receives tart cherries directly from its growers and immediately converts those cherries into finished canned products, which have limited shelf life. . . . Due to restrictions that can be placed upon Burnette’s inventory (inventory that is finished and available for sale to retailers), Burnette is forced to purchase frozen tart cherries and/or “diversion credits” from suppliers that dominate the CIAB in order to comply with restrictions imposed by the CIAB. Burnette is often not able to use its own inventories for reserve requirements due to the limited shelf life of its finished canned inventory and the need to supply its customers on a just in time basis.

Pet. ¶ III 3 at 2. Burnette introduced evidence in support of its allegation that the shelf life of canned tart cherry products makes compliance with volume restrictions more difficult for the canned tart cherry segment of the industry than for the frozen tart cherry segment of the industry (Tr. at 1041-47). However, even if I were to find that compliance with volume restrictions is more difficult for the canned tart cherry segment of the industry than the frozen tart cherry segment of the industry, I would not conclude that the disparate burden of the volume restrictions renders application of the volume restrictions to the canned tart cherry segment of the industry unlawful.⁴³ The application of the Tart Cherry Order volume restrictions to the canned tart cherry segment of the industry is a policy consideration for the Secretary of Agriculture to be undertaken in the context of a formal rulemaking proceeding. Therefore, I find evidence

⁴³ Lamers Dairy, Inc., 60 Agric. Dec. 406, 426 (U.S.D.A. 2001) (a petitioner cannot, in a proceeding under 7 U.S.C. § 608c(15)(A), introduce evidence purporting to show that the petitioner has been damaged or disadvantaged by activities undertaken in accordance with the order), *aff’d*, No. 01-C-890 (E.D. Wis. Mar. 11, 2003), *aff’d*, 379 F.3d 466 (7th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 544 U.S. 904 (2005).

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

regarding the shelf life of canned tart cherry products compared to the shelf life of frozen tart cherry products, irrelevant; I do not adopt the ALJ's findings regarding the shelf life of tart cherry products; and I do not adopt the ALJ's Order exempting canned tart cherry products from volume restrictions.

Third, the Administrator contends the ALJ erroneously rejected alternatives to inventory reserves which can be used by handlers to meet Tart Cherry Order volume restrictions (Administrator's Appeal Brief ¶ IC at 14-15).

If the Cherry Industry Administrative Board establishes restricted percentages, handlers are required to set aside a portion of their tart cherry production. The Tart Cherry Order provides numerous methods by which a handler can comply with volume restrictions. These methods include storing product in inventory reserves, redeeming grower diversion certificates, destroying product, donating product to charitable organizations, donating product for new market development or market expansion, and exporting product to countries other than Canada and Mexico.⁴⁴ The form of cherries (frozen, canned, dried, or concentrated juice) a handler places in reserve is at the option of the handler.⁴⁵

The ALJ found that requiring a canner of tart cherries to use alternatives to inventory is confiscatory, as follows:

22. Frozen tart cherries keep well (at least three years and up to four or five years). The same cannot be said of tart cherries processed into metal cans. Requiring Burnette or any other processor to hold tart cherries in cans off the market until close to the "best by" date (one year after canning) would be the equivalent of confiscation. It would be equally confiscatory to require a canner to meet the restriction requirements by using the alternatives to inventory.

ALJ's Decision and Order ¶ 22 at 15 (footnote omitted). Based, in part, on the finding that alternatives to inventory reserves, by which a handler

⁴⁴ 7 C.F.R. § 930.159.

⁴⁵ 7 C.F.R. § 930.55(b).

Burnette Foods, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 31

may comply with the volume restrictions, are confiscatory, the ALJ ordered modification of the Tart Cherry Order to exempt from volume restrictions tart cherries delivered from being harvested directly to a canner and promptly processed into metal cans with no processing other than canning.⁴⁶

The provision of alternate methods by which to comply with volume restrictions is a policy consideration for the Secretary of Agriculture to be undertaken in the context of a formal rulemaking proceeding. The alternative methods by which a handler may comply with volume restrictions are not rendered unlawful merely because Burnette finds all of the alternatives burdensome. Therefore, I do not adopt the ALJ's conclusion that the alternative methods of complying with volume restrictions are unlawful and I do not adopt the ALJ's Order exempting canned tart cherry products from volume restrictions.

Fourth, the Administrator contends the ALJ erroneously ordered modification of the Tart Cherry Order to require all exempt-from-restriction-tart-cherry-production subtracted from supply for the purpose of calculating restriction percentages (Administrator's Appeal Br. ¶ II at 15-19).

The ALJ concluded that requiring handlers, who are not exempt from volume restrictions, to bear greater volume restrictions by being required to absorb the share of volume restriction that would have been the responsibility of other handlers were those other handlers not exempt, is arbitrary and capricious and, consequently, not in accordance with law.⁴⁷ Based on this conclusion, the ALJ ordered the following modification to the optimum supply formula:

Order

. . . .

41. Beginning with the **2014 Tart Cherry Crop** [July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015 Crop Year] **exempt**-from-restriction-tart-cherry-production . . . must be subtracted from supply for purposes of volume control,

⁴⁶ ALJ's Decision and Order ¶ 40 at 22.

⁴⁷ ALJ's Decision and Order ¶ 1A at 1-2.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

including using the Optimum Supply Formula and calculating the restriction percentages that the **not**-exempt-from-restriction are required to comply with. That additional mathematical step must be employed.

ALJ's Decision and Order ¶ 41 at 22.

While Burnette seeks revisions to the formula for determining volume restrictions set forth in 7 C.F.R. § 930.50,⁴⁸ Burnette did not request the modification ordered by the ALJ. Moreover, the ALJ sets forth no basis for the ALJ's conclusion that requiring handlers, who are not exempt from volume restrictions, to absorb the share of volume restriction that would have been the responsibility of other handlers were those other handlers not exempt, is arbitrary and capricious.

In contrast, the optimum supply formula in the Tart Cherry Order was devised after the Agricultural Marketing Service considered evidence presented during the rulemaking proceeding which resulted in the promulgation of the Tart Cherry Order. The proponents of the Tart Cherry Order provided sufficient evidence for the Secretary of Agriculture to conclude that the volume restrictions would result in a supply management program which would compensate for the erratic natural production cycles of tart cherries and which should provide the market with a more stable supply of tart cherries.⁴⁹ The Tart Cherry Order, which is presumed lawful, must be judged on the evidence contained in the formal rulemaking record on which the Secretary of Agriculture based the Tart Cherry Order. If circumstances have changed so that the Tart Cherry Order no longer produces equitable results, the remedy is through an amendatory or termination process—not through a proceeding conducted pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 608c(15)(A).⁵⁰ Accordingly, I do not adopt the ALJ's Order modifying the optimum supply formula.

Fifth, the Administrator contends the ALJ erroneously exempted all tart cherry canners from volume restrictions. The Administrator asserts, as Burnette was the only petitioner in this proceeding, any order issued by the ALJ should have been limited to Burnette (Administrator's Appeal Br.

⁴⁸ Pet. ¶ V F at 11.

⁴⁹ 60 Fed. Reg. 61,310 (Nov. 29, 1995).

⁵⁰ See *supra* note 41.

Burnette Foods, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 31

¶ III at 19-20).

As I deny all relief requested by Burnette and dismiss Burnette's Petition with prejudice, I find the issue of the scope of the ALJ's exemption from volume restrictions, moot.

Findings of Fact

1. Burnette is a Michigan corporation with a principal place of business in Elk Rapids, Michigan.
2. Burnette produces tart cherries, buys tart cherries from other producers, and processes tart cherries.
3. Burnette processes tart cherries into finished products in metal cans.
4. Burnette is a handler subject to the Tart Cherry Order.
5. CherrCo, Inc. is a federated Capper-Volstead cooperative.
6. CherrCo, Inc. receives consigned tart cherries from its member-cooperatives.
7. CherrCo, Inc. does not direct where consigned tart cherries are sold.
8. Multiple members of the Cherry Industry Administrative Board are also members of cooperatives that are members of CherrCo, Inc.
9. Imported tart cherry products are not included in the optimum supply formula in the Tart Cherry Order.
10. The Tart Cherry Order does not exempt from volume restrictions tart cherries delivered from being harvested directly to a canner and processed into metal cans.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction over this matter.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

2. CherrCo, Inc. is not a “sales constituency” as that term is defined in 7 C.F.R. § 930.16.
3. The membership of the Cherry Industry Administrative Board complies with 7 C.F.R. § 930.20(g).
4. The Secretary of Agriculture is not required by the AMAA, the Tart Cherry Order, or any other law to include imported tart cherry products in the optimum supply formula in the Tart Cherry Order.
5. The Secretary of Agriculture is not required by the AMAA, the Tart Cherry Order, or any other law to exempt from volume restrictions in the Tart Cherry Order tart cherries delivered from harvest directly to a canner and processed into metal cans.
6. The Secretary of Agriculture is not required by the AMAA, the Tart Cherry Order, or any other law to modify the optimum supply formula in the Tart Cherry Order so that handlers, who are not exempt from volume restrictions, are not required to absorb the share of volume restriction that would have been the responsibility of other handlers were those other handlers not exempt from volume restrictions.

For the foregoing reasons, the following Order is issued.

ORDER

1. The relief requested by Burnette in its Petition, filed August 3, 2011, is denied.
2. Burnette’s Petition, filed August 3, 2011, is dismissed with prejudice. This Order shall become effective upon service on Burnette.

RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW

Burnette has the right to obtain judicial review of this Order in any district court of the United States in which district Burnette is an inhabitant or has its principal place of business. A bill in equity for the purpose of review of this Order must be filed within twenty (20) days from the date of entry of this Order. Service of process in any such proceeding may be

Burnette Foods, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 31

had upon the Secretary of Agriculture by delivering a copy of the bill of complaint to the Secretary of Agriculture.⁵¹ The date of entry of this Order is June 19, 2015.

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

⁵¹ 7 U.S.C. § 608c(15)(B).

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

COURT DECISIONS

KOLLMAN v. VILSACK.
No. 8:14-CV-1123-T-23TGW.
Court Decision.
Signed April 7, 2015.

AWA – Administrative procedure – Exhibitor – Exhibit, definition of – Hearing, opportunity for – License, application for – License, revocation of – License, suspension of – Revoke, definition of.

[Cite as: Not Reported in F. Supp.3d, 2015 WL 1538149 (M.D. Fla. 2015)].

United States District Court
M.D. Florida, Tampa Division

The Court held that the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) entitles the Department to refuse to issue a license to a person whose license was previously revoked. The Court also ruled that Complainant was not entitled to an evidentiary hearing prior to revocation because Complainant had waived his opportunity for hearing by failing to respond to the allegations against him. The Court granted the Department's motion to dismiss "Count I" of the complaint for failure to state a claim, ultimately ruling that the Department acted within its authority when it promulgated a regulation that prohibits a person whose license was revoked from obtaining a license upon re-application.

ORDER OF THE COURT

STEVEN D. MERRYDAY, DISTRICT JUDGE, DELIVERED THE OPINION OF THE COURT.

Lancelot Kollman is an exotic-animal trainer who held an exhibitor's license under the Animal Welfare Act (AWA). Thomas J. Vilsack, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and Chester A. Gipson, Deputy Administrator of Animal Care for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, (collectively, the Department) enforce the AWA, a legislative attempt to advance the humane treatment of animals on exhibit. Under the AWA and regulations promulgated by the Department, an exhibitor of lions must have a license, which the Department can revoke if the exhibitor violates the AWA or the regulations. After the death of two lions and Kollman's failure to contest

Kollman v. Vilsack
74 Agric. Dec. 52

charges against him, the Department revoked Kollman's license to exhibit lions. *Kollman Ramos v. U.S. Dep't of Agr.*, 322 Fed. Appx. 814, 818 (11th Cir.2009) (describing the sequence of events in detail and upholding the revocation after Kollman's default). Relying on a regulation prescribing the consequences of revocation, the Department denied Kollman's application for another license.

Kollman sues for a declaration that, "notwithstanding his earlier license revocation, [he] is entitled to apply for and obtain a new exhibitor's license" and that, even without an exhibitor's license, he can "present" animals as an employee of a licensed exhibitor. (Doc. 22 at 12, 15) The Department moves (Doc. 26) to dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim.

I. Count I

Kollman alleges that the Department lacks the authority to "permanently revoke licenses without the opportunity for reinstatement." (Doc. 22 ¶ 44) Specifically, Count I asserts (1) that, despite the revocation of his license, Kollman may apply for and obtain a new license and (2) that Kollman is entitled to a hearing to present evidence supporting his license application.

1. Revocation and re-application

Section 2149 of the AWA states:

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

If the Secretary has reason to believe that any person licensed as a[n] ... exhibitor ... 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.

The AWA fails to define "revoke" or to specify otherwise the consequence

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

of a revocation. However, the Department enforces Section 2149 through regulations such as 9 C.F.R. § 2.10(b), which states, “Any person whose license has been revoked shall not be licensed in his or her own name or in any other manner....” Similarly, 9 C.F.R. § 2.11(a)(3) states, “A license will not be issued to any applicant who ... has had a license revoked....” Although the Department’s regulations existed when the Department revoked his license, Kollman argues that he is not barred forever from obtaining a new license and that the Department impermissibly interprets “revoke.”

The parties agree that *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Counsel Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837, 104 S.Ct. 2778, 81 L.Ed.2d 694 (1984), governs judicial review of an agency’s construction of a statute within the agency’s jurisdiction. Under *Chevron*, if “Congress has directly spoken to the precise question at issue” and “[i]f the intent of Congress is clear,” the construction of the statute necessarily incorporates Congress’s expression. *Chevron*, 467 U.S. at 842. However, if the statute is silent or ambiguous, the judicial interpretation of the statute defers to an administrative interpretation that is “based on a permissible construction of the statute.” *Chevron*, 467 U.S. at 843. Additionally, the Supreme Court has “recognized a very good indicator of delegation meriting *Chevron* treatment in express congressional authorizations to engage in the process of rulemaking or adjudication that produces regulations or rulings for which deference is claimed.” *United States v. Mead Corp.*, 533 U.S. 218, 229, 121 S.Ct. 2164, 150 L.Ed.2d 292 (2001).

By failing to define “revoke,” Section 2149 implicitly leaves a “gap for the agency to fill.” *Chevron*, 467 U.S. at 843. “In such a case, a court may not substitute its own construction of a statutory provision for a reasonable interpretation made by the administrator of an agency.” *Chevron*, 467 U.S. at 844. Further, Section 2151 of the AWA authorizes the Secretary to “promulgate such rules, regulations, and orders as he may deem necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this chapter.” Thus, the AWA’s delegation of authority merits *Chevron* deference.

Kollman argues, “Congress expressly addressed revocation and suspension ... in section 2149, and nowhere in the statute did it authorize permanent revocation.” (Doc. 22 ¶ 45) For contrast, Kollman cites Section 2158(c)(3) (a statute governing the protection of pets), which states, “Any

Kollman v. Vilsack
74 Agric. Dec. 52

dealer who violates this section three or more times shall have such dealer[']s license permanently revoked.” Kollman argues that Section 2158(c)(3)’s use of “permanently revoke” confirms that “Congress clearly knew how to spell out the circumstances when the agency could permanently bar a licensee.” (Doc. 22 ¶ 47) However, although the wording of one statute might aid in the interpretation of another statute, “drafters ... often use different words to denote the same concept.” Antonin Scalia & Bryan A. Garner, *Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts* 170 (2012).

As the Department explains, Section 2149 (the statute at issue) establishes a “three-tier system of penalties,” which range from a suspension not exceeding twenty-one days to, after notice and the opportunity for a hearing, a longer suspension and finally to a revocation. (Doc. 26 at 11) “For the agency to decide that someone who merited the most serious of the three tiers of punishment for licensees—revocation—should not be able to apply for a license in the future is consistent with the goal of promoting the humane treatment of animals.” (Doc. 26 at 11)

Although the AWA fails to specify the consequence of a suspension, the Department construes “suspend” to mean that a person cannot apply for and obtain a new license during a suspension. *See* 9 C.F.R. § 2.11(a)(3) (stating that a “license will not be issued to any applicant ... whose license is suspended”). Similarly, although the AWA fails to specify the consequence of a revocation, the Department construes “revoke” to mean not only a permanent revocation but a prohibition against applying for another license. Accordingly, the Department offers a “reasonable interpretation” of Section 2149, and, therefore, the Department’s interpretation is based on a “permissible construction of the statute.”

However, even assuming that the Department impermissibly interprets Section 2149, a separate section—Section 2133—authorizes the Department’s refusal to issue a license to a person whose license the Department revoked. Section 2133 (the statute governing the licensing of exhibitors) states, “The Secretary shall issue licenses to ... exhibitors upon application therefor in such form and manner as he may prescribe....” Thus, Section 2133 grants to the Department the authority to prescribe the requirements of a license. The Department validly exercised this authority by promulgating 9 C.F.R. § 2.10(b) (“Any person whose license has been

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

revoked shall not be licensed in his or her own name or in any other manner”) and 9 C.F.R. § 2.11(a)(3) (“A license will not be issued to any applicant who ... has had a license revoked....”).

2. Evidentiary hearing

Kollman asserts entitlement to a hearing under 9 C.F.R. § 2.11(b), which states, “An applicant whose license application has been denied may request a hearing in accordance with the applicable rules of practice for the purpose of showing why the application for a license should not be denied.” However, rather than entitling an applicant to a hearing, 9 C.F.R. § 2.11(b) permits an applicant to “request” a hearing. Thus, the Department complied with 9 C.F.R. § 2.11(b) by permitting Kollman to request a hearing.

Also, Kollman asserts that “a hearing must be afforded before an individual can be denied the right to practice his or her profession” because “the right to practice one’s chosen profession is a liberty interest under the due process clause.” (Doc. 22 ¶ 41) However, Kollman overlooks Section 2149, which requires “notice and an opportunity for hearing” before the revocation of a license. Complying with Section 2149, the Department afforded Kollman an opportunity for a hearing before revoking his license, but as *Kollman Ramos v. United States Department of Agriculture*, 322 Fed. Appx. at 821, determines, Kollman waived the opportunity by failing to respond to the allegations against him. After a “fact intensive” review of the “overall fairness of the proceedings,” *Kollman Ramos*, 322 Fed. Appx. at 824, rejects Kollman’s due process argument and holds that, “[T]he Judicial Officer’s Decision and Order [revoking Kollman’s license] did not violate the principles of fundamental fairness embodied in the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution....”

Further, even if Kollman received a hearing to offer evidence in support of his application for a new license, the Department’s regulations, including 9 C.F.R. §§ 2.10(b) and 2.11(a)(3), require the application’s denial. Kollman has no right to—and the Department is not obligated to grant—a futile and purposeless hearing.

II. Count II

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

Count II demands a declaration that as an employee of a licensed exhibitor Kollman can “present” an animal. (Doc. 22 at 15) The Department moves (Doc. 26) to dismiss and cites 9 C.F.R. § 2.10(c), which states that a person whose license the Department has revoked may not “exhibit” an animal. Because neither the AWA nor the regulations define “exhibit,” the Department argues that the term’s common meaning^{*} applies. Kollman responds that the correct definition of “exhibit” should accord with the definition of “exhibitor,” a term defined by both the AWA and the regulations. The Department “do[es] not contend that [Kollman] is acting as an exhibitor.” (Doc. 26 at 15) Kollman argues that, because he is not an “exhibitor,” he is not “exhibiting” and that therefore the Department’s refusal to allow him to “present” an animal as an employee of a licensed exhibitor is “arbitrary and capricious and violates the AWA and [the Department’s] own regulations and practices.” (Doc. 22 ¶ 62) Count II states a claim for a declaratory judgment.

CONCLUSION

The Department’s motion (Doc. 26) to dismiss Count I is **GRANTED**, and the Department’s motion (Doc. 26) to dismiss Count II is **DENIED**. No later than APRIL 17, 2015, Kollman may amend Count I.

ORDERED.

ANIMAL LEGAL DEFENSE FUND v. USDA.
No. 14-12260.
Court Decision.
Decided June 15, 2015.

AWA – Administrative procedure – *Chevron* deference – Exhibitor – Legislative history – License, issuance of – License, renewal of – License, suspension of – Licensing regulations – Proceedings, institution of.

^{*} According to the *American Heritage Dictionary* (5th ed.2014), “exhibit” means “to present for others to see.”

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

[Cite as: 789 F.3d 1206 (11th Cir. 2015)].

United States Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit.

The Court affirmed the district court’s order granting summary judgment to the Department and its ruling that the Department’s license-renewal process “was a permissible construction of” the Animal Welfare Act (AWA). The Court found that Congress had not directly spoken as to whether the AWA prohibits the Department from renewing an AWA license on the anniversary date of the license where the Department knows that the exhibitor has been noncompliant with animal welfare standards. Ultimately, the Court held that AWA licensing regulations are entitled to *Chevron* deference; therefore, the Department did not act arbitrarily or capriciously in renewing Seaquarium’s license.

OPINION OF THE COURT

THE HONORABLE SUSAN HARRELL BLACK DELIVERED THE OPINION OF THE COURT.

The Animal Legal Defense Fund, Orca Network, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Inc., Howard Garrett, and Karen Munro (collectively, ALDF)¹ appeal the district court’s grant of summary judgment in favor of the United States Department of Agriculture; Tom Vilsack, in his official capacity as Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture; and Elizabeth Goldentyer, in her official capacity as Eastern Regional Director of the United States Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (collectively, USDA). ALDF argues the district court erred in ruling USDA’s decision to renew Marine Exhibition Corporation d/b/a Miami Seaquarium’s (Seaquarium) license did not violate the Animal Welfare Act (AWA), 7 U.S.C. §§ 2131–59. According to ALDF, USDA may not renew a license when USDA knows an exhibitor is noncompliant with any animal welfare standards on the anniversary of the day USDA originally issued the

¹ Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 42(b), Appellants moved to dismiss the appeal as to Shelby Proie and Patricia Sykes, on the basis that Proie’s current employment prohibits her from being involved in the litigation and Sykes is now deceased. This Court granted the motion to dismiss the appeal without prejudice as to Proie and dismissed the appeal of Sykes as moot. Proie and Sykes are therefore no longer parties to this appeal.

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

license.²

Congress has prescribed what an exhibitor must do to obtain *issuance* of a license in the first instance, but Congress has not spoken precisely to the question of license *renewal* under the AWA. USDA in turn has adopted comprehensive renewal regulations. USDA's renewal scheme requires Seaquarium to submit a form summarily certifying its regulatory compliance, a fee, and an annual report setting forth the number of exhibited animals. No annual inspection occurs. Given the thousands of exhibitors across the country and its limited resources, USDA conducts license renewal through a purely administrative procedure.

USDA has adopted a different mechanism to achieve substantive compliance with animal welfare standards. The USDA regulations provide for random, unannounced inspections to verify substantive compliance with the AWA. When violations are discovered, either through inspections or third-party complaints, the USDA can charge Seaquarium and seek to suspend or revoke its license after requisite due process. USDA must provide notice to Seaquarium by filing a complaint before an administrative law judge (ALJ) who conducts a hearing in accordance with detailed rules of administrative practice. The ALJ's decision is then subject to judicial review exclusively in the United States Court of Appeals.

USDA's licensing regulations constitute a reasonable policy choice balancing the conflicting congressional aims of due process and animal welfare, and the AWA licensing scheme is entitled to deference by this court. We therefore affirm. As explained below, assuming Seaquarium violated a substantive AWA standard, the remedy in this case lies not in

² There is some confusion arising from USDA's characterization of ALDF's argument. USDA believes ALDF has argued the license renewal scheme is unlawful "because the regulations do not require a demonstration of compliance with the AWA prior to renewal." (USDA Response Brief at 2.) In its reply brief, though, ALDF clarifies that it "make[s] no such argument," and does not seek annual inspections of exhibitor facilities. (ALDF Reply Brief at 1.) Rather, ALDF "challenge[s] the USDA's specific decision to renew the license of Seaquarium despite evidence that the facility is in violation of several Welfare Act standards." (*Id.*) (emphasis removed). For the purposes of this appeal, we assume, without deciding, that USDA renewed the license despite knowing there was evidence Seaquarium was violating several AWA standards.

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

the administrative license renewal scheme, but in USDA's power to initiate an enforcement proceeding. USDA has the discretionary enforcement authority to revoke a license due to noncompliance. Only Congress, not this Court, possesses the power to limit the agency's discretion and demand annual, substantive compliance with animal welfare standards.

I. BACKGROUND³

A. *Lolita*

Lolita is a 20-foot long, 7000 pound *Orcinus orca*⁴ held in captivity at Seaquarium. In 1970, Ted Griffin, the first person to swim with an orca in a public exhibition, captured Lolita in Whidbey Island's Penn Cove, off the coast of Washington State. Lolita was approximately three to six years old and a member of the Southern Resident L Pod. Seaquarium purchased Lolita, and she has lived there since September 24, 1970. Lolita performs each day in an event called the "Killer Whale and Dolphin Show."

Lolita lives in a tank which is surrounded by stadium seating. The stadium covering leaves Lolita exposed to ultraviolet radiation as she floats along the water's surface. As sunscreen, Seaquarium applies a black-colored zinc oxide on Lolita's skin. The effect of this sunscreen on Lolita's physiology is unknown. ALDF alleges Seaquarium's failure to provide Lolita with adequate sun cover violates 9 C.F.R. § 3.103(b)'s requirement to afford adequate protection from the weather or direct sunlight to marine animals kept outdoors.

Lolita's tank is oblong-shaped with a 5 feet 2 inches wide, crescent-shaped concrete platform that extends from the bottom of the tank through the surface of the water. Lolita's trainers stand on this platform during her performances. Her tank measures 80 feet by 60 feet. The concrete platform

³ We recount the facts in the light most favorable to USDA.

⁴ The *Orcinus orca* is colloquially known by the misnomer "killer whale." The creature is not actually a whale; rather, it is the world's largest member of the dolphin family called Delphinidae. Both whales and dolphins are members of an entirely aquatic group of mammals known as cetaceans. For the sake of scientific accuracy, we refer to Lolita as an orca.

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

leaves an unobstructed circular pool of 80 feet by 35 feet. ALDF alleges Lolita's tank is smaller than the 48 feet minimum horizontal standard permitted by agency regulation. *See id.* § 3.104(b) (providing cetaceans in captivity must be given a pool of water with a minimum horizontal dimension of at least "two times the average adult length" of the species).

Orcas are primarily social in the wild and travel in large groups. Lolita has not interacted with another orca since Hugo, who was also captured off the coast of Washington State, died in March 1980. Lolita instead shares her tank with Pacific white-sided dolphins. ALDF alleges these dolphins are not "biologically related" to her, as prescribed by 9 C.F.R. § 3.109.

B. Renewal of Seaquarium's License

Seaquarium received an AWA license from USDA. Each April since the issuance of the license, USDA has renewed Seaquarium's license before its one-year expiration date. On February 16, 2012, before the expiration of Seaquarium's license in April 2012, ALDF sent a letter to USDA alleging Seaquarium exhibited Lolita in violation of 9 C.F.R. §§ 3.103(b), 3.104(b), and 3.109. ALDF stated Lolita's living conditions were inhumane and the renewal of Seaquarium's license would be unlawful. In a March 28, 2012 letter, Goldentyer responded to ALDF's letter, stating USDA intended to renew Seaquarium's exhibitor license because it found Seaquarium was in "compliance with the regulations and standards, and none of the other criteria for license denial under Section 2.11 or 2.12 are applicable." USDA renewed Seaquarium's license on April 21, 2012.

C. License Renewal Regulations

The AWA prohibits exhibitors⁵ from exhibiting any animals unless they "have obtained a license from the Secretary and such license shall not have been suspended or revoked." 7 U.S.C. § 2134. "[N]o such license shall be issued" until the exhibitor "shall have demonstrated that his facilities comply with the standards promulgated by the Secretary." *Id.* § 2133. In addition to this statutory command, the AWA vests USDA with the authority to "promulgate such rules, regulations, and orders as he may

⁵ The AWA defines an "exhibitor" as "any person ... 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." 7 U.S.C. § 2132(h).

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

deem necessary in order effectuate the purposes” of the statute. 7 U.S.C. § 2151. Pursuant to this section, USDA has adopted comprehensive renewal regulations that combine purely administrative requirements, random inspections, and discretionary enforcement proceedings.

On or before the expiration date of his or her one-year license, an exhibitor must submit a completed application form to the appropriate USDA regional office fulfilling three, purely administrative criteria. *See* 9 C.F.R. § 2.1(d). First, the exhibitor certifies by signing the application form that, to the best of her knowledge or belief, she is compliant and will continue to comply with all AWA animal wildlife standards. *Id.* § 2.2(b). Second, the exhibitor pays an annual fee calculated according to USDA’s fee schedule that varies according to the number of animals owned, held, or exhibited. *Id.* § 2.6. Third, the exhibitor submits an annual report detailing the number of animals owned, held, or exhibited. *Id.* § 2.7(d). So long as an exhibitor meets these three criteria, even if her facility fails to comply with animal wildlife standards on the license expiration date, USDA must grant her a renewal. *See id.* § 2.2(b) (stating “[USDA] will issue a license” after applicant fulfills administrative requirements). Otherwise, the license automatically terminates due to expiration. *Id.* § 2.5(b).

Unlike the purely administrative procedure for renewing a license, USDA’s mechanism for suspending or terminating licenses due to animal welfare violations depends on random inspections and enforcement proceedings. Each applicant for renewal is obligated to make her “animals, premises, facilities, vehicles, equipment, other premises, and records available for inspection ... to ascertain the applicant’s compliance with the standards and regulations.” *Id.* § 2.3(a). USDA’s administrative renewal scheme facilitates these inspections by requiring a licensee to “promptly notify [USDA] by certified mail of any change in the name, address, management, or substantial control or ownership of his business or operation, or of any additional sites, within 10 days of any change.” *Id.* § 2.8. In addition to random inspections, any interested person may submit information to USDA regarding alleged violations by a licensee. 7 C.F.R. § 1.133(a)(1); *see also* 9 C.F.R. § 4.1 (applying USDA’s Uniform Rules of Practice for adjudicatory proceedings to section 19 of the AWA (codified at 7 U.S.C. § 2149)). In response, USDA can choose to investigate the submission if, in the opinion of the agency, such an

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

investigation is “justified by the facts.” 7 C.F.R. § 1.133(a)(3).⁶

Under the AWA’s supplemental rules of procedure, USDA may suspend a license temporarily for 21 days upon written notification before an opportunity for notice and hearing if USDA has reason to believe a licensee has violated or is violating the AWA. 9 C.F.R. § 4.10. If, on the basis of inspections or the receipt of third-party information, USDA chooses to suspend a license for more than 21 days, impose a civil penalty, or terminate a license, USDA must afford notice and a hearing in an enforcement proceeding. *Id.* § 2.12 (stating “license may be terminated during the license renewal process ... after a hearing in accordance with the applicable rules of practice”). An interested person who submits a third-party complaint to the agency “shall not be a party to any proceeding which may be instituted as a result thereof.” 7 C.F.R. § 1.133(a)(4).

USDA initiates the enforcement proceeding by filing a complaint with the USDA Hearing Clerk, *id.* § 1.133(b)(1), who assigns the case to an ALJ that conducts the proceeding according to formal rules of evidence and procedure, *see id.* § 1.133–51. Unless a licensee subject to an ALJ’s adverse decision appeals to a Judicial Officer appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, that decision becomes a final order. *Id.* § 1.145(i). Finally, the licensee may appeal an order that is final for the purposes of judicial review to the United States Court of Appeals of the circuit in which she resides or has her principal office, or in the District of Columbia Circuit. 7 U.S.C. § 2149(c); 28 U.S.C. § 2343.

D. ALDF’s Complaint

On August 22, 2012, ALDF filed a complaint against USDA for declaratory and injunctive relief in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. The complaint alleged Seaquarium houses Lolita in conditions that violate the AWA’s standards for granting a license pursuant to 7 U.S.C. §§ 2133–34. ALDF alleged USDA acted unlawfully by (1) renewing Seaquarium’s license in April 2012 and (2) routinely renewing Seaquarium’s AWA license each year. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), (C) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), ALDF

⁶ It is during this time period, when USDA discovers evidence of AWA violations, that USDA undertakes the cooperative enforcement measures described *infra* at Section III(B)(2)(b).

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

requested the district court to set aside the USDA's April 2012 decision to renew Seaquarium's license, award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, and grant any further relief deemed just and proper. The Northern District of California granted Seaquarium's motion to intervene and USDA's 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) motion to transfer the case to the Southern District of Florida.

E. Motion for Summary Judgment

USDA moved for summary judgment. USDA argued ALDF confused the *issuance* of a license with the annual *renewal* of a license. While 7 U.S.C. § 2133 requires a demonstration of compliance with the Secretary's standards before "such license shall be issued," USDA asserted the AWA is silent as to any requirements for renewal of a license already issued. Since the AWA did not explicitly address renewal, USDA promulgated administrative renewal regulations to fill this statutory gap. USDA argued these regulations are a permissible construction of the AWA.

In response, ALDF asserted the AWA's animal welfare compliance requirement unambiguously applies to initial licenses *and* license renewals; therefore, USDA violated § 2133 when it renewed the license despite Seaquarium's alleged failure to comply with applicable AWA standards. Further, USDA's distinction between an issuance and a renewal was simply a *post hoc* litigation strategy not entitled to deference. ALDF also claimed USDA's interpretation was an unreasonable construction of the statute because it would render the entire licensing scheme "virtually meaningless." Exhibitors like Seaquarium could keep receiving licenses even if USDA knows they are blatantly violating AWA standards.

F. District Court Order

The district court granted summary judgment to USDA. The district court did not request or examine the administrative record because the material facts were not in dispute and the only contested issue was a pure question of law. Applying the two-step framework of *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837, 104 S.Ct. 2778, 81 L.Ed.2d 694 (1984), the district court ruled Congress had not spoken to the precise question of license renewal under the AWA because the text and legislative history were silent as to the requirements and procedure for

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

renewal. Accordingly, USDA was free to implement its own administrative renewal scheme.

Under *Chevron* Step Two, the district court concluded USDA's renewal process was a permissible construction of the statute. USDA had adopted a purely administrative renewal scheme requiring a licensee to submit a certification of regulatory compliance, payment of an annual fee, and submission of an annual report detailing the number of animals owned, held, or exhibited during the prior year. This administrative scheme was coupled with a random, unannounced inspection program that, according to USDA, secured AWA compliance more efficiently than an annual inspection program. Accordingly, the district court held USDA's decision to renew Seaquarium's license despite alleged noncompliance with animal welfare standards did not violate 7 U.S.C. § 2133. ALDF filed a timely notice of appeal.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

"We review questions of subject matter jurisdiction de novo." *Yunker v. Allianceone Receivables Mgmt., Inc.*, 701 F.3d 369, 372 n. 2 (11th Cir.2012) (italics omitted). "We review a summary judgment ruling de novo, applying the same legal standards used by the district court." *See Johnson v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. of Ga.*, 263 F.3d 1234, 1242 (11th Cir.2001). In conducting this examination, we view the materials presented and all factual inferences in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. *See Adickes v. S.H. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S. 144, 157, 90 S.Ct. 1598, 1608, 26 L.Ed.2d 142 (1970). Summary judgment is appropriate where "there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(a).

III. DISCUSSION

A. Judicial Reviewability

Before discussing the merits of the district court's summary judgment motion, we address a threshold issue regarding this Court's subject matter jurisdiction over the present controversy. *See Scarfo v. Ginsberg*, 175 F.3d 957, 960 (11th Cir.1999) ("[P]arties cannot waive subject matter jurisdiction, and we may consider subject matter jurisdiction claims at any

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

time during litigation.”).

ALDF brings this suit for judicial review of USDA’s agency action pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 702. Section 702 provides that any “person suffering legal wrong because of agency action, or adversely affected or aggrieved by agency action within the meaning of a relevant statute, is entitled to judicial review thereof.” *Id.* This provision is inapplicable, however, to the extent “agency action is committed to agency discretion by law.” *Id.* § 701(a)(2). Whether an agency action is reviewable under § 701(a)(2) is a matter of subject matter jurisdiction. *See Lenis v. U.S. Attorney Gen.*, 525 F.3d 1291, 1293–94 (11th Cir.2008); *but see Sierra Club v. Jackson*, 648 F.3d 848, 853–54 (D.C.Cir.2011) (holding agency decisions excluded from judicial review by § 701(a)(2) are not justiciable because relief cannot be granted, but courts still retain subject matter jurisdiction over such controversies).

The Supreme Court has held § 701(a)(2) precludes APA review whenever the statute under which the agency acts “is drawn so that a court would have no meaningful standard against which to judge the agency’s exercise of discretion”—that is, where a court would have “no law to apply.” *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 830–31, 105 S.Ct. 1649, 1655, 84 L.Ed.2d 714 (1985) (internal quotation marks omitted). Due to the general unsuitability for judicial review of agency decisions to refuse enforcement, a presumption arises that such decisions are committed to agency discretion by law and thus unreviewable. *Id.* at 832, 105 S.Ct. at 1656 (holding “an agency’s decision not to take enforcement action should be presumed immune from judicial review under § 701(a)(2)”); *see also Conservancy of Sw. Fla. v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Serv.*, 677 F.3d 1073, 1084 (11th Cir.2012) (same).

The presumption of unreviewability does not apply to this case. ALDF does not seek an injunction requiring USDA to initiate enforcement proceedings against Seaquarium.⁷ Instead, ALDF seeks a judicial order setting aside USDA’s affirmative decision to renew Seaquarium’s license in April 2012. This case is about an “affirmative act of approval under a statute,” *Heckler*, 470 U.S. at 831, 105 S.Ct. at 1655, in particular,

⁷ Both parties acknowledge that if ALDF sought an injunction requiring the agency to initiate an enforcement proceeding against Seaquarium, this Court would lack subject matter jurisdiction.

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

USDA's affirmative decision to renew Seaquarium's license in April 2012. *See id.* at 832, 105 S.Ct. at 1656 (stating an agency's refusal to act "does not infringe upon areas that courts often are called upon to protect," as opposed to affirmative agency action that "itself provides a focus for judicial review, inasmuch as the agency must have exercised its power in some manner").

USDA's decision was not committed to agency discretion by law so as to render it unreviewable. The AWA provides "meaningful standard[s]" against which to judge USDA's exercise of discretion. *See id.* at 821, 105 S.Ct. at 1655 We accordingly hold USDA's renewal of Seaquarium's April 2012 license is a final agency action subject to judicial review under § 706(2).

B. AWA Requirements for License Renewal

To determine whether USDA's decision to renew Seaquarium's license in April 2012 must be set aside as unlawful under 5 U.S.C. § 706(2), we evaluate the merits of USDA's interpretation of the AWA's licensing requirements. In doing so, we apply the two-step framework formulated in *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837, 104 S.Ct. 2778, 81 L.Ed.2d 694 (1984). Under *Chevron*, we afford deference to certain agency interpretations because "[i]f Congress has explicitly left a gap for the agency to fill, there is an express delegation of authority to the agency to elucidate a specific provision of the statute by regulation." *Id.* at 843–44, 104 S.Ct. at 2782. Unlike courts, who "are not experts in the field, and are not part of either political branch of the Government," agencies possess invaluable technical expertise and, by virtue of their accountability to the President, are a proper forum to make policy choices based on unresolved "competing interests." *Id.* at 865–66, 104 S.Ct. at 2793.

1. Chevron Step One

When reviewing an agency's construction of a statute it administers, we first decide whether Congress has directly spoken to the question at issue. *Id.* at 842, 104 S.Ct. at 2781. "If the intent of Congress is clear, that is the end of the matter; for the court, as well as the agency, must give effect to the unambiguously expressed intent of Congress." *Id.* at 842–43, 104 S.Ct.

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

at 2781.

To decide if the intent of Congress is clear, we employ traditional tools of statutory construction. *See id.* at 843 n. 9, 104 S.Ct. at 2781 n. 9. These include “examination of the text of the statute, its structure, and its stated purpose.” *Miami—Dade Cnty. v. EPA*, 529 F.3d 1049, 1063 (11th Cir.2008). “As with any question of statutory interpretation, we begin by examining the text of the statute to determine whether its meaning is clear.” *Harry v. Marchant*, 291 F.3d 767, 770 (11th Cir.2002) (en banc). This is because “we presume that Congress said what it meant and meant what it said.” *Id.* (quotation omitted).

a. Statutory language

The precise question before us is whether USDA may renew a license even if it knows an exhibitor is not compliant with AWA standards governing “the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of animals,” 7 U.S.C. § 2143(a)(1), on the anniversary of the date USDA originally issued the license. For example, if USDA issues a license on January 1, 2010, and USDA knows an exhibitor is violating an AWA standard when the clock strikes 12:01 am on January 1, 2011, may USDA still renew the license? To answer whether Congress has directly spoken to this question, we turn to the plain language of 7 U.S.C. § 2133, which provides:

The Secretary shall issue licenses to dealers and exhibitors upon application therefor in such form and manner as he may prescribe and upon payment of such fee established pursuant to 2153 of this title: *Provided*, That no such license shall be issued until the dealer or exhibitor shall have demonstrated that his facilities comply with the standards promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to section 2143 of this title....

The parties dispute whether the word “issue” unambiguously encompasses the word “renew.”

“Issue” is not defined in the AWA. In the absence of a statutory definition, “we look to the common usage of words for their meaning.” *Consol. Bank*,

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

N.A., Hialeah, Fla. v. U.S. Dep't of Treasury, Office of Comptroller of Currency, 118 F.3d 1461, 1464 (11th Cir.1997). “Issue” is defined, in the sense linguistically relevant to the circumstances here, as “to come out, go out,” “to proceed or come forth from a usually specified source,” or “to cause to appear or become available by officially putting forth or distributing or granting or proclaiming or promulgating.” WEBSTER’S NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY 1201 (3d ed.1976).⁸

The word “renew” is also not defined in the AWA, nor does it even appear anywhere in the statute. “Renew” means “to make new again,” “to restore to fullness or sufficiency,” or “to grant or obtain an extension of.” *Id.* at 1922.

Comparing these two definitions, we conclude the plain meaning of “issue” does not necessarily include “renew.” Rather than make a license “come out” or “go out,” one could “restore to fullness” a license that has already “come out” or “gone out.” In fact, that is precisely the type of licensing regime USDA has established under the AWA. USDA makes a license “go out” once an applicant has met the requirements for an issuance. After USDA makes the license go out, it remains “valid and effective” unless the licensee fails to comply with the administrative renewal process. *See* 9 C.F.R. § 2.5(a) (stating a “license issued under this part shall be valid and effective” unless “revoked or suspended pursuant to section 19 of the Act”). No license is given out during the renewal process; instead, the exhibitor maintains the same license number. Based on our analysis of § 2133 standing alone, we cannot conclude Congress has spoken to the precise question at issue.

Whether a statutory term is unambiguous, however, does not turn solely on dictionary definitions of its component words. Rather, “[t]he plainness or ambiguity of statutory language is determined by reference to the language itself, the specific context in which that language is used, and the broader context of the statute as a whole.” *Robinson v. Shell Oil Co.*, 519 U.S. 337, 341, 117 S.Ct. 843, 846, 136 L.Ed.2d 808 (1997). “In

⁸ We have chosen to use a 1976 dictionary because it is more contemporaneous to the 1966 enactment of the AWA than a modern edition. *See Taniguchi v. Kan Pac. Saipan, Ltd.*, — U.S. —, 132 S.Ct. 1997, 2003 n. 2, 182 L.Ed.2d 903 (2012) (using “contemporaneous dictionaries” to elucidate meaning of statutory term).

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

expounding a statute, we must not be guided by a single sentence or member of a sentence, but look to the provisions of the whole law, and to its object and policy.” *United States v. Heirs of Boisdoré*, 49 U.S. (8 How.) 113, 122, 12 L.Ed. 1009 (1850). Examination of the whole AWA statute strengthens USDA’s argument that Congress did not unambiguously require compliance with animal welfare standards on the date of license renewal.

In particular, Congress’s enactment of the AWA’s § 2149 enforcement provision severely undermines the assertion Congress conditioned license renewal on an exhibitor’s compliance with AWA standards on the anniversary of the date USDA originally issued the license. The heading of § 2149 is “Violations by licensees.” See *Almendarez–Torres v. United States*, 523 U.S. 224, 234, 118 S.Ct. 1219, 1226, 140 L.Ed.2d 350 (1998) (“[T]he title of a statute and the heading of a section are tools available for the resolution of a doubt about the meaning of a statute.” (internal quotation marks omitted)). As the heading suggests, § 2149 spells out the adjudicative process for punishing a licensee, *i.e.*, one who already holds a license, see WEBSTER’S NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY 1304 (3d ed.1976) (defining licensee as “a licensed person”). Section 2149(a) says:

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.

Subsection (c) authorizes judicial review of final USDA enforcement orders exclusively in the United States Courts of Appeals.

If § 2133 mandated the revocation of a license whenever USDA thinks the exhibitor has failed to demonstrate compliance on an anniversary date, the

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

due process protections afforded to licensees in § 2149 would be mere surplusage. *See Babbitt v. Sweet Home Chapter of Cmty. for a Great Or.*, 515 U.S. 687, 698, 115 S.Ct. 2407, 2413, 132 L.Ed.2d 597 (1995) (“A reluctance to treat statutory terms as surplusage supports the reasonableness of the Secretary’s interpretation.”). To revoke a license, USDA would not need to bring an enforcement proceeding against a licensee; the agency could patiently bide its time until the license anniversary rolled around, then immediately revoke the license for failure to demonstrate compliance. The exhibitor would have no right to a hearing, nor would she have a right to appeal the denial of her renewal application. In light of the protracted time often necessary to litigate a final agency decision through an appeal, USDA would have no reason to initiate any enforcement proceedings against licensees. Surely Congress did not enact § 2149 to lull licensees into relying on due process protections that do not actually exist.

Moving beyond the AWA itself, a survey of § 2133’s relationship to the whole United States Code shows issuing a license is not unambiguously the same as renewing one. *See Green v. Bock Laundry Mach. Co.*, 490 U.S. 504, 528, 109 S.Ct. 1981, 1994, 104 L.Ed.2d 557 (1989) (Scalia, J., concurring) (remarking a statute should be understood in a manner “most compatible with the surrounding body of law into which the provision must be integrated—a compatibility which, by a benign fiction, we assume Congress always has in mind”). Whereas Congress did not explicitly address renewal in the AWA, Congress has demonstrated an ability to address renewal when it intends to do so. *See, e.g.*, 7 U.S.C. § 85 (stating Secretary “may refuse to renew ... any license”); 12 U.S.C. § 5105(a) (discussing “minimum standards for license renewal”); 16 U.S.C. § 808 (setting forth detailed renewal process); 46 U.S.C. § 7106(a) (stating “license issued” may be “renewed for additional 5-year periods”); 47 U.S.C. § 1421(b)(2) (describing “renewal” of “initial license”).

“Where Congress knows how to say something but chooses not to, its silence is controlling.” *In re Haas*, 48 F.3d 1153, 1156 (11th Cir.1995), *abrogated on other grounds by In re Griffith*, 206 F.3d 1389 (11th Cir.2000). Congress could have unequivocally conditioned license renewal upon demonstrated compliance with AWA standards on the anniversary of license issuance, but chose instead to limit § 2133’s language to issuance alone. On this question, “more important than what

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

Congress said” in § 2133 “is what Congress left unsaid.” *See Gonzalez v. Reno*, 212 F.3d 1338, 1348 (11th Cir.2000). Since the AWA does not mandate a renewal procedure at all, much less prescribe the “particulars of that procedure,” *id.*, Congress has conferred USDA the discretion to implement an administrative renewal scheme for AWA licenses.

In sum, the plain language of the statute shows Congress has not directly spoken to whether USDA can renew a license despite knowing that an exhibitor is noncompliant with animal welfare standards on the anniversary of the day USDA originally issued the license. The terms “issue” and “renew” have distinct meanings; § 2149’s due process protections would be meaningless if we adopted ALDF’s interpretation; and Congress’s silence regarding renewal is controlling.

b. Legislative history

When, as here, the words of Congress are clear, “we need not resort to legislative history, and we certainly should not do so to undermine the plain meaning of the statutory language.” *Harris v. Garner*, 216 F.3d 970, 976 (11th Cir.2000) (en banc). We nonetheless examine the AWA’s legislative history because it is consistent with our conclusion that Congress has not spoken directly to the question of license renewal. *See id.* at 977 (discussing legislative history consistent with plain meaning); *United States v. Fields*, 500 F.3d 1327, 1330 (11th Cir.2007) (“[W]e look to the legislative history of the statute to determine whether Congress provided any guidance concerning its intent.”). Like the statutory language itself, the most striking feature of the AWA’s legislative history is its almost total silence regarding renewal.

As with the current statute, none of the prior versions of the AWA mention license renewal. Congress enacted the AWA in 1966. *See* Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, PUB.L. NO. 89–544, 80 STAT. 350 (1966). Section 3 stated the “Secretary shall issue licenses to dealers upon application therefor in such form and manner as he may prescribe,” provided that “no such license shall be issued until the dealer shall have demonstrated that his facilities comply with the standards promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to section 13 of this Act.” *Id.* § 3, 80 Stat. at 351. Also like the current version of the AWA, Congress authorized USDA to suspend a license through enforcement proceedings safeguarded by notice, hearing,

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

and appeal. *Id.* § 19, 80 Stat. at 352. The word renewal is conspicuously absent, and the topic is omitted from the bill's congressional reports. *See generally* H.R. REP. NO. 89-1848 (1966), 1966 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2649 (Conf.Rep.); S. REP. NO. 89-1281 (1966), 1966 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2635.

Subsequent amendments never discussed license renewal or fundamentally altered the scheme for revoking licenses. *See* Animal Welfare Act of 1970, PUB.L. NO. 91-579, 80 STAT. 1560; Animal Welfare Act Amendments of 1976, PUB.L. NO. 94-279, 90 STAT. 417; Food Security Act of 1985, PUB.L. NO. 99-198, §§ 1751-59, 99 STAT. 1354, 1645-50; Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990, PUB.L. NO. 101-624, § 2503, 104 STAT. 3359, 4066-68; Farm Security and Rural Investments Acts of 2002, PUB.L. NO. 107-171, §§ 10301-05, 116 STAT. 134, 491-94. In sum, Congress has never squarely addressed the precise question at issue.

The parties' and our independent research have revealed only two exceptions to this legislative silence. The first exception appears in H.R. 3556, 87th Cong. § 10-11 (as reported by S. Comm. on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Sept. 28-29, 1962), an unenacted bill sponsored by Rep. Morgan M. Moulder of Missouri in 1962. This unenacted bill would have required persons conducting animal research to obtain a "letter of qualification," *id.* § 10, similar to a "license" under the current statute. Interestingly, the letter would be "valid for no more than one year," but would "be renewed by the Commissioner if renewal is requested, subject to the requirements for an original letter of qualification." *Id.* § 11. Thus, Rep. Moulder's bill contemplated a renewal procedure as to individual letters of qualification conditioned upon annual compliance. By contrast, with regard to the "certificate of compliance" issued to the laboratory itself, the bill established no separate compliance requirement for renewal. *Id.* § 7-9, 12. Section 15 instead established a method for suspending or revoking a certificate of compliance through notice via mail and publication in the Federal Register. *Id.* § 15.

Considered alone, the bill's text lends credence to USDA's argument that Congress considered whether to condition license renewal upon annual compliance with animal welfare standards but declined to do so when enacting the AWA. Under these particular circumstances, however, we decline to infer any such conclusion when (1) neither the bill nor a

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

subsequent version were enacted into law, (2) the bill was proposed in the 87th rather than 89th Congress, (3) and Rep. Moulder did not hold office after the 87th Congress, *see MOULDER, Morgan Moore, BIOGRAPHIC DIRECTORY OF THE U.S. CONGRESS*, <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=M001045> (last visited March 28, 2015). The connection between Rep. Moulder's bill introduced in subcommittee and the AWA's passage in 1966 is simply too attenuated to divine Congress's intent.

The second exception to the legislative silence regarding AWA license renewal appears in Rep. George E. Brown, Jr. of California's remarks inserted into the Congressional Record on June 13, 1995. *See* 141 CONG. REC. E1239-40 (1995) (statement of Rep. George E. Brown, Jr.). According to Rep. Brown, who was "intimately involved in the 1985 amendments to the Animal Welfare Act,"

It was clearly the intent of Congress that facilities should come into compliance before being issued the initial registrations, and that license renewals should be withheld where licenses have been suspended or revoked or in instances where facilities are not in compliance with the provisions of the act.

Id. ALDF argues Rep. Brown's statement shows Congress unambiguously intended to withhold any license—whether an issuance or renewal—from an out-of-compliance applicant.

Rep. Brown's statement lacks persuasive force. Though the Congressman may have assisted in crafting the 1985 amendments to the AWA, those amendments made no alterations to the AWA's licensing provisions. Furthermore, Congress passed the 1985 amendments 19 years after 1966—the year Congress enacted the AWA language relevant to this appeal. Rep. Brown's opinion provides negligible insight into Congress's intent. *See Chrysler Corp. v. Brown*, 441 U.S. 281, 311, 99 S.Ct. 1705, 1722, 60 L.Ed.2d 208 (1979) ("The remarks of a single legislator ... are not controlling in analyzing legislative history.").

In addition to legislative silence, USDA's regulatory actions since the AWA's passage in 1966, combined with Congress's inaction, further

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

suggest Congress has not spoken directly to the precise question under consideration. “Ordinarily, and quite appropriately, courts are slow to attribute significance” to legislative acquiescence. *See Bob Jones Univ. v. United States*, 461 U.S. 574, 600, 103 S.Ct. 2017, 2032, 76 L.Ed.2d 157 (1983). Here, however, one can draw an inference of ambiguity, however minimal, from Congress’s inaction.

USDA has drawn a lengthy and unerring distinction between AWA license issuance versus renewal. USDA promulgated its first regulations interpreting the AWA on February 24, 1967. *See* Laboratory Animal Welfare, 32 Fed.Reg. 3270 (Feb. 24, 1967). Section 2.4 was titled “Issuance of licenses,” and USDA could not “issue[]” a license absent a prior demonstration of compliance. *Id.* at 3271. By contrast, § 2.8 was titled “Renewal and termination.” *Id.* In order to renew a license and avoid automatic termination, a licensee had to fulfill two purely administrative annual requirements: (1) file a form documenting specified dollar receipts and (2) pay a renewal fee. *Id.*

The significance of the contrast between § 2.4 (issuance) and § 2.8 (renewal) is highlighted by § 2.5, titled “Duration of license.” *Id.* Section 2.5 laid out three, independent methods by which a license may be terminated. *Id.* First, under subsection (a), a license could be “revoked or suspended” for failure to comply with AWA standards after notice, hearing, and appeal. *Id.* Second, under subsection (b), a license could be “automatically terminated” pursuant to § 2.8, which governs renewal. *Id.* Third, under subsection (c), a license could be “voluntarily terminated” upon the licensee’s request. *Id.* It has thus been clear since 1967 that USDA regulations do not authorize automatic termination for failure to comply with animal welfare standards. Automatic termination occurs only if a licensee fails to meet its purely administrative obligations.

Subsequent versions of the regulations have maintained this distinction. *See, e.g.*, Animal Welfare, 54 Fed.Reg. 36123–01 (Aug. 31, 1989); Animal Welfare, Licensing and Records, 60 Fed.Reg. 13893–01 (Mar. 15, 1995); Animal Welfare, Inspection, Licensing, and Procurement of Animals, 69 Fed.Reg. 42089–01 (July 14, 2004). Despite this nearly half-century old interpretation, the legislative history does not disclose any serious attempt to overturn USDA’s 1967 rulemaking. Congress’s legislative acquiescence adds weight to USDA’s proposition that 7 U.S.C. § 2133 is

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

ambiguous as to license renewal.

After applying the traditional canons of statutory interpretation to both the relevant text and legislative history, we find Congress has not spoken directly to whether the AWA prohibits USDA from renewing a license when USDA knows an exhibitor has failed to comply with the standards governing the humane handling, care, treatment and transportation of animals on the anniversary date of his or her license. Accordingly, we proceed to Chevron Step Two.

2. *Chevron Step Two*

Under Chevron Step Two, the question for this Court is “whether the agency’s answer is based on a permissible construction of the statute.” *Chevron*, 467 U.S. at 843, 104 S.Ct. at 2782. Because Congress has expressly delegated authority to USDA to elucidate the meaning of 7 U.S.C. § 2133 through regulation, those regulations “are given controlling weight unless arbitrary, capricious, or manifestly contrary to the statute.” *Id.* at 843–44, 104 S.Ct. at 2782. If USDA’s construction of the statute is reasonable in light of the policies committed to its care by the AWA, this Court may not substitute its own construction of the statutory provision. *Id.* at 845, 104 S.Ct. at 2783. Our duty is to decide whether USDA’s construction is a reasonable one in light of the statutory scheme. *Id.*

a. Post hoc rationalization

We initially address ALDF’s assertion that USDA’s license renewal scheme is not entitled to *Chevron* deference because USDA’s view is merely a litigation position and not a reasoned interpretation of the AWA. “An after-the-fact rationalization of agency action—an explanation developed for the sole purpose of defending in court the agency’s acts”—is not entitled to deference. *Gonzalez*, 212 F.3d at 1350; *see also Burlington Truck Lines, Inc. v. United States*, 371 U.S. 156, 168, 83 S.Ct. 239, 246, 9 L.Ed.2d 207 (1962) (“The courts may not accept appellate counsel’s post hoc rationalizations for agency action.”). ALDF raises two reasons why USDA’s interpretation is merely a post hoc rationalization. We address each in turn.

First, ALDF argues Goldentyer’s March 28, 2012 letter demonstrates

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

USDA, prior to this litigation, considered demonstrated compliance a statutory prerequisite for AWA license renewal.⁹ The letter says USDA intended to renew Seaquarium's exhibitor license because it found Seaquarium was in "compliance with the regulations and standards, and none of the other criteria for license denial under Section 2.11 or 2.12 are applicable." Contrary to ALDF's protestations, the letter does not prove USDA's interpretation of 7 U.S.C. § 2133 is a post hoc litigation position.¹⁰

As discussed above, USDA first articulated its license renewal policy not during this litigation, but in 1967. *See* Laboratory Animal Welfare, 32 Fed.Reg. 3720, 3721, §§ 2.4–2.5 (Feb. 24, 1967) (setting independent

⁹ Though ALDF mentioned Goldentyer's letter in its complaint and briefing before the district court, ALDF never submitted the letter itself into this Court's record. ALDF filed a motion with this Court to supplement the record with the letter from Goldentyer. ALDF asks us to admit the letter pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 10(e)(2) or, in the alternative, this Court's equitable powers.

We deny the motion to supplement pursuant to Rule 10(e)(2). The Rule states "[i]f anything material to either party is omitted from or misstated in the record by error or accident, the omission or misstatement may be corrected" by the court of appeals. Supplementation under Rule 10(e)(2) is not warranted because the parties never presented the letter to the district court, nor did they inadvertently omit the letter from the record. *See Ross v. Kemp*, 785 F.2d 1467, 1474 (11th Cir.1986) ("Because the information in the affidavits was not before the district court in any form, and because neither of the parties relied on the evidence at an earlier point in the proceedings, Fed. R.App. P. 10(e) is inapplicable....").

We also decline to admit the letter pursuant to our equitable powers because its admission would not establish beyond any doubt the proper resolution of the pending issues. *See CSX Transp., Inc. v. City of Garden City*, 235 F.3d 1325, 1330 (11th Cir.2000) ("A primary factor which we consider in deciding a motion to supplement the record is whether acceptance of the proffered material into the record would establish beyond any doubt the proper resolution of the pending issues."). With regard to the post hoc litigation argument explained *infra*, this letter alone does not outweigh the USDA's statutory interpretation embodied in notice-and-comment rulemaking for nearly fifty years. With regard to the administrative record issue explained *infra* in footnote 13, the district court did not err in disregarding the administrative record because examining the record would have been pointless. Supplementing the record with the letter would thus not substantially aid the resolution of the issues on appeal.

¹⁰ Although we deny the motion to supplement the record, we still take notice and consider those portions of the letter quoted in ALDF's complaint. Again, we assume, without deciding, that USDA renewed the license despite knowing there was evidence Seaquarium was violating several AWA standards. *See supra* footnote 2.

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

requirements for license issuance versus renewal). While Goldentyer's letter "may not harmonize perfectly" with earlier USDA interpretations, *Gonzalez*, 212 F.3d at 1350, this is not a case where the agency's position is "wholly unsupported by regulations, rulings, or administrative practice," *Bowen v. Georgetown Univ. Hosp.*, 488 U.S. 204, 212, 109 S.Ct. 468, 473-74, 102 L.Ed.2d 493 (1988). Put another way, one paragraph, from one letter, from one regional administrator, does not outweigh an agency's statutory interpretation embodied in notice-and-comment rulemaking for nearly fifty years.

Second, ALDF contends USDA's interpretation is inconsistent with its own regulations. ALDF trains its attention on two regulations: 9 C.F.R. § 2.1(c)(2) and § 2.3(a).

Under § 2.1(c)(2), a license will be issued when the "applicant has paid the application fee of \$10 and the annual license fee indicated in § 2.6 to the appropriate Animal Care regional office for an initial license, and, in the case of a license renewal, the annual license fee has been received by the appropriate Animal Care regional office on or before the expiration date of the license." ALDF argues the regulation says a "license renewal" is "issued," thus contradicting USDA's interpretation that "issue" in 7 U.S.C. § 2133 does not apply to renewal.

The other allegedly inconsistent regulation is § 2.3(a). According to § 2.3(a), "[e]ach applicant" shall demonstrate his or her compliance with the AWA standards, and "[e]ach applicant for an initial license or license renewal" shall make itself available for inspection. ALDF argues this subsection establishes that renewal applicants, just like initial applicants, are required to comply with AWA standards before USDA makes any licensing decision.

ALDF reads too much significance into these two (and the USDA admits) poorly drafted regulatory subsections. Under well-established administrative law, courts defer to an agency's consistent interpretation of its own regulation, "which becomes of controlling weight unless it is plainly erroneous or inconsistent with the regulation." *Bowles v. Seminole Rock & Sand Co.*, 325 U.S. 410, 414, 65 S.Ct. 1215, 1217, 89 L.Ed. 1700 (1945). Such deference is due particularly when the agency "has made a written interpretation of the regulation or has maintained a longstanding

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

policy on the subject.” *McKee v. Sullivan*, 903 F.2d 1436, 1438 n. 3 (11th Cir.1990). The regulations issued in 1967 establish USDA has long adhered to the interpretation that issuance and renewal are separate processes, and compliance with AWA standards is not a prerequisite to renewal. *See* Laboratory Animal Welfare, 32 Fed.Reg. 3720 (Feb. 24, 1967) (differentiating between issuance and renewal of licenses). USDA is therefore entitled to significant deference in interpreting the meaning of §§ 2.1(c)(2) and 2.3(a) within the AWA regulatory framework.

As USDA explains, § 2.1(c)(2) is a payment timing provision; the regulation specifies the moment in time at which an applicant satisfies the licensing requirements after submitting his or her fee. Prior to 2004, § 2.1(c)(2) did not mention renewal and required the application fee to “clear [] normal banking procedures.” *See* Animal Welfare, 54 Fed.Reg. 36123–01, 36148 (Aug. 31, 1989). Responding to comments from the public, in 2004 USDA eliminated the requirement for bank clearance and instead imposed a penalty for bounced checks. Animal Welfare, Inspection, Licensing, and Procurement of Animals, 69 Fed.Reg. 42089–01, 42091 (July 14, 2004). To accomplish this objective, USDA added a new clause mentioning “license renewal” to clarify the bank clearance requirement no longer applied to either initial or renewal licenses. *See id.* Viewed this way, USDA’s interpretation of § 2.1(c)(2) is reasonable. This is especially so when there is no indication in the rulemaking record USDA intended, through this minor amendment, to reverse its four-decade long policy of distinguishing between license issuance and renewal. *Cf. Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass’ns*, 531 U.S. 457, 468, 121 S.Ct. 903, 909–10, 149 L.Ed.2d 1 (2001) (a lawmaking entity “does not alter the fundamental details of a regulatory scheme in vague terms or ancillary provisions—it does not, one might say, hide elephants in mouseholes”).

Additionally, USDA proffers that § 2.3(a) does not condition license renewal on demonstrated compliance with AWA standards. Rather, § 2.3(a) affirms that initial and renewal applicants have an ongoing legal duty to maintain compliance and submit to random inspections. Violation of this duty can result in enforcement proceedings. We find this to be a plausible interpretation of § 2.3(a). Subsection (b), unlike subsection (a), applies only to initial applicants and requires a demonstration of compliance “before [USDA] will issue a license.” USDA’s credible interpretation of § 2.3(a) is supported by the rulemaking record. During its

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

1989 notice-and-comment rulemaking, USDA deleted the phrase “before a license will be issued” from a proposed 1987 rule to illuminate that renewal is not conditioned on prior demonstrated compliance. *See* Animal Welfare Regulations, 54 Fed.Reg. 10835–01, 10840 (proposed Mar. 15, 1989).

While USDA deserves no plaudits for its regulatory draftsmanship, the two regulatory subsections cited by ALDF fail to render USDA’s license renewal interpretation “plainly erroneous or inconsistent,” *Bowles*, 35 U.S. at 414, 65 S.Ct. at 1217. USDA’s explanations of these provisions’ intended meaning and relationship to the whole regulatory framework are imminently reasonable. These regulations thus do not render USDA’s interpretation of 7 U.S.C. § 2133 a mere post hoc litigation position.

b. Reasonableness of agency interpretation

Having found USDA’s interpretation of the AWA license renewal scheme is entitled to deference, we turn to whether that interpretation is reasonable under *Chevron* Step Two. We conclude USDA’s interpretation—which does not condition renewal on compliance with animal welfare standards on the anniversary of the license issuance date—is a reasonable one. The USDA’s renewal scheme is a sensible policy choice that balances the competing demands of due process and animal welfare.

USDA’s administrative renewal process requires a licensee to submit an application fulfilling three requirements: (1) a certification “that, to the best of applicant’s knowledge and belief, he or she is in compliance with the regulations and standards and agrees to continue to comply with the regulations and standards,” 9 C.F.R. § 2.2(b); (2) payment of an annual fee, *id.* § 2.6(c); and (3) submission of an annual report, *id.* § 2.7(d).¹¹ *See* Rules and Regulations, Department of Agriculture, Animal Welfare; Licensing and Records, 60 Fed.Reg. 13893–01, 13894 (Mar. 15, 1995) (creating three renewal requirements). Compliance with AWA standards is not a condition precedent for renewal. *Compare* 9 C.F.R. § 2.2(b)

¹¹ As an exhibitor, Seaquarium’s annual reports must “set forth in his or her license renewal application and annual report the number of animals owned, held, or exhibited by him or her, including those which are leased, during the previous year or at the time he signs and dates the report, whichever is greater.” 9 C.F.R. § 2.7(d).

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

(stating USDA “will renew” a license after fulfilling administrative requirements), *with id.* § 2.3(b) (stating applicant for “initial license” shall “demonstrate compliance with regulations and standards ... before [USDA] will issue a license”). After obtaining an initial license, licensees are subject to random inspections, *id.* § 2.3, and USDA may bring enforcement proceedings to suspend or revoke a license, *id.* § 2.5; 7 U.S.C. § 2149.

USDA’s construction of the AWA’s license renewal process was “a reasonable policy choice for the agency to make.” *Chevron*, 467 U.S. at 845, 104 S.Ct. at 2783. USDA’s administrative renewal scheme furthers the AWA’s competing goals of promoting animal welfare and affording due process to licensees. Purely administrative renewal keeps USDA’s records up-to-date, and then allows the agency to protect animal welfare through random, unannounced inspections. Given its limited resources, USDA could not annually inspect the facilities of every zoo, aquarium or other exhibitor across the country,¹² or initiate license termination proceedings for every violation, no matter how minor. USDA has exercised its “broad discretion to choose how best to marshal its limited resources and personnel to carry out its delegated responsibilities.” *See Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497, 527, 127 S.Ct. 1438, 1459, 167 L.Ed.2d 248 (2007). At the same time, the exclusive use of enforcement proceedings to suspend or revoke licenses for noncompliance fosters Congress’s intent to protect licensees from arbitrary agency action, as codified at 7 U.S.C. § 2149. USDA’s interpretation restrains the agency from using the renewal process as a means to bypass licensees’ right to notice, a hearing, and an appeal.

ALDF also claims the renewal process is unreasonable because, according to the agency’s regulations, USDA is obligated to renew a license even if USDA knows the licensee is failing to comply with the AWA standards. USDA’s “rubber-stamping” licensing scheme thus allegedly sanctions animal abuse in direct contravention of congressional intent.

¹² As of 2004, USDA regulated over 2,500 exhibitors possessing AWA licenses. Animal Welfare, Inspection, Licensing, and Procurement of Animals, 69 Fed.Reg. 42089–01, 42099 (July 14, 2004).

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

ALDF overlooks that, after granting a license renewal, USDA retains the authority under its regulations to suspend or revoke a license for noncompliance. Indeed, according to USDA's experience administering the AWA, revoking a license for a minor infraction does not always promote maximum animal welfare. Animal Welfare, Inspection, Licensing, and Procurement of Animals, 69 Fed.Reg. 42089-01, 42094 (July 14, 2004). Due to the threat of USDA enforcement and the imposition of sanctions less severe than revocation, exhibitors are incentivized to rectify violations within a short time window. *See id.* According to the USDA, this brand of cooperative enforcement "has been more effective than enforcement actions for each citation." *Id.* Since USDA issues numerous citations to exhibitors for minor violations that do not directly or immediately impact animal welfare, it is "unrealistic and counterproductive" to risk the stressful release or transfer of animals by making license renewal contingent on demonstrated compliance. *See id.*

The AWA licensing regulations embody a reasonable accommodation of the conflicting policy interests Congress has delegated to the USDA. The regulations are entitled to *Chevron* deference, and USDA therefore did not act arbitrarily or capriciously by renewing Seaquarium's license.¹³

¹³ ALDF raises one additional issue. ALDF argues the district court erred in failing to require production of the administrative record to determine whether USDA's decision to renew the April 2012 license was "arbitrary, capricious, [or] an abuse of discretion." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). ALDF contends Goldentyer's letter shows USDA granted the April 2012 license renewal because it found Seaquarium's facilities complied with AWA standards. Assuming the agency was not required to ensure Seaquarium's compliance with AWA standards before renewing the license, USDA's finding that Seaquarium was in compliance should, ALDF urges, still be reviewed upon remand to the district court. Under the *Chenery* doctrine, "[w]hen an administrative decision is based on inadequate or improper grounds, a reviewing court may not presume that the [agency] would have made the same decision on other, valid grounds." *Am. Pub. Transit Ass'n v. Lewis*, 655 F.2d 1272, 1278 (D.C.Cir.1981); *see SEC v. Chenery Corp. (II)*, 332 U.S. 194, 196, 67 S.Ct. 1575, 1577, 91 L.Ed. 1995 (1947); *SEC v. Chenery Corp. (I)*, 318 U.S. 80, 88, 63 S.Ct. 454, 459, 87 L.Ed. 626 (1943).

There is no need to remand this case to the district court for additional fact finding because the agency's alleged error was harmless. An agency decision is harmless "when a mistake of the administrative body is one that clearly had no bearing on the procedure used or the substance of decision reached." *U.S. Steel Corp. v. EPA*, 595 F.2d 207, 215 (5th Cir.1979) (quotation omitted) (binding authority because in *Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206, 1209 (11th Cir.1981) (en banc), this Court adopted as binding precedent all decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to close of business on September 30, 1981); *see* 5 U.S.C. § 706 (when reviewing agency action "due

Animal Legal Defense Fund v. USDA
74 Agric. Dec. 57

IV. CONCLUSION

Administration of the AWA standards involves a subject matter that is “technical, complex, and dynamic.” *Nat’l Cable & Telecomms. Ass’n v. Gulf Power Co.*, 534 U.S. 327, 339, 122 S.Ct. 782, 789, 151 L.Ed.2d 794 (2002). Tasked by Congress to perform the difficult job of reconciling the inherently conflicting interests of due process and animal welfare, USDA has exercised its expertise to craft a reasonable license renewal scheme based on a permissible construction of the AWA. USDA has acted within the bounds of Congress’s delegated authority.

As long as USDA refuses to initiate a discretionary enforcement proceeding, the remedy ALDF and Lolita’s legion of supporters seek lies not in the federal courts, but in the halls of Congress. Our democratically elected leaders alone have the authority to limit USDA’s license-renewal discretion in this matter and to demand annual, substantive compliance with animal welfare standards. While we are sensitive to the plight of Lolita and other animals exhibited across this country, we cannot say USDA violated the AWA by renewing Seaquarium’s license through its purely administrative scheme. For the foregoing reasons, we must affirm the district court’s grant of summary judgment to USDA.

AFFIRMED.

account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error”).

ALDF has conceded Seaquarium fulfilled the only three licensing renewal criteria required by law: (1) filing a certification of compliance, (2) paying a fee, (3) and submitting an annual report. Because there is no factual dispute about whether USDA correctly found Seaquarium satisfied all licensing requirements, the district court had no reason to examine the administrative record. Directing the district court to scrutinize the administrative record to evaluate whether USDA complied with a fictitious legal requirement would be the height of pointlessness. *Salt River Project Agric. Improvement & Power Dist. v. United States*, 762 F.2d 1053, 1060, n. 8 (D.C.Cir.1985) (“When it is clear that based on the valid findings the agency would have reached the same ultimate result, we do not improperly invade the administrative province by affirming.”).

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

In re: LE ANNE SMITH.

Docket No. 14-0020.

Decision and Order.

Filed January 2, 2015.

EAJA – Appealability – Application, time for filing – Excessive demand – Fees and expenses – Net worth – Special circumstances – Substantially justified.

Larry J. Thorson, Esq. for Applicant.

Colleen A. Carroll, Esq. for Respondent.

Initial Decision and Order by Jill S. Clifton, Administrative Law Judge.

Final Decision and Order by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

DECISION AND ORDER

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 6, 2013, Le Anne Smith instituted this proceeding under the Equal Access to Justice Act (5 U.S.C. § 504) and Procedures Relating to Awards Under the Equal Access to Justice Act in Proceedings Before the Department (7 C.F.R. §§ 1.180-.203) [EAJA Rules of Practice] by filing an EAJA Application for Award of Attorney’s Fees and Expenses for Le Anne Smith [EAJA Application]. Ms. Smith requests an award of \$17,450 for attorney fees and \$815 for other expenses which she incurred in connection with *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, an adversary adjudication which the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, United States Department of Agriculture [APHIS], instituted against her under the Animal Welfare Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. §§ 2131-2159) [Animal Welfare Act].¹

On March 6, 2014, APHIS filed “Agency Answer to Application Filed by Le Anne Smith for Attorney’s Fees and Expenses” [Answer] denying the allegations in Ms. Smith’s EAJA Application and requesting denial of

¹ EAJA App. at 3.

Le Anne Smith
74 Agric. Dec. 84

Ms. Smith's EAJA Application.² On April 14, 2014, Ms. Smith filed a response to APHIS's Answer.³

On May 5, 2014, Administrative Law Judge Jill S. Clifton [ALJ] issued a Decision and Order Granting EAJA Fees [ALJ's Decision] awarding Ms. Smith \$15,358.33 for attorney fees and \$815 for other expenses which she incurred in connection with *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026.⁴ On June 5, 2014, APHIS appealed the ALJ's Decision to the Judicial Officer.⁵ On July 3, 2014, Ms. Smith filed a response to APHIS's Appeal Petition.⁶ On July 8, 2014, the Hearing Clerk transmitted the record to the Office of the Judicial Officer for consideration and decision.

Based upon a careful consideration of the record, I issue this final decision awarding Ms. Smith \$15,295.83 for attorney fees and \$815 for other expenses that she incurred in connection with *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026.

DISCUSSION

The Equal Access to Justice Act requires an agency that conducts an adversary adjudication to award fees and other expenses to a prevailing party, other than the United States, as follows:

§ 504. Costs and fees of parties

(a)(1) An agency that conducts an adversary adjudication shall award, to a prevailing party other than the United States, fees and other expenses incurred by that party in connection with that proceeding, unless the adjudicative officer of the agency finds that the position of the agency was substantially justified or that special circumstances make an award unjust. Whether or not the position of the agency was substantially justified shall be

² Answer ¶ IV at 25.

³ Applicant's Resp. Br.

⁴ ALJ's Decision ¶ 20 at 11.

⁵ Agency's Pet. for Appeal of Decision and Order Granting EAJA Fees [Appeal Petition].

⁶ Le Anne Smith's Br. in Support of Decision and Order Granting EAJA Fees.

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

determined on the basis of the administrative record, as a whole, which is made in the adversary adjudication for which fees and other expenses are sought.

5 U.S.C. § 504(a)(1).

The ALJ found Ms. Smith was a prevailing party in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, APHIS's position in the adversary adjudication was not substantially justified, and no special circumstances make an award to Ms. Smith unjust.⁷ While APHIS concedes Ms. Smith was a prevailing party in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026 (Appeal Pet. at 8, 14), APHIS raises eight issues on appeal and requests that I reverse the ALJ's Decision.

First, APHIS contends the ALJ erroneously concluded that Ms. Smith's EAJA Application was timely filed (Appeal Pet. at 7-13).

The Equal Access to Justice Act and the EAJA Rules of Practice provide that a party must submit an application for fees and other expenses to the agency from which the party seeks fees and other expenses within thirty (30) days after final disposition of the adversary adjudication.⁸ The term "final disposition" is defined, as follows:

§ 1.193 Time for filing application.

....

(b) For the purposes of this subpart, final disposition means the date on which a decision or order disposing of the merits of the proceeding or any other complete resolution of the proceeding, such as a settlement or voluntary dismissal, become final and unappealable, both within the Department and to the courts.

7 C.F.R. § 1.193(b).

The ALJ held Ms. Smith and APHIS would have had sixty (60) days after entry of the Judicial Officer's September 11, 2013 Order to seek

⁷ ALJ's Decision ¶¶ 2, 7, 10-14 at 2, 4-7.

⁸ 5 U.S.C. § 504(a)(2); 7 C.F.R. § 1.193(a).

Le Anne Smith
74 Agric. Dec. 84

judicial review, as follows:

3. . . . [T]heoretically the parties would have had 60 days to seek review of the Judicial Officer's Order in the U.S. Court of Appeals (60 days from the date of the Judicial Officer's Order, 7 U.S.C. § 2149). . . .

4. As a practical matter, the Judicial Officer spoke for the Secretary of Agriculture in his Order issued September 11, 2013, so APHIS would not appeal the Judicial Officer's Order to the U.S. Court of Appeals. As a practical matter, Le Anne Smith won, so Le Anne Smith would not appeal the Judicial Officer's Order to the U.S. Court of Appeals. . . .

ALJ's Decision ¶¶ 3-4 at 2-3. Sixty days after September 11, 2013 is November 10, 2013; however, because November 10, 2013 was a Sunday and Monday, November 11, 2013 was a legal holiday, Ms. Smith was required to seek judicial review of *Perry*, No. 05-0026, 72 Agric. Dec. ___ (U.S.D.A. Sept. 11, 2013) (Decision as to Le Anne Smith)⁹ [hereinafter referred to as "*Perry*"], no later than Tuesday, November 12, 2013.¹⁰ Therefore, the ALJ concluded Ms. Smith was required to file her EAJA Application no later than December 12, 2013, and Ms. Smith timely filed her EAJA Application on December 6, 2013.

APHIS, relying on 7 U.S.C. § 2149(c), contends Ms. Smith's December 6, 2013 EAJA Application was not timely filed (Appeal Pet. at 7-8).

The Animal Welfare Act provides that any dealer, exhibitor, research facility, intermediate handler, or operator of an auction sale aggrieved by a final order of the Secretary of Agriculture may seek judicial review, as follows:

§ 2149. Violations by licensees

⁹ Available at http://nationalaglawcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/decisions/091113.Perry_DO_AWA05-0026.pdf.

¹⁰ See FED. R. APP. P. 26(a)(1).

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

....

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

7 U.S.C. § 2149(c).

APHIS asserts Ms. Smith was not a dealer, exhibitor, research facility, intermediate handler, or operator of an auction sale aggrieved by *Perry* and had no right to seek judicial review of the Judicial Officer's September 11, 2013 Order. APHIS contends the Judicial Officer's decision disposing of the merits of the proceeding became final and unappealable on September 11, 2013; Ms. Smith was required to file her EAJA Application no later than October 11, 2013; and Ms. Smith's December 6, 2013 EAJA Application was not timely filed.

I conclude APHIS has confused appealability in the context of the Equal Access to Justice Act with the merits of an appeal of the agency disposition of the underlying adversary adjudication. Even when an appeal of an adversary adjudication giving rise to an Equal Access to Justice Act application is nonjusticiable, if the governing statute relevant to the underlying agency adjudication allows an appeal generally, the underlying order must be considered "appealable" for the purposes of an Equal Access to Justice Act proceeding. The thirty-day deadline for filing an Equal Access to Justice Act application does not expire until thirty (30) days after the time to appeal the underlying order has expired or the appeal has

concluded.¹¹ Because Ms. Smith could have potentially appealed *Perry* pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 2149(c), the thirty-day deadline for filing her EAJA Application did not begin to run until sixty (60) days following the entry of the Judicial Officer's September 11, 2013 Order and Ms. Smith's December 6, 2013 EAJA Application was timely filed. Therefore, I reject APHIS's contention that the ALJ's conclusion that Ms. Smith's EAJA Application was timely filed, is error.

Second, APHIS contends the ALJ erroneously failed to reject Ms. Smith's EAJA Application based upon Ms. Smith's failure to identify the APHIS position that Ms. Smith alleges was not substantially justified, as required by 7 C.F.R. § 1.190(a) (Appeal Pet. at 14-15).

The EAJA Rules of Practice require that an applicant identify the United States Department of Agriculture position which the applicant alleges was not substantially justified or show that the United States Department of Agriculture demand was substantially in excess of, and was unreasonable when compared with, the decision in the underlying adversary adjudication, as follows:

§ 1.190 Contents of application.

(a) An application for an award of fees and expenses under EAJA shall identify the applicant and the proceeding for which an award is sought. Unless the applicant is an individual, the application shall state the number of employees of the applicant and describe briefly the type and purpose of its organization or business. The application shall also:

(1) Show that the applicant has prevailed and identify the position of the Department that the applicant alleges was not substantially justified and shall briefly state the basis for such allegation; or

(2) Show that the demand by the Department in the proceeding was substantially in excess of, and was

¹¹ Adams v. SEC, 287 F.3d 183 (D.C. Cir. 2002).

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

unreasonable when compared with, the decision in the proceeding.

7 C.F.R. § 1.190(a).

Ms. Smith identifies the APHIS position which she alleges was not substantially justified, as follows:

3. The position of the USDA was not substantially justified in bringing Le Anne Smith into this matter as is apparent by the total lack of evidence submitted by [APHIS] as to her involvement in any of the alleged violations set forth in the Government's Complaint.

EAJA App. ¶ 3 at 1-2. Ms. Smith's identification of the APHIS position which Ms. Smith alleges was not substantially justified is marked by perplexing brevity; however, Ms. Smith incorporates into the EAJA Application all of the arguments in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, as follows:

1. This Court is familiar with the relevant facts and proceedings. To the extent that facts, law, procedural developments, trial transcript, exhibits, arguments, or circumstances other than those specifically cited in this application may be relevant, Le Anne [Smith] incorporates these by reference and asks the Court to note the same.

EAJA App. ¶ 1 at 1.

Ms. Smith's arguments in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, identify the APHIS position which Ms. Smith alleges was not substantially justified and provide the basis for Ms. Smith's allegation. Therefore, I find Ms. Smith complied with 7 C.F.R. § 1.190(a) by incorporating the arguments presented in the underlying adversary adjudication into Ms. Smith's EAJA Application, and I reject APHIS's contention that the ALJ erroneously found Ms. Smith identified the APHIS position that Ms. Smith alleges was not substantially justified.

Le Anne Smith
74 Agric. Dec. 84

Third, APHIS contends its position in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, was substantially justified (Appeal Pet. 16-21).

The EAJA Rules of Practice provide that a prevailing party may receive an award, unless the position taken by the United States Department of Agriculture in the underlying adversary adjudication was substantially justified.¹² APHIS bears the burden of proving that its position in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, was substantially justified. In order to meet its burden of proof, APHIS must show that its position had a reasonable basis in both law and fact.¹³ APHIS's failure to prevail in the underlying adversary adjudication does not create a presumption that APHIS's position was not substantially justified.¹⁴

In the underlying adversary adjudication, APHIS contended Ms. Smith was jointly responsible with Craig A. Perry and Perry's Wilderness Ranch & Zoo, Inc. [PWR], for violations of the Animal Welfare Act because Ms. Smith was a de facto partner in the business operated by Mr. Perry and PWR or a de facto principal of PWR and played a critical role in the operation of Mr. Perry and PWR's business.

I have long held that when people act together in the exhibition of

¹² 7 C.F.R. § 1.185(a)(1).

¹³ *See Pierce v. Underwood*, 487 U.S. 552, 565 (1988) (holding a substantially justified position is one that would satisfy a reasonable person and must have a reasonable basis in law and fact); *Harmon v. United States*, 101 F.3d 574, 586-87 (8th Cir. 1996) (holding a substantially justified position is one that is clearly reasonable, well founded in law and fact, and solid); *Frey v. CFTC*, 931 F.2d 1171, 1174 (7th Cir. 1991) (stating the standard for "substantial justification," within the meaning of the Equal Access to Justice Act, is one of simple reasonableness; to avoid an award of fees the agency must prove that the proceeding had a reasonable basis in law and fact); *Derickson Co. v. NLRB*, 774 F.2d 229, 232 (8th Cir. 1985) (holding the test of substantial justification is a practical one, namely, whether the agency's position was reasonable both in law and fact); *Iowa Express Distribution, Inc. v. NLRB*, 739 F.2d 1305, 1308 (8th Cir.) (stating the test of whether the position of the United States is substantially justified is essentially one of reasonableness in law and fact), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1088 (1984).

¹⁴ *Scarborough v. Principi*, 541 U.S. 401, 415 (2004) (stating "substantially justified" is not to be read to raise a presumption that the government's position was not substantially justified simply because it lost the case); *Harmon v. United States*, 101 F.3d 574, 586-87 (8th Cir. 1996) (holding a substantially justified position is one that is clearly reasonable, even if it is not correct); *S & H Riggers & Erectors, Inc. v. OSHRC*, 672 F.2d 426, 430 (5th Cir. 1982) (stating the burden of showing substantial justification for a case the government lost is not insurmountable).

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

animals, they can be held jointly and severally liable for violations of the Animal Welfare Act and their relationship need not meet the requirements for a partnership or joint venture.¹⁵ Therefore, I conclude APHIS's position in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, that Ms. Smith was jointly responsible with Mr. Perry and PWR for Animal Welfare Act violations had a reasonable basis in law.

However, in the underlying adversary adjudication, APHIS introduced almost no evidence that Ms. Smith jointly engaged in any animal exhibition. Ms. Smith, whom the ALJ found to be an extremely credible witness, testified extensively and provided an affidavit regarding her minimal connection with the business conducted by Mr. Perry and PWR. Ms. Smith's testimony and affidavit were corroborated by numerous witnesses, including APHIS employees called by APHIS. When I examine the record in the underlying adversary adjudication, I find APHIS did not have a reasonable basis in fact for its position regarding Ms. Smith. As APHIS failed to prove that it had a reasonable basis in fact for its position regarding Ms. Smith, I conclude APHIS's position in the underlying adversary adjudication was not substantially justified.

Fourth, APHIS contends the ALJ erroneously failed to address Ms. Smith's allegation of excessive demand (Appeal Pet. at 21). Ms. Smith alleges APHIS made an excessive and unreasonable demand in the underlying adversary adjudication.¹⁶ The EAJA Rules of Practice provide that an adjudicative officer shall award fees and other expenses related to defending against an excessive demand.¹⁷

I agree with APHIS that the ALJ did not address Ms. Smith's allegation

¹⁵ White, 49 Agric. Dec. 123, 154 (U.S.D.A. 1990) (stating, when two persons act together in the exhibition of animals, it is not necessary that their relationship meet all of the technical requirements of a partnership or joint venture in order to hold that both are exhibitors and jointly and severally liable for the violations); Post, 47 Agric. Dec. 542, 547 (U.S.D.A. 1988) (stating whether or not the shared duties of three persons constituted a joint venture is not the critical issue; the controlling consideration is that each person exercised control and authority over the way the animal was handled when exhibited and any one of them could have prevented the mishandling). Cf. McCall, 52 Agric. Dec. 986, 998 (U.S.D.A. 1993) (stating the distinction between two kennels was so blurred as to make them, in reality, a single operation for which both individual kennel owners were jointly responsible).

¹⁶ EAJA App. ¶ 4 at 2.

¹⁷ 7 C.F.R. § 1.185(b).

Le Anne Smith
74 Agric. Dec. 84

regarding APHIS's excessive and unreasonable demand. I find the ALJ's failure to address Ms. Smith's allegation harmless error because Ms. Smith did not request fees and other expenses related to defending against APHIS's purported excessive and unreasonable demand, and I decline to remand this proceeding to the ALJ to address Ms. Smith's allegation.

Fifth, APHIS contends the ALJ erroneously failed to find special circumstances that make an award to Ms. Smith unjust. APHIS asserts Larry J. Thorson, who represented Ms. Smith in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, also represented Mr. Perry and PWR in that proceeding, and Ms. Smith's EAJA Application does not distinguish between the legal services performed on her behalf and the legal services performed on behalf of Mr. Perry and PWR. APHIS contends Ms. Smith's inability to identify the attorney fees and expenses specifically attributable to her defense in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, constitutes a special circumstance which makes an award of attorney fees and other expenses to Ms. Smith unjust (Appeal Pet. at 22-24).

In the underlying adversary adjudication, APHIS contended Ms. Smith was jointly responsible with Mr. Perry and PWR for violations of the Animal Welfare Act because Ms. Smith was a de facto partner in the business operated by Mr. Perry and PWR or a de facto principal of PWR and played a critical role in the operation of Mr. Perry and PWR's business. Ms. Smith alleges, and I find, based upon my review of the record in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, that Ms. Smith was required to defend herself throughout the entire proceeding.¹⁸

Similarly, Mr. Thorson describes Ms. Smith's involvement in the proceeding as coextensive with the involvement of Mr. Perry and PWR, and Mr. Thorson asserts he attributed one-third of the bill for attorney fees and other expenses for the defense of *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, to Ms. Smith "because there were three defendants and this was the most sensible way to allocate the time spent on the defense" of *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026.¹⁹

¹⁸ EAJA App. ¶ 9 at 3.

¹⁹ Aff. of Larry J. Thorson in Support of EAJA App. by Le Anne Smith at 2, dated December 5, 2013.

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

Based upon my review of the record in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, I reject APHIS's contention that Ms. Smith's inability to identify the attorney fees and expenses specifically attributable to her defense in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, constitutes a special circumstance which makes an award of attorney fees and other expenses to Ms. Smith unjust, and I reject APHIS's contention that the ALJ's failure to find special circumstances that make an award to Ms. Smith unjust is error.

Sixth, APHIS contends the ALJ erroneously failed to reject Ms. Smith's EAJA Application because Ms. Smith failed to provide a net worth exhibit, as required by 7 C.F.R. § 1.191(a) (Appeal Pet. at 24-32).

The EAJA Rules of Practice require that an applicant for fees and expenses provide an exhibit showing the net worth of the applicant, as follows:

§ 1.191 Net worth exhibit.

(a) An applicant, except a qualified tax-exempt organization or cooperative association, must provide with its application a detailed exhibit showing the net worth of the applicant and any affiliates (as defined in § 1.184 of this part) when the proceeding was initiated. The exhibit may be in any form convenient to the applicant that provides full disclosure of the applicant's and its affiliates' assets and liabilities and is sufficient to determine whether the applicant qualifies under the standards in this subpart. The adjudicative officer may require an applicant to file additional information to determine its eligibility for an award.

7 C.F.R. § 1.191(a).

The EAJA Application states Ms. Smith's net worth was less than \$100,000 at the time APHIS initiated and litigated *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026.²⁰ In support of this allegation, Ms. Smith submitted an affidavit in which Ms. Smith attests that, at the time APHIS initiated and

²⁰ EAJA App. ¶ 6 at 2.

Le Anne Smith
74 Agric. Dec. 84

litigated the underlying adversary adjudication, her net worth was under \$100,000 and she had no income because she is a full-time housewife taking care of her children.²¹

The ALJ could have required Ms. Smith to file additional information to determine her eligibility for an Equal Access to Justice Act award. Instead, the ALJ found Ms. Smith's affidavit sufficient to determine her eligibility for an Equal Access to Justice Act award, as follows:

15. Le Anne Smith's net worth did not exceed two million dollars at the time of the adjudication. Evidence during the hearing proved this; Le Anne Smith's EAJA application, including her Affidavit executed December 5, 2013, further confirms this.

ALJ's Decision ¶ 15 at 7.

Based upon the ALJ's finding and Ms. Smith's uncontroverted affidavit, I decline to remand this proceeding to the ALJ to require Ms. Smith to file additional information regarding her net worth. Moreover, I find no basis on which to disturb the ALJ's determination that, at the time APHIS initiated *Smith*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, Ms. Smith's net worth did not exceed \$2,000,000.

Seventh, APHIS contends the ALJ erroneously failed to reject Ms. Smith's EAJA Application because Ms. Smith's EAJA Application was not accompanied by full documentation of the fees and expenses, as required by 7 C.F.R. § 1.192(a)-(c) (Appeal Pet. at 26).

The EAJA Rules of Practice require documentation of fees and expenses, as follows:

§ 1.192 Documentation of fees and expenses.

(a) The application shall be accompanied by full documentation of the fees and expenses, including the cost of any study, analysis, engineering report, test,

²¹ Aff. of Le Anne Smith in Support of EAJA App. at 1, dated December 5, 2013.

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

project, or similar matter, for which an award is sought.

(b) The documentation shall include an affidavit from any attorney, agent, or expert witness representing or appearing on behalf of the party, stating the actual time expended and the rate at which fees and other expenses were computed and describing the specific services performed.

(1) The affidavit shall state the services performed. In order to establish the hourly rate, the affidavit shall state the hourly rate which is billed and paid by the majority of clients during the relevant time periods.

(2) If no hourly rate is paid by the majority of clients because, for instance, the attorney or agent represents most clients on a contingency basis, the attorney or agent shall provide information about two attorneys or agents with similar experience, who perform similar work, stating their hourly rate.

(c) The documentation also shall include a description of any expenses for which reimbursement is sought and a statement of the amounts paid and payable by the applicant or by any other person or entity for the services provided.

7 C.F.R. § 1.192(a)-(c). Ms. Smith attached to the EAJA Application full documentation of the fees and expenses for which Ms. Smith seeks an Equal Access to Justice Act award. The documentation states the actual time expended and the hourly rate at which Mr. Thorson computed attorney fees and describes the specific services performed by Mr. Thorson and the other expenses. In support of this documentation, Ms. Smith submitted Mr. Thorson's affidavit in which Mr. Thorson attests to the accuracy of the documentation of the fees and expenses and the hourly rate at which he computed attorney fees in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026.²² Therefore, I find Ms. Smith's EAJA Application was

²² Aff. of Larry J. Thorson in Support of EAJA App. by Le Anne Smith, dated December 5, 2013.

Le Anne Smith
74 Agric. Dec. 84

accompanied by full documentation of fees and expenses attributable to Ms. Smith's defense of the underlying adversary adjudication, as required by 7 C.F.R. § 1.192(a)-(c).

Eighth, APHIS contends the ALJ awarded Ms. Smith attorney fees at the rate of \$150 an hour, which exceeds the maximum hourly rate that can be awarded in this proceeding (Appeal Pet. at 34).

The ALJ awarded Ms. Smith attorney fees at the rates of \$125 and \$150 per hour, as follows:

16. The \$125.00 per hour maximum attorney fee under EAJA applies until March 3, 2011. The \$150.00 per hour maximum attorney fee under EAJA applies beginning March 3, 2011. 7 C.F.R. § 1.186. . . .

ALJ's Decision ¶ 16 at 7. The EAJA Rules of Practice currently provide that no award for the fee of an attorney may exceed \$150 per hour, as follows:

§ 1.186 Allowable fees and expenses.

. . . .
(b) In proceedings commenced on or after the effective date of this paragraph, no award for the fee of an attorney or agent under the rules in this subpart may exceed \$150 per hour. No award to compensate an expert witness may exceed the highest rate at which the Department pays expert witnesses, which is set out at § 1.150 of this part. However, an award also may include the reasonable expenses of the attorney, agent, or witness as a separate item, if the attorney, agent, or witness ordinarily charges clients separately for such expenses.

7 C.F.R. § 1.186(b) (2014). The final rule amending 7 C.F.R. § 1.186(b) to provide a maximum hourly attorney fees rate of \$150 became effective March 3, 2011.²³ The final rule explicitly states the maximum hourly

²³ 76 Fed. Reg. 11,667 (Mar. 3, 2011).

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

attorney fees rate of \$150 only applies to proceedings initiated on and after the effective date of the final rule, as follows:

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is amending its regulations implementing the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA) by raising the maximum hourly attorney fees rate from \$125.00 to \$150.00 for covered proceedings initiated on and after the effective date of this final rule.

DATES: This final rule is effective March 3, 2011.

....

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 30, 2010, USDA published a proposed rule (75 FR 44928, July 30, 2010) to amend its regulations implementing the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA), 5 U.S.C. 504, to raise the maximum hourly attorney fees rate set forth in 7 CFR 1.186 from \$125.00 to \$150.00 for proceedings initiated on and after the effective date of the publication of this final rule.

76 Fed. Reg. 11,667 (Mar. 3, 2011).

APHIS initiated the adversary adjudication for which Ms. Smith seeks attorney fees and other expenses, on July 14, 2005.²⁴ Therefore, the maximum hourly attorney fees rate of \$150 set forth in 7 C.F.R. § 1.186(b) (2014) is not applicable to this proceeding, and I find the ALJ erroneously awarded attorney fees at the rate of \$150 an hour. Instead, I find the maximum hourly attorney fees rate of \$125 is applicable to this proceeding.²⁵

Ms. Smith seeks an award of \$17,450 for attorney fees based on the \$150 per hour rate for attorney services and \$815 for other expenses.²⁶ Ms. Smith based her request for \$17,450 for attorney fees upon 349 total

²⁴ Perry, No. 05-0026, 72 Agric. Dec. __, slip op. at 1 (U.S.D.A. Sept. 11, 2013) (Decision as to Le Anne Smith), *available at* http://nationalaglawcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/decisions/091113.Perry_DO_AWA05-0026.pdf.

²⁵ 7 C.F.R. § 1.186(b) (2006).

²⁶ EAJA App. ¶¶ 7-8 at 2-3.

Le Anne Smith
74 Agric. Dec. 84

hours of attorney services, with one-third of the total number of hours of attorney services attributable to Ms. Smith's defense of *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026. However, the ALJ noted that the total number of hours of attorney services for the defense of *Perry*, AWA 05-0026, is 369 hours, one-third of which (123 hours) the ALJ allocated to Ms. Smith.²⁷ The ALJ also found that communication with legislators is not recoverable,²⁸ and Mr. Thorson provided 1.9 hours of attorney services related to communications with legislators.

Accordingly, I award Ms. Smith \$15,295.83 for attorney fees²⁹ and \$815 for other expenses for a total of \$16,110.83 incurred by Ms. Smith in connection with *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction over this matter.
2. Ms. Smith is an individual whose address is in Iowa.
3. On July 14, 2005, APHIS instituted an adversary adjudication, *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, against Ms. Smith.³⁰
4. At the time APHIS initiated *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, Ms. Smith had a net worth of less than \$100,000.
5. *Perry* became final and unappealable on November 12, 2013.

²⁷ ALJ's Decision ¶ 19 at 9.

²⁸ See *Dallas Irrigation Dist. v. United States*, 91 Fed. Cl. 689, 706 (2010) (holding fees associated with correspondence with legislators and the media are not recoverable under the Equal Access to Justice Act); *Hillensbeck v. United States*, 74 Fed. Cl. 477, 482 (2006) (holding fees associated with lobbying Congress are not recoverable under the Equal Access to Justice Act).

²⁹ This award is based upon 123 hours of attorney services attributable to Ms. Smith's defense of *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, at an hourly attorney fees rate of \$125 for each hour (\$15,375) minus one-third of the amount attributable to attorney services related to communications with legislators (\$79.17).

³⁰ *Perry*, No. 05-0026, 72 Agric. Dec. ___, slip op. at 1 (U.S.D.A. Sept. 11, 2013) (Decision as to Le Anne Smith), available at http://nationalaglawcenter.org/wpcontent/uploads/assets/decisions/091113.Perry_.DO_.AWA05-0026.pdf.

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

6. Ms. Smith's EAJA Application, which was filed on December 6, 2013, twenty-four (24) days after *Perry* became final and unappealable, was timely filed.
7. Ms. Smith was a prevailing party *Perry*.
8. APHIS's position regarding Ms. Smith in *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, was not substantially justified.
9. No special circumstances make the award of fees or other expenses to Ms. Smith unjust.
10. Ms. Smith meets all conditions of eligibility for an award of fees and other expenses under the Equal Access to Justice Act and the EAJA Rules of Practice.
11. Ms. Smith incurred attorney fees and other expenses in connection with *Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026, to which she is entitled to an award under the Equal Access to Justice Act and the EAJA Rules of Practice totaling \$16,110.83.

For the foregoing reasons, the following Order is issued.

ORDER

Ms. Smith is awarded \$16,110.83 for attorney fees and other expenses which Ms. Smith incurred in connection with *In re Craig A. Perry*, AWA Docket No. 05-0026.¹

RIGHT TO SEEK JUDICIAL REVIEW

Ms. Smith has the right to seek judicial review of this Decision and Order in the courts of the United States having jurisdiction to review the merits of *Perry*.² Ms. Smith must seek judicial review within thirty (30) days after the determination of the award of attorney fees and other

¹ The process by which Ms. Smith may obtain payment of the award in this Order is set forth in 7 C.F.R. § 1.203.

² 5 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2); 7 C.F.R. § 1.202.

Jennifer Caudill
74 Agric. Dec. 101

expenses in this Decision and Order.³

The date of the determination of the award of attorney fees and other expenses in this Decision and Order is January 2, 2015.

In re: JENNIFER CAUDILL, an individual, a/k/a JENNIFER WALKER and JENNIFER HERRIOTT WALKER.

Docket No. 13-0186.

Decision and Order.

Filed February 23, 2015.

EAJA – Adversary adjudication – Allowable fees and expenses – Eligibility – Final disposition.

Colleen A. Carroll, Esq. for Complainant.

William J. Cook, Esq. for Respondent.

Initial Decision and Order by Peter M. Davenport, Chief Administrative Law Judge.

Final Decision and Order by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

DECISION AND ORDER

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On February 28, 2013, Jennifer Caudill instituted this proceeding under the Equal Access to Justice Act (5 U.S.C. § 504) and Procedures Relating to Awards Under the Equal Access to Justice Act in Proceedings Before the Department (7 C.F.R. §§ 1.180-.203) [EAJA Rules of Practice] by filing “Respondent, Jennifer Caudill a/k/a Jennifer Walker a/k/a Jennifer Herriott Walker’s Verified Application for Attorney’s Fees and Other Expenses” [EAJA Application]. Ms. Caudill requests an award of \$18,090 for attorney fees and \$2,648.55 for other expenses which she incurred in connection with *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, an adjudication which the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, United States Department of Agriculture [APHIS], instituted against Ms. Caudill under the Animal Welfare Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. §§ 2131-2159) [Animal Welfare Act]

³ 5 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2). *See also* *Holzbau v. United States*, 866 F.2d 427, 429-30 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (stating the 30-day time for appeal runs from issuance of the determination, not from the date the party receives a copy of the determination); *Sonicraft, Inc. v. NLRB*, 814 F.2d 385, 386-87 (7th Cir. 1987) (stating the deadline runs from the determination itself).

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

and the regulations issued under the Animal Welfare Act (9 C.F.R. §§ 1.1-2.133).⁴

On March 29, 2013, APHIS filed Agency Motion to Strike Application or Request to Stay Proceedings stating no final unappealable disposition of *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, has been issued.⁵ Subsequent to APHIS filing its Agency Motion to Strike Application or Request to Stay Proceedings, I issued a final agency decision dismissing *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, as moot.⁶

On September 12, 2014, former Chief Administrative Law Judge Peter M. Davenport⁷ [Chief ALJ] issued a Decision and Order [Initial EAJA Decision] awarding Ms. Caudill \$18,090 for attorney fees and \$2,648.55 for other expenses which Ms. Caudill incurred in connection with *Caudill*, No. 10-0416.⁸ On November 3, 2014, APHIS appealed the Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision to the Judicial Officer.⁹ On December 8, 2014, Ms. Caudill filed a response to APHIS's Appeal Petition.¹⁰ On December 10, 2014, the Hearing Clerk transmitted the record to the Office of the Judicial Officer for consideration and decision. Based upon a careful consideration of the record, I issue this final decision denying Ms. Caudill's request for attorney fees and other expenses which she incurred in connection with *Caudill*, No. 10-0416.

DISCUSSION

The Equal Access to Justice Act requires an agency that conducts an adversary adjudication to award fees and other expenses to a prevailing party, other than the United States, as follows:

§ 504. Costs and fees of parties

⁴ EAJA App. ¶ 3 at 1.

⁵ Agency Mot. to Strike App. or Request to Stay Proceedings at 2.

⁶ *Caudill*, 73 Agric. Dec. 241 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Ruling Granting Pet. to Reopen and Ruling Granting Request to Issue an Order Dismissing the Proceeding).

⁷ Former Chief Administrative Law Judge Peter M. Davenport retired on January 3, 2015.

⁸ Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision at 9.

⁹ Agency Pet. for Appeal of Initial Decision Awarding Fees and Costs and Supporting Br. [Appeal Petition].

¹⁰ Jennifer Caudill a/k/a Jennifer Walker a/k/a Jennifer Herriott Walker's Resp. to Br. [Response to Appeal Petition].

Jennifer Caudill
74 Agric. Dec. 101

(a)(1) An agency that conducts an adversary adjudication shall award, to a prevailing party other than the United States, fees and other expenses incurred by that party in connection with that proceeding, unless the adjudicative officer of the agency finds that the position of the agency was substantially justified or that special circumstances make an award unjust. Whether or not the position of the agency was substantially justified shall be determined on the basis of the administrative record, as a whole, which is made in the adversary adjudication for which fees and other expenses are sought.

5 U.S.C. § 504(a)(1).

The Chief ALJ found Ms. Caudill was a prevailing party in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416; APHIS's position in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was not substantially justified; and no special circumstances make an award to Ms. Caudill unjust.¹¹ APHIS raises nine issues on appeal and requests that I reverse the Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision.

First, APHIS asserts *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was not an "adversary adjudication" under the Equal Access to Justice Act or a "covered" proceeding under the EAJA Rules of Practice (Appeal Pet. ¶ IA at 9-15). The Equal Access to Justice Act defines the term "adversary adjudication," as follows:

§ 504. Costs and fees of parties

.....
(b)(1) For purposes of this section—

.....
(C) "adversary adjudication" means (i) an adjudication under section 554 of this title in which the position of the United States is represented by counsel or otherwise, but excludes an adjudication for the purpose of establishing or fixing a rate or for the purpose of granting

¹¹ Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision at 6-9.

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

or renewing a license, (ii) any appeal of a decision made pursuant to section 7103 of title 41 before an agency board of contract appeals as provided in section 7105 of title 41, (iii) any hearing conducted under chapter 38 of title 31, and (iv) the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993[.]

5 U.S.C. § 504(b)(1)(C). APHIS contends *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was not an “adversary adjudication” conducted under 5 U.S.C. § 554;¹² Ms. Caudill contends *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was an “adversary adjudication” conducted under 5 U.S.C. § 554.¹³ Neither APHIS nor Ms. Caudill contends that *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was an “adversary adjudication” as that term is defined in 5 U.S.C. § 504(b)(1)(C)(ii), (iii), or (iv).

The Administrative Procedure Act provides that 5 U.S.C. § 554 applies, as follows:

§ 554. Adjudications

(a) This section applies, according to the provisions thereof in every case of adjudication required by statute to be determined on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing. . . .

5 U.S.C. § 554(a). APHIS instituted *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 2133, seeking termination of Ms. Caudill’s Animal Welfare Act license.¹⁴ While Animal Welfare Act license termination proceedings have been determined on the record after an agency hearing,¹⁵

¹² Appeal Pet. ¶ IA at 12.

¹³ Resp. to Appeal Pet. at 2-3.

¹⁴ The Animal Welfare Act provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue licenses to dealers and exhibitors upon application therefore in such form and manner as the Secretary may prescribe (7 U.S.C. § 2133). The power to require and to issue licenses under 7 U.S.C. § 2133 includes the power to terminate licenses and to disqualify persons from becoming licensed. *Greenly*, 72 Agric. Dec. 586, 589 (U.S.D.A. 2013); *Vanishing Species Wildlife, Inc.*, 69 Agric. Dec. 1068, 1070 (U.S.D.A. 2010); *Animals of Mont., Inc.*, 68 Agric. Dec. 92, 94 (2009); *Amarillo Wildlife Refuge, Inc.*, 68 Agric. Dec. 77, 81 (U.S.D.A. 2009); *Vigne*, 67 Agric. Dec. 1060, 1062 (U.S.D.A. 2008); *Bradshaw*, 50 Agric. Dec. 499, 507 (U.S.D.A. 1991).

¹⁵ See 9 C.F.R. § 2.12 providing that an Animal Welfare Act license may be terminated after a hearing in accordance with the Rules of Practice Governing Formal Adjudicatory

Jennifer Caudill
74 Agric. Dec. 101

7 U.S.C. § 2133 does not require that Animal Welfare Act license termination proceedings be determined on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing. Therefore, I conclude *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was not an “adversary adjudication,” as that term is defined in the Equal Access to Justice Act. Consequently, Ms. Caudill is not entitled to an award of fees and expenses which she incurred in connection with *Caudill*, No. 10-0416.

Moreover, the only proceedings that are “covered” proceedings under the EAJA Rules of Practice are “adversary adjudications,” as that term is defined in the Equal Access to Justice Act.¹⁶ As *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was not an “adversary adjudication,” as that term is defined in the Equal Access to Justice Act, it was not a “covered” proceeding under the EAJA Rules of Practice.

Second, APHIS contends the Chief ALJ erroneously concluded Ms. Caudill was a “prevailing party” in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416 (Appeal Pet. ¶ IB at 15-20).

On September 7, 2010, APHIS instituted *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, seeking an order terminating Ms. Caudill’s Animal Welfare Act license based upon Ms. Caudill’s alleged unfitness to hold an Animal Welfare Act license. Ms. Caudill denied APHIS’s allegations and opposed termination of her Animal Welfare Act license. On February 1, 2013, the Chief ALJ issued an initial decision in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, in which he reversed APHIS’s determination that Ms. Caudill was unfit to hold an Animal Welfare Act license and dismissed *Caudill*, No. 10-0416. The Chief ALJ’s initial decision in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, did not become final and effective as both APHIS and Ms. Caudill timely appealed the Chief ALJ’s initial decision to the Judicial Officer. Prior to the Judicial Officer’s issuance of a final agency decision in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, Ms. Caudill failed to pay an annual Animal Welfare Act license renewal fee, as required by 9 C.F.R. § 2.6, and, on October 16, 2013, Ms. Caudill’s Animal Welfare Act license automatically terminated, pursuant to 9 C.F.R. § 2.5(a)(4).

On April 29, 2014, APHIS moved to dismiss *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, as

Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary Under Various Statutes (7 C.F.R. §§ 1.130-.151) [Rules of Practice].

¹⁶ 7 C.F.R. § 1.183(a).

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

moot, based upon the automatic termination of Ms. Caudill's Animal Welfare Act license. Ms. Caudill failed to file a response to APHIS's motion, and on May 16, 2014, I dismissed *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, as moot stating, as follows:

Based upon the record before me, I find the automatic termination of Animal Welfare Act license number 58-C-0947, pursuant to 9 C.F.R. § 2.5, renders moot the instant proceeding in which the Administrator seeks termination of Animal Welfare Act license number 58-C-0947, pursuant to 9 C.F.R. § 2.12.

Caudill, 73 Agric. Dec. 241, 244 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Ruling Granting Pet. to Reopen and Ruling Granting Request to Issue an Order Dismissing the Proceeding).

The Chief ALJ concluded that Ms. Caudill was the prevailing party in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, because, although Ms. Caudill's Animal Welfare Act license was terminated, the termination was not related to her fitness to hold an Animal Welfare Act license.¹⁷

A "prevailing party" is one in whose favor a judgment is rendered.¹⁸ While *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, 73 Agric. Dec. 241 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Ruling Granting Pet. to Reopen and Ruling Granting Request to Issue an Order Dismissing the Proceeding), contains no finding that Ms. Caudill was unfit to hold an Animal Welfare Act license, it contains no judgment rendered in favor of Ms. Caudill. Instead, the specific outcome sought by APHIS in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, and opposed by Ms. Caudill, was obtained due to Ms. Caudill's failure to pay an annual Animal Welfare Act license renewal fee, rendering the Animal Welfare Act license termination proceeding moot. Therefore, I conclude the Chief ALJ's conclusion that Ms. Caudill was a prevailing party in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, is error.

Third, APHIS asserts the Chief ALJ's February 1, 2013, initial decision

¹⁷ Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision at 6-7.

¹⁸ *Buckhannon Bd. & Care Home, Inc. v. W. Va. Dep't of Health & Human Resources*, 532 U.S. 598, 602-05 (2001); *Jeroski v. Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Comm'n*, 697 F.3d 651 (7th Cir. 2012); *Citizens for Better Forestry v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.*, 567 F.3d 1128, 1131 (9th Cir. 2009).

Jennifer Caudill
74 Agric. Dec. 101

in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was not a final disposition of *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, and the Chief ALJ erroneously awarded fees and expenses under the Equal Access to Justice Act to Ms. Caudill based upon the Chief ALJ's initial decision in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416 (Appeal Pet. ¶¶ IC-ID at 21-23).

Caudill, No. 10-0416, was conducted in accordance with the Rules of Practice, which provide that an administrative law judge's decision shall become final and effective unless a party appeals the administrative law judge's decision to the Judicial Officer, as follows:

§ 1.142 Post-hearing procedure.

....

(c) *Judge's decision.*

....

(4) The Judge's decision shall become final and effective without further proceedings 35 days after issuance of the decision, if announced orally at the hearing, or if the decision is in writing, 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; *Provided, however*, that no decision shall be final for purposes of judicial review except a final decision of the Judicial Officer upon appeal.

7 C.F.R. § 1.142(c)(4). On February 1, 2013, the Chief ALJ issued an initial decision in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416. APHIS and Ms. Caudill timely appealed the Chief ALJ's initial decision to the Judicial Officer pursuant to 7 C.F.R. § 1.145(a); therefore, the Chief ALJ's February 1, 2013, initial decision in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, did not become final and effective.

The EAJA Rules of Practice define the term "final disposition," as follows:

§ 1.193 Time for filing application.

....

(b) For the purposes of this subpart, final disposition means the date on which a decision or order disposing of

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

the merits of the proceeding or any other complete resolution of the proceeding, such as a settlement or voluntary dismissal, become final and unappealable, both within the Department and to the courts.

7 C.F.R. § 1.193(b). As the Chief ALJ's February 1, 2013, initial decision in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, did not dispose of the merits of the proceeding, did not constitute a complete resolution of *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, and was appealable within the United States Department of Agriculture, I conclude the Chief ALJ's February 1, 2013 initial decision in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was not a final disposition of *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, and the Chief ALJ's award of fees and expenses under the Equal Access to Justice Act to Ms. Caudill based upon the Chief ALJ's February 1, 2013 initial decision in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was error.

Fourth, APHIS contends the Chief ALJ failed to issue a timely ruling on the Agency Motion to Strike Application or Request to Stay Proceedings (Appeal Pet. ¶ IE.1. at 23-24).

On March 29, 2013, APHIS filed Agency Motion to Strike Application or Request to Stay Proceedings requesting that the Chief ALJ either strike Ms. Caudill's EAJA Application as premature or stay this Equal Access to Justice Act proceeding pending final disposition of *Caudill*, No. 10-0416. On September 12, 2014, the Chief ALJ denied APHIS's motion to strike Ms. Caudill's EAJA Application¹⁹ and stated he had stayed consideration of Ms. Caudill's EAJA Application pending final disposition of *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, as follows:

As an appeal was taken in the license termination case, the stay of the application for attorney's fees and costs required by section 1.193(c) took effect. 7 C.F.R. § 1.193(c). As a final determination has now been made, this matter is again before me for consideration of the application for attorney fees in the amount of \$18,090.00, which has been submitted in this action by [sic] for services provided by William J. Cook, Esquire, as Caudill's attorney, and for the further sum of \$2,648.55

¹⁹ Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision at 5.

Jennifer Caudill
74 Agric. Dec. 101

for costs and expenses incurred.

Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision at 4. While I find the one (1) year, five (5) month, and fourteen (14) day period between APHIS's March 29, 2013 filing and the Chief ALJ's September 12, 2014 ruling, inordinate, I do not find the Chief ALJ was required by the EAJA Rules of Practice to rule on APHIS's March 29, 2013, filing within a specified time. Therefore, I reject APHIS's contention that the Chief ALJ's September 12, 2014, ruling on the Agency Motion to Strike Application or Request to Stay Proceedings was not timely.

Fifth, APHIS asserts the Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision contains unwarranted criticism of APHIS's filing the Agency Motion to Strike Application or Request to Stay Proceedings (Appeal Pet. ¶ IE.2. at 25-29).

The Chief ALJ observed that certain attorneys employed by the United States Department of Agriculture, Office of the General Counsel, routinely respond to Equal Access to Justice Act applications, as follows:

[A]s apparently is routine practice by certain attorneys in the Department's Office of General Counsel, rather than filing an answer, on March 29, 2013, [APHIS] moved to strike [Ms. Caudill's EAJA Application] as being premature, or in the alternative, requested stay of the proceedings.

Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision at 4. While I find the Chief ALJ's observation regarding the routine practice by certain attorneys irrelevant to the disposition of this proceeding, I do not find the Chief ALJ's observation constitutes criticism of APHIS's filing the Agency Motion to Strike Application or Request to Stay Proceedings, as APHIS contends.

Sixth, APHIS contends the Chief ALJ erroneously failed to afford APHIS an opportunity to file an answer to Ms. Caudill's EAJA Application (Appeal Pet. ¶ IE.3. at 29).

The EAJA Rules of Practice provide that agency counsel may file an answer to an Equal Access to Justice Act application within thirty

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

(30) days after service of the application.²⁰ The EAJA Rules of Practice are binding on administrative law judges;²¹ therefore, the Chief ALJ was required to allow APHIS's counsel to file an answer to Ms. Caudill's EAJA Application during the thirty (30) day period after the Hearing Clerk served APHIS with Ms. Caudill's EAJA Application. I find nothing in the record supporting APHIS's contention that the Chief ALJ denied APHIS the opportunity to file an answer to Ms. Caudill's EAJA Application in violation of 7 C.F.R. § 1.195(a). To the contrary, the record reveals that on March 29, 2013, APHIS filed a timely answer denying the allegations in Ms. Caudill's EAJA Application.²² Therefore, I reject APHIS's contention that the Chief ALJ erroneously failed to afford APHIS an opportunity to file an answer to Ms. Caudill's EAJA Application.

Seventh, APHIS contends the Chief ALJ erroneously failed to rule on APHIS's request to conduct further proceedings before issuing the Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision (Appeal Pet. ¶ IE.3. at 29).

The EAJA Rules of Practice provide that an administrative law judge may order "further proceedings," as follows:

§ 1.199 Further proceedings.

(a) Ordinarily, the determination of an award will be made on the basis of the written record. However, on request of either the applicant or agency counsel, or on his or her own initiative, the adjudicative officer may order further proceedings, such as an informal conference, oral

²⁰ 7 C.F.R. § 1.195(a).

²¹ *Cf.*, Reinhart, 59 Agric. Dec. 721, 740-41 (U.S.D.A. 2000) (stating the Rules of Practice are binding on administrative law judges), *aff'd per curiam*, 39 F. App'x 954, 2002 WL 1492097 (6th Cir. July 10, 2002), *cert. denied*, 538 U.S. 979 (2003).

²² Agency Mot. to Strike App. or Request to Stay Proceedings at 2 n.3. In light of APHIS's answer denying the allegations in Ms. Caudill's EAJA Application, I find the Chief ALJ's statement that APHIS filed a motion to strike or, in the alternative, a request for a stay of proceedings "rather than filing an answer" (Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision at 4), perplexing. Based upon the current status of this proceeding, I decline to remand the proceeding to the Office of the Administrative Law Judges to provide an administrative law judge the opportunity to consider APHIS's answer which the Chief ALJ may have overlooked.

Jennifer Caudill
74 Agric. Dec. 101

argument, additional written submissions or, as to issues other than substantial justification (such as the applicant's eligibility or substantiation of fees and expenses), pertinent discovery or an evidentiary hearing. Such further proceedings shall be held only when necessary for full and fair resolution of the issues arising from the application, and shall be conducted as promptly as possible. Whether the position of the Department was substantially justified shall be determined on the basis of the administrative record, as a whole, which is made in the adversary adjudication for which fees and other expenses are sought.

(b) A request that the adjudicative officer order further proceedings under this section shall identify specifically the information sought or the disputed issues, and shall explain specifically why the additional proceedings are necessary to resolve the issues.

7 C.F.R. § 1.199(a)-(b).

On March 29, 2013, APHIS requested that the Chief ALJ order further proceedings pursuant to 7 C.F.R. § 1.199(a).²³ I find nothing in the record indicating that the Chief ALJ ruled on APHIS's March 29, 2013, request for further proceedings. Nonetheless, I decline to remand this proceeding to the Office of the Administrative Law Judges for a ruling on APHIS's March 29, 2013, request. Instead, I find the Chief ALJ's failure to rule on APHIS's March 29, 2013, request for further proceedings and the Chief ALJ's issuance of the Initial EAJA Decision without further proceedings, pursuant to 7 C.F.R. § 1.199(a), operate as an implicit denial of APHIS's request that the Chief ALJ order further proceedings.²⁴

²³ Agency Mot. to Strike App. or Request to Stay Proceedings at 2 n.3.

²⁴ See *Esso Standard Oil Co. v. Lopez-Freytes*, 522 F.3d 136, 144 (1st Cir. 2008) (stating general principles of administrative law provide that an agency's failure to act on a pending matter is treated as a denial of the relief sought); *Hernandez v. Reno*, 238 F.3d 50, 55 (1st Cir. 2001) (treating the Board of Immigration Appeal's failure to act on the petitioner's motion to reopen for more than 3 years as a denial of that motion); *United States v. Stefan*, 784 F.2d 1093, 1100 (11th Cir. 1986) (concluding the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida's failure to rule on appellant's motion for mistrial constitutes an implicit denial of the motion), *cert. denied*, 479 U.S. 1009 (1986); *Dabone v. Karn*, 763 F.2d 593, 597 n.2 (3d Cir. 1985) (stating the Board of Immigration Appeal's failure to

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

Moreover, I agree with the Chief ALJ's implicit denial of APHIS's request for further proceedings as APHIS failed to identify specifically the information sought or the disputed issues and failed to explain specifically why the additional proceedings were necessary to resolve the issues, as required by 7 C.F.R. § 1.199(b).

Eighth, APHIS contends the Chief ALJ awarded Ms. Caudill attorney fees at the rate of \$150 an hour, which exceeds the maximum hourly rate that can be awarded in this Equal Access to Justice Act proceeding (Appeal Pet. ¶ IF at 29-33).

The Chief ALJ awarded Ms. Caudill attorney fees at the rate \$150 per hour.²⁵ The EAJA Rules of Practice currently provide that no award for the fee of an attorney may exceed \$150 per hour, as follows:

§ 1.186 Allowable fees and expenses.

....

(b) In proceedings commenced on or after the effective date of this paragraph, no award for the fee of an attorney or agent under the rules in this subpart may exceed \$150 per hour. No award to compensate an expert witness may exceed the highest rate at which the Department pays expert witnesses, which is set out at § 1.150 of this part. However, an award also may include the reasonable expenses of the attorney, agent, or witness as a separate item, if the attorney, agent, or witness ordinarily charges clients separately for such expenses.

7 C.F.R. § 1.186(b) (2014). The final rule amending 7 C.F.R. § 1.186(b) to provide a maximum hourly attorney fees rate of \$150 became effective

act within a reasonable time period on a motion to reopen constitutes effective denial of that motion); *Toronto-Dominion Bank v. Central Nat'l Bank & Trust Co.*, 753 F.2d 66, 68 (8th Cir. 1985) (stating the failure to rule on a motion to intervene can be interpreted as an implicit denial of that motion); *Greenly*, No. 11-0073, 72 Agric. Dec. , 586, 596 (U.S.D.A. 2013) (stating the administrative law judge's issuance of an initial decision and failure to rule on the complainant's motion for summary judgment operate as an implicit denial of the complainant's motion for summary judgment), *aff'd per curiam*, No. 13-2882 (8th Cir. Aug. 22, 2014).

²⁵ Chief ALJ's Initial EAJA Decision at 9.

Jennifer Caudill
74 Agric. Dec. 101

March 3, 2011.²⁶ The final rule explicitly states the maximum hourly attorney fees rate of \$150 only applies to proceedings initiated on and after the effective date of the final rule, as follows:

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is amending its regulations implementing the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA) by raising the maximum hourly attorney fees rate from \$125.00 to \$150.00 for covered proceedings initiated on and after the effective date of this final rule.

DATES: This final rule is effective March 3, 2011.

....

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 30, 2010, USDA published a proposed rule (75 FR 44928, July 30, 2010) to amend its regulations implementing the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA), 5 U.S.C. 504, to raise the maximum hourly attorney fees rate set forth in 7 CFR 1.186 from \$125.00 to \$150.00 for proceedings initiated on and after the effective date of the publication of this final rule.

76 Fed. Reg. 11,667 (Mar. 3, 2011).

APHIS initiated the adjudication for which Ms. Caudill seeks attorney fees and other expenses, on September 7, 2010.²⁷ Therefore, the maximum hourly attorney fees rate of \$150 set forth in 7 C.F.R. § 1.186(b) (2014) is not applicable to this proceeding, and I find the Chief ALJ erroneously awarded attorney fees at the rate of \$150 an hour. Instead, I find the maximum hourly attorney fees rate of \$125 is applicable to this proceeding.²⁸

Ms. Caudill concedes that the \$125 per hour rate for attorney services is applicable to this Equal Access to Justice Act proceeding and, based upon this rate, Ms. Caudill now seeks an award of \$15,075 for attorney

²⁶ 76 Fed. Reg. 11,667 (Mar. 3, 2011).

²⁷ Caudill, 73 Agric. Dec. 241, 244 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Ruling Granting Pet. To Reopen and Ruling Granting Request to Issue an Order Dismissing the Proceeding).

²⁸ 7 C.F.R. § 1.186(b) (2010).

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

fees instead of the \$18,090 which she sought in her EAJA Application.²⁹ However, based on my findings that *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was not an “adversary adjudication,” as that term is defined in the Equal Access to Justice Act, and that Ms. Caudill was not a prevailing party in *Caudill*, 73 Agric. Dec. 241, 244 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Ruling Granting Pet. to Reopen and Ruling Granting Request to Issue an Order Dismissing the Proceeding), I conclude Ms. Caudill is not entitled to an award of any attorney fees or other expenses under the Equal Access to Justice Act.

Ninth, APHIS contends the Chief ALJ erroneously awarded attorney fees for 1.7 hours of work that, on the face of Ms. Caudill’s EAJA Application, appears not to have been performed for Ms. Caudill, but rather for Mr. Kalmanson, and the Chief ALJ erroneously awarded attorney fees for 2.7 hours of work related to a Freedom of Information Act request that appears to be unrelated to *Caudill*, No. 10-0416 (Appeal Pet. ¶ IF at 32-33).

Ms. Caudill attached to her EAJA Application full documentation of the fees and expenses for which Ms. Caudill seeks an Equal Access to Justice Act award. The documentation states the actual time expended and the hourly rate at which William J. Cook, Ms. Caudill’s attorney in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, computed attorney fees and describes the specific services performed by Mr. Cook and the other expenses. In support of this documentation, Ms. Caudill submitted Mr. Cook’s declaration in which Mr. Cook, under penalty of perjury, swears to the accuracy of the documentation of the fees and expenses and the hourly rate at which he computed attorney fees in *Caudill*, No. 10-0416.³⁰ Mr. Cook explains the entries that APHIS contends appear to relate to Mr. Kalmanson, rather than to Ms. Caudill, as follows:

3. My firm has served as counsel for Ms. Caudill in this case since its inception. During this time, I have expended 120.6 hours for legal services for Ms. Caudill. Attached as Exhibit “B” is a listing of the time I spent on this matter. I also represented Respondent, Mitchel Kalmanson, and I have deleted any time entries devoted exclusively to Mr. Kalmanson’s portion of the case.

²⁹ Resp. to Appeal Pet. ¶ III at 4.

³⁰ Decl. of William J. Cook, dated February 27, 2013 (EAJA App. Ex. 2).

Jennifer Caudill
74 Agric. Dec. 101

Thus, the hours claimed represent time spent only on Ms. Caudill's defense or time spent jointly on both respondents' defense. Most of the time, however, was spent on Ms. Caudill's case, as the allegations against her were more detailed and extensive than the allegations against Mr. Kalmanson.

EAJA Application Ex. 2 ¶ 3 at 1-2. Moreover, I find Mr. Cook's April 27, 2011, entry in the Statement of Attorney's Time establishes that the 2.7 hours of work related to a Freedom of Information Act request is related to *Caudill*, No. 10-0416.³¹

Therefore, I reject APHIS's contention that the Chief ALJ erroneously awarded attorney fees for 1.7 hours of work that was not performed for Ms. Caudill, but rather for Mr. Kalmanson, and APHIS's contention that the Chief ALJ erroneously awarded attorney fees for 2.7 hours of work related to a Freedom of Information Act request that was unrelated to *Caudill*, No. 10-0416. However, based on my findings that *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was not an "adversary adjudication," as that term is defined in the Equal Access to Justice Act, and that Ms. Caudill was not a prevailing party in *Caudill*, 73 Agric. Dec. 241, 244 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Ruling Granting Pet. to Reopen and Ruling Granting Request to Issue an Order Dismissing the Proceeding), I conclude Ms. Caudill is not entitled to an award of any attorney fees or other expenses under the Equal Access to Justice Act.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction over this matter.
2. Ms. Caudill is an individual whose address is in Florida.
3. On September 7, 2010, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 2133, APHIS instituted an adjudication, *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, against Ms. Caudill seeking termination of Ms. Caudill's Animal Welfare Act license.³²

³¹ EAJA App. Ex. B at 2.

³² *Caudill*, 73 Agric. Dec. 241, 243 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Ruling Granting Pet. To Reopen and Ruling Granting Request to Issue an Order Dismissing the Proceeding).

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

4. Ms. Caudill failed to pay timely an annual Animal Welfare Act license renewal fee, and on October 16, 2013, pursuant to 9 C.F.R. § 2.5, Ms. Caudill's Animal Welfare Act license automatically terminated.³³
5. On May 16, 2014, the Judicial Officer dismissed *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, as moot.³⁴
6. *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was not an "adversary adjudication," as that term is defined in the Equal Access to Justice Act (5 U.S.C. § 504(b)(1)(C)).
7. *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, was not a "covered" proceeding under the EAJA Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.183).
8. Ms. Caudill was not a prevailing party in *Caudill* No. 10-0416.
9. Ms. Caudill does not meet the conditions of eligibility for an award of fees and other expenses which she incurred in connection with *Caudill*, No. 10-0416.

For the foregoing reasons, the following Order is issued.

ORDER

Ms. Caudill's February 28, 2013, request for an award of attorney fees and other expenses which she incurred in connection with *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, is denied.

RIGHT TO SEEK JUDICIAL REVIEW

Ms. Caudill has the right to seek judicial review of this Decision and Order in the courts of the United States having jurisdiction to review the merits of *Caudill*, No. 10-0416, 73 Agric. Dec. 241 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Ruling Granting Pet. to Reopen and Ruling Granting Request to Issue an Order Dismissing the Proceeding).³⁵ Ms. Caudill must seek judicial review within thirty (30) days after the determination of the award of

³³ *Id.* at 244.

³⁴ *Id.* at 245.

³⁵ 5 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2); 7 C.F.R. § 1.202.

Jennifer Caudill
74 Agric. Dec. 101

attorney fees and other expenses in this Decision and Order.³⁶ The date of the determination of the award of attorney fees and other expenses in this Decision and Order is February 23, 2015.

³⁶ 5 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2); *see also* *Holzbau v. United States*, 866 F.2d 427, 429-30 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (stating the 30-day time for appeal runs from issuance of the determination, not from the date the party receives a copy of the determination); *Sonicraft, Inc. v. NLRB*, 814 F.2d 385, 386-87 (7th Cir. 1987) (stating the deadline runs from the determination itself).

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

In re: JUSTIN JENNE.

Docket No. 13-0308.

Decision and Order.

Filed April 13, 2015.

HPA – Civil penalty – Sanctions – Sore – Disqualification.

Thomas Bolick, Esq. for Complainant.

Respondent, pro se.

Initial Decision and Order by Janice K. Bullard, Administrative Law Judge.

Final Decision and Order by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

DECISION AND ORDER

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On August 2, 2013, Kevin Shea, Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, United States Department of Agriculture [Administrator], initiated this administrative disciplinary proceeding against Justin Jenne by filing a Complaint. The Administrator alleges: (1) Mr. Jenne, at all times material to this proceeding, was the owner of a horse known as “Led Zeppelin”;¹ and (2) on or about August 27, 2012, Mr. Jenne entered and allowed the entry of Led Zeppelin as entry number 542, class number 110A, at the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee, for the purpose of showing or exhibiting Led Zeppelin while Led Zeppelin was sore, in violation of the Horse Protection Act of 1970, as amended (15 U.S.C. §§ 1821-1831) [Horse Protection Act].²

On September 6, 2013, Mr. Jenne filed an answer in which Mr. Jenne: (1) admitted he was the owner of Led Zeppelin;³ (2) admitted that, on or about August 27, 2012, he entered and allowed the entry of Led Zeppelin as entry number 542, class number 110A, at the 74th Annual Tennessee

¹ Compl. ¶ I(1) at 1.

² Compl. ¶ II(1) at 1.

³ Answer of Justin R. Jenne ¶ I(1) at 1.

Justin Jenne
74 Agric. Dec. 118

Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee, for the purpose of showing or exhibiting Led Zeppelin;⁴ and (3) denied that Led Zeppelin was sore when he entered and allowed the entry of Led Zeppelin as entry number 542, class number 110A, at the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee.⁵

Administrative Law Judge Janice K. Bullard [ALJ] conducted a hearing on March 11, 2014, by an audio-visual connection between Washington, DC, and Nashville, Tennessee.⁶ Thomas Neil Bolick, Office of the General Counsel, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, represented the Administrator. Mr. Jenne appeared pro se.⁷ Three witnesses testified, and seven exhibits were identified and received into evidence at the March 11, 2014, hearing.⁸

On July 29, 2014, the ALJ issued a Decision and Order: (1) concluding Mr. Jenne entered Led Zeppelin as entry number 542, class number 110A, at the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee, for the purpose of showing or exhibiting Led Zeppelin while Led Zeppelin was sore, in willful violation of the Horse Protection Act; (2) assessing Mr. Jenne a \$2,200 civil penalty; and (3) disqualifying Mr. Jenne for one year from showing, exhibiting, or entering any horse and from judging, managing, or otherwise participating in any horse show, horse exhibition, horse sale, or horse auction.⁹

On September 8, 2014, Mr. Jenne filed a timely appeal of the ALJ's Decision and Order,¹⁰ along with a petition to reopen the hearing to take additional evidence.¹¹ On October 30, 2014, the Administrator filed

⁴ Answer of Justin R. Jenne ¶ II(1) at 1.

⁵ Answer of Justin R. Jenne ¶ II(1) at 1.

⁶ References to the transcript of the March 11, 2014, hearing are designated as "Tr." and the page number.

⁷ Prior to the March 11, 2014, hearing, Dudley W. Taylor, Taylor & Knight, Knoxville, Tennessee, represented Mr. Jenne, but, in a conference call with the ALJ and Mr. Bolick on March 6, 2014, Mr. Taylor withdrew his representation of Mr. Jenne.

⁸ The exhibits received in evidence are designated as "CX" and the exhibit number.

⁹ ALJ's Decision and Order at 10-12.

¹⁰ Appeal to Judicial Officer [Appeal Petition].

¹¹ Pet. to Re-Open Hr'g for Submission of Additional Evidence [Petition to Reopen

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

Complainant's response to Mr. Jenne's Appeal Petition and Mr. Jenne's Petition to Reopen Hearing.¹²

On November 7, 2014, the Hearing Clerk transmitted the record to the Office of the Judicial Officer for consideration and decision. Based upon a careful review of the record that was before the ALJ, I agree with the ALJ's Decision and Order.

DECISION

Pertinent Statutory Provisions

Congress enacted the Horse Protection Act to end the cruel practice of deliberately soring Tennessee Walking Horses for the purpose of altering their natural gait and improving their performance at horse shows. When a horse's front feet are deliberately made sore, usually by using chains or chemicals, "the intense pain which the horse suffers when placing his forefeet on the ground causes him to lift them up quickly and thrust them forward, reproducing exactly" the distinctive high-stepping gait that spectators and show judges look for in a champion Tennessee Walking Horse. H.R. Rep. No. 91-1597, at 2 (1970), *reprinted in* 1970 U.S.C.C.A.N. 4870, 4871.

Congress's reasons for prohibiting soring were twofold. First, soring inflicts great pain on the animals. Second, trainers who sore horses gain an unfair competitive advantage over trainers who rely on skill and patience. In 1976, Congress significantly strengthened the Horse Protection Act by amending it to make clear that intent to sore the horse is not a necessary element of a violation.¹³ See *Thornton v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.*, 715 F.2d 1508, 1511-12 (11th Cir. 1983).

The Horse Protection Act defines the term "sore," as follows:

§ 1821. Definitions

Hearing].

¹² Complainant's Resp. to Resp't's Appeal to Judicial Officer and Pet. to Re-open Hr'g for Submission of Additional Evidence [Complainant's Response to Appeal Petition].

¹³ The Horse Protection Act also provides for criminal penalties for "knowingly" violating the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. § 1825(a)). This provision of the Horse Protection Act is not at issue in this proceeding.

As used in this chapter unless the context otherwise requires:

....

(3) The term “sore” when used to describe a horse means that—

(A) an irritating or blistering agent has been applied, internally or externally, by a person to any limb of a horse,

(B) any burn, cut, or laceration has been inflicted by a person on any limb of a horse,

(C) any tack, nail, screw, or chemical agent has been injected by a person into or used by a person on any limb of a horse, or

(D) any other substance or device has been used by a person on any limb of a horse or a person has engaged in a practice involving a horse,

and, as a result of such application, infliction, injection, use, or practice, such horse suffers, or can reasonably be expected to suffer, physical pain or distress, inflammation, or lameness when walking, trotting, or otherwise moving

15 U.S.C. § 1821(3).

The Horse Protection Act creates a presumption that a horse with abnormal, bilateral sensitivity is sore, as follows:

§ 1825. Violations and penalties

....

(d) Production of witnesses and books, papers, and documents; depositions; fees; presumptions; jurisdiction

....

(5) In any civil or criminal action to enforce this chapter or any regulation under this chapter a horse shall be presumed to be a horse which is sore if it manifests abnormal sensitivity or inflammation in both of its forelimbs or both of its hindlimbs.

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

15 U.S.C. § 1825(d)(5).

The Horse Protection Act prohibits certain conduct, including:

§ 1824. Unlawful acts

The following conduct is prohibited:

....

(2) The (A) showing or exhibiting, in any horse show or horse exhibition, of any horse which is sore, (B) entering for the purpose of showing or exhibiting in any horse show or horse exhibition, any horse which is sore, (C) selling, auctioning, or offering for sale, in any horse sale or auction, any horse which is sore, and (D) allowing any activity described in clause (A), (B), or (C) respecting a horse which is sore by the owner of such horse.¹⁵ U.S.C. § 1824(2).

Violators of the Horse Protection Act are subject to civil and criminal sanctions. Civil sanctions include both civil penalties (15 U.S.C. § 1825(b)(1)) and disqualification for a specified period from “showing or exhibiting any horse, judging or managing any horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction” (15 U.S.C. § 1825(c)). The maximum civil penalty for each violation is \$2,200 (15 U.S.C. § 1825(b)(1)).¹⁴ In making the determination concerning the amount of the monetary penalty, the Secretary of Agriculture must “take into account all factors relevant to such determination, including the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the prohibited conduct and, with respect to the person found to have engaged in such conduct, the degree of culpability, any history of prior offenses, ability to pay, effect on ability to continue to do business, and such other matters as justice may require.” 15 U.S.C. § 1825(b)(1).

¹⁴ 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, is authorized to adjust the civil monetary penalty that may be assessed under 15 U.S.C. § 1825(b)(1) for each violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1824. The maximum civil penalty for violations of the Horse Protection Act occurring after May 7, 2010, is \$2,200 (7 C.F.R. § 3.91(b)(2)(viii)).

Justin Jenne
74 Agric. Dec. 118

As to disqualification, the Horse Protection Act further provides, as follows:

§ 1825. Violations and penalties

.....
(c) Disqualification of offenders; orders; civil penalties applicable; enforcement procedures

In addition to any . . . civil penalty authorized under this section, any person . . . who paid a civil penalty assessed under subsection (b) of this section or is subject to a final order under such subsection assessing a civil penalty for any violation of any provision of this chapter or any regulation issued under this chapter may be disqualified by order of the Secretary . . . from showing or exhibiting any horse, judging or managing any horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction for a period of not less than one year for the first violation and not less than five years for any subsequent violation.

15 U.S.C. § 1825(c).

Mr. Jenne Failed to Rebut the Statutory Presumption That Led Zeppelin Was Sore

On August 27, 2012, Mr. Jenne, who, at all times material to this proceeding, was the owner and trainer of Led Zeppelin, presented Led Zeppelin, as entry number 542, class number 110A, to a Designated Qualified Person [DQP]¹⁵ for inspection at the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee (Answer of Justin R. Jenne ¶¶ I(1) at 1, II(1) at 1, III(3) at 2; Tr. at 131;

¹⁵ A DQP is a person meeting the requirements of 9 C.F.R. § 11.7 who has been licensed as a DQP by a horse industry organization or association having a DQP program certified by the United States Department of Agriculture and who may be appointed and delegated authority by the management of any horse show, horse exhibition, horse sale, or horse auction under 15 U.S.C. § 1823 to detect or diagnose horses which are sore or to otherwise inspect horses and any records pertaining to such horses for the purpose of enforcing the Horse Protection Act. *See* 9 C.F.R. § 11.1.

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

CX 1B, CX 4B-CX 5B). The DQP did not find that Led Zeppelin was sore (Answer of Justin R. Jenne ¶ III(3) at 2; Tr. at 153-54, 159-60); however, Bart Sutherland, DVM, a United States Department of Agriculture veterinary medical officer, conducted a pre-show examination of Led Zeppelin after the DQP's examination and found that Led Zeppelin reacted consistently to blanching his thumb along the horse's feet (Tr. at 120-21).¹⁶ Dr. Sutherland described his inspection of Led Zeppelin, as follows:

I noticed no gait deficits as the horse was being led to demonstrate its gait. I approached the horse and began my inspection. I began by inspecting the left pastern. I palpated the posterior pastern area and the horse made repeated and consistent pain withdrawal responses. The withdrawal locations on the pastern were the lateral posterior portions of the pastern. These reactions were both consistent in location and repeatable.

Next I examined the right pastern. I palpated the anterior pastern area and the horse made repeated and consistent

¹⁶ Routinely, DQP examinations are found to be less probative than United States Department of Agriculture examinations and the Judicial Officer has accorded less credence to DQP examinations than to United States Department of Agriculture examinations. Oppenheimer, 54 Agric. 221, 269 (U.S.D.A. 1995) (Decision as to C.M. Oppenheimer); Sparkman (Decision as to Sparkman and McCook), 50 Agric. Dec. 602, 610 (U.S.D.A. 1991); Edwards, 49 Agric. Dec. 188, 200 (U.S.D.A. 1990), *aff'd per curiam*, 943 F.2d 1318 (11th Cir. 1991) (unpublished), *cert. denied*, 503 U.S. 937 (1992). Mr. Jenne did not call the DQP who examined Led Zeppelin as a witness or introduce any report of the results of the DQP's examination of Led Zeppelin. On the other hand, the Administrator called Dr. Sutherland as a witness. Dr. Sutherland testified extensively regarding his examination of Led Zeppelin and his finding that Led Zeppelin was bilaterally sore (Tr. at 113-44, 156-82). In addition, the Administrator introduced Dr. Sutherland's affidavit which Dr. Sutherland prepared shortly after his examination of Led Zeppelin and which describes Dr. Sutherland's examination of Led Zeppelin and the basis for his finding that Led Zeppelin was bilaterally sore (CX 2B). Further still, the Administrator introduced Dr. Sutherland's written report documenting his finding that Led Zeppelin was bilaterally sore (CX 1B). A review of the record does not lead me to believe that I should deviate from my usual practice of according less credence to the DQP examination and findings than to the United States Department of Agriculture examination and findings in this proceeding. I accord Dr. Sutherland's examination of and findings regarding Led Zeppelin more credence than the DQP's examination of and findings regarding Led Zeppelin.

Justin Jenne
74 Agric. Dec. 118

pain withdrawal responses. The withdrawal locations on the pastern were the lateral to medial anterior portions of the pastern. These reactions were both consistent and repeatable.

I found the horse to be bilaterally sore.

CX 2B. Dr. Sutherland stated that, in his professional opinion, Led Zeppelin was sored using chemical and/or action devices (CX 2B).

Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1825(d), Led Zeppelin must be presumed to be sore based upon Dr. Sutherland's finding that Led Zeppelin manifested abnormal sensitivity in both of his forelimbs. Once the statutory presumption is established, the burden of persuasion shifts to the respondent to provide proof that the horse was not sore or that soreness was due to natural causes.

Mr. Jenne contends on appeal that the results of an examination of Led Zeppelin by his veterinarian, Richard Wilhelm, DVM, on August 27, 2012, rebuts the statutory presumption that Led Zeppelin was sore (Appeal Pet. ¶ 4 at 2). Mr. Jenne did not call Dr. Wilhelm as a witness, but testified that Dr. Wilhelm recorded the results of his examination of Led Zeppelin. Mr. Jenne did not have a copy of Dr. Wilhelm's report of his examination of Led Zeppelin to offer into evidence at the March 11, 2014, hearing, but, instead, stated he would have Mr. Taylor, Mr. Jenne's former attorney, forward Dr. Wilhelm's report to the ALJ (Tr. at 150- 51). The ALJ informed Mr. Jenne that she would hold the record open until May 16, 2014, to receive Dr. Wilhelm's report of his examination of Led Zeppelin (Tr. at 186-87); however, Mr. Jenne failed to provide the ALJ with Dr. Wilhelm's written report prior to the close of the record on May 16, 2014.¹⁷

On September 8, 2014, Mr. Jenne filed a Petition to Reopen Hearing, attached to which is an Affidavit of Richard Wilhelm, dated September 5, 2014, in which Dr. Wilhelm states he examined Led Zeppelin on August 27, 2012, he found no evidence that Led Zeppelin was sore, and a true and correct copy of the report of his August 27, 2012, examination of

¹⁷ ALJ's Decision and Order at 2 n.3.

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

Led Zeppelin is attached to the affidavit. On April 10, 2015, I denied Mr. Jenne's Petition to Reopen Hearing as evidence of Dr. Wilhelm's August 27, 2012, examination of Led Zeppelin could have been adduced at the March 11, 2014, hearing or at anytime prior to the close of the record on May 16, 2014. Moreover, I note Dr. Wilhelm's written report of his August 27, 2012, examination of Led Zeppelin is not attached to the Affidavit of Richard Wilhelm, as stated in that affidavit. Therefore, I reject Mr. Jenne's contention that he presented sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption that Led Zeppelin was sore, and I find Mr. Jenne entered and allowed the entry of Led Zeppelin as entry number 542, class number 110A, on August 27, 2012, at the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee, for the purpose of showing or exhibiting Led Zeppelin while Led Zeppelin was sore, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1824(2)(B) and 1824(2)(D).

Sanction

The Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. § 1825(b)(1)) authorizes the assessment of a civil penalty of not more than \$2,000 for each violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1824. However, pursuant to the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990, as amended (28 U.S.C. § 2461 note), the Secretary of Agriculture adjusted the civil monetary penalty that may be assessed under 15 U.S.C. § 1825(b)(1) for each violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1824 by increasing the maximum civil penalty from \$2,000 to \$2,200 (7 C.F.R. § 3.91(b)(2)(viii)). The Horse Protection Act also authorizes the disqualification of any person assessed a civil penalty from showing or exhibiting any horse or judging or managing any horse show, horse exhibition, horse sale, or horse auction. The Horse Protection Act provides minimum periods of disqualification of not less than one year for a first violation of the Horse Protection Act and not less than five years for any subsequent violation of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. § 1825(c)).

The United States Department of Agriculture's sanction policy is set forth in *S.S. Farms Linn County, Inc.* (Decision as to James Joseph Hickey and Shannon Hansen), 50 Agric. Dec. 476, 497 (1991), *aff'd*, 991 F.2d 803 (9th Cir. 1993) (not to be cited as precedent under the 9th Circuit Rule 36-3), as follows:

Justin Jenne
74 Agric. Dec. 118

[T]he sanction in each case will be determined by examining the nature of the violations in relation to the remedial purposes of the regulatory statute involved, along with all relevant circumstances, always giving appropriate weight to the recommendations of the administrative officials charged with the responsibility for achieving the congressional purpose.

The Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. § 1825(b)(1)) provides, in determining the amount of the civil penalty, the Secretary of Agriculture shall take into account all factors relevant to such determination, including the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the prohibited conduct and, with respect to the person found to have engaged in such conduct, the degree of culpability, any history of prior offenses, ability to pay, effect on ability to continue to do business, and such other matters as justice may require. The Administrator recommends that I assess Mr. Jenne a \$2,200 civil penalty (Complainant's Resp. to Appeal Pet. at 4-9).

The extent and gravity of Mr. Jenne's violations of the Horse Protection Act are great. A United States Department of Agriculture veterinary medical officer found Led Zeppelin sore. Dr. Sutherland found palpation of Led Zeppelin's front forelimbs elicited consistent, repeatable pain responses. Mr. Jenne contends on appeal that he is unable to pay the \$2,200 civil penalty assessed by the ALJ, but admits that he failed to present any argument or evidence in mitigation of the civil penalty at the March 11, 2014, hearing (Appeal Pet. ¶ 5 at 2).

I agree with Mr. Jenne that he failed to present any evidence of his inability to pay a civil penalty at the March 11, 2014, hearing. I have consistently held that "the burden is on the respondent to come forward with some evidence indicating an inability to pay the civil penalty or inability to continue to conduct business if the civil penalty is assessed."¹⁸

¹⁸ Clark, 59 Agric. Dec. 701, 710 (U.S.D.A. 2000) (Decision as to Coleman); Stepp, 57 Agric. Dec. 297, 318 (U.S.D.A. 1998), *aff'd*, 188 F.3d 508 (Table), 1999 WL 646138 (6th Cir. 1999) (not to be cited as precedent under 6th Circuit Rule 206), *printed in* 58 Agric. Dec. 820 (U.S.D.A. 1999); Oppenheimer, 54 Agric. Dec. 221, 321 (U.S.D.A. 1995) (Decision as to C.M. Oppenheimer); Armstrong, 53 Agric. Dec. 1301, 1324 (U.S.D.A. 1994), *aff'd per curiam*, 113 F.3d 1249 (11th Cir. 1997) (unpublished); Burks, 53 Agric. Dec. 322, 346 (U.S.D.A. 1994).

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

On September 8, 2014, Mr. Jenne filed a Petition to Reopen Hearing, attached to which is an Affidavit of Justin R. Jenne, dated September 5, 2014, and supporting attachments, in which Mr. Jenne asserts he is unable to pay a civil penalty. On April 10, 2015, I denied Mr. Jenne's Petition to Reopen Hearing as evidence of Mr. Jenne's inability to pay a civil penalty could have been adduced at the March 11, 2014, hearing. As Mr. Jenne failed to present evidence indicating an inability to pay the civil penalty, I reject Mr. Jenne's contention that he is not able to pay a \$2,200 civil penalty.

In most Horse Protection Act cases, the maximum civil penalty per violation has been warranted.¹⁹ Based on the factors that are required to be considered when determining the amount of the civil penalty to be assessed, I do not find a maximum penalty in this case to be inappropriate. The Administrator, an administrative official charged with responsibility for achieving the congressional purpose of the Horse Protection Act, requests a maximum civil penalty; therefore, I assess Mr. Jenne the \$2,200 civil penalty recommended by the Administrator.

The Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. § 1825(c)) provides that any person assessed a civil penalty under 15 U.S.C. § 1825(b) may be disqualified from showing or exhibiting any horse and from judging or managing any horse show, horse exhibition, horse sale, or horse auction for a period of not less than one year for the first violation of the Horse Protection Act and for a period of not less than five years for any subsequent violation of the Horse Protection Act.

The purpose of the Horse Protection Act is to prevent the cruel practice of soring horses. Congress amended the Horse Protection Act in 1976 to enhance the Secretary of Agriculture's ability to end soring of horses. Among the most notable devices to accomplish the purpose of the Horse Protection Act is the authorization for disqualification which Congress specifically added to provide a strong deterrent to violations of the Horse

¹⁹ Back, 69 Agric. Dec. 448, 463 (U.S.D.A. 2010), *aff'd*, 445 F. App'x 826 (6th Cir. 2011); Beltz, 64 Agric. Dec. 1487, 1504 (U.S.D.A. 2005) (Decision as to Christopher Jerome Zahnd), *aff'd sub nom.* Zahnd v. Sec'y of Agric., 479 F.3d 767 (11th Cir. 2007); Turner, 64 Agric. Dec. 1456, 1475 (U.S.D.A. 2005), *aff'd*, 217 F. App'x 462 (6th Cir. 2007); McConnell, 64 Agric. Dec. 436, 490 (U.S.D.A. 2005), *aff'd*, 198 F. App'x 417 (6th Cir. 2006); McCloy, Jr., 61 Agric. Dec. 173, 208 (U.S.D.A. 2002), *aff'd*, 351 F.3d 447 (10th Cir. 2003), *cert. denied*, 543 U.S. 810 (2004).

Justin Jenne
74 Agric. Dec. 118

Protection Act by those persons who have the economic means to pay civil penalties as a cost of doing business.²⁰

The Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. § 1825(c)) specifically provides that disqualification is in addition to any civil penalty assessed under 15 U.S.C. § 1825(b). While 15 U.S.C. § 1825(b)(1) requires that the Secretary of Agriculture consider specified factors when determining the amount of the civil penalty to be assessed for a violation of the Horse Protection Act, the Horse Protection Act contains no such requirement with respect to the imposition of a disqualification period.

While disqualification is discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture, the imposition of a disqualification period, in addition to the assessment of a civil penalty, has been recommended by administrative officials charged with responsibility for achieving the congressional purpose of the Horse Protection Act and I have held that disqualification, in addition to the assessment of a civil penalty, is appropriate in almost every Horse Protection Act case, including those cases in which a respondent is found to have violated the Horse Protection Act for the first time.²¹

Congress has provided the United States Department of Agriculture with the tools needed to eliminate the practice of soring Tennessee Walking Horses, but those tools must be used to be effective. In order to achieve the congressional purpose of the Horse Protection Act, I generally find necessary the imposition of at least the minimum disqualification provisions of the 1976 amendments on any person who violates 15 U.S.C. § 1824.

Circumstances in a particular case might justify a departure from this policy. Since, under the 1976 amendments, intent and knowledge are not

²⁰ See H.R. Rep. No. 94-1174, at 11 (1976), *reprinted in* 1976 U.S.C.C.A.N. 1696, 1705-06.

²¹ Back, 69 Agric. Dec. 448, 464 (U.S.D.A. 2010), *aff'd*, 445 F. App'x 826 (6th Cir. 2011); Beltz, 64 Agric. Dec. 1487, 1505-06 (U.S.D.A. 2005) (Decision as to Christopher Jerome Zahnd), *aff'd sub nom.* Zahnd v. Sec'y of Agric., 479 F.3d 767 (11th Cir. 2007); Turner, 64 Agric. Dec. 1456, 1476 (U.S.D.A. 2005), *aff'd*, 217 F. App'x 462 (6th Cir. 2007); McConnell, 64 Agric. Dec. 436, 492 (U.S.D.A. 2005), *aff'd*, 198 F. App'x 417 (6th Cir. 2006); McCloy, Jr., 61 Agric. Dec. 173, 209 (U.S.D.A. 2002), *aff'd*, 351 F.3d 447 (10th Cir. 2003), *cert. denied*, 543 U.S. 810 (2004).

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

elements of a violation, few circumstances warrant an exception from this policy, but the facts and circumstances of each case must be examined to determine whether an exception to this policy is warranted. An examination of the record does not lead me to believe that an exception from the usual practice of imposing the minimum disqualification period for Mr. Jenne's violations of the Horse Protection Act, in addition to the assessment of a civil penalty, is warranted.

Findings of Fact

1. Mr. Jenne is a resident of Tennessee.
2. At all times material to this proceeding, Mr. Jenne was the trainer of Led Zeppelin.
3. At all times material to this proceeding, Mr. Jenne was the owner of Led Zeppelin.
4. On August 27, 2012, Mr. Jenne entered Led Zeppelin as entry number 542, class number 110A, in the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee, for the purpose of showing or exhibiting Led Zeppelin.
5. On August 27, 2012, Mr. Jenne allowed the entry of Led Zeppelin as entry number 542, class number 110A, in the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee, for the purpose of showing or exhibiting Led Zeppelin.
6. Dr. Sutherland, a United States Department of Agriculture veterinary medical officer, inspected horses participating in the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee, in August and September 2012, for compliance with the Horse Protection Act.
7. On August 27, 2012, Mr. Jenne's employee, Roberto Ricardo, presented Led Zeppelin for inspection at the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee.
8. On August 27, 2012, Dr. Sutherland conducted a pre-show

Justin Jenne
74 Agric. Dec. 118

examination of Led Zeppelin.

9. Based upon his August 27, 2012, examination of Led Zeppelin, Dr. Sutherland concluded that Led Zeppelin was “sore” within the meaning of the Horse Protection Act.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction in this matter.
2. On the basis of the evidence in the record, I conclude Led Zeppelin was “sore,” as that term is defined in the Horse Protection Act, when entered on August 27, 2012, at the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee.
3. On August 27, 2012, Mr. Jenne entered Led Zeppelin as entry number 542, class number 110A, at the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee, for the purpose of showing or exhibiting Led Zeppelin while Led Zeppelin was sore, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1824(2)(B).
4. On August 27, 2012, Mr. Jenne allowed the entry of Led Zeppelin as entry number 542, class number 110A, at the 74th Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee, for the purpose of showing or exhibiting Led Zeppelin while Led Zeppelin was sore, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1824(2)(D).

For the foregoing reasons, the following Order is issued.

ORDER

1. Mr. Jenne is assessed a \$2,200 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:

Mr. Thomas Bolick
United States Department of Agriculture
Office of the General Counsel
Marketing, Regulatory, and Food Safety Division

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Room 2343-South Building
Washington, DC 20250-1417

Mr. Jenne's payment of the civil penalty shall be forwarded to, and received by, Mr. Bolick within six months after service of this Order on Mr. Jenne. Mr. Jenne shall indicate on the certified check or money order that payment is in reference to HPA Docket No. 13-0308.

2. Mr. Jenne is disqualified for a period of one year from showing, exhibiting, or entering any horse, directly or indirectly, through any agent, employee, or device, and from managing, judging, or otherwise participating in any horse show, horse exhibition, horse sale, or horse auction. "Participating" means engaging in any activity beyond that of a spectator, and includes, without limitation: (a) transporting or arranging for the transportation of horses to or from any horse show, horse exhibition, horse sale, or horse auction; (b) personally giving instructions to exhibitors; (c) being present in the warm-up areas, inspection areas, or other areas where spectators are not allowed at any horse show, horse exhibition, horse sale, or horse auction; and (d) financing the participation of others in any horse show, horse exhibition, horse sale, or horse auction. The disqualification of Mr. Jenne shall become effective on the 60th day after service of this Order on Mr. Jenne.

RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW

Mr. Jenne has the right to obtain review of the Order in this Decision and Order in the court of appeals of the United States for the circuit in which Mr. Jenne resides or has his place of business or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Mr. Jenne must file a notice of appeal in such court within 30 days from the date of the Order in this Decision and Order and must simultaneously send a copy of such notice by certified mail to the Secretary of Agriculture.²² The date of the Order in this Decision and Order is April 13, 2015.

²² 15 U.S.C. § 1825(b)(2), (c).

Randall Jones
74 Agric. Dec. 133

In re: RANDALL JONES.
Docket No. 13-0053.
Decision and Order.
Filed June 29, 2015.

HPA – Administrative procedure – Answer, failure to file timely – Default – Service.

Buren W. Kidd, Esq. for Complainant.
Respondent, pro se.
Initial Decision by Janice K. Bullard, Administrative Law Judge.
Final Decision and Order by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

DECISION AND ORDER

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Kevin Shea, Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, United States Department of Agriculture [Administrator], instituted this disciplinary administrative proceeding by filing a Complaint on October 23, 2012. The Administrator instituted the proceeding under the Horse Protection Act of 1970, as amended (15 U.S.C. §§ 1821-1831) [Horse Protection Act]; the regulations issued under the Horse Protection Act (9 C.F.R. pt. 11); and the Rules of Practice Governing Formal Adjudicatory Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary Under Various Statutes (7 C.F.R. §§ 1.130-.151) [Rules of Practice].

The Administrator alleges, on May 29, 2010, Randall Jones, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1824(2)(A) and § 1824(2)(D), exhibited and allowed the exhibition of a horse known as “Jammin The Blues” as entry number 336, in class number 47, at the 40th Annual Spring Fun Show, in Shelbyville, Tennessee, while the horse was sore by virtue of being scarred, as defined in 9 C.F.R. § 11.3.¹

On October 25, 2012, the Hearing Clerk, Office of Administrative Law Judges, United States Department of Agriculture [Hearing Clerk], by certified mail, sent Mr. Jones the Complaint, the Rules of Practice, and the Hearing Clerk’s service letter, dated October 25, 2012. The United States

¹ Compl. ¶ IIB at 2.

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

Postal Service returned the October 25, 2012, mailing to the Hearing Clerk marked “unclaimed.”² On December 18, 2012, in accordance with 7 C.F.R. § 1.147(c)(1), the Hearing Clerk, by ordinary mail, served Mr. Jones with the Complaint, the Rules of Practice, and the Hearing Clerk’s October 25, 2012, service letter.³ Mr. Jones failed to file an answer to the Complaint within 20 days after the Hearing Clerk served Mr. Jones with the Complaint, as required by 7 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

On March 7, 2014, Administrative Law Judge Janice K. Bullard [ALJ] filed an Order to Show Cause Why Default Should Not Be Entered [Order to Show Cause] in which the ALJ provided Mr. Jones and the Administrator 20 days to show cause why an order of default should not be entered in favor of the Administrator due to Mr. Jones’ failure to file an answer. On March 10, 2014, the Hearing Clerk sent the ALJ’s Order to Show Cause to Mr. Jones.⁴ On March 10, 2014, in response to the ALJ’s Order to Show Cause, the Administrator filed a Motion for Adoption of Proposed Decision and Order [Motion for Default Decision] and a Proposed Decision and Order Upon Admission of Facts by Reason of Default [Proposed Default Decision]. On March 13, 2014, the Hearing Clerk served Mr. Jones with the Administrator’s Motion for Default Decision, the Administrator’s Proposed Default Decision, and the Hearing Clerk’s service letter dated March 10, 2014.⁵ On March 27, 2014, Mr. Jones filed a letter in response to the Administrator’s Motion for Default Decision, which response states in its entirety, as follows:

03-14-2014

Janice K. Bullard
Administrative Law Judge

Re: Docket No. 13-0053

² United States Postal Service Product & Tracking Information for article number 7005 1160 0002 7836 2208.

³ Mem. to the File, dated December 18, 2012, signed by Carla M. Andrews for L. Eugene Whitfield, Hearing Clerk.

⁴ Office of Administrative Law Judges, Hearing Clerk’s Office, Document Distribution Form stating the Hearing Clerk sent the ALJ’s Order to Show Cause to Mr. Jones by regular mail, on March 10, 2014.

⁵ United States Postal Service Domestic Return Receipt for article number 7003 1010 0001 7367 4398.

Randall Jones
74 Agric. Dec. 133

Dear Hearing Clerk:

I have not received any info concerning this issue and have no knowledge of any deliveries to my address. Please forward any info concerning issue at hand and I will respond in a timely manner.

_____/s/
Randall Jones

Letter from Randall Jones to the Hearing Clerk, dated March 14, 2014.

On April 9, 2014, in accordance with 7 C.F.R. § 1.139, the ALJ filed a Decision Without Hearing by Entry of Default Against Respondent [Default Decision]: (1) concluding Mr. Jones violated the Horse Protection Act, as alleged in the Complaint; (2) assessing Mr. Jones a \$4,400 civil penalty; and (3) disqualifying Mr. Jones for four years from showing, exhibiting, or entering any horse and from judging, managing, or otherwise participating in any horse show, horse exhibition, horse sale, or horse auction.⁶

On May 29, 2015, Mr. Jones appealed the ALJ's Default Decision to the Judicial Officer. The Administrator failed to file a timely response to Mr. Jones' appeal petition, and on June 23, 2015, the Hearing Clerk transmitted the record to the Office of the Judicial Officer for consideration and decision. Based upon a careful consideration of the record, I adopt, with minor changes, the ALJ's Default Decision as the final agency decision.

DECISION

Statement of the Case

Mr. Jones failed to file an answer to the Complaint within the time prescribed in 7 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. §

⁶ ALJ's Default Decision at 4-5.

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

1.136(c)) provide the failure to file an answer within the time provided under 7 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) shall be deemed an admission of the allegations in the complaint. Further, pursuant to 7 C.F.R. § 1.139, the failure to file a timely answer constitutes a waiver of hearing. Accordingly, the material allegations of the Complaint that relate to Mr. Jones are adopted as findings of fact.⁷ I issue this Decision and Order pursuant to 7 C.F.R. § 1.139.

Findings of Fact

1. Mr. Jones is an individual whose mailing address is in the State of North Carolina.
2. On December 18, 2012, the Hearing Clerk served Mr. Jones at the address acknowledged by Mr. Jones to be his address with the Complaint alleging Mr. Jones violated the Horse Protection Act.⁸
3. Mr. Jones did not file an answer in response to the Complaint.
4. On March 7, 2014, the ALJ filed an Order to Show Cause why an order of default should not be entered in favor of the Administrator due to Mr. Jones's failure to file an answer.
5. On March 10, 2014, the Hearing Clerk served Mr. Jones at the address acknowledged by Mr. Jones to be his address with the ALJ's Order to Show Cause.⁹
6. Mr. Jones did not file a response to the ALJ's Order to Show Cause.
7. On March 10, 2014, the Administrator filed a Motion for Default Decision and a Proposed Default Decision.
8. On March 13, 2014, the Hearing Clerk served Mr. Jones at the address acknowledged by Mr. Jones to be his address with the Administrator's

⁷ The Complaint contains allegations related to Jeanette Baucom, as well as allegations that relate to Mr. Jones. The allegations that relate solely to Ms. Baucom are not relevant to this Decision and Order.

⁸ See *supra* note 3.

⁹ See *supra* note 4.

Randall Jones
74 Agric. Dec. 133

Motion for Default Decision and the Administrator's Proposed Default Decision.¹⁰

9. On March 27, 2014, Mr. Jones filed a letter in response to the Administrator's Motion for Default Decision. Mr. Jones's March 27, 2014 filing does not address the Administrator's Motion for Default Decision or the allegations in the Complaint.

10. At all times material to this proceeding, Mr. Jones was the owner of a horse known as "Jammin The Blues."

11. On May 29, 2010, Mr. Jones exhibited and allowed the exhibition of a horse known as "Jammin The Blues" as entry number 336, in class number 47, at the 40th Annual Spring Fun Show in Shelbyville, Tennessee, while the horse was sore by virtue of being scarred.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction in this matter.
2. By reason of the findings of fact, Mr. Jones has violated the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. § 1824(2)(A), (2)(D)).
3. The Order in this Decision and Order is authorized by the Horse Protection Act and justified under the circumstances described in this Decision and Order.

Mr. Jones's Appeal Petition

Mr. Jones raises two issues in his letter, dated May 19, 2015, which serves as his appeal petition. First, Mr. Jones contends he did not receive any notification of this proceeding until February 2014 and he diligently responded to all filings of which he was aware (Appeal Pet. ¶¶ 1-4).

The Rules of Practice provide for service of a complaint on a party other than the Secretary of Agriculture, as follows:

¹⁰ See *supra* note 5.

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

§ 1.147 Filing; service; extensions of time; and computation of time.

....
(c) *Service on party other than the Secretary.* (1) Any complaint or other document initially served on a person to make that person a party respondent in a proceeding . . . shall be deemed to be received by any party to a proceeding, other than the Secretary or agent thereof, on the date of delivery by certified or registered mail to the last known principal place of business of such party, last known principal place of business of the attorney or representative of record of such party, or last known residence of such party if an individual, *Provided that*, if any such document or paper is sent by certified or registered mail but is returned marked by the postal service as unclaimed or refused, it shall be deemed to be received by such party on the date of remailing by ordinary mail to the same address.

7 C.F.R. § 1.147(c)(1). The record establishes that, on October 25, 2012, the Hearing Clerk mailed the Complaint to Mr. Jones by certified mail.¹¹ The United States Postal Service returned the Complaint to the Hearing Clerk marked “unclaimed.”¹² On December 18, 2012, the Hearing Clerk remailed the Complaint to Mr. Jones by ordinary mail using the same address as the Hearing Clerk used when mailing the Complaint by certified mail.¹³ Therefore, I conclude that, on December 18, 2012, the Hearing Clerk served Mr. Jones with the Complaint in accordance with 7 C.F.R. § 1.147(c)(1).

To meet the requirement of due process of law, it is only necessary that notice of a proceeding be sent in a manner “reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.” *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314

¹¹ See *supra* note 3.

¹² See *supra* note 2.

¹³ See *supra* note 3.

Randall Jones
74 Agric. Dec. 133

(1950).¹⁴ As held in *Stateside Machinery Co., Ltd. v. Alperin*, 591 F.2d 234, 241-42 (3d Cir. 1979):

Whether a method of service of process accords an intended recipient with due process depends on “whether or not the form of . . . service [used] is *reasonably calculated* to give him actual notice of the proceedings and an opportunity to be heard.” *Milliken*, 311 U.S. at 463, 61 S. Ct. at 343 (emphasis added); *see Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 315, 70 S. Ct. 652, 94 L.Ed. 865 (1950). As long as a method of service is reasonably certain to notify a person, the fact that the person nevertheless fails to receive process does not invalidate the service on due process grounds. In this case, Alperin attempted to deliver process by registered mail to defendant’s last known address. That procedure is a highly reliable means of providing notice of pending legal proceedings to an adverse party. That Speigel nevertheless failed to receive service is irrelevant as a matter of constitutional law.

Similarly, in *Fancher v. Fancher*, 8 Ohio App. 3d 79, 455 N.E.2d 1344, 1346 (Ohio Ct. App. 1982), the court held:

¹⁴ *See also* *Trimble v. United States Dep’t of Agric.*, 87 F. App’x 456, 2003 WL 23095662 (6th Cir. 2003) (holding that sending a complaint to the respondent’s last known business address by certified mail is a constitutionally adequate method of notice and lack of actual receipt of the certified mailing does not negate the constitutional adequacy of the attempt to accomplish actual notice); *DePiero v. City of Macedonia*, 180 F.3d 770, 788-89 (6th Cir. 1999) (holding service of a summons at the plaintiff’s last known address is sufficient where the plaintiff is not incarcerated and where the city had no information about the plaintiff’s whereabouts that would give the city reason to suspect the plaintiff would not actually receive the notice mailed to his last known address), *cert. denied*, 528 U.S. 1105 (2000); *Weigner v. City of New York*, 852 F.2d 646, 649-51 (2d Cir. 1988) (stating the reasonableness and hence constitutional validity of any chosen method of providing notice may be defended on the ground that it is in itself reasonably certain to inform those affected; the state’s obligation to use notice “reasonably certain to inform those affected” does not mean that all risk of non-receipt must be eliminated), *cert. denied*, 488 U.S. 1005 (1989); *NLRB v. Clark*, 468 F.2d 459, 463-65 (5th Cir. 1972) (stating due process does not require receipt of actual notice in every case).

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

It is immaterial that the certified mail receipt was signed by the defendant's brother, and that his brother was not specifically authorized to do so. The envelope was addressed to the defendant's address and was there received; this is sufficient to comport with the requirements of due process that methods of service be reasonably calculated to reach interested parties. *See Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.* (1950), 339 U.S. 306, 314, 70 S. Ct. 652, 94 L.Ed. 865 (footnote omitted).

Even if I were to find that Mr. Jones did not receive actual notice of this proceeding until February 2014, as he asserts, I would conclude Mr. Jones was properly served with the Complaint on December 18, 2012. The Rules of Practice 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 paragraph (a) of this section 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

Randall Jones
74 Agric. Dec. 133

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.

§ 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 informs Mr. Jones of the consequences of failing to file a timely answer, as follows:

The respondents 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 2.

Mr. Jones's answer was due no later than twenty (20) days after the

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

Hearing Clerk served Mr. Jones with the Complaint,¹⁵ namely, January 7, 2013. Mr. Jones filed his first document in this proceeding on March 27, 2014, one (1) year, two (2) months, and twenty (20) days after Mr. Jones's answer was due. Moreover, Mr. Jones's March 27, 2014 filing does not respond to the allegations in the Complaint. Therefore, in accordance with the Rules of Practice, Mr. Jones is deemed, for purposes of this proceeding, to have admitted the allegations in the Complaint and waived opportunity for hearing.

Second, Mr. Jones asserts he has no legal training and may not clearly understand the procedures applicable to this proceeding (Appeal Pet. ¶ 5). On December 18, 2012, the Hearing Clerk served Mr. Jones with the Rules of Practice, which set forth the procedures applicable to this proceeding.¹⁶ Mr. Jones fails to identify any provision in the Rules of Practice which he does not understand. I find Mr. Jones's possible lack of understanding of the procedures applicable to this proceeding, and Mr. Jones's lack of legal training are not excuses for Mr. Jones's failure to file a timely answer or bases for setting aside the ALJ's Default Decision.¹⁷

For the foregoing reasons, the following Order is issued.

ORDER

¹⁵ 7 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

¹⁶ See *supra* note 3.

¹⁷ Arends, 70 Agric. Dec. 839, 857 (U.S.D.A. 2011) (stating pro se status is not relevant to whether a party filed a timely answer or whether a motion for default decision should be granted); Vigne, 68 Agric. Dec. 362, 364 (U.S.D.A. 2009) (Order Den. Pet. To Reconsider) (stating the Rules of Practice do not distinguish between persons who appear pro se and persons represented by counsel; Ms. Vigne's status as a pro se litigant is not a basis on which to set aside her waiver of the right to an oral hearing); Octagon Sequence of Eight, Inc., 66 Agric. Dec. 1283, 1286 (U.S.D.A. 2007) (Order Den. Pet. For Reh'g as to Lancelot Kollman Ramos) (holding the respondent's status as a pro se litigant is not a basis on which to grant his petition for rehearing or set aside the default decision); Knapp, 64 Agric. Dec. 253, 299 (U.S.D.A. 2005) (stating the respondent's decision to proceed pro se does not operate as an excuse for the respondent's failure to file a timely answer to the complaint); Noell, 58 Agric. Dec. 130, 146 (U.S.D.A. 1999) (stating lack of representation by counsel is not a basis for setting aside the default decision), *appeal dismissed sub nom.* The Chimp Farm, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Agric., No. 00-10608-A (11th Cir. July 20, 2000); Byard, 56 Agric. Dec. 1543, 1559 (U.S.D.A. 1997) (Decision as to Dean Byard) (stating the respondent's decision to proceed pro se does not operate as an excuse for the respondent's failure to file an answer).

Randall Jones
74 Agric. Dec. 133

1. Mr. Jones is assessed a \$4,400 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:

Buren W. Kidd
United States Department of Agriculture
Office of the General Counsel
Marketing, Regulatory, and Food Safety Division
1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Room 2343-South Building
Washington, DC 20250-1417

Mr. Jones's civil penalty payment shall be forwarded to, and received by, Mr. Kidd within sixty (60) days after service of this Order on Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones shall indicate on the certified check or money order that the payment is in reference to HPA Docket No. 13-0053.

2. Mr. Jones is disqualified for four (4) uninterrupted years from showing, exhibiting, or entering any horse, directly or indirectly through any agent, employee, corporation, partnership, or other device, and from judging, managing, or otherwise participating in any horse show, horse exhibition, horse sale, or horse auction. "Participating" means engaging in any activity beyond that of a spectator, and includes, without limitation: (1) transporting, or arranging for the transportation of, horses to or from equine events; (2) personally giving instructions to exhibitors; (3) being present in the warm-up or inspection areas or in any area where spectators are not allowed; and (4) financing the participation of others in equine events. The disqualification of Mr. Jones shall become effective on the 60th day after service of this Order on Mr. Jones.

RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW

Mr. Jones has the right to obtain judicial review of this Order in the court of appeals of the United States for the circuit in which he resides or has his place of business or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Mr. Jones must file a notice of appeal in such court within 30 days from the date of this Order and must simultaneously send a copy of any notice of appeal by certified mail to the

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

Secretary of Agriculture.¹⁸ The date of this Order is June 29, 2015.

¹⁸ 15 U.S.C. § 1825(b)(2), (c).

Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals
74 Agric. Dec. 145 – 161

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

Editor's Note: This volume continues the new format of reporting Administrative Law Judge orders involving non-precedent matters [Miscellaneous Orders] with the sparse case citation but without the body of the order. Miscellaneous Orders (if any) issued by the Judicial Officer will continue to be reported here in full context. The parties in the case will still be reported in Part IV (List of Decisions Reported – Alphabetical Index). Also, the full text of these cases will continue to be posted in a timely manner at: www.dm.usda.gov/oaljdecisions].

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

**In re: DEER FOREST EXOTIC ANIMAL SANCTUARY, LLC.
Docket No. D-14-0164.
Order of Dismissal.
Filed January 1, 2015.**

**In re: LEE MARVIN GREENLY, an individual; SANDY GREENLY, an individual; CRYSTAL GREENLY, an individual; and MINNESOTA WILDLIFE CONNECTION, INC., a Minnesota corporation.
Docket No. 11-0072.
Miscellaneous Order.
Filed February 10, 2015.**

AWA – Administrative procedure – Stay.

Colleen A. Carroll, Esq. for Complainant.
Larry Perry, Esq. for Respondents.
Initial Decision and Order by Peter M. Davenport, Chief Administrative Law Judge.
Order entered by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

ORDER LIFTING STAY ORDER AS TO LEE MARVIN GREENLY AND MINNESOTA WILDLIFE CONNECTION, INC.

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

I issued *Greenly*, 72 Agric. Dec. 603, No. 11-0072, 2013 WL 8213615 (U.S.D.A. 2013) (Decision as to Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc.): (1) ordering Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc., to cease and desist from violations of Animal Welfare Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. §§ 2131-2159) [the Animal Welfare Act] and the regulations and standards issued under the Animal Welfare Act (9 C.F.R. §§ 1.1-3.142) [Regulations]; (2) revoking Mr. Greenly's Animal Welfare Act license; and (3) assessing Mr. Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc., jointly and severally, a \$11,725 civil penalty.

On August 27, 2013, Mr. Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc. filed a "Motion for Stay of Order Pending Judicial Review" [Motion for Stay] seeking a stay of the Order in *Greenly*, 72 Agric. Dec. 603, No. 11-0072, 2013 WL 8213615 (U.S.D.A. 2013) (Decision as to Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc.), pending the outcome of proceedings for judicial review. On September 19, 2013, I granted Mr. Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc.'s Motion for Stay.¹

On November 24, 2014, the Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, United States Department of Agriculture, filed Complainant's Motion to Lift Stay Order stating proceedings for judicial review are concluded and requesting that I lift the September 19, 2013 Stay Order as to Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc. Neither Mr. Greenly nor Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc. filed a response to Complainant's Motion to Lift Stay Order.

As proceedings for judicial review have concluded, the September 19, 2013 Stay Order as to Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc. is lifted and the Order in *Greenly*, 72 Agric. Dec. 603, No. 11-0072, 2013 WL 8213615 (U.S.D.A. 2013) (Decision as to Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc.), is effective as follows.

ORDER

¹ *Greenly*, 72 Agric. Dec. 764, No. 11-0072, 2013 WL 8213623 (U.S.D.A. 2013) (Stay Order as to Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection).

Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals
74 Agric. Dec. 145 – 161

1. Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc., their agents and 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, in particular, shall cease and desist from:

a. failing to handle animals as carefully as possible in a manner that does not cause trauma or physical harm;

b. failing to handle animals, during public exhibition, so there is minimal risk of harm to the animals and to the public, with sufficient distance and/or barriers between the animals and the general viewing public so as to assure the safety of animals and the public;

c. failing to construct housing facilities so that the housing facilities are structurally sound;

d. failing to maintain housing facilities in good repair;

e. failing to enclose outdoor housing facilities for animals with adequate perimeter fences;

f. failing to store food in a manner that adequately protects the food from contamination;

g. failing to make, keep, and maintain adequate records of the acquisition and disposition of animals; and

h. failing to allow Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service officials to inspect their facilities, property, animals, and records, during normal business hours.

Paragraph one of this Order shall become effective upon service of this Order on Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc.

2. Mr. Greenly's Animal Welfare Act license (Animal Welfare Act license number 41-C-0122) is revoked. Paragraph two of this Order shall become effective 60 days after service of this Order on Lee Marvin

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

Greenly.

3. Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc. are assessed, jointly and severally, a \$11,725 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:

Colleen A. Carroll
United States Department of Agriculture
Office of the General Counsel
Marketing, Regulatory, and Food Safety Division
1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Room 2343-South Building
Washington, DC 20250-1417

Payment of the civil penalty shall be sent to, and received by, Ms. Carroll within 60 days after service of this Order on Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc. Lee Marvin Greenly and Minnesota Wildlife Connection, Inc., shall state on the certified check or money order that payment is in reference to AWA Docket No. 11-0072.

In re: LEE MARVIN GREENLY.
Docket No. 11-0073.
Decision and Order.
Filed February 10, 2015.

AWA – Administrative procedure – Stay.

Colleen A. Carroll, Esq. for Complainant.
Larry Perry, Esq. for Respondent.
Initial Decision and Order by Peter M. Davenport, Chief Administrative Law Judge.
Order entered by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

ORDER LIFTING STAY ORDER

I issued *Greenly*, 72 Agric. Dec. 586, No. 11-0073, 2013 WL 8213613 (U.S.D.A. 2013), terminating Animal Welfare Act license number 41-C-0122 and disqualifying Lee Marvin Greenly for two years from

Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals
74 Agric. Dec. 145 – 161

becoming licensed under the Animal Welfare Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. §§ 2131-2159) [Animal Welfare Act].

On August 27, 2013, Mr. Greenly filed “Motion for Stay of Order Pending Judicial Review” [Motion for Stay] seeking a stay of the Order in *Greenly*, 72 Agric. Dec. 586, 2013 WL 8213613 (U.S.D.A. 2013), pending the outcome of proceedings for judicial review. On September 17, 2013, I granted Mr. Greenly’s Motion for Stay.¹

On November 24, 2014, the Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, United States Department of Agriculture, filed Complainant’s Motion to Lift Stay Order stating proceedings for judicial review are concluded and requesting that I lift the September 17, 2013 Stay Order. Mr. Greenly has not filed a response to Complainant’s Motion to Lift Stay Order.

As proceedings for judicial review have concluded, the September 17, 2013 Stay Order is lifted and the Order in *Greenly*, 72 Agric. Dec. 586, 2013 WL 8213613 (U.S.D.A. 2013), is effective, as follows.

ORDER

1. Animal Welfare Act license number 41-C-0122 is terminated.
2. Mr. Greenly, his agents and assigns, and any business entity for which Mr. Greenly is an officer, agent, or representative or otherwise holds a substantial business interest, are disqualified for two years from becoming licensed under the Animal Welfare Act or otherwise obtaining, holding, or using an Animal Welfare Act license, directly or indirectly through any corporate or other device or person.

This Order shall become effective on the 60th day after service of this Order on Mr. Greenly.

—

¹ *Greenly*, 72 Agric. Dec. 763, No. 11-0073, 2013 WL 8213622 (U.S.D.A. 2013) (Stay Order).

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

**In re: PAUL ROSBERG AND KELLY ROSBERG, d/b/a
NEBRASKA'S FINEST MEATS.**

Docket Nos. 12-0182; 12-0183.

Miscellaneous Order.

Filed January 2, 2015.

FMIA – Administrative procedure – Extension of time.

Lisa Jabaily, Esq. for Complainant.

Respondents, pro se.

Initial Decision and Order by Janice K. Bullard, Administrative Law Judge.

Ruling by William G. Jensen, Judicial Officer.

**RULING DENYING RESPONDENTS' MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME**

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 2, 2014, Paul Rosberg and Kelly Rosberg [Respondents] filed a motion to extend the time for filing a response to *Rosberg*, 73 Agric. Dec. 562 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Order Den. Late Appeal). On December 5, 2014, Alfred V. Almanza, Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, United States Department of Agriculture [Administrator], filed Opposition to Respondents' Motion for Extension of Time. On December 31, 2014, Respondents filed a response to the Administrator's Opposition to Respondents' Motion for Extension of Time, and the Hearing Clerk transmitted the record to the Office of the Judicial Officer for a ruling on Respondents' December 2, 2014 Motion for an Extension of Time.

DISCUSSION

The rules of practice applicable to this proceeding¹ provide that a party to a proceeding may file a petition to reconsider the decision of the Judicial Officer within 10 days after the date of service of the decision upon the

¹ The rules of practice applicable to this proceeding are the Rules of Practice Governing Formal Adjudicatory Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary Under Various Statutes (7 C.F.R. §§ 1.130-.151) [Rules of Practice].

Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals
74 Agric. Dec. 145 – 161

party filing the petition, as follows:

§ 1.146 Petitions for reopening hearing; for rehearing or reargument of proceeding; or for reconsideration of the decision of the Judicial Officer.

(a) *Petition requisite. . . .*

. . . .

(3) *Petition to rehear or reargue proceeding, or to reconsider the decision of the Judicial Officer.* A petition to rehear or reargue the proceeding or to reconsider the decision of the Judicial Officer shall be filed within 10 days after the date of service of such decision upon the party filing the petition. Every petition must state specifically the matters claimed to have been erroneously decided and alleged errors must be briefly stated.

7 C.F.R. § 1.146(a)(3).

I find Respondents' December 2, 2014, motion to extend the time for filing a response to *Rosberg*, 73 Agric. Dec. 562 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Order Den. Late Appeal), constitutes a motion to extend the time for filing Respondents' petition for reconsideration of *Rosberg*, 73 Agric. Dec. 562 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Order Den. Late Appeal).

The Hearing Clerk served Respondents with *Rosberg*, 73 Agric. Dec. 562 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Order Den. Late Appeal), on November 12, 2014,² and Respondents were required to file a petition for reconsideration of the November 7, 2014, Order Denying Late Appeal no later than November 24, 2014.³ As Respondents filed the request to extend the time

² Office of Administrative Law Judges, Hearing Clerk's Office, Document Distribution Form, relating to the November 12, 2014, distribution of the Judicial Officer's Order Denying Late Appeal filed in FMIA Docket Nos. 12-0182 and 12-0183.

³ Ten days after the date the Hearing Clerk served Respondents with the November 7, 2014, Order Denying Late Appeal was Saturday, November 22, 2014. The Rules of Practice provide, when the time for filing a document or paper expires on a Saturday, the

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

for filing a petition for reconsideration after Respondents' petition for reconsideration was required to be filed, Respondents' request for an extension of time to file a petition for reconsideration of *Rosberg*, 73 Agric. Dec. 562 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Order Den. Late Appeal), is denied.

For the foregoing reasons, the following Ruling is issued.

RULING

Respondents' December 2, 2014, motion for an extension of time to file a petition for reconsideration of *Rosberg*, 73 Agric. Dec. 562 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Order Den. Late Appeal), is denied.

**In re: PAUL ROSBERG AND KELLY ROSBERG, d/b/a
NEBRASKA'S FINEST MEATS.
Docket Nos. 12-0182; 12-0183.
Miscellaneous Order.
Filed February 3, 2015.**

FMIA – Administrative procedure.

Lisa Jabaily, Esq. for Complainant.
Respondents, pro se.
Initial Decision and Order by Janice K. Bullard, Administrative Law Judge.
Ruling by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

**RULING DENYING RESPONDENTS' MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE AN APPEAL PETITION**

time for filing shall be extended to the next business day, as follows:

§ 1.147 Filing; service; extensions of time; and computation of time.

.....
(h) *Computation of time.* Saturdays, Sundays and Federal holidays shall be included in computing the time allowed for the filing of any document or paper: *Provided*, That, when such time expires on a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday, such period shall be extended to include the next following business day.

7 C.F.R. § 1.147(h). The next business day after Saturday, November 22, 2014 was Monday, November 24, 2014.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 29, 2015, Paul Rosberg and Kelly Rosberg [Respondents] filed a motion to extend the time for filing a second appeal of Administrative Law Judge Janice K. Bullard's¹ July 29, 2014 Decision and Order Dismissing Case as Moot [Decision].² Respondents contend the time for filing a second appeal petition should be extended for "excusable neglect," as authorized by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 45(b)(1)(B).

The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure are applicable to criminal proceedings in the United States district courts, the United States courts of appeals, and the Supreme Court of the United States.³ The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure are not applicable to this disciplinary administrative proceeding.⁴ Instead, the rules of practice applicable to this proceeding are the Rules of Practice Governing Formal Adjudicatory Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary of Agriculture Under Various Statutes (7 C.F.R. §§ 1.130-.151) [Rules of Practice].

The Rules of Practice provide that an administrative law judge's written decision must be appealed to the Judicial Officer by filing an appeal petition with the Hearing Clerk within 30 days after service,⁵ and, unlike the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Rules of Practice contain no provision for an extension of time after time expires based upon excusable neglect.

¹ Effective January 4, 2015, Administrative Law Judge Janice K. Bullard [Chief ALJ] was appointed Acting Chief Administrative Law Judge.

² Respondents previously appealed the Chief ALJ's Decision. I denied Respondents' September 23, 2014 appeal petition because Respondents filed their appeal petition after the time for filing an appeal petition had expired. Rosberg, 73 Agric. Dec. 562 (U.S.D.A. 2014) (Order Den. Late Appeal).

³ FED. R. CRIM. P. 1(a)(1).

⁴ *Morrow v. Dep't of Agric.*, 65 F.3d 168 (Table) (per curiam), 1995 WL 523336 (6th Cir. 1995), *printed in* 54 Agric. Dec. 870 (U.S.D.A. 1995) (stating the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure do not apply to administrative hearings); *Mister Discount Stockbrokers, Inc. v. SEC*, 768 F.2d 875, 878 (7th Cir. 1985) (same).

⁵ 7 C.F.R. § 1.145(a).

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

The Hearing Clerk served Respondents with the Chief ALJ's Decision on August 18, 2014;⁶ therefore, Respondents were required to file their appeal petition with the Hearing Clerk no later than September 17, 2014. As Respondents filed their January 29, 2015, request to extend the time for filing a second appeal petition after Respondents' time for filing an appeal petition had expired, Respondents' request for an extension of time to file a second appeal of the Chief ALJ's July 29, 2014, Decision, must be denied.

For the foregoing reasons, the following Ruling is issued.

RULING

Respondents' January 29, 2015 motion for an extension of time to appeal the Chief ALJ's July 29, 2014 Decision, is denied.

**In re: PAUL ROSBERG & NEBRASKA'S FINEST MEATS, LLC.
Docket Nos. 14-0094; 14-0095.
Miscellaneous Order.
Filed February 3, 2015.**

FMIA – Extension of time – Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure – Rules of Practice.

Lisa Jabaily, Esq. for Complainant.
Respondents, pro se.
Initial Decision and Order by Janice K. Bullard, Administrative Law Judge.
Ruling by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

RULING DENYING RESPONDENTS' MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE AN APPEAL PETITION

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 29, 2015, Paul Rosberg and Nebraska's Finest Meats, L.L.C. [Respondents] filed a motion to extend the time for filing a second

⁶ United States Postal Service Domestic Return Receipt for article number 7012 3460 0003 3833 4177.

Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals
74 Agric. Dec. 145 – 161

appeal of Administrative Law Judge Janice K. Bullard's¹ June 19, 2014 Decision and Order on the Record [Decision].² Respondents contend the time for filing a second appeal petition should be extended for "excusable neglect," as authorized by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 45(b)(1)(B).

The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure are applicable to criminal proceedings in the United States district courts, the United States courts of appeals, and the Supreme Court of the United States.³ The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure are not applicable to this disciplinary administrative proceeding.⁴ Instead, the rules of practice applicable to this proceeding are the Rules of Practice Governing Formal Adjudicatory Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary of Agriculture Under Various Statutes (7 C.F.R. §§ 1.130-.151) [Rules of Practice].

The Rules of Practice provide that an administrative law judge's written decision must be appealed to the Judicial Officer by filing an appeal petition with the Hearing Clerk within 30 days after service,⁵ and, unlike the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Rules of Practice contain no provision for an extension of time after time expires based upon excusable neglect.

The Hearing Clerk served Respondents with the Chief ALJ's Decision on June 23, 2014;⁶ therefore, Respondents were required to file their appeal petition with the Hearing Clerk no later than July 23, 2014. As Respondents filed their January 29, 2015 request to extend the time for

¹ Effective January 4, 2015, Administrative Law Judge Janice K. Bullard [Chief ALJ] was appointed Acting Chief Administrative Law Judge.

² Respondents previously appealed the Chief ALJ's Decision. I denied Respondents' July 29, 2014 appeal petition because Respondents filed their appeal petition after the time for filing an appeal petition had expired. *Rosberg*, 73 Agric. Dec. 551, 2014 WL 7405834 (U.S.D.A.b2014) (Order Den. Late Appeal).

³ FED. R. CRIM. P. 1(a)(1).

⁴ *Morrow v. Department of Agric.*, 65 F.3d 168 (Table) (per curiam), 1995 WL 523336 (6th Cir. 1995), *printed in* 54 Agric. Dec. 870 (U.S.D.A. 1995) (stating the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure do not apply to administrative hearings); *Mister Discount Stockbrokers, Inc. v. SEC*, 768 F.2d 875, 878 (7th Cir. 1985) (same).

⁵ 7 C.F.R. § 1.145(a).

⁶ United States Postal Service Product & Tracking Information for article number 7003 1010 0001 7367 4916.

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

filing a second appeal petition after Respondents' time for filing an appeal petition had expired, Respondents' request for an extension of time to file a second appeal of the Chief ALJ's June 19, 2014 Decision, must be denied.

For the foregoing reasons, the following Ruling is issued.

RULING

Respondents' January 29, 2015 motion for an extension of time to appeal the Chief ALJ's June 19, 2014 Decision, is denied.

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

**In re: JUSTIN JENNE.
Docket No. 13-0308.
Miscellaneous Order.
Filed April 10, 2015.**

HPA – Administrative procedure – Petition to reopen hearing.

Thomas Bolick, Esq. for Complainant.
Respondent, pro se.
Initial Decision and Order by Janice K. Bullard, Administrative Law Judge.
Order entered by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

ORDER DENYING PETITION TO REOPEN HEARING

On March 11, 2014, Administrative Law Judge Janice K. Bullard [ALJ] conducted a hearing in this proceeding.¹ Thomas Neil Bolick, Office of the General Counsel, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, represented the Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, United States Department of Agriculture [Administrator]. Justin Jenne appeared pro se.² On July 29, 2014, the ALJ issued a Decision and Order.

¹ References to the transcript of the March 11, 2014 hearing are designated as "Tr." and the page number.

² Prior to the March 11, 2014, hearing, Dudley W. Taylor, Taylor & Knight, Knoxville, Tennessee, represented Mr. Jenne, but, in a March 6, 2014 conference call with the ALJ and Mr. Bolick, Mr. Taylor withdrew his representation of Mr. Jenne.

Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals
74 Agric. Dec. 145 – 161

On September 8, 2014, Mr. Jenne filed an Appeal to Judicial Officer [Appeal Petition] and concurrently filed a Petition to Re-open Hearing for Submission of Additional Evidence [Petition to Reopen Hearing] requesting that the ALJ consider additional evidence that Mr. Jenne failed to adduce at the March 11, 2014 hearing. On October 30, 2014, the Administrator filed a response opposing Mr. Jenne's Petition to Reopen Hearing.³ On November 7, 2014, the Hearing Clerk transmitted the record to the Office of the Judicial Officer for a ruling on Mr. Jenne's Petition to Reopen Hearing.

The Rules of Practice Governing Formal Adjudicatory Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary of Agriculture Under Various Statutes (7 C.F.R. §§ 1.130-.151) [Rules of Practice], which are applicable to this proceeding, apportion jurisdiction to rule on a petition to reopen a hearing and set forth the requirements for a petition to reopen a hearing, as follows:

§ 1.146 Petitions for reopening hearing; for rehearing or reargument of proceeding; or for reconsideration of the decision of the Judicial Officer.

(a) *Petition requisite*—

(1) *Filing; service; ruling.* . . . Any such petition filed prior to the filing or an appeal of the Judge's decision pursuant to § 1.145 shall be ruled upon by the Judge, and any such petition filed thereafter shall be ruled upon by the Judicial Officer.

(2) *Petition to reopen hearing.* A petition to reopen a hearing to take further evidence may be filed at any time prior to the issuance of the decision of the Judicial Officer. Every such petition shall state briefly the nature and purpose of the evidence to be adduced, shall show that

³ Complainant's Resp. to Resp't's Appeal to Judicial Officer & Pet. to Re-Open Hr'g for Submission of Additional Evid.

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

such evidence is not merely cumulative, and shall set forth a good reason why such evidence was not adduced at the hearing.

7 C.F.R. § 1.146(a)(1)-(2).

Mr. Jenne concurrently filed the Appeal Petition and the Petition to Reopen Hearing; therefore, pursuant to 7 C.F.R. § 1.146(a)(1), jurisdiction to rule on Mr. Jenne's Petition to Reopen Hearing lies with the Judicial Officer.

Mr. Jenne attached to the Petition to Reopen Hearing the evidence he seeks to introduce and describes the purpose of the evidence to be introduced. Specifically, Mr. Jenne seeks to reopen the hearing to introduce: (1) Affidavit of Richard Wilhelm, dated September 5, 2014, in which Dr. Wilhelm describes the results of his August 27, 2012 examination of a horse known as "Led Zeppelin," the horse which is the subject of this proceeding; and (2) Affidavit of Justin R. Jenne, dated September 5, 2014, and supporting attachments, in which Mr. Jenne asserts, prior to the institution of this proceeding and *Jenne*, No. 13-0080, he had never been accused by the United States Department of Agriculture of violating the Horse Protection Act and he is unable to pay a civil penalty. Mr. Jenne offers the following as the reasons for his failure to adduce the evidence in question at the March 11, 2014, hearing:

2. Judge Bullard noted in her Decision that she held the record open for receipt of report of examination by Respondent's veterinarian, but that report was not submitted. The Respondent, who was not represented by counsel, was not aware of that fact until it was recently pointed out to Respondent by an attorney.

Pet. to Reopen Hr'g ¶ 2 at 1.

Evidence of the results of Dr. Wilhelm's August 27, 2012 examination of Led Zeppelin; evidence that Mr. Jenne had not been accused by the United States Department of Agriculture of violating the Horse Protection Act prior to the institution of this proceeding and *Jenne*, No. 13-0080; and evidence of Mr. Jenne's inability to pay a civil penalty could have been

Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals
74 Agric. Dec. 145 – 161

adduced at the March 11, 2014, hearing. Moreover, the ALJ held the record open until May 16, 2014, for receipt of Dr. Wilhelm's report of his August 27, 2012 examination of Led Zeppelin (Tr. at 186-87), and Dr. Wilhelm's report could have been adduced prior to May 16, 2014.

The Rules of Practice do not distinguish between persons who appear pro se and persons who are represented by counsel,⁴ and Mr. Jenne's status as a pro se litigant is not a good reason for his failure to adduce available evidence at the March 11, 2014, hearing.⁵ Moreover, Mr. Jenne was present when the ALJ explicitly stated the record would remain open until May 16, 2014, for receipt of Dr. Wilhelm's report regarding his August 27, 2012, examination of Led Zeppelin (Tr. at 186-87), and the record reveals no basis for Mr. Jenne's lack of awareness that the ALJ held the record open for receipt of Dr. Wilhelm's report.

Under these circumstances, I decline to reopen the hearing in this proceeding to receive in evidence the September 5, 2014 Affidavit of Richard Wilhelm or the September 5, 2014 Affidavit of Justin R. Jenne.

For the foregoing reasons, the following Order is issued.

ORDER

Mr. Jenne's Petition to Reopen Hearing, filed September 8, 2014, is

⁴ Vigne, 68 Agric. Dec. 362, 364 (U.S.D.A. 2009) (Order Den. Pet. to Reconsider); Octagon Sequence of Eight, Inc., 66 Agric. Dec. 1283, 1286 (U.S.D.A. 2007) (Order Den. Pet. for Reh'g as to Lancelot Kollman Ramos); Knapp, 64 Agric. Dec. 253, 299 (U.S.D.A. 2005); Meyers, 58 Agric. Dec. 861, 865 (U.S.D.A. 1999) (Order Den. Pet. for Recons.).

⁵ Cf. Vigne, 68 Agric. Dec. 362, 364 (U.S.D.A. 2009) (Order Den. Pet. to Reconsider) (holding the respondent's status as a pro se litigant is not a basis on which to set aside the respondent's waiver of the right to an oral hearing); Octagon Sequence of Eight, Inc., 66 Agric. Dec. 1283, 1286 (U.S.D.A. 2007) (Order Den. Pet. for Reh'g as to Lancelot Kollman Ramos) (holding the respondent's status as a pro se litigant is not a basis on which to grant the respondent's petition for rehearing or set aside the default decision); Noell, 58 Agric. Dec. 130, 146 (U.S.D.A. 1999) (stating lack of representation by counsel is not a basis for setting aside the default decision), *appeal dismissed sub nom.* The Chimp Farm, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Agric., No. 00-10608-A (11th Cir. July 20, 2000); Byard, 56 Agric. Dec. 1543, 1559 (U.S.D.A. 1997) (Decision as to Byard) (stating the respondent's decision to proceed pro se does not operate as an excuse for the respondent's failure to file an answer).

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

denied.

**In re: SHOW, INC.
Docket No. 14-0056.
Order of Dismissal.
Filed April 14, 2015.**

**In re: RANDALL JONES.
Docket No. 13-0053.
Miscellaneous Order.
Filed April 15, 2015.**

HPA – Administrative procedure – Extension of time.

Buren W. Kidd, Esq. for Complainant.
Respondent, pro se.
Initial Decision and Order by Janice K. Bullard, Administrative Law Judge.
Ruling by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

**ORDER EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING MR. JONES'S
APPEAL PETITION**

On April 9, 2014, Administrative Law Judge Janice K. Bullard [ALJ] issued a Decision Without Hearing by Entry of Default Against Respondent [Default Decision]. The Hearing Clerk served Randall Jones with the ALJ's Default Decision on April 29, 2014,¹ and on May 19, 2014, Mr. Jones filed a letter indicating some confusion regarding the time within which he was required to appeal the ALJ's Default Decision to the Judicial Officer.²

In order to clarify the time within which Mr. Jones must file an appeal petition, I treat Mr. Jones's May 19, 2014, filing as a request for an extension of time to appeal the ALJ's Default Decision to the Judicial Officer. On April 15, 2015, Buren W. Kidd, counsel for Complainant, informed me by telephone that Complainant has no objection to my extending the time within which Mr. Jones may file an appeal petition; therefore, I extend the time for filing Mr. Jones's appeal petition to, and

¹ Mem. to the File, dated April 29, 2014, issued by Shawn C. Williams, Hearing Clerk.

² Specifically, Mr. Jones states in his May 19, 2014, filing: "Is a [sic] appeal necessary at this time?"

Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals
74 Agric. Dec. 145 – 161

including, May 29, 2015.³

ORGANIC FOODS PRODUCTION ACT

**In re: BOB THOMAS, d/b/a MAGNUM LAND HOLDING.
Docket No. 14-0158.
Order of Dismissal.
Filed April 24, 2015.**

**In re: PAUL A. ROSBERG, d/b/a ROSBERG FARM.
Docket No. 12-0216.
Miscellaneous Order.
Filed June 9, 2015.**

**SOYBEAN PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND CONSUMER
INFORMATION ACT**

**In re: J.W. WILLIAMSON GINNERY, INC.
Docket No. 15-0010.
Miscellaneous Order.
Filed March 16, 2015.**

**In re: JOHNNY WILLIAMSON, a/k/a JOHN W. WILLIAMSON III.
Docket No. 15-0012.
Miscellaneous Order.
Filed March 16, 2015.**

³ The Hearing Clerk's Office receives documents from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Eastern Time. To ensure timely filing, Mr. Jones must ensure his appeal petition is received by the Hearing Clerk no later than 4:30 p.m., Eastern Time, May 29, 2015.

DEFAULT DECISIONS

DEFAULT DECISIONS

Editor's Note: This volume continues the new format of reporting Administrative Law Judge orders involving non-precedent matters [Default Decisions and Orders] with the sparse case citation but without the body of the order. Default Decisions and Orders (if any) issued by the Judicial Officer will continue to be reported here in full context. The parties in the case will still be reported in Part IV (List of Decisions Reported – Alphabetical Index). Also, the full text of these cases will continue to be posted in a timely manner at: www.dm.usda.gov/oaljdecisions].

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

CASEY LUDWIG.
Docket No. 14-0132.
Default Decision and Order.
Filed January 23, 2015.

ORGANIC FOODS PRODUCTION ACT

EMMANUEL H. COBLENTZ.
Docket No. 15-0049.
Default Decision and Order.
Filed March 16, 2015.

PLANT PROTECTION ACT

JULIO ALVAREZ III.
Docket No. 15-0662.
Default Decision and Order.
Filed May 13, 2015.

Consent Decisions
74 Agric. Dec. 163 – 165

CONSENT DECISIONS

ANIMAL HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

T. Kenneth Emery, LLC.

Docket No. 14-0148

Filed May 21, 2015.

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

Deer Forest Amusements, Inc.

Docket No. 14-0135

Filed June 22, 2015.

Anthony L. Schachtele

Docket No. 15-0090

Filed May 13, 2015.

Rebecca Jo Schachtele

Docket No. 15-0091.

Filed May 13, 2015.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Keith Wendell Hooks.

Docket No. 15-0025.

Filed June 30, 2015.

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

Lemay and Sons Beef Co.

Docket No. 15-0066.

Filed February 6, 2015.

Richard Lemay.

Docket No. 15-0067.

Filed February 6, 2015.

CONSENT DECISIONS

Tri-Town Packing Corp.

Docket No. 14-0180.

Filed May 19, 2015.

DeHaven's Butchering and Country Market & Carl DeHaven.

Docket No. 15-0076.

Filed February 20, 2015.

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

Alvin Strickland.

Docket No. 13-0232.

Filed March 12, 2015.

Toni Strickland.

Docket No. 13-0233.

Filed March 12, 2015.

Kevin Gower.

Docket No. 15-0040.

Filed March 31, 2015.

Megan M. Baker.

Docket No. 13-0265.

Filed April 6, 2015.

Dennis Smith.

Docket No. 13-0364.

Filed April 29, 2015.

Dustin Smith.

Docket No. 15-0038.

Filed April 29, 2015.

David C. Polk, d/b/a David Polk Stables.

Docket No. 14-0121.

Filed May 5, 2015.

Consent Decisions
74 Agric. Dec. 163 – 165

Andrew Simpson.
Docket No. 14-0110.
Filed May 8, 2015.

POULTRY PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT

Tri-Town Packing Corp.
Docket No. 14-0180.
Filed May 19, 2015.

**SOYBEAN PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND CONSUMER
INFORMATION ACT**

Alton Phillips.
Docket No. 15-0011.
Filed February 13, 2015.

Carolina Soya, LLC.
Docket No. 15-0007.
Filed February 13, 2015.

Lynchburg Grain Company.
Docket No. 15-0008.
Filed February 13, 2015.

Carolina Eastern, Inc.
Docket No. 15-0009.
Filed February 13, 2015.

AGRICULTURE DECISIONS

Volume 74

Book One

Part Two (P & S)

Pages 166 – 179



THIS IS A COMPILATION OF DECISIONS ISSUED BY THE
SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND THE COURTS
PERTAINING TO STATUTES ADMINISTERED BY THE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

LIST OF DECISIONS REPORTED

JANUARY – JUNE 2015

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

EASTERN LIVESTOCK COMPANY, LLC & THOMAS P. GIBSON.
No. 11-0062.
Decision and Order on the Record 166

--

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

No miscellaneous orders or dismissals reported.

--

DEFAULT DECISIONS

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

AL HARRISON COMPANY DISTRIBUTORS.
Docket No. D-14-0050.
Default Decision and Order 178

--

CONSENT DECISIONS

Consent Decisions 179

Eastern Livestock Company & Thomas P. Gibson
74 Agric. Dec. 166

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

In re: EASTERN LIVESTOCK COMPANY, LLC & THOMAS P. GIBSON.

Docket No. 11-0062.

Decision and Order.

Filed February 20, 2015.

P&S-D.

Charles Kendall, Esq. for Complainant.

Thomas P. Gibson, pro se for Respondents.

Decision and Order by Janice K. Bullard, Acting Chief Administrative Law Judge.

DECISION AND ORDER ON THE RECORD

I. Introduction

This matter is before me pursuant to a complaint filed by Complainant United States Department of Agriculture (“USDA”; “Complainant”) against Eastern Livestock Company, LLC, and Thomas P. Gibson (“Respondents”) alleging violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, 7 U.S.C. § 181 *et seq.* (“the Act”). The Complaint alleges that Respondent failed to comply with the Act and its implementing regulations, administered by the Packers and Stockyards Program, Grain Inspection Service, Packers and Stockyards Administration (“GIPSA”).

II. Issues

1. Whether a hearing is necessary in this matter;
2. Whether Respondents failed to timely pay sellers for the purchase of livestock in willful violation of the Act; and
3. If Respondents willfully violated the Act, whether the sanctions recommended by Complainant should be imposed.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

III. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Procedural History

On November 19, 2010, Complainant filed a complaint against Respondents with the Hearing Clerk for the Office of Administrative Law Judges (“OALJ”; “Hearing Clerk”). On December 7, 2010, Respondents filed an answer. References to the Answer in this Decision and Order shall be denoted as “RX-1.” On April 6, 2011, I held a telephone conference with representatives for the parties and was advised that the corporate entity Eastern Livestock Company, LLC (“Eastern”) had filed proceedings in bankruptcy. In addition, I was informed that the Department of Justice was investigating the actions of the Respondents in this matter. Pursuant to a motion filed by Complainant, I placed this matter in abeyance by Order issued July 28, 2011.

On November 1, 2011, Complainant filed a status report, advising that Respondents and others had been indicted and asking that the stay of action in the instant administrative matter be extended. I granted the request. Thereafter, counsel for Complainant regularly filed notices of the status of indictment and bankruptcy proceedings. In a status report filed in September 2013, counsel for Complainant informed me that Respondent Thomas Gibson was expected to begin a prison term related to the investigation and indictment by the Department of Justice.

On November 7, 2014, I directed Complainant’s counsel to file all of the evidence that USDA expected to rely upon in this matter in advance of issuing a Decision and Order on the Record. Eastern and Complainant entered into a Consent Decision and Order, which I signed on December 17, 2015. No settlement was reached between Complainant and Respondent Gibson, and, pursuant to my Order, Complainant’s counsel filed a motion for a Decision and Order on the Record, accompanied by supporting evidence.

On February 10, 2015, Respondent Gibson filed a “Notice of Appeal and Request for Reconsideration.” I infer that Respondent misconstrued Complainant’s pleadings as the issuance of an Order, and I deem his filing to be a response to Complainant’s motion. As the response contains some

Eastern Livestock Company & Thomas P. Gibson
74 Agric. Dec. 166

evidentiary allegations, I have marked it as “RX-2” and hereby admit it to the record both as a pleading and evidence. Complainant’s exhibits identified as “CX-1” through “CX-42” are also admitted to the record, together with all of Complainant’s pleadings and supporting documentation.

The matter is ripe for adjudication, and the record is closed.

Statutory and Regulatory Authority for On the Record Decisions

7 C.F.R. § 1.139 provides, in pertinent part:

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’s objections thereto. If the Judge finds that meritorious objections are not filed, the Judge shall issue a decision without further procedure or hearing. . .

7 C.F.R. § 1.139.

In addition, the Judicial Officer for the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has recognized that entry of summary judgment is appropriate in cases where there is no material factual dispute. *See Knaust*, 73 Ag. Dec. 92, 98 (U.S.D.A. 2014).

Respondents’ Answer admits many of the allegations, including those that establish jurisdiction for the complaint. The Answer does not specifically address the allegations set forth in the complaint but merely denies the allegations and raises general defenses. *See RX-1*. Respondents’ response to Complainant’s motion repeats much of what was stated in the Answer and makes an argument against Complainant’s proposed sanction. *See RX-2*. Respondents have not raised any issues of material fact in dispute. Accordingly, I find that a Decision on the Record

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

may be entered in this case.

Statutory and Regulatory Authority Related to Allegations

Livestock buyers are required to make prompt payment for livestock purchases that are governed by the act. 7 U.S.C. § 228(b). Specifically, livestock buyers must make full payment to the seller's account by the close of the next business day following the purchase and transfer of possession of livestock by paying by check to the seller or authorized representative at the point where the livestock is transferred or by paying through a wire transfer. *Id.* The deadline for making payment in full by the next business day can only be circumvented by express written agreement between the buyer and the seller. *Id.* Failing to pay for livestock purchases when due, as established by the Act, is considered an unfair and deceptive practice that violates 7 U.S.C. § 192(a).

Livestock dealers, market agencies, and packers operating subject to the Act are required to obtain reasonable bonds to secure their obligations to livestock sellers. 7 U.S.C. § 704. The Secretary has issued regulations requiring parties subject to the bond requirements to file bonds or bond equivalents with the Packers and Stockyards Program, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration ("GIPSA"), in an amount set forth by 9 C.F.R. § 201.29. The Act allows for the assessment of civil money penalties in an amount of up to \$11,000 per violation for violations of the Act. 7 U.S.C. § 213(b).

The Act allows for the assessment of civil money penalties in an amount of up to \$11,000.00 per violation for violations of the Act. 7 U.S.C. § 193(b). The imposition of sanctions in each case should be considered with the purpose of effectuating the remedial purposes of the Act. *See S.S. Farms Linn County*, 1991 WL 290584 (Feb. 8, 1991); 50 Agric. Dec. 476 (U.S.D.A. 1991). One of the primary purposes of the Act is to assure fair trade practices and safeguard farms and ranchers from being paid less than the fair market value of their livestock. *Bruhn's Freezer Meats v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.*, 438 F.2d 1332, 1337 (8th Cir. 1971).

Discussion

1. *Jurisdiction*

Eastern Livestock Company & Thomas P. Gibson
74 Agric. Dec. 166

Respondents were registered with USDA as livestock dealers. In their Answer, signed by Respondent Gibson, Respondents admit the allegations contained in Paragraph I(a), I(b), and 1(c) of the Complaint. Those allegations state:

- (a) Eastern Livestock Company LLC (hereinafter “Respondent LLC”) is a limited liability company with an operational and mailing address of 135 West Market Street, New Albany, Indiana 47150.
- (b) Respondent LLC, at all times material herein, was:
 - (i) The 65% owner of Respondent LLC;
 - (ii) The President of Respondent LLC; and
 - (iii) Responsible for the day-to-day direction, management, and control of Respondent LLC.

In his filing of February 10, 2015, Respondent Gibson again adopted the facts set forth at ¶ (c)(1)-(3), *supra*. Complainant’s exhibits CX-01 through CX-11 also demonstrate that Respondent is subject to the Act and prevailing regulations and establishes jurisdiction.

2. Respondents Failed to Make Timely Payments Under the Act

The record is undisputed that Respondents failed to make timely payments within the mandates of the Act. Respondent Gibson admits as much in his pleading dated February 10, 2015. RX-2. Respondent Gibson held envelopes containing payment checks that were not deposited in the mail when payment was due. CX-12 through CX-14. Between January 2009 and January 2010, Respondents failed to timely pay for livestock in at least forty-five (45) transactions. CX-12. Copies of livestock purchases recorded at CX-12 for Cullman Stockyard, Inc., and Okeechobee Livestock Market, Inc. demonstrate that transactions were not paid for properly. *See* CX-12. Records from USPS reflect that Respondents made payments well after the time required by the Act. Investigator Amy Blechinger’s report describing an OIG memorandum also contains

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

admissions of the mailing delay scheme by Eastern official Steve McDonald. CX-14.

The evidence further supports finding that Respondents willfully failed to pay the full price for livestock transactions, in addition to delaying payment. CX-15 through CX-28. CX-17 represents a schedule of checks that Eastern issued in payment for livestock, which the bank returned unpaid. CX-18 consists of copies of checks which were not honored and were submitted by livestock sellers with their bond claims.

3. Respondents Operated Without Adequate Bonding

According to GIPSA's bond claim analysis, approximately 375 livestock sellers, trucking companies, and others filed claims totaling \$37,036,348 against Eastern's bond. CX-19. Of that total, approximately \$29,414,316 represented timely claims for amounts in connection with livestock transactions covered by the bond. The Kentucky Attorney General's Office (KY AG) collected court-ordered restitution from two former officials associated with Eastern, including one of the Respondent's sons, Grant Gibson, as part of a criminal plea agreement. CX-20. In 2012, the KY distributed restitution payments totaling approximately \$821,291 to 174 persons who filed bond claims against Eastern, nearly two years after the transactions that triggered Respondents' obligations under the Act and regulations were completed.

The bond trustee adjudicated disputed bond claims, reached a settlement agreement on the largest claim against Eastern's \$875,000 bond, and submitted a list of approved claims with pro-rata distribution amounts to the bankruptcy court for review and authorization to begin distribution of the proceeds. CX-21. After obtaining the court's authorization, in 2014, the bond trustee distributed the bond proceeds of approximately \$745,673 on a pro-rata basis to 146 bond claimants, nearly four years after Respondents' obligations arose.

The evidence establishes that claimants filed apparently valid claims totaling approximately \$27,847,221, which does not include rejected claims, or any livestock transaction that did not result in a claim on Respondents' bond. The amount also reflects the trustee's reduction of claims through settlement and litigation in the related bankruptcy cases.

Eastern Livestock Company & Thomas P. Gibson
74 Agric. Dec. 166

CX-22 through CX-28. It is clear that Respondents did not hold an adequate bond under the Act and regulations. CX-29 through CX-35.

The record demonstrates that Respondent Gibson was personally involved in purchasing livestock on behalf of Eastern and signed at least one check issued by Eastern in purported payment for livestock. CX-27. He was also personally involved in reselling livestock on behalf of Eastern. CX-33 through CX-35.

Respondents operated subject to the Act without adequate bonding despite being advised by GIPSA by letter of May 5, 2010 that the volume of business reported by Eastern indicated that Respondents' bond must increase from \$875,000 to \$1,150,000. CX-29. On or about June 10, 2010, GIPSA sent Respondent Gibson, as President of Eastern, a Notice of Default Registration/Bonding, via certified mail, which informed Respondent Gibson that Eastern was operating without the required bond, and advised that continuing to engage in business without adequate bond could subject him and Eastern to disciplinary action. CX-30. The notice stated that the disciplinary action could include an order to cease and desist from the unlawful conduct, civil penalties of up to \$11,000 per violation, or suspension of Eastern's registration. The certified mail return receipt was signed on June 17, 2010, by Scott Gibson, of one of Respondent Thomas Gibson's sons. CX-30. Eastern continued to operate subject to the Act without having filed the required bond increased. CX-33 through CX-35.

The Secretary has found that “. . . once a licensee has been adequately warned, if he subsequently violated the Act the agency may proceed to suspend his license without any further warning, notice, or opportunity to demonstrate informally that he did not violate the Act.” *Palmer*, 50 Agric. Dec. 1762, 1782 (U.S.D.A. 1991).

I find that Respondents have willfully violated the Act by failing to make payments when due. The Secretary has concluded that the failure to pay the full amount of the purchase price within the time period required by the Act constitutes an unfair and deceptive practice in willful violation of the Act. *Great American Veal, Inc.*, 48 Agric. Dec. 183, 202-03 (U.S.D.A. 1989). Respondent failed to make timely payments despite receiving a notice from GIPSA advising him of the need to comply with

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

the Act. I conclude that the continued practice of making late or incomplete payments despite notice constitutes substantial evidence of willingness.

I further find that Respondent Thomas P. Gibson willfully violated the Act by continuing to operate under the Act after failing to increase bonds despite notice from GIPSA to do so.

I accord substantial weight to Ms. Blechinger's recommended sanctions (CX-42), considering the number of years and transactions involved in Respondents' violations of the Act, their flagrant refusal to increase their bond, and the widespread harm to the industry that resulted from their actions. GIPSA's notice to Respondents failed to serve as a suitable deterrent to Respondent's practice of delaying or refusing to make payments. I agree with GIPSA's assessment of penalties and find that a cease and desist Order and a suspension of ten (10) years from registering to operate under the Act is appropriate.

I have considered Respondent Gibson's argument that a prohibition from registration under the Act for ten (10) years would effectively prevent him from operating in the future. Mr. Gibson suggested that a five-year prohibition on him personally would not be appropriate, noting that at no time did he use the corporate entity as an "alter ego" and did not attempt to hide his assets or otherwise seek to defraud creditors. Mr. Gibson also observed that the Bankruptcy Court sold him assets at an extremely low price, while the sales administration collected high fees that would have been better used to satisfy claims.

I find that Mr. Gibson did in fact use the company as an alter ego, and I reject his argument for leniency on those grounds. I accord weight to Mr. Gibson's arguments regarding victims whose claims were unsatisfied. However, it was Respondent's actions that made victims of his customers, and I am persuaded that a ten-year suspension carries the deterrent effect in a case of such widespread harm. I also note that Complainant has not recommended the imposition of civil money penalties, which recognizes that Respondent's assets should offset claims, so far as they are able.

Findings of Fact

Eastern Livestock Company & Thomas P. Gibson
74 Agric. Dec. 166

1. Eastern Livestock Company LLC (Respondent Eastern) is a limited liability company with a physical address and mailing address of 135 West Market Street, New Albany, Indiana 47150.
2. Respondent LLC, at all times material herein, was:
 - (a) Engaged in the business of a dealer buying and selling livestock in commerce for its own account and of a market agency providing clearing services; and
 - (b) Engaged in the business of a market agency selling livestock in commerce on a commission basis at the stockyard; and
 - (c) Registered with the Secretary of Agriculture as a dealer buying and selling livestock in commerce for its own account as a market agency providing clearing services.
3. Thomas P. Gibson (Respondent Gibson), at all times material herein:
 - (a) The President of Respondent Eastern;
 - (b) The 65% owner of Respondent Eastern; and
 - (c) The sole director of Corporate Respondent.
4. Respondent Eastern, under the direction, management, and control of Respondent Gibson, issued checks in purported payment for cattle purchases that were returned as dishonored by the bank against which they were drawn, in a total amount of \$11,636,008.79.
5. As of November 8, 2010, Respondent Eastern's records reflected a balance of accounts payable, for which no payment had been tendered, of \$3,698,253.00.
6. Respondents failed to pay for livestock purchases in the amount of at least \$15,334,261.79.
7. As of November 5, 2010, according to Respondent Eastern's records, Respondent Eastern had issued checks that were dishonored by the

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

bank upon which they were drawn in the total amount of \$81,035,249.56.

8. Respondent Eastern, under the direction, management, and control of Respondent Gibson, during the period of August 31, 2009 through January 22, 2010, failed to make prompt payment to four (4) sellers, in regard to twenty-one (21) transactions, for 2,424 head of cattle in a total amount of \$1,121,888.88 when Respondent Eastern failed to deposit checks therefor in the United States mail within the time limits specified in the Act.
9. Respondent Eastern was notified by certified mail, received June 17, 2010, that it was necessary to increase its surety bond to \$1,150,000.00 to secure its livestock operations under the Act before continuing such operations. Notwithstanding such notice, Respondent Eastern continued to engage in the business of a dealer by buying and selling livestock on its own account as a market agency providing clearing services without maintaining an adequate bond or its equivalent.
10. By reason of the facts in Finding of Fact 3 above, Respondent Eastern is the alter ego of Respondent Gibson.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Secretary has jurisdiction in this matter.
2. A hearing in this matter is not necessary, as there are no material facts in dispute.
3. By failing to pay for livestock purchases, failing to timely pay for livestock purchases, and by issuing checks in purported payment for livestock purchases without sufficient funds on deposit to pay those checks, Respondent Thomas B. Gibson willfully violated sections 312(a) and 409 of the Act (7 U.S.C. §§ 213(a), 228b).
4. By engaging in the business of a dealer buying and selling livestock on its own account and as a market agency providing clearing services without maintaining an adequate bond or its equivalent, despite notice, Respondent Thomas P. Gibson willfully violated section 312(a) of the

Eastern Livestock Company & Thomas P. Gibson
74 Agric. Dec. 166

Act (7 U.S.C. § 213(a)) and sections 201.29 and 201.30 of the regulations (9 C.F.R. § 201.29, 201.30).

5. Sanctions are appropriate to deter Respondent and others from willfully failing to make prompt payments, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 193(b).

ORDER

Respondent Thomas P. Gibson, his agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with operations subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, shall cease and desist from:

1. Failing to pay the full purchase price of livestock;
2. Failing to pay, when due, the full purchase price of livestock;
3. Issuing checks in payment for livestock purchases without sufficient funds on deposit and available in the account upon which such checks are drawn to pay such checks when presented; and
4. Engaging in business in any capacity for which bonding is required under the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended and supplemented, and the regulations, without filing and maintain an adequate bond or its equivalent, as required by the Act and regulations.

In accordance with 7 U.S.C. § 204, Respondent Thomas P. Gibson is prohibited from registration under the Packers and Stockyards Act for a period of ten (10) years.

This Decision and Order shall become final and effective without further proceedings thirty-five (35) days after service on Respondent, unless appealed to the Judicial Officer for the U.S. Department of Agriculture by a party to the proceeding within thirty (30) days of service, pursuant to 7 C.F.R. §§ 1.139, 1.145.

The Hearing Clerk shall serve copies of this Decision and Order upon the parties.

—

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

Editor's Note: This volume continues the new format of reporting Administrative Law Judge orders involving non-precedent matters [Miscellaneous Orders] with the sparse case citation but without the body of the order. Miscellaneous Orders (if any) issued by the Judicial Officer will continue to be reported here in full context. The parties in the case will still be reported in Part IV (List of Decisions Reported – Alphabetical Index). Also, the full text of these cases will continue to be posted in a timely manner at: www.dm.usda.gov/oaljdecisions].

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

--

No miscellaneous orders or dismissals reported.

Default Decisions
74 Agric. Dec. 178

DEFAULT DECISIONS

Editor's Note: This volume continues the new format of reporting Administrative Law Judge orders involving non-precedent matters [Default Decisions and Orders] with the sparse case citation but without the body of the order. Default Decisions and Orders (if any) issued by the Judicial Officer will continue to be reported here in full context. The parties in the case will still be reported in Part IV (List of Decisions Reported – Alphabetical Index). Also, the full text of these cases will continue to be posted in a timely manner at: www.dm.usda.gov/oaljdecisions].

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

**Al Harrison Company Distributors.
Docket No. D-14-0050.
Default Decision and Order.
Filed March 24, 2015.**

CONSENT DECISIONS

CONSENT DECISIONS

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Ashville Stockyard, Inc.

Docket No. 14-0103.

Filed January 9, 2015.

Bradley Plunkett.

Docket No. 14-0104.

Filed January 9, 2015.

Tilda Plunkett.

Docket No. 14-0105.

Filed January 9, 2015.

Don Forester.

Docket No. 15-0033.

Filed January 29, 2015.

Athens Commission Company, Inc.

Docket No. 15-0034.

Filed January 29, 2015.

Eastern Livestock Company, LLC & Thomas P. Gibson.

Docket No. 11-0062.

Filed February 20, 2015.

Nancy Schrock, d/b/a Midwest Exchange Regional Stockyards.

Docket No. 15-0052.

Filed February 24, 2015.

SIG International Iowa, Inc.

Docket No. 15-0048.

Filed February 25, 2015.

Well Bred Farms, Inc.

Docket No. 15-0054.

Filed February 25, 2015.

Consent Decisions
74 Agric. Dec. 189 – 190

Robert W. Schenk.

Docket No. 13-0357.
Filed March 31, 2015.

Birdsboro Kosher Farm Corporation.

Docket No. 15-0070.
Filed April 6, 2015.

Robert Butzer & Sons, Inc.

Docket No. 13-0356.
Filed April 17, 2015.

Randy Deaton, d/b/a Deaton Livestock.

Docket No. 15-0047.
Filed April 21, 2015.

H&P Cattle LLC, d/b/a Gowan Stockyards.

Docket No. 15-0053.
Filed April 24, 2015.

Euclid Stockyards, Inc., d/b/a Euclid Stockyards.

Docket No. 15-0555.
Filed June 1, 2015.

Jeremy T. Gorham, d/b/a Euclid Stockyards.

Docket No. 15-0056.
Filed June 1, 2015.

Kenneth L. Smoker, LLC.

Docket No. 15-0087.
Filed June 22, 2015.

Kenneth L. Smoker.

Docket No. 15-0088.
Filed June 22, 2015

AGRICULTURE DECISIONS

Volume 74

Book One

Part Three (PACA)

Pages 180 – 242



THIS IS A COMPILATION OF DECISIONS ISSUED BY THE
SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND THE COURTS
PERTAINING TO STATUTES ADMINISTERED BY THE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

LIST OF DECISIONS REPORTED

JANUARY – JUNE 2015

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

AL HARRISON COMPANY DISTRIBUTORS.
Docket No. D-14-0050.
Decision and Order 180

PANGEA PRODUCE DISTRIBUTORS, INC.
Docket No. 15-0914.
Decision and Order 183

--

REPARATION DECISIONS

MAIN STREET PRODUCE, INC. v. WESTERN VEG. PRODUCE, INC;
MAIN STREET PRODUCE, INC. v. FLORANCE DISTRIBUTING CO.
Docket Nos. W-R-2012-228; W-R-2012-463.
Decision and Order 192

--

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

KRISTINA BAKES.
Docket No. 15-0078.
Order of Dismissal 240

--

DEFAULT DECISIONS

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

PHOENIX PRODUCE COMPANY.
Docket No. D-15-0044.
Default Decision and Order 241

TAYLOR PRODUCE, LLC.
Docket No. D-15-0045.
Default Decision and Order 241

--

CONSENT DECISIONS

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Consent Decisions 242

Al Harrison Company Distributors
74 Agric. Dec. 180

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

In re: AL HARRISON COMPANY DISTRIBUTORS.

Docket No. D-14-0050.

Decision and Order.

Filed March 24, 2015.

PACA-D.

Christopher Young, Esq. for Complainant.

Jeffrey M. Chebot, Esq. for Respondent.

Decision and Order by Jill S. Clifton, Administrative Law Judge.

DECISION AND ORDER

In this disciplinary proceeding under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended (7 U.S.C. § 499a *et seq.*) (PACA), a Complaint was filed on December 13, 2013, alleging that Respondent had committed willful, flagrant, and repeated violations of section 2(4) of the PACA by failing to make full payment promptly to twelve (12) sellers of the agreed purchase prices in the total amount of \$690,537.93 for 104 lots of perishable agricultural commodities, which Respondent purchased, received, and accepted in the course of interstate commerce during the period of April 2012 through April 2013. The Complaint sought the issuance of an order finding that Respondent had committed willful, flagrant, and repeated violations of section 2(4) of the PACA and revocation of Respondent's PACA license pursuant to section 8(a) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499h(a)).

A Consent Decision and Order was issued on August 21, 2014, pursuant to the consent decision provisions (7 C.F.R. § 1.138) of the Rules of Practice Governing Formal Adjudicatory Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary Under Various Statutes (7 C.F.R. § 1.130 *et seq.*) (Rules of Practice) applicable to this proceeding.

The Consent Decision concluded that Respondent's failure to make full payment promptly to twelve (12) sellers of the agreed purchase prices of

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

the perishable agricultural commodities constituted willful, flagrant, and repeated violations of section 2(4) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499b(4)).

The Consent Decision issued a finding that Respondent engaged in willful, flagrant, and repeated violations of the PACA, and ordered that Respondent's PACA license be revoked. The finding and the revocation of the license were held in abeyance so long as Respondent paid the produce sellers listed in Appendix A to the Complaint and satisfied the amounts owed to each, as stated in the Complaint and Consent Decision, in full, within six (6) months (180 days) of the effective date of the Consent Decision and Order.

The Consent Decisions stated that the PACA Branch of the Agricultural Marketing Service shall be the final arbiter of whether full payment to the produce sellers in the amounts listed in the Complaint had been paid, and further, that it would be Respondent's obligation to demonstrate that full payment as described above had been made.

The Consent Decision further stated, *inter alia*, that if full payment of the sellers and amounts listed in the Appendix A to the Complaint was not made within 180 days of the effective date of the Consent Decision and Order, then the finding of willful, flagrant, and repeated violations and the revocation of Respondent's PACA license would no longer be held in abeyance and would be issued without further proceeding, **other** than a filing by Complainant informing the Administrative Law Judge of Respondent's failure to comply with the terms of the Consent Decision and Order, and requesting that the finding of violation and order of revocation no longer be held in abeyance, and that Respondent's PACA license be immediately revoked. Respondent expressly waived all further procedure in the matter following the Consent Decision and Order.

On or about March 19, 2015, Complainant informed this forum that as of March 6, 2015, more than 180 days following the effective date of the Consent Decision and Order, Complainant has determined and Respondent has acknowledged that full payment of the sellers listed in the Complaint had not been made. Complainant requested the issuance of an order. Therefore, pursuant to the Consent Decision issued on August 21, 2015, this Decision and Order is entered without further procedure or hearing pursuant to the consent decision provisions (7 C.F.R. § 1.138) of

Al Harrison Company Distributors
74 Agric. Dec. 180

the Rules of Practice Governing Formal Adjudicatory Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary Under Various Statutes (7 C.F.R. § 1.130 *et seq.*) (Rules of Practice) applicable to this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. Respondent is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of Arizona. Respondent's business and mailing address is 561 W. Gold Hills Road, Nogales, Arizona 85621.
2. At all times material herein, Respondent was licensed and operating subject to the provisions of the PACA. License number 19175522 was issued to Respondent on April 14, 1958. The license has been renewed annually and is next subject to renewal on April 14, 2015.
3. During the period April 2012 through April 2013, Respondent purchased, received, and accepted, in interstate and foreign commerce, from twelve (12) sellers, 104 lots of perishable agricultural commodities, and failed to make full payment promptly of the agreed purchase prices in the total amount of \$690,537.393.

Conclusions

Respondent's failure to make full payment promptly to twelve (12) sellers of the agreed purchase prices of the perishable agricultural commodities described in paragraph 3 of the Findings of Fact above constitutes willful, flagrant, and repeated violations of section 2(4) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499b(4)).

ORDER

Respondent has engaged in willful, flagrant, and repeated violations of the PACA, and Respondent's PACA license is hereby revoked pursuant to section 8(a) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499h(a)).

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

In re: PANGEA PRODUCE DISTRIBUTORS, INC.
Docket No. 15-0014.
Decision and Order.
Filed June 23, 2015.

PACA-D.

Shelton S. Smallwood, Esq. for Complainant.
Scott Alan Orth, Esq. for Respondent.
Decision and Order by Jill S. Clifton, Administrative Law Judge.

DECISION AND ORDER ON THE WRITTEN RECORD

Decision Summary

Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc. willfully, flagrantly, and repeatedly violated section 2(4) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499b(4)) during October 8, 2010 through December 7, 2013 by failing to make full payment promptly of the purchase prices, or balances thereof, for \$217,544.07 in fruits and vegetables [being \$142,716.79 to De Bruyn Produce Company; \$20,017.34 to G.W. Palmer & Co. Inc.; and \$54,809.94 to Premier Trading LLC], all being perishable agricultural commodities that Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc. purchased, received, and accepted in the course of interstate or foreign commerce.

Parties and Allegations

1. The Complainant is the Deputy Administrator, Fruit and Vegetable Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture (“AMS” or “Complainant”).
2. The Respondent is Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc., a corporation existing under the laws of the state of Florida (“Pangea Produce” or “Respondent”).
3. AMS alleges in the Complaint filed on October 23, 2014 that Respondent Pangea Produce violated section 2(4) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499b(4)) by failing to pay three produce sellers for \$262,199.48 in produce purchases during 2010 to 2013, as more particularly described in Appendix A to the Complaint. The

Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 183

Complaint alleges that Pangea Produce willfully, flagrantly, and repeatedly violated section 2(4) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499b(4)) and asks the judge so to find and to order the facts and circumstances of the violations published, pursuant to section 8(a) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499h(a)).

4. AMS's "Motion for Decision Without Hearing by Reason of Admissions," filed December 17, 2014 ("Motion for Decision Without Hearing by Reason of Admissions"), asks me to issue a decision based on the requirements of the PACA in light of Pangea Produce's admissions. AMS's Motion asserts that there is no need for a hearing. Following careful review of all documents filed, I agree that there is no need for an oral hearing and that I will issue this Decision and Order based on the written record.
5. Pangea Produce timely filed its Answer on December 5, 2014 and timely filed its Response to the Motion for Decision on February 26, 2015 ("Pangea Produce's Response"). Pangea Produce explains and documents certain of Pangea Produce's transactions with the three produce sellers:
 - a. De Bruyn Produce Company, Weslaco, Texas;
 - b. G.W. Palmer & Co., Inc., Memphis, Tennessee; and
 - c. Premier Trading LLC, Greenwood Village, Colorado.

These three produce sellers are all of the produce sellers described in Appendix A to the Complaint, which provided that Pangea Produce allegedly owed \$262,199.48, past due and unpaid, for produce purchases during the period of 2010 to 2013.

De Bruyn Produce Company, Weslaco, Texas

1. According to Appendix A of the Complaint, the amount past due and unpaid by Pangea Produce to De Bruyn Produce Company, Weslaco, Texas, was \$142,716.79, due October 8, 2010 through December 10, 2011.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

2. According to Appendix A of the Complaint, the amount past due and unpaid by Pangea Produce to G.W. Palmer & Co., Inc., Memphis, Tennessee was \$24,179.34, due March 29, 2013 through April 27, 2013.
3. A “Stipulation for Judgment” signed April 5, 2012 was entered in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Miami Division (Case No. 1:12-cv-20120-JEM), in the amount of \$142,716.79, against Pangea Produce and in favor of De Bruyn Produce. *See* Exhibit A to AMS’s “Motion for Decision Without Hearing by Reason of Admissions.” Of the \$142,716.79, Pangea Produce asserts in its Response filed February 26, 2015 that it no longer owes anything to De Bruyn Produce. While laudable if true, that would not negate the requirement to pay promptly under the PACA. *See* 7 C.F.R. § 46.2(aa) regarding making full payment promptly, especially 7 C.F.R. § 46.2(aa)(5) and (11).

G.W. Palmer & Co., Inc., Memphis, Tennessee

1. According to Appendix A of the Complaint, the amount past due and unpaid by Pangea Produce to G.W. Palmer & Co., Inc., Memphis, Tennessee was \$24,179.34, due March 29, 2013 through April 27, 2013.
2. Pangea Produce claimed the pending balance to be \$20,017.34 in its letter to AMS/ PACA dated October 10, 2013 (a copy of which is attached to Pangea Produce’s Response). Earlier, Pangea Produce had written that it owed G.W. Palmer \$25,017.33 in its email to Stan Paluszewski at G.W. Palmer & Co. Inc., dated July 16, 2013 (a copy of which is attached to Pangea Produce’s Response).
3. Pangea Produce states in its Response filed February 26, 2015 that “(t)here were a total of 13 loads and the final adjustments amount to only one load being in dispute.”
4. For purposes of this Decision and Order, I will accept Pangea Produce’s admission in its Response, that Pangea Produce owed, past due and unpaid, \$20,017.34 to G.W. Palmer & Co. Inc. as of October 10, 2013. Whether Pangea Produce owed G.W. Palmer more than

Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 183

\$20,017.34, or at an earlier time owed G.W. Palmer more than \$20,017.34, is not material for purposes of this Decision and Order, because the precise past due dollar amount that Pangea Produce failed to pay promptly to G.W. Palmer does not affect the outcome.

Premier Trading LLC, Greenwood Village, Colorado

1. The amount past due and unpaid by Pangea Produce to Premier Trading LLC, Greenwood Village, Colorado, according to the Complaint, Appendix A, was \$95,303.35, due November 1, 2013, through December 7, 2013. A reparation order in the amount of \$95,303.35 was entered by default against Pangea Produce, in favor of Premier Trading LLC.
2. The reparation Complaint that Premier Trading LLC prepared on March 6, 2014, and filed with the PACA Branch on March 10, 2014, contained a correct address in paragraph 2 for Pangea Produce, 751 N.E. 75th Street, Miami, Florida 33138. Inexplicably, the AMS letter dated March 24, 2014 that was intended to provide notice of the Complaint to Pangea Produce was mistakenly addressed to a “Padilla” (misspelling) and mistakenly addressed to “NE1 NE 75th Street.”
3. Consequently, any reparation order in the amount of \$95,303.35 entered by default is disregarded for purposes of this Decision and Order. Instead, for this Decision and Order, I will accept Pangea Produce’s admission in its Response filed February 26, 2015, at page 3, that Pangea Produce owes \$54,809.94 to Premier Trading LLC. Pangea Produce attached to its Response copies of numerous complaints it made to Premier Trading regarding the quality of the product, especially when shipments were not kept cool enough. For example, Pangea Produce lodged complaints regarding cantaloupes that arrived over-ripe and soft, bell peppers that were not the prescribed size and had some decay, and concerns regarding avocados, jalapenos and pineapples that had not been kept cool enough during shipping. Whether Pangea Produce owes Premier Trading LLC more than \$54,809.94, or at an earlier time owed Premier Trading LLC more than \$54,809.94, is not material for purposes of this Decision and Order because the precise past-due dollar amount that Pangea Produce failed to pay promptly to Premier Trading LLC does not affect the

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

outcome.

Discussion

1. Section 2(4) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499b(4)) requires licensed produce dealers to make “full payment promptly” for fruit and vegetable purchases, usually within ten days of acceptance, unless the parties agreed to different terms prior to the purchase. *See* 7 C.F.R. § 46.2(aa)(5) and (11) (defining “full payment promptly”).
2. A respondent in an administrative proceeding does not have a right to an oral hearing under all circumstances, and an agency may dispense with a hearing when there is no material issue of fact on which a meaningful hearing can be held. *H. Schnell & Company, Inc.*, 57 Agric. Dec. 1722, 1729 (U.S.D.A. 1998). *See also Five Star Food Distributors, Inc.*, 56 Agric. Dec. 880, 894 (U.S.D.A. 1997) (Decision Without H'rg by Reason of Admis.).
3. The policy of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in cases where PACA licensees have failed to make full or prompt payment for produce is straightforward:

In any PACA disciplinary proceeding in which it is alleged that a respondent has failed to pay in accordance with the PACA and respondent admits the material allegations in the complaint and makes no assertion that the respondent has achieved full compliance or will achieve full compliance with the PACA within 120 days after the complaint was served on the respondent, or the date of the hearing, whichever occurs first, the PACA case will be treated as a “no-pay” case. In any “no-pay” case in which the violations are flagrant or repeated, the license of a PACA licensee, shown to have violated the payment provisions of the PACA, will be revoked.

Scamcorp, Inc., 57 Agric. Dec. 527, 549 (U.S.D.A. 1998).

4. The Complaint was served October 29, 2014 (USPS tracking number 7012 3460 0003 3833 9455). More than 120 days later, Pangea Produce still had failed to pay past due amounts (at minimum, the

Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 183

\$54,809.94 still owed to fruit and vegetable seller Premier Trading LLC, Greenwood Village, Colorado). Pangea Produce's inability to assert that it had achieved full compliance with the PACA within 120 days of having been served with the Complaint makes this a "no-pay" case. "Full compliance" requires not only that the respondent have paid all produce sellers in accordance with the PACA but also that the respondent have no credit agreements with produce sellers for more than thirty (30) days. *Scamcorp, Inc.*, 57 Agric. Dec. 527, 549 (U.S.D.A. 1998); *Carpentino Bros., Inc.*, 46 Agric. Dec. 486, 505-06 (U.S.D.A. 1987), *aff'd*, 851 F.2d 1500 (D.C. Cir. 1988).

5. The appropriate sanction in a "no-pay" case where the violations are flagrant and repeated is license revocation. A civil penalty is not appropriate because "limiting participation in the perishable agricultural commodities industry to financially responsible persons is one of the primary goals of the PACA", and it would not be consistent with the Congressional intent to require a PACA violator to pay the Government while produce sellers are left unpaid. *Scamcorp, Inc.*, 57 Agric. Dec. 527, 570-71 (U.S.D.A. 1998).
6. Pangea's Produce "shifted the risk of nonpayment to sellers of the perishable agricultural commodities", intentionally, or with careless disregard for the payment requirements in section 2(4) of the PACA. *Scamcorp, Inc.*, 57 Agric. Dec. 527, 553 (U.S.D.A. 1998).
7. Where there is no longer a valid license to revoke, the appropriate sanction in lieu of revocation is a finding of willful, flagrant and repeated violations of the PACA and publication of the facts and circumstances of the violations. *Furr's Supermarkets Inc.*, 62 Agric. Dec. 385, 386-87 (U.S.D.A. 2003).
8. Pangea Produce stated in its Answer and provided documentation to show that it was owed (as of November 19, 2014) a total of \$268,996.46 in overdue receivables; that Pangea Produce was a victim of buyers that did not pay for commodities. Such mitigating circumstances do not negate findings of "willful, flagrant and repeated violations" in disciplinary cases such as this. Here, buying perishable agricultural commodities without sufficient funds to comply with the prompt payment provision of the PACA is regarded as an intentional

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

violation of the PACA or, at the least, careless disregard of the statutory requirements.

Findings of Fact

1. Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc., the Respondent, is a corporation existing under the laws of the state of Florida. Pangea Produce has ceased operations, but Pangea Produce's address was 751 N.E. 75th Street, Miami, Florida 33138-5275.
2. Pangea Produce was licensed for two years under the provisions of the PACA: license number 2012 0658 was issued to Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc. on February 24, 2012 and terminated on February 24, 2014, after Respondent Pangea Produce failed to pay the annual renewal fee. Section 4(a) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499d(a)).
3. Pangea Produce owed, past due and unpaid, \$142,716.79 to De Bruyn Produce Company, Weslaco, Texas. *See* "Stipulation for Judgment," signed April 5, 2012, entered in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Miami, Division (Case No. 1:12-cv-20120-JEM).
4. Pangea Produce owed, past due and unpaid, \$20,017.34 to G.W. Palmer & Co., Inc., Memphis, Tennessee. *See* Pangea Produce's letter to AMS/ PACA dated October 10, 2013 (a copy of which is attached to Pangea Produce's Response).
5. Pangea Produce owes, past due and unpaid, \$54,809.94 to Premier Trading LLC, Greenwood Village, Colorado. *See* Pangea Produce's Response filed February 26, 2015, at page 3.
6. Respondent Pangea Produce was not in full compliance with the PACA within 120 days after having been served with the Complaint. The Complaint was served on October 29, 2014; the \$54,809.94 past due amount owed to Premier Trading LLC remained unpaid more than 120 days after the Complaint was served. Respondent Pangea Produce's inability to show full compliance with the PACA within 120 days of having been served with the Complaint makes this a "no-pay" case.

Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 183

7. Respondent Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc. failed, during October 8, 2010 through December 7, 2013, to make full payment promptly of the purchase prices, or balances thereof, for \$217,544.07 in fruits and vegetables, all being perishable agricultural commodities, that Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc. purchased, received, and accepted in the course of interstate or foreign commerce.
8. Pangea Produce's violations of the PACA are willful, as that term is used in the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. § 558(c)), because of "the length of time during which the violations occurred and the number and dollar amount of the violative transactions involved." *Scamcorp, Inc.*, 57 Agric. Dec. 527, 553 (U.S.D.A. 1998); *Allred's Produce v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.*, 178 F.3d 743, 748 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 528 U.S. 1021 (1999); *Cox v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.*, 925 F.2d 1102, 1105 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 860 (1991); *American Fruit Purveyors, Inc. v. United States*, 630 F.2d 370, 374 (5th Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 450 U.S. 997 (1981); *Eastern Produce Co. v. Benson*, 278 F.2d 606, 609 (3d Cir. 1960).
9. Willfulness under the PACA does not require evil intent. Willfulness requires intentional actions or actions undertaken with careless disregard of the statutory requirements. See, e.g., *Toney v. Glickman*, 101 F.3d 1236, 1241 (8th Cir. 1996); *Finer Foods Sales Co. v. Block*, 708 F.2d 774, 777-78 (D.C. Cir. 1983); *Ocean View Produce, Inc.*, 2009 WL 218027, 68 Agric. Dec. 594, 599 (U.S.D.A. 2009).
10. Respondent Pangea Produce intentionally, or with careless disregard for the payment requirements in section 2(4) of the PACA, "shifted the risk of nonpayment to sellers of the perishable agricultural commodities." *Scamcorp, Inc.*, 57 Agric. Dec. 527, 553 (U.S.D.A. 1998).
11. Pangea Produce's violations are "repeated" (repeated means more than one); and Pangea Produce's violations are "flagrant." Whether violations are "flagrant" under the PACA is a function of the number of violations, the amount of money involved, and the time period during which the violations occurred. *Allred's Produce v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.*, 178 F.3d 743, 748 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 528 U.S. 1021 (1999); *Five Star Food Distributors, Inc.*, 56 Agric. Dec. 880, 894-95

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

(U.S.D.A. 1997); *D.W. Produce, Inc.*, 53 Agric. Dec. 1672, 1678 (U.S.D.A. 1994).

Conclusions

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction over Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc. and the subject matter involved herein.
2. Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc. failed to comply with 7 C.F.R. § 46.2(aa) regarding making full payment promptly.
3. Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc. willfully, flagrantly, and repeatedly violated section 2(4) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499b(4)) by failing to make full payment promptly of the purchase prices, or balances thereof, during October 8, 2010 through December 7, 2013, for \$217,544.07 in fruits and vegetables, all being perishable agricultural commodities that Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc. purchased, received, and accepted in the course of interstate or foreign commerce.

ORDER

Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc. is found to have committed willful, repeated, and flagrant violations of section 2(4) of the PACA, 7 U.S.C. § 499b(4). The facts and circumstances of the violations shall be published pursuant to section 8(a) of the PACA, 7 U.S.C. § 499h(a).

This Order shall take effect on the eleventh (11th) day after this Decision becomes final.

Finality

This Decision and Order shall be final without further proceedings thirty-five (35) days after service unless an appeal to the Judicial Officer is filed with the Hearing Clerk within thirty (30) days after service, pursuant to section 1.145 of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.145). *See* Appendix A.

Copies of this Decision and Order shall be served by the Hearing Clerk upon each of the parties (to Respondent's counsel by certified mail; to

Pangea Produce Distributors, Inc.
74 Agric. Dec. 183

AMS's counsel by in-person delivery to an Office of the General Counsel representative).

—

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

REPARATION DECISIONS

MAIN STREET PRODUCE, INC. v. WESTERN VEG. PRODUCE, INC.; AND MAIN STREET PRODUCE, INC. v. FLORANCE DISTRIBUTING CO.

Docket Nos. W-R-2012-228; W-R-2012-463.

Reparation Decision.

Filed May 7, 2015.

PACA-R.

F.o.b., “no grade” sale

In an f.o.b. “no grade” contract, it is a Respondent’s obligation to load subject produce at shipping point which conforms to the contract, and which is in suitable shipping condition.

Good delivery

The maximum allowance for f.o.b. no grade strawberries to make good delivery after five days in transit is 15% total damage, 8% serious damage and 3% decay.

Inspection, time between arrival and inspection

In cases where the condition on arrival is in such poor condition that we can be reasonably certain that the suitable shipping warranty would have been breached even under different conditions (in this case, storage temperatures and time of inspection are the relevant conditions), we can allow more time between arrival and inspection and still rely upon the inspection.

Rejection, seller’s duty

A seller always has the duty of accepting a procedurally effective rejection, whether the rejection is rightful or wrongful.

Rejection, buyer’s duty

A buyer, post-rejection, is only to act in good faith in an attempt at reworking. A buyer assuming the duty acts as the seller’s agent for disposition. However, the type of agency here enforced upon a buyer is restricted, and the buyer is only required to act in good faith. Good faith means honesty in fact and the observance of reasonable commercial standards of fair dealing in the trade.

Christopher Young, Presiding Officer.

Terrence R. O’Connor, for Complainant in W-R-2012-228 and W-R-2012-463

Elizabeth Estrada, for Respondent in W-R-2012-228

Daniel A. McDaniel, for Respondent in W-R-2012-463

Decision and Order issued by William G. Jenson, Judicial Officer.

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

DECISION AND ORDER

Preliminary Statement

These are two related reparation proceedings under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended (7 U.S.C. § 499a *et seq.*) (PACA). A timely Complaint in the case docketed W-R-2012-228 was filed with the Department on September 12, 2012 in which Complainant Main Street Produce, Inc. (Complainant or Main Street) sought a reparation award against Respondent Western Veg. Produce, Inc., (Respondent Western Veg.) in the amount of \$34,474.67 (plus applicable interest), which was alleged to be past due and owing in connection with three (3) shipments of the perishable agricultural commodity strawberries sold to Respondent in the course of interstate commerce.¹ A Report of Investigation (ROI) was prepared by the Department and served upon the parties. A copy of the Complaint was served upon the Respondent, which filed an Answer thereto on December 21, 2012, denying liability in part², lodging a counterclaim for its own damages in the amount of \$51,865.00, and requesting an oral hearing.

A timely Complaint in the case docketed W-R-2012-463 was filed with the Department on October 9, 2012 in which Complainant sought a reparation award against Respondent Florance Distributing Co., Inc., (Respondent Florance) in the amount of \$77,011.00 (plus applicable interest, filing fees and costs)³, which was alleged to be past due and owing

¹ Complainant later appeared to modify its W-R-2012-228 damage claims during the course of the hearing and in Brief and Reply Brief. In Brief and Reply, Complainant asks for \$19,524.75 plus interest, and any damages, fees, and costs that Complainant might bear in the event that it loses its reparation against Respondent Florance Distributing in W-R-2012-463. *See* discussion *infra* at 47-48, 51.

² Respondent, in its Answer, appears to admit the majority of the allegations of the complaint, with the following exceptions: Respondent denies that the terms of the sale for the three loads were f.o.b, no grade (*see infra* at 9) for definition and further discussion of the term f.o.b), and states that the terms were f.o.b acceptance final (*see infra* at 20-22). Further, Respondent denies that Complainant incurred any loss on these three loads, and takes issue with the ultimate handling and disposition of the loads.

³ Here again, as in W-R-2012-228, Complainant later appeared to modify its damage claims during the course of the hearing and in Brief and Reply Brief. In W-R-2012-463, Complainant appears to claim no damages against Respondent Florance in its Brief or Reply Brief.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

in connection with three (3) shipments of the perishable agricultural commodity strawberries sold to Respondent in the course of interstate commerce. A Report of Investigation was prepared by the Department and served upon the parties. A copy of the Complaint was served upon the Respondent, which filed an Answer thereto on January 7, 2013, denying liability, lodging a counterclaim for its own damages in the amount of \$14,889.87⁴, and requesting an oral hearing.

A consolidated oral hearing was held in Bakersfield, California, on July 16-17, 2014. At the hearing, Complainant was represented by Terrence O'Connor, Esq., of Noland, Hamerly, Etienne and Hoss in Salinas, California. Respondent Western Veg. was represented by Elizabeth Estrada, Esq., of Alexander and Associates in Bakersfield, California, and Respondent Florance was represented by Daniel McDaniel, Esq., of Nomellini, Grilli, and McDaniel in Stockton, California. Christopher Young, Esq., attorney with the Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, served as the Presiding Officer. Complainant submitted Exhibits 1-61 (CX) in both W-R-2012-228 and W-R-2012-463. Respondent Western Veg. submitted Exhibits 1-9 (RXWV) in W-R-2012-228, and Respondent Florance submitted Exhibits 1-10 (RXF) in W-R-2012-463. Additional evidence in both W-R-2012-228 and W-R-2012-463 is contained in the Department's Report of Investigation.

At the hearing, two witnesses testified for Complainant, one witness testified for Respondent Western Veg., and two witnesses testified for Respondent Florance. A transcript of the hearing was prepared (Tr.). The parties filed post-hearing briefs, reply briefs, claims for fees and expenses, and objections to the claims.

Findings of Fact

1. Complainant in both W-R-2012-228 and W-R-2012-463, Main Street Produce, Inc., is a corporation whose business mailing address is 2165 West Main Street, Santa Maria, California, 90058-2207. At the time of the transactions alleged in the Complaint, Complainant was licensed under the PACA.⁵ (Complainant's Compl. at 1.).

⁴ Respondent Florance also modified its damage claim in Brief and Reply Brief, to \$12,978.11, plus fees and expenses (*see* Resp't Florance's Reply Br. at 13).

⁵ PACA license number 19940550 (PACA license records and information).

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

2. Respondent in W-R-2012-228, Respondent Western Veg., is a corporation whose business address is 2020 Eye Street, Bakersfield, California 93301 (PACA license records and information) and whose mailing address is P.O. Box 82217, Bakersfield, CA 93380. (Resp't Western Veg.'s Answer). At the time of the transactions alleged in the Complaint, Respondent Western Veg. was licensed under the PACA.⁶ (Complainant's Compl. at 1).

3. Respondent in W-R-2012-463, Respondent Florance, is a corporation whose business address is 4555 Pacific Blvd., Vernon, California 90058-2207. (Resp't Florance's Answer at 1). At the time of the transactions alleged in the Complaint, Respondent Florance was licensed under the PACA.⁷ (Resp't Florance's Answer at 1).

Contract(s) in W-R-2012-228, Main Street v. Western Veg.

4. In W-R-2012-228, on November 19, 2011, by oral contract, Complainant purchased from Respondent 756 trays of strawberries at the agreed upon f.o.b price of \$17.50 per tray.⁸ (Complainant's Compl. at 1; Resp't's Answer at 1). Upon delivery in Winnipeg, Canada, on November 22, 2011 (CX 5), the strawberries were inspected by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) and had total defects of 34% including 18% decay. (*Id.*; CX 18, RXF 1). The product was rejected.⁹ (Complainant's Compl. at 1; CX 4-19; Tr. 66-69, 79-80, 116, 129, 166, 398, 432-433, 436).

5. In W-R-2012-228, on November 19, 2011, by oral contract, Complainant purchased from Respondent 1296 trays of strawberries at the agreed upon f.o.b price of \$17.50 per tray.¹⁰ (Complainant's Compl.

⁶ PACA license number 19940988 (PACA license records and information.)

⁷ PACA license number 19162270 (PACA license records and information.)

⁸ The terms of the sale, whether "f.o.b. no grade contract" or "f.o.b. acceptance final" are in dispute, and have significant bearing upon this decision. They will be addressed *infra*, as will the definitions of the terms.

⁹ Respondent Western Veg. provides arguments surrounding the rejection of the loads, which is addressed *infra*.

¹⁰ The terms of the sale, whether "f.o.b. no grade contract" or "f.o.b. acceptance final" are in dispute, and have significant bearing upon this decision. They will be addressed *infra*, as will the definitions of the terms.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

at 1; Resp't Western Veg.'s Answer at 1). Upon delivery in Calgary, Canada, on November 23, 2011 (CX 23), the strawberries were inspected by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) and had total defects of 22% including 12% decay. (*Id.*; CX 36, RXF 2). The product was rejected. (Complainant's Compl. at 1; CX 22-36; Tr. 66-69, 79-80, 116, 129, 166, 398, 432-433, 436).

6. In W-R-2012-228, on November 22, 2011, by oral contract, Complainant purchased from Respondent 2160 trays of strawberries at the agreed upon f.o.b price of \$17.50 per tray.¹¹ (Complainant's Compl. at 1; Resp't's Answer at 1). Upon delivery in Winnipeg, Canada, on November 24, 2011 (CX 42, 43), the strawberries were inspected by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) in a two part inspection: the first lot of 529 trays out of the entire 2160 had total defects of 22% including 20% decay (*Id.*; CX 55, RXF 3), and the second lot of 1631 trays out of the entire 2160 had total defects of 21% including 7% decay. (*Id.*; CX 55, RXF 3). The product in both lots was rejected. (Complainant's Complaint, pg. 1; CX 40-58; Tr. 66-69, 79-80, 116, 129, 166, 398, 432-433, 436).

7. The oral contract(s) in W-R-2012-228 were reached between Scott Allen, sales manager for Complainant, and Dave Johnson, salesman for Respondent Western Veg.¹² (Tr. 8-15, 18, 28-31, 49, 51-54, 57, 62, 66-69, 100, 112, 146, 207, 299-300, 529-530, 604-605). Both Complainant and Respondent were aware that the destination of the three loads was western Canada. (Tr. 18, 75, 111).

8. After the strawberries in the three loads were rejected upon arrival in Canada, Complainant and Respondent Western Veg. agreed to have Respondent Florance handle the three loads of strawberries and to attempt to find buyers for them in Western Canada. (Tr. 79-81, 309, 313-315).

9. Respondent Florance contacted Phil Dixon of Sun Fresh, who had experience handling distressed loads in Western Canada. (Tr. 644, 646-647, 654.) There is a limited market and limited number of outlets for distressed strawberries in Western Canada. (Tr. 80, 90, 251-253, 309, 314-

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² Dave Johnson was not employed with Western Veg. at the time of the hearing. Throughout, in cases where the witness is referred to as "Dave Johnson of Western Veg.," that reference is at the time of the transactions.

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

315, 511, 545-560, 606-607, 644, 652-668). At the time Phil Dixon was contacted, despite his attempts, the strawberries could not be re-worked or re-sold because of their poor condition, and they had to be discarded in their entirety. Sun Fresh charged Respondent Florance standard charges for dumping and disposal. (Tr. 306, 559-561, 654-665; RXF 1 at 16; RXF 2 at 21; RXF 3 at 26).

Contract(s) in W-R-2012-463, *Main Street v. Florance*

10. Complainant and Respondent Florance agree on the terms of their contract. On November 19 through November 22, 2011, Complainant, by oral contract, sold the three loads identified in Finding of Fact 4-6, above, to Respondent Florance, to be shipped f.o.b. “no grade” from Western Veg.’s cooling facility affiliate in Santa Maria, California. (Complainant’s Compl. at 1; Resp’t Florance’s Answer at 1; Tr. 109, 112, 530).¹³

11. Complainant and Respondent Florance agree that f.o.b. “no grade” were the contract terms (*see* previous Finding of Fact ¶ 10) and that “some softness and bruising was acceptable so long as there was no ‘decay or leakers’” (Tr. 111-112), and the fruit arrived “otherwise sound.” (Tr. 603-604). Both Complainant and Respondent Florance agree that their contract contemplated that the three strawberry loads would make good delivery at their destination in Western Canada. (Tr. 69, 111-112, 146, 299, 605).

12. Complainant and Respondent Florance agree that inspections were taken on all three loads, and agree on the results of the inspections of all three loads. Both Complainant and Respondent Florance agree that the product did not make good delivery. (Tr. 299, 573-626.)

13. As to the first load, upon delivery in Winnipeg, Canada, on November 22, 2011 (CX 5), the strawberries were inspected by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) and had total defects of 34% including 18% decay. (*Id.*; CX 18, RXF 1). The product was rejected by Respondent

¹³ Complainant’s representative at hearing, Scott Allen, testified that to form the contract with Respondent Florance, he relayed to David Diener, representative of Respondent Florance, “the exact same terms as they were expressed to me by Dave Johnson.” As stated in footnotes 10 and 11 of this Decision, the definition of f.o.b. will be addressed *infra*.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Florance. (Complainant's Compl. at 1; CX 4-19; Tr. 66-69, 116, 129, 166, 398, 432-433, 436).

14. As to the second load, upon delivery in Calgary, Canada, on November 23, 2011 (CX 23), the strawberries were inspected by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) and had total defects of 22% including 12% decay. (*Id.*; CX 36, RXF 2.) The product was rejected by Respondent Florance. (Complainant's Compl. at 1; CX 22-36; Tr. 66-69, 116, 129, 166, 398, 432-433, 436).

15. As to the third load, upon delivery in Winnipeg, Canada, on November 24, 2011 (CX 42, 43), the strawberries were inspected by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) in a two part inspection: the first lot of 529 trays out of the entire 2160 had total defects of 22% including 20% decay (*Id.*; CX 55, RXF 3), and the second lot of 1631 trays out of the entire 2160 had total defects of 21% including 7% decay (*Id.*; CX 55, RXF 3.) The product in both lots was rejected by Respondent Florance. (Complainant's Compl. at 1; CX 40-58; Tr. 66-69, 116, 129, 166, 398, 432-433, 436).

16. After the strawberries in the three loads were rejected upon arrival in Canada, Complainant and Respondent Western Veg. agreed to have Respondent Florance handle the three loads of strawberries and to attempt to find buyers for them in Western Canada. (Tr. 79-81, 309, 313-315). Complainant asked Respondent Florance to handle the strawberries and to attempt to find a buyer in Western Canada. (Tr. 309, 313-315).

17. Respondent Florance contacted Phil Dixon of Sun Fresh, who had experience handling distressed loads in Western Canada. (Tr. 644, 646-647, 654). There is a limited market and limited number of outlets for distressed strawberries in Western Canada. (Tr. 80, 90, 251-253, 309, 314-315, 511, 545-560, 606-7, 644, 652-668). At the time Phil Dixon was contacted, despite his attempts, the strawberries could not be re-worked or re-sold because of their poor condition, and they had to be discarded in their entirety (either dumped or donated). (RXF 1 at 16; RXF 2 at 21; RXF 3 at 26). Sun Fresh charged Respondent Florance standard charges for dumping and disposal. (Tr. 306, 559-561, 654-665; RXF 1 at 16; RXF 2 at 21; RXF 3 at 26).

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

18. Complainant and Respondent Florance agree that Respondent Florance “did all it could” with attempted resale of the three loads of strawberries, (Tr. 250), that there were limited options for resale after rejection (Tr. 251-253), and that no return from any of the three loads was “not surprising.” (Tr. 306-308).

Discussion and Conclusions in W-R-2012-463

The conclusions in this case will be addressed first, since they involve less dispute and require less explanation (because the parties now appear to agree on the entirety of the issues in the case). As to the actual terms of the contract, Complainant and Respondent Florance, as noted *supra*, are in agreement as to that issue: f.o.b. “no grade” were the contract terms (*see* Finding of Fact ¶ 10), and “some softness and bruising was acceptable so long as there was no ‘decay or leakers’” (Tr. 111-112), and the fruit arrived “otherwise sound.” (Tr. 603-604.) The contract contemplated that the three strawberry loads would make good delivery at their destination in Western Canada. (Tr. 111-112, 146, 299, 605). F.o.b. means that “the produce quoted or sold is to be placed free on board the boat, car, or other agency of the [buyer] through land transportation at shipping point, in suitable condition . . . and that the buyer assumes all risk of damage and delay in transit not caused by the seller irrespective of how the shipment is billed.” 7 C.F.R. § 46.43(i); *Primary Export International v. Blue Anchor, Inc.*, 56 Agric. Dec. 969, 975-76 (U.S.D.A. 1997). “The buyer shall have the right of inspection at destination before the goods are paid for to determine if the produce shipped complied with the terms of the contract at the time of shipment” 7 C.F.R. § 46.43(i).

A “no grade” contract simply means that no grade was specified in the contract, and all that is necessary for such a contract to exist is for the parties to fail to mention a grade. *Ta-De Distributing Company, Inc. v. R.S. Hanline & Co., Inc.*, 58 Agric. Dec. 658, 673 (U.S.D.A. 1999); *Supreme Berries, Inc. v. McEntire*, 49 Agric. Dec. 1210, 1215-17 (U.S.D.A. 1990) (the suitable shipping condition provisions require delivery to contract destination “without abnormal deterioration,” or good delivery). *See also* 7 C.F.R. §§ 46.43, 46.44.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

As stated *supra*, page 2, in the formal Complaint, Complainant claimed it was due the full unpaid amount of the invoice prices for the three strawberry loads. However, as is also stated *supra*, at hearing and thereafter (in Brief and Reply), Complainant's position as to the loads and the amounts they were worth changed significantly.

While Complainant gives a "nod" to its formal Complaint claim in its brief-- "[Main Street] claims the full invoice price of the three loads" (Complainant's Br. at 2)... "[i]f the Hearing Officer concludes that any of the loads were of suitable shipping condition at the shipping point, [Main Street] would be entitled to the fair market value of good product at destination less the condition defects shown on the inspection" (Complainant's Brief, pg. 16) --throughout the hearing and in the majority of its brief and reply brief, Complainant appeared to concentrate on proving that the three loads were *not* of suitable shipping condition. Based on the inspections of the loads (CX 18, CX 36, CX 55, RXF 1, RXF2, RXF3, CX 36, RXF 2 CX 55, RXF 3), and on the testimony of *every* witness who testified at hearing (for Complainant- Tr. 66-69, 116, 129, 166, for Respondent Western Veg.- Tr. 398, and for Respondent Florance- Tr. 432-433, 436, 573-626), we agree, and find that the three loads of strawberries did not make good delivery (*see infra* pages 11-12 for further discussion), and were not of suitable shipping condition upon arrival (*see* CX 4-19 as to the first load; *see* CX 22-36 as to the second load; *see* CX 40-58 as to the third load) or at the time of inspection. (CX 18, CX 36, CX 55, RXF 1, RXF2, RXF3).

It is generally expected within the industry that strawberries sold without reference to grade will meet the condition requirements for U.S. No.1, but not the quality requirements.¹⁴ When quality requirements are discounted, the tolerances allowed for condition defects for U.S. No.1 strawberries are 10% for total defects, including not more than 5% for serious defects, including not more than 2% for decay. 7 C.F.R. § 51.3115 (b) (*see also* PACA GOOD DELIVERY GUIDELINES, www.ams.usda.gov). Under the suitable shipping condition warranty, assuming good transportation and prompt inspection on arrival, good delivery could be

¹⁴ "Quality and "condition" are terms of art as used in inspection certificates, in U.S. Grade Standards, and within the produce industry. "Grade" is often, but not always, used as a synonym for "quality." *See* NEIL E. HARL, 10 AGRICULTURAL LAW § 72.10[4][b] n.8 (2013).

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

achieved on a coast to coast (or several day) shipment with up to 15% total defects/damage, including 8% serious damage, including 3% decay. (*Id.*). Applying these criteria to the inspections at destination outlined in Findings of Fact numbers 13-15 (*and* because the parties agree), all three strawberry loads failed to make good delivery.

We find that Respondent Florance properly rejected the three loads of strawberries, and communicated this in timely manner to Complainant. (CX 4-19, CX 22-36, CX 40-58; Tr. 66-69, 116, 129, 166, 398, 432-433, 436). After the strawberries in the three loads were rejected upon arrival in Canada, Complainant asked Respondent Florance to handle the strawberries and to attempt to find a buyer in Western Canada. (Tr. 309, 313-315).

Respondent Florance contacted Phil Dixon of Sun Fresh, who had experience handling distressed loads in Western Canada, to handle the product. (Tr. 644, 646-647, 654). Because there is a limited market and limited number of outlets for distressed strawberries in Western Canada (Tr. 80, 90, 251-253, 309, 314-315, 511, 545-560, 606-7, 644, 652-668), at the time Phil Dixon was contacted, despite his attempts, the strawberries could not be re-worked or re-sold because of their poor condition, and they had to be discarded in their entirety. Two of the three loads were donated, and one was dumped. Sun Fresh charged Respondent Florance standard charges for dumping and disposal. (Tr. 306, 559-561, 654-665; RXF 1 at 16; RXF 2 at 21; RXF 3 at 26).

Complainant and Respondent Florance agreed at hearing and in Reply Brief on the terms of the contract, on the timeliness and the results of the inspections (*see* Complainant's Reply Br.; *see also* Resp't Florance's Reply Br.; CX 18, CX 36, CX 55, RXF 1, RXF2, RXF3, CX 36, RXF 2 CX 55, RXF 3), and that the three loads of strawberries were not in suitable shipping condition and did not make good delivery. Complainant and Respondent Florance further agreed at hearing and in Reply Brief that Respondent Florance rejected the strawberries (*see* Complainant's Br. and Reply Br.), and that "did all it could" with attempted resale of the three loads of strawberries (Tr. 250), that there were limited options for resale after rejection (Tr. 251-253), and that no return from any of the three loads was "not surprising." (Tr. 306-308). Since Complainant and Respondent

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

appear to be, at least post- Complaint and Answer, in total agreement on all of these above-mentioned issues, and since the documentary evidence further supports the findings, we find as such now. If there was any breach of contract between Complainant and Respondent Florance, it was on the part of Complainant. A contract for three loads of strawberries between Complainant as Respondent Florance was reached, as stated above, and each load was properly and promptly rejected by Respondent Florance because they did not make good delivery, based on inspections, as also stated above. At this point, it was the duty of Complainant (and possibly in turn Respondent Western Veg.; *see infra* at pages 33-40 for further discussion and conclusions on that issue), to take possession of the loads.

Upon a rejection, a buyer such as Respondent Florance “has no duties relative to the rejected goods (except to hold them for a sufficient time for the seller to remove them) unless the seller has no agent or place of business at the market of rejection, and if such agent or place of business does not exist, then the obligation of the buyer is to follow whatever reasonable instructions for the disposition of goods may be given by the owner of the goods (the seller)...” *Ta-De Distributing Company, Inc. v. R.S. Hanline & Co., Inc.*, 58 Agric. Dec. 658, 672 n.2 (U.S.D.A. 1999). “A request by the seller that goods be salvaged by reworking would be considered unreasonable, unless the buyer’s business is set up to do reworking, and if not, it would clearly be only within the province of the seller to arrange for reworking of what, by rejection, would now be the seller’s goods.” *Id.* In any case, it appears that whether the buyers business is or is not set up to rework, a buyer in a position such as Respondent Florance, post-rejection, is only to act in good faith in an attempt at reworking. *Cowley v. Calflo Produce, Inc.*, 55 Agric. Dec. 674, 681 (U.S.D.A. 1996). A buyer assuming the duty acts as the seller’s agent for disposition. However, the type of agency here enforced upon [a buyer] is restricted, and the buyer is only required to act in good faith. Good faith means honesty in fact and the observance of reasonable commercial standards of fair dealing in the trade. *Id.*

Here, after proper rejection, Complainant asked Respondent Florance to attempt to handle the loads, which it did in good faith, to an inevitable (based on the record) and proper conclusion. (*See supra* at 10-12.) Based on the foregoing, Complainant breached the contract(s) and the Complaint against Respondent Florance should be dismissed. Further, because

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

Complainant breached the contract(s), Respondent Florance is entitled to damages.

Respondent Florance's claimed damages in the Answer to the Complaint are somewhat confusing. First, Respondent Florance claims the amount of \$14,889.87 for all three loads, which appears to include expenses such as border crossing, freight, inspection and lost profits, *minus* some amount invoiced (and purportedly paid for) by Complainant. In the breakdown and explanation of expenses, provided later in the Answer, Respondent Florance mentions the f.o.b. price of the strawberries, but does *not* appear to include the amounts in the \$14,889.87 claim. (See Resp't Florance's Answer at 1-3). Then, on the last page of the Answer, Respondent Florance makes mention of a \$7,7011.80 amount for the "f.o.b invoices" from Complainant, and "additional charges related to the product in the amount of \$10,382.31," stating that the total losses to Respondent Florance were \$87,394.11. Finally, however, in the last paragraph of the Answer, Respondent Florance again asks that it be awarded the sum total of \$14,889.87 for Complainant's breach of contract. (See Resp't Florance's Answer at 4-5).

Respondent Florance's damage claim was modified in its Brief and Reply Brief to an amount of \$12,978.11 for freight, border crossing fee, inspection, disposal fees, and lost profit on all three loads of strawberries. Respondent Florance calculates lost profits for each load as follows: the amount of the agreed upon selling price to its own customer, Sobey's (had the product made good delivery and been accepted by Sobeys), minus the amount of the agreed upon selling price in the contract between Complainant and Respondent Florance (had the product made good delivery and been accepted by Sobeys).

Upon proper rejection, a buyer is allowed its damages. Where the buyer rightfully rejects or revokes acceptance such buyer has the options of "cover," or recovering damages for non-delivery under *Uniform Commercial Code* (U.C.C.) § 2-713. See U.C.C. § 2-711(1)(b). (Cover is not an issue in this case.). The measure of damages for nondelivery or repudiation by the seller is the difference between the market price at the time when the buyer learned of the breach and the contract price together with any incidental and consequential damages provided in U.C.C. § 2-

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

715, but less expenses saved in consequence of the seller's breach. U.C.C. § 2-713(1). Market price is to be determined... in cases of rejection after arrival or revocation of acceptance, as of the place of arrival. U.C.C. § 2-713(1). Incidental damages resulting from the seller's breach include expenses reasonable incurred in inspection, receipt, transportation, and care and custody of goods rightfully rejected, any commercially reasonable charges, expenses, or commissions in connection with effecting cover and any other reasonable expense incident to the delay or other breach. U.C.C. § 2-715(1).

Case law, as well as U.C.C. § 2-603, specifically provide that in a post-rejection agency situation such as that in this case between Respondent Florance and Complainant, Respondent is entitled to all expenses as well as damages as specified in U.C.C. § 2-713(1) and U.C.C. § 2-715(1). *Cowley v. Calflo Produce, Inc.*, 55 Agric. Dec. at 682 (After rejection...the berries belonged to Complainant, and Respondent was not purchasing the berries but acting as Complainant's agent in effectuating their sale).

Accordingly, for each of the three loads, we allow Respondent Florance's claim of freight, border crossing fee, inspection, disposal fees, and "lost profit." Lost profit, as the term is used by Respondent Florance, actually appears to be the measure of damages specified in U.C.C. § 2-713(1), as stated above: the amount of the "market price"-- here estimated by Respondent Florance's agreed upon selling price to its own customer, Sobey's (had the product made good delivery and been accepted by Sobey's) minus the amount of the "contract price"-- the agreed upon selling price in the contract between Complainant and Respondent Florance (had the product made good delivery and been accepted by Sobey's). See *Cowley v. Calflo Produce, Inc.*, 55 Agric. Dec. at 682; U.C.C. §§ 2-603, 2-713(1), 2-715(1). Complainant, in its Reply Brief, did not object to the calculations of damages put forth by Respondent Florance in its Brief.

The breakdown for each load, as stated in Respondent Florance's Brief, is as follows:

Load 1-	Freight	\$1,573.63
	Border Crossing Fee	\$75.60
	Inspection	\$125.22
	<u>Lost Profit</u>	<u>\$470.40</u>

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

	Total	\$2,244.85
Load 2-	Freight	\$2,697.66
	Border Crossing Fee	\$129.60
	Inspection	\$175.30
	Disposal Fee	\$622.08
	<u>Lost Profit</u>	<u>\$806.40</u>
	Total	\$4,431.04
Load 3-	Freight	\$4,468.54
	Border Crossing Fee	\$216.00
	Inspection	\$298.68
	<u>Lost Profit</u>	<u>\$1,319.00</u>
	Total	\$6,302.22

Respondent Florance is awarded its claimed damages in the amount of \$12,978.11, plus applicable interest.¹⁵

Fees and Expenses in W-R-2012-463

Fees and expenses will be awarded to the prevailing party to the extent that they are reasonable. *East Produce, Inc. v. Seven Seas Trading Co., Inc.*, 59 Agric. Dec. 853, 864 (U.S.D.A. 2000); *Mountain Tomatoes, Inc. v. E. Patapanian & Son, Inc.*, 48 Agric. Dec. 707, 715 (U.S.D.A. 1989). The question of which party is the prevailing party is one that depends upon the facts of the case. *Anthony Vineyards, Inc. v. Sun World International, Inc.*, 62 Agric Dec. 343 (U.S.D.A. 2003). In hearing cases, it is the province of the Secretary to determine what are reasonable fees and expenses. *Mountain Tomatoes*, 48 Agric. Dec. at 707.

Section 47.19(d)(2) of the regulations applicable to the PACA (7 C.F.R. § 47.19(d)(2)) states that the term “fees and expenses” as used in section 7(a) of the Act includes:

- (i) reasonable fees of an attorney or

¹⁵ Respondent Florance includes its own calculation of interest in its claim, however, no explanation of the interest rate used is offered. The interest rate will therefore be determined in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1961 (*see infra* page 52 for further discussion).

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

authorized representative for appearance at the hearing and for the taking of depositions necessary for introduction at the hearing;

- (ii) fees and mileage for necessary witnesses at the rates provided for witnesses in the courts of the United States;
- (iii) fees for the notarizing of a deposition and its reduction to writing;
- (iv) fees for serving subpoenas; and
- (v) other fees and expenses necessarily incurred in connection with the oral hearing. Fees and expenses which are not considered to be reasonable or necessarily incurred in connection with the oral hearing will not be awarded.

Each party made claims for fees and expenses in this case. Since Complainant failed to carry its burden of proof, for which its Complaint should be dismissed, it is not the prevailing party. Therefore, any fees and expenses claimed by Complainant in connection with case W-R-2012-463 are disallowed.

As Respondent is the prevailing party here it is entitled to reasonable fees and expenses. Respondent claimed \$23,512.50 in attorney's fees at \$250.00 per hour (*see* Resp't Florance's Claim for Fees and Expenses). The fees and expenses provision under section 7(a) of the PACA has been interpreted to exclude any fees or expenses which would have been incurred in connection with the case if that case had been heard by documentary procedure. *Mountain Tomatoes, Inc., v. Patapanian & Son*, 48 Agric. Dec. 707 (U.S.D.A. 1989); *Pinto Bros. v. F.J. Bolestrieir Co.*, 38 Agric. Dec. 269 (U.S.D.A. 1979); *Nathan's Famous v. N. Merberg & Son*, 36 Agric. Dec. 24 (U.S.D.A. 1977); *East Produce, Inc., v. Seven Seas Trading Co., Inc.*, 59 Agric. Dec. 853 (U.S.D.A. 2000) (claim for fees

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

incurred in connection with the preparation of answer, response to cross-claim, preparation of brief, and proposed findings of fact disallowed).

Included in Respondent Florance's claim for attorney's fees are items specifically for preparation of the briefs and trial briefs in this case (*see* Resp't Florance's Claim for Fees and Expenses, Exhibit "A," itemized dates 7/3/14 through 9/2014),¹⁶ in the amount of \$7,512.50. We deny the claim of Respondent Florance for attorney hours expended on the post-hearing brief and reply brief, and find that such activity is not connected to the oral hearing. This activity takes place entirely after the hearing is completed, and briefs and reply briefs are eventualities that routinely take place in documentary procedure cases. *See Pinto Bros., Inc. v. Frank J. Balestrieri Co.*, 38 Agric. Dec. 269; *Nathan's Famous v. N. Merberg & Son*, 36 Agric. Dec. 243; *Mahns v. A. M. Fruit Purveyors*, 34 Agric. Dec. 1950 (U.S.D.A. 1975). We find the remainder of Respondent Florance's claim for attorney fees reasonable, and allow them in the amount of \$16,000.00.

Respondent Florance also claims the expense of the transcript, in the amount of \$975.00, which is awarded. *See Progreso Limited, L.L.P. v. The Fresh Group, LTD.*, 66 Agric. Dec. 1492 (U.S.D.A. 2007); *Mayoll, Inc. v. Weis-Buy Services, Inc.*, 65 Agric. Dec. 648 (U.S.D.A. 2006). Finally, Respondent Florance claims the following expenses: hotel expenses for witness/party representative David Diener in the amount of \$512.07, hotel expenses for Respondent Florance's counsel in the amount of \$512.07, hotel expenses for witness Phil Dixon in the amount of \$524.61, air travel for witness Phil Dixon in the amount of \$712.79, taxi and "miscellaneous" for witness Phil Dixon in the amount of \$81.25, automobile mileage for Respondent Florance's counsel in the amount of \$272.90 (at the rate of \$.045 per mile), and overnight mail/UPS in the amount of \$148.40. These expenses related to the oral hearing, although not documented with receipts and/or proof of payments, are allowed, since Complainant did not

¹⁶ Specifically, we deny the following entries: 7/3/14 in the amount of \$175.00, 8/11/14 in the amount of 675.00, 8/12/14 in the amount of \$125.00, 8/14/14 in the amount of \$175.00, 8/18/14 in the amount of \$125.00, 8/19/14 in the amount of \$62.50, 8/21/14 in the amount of \$100.00, 8/22/14 in the amount of \$125.00, 8/22/14 in the amount of \$125.00, 8/26/14 in the amount of \$750.00, 8/29/14 in the amount of \$200.00, and 9/14 in the amount of \$5000.00.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

object to these expenses. *East Produce, Inc. v. Seven Seas Trading Co., Inc.*, 59 Agric. Dec. 853 (U.S.D.A. 2000). Respondent Florance also claimed the expenses of meals for witness Phil Dixon in the amount of \$121.19 and for witness/representative David Diener and counsel for Respondent Florance combined in the amount of \$221.07. Complainant did not object to these expenses, and they are allowed. *Watson Distributing v. Fruit Unlimited, Inc.*, 42 Agric. Dec. 1613, 1618 (U.S.D.A. 1983); *Patterson Produce Co. v. John Lowe Produce Co., Inc.*, 39 Agric. Dec. 1006 (U.S.D.A. 1980); *Tenneco West, Inc. v. Gilbert Dist. Co., Inc.*, 38 Agric. Dec. 488 (U.S.D.A. 1979).

Based on the foregoing, the allowable amount of expenses claimed by Respondent Florance 's is \$16,000.00 for attorney's fees and \$3,106.35 for expenses.

Discussion and Conclusions in W-R-2012-228

Complainant alleged in the formal Complaint that Respondent Western Veg. is liable for \$34,474.67 (plus applicable interest), in connection with three (3) shipments of strawberries purchased from Respondent Western Veg. in the course of interstate commerce. This amount included a full invoice amount of \$23,040.00 that Complainant mistakenly paid to Respondent Western Veg. for one of the three loads, plus \$11,434.67 for damages "incurred upon arrival" of the three loads. (Complainant's Compl. at 1).¹⁷ Respondent Western Veg. counterclaimed for damages on the three loads in the amount of \$51,865.00.

Substantively, in the Complaint and Answer, Complainant and Respondent Western Veg. differ on only a few points. Respondent Western Veg. admits in its Answer that between November 19, 2011 and November 22, 2011, it agreed to sell the three loads of strawberries to Complainant. (*See Resp't Western Veg.'s Answer at 1-2.*) Respondent

¹⁷ During the course of the formal reparation case, hearing and briefs, Complainant appeared to modify its claim in W-R-2012-228 to: 1) a balance claimed by Complainant in the amount of \$19,524.75 for a mistaken payment for "load 2", *See Complainant's Reply Brief*, pg. 5; and 2) inspection fees, freight, border crossing fee, and dump/disposition fees for all three loads. Complainant, in its brief and reply, does not identify a specific amount for these damages (*See Complainant's Br. at 2, 16; Complainant's Reply Br. at 5.*) *See infra* at pgs. 47-48 for further discussion on this issue.

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

Western Veg. also admits in its Answer that the three loads arrived in Western Canada with the defects stated in Finding of Fact 4-6, *supra*, at 4-5. Respondent Western Veg.'s main argument in the Answer is that the terms of the contract were f.o.b. "acceptance final," and that the losses claimed on the strawberries were inflated; the strawberries should have been reworked to a much greater yield than they were. (*See* Respondent Western Veg.'s Answer at 1-2). In brief and reply, however, Complainant and Respondent differ greatly on several issues (including those that were contested in the Answer). Each will be addressed in turn, below.

In its Brief, Respondent Western Veg. reiterates that the terms of the contract were f.o.b. "acceptance final," and that good delivery standards did not apply to the three loads of strawberries. (Resp't Western Veg.'s Br. at 13-14). In its Response Brief, Respondent Western Veg. appears to argue that *only* the second load was acceptance final. (Resp't Western Veg.'s Reply Br. at 4-5). There was some testimony at hearing that salesman Dave Johnson, who negotiated the contract(s) for the three loads, noticed that Julio Partida, part owner of Respondent Western Veg. had "inserted" the phrase "acceptance final" on all three bills of lading, and thought he deleted the phrase on the passings. (Tr. 42-45, 53-54). Despite his efforts, the language remained on the passing for the third load, which was faxed to Complainant on November 21, 2011. (Tr. 44-45). While Complainant does not appear to have objected at that time to the fax (Tr. 44), which was purportedly received (according to the fax transmission notation on the document), Scott Allen, salesman for Complainant, testified that he did not personally receive or view the passing at the time of the transactions, and that in all past instances where he agreed to the terms f.o.b. "acceptance final" (one in 18 years), he agreed to the terms in writing (the seller faxed him a passing, which he signed/initialed and sent back). (Tr. 184, 276, 283, 495- 497).

In any case, regardless of whether Complainant saw the term inserted on any document after the oral contract was reached, based on the testimony of the only two individuals who negotiated the contract(s)¹⁸ and

¹⁸ Julio Partido, part owner of Respondent Western Veg. (and part owner of the grower who purportedly supplied the strawberries), presumably inserted the "acceptance final" term himself. (Tr. 34-36, 72, 149, 238). However, he did not testify at hearing, for any party. (*See* Tr. 36). In any case, Mr. Partido never dealt with Complainant in forming the

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

who reached a “meeting of the minds” as to the three loads here (*Primary Export International v. Blue Anchor, Inc.*, 56 Agric. Dec. 969, 980 n.18 (U.S.D.A. 1997); *A. Sam & Sons Produce Company, Inc. v. Sol Salins, Inc.*, 50 Agric. Dec. 1044, 1064 n.39 (U.S.D.A. 1991); *Griffin-Holder Co. v. Joseph Mercurio Produce Corp.*, 40 Agric. Dec. 1002 (U.S.D.A. 1981); *Blase v. Keegan, Inc.*, 36 Agric. Dec. 709; *Independent Grayse Distributors v. Barbera Packing Corp.*, 25 Agric. Dec. 1144 (U.S.D.A. 1966)), Complainant’s Scott Allen and Respondent Western Veg.’s Dave Johnson, the record does not support that the terms were “acceptance final.”

Both Scott Allen and Dave Johnson testified in no uncertain terms that the contract terms for all three loads were f.o.b. no grade, and that “some softness and bruising was acceptable so long as there was no ‘decay or leakers,’ and *not* “acceptance final.” (Tr. 14-15, 28- 29, 42, 52, 54, 56-57, 62, 77-79, 100,111-112, 146-147, 184). Based also on this testimony, we find that the contract contemplated that the three strawberry loads would make good delivery at their destination in Western Canada. (Tr. 18-19, 69, 111-112, 146, 299, 605). See *Georgia Vegetable Co., Inc. v. Battaglia Produce Sales, Inc.*, 41 Agric. Dec. 969 (U.S.D.A. 1982); see also *Joseph F. Byrnes Produce, Inc. v. Kaleck Distributing Co.*, 40 Agric. Dec. 997 (U.S.D.A. 1981); *Florance Distributing Co., Inc. v. M. Offutt Brokerage Company, Inc.*, 35 Agric. Dec. 1276 (U.S.D.A. 1976).

As stated *supra*, a “no grade” contract simply means that no grade was specified in the contract, and all that is necessary for such a contract to exist is for the parties to fail to mention a grade. *Ta-De Distributing Company, Inc. v. R.S. Hanline & Co., Inc.*, 58 Agric. Dec. 658, 673 (U.S.D.A. 1999); *Supreme Berries, Inc. v. McEntire*, 49 Ariz. Dec. 1210, 1215-17 (U.S.D.A. 1990) (the suitable shipping condition provisions require delivery to contract destination “without abnormal deterioration”, or good delivery); see also 7 C.F.R. §§ 46.43, 46.44. The term “acceptance final,” on the other hand, which contemplates a contract where suitable shipping condition or good delivery does not apply and where a buyer has no right of rejection (see 7 C.F.R. § 46.43), must be very clearly established due to “the harshness of the conditions imposed. . . , as well as. . . the rarity of its use in the trade. . . .” *Morgan Products Corporation v.*

contract or agreeing on any changes. (Tr. 49, 238-239).

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

United Produce Co., Inc., 25 Agric. Dec. 1484 (U.S.D.A. 1966.) That term was *not* so established by the evidence in this case, and there was no clear assent by Complainant in the record that f.o.b acceptance final were the terms of the contract. (Tr. 14-15, 28- 29, 42, 52, 54, 56-57, 62, 77-79, 100,111-112, 146-147, 184). We find, rather, that the contract terms were f.o.b. no grade, and that good delivery standards applied.

Respondent Western Veg. states in its Brief that, “[a]lthough [Western Veg.] originally believed that the strawberries arrived with the defects noted in the Canadian Inspection Certificates, and responded accordingly in its Answer, upon introduction of the evidence at the hearing, it is apparent that Sobey’s allowed the strawberries to sit for great lengths of time at extreme temperatures, thereby accelerating the decay of already soft berries.” (Resp’t Western Veg.’s Br. at 2).¹⁹

The inspections for all three loads showed significant defects such that none of the three loads made good delivery upon arrival. The maximum allowance for f.o.b. no grade strawberries to make good delivery after five days in transit is 15% total damage, 8% serious damage and 3% decay. *Supreme Berries, Inc. v. McIntire*, 49 Agric. Dec. 1210 (U.S.D.A. 1990). According to the inspections, the defects for every load far exceeded these limits, after less than five days in transit, and therefore, did not make good delivery. (CX 18, CX 36, CX 55, RXF 1, RXF2, RXF3).

While Respondent Western Veg.’s claim the strawberries sat upon arrival for an unreasonable time at unreasonable temperatures, if true, could serve to negate the inspections taken and call into question Complainant’s claim that the strawberries did not make good delivery, the claim is not borne out by the facts.

For the first load of 756 strawberries shipped on November 19, 2011, Respondent Western Veg.’s bill of lading shows that the strawberries were shipped from Respondent Western Veg.’s loading facility at 11:31 am. (RXWV 1). A temperature recorder was placed on the truck with this load. (Tr. 515). The temperature tape for that load shows when the truck doors

¹⁹ We note here that none of the parties in either W-R-2012-463 or W-R-2012-228 make any claims that the transportation was abnormal, or that the strawberries were not kept at proper temperature during transportation.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

were closed after loading, and then when they were opened on arrival at approximately 5:00 am on November 22 in Western Canada, after the approximately 2 ¾ day trip. (RXF 1 at 4; CX 6.) Emails sent by employees of the customer at destination, Sobeys, to Florance Distributing (Respondent in W-R-2012-463), show that a pre-inspection was performed, showing 30 percent to 50 percent decay (RXF 1 at 5), and that they had a problem with the load (“on hold,” “called for inspection”) as of at least 7:48 am on November 22, and called for an inspection (RXF 1, pg. 10.) An inspection was performed on the 756 flats of strawberries at 10:00am on November 22, showing total defects of 34% including 18% decay. (CX 18, RXF 1 at 11). From the evidence of record, we conclude that the inspection was performed approximately 5 hours after arrival, and that it was timely.

For the second load of 1296 flats of strawberries shipped on November 19, 2011, Respondent Western Veg.’s bill of lading shows that the strawberries were shipped from Respondent Western Veg.’s loading facility at 1:01 pm. (RXWV 2). A temperature recorder was placed on the truck with this load. (Tr. 515). The temperature tape for that load shows when the truck doors were closed after loading, and then when they were opened on arrival at approximately 10:00 pm on November 21 in Western Canada, after the approximately 2 ½ day trip. (RXF 2 at 4; CX 24.) Emails sent by employees of the customer at destination, Sobey’s, to Florance Distributing (Respondent in W-R-2012-463), show that a pre-inspection was performed, showing 25 percent to 30 percent decay (RXF 2, pg. 5), and that they had a problem with the load (“mold/wet/decay/bruising”, “CFIA inspection called”) as of at least 8:43 am on November 22, and called for an inspection at 11:04 am on that date. (RXF 2, pg. 13). An inspection was performed on the 1296 flats of strawberries at 9:30am on November 23, showing total defects of 22% including 12% decay. (CX 36, RXF 2). From the evidence of record, we conclude that the inspection was performed approximately 36 hours after arrival, and that it was timely.

For the third load of 2160 flats of strawberries shipped on November 21, 2011, Respondent Western Veg.’s bill of lading shows that the strawberries were shipped from Respondent Western Veg.’s loading facility at 9:37 pm. (RXWV 7-2). A temperature recorder was placed on the truck with this load. (Tr. 515). The temperature tape appears to have been activated earlier, before actual departure (RXF 3 pg. 4; RXWV 7-2),

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

and the temperature tape for that load shows that the doors were opened on arrival at approximately 12:51 pm in Western Canada, after the approximately 3 day trip. (RXF 3 at 4). (The temperature recorder time in and time out here appear to be inaccurate, since the times do not coincide with arrival emails; however, no party has raised this, hence I will attribute the discrepancy no meaning). Emails sent by employees of the customer at destination, Sobey's, to Florance Distributing (Respondent in W-R-2012-463), show that a pre-inspection was performed, showing 30 percent "plus" decay (RXF 3 at 5), and that they had a problem with the load ("[f]inding 1-4 berries with mold and decay in almost every case checked", "[h]ave them picked and removed from warehouse") as of at least 10:56 am on November 24, and called for an inspection. (RXF 3 at 14-18). An inspection of 529 trays was performed at 7:15 am on November 25, showing total defects of 22% including 20% decay (CX 55, RXF 3), and another inspection of the second lot of 1631 flats trays out of the entire 2160 was also performed at 7:15am on November 25 and had total defects of 21% including 7% decay. (CX 55, RXF 3). From the evidence of record, we conclude that the inspection was performed approximately 20 hours after arrival, and that it was timely.

Respondent Western Veg. argues that the strawberries in the three loads were left "to decay in elevated temperatures" anywhere from 12 to 36 hours before the inspections were performed (Resp't Western Veg.'s Br. at 10). As to the time frame within which the inspections were completed in this case, Department precedent suggests that the time that elapsed between arrival and inspection here (between 5 and 36 hours) is entirely acceptable. *Bruce Newlon Co., Inc. v. Richardson Produce Co.*, 34 Agric. Dec. 897 (U.S.D.A. 1975); *D.L. Piazza Co. v. Stacy Distr. Co.*, 18 Agric. Dec. 307 (U.S.D.A. 1959).

Moreover, in cases where the condition on arrival is in such poor condition that we can be reasonably certain that the suitable shipping warranty would have been breached even under different conditions (in this case, storage temperatures and time of inspection are the relevant conditions), we can allow more time between arrival and inspection and still rely upon the inspection. See *Midwest Marketing Co., v. Ralph & Cono Commune Produce Co.*, 46 Agric. Dec. 179 (U.S.D.A. 1987) (inspections made on two truckloads of watermelons four days after arrival

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

showing 31% and 23% decay respectively were held to show a breach of contract by the supplier); *see also SEL International Corp. v. Brown*, 52 Agric. Dec. 740 (U.S.D.A. 1993).²⁰ We find that such is the case here, and that the results of the inspections, performed 5 hours, 20 hours, and 36 hours after arrival, can be relied upon.

As to Respondent Western Veg.'s argument that the three loads were kept at elevated temperatures between actual arrival and inspection, Respondent Western Veg. points to (1) the pulp temperatures of the loads upon pre-inspection by Sobeys versus the pulp temperatures of the fruit upon inspection; and (2) the warehouse temperature and/or the cooler temperature as noted on the inspection. We find that Respondent Western Veg. provides no reliable evidence of improper storage temperatures between arrival and inspection.

First, with respect to the pulp temperature argument, while the inspection shows, in each case, elevated temperatures between pre-inspection and inspection (roughly rises between 0 and 7 degrees Fahrenheit), several witnesses testified at hearing, *including* Respondent Western Veg.'s witness, David Ollivier (Tr. 394-396), that pulp temperatures of strawberries continue to rise over time and as they inevitably decay, whether or not they are properly cooled. (Tr. 546, 674.) David Ollivier also testified that there are "so many factors that affect" progression of decay, and that "the more decay [a berry has], obviously the more [internal] heat it's going to generate." (Tr. 396.) Moreover, the arrival that had the *highest* pulp temperature (37.5 degrees Fahrenheit, see RXF 3 at 5), had the *least* amount of decay upon inspection (RXF 3 at 20). We therefore find that the pulp temperature alone cannot be used as a reasonable or reliable measure as to the condition of the strawberries on arrival, or to speculate as to whether the fruit was "kept at elevated

²⁰ We also note that foreign shipments are often allowed more time between arrival and inspection to show the condition of the produce, particularly where the percentage of defects and decay is high. *Trans-West Fruit Co., Inc. v. Ameri-Cal Produce, Inc.*, 42 Agric. Dec. 1955, 2008 (U.S.D.A. 1983) (where, as to foreign shipments of containers of citrus, approximately 5 percent as to decay was the amount allowed for good delivery, and containers were not surveyed until 5 days after arrival. The buyer was found not to have met its burden of proving abnormal deterioration as to containers showing 7.55% to 8.58% decay due to the length of time between arrival and inspection, but was found to have met such burden as to containers showing 12.42% to 16.26% decay, even though the length of time between arrival and survey was the same).

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

temperatures” awaiting inspection, as is claimed by Respondent Western Veg.

Second, Respondent Western Veg. argues that the inspections themselves reveal improper handling upon arrival and until the inspections were performed (because of the warehouse and/or cooler temperature notations on the inspections) (Resp’t Western Veg.’s Br. at 10-12). There are several problems with this argument. We cannot reasonably glean the temperatures at which the berries were actually kept and stored prior to inspection solely from the warehouse temperatures noted on the inspection, and to say the berries were not properly cooled and “left to rot” (Resp’t Western Veg.’s Br. at 10-11) based on the warehouse temperature notations alone is pure speculation.²¹ There was no testimony from any witness as to the temperatures at which the berries were kept between arrival and inspection, other than when David Diener of Respondent Florance, who deals regularly with the customer Sobeys, stated that “they know their responsibility to maintain temperatures.” (Tr. 624, 629).

On the third load, there *is* a notation for both warehouse temperatures (46.4 degrees Fahrenheit) and “cooler” temperatures of 42.8 degrees Fahrenheit for the first lot, and cooler temperatures only (37.4 degrees Fahrenheit) for the second lot. (RXF 3 at 19-20). Neither of the other inspections on the first two loads contain a recorded cooler temperature (*see* RXF 1 and RXF 2). However, it is unclear as to what this means on the inspection: why the first lot has a notation for both warehouse and cooler, what cooler facility is being referenced on either lot, and what data the CFIA uses to measure and record the temperature. Further, on this inspection (in contrast to the cooler notation on the document), there is also a notation of “where inspected” which states “applicant warehouse” (which further calls into question the meaning of the cooler notation). (RXF 3 at 19-20).

²¹ Moreover, it appears that the warehouse temperatures had little bearing on the pulp temperatures of the berries. For example, the highest measure of warehouse temperatures (64 degrees Fahrenheit for load 2, *see* RXF 2, pg. 5) yielded strawberries with pulp temperatures of 38.28 degrees Fahrenheit after approximately 36 hours, by Respondent Western Veg.’s own account (Resp’t Western Veg.’s Br. at 6.). This was a 4-6 degree increase of pulp temperatures, which was less than that of other loads kept at cooler warehouse temperatures for *less* time. (*Id.*).

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Without more evidence on the meaning of the warehouse and cooler notations on the inspections and how they were derived, we are left to speculate, without any real basis, as to any bearing it may have in this case, and as to exactly where the strawberries were kept between arrival and inspection (or at what temperature). There was no testimony on the subject of whether the strawberries were kept in a cooler after arrival, other than when David Diener of Respondent Florance opined that “you want to cool [strawberries] in a 34-36 degree” Fahrenheit cooler. (Tr. 631). He also observed that they were not cooled at that temperature in the “particular cooler” noted on the inspection (the cooler temperature noted on the inspection for the second lot of the third load was 37.4 degrees Fahrenheit). (*Id.*). The “particular cooler” remark, and its meaning, was not further explored at hearing.

It is unclear from the evidence exactly where the strawberries were kept prior to inspection, and there is a myriad of possibilities. It is possible they were all kept on a cooled truck and unloaded only to the degree that samples could be pre-inspected and then later inspected, possible they were all kept in a cooler until inspection and then removed and inspected in the warehouse, possible they were all kept in a cooler until inspection and actually inspected in the cooler, and possible they were all kept in a warehouse and then inspected. (This does not purport to be an exhaustive list of the possibilities, there may be others.). It is also possible that some portions of each load were kept in one or more of the above mentioned locations, and that other portions were kept in one or more of the above mentioned locations. We decline to engage in speculation on the issue; suffice it to say that we cannot find, as Respondent Western Veg. urges us to do, that the strawberries were kept at improper temperatures between arrival and inspection, and that this was the cause of the strawberries’ failure to make good delivery.²²

²² We note that Respondent Western Veg. makes an argument that the second portion of the third load was kept in a cooler after arrival as opposed to being left in the warehouse. (Resp’t Western Veg.’s Br. at 10-11; RXF 3 at 20), and that those strawberries showed the least damage/decay/defects; however, even assuming, *arguendo*, that this portion of the load was properly cooled between arrival and inspection, they *still* had total defects of 21% including 7% decay, and did not make good delivery. (RXF 3 at 20). *See* Supreme Berries, Inc. v. McIntire, Jr., 49 Agric. Dec. 1210 (U.S.D.A. 1990).

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

Finally, on the issue of whether the strawberries were properly cooled between arrival and inspection, and in support of our declination to find that they were not properly cooled (*and* our declination to find that improper storage after arrival was the cause of the strawberries to failure to make good delivery), we note that the pre-inspection reports, presumably taken almost immediately after arrival, showed that the examined samples of the first load had 30%-50% decay and “soft, mold, wet” (RXF 1 at 5), the second load had 25%-30% decay and “mold, wet, decay, and bruising” (RXF 2 at 5), and the third load had 30% “plus” problems, with “1-4 berries with mold and decay in almost every case checked.” (RXF 3 at 5). The aggregate of the evidence of record does not support that storage and handling conditions prior to the inspection contributed significantly to the three loads’ failure to make good delivery in this case.

Respondent Western Veg. also claims that upon arrival in Western Canada, Sobey's confused the “merely soft berries” with decayed berries, and that the evidence was not adequate to conclusively establish that the berries in question were decayed rather than soft upon delivery. We disagree. The evidence, the pre-inspection reports, the emails, the attached pictures, and the inspections themselves establish the condition of the strawberries in the three loads upon arrival, and that they did not make good delivery. Perhaps *some* strawberries in the three loads were soft rather than actually decayed, but even if so, that is not relevant to the outcome of this case. The proper and non-subjective measure of the condition of produce at contract destination in an f.o.b contract, such as we have here, is a neutral inspection. *Tantum v. Phillip R. Weller*, 41 Agric. Dec. 2456 (U.S.D.A. 1982); *O. D. Huff, Jr., Inc. v. Pagano & Sons*, 21 Agric. Dec. 385 (U.S.D.A. 1962). We have three Canadian Federal Inspections (CX 18, CX 36, and CX 55; *see also* RXF1, RXF 2, and RXF 3) in this case; hence, there is no need to speculate as to whether some strawberries were merely soft, and some were decayed—the inspections show that the three loads did not make good delivery because of their high levels of defects and decay. (*Supra* at 22-25). *See* 7 U.S.C. § 499n(a); *see also Fruit Distributing Corp. v. Gary D. Harney Company*, 44 Agric. Dec. 1331 (U.S.D.A. 1985) (federal inspections of produce are *prima facie* evidence of the accuracy of the information set forth in the inspection report).

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Respondent Western Veg. argues that “upon receipt of the berries, some clamshells had no decay and were otherwise marketable, and some clamshells could be easily repackaged. Nevertheless, Sobey’s rejected every single clamshell, thereby causing additional potential damage to Western.” (Resp’t Western Veg.’s Br. at 3, 12). There are a number of problems with this argument. First, Respondent Western Veg. appears to blame the alleged wrongdoing on Sobey’s, which is not a party to this reparation case. Second, Respondent Western Veg.’s argument is speculative, and cites “potential damage.” As stated *supra*, whether *some* strawberries in *some* clamshells were not decayed is not the issue; all three loads failed the Canadian Federal Inspections and were rejected by Sobey’s. Once the loads failed inspection, Sobey’s rejected the loads, which was within its rights.

Respondent Western Veg. appears to argue that Sobey’s had some obligation upon arrival of the loads to accept them and make the best of them, no matter their condition, and to repack, parceling out any “good” strawberries.²³ (Resp’t Western Veg.’s Br. at 12). Such is not the case. Upon arrival, the strawberries in the three loads were pre-inspected, inspected, and rejected. At that point, Sobey’s obligation was to communicate the rejection in timely fashion, which they did, to Florence. *Jen Sales, Inc. v. S. Friedman & Sons, Inc.*, 53 Agric. Dec. 810 (U.S.D.A. 1994); *G. Tanaka Farms v. Garden State Farms, Inc.*, 48 Agric. Dec. 729 (U.S.D.A. 1989). A seller always has the duty of accepting a procedurally effective rejection, whether the rejection is rightful or wrongful. *Cal/Mex Distributors Inc. v. Tom Lange Co., Inc.*, 46 Agric. Dec. 1113 (U.S.D.A. 1987); *Yokoyama Bros. v. Cal-Veg. Sales*, 41 Agric. Dec. 535 (U.S.D.A. 1982); *Pope Packing & Sales v. Sante Fe Veg. Growers Coop. Ass’n.*, 38 Agric. Dec. 101 (U.S.D.A. 1979); *Produce Brokers & Dists. v. Monsour’s*, 36 Agric. Dec. 2002 (U.S.D.A. 1977); and *Bruce Church, Inc., v. Tested Best Foods Division*, 28 Agric. Dec. 337 (1969). And in this case, the rejection was rightful, as evidenced by the inspections.²⁴

²³ Respondent Western Veg. also argues that Sobey’s rejected in bad faith. There is no evidence of this.

²⁴ It is possible that Respondent Western Veg. predicates its argument on the claim that one or more of the three loads were sold on f.o.b. acceptance final terms and that Complainant had no right of rejection; however, we have already found that the contract terms on the three loads were not “acceptance final.” (*Supra* at 20-22). Even had we found that those terms applied in the contract between Complainant and Respondent Western

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

Moreover, there was testimony at hearing from several witnesses who deal extensively with the sale and purchase of strawberries, that upon arrival of the strawberries in this case, re-sorting and re-packing, and parceling out the strawberries with decay, was not a reasonable possibility, because of the highly perishable nature of the fruit. (Tr. 90, 251-253, 548-555, 570, 573, 585-600).

Respondent Western Veg. further argues that Sobeys was responsible for arranging transportation for the three loads, and that they delayed in picking them up, “thereby causing the strawberries to age in cold storage.” Respondent Western Veg. goes on to argue that “Scott Allen [of Complainant] testified that he would not have purchased 2-3 day old fruit...the fruit was not 2-3 days old when [Complainant] Main Street purchased it. The fact that the fruit was 2-3 days old time of shipment²⁵ was the result of Sobeys’ delay in picking up the fruit.”

Again, as noted above, this appears to be an alleged claim against Sobeys, which is not a party to the reparation in either W-R-2012-228 or W-R-2012-463. Irrespective of that, the testimony of Respondent Western Veg.’s own witness, David Ollivier, belies the argument. David Ollivier testified that his recollection was that each of the three loads of strawberries were shipped within 24 hours of the harvest, and that the strawberries were put into cooling tunnels and then cold storage, maintained at 33 to 34 degrees prior to shipment. (Tr. 363-365; 368-369, 435). He also testified that it appeared to him that the three loads were “handled almost to perfection” prior to loading onto the trucks to western Canada. (Tr. 425).²⁶ Testimony of other witnesses further supports that there was no delay in the pick-up of the three loads; David Johnson (see Tr. 13-39), who negotiated the contract(s) with Scott Allen, Mr. Allen (Tr. 487-488), and David Diener of Florance (Tr. 518) all testified that the fruit was picked up one day or less after the contracts were formed, and none mentioned any delay in their testimony.

Veg., those terms would not apply to Florance’s customer, Sobeys.

²⁵ We will not explore the issue of whether Respondent Western Veg. concedes in its Brief that it loaded 2-3 day old fruit.

²⁶ Incidentally, there was also testimony from David Ollivier that some of the berries for the three loads were picked up to two days before shipment. (Tr. 459, 466-467).

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Moreover, in an f.o.b. no grade contract, destination Western Canada, such as the contract(s) in this case were (*supra* at 20-22), it was Respondent Western Veg.'s obligation to load fruit at shipping point that conformed to the contract. If any of the three loads were loaded that were not in suitable shipping condition, then that was the fault and responsibility of Respondent Western Veg. *Primary Export International v. Blue Anchor, Inc.*, 56 Agric. Dec. 969, 975-976 (U.S.D.A. 1997); 7 C.F.R. § 46.43(i). We therefore give no weight to Respondent Western Veg.'s argument that there was a delay in picking up the fruit, and that this somehow contributed to the condition of the three loads of strawberries at destination in Western Canada.

The fruit was picked up timely, properly cooled in transportation (as noted *supra*, there were no claims of improper or abnormal transportation by any party), it was pre-inspected upon arrival with noted problems, mold and decay, and timely inspected, upon which it failed to make good delivery and was not in suitable shipping condition.

The three loads were also properly and timely rejected by Sobeys to Florance, Florance properly and timely rejected to Main Street, and Main Street in turn properly and timely rejected to Respondent Western Veg. Western Veg. argues, however, that Complainant did not notify it of the rejection of until February, 2012. (Respondent Western Veg.'s Brief, pgs. 3, 9.) The UCC, section 2-602, provides that rejection of goods must be within a reasonable time after their delivery or tender. It is ineffective unless the buyer reasonably notifies the seller. An ineffective rejection has the same legal consequence as acceptance. *Dew-Grow, Inc., a/t/a Central West Produce v. First National Supermarkets, Inc.*, 42 Agric. Dec. 2020 (1983). The burden of proof regarding seasonable notice rests upon the buyer. *San Tan Tillage Co., Inc. v. Kaps Foods, Inc.*, 38 Agric. Dec. 867 (1979); *Sun World Marketing v. Bayshore Perishable Distributors*, 38 Agric. Dec. 480 (1979).

Here, as noted *supra* at pgs. 12-13, there is no dispute between Complainant and Respondent Florance in W-R-2012-463 that the produce was properly rejected shortly after arrival by Sobeys, and that it in turn was timely rejected by Respondent Florance and communicated to

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

Complainant Main Street. The aggregate of evidence of record supports that there was *also* a proper and timely rejection by Complainant which was communicated to Respondent Western Veg in this case.

Rejection of load 1

As to the rejection for the first load, while the emails (with attachment pictures and documents) introduced as evidence (CX 4- CX 19, RXF 1) indicate that there was a problem, that inspections would be called, and the results of the inspections, they do not clearly state that there was a rejection by Sobey's, Florance, or Main Street. *See Firman Pinkerton Co., Inc. v. Casey*, 55 Agric. Dec. 1287 (U.S.D.A. 1996); *Beamon Brothers v. California Sweet Potato Growers*, 38 Agric. Dec. 71 (U.S.D.A. 1979) (mere complaint or expression of displeasure may communicate breach but insufficient for rejection).

However, CX 19 also contains an email from David Diener of Florance to Scott Allen of Complainant Main Street that states: "I am having Sunfresh pick up fruit and work it. Will Advise." David Diener of Florance testified that he forwarded all documentation to Complainant Main Street from Sobey's, including emails, the pre-inspection, pictures, and the inspections. (Tr. 556-558). Mr. Diener also testified that he had conversations with Scott Allen of Complainant that the load was rejected immediately after inspection, and that his email stating Sunfresh would pick up the fruit was following a discussion with Scott Allen wherein David Diener stated Florance's verbal rejection of the load. (*Id.*; Tr. 556-559 585, 588-593).

Scott Allen testified that he immediately forwarded all of the above-mentioned documentation to Dave Johnson at Western Veg. (Tr. 136) (typically the same day, or at most, the following day, Tr. 262), and he confirmed that David Diener rejected the three loads. (Tr. 136-138). He also testified that there was "no doubt" that he communicated Florance's rejection (by email and verbally), and in turn Main Street's, to Dave Johnson. (*Id.*; *see also* Tr. 261-262, 300). Scott Allen also indicated in his testimony that he had discussion(s) with Dave Johnson regarding rejection and the agreement to ask Florance to handle the three loads. (Tr. 250, 262, 314-315).

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Dave Johnson testified somewhat vaguely that he got paperwork suggesting there was a problem several days after the load shipped (possibly up to a week later) (Tr. 38-39), that sometime prior to that he heard verbally from Scott Allen that an inspection was being called for, and the load was “being asked to be removed.” (Tr. 39). He also stated that Scott Allen told him that the load was either “inspected or rejected” (Tr. 75). His testimony indicates that this was when the “third load hit” on November 24. (Id.) Dave Johnson also testified that he had discussions internally at Western Veg. about how load 1 was “being inspected, and that they were being consigned.” (Tr. 78). However, Dave Johnson agreed during his testimony that the load was rejected and that Complainant and Western Veg. agreed to have Florance handle the loads. (Tr. 79-80, 87).

Finally, David Ollivier of Respondent Western Veg. testified that there was a rejection of the loads communicated to David Johnson of Western Veg. by Complainant. He stated that as to the returns of the three shipments, “there were several conversations that had happened and there was...[Dave Johnson] would just say, well, the market is really good up there, so we’re probably not going to have a problem. You know, these loads have been rejected... .” His testimony indicates that there was a timely rejection of all three loads. (Tr. 413).

Rejection of load 2

As to the rejection of the second load, there are again emails (with attachment pictures and documents) introduced as evidence of rejection. (CX 22-CX 36, RXF 2.) These alone, more than in the first load, at least serve to communicate a rejection by Sobey's to Florance (*see* CX 35, email from Sobey's to Florance: “Please advise on your removal arrangements.”) There is again an email from David Diener to Scott Allen stating: “Again having Sun Fresh pick fruit up and work. (CX 35). As was the case in load 1, David Diener testified that he forwarded all documentation on to Scott Allen of Complainant Main Street, and that he verbally communicated Florance’s rejection to Main Street “without a doubt within 24 hours.” (Tr. 566-580).

Scott Allen’s testimony as to the rejection of the second load was somewhat equivocal. While Scott Allen testified that he had several

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

discussions regarding rejections with David Diener of Florance, it is not clear from the testimony exactly what discussions he had regarding rejection with Respondent Western Veg. (Tr. 150, 171, 181). However, Scott Allen did testify that he forwarded along the inspection and possibly other information from David Diener (presumably the pre-inspection report, pictures, and emails) to Dave Johnson at Western Veg. (Tr. 181) (typically the same day, or at most, the following day, Tr. 262), and that he received notice of rejection from Florance, and passed on that notice of rejection to Western Veg. (Tr. 300-301). Scott Allen also indicated that *some* rejection discussion between Complainant and Respondent Western Veg. and subsequent agreement to have Florance handle the loads was had. (Tr. 250, 262, 314-315).

In any case, Dave Johnson, who handled the contract(s) for Western Veg., agreed during his testimony that the product in the three loads was rejected and it was agreed to have Florance handle the loads. (*Supra* at 33-34). David Ollivier of Respondent Western Veg. corroborated this testimony. (Tr. 413.)

Rejection of load 3

As to the rejection of the third load, there are again emails (with attachment pictures and documents) introduced as evidence of rejection (CX 40-CX 55, RXF 3). Once again, these alone, more than in the first load, at least serve to communicate a rejection by Sobey's to Florance (*see* CX 40-41, email from Sobey's to Florance: "Please advise on your removal arrangements."). Also, for this load, both the pre-inspection report and inspection itself contain the notation "Have them picked up and removed from warehouse." (CX 42, CX 55). There is again an email from David Diener to Scott Allen stating: "Will have them picked up and worked by Sun Fresh." (CX 41). As was the case in loads 1 and 2, David Diener testified that he forwarded all documentation on to Scott Allen of Complainant Main Street, and that he verbally communicated Florance's rejection to Main Street. (Tr. 582-589, 591-593).

Scott Allen's testimony as to the rejection of the third load was again somewhat equivocal. While Scott Allen testified that he had several discussions regarding rejections with David Diener of Florance, it is not

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

clear from the testimony exactly what discussions he had regarding rejection with Respondent Western Veg. (Tr. 150, 171, 181). However, Scott Allen did testify that he forwarded along the inspection, emails, pre-inspection reports (which all indicate at least a rejection between Sobey's and Florance), and pictures to Dave Johnson at Western Veg. (Tr. 228-233). He stated this was done typically the same day, or at most, the following day. (Tr. 262). Scott Allen further testified that he received notice of rejection from Florance, and passed on that notice of rejection to Western Veg. (Tr. 300-301). Scott Allen also indicated in his testimony that he had *some* discussion(s) with Dave Johnson regarding rejection and the agreement to ask Florance to handle the three loads. (Tr. 250, 262, 314-315).

In any case, Dave Johnson, who handled the contract(s) for Western Veg., agreed during his testimony that the product in the three loads was rejected and it was agreed to have Florance handle the loads. (*Supra* at 33-34). David Ollivier of Respondent Western Veg. corroborated this testimony. (Tr. 413).

Respondent Western Veg. points out, correctly, that while Complainant's Scott Allen testified that he forwarded to Dave Johnson of Western Veg. all of the emails between Florance and Main Street regarding the loads, including their condition and rejection, Complainant did not produce the forwarded emails and proof they were received by Dave Johnson or anyone else at Western Veg. (Respondent Western Veg.'s Br. at 13). When questioned on that issue at hearing, Scott Allen testified that he was only asked (purportedly by his attorney) to do a search on his computer for email exchanges between himself and David Diener. (Tr. 261). While the absence of proof of the forwarded emails in document form *is* troubling, and providing them as evidence seems the obvious choice on the part of Complainant to support its case in W-R-2012-228, we will not invoke the negative inference rule as to their existence (or lack thereof) in this case. *See Mattes Livestock Co.*, 42 Agric. Dec. 81, 96 (U.S.D.A. 1982); *Speight*, 33 Agric. Dec. 280, 300 (U.S.D.A. 1974); *SEC v. Scott*, 565 F. Supp. 1513 (S.D. N.Y. 1983).

We decline to do so, because as already stated, Dave Johnson acknowledged that he saw, at the least, the inspections for the three loads, and agreed during his testimony that the product in the three loads was

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

rejected and it was agreed to have Florance handle the loads. Moreover, David Ollivier, representative of Respondent Western Veg. at hearing, corroborated this testimony, and stated that the three loads were rejected. (Tr. 413-414). Therefore, based on the aggregate of evidence of record, as discussed above, we find that Complainant rejected the three loads, and that Complainant communicated the rejections to Respondent Western Veg. in timely fashion.²⁷ While Respondent Western Veg. claims that it was not notified of the rejection until February 2012, the record supports that this was merely when Respondent Western Veg. learned of the *return* for the three loads, and not when they learned of the rejection. (Tr. 413-414).

Respondent Western Veg. claims that the loads were inappropriately handled once the agreement was made to re-work the loads. (Respondent Western Veg.'s Br. at 7-8.). Respondent Western Veg. appears to lay blame on non-parties to either of the reparations at hand: on Sobey's, because the fruit further decayed while waiting for pick-up after rejection, and on SunFresh, for not repacking the clamshells and trays of strawberries in attempt to salvage them after pick-up from Sobey's. Aside from the clear flaw in the argument that the loads were handled improperly by non-parties (with no analysis as to how any liability claimed might attach to the actual parties in the case), we find that the evidence of record does not support that the loads were inappropriately handled after rejection.

Here, Complainant's duty after rejection was to act in good faith, meaning honesty in fact and the observance of reasonable commercial standards of fair dealing in the trade. *Cowley v. Calflo Produce, Inc.*, 55 Agric. Dec. at 681. (See discussion *supra*, at pages 12-13). We find that Complainant adhered to this duty. There is no dispute in the record that after the inspections on the three loads were performed, Complainant and Respondent Western Veg. agreed (because neither were familiar with nor had buyers in the area) to ask Florance to try to rework the produce and to attempt to find buyers for them in Western Canada. (Tr. 79-81, 309, 313-

²⁷ We note that in this case, whether Complainant accepted or rejected the three loads, since Respondent Western Veg. breached the contract because the loads did not make good delivery and their condition was supported by inspections, Complainant would be entitled to some measure of damages. See § 2-713(1); see also U.C.C. § 2 - 607(1).

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

315). Respondent Florance contacted Phil Dixon of SunFresh, who had experience handling distressed loads in Western Canada. (Tr. 644, 646-647, 654). SunFresh picked up each of the three loads within one day after the inspection was conducted. (*See* Resp't Western Veg.'s Br. at 8.) There is a limited market and limited number of outlets for distressed strawberries in Western Canada. (Tr. 80, 90, 251-253, 309, 314-315, 511, 545-560, 606-7, 644, 652-668.) At the time Phil Dixon was contacted, despite his attempts, the strawberries could not be re-worked or re-sold because of their poor condition, and they had to be discarded in their entirety. (Tr. 306, 559-561, 654-665; RXF 1 at 16; RXF 2 at 21; RXF 3 at 26). Re-sorting and re-packing the strawberries, and parceling out those with decay, was not a reasonable possibility, because of the highly perishable nature of the fruit. (Tr. 87, 90-91, 251-253, 548-555, 570, 573, 585-600).

To support its argument that produce decayed while waiting for pick-up after rejection, Respondent Western Veg. points to further decay the three loads underwent prior to pick-up by Sunfresh (Resp't Western Veg.'s Br. at 7) (Sunfresh was asked, per agreement between Complainant and Respondent Western Veg. and subsequent agreement between Complainant and Respondent Florance, to pick up the loads from Sobeys and to attempt to rework them) (Tr. 79-81, 309, 313-315, 644, 646-647, 654). Respondent Western Veg. bases its argument on the notations on the inspection versus the notations in a letter from Sunfresh to Florance sent upon dumping of the loads, which according to Respondent Western Veg., purport to show that the product of the three loads was "left to further decay." We find that it is not necessary to go through each notation and comment identified by Respondent Western Veg. Suffice it to say, for each of the three loads, the comments listed on the pre-inspection reports (CX 5, CX 23, CX 42; *see supra* at 22-25), the inspection reports (CX 18, CX 36, CX 55; *see supra* at 22-25), and the Sunfresh letters (RXF 1, pg. 16, RXF 2, pg. 21, RXF 3, pg. 26) all indicate decaying fruit *upon arrival* at destination in Western Canada that *continued* to decay over time. However, there is no evidence in the record to show that the reason for the continued decay was a result of improper handling or delay in pick-up.

Moreover, there was extensive testimony from witnesses, including Respondent Western Veg.'s witness, David Ollivier (Tr. 394-396 for David Ollivier's testimony), as to the highly perishable nature of

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

strawberries. There was further testimony from witnesses that strawberries will continue to decay rapidly over time, regardless of proper handling, and that re-sorting decaying strawberries to re-sell any good berries in a decaying load was a near impossibility. (Tr. 90, 251-253, 546-555, 570, 573, 585-600, 674). Moreover, Phil Dixon of SunFresh testified credibly and extensively that it was in his interest to make every effort to sell the fruit from these three loads, and that he did so. (Tr. 656-672, 674-675). He also testified as to his efforts at re-sale, and why they failed: because of the extremely limited market and number of re-sale outlets in Western Canada, and because of the poor condition of the strawberries. (*Id.*; see RXF 1 at 16, RXF 2 at 21, RXF 3 at 26.).²⁸ He further testified as to his methods of dumping and disposal: two out of three loads were donated to “Winnipeg Food Bank,” at no cost (RXF 1 at 16, RXF 3 at 26), and one was placed in Sunfresh’s “garbage system,” to save on “dumping costs.” (RXF 2 at 21.) The record, if anything, supports that the strawberries were handled properly by all parties post-rejection, and that following the proper rejection of the three loads, Complainant fulfilled its duties in accordance with department law. *Ta-De Distributing Company, Inc. v. R.S. Hanline & Co., Inc.*, 58 Agric. Dec. at 672; *Cowley v. Calflo Produce, Inc.*, 55 Agric. Dec. at 681.

Finally, Respondent Western Veg. argues that Complainant’s payment of the invoice for load 2 “precludes its recovery of the payment.” (Resp’t Western Veg.’s Br. at 14-15). Respondent Western Veg.’s argument is twofold.

First, Respondent Western Veg. argues that the terms of the contract as to load 2 were altered and that f.o.b. “acceptance final” was an “additional term” that became part of the contract²⁹, and that (purportedly) Complainant assented to the additional term, and this was the reason Complainant paid the invoice for load 2. In support of this argument,

²⁸ We note that Respondent Western Veg.’s witness, David Ollivier, testified that the zero return on the three loads was inappropriate, and that there should have been *some* return. (Tr. 372). However, David Ollivier also testified that he didn’t know the market in Western Canada. (Tr. 473).

²⁹ This argument is somewhat contradictory to Respondent Western Veg.’s earlier argument that the original terms of the contract were always f.o.b. (Resp’t Western Veg.’s Br. at 11).

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Respondent Western Veg. explains that additional terms become part of the contract unless “(1) the additional term materially alters the contract; and (2) the parties do not expressly agree to the material term. Some examples of material alterations are clauses negating standard warranties in cases where a warranty normally attaches...” (Resp’t Western Veg.’s Br. at 14; U.C.C. § 2-207).

Here, we have already found, *supra* pages 20-22, that no part of the contract(s) were “acceptance final.” However, solely for the purpose of addressing Respondent Western Veg.’s particular argument on this issue, we find that the additional term is indeed a material alteration of the contract, since under an f.o.b. acceptance final scenario, the term is voiding any warranty of suitable shipping condition, and Complainant would have no right to reject. Moreover, we find that the parties did not expressly agree to the material term, as would be required under U.C.C. section 2-207. (Tr. 14-15, 18-19, 28- 29, 42, 52, 54, 56-57, 62, 77-79, 100,111-112, 146-147, 184, 299, 605). *Morgan Products Corporation v. United Produce Co., Inc.*, 25 Agric. Dec. 1484 (U.S.D.A. 1966.).

Second, in support of its argument that Complainant is precluded from recovering its payment for load 2, Respondent Western Veg. cites section 2-605(2) of the U.C.C., which provides that “[p]ayment against documents made without reservation of rights precludes recovery of the payment for defects apparent on the face of the documents.” The only defects concerned in the present subsection are defects in the documents which are apparent on their face. (*Comment* to U.C.C. section 2-605(4).) Where payment is required against the documents they must be inspected before payment, and the payment then constitutes acceptance of the documents. Under the section dealing with this problem, such acceptance of the documents does not constitute an acceptance of the goods or impair any options or remedies of the buyer for their improper delivery. (*Id.*).

Here, while there is a preliminary passing document, referenced by Respondent Western Veg., that has a notation at the bottom “”type on bill f.o.b. acceptance final (no recourse),”³⁰ and a fax transmission notation

³⁰ We note that Dave Johnson, salesman for Western Veg., testified that he “believed” Julio Partido, who was not a party to the contract formation, typed this on the passing after the contract was formed. (Tr. 31, 35). We *also* note that there is a “terms” section of this document that states only “f.o.b.”, and not “acceptance final.” (RXF 2, at 3). Finally, we

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

indicates that this document was faxed to Scott Allen on November 21, there appears to be no actual invoice in the record that contains an f.o.b. “acceptance final” term. There *is* a document in Respondent Western Veg.’s Answer that states “Invoice” at the top, which again contains at the bottom a notation: “ type on bill f.o.b. acceptance final (no recourse)” (Resp’t Western Veg.’s Answer, Ex. D)-- however, when comparing this document to other invoices in the record, (WVX 8, Resp’t Western Veg.’s Answer, Ex. E, K) it is substantially different from them (it lacks a Western Veg. letterhead and background logo, and information on the face of the document is arranged differently from the original invoices in the record—perhaps it is no more than coincidence, but load 2 is the *only* load that does not appear to include an original invoice), and it does not appear, in comparison with the others, to be the “actual” invoice for this load. Further, we conclude that the notation to “ type on bill f.o.b. acceptance final (no recourse)” is somewhat ambiguous, and suggests that it is an instruction, of sorts, to someone to further type those terms on some actual invoice or bill (either a bill for payment, or a bill of lading) to follow.³¹ Finally, the document from the Answer that pertains to load 2, is not shown by the evidence of record to have ever been received by Complainant (only the bill of lading was shown at hearing to have been faxed to Complainant, not an invoice regarding load 2). Hence, it does not appear from the record that the plain language of section 2-605(2) of the UCC applies with respect to Complainant’s payment for load 2, as the record does not show that Complainant received an invoice document that had a defect “apparent on its face” (f.o.b. acceptance final in this case), accepted the document, and then paid in accordance with price terms (contract f.o.b. terms acceptance final, along with price) stated on that document. (*See Comment* to U.C.C. section 2-605(4).) Neither party, in dealing with the issue of the payment of load 2, produced a check that matched specifically to an original, or even revised, load 2 invoice (only a later account balance, generated by Respondent Western Veg. and contained in Complainant’s records, was produced to show payment for load 2, *see* discussion immediately below).

note that Scott Allen of Complainant claimed at hearing that he didn’t see this document “at the time it was made up.” (Tr. 245.)

³¹ It also contains what appears to be a fax numeral “pg. 1” at the top, but there is no “page 2” in the exhibit.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Moreover, the record supports that both parties knew that the three loads, the contract terms, and the amounts owed for the three loads were in dispute shortly after the loads arrived in Western Canada, and that there were even settlement negotiations between Complainant and Respondent Western Veg. regarding the loads that took place even before an informal Complaint in this case was filed. (Tr. 83, 87-89, 374, 414-415). Presumably, based on those various negotiations, Respondent Western Veg. at some point reduced the original invoice price of \$23,040.00 to \$15,264.00, as is shown by a June 2012 account balance document of Western Veg. sent to Complainant. (CX 37). This document shows that the load was paid for after the original invoice price was reduced by Respondent Western Veg. (*Id.*). The load was paid for in full after the informal dispute was filed on March 9, 2012, paid on or about March 16, 2012. (ROI, Ex. C). According to Scott Allen of Complainant, the original load price of \$23,040.00 was paid by someone at accounting by mistake, and he had no idea why the amount was paid. (Tr. 277).³²

The fact that the full original invoice price was paid *after* the amount requested as due had been reduced by Respondent Western Veg. is strong evidence that the \$23,040.00 amount was paid by mistake, and at the time, should have been an indication to Respondent Western Veg. that Complainant did not mean for the payment to be satisfaction of the debt in dispute.³³ *Louis Caric & Sons v. Ben Gatz Co.*, 38 Agric. Dec. 1486 (U.S.D.A. 1979); *Mendelson-Zeller Co. v. Michael J. Navilio, Inc.*, 34 Agric. Dec. 903 (U.S.D.A. 1975); *Spada Distributors Co. v. Frank*

³² While it is certainly possible that “someone” from accounting saw the preliminary passing that contained the “type on bill f.o.b. acceptance final (no recourse)” notation, (RXF 2, pg. 3) or perhaps saw the document that contained the same notation in Respondent Western Veg.’s Answer (Exhibit D), and paid the original contract amount on that basis, Scott Allen opined in testimony that it was the result of “the worst conceivable coincidence”. (Tr. 277).

³³ Scott Allen testified only that “someone from accounting” called Respondent Western Veg. and asked for the payment back. (Tr. 277-278). David Ollivier of Western Veg. testified that Complainant typically pays for invoices within 30 days, and that this load was paid in “around 90.” (Tr. 372-373). He stated that he believed that because load 2 was paid in “around 90 days”, there were “obviously” discussions [by Complainant] on whether to pay the full amount, and that “it appears that there was a decision [by Complainant] to pay it. (*Id.*). David Ollivier did not explain the basis for his belief or his reasoning. The testimony from both witnesses is vague, and does not add to resolving the mystery of how or why the payment, in fact, was made, but based on the entire record, we find that it was indeed a mistake on Complainant’s part.

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

Kenworthy Co., 17 Agric. Dec. 347 (1958); *Mendelson-Zeller Co. v. The Season Produce Co.*, 31 Agric. Dec. 1288 (U.S.D.A. 1972) (To constitute an accord and satisfaction it is necessary that the money be offered in full satisfaction of the demand, and be accompanied by such acts and declarations as amount to a condition that the money, if accepted, is accepted in satisfaction...).

Finally, Complainant gave Respondent Western Veg. further indication that it objected to or mistakenly paid for load two when Complainant amended its informal complaint in this case to ask for return of the \$23,040.00 payment (ROI, Exs. F, G) and when it filed its formal Complaint, wherein it also sought as damages the return of the mistaken payment. (Complainant's Compl. at 2).³⁴ Based on the foregoing, we find that Complainant is not precluded from seeking the return of the payment for load 2 as part of any damages to which it may be entitled.

We have found that an f.o.b. no grade contract was reached for the three loads of strawberries, wherein some bruising would be acceptable, but that the strawberries were expected to make good delivery in Western Canada. We have also found that due to the condition of the fruit upon arrival, the contract was breached by Respondent Western Veg., and Complainant properly rejected the three loads. Accordingly, Complainant is the prevailing party in this case, and is entitled to damages. *See Newbern Groves, Inc. v. C. H. Robinson Company*, 53 Agric. Dec. 1766 (U.S.D.A. 1994); *see also Mic Bruce, Inc.*, 45 Agric. Dec. 1215 (U.S.D.A. 1986); *V. V. Vogel & Sons Farms v. Continental Farms*, 44 Agric. Dec. 886 (U.S.D.A. 1985.)

³⁴ Respondent Western Veg. addressed the payment in its response to the informal complaint, wherein it stated that it assumed, upon receipt of the \$23,040.00, that there was no further dispute as to that particular load. Curiously, there is no further correspondence in either the informal file (other than the amended informal complaint to which includes the "mistaken" payment as damages), or the formal Complaint (which does the same.) We believe that it is quite likely that the parties, who have continued to do regular business with one another since this dispute began in November 2011 (in 2012 through 2014, Complainant and Respondent Western Veg. did 2.7 million worth) (Tr. 373-374), communicated back and forth about this issue, but if there were such communications, no evidence to that effect by either side was produced, other than Scott Allen's vague testimony that "someone" from accounting at Complainant requested return of the payment from Respondent Western Veg. (Tr. 277-278).

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Upon proper rejection, a buyer is allowed its damages. Where the buyer rightfully rejects or revokes acceptance such buyer has the options of “cover”, or recovering damages for non-delivery under *Uniform Commercial Code* (U.C.C.) § 2-713. See U.C.C. § 2-711(1)(b). (Cover is not an issue in the case). The measure of damages for nondelivery or repudiation by the seller is the difference between the market price at the time when the buyer learned of the breach and the contract price together with any incidental and consequential damages provided in (U.C.C. § 2-715), but less expenses saved in consequence of the seller’s breach. *Uniform Commercial Code* (U.C.C.) § 2-713(1). Market price is to be determined . . . in cases of rejection after arrival or revocation of acceptance, as of the place of arrival. UCC § 2-713(1). Incidental damages resulting from the seller’s breach include expenses reasonably incurred in inspection, receipt, transportation, and care and custody of goods rightfully rejected, any commercially reasonable charges, expenses, or commissions in connection with effecting cover and any other reasonable expense incident to the delay or other breach. U.C.C. § 2-715(1).

Case law, as well as U.C.C. § 2-603, specifically provide that in a post-rejection agency situation such as that in this case between Complainant and Respondent Western Veg., Complainant is entitled to all expenses as well as damages as specified in U.C.C. § 2-713(1) and U.C.C. § 2-715(1). *Cowley v. Calflo Produce, Inc.*, 55 Agric. Dec. at 682 (After rejection . . . the berries belonged to Complainant, and Respondent was not purchasing the berries but acting as Complainant’s agent in effectuating their sale.).

Complainant, in its Reply Brief, does not appear to apply the above outlined measures of damages after rejection, and requests as damages only (1) the amount of \$19,524.75 plus interest for the mistaken payment made to Respondent Western Veg. for load 2 (the reduction from \$23,040, so far as we can tell from the record, is unexplained); and (2) “any damages, fees, and costs of Respondent Florance Distributing which are sustained in PACA case number W-R-2012-463.”

Based on our discussion above, we award Complainant the requested \$19,524.75 for the mistaken payment for load 2.³⁵ As to the damages,

³⁵ We note that the reduction from \$23,040 is unexplained in the record, and it is a basic axiom of damages that they cannot be speculative. *Anthony Brokerage, Inc. v. The Auster*

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

fees, and costs of Respondent Florance Distributing which were sustained in PACA case number W-R-2012-463 (*see supra* at 15-16), Complainant claims that “because the cause of these expenses is attributable to the failure of Respondent Western Veg. to provide product in suitable shipping condition”, Respondent Western Veg. should be required to reimburse Complainant for expenses proven by Respondent Florance in that case. (Complainant’s Br. at 16-17). However, we have dismissed that case because Complainant failed to prove the breach alleged by Complainant, and awarded damages to Respondent Florance.

Complainant asserts that the damages sustained because of its failure to prove the Complaint against Respondent Florance (W-R-2012-463) should be “passed on” to Respondent Western Veg. in this case (W-R-2012-228), because Respondent Western Veg. in this case is the cause of Complainant’s breach (and Complainant’s failure to prove the case, and ultimate loss of the case) in the case against Respondent Florance. We disagree that the damages for which Complainant is liable in W-R-2012-463 should be “passed on” to Respondent Western Veg. in this case.

It was Complainant’s choice to bring suit in this case against Respondent Western Veg., wherein it alleged breach of contract for failure of the three loads to conform to the contract, and it has prevailed. It was likewise Complainant’s choice to bring suit in the against Respondent Florance in W-R-2012-463, wherein it alleged breach of contract for Respondent Florance’s failure to pay the full contract price for the three loads, and in that case, it did not prevail.³⁶ There were two separate reparations filed, involving two separate contracts and parties. We will not pass on the expenses from one, where Complainant failed to prevail

Company, Inc., 38 Agric. Dec. 1643 (U.S.D.A. 1979). Although there is no evidence to support the reduction itself, the payment of the \$23,040.00 was proven and is supported by the record, and we found that Complainant could claim that mistaken payment to Respondent Western Veg. as damages. Therefore, since Complainant asks for a lesser amount, though inexplicably, we have no reservations in awarding that lesser amount. *See Meyer Tomatoes v. Hardcastle Produce Co.*, 40 Agric. Dec. 1172 (U.S.D.A. 1981).

³⁶ Complainant also alleged as part of the formal Complaint in W-R-2012-463 that Respondent Florance accepted the produce for which it failed to pay, and that, apparently, the produce was in suitable shipping condition upon arrival. (Complainant’s Compl. at 1-2). Complainant failed to carry its burden of proof. *See Sun World International, Inc. v. J. Nichols Produce Co.*, 46 Agric. Dec 893, 894 (U.S.D.A. 1987).

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

and meet its burden of proof, to another, where it succeeded in doing so. *See Dimare Brothers, Inc. v. Wholesale Produce Supply, Inc.*, 39 Agric. Dec. 257 (U.S.D.A. 1980).

Fees and Expenses in W-R-2012-228

Fees and expenses will be awarded to the prevailing party to the extent that they are reasonable. *East Produce, Inc. v. Seven Seas Trading Co., Inc.*, 59 Agric. Dec. 853, 864 (2000); *Mountain Tomatoes, Inc. v. E. Patapanian & Son, Inc.*, 48 Agric. Dec. 707, 715 (U.S.D.A. 1989). The question of which party is the prevailing party is one that depends upon the facts of the case. *Anthony Vineyards, Inc. v. Sun World International, Inc.*, 62 Agric. Dec. 343 (U.S.D.A. 2003). In hearing cases, it is the province of the Secretary to determine what are reasonable fees and expenses. *Mountain Tomatoes*, 48 Agric. Dec. at 707. *See supra*, pages 16-17 for a discussion of items included in the term fees and expenses under section 47.19(d)(2) of the regulations applicable to the PACA (7 C.F.R. § 47.19(d)(2)).

Each party made claims for fees and expenses in this case. Complainant, as the prevailing party here, is entitled to reasonable fees and expenses. Respondent failed to carry its burden of proof, is not the prevailing party, and any fees and expenses claimed by Respondent in connection with case W-R-2012-228 are disallowed.

Complainant claimed \$19,520.50 in attorney's fees (at \$295.00 per hour for its attorney and \$140.00 per hour for its paralegal) (*see* Complainant's Claim for Fees and Expenses). The fees and expenses provision under section 7 (a) of the PACA has been interpreted to exclude any fees or expenses which would have been incurred in connection with the case if that case had been heard by documentary procedure. *Mountain Tomatoes, Inc., v. Patapanian & Son*, 48 Agric. Dec. 707 (U.S.D.A. 1989); *Pinto Bros. v. F.J. Bolestrieir Co.*, 38 Agric. Dec. 269 (U.S.D.A. 1979); *Nathan's Famous v. N. Merberg & Son*, 36 Agric. Dec. 24 (U.S.D.A. 1977); *East Produce, Inc., v. Seven Seas Trading Co., Inc.*, 59 Agric. Dec. 853 (U.S.D.A. 2000) (claim for fees incurred in connection with the preparation of answer, response to cross-claim, preparation of brief, and proposed findings of fact disallowed).

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

Included in Complainant's claim for attorney's fees are items specifically for preparation of the briefs and trial briefs in this case (*see* Complainant's Claim for Fees and Expenses, Exhibit "A," itemized dates 7/23/14 through 9/22/2014),³⁷ in the amount of \$10,008.25. We deny the claim of Complainant for attorney hours expended on the post hearing brief and reply brief, and find that such activity is not connected to the oral hearing. This activity takes place entirely after the hearing is completed, and briefs and reply briefs are eventualities that routinely take place in documentary procedure cases. *See Pinto Bros., Inc. v. Frank J. Balestrieri Co.*, 38 Agric. Dec. 269; *Nathan's Famous v. N. Merberg & Son*, 36 Agric. Dec. 243; *Mahns v. A. M. Fruit Purveyors*, 34 Agric. Dec. 1950 (U.S.D.A. 1975). We also disallow Complainant's claim for a "phone conference with attorney for Florance" on 7/11/14, in the amount of \$295.00, as we find that that item does not appear to be in connection with the oral hearing in case W-R-2012-228 against Respondent Western Veg., where Complainant was the prevailing party. We find the remainder of Respondent Florance's claim for attorney fees reasonable, and allow them in the amount of \$9,217.25.

Complainant Florance claims the following expenses: hotel expenses for Complainant's counsel in the amount of \$201.58, meals for Complainant's counsel in the amount of \$40.92, and mileage for travel (at the rate of \$.56 per mile) for Complainant's counsel in the amount of \$234.08. These expenses, although not documented with receipts and/or proof of payments, are allowed, since Respondent did not object to these expenses. *East Produce, Inc. v. Seven Seas Trading Co., Inc.*, 59 Agric. Dec. 853 (U.S.D.A. 2000); *Watson Distributing v. Fruit Unlimited, Inc.*, 42 Agric. Dec. 1613, 1618 (U.S.D.A. 1983); *Patterson Produce Co. v. John Lowe Produce Co., Inc.*, 39 Agric. Dec. 1006 (U.S.D.A. 1980);

³⁷ Specifically, we deny the following entries: 7/23/14 in the amount of \$59.00, 8/5/14 in the amount of \$59.00, 8/6/14 in the amount of \$59, 8/7/14 in the amount of \$1,180.00, 8/8/14 in the amount of \$413, 8/11/14 in the amount of \$42.00, 8/11/14 in the amount of \$147.50, 8/12/14 in the amount of \$236, 8/13/14 in the amount of \$221.25, 8/14/14 in the amount of \$177.00, 8/18/14 in the amount of \$590, 8/19/14 in the amount of \$885.00, 8/20/14 in the amount of \$885.00, 8/21/14 in the amount of \$1327.50, 8/22/14 in the amount of \$885.00, 9/12/14 in the amount of \$42.00, 9/15/14 in the amount of \$590.00, 9/16/14 in the amount of \$988.25, 9/18/14 in the amount of \$826.00, 9/22/14 in the amount of \$73.25, and 9/22/14 in the amount of \$280.00.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Tenneco West, Inc. v. Gilbert Dist. Co., Inc., 38 Agric. Dec. 488 (U.S.D.A. 1979).

As with damages, Complainant claims that any fees and expenses for which it is liable in W-R-2012-463 should be “passed on” to Respondent Western Veg. in this case. Complainant argues that this is so “because [Complainant] was compelled to make a separate claim against Respondent Florance [in W-R-2012-463] to defend against Western Veg.’s counterclaim [in W-R-2012-228].” Complainant provides no rational explanation of exactly how it was “compelled” to file the reparation against Respondent Florance, and we disagree with the statement. Moreover, the fees and expenses awarded in W-R-2012-463 are not “in connection” with the oral hearing in W-R-2012-228. *See Mountain Tomatoes, Inc. v. E. Patapanian & Son, Inc.*, 48 Agric. Dec. 707 (U.S.D.A. 1989); *Pinto Bros. v. F.J. Bolestrieri Co.*, 38 Agric. Dec. 269 (U.S.D.A. 1979); *Nathan’s Famous v. N. Merberg & Son*, 36 Agric. Dec. 243 (U.S.D.A. 1977). For the reasons stated above, *see supra* pages 47-48, we decline to find that Respondent Western Veg. must pay the fees and expenses for which Complainant is liable in W-R-2012-463.

Based on the foregoing, the allowable amount of expenses claimed by Complainant is \$9,217.25 for attorney’s fees and \$476.58 for expenses.

Interest in W-R-2012-463 and W-R-2012-228

Section 5(a) of the Act requires that we award to the person or persons injured by a violation of section 2 of the Act “the full amount of damages sustained in consequence of such violations.” Such damages include interest. *L & N Railroad Co. v. Sloss Sheffield Co.*, 269 U.S. 217 (1925); *L & N Railroad Co. v. Ohio Valley Tie Co.*, 242 U.S. 288 (1916). Since the Secretary is charged with the duty of awarding damages, he also has the duty, where appropriate, to award interest at a reasonable rate as a part of each reparation award. *See Crockett v. Producers Marketing Association, Inc.*, 22 Agric. Dec. 66 (U.S.D.A. 1963).

If parties contract for the payment of interest at a rate which is different than that normally awarded in reparation proceedings, this forum will award the percent of interest for which the parties contracted. *Seaquist v. Gro-Pro, Inc.*, 43 Agric. Dec. 161 (U.S.D.A. 1984); *Swanee Bee Acres*,

Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Western Veg. Produce, Inc.
Main Street Produce, Inc. v. Florance Distributors Co.
74 Agric. Dec. 192

Inc. v. Gro-Pro, Inc., 42 Agric. Dec. 637 (U.S.D.A. 1983); *Grange v. Mark Bernstein Co.*, 29 Agric. Dec. 978 (U.S.D.A. 1970); *Scherer v. Manhattan Pickle Co.*, 29 Agric. Dec. 335 (U.S.D.A. 1970). It is not evident from the record that either of the prevailing parties, Respondent Florance in W-R-2012-463, or Complainant in W-R-2012-228, did so in this case. The interest that is to be applied shall be determined in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1961, *i.e.*, the interest rate shall be calculated at a rate equal to the weekly average one-year constant maturity treasury yield, as published by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for the calendar week preceding the date of the Order. *PGB International, LLC v. Bayche Companies, Inc.*, PACA Docket No. R-05-118, 65 Agric. Dec. 669 (U.S.D.A. 2006) (Order on Recons.).

Pursuant to section 5(a) of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499e(a)), the party found to have violated section 2 of the PACA (7 U.S.C. § 499b) is liable for any handling fee paid by the injured party. Complainant in this action paid a \$500.00 handling fee to file its Complaint.

Order in W-R-2012-463

The Complaint in this case is dismissed.

Within 30 days from the date of this Order, Complainant shall pay Respondent Florance as reparation \$32,084.46 (\$12,978.11 in damages plus \$16,000.00 in attorney's fees plus \$3,106.35 in fees and expenses), with interest thereon at the rate of 0.25 of 1% per annum from January 1, 2012 until paid; plus the amount of \$500.00 filing of the reparation claim.

Copies of this Order shall be served upon the parties.

Order in W-R-2012-228

Within 30 days from the date of this Order, Respondent Western Veg. shall pay Complainant as reparation \$29,218.58 (\$19,524.75 in damages plus \$9,217.25 in attorney's fees plus \$476.58 in fees and expenses), with interest thereon at the rate of 0.25 of 1% per annum from January 1, 2012 until paid; plus the amount of \$500.00 filing of the reparation claim.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Copies of this Order shall be served upon the parties.

—

Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals
74 Agric. Dec. 240

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS & DISMISSALS

Editor's Note: This volume continues the new format of reporting Administrative Law Judge orders involving non-precedent matters [Miscellaneous Orders] with the sparse case citation but without the body of the order. Miscellaneous Orders (if any) issued by the Judicial Officer will continue to be reported here in full context. The parties in the case will still be reported in Part IV (List of Decisions Reported – Alphabetical Index). Also, the full text of these cases will continue to be posted in a timely manner at: www.dm.usda.gov/oaljdecisions].

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

In re: KRISTINA BAKES.
Docket No. 15-0078.
Order of Dismissal.
Filed March 13, 2015.

DEFAULT DECISIONS

DEFAULT DECISIONS

Editor's Note: This volume continues the new format of reporting Administrative Law Judge orders involving non-precedent matters [Default Decisions and Orders] with the sparse case citation but without the body of the order. Default Decisions and Orders (if any) issued by the Judicial Officer will continue to be reported here in full context. The parties in the case will still be reported in Part IV (List of Decisions Reported – Alphabetical Index). Also, the full text of these cases will continue to be posted in a timely manner at: www.dm.usda.gov/oaljdecisions].

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

PHOENIX PRODUCE COMPANY.

Docket No. D-15-0044.

Default Decision and Order.

Filed April 21, 2015.

TAYLOR PRODUCE, LLC.

Docket No. D-15-0045.

Default Decision and Order.

Filed May 29, 2015.

Consent Decisions
74 Agric. Dec. 242

CONSENT DECISIONS

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Farmers Processing, Inc.

Docket No. 15-0032.

Filed February 27, 2015.

Bissett Produce Company, Inc.

Docket No. 15-0022.

Filed March 31, 2015.

Pros Ranch Market CA, LLC.

Docket No. 15-0075.

Filed May 1, 2015.

AGRICULTURE DECISIONS

Volume 74

Book One

Part Four

List of Decisions Reported
(Alphabetical Listing)

Index
(Subject Matter)



THIS IS A COMPILATION OF DECISIONS ISSUED BY THE
SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND THE COURTS
PERTAINING TO STATUTES ADMINISTERED BY THE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

LIST OF DECISIONS REPORTED

JANUARY – JUNE 2015

(ALPHABETICALLY LISTED)

AL HARRISON COMPANY DISTRIBUTORS	178, 180
ALVAREZ, JULIO III.	162
ANIMAL LEGAL DEFENSE FUND v. USDA	57
ASHVILLE STOCKYARD, INC.	179
ATHENS COMMISSION COMPANY, INC.	179
BAKER, MEGAN	164
BAKES, KRISTINA	240
BIRDSBORO KOSHER FARM CORPORATION	180
BISSETT PRODUCE COMPANY, INC.	242
BURNETTE FOODS, INC.	31
CAROLINA EASTERN, INC.	165
CAROLINA SOYA, LLC	165
CAUDILL, JENNIFER	101
COBLENTZ, EMMANUEL	162
DAVID POLK STABLES	164
DEATON, RANDY	180
DEATON LIVESTOCK	180
DEER FOREST AMUSEMENTS, INC.	163
DEER FOREST EXOTIC ANIMAL SANCTUARY	145
DEHAVEN'S BUTCHERING AND COUNTRY MARKET	164
DEHAVEN, CARL	164
EASTERN LIVESTOCK COMPANY, LLC	166, 179
EUCLID STOCKYARDS, INC.	180
FARMERS PROCESSING, INC.	242
FLORANCE DISTRIBUTING CO.	192
FORESTER, DON	179
GIBSON, THOMAS P.	188
GORHAM, JEREMY T.	180
GOWER, KEVIN	164
GREENLY, CRYSTAL	145
GREENLY, LEE MARVIN	145, 158
GREENLY, SANDY	145
H&P CATTLE, LLC	180
HOOKS, KEITH WENDELL	163
HORNE v. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE	1
J.W. WILLIAMSON GINNERY, INC.	161
JONES, RANDALL	133, 170
JENNE, JUSTIN	118, 156
KENNETH L. SMOKER, LLC.	180
KOLLMAN v. VILSACK	52
LEMAY AND SONS BEEF CO.	63
LEMAY, RICHARD	63
LUDWIG, CASEY	162
LYNCHBURG GRAIN COMPANY	165
MAGNUM LAND HOLDING	171
MAIN STREET PRODUCE, INC.	192
MIDWEST EXCHANGE REGIONAL STOCKYARDS	179
MINNESOTA WILDLIFE CONNECTION	143

NEBRASKA'S FINEST MEATS	160, 162, 164
PANGEA PRODUCE COMPANY DISTRIBUTORS, INC.	183
PHILLIPS, ALTON	165
PHOENIX PRODUCE COMPANY	241
PLUNKETT, BRADLEY	179
PLUNKETT, TILDA	179
POLK, DAVID C.	164
PROS RANCH MARKET CA, LLC	242
ROBERT BUTZER & SONS, INC.	180
ROSBERG, KELLY	150, 152
ROSBERG, PAUL	150, 152, 154, 171
ROSBERG FARM	171
SCHACHTELE, ANTHONY L.	163
SCHACHTELE, REBECCA JO	163
SCHENK, ROBERT W.	190
SCHROCK, NANCY	179
SHOW, INC.	160
SIG INTERNATIONAL IOWA, INC.	179
SIMPSON, ANDREW	165
SMITH, DENNIS	164
SMITH, DUSTIN	164
SMITH, LE ANNE	84
SMOKER, KENNETH L.	180
STRICKLAND, ALVIN	174
STRICKLAND, TONI	174
T. KENNETH EMERY, LLC	163
TAYLOR PRODUCE, LLC	241
TRI-TOWN PACKING CORP.	164, 165
THOMAS, BOB	161
WELL BRED FARMS, INC.	179
WESTERN VEG. PRODUCE, INC.	192
WILLIAMSON, JOHNNY	161
WILLIAMSON, JOHN W. III	161

SUBJECT-MATTER INDEX

JANUARY – JUNE 2015

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

Answer, failure to file timely	133-34, 136, 140-42, 159, 168
Appeal	63, 71, 73, 77, 84-89, 104, 105, 107, 108, 117, 153, 155-57, 160
<i>Chevron</i> deference	54, 57, 58, 64, 65, 67, 76, 80-82
Default	133-35, 140, 142, 159
Hearing, opportunity for	34, 52-56, 63, 71, 72, 75, 104, 105, 142
Hearing, waiver of	52, 56, 65, 136, 140-42, 168, 181
Proceedings, institution of	57, 63, 158
Service	50, 107, 110, 133, 134, 137-41, 150-53, 155, 157, 168
Stay	102, 108-10, 145, 146, 148, 149, 167
Extension of time	138, 150-55, 160
Rules of Practice	56, 62, 63, 104, 105, 107, 110, 135-37, 140-42, 150-53, 155, 157, 159
Petition to reopen hearing	111, 112, 119, 126, 128, 151, 156-59

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

Canned tart cherries	31, 41-47
Canners	31, 33, 41-44, 46-50
Cherry Industry Administrative Board	31-33, 35-37, 39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, 50
Civil penalty	1, 2, 15
Handler	1, 2, 9, 15, 36, 38-42, 47, 49-53, 55
Optimum supply	2, 7, 12, 13, 31-37, 42, 44-50
Raisin Administrative Committee	1, 2, 18
Raisin Marketing Order	1, 7, 9, 16, 19, 21
Reserve requirement	1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 30, 45
Sales constituency	31-33, 35-39, 50
Taking	1-31
Tart Cherry Order	31-37, 39-41, 43-50
Volume restrictions	31-33, 36, 40-50

ANIMAL HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

<i>Consent Decisions</i>	163
--------------------------	-----

ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

Exhibit, definition of	52, 57
Exhibitor	52, 53, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 68-72, 76, 77, 80, 87, 88
License, application for	52, 53, 55, 56, 62, 68, 71, 72, 78-80
License, issuance of	57, 59, 61, 64, 69, 71, 74, 75, 78, 79, 80
License, renewal of	58, 59, 61, 64, 65, 66-69, 71, 72, 75, 77, 81-83
License, revocation of	52-56, 59, 60, 70, 71, 81, 82
License, suspension of	52-55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 69, 70, 72-75, 81, 82, 88
Licensing regulations	57, 58, 59, 67, 69, 74, 79, 81-83

<i>Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals</i>	145-49
<i>Default Decisions</i>	162
<i>Consent Decisions</i>	163

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

Adversary adjudication	84-86, 88-93, 95, 97-99, 101-05, 111, 114-16
Appealability	88, 100, 101, 107, 108, 117
Application, time for filing	84, 86-89, 100
EAJA Rules of Practice	84, 86, 89, 91, 92, 94, 95, 97, 100, 101, 103, 105, 107, 109, 110, 112
Excessive demand	84, 92
Fees and expenses	84, 89, 93-97, 101, 105, 107, 108, 111, 114
Final disposition	86, 101, 107, 108
Net worth	84, 94, 95
Special circumstances	84-86, 93, 94, 100, 103

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

<i>Consent Decisions</i>	163
--------------------------	-----

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

<i>Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals</i>	150-55
<i>Consent Decisions</i>	163-64

HORSE PROTECTION ACT

Civil penalty	128, 129, 132, 133, 136-42, 145, 153
Disqualification	118, 119, 122, 123, 126, 128-30, 132, 143
Sanctions	118, 122, 126, 127
Sore	118-27, 131, 133
<i>Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals</i>	156-61
<i>Consent Decisions</i>	164-65

ORGANIC FOODS PRODUCTION ACT

<i>Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals</i>	160
<i>Default Decisions</i>	162
<i>Consent Decisions</i>	163-64

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

P&S	166-80
Civil penalty	169, 172, 173
Prompt payment	169-73, 175, 176
Sanctions	166, 168, 169, 173, 176
Willful	166, 171, 172, 175, 176

<i>Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals</i>	177
<i>Default Decisions</i>	178
<i>Consent Decisions</i>	179-80

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

PACA	180-242
Acceptance	187, 194, 204, 205, 210-12, 219, 221, 228-31, 233
Delivery, good	193, 198, 200-05, 210-12, 215, 217, 218, 226, 232
F.o.b., "no grade" sale	193, 194, 196, 198, 200, 211, 212, 221, 232
Inspection, time between arrival and inspection	193, 201, 202, 213, 214, 217, 218
Prompt payment	180, 182, 183, 185-87, 190, 191
Rejection	193, 196, 202-05, 211, 219, 221-28, 233
Reparations	193
Repeated violations	188, 190
Willfulness	190
<i>Miscellaneous Orders & Dismissals</i>	240
<i>Default Decisions</i>	241
<i>Consent Decisions</i>	242

PLANT PROTECTION ACT

<i>Default Decisions</i>	162
--------------------------	-----

POULTRY PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT

<i>Consent Decisions</i>	165
--------------------------	-----

SOYBEAN PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND CONSUMER INFORMATION ACT

<i>Consent Decisions</i>	165
--------------------------	-----