

AGRICULTURE DECISIONS

Volume 72

Book Two

Part Two (P&S)

Pages 798 – 830



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

JULY – DECEMBER 2013

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

WEST COAST COMMODITIES, LLC, D/B/A MICHAEL PAUL
PARTLOW.
Docket No. 12-0475.
Decision and Order. 798

PAUL DAY.
Docket No. 13-0201.
Decision and Order. 819

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS

TIM ROWAN.
Docket No. 13-0123.
Order of Dismissal. 824

GRANT GIBSON AND TAGM, LLC.
Docket No. 12-0627.
Order of Dismissal. 824

CHRISTOPHER J. BARTELS, D/B/A BARTELS PACKING.
Docket No. 14-0006.
Order of Withdrawal. 824

SOULEYMANE N. KONE, D/B/A INTERNATIONAL OASIS.
Docket No. 13-0247.
Order of Dismissal. 824

PANOLA LIVESTOCK ENTERPRISE, INC.
Docket No. 14-0042.
Order of Dismissal. 824

RANDY LOWERY.
Docket No. 14-0043.
Order of Dismissal. 825

DEFAULT DECISIONS

ORANGE LIVESTOCK MARKET, INC.
Docket No. 13-0204.
Default Decision and Order. 826

JOSEPH K. HOWELL.
Docket No. 13-0205.
Default Decision and Order. 826

RIVERSIDE CATTLE CO., LLC.
Docket No. 13-0146.
Default Decision and Order. 826

PAUL E. GIBSON, JR., D/B/A G&S LIVESTOCK CO.
Docket No. 13-0206.
Default Decision and Order. 826

AL-HOUDA MEAT MARKET, INC.
Docket No. 13-0228.
Default Decision and Order. 826

DEREK W. CRITES, D/B/A DC FARMS AND WAYNE H. CRITES.
Docket No. 13-0180.
Default Decision and Order. 827

JOSEPHINE E. BONACCURSO, INC., D/B/A SALEM PACKING
COMPANY AND SAMUEL BONACCURSO.
Docket Nos. 13-0115, 13-0116.
Default Decision and Order. 827

JERRY O. SMITH.
Docket No. 13-0207.
Default Decision and Order. 827

CONSENT DECISIONS

Consent Decisions. 828 - 830

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS

In re: WEST COAST COMMODITIES, LLC, d/b/a MICHAEL PAUL PARTLOW.

Docket No. 12-0475.

Decision and Order.

Filed November 4, 2013.

P&S-D.

Darlene Bolinger, Esq. for Complainant.

Michael Partlow, pro se, for Respondents.

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

DECISION AND ORDER

This matter is before me pursuant to a complaint filed by the Deputy Administrator, Packers and Stockyards Programs, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, United States Department of Agriculture (“GIPSA”; “Complainant”; “USDA”) against West Coast Commodities, LLC, d/b/a Michael Paul Partlow and its corporate officer, Michael Paul Partlow (“Respondents”), alleging violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 7 U.S.C. § 181 *et seq.* (“the Act”) and prevailing regulations.

This Decision and Order is based upon the pleadings and arguments of the parties, and the documentary and testamentary evidence.

I. Issues

1. Whether Respondents were registered as a dealer pursuant to 9 C.F.R. § 201.10;
2. Whether Respondents maintained a bond or bond equivalent as required by the Act;
3. Whether Respondents failed to pay the full purchase price for livestock within the time required by the Act and regulations;

West Coast Commodities, LLC
72 Agric. Dec. 798

4. Whether Respondents maintained sufficient funds in an account from which a check was made to cover the amount of the check when presented for payment;
5. Whether Respondents maintained accurate and complete records of transactions covered by the Act; and
6. Whether a civil money penalty should be assessed against Respondents, and if so, the amount of the penalty.

II. Statement of the Case

A. Procedural History

On June 15, 2011, Complainant filed a complaint against the Respondents with the Hearing Clerk for the Office of Administrative Law Judges for USDA (“OALJ”). On July 17, 2012, Respondents filed an Answer. By Order issued July 30, 2012, I set the time for the filing of lists and exchange of evidence. I granted Respondents’ motion of September 14, 2012, for an extension of time to exchange and file evidence. Respondents failed to file lists and exchange evidence and by Order issued November 11, 2012, I directed Respondents to show cause why deadlines had not been met. On December 13, 2013, Complainant filed proposed findings of fact pursuant to my Order. On that date, Respondents moved for another extension of time. I held a telephone conference with the representatives for the parties, during which time I allowed Respondents time to submit and exchange evidence and set the hearing to commence on June 13, 2013. The week before the hearing, I learned that Respondents had not yet exchanged evidence with Complainant’s counsel, and I directed Mr. Partlow to directly send information electronically to me and counsel. He did submit and exchange some documents in advance of the hearing.

The parties convened on the scheduled date, and the hearing commenced by audiovisual connection between Washington, DC, Portland, Oregon, and Denver, Colorado. At the hearing, I admitted to

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

the record¹ Complainant's exhibits identified as CX-1 through CX-29. I admitted Respondents' exhibits identified as RX-1 through RX-12. I excluded from the record several documents that Respondents had failed to exchange with counsel for Complainant. Tr. at 171-175. I admitted to the record Complainant's list of exhibits as ALJX-1. I heard testimony from several witnesses presented by Complainant and from Respondents' representative. I allowed the parties to make oral argument, and I held the record open for the submission of additional written argument.

Complainant filed closing arguments on August 28, 2013. Respondent filed written closing argument on September 27, 2013. On October 30, 2013, Complainant filed a reply brief, objecting to the admission of additional documents and revised versions of the documents that had been admitted. I GRANT that objection. Respondents were given several extensions of time to provide documents to counsel for Complainant during the almost one year spanning the date the complaint was filed and the hearing was held. Since Respondents had argued that GIPSA refused proffered documents at the time it conducted its investigation, those documents should have been easily accessed and exchanged. In addition, at a telephone conference that I held with parties the week before the hearing, I gave detailed instructions to Respondents' representative about what he needed to produce. His explanation at the hearing for not exchanging all of his documents was merely to state, "I failed." Tr. at 171.

Accordingly, although Respondents' submissions are part of the record, I have given them no probative weight, and shall rely purely upon the evidence that was marked and entered into the record at the hearing. The record before me is now closed but for the filing of the instant Decision and Order

B. Statutory and Regulatory Authority

Pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 301(d), a "dealer is any person, not a market agency, engaged in the business of selling in commerce livestock, either on his own account or as the employer or agent of the vendor or

¹ Throughout this Decision and Order, Complainant's exhibits are identified as "CX-#"; Respondent's exhibits are identified as "RX-#"; and references to the transcript of the hearing shall be denoted as "Tr. at [page#]."

West Coast Commodities, LLC
72 Agric. Dec. 798

purchaser.” Every person operating as a market agency or dealer must apply with USDA for registration, pursuant to 9 C.F.R. § 201.10. In addition, every market agency or dealer must obtain reasonable bonds or bond equivalents to secure their obligations to livestock sellers. 9 C.F.R. §§ 201.27 - 201.34. Dealers are required to keep accounts, records and memoranda that fully and correctly disclose all transactions involved in livestock purchasing. 7 U.S.C. § 221.

The Act requires dealers purchasing livestock to deliver to the seller or his representative the full amount of the purchase price before the close of the next business day following the purchase and transfer of livestock. 7 U.S.C. § 228b(a). Failure to pay the full purchase price of livestock when due constitutes an unfair and deceptive practice in willful violation of sections 312(a) and 409 of the Act. 7 U.S.C. §§ 213(a) and 228b(c). Civil penalties of up to \$11,000.00 per violation may be assessed for each instance of failure to pay for purchases promptly. 7 U.S.C. § 213(b). In addition, dealers who issue checks that are refused for insufficient funds are considered to have engaged in unfair and deceptive practices, even where funds cover the amount of the check at a later date. *See Tiemann*, 47 Agric. Dec. 1573, 1580 (1988).

Although dealers are generally required to pay for livestock purchases by the close of the following business day, the parties to the purchase and sale of livestock may expressly agree in writing, before such purchase or sale, that payment may be made in a different manner. 7 U.S.C. § 228b(b). Such agreements must be disclosed in the records of any market agency or dealer selling the livestock, and in the purchaser's records and on the accounts or other documents issued by the purchaser relating to the transaction. *Id.*

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*, 50 Agric. Dec. 476 (1991).

Summary of the Evidence

1. *Admissions*

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

In the filed Answer to the Complaint, Respondents admitted that West Coast Commodities, LLC is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, whose President and sole owner at all times pertinent herein was Michael Paul Partlow.

Respondents admit that they bought livestock but averred that they believed that they were not subject to the Act because they were not “advised of provisions of the act which allows for ‘how the cattle were bought.’” *See* Answer to Complainant’s Proposed Findings at 1.

At the hearing (Tr. at 208) and in his written closing argument, Mr. Partlow admitted that Respondents delayed paying Ollerich Livestock due to a change in banks and late transfer of funds. *See* Answer to Complainant’s Proposed Findings at 3.

2. Documentary Evidence

Complainant’s exhibits CX-1 through CX-29 include copies of Respondents’ corporate records; documents showing livestock purchases by Respondents; Respondents’ bank records; and documents and notices prepared by GIPSA.

Respondents’ exhibits identified as RX-1 through RX-12 consist of correspondence to Respondents from various livestock sellers, samples of Cattle Sale (a/k/a Cattle Purchase) Agreements, an article about Respondents’ business activities,² and statements authored by Respondents’ representative.

ALJX-1 represents the list identifying Complainant’s exhibits.

3. Testamentary Evidence

Martin Falstad (Tr. at 22-40)

² Although the copy of the article provided at the hearing and attached to Respondents’ answer was incomplete, Respondents’ later submissions included a more complete version. Neither version has much probative value.

West Coast Commodities, LLC
72 Agric. Dec. 798

Mr. Falstad held the position of Resident Agent for GIPSA in Yakima, Washington from June, 2009 until March, 2013, when he retired. Mr. Falstad's primary responsibility was to investigate livestock and other dealers throughout many states in the Northwest. His investigations involved whether accounts were maintained in compliance with the Act and prevailing regulations.

In January, 2010, Mr. Falstad began an investigation into Respondents' livestock business, which included instances where Mr. Partlow bought and resold livestock. Mr. Falstad advised Respondents that registration with USDA at its regional office was required, and that Respondents need to be bonded as a dealer under the Act because of those transactions. Although he did not provide Mr. Partlow with documents for registration, Mr. Falstad explained the requirements for bonding and for keeping records, as well as payment obligations under the Act.

Mr. Partlow did not submit registration documents, and in late May or early June, 2010, Mr. Falstad contacted Mr. Partlow to discuss his business operations. Mr. Falstad believed that following a subsequent conversation between his supervisor and Mr. Partlow, it was determined that Respondents did not need to be registered and bonded so long as they no longer bought and resold livestock within a short period of time. Although Respondents' case was closed at that time, it would be reopened if it was later shown that Respondents bought and resold livestock.

Brian Burk (Tr. at 41 – 105; 215-224)

Since September, 2012, Mr. Burk has worked as a supervisory resident agent with the Western Regional Office of GIPSA, which is responsible for assuring compliance with the Act in the western states of the United States. Mr. Burk assigns investigations to agents, reviews agents' work, and makes decisions regarding investigation outcomes. From April, 2000 until his promotion in 2012, Mr. Burk worked as a senior auditor and was responsible for conducting complex investigations often involving livestock auctions, dealers and packers. He typically performed his duties at the investigation target's offices, where he reviewed documents and accounting records.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. Burk recalled conducting an investigation into an allegation that Respondents had not properly paid a livestock seller, who had been presented a check for which there were insufficient funds. The investigation was unusual in that Respondents did not have a fixed office site and Mr. Burk and Mr. Partlow were unable to agree on a location to review Respondents' records. Respondents complied with a subpoena issued by USDA, and Mr. Burk and Mr. Partlow eventually met at a USDA office in Portland, Oregon on September 20, 2011 through September 22, 2011. Respondents' records were incomplete and disorganized, but they provided the basis for Mr. Burk to seek additional records from other sources.

Mr. Burk was aware that Respondents had been investigated by Mr. Falstad, who advised Respondents to get bonded and registered to conduct business covered by the Act. GIPSA first became aware of Respondents' activities under the Act because Mr. Partlow had filed a claim against the Packer's Trust fund, alleging that he had not been paid by a company in Colorado. Respondents were not registered as a buyer or seller of livestock, as required by the Act at the time of the claim, and continued to be unregistered at the time of the hearing. In addition, Mr. Burk could not locate evidence that Respondents had received bonding and filed required notices with GIPSA. Respondents would need to get financial surety under a "Clause 2" type of bond to cover activities as a dealer, and would need to be bonded to cover purchases for commission made by Respondents for others. Mr. Burk explained that a Clause 2 bond covers dealer activities and market agencies that buy on commission for others. Clause 1 bonds cover auction houses and Clause 4 bonds covered slaughter activities. Clause 3 bonds cover activities of a person hired by others.

Mr. Partlow provided Mr. Burk with documentation of transactions that he believed fell within the Act. *See* CX-8 at 2. Mr. Partlow also discussed Clause 4 types of bonds, which Mr. Burk explained cover sales of cattle for slaughter. He differentiated between cattle "trading," which is covered under the Act, and cattle "feeding" businesses, which are not. Tr. at 65. The investigation disclosed that Respondents had conducted transactions that were feed type sales and exempt from the Act, and

West Coast Commodities, LLC
72 Agric. Dec. 798

identified eighteen transactions that represented cattle dealing under the Act. *See* CX-7.

Mr. Burk concluded that during the period from August 9, 2010 to August 4, 2011, Respondents had purchased 1,405 head of cattle for the aggregate sum of \$1,882,587.50 while not bonded or registered under GIPSA. Mr. Burk assembled a schedule of thirteen transactions that Respondents failed to pay for in compliance with the Act. *See*, CX-29. He documented the purchases through copies of cattle sale agreements, shipping documents, invoices, and bank records. Mr. Burk acknowledged that the Act allows for payment on a date other than the next business day if a buyer and seller entered into a written agreement before the transaction. In instances where Mr. Burk identified such written agreements, he used the date of invoicing, rather than the date that the actual purchase occurred to determine the due date for payment.

Mr. Burk found examples of sale agreements, but they did not seem to be kept by both parties to transactions, as required by the Act. Moreover, although a valid sale agreement may exempt a purchaser from the rule requiring payment on the next business day, it is the nature of the transaction and not how payment should be made that characterizes transactions that fall within the scope of the Act. During the course of his investigation, Mr. Burk had several conversations in which he advised that Respondents needed to be bonded and registered in compliance with the Act.

At the time Mr. Burk conducted his investigation, Mr. Partlow did not provide him with the copies of agreements that were exchanged with counsel in preparation for the hearing in this matter. Mr. Burk observed that the agreements that were introduced to the record were not signed by both parties, as required.

Craig Roesch (Tr. at 108 – 139)

Since July, 2012, Mr. Roesch has been the Regional Director of the Western Regional Office of Packers and Stockyards Programs. Prior to his promotion, he was legal specialist for the Region, where he obtained his knowledge about GIPSA programs. As Regional Director, he is responsible for the administration of all of the programs in his region.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. Roesch reviewed Mr. Burk's investigative file of Respondents' case, and concluded that Respondents had operated as a dealer without being bonded or registered, had failed to make timely payments, had issued a check that could not be honored because of nonsufficient funds, and failed to maintain proper records. He concurred with Mr. Burk's assessment that Respondents had bought livestock and resold them within a matter of days, thereby making Respondents dealers under the Act. The fact that Respondents had sale agreements with some sellers would change the date that payment was due, but would not relieve Respondents from being subject to the Act. Respondents would need to make payment in compliance with the terms of the sale agreements to be considered compliant with the requirements for timely payment under the Act. A delay in payment, with or without a purchase agreement, is considered an unfair trade agreement.

Mr. Roesch explained that dealers must be bonded to provide protection to sellers in the event of non-payment, as sellers would then have a claim on the bond. It is important to enforce the requirements for registration and bonding to encourage compliance with the Act. On November 03, 2009, GIPSA issued a "Notice of Default" (CX-4) to the Respondents and directed them to obtain bonding and register as dealers.

According to Mr. Roesch, the provisions requiring prompt payment prevented buyers from using a seller's assets to fund the buyers' business and ensure liquidity in the industry. Mr. Roesch testified that a sales agreement need not take a particular form, but must specifically state the terms when payment would be due.

The investigation revealed that Respondents failed to keep all records supporting transactions, which constitutes a separate violation of the Act. Mr. Roesch considered the amount involved in the transactions significant, and expressed concern about the impact of Respondents' potential inability to pay for purchases.

Mr. Roesch acknowledged that GIPSA had no other complaints about Respondents failing to meet his payment obligations. He did not know if the instant disciplinary action by GIPSA would affect Respondents' ability to secure a bond. He was not familiar with the notice of a thirty

West Coast Commodities, LLC
72 Agric. Dec. 798

(30) day disciplinary period that would have prevented Respondents from applying for a bond. Mr. Roesch testified that he was certain that bonding and surety companies would rely upon a business' financial statements and records before issuing a bond, and conceded that if a company's financial footing was poor, a bond may not be issued. However, a company can set aside its own surety in a secure account, or can use a trust fund agreement associated with a letter of credit from a bank to satisfy the requirements for surety.

Amy Blechinger (Tr. at 142 – 168)

Ms. Blechinger has been a Senior Policy Analyst in the Policy and Litigation Division of GIPSA for six years. She has worked for USDA since 1989. One of her primary duties is to review investigation files and make recommendations regarding enforcement and sanctions. Ms. Blechinger reviewed the file of the investigation into Respondents' business and concurred with the assessment that Respondents had conducted business as a dealer subject to the Act without securing requisite bonding or registering with GIPSA. Ms. Blechinger observed that Respondents had failed to register despite being informed of the requirement to do so in GIPSA's notice of default issued in 2009. She also agreed that the documentation supported the conclusion that Respondents' recordkeeping was inadequate.

Ms. Blechinger testified that the investigation showed that Respondents willfully violated the Act by not paying people timely. She believed that the issuance of a check without sufficient funds to cover the amount due to the seller demonstrated willfulness. In Ms. Blechinger's opinion, Respondents' conduct undermined the purposes of the Act to promote the integrity of financial transactions in the livestock trade and to assure fair business practices in the trade.

When determining whether a violation warrants a sanction, GIPSA looks at the size of the business, the gravity of the violation, and the ability of the entity being penalized to continue in the business. Ms. Blechinger considered Respondents' actions to be serious violations of the law. Respondents' failure to register and acquire surety put sellers at risk of not being paid if Respondents defaulted entirely. Ms. Blechinger recommended that GIPSA would not accept Respondents' registration to

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

operate as a dealer and bonding information for a period of thirty days. Respondents could secure the bond and file the required paperwork, but GIPSA would not process it for thirty (30) days. If Respondents filed for a bond and registered, they could operate after thirty (30) days from the date the sanction was upheld. The ban on operation would extend beyond thirty days if Respondents could not show proof of a surety. Respondents could resume operations as soon as GIPSA issued a letter approving registration and bond.

Ms. Blechinger recommended a civil penalty of \$14,000.00 for the failure to pay promptly. The law allows a penalty of \$11,000.00 per violation for failure to pay promptly, and Ms. Blechinger explained that the nonsufficient funds transaction constituted failure to pay promptly for which Respondents should be penalized \$1,000.00. The balance of the recommended sanctions were related to the other instances of Respondents' failure to pay promptly. GIPSA also recommended that Respondents be ordered to keep all records pertaining to transactions covered by the Act, such as bank statements and canceled checks.

Michael Paul Partlow³ (Tr. at 169 – 215; 224-230)

Mr. Partlow testified that his company's primary focus was on cattle feeding, which is not subject to the Act, and not on cattle dealing. He believed that he was in compliance with the Act because he had agreements with sellers about payments, and paid his sellers according to the agreements. Mr. Partlow did not recall having discussions with GIPSA employees about the prompt pay provisions, but he contended that he sent sale agreements to all of his customers. He conceded that he had not provided copies of all agreements to Mr. Burk, but his customers wrote testimonials that supported his assertion that they were paid in accordance with the agreements. Mr. Partlow explained that he or his secretary signed some of the copies of the cattle purchase agreements in evidence. He enters into agreements orally and then email or fax them to sellers. Many of the sellers don't have fax machines, and he doesn't get signed copies back.

³ Portions of the summary of Mr. Partlow's testimony were taken from colloquies he held with witnesses, and are referenced by actual transcript page.

West Coast Commodities, LLC
72 Agric. Dec. 798

Because he did not have the original copies of the agreements, Mr. Partlow relied upon testimonials from individuals affirming that they were paid in accordance with the agreements. He was not certain whether dates on the agreements represented the date the invoice was prepared or the date the agreement was made. The contracts usually call for a shipping date later than the purchase date, which explains two dates “within a couple of weeks” (Tr. at 227-228). He described his notes on sales that indicated whether he paid for the purchase by bank wire. Mr. Partlow stated that he used bank wire to pay for the purchase that was refused for non-sufficient funds.

Mr. Partlow testified that he has an office at his house and would have met auditors there. He did not withhold documents, but found some of the records that Mr. Burk was looking for and offered to give them to him. Mr. Burk declined the records as he had already completed his audit. However, Mr. Partlow believed that the records would show that he made all of his payments timely in accordance with purchase agreements.

Mr. Partlow was aware that he was required to get a bond and had not done so. He filled out the paperwork to be bonded, but believed that it wasn’t approved because of the thirty (30) day period preventing him from conducting transactions covered by the Act (Tr. at 131-132).

C. Discussion

1. *Violations*

Failure to register as a dealer with GIPSA and to obtain a bond or bond equivalent

The evidence is uncontroverted that Respondents engaged in dealer activities that were subject to the requirements of the Act. Respondents were aware of the requirement to register and secure bonding. Mr. Falstad advised Mr. Partlow several times that registration and bonding were required to continue to conduct transactions as a dealer. Tr. at 27; 30. Mr. Burk similarly advised Respondents of the requirements of the Act. GIPSA sent Respondents a Notice of Default in 2009 that instructed Respondents to register and acquire appropriate surety. CX-4.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. Partlow acknowledged familiarity with the Notice of Default, because he believed that the letter prohibited Respondents from being registered for thirty (30) days, thereby preventing them from conducting business covered by the Act. Tr. at 158.

When GIPSA did not receive Respondents' registration and proof of bonding, Agent Falstad again contacted Respondents' representative, and learned that Mr. Falstad's supervisor had advised Respondents that they need not register or be bonded so long as they did not perform the activities of a dealer. Tr. at 26-28. Based upon Respondents' representations about their business activities, GIPSA determined that they did not need to be registered or bonded. Tr. at 28-32. Although the majority of Respondents' activities did not fall within the definition of a dealer, individuals need not be engaged only in the business of a dealer to fall within the scope of the Act. *Kelly v. United States*, 202 F. 2d 838, 841 (10th Cir. 1953).

I find that Mr. Partlow's insistence that agents for GIPSA told him Respondents did not need to be registered and bonded, and further, that the use of payment agreements exempted them from the Act, is specious and self-serving. I accord weight to the Notice of default and the government's witnesses, who testified that Mr. Partlow was instructed about the need to register and get bonding. Respondents continued to buy and sell livestock as a dealer pursuant to the Act, as evidenced by the complaint lodged by Tom Ollerich of Ollerich Livestock LLC in April, 2011. Tr. at 49; CX-6. Mr. Partlow seemed aware that sales agreements provided an alternate method of payment to the mandatory payment on the day following a purchase. Mr. Burk credibly testified that he talked with Mr. Partlow about the effect of sales agreements on prompt payment provisions. Tr. at 102. Respondents' use of sales agreements suggests that they were aware that they engaged in transactions that made them dealers, but thought they had found a loophole to escape the law's requirements. Respondents provided a reference to GIPSA-issued information about how to comply with the Act. *See Answer to Complainant's Proposed Findings.*

Respondents' arguments imply that they were ignorant of the law, but the record shows otherwise. It is clear that the existence of a written sales agreement providing for payment terms other than cash by the next

West Coast Commodities, LLC
72 Agric. Dec. 798

business day exempts dealers from compliance with that provision, but not from the other requirements of the Act. Respondents have willfully chosen to interpret the law and regulations in a manner favorable to their business practices.

The evidence demonstrates that Respondents were advised by Agent Falstad and Auditor Burk that they were required to secure a bond or bond equivalent, and were given notice of that requirement in GIPSA's notice of default. There is no evidence that Respondents attempted to acquire a bond or bond equivalent as surety for purchases made as a dealer under the Act during the period covered by GIPSA's investigations. Mr. Partlow suggested that he could not get bonding because he was prohibited from registering for thirty (30) days pursuant to the Notice of Default, but he provided nothing to show that he made application for surety that was rejected.

Respondents failed to register and failed to acquire a bond or bond equivalent in violation of the Act.

Failure to Pay Promptly--Non-Sufficient Funds

The evidence is unrefuted that a seller was refused payment by Respondents due to non-sufficient funds. Mr. Partlow admitted that his wire transfer of funds did not cover the amount of the purchase in a timely manner. Accordingly, this allegation is substantiated.

Failure to Pay Promptly—Cattle Sale Agreements

It is not entirely clear that Respondents failed to pay promptly in all of the other transactions alleged as violating prompt payment requirements. Mr. Partlow testified that he entered into oral agreements with sellers, and then sent them his written summary of that communication in the form of a Cattle Sale Agreement. Tr. at 212-213. Mr. Burk testified that he credited Respondents with prompt payment resulting from agreements when he found documents to support that conclusion. Tr. at 84-89. Despite the possibility that Respondents may have paid for some purchases promptly, the evidence of record fails to support that presumption.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

The Cattle Sale Agreements in evidence do not reflect when the agreements were made, when the cattle were bought and delivered, and when the transaction was paid (RX-4, 5, 11), and therefore do not meet the regulatory requirements for agreements that constitute a waiver of the requirement to pay for purchases by the day following a sale. The agreements were not signed in advance by both parties as required. See, Burk's testimony at 155. Mr. Partlow could not explain whether the date on an agreement represented the date of the agreement, the date of the purchase, or the date of the invoice. Tr. at 206. He admitted to signing declarations made by other people with their permission. Tr. at 198-199. Moreover, the agreements of record serve only as examples of Respondents' practice, as they do not pertain to any of the transactions that GIPSA concluded were not promptly paid. See, RX-4, Lincoln Provision transaction of 3/31/2010; RX-5, Ollerich Cattle Co., Inc. transaction of 12/10/2010⁴; and RX-11, Calvin Heitzman transaction of 2/6/2009; c.f. CX-29.

I decline to credit the additional documents provided by Respondents with their closing argument in consideration of the many opportunities they were given to exchange the records with Complainant's counsel. I conclude that Respondents were not prejudiced by Mr. Burk's refusal to review the documents because they had ample opportunity to provide that documentation to Complainant and to me. Mr. Partlow failed to do so. Throughout the entire course of this adjudication, Mr. Partlow was not forthcoming with documents. Further, the unreliable nature of the documents that are meant to buttress Respondents' case make it difficult to rely upon them.⁵

I find that Mr. Partlow's testimony about entering into agreements with sellers and paying within the terms of the agreements is credible and is partially supported by documentary evidence, which shows that he generally paid for purchases within days of a transaction. See, CX-29.

⁴ There are transactions with Ollerich from December 2010 (CX-17 and 18), but none of the documents support that the transactions relate to the purchase agreement dated December 10, 2010 at RX-5.

⁵ Based upon the testimony of Mr. Partlow and Mr. Burk, I have no reason to believe that the evidence that was excluded due to Respondents' failure to exchange it with Complainant would have been more reliable than what has been admitted to the record.

West Coast Commodities, LLC
72 Agric. Dec. 798

However, I accord limited weight to the “testimonials” of the sellers who “signed” statements averring the Respondents had always paid timely for livestock purchases. *See* RX-1, 2, 2(a), 3, 6, 7, 9, 10. One of the statements was made by Mr. Ollerich, who complained to GIPSA about the non-sufficient funds check. RX-3. The statement made by Dennis Helwig of Hub City Livestock Auction, Inc. (RX-7), is contradicted by the evidence demonstrating that a sale made in January, 2010, was not paid in full (CX-29).

Respondents’ evidence does not sufficiently rebut Complainant’s evidence and conclusions. Respondents’ records do not show that they made prompt payments subject to the terms of Agreements. Respondents did not timely produce the records during GIPSA’s investigation, and did not produce the records in the year that lapsed since the complaint was filed on June 15, 2012, and the hearing held on June 13, 2013. Respondents’ failure to provide documentation of timely payment pursuant to agreements is attributable solely to Mr. Partlow’s actions.

Accordingly, I find that Complainant’s allegations regarding failure to promptly pay for livestock transactions made as a dealer are sustained.

Recordkeeping Violations

I accord substantial weight to Mr. Burk’s testimony describing how he needed to collect records from other sources in order to determine whether Respondents complied with prompt pay provisions because Mr. Partlow did not provide documents when they were requested. Although Mr. Burk refused to inspect records offered by Mr. Partlow months after Mr. Burk initiated his investigation, the record does not establish that those records would have been complete, or that Mr. Partlow told Mr. Burk what they were. Mr. Partlow acknowledged that he did not have copies of sale agreements that were signed by both parties. Tr. at 211-212. The copies submitted to the record of this proceeding are not copies of the originals, but duplicate images of the agreements. RX-4, 5, 11. Mr. Partlow admitted that he signed the names of other parties himself. Tr. at 198-205. Despite being given multiple extensions over almost a year to find and submit documents to Complainant, Respondents failed to provide them until days before the hearing. Respondent failed to

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

exchange all relevant documents, and attempted to include documents that were not exchanged as attachments to written closing argument.

The entirety of the record establishes that Respondents failed to maintain accurate records of transactions conducted pursuant to the Act. Respondents have violated recordkeeping requirements of the Act and regulations.

D. Sanctions

I accord weight to the rationale offered by GIPSA Analyst Amy Blechinger, and find it appropriate to assess the penalties she recommended against Respondents. I find that Respondents 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, 202-203 (1989). I recognize that Respondents perceived that some of the transactions may have been paid timely within the terms of an Agreement with the sellers. However, Respondents did not timely corroborate their compliance with documentation of valid Agreements despite many opportunities to do so.

I note that Complainant has recommended a reduced monetary sanction, which I find appropriate. Respondents' actions also support the imposition of an Order directing them to cease and desist the practice of late payment, and a further Order directing them to keep adequate records documenting transactions covered by the Act. Moreover, Respondents must register with GIPSA and obtain proper surety for covered transactions.

Respondents' failure to register and secure a bond, and failure to keep adequate records are the direct results of the actions of Michael Paul Partlow. Mr. Partlow refused to follow the direction of GIPSA officials to register and secure a bond while engaging in dealer transactions. Mr. Partlow determined that he was not subject to the Act by misconstruing alternate payment provisions as exempting Respondents from coverage. Further, Mr. Partlow neglected to properly document transactions to meet the requirements for waiver of prompt pay

West Coast Commodities, LLC
72 Agric. Dec. 798

provisions, and then failed to timely provide records to investigators, auditors, Complainant's counsel, and to me. Liability for Respondents' violations of the Act and regulations should be borne by Mr. Partlow, wholly and severally from the Corporate Respondent, and the Corporate Respondent.

III. Findings of Fact

1. Respondent West Coast Commodities, LLC, doing business as M. Partlow Co., is a corporation organized under the laws of Oregon, and its principal place of business is at the residence of Michael Paul Partlow (address excluded in the interests of privacy).
2. Respondent Michael Paul Partlow is sole corporate officer of West Coast Commodities, LLC.
3. At all time material herein, the corporate Respondent acted under the direction, management and control of Respondent Michael Paul Partlow, sole corporate officer, and was:
 - (a) Engaged in the business of a dealer, buying and selling livestock in commerce; and
 - (b) Not registered or bonded with the Secretary of Agriculture as a dealer.
4. On November 30, 2009, GIPSA sent Respondents written notification of the requirement to register as a dealer and secure appropriate bond or bond equivalent.
5. During an investigation conducted by GIPSA Agent Falstad, it was noted that Respondents' primary business was not as a dealer, and Respondents were advised that if they discontinued making transactions as a dealer they did not need to register or secure a bond.
6. Respondents continued to engage in the activities of a dealer.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

7. Respondents failed to register or secure surety required by the Act.
8. Respondents purchased livestock under verbal and written agreements that provided for payment terms other than by the close of business on the day following the purchase.
9. Documentation of agreements providing waiver of the requirement to pay by the day following a sale were not signed by both parties and do not specify the date of the sale, the date of delivery of the cattle, or the date of payment.
10. No cattle were shipped to Florida, Illinois, Iowa, or Massachusetts.
11. Respondents purchased livestock and failed to pay the full amount of the purchase price within the time period required by the Act when a payment sent by Respondents to a seller on April 4, 2011 was returned for non-sufficient funds.
12. Respondents failed to make timely payments in other transactions.

IV. Conclusions of Law

1. Respondents failed to keep records required by 9 C.F.R. § 201.43.
2. Respondents' records of sales agreements do not comply with the Act and regulations so as to provide a waiver from the requirement to pay for sales by the close of business on the day following purchases.
3. Respondents failed to register as a dealer in violation of 9 C.F.R. § 201.10.
4. Respondents failed to secure a bond or bond equivalent in violation of 9 C.F.R. §§ 201.27 – 201.32.

West Coast Commodities, LLC
72 Agric. Dec. 798

5. Respondents willfully violated 7 U.S.C. § 192(a) and § 228b of the Act by failing to pay the full amount of the purchase price for livestock within the time period required by the Act.
6. Sanctions are appropriate to deter Respondents and others from willfully failing to make prompt payments, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. §193(b).

ORDER

Respondents West Coast Commodities, LLC, its agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, and Michael Paul Partlow, in connection with activities subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, shall cease and desist from engaging in any capacity for which registration and bonding is required under the Packers and Stockyards Act and implementing regulations without registering with the Secretary of Agriculture and obtaining an adequate bond or bond equivalent.

Respondents West Coast Commodities, LLC, its agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, and Michael Paul Partlow, in connection with activities subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, shall cease and desist from failing to pay, when due, the full purchase price of livestock.

Respondents West Coast Commodities, LLC, its agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, and Michael Paul Partlow, in connection with activities subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, shall cease and desist from issuing checks in payment for livestock without having and maintaining sufficient funds on deposit and available in the account upon which they are drawn to pay checks when presented.

Respondents West Coast Commodities, LLC, its agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, and Michael Paul Partlow, in connection with activities subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, shall keep and maintain accounts, records, and memoranda which fully and accurately disclose the true nature of their operations subject to the Act, including, but not limited to, purchase and

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

sale invoices, bank statements, canceled checks, deposit slips, kill sheets, and sale agreements.

To the extent that Respondent West Coast Commodities, LLC, through its officer and Respondent Michael Paul Partlow, its agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, seek to enter into written agreements extending the terms of prompt payment beyond the close of business on the day following a purchase of livestock, Respondents must ensure that all agreements are in writing and are acknowledged and signed by the seller of the livestock, and include the date of signing, the date payment is due, and the date of the livestock transaction.

Pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 193(b), Respondents are assessed, jointly and severally, a civil penalty in the amount of fourteen thousand dollars (\$14,000.00). Payment shall be made out to the “U.S. Department of Agriculture” and sent to USDA-GIPSA, P.O. Box 790335, St. Louis, Missouri 63179-0335. A reference to this case, Docket No. 12-0475, must be included on the payment.

Respondents West Coast Commodities, LLC, and Michael Paul Partlow are prohibited from being registered and from engaging in any activity for which registration is required under the Act for a period of thirty (30) days and thereafter until such time as Respondents demonstrate to the satisfaction of GIPSA that they have an adequate bond or bond equivalent and that they are in full compliance with the Act. Provided that Respondents demonstrate to the satisfaction of GIPSA that they have an adequate bond or bond equivalent and that they are in full compliance with the Act, after expiration of the initial thirty (30) day period, upon application to GIPSA, a supplemental Order may be issued terminating the prohibition on Respondents. At such time and thereafter, any application for registration that Respondents may file with GIPSA will be processed in accordance with standard GIPSA procedures.

This Decision and Order shall become final and effective without further proceedings thirty-five (35) days after service on Respondents, unless appealed to the Judicial Officer for the U.S. Department of

Paul Day
72 Agric. Dec. 819

Agriculture by a party to the proceeding within thirty (30) days after 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.

—

In re: PAUL DAY.
Docket No. 13-0201.
Decision and Order.
Filed November 25, 2013.

P&S-D.

Darlene M. Bolinger, Esq. for Complainant.
Paul Day, pro se.
Decision and Order entered by Jill S. Clifton, Administrative Law Judge.

DECISION AND ORDER BY REASON OF ADMISSIONS

Decision Summary

For Respondent Paul Day's failures to comply with the Packers and Stockyards Act, I impose: (a) **cease and desist orders**; *see* paragraph 16; (b) a prohibition from engaging in operations subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act of **at least one-year**; *see* paragraph 17; and (c) civil penalties totaling **\$4,000.00** (four thousand dollars); *see* paragraph 18.

Parties and Allegations

1. The Complainant is the Deputy Administrator, Packers and Stockyards Program, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA), United States Department of Agriculture (frequently herein "Packers and Stockyards" or "Complainant").
2. The Respondent is Paul Day, an individual (herein frequently "Paul Day" or "Respondent Day" or "Respondent Paul Day" or "Respondent").
3. The Complaint, filed on April 2, 2013, alleged there is reason to believe that the Respondent Paul Day willfully violated the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. § 181, *et seq.*) (frequently

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

herein the “Packers and Stockyards Act” or the “Act”), and the regulations promulgated thereunder, 9 C.F.R. § 201.1 *et seq.*

4. The Respondent Paul Day filed his Answer timely on April 23, 2013, stating among other things: “I have stopped doing any cattle business for almost a year. If I ever get back into the cattle business I will contact your office at once. But at this time I’m unemployed and filing for disability.”

Procedural History

1. Packers and Stockyards filed its “Amended Motion for Decision Without Hearing by Reason of Default” on June 6, 2013. Respondent Day has failed to respond to that Amended Motion. Respondent Day did not receive his copy when it was sent by certified mail, which went “UNCLAIMED” and was returned to the Hearing Clerk [“Return to Sender”]. However, Respondent Day is deemed served with that Amended Motion on June 18, 2013, the date that the Amended Motion was re-mailed to him by ordinary mail. *See* section 1.147(c)(1) of the Rules of Practice, 7 C.F.R. § 1.147(c)(1).
2. The parties participated in a telephone conference with me on August 20, 2013. During that telephone conference Respondent Day admitted his failures to comply with the Packers and Stockyards Act and said he would love to see the \$12,750.00 lowered (the civil penalties amount requested by Packers and Stockyards). His failure to pay for purchased livestock, he said, was in part because he never received two payments that his wife, from whom he was separated, used; the two payments had been mailed to him at his old address. [REDACTED] (redacted by Editor pursuant to FOIA Exemption 6). Respondent Day said he was on disability, receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Medicaid (since May 2013).
3. During the August 20 telephone conference, counsel for Packers and Stockyards Ms. Bolinger expressed willingness to review documentation of Respondent Day’s financial condition if he would provide it, so that Packers and Stockyards could determine whether to persist in its request for a \$12,750.00 civil penalty. Ms. Bolinger asked Respondent Day to provide also copies of his recent income tax returns; he responded that he had not filed recent income tax returns: not for 2012, not for 2011, not for 2010. I encouraged Respondent Day to seek help in getting his income tax returns filed. During the August 20 telephone conference, Respondent Day and Ms. Bolinger agreed to talk by phone the next day, with the idea of working out a Consent Decision; and we scheduled another telephone conference to

Paul Day
72 Agric. Dec. 819

include me for September 30, 2013, at 2:00 pm Central time, 3:00 pm Eastern. The September 30 telephone conference was held as scheduled, and Respondent Day failed to participate; there was no answer when his phone number was called. Beginning the following day, the lapse of funding prevented Ms. Bolinger from working and prevented the entire Office of Administrative Law Judges, including Ms. Kennedy and me, from working, until October 17, 2013. There is no indication that Respondent Day has tried to reach either Ms. Bolinger or Ms. Kennedy and me during the prohibition against us working or during the more than one month since, despite repeated attempts by both Ms. Bolinger and Ms. Kennedy to reach him. Respondent Day has failed, to this day, to provide any financial disclosure or documentation to Ms. Bolinger. Respondent Paul Day's Answer did not deny the factual allegations of the Complaint. The factual allegations of the Complaint are admitted by the Respondent's failure to deny them and are adopted and set forth herein as Findings of Fact. This Decision and Order, therefore, is issued pursuant to section 1.139 of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.139).

Findings of Fact

1. The Respondent Paul Day is an individual with a mailing address in [REDACTED] (*redacted by Editor pursuant to FOIA Exemption 6*).
2. The Respondent Paul Day, at all times material herein, was engaged in the business of a dealer buying and/or selling livestock in commerce and a market agency buying and/or selling livestock in commerce on a commission basis, without being registered with the Secretary of Agriculture and without maintaining an adequate bond or bond equivalent, including from about October 3, 2011 through November 1, 2011, and again from February 1, 2012 through March 7, 2012, in approximately 15 transactions involving the purchase of a total of 746 head of livestock. *See* paragraph III of the Complaint.
3. Further, the Respondent Paul Day was engaged in the business of a dealer buying and/or selling livestock in commerce, either on his own account or as an agent of the vendor or purchaser, without maintaining an adequate bond or bond equivalent, particularly on November 16, 2011 in a transaction involving the purchase of 9 head of livestock; and on November 18, 2011 in a transaction involving the sale of 8 head of livestock. *See* paragraph IV of the Complaint.
4. In addition, when the Respondent Paul Day purchased livestock on or about November 16, 2011, he failed to pay the full purchase price of \$15,112.95

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

when due, and **\$4,744.64 remained unpaid** as of February 14, 2013. *See* paragraph V of the Complaint.

Conclusions

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter.
2. Respondent Paul Day engaged in operations subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act without maintaining an adequate bond or bond equivalent, thereby engaging in an “unfair practice” in violation of section 312(a) of the 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). *See* paragraph 10 and paragraph 11.
3. Respondent Paul Day purchased livestock for which full payment was not timely made, thereby engaging in an “unfair practice” in violation of section 312(a) of the Act (7 U.S.C. § 213(a)), and a violation of section 409(a) of the Act (7 U.S.C. § 228b(a)); and section 201.43 of the regulations (9 C.F.R. § 201.43). *See* paragraph 12.

ORDER

1. Respondent Paul Day and his agents and employees, directly or indirectly through any corporate or other device, in connection with activities subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, **shall cease and desist** from:
 - (a) engaging in business in any capacity for which bonding is required under the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended and supplemented, and the regulations promulgated thereunder, without **filing and maintaining an adequate bond or bond equivalent**; as required by sections 201.29 and 201.30 of the regulations (9 C.F.R. §§ 201.29, 201.30); AND
 - (b) Respondent Paul Day is prohibited from engaging in business in any capacity for which bonding is required under the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended and supplemented, without **first becoming properly registered** under the Act, as required by section 201.10(a) of the regulations (9 C.F.R. § 201.10(a)); AND
 - (c) Respondent Paul Day shall **cease and desist** from purchasing livestock and failing to **pay the full purchase price** of livestock **when due** (normally before the close of the next business day

Paul Day
72 Agric. Dec. 819

following each purchase of livestock); as required by section 409 of the Act (7 U.S.C. § 228b) and section 201.43 of the regulations (9 C.F.R. § 201.43).

2. Respondent Paul Day is prohibited from being registered and from engaging in any activities for which registration is required under the Packers and Stockyards Act for **one year and thereafter** until such time as Respondent demonstrates to the satisfaction of Packers and Stockyards that he has an adequate bond or bond equivalent, that he has paid in full the assessed civil penalties as specified in paragraph 18, and that he is in full compliance with the Act. After expiration of the initial one year period, upon application to Packers and Stockyards, a supplemental order may be issued terminating the prohibition on Respondent. At such time and thereafter, any application for registration that Respondent may file with Packers and Stockyards will be processed in accordance with standard Packers and Stockyards procedures.
3. Respondent Paul Day shall pay civil penalties totaling **\$4,000.00** (four thousand dollars), in accordance with section 312(b) of the Act (7 U.S.C. § 213(b)). The civil penalty payment instrument(s) shall be made payable to the order of the **United States Department of Agriculture**, marked with **PS-D-13-0201**, and sent to:

USDA-GIPSA
P.O. Box 790335
St. Louis, Missouri 63179-0335

Payment(s) shall be **completed within one year** from the date this Order is final and effective. *See* paragraph 19.

Finality

This Decision and Order shall be final and effective without further proceedings 35 days after service unless an appeal to the Judicial Officer is filed with the Hearing Clerk within 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 shall be served by the Hearing Clerk upon each of the parties.

—

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS

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

TIM ROWAN.

Docket No. 13-0123.

Order of Dismissal.

Filed July 18, 2013.

GRANT GIBSON AND TAGM, LLC.

Docket No. 12-0627.

Order of Dismissal.

Filed September 5, 2013.

CHRISTOPHER J. BARTELS, D/B/A BARTELS PACKING.

Docket No. 14-0006.

Order of Withdrawal.

Filed November 25, 2013.

SOULEYMANE N. KONE, D/B/A INTERNATIONAL OASIS.

Docket No. 13-0247.

Order of Dismissal.

Filed December 3, 2013.

PANOLA LIVESTOCK ENTERPRISE, INC.

Docket No. 14-0042.

Order of Dismissal.

Filed December 19, 2013.

Miscellaneous Orders
72 Agric. Dec. 824 – 825

RANDY LOWERY.
Docket No. 14-0043.
Order of Dismissal.
Filed December 19, 2013.

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] with the sparse case citation but without the body of the order. Default Decisions (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

ORANGE LIVESTOCK MARKET, INC.

Docket No. 13-0204.

Default Decision and Order.

Filed July 3, 2013.

JOSEPH K. HOWELL.

Docket No. 13-0205.

Default Decision and Order.

Filed July 3, 2013.

RIVERSIDE CATTLE CO., LLC.

Docket No. 13-0146.

Default Decision and Order.

Filed July 16, 2013.

PAUL E. GIBSON, JR., d/b/a G&S LIVESTOCK CO.

Docket No. 13-0206.

Default Decision and Order.

Filed August 6, 2013.

AL-HOUDA MEAT MARKET, INC.

Docket No. 13-0228.

Default Decision and Order.

Filed August 7, 2013.

Default Decisions
72 Agric. Dec. 826 – 827

DEREK W. CRITES, d/b/a DC FARMS AND WAYNE H. CRITES.
Docket No. 13-0180.
Default Decision and Order.
Filed November 7, 2013.

**JOSEPHINE E. BONACCURSO, INC., d/b/a SALEM PACKING
COMPANY AND SAMUEL BONACCURSO.**
Docket Nos. 13-0115, 13-0116.
Default Decision and Order.
Filed November 25, 2013.

JERRY O. SMITH.
Docket No. 13-0207.
Default Decision and Order.
Filed December 3, 2013.

CONSENT DECISIONS

CONSENT DECISIONS

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

David Starks, D/B/A Slow Cow Cattle Company.

Docket No. 13-0182.

Filed July 5, 2013.

Wayne F. Craig & Sons, Inc.

Docket No. 13-0225.

Filed July 15, 2013.

J.H. Routh Packing Company.

Docket No. 13-0111.

Filed July 25, 2013.

Scott Deters, D/B/A Scott Deters Livestock Co.

Docket No. 13-0226.

Filed July 26, 2013.

Gary Wayne Tuttle.

Docket No. 13-0240.

Filed August 6, 2013.

Riverside Cattle Co., LLC & Brian J. Witt.

Docket Nos. 13-0148; 13-0150.

Filed August 7, 2013.

Jerry Stokes, D/B/A Jerry Stokes Cattle.

Docket No. 13-0243.

Filed August 13, 2013.

Celivo "Nick" Farinelli, D/B/A Farinelli Enterprises & Wild Rose Ranch.

Docket No. 12-0583.

Filed August 15, 2013.

Consent Decisions
72 Agric. Dec. 828 – 830

Ronald L. Lemons & Ronald L. Lemons Livestock, LLC.

Docket Nos. 13-0299; 13-0300.

Filed August 21, 2013.

Al-Houda Meat Market, Inc.

Docket No. 13-0228.

Filed August 22, 2013.

Justin Turner.

Docket No. 13-0257.

Filed August 22, 2013.

Tina Stockyards, LLC; Carl Jacob Auer; and Heather Auer.

Docket Nos. 13-0236; 13-0237; 13-0238.

Filed August 29, 2013.

Lincoln Provision, Inc.

Docket No. 13-0199.

Filed September 6, 2013.

F&F Farms & Cattle, Inc. and Todd Fortner.

Docket Nos. 13-0261; 13-0262.

Filed September 6, 2013.

Gary Fulton.

Docket No. 13-0264.

Filed September 12, 2013.

Gary H. Luck, D/B/A Luck's Livestock.

Docket No. 13-0330.

Filed October 21, 2013.

Charles Delbert Cole, II, D/B/A Weston Livestock Marketing.

Docket No. 13-0304.

Filed October 22, 2013.

CONSENT DECISIONS

Daniel Ault and Carrie Ault, D/B/A Strawtown Livestock Auction, LLC.

Docket Nos. 13-0328; 13-0329.
Filed October 28, 2013.

David Snell.

Docket No. 13-0363.
Filed November 26, 2013.

Weldon Gidwell, D/B/A Mineral Wells Stockyards Company.

Docket No. 13-0315.
Filed December 19, 2013.
