

U.S. Department of Labor

Office of Administrative Law Judges
50 Fremont Street - Suite 2100
San Francisco, CA 94105

(415) 744-6577
(415) 744-6569 (FAX)



Issue Date: 24 September 2004

CASE NO.: 2004-AIR-00023

In the Matter of:

PATRICK A. TEAGARDEN,
Complainant,

vs.

RAYTHEON COMPANY,
L-3 COMMUNICATIONS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Respondents.

Appearances: Patrick A. Teagarden
The Complainant, Pro Se

Joseph E. Reynolds, Esquire
For Raytheon Company

Steven H. Dymond, Esquire
For L-3 Communications

Cynthia M. Van Rassen, Esquire
For the Department of the Army

Before: Jennifer Gee
Administrative Law Judge

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT

This proceeding before the Office of Administrative Law Judges (“OALJ”) was initiated when the Complainant, Patrick Teagarden, and Respondent, L-3 Communications, both requested hearings before the OALJ to challenge the decision issued by the Regional Administrator in complaints filed by the Complainant under § 519 of the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (“AIR21”), § 1450 the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (“SDWA”), § 507 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Amendments of 1973 (“FWPCA”), § 23 of the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 (“TSCA”), § 7001 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1976 (“SWDA”), § 312 of the Clean Air Act, Amendments of 1977 (“CAA”), § 10 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and

Liability Act of 1980 (“CERCLA”), § 211 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1978 (“ERA”), and § 806 of the Corporate and Criminal Fraud Accountability Act enacted on July 30, 2002 (“CCFAA”).

The complaints filed under SDWA, FWPCA, TSCA, SWDA, CAA, CERCLA, ERA, and CCFAA were dismissed on August 31, 2004, after the Complainant asked to withdraw those complaints and L-3 Communications joined in the request.

On September 22, 2004, I received a settlement agreement signed by the Complainant, Raytheon Company, L-3 Communications, and the Department of the Army. The settlement agreement was accompanied by a request for approval of the settlement terms.

I have carefully reviewed the terms of the settlement agreement submitted in this case and I find the settlement agreement to be a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement of the Complainant’s AIR 21 complaint. Accordingly, the settlement agreement between the Complainant, Patrick A. Teagarden, and Respondents, Raytheon Company, L-3 Communications, and the Department of the Army, is hereby APPROVED, and this matter is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

A

JENNIFER GEE
Administrative Law Judge