

In the Matter of:

HAROLD ANDREWS,

ARB CASE NO. 10-040

COMPLAINANT,

ALJ CASE NO. 2009-STA-067

v.

DATE: February 16, 2010

J.B. HUNT TRANSPORT SERVICES, INC.,

RESPONDENT.

BEFORE: THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW BOARD

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT AND DISMISSING COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE

Harold Andrews complained that J.B. Hunt Transport Services violated the employee protection provisions of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (STAA), and its implementing regulations, when it terminated his employment because he refused to drive in unsafe conditions. Following an investigation of this complaint, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) concluded that there was no reasonable cause to believe that J.B. Hunt violated the STAA when it terminated Andrews's employment. Accordingly, OSHA dismissed the complaint.

Andrews objected to OSHA's findings and requested a hearing before a Department of Labor (DOL) Administrative Law Judge (ALJ).³ The ALJ assigned to the

USDOL/OALJ REPORTER PAGE 1

¹ 49 U.S.C.A. § 31105 (Thomson/West Supp. 2008). Section 405 of the STAA provides protection from discrimination to employees who report violations of commercial motor vehicle safety rules or who refuse to operate a vehicle when such operation would violate those rules.

² 29 C.F.R. Part 1978 (2009).

³ See 29 C.F.R. § 1978.105.

case scheduled a hearing, but before the hearing took place, the parties reached a settlement agreement. The parties submitted the settlement agreement to the ALJ, and he issued an order recommending approval of the settlement agreement and dismissing the case on December 22, 2009.

The case is now before the ARB pursuant to the STAA's automatic review provisions.⁴ The ARB "shall issue the final decision and order based on the record and the decision and order of the administrative law judge."⁵

The ARB issued a Notice of Review and Briefing Schedule reminding the parties of their right to submit briefs in support of or in opposition to the ALJ's order. Neither party filed a brief with the Board.

Under the regulations implementing the STAA, the parties may settle a case at any time after filing objections to OSHA's preliminary findings, and before those findings become final, "if the participating parties agree to a settlement and such settlement is approved by the Administrative Review Board [ARB]" Accordingly, we review the settlement to determine whether the settlement agreement constitutes a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement of Andrews's STAA complaint.

Initially we note that the settlement agreement may encompass the settlement of matters under laws other than the STAA. The Board's authority over settlement agreements is limited to the statutes that are within the Board's jurisdiction as defined by the applicable statute. Therefore, we approve only the terms of the agreement pertaining to Andrews's current STAA case. 8

Finally, we construe paragraph 9, the governing law provision, as not limiting the authority of the Secretary of Labor and any federal court, which shall be governed in all respects by the laws and regulations of the United States.⁹

USDOL/OALJ REPORTER PAGE 2

⁴ 49 U.S.C.A. § 31105(b)(2)(C); see 29 C.F.R. § 1978.109(c)(1).

⁵ 29 C.F.R. § 1978.109(c); *Monroe v. Cumberland Transp. Corp.*, ARB No. 01-101, ALJ No. 2000-STA-050, slip op. at 2 (ARB Sept. 26, 2001).

^{6 29} C.F.R. § 1978.111(d)(2).

⁷ Settlement Agreement and General Release para. 3.

⁸ Fish v. H & R Transfer, ARB No. 01-071, ALJ No. 2000-STA-056, slip op. at 2 (ARB Apr. 30, 2003).

⁹ See Phillips v. Citizens Ass'n for Sound Energy, 1991-ERA-025, slip op. at 2 (Sec'y Nov. 4, 1991).

As so construed, we find the agreement to be a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement of Andrews's STAA complaint. Accordingly, we **APPROVE** the settlement and **DISMISS** the complaint with prejudice.

SO ORDERED.

PAUL M. IGASAKI Chief Administrative Appeals Judge

E. COOPER BROWN Administrative Appeals Judge

USDOL/OALJ REPORTER PAGE 3