UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD,

Complainant,

VS.

EDWARD MASON,

Respondent.

Docket Number 2023-0047 Enforcement Activity No. 7542903

DEFAULT ORDER

<u>Issued: July 23, 2024</u>

By Administrative Law Judge: Honorable Timothy G. Stueve

Appearances:

Eric Bauer USCG S&R National Center of Expertise

For the Coast Guard

Edward Mason, pro se

For Respondent

Background

On February 8, 2023, the Coast Guard filed a Complaint against Edward Mason (Respondent). The Amended Certificate of Service for the Complaint filed by the Coast Guard indicates the Complaint was delivered to Respondent's residence by Express Courier Service and signed for by a person of suitable age and discretion residing at the residence on May 6, 2024 (Attachment A)¹.

On June 3, 2024, the Coast Guard filed a Motion for Default Order (Motion), explaining Respondent failed to file an Answer, and the response time has passed. See 33 C.F.R. § 20.308. The Return of Service for Motion for Default states the Motion was delivered to Respondent's residence by Federal Express and signed for by a person of suitable age and discretion residing at the residence on June 7, 2024 (Attachment B)². The Chief Administrative Law Judge assigned the matter to me on June 11, 2024.

Discussion

The applicable regulations require a respondent to "file a written answer to the complaint 20 days or less after service of the complaint." 33 C.F.R. § 20.308(a). An administrative law judge (ALJ) may find a respondent in default "upon failure to file a timely answer to the complaint or, after motion, upon failure to appear at a conference or hearing without good cause shown." 33 C.F.R. § 20.310(a). Default constitutes an admission of all facts alleged in a complaint and a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing on those facts. 33 C.F.R. § 20.310(c).

The Complaint filed by the Coast Guard and properly served on Respondent contained instructions that clearly stated "YOU MUST RESPOND TO THIS COMPLAINT WITHIN 20

¹ The Coast Guard's Amended Certificate of Service for the Complaint indicates that Respondent signed for receipt of the document from the Express Courier.

² The Fedex Proof of Service attached to the Return of Service for the Motion for Default Order indicates that "O. Smith" signed for the document.

DAYS" and provided the applicable regulatory provision, 33 C.F.R. § 20.308. The instructions also informed Respondent an extension of time could be requested "within 20 days" of receipt. Respondent failed to respond to the Complaint or the Motion for Default Order.

Accordingly, I find Respondent in default pursuant to 33 C.F.R. § 20.310(a). Default constitutes an admission of all facts alleged in the Complaint and a waiver of the right to a hearing. 33 C.F.R. § 20.310(c). See Appeal Decision 2682 (REEVES) (2008).

Turning to the allegations in the Complaint, the Coast Guard alleges on May 9, 2022, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) determined Respondent does not meet the security threat assessment standards described in 49 C.F.R. § 1572.5, poses an imminent security threat in accordance with 49 C.F.R. § 1572.21(d)(3), and revoked Respondent's TWIC in accordance with 49 C.F.R. § 1572.5(b). As a result of TSA's actions, the Coast Guard asserts Respondent is a security risk as described by 46 U.S.C. § 7703(5). Furthermore, the Coast Guard alleges on February 9, 2022, Respondent was convicted of violating Florida Statutes § 893.13(6)(a) and § 893.147(1), which are convictions for dangerous drug law violations as described by 46 U.S.C. § 7704(a).

Having concluded Respondent admitted TSA revoked his TWIC, and all other facts in the Complaint, I agree TSA's determination that Respondent is not eligible to hold a TWIC is proof that a mariner is not eligible to hold an MMC. See 46 C.F.R. §§ 10.235(h) and 10.235(i). Based on these admissions, I find these facts as admitted are legally sufficient to find the charge that Respondent is a security risk as described in 46 U.S.C. § 7703(5) **PROVED**. Id. Having also concluded Respondent admitted he was convicted of dangerous drug law violations, and all other facts in the Complaint, I find these facts are legally sufficient to find the charge that Respondent

has convictions for dangerous drug law violations as described in 46 U.S.C. § 7704 (a) PROVED.

I find the facts alleged in the Complaint sufficient to warrant the suggested sanction of **REVOCATION**. See 46 C.F.R. §§ 5.59, 10.235(h) and 10.235(i).

WHEREFORE,

ORDER

Upon consideration of the record, I find Respondent in **DEFAULT**.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, in accordance with 33 C.F.R. § 20.310, I find the allegations set forth in the Complaint **PROVED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, all of Respondent's Coast Guard issued credentials, including Respondent's Merchant Mariner Credential (MMC), are **REVOKED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, Respondent shall immediately deliver all Coast Guard issued credentials, licenses, certificates, or documents, including the MMC, by mail, courier service, or in person to: USCG Suspension & Revocation National Center of Expertise, 100 Forbes Drive, Martinsburg, WV 25404. In accordance with 18 U.S.C. § 2197, if Respondent knowingly continues to use the Coast Guard issued MMC, Respondent may be subject to criminal prosecution.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to 33 C.F.R. § 20.310(e), for good cause shown, an ALJ may set aside a finding of default. A motion to set aside a finding of default may be filed with the ALJ Docketing Center in Baltimore. The motion may be sent to the U.S. Coast Guard Administrative Law Judge Docketing Center; Attention: Hearing Docket Clerk; Room 412; 40 S. Gay Street; Baltimore, MD 21201-4022.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, service of this Default Order on the parties serves as notice of appeal rights set forth in 33 C.F.R. § 20.1001-20.1004 (Attachment C).

SO ORDERED.

Done and dated July 23, 2024, at Alameda, California

Hon. Timothy G. Stueve Administrative Law Judge U.S. Coast Guard