

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

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD,	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	Docket Number: 2025-0429
v.	)	
	)	MISLE Activity ID: 8200030
JONATHAN JEWETT	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

**ORDER GRANTING UN-OPPOSED MOTION  
TO WITHDRAW COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE**

This matter comes before me on the United States Coast Guard (USCG) Un-Opposed Motion to Withdraw Complaint with Prejudice (Motion), filed on October 22, 2025. Jonathan Jewett (Respondent) does not oppose this Motion. For the reasons set forth below, the Coast Guard's Motion is **GRANTED**.

The Coast Guard initiated this administrative proceeding on September 2, 2025, seeking a three-month outright suspension of Respondent's Merchant Mariner Credential (MMC). Subsequently, the parties entered into a Settlement Agreement on September 15, 2025, and filed a Motion for Approval of the Settlement Agreement and Entry of Consent Order. Due to the lapse in congressional funding and the resulting federal government shutdown, the Investigating Officer for the Coast Guard was furloughed and new Coast Guard representative was assigned to represent the Coast Guard.

On October 17, 2025, the undersigned received an email from the new Coast Guard representative inquiring when to expect a decision on the requested consent order and informing the undersigned that Respondent had completed the SAP process and rehabilitation program; Respondent was not included in this email. The undersigned then scheduled a Pre-Hearing

Conference to address the *ex parte* communication. On October 22, 2025, the Motion was filed and, on October 23, 2025, the undersigned convened the pre-hearing conference. During the pre-hearing conference the parties and the undersigned addressed the outstanding Motion, the *ex parte* communication, and other matters associated with the case.

In its Motion, the Coast Guard provided a good cause response to the question of the perceived *ex parte* communications and asserted they do not believe the case should be dismissed under 5 U.S.C. § 556(d). However, the Coast Guard does believe it is in the best interest of the parties to withdrawal the case with prejudice pursuant to 33 C.F.R. § 20.311. Having reviewed the Motion, the procedural history of the case, and the record, I find the Motion is well-founded and unopposed. Accordingly, the Motion is hereby **GRANTED**. Finally, the undersigned denies the Motion for Approval of the Settlement Agreement and Entry of Consent order, as the withdrawal of the Complaint renders the motion moot.

#### ORDER

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Coast Guard's Un-Opposed Motion to Withdraw Complaint with Prejudice is **GRANTED** and this matter is withdrawn with prejudice pursuant to 33 C.F.R. § 20.311.

**IT IS FURTHER HEREBY ORDERED** that the Motion for Approval of the Settlement Agreement and Entry of Consent Order is **DENIED** as **MOOT**.

**SO ORDERED.**

Done and date October 24, 2025, at  
Houston, Texas

  
TOMMY CANTRELL  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD