Manual
for
Administrative Law Judges

2001 Interim
Internet Edition

Morell E. Mullins
Professor of Law

University of Arkansas at Little Rock
William H. Bowen School of Law

Table of Contents

PREFACE AND INTRODUCTION: 2001 INTERIM INTERNET EDITION

Morell E. Mullins[i]

Background

Almost a decade ago, I was the principal revisor for the Third Edition of the Manual for Administrative Law Judges (Manual or 3rd Edition), which was prepared and published under the auspices of the Administrative Conference of the United States (ACUS or Administrative Conference). As noted in the Preface to the Third Edition, the Manual had become something of a standard in its field.[ii] Although the Third Edition has been out of print

---

[i] Previous editions of this Manual were published by the United States Government, under the auspices of the now-defunct Administrative Conference of the United States. This edition has been prepared in a spirit of public service, and copyright in original government materials is not claimed. Copyright in this edition is asserted primarily to prevent commercial piracy. Permission is hereby given for any noncommercial use of this Manual (including, but not limited to, noncommercial or not-for-profit educational use and noncommercial use by any governmental entities), as long as the law school and I are appropriately credited.

[ii] Agency decisions citing the 3rd and earlier editions of this Manual include In the Matter of Pepperell Associates, 1999 EPA ALJ LEXIS 16 (DOCKET NO. CWA-2-I-97-1088, Feb. 26, 1999) (United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges) (discussing ALJ's affirmative duty to ensure complete and accurate record, even if ALJ must raise issue *sua sponte*); In the Matter of Woodcrest Manufacturing, 1997 EPA ALJ LEXIS 81, Docket No. 5-EPCRA-96-007, June 13, 1997) (United States Environmental Protection Agency; Office of Administrative Law Judges) (importance of impartial decision-maker); In re David Harriss, Ruling on Certified Questions filed May 1, 1991, 50 Agric. Dec. 683 (P.Q. Docket No. 91-27) (noting that ALJ is required to follow policies set out in agency's published opinions) (citing 1982 edition of Manual); Department of Veteran's Affairs, Veterans Administration Medical Center, Boise Idaho, 40 F.L.R.A. 992, 1991 FLRA LEXIS 339 (May 24, 1991) (ALJ decision) (noting ALJ's responsibility to call agency's attention an important problem of law or policy) (citing 1982 edition of this Manual); In the Matter of Sequoyah Fuel Corporation and General Atomics, 41 N.R.C. 253, n. 20, 1995 NRC LEXIS 13 (April 18, 1995) (citing Form 19-d in the Manual). Cites in law review

for several years, the Office of Administrative Law Judges, U.S. Department of Labor (OALJ DOL), made a modified version of that edition available in 1998 at:
http://www.oalj.dol.gov/public/apa/refrnc/aljmantc.htm

The OALJ DOL is owed a double debt of gratitude for this public service. First, it kept the Manual available to the public, after it was no longer in print.[iii]

Second, the OALJ site provided the inspiration for this particular, and experimental, edition of the Manual — the 2001 Interim Internet Edition. For various reasons, a complete textual overhaul was not feasible, and probably was not necessary. However, a few textual revisions to the 3rd Edition were needed. In addition, citations to the CFR had become outdated. Some of the regulations cited in the 3rd Edition had been amended. Others had been repealed. Moreover, there had been significant developments during the 1990's — which are described below.

The OALJ DOL site therefore provided the inspiration for a less conventional format — a webpage publication. Using a webpage format for some modest updating and upgrading seemed to be not only an intriguing experiment, but also a simpler and more efficient way to do the needed revisions.

Developments Since 1991

As for federal administrative adjudication itself, developments in the past decade have evolutionary, rather than revolutionary. For example, alternative dispute resolution (ADR) continues to flourish and grow in the administrative law setting. Also, the shift away from old line economic regulatory agencies continues, as typified by the termination of the Interstate

---

articles include Michael Frost, *The Unseen Hand in Administrative Law Decisions: Organizing Principles for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 151 (1997); Alan W. Heifitz, *The Continuing Need for the Administrative Conference: Fairness, Adequacy, and Efficiency in the Administrative Process*, 8 ADMIN. L.J. AM. U. 703 (1994) (Testimony before Congressional Committee of Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, discussing at 704 the value of the Manual to ALJs); James M. Timony, *Demeanor Credibility*, 49 CATH. U.L. REV. 903 (2000) (quoting 3rd Edition — in fn. 117, regarding standards for resolving credibility issues).

[iii] Because of the OALJ DOL site, I have been able to respond to requests for copies of the Manual in the last few years including representatives of at least three state agencies wanting to use it for training purposes — by referring callers to that site.

Commerce Commission. Interstate Commerce Commission Termination Act of 1995 ("ICCTA"), Pub. L. No. 104-88, 109 Stat. 803 (codified as amended at scattered sections of 49 U.S.C.).

As for matters outside the immediate realm of administrative adjudication, two developments warrant special mention in this Preface. First, the demise of the Administrative Conference (ACUS). Congress ended funding for ACUS during the 1990's, in effect terminating that agency. The termination of ACUS was statutorily recognized under Public Law 104-52, title IV, 109 Stat. 480 (Nov. 19, 1995). The legislative process leading to the demise of ACUS was treated at length in Toni M. Fine's article, *A Legislative Analysis of the Demise of the Administrative Conference of the United States*, 30 ARIZ. ST. L.J. 19 (1998). A number of other articles about the extinction of ACUS appeared in the same issue of that law journal, and in other law journals. In general, the loss of ACUS was a serious blow to the study of federal administrative law. In particular, for purposes of this Manual, the loss of ACUS meant that there was no longer any government organization readily available to sponsor and publish a new edition of this Manual.

Second, the 1990's saw substantial growth among organizations of Administrative Law Judges and hearing officers, both federal and state. These important organizations include the Federal Administrative Law Judges Conference (FALJC) (http://www.faljc.org/); the National Association of Administrative Law Judges (NAALJ) http://www.naalj.com/); the National Conference of Administrative Law Judges (NCALJ, ABA Judicial Division, http://www.abanet.org/jd/ncalj/home.html), and the Association of Administrative Law Judges (AALJ, http://www.aalj.org/). Moreover, there are many state-level organizations of state ALJs and hearing officers, such as the Oregon Association of Administrative Law Judges, http://www.efn.org/~oaalj/ . The growth of these organizations has facilitated communication among, and increased the influence of, the ALJ and hearing officer community. The websites and web pages mentioned above are manifestations of this development. Another offshoot of this development has been publications such as the JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES, which is frequently cited in this edition of the Manual. These organizations, their activities, and their publications, will be an important source of growth and change in administrative law during the next decade.

Contents of the 2001 Interim Internet Edition

In terms of contents, this 2001 Interim Edition is a modest updating, or upgrading, of the 3rd Edition. Revisions have been made to text, of course, where warranted. Citations to the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR or C.F.R.) and U.S. Code have been

revised or updated. Law review articles were added to footnotes and to the bibliographical appendices. Many of these articles deal with state administrative adjudications, and a separate section has been devoted to state materials in one of the bibliographies. Cases have been added to various footnotes.

Form of the 2001 Interim Internet Edition

The substantive contents of the Manual have not been changed dramatically. In terms of *form*, however, the 2001 Interim Edition is an experiment.

Hopefully, this electronic format will have a number of advantages over the traditional print media. Readers can download, view, print, and search the Manual from most internet capable workstations. Obviously, the electronic format is a lot cheaper for the user. With this electronic format, the revision and updating processes are much easier. Finally, errors can easily be called to our attention contact malj@ualr.edu .

The Future

As the title indicates, the 2001 Interim Internet Edition is an effort to update the 3rd Edition of the Manual. It is, to put it bluntly, something of a stop-gap. A more extensive revision, in the form of a full-fledged 4th edition which contains materials on state administrative adjudication, is certainly a possibility for the future. In the meantime, suggestions and ideas for future development of this Manual are welcome.

Thanks and Acknowledgments

Special thanks relative to the 2001 Interim Internet Edition are in order to David Loyall, my computer consultant who prepared the 2001 Interim Internet Edition for publication in this format, and to Steve Hyatt, Melissa Serfass, and the UALR Computing Services for their assistance in putting it on the UALR William H. Bowen School of Law site. Likewise, I want to thank Dean Charles W. Goldner for his enthusiastic support of this project.

Special thanks also are in order to my recently-graduated research assistant Erin Vinett not only for her work, but also for her assurance that substantial revisions of the text were not needed. I also wish to thank Ken Gallant and Sheila Freidman for their assistance in updating the ADR materials. Very Special Thanks also are extended to Deborah Schick Laufer, for her assistance and her permission to use in the appendices a substantial amount of her bibliographical material regarding ADR in the federal government. Ms. Laufer (BA, Barnard College, Columbia University; JD, Georgetown University Law Center) is an attorney and mediator, who also is Director of the Federal ADR

Network and is co-editor of the Federal Administrative Dispute Resolution Deskbook (ABA 2001).

I also want to thank from Chief Judge John M. Vittone, Office of Administrative Law Judges, U.S. Department of Labor and Acting Chief Judge Ronnie Yoder, Office of Hearings, U.S. Department of Transportation, for their helpful suggestions and information in preparing the 2001 Interim Internet Edition.

Finally, I want to recognize, again, all of those whom I acknowledged and thanked in the Preface to the 3rd Edition, because that Edition forms so much a part of this one.

Preface - 1993 Edition

Revising this Manual for Administrative Law Judges, which was originally written by an Administrative Law Judge of Merritt Ruhlen's stature, presented a unique challenge. To begin with, there was a natural reluctance to tamper with the voice of experience. Moreover, Judge Ruhlen's little book had become something of a standard in its field. An article in one law journal described it as "an admirable handbook [which] reflects his long experience . . . with the CAB."[iv] In fact, Judge Ruhlen's Manual has been cited in several scholarly articles,[v] and in a number of agency and administrative law judge decisions[vi]. Recognizing this, the present edition has tried to

---

[iv] W. H. Allen, *Twilight or Just an Overcast Afternoon*, 1986 DUKE L.J. 276, 278, n. 10.

[v] F. Anderson, *Negotiation and Informal Agency Action: The Case of Superfund*, 1985 DUKE L.J. 261,356, n.357; Breger, *The APA: An Administrative Conference Perspective*, 72 VA. L. REV. 337, n.4 (1986); Graham, *Evidence and Procedure for the Future: Application of the Rules of Evidence in Administrative Agency Formal Adversarial Adjudications: A New Approach*, 1991 U. ILL. L. REV. 353, 370, n. 125; Kauper, *Note: Protecting the Independence of Administrative Law Judges: A Model Administrative Law Judge Corps Statute*, 18 U. MICH. J.L. REF. 537, n. 1 (1985); Whiteside, *Comment: Administrative Adjudications: An Overview of the Existing Models and Their Failure to Achieve Uniformity and a Proposal for a Uniform Adjudicatory Framework*, 46 OHIO ST. L.J. 355, 371, n.139 (1985).

[vi] *E.g.*, In the Matter of Benedict P. Cottone, 63 FCC 2d 596, 605 (1977) (citing 1974 edition of the Manual); D. Federico Co., 3 OSHC (BNA) 1970, 1971, 1975-76 (1976) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission: majority citing 1974 edition of the Manual, describing it as "[a] highly respected guide for Administrative Law Judges," at 1971, and dissent citing other passages from the Manual, at 1975-76); Emery Richardson v. Department of Justice, 11 MSPR 186, Docket No. SF07528110018 (1982); Department of Veteran's Affairs, Veterans Administration Medical Center, Boise, Idaho (Respondent) and AFGE, Local 1273 (Charging Party/Union), 40 FLRA 992, Case No. 9-CA-90575 (1991)

leave intact as much of the original as possible. Special efforts have been made to preserve the spirit of Judge Ruhlen's text, and sometimes the exact words, where they address the actual process of judging and conducting administrative proceedings.

However, important changes in administrative law have occurred since 1982. For instance, the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act (Pub. L. No. 101-552, 104 Stat. 2736 (1990) incorporated alternative dispute resolution (ADR) into federal administrative law and amended the Administrative Procedure Act to remove any doubt that ADR could be an integral part of agency adjudications.

Even before that watershed, the administrative adjudication landscape had changed significantly. Legislation had reduced several agencies' economic regulatory authority over such matters as routes, rates, and licensing in industries such as trucking (Motor Carrier Act, Pub. L. No. 96-296, 92 Stat. 793 (1980), the railroads (Staggers Rail Act, Pub. L. No. 96-448, 94 Stat. 1895 (1980), and natural gas (Natural Gas Policy Act, Pub. L. No. 95-621, 92 Stat. 335 (1978). Under the Airline Deregulation Act, Pub. L. No. 95-204, 92 Stat. 1705 (1978), route and price regulation in the airlines industry met the same fate, and Judge Ruhlen's old agency (the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) was phased out.

These enactments hastened an ongoing evolution in administrative law. The number, and type, of cases decided by administrative law judges had already changed drastically between 1946 and the 1980's. In 1946, there were fewer than 200 federal administrative law judges (then hearing examiners) and 60 per cent of these were employed by agencies engaged primarily in the regulation of routes, rates, and other economic aspects of various industries[vii]. After 1982, there were almost 1200 federal administrative law judges, but only about seven per cent of them were in the old-line regulatory agencies. More than ninety per cent were employed in agencies where contested benefits claims

---

(ALJ decision).

[vii] Palmer, *The Evolving Role of Administrative Law Judges,* 19 NEW ENG. L. REV. 755, 784-85 (1984), citing and giving appropriate credit to Lubbers, *A Unified Corps of ALJs: a Proposal to Test the Idea at the Federal Level*, 65 JUDICATURE 266, 268-69 (Nov. 1981).

and law enforcement adjudications were the norm,[viii] agencies such as the Social Security Administration, the U. S. Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.

Since 1982, the center of gravity for cases decided by administrative law judges has continued to shift away from economic regulatory agencies such as the old CAB, the ICC, and the FCC.[ix]

Revisions to Judge Ruhlen's 1982 edition of the Manual were therefore needed. In fact, these revisions became somewhat more extensive than originally planned. In many respects, it simply was not enough to update citations and revise the 1982 text to correlate with current practices. Too many changes and too much evolution had occurred since 1982.

Nevertheless, Judge Ruhlen's 1982 Manual was not necessarily obsolete. Although much of the 1982 edition refers to agencies like the CAB, and much of it speaks in the immediate context of economic regulation cases, the process of judging remains at the center of the book. Complex, multi-party cases are not limited to litigation over rates, licenses, and routes. Judge Ruhlen still provided a sound point of departure and sound ideas concerning how to manage complex, difficult cases. That is where the need for a Manual for Administrative Law Judges is most acute. And that is one reason why special efforts were made, despite considerable revision and updating, to preserve much of Judge Ruhlen's text.

Now for the customary acknowledgments and thank-you's. (That these acknowledgments are traditional in no way reduces the sincerity with which they are expressed.) As always, the staff of the Administrative Conference have gone out of their way to be helpful and responsive to the needs of the revision process. Special thanks, of course, are extended to Jeffrey Lubbers, ACUS Research Director, and the Administrative Conference. Several Administrative Law Judges have been particularly helpful, and at some risk of inadvertent omission, let me mention in particular Acting Chief Administrative Law Judge Jose A. Anglada (SSA), Judge Ivan Smith (NRC), Chief Administrative Law Judge Curtis Wagner (FERC), and Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge John Vittone (USDOL). Thanks also are in order for Peter Dowd,

---

[viii] *Id.*, at 785.

[ix] Holmes, *ALJ Update: A Review of the Current Role, Status, and Demographics of the Corps of Administrative Law Judges*, 38 FEDERAL BAR NEWS AND J. 202 (May, 1991).

Director, Division of Field Practices and Procedure (SSA), and Judge Moody R. Tidwell, U.S. Claims Court. This list would be incomplete, of course, without appropriately recognizing Danny R. Williams, a tireless research assistant (and third-year student at UALR School of Law), Melba Myers for all of that "hurry-up-I-need-it-now" secretarial support earlier in this project, and Juaniece Ammons for her help in completing it.

Morell E. Mullins

September 14, 1992

I. INTRODUCTION

Today, the powers and responsibilities of federal Administrative Law Judges (ALJ or Administrative Law Judge) are defined in the Administrative Procedure Act[1] (APA) and in the enabling acts and procedural rules of the various agencies[2]. Their powers, duties, and status have been considered on several occasions by the federal courts.[3]

Historically, however, the need for administrative hearing

---

[1] Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 551-559, 701-706, 1305, 1306, 3105, 3344, 5372, and 7521 (1994 and Supp. V 1999), originally enacted as ch. 324, 60 Stat. 237 (1946). The APA is printed in an Appendix to this Manual.

The source of the federal Administrative Law Judge's authority and independence have been succinctly described at the website of the Federal Administrative Law Judges Conference, http://www.faljc.org/faljc1.html

> Administrative Law Judge powers and decisional independence come directly from the Administrative Procedure Act "without the necessity of express agency delegation," and "an agency is without the power to withhold such powers" from its Administrative Law Judges. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S MANUAL ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT 74 (1947), reprinted in ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES, FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE SOURCEBOOK 140 (2d ed. 1992); In the Matter of Bilello [Current Transfer Binder] Comm. Fut. L. Rep.(CCH) 26,032 (Mar. 25, 1994) (citing S. REP. NO. 752, 79th Cong., 1st Sess. 21 (1945)); Tourist Enterprises Corporation"ORBIS", CAB Docket No. 27914, Recommended Decision served October 7, 1977, p. 11, n.9, adopted by CAB Order 78-5-11, dated May 8, 1978, p. 2; "Judicial Response to Misconduct," p. 114 (ABA Center for Professional Responsibility 1995).

[2] A list of citations to the procedural rules of many federal agencies that conduct adjudicative hearings is set forth in Appendix IV.

[3] *See, e.g.,* Butz v. Economou, 438 U.S. 478 (1978); Ramspeck v. Federal Trial Examiners Conference, 345 U.S.128 (1953); Riss & Co. v. United States, 341 U.S. 907 (1951); Universal Camera Corp. v. NLRB, 340 U.S. 474 (1951); Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath, 339 U.S. 33 (1950); Benton v. United States, 488 F. 2d 1017 (Ct. Cl. 1973).

officers was recognized well before the APA[4]. The large number of cases where an agency was required, statutorily or constitutionally, to afford a hearing impelled federal agency heads to delegate responsibility for conducting those hearings to subordinates[5]. However, these subordinates were subject to the direction and control of the agency, and thus perceived as being prone to make findings favorable to the agency. Considerations of fairness led to granting these hearing officers increasing degrees of independence, culminating in the provisions of section 11 of the APA,[6] which accords the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ)[7] a unique status.[8]

Although an employee of the agency, the ALJ is responsible for conducting formal proceedings, interpreting the law, applying agency regulations, and carrying out the policies of the agency

---

[4] *See* Morgan v. United States, 298 U.S. 468 (1936). For an article summarizing the historical background of administrative adjudication and ALJs in the United States, see Michael Asimow, *The Administrative Judiciary: ALJs in Historical Perspective*, 19 J. NAALJ 25 (1999). For another historical account, which unfortunately is no longer widely available, see The Federal Administrative Judiciary, 1992 ACUS 771, 798-303. This is a report prepared by the Administrative Conference of the United States, a government organization which is not longer in operation. *See supra,* Preface to 2001 Interim (Internet) edition of this Manual.

[5] *See* Ramspeck v. Federal Trial Examiners Conference, 345 U.S. 128 (1953).

[6] The original section 11 has, of course, been amended and its successor provisions are now found mainly in 5 U.S.C. §§ 3105 (1994), 5372 (1994 and Supp. V 1999), and 7521 (1994).

[7] The title was changed to Administrative Law Judge by United States Civil Service Commission regulation on Aug. 19, 1972, 37 Fed. Reg. 16787, and by statute on March 27, 1978, 5 U.S.C. § 3105 (1994).

[8] *See* Ramspeck v. Federal Trial Examiners Conf., 345 U.S. 128, 132 ("a special class of semi-independent subordinate hearing officers"). See also, Local 134, IBEW v. NLRB, 486 F.2d 863, 867 (7th Cir. 1973).

in the course of administrative adjudications[9]. To insure independent exercise of these functions, the ALJ's appointment is absolute. The ALJ is not subject to most of the managerial controls which can be applied to other employees of a federal agency. For example, ALJ's are not subject to performance appraisals, and compensation is established by the Office of Personnel Management, independent of agency recommendations.[10] Furthermore, the agency can take disciplinary action against the Judge only when good cause is established in proceedings before the Merit Systems Protection Board.[11]

---

[9] The discussion in this Manual assumes that the Administrative Law Judge is an employee of an agency charged with enforcement and policy making responsibilities for a substantive program. However, a few Administrative Law Judges are employed by agencies which adjudicate cases originating in the enforcement programs of other agencies. For example, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission (OSHRC) (29 U.S.C. § 661 (1994)) and the Mine Safety and Health Review Commission (MSHRC) (30 U.S.C. § 823 (1994) are independent agencies which conduct hearings in enforcement cases brought by the Department of Labor. Therefore, some of the discussion in the text dealing with the relationship of the Judge to his agency is not directly applicable to OSHRC, MSHRC, or similar agencies.

[10] See 5 U.S.C. § 4301(2)(D) (1994)(exempting ALJs from the definition of "employee" in context of performance appraisals) Basic grades and pay levels of ALJs are addressed in 5 U.S.C. § 5372(1994 and Supp. V 1999), which also provides that OPM shall determine levels of ALJ positions by regulation. For an article summarizing many aspects of performance evaluation of ALJs and proposals to modify the current system, see James P. Timony, *Performance Evaluation of Federal Administrative Law Judges*, 7 ADMIN. L.J. AM. U. 629 (1994). An earlier student note on the topic also provides background on this topic. L. Hope O'Keeffe, *Note, Administrative Law Judges, Performance Evaluation, and Production Standards: Judicial Independence Versus Employee Accountability*, 54 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 591(1986). For an article which also deals with state ALJs, see Ann Marshall Young, *Evaluation of Administrative Law Judges*, 17 J. NAALJ 1 (1997).

[11] 5 U.S.C. § 7521 (1994). An important early decision of a Merit Systems Protection Board (MPSB) ALJ stated that discipline or discharge for good cause should not normally be based on the content of an ALJ's opinions or the ALJ's conduct of his/her

cases, unless there were "serious improprieties, flagrant abuses, or repeated breaches of acceptable standards of judicial behavior." In re Chocallo, 1 M.S.P.R. 605, 632 (1980), aff'd, 2 M.S.P.B. 20, aff'd w/o opinion, 716 F. 2d 889 (3d Cir. 1983), cert. den. 464 U.S. 983 (1983). Another significant, relatively early decision was Social Security Adm. v Burris (11/3/88, MSPB) Docket No. HQ752186100023, 39 MSPR 51, aff'd w/o opinion, 878 F.2d 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1989)(stating that good cause was shown by proof of insubordination, but as to another charge, agency did not establish good cause for disciplining ALJ for ALJ's including in his decisions statements that the agency was attempting to influence his decisions) Some other significant cases interpreting or applying this provision are Benton v. U.S., 203 Ct. Cl. 263, 488 F.2d 1017 (Ct. Cl. 1973); Association of Administrative Law Judges v. Heckler, 594 F. Supp. 1132 (D. D.C. 1984); Goodman v. Svahn, 614 F. Supp. 726 (D. D.C. 1985); Brennan v. Department of Health & Human Services, 787 F.2d 1559, 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1986)(stating that charges based on reasons which constitute improper interference with administrative law judge's performance of quasi-judicial functions cannot constitute "good cause."), cert. den. 479 U.S. 985 (1986); McEachern v. Macy, 233 F. Supp. 516 (D. S.C. 1964), aff'd, 341 F.2d 895 (4th Cir. 1965)(involving failure to pay financial obligations).

There also have been several relevant cases decided since the 3rd edition of this Manual was published. SSA v Dantoni, 77 MSPR 516 (1998), aff'd 173 F. 3d 435 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (decision without published opinion, full text available at 1998 U.S. App. LEXIS 24902)(MPSB opinion recounting discharged ALJ's conduct harassing and embarrassing Deputy Chief ALJ by, among other things, forging Deputy Chief ALJ's signature on order forms and other documents, resulting in Deputy Chief ALJ's receiving 1547 pieces of mail, including solicitations for a book entitled "How to Get the Women You Desire into Bed"); Carr v SSA 185 F3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 1999)(stating that agency had carried its burden of establishing charges against whistle-blowing ALJ whom it sought to remove for, inter alia, reckless disregard for personal safety of others; even if ALJ had also engaged in protected activity, agency would have sought to remove her even in absence of that activity; noting also that there were charges which ALJ did not contest, such as persistent use of vulgar and profane language, demeaning comments, sexual harassment and ridicule, and interference with efficient and effective agency operations); Office of Hearings & Appeals, Social Sec. Admin. v. Whittlesley, 59 MSPR 684 (1993), aff'd w/o op, 39 F3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 1994),

A. General Overview

Before considering some specific APA-recognized powers of the Administrative Law Judge, a general overview may be helpful. To begin with, the Administrative Law Judge is a common feature in formal agency adjudications. Whenever the APA applies to a matter which must be determined on the record of a trial-type hearing, the proceedings with some exceptions are likely to be conducted by an Administrative Law Judge. In fact, the APA is quite explicit. For proceedings required by statute to be determined on the record after notice and opportunity for an evidentiary hearing:

> (b) There shall preside at the taking of evidence --
> (1) the agency;
> (2) one or more members of the body which comprises the agency; or
> (3) one or more administrative law judges appointed under section 3105 of this title.
> This subchapter does not supersede the conduct of specified classes of proceedings . . . before boards or other employees specially provided for . . . under statute.[12]

Boards, Commissions or Administrators heading a federal agency do not routinely preside over hearings. However, as the language quoted above indicates, an Administrative Law Judge is not

---

cert den 514 U.S. 1063(1995)(stating that good cause to remove ALJ was shown by evidence that he violated agency rules and settlement agreement by engaging in unauthorized practice of law).

For some relevant articles, see Rosenblum, *Contexts and Contents of "For Good Cause" as the Criterion for Removal of Administrative Law Judges: Legal and Policy Factors*, 6 W. NEW ENG. L. REV. 593 (1984); Timony, *Disciplinary Proceedings Against Federal Administrative Law Judges*, 6 W. NEW ENG. L. REV. 807 (1984).

[12] 5 U.S.C. § 556(b)(1994)(emphasis added).

required if some statute specifically provides otherwise.[13]

An important study in the 1990's established that there are a significant number of proceedings where the hearing officer is not an Administrative Law Judge[14]. Still, the Administrative Law Judge seems to provide a "model," even in such cases. Especially noteworthy, this study pointed out that: (1) such hearing officers often are -- like Administrative Law Judges -- administratively "housed" in "independent" organizations separate from the rest of the agency;[15] and (2) agencies apparently are willing "to accord these presiding officers a fair degree of independence."[16] Moreover, whether the term ALJ or "hearing officer" is used, the essential function of conducting an adjudicative proceeding is basically the same. Most of this Manual, therefore, should be relevant to non-Administrative Law Judge hearing officers.

Several other general points regarding Administrative Law Judges should be made at this juncture. In most types of cases the ALJ issues either an initial or a recommended decision, orally or in writing[17]. The ALJ's decision is subject to review by the agency (a function sometimes delegated to an agency official or to a review board),[18] and the agency's decision is in

---

[13] *Id.*

[14] Frye, *Survey of Non-ALJ Hearing Programs in the Federal Government*, 44 AD. L. REV. 261, 264 (1992).

[15] *Id.* at 341-43.

[16] *Id.* at 343. For another article describing the non-ALJ federal agency adjudicators, as of 1992, see Paul R. Verkuil, *Reflections Upon the Federal Administrative Judiciary*, in *Symposium: Contemporary Issues in Administrative Adjudication,* 39 UCLA L. REV. 1341 (1992).

[17] 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) (1994). In cases involving rulemaking or initial licenses, the agency may direct that the Judge's decision be omitted and the formal record be certified directly to the agency for decision. *Id.*

[18] *See, e.g.,* Northeastern Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC, 400 F.2d 749 (D.C. Cir. 1968)(FCC Review Board); McDaniel v. Celebrezze, 331 F.2d 426 (4th Cir. 1964) (Social Security & Appeals Council); 9 CFR § 317.369 (2000) (Department of Agriculture nutrition labeling; hearing before an ALJ with appeal

turn usually subject to review by the courts[19]. The ALJ's decision can become final agency action if review is not directed by the head of the agency or other official designated to entertain appeals from the ALJ's decision.[20]

The Administrative Law Judge is the person primarily responsible for developing an accurate and complete record and a fair and equitable decision in a formal administrative proceeding. The parties to the proceeding, including agency staff, are all subject to pressures and preconceptions which may inhibit objective presentation of facts and policies. The reviewing agencies and the courts, though independent and objective, have heavy work loads and other obligations. They simply do not have the time and the facilities to investigate all aspects of each formal proceeding. This function has come to be the responsibility of the Administrative Law Judge. Consequently, an Administrative Law Judge has a strong affirmative duty not only to try a case fairly and to write a sound decision but to insure that an accurate and complete record is developed.

In *Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference v. Federal Power Commission*, the Second Circuit stated:

> [T]he Commission has claimed to be the representative of the public interest. This role does not permit it to act as an umpire blandly

---

to the Department's "Judicial Officer"; 43 CFR § 4.1 (2000)(various Department of the Interior appeals boards, e.g., Board of Indian Appeals, Board of Land Appeals; 40 CFR § 1.25(e)(2000)(Environmental Appeals Board)).

[19] 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706 (1994). However, judicial review can be statutorily precluded, at least in certain kinds of cases. Lindahl v. OPM, 470 U.S. 768 (1985); Webster v. Doe, 486 U.S. 592 (1988).

[20] 5 U.S.C. § 557(b)(1994)("When the presiding employee makes an initial decision, that decision then becomes the decision of the agency without further proceedings unless there is an appeal to, or review on motion of, the agency within the time provided by rule.") For examples of implementing regulations, see 24 CFR § 1720.605 (2000)(HUD); 29 CFR § 580.13 (2000) (civil penalties for violations of federal child labor laws).

> calling balls and strikes for adversaries appearing before it; the right of the public must receive active and affirmative protection at the hands of the Commission. . ..
>
> The Commission must see to it that the record is complete. The Commission has an affirmative duty to inquire into and consider all relevant facts.[21]

Although the court was referring to an administrative agency and not directly to Administrative Law Judges, the net result is the same. Because the agency itself does not preside over the taking of evidence, the ALJ, as presiding officer on behalf of an agency, has the initial responsibility for developing an accurate and complete record[22]. This may require affirmative measures at several stages of a proceeding. The ALJ certainly should call the attention of the parties to gaps in the record and insist that they be filled. The ALJ also may need to question or cross-examine a party's witnesses,[23] and may even call witnesses or raise issues *sua sponte* upon essential matters not covered adequately by the parties[24]. The ALJ may direct the parties to

---

[21] 354 F.2d, 608, 620 (2d Cir. 1965),later quoted in Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakima Indian Nation v. FERC, 746 F.2d 466, 472 (9th Cir. 1984) (as amended)

[22] *See* Marsh v. Harris, 632 F.2d 296 (4th Cir. 1980).

[23] *See, e.g.*, Beck v. Mathews, 601 F.2d 376 (9th Cir. 1979); Holland Furnace Co. v. FTC, 295 F.2d 302 (7th Cir. 1961); NLRB v. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 432 F.2d 965 (8th Cir. 1970).

[24] Examples of this necessary zeal in developing a complete record may be found in the opinions of Judge Seymour Wenner in *The Permian Basin Rate Case*, 34 FPC 159 (1965), and Judge Stephen Gross in the *Continental-Western Merger Case*, CAB Docket 33465 (served April 16, 1979), in calling their own witnesses when they found the record inadequate. For examples of cases recognizing a hearing officer's authority, zeal or no zeal, to protect and develop the record in a fair manner, see also, e.g., NLRB v. Staten Island Hotel, 103 F. 3d 858, 860 (2d Cir. 1996)(ALJ's authority to reopen a record sua sponte judicially reviewed under

discuss in oral argument, in brief, or in special memoranda, any issues or points which are germane, and he may direct counsel to research a question of law and policy at any time.[25]

If the agency or a court finds omissions in the record, inappropriate procedures, insufficient evidence, or other inadequacies, frequently the case must be returned to the Administrative Law Judge for correction or supplemental action[26]. This, of course, involves additional work, expense and further delay.

B. Specific APA Powers of the Administrative Law Judge

Section 556(c) of the APA furnishes a convenient point of departure by listing some of the powers and functions which an agency may be authorized to delegate to Administrative Law Judges[27]. Specifically, and in the order listed in § 556(c)

---

an abuse of discretion standard); Freeman United Coal Mining Co. v. Director, OWCP, 94 F. 3d 384, 388 n.2 (7th Cir. 1996)(ALJ sua sponte inquiry into earlier application necessary in order to determine which regulations applied to claim); Poulin v. Bowen, 817 F.2d 865 (D.C. Cir. 1987); Fernandez v. Schweiker, 650 F.2d 5 (2d Cir. 1981); Busey v. St. Hilaire, 1990 NTSB Lexis 20, Order EA-3073, Docket SE-8606 (1990) (recognizing that ALJs may address, sua sponte, relevant matters which the parties may have overlooked, or deliberately ignored).

For a recent ALJ decision recognizing this duty and power, see In the Matter of Pepperell Associates, Respondent, 1999 EPA ALJ LEXIS 16 (February 26, 1999).

For recent article related to this topic, see Allen E. Schoenberger, *The Active Administrative Law Judge: Is There Harm in an ALJ Asking?*, 18 J. NAALJ 399 (1998); Jeffrey Wolfe Jeffrey and Lisa B. Proszek, *Interaction Dynamics in Federal Administrative Decision Making: The Role of the Inquisitorial Judge and the Adversarial Lawyer*, 33 Tulsa L. J. 293 (1997).

[25]Form 8-a in Appendix I is a sample order directing the parties to research a question of law.

[26] See, Marsh v. Harris, 632 F.2d 296 (4th Cir. 1980).

[27] However, § 556(c) is not limited expressly to Administrative Law Judges. By its own terms, § 556(c) extends to "employees presiding at hearings" which are subject to § 556 of the APA. For examples of implementing procedural regulations, see

itself, an Administrative Law Judge may: (1) administer oaths and affirmations; (2) issue subpoenas authorized by law; (3) rule on offers of proof and receive relevant evidence; (4) take depositions or have depositions taken when the ends of justice would be served; (5) regulate the course of the hearing; (6) hold conferences for the settlement or simplification of the issues by the consent of the parties, or by the use of alternative means of dispute resolution as provided in subchapter IV of this chapter; (7) inform the parties about the availability of one or more alternative means of dispute resolution, and encourage use of such methods; (8) require the attendance at any conference held pursuant to paragraph (6) of at least one representative of each party who has authority to negotiate concerning resolution of issues in controversy; (9) dispose of procedural requests or similar matters; (10) make or recommend decisions in accordance with section 557 of the APA; and (11) take other action authorized by agency rule consistent with the APA.

Two important points should be emphasized with respect to this list. First, the Administrative Law Judge obviously is in many ways the functional equivalent of a trial judge in federal or state court. Receiving relevant evidence, ruling on offers of proof, holding conferences, disposing of procedural matters, and regulating the course of hearings obviously involve the very essence of the judicial function. (Equally obvious, many of the functions enumerated in § 556(c) require Administrative Law Judges to exercise judicial-type discretion and judgment.)

Second, the underlined passages in the list above emphasize a less obvious, but important, aspect of the administrative Law Judge's role. Recent changes in federal law,[28] and § 556(c) in

---

24 CFR § 26.1, et seq.(2000) (HUD)(24 CFR § 26.2 specifically sets out the powers of administrative law judges and hearing officers); for another set of implementing procedural regulations, which are apparently limited to proceedings under one federal statute, see 24 CFR § 1720.105, *et seq.* (2000) (HUD)(hearings under Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act).

[28] Administrative Dispute Resolution Act, Pub. L. No. 101-552, 104 Stat. 2736 (1990) (with changes to section numbering in Title 5 made by the Administrative Procedure Technical Amendments Act, Pub. L. No. 102-354, 106 Stat. 944 (1992)) (codified mainly at 5 U.S.C. §§ 571-83, with codification of miscellaneous provisions in various sections of titles 9, 28, 29, and 41). Further amendments were made by the Administrative Dispute

particular,[29] remove any doubt that Administrative Law Judges can be authorized to go beyond a narrow or rigid version of the judicial role. In a phrase, the changes involve "alternative dispute resolution," a topic which warrants separate treatment in this Manual.

C. Alternative Dispute Resolution and Administrative Law

1. General Background

One of the most significant legal developments during the past three decades has been a strong movement toward using alternatives to formal adjudication in the resolution of disputes. A term frequently employed to describe this movement is "alternative dispute resolution" (ADR or dispute resolution). The term itself, ADR, actually is a short-hand label which covers a lot of territory. It denotes an open-ended, evolving set of techniques and concepts. It is an "inclusive"[30] and elastic term, which embraces not only established concepts such as negotiation, arbitration and mediation, but also a growing variety of innovations and hybrids[31]. As the words themselves imply, perhaps the most important common denominator linking various ADR techniques is their nature as alternatives -- alternatives to formal litigation as a means of resolving disputes.

The term "ADR" eludes precise definition. A wide assortment of procedural devices -- some of which have not yet been invented -- could fairly be classified as ADR. As a concept, ADR is still

---

Resolution Act of 1996, Act Oct. 1996, P.L. 104-320, 110 Stat. 3870 (amending, *inter alia*, 5 U.S.C. §§ 569, 571, 571 note, 573, 574, 575, 580, and 28 U.S.C. § 1491, and 41 U.S. § 605).

[29] 5 U.S.C. § 556(c) was amended by §4 of the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act, Pub. L. No. 101-552, 104 Stat. 2736, 2737 (1990).

[30] Administrative Conference of the U.S., THE ADMINISTRATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION ACT: GUIDANCE FOR AGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION SPECIALISTS 3 (1992) (hereafter, GUIDANCE FOR AGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION SPECIALISTS).

[31] See L. Ray, *Emerging Options in Dispute Resolution*, 75 A.B.A. JOURNAL 66 (June, 1989). Among the standard publications on ADR in the 1990's, there are ALI-ABA, ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION: HOW TO USE IT TO YOUR ADVANTAGE: ALI-ABA COURSE OF STUDY MATERIALS (1996); Jay Grenig, Alternative Dispute Resolution with Forms (2d ed 1997).

evolving. The main qualification for being classified as ADR seems to be that the technique or process offers a substitute for formal adjudication.

Despite the open-ended quality of ADR as a concept, ADR still is susceptible to classification and organizing principles of one kind or another. One of the typical ways of classifying ADR techniques is to conceive of them in terms of a spectrum or continuum of methods, arranged according to the degree of control remaining in the hands of the parties[32]. At one end of the spectrum are procedures where the parties retain virtually complete control, with no input from neutrals or non-parties. Here, we would find the very traditional concept of voluntary, unstructured negotiation between (or among) the parties. At the other end of the spectrum are procedures where the parties surrender control over resolution of the dispute to some third party. There, we would find another traditional concept, binding arbitration. With binding arbitration, the result of the arbitrator's decision is indistinguishable, as a practical matter, from adjudication by a court. Between the extremes is a wide range of techniques and devices which, for the most part, share one feature -- the intervention of some third party who plays variations on the theme of mediation.

2. Relevance of ADR to Administrative Law Judges.

Familiarity with ADR, as a concept and process, is likely to become an important part of the competent ALJ's professional qualifications. Even without the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act,[33] ADR would be a topic of considerable significance to Administrative Law Judges. If nothing else, familiarity with ADR techniques and concepts can help avoid time-consuming litigation by enhancing the judge's ability to foster negotiations and settlements between parties. Many ADR approaches are quite adaptable and fully consistent with agency rules and the organic acts governing particular agencies. Certainly, almost all agencies have a policy of favoring appropriate settlements as an alternative to formal adjudications.

An ALJ therefore may be able to borrow ideas from ADR, adapt them to pending cases, and encourage resolution of disputed matters without formal adjudication. In a sense, ADR is not just

---

[32] See Ray, *supra* note 31, at 67, and GUIDANCE FOR AGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION *Specialists, supra* note 30 at 4-7.

[33] See text *supra* accompanying note 28, and *infra* accompanying notes 70-76.

an important and evolving assortment of techniques for avoiding formal litigation. It is a state of mind -- a willingness to entertain alternatives and to re-examine assumptions about formal litigation.

In any event, ADR has become a part of administrative law and a fact of life for administrative law judges. However, before discussing the extension of ADR into administrative law, it is advisable to discuss some ADR techniques and devices. Although the following list is far from complete, and does not purport to be exhaustive, it summarizes a number of ADR techniques and devices which should be relevant to Judges.

(1). *Informal, unstructured settlement negotiations*[34]. Negotiated agreements always have been, and probably always will be, an alternative to formal adjudication. No citation is needed to support the fact that most cases (upwards of 90% or more) are settled without going to trial.

(2). *Structured case management devices*.[35] Although not commonly included in ADR taxonomies, and although an extremely broad concept, structured case management devices can be used as ADR tools. Within the concept of structured case management are such devices as court or agency rules which systematically regulate the parties' pre-trial preparation. As one study has indicated, negotiations and settlements can be facilitated (and formal litigation therefore avoided) if the parties are forced, by rule or judge's order, to evaluate their own cases.

> [S]ome lawyers . . . seem to find it difficult to squarely face their own situations early in the life of a lawsuit. Sometimes counsel have difficulty developing at the outset a coherent theory of their own case . . . . Sometimes [they] are so pressed

---

[34] Ray, *supra* note 31 at 67.

[35] *Cf.*, Administrative Conference of the United States, *Recommendation 86-7, Case Management as a Tool for Improving Agency Adjudication*, 1 C.F.R. § 305.86-7 (1993). (As discussed in the Preface and elsewhere in this Manual, the termination of the Administrative Conference (ACUS) was statutorily recognized under Public Law 104-52, title IV, 109 Stat. 480 (Nov. 19, 1995). The last CFR to reproduce the ACUS Recommendations in full appears to be the 1993 edition. After ACUS was dismantled, the chapter of the CFR relevant to ACUS recommendations was removed pursuant to 61 Fed. Reg. 3539 (Feb. 1, 1996).

> by other responsibilities that they . . . systematically analyze their own cause only when some external event forces them to do so.[36]

As one example of ways to force parties to analyze their cases early on, rules governing pleadings might require the parties to be specific about the factual bases of the allegations contained in the complaint and answer. The parties, or at least their lawyers, would then need to examine the case more closely, instead of making broad, general assertions in their pleadings which could cover almost any conceivable state of facts. In other words, an agency might impose a kind of hybrid fact-pleading on the parties[37]. Or, by rule or a judge's order, parties may be required to file a report with the judge summarizing their settlement efforts. These types of techniques differ from various types of mediation because no judge or third party has personally intervened in an effort to mediate directly between the parties. The rules or orders themselves impel the parties to focus on their cases, and may even force the parties to begin negotiating because they must report to the judge.

(3). *Mediation*. Mediation generically is the use of a neutral to help the parties reconcile their differences[38]. Put

---

[36] Brazil, Kahn, Newman, & Gold, *Early Neutral Evaluation: An Experimental Effort to Expedite Dispute Resolution*, 69 JUDICATURE 279 (1986) (emphasis added).

[37] Mullins, *Alternative Dispute Resolution and the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission*, 5 AD. L. J. 555, 568-69 (1991). (The Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, however, amended its rules to eliminate fact-pleading in 1992. 57 FR 41676 (Sept. 11, 1992). However, with respect to the FCC, see 63 FR 690, at 1002, 1007, 10022 (January 7, 1998) (referring to requirement imposed for fact-pleading in formal complaints against common carriers.)

[38] GUIDANCE FOR AGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION SPECIALISTS, *supra* note 36 at 5, and Ray, *supra* note 31 at 67; Administrative Conference of the United States, RECOMMENDATION 86-3: AGENCIES' USE OF ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION, 1 CFR § 305.86-3 (1993) (at Appendix--Lexicon of Alternative Means of Dispute Resolution)[hereafter, AGENCIES' USE OF ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION], *reprinted* in ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE, SOURCEBOOK: FEDERAL AGENCY USE OF ALTERNATIVE MEANS

colloquially, the mediator is a neutral go-between, ideally the proverbial "honest broker." The classic mediator has no power at all to impose an outcome or render a decision. In fact, one set of standards for professional conduct of mediators expressly states, "Self-determination is the fundamental principle of mediation. It requires that the mediation process rely upon the ability of the parties to reach a voluntary, uncoerced agreement."[39] Nor is the mediator ordinarily bound to follow any set procedures, rules of evidence, agenda, or approach. Indeed, an important advantage of mediation is its inherent flexibility of form and approach. Unless there are constraints to the contrary, a mediator can meet with all parties together, or separately, or at some times together and at other times separately. Techniques and tactics can vary[40]. The mediator in one dispute may engage in the equivalent of shuttle diplomacy, going back and forth between the parties, communicating offers and counter-offers and the mediator's own views. In another dispute, the same mediator may insist that all parties sit down together with the mediator and engage in some genuine communication with each other. Whatever the procedures and tactics may be, the mediator's goal is to help the parties reach an agreement acceptable to all of them.

(4). *Conciliation*. The distinctions between conciliation and mediation may be fuzzy, but at least one lexicon of ADR terminology implies that there is a difference in degree between the two concepts. The word "conciliation" is used to

---

OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION 113, 117-8 (1987).

[39]Standards of Conduct for Mediators, #I, adopted in 1994 by the American Arbitration Association and the Society for Professionals in Dispute Resolution, *reprinted in* Sara A. Cole, Nancy H. Rogers, and Craig A. McCain, 2 MEDIATION: LAW POLICY AND PRACTICE, Appendix D, p. 2 (1994). (Emphasis added.) Another Code for mediators states: "It is the mediator's responsibility to assist the disputants in reaching a settlement. At no time should a mediator coerce a party into agreement." Code of Professional Conduct developed by the Center for Dispute Resolution, Denver, Colorado, #1, *reprinted in* Edward A. Dauer, et al., 2 Manual of Dispute Resolution: ADR Law & Practice, Appendix G-1, Art. 1 (1996)(noting that the code was drafted by Christopher Moore, PhD, CDR Associates).

[40]*See generally*, Sara A. Cole, Nancy H. Rogers, and Craig A. McCain, MEDIATION: LAW POLICY AND PRACTICE (1994).

refer to situations where the neutral must reduce tensions and improve communication among the parties "in volatile conflicts where the parties are unable, unwilling, or unprepared to come to the table to negotiate their differences."[41]

(5). *Facilitating*. Another first cousin to mediation, facilitating (or facilitation) seems to refer to neutrals who intervene procedurally (e.g., to conduct meetings and coordinate discussions), but who avoid becoming involved in resolving disputed substantive issues. In other words, a facilitator concentrates on promoting negotiation and settlement by using procedural devices to bring the parties together, but does not intervene actively in the substance of the parties' positions or negotiations.[42]

(6). *Neutral evaluation, or early neutral evaluation*. This process, often employed early in the course of a dispute, generally entails a neutral factfinder, possessed of substantive expertise if needed, who evaluates the merits of the parties' cases. The evaluation, often in writing, is non-binding, but it gives the parties an idea of how an objective decision maker might perceive the strengths and weaknesses of their respective positions. Several courts and the Departmental Appeals Board of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services have established early neutral evaluation programs of one sort or another.[43]

(7). *Factfinding.* This process involves a neutral or a

---

[41] Ad Hoc Panel on Dispute Resolution and Public Policy, National Institute for Dispute Resolution, *Paths to Justice: Major Public Policy Issues of Dispute Resolution* 36-37 (1983), *reprinted in* Administrative Conference of the U.S., SOURCEBOOK: FEDERAL AGENCY USE OF ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION 44-45 (1987).

[42] See AGENCIES' USE OF ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION, *supra* note 38, in Appendix; *Paths to Justice*, *supra* note 41 at 37, *reprint* at 45.

[43] See GUIDANCE FOR AGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION EXPERTS, *supra* note 30 at 6, and Brazil, Kahn, Newman, & Gold, *supra* note 31. Two federal regulations expressly referring to early neutral evaluation are 14 CFR § 17.17 and 17.31 (2000) (FAA, Procedures for Protests and Contract Disputes). Reference to "neutral evaluation" in the ADR context are found at 45 CFR § 74.91 (2000) (Department of Health & Human Services, Awards and Subawards to Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, etc.) and 45 CFR § 2540.230 (2000) (Department of Health & Human Services, grievance procedures re: Corporation for National and Community Service).

panel of neutrals, typically with relevant technical expertise, who make advisory findings of facts on disputed matters. Factfinding often involves informal presentation by each party of its case to the factfinder(s). After the factfinder(s) render their findings, the parties can continue to negotiate[44]. As one textbook on dispute resolution has noted, factfinding by neutral experts has the potential to become particularly important in cases where the disputes orbit around complex technological, scientific, or other data from specialized fields[45]. Rule 706 of the Federal Rules of Evidence already allows a federal court to appoint expert witnesses on its own motion or on the motion of a party.[46]

(8). *Settlement Judge*. The settlement judge is a fairly recent hybrid of special interest to administrative law judges. The settlement judge basically is a mediator or neutral evaluator[47]. What distinguishes the settlement judge from other types of mediators and neutrals is the fact that the settlement judge is typically an administrative law judge from the agency which is adjudicating the dispute[48]. The settlement judge, simply put, is (usually) an agency administrative law judge who is specially assigned to undertake mediation-type efforts in an appropriate case, but who is not assigned to decide that case. The settlement judge has been described as "an ingenious device,"[49] because it preserves the very real advantages of

---

[44] See GUIDANCE FOR AGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION SPECIALISTS, *supra* note 30 at 6; AGENCIES' USE OF ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION, *supra* note 38, in Appendix. Rules of the National Credit Union Administration expressly refer to possible authorization of early neutral factfinding. 12 CFR § 709.8(c)(2) (2000).

[45] See Dauer, *supra* note 39 at 5.01, p. 5-5.

[46] Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 706 (a)(2000).

[47] GUIDANCE FOR AGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION SPECIALISTS, *supra* note 36 at 6-7.

[48] *Id.* See also Administrative Conference of the U.S., AGENCY USE OF SETTLEMENT JUDGES, RECOMMENDATION 88-5, 1 C.F.R. § 305.88-5 (1993).

[49] Joseph & Gilbert, *Breaking the Settlement Ice: The Use of Settlement Judges in Administrative Proceedings*, 3 ADMIN. L. J. 571, 573 (1989-90).

having a judge actively involved in the settlement process, while simultaneously avoiding the problems which could arise if the judge who is to decide the case becomes too actively involved in settlement negotiations[50]. Among other advantages, an agency administrative law judge appointed to serve as a settlement judge: (1) is free of constraints such as the APA's prohibitions on ex parte contacts;[51] (2) brings to the negotiation process authority which stems from being a judge; (3) has a familiarity with the subject-matter which is born of experience in presiding over the agency's cases; and (4) has the flexibility of a mediator as to the tactics and strategies which can be employed[52]. Among the agencies using settlement judges are the Federal Labor Relations Authority (FLRA), Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), the U.S. Department of Labor, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission (OSHRC), and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).[53]

(9). *Minitrial*. The word "minitrial" is somewhat misleading. A minitrial does involve presentations by each party in a hearing-type setting. However, the presentations are given before senior officials, of each party, who are authorized to settle the case. Thus, a minitrial actually is a structured settlement process. Each side, after agreeing on details of the procedure, presents a highly abbreviated version of its case to the senior officials, who are sometimes aided by a neutral. These senior officials, authorized to settle the dispute, can see

---

[50] See Mullins, *supra* note 37 at 560.

[51] 5 U.S.C. §§ 554(d), 557(d)(1994). See also, Joseph & Gilbert, *supra* note 49 at 582-84.

[52] *See,* Joseph & Gilbert, *supra* note 49 at 585-86; Mullins, *supra* note 37 at 560-61, 591-99.

[53] 5 CFR § 2423.25 (2000) (FLRA); 18 CFR § 385.603 (2000) (FERC); 24 CFR § 180.620 (2000) (HUD); 29 CFR § 18.9 (2000)(Department of Labor, general rules of practice and procedure); 29 CFR § 2200.101 (2000) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission); 47 CFR § 1.244 (2000) (FCC); 48 CFR § 6302.30 (1991)(DOT Board of Contract Appeals).

For an interesting critique of a proposal that the NLRB use settlement judges, see Erin Parkin Huss, *Note: Response to the Experimental Role of Settlement Judges in Unfair Labor Practice Proceedings*, 37 ARIZ. L. REV. 895 (1995).

for themselves how their case and that of the other party (or parties) could be perceived at a full-fledged trial, thus providing a basis for more realistic negotiations[54]. Agencies which have used minitrials include the Army Corps of Engineers (contract and environmental disputes), NASA; the Department of the Interior; the Department of Energy, and FERC.[55]

(10). *Conference*. Although omitted from some lists of ADR techniques, the good old-fashioned pre-hearing or other conference, presided over by a Judge (or other hearing official), has substantial ADR potential and should not be ignored. Unless there are some very good reasons to the contrary, a Judge holding a conference with the parties should, almost as a matter of routine, explore the possibilities for settlement. The APA expressly authorizes conferences for the settlement or simplification of issues,[56] and agency procedural rules typically contain virtual boiler-plate language authorizing ALJs and other hearing officers to hold conferences for the settlement or simplification of issues[57]. Moreover, several agencies have regulations explicitly providing, in various contexts, for settlement conferences.[58]

---

[54] See e.g., AGENCIES' USE OF ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION, *supra* note 38 in Appendix -- Lexicon of Alternative Means of Dispute Resolution; GUIDANCE FOR AGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION SPECIALISTS, *supra* note 30 at 7.

[55] GUIDANCE FOR AGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION SPECIALISTS, *supra* note 36 at 7. Agency regulations expressly referring to minitrials in the ADR context include the FAA, 14 CFR § 17.31 (2000); the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), 18 CFR § 385.604 (2000); and the Department of Justice, 28 CFR § 35.176 (2000) (nondiscrimination on the basis of disability in state and local government services).

[56] 5 U.S.C. § 556(c)(1994).

[57] See for example, 16 C.F.R. § 3.42(c)(7) (2000)(Federal Trade Commission, Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings); 29 C.F.R. § 417.6 (2000) (Procedures for Removal of Local Labor Organization Officers); 49 C.F.R. § 386.54 (2000)(Motor Carrier Safety Regulations).

[58] For example, 14 C.F.R. § 1264.117(b)(3) (2000)(NASA, Implementation of the Program Fraud Civil Penalties Act of 1986, Authority of the presiding officer); 18 C.F.R. § 157.205

(11) *Arbitration*. In terms of its practical effect, arbitration is only a step or so removed from adjudication. The arbitrator, like a judge, is a neutral (supposedly) who is authorized to resolve a dispute between or among parties. Generally, the parties will make some kind of presentation to the arbitrator, in the equivalent of a hearing. (Also, there may be a panel of arbitrators, rather than a single arbitrator.) However, the arbitrator is not necessarily required to follow the lawbooks, either substantively or procedurally. The parties themselves may select the arbitrator, agree on the procedures to be followed, and even determine the criteria for the arbitrator's decision -- although much depends on the kind of arbitration being conducted. For example, at one extreme, the original negotiation of a commercial transaction between two parties may result in contractual provisions under which the parties agree to submit all (or certain) disputes arising under the contract[59]. At the other extreme, but quite rarely, one may find examples of mandatory arbitration being imposed by law on the parties[60]. In between, there are any number of possible variations on the theme of arbitration, but one key variable is whether the arbitration will result in a binding decision or have merely an advisory effect.[61]

3. Confidentiality.

There is one crucial aspect to mediation, variations on mediation, and ADR in general which must be emphasized, even in a summary treatment of the subject -- **confidentiality**. Mediators

---

(2000)(FERC, Interstate Pipeline Blanket Certificates, Notice Procedure); 33 CFR § 20.202(e) (2000) (Coast Guard, powers of administrative law judges).

[59] For one example of cases which enforce such contractual agreements, see Grigson v. Creative Artists Agency, LLC, 210 F. 3d 524 (5th Cir. 2000) (applying equitable estoppel against production company and actor alleging tortious interference with a distribution agreement).

[60] See, 7 U.S.C. § 136a(c)(2)(B)(iii) (1994) (regarding arbitration to determine compensation for development of government-required data); 29 U.S.C. § 1401 (1994) (arbitrating amount of liability for withdrawal from certain kinds of pension plans).

[61] See Ray, *supra* note 31 at 67.

and other ADR neutrals often communicate *ex parte* and obtain information on a confidential basis. The neutral or mediator may be told, in confidence, that a party's bargaining position is substantially different from what the party regards as an acceptable compromise. Without the possibility for confidentiality, the effectiveness of neutrals in ADR would be seriously jeopardized. The Administrative Conference has summarized this need for confidentiality in a way which hardly can be improved upon:

> Most ADR techniques, including mediation, non-binding arbitration, factfinding and minitrials, involve a neutral third party who aids the parties in reaching agreement. . . . A skillful mediator can speed negotiations and increase chances for agreement by holding separate confidential meetings with the parties, where each party may give the mediator a relatively full and candid account of its own interests (rather than its litigating position), discuss what it is willing to accept, and consider alternative approaches. The mediator, armed with this information but avoiding premature disclosure of its details, can then help to shape the negotiations in such a way that they will proceed most directly to their goal. The mediator may also carry messages between the parties, launch 'trial balloons,' and act as an agent of reality to reduce the likelihood of miscalculation. This structure can make it safe for the parties to talk candidly and to raise sensitive issues and creative ideas. . . .
>
> With all of these neutrals, many of the benefits of ADR can be achieved only if the proceedings are held confidential. Confidentiality assures the parties that what is said in the discussions will be limited to the negotiations alone so they can be free to be forthcoming. This need extends to the neutral's materials, such as notes and reports, which are produced solely to assist the neutral in the negotiation process and which others could misconstrue as indicating

> a bias against some party or interest. This is why many mediators routinely destroy their personal notes and drafts and return all other materials to the parties. . . .[62]

However, absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, and there are situations where disclosure could be required. Of particular significance to federal agencies and ALJs are certain provisions of the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act which on the one hand prohibit disclosure of any "dispute resolution communication," but then allow disclosure under several exceptions contained that Act, including disclosures which are judicially determined to be necessary to prevent manifest injustice or public harm.[63]

Nevertheless, it is especially important, in this Manual for Administrative Law Judges, to emphasize the confidentiality aspects of much ADR. An ALJ accustomed to presiding over formal evidentiary hearings is likely to have developed a strong mind-set favoring placing everything on the record and avoiding even the appearance of secretive dealings. For formal adjudications this is highly appropriate. However, if appointed to serve as a settlement judge or as some other kind of neutral, the Judge must adapt -- sometimes quickly -- to the need for confidential, even ex parte, communications.

4. The Extension of ADR into Administrative Law

Although impetus for the ADR movement originally stemmed

---

[62] Administrative Conference of the U.S., ENCOURAGING SETTLEMENTS BY PROTECTING MEDIATOR CONFIDENTIALITY, RECOMMENDATION NO. 88-11, 1 C.F.R. § 305.88-11 (1993) (emphasis added) [hereinafter PROTECTING MEDIATOR CONFIDENTIALITY]. As noted elsewhere in this Manual, after ACUS was abolished, this C.F.R. chapter was removed, pursuant to 61 Fed. Reg. 3539 (1996)

[63] *See, e.g.*, 5 U.S.C. § 574 (1994 & Supp. V 1999), *formerly numbered as* 5 U.S.C. § 584, *but renumbered* pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Technical Correction Act, Pub. L. No. 102-354, 106 Stat. 944 (August 26, 1992). *See generally*, Administrative Conference, MEDIATION: A PRIMER FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES (1993).

from discontent with the judicial system,[64] extension of ADR into administrative law was both predictable and natural. For one thing, agency adjudications involving the right to a full evidentiary hearing are all but indistinguishable, functionally, from full evidentiary hearings before a state or federal court[65]. For another, such formal agency adjudications far outnumber the federal court caseload[66]. Quantitatively and qualitatively the net result has been considerable judicialization of our administrative law system[67]. As ADR gained momentum in state and federal court systems, it was almost inevitable that ADR would be transplanted into the federal agencies.

The extension of ADR to administrative law during the past twenty years or so can be summarized with three key words: experimentation, implementation, and legislation. During the 1980's various federal agencies experimented with ADR techniques and procedures. For example, one early development was the application of ADR to government contracting disputes[68]. Other

---

[64] See, Edwards, *Alternative Dispute Resolution: Panacea or Anathema*, 99 HARVARD L. REV. 668 (1986); Ray, *Emerging Options in Dispute Resolution*, 75 A.B.A.J. 66 (June, 1989); Riggs & Dorminey, *Federal Agencies' Use of Alternative Means of Dispute Resolution*, 1 ADMIN. L. J. 125, 126 (1987); Sander, *The Variety of Dispute Resolution*, 70 F.R.D. 111 (1976).

[65] For example, see the APA's provisions for formal adjudications: §§ 554, 556, 557 (1994).

[66] For example, see Bernard Schwartz, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW: A CASEBOOK 62-65(4th ed. 1994).

[67] Harter, *Dispute Resolution and Administrative Law*, 29 VILL. L. REV. 1393, 1403, n. 46 (1983-84). See generally, AGENCIES' USE OF ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION, *supra* note 38.

[68] Crowell & Pou, *Appealing Government Contract Decisions: Reducing the Cost and Delay of Procurement Litigation with Alternative Dispute Resolution Techniques*, 1987 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE 1139; Crowell & Pou, *Appealing Government Contract Decisions: Reducing the Cost and Delay of Procurement Litigation with Alternative Dispute Resolution Techniques*, 49 MD. L. REV. 183 (1990).

agencies and kinds of agency actions followed suit, experimenting and implementing[69]. Then came the legislation, starting in 1990.

In a sense, the first Administrative Dispute Resolution Act (ADR Act)[70] was a culmination of earlier experimentation and implementation, and a forerunner of more legislation[71]. The 1990

---

[69] *E.g.*, Edelman, Carr, & Simon, *ADR at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, Pou, *Federal Agency Use of ADR: The Experience to Date*, and Robinson, *ADR in Enforcement Actions at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*, in CONTAINING LEGAL COSTS: ADR STRATEGIES FOR CORPORATIONS, LAW FIRMS, AND GOVERNMENT (Fein, ed. 1987); *A Colloquium on Improving Dispute Resolution: Options for the Federal Government*, 1 ADMIN. L. REV. 399 (1987) (entire issue devoted to this colloquium); Mullins, *supra* note 37, at 558-59.

[70] Administrative Dispute Resolution Act, Pub. L. No. 101-552, 104 Stat. 2736 (1990) (with changes to section numbering in Title 5 made by the Administrative Procedure Technical Amendments Act, Pub. L. No. 102-354, 106 Stat. 944 (1992)) (codified mainly at 5 U.S.C. §§ 571-83, with codification of miscellaneous provisions in various sections of titles 9, 28, 29, and 41). Further amendments were made by the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1996, Act Oct. 1996, P.L. 104-320, 110 Stat. 3870. These amendments modified several provisions of the 1990 Act, among them 5 U.S.C. §§ 571, 574 (confidentiality provisions), 580, and 583.

To convey a somewhat more precise picture of the scope of the original 1990 Act, it should be noted that its provisions adding to or amending the U.S. Code will be found at 5 U.S.C. §§ 571-83 (1994 & Supp. V 1999) (general provisions, definitions, confidentiality, arbitration); 5 U.S.C. § 556(c)(1994) (ALJ authority); 9 U.S.C. § 10 (arbitration, judicial review)(1994); 41 U.S.C. § 605 (public contract disputes)(1994); 29 U.S.C. § 173 (1994 & Supp IV 1998)(Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service authority); 28 U.S.C. § 2672 (1994) (tort claims); and 31 U.S.C. § 3711(a)(2) (1994) (government claims). Pub. L. No. 101-552, 104 Stat. 2736, as amended by Administrative Procedure Technical Amendments Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-354, 106 Stat. 944 (1992).

[71] In addition to the 1996 amendments mentioned *supra* note 70, federal statutes dealing specifically today with

ADR Act still remains the most significant piece of federal legislation because, among other things, it required each federal agency to: (1) review its programs and adopt policies addressing the use of ADR;[72] and (2) designate a senior official as the agency's dispute resolution specialist, to be responsible for implementing the ADR Act and relevant agency policies[73]. The ADR Act also removed any doubt concerning a federal agency's authority to use ADR where the parties agree[74]. It also authorized administrative law judges to use or encourage the use of ADR and to require at settlement conferences the attendance of parties' representatives who are authorized to negotiate concerning disputed issues[75]. The ADR Act also added a new subchapter to Chapter 5 of title 5 of the U.S. Code entitled "ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS."[76] Among other things, this new subchapter: (1) provided criteria for an agency's use in evaluating the appropriateness of ADR;[77] (2) stated that ADR procedures authorized under the ADR Act are voluntary and supplemental in nature;[78] (3) went into considerable detail regarding confidentiality and communications which are made during the course of ADR processes;[79] and (4) contained, again in

---

ADR and federal agencies include 12 U.S.C. § 4806(e)(1994)(requiring pilot program of ADR by federal agencies regulating banks and credit unions); 20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(1994 & Supp. IV 1998)(expressly listing mediation of disputes involving children with disabilities in educational institutions receiving federal funding); and 26 U.S.C. § 7123 (1994 & Supp. IV 1998) (directing IRS to establish ADR procedures, added in 1998 by P.L. 105-206).

[72] Pub. L. No. 101-552, § 3(a).

[73] *Id.* at § 3(b)(see 5 U.S.C. § 581 note (1994).

[74] *Id.* at § 4 (see 5 U.S.C. § 581 note).

[75] *Id.* at § 4(a), codified at 5 U.S.C. § 556(c)(1994).

[76] *Id.* at § 4(b).

[77] 5 U.S.C. § 572(b)(1994).

[78] 5 U.S.C. § 572(c)(1994).

[79] 5 U.S.C. § 574 (1994 & Supp. V 1999).

considerable detail, provisions authorizing and governing agency arbitration procedures.[80]

For the foreseeable future, administrative law judges and other agency hearing officers will encounter more -- not less -- emphasis on ADR. Familiarity with ADR, as a concept and a process, is likely to become as much a part of the competent administrative law judge's professional qualifications as the ability to write a decision or substantive knowledge of the applicable law.

[80] 5 U.S.C. §§ 575-581 (1994 & Supp. V 1999).

II. PREHEARING CONFERENCES & SETTLEMENTS

As soon as a case is assigned, the ALJ should thoroughly study the pleadings (and other filings) in order to assess the need for a pre-hearing conference and the possibilities for settlement. Not every case will require a full-blown conference, with all of the features described later in this chapter. The issues may be relatively simple, the substantive law or regulations fairly specific, and the facts subject to only a limited range of disagreement. In many kinds of proceedings, the typical case may need only a simple telephone conference call with the parties[81] and a brief conference report summarizing the matters which were agreed upon. Sometimes, the objectives served by a prehearing conference can be achieved by correspondence between the ALJ and the parties,[82] or by the ALJ directing the parties to correspond or confer by telephone with each other[83].

---

[81] The value of telephone conferences to the attorney is discussed in Victor W. Palmer, Administrative Hearings for the General Practitioner, 73 A.B.A.J. 86 (March 1, 1987). For examples of federal regulations authorizing telephone prehearing conferences, see 5 CFR § 2434.24(d)(2000)(Federal Labor Relations Authority, unfair labor practice proceedings); 9 CFR 202.110(b)(2000)(Department of Agriculture, proceedings applicable to reparations proceedings under Packers and Stockyards Act); 28 CFR § 76.19(2000)(Department of Justice, civil penalties for possession of certain controlled substances; stating, "Prehearing conferences normally shall be conducted by telephone . . . ."). An interesting booklet, which contains not only valuable suggestions, but also a page of additional information sources, is: American Bar Association (Action Commission to Reduce Court Costs and Delay, Telephone-Conferenced Court Hearings: A How-To Guide for Judges, Attorneys, and Clerks (1983).

[82] *See*, 9 CFR § 202.110(b)(2000)(Department of Agriculture, reparations proceedings under Packers and Stockyards Act; 28 CFR § 76.19(2000)(Department of Justice, civil penalties for possession of certain controlled substances).

[83] *See*, 19 CFR § 354.11(b)(2000) (Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration; "If a

After all, the prehearing conference is a tool -- a means to an end, not an end in itself. Prehearing conferences are primarily a way to organize the proceedings to achieve optimum productivity and avoid wasting time and effort. An effective prehearing conference can be useful in identifying areas of disagreement (and agreement), setting a schedule or agenda for any pre-trial discovery, and taking other steps to lay the groundwork for either: (a) settlement, or (b) an efficient, orderly, and fair hearing. Moreover, a prehearing conference usually is not limited to any set form or time. Parties, agencies and ALJs can hold conferences of various types, for various purposes, at different times during a case.

The main point is: whatever form it may take, there should be prehearing assessment and preparation which is adequate and appropriate to the case.

Adequacy and appropriateness, however, are not always simple matters. Formal administrative proceedings vary so much in complexity, type and number of issues, length of hearing, or other factors, that special prehearing procedures may be necessary. The ALJ may have to devise individually tailored procedures to insure that all parties will receive an equitable and expeditious decision. (This may help explain why there seems to be at least one common thread running through the mind-staggering number and variety of agency procedural regulations dealing with [or mentioning] prehearing conferences[84] and procedures. Most of them give considerable discretion, one way or another, to the ALJ or presiding officer.[85])

---

prehearing conference is impractical, the presiding official will direct the parties to correspond with each other or to confer by telephone or otherwise to achieve the purposes of such a conference.").

[84] In response to a search request on the Lexis CFR data base, on August 12, 2000, for the term "prehearing conference," Lexis reported 420 documents.

[85] For example, the Department of Agriculture's rules of practice governing formal adjudicatory proceedings under various statutes empower the ALJ, upon motion of any party or on the ALJ's own motion, to "direct the parties or their counsel to attend a conference at any reasonable time, prior to or during the course of the hearing," if the ALJ finds the proceeding would be expedited by a conference. The rule also refers, in open-ended fashion to "Such other matters as

Sometimes, the issues and facts are so complex or the number or identity of the parties so uncertain that several preliminary steps are necessary before evidence even can be obtained. In such situations, the need for a fairly elaborate and carefully prepared prehearing conference is obvious. Furthermore, in such cases exhibits and other direct evidence often cannot be prepared until discovery produces the necessary information or data[86]. Several prehearing conferences ultimately may be needed. The ALJ must adapt procedures to each individual case.

Because a prehearing conference is one of the most practical and efficient methods of starting a complex, formal proceeding, a detailed discussion of conferences in such cases follows. It should be emphasized, however, many of the tactics, techniques, and concepts described below can be used, or adapted for use, in any type of case. Although many cases will not require all of the steps and tactics described below, efficient management of any proceeding can be enhanced by familiarity with them. Also, it goes without saying that the ALJ always should be alert before, during, and after any conferences -- and at all times -- to the possibility of aiding the parties to settle the case and to the use of other alternatives to full-scale litigation. However, rather than belabor these points throughout the following discussion of prehearing conference procedures, the topics of settlement and alternative dispute resolution will be accorded a separate section in their own right, at the end of this chapter.

A. Preparation for Prehearing Conference, With Emphasis on Complex, Multiparty Proceedings

Although a conference serves many purposes, it is almost indispensable as a means of organizing a complex, formal,

---

may expedite and aid in the disposition of the proceeding." 7 CFR § 1.140(a)(2000). For another example, see 10 CFR § 1013.19(a) (2000)(Department of Energy, Program Fraud Civil Remedies and Procedures: "The ALJ may schedule prehearing conferences as appropriate.")

[86] For a rule which contemplates a prehearing conference before discovery, see 10 CFR § 2.740(b)(1) 2000)(NRC, proceeding on application for construction permit or operating license for a production or utilization facility). For an example of a regulation which permits discovery to be initiated before or after prehearing conference, see 47 CFR § 1.311 (2000)(FCC).

multiparty administrative proceeding. A conference in such cases permits joint consideration of various procedural matters, such as the need for exchange of information and evidence before the hearing, arrangements for stipulations, and the time and place of hearing. A well-run conference, requiring only a day or two (compared to days or weeks of hearing) will usually ease all succeeding steps. However, preparation for the conference is necessary.

An ALJ always should be familiar with the pleadings and all known facts regarding the case before setting a prehearing conference. The ALJ who sets a prehearing conference and goes into it ignorant of the pleadings and with no effort to obtain at least some basic information about the case is asking for serious trouble -- and wasted time. Nor should the ALJ allow the parties to come to the conference unprepared. A prehearing conference should not be the participants' introduction to a case. To the contrary, all interested persons should prepare for it in advance. The conference can be crucial in shaping the course of the later proceedings. It should serve as the first opportunity to clarify, isolate, and dispose of the problems involved.

However, the ALJ need not, and should not, conduct a personal investigation in order to obtain more information about the case. (Special situations and conditions exist for Social Security Administrative Law Judges, as indicated in cases such as *Burnett v. Commissioner*, 220 F. 3d 112, 120 (3d Cir. 2000)). Instead, the ALJ should motivate the parties to provide information.

There may be available at least one important device which can provide information and, at the same time, impel the parties to prepare for the conference. The ALJ may direct interested persons to submit to him and to all known parties proposed statements of issues, proposed stipulations, requests for information, statements of position, proposed procedural dates, and other informational material.[87] This direction may appear in

[87] For example, see 7 CFR § 1.140 (2000)(Department of Agriculture, material to be submitted at or subsequent to the conference); 10 CFR § 820.28(c)(2000)(Department of Energy)(rule itself requires parties to exchange names of expert witnesses, summaries of expected testimony, copies of documents and exhibits); 14 CFR §16.211(a)(2)(2000) (prehearing conference notice may direct parties to exchange proposed witness lists requests for evidence and production of documents, admissions, and other matter prior to the date of the conference).

the prehearing conference notice or in a supplemental letter.

B. Notice

In many agencies the ALJ establishes the date and issues the prehearing conference notice[88]. For complex, multiparty cases, however, there may be some problems. For instance, there may be questions concerning who is, or can be, a party[89]. Therefore, regardless of minimum legal requirements for notice, such as publication in the Federal Register, the public may be best served in a complex, potentially multi-party case, if actual notice is given to all those with an apparent interest. If particular individuals or associations, few in number, are directly affected, they could be notified directly. If a specific geographic area is involved, it may be appropriate to notify local governmental authorities and civic groups individually. If many persons or groups may be interested, or if the identity of interested persons is not known, news media, including trade journals, might be used. Frequently, trade or professional associations will notify their members through regular or special circulations. The ALJ should use ingenuity to devise ways to notify all interested persons. It must be emphasized, of course, that all of these remarks are relevant only to truly complex, multi-party cases.

C. Conference Transcript

Some ALJs believe that transcribing a conference inhibits frank exchange. Whether or not this is so, it is an expense that may be avoided if the ALJ is authorized simply to record agreements and rulings in notes or by dictation to his secretary

---

[88]Forms 1-a and 1-b in Appendix I are samples related to notices of a prehearing conference.

[89] *See*, Office of Communication v. FCC, 359 F.2d 994 (D.C. Cir. 1966) (intervention as party in license renewal proceedings for commercial television broadcaster) and ECEE v. FERC, 645 F. 2d 339 (5th Cir. 1981) (standing in certain FERC proceeding). Sometimes, agency rules may deal expressly with party status. For example, 30 CFR § 44.3 (2000)(Mine Safety and Health Administration, petitions for modification of mandatory safety standards); 47 CFR § 1.223 (2000)(FCC general procedures for intervening as a party).

or into a recorder[90]. Since the ALJ ordinarily will provide to the parties a report or order summarizing the outcome of the conference,[91] the need for a verbatim transcript may be marginal.

In complex cases, however, any inhibiting effect is usually outweighed by the need to prevent any later dispute about the conference conditions, rulings, and agreements, and it is better to have a verbatim transcript. Some agencies require an official transcript of prehearing conferences.[92]

If funds for a verbatim transcript are not available in the agency, major parties may agree to divide the cost. In any event, if a transcript is made, the ALJ should ensure that all interested persons can see the agency's copy at its offices and

---

[90] For examples of agency regulations which indicate that the ALJ has discretion on whether a transcription of a prehearing conference is to be made, see 7 CFR § 1.140(b) (2000)(Agriculture: prehearing conference will not be stenographically reported unless so directed by the ALJ); 7 CFR § 283.11(d)(1)(2000)(prehearing conference will not be stenographically recorded unless directed by ALJ); 10 CFR § 10.104(2000)(Commodities Futures Trading Commission; reference to the record of prehearing conference, "if recorded"); 12 CFR § 19.31 (2000)(Comptroller of Currency rules of practice and procedure: "{ALJ]"in his or her discretion may require that a scheduling or prehearing conference be recorded by a court reporter."); 16 CFR 3.21(g) (2000) (FTC; ALJ discretion to determine whether prehearing conference will be stenographically reported); 40 CFR § 85.1807(k)(2)(2000) (EPA: results of conference, if not transcribed, shall be summarized in writing). However, the ALJ may be required by rule to record or transcribe the prehearing conference. For example, 24 CFR § 26.21 (2000)(HUD; prehearing conference "shall . . . be recorded or transcribed" at request of any party.)

[91] See for example 24 CFR § 26.21(c) (2000)(requiring an order after the prehearing conference stating the rulings on matters considered at the conference and any directions to the parties). Also see *infra*, text at note 99.

[92] See for example, 10 CFR § 2.1021(c) (2000)(Nuclear Regulatory Commission); 47 CFR § 1.248(e) (2000)(FCC); 16 CFR § 1025.21(d)(2000)(Consumer Product Safety Commission).

obtain copies pursuant to agency rules.

D. Management of the Conference

The ALJ should prepare, and may circulate in advance, a conference agenda. Obviously those proposals or suggestions which affect the scope of the proceeding should be scheduled first. Although the conference may be informal, all remarks should be addressed to the ALJ, who should permit reasonable discussion. However, when a subject is fully aired, the ALJ should rule and move on.

Most conferences involve at least the following steps:

1. ***Opening Statement*** -- The ALJ should announce the name of the case, the tentative agenda, conference procedures, the rights of persons to participate in the conference, and other pertinent matters.

2. ***Appearances*** -- (Again, it should be emphasized that complex formal proceedings often have a number of parties, or would-be parties,[93] participating.) Blank appearance sheets should be available, which provide for the name and address of the person appearing and the name and the interest of each person he is representing[94]. The ALJ should direct that each party or interested person notify the reporter, or the ALJ if no transcript is made, of the name and address of one person to whom all documents should be sent. For convenience, oral appearances should also be entered.

3. ***Preliminary Matters*** -- The ALJ should permit each participant to propose additional items and to raise preliminary matters -- for example, an inquiry as to the anticipated duration of the conference.

4. ***Participation*** -- The ALJ should rule immediately on requests to participate. Even if final rulings as to the right to participate are made by the agency, the ALJ can frequently make a tentative ruling, based on his knowledge of agency standards, as to each person's right to participate in the conference and in the entire proceeding.

---

[93] *See*, 21 CFR § 12.89(a) (2000) (FDA, participation of "nonparty participant"). For examples of agency rules dealing expressly with obtaining party status, see 30 CFR § 44.3 (2000)(Mine Safety and Health Administration, petitions for modification of mandatory safety standards); 47 CFR § 1.223 (FCC general procedures)

[94] Form 2 in Appendix I is a sample appearance sheet.

5. ***Issues*** -- If final determination of the issues to be tried has been made before the conference, the conferees may consider the interpretation of the issues as framed. The ALJ should make any necessary rulings.

If, on the other hand, determination of the scope of the proceeding is still tentative, the participants may submit any proposals for modification, clarification, or limitation. After discussion, the ALJ should rule, for conference-planning purposes, and the conference should continue on that basis. (If the agency should later disagree, a further conference may be necessary.)

6. ***Discovery*** -- In complex cases, an early prehearing conference may need to address issues pertaining to discovery. Moreover, the prehearing conference itself can serve a discovery role. Each party, including agency staff, may request other parties to submit information, including specially prepared studies. Disposing of such requests and arranging for the preparation and exchange of the evidentiary material are frequently the most difficult conference functions. The ALJ, as well as agency staff, even though well-trained, experienced, and familiar with the subject matter, may not be able to determine whether objections to producing the requested material are induced by its lack of relevance, the burden of producing it, or a party's belief that it will be adverse to its interests. Moreover, even counsel for the party from whom the material is sought may not know the importance of the requested information, its availability, or the difficulty of assembly.

As difficult as these problems may be, it is preferable to face them at the conference. Otherwise they are merely delayed and will still have to be dealt with later in requests for subpoenas, depositions, and interrogatories, or by extensive correspondence. It is frequently quicker, easier, and more equitable to decide these questions after a full informal discussion at the conference than it is after formal motions to quash subpoenas or to strike material after it has been supplied. Moreover, if the rulings are made at the conference there may be time to modify them without delaying the proceeding if later developments show that some of the requested material is not necessary or obtainable or cannot be assembled as proposed.

When a party resists requests for necessary information the ALJ should direct that it be submitted. But in considering information requests the ALJ should reduce them to the minimum consistent with obtaining sufficient information to decide the issues. Most parties, including agency staff, tend to ask for the maximum data available so that they will have more from which to choose. The parties may agree to furnish requested material,

even though they believe some of the data to be irrelevant or immaterial, because they do not want to antagonize agency staff or other parties or because the information is easily accessible.

The ALJ should not acquiesce in this course of least resistance. The difficulty in striking trivia at the hearing and in sorting out the important facts when deciding the case is compounded if the ALJ has to examine voluminous data that should never have been required or approved at the conference.

The difficulty in determining at the conference what information is needed may be mitigated in several ways: (1) agency rules may require that some or all of the direct evidence be filed with the application or petition;[95] (2) the agency's hearing order may require the parties to prepare and exchange direct, and perhaps rebuttal, evidence before the conference;[96] and (3) the ALJ at a preliminary conference may arrange for the exchange of requests for information which, if objected to, will be resolved at a reconvened conference[97]. The feasibility and utility of such devices depend on agency rules, the nature of the case, the number of known parties or interested persons, the extent of divergent interests, and the amount and type of material requested.

7. ***Exchange of Information and Proposed Evidence*** -- Dates

---

[95]See for example 18 CFR § 157.6 (2000)(FERC); 18 CFR § 385.601(c)(2)(2000)(FERC)(discretionary with presiding officer).

[96]See for example 12 CFR § 19.31(b)(8)(2000) (Comptroller of Currency, typical omnibus authority to address "Such other matters as may aid in the orderly disposition of the proceeding."); 29 CFR § 2200.51 (2000)(Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, prehearing conferences and orders, omnibus provisions re: "any other matter that may expedite the hearing"). For an example of a case, see Bluestone Energy Design, Inc., 58 F.E.R.C. 63,025 (1992), where the Commission refers to an earlier hearing order directing parties to exchange narrative summaries of material points, exhibits, etc.

[97] See for example 46 CFR § 502.94(c)(2000)(Federal Maritime Commission). The possibility for more than one prehearing conference is indicated by the casual reference to "a series of prehearing conferences." Ellis v. Director, 1999 U.S. App. Lexis 21638 (4th Cir.)("unreported" case)

for the exchange of information and proposed evidence should be established, with the consent of the parties if possible. The time allowed should depend upon the nature of the material sought, the difficulty of preparation, the complexity of the issues, and the procedural time limits imposed by law or agency regulation.

Sometimes, in multi-party proceedings, a party or interested person may desire that a document be served on two or more persons in his organization, or he may not require some of the material requested by other parties. Consequently, the ALJ may request each interested person to state what material he needs, the number of copies, and the names and addresses of the persons to be served.

The ALJ's secretary *(assuming the ALJ has a secretary)* may compile this information to be circulated to all parties either as a part of the prehearing conference report or in a separate document.

8. ***Ground Rules*** -- To supplement the relevant statutes, the APA, and agency rules, the ALJ may establish special rules, frequently called "ground rules," for each individual case, covering such matters as order of presentation, motions, and cross-examination. These may be adaptations of rules commonly used by the agency's ALJs or they may be tailor-made for the particular case[98]. Such rules may be unnecessary in relatively simple cases with experienced counsel, or the agency may have standard rules which are adequate for most proceedings.

E. Conference Report

A conference report consisting of a list of appearances, agreements reached, the ALJ's rulings, and other matters decided should, and sometimes must, be prepared and served on all persons who entered appearances.[99]

---

[98]Form 3 in Appendix I is a sample set of ground rules.

[99]Forms 4-a, 4-b, and 4-c in Appendix I are sample prehearing conference reports. For examples of agency regulations pertaining to the ALJ's or presiding officer's duty to prepare a summary reporting what transpired at a conference, see 10 CFR § 2.751a(d) (2000) (Nuclear Regulatory Commission, construction permit and operating licensing proceedings; report referred to as an "order"); 14 CFR 302.22(c)(2000)(Department of Transportation; Aviation Proceedings) 49 CFR § 386.55(b)(2000)(DoT, Federal Highway

If final determination of the issues to be tried depends on a post conference ruling by the agency itself, then the ALJ's conference report should include his recommendations. If the agency disagrees with the ALJ as to the issues, and modifies them, the ALJ will have to decide whether another conference is necessary. Often the ALJ can rectify the difference in a supplemental report.

Exceptions should be limited to errors of substance. Further argument of a point decided at the conference should not be considered unless there are unusual circumstances. The ALJ should rule in a supplemental report on the exceptions, or make modifications or corrections. This does not necessarily commit the ALJ to the prescribed procedures; they can be modified later if necessary.

F. Preliminary Motions and Rulings

All prehearing motions that are within the ALJ's jurisdiction should be decided promptly. Unless the ruling is self-explanatory or is the affirmance of a prior ruling, it should include a statement of reasons[100]. Many motions, petitions, and requests can be disposed of without a formal order; a notice or letter to all interested persons is sufficient.

G. Other Prehearing Procedures

At the risk of being repetitious, it should be emphasized that a full-fledged prehearing conference is not always appropriate. If the issues are simple and the parties few, it may be unnecessary; if the proceeding is to be held in the field, it may be inconvenient. Any number of factors and variables may make a full-scale prehearing conference uneconomical or otherwise inadvisable.

When a conference is not feasible or desirable, other methods to organize and expedite a proceeding are available. For example, the ALJ may by written notice suggest the type of

---

Administration; report referred to as an "order").

[100]Form 5 in Appendix I is a sample interlocutory order.

evidence needed,[101] or may direct the submission prior to the hearing of such material as a list of witnesses, a description of the material to be offered in evidence, and proposed stipulations. However, if a prehearing conference is not held, the ALJ should at least consult informally with all parties or their counsel prior to the official opening of the hearing to discuss and decide on hearing procedures.

In addition, a procedure formerly adopted by the U.S. Court of Federal Claims[102] provided for the development of information by the parties before the hearing without a prehearing conference[103]. This procedure, which is described in the Court of Federal Claims forms set forth in Appendix I,[104] appears adaptable to many administrative proceedings.

H. Settlement Negotiations and ADR Possibilities

1. ***Settlements***. Settlement by negotiation should be considered at every step and stage of a proceeding. Depending on such variables as the nature of the issues, the parties, and

---

[101]Forms 6-a-c in Appendix I are samples of prehearing orders and instructions to the parties.

[102] Since the first edition of this Manual, this court has been variously referred to as the Court of Claims and as the U.S. Claims Court. In 1992, it was officially designated as the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. P.L. 102-572 (Title IX, § 902(a)), 106 Stat. 4516 (October 29, 1992). This Manual generally will use the 1992 designation, although lapses in usage will be likely.

[103] Appendix G of the present Rules of the Court of Federal Claims still provides an excellent model for an ALJ who wants to assure that the parties engage in substantial pre-conference development of their cases. Among other things, Appendix G provides for early communication between counsel to identify each party's factual and legal contentions, discuss discovery needs, scheduling, and possible settlement. It also requires a Joint Preliminary Status Report be filed by the parties. This Appendix (G) to the Court of Claims Rules can be found in 28 U.S.C. Appx (1994), among the appendices to the Federal Court of Claims Rules.

[104]See Forms 18-a through 18-e in Appendix I.

applicable rules, a case might be settled as soon as assigned to an ALJ, shortly afterwards, during any of the usual prehearing procedures, during the hearing, at the close of the hearing, before decision by the ALJ, or even between the decision of the ALJ and the decision of the agency. Subject to agency rules, a settlement conference may be organized and conducted by the ALJ, or the ALJ may organize it and turn it over to the parties for action, or the parties may, with or without the ALJ's consent, hold private discussions so long as the rights of other parties or the public are not impaired.

Whenever it seems opportune, the ALJ should suggest settlement discussions. Sometimes, as the hearing proceeds and the parties hear the testimony and learn the facts, they will be more amenable to settlement. This applies not only to a full or partial settlement of the case but also to procedural questions. Frequently the parties may, after conferences, make important factual or procedural agreements.

The extent to which the ALJ should participate in settlement negotiations depends on agency practice and personal judgment. It is not uncommon for an ALJ to take an active role in such negotiation, especially in enforcement cases. However, too much involvement, or too active a role might raise doubts concerning the ALJ's ability to conduct a fair hearing or reach an equitable decision if negotiations fail. In such situations recusal might be appropriate.

As indicated earlier in this Manual,[105] one way to avoid the problems which could arise if the ALJ becomes too active in settlement negotiations is to use a Settlement Judge[106] or some other form of mediator.

More than twenty years ago, a survey of ALJs, including Chiefs, at eleven agencies indicated that, in addition to saving

---

[105] See *supra,* text at notes 47-53.

[106] For examples of agency regulations pertaining to settlement judges, see 5 CFR § 2423.25(d)(2000)(Federal Labor Relations Authority; unfair labor practice proceedings); 18 CFR § 385.603 (2000)(FERC); 24 CFR §180.445 (2000)(HUD; proceedings for civil rights matters); 29 CFR 18.9 (2000)(Department of Labor); 29 CFR § 2200.101 (2000) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission); 47 CFR § 1.244 (2000) (FCC); 48 CFR § 6302.30 (1991)(DOT Board of Contract Appeals). For a case which refers to the use of a settlement judge, see Oxy USA, Inc. v. FERC, 64 F. 3d 679, 687 (D.C., 1995).

the time, cost, and energy involved in a formal hearing, a settlement can neutralize hostilities that might be aggravated by litigation[107]. Many of the lessons garnered from that survey remain valid today and helped in the development of ADR in federal agencies, so it is worth discussing further at this point.

The principal questions investigated in the survey were how to persuade parties to get together to consider settling their differences (whether substantive or procedural), and, once a meeting is arranged, how to get them to reach some agreement.

The survey suggested several ways of encouraging negotiations. Agencies could assign ALJs who are particularly adept at negotiating to handle settlement discussions. They could arrange training for ALJs in how to encourage negotiations without compromising their judicial independence. Techniques available to individual ALJs include the following:

(1) Directing the parties to meet prior to the hearing to discuss settlement.

(2) Issuing discovery orders requiring the exchange of basic facts and documents.

(3) Holding telephone conferences to discuss settlement possibilities. The ALJ can suggest issues that appear amenable to settlement.

(4) Submitting to the parties and interested persons pretrial statements on technical matters at issue, prepared by the ALJ's staff.

(5) Setting early hearing dates to compel immediate consideration of the issues.

(6) Holding *in camera* negotiating sessions immediately prior to the hearing, when the merits of each party's claims and his chance of success have been thoroughly explored.

Of course, the use of settlement techniques depends on the type of issues, the agency rules, and the personality, attitude,

---

[107]Coast Guard, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Departments of Health and Human Services, Interior, and Labor. The survey was conducted in 1979 and 1980. *See* G. Lawrence, Settlement Practices of Administrative Law Judges (March 18, 1981). Unpublished paper submitted to the Administrative Conference of the United States.

and training of the ALJ. Many cases cannot be settled, regardless of agency procedures or the ALJ's ability. But if the case is of the type in which settlement is possible, the ALJ should support all legitimate settlement efforts.[108]

2. ***ADR.*** As previously mentioned,[109] federal agency use of ADR increased substantially during the 1980's and culminated in a sense with the ADR Act of 1990. ADR is now -- and for the foreseeable future -- a subject of considerable significance to administrative law judges. For that reason, ADR was described and examined in some detail early in this Manual.[110]

Moreover, the specifics of each agency's ADR programs are still being developed[111]. This development probably will be, and

---

[108] *See* Roger Fisher & William Ury, GETTING TO YES -- NEGOTIATING AGREEMENT WITHOUT GIVING IN (2d ed. 1991), and Roger Fisher & Danny Ertel, GETTING READY TO NEGOTIATE: THE GETTING TO YES WORKBOOK (1995).

[109] See *supra*, text at notes 64-80.

[110] See text *supra* at notes 30-80. Moreover, in some agencies, relevant regulations contemplate the potential for ALJs or other hearing officers themselves to perform an ADR role or to rule on parties' motions. 18 CFR § 385.604(c)(3) (2000) (ALJs may serve as neutrals); 47 CFR § 1.722(d)(1) (2000) (ALJs as mediators in voluntary mediation of damages where liability is clear); and 40 CFR § 22.18 (Presiding Officer to rule on parties' motion for appointment of a neutral).

[111] See for example 65 FR 38986, 39003 (June 22, 2000)(Commodities Futures Trading Commission) (Notice of Proposed Rulemaking; new regulatory framework for multilateral transaction execution facilities, etc.); 65 CFR 36888 (June 12, 2000)(Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration, Notice Announcing Reopening of Public Comment Period re: ADR for online consumer transactions); 65 FR 31131 (May 16, 2000)(Department of Defense Proposed Rule re: Defense Logistics Agency solicitations); 64 FR 61236, 61237 (November 10, 1999)(Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission Notice of Proposed Rulemaking re: procedural rules); 64 FR 40138, 40158 (July 23, 1999) (Environmental Protection Agency, Final Rule, consolidated rules of practice for civil penalties, compliance orders, etc.).

certainly should be, an ongoing process. ADR is still at an early stage as far as its use in administrative agencies is concerned. Indeed, as one article regarding ADR in general put it, "[W]e have only begun to identify the kinds of disputes likely to be amenable to the techniques of ADR."[112] One task for administrative law judges will be to aid in realizing the potential of ADR for the administrative process.

III. DISCOVERY

If authorized by statute and agency rule, the ALJ may require the parties to submit to discovery. This may consist of subpoenas *ad testificandum* and *duces tecum*, depositions, written interrogatories, cross-interrogatories, inspections, physical or mental examinations, requests for admissions, production of documents or things, or permission to enter upon land or other property, or the preparation of studies, summaries, forecasts, surveys, polls, or other relevant materials.

Discovery rulings may be made if the ALJ finds it necessary to apply compulsion to obtain the necessary information[113]. Supplemental discovery orders may be issued as needed. The ALJ should be attentive, throughout the discovery stage, to the possibility of delay resulting from abuse of the discovery process.

A. Subpoenas

In some agencies, the ALJ must issue a subpoena upon request, subject to a motion to quash[114]. In other agencies, the ALJ may refuse to issue a subpoena absent a showing of relevance

---

[112] Lieberman & Henry, *Lessons from the Alternative Dispute Resolution Movement*, 53 U. CHI. L. REV. 424, 438 (1986).

[113] *See,* Freije, *The Use of Discovery Sanctions in Administrative Agency Adjudication*, 59 IND. L. J. 113 (1983); Tomlinson, *Discovery in Agency Adjudication*, Report in Support of Recommendation [70-4], 1 ACUS 37, 571, 577 (1971); 1 CFR § 305.70-4 (1993).

[114] See for example 29 CFR § 2200.57 (2000) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission).

or related requirements[115]. In either case, to prevent evasion of service, the subpoena usually is granted *ex parte* and its signing is not disclosed until either service has been accomplished or the party who obtained the subpoena chooses to disclose it.

Even if reimbursed for travel expenses and compensated by witness fees, a witness who is required to travel far from home will be inconvenienced at best, and may undergo severe hardship. Furthermore, subpoenas duces tecum may compel the transportation of bulky documents and may deprive a business of records and files needed for its daily operation. These burdens should not be lightly imposed[116]. The ALJ may in appropriate cases, and subject to agency rules, shift some of these burdens to the party seeking documents by permitting inspecting and copying of them on the premises where they are regularly kept. The ALJ also may encourage agreements between the parties providing for the submission of copies of specified material at the hearing, subject to verification procedures agreeable to the parties.

Sometimes subpoenas will be requested for material the ALJ has previously ruled need not be produced. Upon learning of this, the ALJ should deny the request unless it appears that the earlier ruling should be changed. It is not usually worthwhile, however, to search the record of a lengthy prehearing conference or other prehearing actions to determine whether the matter has already been considered. The subpoenaed witness can always move to quash.

Sooner or later an ALJ will encounter a party who refuses to comply with a subpoena. When that happens, the agency probably will have to file an enforcement action in federal district

---

[115] See for example, 7 CFR § 1.149 n4(2000)(Department of Agriculture); 10 CFR § 2.720(a) (2000)(Nuclear Regulatory Commission, domestic licensing proceedings); 12 CFR § 19.26(a)(2000) (Comptroller of the Currency); 16 CFR § 3.34(b) (2000) (FTC, rules of practice for adjudicative proceedings). The relevant provision of the APA states: "Agency subpoenas authorized by law shall be issued to a party on request and, when required by rules of procedure, on a statement or showing of general relevance and reasonable scope of the evidence sought." 5 U.S.C. § 555(d) (1994).

[116] *Cf.*, Oklahoma Press Publishing Co. v. Walling, 327 U.S. 186, 213 (1946)(dicta).

court[117]. The ensuing litigation can delay the agency's adjudication considerably,[118] but Supreme Court precedents strongly tend toward upholding an agency's subpoenas[119]. Moreover, the APA states, "On contest, the court shall sustain the subpoena or similar process or demand to the extent that it is found to be in accordance with law."[120] Once the agency's statutory authority to issue the challenged subpoenas is established, the subpoena generally will be found to be in accordance with law "if the inquiry is within the authority of

---

[117]For an example of an agency rule pertaining to enforcement of subpoenas, see 29 CFR § 2200.57(d) (2000).

[118]See for example FTC v. Anderson, 631 F.2d 741 (D.C. Cir. 1979). Although not within the scope of this Manual, agency enforcement of administrative subpoenas can, in addition to creating substantial delays in the proceedings, create serious problems and complications for ALJs in conducting proceedings. For example, there may be serious questions about the ALJ's authority to issue subpoenas, which the ALJ and the agency may need to address in the first instance, a matter which may involve statutory interpretation. For example, although agreeing with the agency, the court in U.S. v. Florida Azalea Specialists, 19 F. 3d 620, 622-23 (11th Cir. 1994) still addressed the statutory interpretation argument which the subpoenaed party raised.

[119] *See*, CAB v. Hermann, 353 U.S. 322 (1957) (production of all books and records covering a period of three years); United States v. Morton Salt, 338 U.S. 632 (1950). However, it should be noted that challenges to the agency in actions to enforce agency subpoenas can present complications and problems, which if not handled properly, can lead to delay and even reversal of the agency's position. For example, in NLRB v. Detroit Newspapers, 185 F. 3d 602, 605-06 (6th Cir. 1999), a court ruled that the ultimate authority to decide whether subpoenaed material was privileged from disclosure is a matter for the Article III Judiciary. Of course, an ALJ and the agency will rule on such questions in the first instance, but the ultimate decisional authority would seem to be in the courts, if the party refuses to comply with the agency subpoena.

[120] 5 U.S.C. 555(d) (1994).

the agency, the demand is not too indefinite and the information sought is reasonably relevant."[121]

B. Discovery and Confidential Material

When it is desirable to have an advance written exchange of confidential material, the ALJ should develop appropriate safeguards to assure confidentiality. The ALJ may, for example: (1) obtain the commitment of the parties receiving the material to limit its distribution to specific persons; or (2) ask unaffected parties to waive the receipt of certain material; or (3) issue appropriate orders. As an additional safeguard, ALL copies of such material should bear a prominent legend stating the limitations upon its distribution pursuant to the order of the ALJ.

In some agencies, such as the FCC or FTC, confidential information, particularly material claimed to be proprietary information or trade secrets, may be handled by procedures contained in a protective order issued by the ALJ[122]. The need for such an order often arises during prehearing discovery when a party refuses to release material to an adversary party, an intervenor, or the agency staff without provision for confidential treatment. The request for the order is usually grounded on the claim that unrestricted release of the material may result in its misuse, such as unfairly benefitting competitors. To guard against misuse of the information the order should provide the terms and conditions for the release of the material. It should also contain an agreement to be signed by users of the material, and may include procedures for handling the material if offered in evidence, including, for example, prior notification to the party submitting the material of the intention to offer it as evidence, and provisions for sealing the

---

[121] United States v. Morton Salt Co., 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950).

[122] *See* Exxon Corp.; v. Federal Trade Commission, 665 F.2d 1274 (D.C. Cir. 1981). For examples of agency regulations related to various protective orders, see 10 CFR § 2.734 (2000) (Nuclear Regulatory Commission; confidential informant); 10 CFR § 501.34(d)(2000) (Department of Energy); 14 CFR § 13.220 (h) (2000) (FAA civil penalty actions); 15 CFR § 25.24 (2000)(Department of Commerce, Program Fraud Civil Remedies); 16 CFR § 3.31(d) (2000) (FTC).

pertinent portions of the record, briefs, and decisions[123]. In some situations the ALJ may find it easier to allow the parties to draft a proposed order for his signature.

The ALJ must realize that protective order procedures could be inimical to the concept of a proceeding which is a matter of public record. Consequently, extreme care must be exercised in the issuance and application of the order to insure that the integrity of the record is preserved and the rights of the parties and the public are duly considered.

Moreover, the order should make clear that it does not constitute a ruling that any material claimed by a party to be covered is in fact confidential and entitled to be sealed and withheld from examination by the general public.[124]

C. Testimony of Agency Personnel and Production of Agency Documents

Testimony of agency personnel and the production of documents in agency custody must sometimes be restricted to protect the agency's investigative or decisional processes[125]. Consequently some agencies provide special procedures applicable to discovery requests for materials in the agency's custody, such as requiring that they be referred to the agency either initially

---

[123]Forms 19-a-d in Appendix I are sample protective orders.

[124] For further discussion of confidential material and administrative proceedings, see text *infra* accompanying notes 242-48.

[125] *See*, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b) (1994 & Supp. V 1998). The cited statutory provision is part of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), which deals with public access to federal government records, rather than discovery by private litigants. FOIA and discovery pertaining to government records sought by private litigants obviously are related. At least some cases indicate that precedents construing one of the FOIA exemptions are not always irrelevant to issues involving discovery. *See*, McClelland v. Andrus, 606 F.2d 1278, 1285, n. 48 (D.C. Cir. 1979), Washington Post Co. v. U.S. Dept. of Health & Human Services, 690 F.2d 252, 258 (1982).

or upon interlocutory appeal by the agency staff[126]. The ALJ should assure that these procedures are not used frivolously or for clearly improper purposes.[127]

In *Jencks v. United States* [128] it was held that the defendant in a criminal prosecution has the right to examine all reports in the possession of the prosecution that bear upon the events and activities to which a prosecution witness testifies at trial. This principle has been extended to administrative proceedings in which the agency is an adversary[129]. Some agencies have adopted procedural rules specifically directed to the "Jencks" problem.[130]

In ruling upon such requests, the ALJ does not occupy precisely the same position as did the court in *Jencks*. The Administrative Law Judge is not a court, or the representative of a separate branch of government who is being asked to compel unwilling disclosure by the agency. The Administrative Law Judge is an employee of the agency, who is making the initial decision for the agency itself as to what it shall voluntarily disclose. Accordingly, in the absence of agency policy to the contrary, and within the scope of sound discretion, the ALJ should be guided by agency policies and a sense of fair play rather than by a narrow

---

[126] For an example, see FTC regulations, 16 CFR §§ 3.23(a), 3.36 (2000).

[127] *See* Domestic Cargo-Mail Service Case, 30 CAB 560, 651 (1960).

[128] 353 U.S. 657, 672 (1957). The principle of this case, with some modifications, was later codified, 18 U.S.C. § 3500 (1994). This provision is applicable only to criminal cases.

[129] Great Lakes Airlines v. CAB, 291 F.2d 354, 363-365 (9th Cir. 1961), *cert. denied*, 368 U.S. 890 (1961); NLRB v. Adhesive Product Corp., 258 F.2d 403, 408 (2d Cir. 1958); Communist Party of the United States v. SACB, 254 F.2d 314, 327-328 (D.C. Cir. 1958).

[130] See for example, 7 CFR § 1.141 (2000) (Department of Agriculture, providing that production of such documents "shall be made according to the procedures and subject to the definitions and limitations prescribed in the Jencks Act"); 17 CFR § 201.231(a)(2000)(SEC).

legal analysis of whether, under *Jencks*, the Constitution would force the agency grudgingly to provide the information requested.

In the absence of good reasons to the contrary, the ALJ should seriously consider requiring production of all relevant and material factual statements, whether or not covered in the witness' testimony. (If nothing else, disclosure could prevent a court from later reversing and remanding the case, with an attendant waste of time for everyone concerned.) In deciding this question the ALJ, to the extent permitted by agency rules, may examine the statements *in camera*. To avoid delay at the hearing the ALJ may require the parties to submit such statements before the hearing.

D. Reports, Estimates, Forecasts, and Other Studies

Although most discovery questions which an Administrative Law Judge may encounter will be fairly analogous to discovery issues confronting courts, there are some situations which have few or no counterparts outside of administrative agency proceedings. For instance, historical data, statistical or technical reports, forecasts, or estimates may have to be prepared, sometimes by more than one party. If so, it is frequently necessary for the ALJ to establish standard bases and time periods. In addition, it is sometimes necessary to specify in some detail the manner of preparation -- by requiring, for example, that the parties use certain specified methods in preparing cost estimates. Use of such procedures should not prevent a party from supplementing its data with similar material in other forms, subject to the ALJ's discretion.

E. Polls, Surveys, Samples, and Tests

As with reports, estimates and forecasts, information may be needed about habits, customs, or practices for which little reliable information is available -- for example, the method of loading trucks, the volume of traffic along a particular route, or the percentage of travelers who prefer non-smoking areas. Polls, surveys, samples, or tests may be the most feasible methods of obtaining the needed data. These may have been previously prepared by a party or an independent source for other purposes or they may be prepared specifically for the pending proceeding -- either by one or more of the parties independently or with the consent and knowledge of the ALJ and the other parties as a part of the prehearing procedure.[131]

---

[131] *Cf.*, 18 CFR § 156.5 (2000) (FERC, Application for Orders under Section 7(a) of the Natural Gas Act).

Polls, surveys, samples, and tests frequently raise serious questions of objectivity and reliability, especially if they have been prepared specifically for the proceeding in question. The ALJ should require the methods by which they were produced to be described in sufficient detail to permit a fair evaluation of these factors. If a poll, survey, sample, or test is proposed, and prior approval is requested, the ALJ should seek agreement among the parties on the methods to be used. The ALJ may grant such approval, subject to the parties having an opportunity to raise objections during the course of the hearing.

IV. PREHEARING TECHNIQUES FOR EXPEDITING AND SIMPLIFYING THE COMPLEX PROCEEDING

The formal administrative hearing often is quite similar to a trial before an ALJ sitting without a jury. One party may have a claim against another, as in workers' compensation. Or, a government agency may be proceeding against a private party who allegedly has not complied with some law or regulation, as in enforcement proceedings under the National Labor Relations Act,[132] or the Occupational Safety and Health Act,[133] or any of a large number of other laws under which sanctions can be imposed and violations remedied. Then of course there are cases involving claims for benefits or entitlements payable by the government, such as Social Security disability benefits or veterans' benefits. A word often used to describe such proceedings is "quasi-judicial." Typically, these quasi-judicial proceedings are nearly identical to a formal adjudication without a jury. Pleadings of some sort -- complaint, charge, answer, response, etc. -- are filed[134]. There are adverse parties and pre-hearing discovery often is available. Witnesses testify orally on direct and cross-examination. The ALJ or other presiding officer usually disposes of the case by a decision, ruling, or order, with appeal to higher authority generally being available. In fact, the quasi-judicial, formal adjudicative model has been incorporated into administrative law and institutionalized by

[132] 29 U.S.C. §§ 151-68 (1994).

[133] 29 U.S.C. §651 *et seq.* (1994).

[134] *See, e.g.*, 29 CFR §§ 2200.30 -.41 (2000) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission).

certain provisions of the APA[135] which are triggered, with certain exceptions, by any statute which requires an adjudication to be determined on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing.[136]

Very often, these formal agency adjudications are relatively simple cases. There may be only a few witnesses; the sanctions may be small money penalties; the issues may fairly straightforward; the hearing may last only a few hours, or less.

However, some formal agency adjudications can be much more complicated. Complex issues or several parties with conflicting interests may be very entangled. The resolution of a number of legal questions may be contingent on disputed facts which are the subject of weeks of testimony and volumes of documentary evidence. The substantive statutory law may require the agency to apply open-ended criteria, such as "unfair competition," to decide whether a fabric of calculated ambiguities, enigmatic business strategies, unconventional advertising policies and unusual accounting practices amount to "unfair competition." Moreover, some types of complex cases are not wholly comparable to our usual notions of adjudications. An agency's organic statute may compel the ALJ, and ultimately the agency, to "adjudicate" cases which involve public policy, rather than liabilities for noncompliance with the law or entitlements to benefits. To mention only a few examples, the agency may have to determine which of several competing applicants would better serve "the public interest" in contexts such as granting broadcast licenses, providing electric power service to consumers, or transportation.

Although it would be naive, and misleading, to draw a sharp line between "simple," and "complex" cases, the fact remains that there are some cases which take more of an ALJ's time and effort than others. This Manual, like everything else, is subject to limitations of time and space. As a matter of priorities, a chapter on techniques for expediting and simplifying complex proceedings probably will be more worthwhile than a chapter belaboring the more routine type of cases. There is little need for a chapter focusing on cases which are short (the hearing lasts a day or less), and which involve few issues, few parties, few prehearing procedures, few exhibits, and a brief prehearing conference over the telephone. Certainly there is no strong need to develop special procedures to shorten the simpler hearing to

---

[135] 5 U.S.C. §§ 554, 556, 557 (1994).

[136] 5 U.S.C. § 554(a) (1994).

save only an hour or two.

Complex cases are another matter. They may involve hearings lasting from a few days to a month or more, with many parties, many issues, and factual questions of enormous difficulty. Typically, much of the testimony is highly technical and lengthy, and is submitted in written form prior to the hearing. For example, a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) adjudication may have scores of separately represented parties taking different positions and presenting evidence. A typical FERC case may involve disputes concerning hundreds of millions of dollars in increased electricity or gas costs. Hearings may last two or three months, with a record well in excess of 10,000 pages.[137]

However, the emphasis in this chapter on complex cases carries no implication that the shorter case requires less technical or judicial skill than the complex one, or that the ALJ, regardless of agency or assignments, can competently perform the judicial function without being qualified for all types of cases, or that the ALJ trying simple cases has an easier task than the ALJ trying complex cases. The simple case frequently includes questions of credibility, the trying of which requires maximum judicial skill and insight. Furthermore, ALJs who hear only complex cases may decide only 10 to 25 cases per year. ALJs hearing simple cases frequently handle many times that number. For example, in 1992, individual Social Security Administration ALJs were handling an average of 450 cases per year.[138]

Still, for the complex case the Judge must try to expedite the proceeding while developing a fair and complete record. To accomplish this, several procedural tools have been developed for simplifying and managing such proceedings. These tools, with minor modifications at different agencies, and for different types of proceedings, have been used successfully for many years. In addition, more recent innovations in ADR devices and techniques offer considerable promise for simplifying the complicated case.

Examples of possible or proposed improvements in the conduct

---

[137] Federal Administrative Judiciary, *supra* note 4, at 849-50.

[138] Letter dated May 20, 1992 from Acting Chief Administrative Law Judge Jose A. Anglada, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Social Security Administration, to Morell E. Mullins, principal revisor for the 3rd edition of this Manual.

of complex proceedings can take varied forms. More than 25 years ago, a leading practitioner advocated techniques for expediting formal proceedings by requiring most of the evidence to be submitted in written form, by making cross-examination subject to the discretion of the hearing officer, and by substituting a conference of lawyers and lay assistants for the formal hearing[139]. This approach does not seem to have been adopted completely by any agency, although it was suggested at the time that the Civil Aeronautics Board, for example, could have done so under then-existing law[140]. From time to time, bills have been introduced to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to broaden the circumstances in which agencies may substitute written procedures for oral testimony.[141]

Another innovative approach to complex cases is found in specialized procedures conducted by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The NRC is statutorily authorized the establish Atomic Safety and Licensing Boards, "each comprised of three members, one of whom [is] qualified in the conduct of administrative proceedings, and two of whom . . . have . . . technical or other qualifications . . . to conduct hearings . . . with respect to the granting, suspending, revoking or amending of any license or authorization under the provisions of this Act . . . ."[142] At the end of fiscal year 1990, the NRC had about 30 individuals who served on its Atomic Safety and Licensing Boards, and almost two-thirds of them were non-lawyers holding advanced degrees in engineering, physics, public health, medicine, or

---

[139]Westwood, *Administrative Proceedings: Techniques of Presiding,* 50 ABAJ 659 (1964).

[140]*Id.* at 662.

[141]*Cf.* S. 262, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. (1980). It also should be mentioned that SSA ALJs often decide cases where most of the evidence is in written form, with additional testimony by lay witnesses. Anglada letter, *supra* note 138.

[142]42 U.S.C. § 2241(a)(1994). Relevant rules of practice governing proceedings before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Boards (and other NRC hearing bodies) are published in 10 CFR Part 2 (2000).

environmental science.[143]

When these boards are used, the technically qualified members of the Board contribute technical questions, comments, and observations in the resolution of preliminary or procedural matters and in the examination of technical witnesses. They take the lead in determining whether the Board has met its responsibility to develop a reliable record and in advising the panel when, and what type of, additional evidence is needed. The Board can complete the record by advising the parties to produce additional evidence on a specified matter. Although technical members are not permitted to make a decision based on their personal knowledge of the facts, they have a duty to clarify any contradictory testimony. This they may do by questioning a witness, calling for the production of more testimony, or by calling a Board witness. By the use of a hearing panel of this type, an agency has personnel, specially trained in all facets of its operations, participating continually in each administrative hearing.[144]

Although without legislation other regulatory agencies cannot assign persons not qualified as Administrative Law Judges to preside over the taking of evidence in formal cases, there appear to be several NRC procedures that could be adopted by agencies using Administrative Law Judges. Most agencies either have, or have authority to employ, technical assistants such as accountants and engineers to assist their ALJs. Such assistants, if technically qualified, should be able to provide the ALJ in a technical case the same type of information that technical members of NRC panels provide. A technical assistant might not

---

[143] THE FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE JUDICIARY, *supra* note 4, at 850-51.

[144]Paris, *Role of the Scientist in NRC Administrative Proceedings*, 20 IDEA, The Journal of Law and Technology 357 (1979). *See also* U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, *Statement of Policy on Conduct of Licensing Proceedings* (CLI-81-8) (May 20,1981). Revisor's Note: The information in the present text regarding the Nuclear Regulatory Commission procedures, although based on the 1982 edition of this Manual, was slightly revised for the 1993 edition and this edition on the basis of information provided to the revisor by Judge Ivan Smith, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, during a telephone conversation on March 26, 1992. A written summary of the conversation is in the revisor's files.

be permitted to question witnesses and participate directly in the hearing, but attending the hearing and advising the ALJ, on the record, during the hearing should present no problems.[145]

In a similar vein, it is well-established that an Administrative Law Judge can use an independent medical adviser as an expert witness in Social Security disability proceedings[146]. And certainly, with the passage of the ADR Act, various possibilities, especially the use of expert factfinding and neutral evaluation techniques, immediately should come to mind as devices for possible use in complex agency proceedings.[147]

In addition to using panels, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission developed other procedures to improve the hearing process. A brief summary of some of those which were used by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in the *Three Mile Island, Unit 1 Restart Proceeding* follows:

1. Lead Intervenor -- The intervenors are required to select a lead intervenor who consolidates the direct cross-examination with the other intervenors and then individually conducts the examination of the witnesses.

2. Cross-Examination Plans -- Parties wishing to cross-examine on prefiled direct testimony are required to submit a plan that is kept confidential by the Board until trial of the issue. The plan must be in sufficient detail to inform the Board of the points raised and to assist the Board in regulating cross-examination. It must specify (a) cross-examination objectives, (b) affirmative evidence that the cross-examination is expected to produce, and (c) the direct testimony that the cross-examination is expected to discredit.

3. Negotiations -- Negotiations, monitored by the Board, are required on procedural matters and specification of issues.[148]

---

[145]For an article discussing legal and technical assistants to Administrative Law Judges, see Mathias, *The Use of Legal and Technical Assistants by Administrative Law Judges in Administrative Proceedings*, 1 AD. L. J. 107 (1987).

[146] *See*, Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389 (1971).

[147] See text *supra* at notes 30-80.

[148] Ruhlen, MANUAL FOR ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES 22-23 (1982) (citing conversation between Administrative Judge Merritt

Although procedures such as those described above may expedite the development of a complete record, efficiency still is not the only goal. Hearings must be conducted fairly and all interested persons who have something worthwhile to contribute must have an opportunity to participate. Moreover, the most efficient hearing conceivable can be rendered a near-total waste of time if this efficiency leads to prejudicial error and a case is reversed and remanded because of defective, unfair procedures.

The rest of this chapter describes procedures and devices which have been used in various agencies for facilitating the conduct of complex cases.

A. Written Exhibits in Complex Cases

In formal adjudications governed by the Administrative Procedure Act:

> . . . . A party is entitled to present his case or defense by oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. In rule making or determining claims for money or benefits or applications for initial licenses an agency may, when a party will not be prejudiced thereby, adopt procedures for the submission of all or part of the evidence in written form.[149]

Ruhlen and Administrative Law Judge Ivan Smith, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and letter to Judge Ruhlen from Lawrence Brenner, Consulting Legal Counsel, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (December 1, 1980)).

[149] 5 U.S. C. § 556(d) (1994).(Emphasis added.) Although the Supreme Court has said that the term "hearing" as used in the Administrative Procedure Act "does not necessarily embrace either the right to present evidence orally and to cross-examine opposing witnesses, or the right to present oral argument to the agency's decision-maker." United States v. Florida East Coast Ry. Co., 410 U.S. 224, 240 (1973), judges should be extremely cautious about denying parties an opportunity to cross-examine witnesses. See also, Cellular Mobile System of Pennsylvania v. FCC, 782 F. 2d 182 (D.C. Cir. 1985) ("Cross-examination is therefore not an automatic right conferred by the APA; instead,

Preparation and exchange of direct and rebuttal evidence in writing before hearing is usually beneficial in complex cases. Furthermore, if such exchange of evidence is preceded by an exchange of information, subsequent proceedings are easier and the duration of the hearing is reduced. To obtain the maximum benefit the ALJ must study the proposed testimony before commencing the hearing.

The following pattern for the exchange of material, within reasonable but short time periods, is illustrative: first, each party furnishes information requested by others; second, each party submits its proposed direct evidence; third, each party submits rebuttal evidence; and fourth, each party submits surrebuttal, if any. Usually all parties observe the same exchange dates, though this may vary when appropriate. This pattern gives each party an opportunity (1) to examine information supplied by others before preparing its direct evidence; (2) to study the direct evidence of others before preparing rebuttal; and (3) to prepare cross-examination and procedural motions without interrupting the hearing or having to study the transcript during recesses.

Even when the parties cannot be required to submit all evidence in writing, they often may agree to present most of it in written form. Experienced counsel recognize that the advantages are many and the disadvantages few.

Oral testimony may be necessary if a witness is hostile to the party calling him or is not under his control, or if new evidence is discovered after the exchange of written evidence.

Written evidence is usually prepared in the form of exhibits, which may include narrative statements, testimony in question-and-answer form, tables, charts, or other documentary material. Each exhibit, if not self-explanatory, should contain notes or narrative to explain its meaning or purpose. Each separate document should be given an exhibit number, a symbol identifying the party submitting it, and, perhaps, a symbol identifying its subject. Each volume of exhibits should include a table of contents or index. If an exhibit contains extensive written testimony, it should have a separate index of the subjects covered.

Since the ALJ must rely on such an index or table of

---

its necessity must be established under specific circumstances by the party seeking it.")*and* Central Freight Lines, Inc. v. United States, 669 F. 2d 1063 (5th Cir. 1982) (cross-examination not an absolute right under the APA).

contents when preparing the decision or a personal index of the record, the parties should be informed that the titles must aptly and precisely describe the contents. The parties should be particularly admonished to avoid argumentative titles, or "singing titles," as they are sometimes called.

In complex cases with several parties it is helpful to establish a uniform identification system. For example, in a transportation case involving an application for a new route, all parties may be required to put their historical traffic data in the A series, their traffic projections in the B series, and their revenue and expense estimates in the C series.

B. Elimination or Curtailment of Hearing Suspensions

Emergencies, or unexpected occurrences, sometimes require a suspension of the hearing. Counsel or a witness may become ill, an out-of-town witness may be delayed, counsel may have to appear in another forum, or it may be necessary to enforce a *subpoena* or other discovery process, or to prepare rebuttal or cross-examination with respect to newly discovered evidence.

However, the unnecessary or frequent suspension or recessing of hearings for substantial periods should not become a regular practice, even in complicated or multi-party cases. Repeated suspensions, each lasting from a week to several months, can cause a hearing to go on for years.

Protracted or frequent suspensions are usually unnecessary. Requests for suspensions are frequently based on assertions that additional time is needed (1) to prepare cross-examination; (2) to prepare a defensive case or rebuttal after hearing the proponent's case; or (3) to devise defensive strategy after cross-examination of the adversary's witnesses.

If the prehearing procedures in a complex, multi-party proceeding are carefully organized in the manner discussed in Chapter II (Prehearing Conferences and Settlements), counsel in most cases can complete substantially all of the basic preparation before the hearing commenced. Delay can be reduced and nearly eliminated by such procedures as: (1) requiring inclusion of the direct case with the original petition or application; (2) exchanging direct and rebuttal evidence before hearing; and (3) using rebuttal experts rather than cross-examination to answer expert testimony. The relative merits of cross-examining experts as compared with the use of rebuttal experts have been discussed in an article by Judge Benkin of the

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.[150]

C. Stipulations and Official Notice of Documentary Material

Stipulations and official notice can avoid much factual presentation. Some agencies have provided by rule a list of the documents that will be officially noticed[151]. In the absence of, or in addition to, such a list the agency, the ALJ, or both, may announce that official notice will be taken of certain specific material, subject to the right of any party on timely request to introduce contradictory evidence[152]. The parties should be directed at the prehearing conference or by written notice to cite specifically any material of which they request official notice.

Parties frequently agree to stipulate to the existence of certain facts or, even more often, to the reception of certain evidence without oral sponsorship or authentication. In multi-party proceedings the ALJ may have the authority to appoint a continuing committee composed of representatives of the parties to consider and recommend stipulations.

On matters of authenticity of exhibits, the ALJ's instructions or the agency rules concerning exhibits may provide, among other things: (1) if a party wishes an exhibit to be received in evidence without oral sponsorship, he shall submit a written request to the ALJ and all parties, accompanied by the exhibit in question and by a statement signed by the person sponsoring it that it was prepared by him or under his direction and is true and correct; (2) within a specified time prior to the hearing any party desiring to cross-examine with respect to any such material shall give the ALJ and the parties written notice specifying the witness and the exhibit involved and the matters or parts of the exhibit upon which cross-examination is desired; and (3) if no request for cross-examination is received, the exhibit shall be received in evidence without oral sponsorship,

---

[150] I. Benkin, *Is it Bigger than a Breadbox? - An Administrative Law Judge Looks at Cross-Examination of Experts*, 21 AIR FORCE LAW REVIEW 365 (1979).

[151] For one example, see 14 CFR § 302.24 (g) (2000) (DOT, Aviation Proceedings).

[152] 5 U.S.C. § 556(d) (1994).

subject to objection on other grounds.[153]

D. Intervention and Participation by Non-parties[154]

In some proceedings only the designated parties and the agency take part -- for example, proceedings for the revocation or suspension of licenses or permits, or for the imposition of civil money penalties. Other proceedings may attract participation by many people -- for example, Nuclear Regulatory Commission plant siting cases and Department of Transportation railroad track abandonment cases (49 U.S.C. § 10903 (Supp. IV 1998)). An agency may provide for different categories of participation: for example, *intervention* by interested persons wishing to become parties to the proceeding, thereby assuming all of the rights and duties of parties;[155] or various forms of *limited participation* by interested persons who have insufficient interest or inadequate resources to assume party status.[156]

Petitions to intervene must be handled expeditiously because persons cannot prepare their cases properly until they know their official status. If the ALJ has authority a ruling should be made promptly; if not, the petitions should be immediately

---

[153] *See, e.g.*, 46 CFR § 201.131(d) (2000) (DOT, Maritime Administration); 42 CFR § 1005.8(c)(2000).

[154] *See*, ACUS Recommendation 71-6, Public Participation in Administrative Hearings, 1 CFR § 305.71-6 (1992).

[155] See for example 14 CFR § 302.20 (2000) (DOT Aviation Proceedings); 17 CFR § 10.33 (2000)(Commodities Futures Trading Commission).

[156] See for example 17 CFR § 10.34 (2000) (Commodity Futures Trading Commission [CFTC], "Limited Participation"); 47 CFR § 1.223(b)(2000) (FCC); 17 CFR § 10.35 (2000) (CFTC, "Permission to state views"); 17 CFR § 201.210(c) (2000) (SEC: "Parties and limited participation"); 29 CFR § 2200.21(c) (2000) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission: "Intervention: appearance by non-parties"["The Commission or Judge may grant a petition for intervention to such an extent and upon such terms as the Commission or Judge shall determine."]).

referred to the agency[157]. Some agencies have fairly detailed requirements, or list factors to be considered, for intervention.[158] Others have generalized criteria.[159]

Although it is easier to manage a proceeding if all persons comply with the same rules, there are obvious advantages in providing a mode of limited participation for persons with limited interests that would be less expensive or burdensome than participation as a party. Agencies that allow such limited participation typically give the ALJ substantial discretion as to the scope of activity allowed.[160]

The ALJ should explain the rights of participants to inexperienced or uninformed persons, and should devise ways for them to introduce evidence or state their position with minimal disruption of orderly procedure. Generally, the ALJ may permit any person to appear, present evidence, submit argument, or cross-examine subject to the ALJ's supervision. A reasonable limitation on the number of persons permitted to submit similar evidence or arguments may be imposed. The ALJ may himself call such persons as witnesses and question them to develop facts or their point of view. Or, if there is no conflict of interest, or comparable problem, the ALJ may request agency staff to assist such persons or groups.

---

[157]Form 9 in Appendix I is a sample order granting, denying, and dismissing various petitions to intervene.

[158] See for example, 14 CFR § 302.20 (2000) (DOT Aviation).

[159] See for example, 24 CFR § 1720.175 (2000)(HUD; (1) applicable law; (2) directness and substantiality of petitioner's interest in the proceeding; (3) effect on the proceeding of allowing intervention).

[160] See for example, 14 CFR § 13.206(b)(2000)(FAA: "The administrative law judge may determine the extent to which an intervenor may participate in the proceedings."); 16 CFR § 3.14(a)(2000)(FTC: "The Administrative Law Judge or the Commission may permit the intervention to such extent and upon such terms as are provided by law or as otherwise may be deemed proper."); 29 CFR § 2200.21(c) (2000) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission: "The Commission or Judge may grant a petition for intervention to such an extent and upon such terms as the Commission or the Judge shall determine.")

In complex, multi-party, multi-issue cases, the ALJ may be authorized to limit the required distribution of documents to those persons who have a direct interest in the pertinent issue -- subject, of course, to the right of any participant to request copies of material distributed to other participants. Interested persons or groups with modest resources may be permitted to file copies of their documents in the agency's public reference room instead of reproducing and mailing them to all parties; or, if the material is extremely brief, it may even be read at the hearing without prior delivery to the parties.

Another possibility is to permit parties with limited resources to submit written testimony without being subject to cross-examination. This can sometimes be done by stipulation. In any event, subject to agency rules, such procedure may be authorized on the ALJ's own motion. Arrangements can vary with each case, but the ALJ should give each interested person as full and convenient an opportunity to participate as is consistent with that person's needs, the rights of others, and the efficient management of the proceeding.

E. Joint Presentations

Persons or groups having the same or similar interests may be encouraged to present part or all of their cases jointly, thereby easing the financial and work burden of each, saving the time of the other parties, and shortening the record. The ALJ may also encourage such persons or groups to select a single counsel to handle their cross-examination.

In cases of extreme complexity, with many parties, the ALJ may be able to *require* parties with the same or similar interests to be represented by a single counsel, or to join together in presenting a particular phase of their case[161]. This may include direct examination, cross-examination, and briefing. The ALJ may permit separate questions or argument about particular matters upon request by any counsel who shows that his position differs from other members of the group, or that his request to develop a point has been denied by the group counsel. Obviously, the ALJ's authority on such matters will depend on the agency's rules, and the ALJ's exercise of such authority must be exercised with

[161] *Cf.*, 21 CFR § 15.21(c) (2000) (FDA: "Public Hearing Before the Commissioner"). An example of such authority in the agency itself in appeals from ALJs can be found at 29 CFR 2200.95 (2000) (OSHRC).

careful regard to constitutional requirements related to due process and right to counsel.

F. Organizing the Complex or Multi-Party Hearing

Except in the shorter or simpler cases, the order of oral presentation should be established well before the hearing -- in the prehearing conference report or by other notice.

The party with the burden of persuasion or proof should usually make the initial presentation, followed first by persons in support, second by persons in opposition, and then by others, if any. This order may be varied to fit the specific case. For example, frequently it is convenient to hear civic or consumer groups or individual participants with comparatively short presentations first. Or such participants may be permitted to appear at a scheduled time even though this interrupts other testimony. In multi-party proceedings each category of parties might be heard in alphabetical order or in any other convenient sequence.

Some parties or interested persons may find it impossible, or extremely inconvenient or expensive, to be represented at all sessions of the hearing. This is particularly true in lengthy and complicated cases with multiple issues, some of which are of no interest to certain participants.

While a party and counsel are responsible for protecting the party's interest at all times, the ALJ should take reasonable action, consistent with adjudicatory responsibilities, to prevent the absence of the party and counsel from prejudicing the party's interest. Any person's scheduling problems may be called to the attention of counsel and counsel may be requested to take reasonable action to keep such persons informed as to the progress of the hearing. Counsel will frequently oblige, out of professional courtesy.

Major changes in scheduling, such as recalling a witness or having an additional day of hearings, will often inconvenience other parties. In some instances, however, the ALJ may be able to make minor changes, such as recessing a hearing early and advising counsel to be present at the next session so that counsel can hear the pertinent testimony. The ALJ should encourage reduction of these problems by informal agreement among counsel -- for example, agreement that certain issues will not be pursued on certain days or that upon request counsel will advise an absent party when a specific matter will be presented.

G. Special Committees

When numerous parties or persons enter appearances it may be possible, and advisable, to designate a representative for each identifiable group to discuss with the ALJ and other parties interim or emergency procedures. Through a committee of such representatives, the ALJ or any party may communicate with each group to obtain its viewpoint or position. If any person objects to this procedure and does not wish to be represented, it is usually a simple matter to give him personal notice.

H. Telephone or Videophone Conference

Conferences can be conducted either by telephone or videophone. Such a procedure was specifically authorized at the Federal Communications Commission as early as 1991,[162] and it has become quite common for the ALJ now to have broad authority to hold conferences by telephone.[163] The benefits of telephone conferences are obvious. They can eliminate the expense and inconvenience of travel or the delay of correspondence. They also are helpful when immediate access to data at a party's home office is desirable.

Although it may not be a practical means of conducting a large conference with many parties or numerous issues, such as a prehearing conference in a complicated rate or route case or a merger, it may save much time and travel in a simple case with

---

[162] 47 CFR § 1.248(f) (1991).

[163] For example, 5 CFR § 24.2324(d) (2000) (Federal Labor Relations Authority); 7 CFR § 1.140 (2000) (Department of Agriculture); 12 CFR § 19.31 (2000) (Comptroller of Currency); 17 CFR § 201.221(2000) (SEC); 29 CFR § 2700.53 (2000) (Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission). See also Hanson, Mahoney, Nejelski, and Shuart, *Lady Justice -- Only a Phone Call Away,* 20 Judges' Journal 40 (No. 2, Spring 1981), and accompanying notes on personal experiences with telephone conferences. For some practical guidance, see the ABA's little booklet, Telephone-Conferenced Hearings: A How-To Guide for Judges, Attorneys, and Clerks (1983). For a case upholding procedures where the actual hearing, not just the prehearing conference, was conducted by telephone conference, see Casey v. O'Bannon, 536 F. Supp. 350 (E.D. Pa. 1982).

simple issues or few parties. It may also be helpful and save time in complicated cases when a party has a simple procedural question. For example, when a postponement is requested, a party by a telephone call to the ALJ may initiate a telephone conference with representatives of the principal parties in order to solve a problem that would require weeks of correspondence or numerous telephone calls.

The earlier generation of videophones have seldom been used for conferences. With improved and simplified technology, and the prospect of increasing travel costs, it is probable that the use of videophone conferences will increase[164]. Needless to add, technological developments related to the transmission of live images and voices over the Internet, satellite, or other media, will facilitate, and are likely to revolutionize conferences in the 21st century.

Some things must not change, however. Whatever devices are used to facilitate long-distance or "virtual" conferences, the ALJ is responsible for maintaining a clear record. The ALJ should assure, for example, that each participant is identified or clearly identifiable each time he or she speaks and that all documents referred to be clearly identified.

I. Additional Conferences

Additional conferences, if needed, may be called at any time. These serve the same purposes as the original prehearing conference, as well as to rectify or revise procedures that have broken down or to cope with new problems. Sometimes an additional conference may be scheduled at the opening of the hearing; but if further prehearing preparation is likely to be needed, the conference is best scheduled a reasonable time before the hearing.

J. Trial Briefs or Opening Statements

Some cases, particularly complex ones, can be facilitated by pre-trial briefs stating the principal contentions of the parties, the evidence to be presented and the purposes for which it is submitted, the names of the witnesses, and the subjects each witness will discuss. Such briefs may also present the results of research the ALJ has requested on legal or technical

---

[164] Bulkeley, *Eye Contact: The Videophone Era May Finally Be Near, Bringing Big Changes*, Wall. St. J., March 10, 1992, at 1, col.6.

problems. The ALJ may instruct each party to include in the brief any procedural motions and requests, such as motions to strike proposed written evidence. In lieu of or in addition to the trial brief, the ALJ may require, or permit, an opening statement by counsel.

K. Interlocutory Appeals

The rules of some agencies prohibit an immediate appeal from an ALJ's interlocutory ruling without the ALJ's permission and a finding that an appeal is necessary to, for example, prevent substantial detriment to the public interest or undue prejudice to any party[165]. Strict application of such a rule prevents unnecessary delay, avoids consumption of the agency's time on minor procedural matters, and saves the time and labor of the persons who would have to participate in the appeal[166]. The ALJ's rulings remain subject to review when the case is before the agency for review on its merits, and the reviewing agency ordinarily has ample authority to correct any problems which may result from a denial of interlocutory appeal[167]. Other agencies, although not always requiring an affirmative finding by the ALJ that an appeal is desirable, may impose such restrictions as to make permission of the ALJ and affirmative findings necessary

---

[165] For an example, see 14 CFR § 13.219(b) (2000) (FAA civil penalty actions; delay on ruling would be detrimental to the public interest or result in undue prejudice to any party. For a provision vesting considerable discretion in the ALJ, see 15 CFR § 904.253(a)(2000)(Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) (interlocutory appeal "if the Judge determines that an immediate appeal therefrom may materially advance the ultimate disposition of the matter." For a similarly worded provision, see 43 CFR § 4.1124 (2000) (Department of Interior, surface coal mine hearings and appeals.) See also ACUS Recommendation 71-1, Interlocutory Appeal Procedures, 1 CFR § 305.71-1 (1992).

[166] Form 7 in Appendix I is a sample submission to the agency of an appeal from an interlocutory ruling.

[167] *See*, 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) (1994) (reviewing agency has all powers it would have had if it had made the initial decision, subject to agency's own rules or orders).

except in a few specified circumstances.[168]

L. Mandatory Time Limits

To speed up administrative proceedings, Congress by statute,[169] and some agencies by regulation,[170] have sometimes imposed time limits for completion of some or all of the steps in formal administrative proceedings. Rigid time limits often have undesirable consequences, but when imposed they do provide participants early notice of the time available and they also provide the ALJ with authority and support for the imposition and enforcement of deadlines. This authority, of course, can be used to expedite and streamline complex cases.[171]

---

[168] See for example, 16 CFR § 3.23(a) and (b)(2000) (FTC); 17 CFR § 10.101 (2000)(Commodity Futures Trading Commission).

[169] For example, Congress as of 1988 had imposed time limits on certain proceedings pursuant to 19 U.S.C. § 1337 (1988). However, that statute has been amended to eliminate the time limit, substituting for it a provision requiring the agency to establish a target date for its final determination. 19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(1) (1994)(The amendment was among those contained in P.L. 103-465, Title II, Subtitle B, Part 2, § 261(d)(1)(B)(ii), Title III, Subtitle C, § 321(a), 108 Stat. 4909, 4910, 4943).

[170] Since the 3rd edition of this Manual was published, such regulations seem to be on the decline. For example, two regulations cited as examples in the 3rd edition, 17 CFR § 10.84(b)(1992)(CFTC), and 16 CFR § 3.51 (1992) (FTC), have been amended. 17 CFR § 10.84(b) (2000) no longer imposes time limits, and 16 CFR § 3.51 (2000) allows the ALJ to request an extension of time, although the ALJ's decision, with some exceptions, still must be issued within one year.

[171] See for example, 5 CFR § 1201.73(f)(3) (2000) (Merit Systems Protection Board: "Because of the short statutory time limit for processing these cases, parties must file their submissions by overnight Express Mail . . . if they file their submissions by mail."); 29 CFR § 525.22 (2000) (Department of Labor, Wage & Hour Division, employment of workers with disabilities under special certificates:

The Administrative Conference of the United States, long familiar with the delays involved in complex administrative proceedings, considered this problem in 1978[172]. At that time it found that rigid statutory time limits tended to undermine an agency's ability to establish priorities and to control the course of its proceedings, and that such limits enabled outside interests to impose their priorities upon an agency through suit or threat of suit.

The Conference recognized, however, the value of time limits for reducing administrative delay and recommended that time limits should be established by the agencies rather than by statute. It advised, further, that if Congress does enact time limits, it should recognize that special circumstances may justify an agency's failure to act within a predetermined time, and it should require agencies to explain departures from the legislative timetable in current status reports to affected persons or to Congress.[173]

Although statutory time limits may hinder the efficient and fair processing of some cases, and may be impossible to meet in others, the ALJ should, if possible, adopt procedures and rules which meet these deadlines. The ALJ should always keep accurate records of the steps involved and any difficulties encountered that will explain any failure to meet time limits. Such information can be of value to the agency or the Congress in appraising both agency performance and the appropriateness of time limits.

M. Summary Proceedings

Delays in the administrative process can be avoided by eliminating or curtailing evidentiary hearings when no genuine issue of material fact exists or when the factual evidence can be

---

"Because of the time constraints imposed by the statute, requests for postponement shall be granted only sparingly and for compelling reasons.").

[172] E. Tomlinson, *Report on the Experience of Various Agencies with Statutory Time Limits,* 1978 ACUS Recommendations and Reports 119 ("Time Limits on Agency Actions"); ACUS Recommendation 78-3, 1 CFR § 305.78-3 (1993).

[173] *Id.*

submitted in written form.

The Administrative Conference of the United States recommended the adoption of procedures providing for summary judgment or decision[174]. The Conference's recommendation contains a model rule that was adopted nearly verbatim by several agencies, including the Commodity Futures Trading Commission,[175] and the Federal Communications Commission[176] and the Federal Trade Commission[177]. Other agencies, including the Consumer Product Safety Commission,[178] the Environmental Protection Agency,[179] and the Department of Transportation,[180] have rules that are consistent with the ACUS recommendation. In fact, provision for summary decision is quite common in agency regulations.[181]

Moreover, explicit agency regulations may not be absolutely necessary. Although the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's rules did not specifically authorize the ALJ to use summary proceedings in 1979, the Commission ruled that under the ALJ's powers to control a proceeding and to dispose of procedural matters he had authority to rule on motions for summary

---

[174] Recommendation 70-3, Summary Decision in Agency Adjudication, 1 CFR § 305.70-3 (1993). As discussed in the Preface to the 2001 Interim Internet edition, and elsewhere in this Manual, funding for the Administrative Conference of the United States (ACUS) ceased in and ACUS is no longer an operative agency of the federal government.

[175] 17 CFR §§ 10.91-10.92 (2000).

[176] 47 CFR § 1.251 (2000).

[177] 16 CFR § 3.24 (2000).

[178] 16 CFR § 1025.25 (2000).

[179] 40 CFR §§ 164.91, 164.121 (2000).

[180] 49 CFR § 511.25 (2000).

[181] See for example, 10 CFR § 2.749 (2000) (Nuclear Regulatory Commission); 21 CFR § 12.93 (2000) (FDA); 29 CFR § 1841 (2000) (Department of Labor, Office of Administrative Law Judges); 29 CFR § 1905.41 (2000) (Department of Labor, variances from safety and health standards); 29 CFR § 2570.67 (2000) (Department of Labor, Pension & Welfare Benefits, assessment of civil penalties).

judgment[182]. Thus, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's action suggests that, unless specifically forbidden, an ALJ could use this procedure under his general powers to control a formal proceeding.[183]

ALJs handling cases amenable to summary disposition may benefit from consulting the appropriate provisions of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and referring to Professor E. Gellhorn's discussion of the summary decision in his report to the Administrative Conference of the United States in support of the Conference's recommendation.[184]

N. ADR

It almost goes without saying that ADR and the authority created by the ADR Act[185] will offer even more opportunities for ALJs to streamline all sorts of difficult and complex cases. The ALJ now can be authorized, among other things, to hold conferences addressing the use of ADR procedures, to encourage the use of ADR methods, and even to require attendance at conferences by representatives of parties who have the authority to negotiate concerning the resolution of issues in controversy[186]. ADR's potential for expediting and simplifying

---

[182]Minnesota Power & Light Company, Docket No. ER78-425 (March 26, 1979);and Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, 10 FERC ¶63,068 (April 30, 1980).

[183]5 U.S.C. § 554(c)(1994), for example, states that the agency is to give interested parties an opportunity for "the submission and consideration of facts . . . when time, the nature of the proceeding and the public interest permit." (Emphasis added.) If facts in a case are essentially uncontroverted or uncontested, it would seem implicit in this provision of the APA that an ALJ would be authorized to resolve the case in summary judgment fashion. In a related vein, courts have recognized that cross-examination is not an absolute right under the APA. Cellular Mobile Systems of Pa., Inc. v. FCC, 782 F. 2d 182 (D.C. Cir. 1985).

[184]*See* E. Gellhorn and W. Robinson, *Summary Judgment in Administrative Adjudication,* 84 HARV. L. REV. 612 (1971).

[185]See text *supra*, accompanying notes 28, 70.

[186]See text *supra* at notes 27-29.

complex proceedings has barely been tapped. Techniques such as mediation, early neutral evaluation (ENE), the settlement judge, minitrials, and arbitration[187] will become available in various agencies,[188] Ingenuity and innovation will suggest new hybrids. There will be challenges, as in the past, to adapt to changing circumstances. There will also be opportunities once more to demonstrate how versatile and valuable the Administrative Law Judge, as an institution, can be.

V. HEARING

A. Preparation

1. Notice

A notice of hearing complying with statutory requirements and agency rules should be served upon all parties[189]. In addition, statutory provisions or agency rules may require notice to be published in the Federal Register[190]. Even though

---

[187]See *supra*, text at notes 30-80.

[188]See for example, 48 CFR § 6302.30 (2000)(DOT Board of Contract Appeals; states that Board has adopted two ADR methods, Settlement Judges and Mini-Trials); 18 CFR § 385.604 (2000)(Department of Energy, alternative dispute resolution includes but is not limited to conciliation, facilitation, mediation, factfinding, minitrials, and arbitration); 14 CFR § 17.33 (FAA, Department of Transportation)(2000); 40 CFR § 22.18 (Environmental Protection Agency; civil penalties, revocation, termination, suspension of permits).

[189]Forms 10-a and 10-b in Appendix I are examples of notices of hearing.

[190] For examples of regulations regarding publication of notice in the Federal Register, see 7 CFR § 1200.5 (2000) (Department of Agriculture) (Rules of Practice regarding proceedings to formulate or amend an order); 10 CFR § 2.104 (2000) NRC); 14 CFR § 77.49 (2000) (FAA; objects affecting navigable airspace): 16 CFR § 3.72 (2000) (FTC, Reopening of certain proceedings); 21 CFR § 1301.43 (2000) (Drug Enforcement Administration, registration of manufacturers, distributors, dispensers of controlled substances); 40 CFR §

responsibility for notice may fall on agency staff, the ALJ should personally make certain that all legal requirements are complied with and that all persons who participated in the prehearing conference or who requested notice receive actual notice.

2. Place of Hearing

The APA, with respect to formal adjudicative hearings, provides expressly that "due regard shall" be paid to the "convenience and necessity of the parties" in fixing the place, and time, of hearings[191]. Accordingly, the ALJ should consider holding the hearing in the field if anyone suggests it. Agency rules and unavailability of travel funds may override the ALJ's willingness to hold field hearings. (However, agency rules quite commonly track the APA with respect to the place of hearing.[192]) In the absence of budget constraints or clearly applicable agency rules, factors to be considered are the convenience of interested persons, the suitability of the hearing facilities involved, and the locations of the parties and witnesses. Sometimes, when several geographical areas are affected or interested persons have different places of business or interest, it may be desirable to hold sessions in two or more places. In some agencies such as the Social Security Administration and the Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission, the problem of travel is reduced by stationing ALJs in the field. Even so, the ALJs of such agencies frequently travel in order to hold hearings at sites convenient to the parties and witnesses.

In agencies where field hearings are not fairly routine, the site of the hearing often is an ad hoc matter. Especially in such agencies, another factor to be considered is the nature of

---

179.20 (2000) (EPA, Pesticide Programs).

[191] 5 U.S.C. 554 (b) (1994).

[192] See for example, 7 CFR § 47.15(c) (2000) (Department of Agriculture, reparation proceedings; "careful consideration to the convenience of the parties"); 10 CFR § 2.703(b) (2000) (Nuclear Regulatory Commission, domestic licensing proceedings); 14 CFR § 13.55 (2000) (FAA); 29 CFR § 2200.60 (2000) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission, "as little inconvenience and expense to the parties as is practicable"; 49 CFR § 821.37 (2000) (NTSB, air safety proceedings).

the parties. For example, if a private party is seeking a lucrative privilege or a benefit such as a license, it may be fair to place the travel burden on him. However, if the agency threatens imposition of a sanction or withdrawal of a license, it may be more equitable to hold the hearing at the place requested by, or convenient to, the respondent.

An early determination of the place of hearing benefits all parties. If a prehearing conference is held, the ALJ should announce the time and place of hearing either at the conference or in the conference report. If no conference is held, the announcement is made in the Notice of Hearing. In cases where a field hearing is scheduled, an order should be issued, and the parties notified. Where appropriate, the hearing may be publicized in the local communities affected.[193]

3. Hearing Facilities

Comfortable and functional hearing facilities are of real assistance in developing an accurate record. Most agencies have satisfactory hearing facilities at their home offices. Moreover, the ALJs of agencies which commonly hold field hearings may develop and share an extensive network of contacts with governmental and non-governmental bodies which can provide suitable hearing facilities. However, locating or obtaining such facilities still may be difficult, especially for an ALJ whose agency rarely holds field hearings. There are several potential sources of information about hearing facilities: other federal Administrative Law Judges; the offices of hearings and appeals of various federal agencies; local and regional offices of various federal agencies; state Administrative Law Judges or hearing officers (especially those in agencies such as workers' compensation); and state agencies themselves. These are only some of the sources which may provide information helpful in locating hearing facilities. Another source of information abut hearing facilities is the regional office of the GSA Public Building Service, or the manager of a federal building in the

[193] *See,* 7 CFR § 900.4 (2000) (Department of Agriculture, proceedings for marketing orders; authorizing Administrator, among other things, to issue press release regarding hearing); 7 CFR § 1200.5 (2000) (Department of Agriculture, proceeding under research, promotion, and education programs); 40 CFR § 142.33(a) (2000) (EPA, drinking water, Federal Register and newspaper of general circulation).

area where the ALJ contemplates holding the hearing.

If all else fails, the ALJ may be able to obtain adequate facilities by making arrangements directly with a local college, school, library, civic association, hotel, or any other public or private organization with satisfactory facilities. Counsel or interested persons in the area may provide assistance. In some agencies the staff arranges for the hearing room subject to the ALJ's approval.

The ALJ should inspect the hearing room a substantial time before opening the hearing, if possible, to check the heating or air conditioning, lighting, furniture arrangement, seating facilities, and the public address system. The furniture should be arranged so that everyone in the room can see and hear the witnesses, and the reporter can see and hear the ALJ, the witnesses, and counsel.

The ALJ is responsible for the hearing room and furniture, and should take care to maintain them in the condition in which they are received. The ALJ should remind participants to refrain from unauthorized use of telephones that may be found in the hearing facilities. Smoking or eating in the hearing room should be prohibited whether or not the hearing is in session. If night or weekend sessions are contemplated the ALJ should make necessary arrangements for opening and closing the room. If parties must leave documents overnight in the hearing room, the ALJ should arrange for overnight security.

B. Mechanics of the Hearing

There is no rigid script for a formal administrative hearing, although traditionally the party with the burden of proof makes the first presentation. Still, the organization and form depend upon such factors as agency rules, the type of case, the issues, the number of parties and witnesses, agency custom, and the temperament of the ALJ. The one universal criterion is the development of a fair, adequate, and concise record.

A formal administrative hearing should possess substantially the same formality, dignity, and order as a judicial proceeding. It should move as rapidly as possible, consistent with the essentials of fairness, impartiality, and thoroughness.

1. Transcript

Formal proceedings are recorded verbatim[194]. The reporter

[194] *See*, 5 U.S.C. § 556(e) (1994).

may use shorthand, stenotype, or any other recording device. (In some agencies, the rules may authorize or contemplate tape recording, rather than stenographic reporting.[195])

Agency rules and policies vary considerably when it comes to the cost of transcripts to a party or other interested person. In many agencies, copies of the transcript are made available at rates established by the agency, although some agencies have provisions for furnishing a copy without charge, and with the advent of the Internet, a transcript may be available on an agency website[196]. Daily copy may be available, but at a substantial premium if the reporting is done by a private company. Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, an agency, subject to certain exceptions, may be required to make copies of the transcript available to any person at actual cost of reproduction[197]. In addition, agencies can make copies of transcripts available for inspection at the agency offices.[198]

Since an accurate transcript is essential the ALJ should insure faithful reproduction. With an unfamiliar reporter, it may be desirable to have material read back early in the hearing to determine its accuracy. Before opening the hearing the ALJ should supply the reporter with the names of the parties and counsel, their physical location in the hearing room, and any

---

[195] *See*, 5 CFR § 1201.53 (2000) (Merit Systems Protection Board); 38 CFR § 20.714 (2000) (Board of Veteran's Appeals; 7 CFR § 11.8(c)(5)(iii) (2000) (Department of Agriculture National Appeals Division Rules of Procedure); 40 CFR § 24.16 (2000) (EPA, certain hearings on corrective action orders).

[196] *See*, 10 CFR § 2.750(a) (2000) (Nuclear Regulatory Commission: http://www.nrc.gov). For examples of agency rules dealing with traditional forms of transcript, see 20 CFR § 416.1565(o) (2000) (Social Security Administration: SSI, payment may be waived "for good cause"); 34 CFR § 81.18(a) (2000) (Department of Education, General Education Provisions Act: transcript available "at a cost not to exceed the actual cost of duplication").

[197] *See* 5 U.S.C. App. § 11 (1994). *See also*, 1 CFR § 305.71-6 (1993) (Administrative Conference Recommendation, Public Participation in Administrative Hearings).

[198] For example, see 10 CFR § 2.750(a) (2000) (NRC Public Document Room); 47 CFR § 1.202 (2000)(FCC).

other information that will help the reporter identify the participants. The reporter should be stationed where the ALJ, witnesses, and counsel can be easily heard. The reporter should be told to notify the ALJ if there is a need to change tapes, an inability to hear the parties, personal fatigue, or some other difficulty that might interfere with obtaining an accurate transcript. However, the reporter should not interrupt the proceeding except for such reasons.

Upon request and subject to agency rules, counsel may be permitted to record the hearing for his own use, provided the recording is done unobtrusively. However, the transcript is the only official record of the hearing.

2. Convening the Hearing

The ALJ should convene the hearing, announce the title of the case, and, if appropriate, give preliminary instructions concerning decorum, procedure, and hearing hours. The opening should, of course, be adapted to the type of case and the circumstances. When all interested persons are represented by knowledgeable and experienced counsel the opening statement can be brief. But if counsel or interested persons who are not acquainted with the agency's hearing procedure are present, the ALJ should explain in detail what the case is about and the procedures to be followed.

Appearances should be entered in the same manner as at the prehearing conference[199]. Ideally, any preliminary motions of substance should have been addressed and decided prior to commencement of the actual hearing. However, where this is not feasible, the ALJ, after appearances are entered, should receive and either dispose of or take under advisement, any preliminary motions. Motions relating to hearing procedures should normally be disposed of immediately.

Each witness should be sworn before testifying[200]. When a

---

[199]*See* text *supra* at notes 93-94.

[200]The following oath or affirmation is sufficient: "Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (so help you God)?" In exceptional cases, such as religious objections to both oaths and affirmations, it would appear that no particular form of words is required. A statement indicating that the witness is aware of the duty to tell the truth and understands that he or she can be

person testifies before being sworn, the oath can be modified to cover testimony previously given.

In a case with few witnesses, all or most of whom are present at the opening of the hearing, it sometimes saves time and is more convenient to swear all potential witnesses in a group at the opening of the hearing. If some do not testify, no harm is done. Witnesses not present at the opening of the hearing can be sworn later.

3. Trying the Simple Case

Again, the distinctions between simple and complex cases often are matters of degree. However, such distinctions provide a framework for organizing a discussion. The following remarks are addressed to the relatively simple case.

a. ***Opening Statement*** Before the parties present their direct cases the ALJ should give counsel an opportunity to make an opening statement setting forth the relief requested, a short description of the evidence to be submitted, and a short summary of other relevant matters. The ALJ may require all statements to be made at the opening of the hearing, or may permit each counsel to make a statement when presenting his direct case. Opening statements should not be subject to questioning except for clarification.

b. Direct Presentation. The ALJ should call upon each party to present its case in a predetermined order. In two-party cases it is customary to call on the party having the affirmative, if such distinction exists, to present his case first.

The rules of evidence in formal administrative hearings will be examined in more detail later in this Manual. However, for the purpose of discussing the relatively simple case, it should be noted that in many Federal administrative proceedings the Federal Rules of Evidence do not apply[201]. However, there are exceptions[202]. Moreover, even if the Federal Rules of Evidence

---

prosecuted for perjury for failure to do so should be sufficient. See Gordon v. State, 778 F. 2d 1397 (9th Cir. 1985)(involving deposition)

[201] See for example, 10 CFR § 1013.34 (2000) (Department of Energy, Program Fraud Civil Remedies and Procedures).

[202] For one exception, see 29 CFR § 2200.71 (2000) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission). However,

are not applicable by agency rule, they may provide guidance for filling in gaps, and in situations where the ALJ has discretion in conducting the hearing. For example, when the witness is friendly and there is a question of credibility, it is may be advisable for the ALJ to hark to the rule restricting leading questions.[203]

Some of the procedures for admission of exhibits which are discussed later, in connection with the complex case, may not be applicable in a simple case. Still, reference to that section may be helpful in addressing some of the difficult questions pertaining to the presentation and receipt of evidence. For present purposes, it should be noted that even in a "simple" case the ALJ should use prehearing conferences or other devices to lay the groundwork for smooth, professional handling of exhibits and other evidence. Agency rules may provide expressly for exchange of proposed exhibits prior to the hearing or similar procedures[204]. Moreover, when problems of authenticity are involved, and agency rules are not dispositive, the ALJ may be able to give substantial weight to Federal Rules 901-903.

c. Cross-examination. In proceedings involving more than two parties it is frequently advantageous to permit that party who has the most substantial adverse interest to cross-examine first. Otherwise the order of cross-examination may be prearranged at the ALJ's discretion.

On matters of credibility the ALJ should be alert to prevent both coaching the witness (indicating the answer desired by a nod or other signal) and the interruption of cross-examination by distracting objections or otherwise. On the one hand, the ALJ may permit more wandering, illogical, and perhaps less relevant questioning if counsel is in good faith attempting to trap a recalcitrant or possibly dishonest witness. On the other hand, the ALJ may find it desirable to let objecting counsel know that

---

in simplified proceedings (E-Z Trial) before the same agency, the Federal rules of evidence do not apply. 29 CFR § 2200.209(c)(2000).

[203]Fed. R. Evid. 611 (2000).

[204] See for example, 7 CFR § 15.113 (2000) (Department of Agriculture: Nondiscrimination); 28 CFR § 68.43 (2000) (Department of Justice: Unlawful employment of aliens and related employment practices); 29 CFR § 18.47 (2000) (Department of Labor).

frivolous objections are counter-productive, or to defer a recess or to refuse to go off the record. If witnesses are sequestered, it may be necessary to prevent witnesses who have not testified from talking to witnesses who have. This can frequently be accomplished by extending the length of the session to avoid overnight or other lengthy recesses. Also, it goes without saying that the ALJ should be alert to protect a witness, and the record, if the witness is unsophisticated, unfamiliar with courtroom procedure, timid, or suffering from any other personal trait or handicap that would make for vulnerability to the questioning of a clever or forceful lawyer. The ALJ should assure, as much as humanly possible, that the record reflects the witness' actual observations and viewpoints.

When cross-examination by all adverse parties is concluded, the ALJ should permit redirect examination on matters brought out on cross-examination.

If there is more than one party in an otherwise simple case, each party in turn should try its case in the manner outlined above except that each party should, during or at the conclusion of its direct presentation, rebut the case of any party that has previously presented its direct case. Each party should be permitted to rebut the cases of those parties that followed it in making their direct presentations.

The ALJ should usually excuse a witness when his testimony is concluded, subject to recall pending later developments at the hearing.

d. Miscellaneous. Administrative proceedings conducted under particular statutes, types of regulations, or agency customs may present special problems that call for alertness and ingenuity on the part of the ALJ. For example, in Social Security claims cases the agency is not represented and the claimant may appear without counsel[205]. Although these Social

---

[205] It should be noted that the Social Security ALJs operate under a special statutory regimen in disability cases, where they are not presiding over purely adversarial proceedings. In a sense, the Social Security ALJs are under a duty to independently consider the positions of all parties. See Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389 (1971); see also Rausch v. Gardner 267 F. Supp. 4, 6 (E.D. Wis. 1967)(ALJ wears "three hats.") Incidentally, the number of cases where a claimant is represented seems to have increased substantially. As of 1992, the rate of claimants represented by an attorney apparently was over 80%. Letter from Acting Chief Administrative Law Judge, dated May 20,

Security cases are not normally considered adversary proceedings, they do require a delicate sense of fairness and an extra effort by the ALJ to insure that the record is fully developed and that the claimant is fully aware that the ALJ is treating both the agency and the claimant fairly and impartially. Indeed, courts have remanded cases for further hearing when Administrative Law Judges have not met their special obligations in cases involving unrepresented claimants.[206]

The unrepresented party is more likely to be encountered in the "simple" cases. The ALJ often needs a high order of skill to deal with the inexperienced *pro se* party, especially in proceedings which structurally are more adversarial than Social Security disability cases. The *pro se* party may never have been in a hearing room or courtroom before. The ALJ sometimes is whipsawed between complying with the mandate of reviewing courts -- take the unrepresented party's circumstances into consideration -- and the simple fact that the unrepresented party may be difficult to control. This party may present the volatile combination of a weak case and strong feelings about the righteousness of his or her cause. Furthermore, *pro se* cases occasionally involve conflicting claims and personal animosity. A relatively small amount of benefits or penalty sometimes generates more ill-will and hard feelings than larger sums. Also, the ALJ sometimes must make special efforts to calm witnesses who are frightened, confused, or angry and must be

---

1992, to Morell E. Mullins, principal revisor of the 1993 edition of this Manual. Moreover, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the agency may seek, directly by legislation or indirectly by other means, to have legal representation at some hearings. *Cf.*, Salling v. Bowen, 641 F. Supp. 1046 (W.D. W. Va. 1986).

[206] The Ninth Circuit has stated that: "When a claimant is not represented by counsel, the administrative law judge has an important duty to scrupulously and conscientiously probe into, inquire of, and explore for all relevant facts and he must be especially diligent in ensuring that favorable as well as unfavorable facts and circumstances are elicited." Cruz v. Schweiker, 645 F.2d 812 (9th Cir. 1981). *See also*, Sims v. Harris, 631 F.2d 26 (4th Cir. 1980). Another typical case follows a similar philosophy, referring to the ALJ's duty to probe and explore relevant facts if a claimant is unrepresented by counsel and disabled. Poulin v. Bowen, 817 F.2d 865 (D.C. Cir., 1987).

prepared to cope with intemperate outbursts and, if worse comes to worse, even physical violence.

In enforcement cases brought by federal agencies, the problems may be particularly acute. The *pro se* party who is the subject of civil penalty or other proceedings brought by an agency, such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, may be quite angry. Even worse, the *pro se* party may have a yen to "play lawyer," but is handicapped by misunderstanding, fostered by the distortions of the popular media, about what lawyers do, and how they do it.

Other problems may arise in the "simple" case, even when a party is represented by counsel. For example, in enforcement cases, there is often a real need for an agency to protect sources of information, to develop evidence from hostile sources, and to prevent possible fabrication of rebuttal testimony. Use of some of the procedural devices previously discussed, such as prehearing discovery, may be modified or curtailed in such agencies, such as the National Labor Relations Board. In cases of this nature, devices similar to some of those described below, such as *in camera* inspection of documents,[207] may be helpful.

4. Trying the Complex Case

In addition to the suggestions set out under *Convening the Hearing* and *Trying the Simple Case,*[208] there are several techniques that the ALJ handling a complex case may find useful for developing a relatively concise, but complete and fair record. Applicability will depend on such variables as the type of case, the issues, the number (and possible grouping) of parties, and the place of hearing. Each case requires tailoring. A boiler-plate script or customary format may not be possible or desirable because of the great variety of types of cases heard by Administrative Law Judges in different programs and different agencies.

Nevertheless, the following discussion may be useful for arranging and organizing a hearing in a complex case. This discussion assumes that written testimony, both direct and rebuttal, has been exchanged a substantial period of time before

---

[207] See text *infra*, at notes 246-48.

[208] *See* text and text at notes *supra* 199-206.

the hearing commences.[209] Agency rules, or other considerations, may limit the ALJ's authority in this respect, of course.

a. Direct Presentation. In complex cases, the ALJ by prehearing order (or the agency rules) may have laid the groundwork for introduction of exhibits. If not, it may be desirable to hold a preliminary admissions conference, before the hearing, at which the parties identify their proposed exhibits, objections of opposing counsel are received, and the ALJ rules on the admissibility of challenged portions.

If written testimony has been exchanged as part of the prehearing development of a case, each party should be called upon in a predetermined order to present its entire case, including all rebuttal evidence. Counsel may be required or permitted to make an opening statement. This is not subject to cross-examination, though the ALJ and counsel may ask questions.

Normally counsel should present any exhibits for identification, and should specify which exhibits will be sponsored by each witness and the order of presentation. He should then call his first witness, qualify him, have him sponsor or authenticate his exhibits,[210] (if needed) and commence direct

---

[209] For examples of agency rules which contemplate exchange of written testimony or summaries, see 12 CFR § 308.106 (2000)(FDIC, General Rules of Procedure; ALJ may order parties to present part or all of their case in chief in the form of written statements and exhibits); 14 CFR § 16.223 (2000) (FAA Rules of Practice for Federally Assisted Airport Enforcement Proceedings; subject to certain exceptions, "party's direct and rebuttal evidence shall be submitted in written form in advance of the oral hearing pursuant to the schedule established in the hearing officer's prehearing conference report"); 15 CFR § 971.901 (2000) (National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, Deep Seabed Mining; "judges will have the power to . . . require the submission of part or all of the evidence in written form"); 18 CFR § 385.601(c) (2000) (FERC, Rules of Practice and Procedure; authorizing presiding officer to order exchange of exhibits and testimony in advance of the hearing).

[210] The sponsoring question may be phrased as follows: "Were exhibits _____ prepared by you or under your control and supervision, and are they true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?" For examples of some

examination. Testimony regarding exhibits may be confined primarily to the correction and clarification of exhibits and to matters that have occurred since the exhibits were prepared. Exhibit material should not be summarized, repeated, or read. Following direct examination, counsel should offer the witness' exhibits in evidence before the witness is released for cross-examination.

In the event that cross-examination on any exhibits has been waived, counsel, following their identification, may simply offer them in evidence[211]. They should be received, subject at any time to any objection other than lack of oral sponsorship.

b. Receipt of Exhibits. When exhibits are offered, the ALJ should consider motions to strike. The ALJ should take careful note of the material objected to and the basis of objection. When all objections have been received, the ALJ should announce what testimony (not otherwise objected to) is deemed improper, giving his reasons. Counsel for the witness should be permitted to reply. The ALJ should weigh the arguments, perhaps during a short recess, and rule on the admissibility of all challenged portions.

Factual exhibits are sometimes interlaced with argumentative, redundant, and inconsequential material. Rather than take the time to go through the procedures outlined above and to examine the exhibits word by word or line by line to strike such matter, it is frequently quicker, easier, and more satisfactory for the ALJ to announce that he will not consider such material, and that if anyone attempts to cross-examine on it, it will be stricken. Unless the exhibit is substantially lacking in relevant material or is so argumentative as to obfuscate the record, opposing counsel will usually acquiesce.

---

regulations pertaining to sponsorship or authentication, see 24 CFR § 180.645 (2000)(Housing and Urban Development; civil rights matters); 46 CFR § 201.131 (2000) (Maritime Administration); 7 CFR § 15.113 (2000) (Department of Agriculture, civil rights, authenticity of documents deemed admitted unless time written objection filed).

[211] For examples of agency rules contemplating the prehearing development of questions such as authenticity, see 7 CFR § 15.113 (2000) (Department of Agriculture, Hearings under Civil Rights Act of 1964); 17 CFR § 201.221(c)(3) (2000)(SEC); 29 CFR § 18.50 (2000) (Department of Labor).

The primary advantage of considering motions to strike at the outset is that it eliminates cross-examination on inadmissible evidence. Objectionable material, if admitted, frequently generates the most cross and redirect examination. Additional motions to strike may be entertained at any time based on further developments at the hearing.

The reporter should mark each exhibit "Received" or "Rejected" pursuant to the ALJ's ruling. Ordinarily, excluded material should not be physically removed but should accompany the record with the notation "Rejected". This material is not a part of the record and cannot be considered by the agency except to rule on the validity of its exclusion. Counsel should be directed to delineate stricken portions on all copies of the exhibit submitted for the record.

c. Cross-examination. Rules concerning cross-examination usually are an important part of the ground rules that are established by the ALJ at the prehearing conference and included in the conference report[212]. Whether by ground rules or otherwise, the ALJ should establish that order of cross-examination which will develop the most concise and clear record. This frequently cannot be determined until the direct examination has been completed. Ordinarily priority is given to that party likely to have the most extensive cross-examination or who has the greatest interest in the direct testimony.

Unless witness credibility is involved, cross-examination is frequently confined to clarifying the exhibits, determining the source of the material, and testing the basis for the witness' conclusions. As stated previously, one writer has suggested that the major rebuttal of expert opinion testimony should take place not by cross-examination but by submission, prior to the hearing, of rebuttal testimony prepared by the opponent's experts[213]. In any event, when cross-examination with respect to opinion testimony is needed in an attempt to demonstrate inconsistencies or improbabilities, the ALJ should not let the examination degenerate into mere rhetoric. The ALJ also may find it helpful to gently remind counsel that there is no jury present.

Cross-examination should be limited to matters covered on direct unless there are special reasons for further questions. A

---

[212] *See* text at notes 98-99 *supra*, and Appendix I, Form 3,¶8.

[213] *See* text *supra* at note 150 (Benkin).

departure may be justified, for example, if a party is seeking to elicit from the witness information that cannot readily be obtained in any other way, or if limiting the testimony would result in the witness being recalled later.

Although usually only those parties adversely affected by a witness' testimony should be permitted to cross-examine, special circumstances may make it appropriate to deviate from this practice. For example, counsel representing a community which favors an application should be permitted to cross-examine an applicant's witnesses if the applicant shows only mild interest in, and makes a weak factual presentation in support of, an application in which the affected community has an important interest.

Generally, counsel should not be permitted to interject questions during cross-examination by other counsel. However, like all general principles, this is subject to exception, especially where counsel is intervening in good faith for the sake of clarification and the clarification would clearly save substantial time.

d. Rebuttal Testimony. As previously stated, rebuttal testimony ideally could be included in the party's original presentation, especially where parties had originally exchanged written testimony. However, the ideal is not always possible. For example, agency rules may not allow a ALJ to require full exchange of written testimony prior to the hearing. Or, the case may be of a type which is not susceptible to that kind of approach. Moreover, additional rebuttal evidence may become available after the hearing begins. If rebuttal evidence later becomes available, or if another party later presents new material that requires some response, additional rebuttal, either oral or written, certainly may be permitted. If the rebuttal is extensive, a short suspension of the hearing or a temporary withdrawal of the witness may be necessary to permit counsel to prepare for cross-examination.

e. Redirect. Following cross-examination, redirect should be permitted, confined to matters brought out on cross-examination. A short conference between counsel and his witness may be allowed.

f. Multiple Witness Testimony. Sometimes the testimony can be clarified, expedited, and simplified by placing more than one

witness on the stand at the same time[214]. A panel of two or more witnesses is called to the stand. Counsel for the witnesses qualifies them individually, and may question them individually or collectively depending on the material covered and the circumstances. Following direct examination the panel may be cross-examined. Questions may be directed to the panel and answered by the witness or witnesses having the pertinent information, or the witnesses may be questioned individually, with counsel choosing the witness he prefers to answer the question. The possibilities are numerous. Following cross-examination, the panel may be subjected to redirect examination.

At the former Civil Aeronautics Board the ALJs used this device for many years[215]. Technical information was presented by a panel of two or more witnesses, each qualified on a different aspect of the evidence. Cross-examining counsel, uncertain about whom to direct a particular question to, would ask the question, and the witness having the pertinent information would answer. This procedure proved quicker and made a cleaner record than examining the witnesses seriatim with the frequent necessity of repeating previously unanswered questions and for recalling an earlier witness.

Similar procedures have been used by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which used panels of witnesses for technical cases involving rates and licensing,[216] and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.[217]

---

[214]P. Nejelski and K. Shuart, *Trial Balloon -- Is Multiple Witness Testimony Worth a Try?,* 7 Litigation Magazine 3 (Winter 1981).

[215] Ruhlen, MANUAL FOR ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES 47 (Administrative Conference, 1982).

[216]P. Nejelski and K. Shuart, *supra* note 214, at 3. In a telephone conversation during 1992 with Morell E. Mullins, revisor for the 1993 edition of this Manual, Chief Administrative Judge Curtis Wagner, FERC, reported that he still used this technique.

[217] For example, NRC rules regarding hearings on license transfer applications provide for panels of witnesses. 10 CFR § 2.1323(e) (2000).

Details on witness panel testimony were provided in a telephone conversation, March 26, 1992, between Judge Ivan Smith, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and Morell E. Mullins,

Although testimony by multiple witnesses can be used to advantage in many types of cases and circumstances, it would seem particularly adapted to cases involving cross-examination on highly technical evidence submitted before the hearing in written form where there is no substantial question of credibility of witnesses. Multiple witness testimony may also be used to advantage when it is necessary to have several witnesses testify as to a procedure in which they all participated or when the operation of a technical piece of equipment can best be explained by two or more experts. The feasibility and benefits of using this procedure will frequently depend on the ingenuity and resourcefulness of the ALJ and counsel.

The mechanics of eliciting such testimony are simple. Usually, two or more witnesses would be seated where they could be observed by the reporter, the ALJ, and counsel. Counsel directs questions to one or more specific witnesses or to the panel as he chooses, or as previously arranged. Each counsel cross-examines in the agreed-upon order. The procedure can be changed according to circumstances so long as it deprives no party of substantive rights.

Nevertheless, problems may arise with the use of multiple witness panels. Some of those problems can best be resolved at a prehearing conference or at a conference during the course of the hearing, where the ALJ and counsel can arrange for the specific questions to be considered and the procedures to be followed. For example, they may agree as to whether questions are to be directed to the panel as a whole or to individual witnesses. Furthermore, whether this procedure will be used or permitted may affect how testimony is to be prepared. The ALJ should also be alert to possible confusion if two or more witnesses start talking at the same time, if the witnesses start arguing, or if it is not clear what the question is or which witness is qualified to answer it. Another problem is that indexing the

---

principal revisor, 1993 edition of this Manual. Judge Smith indicated that he had used the multiple witness technique in the 3-Mile Island case. For some reported NRC cases which refer to witness panels, see In the Matter of Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), 30 NRC 331, 1989 NRC Lexis 69 (Docket Nos. 50-443-OL; 50-444-OL (Offsite Emergency Planning Issues, 1989); In the Matter of Florida Power and Light Co. (Turkey Point Plant, Units 3 & 4), 27 NRC 387, 1988 NRC Lexis 29 (Docket Nos. 50-250-OLA-2, 50-251-OLA-2, ASLBP No. 84-504-07-LA (Spent Fuel Pool Expansion), LBP-88-9A (1988)).

transcript by witness or subject may become more difficult.

Obviously, multiple witness testimony may not be feasible or desirable in many situations. For example, it may have little, if any, use when credibility of witnesses is at issue, when witnesses are sequestered, or the factual questions are to be covered by only one witness.

However, we are so accustomed to the seriatim testimony of one witness after another that we may have neglected too long a device which holds considerable potential for the complex case involving high-tech factual disputes. The use of multiple witness testimony or panels, on its face, seems quite compatible with due process and could enhance the truth-finding function of the ALJ. At least some agencies by rule explicitly allow, or at some time have allowed, multiple witness testimony or panels.[218]

g. Questions by the ALJ. The ALJ certainly may question a witness if there is good reason to do so. However, in an adversary proceeding where parties are represented by counsel, the ALJ should be very circumspect in exercising this power. Prudence should be the ALJ's watchword. For example, the ALJ ordinarily should not question a witness initially, before the parties have their opportunity to ask their own questions. However, on rare occasions, an ALJ might do so if it seems absolutely necessary for such purposes as: (1) preventing reversible error; (2) protecting the record against the inclusion of seriously misleading, obfuscating, or confusing testimony; or (3) avoiding serious waste of time by forestalling extensive, useless, or irrelevant examination by counsel who is incompetent, or worse. Within reason, and with due regard for the need to maintain both the fact and appearance of impartiality, the ALJ also may need to interrupt when the witness and counsel are at

---

[218] 10 CFR § 110.107(f) (2000) (NRC, Export & Import of nuclear equipment and material: "Participants and witnesses will be questioned orally or in writing and only by the presiding officer. Questions may be addressed to individuals or to panels of participants or witnesses."). For a provision which has since been repealed, see 40 CFR § 124.85 (1991) (EPA, evidentiary hearings for EPA-issued NPDES permits and EPA-terminated RCRA permits: authorizing hearing officer to "[p]rovide for the testimony of opposing witnesses to be heard simultaneously or for such witnesses to meet outside the hearing to resolve or isolate issues or conflicts.")(This section was removed, see 65 FR 30886 (May 15, 2000).

cross purposes, when the record may not reflect with clarity what the witness intends to convey, or when for some other reason assistance is needed to assure orderly development of the subject matter. At the close of cross-examination or redirect, the Judge may question the witness to clarify any confusing or ambiguous testimony or to develop additional facts. When the testimony of the parties' experts is inconclusive, or when no expert witnesses are presented, the Judge sometimes may find it necessary to call an expert as his own witness[219]. Indeed, the ALJ is not necessarily limited to calling expert witnesses. Where necessary, and subject to any agency or statutory constraints, the ALJ usually can call witnesses or adduce evidence on any crucial issue.[220]

h. Closing the Presentation. When written evidence has been exchanged before the hearing, all of a party's witnesses, including rebuttal witnesses, should normally be called and examined before the witnesses for the next party are called. When his testimony is completed, a witness should be excused subject to recall at the ALJ's discretion.

5. Rules of Evidence

Few legal concepts have become more deeply entrenched than the postulate that the strict common law rules of evidence do not apply, by their own force, to administrative proceedings. The

---

[219] Form 11 in Appendix I is a sample request for an expert to serve as an ALJ's witness. *See also,* Federal Administrative Judiciary, *supra* note 4 at 82-83. It should be emphasized that special circumstances exist, and even put a responsibility on, Social Security Administration Administrative Law Judges to be more active in questioning witnesses in that agency's non-adversarial proceedings. See *supra*, note 206.

[220] *See* 29 CFR § 2200.67(j) (2000) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission: authorizing ALJ to "[c]all and examine witnesses and to introduce into the record documentary or other evidence"). For recent articles discussing this issue, see Allen E. Schoenberger, The Active Administrative Law Judge: Is There Harm in an ALJ Asking?, 18 J. NAALJ 399 (1998); Jeffrey Wolfe and Lisa B. Prussic, *Interaction Dynamics in Federal Administrative Decision Making: The Role of the Inquisitorial Judge and the Adversarial Lawyer*, 33 Tulsa L. J. 293 (1997).

reasons for this are fairly plain. To the extent that traditional common law rules of evidence were developed to insulate jurors from certain kinds of information, they are not very relevant to the administrative proceeding, where there is no jury. Even before the APA, the inapplicability of the strict rules of evidence was well-established. For instance, Judge Learned Hand, in an opinion regarding the admission of hearsay in an NLRB proceeding, had approved a less rigorous standard, referring to "the kind of evidence on which responsible people are accustomed to rely in serious affairs."[221]

However, this does not necessarily mean that the rules of evidence prevailing in the courts can never be applied in agency proceedings. As usual, much depends on the organic statute governing the agency, and the agency's own rules. Statutorily, a legislature may require an agency to apply nearly any set of evidentiary rules. The statutory provisions governing unfair labor practice hearings before the NLRB, for instance, require that those proceedings, "so far as practicable, be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States under the rules of civil procedure for the district courts of the United States. . . ."[222] The variations are numerous. For example, one agency provides that the Federal Rules of Evidence (FIRE) will be employed as general guidelines, but that all relevant and material evidence shall be received.[223] Another provides that the FIRE shall apply unless provided otherwise by statute, and, additionally, that the presiding officer may relax the rules if the ends of justice "will be better served by so doing".[224]

Still, the APA provides something of a guide, or statutory norm: any oral or documentary evidence may be received, but the agency as a matter of policy must provide for the exclusion of

---

[221] NLRB v. Remington Rand, Inc., 94 F.2d 862, 873 (2d Cir.), *cert. den.*, 304 U.S. 576 (1938).

[222] 29 U.S.C. § 160(b) (1994).

[223] 49 CFR § 209.15 (2000) (Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Railroad Safety Enforcement Proceedings). For an NRC case, see Duke Power Co., 15 NRC 453, 475 (1982) (FIRE not directly applicable, but Commission looks to them for guidance).

[224] 16 CFR § 1025.43(a) (2000) (Consumer Product Safety Commission, Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings).

irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence[225]. Many agencies include provisions similar to the APA in their Rules of Practice[226]. However, some follow a different drummer and do apply the Federal Rules of Evidence.[227]

At any rate, the Federal Rules of Evidence are not controlling in administrative proceedings unless made so by statute or agency rule[228]. It is worthwhile, however, for the ALJ to be familiar with these rules. They can furnish guidance and insights which can help resolve evidentiary problems.

While technical rules of evidence often are not applicable in administrative proceedings, sound judgment concerning the probative value of proffered evidence is crucial. Relaxed rules of evidence may lull counsel into sloppiness, or tempt them to engage in deliberate tactics aimed at clouding the record with chaff. The ALJ must remain alert, and should strike, upon objection or upon his own motion, evidence so confusing, misleading, prejudicial, time wasting, repetitious, or cumulative that its pernicious influence outweighs its probative value.

---

[225] 5 U.S.C. § 556(d) (1994).

[226] See for example, 10 CFR § 2.743(c) (2000); 12 CFR § 622.8 (2000) (Farm Credit Administration); 14 CFR 13.222 (2000)(b) (2000) (FAA; civil penalty actions); 16 CFR § 3.43(b) (2000) (FTC); 18 CFR § 385.509 (2000) (FERC); 45 CFR § 81.78 (2000) (Health & Human Services, Part 80 proceedings).

[227] *See*, 29 CFR § 2200.71 (2000) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission). The Consumer Product Safety Commission also makes the Federal Rules applicable, but with loopholes. "Unless otherwise provided by statute or these rules, the Federal Rules of Evidence shall apply to all proceedings held pursuant to these Rules. However, the Federal Rules of Evidence may be relaxed by the Presiding Officer if the ends of justice will better served by so doing." 16 CFR § 1025.43(a) (2000) (rules of practice for adjudicative proceedings).

[228] For a significant article on the Federal Rules of Evidence and administrative law, see Pierce, *Use of the Federal Rules of Evidence in Federal Agency Adjudications*, 39 ADMIN. L. REV. 1 (1987). For a relevant Administrative Conference Recommendation, see 1 CFR § 305.86-2, *Use of the Federal Rules of Evidence in Agency Adjudications"* (1993).

Marginally relevant evidence is not merely useless; it is positively harmful because it inflates the record which the parties, the ALJ, and the agency must examine.[229]

a. Hearsay. Any rigid rule about hearsay is unsuited to the varied inquiries conducted by administrative agencies. Unless statute or agency rule dictates otherwise, hearsay should be admitted if it appears reliable and is not otherwise improper. It should be admitted if the nature of the information and the state of the particular record persuade the ALJ that it is useful.[230]

b. Best Evidence. Counsel sometimes offer a copy of a document without a proffer of the original. The accuracy and authenticity of the document may be assumed unless questioned. The agency rules[231] or the procedural ground rules adopted by the ALJ[232] may provide that the authenticity of proffered documents shall be deemed admitted unless written objections are filed within a specified time. The prehearing proceedings will frequently produce stipulations concerning the principal documents at issue and the facts they contain.

6. Offers of Proof

When documents offered in evidence are rejected they may, if requested by counsel, serve as offers of proof of the facts stated. When an objection to the receipt of oral testimony is sustained, counsel should be permitted, as an offer of proof, to state orally the substance of the evidence to be offered; or if

---

[229] *See* Union Stockyard Co. v. United States, 308 U.S. 213, 223-24 (1939); United States v. Bows, 360 F.2d 1, 7 (2d Cir. 1966), *cert. denied,* 385 U.S. 961 (1966); Fed. R. Enid. 401-403; and Gardner, *Shrinking the Big Case*, 16 Admin. L. Rev. 5 (1963).

[230] *See*, Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389 (1971).

[231] *See, e.g.,* 16 CFR § 3.32(b) (2000) (FTC); 47 CFR § 1.246 (2000) (FCC).

[232] *See* text at note 98, *supra*, and Appendix I, Form 3.

the offer is lengthy, the ALJ may require a written submission.[233]

Counsel may argue that permitting a rejected exhibit to accompany the record as an offer of proof will not save any time unless cross-examination is permitted. Nevertheless, cross-examination on an offer of proof should not be allowed -- absent agency rules or other overriding mandates -- because it would defeat the purpose of the exclusion.

7. Constitutional Privileges: Self-Incriminating Testimony, Search and Seizure, and Suppression of Evidence

The Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination, if invoked in an administrative proceeding, raises some complex and delicate issues. On the one hand, the privilege against self-incrimination is applicable to testimony in administrative proceedings. However, there are at least two important refinements which should be noted in this regard. First, the privilege against self-incrimination is personal and testimonial in nature, so ordinarily it does not apply to corporations,[234] other entities,[235] business records, and most records required by valid law or regulation to be kept.[236] Consequently, for

---

[233] For some examples of agency rules dealing with offers of proof, see 7 CFR § 1.141(h)(7) (2000) (Department of Agriculture); 14 CFR § 13.225 (2000) (FAA); 29 CFR § 2200.72(b) (2000) (Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission); 49 CFR § 511.43(g) (2000) (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration).

[234] U.S. v. White, 322 U.S. 694, 699 (1944).

[235] *See*, Bellis v. U.S., 417 U.S. 85 (1974); U.S. v. Greenleaf, 546 F.2d 123 (5th Cir. 1977).

[236] Shapiro v. U.S., 335 U.S. 1 (1948). *But see*, Marchetti v. U.S., 390 U.S. 39 (1968). To qualify as a record "required" to be kept the record must satisfy a three-part test: (1) the purposes for which it is kept must be essentially regulatory, (2) it must be the kind of record which the regulated party has customarily kept, and (3) it must have assumed "public aspects" which renders it analogous to public documents. Grosso v. United States, 390 U.S. 62, 67-68 (1968). In a later, and somewhat confused opinion, the Supreme Court ruled, in the context of a grand jury subpoena action, that the contents of certain business

documents, materials, and testimony which are not protected by the Fifth Amendment, it would seem that production or testimony may be compelled in accordance with the agency's usual procedures for requiring the production of evidence and testimony, which ordinarily require resort to the courts to enforce administrative subpoenas and orders Second, failure to assert this protection constitutes a waiver.[237]

In addition, if Fifth Amendment self-incrimination protections do apply, there are procedures under which a witness can be granted immunity and required to testify. Once a witness has claimed the privilege, the ALJ should refer any request to compel the witness to testify to the agency for determination pursuant to the relevant statute.[238]

The agency may, with the approval of the Attorney General, issue an order requiring an individual to provide testimony or other information which is withheld on the basis of the privilege against self-incrimination, but only if the agency concludes that the testimony or other information from the individual may be necessary to the public interest and that the individual has refused or is likely to refuse to testify or provide such information. If such an order is issued, the individual is immunized from any criminal prosecution based on his testimony or

---

records were not privileged, but that, under the facts of that case, the act of complying with the subpoena was within the privilege against self-incrimination. United States v. Doe, 465 U.S. 605 (1984).

Perhaps more basically, as the Supreme Court stated in Hoffman v. United States, 341 U.S. 479, 486-87 (1951), a contempt case stemming from grand jury proceedings, "The witness is not exonerated from answering merely because he declares that in so doing he would incriminate himself -- his say-so does not of itself establish the hazard of incrimination. It is for the court to say whether his silence is justified . . ., and to require him to answer if it clearly appears to the court that he is mistaken." (Citations and quotation marks omitted)

[237]United States v. Kordel, 397 U.S. 1, 10 (1970).

[238]*See* 18 U.S.C. §§ 6001-6005 (1994 & Supp. IV 1998).

information.[239]

Application of the Fourth Amendment's provisions regarding search and seizure likewise can be quite complex, even abstruse. Some issues, such as the agency's basic authority to inspect commercial premises without a warrant, are likely to be heard in the judicial branch[240]. The Administrative Law Judge perhaps is most likely to encounter Fourth Amendment issues in the context of efforts to exclude or suppress evidence allegedly obtained illegally, in violation of this, or other, constitutional rights. Thus far, the key Supreme Court decision is *INS v. Lopez-Mendoza*[241], which candidly resorted to balancing the likely social benefits of excluding unlawfully seized evidence against the likely costs of excluding it.

8. Argument on Motions and Objections

The ALJ may permit oral argument in support of or in opposition to motions and objections. If he finds it desirable, and not unduly delaying, he may request written memoranda upon disputed points. Whether or not oral argument is requested, exceptions to unfavorable rulings should be deemed automatic; there is no need for a constant chorus of "Exception" from counsel to preserve counsel's exceptions.

9. Confidential Information

---

[239] 18 U.S.C. §§ 6002, 6004 (1994 & Supp. IV 1998). For some agency rules regarding this process, see 14 CFR § 13.119 (2000) (FAA); 16 CFR § 3.39 (2000) (FTC); 16 CFR § 1025.39 (2000) (Consumer Produce Safety Commission; Flammable Fabrics Act).

[240] *See, e.g.*, New York v. Burger, 482 U.S. 691 (1987); Dow Chemical Co. v. U.S., 476 U.S. 227 (1986); Donovan v. Dewey, 452 U.S. 594 (1981); Marshall v. Barlow's, Inc., 436 U.S. 307 (1978).

[241] 468 U.S. 1032 (1984). For examples of cases where ALJs have been asked to resolve 4th Amendment search issues, see Globe Contractors, Inc. v. Herman, 132 F. 3d 367 (7th Cir. 1998) (OSHA); First Alabama Bank of Montgomery v. Donovan, 692 F. 2d 714 (11th Cir. 1982) (Compliance review under E.O. 11246, prohibiting discrimination by government contractors).

a. Methods of Handling Confidential Material.

When it is desirable to prevent competitors from obtaining information about specific trade relationships, it is sometimes possible to substitute symbols for names and to receive the information at the public hearing without an *in camera* session. When similar statements or reports from several individuals are involved, counsel may agree to identify, and cross-examine on, a number of representative reports and to receive the others without cross-examination and with no public identification other than symbols[242]. Alternatively, the parties may agree to submit data on a confidential basis to a neutral expert for preparation of summaries or averages. It is sometimes desirable to hold separate *in camera* sessions for different parties, with competitors excluded from each session. This may require the consent of the parties involved.

When it is desirable to have an advance written exchange of confidential material, the ALJ should develop appropriate safeguards to assure confidentiality. The ALJ may, for example, obtain the commitment of the parties receiving the material to limit its distribution to specific persons; or he may ask unaffected parties to waive the receipt of certain material. All copies of such material should bear a prominent legend stating the limitations upon its distribution pursuant to the order of the ALJ.

In some agencies, such as the FCC or FTC, confidential information, particularly material claimed to be proprietary information or trade secrets, may be handled by procedures contained in a protective order issued by the ALJ[243]. Such an order often is issued during prehearing discovery, as a result of a party's refusal to release material to an adversary party, an intervenor, or the agency staff without provision for confidential treatment. The request for the order is usually grounded on the claim that unrestricted release of the material

---

[242] *Cf.* North Atlantic Tourist Commission, 16 CAB 225, 227, 228, 234, 235 (1952).

[243] *See e.g.*, Exxon Corp. v. Federal Trade Commission, 665 F.2d 1274 (D.C. Cir. 1981). Some examples of agency rules pertaining to protective orders include: 10 CFR § 2.740 (2000)(NRC); 15 CFR § 25.24 (1991) (Department of Commerce, Program Civil Fraud Remedies); 16 CFR § 3.31(c) (2000) (FTC); 16 CFR § 1025.31(d) (2000) (Consumer Product Safety Commission); 18 CFR § 385.410 (2000) (FERC); 29 CFR § 18.15, (2000) (Department of Labor).

may result in its misuse, such as unfairly benefitting competitors. To guard against misuse of the information the order should provide the terms and conditions for the release of the material. It should also contain an agreement to be signed by users of the material, and may include procedures for handling the material if offered in evidence, including, for example, prior notification to the party submitting the material of the intention to offer it as evidence, and provisions for sealing the pertinent portions of the record, briefs, and decisions[244]. In some situations the ALJ may find it easier to allow the parties to draft a proposed order for his consideration.

The ALJ must recognize that the use of protective order procedures could be inimical to the concept of a public hearing. Consequently, extreme care must be exercised in the issuance and application of the order to insure that the integrity of the record is preserved and the rights of the parties and the public are given due consideration.

At the hearing, if material covered by the prehearing order is offered in evidence, the ALJ must decide whether the material should be admitted, rejected, or admitted with special protection[245]. To do this, the ALJ should examine the material, hear arguments, and make rulings *in camera*. If the ALJ rules that the material is not covered by the order and a request to appeal the ruling is made, the request should usually be granted, if interlocutory appeal on this issue is permitted by agency rules. Further action with respect to the material then would be deferred until the appeal is decided.

b. In Camera or Closed Sessions[246]. Hopefully, any issues

---

[244]Forms 19-a to -d in Appendix I are sample protective orders.

[245]*See,* 16 CFR § 3.45 (2000) (FTC); 49 CFR § 511.45 (2000) (DoT, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration).

[246]The 1982 edition of this Manual used the term "executive session" to refer to those parts of an administrative hearing closed by the ALJ, in order to consider confidential material and similar matters. However, trolling through the CFR and Lexis, the revisor in 1992 noticed a tendency for the term "executive session" to be used mainly in the context of non-public proceedings of the agency or board itself. See for example, 16 CFR § 4.15

involving confidential, privileged, or similar matter will have been raised and resolved during the prehearing stage of a case. However, much of what is discussed here would apply equally to handling the problems of confidential material during discovery and other prehearing proceedings.

By specific rule or under the general authority to regulate the course and conduct of the hearing, an ALJ not only may consider documents *in camera*, but also may hold *in camera* (i.e., closed) sessions to receive confidential material. However, closed sessions or *in camera* proceedings should be discouraged because they often create serious practical problems in the conduct of the hearing, in the preparation of briefs, and upon administrative and judicial review. However, they may prove unavoidable from time to time, especially in agencies which regularly deal with sensitive governmental, technical, or commercial information.

An *in camera* session is a part of the formal proceeding, but the testimony, documents, and exhibits received are not included in the public record[247]. This permits confidential receipt of evidence that may be, among other things, exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), especially "matters that are . . . specifically authorized . . . to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy . . .” or "trade secrets and commercial or financial information [which

---

(2000) (FTC). A Lexis search for "executive session" disclosed the use of that term in connection with ALJs or other hearing officers mainly in a few EPA regulations, such as 40 CFR § 85.1807(n)(3) (2000) (referring, apparently indiscriminately, to both *in camera* testimony and executive session); 40 CFR § 86.614-84(n)(3) (2000). The more commonly used term in the CFR seems to be "in camera." See for example, 16 CFR § 3.45(b) (2000) (FTC); 16 CFR § 1025.45 (2000) (Consumer Product Safety Commission); 40 CFR § 86.614-84(n)(2)(ii) (2000) (EPA: referring to "in camera proceeding"). Accordingly, for whatever difference it may make, the term "executive session" will not be used here.

[247] See for example, 16 CFR § 3.45(2000) (FTC); 16 CFR § 1025.45 (2000) (Consumer Product Safety Commission); 19 CFR § 210.*39* (2000) (International Trade Commission); 49 CFR § 511.45 (2000) (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration).

are] privileged or confidential."[248]

Subject to agency rules, an *in camera* session may be held when a witness, an attorney representing a party, or any other person objects to the public disclosure of any privileged or confidential information. Before granting an *in camera* session the ALJ should be sure that the evidence in question may qualify for protection pursuant to agency rule or statute. If the information to be received is classified, the ALJ should determine whether he and all of the participants have the required security clearance.

An *in camera* or closed session is justifiable only when the law or orderly development of the record and the needs of the parties require it. When this occurs during the hearing, the ALJ should announce that the public session is in recess, that an *in camera* or closed session will be held, and, if possible, that the public session will resume at a stated time. If the session is to be conducted at the end of the hearing, the ALJ should announce that the public session is closed and that an *in camera* or closed session will follow.

The *in camera* session should be attended only by the ALJ, the official stenographer, and such representatives of parties or interested persons as the ALJ designates, or the agency rules may

---

[248] 5 U.S.C. §§ 552(b)(1), (4) (1994, Supp. IV 1998). These provisions are part of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). 5 U.S.C. § 552 (1994, Supp. IV 1998.) An *in camera* session is not required merely because evidence arguably within FOIA may be involved. In fact, requests under FOIA for documents in the possession of federal agencies are generally dealt with under entirely separate regulations. However, the ALJ should be alert to the possibility that matters subject to discovery and *in camera* proceedings might be exempt from disclosure under FOIA. Agency hearing rules regarding material or evidence taken *in camera* sometimes overlap, or should be coordinated with, FOIA-type disclosure rules. Examples of regulations which make some effort in this direction are found in 16 CFR § 3.36(a) (2000) (FTC), 18 CFR § 385.410 (2000) (FERC), 49 CFR 511.45 (2000) (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration). At least one agency rule tries to distinguish between FOIA and discovery, 29 CFR § 2201.1 (2000) (Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, rules pertaining to FOIA, which state, "This part does not affect discovery in adversary proceedings before the Commission. Discovery is governed by the Commission's Rules of Procedure . . . .").

require. The names of all persons present must be recorded by the official stenographer. After the hearing room is cleared of all others, the session may be opened as follows:

> This is an *in camera* [or closed] session. I direct the reporter to keep the transcript of this session confidential until released by the agency; to record the names of the persons present and the fact that they were sworn to secrecy; to make only one transcription of the proceedings and immediately thereafter to place the typed record, together with the stenographic notes and any papers or exhibits received in evidence, in an envelope; to seal the envelope and deliver it to me (or such other agency official as is appropriate).

Before proceeding the ALJ should administer an oath or affirmation such as the following to *all* persons present, including himself:

> Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that you will hold secret and will not divulge in any manner whatsoever to any person any of the evidence or information which is adduced at this session until such time as the agency may by order indicate that the public interest does not require the continued withholding of such evidence or information, (so help you God)?

When the reason for secrecy is the desire to withhold information for competitive purposes and not national defense, the parties may modify their agreement about confidentiality in any manner they choose.

10. Supplemental Data

During the hearing counsel may request or the ALJ may require supplemental information. The ALJ may direct its submission during or after the close of the hearing. If submitted during the hearing, unless stipulated, a sponsoring or authenticating witness should be made available. If it is to be submitted after the close of the hearing, the ALJ should establish the date for submission, request a waiver of cross-examination, and set the date for filing objections. Even if waiver of cross-examination cannot be obtained in advance, it may be obtained after the parties have received the supplemental material. Otherwise it may be the basis for an objection. The ALJ should identify, by mark or otherwise, the information submitted and rule on all objections.

If the basis of an objection is the need for cross-examination, it should be accompanied by a statement of the specific purposes of such questioning. If it does not appear that cross-examination is "required for a full and true disclosure of the facts,"[249] or if the material is in any event subject to official notice, the objection should be overruled. Relevant statutory provisions and agency rules governing official notice must, of course, be followed. If the supplemental information is necessary and cross-examination is required, the ALJ should reconvene the hearing.

Sometimes the parties may stipulate that certain reports or other documents (such as production, income, or cost data), whether or not regularly scheduled, will be received in evidence when released, up to an agreed-upon time no later than final agency decision.

11. Mechanical Handling of Exhibits

As each exhibit is introduced, the reporter should be supplied with the number of copies specified in the rules (usually two). The ALJ should be supplied with one copy. All copies submitted must be legible. If corrections are required later, all copies should be manually corrected by the party submitting them or revised copies should be submitted. The reporter should transmit the exhibits to the agency's docket section with the pertinent parts of the transcript.

When sufficient copies of an exhibit are not available at the hearing, the original may be consigned to counsel with the understanding that it will be reproduced and returned to the ALJ, with copies to all parties. This action should be reflected on the record.

C. Concluding the Hearing

1. Oral Argument

Subject to agency rules, the ALJ either on his own motion or on request may permit or require oral argument on the merits of the entire case, or on specific issues, at the close of the hearing or at such other time as he directs.

The Administrative Procedure Act (APA) requires that parties be afforded a reasonable opportunity to submit proposed findings

[249] 5 U.S.C. § 556(d) (1994).

and conclusions to the ALJ[250]. Although the APA does not literally require that the proposed findings and conclusions be in writing, this is customary, and may be required by agency rules. The ALJ who wishes to substitute oral argument for briefs should tell the parties at the earliest opportunity, preferably before convening the hearing. If that is not feasible, the ALJ may permit a short recess at the close of the hearing to give the parties time to prepare oral argument. The latter procedure may be inconvenient and may offer no advantages over written briefs if the argument is not made the day the hearing ends.

2. Conferences

At the close of the hearing, after the parties have presented their cases and heard the testimony of all parties, they may find it advantageous to settle some or all of the substantive issues, or to enter into procedural stipulations. If requested, or if the ALJ believes that it might eliminate, expedite, or simplify some procedural steps, he may suggest or order a conference to consider such matters.

3. Briefs

Subject to agency rules, the ALJ should establish dates for submission of briefs. The ALJ may also authorize reply briefs. Briefs should conform in length and form to agency rule and to the ALJ's instructions. They should contain precise citations to the record and to the authorities relied upon. Counsel are sometimes careless about citation form, referring to cases without adequate identification. The ALJ may avoid this by requiring reasonable adherence to the *Uniform System of Citation* or any other standard citation system[251]. The ALJ should require a table of authorities and, if the brief exceeds a stated number of pages, a table of contents or an index. The ALJ may require research on legal or technical issues and may require the parties

---

[250] 5 U.S.C. § 557(c)(1994).

[251] A Uniform System of Citation (17th ed. 2000) (often called the "Bluebook"). For a recent competitor, see Association of Legal Writing Directors & Darby Dickerson, *ALWD Citation Manual* (Aspen L. & Bus. 2000). The latter publication is updated at www.alwd.org

to brief specific issues.[252]

4. Notice of Subsequent Procedural Steps

The ALJ should insure that all parties and interested persons who appeared at the hearing are notified of the dates fixed for submission of briefs and for other procedural steps.

5. Closing the Record

After receipt of all supplemental data the ALJ may announce by order the closing of the record. For extraordinary reasons, such as newly discovered evidence, and subject to agency rules, the record may be reopened for additional hearing or to stipulate additional material.

6. Correcting the Transcript

If the agency rules prescribe no procedure for correcting prejudicial errors in the transcript, the ALJ should set them. These should specify the period of time after receipt of the transcript during which changes may be requested. Requests in writing should be made to the ALJ, with copies to all parties, and should set forth the specific changes desired. If no objections are received within a specified time, and if the ALJ does not find the proposed corrections inaccurate, the transcript should be corrected accordingly. If any party or the ALJ does object to the proposed correction, it should be submitted to the official reporter for comparison with the stenographic record. After receipt of the reporter's reply the ALJ should rule on the request.[253]

The ALJ should propose corrections on his own initiative if he discovers substantial errors. He should notify all parties of the changes he proposes and advise them that unless objections are received within a specified time the record will be corrected accordingly.

---

[252]Form 12 in Appendix I is a sample request for the briefing of certain issues.

[253]Form 13 in Appendix I is a sample order correcting the transcript when the motion to correct is opposed.

D. Retention of Case Files

The ALJ should not dispose of his personal case file after issuing the decision. Copies of official documents should be retained until the case is finally resolved, either by action of the agency or the courts. Either may remand the case to the ALJ for further hearing, reconsideration, or both. It will be inconvenient if the ALJ's own record has been destroyed, and may make the task of reconstructing the record extremely difficult if any part of the agency record has been misplaced, damaged, or lost.

VI. Techniques of Presiding

As to those aspects of technique touching on matters purely of style, this or any other general Manual will be of limited value. There probably is no single "right" personal style, when it comes to presiding over a case. Every ALJ has, and develops, an individual style of presiding.

Judges -- like managers, mediators, and other professionals whose job is to exert control over a situation -- can differ in basic personal style and still be effective. An ALJ can be extroverted or introverted, aggressive or diffident, pragmatic or idealistic, empathetic or detached, formal or informal, gregarious or reserved. Every ALJ has a personal temperament shaped by years of experience, and that temperament does not change instantly upon appointment as an Administrative Law Judge. The most important personal quality relative to presiding is probably the capacity for insight or introspection into one's own basic temperament. This is a necessary precondition to learning how to control any personal quirks or characteristics -- such as a quick temper at one extreme, or timidity at the other -- which might detract from judicial professionalism.

As to other aspects of judging, the proper techniques and methods of presiding depend upon the nature of the case, the number and character of the parties, the issues, the personality of the ALJ and counsel, and many other variables. Methods and procedures helpful to one ALJ may be detrimental to another; techniques fair and reasonable in one situation may be arbitrary and inequitable in another. Nevertheless, over the years, Administrative Law Judges have developed certain approaches, customs, and practices which help develop a fair and adequate record in minimal time.

A. Preparation and Concentration

The ALJ must know the case. It is forgivable for an ALJ to be less than brilliant and even imperfect. It is not forgivable for a ALJ, in case after case, to be unprepared. Before opening the hearing the ALJ should study the pleadings, the evidence, the prehearing filings, and the trial briefs. The ALJ also should analyze any anticipated legal, policy, or procedural problems. The experience of fellow ALJs can be a source of general information and advice.

At the opening of the hearing -- and at other times during the proceedings -- if the ALJ needs to make a lengthy statement, the statement should, whenever possible, be prepared in advance and read into the record. It is more likely to be accurate, and it will be easier to understand. (Some lawyers may still remember their first transcript, where the reporter's faithful transcription of the lawyer's extemporaneous or unprepared remarks showed that the lawyer's unprepared remarks were gobbledygook.)

On a par with preparation is concentration. It is easy to suffer lapses in this department. Fortunately for ALJs, a lapse in concentration may not be quite as fatal as it could be for a trial lawyer whose inattention results in failure to make timely objection or in a waiver of the client's rights. However, the ALJ still must concentrate. During the hearing the ALJ should follow the testimony closely, not only to prepare for writing a decision, but to keep the hearing on course.

In a related vein, it is wise to skim the previous day's notes, exhibits, and transcript before convening the hearing each day. This procedure has dual benefits. The ALJ who is fully familiar with the case and the record will be better equipped to exclude unnecessary questions and testimony and keep the hearing moving; it will be easier to rule promptly. Furthermore, notes made concurrently with the transcript may be of incalculable value when he is searching the record while drafting the decision.

B. Judicial Attitude, Demeanor, and Behavior

The ALJ should be in control, but considerate of counsel, witnesses, and others in attendance. Each witness should be called by name and thanked when he is excused from the stand. Informal reprimands when necessary should ordinarily be delivered privately during recesses or otherwise off the record; they

should be entirely avoided if possible.

The ALJ should not argue with counsel. The ALJ should listen to counsel's point at reasonable length, make a ruling, and proceed. The ALJ courteously should tell any counsel who continues to argue about the ruling to proceed with the examination. If necessary, the ALJ may use any other courteous admonition to close the discussion.

Some aspects of judicial authority and trial protocol should be suspended as soon as a recess or an adjournment is announced. If counsel have been recalcitrant, evasive, or even antagonistic, the ALJ should harbor no resentment upon leaving the bench. One who bears a grudge cannot preside effectively.

The experience, training, and background of participants always should be considered. If an experienced or professional witness is verbose, evasive, or irrelevant, the ALJ should either stop the testimony or lead it back to relevant territory. When there is any question of a witness' veracity or forthrightness, cross-examining counsel should be permitted maximum latitude.

However, a witness may be comparatively inexperienced, unacquainted with judicial procedures, frightened, or nervous. The ALJ should tactfully put such witnesses at ease, protect them from improper questioning of counsel, interrupt when necessary to simplify or clarify questions, permit a certain amount of wandering and meandering testimony, and review with the witness any testimony that has become confused.

C. Controlling the Hearing

The ALJ must control the hearing. As soon as the subject under inquiry is exhausted or fully developed, the ALJ should stop counsel or the witness and direct him to go to other matters. If a question or an answer is irrelevant or improper, the ALJ should strike it without necessarily waiting for an objection.

On the other hand, if counsel is usefully developing a significant matter, the ALJ should let him proceed regardless of tedium or ennui. Every veteran ALJ ruefully recalls searching the record for an important item, only to discover that at the hearing a question seeking that information had been prohibited.

Prompt rulings are essential. If sure about the ruling, the ALJ should limit argument. If the proponent's argument is not persuasive, the ALJ should deny the motion or objection without hearing opposing counsel. In multi-party cases, the ALJ does not necessarily need to hear argument from all counsel for every party. It may be feasible to hear argument only from one counsel for each side. Also, in such situations, rebuttal should rarely

be permitted.

If the reason for a ruling is obvious the ALJ need not waste time explaining. If the issue is more doubtful, reasons should be stated.

An ALJ should correct an unsound ruling. If, however, making the correction will cause great inconvenience, such as substantial repetition of testimony, the ALJ should consider whether the error was so prejudicial as to justify such a burden or whether it might be rendered harmless in some other fashion[254] Counsel will often cooperate in working out a satisfactory solution.

Sometimes counsel will repeat the same line of questioning when inquiring into similar factual situations. The ALJ may shorten this type of examination by questioning the witness as follows: "If counsel asked you the same questions with reference to your testimony on B, C, and D as he did with reference to A, would your answers be the same?"

Occasionally one party or a group with the same interests will have several counsel in attendance. The ALJ normally should allow only one counsel to examine each witness and require the ALJ's permission before co-counsel may take over the examination. In appropriate circumstances, the ALJ may insist that only lead counsel state the position of the group.

Although the ALJ should expedite the hearing and prevent unnecessary testimony, arbitrary time limits should be avoided: for example, allotting counsel one day to present his case or thirty minutes for cross-examination. It is seldom possible to determine in advance how much time will be needed, and an arbitrary cutoff can be seriously prejudicial. The object is to make the hearing as short as the subject requires -- not to fit it into a predetermined time frame.

Although the record will presumably be cleaner and easier to understand if the planned order of presentation is strictly followed, circumstances such as the illness or unforeseen unavailability or serious inconvenience of a witness often interfere. Rather than adjourning the hearing until the witness is available, it is usually preferable to rearrange the schedule after informal discussions with counsel. Similarly, if essential material is offered after the time fixed for its presentation has expired, the schedule should be revised, if no one is prejudiced, to permit its receipt. If the parties need time to prepare

---

[254] *See*, 5 U.S.C. § 706 (1994) (mentioning that, on judicial review, due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error).

cross-examination or rebuttal, the original order of presentation can be resumed until cross-examination or rebuttal is prepared. If this is not feasible a brief recess may be called.

D. Some Common Problems

An important aspect of the judicial duty is to maintain control of the proceedings. A proper tone should be set to deter counsel who would try to dominate or manage a hearing. The ALJ must be alert to detect and restrain such counsel, whose tactics take many forms. They may stall on cross-examination until the noon or evening recess to get time to think of more questions. They may use questionable or even counterproductive tactics to contest the ALJ's rulings for example, by incessant argument or by repeated inconsequential changes in the form of a stricken question. They may inject themselves into matters of no interest to their clients. They may fail to have their witnesses present when they are scheduled to testify. If these tactics are successful, they may produce in opposing counsel not only animosity but emulation. The resulting record is unmanageable.

If one or more of the parties is engaged or interested in a related administrative or judicial proceeding, counsel may attempt to develop evidence only peripherally relevant in order to use it in the other proceeding. The ALJ must stop such attempts or end up with a record containing vast amounts of useless material.[255]

If tempers become short and an altercation threatens to disrupt the hearing, the ALJ must restore order. In some cases a recess may be useful. If counsel, a witness, or any person in the hearing room becomes unruly or offensive in remarks or manner, the ALJ should assert control, express disapproval of the opprobrious conduct and warn against a repetition.

The ALJ might also consider directing that the objectionable remarks be stricken physically from the record,[256] but this power

---

[255] *See, e.g.,* 5 U.S.C. 556(d)(1994) (stating that agencies are to provide for the exclusion of irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence. For an early case which provides an example of the point made above in the text, see Toolco-Northeast Control Case, 36 CAB 280, 283, 285, 302, 307, 308 (1962).

[256] Stricken material is included in the transcript with an annotation of the ALJ's ruling. Physically stricken

should rarely be used. The sensibilities of agencies are not easily offended. No matter how offensive, obscene, slanderous, or vile, the questionable remarks may be relevant to a later charge concerning the credibility or other actions of the person making the remarks. Generally, material should be stricken physically only with the consent of all parties and only where the material has no conceivable relevance to the merits, or to an adequate record of the case.

A final resort is to exclude counsel from further participation in the case, to take prejudicial action against the client if authorized by statute or rule, or to recommend disciplinary action by the agency.

E. Off-the-Record Discussions

The reporter should be instructed to make a verbatim transcript of the proceeding unless directed by the ALJ to go off the record. The ALJ should seldom go off the record, however. True enough, off-the-record discussions sometimes can be helpful in considering mechanical details of the hearing, such as procedural dates or the order of presentation of witnesses. They may also be appropriate in handling emergency situations such as the sudden illness of a witness.

They may also help to clear up substantive matters without cluttering the record. For example, counsel and the witness may so confuse each other that the record makes little or no sense. A short discussion off the record will clear up the problem and make the resulting record easier to understand. Similarly, counsel and witness may basically agree but their ideas of how to record the matter may differ. A few minutes off the record may result in a succinct and accurate statement that may save substantial time and make a cleaner record.

This device must not, however, be overused. In fact, it should be used very sparingly. Requests for off-the-record discussions should be denied unless a verbatim transcript is

---

material does not appear in the transcript. *Cf.*, Larter & Sons v. Dinkler Hotels Co., Inc., 199 F.2d 854 (5th Cir. 1952); Ramsey v. United States, 448 F. Supp. 1264 (N.D. Ill. 1978); Midwest Helicopter Airways, Inc., 2 NTSB 623, 1973 NTSB Lexis 3 (Order EA-532, Docket SE-1765, 1973), *aff'd*, Midwest Helicopter Airways, Inc. v. Butterfield, Civil No. 74-1147 (7th Cir., filed Jan. 6, 1975).

clearly unnecessary or will serve no apparent purpose. Even when discussions are held off the record, decisions or agreements that result should be summarized for the record and confirmed by counsel to prevent later misunderstanding.

F. Hearing Hours and Recesses

In complex, multiparty cases, some Administrative Law Judges customarily hold hearings for approximately five hours per day -- for example, 10 A.M. to 12:30 P.M. and 2 P.M. to 4:30 P.M. There is nothing magical about these hours, but such a schedule has several advantages. It allows time for the ALJ, counsel, and the parties to review, during the evening, the day's hearing and prepare for the next; without adequate preparation counsel's examination may be disorganized, rambling, and ineffective. Second, counsel, especially those from small offices, often need a few business hours each day to handle other matters. Finally, the concentration and constant attention required while a hearing is in session is mentally fatiguing; after approximately five hours, counsel's examination is likely to become less articulate and concise, and the risk of confusing, ambiguous, and mistaken questions and answers is increased.

The ALJ should extend or shorten the regularly scheduled sessions as the situation requires. For example, an afternoon session may be extended to permit an out-of-town witness to finish his testimony and return home. If the hearing is drawing to a close on Friday afternoon, an evening session may be appropriate. Moreover, where it appears possible to complete the hearing in a single day, the ALJ, after consultation with counsel, may begin the hearing earlier and shorten the luncheon recess.

The ALJ should insist, of course, that five minute recesses do not drag into fifteen and that participants appear after recesses or intermissions at the appointed time.

G. Audio-Visual Coverage

Historically, the courts and the American Bar Association have tended to disapprove of photographing and telecasting courtroom proceedings. There was a time when Canon 3A(7) of the American Bar Association's Code of Judicial Conduct stated that such procedures should not be permitted[257]. Similar blanket

[257]Ruhlen, MANUAL FOR ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES 66 (1982).

proscriptions were adopted by the bar and courts of many states. However, the United States Supreme Court held in a landmark criminal case that

> An absolute constitutional ban on broadcast coverage of trials cannot be justified simply because there is a danger that, in some cases, prejudiced broadcast accounts of pretrial and trial events may impair the ability of jurors to decide the issue of guilt or innocence uninfluenced by extraneous matter. The risk of juror prejudice in some cases does not justify an absolute ban on news coverage of trials by the printed media; so also the risk of such prejudice does not warrant an absolute constitutional ban on all broadcast coverage.[258]

In 1972 the Administrative Conference of the United States adopted its Recommendation 72-1, which encouraged audio-visual coverage of certain proceedings, with safeguards to prevent disruption, and subject to the right of any witness to exclude coverage of his testimony.[259]

At the time this recommendation was adopted, broadcasting of agency proceedings was very limited. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Social Security Administration denied such coverage, and other agencies, although some more equivocally than others, usually discouraged it. The Federal Communications Commission authorized television coverage at the discretion of its ALJs. Most agencies, however, at that time discouraged such coverage.[260]

The Administrative Conference of the United States reviewed agency action upon its recommendation in 1977[261]. This review disclosed that only the Department of Labor,[262] the Federal

---

[258]Chandler v. Florida, 449 U.S. 560, 574-75 (1981).

[259]Broadcast of Agency Proceedings, 1 CFR § 305.72-1 (1993). *See also* R. Bennett, Broadcast Coverage of Administrative Proceedings, 2 ACUS 625, 67 Nw. L. Rev. 528 (1972).

[260]Ruhlen, MANUAL FOR ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES 66 (1982).

[261]*Id.*, at 67, citing Recommendation Implementation Summary, 8/29/77, 72-1.

[262]*Id.*, citing 29 CFR §§ 2.10-2.16 (1981) for Department of Labor regulations.

Communications Commission, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission were in substantial conformity. Fourteen other agencies had partially complied.[263]

In the 1990's, opposition to live or videotaped media coverage of trials and hearings decreased, but remained substantial in some quarters. However, support for such coverage grew to the point where a channel on cable TV featured the telecasting of trials.[264]

On the administrative front, the overall picture remains mixed. For example, the Social Security Administration takes the position that Social Security hearings involve private claims. Accordingly, the hearing is not public in the usual sense. Outside observers, and this presumably includes the media, may not be present unless all claimants to the hearing consent and the ALJ finds that the outsider's presence would not disrupt the hearing[265]. Among the agencies presently having regulations concerning, or mentioning, media coverage are such varied organizations as the Comptroller of the Currency,[266] the Department of Housing and Urban Development,[267] the Surface Transportation Board of the Department of Transportation,[268] the Department of the Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service,[269] and the

---

[263] *Id.*, also stating at n. 129, "The Commodity Futures Trading Commission indicated that it had no formal policies on this subject. The Federal Power Commission (now the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) indicated disapproval."

[264] *E.g.*, Goodman, *The Wheels of Justice, Live on Cable*, New York Times, Section C, p. 17, col. 1 (July 3, 1991).

[265] Social Security Administration, Office of Hearings and Appeals, HEARINGS, APPEALS, LITIGATION AND LAW MANUAL (HALLEX), I-2-650(1990).

[266] 12 CFR § 19.5(b)(10) (2000) (authority of the Administrative Law Judge).

[267] 12 CFR § 1780.5(b)(15)(2000)(authority of the Administrative law Judge).

[268] 49 CFR § 1113.3 (2000).

[269] 50 CFR § 18.76(b)(8) (2000) (Marine Mammals, hearings on Section 103 Regulations).

FDA.[270]

The question for ALJs in many agencies therefore is no longer whether it is within their authority to permit audio-visual coverage of formal hearings. The question is one of following agency rules, and where agency rules give them discretion, the questions then may multiply. Should any live or videotaped coverage be allowed? If so, in what form? Can a fair hearing can be assured in the presence of such coverage, and, if so, what precautionary measures can and should be imposed?

For dealing with such questions, the ALJ should consider a number of factors and policies. For one thing, the free press educates and informs citizens about public affairs, and as a by-product helps induce honesty and integrity in our government. Moreover, government officials and government employees are servants of the public. We sometimes forget that the "public" is a shorthand term for that inchoate conglomerate of all U.S. citizens -- who are the true "owners" of all government property, including information generated and being generated by the "government." Nevertheless, although all information, with certain limited exceptions such as national security, should be revealed to the public, this does not necessarily imply the right to use any particular method to obtain such information. To determine the extent to which audio-visual coverage should be permitted, it is worthwhile to consider the most frequent objections.

1. Physical Interference

The lights, cameras, microphones, and wires which frequently accompany broadcasting (particularly television), can physically interfere with the hearing. Unrestricted deployment of broadcast equipment, personnel, and glaring lights throughout the hearing room may be seriously disruptive[271]. However, with modern broadcasting equipment, physical disruption is not now an inevitable consequence of telecasting. Television broadcasting can now take place with inconspicuous and distant cameras using non-irritating lights. Simple videotaping can be even less intrusive.

Requests for coverage by several stations may also cause problems. However, if more than one station wants to cover a proceeding they can all be limited to one set of microphones and

---

[270] 21 CFR § 10.200, *et seq.* (2000).

[271] *See, e.g.,* Estes v. Texas, 381 U.S. 532 (1965).

one set of cameras.

2. Interference with the Dignity of Proceedings

The presence of cameras, microphones, lights, and wires is sometimes said to detract from the dignity of formal proceedings. This may be merely another way of describing the physical disruption problem. There may be some, however, who feel that even unobtrusive recording equipment is undignified as a matter of aesthetics.

Any such concern probably is too insubstantial to justify exclusion. With reference to trial publicity the Supreme Court has said "where there was `no threat or menace to the integrity of the trial' . . . we have constantly required that the press have a free hand, even though we sometimes deplored its sensationalism."[272] Similarly, unless there is a more tangible basis for exclusion than dignity, the interest in acquiring information directly must prevail.

3. Psychological Distraction

The presence of electronic media may present a risk of psychological distraction. The knowledge that electronic media are present may convey to the parties, witnesses, and attorneys the feeling that their actions are taking place on a stage, rather than in a hearing room. This may lead some to withdraw in shyness and others to play up to that larger audience. In either event it will distort conduct.

This concern is greatly exaggerated. Television has been used in dozens of federal administrative proceedings without undue consequences[273]. As its use becomes more common, the psychological effect will be minimized. Moreover, this is a problem that can be handled by the ALJ, who can ensure the preservation of decorum and fair play by instructing representatives of the news media and others as to permissible activities in the hearing room, by the equitable assignment of seats to news media representatives and others, and by such other action as may be necessary. Audio-visual coverage should be permitted only so long as it is conducted unobtrusively and does not interfere with the orderly conduct of the proceeding.

H. Taking Notes

---

[272]Sheppard v. Maxwell, 384 U.S. 333, 350 (1966).

[273] Ruhlen, MANUAL FOR ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES 68 (1982).

The extent to which the ALJ should take notes depends on personal temperament and work habits. Some ALJs take no notes, feeling that it distracts from the immediate task of controlling the hearing. Others prepare a simple topical index. Still others take detailed notes of the testimony of each witness, which a secretary may later type, possibly with transcript references. Such notes should be considered the personal property of the ALJ. They should not be made available to counsel under any circumstances.

Some ALJs make notations on the written exhibits and testimony that are later keyed to the transcript by a secretary or law clerk. This makes searching the record substantially easier when the ALJ is writing the decision.

In a protracted hearing involving numerous exhibits and requests for supplemental data the ALJ should at least note the identification of each exhibit, in order to verify that it has been offered and received in evidence before the sponsoring witness is excused. The ALJ should note the details of any arrangement for submission of supplemental material. At the opening of the hearing each day the ALJ should consult his notes and inquire of counsel whether the material requested for that day is available. If anything is to be submitted after the close of the hearing, the ALJ should review his notes on the final hearing day and remind counsel of the material to be submitted and the submission date.

VII. CONDUCT

A federal Administrative Law Judge is subject to several different, but overlapping, standards of behavior. As a lawyer, the federal ALJ is subject generally to the ethical canons of the bar[274]. As a federal employee, the federal ALJ must comply with the laws and regulations generally applicable to employees of the Federal Government[275]. As the employee of a particular federal agency, the ALJ is responsible for following that agency's rules. Some federal agencies' rules in fact specifically address Administrative Law Judges,[276] presiding officers,[277] or the conduct of those involved in proceedings before the agency.[278]

However, the federal ALJ is not automatically governed by professional codes applicable to the judiciary. For instance, the Model Code of Judicial Conduct states, "Applicability of this Code to administrative law judges should be determined by each adopting jurisdiction . . . . [E]ach adopting jurisdiction should consider the unique characteristics of particular administrative law judge positions in adopting and adapting the Code for

---

[274] *E.g.*, American Bar Association, MODEL RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (1995). Developments regarding state administrative law judges will be discussed briefly, below in footnote 286.

[275] See for example, 5 CFR Part 735 (2000). Administrative Law Judges, of course, are subject to laws regulating the partisan political activities of federal employees, e.g., the Hatch Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 7321-7327 (1994).

[276] *See, e.g.*, 14 CFR § 300.1 (2000)(DOT Aviation Proceedings, "any DOT employee or administrative law judge carrying out DOT's quasi-judicial functions") (DOT Aviation Proceedings); 40 CFR § 164.40 (2000) (EPA Pesticide Proceedings); 43 CFR § 4.1122 (2000) (Department of the Interior Surface Coal Mine Hearings and Appeals).

[277] *E.g.*, 50 CFR § 18.76 (2000) (Department of Interior, Marine Mammals Section 103 Regulations).

[278] *E.g.*, 21 CFR § 12.90 (2000) (FDA, Conduct at oral hearings or conferences).

administrative law judges."[279] Therefore the Model Code of Judicial Conduct (Judicial Code) is not directly applicable to a federal Administrative Law Judge unless or until it is adopted by the ALJ's employing agency, or by the federal government as a whole.

Nevertheless, the Judicial Code remains relevant to the federal ALJ. If nothing else, some federal agencies, in their rules, still incorporate by reference the judicial "canons" of ethics or code[280]. It also provides, indirectly, a source of guidelines by which to assess the propriety of a ALJ's behavior[281]. Finally, the Judicial Code has provided the basis for Model Codes specifically developed for Administrative Law Judges -- the Model Code of Judicial Conduct for Federal Administrative Law Judges (federal ALJ Code) and the Model Code of Judicial Conduct for State Administrative Law Judges.[282]

---

[279] American Bar Association, MODEL CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT 31, n.11 (2000 ed.).

[280] 40 CFR § 164.40 (2000) (EPA Pesticide Programs: "shall conduct the proceeding in . . . manner subject to the precepts of the Canons of Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association"); 43 CFR § 4.1122 (2000) (Interior Surface Coal Hearings: "Administrative law judges shall adhere to the 'Code of Judicial Conduct.'). See also, 14 CFR § 300.1 (2000) (DoT, "are expected to conduct themselves with the same fidelity to appropriate standards of propriety that characterize a court and its staff"); 43 CFR § 4.27(d) (2000) (Interior General Rules: "shall withdraw from a case if he deems himself disqualified under the recognized canons of judicial ethics").

[281] For a discussion of the Code of Judicial Conduct as a source of guidelines and analogies, see Lewis, *Administrative Law Judges and the Code of Judicial Conduct: A Need for Regulated Ethics*, 94 DICKINSON L. REV. 929, 949-50 (1990) (citing a Merit System Protection Board case, *In re* Chocallo, 2 M.S.P.B. 23, *aff'd* 2 M.S.P.B. 20 (1980), and ABA Informal Opinions of the Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility).

[282] As to Federal ALJs, there is ABA, MODEL CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT FOR FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES Preface at p. 3 (1989); *see also*, Yoder, *Preface, Model Code of Judicial Conduct for Federal Administrative Law Judges*, 10 J. NAALJ

As with the Judicial Code, the federal ALJ Code is not self-enforcing. To be directly controlling or applicable, it must be adopted by the appropriate governmental authority. However, it was endorsed by the Executive Committee of the National Conference of Administrative Law Judges in 1989, and this endorsement was intended to reflect "the considered judgment of the Conference on appropriate provisions" adapting the Model Code of Judicial Conduct for application to Administrative Law Judges.[283]

The federal ALJ Code contains seven numbered canons, with explanations and commentary[284]. Omitting the explanations and commentary, the canons themselves are:

Canon 1

An Administrative Law Judge Should Uphold the Integrity and Independence of the Administrative Judiciary

Canon 2

An Administrative Law Judge Should Avoid Impropriety and the Appearance of Impropriety in All Activities

Canon 3

An Administrative Law Judge Should Perform the Duties of the Office Impartially and Diligently.

Canon 4

An Administrative Law Judge May Engage in Activities to Improve the Law, the Legal System, and the Administration of Justice.

Canon 5

An Administrative Law Judge Should Regulate His or Her Extra-Judicial Activities to Minimize the Risk of Conflict with Judicial Duties.

Canon 6

An Administrative Law Judge Should Limit Compensation Received for Quasi-Judicial and Extra-Judicial Activities.

---

131 (1990). As to state ALJs and hearing officers, there is ABA, National Conference of Administrative Law Judges, A MODEL CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT FOR STATE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES, PREFACE (1995)(Endorsed by the Executive Committee, National Conference of Administrative Law Judges, Judicial Administration Division, American Bar Association in 1995.) *Id.*

[283] Yoder, supra note 282, at 132.

[284] American Bar Association, federal ALJ Code, *supra* note 282 at 6-24; Yoder, *supra* note 282 at 134-48.

Canon 7

An Administrative Law Judge Should Refrain from Political Activity Inappropriate to the Judicial Office.[285]

In some respects, the federal ALJ Code is only part of a larger set of considerations involving the conduct of Administrative Law Judges. These considerations revolve around a tension between independence and accountability. On the one hand, it is crucial to preserve the Judges' independence -- insulating them from improper agency pressures with respect to the substance of their decisions. On the other hand, it is also crucial to assure that the Judges are accountable for improper conduct and unprofessional, inadequate performance.

These tensions have helped stimulate important developments and a growing body of studies, articles, and proposals regarding the status and conduct of Administrative Law Judges, both state and federal[286]. Such studies, articles, and proposals will

---

[285] From: ABA, MODEL CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT FOR FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES (1989).

[286] During the 1990's, there were so many major developments and significant articles that it is impossible to do justice to all of them. However, as already indicated, notable institutional developments included a model code of conduct for state administrative law judges: American Bar Association, National Conference of Administrative Law Judges, A MODEL CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT FOR STATE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES (1995). In no small part, this code reflected the growth and growing influence of organizations such as the National Association of Administrative Law Judges, the National Conference of Administrative Law Judges, and the Federal Administrative Law Judges' Conference. This growth also has led to the expansion of professional journals such as the Journal of the National Association of Administrative Law Judges, and an important flow of relevant articles. Among the articles dealing with the status and conduct of administrative law judges during this period, and to name only a few: Edwin L. Felter, Jr., *Maintaining the Balance Between Judicial Independence and Judicial Accountability in Administrative Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 89 (1997); John Hardwicke and Ronnie A. Yoder, *Does Mandatory Quality Assurance Oversight of ALJ Decisions Violate ALJ Decisional Independence: Due Process or Ex Parte Prohibitions?* 17 J. NAALJ 75 (1997); Jeffrey S. Lubbers, *The Federal Administrative Judiciary: Establishing an Appropriate System of Performance Evaluations for ALJs*, 7 ADMIN. L.J. AM. U.

undoubtedly lead to new changes and developments in the future. Exactly what those changes will be and where they will lead remains an open question. In the meantime, however, there are several topics pertaining to professional conduct which should be discussed in this Manual.

A. Disciplinary Actions Against ALJs

Although not an ideal source of guidance, some notion at least of minimal standards of acceptable conduct can be garnered from examining the law and case precedents pertaining to disciplinary action against federal administrative law judges. (Needless to add, the situation with respect to state administrative law judges and other hearing officers is even more complex and difficult.)

Statutorily, the federal employing agency can take disciplinary action against a ALJ "only for good cause

---

589 (1994); James P. Timony, *Performance Evaluation of Administrative Law Judges,* 7 ADMIN. L. J. AM. U. 629 (1993-94; Ann Marshall Young, *Judicial Independence in Administrative Adjudication: Past, Present, and Future*, 19 J. NAALJ 101 (1999); and Ann Marshall Young, Evaluation of Administrative Law Judges: 17 NAALJ 1 (1997). For some works published prior to the 3rd edition of this Manual, see *e.g.*, ABA, *New ACUS Study on Administrative Law Judges*, 17 Administrative Law News 1 (Summer 1992); Cofer, *The Question of Independence Continues: Administrative Law Judges Within the Social Security Administration*, 69 JUDICATURE 228 (Dec. 1985); Holmes, *ALJ Update: A Review of the Current Role, Status, and Demographics of the Corps of Administrative Law Judges*, 38 FED. BAR NEWS & JOURNAL 202 (May, 1991); Levant, *Pointing the Way to ALJ Independence*, 24 JUDGES JOURNAL 36 (Spring, 1985); Levinson, *The Proposed Administrative Law Judge Corps: An Incomplete But Important Reform Effort*, 19 NEW ENGLAND L. REV. 733 (1984); Lewis, *Administrative Law Judges and the Code of Judicial Conduct: A Need for Regulated Ethics*, 94 DICKINSON L. REV.929 (1990); Moss, *Judges Under Fire: ALJ Independence At Issue*, 77 ABA JOURNAL 56 (Nov. 1991); O'Keefe, *Administrative Law Judges, Performance Evaluation, and Production Standards: Judicial Independence Versus Employee Accountability*, 54 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 591 (1986); Palmer, *The Evolving Role of Administrative Law Judges*, 19 NEW ENGLAND L. REV. 755 (1984); Zankel, *A Unified Corps of Federal Administrative Law Judges Is Not Needed*, 6 WESTERN NEW ENGLAND L. REV. 723 (1984).

established and determined by the Merit Systems Protection Board on the record after opportunity for hearing . . . ."[287] One must look to the cases decided by the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB), and the courts, for a gloss on what constitutes "good cause."

A study published in 1992 indicated that there had been about two dozen reported cases since 1946 involving discipline or removal of ALJs "for good cause" under 5 U.S.C. § 7521.[288] Five of these cases apparently resulted in removal[289]. (The reported cases, of course, do not reflect resignations or adjustments that may have been reached without formal proceedings.) Some cases which have been decided since the 3rd Edition of this Manual was published have been added to footnotes in the discussion which follows.

Because the reported cases are relatively few in number, their value is somewhat limited as a source of guidance. However, some consideration of them still may be instructive. The grounds for "good cause" reflected in these cases seem to fall, for the most part, roughly into four categories: (1) personal conduct that is unrelated (or remotely related) to employment or professional duties; (2) misconduct, other than insubordination, related to the individual's behavior as a federal employee or judge (or both); (3) insubordination, with or without other misconduct; and (4) professional incompetence, *i.e.*, generally matters of productivity and the quality of the judge's adjudications. Some cases, of course, fall into more than one category.

Personal Misconduct Unrelated to Employment. Although there seems to be one, relatively early case that falls purely within

---

[287] 5 U.S.C. § 7521 (1994). Disciplinary sanctions can include removal, suspension, a reduction in grade, a reduction in pay, or furlough of 30 days or less. *Id.* In addition, action can be taken against an administrative law judge under 5 U.S.C. § 7532 (1994) (pertaining to national security and related matters), or, by MSPB Special Counsel under 5 U.S.C. §§ 1215, 1216 (1994).

[288] Federal Administrative Judiciary, *supra* note 4 at 1016-19. This figure is consistent with an earlier article on disciplinary proceedings against federal ALJs. Timony, *Disciplinary Proceedings Against Federal Administrative Law Judges*, 6 NEW ENG. L. REV. 807, n1 and 2 (1984).

[289] Federal Administrative Judiciary, *supra* note 4 at 1231.

the "personal conduct" category, this case is enough to serve as a warning that a judge's purely personal life could furnish "good cause" for disciplinary action. In this case, financial irresponsibility in the form of failure to make any effort toward paying admitted debts was upheld as a sufficient ground for disciplinary action and removal.[290]

Unfortunately, a single case does not provide much guidance regarding exactly how far an agency could reach into an ALJ's private life to support a "for good cause" sanction or dismissal. The fact that there has been only one reported case clearly on point after nearly 50 years suggests that a "good cause" proceeding would not lightly be brought on the basis solely of an ALJ's private life or personal lifestyle. However, the existence of even one precedent for disciplinary action based on purely personal conduct (or misconduct) remains troublesome. An agency certainly might attempt to argue that an ALJ occupies an especially sensitive position, and that therefore purely personal, off-duty misbehavior might compromise the ALJ's effectiveness as an adjudicator. As always, there is language to be found in the cases that could support this (or almost any other) position. For example, "Honesty, integrity, and other essential attributes of good moral character are foremost among the qualities that lawyers, and especially judges, ought to possess if public confidence in the legal profession and the judiciary is to be promoted and preserved."[291]

Misconduct (Other Than Insubordination). In the category of misconduct, other than insubordination, the reported cases cover a fairly wide range of matters related to the ALJs' duties or at-work behavior. Involved here are serious improprieties by an ALJ, including, but not limited to, accepting gifts or favors from a party,[292] and serious improprieties in the actual conduct of adjudications.[293] Cases involving non-adjudicative actions include

---

[290] McEachern v. Macy, 233 F. Supp. 516 (W.D. S.C. 1964), *aff'd* 341 F. 2d 895 (4th Cir. 1965). See 5 CFR § 2635.809 (2000).

[291] *In re* Spielman, 1 MSPB 51, 56 (1979).

[292] Hasson v. Hampton, 34 AD. L. REP. 2d (P&F) 19 (D.D.C. 1773), *aff'd mem.*, D.C. Cir. (April 20, 1976).

[293] SSA v. Friedman, 41 MSPR 430 (1989)(cancelling hearings without reason); *In re* Chacallo, 2 M.S.P.B. 20 (1980) (affirmed by unpublished opinions in D.D.C. and D.C. Cir.) (demonstrated

incidents of improper behavior toward fellow employees, such as sexual harassment,[294] and abusive, rude, assaultive, or other seriously improper conduct.[295] In some cases, the disciplinary action is predicated, at least in part, on non-adjudicatory conduct that is work-related, but does not involve fellow employees; for instance, serious or recurring unauthorized

---

bias and lack of judicial temperament, in addition to various acts of disobedience and insubordination). *See also*, SSA v. Anyel, Docket No. CB752119009T1 (MSPB, January 16, 1992)(ALJ slip opinion) (upholding charge based on SSA ALJ's treatment of *pro se* claimants, remanded on other grounds, SSA v. Anyel, 58 MSPR 261 (1993) (remanding to ALJ and stating that high rate of substantive errors constituted cause for removal) (case later settled with 90-day suspension, 66 MSPR 328 (1995).

[294] SSA v. Davis, 19 MSPR 279 (1984), *aff'd* 758 F. 2d 661 (Fed. Cir. 1984)(unpublished opinion) (lewd and lascivious remarks to employees); SSA v. Carter, 35 MSPR 485 ((18987) (sexual harassment).

[295] Carr v. Social Security Administration, 185 F. 3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (reckless disregard of personal safety [slamming door and causing injury to employee], profanity, abusive language, sexual harassment), affirming 78 MSPR 313 (1998); Department of Commerce v. Dolan, 39 MSPR 314 (1988) (kicking employee); *In re* Glover, 1 MSPR 660, 663 (1979); SSA v. Dantoni, 77 MSPR 516 (1998), aff'd 173 F. 3d 435 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (decision without published opinion, full text available at 1998 U.S. App. LEXIS 24902)(MSB opinion recounts discharged ALJ's conduct, *inter alia*, harassing Deputy Chief ALJ, forging name of Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge [DCALJ] to large numbers of mail orders for commercial products and samples, resulting in DCALJ's office receiving 1547 pieces of mail). For a case involving favors or gifts from a party in proceedings before the ALJ, see Hasson v. Hampton, 34 AD. L.. REP. (Pike & Fischer) 19 (D.D.C. 1973), *aff'd mem., D.C. Cir.*, April 20, 1979. For a case involving unauthorized practice of law, see Office of Hearings & Appeals, Social Sec. Admin. v. Whittlesley, 59 MSPR 684 (1993), aff'd w/o opinion, 39 F. 3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 1994), cert den 514 U.S. 1063(1995)(stating that good cause to remove ALJ was shown by evidence that he violated agency rules and settlement agreement by engaging in unauthorized practice of law)

personal use of government property,[296] or falsifying documents.

Insubordination. This category of insubordination likewise covers a fairly wide range of specific factual incidents, but these incidents of course concern the ALJs' conduct toward supervisors or superiors. The cases generally fall into one of two categories. First there is insubordination in the form of deliberate disobedience of valid orders or directives refusals to comply with instructions, procedures, or case assignments.[297]

Second, there is insubordination in the form of rude or abusive behavior toward as supervisor or other superior. Cases in this subcategory, of course, may involve both disobedience and abusive behavior, as well as other misconduct.[298]

As to the three major categories discussed above, the reported cases are of limited direct value, in an of themselves, as guides for an ALJ's conduct. They are few in number and deal

---

[296] SSA v. Givens, 27 MSPR 360, 1985 MSPB Lexis 1130 (1985) (personal use of government car).

[297] For example, SSA v. Boham, 38 MSPR 540 (1988) (refusing to hear case involving overnight travel); SSA v. Brennan, 27 MSPR 242 (1985), *aff'd sub nom.* Brennan v. DHHS, 787 F. 2d 1559(Fed. Cir. 1986) (refusing to follow case proceeding procedures, including routing of mail and us of worksheets); SSA v. Manion, 19 MSPR 298 (1984) (refusing to schedule hearings); SSA v. Arterberry, 15 MSPR 320 (1983), *aff'd in an unpublished opinion,* 732 F. 2d 166 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *In re* Chacallo, 2 MSPR 20 (1980) (among other things, refusing to return case files and conducting a hearing after the case had been removed from the ALJ's jurisdiction), *aff'd by unpublished opinions* in D.C.C. and D.C. Cir.; Office of Hearings and Appeals, SSA v. Whittlesey, 59 MSPR 684 (1993) (unapproved outside practice of law, willful failure to compel with time and attendance requirements), aff'd without officially published opinion 39 F. 3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 1994), cert den. 115 S. Ct. 1690 (1995).

[298] For example, SSA v. Burris, 38 MSPR 51 (1988), *aff'd* 878 Fed. Cir. 1989) (unpublished opinion) (insubordination with travel vouchers, office disruptions, attempts to undermine supervisor's authority by countermanding his instructions, ridiculing him, and unreasonably refusing to deal directly with him.); SSA v. Glover, 23 MSPR 57 (1984) (vulgarity toward supervisor, throwing files).

with fact-specific situations. However, they are a worthwhile gloss on the subject of an administrative law judge's conduct. The cases suggest that the ALJ who observes simple courtesy toward subordinates and peers, who displays a veneer of respect for supervisors, and who generally treats others the way the ALJ would like to be treated will go a long way toward satisfying any reasonable standards of conduct.

Professional Incompetence Productivity/Quality. There remains the troublesome issue of professional competence and its relation to "for good cause" in particular, matters of productivity and quality of adjudication. The problems, of course, orbit around mainly the need to reconcile accountability with adjudicative independence.

The cases themselves seem to recognize this problem, and consequently might be described as "squinting" both ways. For example, one leading study has described three significant SSA-ALJ "productivity" cases decided by the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) in 1984 as a "pyrrhic victory" for the agency.[299] "The agency won the right to bring low-productivity-based charges against ALJs," but lost before the MSPB, which rejected the agency's statistical evidence.[300] In the first of these cases, the agency had presented evidence that the judge's case dispositions were about half the national average, but the MSPB "opined that SSA cases were not fungible and that SSA's comparative statistics did not take into sufficient account the differences among these types of cases. The same reasoning was later applied to [the] two other pending cases against the SSA ALJs with similar productivity records."[301]

However, in a later case, the MSPB stated that a high rate of significant adjudicatory error can establish good cause for disciplining an administrative law judge.[302] In another line of

---

[299] FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE JUDICIARY, *supra* note 4, at 1020. The cases were SSA v. Goodman, 19 MSPR 321 (1984); SSA v. Brennan, 19 MSPR 335, *opinion clarified*, 20 MSPR 34 (1984), and SSA v. Balaban, 20 MSPR 675 (1984).

[300] FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE JUDICIARY, *supra* note 4 at 156-57.

[301] *Id*.

[302] SSA v. Anyel, 58 MSPR 261 (1993) (remanding to ALJ and stating that high rate of substantive errors constituted cause for removal) (case later settled with 90-day suspension, 66 MSPR

cases, the MSPB has made it clear that good cause can include serious and long-term disabilities which prevent the ALJ from performing his or her duties.[303]

In a line of cases that did *not* directly involve the MSPB, some ALJ challenges to certain agency-management initiatives regarding productivity and uniformity have resulted in similar examples of judicial reasoning. One significant judicial opinion said, at one point, that an SSA "goal" of 338 decisions annually per ALJ was reasonable, and that policies "designed to ensure a reasonable degree of uniformity among ALJ decisions are not only within the bound of legitimate agency supervision but are to be encourage."[304] But the same opinion also warned, "To coerce ALJs into lowering reversal rates . . . would, if shown, constitute . . . 'a clear infringement of judicial independence.'"[305]

---

328 (1995).

[303] SSA v. Mills, 73 MSPR 463 (1996); Department of Health and Human Services v. Underwood, 68 MSPR 24 (1995).

[304] Nash v. Bowen, 869 F. 2d 675, 680 (2d Cir. 1989).

[305] *Id.* at 681. For another example of an opinion which seemed distinctly ambivalent, see Ass'n of Administrative Law Judges v. Heckler, 594 F. Supp. 1132 (D. DC., 1984) (criticizing aspects of SSA management program, but refusing to issue injunction because ameliorative changes had been made to the program in the meantime.)

The tension between maintaining judicial independence and at the same time assuring accountability continues to be subject of significant articles and studies. See for example, Edwin L. Felter, Jr., *Maintaining the Balance Between Judicial Independence and Judicial Accountability in Administrative Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 89 (1997); John Hardwicke and Ronnie A. Yoder, *Does Mandatory Quality Assurance Oversight of ALJ Decisions Violate ALJ Decisional Independence: Due Process or Ex Parte Prohibitions*? 17 J. NAALJ 75 (1997); Jeffrey S. Lubbers, *The Federal Administrative Judiciary: Establishing an Appropriate System of Performance Evaluations for ALJs*, 7 ADMIN. L.J. AM. U. 589 (1994); James P. Timony, *Performance Evaluation of Administrative Law Judges*, 7 ADMIN. L. J. AM. U. 629 (1993-94; Ann Marshall Young, *Judicial Independence in Administrative Adjudication: Past, Present, and Future*, 19 J. NAALJ 101 (1999); and Ann Marshall Young, *Evaluation of Administrative Law Judges*, 17 NAALJ 1 (1997).

About all this Manual can do is conclude that, in theory, the power of an agency to bring "good cause" actions against unproductive or incompetent ALJs certainly exists. So far, the MSPB appears to have been cautious in the actual application of that theory. This is understandable, and justified, because such actions could raise serious problems related to reconciling the need for professional competence with the need for adjudicative independence. Those problems are likely to be with us for the foreseeable future. In the meantime, it is probably safe to say that no ALJ should want to be the subject of a future case that tests an agency's power to discharge "for good cause" on grounds of demonstrably slack productivity.

B. Confidentiality

Although the ALJ presides over a hearing which in most agencies is open to the public, and compiles what will usually be a public record, there are aspects of the ALJ's duties which require confidentiality. When confidentiality is required, the ALJ should be above reproach.

For example, there is the matter of the ALJ's decision. Until the decision is finally issued or published the ALJ should in no way reveal it to the parties, the agency, the agency staff, or anyone else except his own staff and associates (who are themselves subject to the same rules). Maintaining this secrecy requires constant circumspection.

On a matter related to duties of a more recent vintage, the ALJ must become especially sensitive to the need for confidentiality in certain phases and kinds of alternative dispute resolution proceedings. A prime example here, of course, is the confidentiality customarily accorded mediation efforts,[306] including mediation by Settlement Judges.[307]

C. Ex Parte Communications

Ex parte communications should be avoided. Communications between the ALJ and one party, without the presence of the other party/parties, are always suspect. In formal adjudications

---

[306] See for example, Administrative Conference of the U.S., ENCOURAGING SETTLEMENTS BY PROTECTING MEDIATOR CONFIDENTIALITY, RECOMMENDATION NO. 88-11, 1 C.F.R. § 305.88-11 (1993).

[307] See for example, 29 CFR § 18.9 (2000) (Department of Labor, Office of Administrative Law Judges); 2200.101(c) (2000) (Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission).

governed by the APA, the ground rules are fairly clear and quite explicit. "Except to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law, [the ALJ] may not -- (1) consult a person or party on a fact in issue, unless on notice and opportunity for all parties to participate . . . ."[308]

> [E]xcept to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law --
>
> (A) no interested person outside the agency shall make or knowingly cause to be made to any . . . administrative law judge, or other employee who is or may reasonably may be expected to be involved in the decisional process of the proceeding, an ex parte communication relevant to the merits of the proceeding;
>
> (B) no . . . administrative law judge, or other employee who is or may reasonably be expected to be involved in the decisional process of the proceeding, shall make or knowingly cause to be made to any interested person outside the agency an ex parte communication relevant to the merits of the proceeding;
>
> (C) a[n] . . . administrative law judge, or other employee who is or may reasonably be expected to be involved in the decisional process . . . who receives or who makes . . . a communication prohibited by this subsection shall place on the public record of the proceeding:
>
> (i) all such written communications;
>
> (ii) memoranda stating the substance of all such oral communications; and
>
> (iii) all written responses, and memoranda stating the substance of all oral responses described in . . . this subparagraph . . . .[309]

Moreover, the APA further provides that if a prohibited ex parte communication is knowingly made, the ALJ or other presiding officer, may (subject to agency policies and regulations) require the party making the communication to show cause why he should not be dismissed as a party or otherwise sanctioned because of

---

[308] 5 U.S.C. 554(d) (1994) (emphasis added).

[309] 5 U.S.C. § 557(d) (1994) (emphasis added).

that violation[310]. The agency itself may be authorized to decide the whole case adversely to the offending party[311]. Furthermore, many agencies have their own regulations relating to the handling of ex parte communications, which the ALJ should rigorously observe.[312]

Some ex parte conversations are innocent in the sense that the person approaching the ALJ is unaware that this action is improper. When such an incident occurs, the ALJ, in proceedings governed by the above-quoted provisions of the APA, must prepare a written memorandum describing the conversation and file it in the public record in the docket section. This also must be done when another common type of innocent ex parte communication occurs -- letters to the ALJ relating to the merits of the case.

Even for proceedings not covered by the APA, and even if the agency rules on ex parte contacts do not extend to the particular proceedings, an ALJ who has received ex parte communications on the merits probably should, in any event, make them part of the record. It is usually best to do one's utmost to remove any doubt about the proprieties of the matter.

D. Bias and Recusal

Another sensitive and special matter concerning the conduct of ALJs involves bias. "[A]n impartial decision maker is essential."[313] Of course, no one is totally free from all possible forms of bias or prejudice. But the ALJ must conscientiously strive to set aside preconceptions and rule as objectively as possible on the basis of the evidence in the record. In addition, and despite an ALJ's subjective good faith, an ALJ who has a financial interest (even if small or diluted) in the outcome of a case should not decide that case[314]. If grounds

---

[310] 5 U.S.C. § 557(d)(1)(D) (1994).

[311] 5 U.S.C. § 556(d) (1994).

[312] *See, e.g.*, 14 CFR § 300.2 (2000) (DOT, Aviation Proceedings); 16 CFR § 4.7 (2000) (FTC).

[313] Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 254, 271 (1970). For an excellent discussion of bias, see FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE JUDICIARY, *supra* note 4 at 967-974.

[314] *See*, Ward v. Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57 (1972); Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927).

for finding bias truly exist, then recusing oneself[315] is preferable to courting a later reversal and jeopardizing the validity of the whole proceedings.

E. Fraternization

In a related vein, conduct which creates an appearance of favoritism or bias also should be avoided. Public attitudes about judicial conduct have become stricter in recent years, and ALJs should be sensitive to this change. An ALJ should limit social activities with friends or colleagues if there is any likelihood of their being involved in matters coming before the ALJ. It is not enough merely to avoid discussing pending matters; an ALJ should shun situations that might lead anxious litigants or worried lawyers to think that the ALJ might favor or accept the views of friends more readily than those of unknown parties. The same considerations argue against social contacts with agency staff; any indication that the ALJ and staff are members of one happy family should be avoided.

One approach is for ALJs to maintain their personal ties but disqualify themselves in any case in which a friend appears. If the bar is small this may be unfair to counsel and their clients, and impractical as well. An alternative course is to describe publicly the relationships whenever a friend or associate is involved and offer to disqualify oneself if so requested. However, this places an unfair burden on objecting counsel, who is put in the position of implying publicly that the ALJ may be biased. Also, if done frequently, this approach may seem to be avoidance of the ALJ's own responsibility.

In any event, an ALJ must avoid the appearance of impropriety. Thus the ALJ should not regularly play bridge or golf or dine with lawyers whose firms may appear before him. Nor should the ALJ actively participate in politics or political meetings.[316]

Judges must accept a certain amount of loneliness. They needn't become recluses, but they should realize they are no longer "one of the gang."

---

[315] 5 U.S.C. §556(b)(1994). For an ALR Annotation relevant to this topic, see 51 ALR Fed. 400.

[316] Federal Administrative Law Judges are, of course, subject to the Hatch Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 7321-7327 (1994, Supp. V 1999).

F. Individual Requests for Information

The Judge will often receive requests for information from interested persons. Frequently the material sought will be confidential -- such as which party will prevail, when the decision will be issued, and what effect it might have on the community. The Judge should make every effort to explain courteously any refusals to answer. Sometimes, it may be possible, and appropriate, to deflect the inquiry with a suggestion that the person might be able to obtain additional information, and views, from sources not subject to judicial restraints, such as agency staff or private parties involved in the proceeding.

G. Interaction with Other Independent Officers

While there is little case law on the subject, at least one case, *U.S. Navy-Marine Corps Court of Military Review v. Carlucci,* has raised the issue concerning the extent to which independent adjudicative officers must cooperate with investigations of officials such as a military Inspector General[317]. While generally acknowledging the statutory right of IGs to investigate a military judge's misappropriation of funds, fraudulent claims, or other abuses of appointment, the *Carlucci* case addresses the issue of an allegation of impermissible use of *ex parte* information during a judge's deliberations. This raises a question concerning the judge's duty under Judicial Canons to uphold the independence and integrity of the court when an IG seeks to investigate matters involved in judicial deliberations even after the case has closed and a final decision has been rendered. Agencies can provide appropriate procedural rules to handle such issues within their adjudicative divisions to preclude such problems from arising.

H. The Media

[317] United States Navy-Marine Corps Court of Military review v. Carlucci, 26 M.J. 328 (C.M.A. 1988), especially at 337-43 This case was discussed in Joseph H. Baum and Kevin J. Barry, *United States Navy-Marine Corps Court of Military Review v. Carlucci: A Question of Judicial Independence*, FEDERAL BAR NEWS AND JOURNAL, Vol, 36, No. 5, June 1989, 242-248.

The persistence of the press in a major or newsworthy case may be annoying at times, but the Administrative Law Judge should cooperate, to the extent permitted by ethics and agency rules, in the circulation of public information about the proceeding. Questions about non-confidential, public matters can be answered, so long as this does not interfere with the orderly conduct of the hearing. For example, the ALJ certainly may respond to queries about the place or time of the hearing or the length of a recess. The merits of the case, however, must be off-limits, both directly and by implication. The ALJ should not be interviewed under circumstances likely to lead to questions relating to the merits.

Likewise, the ALJ should not give off-the-record or not-for-attribution interviews. If the material is not confidential, quotation should be permitted; if it is confidential, it should not be revealed in the first place.

VIII. THE DECISION

After receipt of all supplemental material and briefs the ALJ should prepare the decision, the findings of fact and conclusions of law. Agency rules and practice will govern the details of how the ALJ submits the decision to the agency and serves it upon the parties. The notice of decision should provide for filing of exceptions and briefs.

Some agencies have authorized their Administrative Law Judges to make the agency's decision, subject only to discretionary review by the agency[318]. The title page of such a decision should state that it is an agency decision issued pursuant to delegated authority (citing the pertinent rules) and the notice of decision should describe how and when petitions for review may be filed. Any order attached to the decision should include a similar statement of delegated authority and should provide that, absent filing of a petition for discretionary review or review on the agency's own initiative, it will become effective as the final agency order after a specified time. The form for issuance of other decisions is similar, with such changes as are necessary to show that they are not final until affirmed by the agency or the agency review board.

The ALJ's jurisdiction usually ends upon the issuance of the decision, except that errors may be corrected by issuance of an errata sheet[319]. This should be used to correct serious errors of substance only, never to correct obvious typographical mistakes or errors already the subject of exceptions.

A. Oral Decision

In cases involving few parties, limited issues, and short hearings the ALJ may save substantial time by rendering the

---

[318]*See* ACUS Recommendation 68-6, Delegation of Final Decisional Authority Subject to Discretionary Review by the Agency, 1 CFR § 305.68-6 (1993). *See also, e.g.,* 29 CFR § 2200.91(2000)(Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission); 17 CFR § 12.101, .106 (2000) (CFTC, reparation cases: "Voluntary Decisional Proceedings"). For an article discussing discretionary review by agencies, see Gilliland, *The Certiorari-Type Review*, 26 ADMIN L. REV. 53 (1974).

[319]Form 14 in Appendix I is a sample errata sheet.

decision orally -- if permitted by agency rules or policies. However, it must be emphasized that agency rules or policies control. The rest of this section is relevant only to the extent that the ALJ has authority, in the first instance, to render an oral decision.[320]

If the ALJ is authorized to issue an oral decision, the parties can be advised before the hearing to prepare for oral argument on the merits at the close of the testimony. After all evidence has been received and any procedural matters disposed of, the ALJ may recess the hearing for a few minutes to give counsel an opportunity to read their notes and prepare for oral argument. After listening to oral argument and rebuttal, the ALJ, perhaps after another short recess, may deliver the decision orally on the record.

This procedure obviously increases the risk of overlooking some material fact or legal precedent, but in a case simple enough to truly warrant an oral decision, that risk is not substantial. There are, moreover, compensating advantages in addition to the time saved. If witness credibility is involved the demeanor and the actual testimony of the witness are fresh in the ALJ's mind.

Some cases involving formal adjudications will be governed by the provision of the APA which entitles the parties to a reasonable opportunity to submit proposed findings or conclusions, and supporting reasons, before a recommended, initial, or tentative decision[321]. Advising the parties before the end of the hearing that an oral decision will be made at the close of the hearing, and that parties desiring to submit proposed findings and conclusions should be prepared to do so orally, probably meets this requirement[322].

---

[320]For some cases where the ALJ exceeded any authority to rule orally under agency rules or precedents in force at that time, see Local Union No. 195, United Ass'n of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry, 237 NLRB 931, 99 LRRM 1098 (1978); Plastic Film Products Corp. and Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, AFL-CIO 232 NLRB 722, 97 LRRM 1313 (1977).

[321]5 U.S.C. § 557(c) (1994).

[322] *See*, Charles E. McElroy, 2 NTSB 444, 1973 NTSB Lexis 30 (Order EA-499, Docket No. SE-1772) (1973). However, it should be noted that this opinion seems to focus on compliance with the

Sometimes, agency rules expressly authorize oral decisions. The Rules of Practice of the National Transportation Safety Board, for example, provide that "The law judge may render his initial decision orally at the close of the hearing . . . except as provided in § 821.56(b)."[323]

When an oral decision is issued from the bench the transcript pages upon which the oral decision appears constitute the official decision. No editing except typographical corrections should be made. A footnote should be inserted after the decision stating, in effect: "Issued orally from the bench on _____ in transcript volume _____ at page _____ through page _____ ."[324]

B. Written Decision

Most cases, because of their complexity, the size of the record, the number of parties, or the number of issues, do not lend themselves to oral disposition. The following discussion is directed to the drafting of written opinions, although some of the suggestions may also be applicable to oral decisions.

Ideally, the ALJ starts planning the decision when the case is assigned. Each procedural step, including learning and shaping the issues, determining what evidence is needed, arranging for and obtaining essential material, and conducting the hearing, should be aimed toward producing a clear, concise,

---

agency's rules.

[323] 49 CFR § 821.42 (2000). For some other examples of agency rules authorizing the ALJ to render a decision orally, see 7 CFR § 1.142(c) (2000) (Department of Agriculture); 46 CFR § 201.161 (2000) (Maritime Administration, referring to decision "whether oral or in writing").

[324] For examples of agency rules which expressly deal with the transcript of an oral decision, or otherwise reducing an oral decision to writing, see 7 CFR § 1.142(c)(2) (2000) (Agriculture: copy to be excerpted from the transcript and furnished the parties by the Hearing Clerk); 39 CFR § 961.8(g) (2000) (Postal Service: written confirmation of oral decision to be sent to the parties); 49 CFR § 821.42 (d) (2000) (NTSB, copy excerpted from transcript and furnished to parties).

and fair record[325]. Any weakness or delinquency in these earlier steps makes the final task more difficult.

Still, the most difficult writing problem usually occurs when the ALJ, facing an onerous deadline, assembles the transcript, exhibits, notes, and briefs, and starts to put down on paper the findings and conclusions. Each ALJ differs in writing habits, but all ALJs should strive constantly for improvement.

Some aspects of decision-writing, like any other form of composition, probably cannot be "taught," at least not in the sense of learning some rote formula or mechanical "rules" which will make the ALJ rival Oliver Wendell Holmes as a wordsmith. All of us probably have harbored mild envy, at one time or another, toward a colleague who seems to have a natural talent for writing. There are ALJs who seem to have a remarkable ability to organize the material, and to use language in a way which converts a thick, jumbled record into a coherent decision where everything falls into place, capturing the essence of what happened and what the case is about, and how it should be decided. Such a decision leaves the reader with a sense of inevitability -- that this was the only way that this particular decision could have been written. Most judicial opinions fall considerably short of such an ideal, but it is a goal worth keeping in mind. Unless the ALJ is simply a genius, however, it takes considerable effort and experience to attain such a state of craftsmanship.[326]

---

[325] Form 23 reflects one Judge's innovative effort to keep the record and materials organized by using the ongoing computer revolution. In complex cases, Judge Tidwell, U.S. Claims Court, sometimes issues an order requiring parties to supplement their usual paper filings by providing the court with electronic copies (on floppy disk) of filings which are greater than two pages in length. Using the search capabilities of word processing programs such as WordPerfect, Judge Tidwell is able to locate information and points in the materials much more efficiently than otherwise could be done by trying to visually scan hundreds of pages of material. Letter from Judge Moody R. Tidwell, U.S. Claims Court, dated April 3, 1992, to Morell E. Mullins.

[326] For several articles on this subject, see Borchers, Patrick, *Making Findings of Fact and Preparing a Decision*, 11 J.NAALS 85 (1991)[cited in Frost, *The Unseen Hand in Administrative Law Decisions: Organizing Principles for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 151, 171, n. 7

In the meantime, there are certain approaches, procedures, and tools that may help to make deciding and writing the case easier. Some of these will be the focus of the rest of this chapter.

1. Format

No rigid structure can be prescribed for all written decisions, but some uniformity in basic outline is customary. Every decision should contain certain preliminary material, including a *title page* with the name of the case, the type of decision (e.g. initial decision or recommended decision), the date of issuance, and the name of the ALJ. If the decision is long, there should be a *table of contents* and *headnotes* that summarize the principal issues and the decision. Also, a list of *appearances* should be included, with the names of all persons and organizations who entered an appearance and the persons and organizations represented. The name and address of each person on whom the decision is to be served should be included on a *service sheet*, usually attached at either the beginning or end of the decision.

The form of the text depends largely on the nature of the case, agency practice, and the ALJ's style. The following suggestions may be helpful:

(a) The opening paragraphs should describe succinctly what the case is about. They may include a summary of the prior procedural steps and the applicable constitutional provisions, statutes, and regulations.

(b) Although the relief requested by the parties may be described in the introduction, *detailed contentions should not be recited*. These lengthen the opinion unnecessarily since, if they

---

(1997)]; Michael Frost, *The Unseen Hand in Administrative Law Decisions: Organizing Principles for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 151 (1997); Patrick Hugg, *Professional Legal Writing: Declaring Your Independence*, 11 J. NAALS 114 (1991)[cited in Frost, *The Unseen Hand in Administrative Law Decisions: Organizing Principles for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 151, 171, n. 7 (1997)]; Patrick Hugg, *Professional Writing Methodology*, 14 J. NAALJ 165 (1994); Harold H. Kolb, Jr., *Res Ipsa Loquitur: The Writing of Opinions* 12 J. NAALS 53 (1992)[cited in Frost, *The Unseen Hand in Administrative Law Decisions: Organizing Principles for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 151, 171, n. 7 (1997)]; Irvin Stander, *Administrative Decision Writing*, 10 J. NAALJ 149 (1990).

are material and relevant, they must be set forth in detail in discussing the merits. Not observing this proscription is a common failing in opinion writing.

(c) If proposed findings and conclusions have been submitted, the ruling on each of them should be apparent from the decision,[327] so the ALJ does not necessarily need to refer to each of them specifically[328]. Likewise, insignificant or irrelevant issues raised by the parties need not be addressed specifically but can be disposed of with a statement that all other questions raised have been considered and do not justify a change in the result[329]. However, a ALJ must be extremely careful in applying this principle. If the agency or a reviewing court disagrees about the significance of a particular issue, remand may result.[330]

(d) The decision should include specific findings on all the major facts in issue without going into unnecessary detail.[331]

(e) The ALJ should apply the law to the facts and explain the decision. Whether the facts, law, and conclusions should be combined or placed in separate sections of the decision depends on the agency's requirements, the ALJ's style and such other factors as the type of case and the nature of the record.

(f) The decision should end with a summary of the principal findings of fact and conclusions of law. In addition to making specific findings and conclusions, there should be ultimate findings framed in the applicable statutory or regulatory

---

[327] *Cf.*,5 U.S.C. § 557(c) (1994).

[328] Transcontinental Coach Type Service Case, 14 CAB 720 (1951). *Cf.*, Michigan Consol. Gas Co. v. FPC, 203 F.2d 895 (3d Cir. 1953).

[329] In Northwest Air Service, Operating Authority, 32 CAB 89, 97-98 (1960), the Board denied a motion requesting a specific ruling by the ALJ on each proposed finding. For a similar holding, *see* Allegheny Segment 3 Renewal Proceeding, 36 CAB 52, 54, n. 3 (1962).

[330] *See, e.g.*, Affiliation of Arizona Indian Centers, Inc. v. Dept. of Labor, 709 F.2d 602 (9th Cir. 1983); P&Z Company, 6 OSHC (BNA) 1189, 1977 OSHD P22,055) (1977).

[331] *See e.g.*, People for Environmental Enlightenment and Responsibility (PEER) v. Minnesota Environmental Quality Council, 266 N.W. 2d 858 (Minn. 1978).

language.[332]

In a case involving many issues or complicated facts, the decision can be divided into labeled sections and subsections, with appropriate titles and subtitles. This will usually make reading, studying, and analysis of the decision easier and quicker. These divisions, with their titles, should be set forth in the table of contents.

Frequently, adopting a framework, or outline, for the decision with appropriate headings before drafting the decision will make organizing the record, deciding the issues, and writing the conclusions easier and clearer. This outline can, and probably should, change as the decision-making progresses.

(g) Footnotes should be used for such material as citations of authority and cross-references, but rarely for substantive discussion. Footnotes on each page are preferable to a numerical listing of notes (endnotes) at the end of the opinion or in an appendix. The latter arrangement is inconvenient for the reader and hinders careful reading of the decision.

(h) Citations must be sufficiently detailed to enable the researcher to find the source without difficulty. This can be assured by using a standard reference work.[333]

(i) Maps, charts, technical data, accounts, financial reports, forecasts, procedural details, and other germane background material too lengthy to be included in the text may be attached as appendices.

(j) In many cases the ALJ issues an order or proposed order. In some cases other actions are appropriate. For example, in franchise cases, a certificate must sometimes be issued or amended. Such documents should usually be added as

---

[332] Expressly setting out "ultimate" findings in words which track the statutory language or criteria is a precaution which is strongly advisable because there are older Supreme Court cases which suggest that such findings cannot be inferred from the decision's other findings and conclusions. *See*, Yonkers v. United States, 320 U.S. 685 (1944); Wichita Railroad v. Public Utilities Commission, 260 U.S. 48 (1922). *But see*, Penn Central Merger Cases, 389 U.S. 486 (1968).

[333] *E.g.*, A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF CITATION (17th ed. 2000), commonly referred to as the "Harvard Blue Book." A recent competitor to the Harvard Blue Book is Association of Legal Writing Directors & Darby Dickerson, *ALWD Citation Manual* (Aspen L. & Bus. 2000). The latter publication is updated at www.alwd.org

supplements to the decision.

2. Research

The ALJ must study the record and make an independent analysis of the facts and contentions. This requires careful examination of legal and policy precedents of the agency and of the courts.

In some agencies technical assistants may be available to Administrative Law Judges to help analyze and cross-index detailed or complicated data. At other agencies law clerks are available to provide this help.[334]

In researching agency decisions the ALJ should cover those not yet published in the bound volumes of the official reports. Many agencies have a section charged with indexing and digesting decisions and orders; the ALJ should enlist its help in finding relevant agency authority. Some agencies maintain a list of all their cases appealed to the courts and supply their ALJs with current copies.[335]

The ALJ may also seek the advice of the senior ALJs of the agency, who may recall a relevant case that has escaped the attention of other researchers. Of course the standard research texts should also be used -- notably the commercial services, texts, and law reviews. Moreover, the ALJ must take advantage of the on-going revolution in electronic data bases and computer-based electronic research. Today's commercially available services, such as Lexis® and Westlaw®, and websites maintained by agencies themselves, enable a user to conduct legal, and other, research in ways which simply would not have been feasible for a decision-writer laboring under a heavy caseload and time deadlines ten years ago. For example, an ALJ using computerized legal research literally could have at the fingertips every case decided by a particular agency, if the agency's cases are in the relevant data base. Every case "in the computer" mentioning a particular regulation can be retrieved with a few strokes on a keyboard. Or, an ALJ could locate almost every reference in the

---

[334] For an article dealing with legal and technical assistants, see Mathias, *The Use of Legal and Technical Assistants by Administrative Law Judges in Administrative Proceedings*, 1 ADMIN. L.J. 107 (1987).

[335] *See, e.g.,* cases collected by the now-defunct CAB, in its Compilation of Court Cases of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

CFR (except perhaps the changes which have only been recently published) to a term like "in camera." Research that took hours, or simply could not have been done without poring for days over printed materials, can be finished in minutes, using computerized legal research. The main problem, of course, is that the cases or other materials for which the ALJ is searching must first be in the particular data base. Although noncommercial Internet research tools are becoming increasingly available, their data bases generally do not go back as far, and are not as complete as, the commercial data bases.

Another convenient source of information about relevant facts, policy, and law is the briefs of the parties. Proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, if reliable, can save the ALJ time and effort. Of course, the ALJ must consider the reliability of counsel or the party, or both. But it is certainly acceptable to make proper and careful use of proposed findings and conclusions.[336]

Although this use of counsel's briefs and arguments is beneficial, the ALJ alone is responsible for the decision. The ALJ must use the utmost care to be sure that findings of fact are supported by the record and the conclusions of law by reliable precedent. This may require study of the legislative history of relevant statutes or review of the law of another agency which regulates a similar industry or activity.

3. The Decisional Process

The cornerstone of the formal administrative process is the principle that the decision of the Administrative Law Judge is an independent intellectual judgment, based solely upon the applicable law (including agency regulations and precedent) and the facts contained in the record. This has several consequences.

Unless the material is properly entered into the record of the case, the ALJ should not consider public or private statements of agency members, Congressmen, congressional committees, or administration officials. Other than statements that are considered part of the legislative history of the relevant statute, the only non-record pronouncements of government officials relevant to the decision are *official* and *operative* pronouncements -- agency rules and decisions, but not policy statements by the agency members; current Executive Orders, but not speeches by administration officials; statutes and relevant legislative history, but not newspaper interviews of

---

[336] *See, e.g.*, Schwerman Trucking Co. v. Gartland Steamship Co., 496 F.2d 466, 475 (7th Cir. 1974).

Congressmen.

Such statements, however high the source, are normally made without benefit of the facts and arguments developed in the hearing process. Still more important, in many cases the APA would prohibit the use of matters which are not on the record. "The transcript of testimony and exhibits, together with all papers and requests filed in the proceeding, constitutes the exclusive record for decision in accordance with section 557 of this title."[337] Even if the proceedings are not controlled by the APA's statutory limitations, it is still the better part of judging to avoid basing a decision on anything extraneous to the record.[338]

A few words are necessary concerning the relationship which the decision should bear to the established policies of the agency. It is the ALJ's duty to decide all cases in accordance with agency policy.[339]

This duty can be especially perplexing in at least two types of situations. First, court decisions (other than those of the Supreme Court) may have found the agency's policy or view to be erroneous, but the agency disagrees, and announces its "nonacquiescence," at least outside the circuit where the unfavorable decision was rendered. In this case, the agency takes

---

[337] 5 U.S.C. § 556(e) (1994). This section also provides for official notice.

[338] *See*, Home Box Office, Inc., v. FCC, 567 F.2d 9 (D.C. Cir. 1977) (rulemaking). *But see*, Action for Children's Television v. FCC, 564 F.2d 468 (D.C. Cir. 1977) (rulemaking); Sierra Club v. Costle, 657 F.2d 298 (D.C. Cir. 1981) (rulemaking). While the cases cited here involved rulemaking of one sort or another, and (in the main) ex parte contacts at agency head level, the point in the text remains the same. The administrative law judge's use of extra-record materials is likely to provide colorable grounds for appeal, at the very least.

[339] "Once the agency has ruled on a given matter, [moreover,] it is not open to reargument by the administrative law judge; . . . although an administrative law judge on occasion may privately disagree with the agency's treatment of a given problem, it is not his proper function to express such disagreement in his published rulings or decisions." *Iran Air v. Kugelman, 996 F. 2d 1253, 1260 (D.C. Cir. 1993)*,(opinion by Judge Ruth B. Ginsburg), quoting Joseph Zwerdling, *Reflections on the Role of an Administrative Law Judge*, 25 ADMIN. L. REV. 9, 12-13 (1973).

the position that the ALJ is bound to apply the agency view if the agency has authoritatively declared nonacquiescence[340]. Nonacquiescense has been strongly criticized by some reviewing courts.[341]

Second, the ALJ may have to decide a case under statutory criteria which are open-ended, such as "public interest," and the

---

[340] *See* Insurance Agents International Union, 119 NLRB 768 (1957). As described in an article in 1998, "Non-acquiescence is a policy of federal administrative agencies in which the agency, rather than appealing a court decision which is unfavorable to the agency, chooses to ignore it. In the context of Social Security disability claims, this has been a bone of contention for many years." Joyce Krutlick Barlow, *Alcoholism as a Disability Under the Social Security Act - An Analysis of the History, and Proposals for Change*, 18 J. NAALJ 273, 290, n. 97 (1998).

[341] Ithaca College v. NLRB, 623 F.2d 224 (2d Cir. 1980). More recent cases continue to criticize non-acquiescence. See for example, Rogers v. Chater, 118 F. 3d 600, 602 (8th Cir. 1997) ("The Commissioner's policy of non-acquiescence is flagrantly unlawful.") (dicta). For a case which recognizes that the ALJ is somewhat whipsawed if an agency is "nonacquiescent," see Hillhouse v. Harris, 547 F. Supp. 88, 93 (W.D. Ark. 1982), aff'd, 715 F.2d 428 (8th Cir. 1983) (referring to ALJ being in the position of trying to serve two masters, the courts and the Secretary of Health and Human Services). "Nonacquiescence" has generated a substantial number of law review articles, among them, Diller & Morowetz, *Intracircuit Nonacquiescence and the Breakdown of the Rule of Law: A Response to Estreicher and Revesz*, 99 YALE L.J. 801 (1990); Estreicher & Revesz, *The Uneasy Case Against Intracircuit Nonacquiescence: A Reply*, 99 YALE L.J. 831 (1990); Estreicher & Revesz, *Nonacquiescence by Federal Administrative Agencies*, 98 YALE L.J. 679 (1989); *Figler, Executive Agency Nonacquiescence to Judicial Opinions, 61 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 1664 (1993);* J. Schwartz, *Nonacquiescence, Crowell v. Benson, and Administrative Adjudication*, 77 GEO. L.J. 1815 (1989) Weis, *Agency Non-Acquiescence: Respectful Lawlessness or Legitimate Disagreement?*, 48 U. PITT. L. REV. 845 (1987); Note, *Administrative Agency Intracircuit Nonacquiescence*, 85 COLUM. L. REV. 582 (1985).

agency's decisional precedents are policy-intensive, rather than strictly legalistic. On the one hand, if the ALJ operating under such a regime can discern the agency policy, then the ALJ's decision must adhere to that policy. On the other hand, if the parties have introduced evidence or arguments not previously considered by the agency, or if there are facts or circumstances indicating that reconsideration of established agency policy may be necessary, the ALJ has not only a right but a duty to consider such matters and rule accordingly.

Moreover, although the ALJ should follow agency policy and the law, the ALJ' decision may be the last opportunity to call the attention of the agency (or the courts if the agency denies review) to an important problem of law or policy. An ALJ, while adhering to agency policies may well have a duty to the agency itself to include in his or her written opinion a temperate, careful discussion or analysis calling attention to a serious legal problem with present agency policies. The agency can ignore, or even criticize, an ALJ who is wrong , but if the agency concludes that the ALJ has identified a serious problem, the ALJ who is correct may prevent substantial inequity and injustice. Such action by an ALJ cannot be undertaken lightly but must reflect long and careful research and analysis. The ALJ's facts and reasoning, based on the record and the law, should be so clearly set forth that the agency will know exactly what has been done and why.

Turning to another delicate subject, the ALJ also must preserve the integrity of the decisional process in ways that are less obvious. For instance, the ALJ should never write a decision motivated by a desire to curry favor with the current heads of the agency, or based on considerations of the result which the ALJ thinks the current agency heads subjectively want. An ALJ's responsibility is to follow agency policy, or where necessary in a case of first impression, establish a policy consistent with existing agency policy. Attempting merely to predict future agency positions would be an abdication of this role. The whole purpose of the ALJ's decision is to give the agency the benefit of a considered decision after a proceeding specifically designed to elicit the truth. Nothing whatever is gained, and a lot can be lost, if an ALJ's decision seeks to set before the agency members only a mirror of their own thoughts, no matter how obtained.

It follows that the ALJ should not be swayed by any tentative finding of fact or tentative conclusion of law or policy contained in an order of investigation, an order to show cause, or any other action by which the agency has indicated how it may be thinking. Such premature findings may be based on

staff recommendations and, although necessary for procedural reasons, are not, cannot be, and are not intended to be, the agency's final decision. Indeed, to attribute that kind of finality to preliminary agency determinations would be to flirt with violations of procedural due process.[342]

Agency staff's views should be subjected to the same impartial scrutiny as the views of any other interested persons. The staff position is not automatically correct merely because it is put forward as an objective, untainted furthering of the public interest. It is the ALJ's responsibility to decide where the public interest lies, and the theory of the system presumes that this is best achieved by an impartial weighing of all facts and arguments.

Turning to more mechanical aspects of decision-making, the ALJ sometimes must exercise discretion in determining which issues in a complex case to consider first -- but once an issue that is determinative has been decided, the ALJ usually should proceed no further. It may be argued that if the agency disagrees as to the single decisive issue it will not have the benefit of the ALJ's independent analysis and recommendation on alternative issues. However, in a complex case the major issues may be so numerous that to decide all of them in their various combinations could be a waste of time and generate an unreasonably long and complicated decision. It will likely be quicker and easier for the agency (if it disagrees with the ALJ) to develop one alternative dispositive issue than it is for the ALJ to develop a dozen alternatives initially. Nevertheless, in a case where the decision is close on either of two determinative issues, or where two important policy or legal issues are raised, it may be advisable to decide both.

The ALJ should not uncritically accept the parties' contentions as to which issues are decisive. The parties' lack of skill, abundance of cunning, or excessive zeal, may cause them to make contentions which are incorrect as a matter of fact or law. After analyzing the record and reading the briefs the ALJ should make an independent determination of the decisive issues and focus the decision on those issues, regardless of the parties' emphasis.

A decision must not, however, rest upon a point which has not been raised at the hearing, in briefs, or in oral argument. Thorough preparation and proper management of the earlier stages of the proceeding should avoid this problem; but if, after the proceeding has been concluded, the ALJ finds an unexplored issue

[342] *See*, Withrow v. Larkin, 421 U.S. 35 (1975).

which may be dispositive, supplementary briefs or memoranda, at a minimum, should be requested.

The ALJ should decide all the issues necessary to dispose of the case unless circumstances indicate that some or all should be deferred. A decision may be deferred, for example, if it would be affected by the outcome of an appeal pending before the agency,[343] or before the Supreme Court[344]. However, there may be countervailing constraints, such as statutory time limits within which to issue a decision. These can limit the ALJ's authority to defer rendering a decision.

If in the course of hearing and deciding the case the ALJ discovers facts that indicate agency action may be necessary on other issues, recommendations for institution of another proceeding may be appropriate. For example, in a case involving the desirability of extending weekend family air fares to other days of the week, the ALJ realized that the legality of all family fares should be investigated, and recommended that the agency start such a proceeding[345]. The agency did so.[346]

If the parties timely raise new procedural questions after the close of the hearing, such as a motion to strike all or part of a brief, the ALJ should rule on them in his decision if practicable. However, when the question must be ruled upon before decision, such as a motion to receive newly discovered evidence, the ALJ should rule upon it promptly, deferring issuance of the decision if necessary. But if the parties merely renew procedural motions or objections made and disposed of at the hearing, the ALJ should let the record speak for itself unless new matters are presented that require further action or discussion.

4. Style

Administrative cases sometimes involve complicated technical

---

[343] *See* Flying Tiger-Additional Points Case, 58 CAB, 319, 322, 364, 365 (1971).

[344] This practice is, of course, common among the lower federal courts. *See, e.g.*, U.S. v. Hayles. 492 F.2d 125 (5th Cir. 1974).

[345] Capital Family Plan Case, 26 CAB 8, 9 (1957).

[346] Family Excursion Fares E-11867 (CAB, Oct. 11, 1957).

matters, statistical concepts, intricate details and abstract ideas. The ALJ should strive to present these in a fashion that a layman can understand. Technical or abstruse words should be avoided if possible; if not, they should be explained in a footnote.

Decisions should be as brief as the subject matter permits. Complicated statistical, financial, and scientific questions frequently require detailed analysis, computations, or calculations. If these are included in the text, the opinion may become unnecessarily complicated, difficult to comprehend, and unreasonably long. It is frequently preferable to include only the basic findings in the text and place the detailed material in appendices.

Sometimes factual findings should be supported by specific citations to the record. If, for example, a factual determination is based on a single item of evidence, the transcript reference should be given; or if in a rate case the ALJ makes independent cost computations from the conflicting bases and theories of different parties, citations to the record should be included, showing the derivation of each computation. However, a determination on a major factual question frequently results from consideration of numerous items of testimony of varying weight. In such circumstances, excessive references to the record can be misleading to the reader. The substance of the decision must be anchored in the record, but the number and selection of citations to the record in some respects is a matter of style.

If the evidence is conflicting, but a finding is essential, the ALJ may be tempted to compromise by using weak phrases such as "it appears" or "it seems." The ALJ should not try to evade responsibility in this fashion. A finding must be positive.

It may occasionally be desirable to quote directly from the transcript of the oral testimony. This device can be effective for emphasis, but should be used carefully. Long verbatim excerpts from the transcript may be unclear and prolix, and editing them for the opinion may lead to charges of selective quotation.

With respect to a sometimes-overlooked resource which is available to the ALJ, it is frequently advantageous to borrow directly from a brief -- a document which is, after all, part of the record. If counsel has submitted an objective finding of fact or an articulate statement of law or policy with which the ALJ entirely agrees, it is wasted effort to recast it in the ALJ’s own words. However, wholesale incorporation by reference of a party's entire brief and proposed findings, of course, ordinarily should be avoided.

It may sometimes be necessary for the decision to contain derogatory findings about a particular individual. If, for example, the testimony of a certain witness contradicts one of the findings, the ALJ may have to explain why the witness was not competent or credible. This should be avoided if possible without weakening the opinion; but if and when it is necessary, the explanation should be as temperate as the integrity of the decision will permit. Similarly, if it is necessary to correct an error or refute an absurd argument, the name of the person responsible should be omitted if that will not impair the coherence of the decision. Although the ALJ should not needlessly offend or insult any person, the decision should be scrupulous in stating the facts accurately and clearly.

Where credibility is in issue the reviewing authority may look to the ALJ's demeanor findings on the theory that the ALJ observed the witness and therefore was in the best position to evaluate the witness' credibility. Consequently, the ALJ should exercise extreme care in such findings, and avoid conclusory statements such as "from the witness' demeanor it is concluded that he cannot be believed." Instead, credibility findings should be supported by specific conduct or observations. For instance, a witness may be talkative and comfortable in response to all questions, except those addressing the issue on which credibility is doubtful, but whenever the questioning turns to that issue, the witness becomes evasive and starts looking away from the ALJ and toward counsel, as if for signals. At any rate, to the extent possible, findings grounded on witness demeanor should have some reference point in observed behavior, such as evasiveness, hesitancy, or discomfort under questioning. (For an article addressing this topic, see James P. Timony, *Demeanor Credibility*, 49 CATHOLIC U. L. REV. 903 (2000))

C. Writing the Decision

The ability to conduct a hearing and decide a case fairly and accurately is crucial, but an inability to clearly and concisely explain the resulting decision impairs the value of all other aspects of the ALJ's performance. Writing is a difficult art, and despite high qualifications, writing experience, and training, an ALJ may have difficulty putting findings and thoughts on paper. Except for the fortunate few endowed with exceptional writing ability, each ALJ must constantly work on maintaining and improving this skill.

The inferior quality of much legal writing has inspired corrective action by many schools, writers, teachers, and

critics. Some federal agencies have attempted to improve their written materials. A recent example is National Labor Relations Board, NLRB STYLE MANUAL: A GUIDE FOR LEGAL WRITING IN PLAIN ENGLISH (Revised, January 2000).

In addition, there are numerous excellent books on style and writing simple English. Some of special relevance to lawyers and ALJs are set out in Appendix III.

Legal writing need not be complex or confusing. Judge John M. Woolsey's opinion in the *Ulysses Case*,[347] familiar to many judges, is an example of clear judicial writing:

II. I have read 'Ulysses' once in its entirety and I have read those passages of which the Government particularly complains several times. In fact, for many weeks, my spare time has been devoted to the consideration of the decision which my duty would require me to make in this matter.

`Ulysses' is not an easy book to read or to understand. But there has been much written about it, and in order properly to approach the consideration of it it is advisable to read a number of other books which have now become its satellites. The study of `Ulysses' is, therefore, a heavy task.

III. The reputation of `Ulysses' in the literary world, however, warranted my taking such time as was necessary to enable me to satisfy myself as to the intent with which the book was written, for, of course, in any case where a book is claimed to be obscene it must first be determined, whether the intent with which it was written was what is called, according to the usual phrase, pornographic -- that is, written for the purpose of exploiting obscenity.

If the conclusion is that the book is pornographic that is the end of the inquiry and forfeiture must follow.

But in `Ulysses,' in spite of its unusual frankness, I do not detect anywhere the leer of the sensualist. I hold, therefore, that it is not pornographic.

---

[347]United States v. One Book Called Ulysses, 5 F. Supp. 182 (S.D.N.Y. 1933).

In writing on a difficult legal question involving a book written in an unconventional manner, Judge Woolsey's use of "I" is particularly striking. For a case of this type involving somewhat subjective standards, the use of the first person makes his thinking clear. It emphasizes that this decision, the law, and the book, *Ulysses*, deal with human beings. The only legal words in the excerpt quoted are "I hold, therefore." The language used is clear and simple English, and it tells clearly what he did personally to reach his decision. The decision is four pages long. The complete opinion contains a few unusual words and several long ones, but the entire opinion and the reasons for Judge Woolsey's action are easily understood by a layman.

Most Judges do not write with the elegance of Judge Woolsey. Sometimes, they simply do not have enough time to revise and rewrite. Nevertheless, they at least should strive to write simply enough so that anyone can understand them. Plain, simple English is more likely to convey a Judge's findings to the reader than complicated legalistic phrasing.

Nothing suggested in this book will be sufficient to give any ALJ the smooth and clear legal writing ability to which all judges aspire. Nevertheless, there are certain customs and patterns, which, if followed, can make the ALJ's decision shorter and easier to read.

Set out below, therefore, are several areas in which improvement is frequently needed. Study of this material can serve as a starting point for an ALJ seeking greater skill. No attempt is made to give a mini-course in writing or a review of grammar. This discussion deals primarily with matters of brevity, clarity, and stylistic quirks. Thorough discussions of these subjects and related matters of style and grammar will be found in books cited in Appendix III.

1. Brevity

a. Needless Words. Strunk and White's *The Elements of Style* is a good place to start. This book of only 85 pages is filled with clear suggestions for making writing more readable. The authors, emphasizing that one should omit needless words, say: "A sentence should contain no unnecessary words, a paragraph no unnecessary sentences, for the same reason that a drawing should have no unnecessary lines and a machine no unnecessary parts. This requires not that the writer make all his sentences short, or that he avoid all detail and treat his subjects only in

outline, but that every word tell."[348]

b. Short Simple Words. Long, cumbersome, and confusing words and phrases are used frequently by professional and business people including judges, lawyers, and teachers. There are, no doubt, numerous reasons for this tendency, such as a desire for precision, a desire to impress a client, or the tendency to use highly technical words even though one is writing for the layman.

Sometimes, the longer word or phrase is merely a short word lengthened unnecessarily -- a kind of inflation. A classic example is substitution of *utilize* for *use*. Unfortunately, the tendency to *utilize*, rather than *use*, remains prevalent. A few examples of the "longer word" problem follow, but their number is legion.

Long	*Short*
finalize	finish, complete
effectuate	effect
preplan, plan ahead, plan in advance	plan
point in time	time
at the present writing	now
are bound to be in agreement	agree
in the not too distant future	soon
have duly noted the contents of	have read
to the fullest possible extent	fully
along the lines of	like
regardless of the fact that	although
under circumstances in which	when
in reference to	about
in the event that	if

Use the longer words or phrases only if the shorter ones will not do.

c. Redundant Phrases. Lawyers habitually group two or more words meaning the same thing, such as *null and void; last will and testament; rest, residue, and remainder; transfer, convey, and pay over*; or *alter, change, or modify*. If a lawyer is trying to impress a client, well-known redundant phrases may be helpful, but even that is doubtful. Probably more clients are annoyed by needlessly repetitious language than are impressed by the use of stock phrases.

A judge needs only to explain to his readers -- the parties and their attorneys, the agency, the interested public, and

---

[348] Strunk & White, *The Elements of Style* 23 (3d ed. 1979).

perhaps a reviewing court -- what was done and why. A reader does not like words that confuse or words that are used for display. A reader wants only to learn with minimum time and effort what the judge said.

d. Short Sentences. Long sentences are hard to understand. A timeless motto for writers is, "Short sentences can be read; long sentences must be studied."[349] The Judge should state facts and reasons in terms easily understood by the layman as well as by the lawyer. By the use of a few connecting words with short sentences it is frequently easy to make the story flow evenly. Even if the use of simple words and short sentences in an opinion results in a little jerkiness that a stylist might avoid, little is lost so long as the meaning is clear.

Tests over a seven year period show that the average sentence length in popular magazines has been kept between twelve and fifteen words[350]. Although a Judge may argue that a legal decision is more important and deals with deeper subjects than those in popular magazine articles, ease of reading and comprehension is surely as important in the documents that rule our lives as in those that entertain us.

Long sentences make writing hard to understand. The reader, either consciously or subconsciously, needs a break -- a rest. Furthermore, one thought per sentence is easy to understand.

Therefore, break up long sentences. Aim to keep average sentence length below twenty-five words. Try to separate a long compound sentence into two or more shorter sentences. A related problem is the questionable connection of two sentences by the word *however*:

> He was driving only 30 miles per hour, however, this was too fast.

One way to revise such a sentence:

> He was driving 30 miles per hour. This was too fast.

Occasionally thoughts are so interrelated that one sentence with several clauses and phrases may seem essential. However, if no matter how arranged it is still difficult to understand, then break up the sentence into three or four parts. Clarity is more

---

[349] The revisor of the 1992 edition and the present edition cannot recall the source of this quotation, but reluctantly disclaims authorship.

[350] R. Gunning, *Technique of Clear Writing* 34 (1968).

important than stylish beauty.

Sometimes even breaking up a sentence or rewriting it does not clarify the meaning. The reason may be that the thinking is not sound or the facts are inconsistent. This applies not only to sentences but to paragraphs and even entire decisions. As Dean Landis said:

> Any judge can testify to the experience of working on opinions that won't write with the result that his conclusions are changed because of his inability to state to his satisfaction the reasons on which they depend. . . .[351]

If a thought does not look right on paper, consider backing up for a rethinking or an entirely new approach. What you believe initially to be stylistic problems in expressing the idea or point actually may be symptoms of more basic defects in the substance of the idea or point.

e. Paragraphs. Although a paragraph is used to group thoughts, there is no rigid rule for length of a paragraph. A paragraph may vary in length from a one word sentence to many sentences of substantial length and complexity.

Paragraph length should depend on what the writer is trying to communicate. Still, the writer needs to seek a balance between extremes. On the one hand, large blocks of print scare the reader. On the other hand, several short paragraphs in succession may be annoying. Most good paragraphs have between two and ten sentences. If a paragraph seems too long, it is usually possible to divide it into two or more paragraphs without disturbing or distracting the reader.

2. Punctuation

Punctuation is the simplest device for making things easier to read. It is also an important road sign to the reader: i.e., making it easier to understand the intended meaning of a passage.

Punctuation is frequently left to a stenographer. This is a mistake. Even a stenographer who knows how to punctuate may not know precisely what you want to say. Punctuation can be used to emphasize, to clarify, and to simplify. Commas, semi-colons, periods, hyphens, dashes, and all the other punctuation symbols have specific purposes. If used correctly they will simplify

---

[351]J. Landis, *The Administrative Process* 105 (1938).

writing and make your writing easier to read. Useful rules can be found in the U.S. Government Printing Office Style Manual,[352] and other grammar and style manuals. Rules vary somewhat, but reliance on any standard work should suffice to keep meanings clear and easy to understand.

3. Active or Passive Voice

Use of the active voice rather than the passive voice is frequently preferable for two reasons. First, it saves words:

The convict was sentenced by Judge Jones.
Judge Jones sentenced the convict.

Second, it is more likely to reveal who the actor is:

Drivers' licenses will be issued.
The clerk will issue drivers' licenses.

In addition, the active voice is normally more direct and vigorous. The subject of the active-voice sentence is acting or doing something. Consequently, the active voice should be used in the absence of a good reason for using the passive.

This does not mean that the passive voice always should be avoided. To the contrary, passive may be preferable when the thing done is important and who did it is not, or when the actor is unknown or indefinite. The passive voice can also be used for emphasis, or when detached abstraction is desired.

4. Ambiguity

Avoid the ambiguous. Like much advice, this is easier said than done. Often we do not realize that what we have said or written could be susceptible to more than one meaning. "This brief reads like a first draft dictated to a stenographer needing improvement." Sometimes we even refuse to see the ambiguity in our words when it is pointed out. At any rate, ambiguity slows and confuses the reader. It may even be used as a deliberate way to deceive.

Ambiguity may be especially likely when the writer uses a word with two meanings or two words with the same meaning near each other. For example, a lawyer or a judge should not use "exception," meaning an exclusion, in, or near, a sentence containing "exception" used as a legal term meaning a formal

[352]U.S. Government Printing Office (2000).

objection. (If this shortcoming occurs frequently in a piece of writing, it may be a clue that the piece is a first draft, possibly dictated to a machine or stenographer.)

When a writer deliberately uses, for the sake of "variety," two words meaning the same thing, the potential for ambiguity is no less. Problems resulting from deliberately using different words meaning the same thing, especially in the same passage of a decision or document, are discussed in the section on Elegant Variation.

In related vein, some people cannot bear to repeat a name or proper noun anywhere near its original use. They feel somehow that they must use a pronoun. But sometimes the antecedent of a pronoun is not clear. If so, do not hesitate to strike the pronoun and use the name of the individual or object. Minor stylistic awkwardness is a small price to pay for major misunderstandings. A lapse in stylistic elegance is not as bad as creating the impression among your readers that you were completely oblivious to the meaning of what you have written.

After writing and rewriting a decision, an ALJ frequently becomes so familiar with its contents that it is difficult to detect ambiguous passages. It always helps to turn it over to a law clerk or an associate for a fresh look.

5. Stylistic Quirks

Avoid stylistic quirks. These small distractions divert the reader's attention from what is being said to how it is being said. The reader has enough distractions without the writer increasing them by efforts to be verbally eccentric or cute.

a. Elegant Variation[353]. Elegant variation is the use of variety for its own sake -- changing words and structure to hold the reader's attention and to avoid boredom. The following is an example:

> The first *case* was *settled* for $2,000, and the second *piece of litigation* was *disposed of out of court* for $3,000, while the price of *amicable accord* reached in the third *suit* was $5,000.[354]

---

[353]H. Fowler, *A Dictionary of Modern Usage* 148-151 (2d ed. E. Gowers 1965).

[354]R. Wydick, *Plain English for Lawyers* 57 (1979).

But what has happened? The reader may wonder whether distinctions were intended between *case*, *piece of litigation*, and *suit*, and between *settled*, *disposed of out of court*, and *amicable accord*.

(Some writers have real difficulty avoiding elegant variation. These poor souls may be the by-product of high school and college English teachers' otherwise appropriate efforts to make their students use synonyms and produce "lively" writing. However, to any judge who is writing a decision, clear communication is primary, and liveliness is secondary.)

There are at least two ways, stylistically, to handle an elegant variation: (1) Repeat the same words or phrases. It is better to bore the reader than to confuse him. (2) Sometimes it is possible to put the repetitious material in an opening clause followed by two or more phrases or clauses that implicitly refer back to the opening clause. For example, the sample sentence could be reworded as follows:

"The first case was settled for $2000, the second for $3000, and the third for $5000."

Although breaking a document, or passage, into lettered or numbered divisions may sometimes confuse the reader, this procedure, used carefully, can frequently assist the reader. "The complainant has: (1) not filed a response to respondent's motion to suppress; (2) ignored repeated admonitions to conclude discovery by the agreed-upon date; (3) been late in every filing required by the agency's rules . . . ."

b. Litotes. Some judges use litotes, affirmative statements expressed by denying the contrary, either as false courtesy to spare someone's feelings or to express a doubtful finding. Avoid litotes unless they are clearly needed. Use *kindly* rather than *not unkindly*, *naturally* rather than *not unnaturally*. George Orwell recommended inoculation against using litotes by memorizing this sentence: "A not unblack dog was chasing a not unsmall rabbit across a not ungreen field."[355]

c. Genderless English. Avoiding the appearance of gender-bias in writing is worthwhile, but requires some effort. Moreover, the effort can be overdone, especially if the writer resorts to creating new words, like substituting "personhole" for "manhole." However, a little good faith effort often can avoid

[355]G. Orwell, *Politics and the English Language*, in SHOOTING AN ELEPHANT AND OTHER ESSAYS 90 (1950).

passages like "the writer should know that his failure to demonstrate his sensitivity to gender-bias can result in his leaving an impression that he is totally ignorant about the way language conditions his behavior." Nevertheless, the writer is in a sometimes-difficult situation. If you use *his* for any pronoun, you may be criticized. *His or her* frequently sounds awkward, and substituting *their* may obscure the meaning.

At the very least, be aware of the problem. And certainly, be consistent in referring to males and females. If you refer to men by their last names or first names do the same with women. Try to omit irrelevant references to physical characteristics of either sex. Avoid patronizing and stereotypes. Do not say *fair sex, weaker sex,* or *the ladies;* say *women*. If you use *Esquire* on a service sheet, use it for all lawyers regardless of sex. Bias implicit in such phrases as *a manly effort* or *a weak sister* should be avoided. But don't overdo it by neutering everything in sight.

There are not always clear-cut answers to problems of gender and language, but so long as sex is irrelevant the judge should word the decision carefully to avoid any sexual bias.

6. Miscellaneous

a. Names. If referring to a person or organization, it generally is appropriate to set out the name in full the first time it is mentioned, followed parentheses containing a shorter version of the name such as a word, abbreviation, or shortened title. Thereafter the word, abbreviation, or shortened title can be used throughout the decision. In most situations, do not assume that the reader is already acquainted with the NLRB or AAA. (In fact, there could be several groups with the "AAA" initials.) Write out "National Labor Relations Board (NLRB)" the first time it is mentioned; treat the American Automobile Association similarly. If the names of persons or things are similar or confusing, the ALJ should devise short easily distinguishable names or descriptions (with parenthetical explanations, if necessary).

Personal honorific titles such as Doctor, Professor, or General ordinarily should not be used if they are irrelevant. A party may infer that the ALJ is assigning some weight to the title.

b. Technical Terms. Technical terms are frequently necessary when dealing with many subjects. An ALJ who is familiar with the subject may tend to use complex and technical language incomprehensible to many persons interested in his decision. The ALJ should resist this tendency and, if possible, use words and expressions comprehensible to a lay reader. If that is

impossible, unusual words and phrases should be defined. This can be done in a footnote or a special section for definitions. Alternatively, the ALJ may summarize in the main text and put the technical details and computations in an appendix.

***c.* Attribution.** Excessive or needless attribution wastes a great deal of space, especially in judicial writing. As a consequence of realizing that anything in the written decision may have legal effect, the ALJ is tempted to overreact by repeating the source of every bit of information. There are several convenient devices for avoiding this problem. The ALJ may only need to state:

"Mr. X testified as follows:"

and continue with indirect quotations for a sentence, paragraph, or page without repeating the attribution.

The ALJ may place a summary of the testimony or statements of each witness under separate subheadings such as *Green's testimony* or *Smith's statement*.

Provided the result is clear, the ALJ may attribute the testimony early in the passage with no further reference until the last sentence, then say: "Mr. Jones concluded his testimony by stating that. . . ."

d. Speech Tags. These are journalistic expressions such as *he said*, used to attribute direct quotations. Ordinarily, speech tags should not be placed in the middle of a sentence. Also, a speech tag need not be repeated even for a long quotation. Once is usually enough.

e. Ellipsis. Ellipsis is the omission of a word or words that the reader will, by inference, understand or apply. It is frequently an easy way to avoid needless and boring repetition.

"X bank has $9 million in negotiable municipal bonds, Y bank $7 million, and Z bank $4 million."

Ellipsis is also used to shorten quotations by inserting three periods (four if the sentence is ended) for the omitted material.

f. Latin Terms. *Et al.,* an abbreviation for *et alii,* is Latin for *and others. Etc.,* an abbreviation for *et cetera,* is Latin for *and other things. And etc.* is redundant. *Et al.* may be useful in legal instruments to indicate persons whose names are not known, or for the names of parties too numerous to mention.

Sic is Latin for *so* or *thus*. It should be used only to assure the reader that what is immediately preceding is correctly quoted when on its face it appears doubtful. It should never be used to criticize grammatical errors, to call attention to jokes, or (in place of quotation marks) to indicate an ironical use of a word. *Sic* may be used to indicate that a misspelling in quoted

material appears in the original.

g. Write It Down. Although this point is not directly related to the actual writing of opinions, the ALJ should cultivate the habit of marking such details as dates, names, addresses, telephone numbers, and even the time of day, on relevant documents. The ALJ should also record such matters in office appointment books, calendars, and professional diaries. This suggestion will not directly improve an ALJ's writing, but it will save time and effort in writing opinions. All judges realize the necessity for written records and exact dates, but many waste hours looking for and attempting to verify details.

7. Being Clever

Dr. Samuel Johnson reportedly said: "Read over your composition, and when you meet with a passage that you think is particularly fine, strike it out." Although there are plenty of exceptions to this dictum, it contains some wisdom. Attempting to shine with cleverness is a good way to look foolish, and egocentric.

Once more, cleverness is NOT the first priority of decision-writing. Judges, like all writers, on occasion will have an inspiration or perform a brilliant bit of stylistic acrobatics on some obscure point, that viewed a few days no longer seems very brilliant.

The ideal is not to demonstrate your own brilliance. The ideal lies in the opposite direction. The ideal is a decision which takes so little effort to read and understand that the reader becomes unaware of the writer.

8. Rewriting

The preceding suggestions of how any judge, ALJ or otherwise, can simplify and clarify the written decision should be helpful. Judges may find that a good way to ensure clarity and sound reasoning is to have an able colleague review, edit, and criticize the decision.

Finally, all judges know that the only way to write any document is to assemble the relevant material and the dictionary, thesaurus, stylebook, and guide to citations, and to write. Then rewrite, rewrite, and rewrite.[356]

---

[356] For an excellent book which concentrates on the much-neglected topic of <u>how</u> to revise one's writing, see Ede, WORK IN PROGRESS: A GUIDE TO WRITING AND REVISING (St. Mary's Press, 1989).

Appendices

Appendix I includes a number of forms which illustrate some of the orders and devices described in the text. They were adapted from instruments used at some time or other in cases before various agencies. However, these forms are not meant to serve as a form book. They merely provide concrete examples of orders and devices described in the text. In actual practice, each case will require tailoring and departures from the example. Being merely examples, the forms remain largely unchanged from the 3rd edition, which in turn had retained many of the forms in the 1982 edition of the Manual. (Likewise, even though the Court of Federal Claims has changed its rules, Forms 18-a through 18-e, from the 1982 edition, remain excellent examples of matters discussed in the text.) Other forms in Appendix I have been adapted from orders or documents of more recent vintage, or from agencies other than those which were sources for the 1982 edition. Again, Appendix I is NOT a form book. In any event, current agency rules and practices would govern the drafting of orders or documents in particular cases.

Anyone wishing to contribute additional examples of forms is welcome to contact me.

Appendix II is a short bibliography of selected works related to alternative dispute resolution, and includes a selected list of federal government web addresses for various agencies.

Appendix III is a bibliography of trial manuals, pamphlets, periodicals, treatises, and style books, and works on writing.

Appendix IV is a selective list of books and articles related to administrative adjudication, administrative law judges, and other hearing officers. For the 2001 Interim edition, some articles and works on matters of **state agency adjudication** have been entered under their own separate category.

Appendix V is a very selective list of citations to the

procedural rules of various federal agencies using Administrative Law Judges.

Appendix VI is a copy of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Appendix I

Form 1-a

Order Scheduling Prehearing Conference, With Instructions

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

ORDER PRIOR TO PREHEARING CONFERENCE

The prehearing conference in this preceding is scheduled for _____[date]_____, commencing at 9:00 A.M.

IT IS ORDERED, that prior to the conference

(1) The parties shall attempt to achieve a settlement and shall report on their efforts at the conference, and

(2) Counsel are directed to explore the possibility of stipulating to facts and procedural matters.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that at the conference counsel shall be prepared to discuss any relevant questions including:

Pending Motions or Pleadings

All questions relating to procedures governing the course of this hearing. Counsel will disclose any plans to file additional motions or pleadings and the relief to be sought.

Discovery

Discovery plans, procedures already started, current status, probable completion date, and deadlines, subject to the following guidelines:

(1) Discovery must be initiated no later than _____date_____ and

(2) Written interrogatories or depositions upon oral examination may be used, but no both in the absence of unusual circumstances.

Exhibits

(1) The extent to which direct and rebuttal cases will be submitted in writing.

(2) Dates for exchange of exhibits.

(3) Preparation and organization of exhibits, including identification and numbering.

(4) The need for copies and the numbering of documents of which official notice is requested.

Witness Notification

The date or dates on which each party will notify every other party of those witnesses it desires to cross-examine and the areas to be covered by such cross-examination.

Hearing Date and Place

The date and place of the hearing most convenient to the parties.

[Date]

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This order is adapted from a Federal Communications Commission order.

Order Scheduling Prehearing Conference **Form 1-b**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AGENCY
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

PRESIDING ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S ORDER
CONVENING PREHEARING CONFERENCE

In accordance with the agency's order of _____[date]_____, a prehearing conference will be held at 10:00 A.M., ____[date]____, in a hearing room at _____[place]_____, Washington, D.C. The parties are to be prepared to present discovery requests, to identify all outstanding issues, to stipulate to all factual matters not in dispute, and to propose a procedural schedule.

[Date]

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This order is adapted from a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission order.

Form 1-c

Letter to Unrepresented Party Confirming Prehearing Conference

Agency/ALJ Address

Addressee Address

Dear _____ :

This is to confirm my telephone call setting up a prehearing conference. As was indicated in our conversation, [I/the Administrative Judge] believe[s] such a conference will help expedite your case. He/She has asked me to conduct the conference with you.

The prehearing conference will be held on (Day of Week), (Full Date), at (Time) o'clock in Room _____ of _____ Building, (Number and Street, City. State) .

You should bring to the conference _____ (and) any additional evidence you wish to submit.

The time of this Conference has been set aside especially for you. If you are not able to attend at the scheduled timed or if you decide that you do not wish to attend the conference, please call me at once at (telephone number).

The purpose of this conference is (1) to clarify the factual data and issues in your case (and)/, (2) to determine if additional evidence is needed (./and _____) . The conference will be informal and no testimony will be taken. Therefore you do not need to bring any witnesses with you.

If you have obtained, or are planning to obtain, an attorney or other individual to represent you in your (claim)/case please advise me at once.

Sincerely yours,

NOTE: Adapted from Social Security Administration letter.

Form 1-d

Letter to Representative Confirming Prehearing Conference

Agency/ALJ Address

Addressee Address

Dear _____ :

This is to confirm my telephone call setting up a prehearing conference in the case of _____. As was indicated in our conversation, [I/the Administrative Judge] believe[s] such a conference will help expedite your client's case. [The Administrative Law Judge has asked me to conduct the conference with you.]

The prehearing conference will be held on (Day of Week), (Full Date), at (Time) o'clock in Room _____ of _____ Building, (Number and Street, City. State) .

You should bring to the conference _____ (and) any additional evidence you wish to submit.

The time of this Conference has been set aside especially for you. If you are not able to attend at the scheduled timed or if you decide that you do not wish to attend the conference, please call me at once at (telephone number) .

The purpose of this conference is (1) to clarify the factual data and issues in your case (and)/, (2) to determine if additional evidence is needed (./and _____) . The conference will be informal and no testimony will be taken. Therefore you do not need to bring any witnesses with you.

You may wish to have your client accompany you to the conference.

Sincerely yours,

cc. claimant or others

APPENDIX I - FORMS

NOTE: Adapted from Social Security Administration letter.

Appearance Sheet **Form 2**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AGENCY
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____
PLEASE PRINT OR
WRITE CLEARLY Date _____

APPEARANCE SHEET

1. Applicant _____ Prospective Applicant _____
   Intervenor _____ Prospective Intervenor _____
2. Person upon whom service is to be made (one person):
   Full Name _____
   Firm Name _____Telephone:_____
   Address _____ ZIP_____
   Representing _____
3. Persons in addition to (2) above whose appearances are to be noted:
   Full Name _____Telephone:_____
   Address _____ ZIP_____
   Full Name _____Telephone:_____
   Address _____ ZIP_____
4. Number of copies of exhibits, pleadings, and other communications to be sent to the person in (2) above:_____copies
5. Persons, in addition to (2) above, to whom exhibits, pleadings, and other communications are to be sent. In deference to each other and to minimize expenses, please limit requests to copies actually needed. A mailing list will be attached to the prehearing conference report.

Full Name _____ Copies _____
Address _____ ZIP_____
Full Name _____ Copies _____
Address _____ ZIP_____
Full Name _____ Copies _____
Address _____ ZIP_____

NOTE: This appearance sheet is adapted from standard forms used at the former Civil Aeronautics Board and at the Federal Communications Commission.

GROUND RULES **FORM 3**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

GROUND RULES

1. **Evidence**. All evidence, including the testimony of witnesses, shall be prepared in written exhibit form and shall be served at dates designated by the Administrative Law Judge in advance of the hearing. Evidence as to events occurring after the exhibit exchange dates shall be presented by revision of exhibits.

Unless sponsorship is waived, witnesses cognizant of the exhibits shall be made available for cross-examination. Such witnesses shall have available at the hearing the work papers used in preparing their exhibits. Witnesses will not be permitted to read prepared testimony into the record.

The evidentiary record shall be limited to factual material. Argument will not be received in evidence but rather should be presented in the briefs.

2. **Exhibits Generally**. Information responses, exhibits, and written testimony shall be exchanged on prescribed dates prior to the hearing. Two copies shall be served upon the Administrative Law Judge and copies shall be sent to the parties in accordance with the attached mailing list. One of the Administrative Law Judge's copies is to be tabbed.

The exhibits shall include appropriate footnotes or narrative explaining the source of the information used and the methods employed in statistical compilations and estimates. Rebuttal exhibits shall refer specifically to the exhibits being rebutted.

Each party shall submit, prior to the hearing, lists of (a) its exhibits, appropriately indexed as to number and title, and (b) the witnesses sponsoring particular exhibits.

Where one part of a multi-page exhibit is based upon another part, appropriate cross-reference shall be made. For example, a profit-and-loss forecast based on detailed estimates appearing on

other pages should contain specific references showing which pages support the different individual items of the forecast. Such exhibits shall be arranged in an organized manner in accordance with the party's theory of the case.

3. **Title of Exhibits.** The principal title of each exhibit should state precisely what it contains and may also contain a statement of the purpose for which the exhibit is offered. However, such statements will not be considered as part of the evidentiary record.

4. **Authenticity of Documents.** The authenticity of all documents submitted as proposed exhibits in advance of the hearing shall be deemed admitted unless written objection is filed prior to the hearing, except that a party will be permitted to challenge such authenticity at a later time upon a clear showing of good cause for failure to have filed such written objection. For example, absent objection, if an exhibit purporting to be a copy of a letter mailed on a certain date were submitted, it would not be necessary to prove such mailing or the accuracy of the copy.

HEARING

5. **Statement of Position.** Counsel for each party shall submit a statement of position before he presents his direct case. It shall include his theory of the case and such other material as directed by the Judge. This statement shall not be subject to cross-examination and shall not be received in evidence.

6. **Order of Presentation and Cross-Examination.** The order of presentation will be as follows, alphabetically within each category:

(1) Civic Parties
(2) Applicants
(3) Industry Intervenors
(4) Labor Parties
(5) Governmental Agencies
(6) Other Parties and Other Interested Persons
(7) Agency Staff

Each party shall develop the hearing record on direct examination in logical order, and rebuttal shall be presented at the same time as the direct case. The order of cross-examination

will be the same as for presenting direct cases unless the Judge deems some other order more appropriate.

7. **Requirement for Submission of Corrected Copies of Exhibits.** Each party shall present at the hearing three fully corrected sets of its exhibits received in evidence. The original is to be presented to the reporter, and ultimately will be transmitted to the agency for inclusion in the original docket. The other two copies are to be presented to the Administrative Law Judge, one for his use and the other for inclusion in the duplicate docket maintained by the agency.

8. **Cross-Examination.** Cross-examination, except by agency staff, shall be limited to the scope of the direct examination and to witnesses whose testimony is adverse to the party desiring to cross-examine. This is intended specifically to prohibit so-called "friendly cross-examination."

Second rounds of cross-examination normally will not be permitted. Cross-examination of any particular witness shall be limited to one attorney for each party.

9. **Motions.** Oral presentation on any motion or objection shall be limited to the party or parties making the motion or objection and the party or parties against whom the motion or objection is directed. Such presentations shall also be limited to one attorney for each party.

10. **Official Notice and Stipulation.** Parties using stipulated or officially noticed material shall refer to it by specific pages.

11. **Receipt of Evidence Without Sponsoring Witnesses.** Any party who believes he has evidence of a non-controversial nature that is appropriate for receipt in evidence without the necessity of a sponsoring witness may present with his exhibit exchange time (1) an affidavit, by the persons who prepared the exhibits, to the effect that they were prepared by the witness or under his direction and are true and correct, and (2) a request that the exhibits be received in evidence without a witness at the hearing.

Any party who desires to cross-examine and therefore objects to such a request shall advise the requesting party in writing, with copy to the Administrative Law Judge, at least ten calendar days prior to the hearing (five calendar days in the case of rebuttal exhibits), specifying the witness or witnesses he

intends to cross-examine. If no objections are received, the exhibit will be received without a witness at the hearing, subject, of course, to the right of objection on other grounds.

12. These rules are deemed consistent with the orderly conduct of this proceeding. Exceptions to any rule may be made by the Administrative Law Judge for good cause shown.

[Date}

_____

Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: These rules are adapted from the standard rules used at the former Civil Aeronautics Board.

Prehearing Conference Report **Form 4-a**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. 101

PREHEARING CONFERENCE REPORT

Pursuant to notice a prehearing conference was held on [date] and the following appearances were entered:

[Names of counsel and parties represented]

Issues. The agency on [date] directed that this proceeding, which involves the question of whether A company or John Smith has acquired control of B Company and whether such control should be approved, be set for hearing on an expedited basis.

On [date], A Company, B Company, and C Company filed an application requesting approval of the acquisition of control of B Company by A Company from C Company. This application was assigned Docket No. 102.

At the prehearing conference the Administrative Law Judge ruled that he would recommend that docket Nos. 101 and 102 be consolidated, and the conference was held on that basis.

Requests for Information. Several parties requested that specified information be submitted by one or more of the other parties. The parties agreed to circulate the material described in Appendix I.

Material to be Stipulated. A proposed stipulation listing material of general availability was circulated. A copy of that document will be attached only to the docket copy of this report, but not to any other copies since the proposed stipulation was distributed to counsel at the conference. Additional copies of the stipulation, if needed, may be obtained from agency staff.

It was agreed that the parties will be allowed until the date fixed for the submission of exhibits-in-chief to object to any item on the list or to suggest additional items. Otherwise the material will be considered to have been admitted by stipulation.

Written Testimony. Each party shall submit written or explanatory testimony with reference to its own exhibits at the time these exhibits are submitted. Rebuttal or surrebuttal testimony shall be submitted at the time fixed for submitting that type of exhibit.

Ground Rules. A proposed set of "ground rules" to be followed during subsequent stages of the proceeding was circulated. After some minor adjustments the Administrative Law Judge adopted the ground rules attached as Appendix 2.

Dates for Subsequent Procedural Steps:

Exhibits in Chief _____

Rebuttal Exhibits _____

Tentative Hearing Date _____

[Date]

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This report is adapted from a former Civil Aeronautics Board report. The attachments are omitted.

Prehearing Conference Report **Form 4-b**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

Issued: [date] Released: [date]

Pursuant to agreement reached at a prehearing conference held this date, IT IS ORDERED that the following schedule shall govern the initial course of this proceeding:

[date]	-Exchange of exhibits in regard to Issue 1 plus a list of any witnesses who will testify orally, including an indication of the nature of their proposed testimony.
[date]	-Notification of witnesses desired for cross-examination.
[date]	-Commencement of hearing re Issue 1.

At the conclusion of this phase of the proceeding, dates will be set for the hearing in regard to the comparative issue and whatever additional issues might by then have been added as a result of the pending petitions to enlarge issues.

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This report is adapted from an order of the Federal Communications Commission.

Final Prehearing Conference Order **Form 4-c**

FINAL PREHEARING ORDER

Case Caption

A final prehearing conference was held in this matter, pursuant to Rule ___ of the Commission's Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings (___ CFR _____), on the -- -- -- day of -- -- -- -- -- -- , 19 -- , at -- -- o'clock, -- m.

Counsel appeared as follows:

For the Complainant:

For the Respondent(s):

Others:

1. Nature of Action and Jurisdiction. This is an action for -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- and the jurisdiction of the Commission is invoked under United States Code, Title -- -- -- -- -- -- , Section -- -- -- -- -- -- and under the Code of Federal Regulations, Title -- -- -- -- , Section -- -- -- -- . The jurisdiction of the Commission is (not) disputed. The question of jurisdiction was decided as follows:

2. Stipulations and Statements. The following stipulation(s) and statement(s) were submitted, attached to, and made a part of this order:

(a) A comprehensive written stipulation or statement of all uncontested facts;

(b) A concise summary of the ultimate facts as claimed by each party. (Set forth the claimed facts, specifically; for example, if a violation is claimed, Counsel must assert specifically the acts of violation complained of; Counsel for each respondent must reply with equal clarity and detail.)

(c) Written stipulation(s) or statement(s) setting forth the qualifications of the expert witnesses to be called by each party;

(d) Written list(s) of the witnesses whom each party will call, written list(s) of the additional witnesses whom each party may call, and a statement of the subject matter on which each witness will testify;

(e) An agreed statement of the contested issues of fact and of law, or separate statements by each party of any contested issues of fact and law not agreed to.

(f) A list of all depositions to be read into evidence and statements of any objections thereto;

(g) A list and brief description of any charts, graphs, models, schematic diagrams, and similar objects that will be used in opening statements or closing arguments but will not be offered in evidence. If any other such objects are to be used by any party, those objects will be submitted to opposing counsel at least three days prior to the hearing. If there is then any objection to their use, the dispute will be submitted to the Presiding Officer at least one day prior to the hearing;

(h) Written waivers of claims or defenses which have been abandoned by the parties.

The foregoing were modified at the pretrial conference as follows:

(To be completed at the conference itself. If none, recite "none".)

3. Complainant's Evidence.

3.1 The following exhibits were offered by Complainant, received in evidence, and marked as follows:

(Identification number and brief description of each exhibit)

The authenticity of these exhibits has been stipulated.

3.2 The following exhibits were offered by complainant, and respondent(s) (and party intervenors) the right to object to their receipt in evidence on the grounds stated:

(Identification number and brief description of each exhibit. State briefly ground of objection, e.g., competency, relevancy, materiality) brochure

4. Respondent's Evidence.

4.1 The following exhibits were offered by the respondent(s), received in evidence, and marked as herein indicated:

(Identification number and brief description of each exhibit)

The authenticity of these exhibits has been stipulated.

4.2 The following exhibits were offered by the respondent(s) and marked for identification. T here was reserved to complainant (and party intervenors) the right to object to their receipt in evidence on the grounds stated:

(Identification number and brief description of each exhibit. State briefly ground of objection, e.g., competency, relevancy, materiality)

5. Party Intervenor's Evidence.

5.1 The following exhibits were offered by the party intervenor(s), received in evidence, and marked as herein indicated:

(Identification number and brief description of each exhibit)

The authenticity of these exhibits has been stipulated.

5.2 The following exhibits were offered by the party intervenor(s) and marked for identification. There was reserved to complainant and respondent(s) the right to object to their receipt in evidence on the grounds stated:

(Identification number and brief description of each exhibit. State briefly ground of objection, e.g., competency, relevancy, materiality)

Note -- If any other exhibits are to be offered by any party, such exhibits will be submitted to opposing counsel at least ten (10) days prior to hearing, and a supplemental note of evidence filed into this record.

6. Additional Actions. The following additional action(s) were taken:

(Amendments to pleadings, agreements of the parties, disposition of motions, separation of issues of liability and remedy, etc., if necessary)

7. Limitations and Reservations.

7.1 Each of the parties has the right to further supplement the list of witnesses not later than ten (10) days prior to commencement of the hearing by furnishing opposing counsel with the name and address of the witness and general subject matter of his/her testimony and by filing a supplement to this pretrial order. Thereafter, additional witnesses may be added only after application to the Presiding Officer, for good cause shown.

7.2 Rebuttal witnesses not listed in the exhibits to this order may be called only if the necessity of their testimony could not reasonably be foreseen ten (10) days prior to trial. If it appears to counsel at any time before trial that such rebuttal witnesses will be called, notice will immediately be given to opposing counsel and the Presiding Officer.

7.3 The probable length of hearing is -- -- days. The hearing will commence on the -- -- day of -- -- -- -- , 19 -- , at -- o'clock -- m. at -- -- -- -- .

7.4 Prehearing briefs will be filed not later than 5:00 p.m. on -- -- -- --
(Insert date not later than ten (10) days prior to the hearing.) All anticipated legal questions, including those relating to the admissibility of evidence, must be covered by prehearing briefs.

This prehearing order has been formulated after a conference at which counsel for the respective parties appeared. Reasonable opportunity has been afforded counsel for corrections or

additions prior to signing. It will control the course of the hearing, and it may not be amended except by consent of the parties and the Presiding Officer, or by order of the Presiding Officer to prevent manifest injustice.

_____

Presiding Officer.

Dated:

Approved as to Form and Substance Date: --

Attorney for Complainant. --

Attorney for Respondent(s) --

Attorney for Intervenors

(Adapted from Consumer Produce Safety Commission, suggested form at 16 CFR § 1025. Appendix I)

Interlocutory Order **Form 5**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

ORDER

Issued: _____ Released: [date]

Under consideration is a letter dated _____ from counsel for the Respondent, requesting that the hearing in this case be postponed to a date more convenient for counsel. The letter does not comply with agency rules and, apparently, the required filing with the agency's secretary was not made. Nevertheless, consideration will be given to the merits of the request.

The letter arrived in this office on [date], the day after exhibits and witness lists were due and nearly a month after the order scheduling this case for hearing. Moreover, the Agency Bureau has now filed and served the Respondent with the exhibits for the proceeding. (The Respondent has not indicated whether he will present witnesses or exhibits.) To delay further a hearing would be a disservice to all parties, and inefficient use of the agency's resources, and would not serve the public interest.

IT IS ORDERED that the request to postpone the hearing BE DENIED.

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This order is adapted from a Federal Communications Commission order.

Prehearing conference Instructions **Form 6-a**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

ORDER PRIOR TO PREHEARING CONFERENCE

Issued: [date] Released: [date]

A prehearing conference and a hearing are scheduled to begin at [place], on October 12, 1982, at 10:00 A.M.

To prepare for the hearing IT IS ORDERED that the parties comply with the five following subparagraphs:

(1) On designated issues (b) and (c), Bureau counsel will prepare and serve on the other parties and the Presiding Officer a document that specifies the reasons those issues were included in the designation order. See __CFR ____. This document will be served on or before August 24, 1982.

(2) On designated issues (b) and (c), both the burden of proceeding and the burden of proof have been placed on A Company. On or before September 7, 1982, A Company will serve on all other parties and the Presiding Officer any written documents it intends to rely on in support of its direct case, and a list of the witnesses (names and addresses) who will testify regarding those two issues.

(3) On issues (a)(1) through (7), each applicant is responsible for presenting the required information about its own proposal.

(4) On issues (a)(2) through (7), each applicant will reduce the essential facts to writing and present that material as an exhibit at the hearing. That exhibit will be accompanied by the affidavit of the witness or witnesses who prepared the material and who may be cross-examined on it.

(5) All written materials referred to in paragraphs (3) and (4) supra will be exchanged with all the other parties and the Presiding Officer on or before September 7, 1982.

_____

Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This order is adapted from an FCC order.

Prehearing Conference Order/Instructions ("Simple" case) Form 6-b

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
[ADDRESS]

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

NOTICE OF CONFERENCE AND HEARING

This case is noticed for conference to be immediately followed by hearing. Said conference/hearing to be held on _____, at _____. [The parties will be notified later as to the exact location of the hearing.]

Parties or their representatives are required to be present unless previously excused by the undersigned Judge. Failure to appear will be considered a cause for dismissal and entry of judgment.

Prior to the date of the conference, the parties shall confer regarding: (1) possible settlement; (2) possible stipulations or admissions; (3) the narrowing of issues; (4) defenses; (5) witnesses and exhibits; (6) motions; (7) an agreed statement of issues and facts; and (8) any other pertinent matters.

At the conference, the parties shall be prepared to report on settlement efforts and all other matters which will tend to simplify the issues and expedite the proceedings. Hearing will proceed immediately upon the conclusion of the conference.

If a settlement has been agreed to, even though not yet executed, and the undersigned Judge has been timely advised, it may be unnecessary for the parties to attend this conference/hearing.

[The respondent shall post and/or serve a copy of this notice in accordance with Rule ____ of the [Commission's] Rules of Procedure. Failure of the respondent to do so may be considered as grounds for dismissal of respondent's notice of contest.]

[Employees or their representatives wishing to take part in these proceedings as a party may do so by filing notice of their determination to do so at least ten (10) days before the date set for hearing. See [§ 29 C.F.R. ____]

_____

Administrative Law Judge

Date: _____

NOTE: This notice is adapted from an Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission ALJ's notice.

Prehearing Conference Order/Instructions ("Simple" case) Form 6-c

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
[ADDRESS]

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

ORDER REQUIRING PARTIES TO MEET
PURSUANT TO [SIMPLIFIED PROCEEDINGS]

This matter is before the undersigned for simplified proceedings pursuant to _____ C.F.R. § _____.

It is hereby ORDERED:

That the parties meet and confer within twenty (20) days after receipt of this Order.

The following matters shall be discussed:

1. Settlement of the case.

2. Narrowing the issues.

3. Agreed statement of the issues and facts.

4. Defenses.

5. Witnesses and exhibits.

6. Motions.

7. Any other pertinent matter(s).

It is further ORDERED that within twenty-five (25) days of receipt of this order, the parties shall report the results of their discussions to the undersigned Judge. Upon receipt of this report, unless the case is settled, the undersigned shall

schedule and preside over a conference/hearing at an early date.

_____

Administrative Law Judge

Date: _____.

Copies to:

_____

_____

_____

NOTE: This order is adapted from an Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission ALJ's order.

Order Granting Permission to Appeal Interlocutory Ruling Form 7

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

ORDER GRANTING PERMISSION TO FILE APPEAL FROM INTERLOCUTORY RULING

SERVICE: [List of names and addresses of all parties and counsel]

On _____[date]_____ agency staff submitted a request for (1) reconsideration or, in the alternative, (2) permission to file an appeal from an interlocutory ruling, dated _____.

In view of the extraordinary circumstances involved, I consent to the appeal of my ruling on agency staff's motion to dismiss, in accordance with Section ____ of the agency's Rules of Practice, ____CFR____. An agency ruling at this point on the question of the application of res judicata in cases where the passage of time is a factor, as contrasted with a ruling after a full hearing in the matter is completed, is in the public interest and is necessary to prevent substantial detriment to the public interest and the parties.

The parties shall have thirty (30) days in which to brief the question presented in the appeal to the agency.

[Date]

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This form is adapted from a National Transportation Safety Board order.

Administrative Law Judge's Questions **Form 8-a**

UNITED STATE OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of case] Docket No. _____

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES'S QUESTIONS

Counsel for the agency and for the respondents are directed to answer and present argument on the following questions. Responses shall be in writing and served by _____[date]_____.

1. What does the legislative history indicate were all the reasons for adopting the requirement of Presidential approval of the regulations? Give all specific references. Was there discussion of a need for uniformity prior to ___[date]____ when Congressman _____ introduced this proposal?

2. Section _____of the Act originally provided that each agency should take action to effectuate the provisions of section _____and that such action may be taken by rule or regulation or order of general applicability. This was later amended to a direction to effectuate section _____by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability. Why was this change made? Give all specific references. Was this change made after _____[date]_____? If so, does it affect the argument on page 17 of the brief of the agency that there was no suggestion that all major issues must be resolved by regulation, and that the agencies (not the President) would have a good deal of discretion?

Counsel for respondents are invited to answer the questions previously addressed to the agency by the notice of ___[date]___.

[Date]

_____
Administrative Law Judge

Copies to all parties

NOTE: These questions are adapted from questions used in a Department of Health and Human Services proceeding.

Administrative Law Judge's Letter to Expert Witness Form 8-b

Dear [Dr.] _____:

This letter is a request for your professional opinion in connection with _____'s disability claim, which is now before me for a hearing and decision.

Enclosed is a proposed exhibit, _____, which summarizes your professional qualifications. If necessary, please correct or complete the form to accurately reflect your professional qualifications, and return the original to me. The copy is for your files.

Also enclosed are copies of pertinent evidence for your consideration. Based on your professional knowledge and the information provided, please furnish written answers to the enclosed interrogatories. If additional space is needed, you may use the reverse side of the interrogatories or attach additional pages. A copy of this letter and the completed interrogatories will be made a part of the record of the proceedings in this case.

Submit your charges for this service in accordance with your Blanket Purchase Arrangement with the Department of _____ _____. Sign the enclosed Contractor's Invoice and return it to me, along with the completed interrogatories, the evidence, and the other documents, as soon as possible, but no later than __ (date) ___. For your convenience, I am enclosing a postage-paid, self-addressed envelope.

Sincerely yours,

Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This form is adapted from a letter used by the Social Security Administration.

Administrative Law Judge's Interrogatories to Expert **Form 8-c**

Individual:

SSN:

Claim for:

1. Please state your full name and address.

2. Is the attached curriculum vitae a correct summary of your professional qualifications?

3. Are you board-certified in any medical field and, if so, which field?

4. Are you aware that your responses to these interrogatories are sought from you in the role of an impartial _(medical) (vocational) (other)_ expert?

5. Has there been any prior communication between the Administrative law Judge and yourself regarding the merits of this case?

6. Have you ever personally examined the claimant?

7. Have you read the medical data pertaining to the claimant which we furnished you?

8. Is there sufficient medical evidence of record to allow you to form an opinion of _(the claimant's medical status) (other)_ ? If not, what other evidence is required?

9. Please list the claimant's physical and/or mental impairments resulting from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which are demonstrable by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. In addition, please state your opinion as to the severity of each impairment, and the exhibits and objective findings which support your opinion.

10. Are there any conflicts in the medical evidence of record which affected your opinion and, if so, please state how you resolved them?

11. Have we furnished you with copies of the pertinent section of the Listing of Impairments, Appendix I, Subpart P, Social Security Regulations, No. ___?

12. In your opinion, do any of the claimant's impairments, when taken individually, meet the requirements of any of the listed impairments? Please fully explain this answer . . . .

13. . . .

. . . .

20. Do you have any additional comments or information which may assist us in reaching a decision? If so, please state.

NOTE: This form is adapted from a form used by the Social Security Administration.

Form 8-d

Letter Sending Interrogatories to Claimant or Representative

Dear _____:

This refers to Mr./Mrs./Ms./your claim for disability benefits. I have determined that it is necessary to obtain further evidence from a/an medical/other expert. I proposed to do this by requesting a/an medical/other expert to review the file and to answer written interrogatories/questions about your claim.

I am enclosing the interrogatories/questions that I propose to submit to the expert. You may:

object to any of the questions;
propose other questions; or
object to my obtaining this information by means of interrogatories/questions .

If I revise the interrogatories/questions based on your comments, I will give you another opportunity to comment on the revised interrogatories/questions. I will also send you a copy of the expert's responses. You may then:

comment on the responses to the interrogatories/questions;
submit more evidence; or
ask me to submit additional interrogatories/questions to the expert.

If you object to my sending interrogatories/questions to an expert, you may request that I obtain the evidence at a supplemental hearing.

If I do not receive a response from you within 20 days from the date of this letter, I will assume you have no objections and no additional interrogatories/questions. I will then send the enclosed interrogatories/questions to the expert.

Please contact me if you have any questions on this procedure.

Sincerely yours,

Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This form is adapted from a letter used by the Social

Security Administration.

Letter Sending Revised Interrogatories to Claimant or Representative **Form 8-e**

Dear _____:

In response to your comments of date, I have revised the interrogatories/questions that I originally proposed to submit to a/an medical/other expert. I am enclosing the revised interrogatories/questions.

If you have any further comments, please send them to me within 10 days from the date of this letter. After that time, I will request an expert to respond to the interrogatories/questions.

Sincerely yours,

Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This form is adapted from a letter used by the Social Security Administration.

Letter Proffering the Responses to the Interrogatories to the Claimant or Representative **Form 8-f**

Dear _____:

This refers to [Mr./Mrs./Ms. 's] [your] claim for disability benefits. I have received responses to the [interrogatories/questions] I submitted to _____, a _____ expert. I have enclosed a copy of those responses and a statement of _____'s professional qualifications.

Please review this material carefully. You may:

o submit a written statement of the facts and law in this case, including any comments you wish to make on the expert witness' responses; or

o request that the expert witness answer further [interrogatories/questions]; or

o _____.

If you wish to question the expert witness at a [supplemental] hearing, you may so request. If you so request, I will schedule a [supplemental] hearing and will notify you of the time and location of the hearing.

If I do not receive a response from you within 20 days from the date of this letter, I will conclude that you have no additional [interrogatories/questions] and that you do not wish to submit anything further. Also, I will accept into the record as additional evidence the questions to the expert, the expert's responses, and the statement of the expert's professional qualifications, and issue a decision.

Sincerely yours,

Administrative Law Judge

Enclosures
[cc: claimant/others]

NOTE: This form is adapted from a letter used by the Social Security Administration.

Intervention Order **Form 9**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Agency

Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

ORDER GRANTING, DENYING, AND DISMISSING PETITIONS TO INTERVENE

Petitions to intervene were filed before May 10, 1982, by a Company, B city, C City, D City Airport commission, and E Association International. The hearing commenced May 10, 1982.

A Company provides service to points at issue herein. As such, therefore, it may be affected by any order that may be entered, and its interest may not be adequately represented by existing parties.

Cities B and D now receive service pursuant to route authorizations that are at issue herein. Each, therefore, may be affected by any order that may be entered and its interest may not be adequately represented by existing parties.

The petitioning labor organization E represents employees of carriers whose route authorizations are proposed for modification and/or change herein. It, therefore, may be affected by any order that may be entered and its interest may not be adequately represented by existing parties.

No proposal for modifying the air service authorized to C City is included among the issues in this proceeding and, consequently, any interest C City may have it too remote to justify intervention.

Pursuant to authority delegated by the agency in its regulations, it is found that each petitioner, except C City, has a sufficient economic interest in this proceeding to justify its participation as a party.

By petition filed August 2, 1982, F City seeks to intervene. The agency's Rules of Practice require filing of a petition to intervene by a city, other public body, or a chamber of commerce not later than the last day prior to the beginning of the

hearing. This rule provides that a petition that is not timely filed shall be dismissed unless the petitioner shall clearly show good cause for the failure to file on time.

In support of its contention that there is good cause for failure to file the petition until this late date, the petitioner asserts failure to receive notice of the pendency of the proceeding. The notice of hearing was published on April 1, 1982 (_____Fed. Reg. _____). Moreover, official notice is taken that the pendency of this proceeding has also been widely covered in the press, including trade and business magazines and publications.

Pursuant to authority delegated by the agency in its regulations,_____CFR_____, it is found that the petitioner has not clearly shown good cause for failure to file its petition on time.

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED:

1. That all of the above petitions to intervene, except that of C City and F City, are granted.

2. That the petition of C City to intervene is denied.

3. That the petition of F City is dismissed.

Persons entitled to petition the Board for review of this order pursuant to the agency's regulations, ____CFR_____, may file such petitions within ten days after the date of service of this order.

This order shall be effective and become the action of the agency upon expiration of the above period unless before that date a petition for review is filed, or the agency gives notice that it will review this order on its own motion.

[Date]

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This form is adapted from several orders issued by the former Civil Aeronautics Board.

NOTICE OF HEARING **FORM 10-a**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

NOTICE OF HEARING

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the hearings in docket Number ___, ____, and will commence at 10:00 A.M. on _____[date]___, in Room _ _____, Federal Building, ____[city and state]___.

For information concerning the issues involved and other details in this proceeding, interested persons are referred to the prehearing conference report issued on ___[date]_____ and other documents which are in the docket of this proceeding on file in the Docket Section of the Agency.

[Date]

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This notice is adapted from a Federal Reserve System notice.

NOTICE OF HEARING **FORM 10-b**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Adress

Caption

NOTICE OF HEARING

A hearing will be held in the above matter on August 29, 1988, at 9:30 a.m. at/in [full address, including where relevant the name of the building [e.g., New Courthouse Building, city, state] __. Please report to [clerk's office, first floor, for information regarding room number] [other purposes].

Pursuant to section 9(b) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act and section [ ] of the Commission's Rules of Procedure, the respondent is hereby required to serve and/or post this Notice of Hearing in order to afford affected employees or their representatives an opportunity to participate as parties during this proceeding.

Affected employees/others are entitled to participate in this hearing under terms and conditions established by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission in its Rules of Procedure.

Notice of intent to participate should be sent to:

[Full address of administrative law judge/agency/or other addressee, as appropriate]

Date: _____

_____

Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This notice is adapted from an Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission ALJ's notice.

Request by Judge for a Person to Appear as a Witness **Form 11**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

Date _____

Re: [Name of Case]
[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

Dear Sir:

The agency is holding a proceeding involving the reclassification of mail. The issue is the possible development of a new system of classification based on the technological capabilities that may reasonably be attained in the near future. For example, do machines exist that can read and sort mail? When are such machines likely to be available? What are the practical and financial problems involved in using such machines?

I request that you, in your capacity as a knowledgeable and concerned private citizen, appear and testify on this matter at any agency hearing to be held at _____[place]___, Washington, D.C. at 10 A.M., Thursday, _____[date]_____.

Rules of this agency prevent your discussing your testimony with me outside of the hearing.

Sincerely,

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This letter is adapted from a Postal Rate Commission letter.

Presiding Judge's Instructions for Briefing **Form 12**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

PRESIDING JUDGE'S INSTRUCTIONS FOR BRIEFING

An examination of the record discloses certain novel or legal problems that were not fully covered in the factual record or arguments of the parties during the hearing. Consequently, to expedite the decision the following specific matters shall be briefed.

1. Subsidy Eligibility

Each of the applicants is now receiving subsidy and it is possible, if the merger is approved, that the surviving carrier will be entitled to subsidy in an amount to be determined by the agency. The applicants request that the merger issues should be decided at once and that, if the merger is approved, determination of the amount of the subsidy, if any, be deferred for decision in another proceeding. The agency, on the other hand, contends that decision on the merger should be deferred pending decision on subsidy needs in an ancillary rate proceeding.

The applicants and the agency are requested to include arguments on this matter in their brief.

2. Labor Protective Conditions

Historically, the agency has in merger cases used the labor protective conditions adopted in X Case in 1952 and reaffirmed in Y Case in 1979. (These conditions are based on those included in the **WASHINGTON JOB AGREEMENT OF MAY 21, 1936.**)

The applicants request that the same conditions be imposed if the merger is approved. The C Union, in light of changed economic conditions, requests that the agency reexamine the labor protective conditions and make such changes as it finds needed.

The applicants, the C Union, and the agency are requested to include arguments on this matter in their briefs.

Briefs shall be submitted ten days after the close of the hearing. Reply briefs will not be permitted.

_____

Administrative Law Judge

[Date]

ORDER CORRECTING TRANSCRIPT **Form 13**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

ORDER CORRECTING TRANSCRIPT

Issued: _____ Released: _____

Under consideration are a motion to correct transcript filed by A on _____[Date]____ and on opposition filed by B on ____ [Date]_____ .

A's motion requests that references to section 21.505 of the Rules that are found on page 167, line 25 and on page 168, line 6 of the transcript be changed to section 21.504. Accompanying A's motion is an affidavit of C, consulting engineer, indicating that upon reviewing his testimony he discovered these typographical errors.

The references in question appear in the testimony of the witness C, and refer to a series of propagation curves actually set forth in section 21.504.

B's contention that A's motion is an attempt to change C's testimony is unsound. It is obvious that the reference to section 21.505 rather than section 21.504 is a typographical error.

In order that the agency may have an accurate record before it, IT IS ORDERED that A's motion IS GRANTED and the transcript IS CORRECTED as proposed.

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This order correcting transcript is adapted from an order of the Federal Communications Commission.

ERRATA SHEET **Form 14**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

ERRATA SHEET

INITIAL DECISION OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
(Issued _____)

1. On page 4, paragraph 2, line 7, change "$74,936" to "$74,936,000".

2. On page 7, paragraph 2, line 38, change "$21,401" to "$21,401,000".

3. On page 9, paragraph 2, line 3, between the words "can" and "exceed" insert the word "not".

4. On page 14, second quote, line 12, change "employer" to "employee".

5. On page 14, last paragraph, line 11, change "yards" to "meters".

6. On page 16, last paragraph, line 1, change "is dismissed" to "is denied".

[Date]

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This errata sheet is adapted from one used by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

CERTIFICATION OF A RECORD TO AN AGENCY **FORM 15**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

PRESIDING ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S
CERTIFICATION OF THE RECORD ACCOMPANYING
INITIAL DECISION

TO THE SECRETARY:

In accordance with the provisions of Section ___ of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, I hereby certify:

I. That the following constitutes the record of the hearing in this proceeding:

(1) The official stenographer's report of the hearings held on October 5 through 8, 1982, consisting of volumes numbered 1 through 5, pages numbered 1 through 715, including errata.

(2) Exhibits numbered 1 through 16, which are described on the various index pages of the official stenographer's report. All exhibits were admitted into evidence.

(3) Items A through G, which are described on the various index pages of the official stenographer's report.

II. That, in accordance with Section ____of the Rules of Practice and Procedure, the attached document, dated _____, is my Initial Decision in this proceeding.

[Date]

_____
Presiding Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This certification of a record is adapted from one used at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

ORDER ADMITTING EXHIBIT INTO EVIDENCE **FORM 16**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

ORDER ADMITTING EXHIBIT INTO EVIDENCE

Pursuant to the Judge's request at the hearing, A city has submitted its rate contract with X Power Company to the Judge and all parties. This contract, dated _____, is marked A exhibit 1 for purposes of identification.

It appears that the document is relevant to the issues and is received into evidence.

Any party wishing to object to the admission of this document into evidence should submit its objections in writing and hand deliver them to the Presiding Judge on or before _____[date]_____. If any objections are received, the Presiding Judge will reconsider the action taken in this order and issue a further order dealing with the objections.

SO ORDERED.

[Date]

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This order is an adaptation of one issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

ORDER SETTING ORAL ARGUMENT **FORM 17**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICAN
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

ORDER SETTING ORAL ARGUMENT

By motion filed ____[date]____ X Company sought an order allowing the Company access to certain documents in the files of Agency Staff. Agency Staff filed a response in opposition on ____ [date]____. X Company seeks oral argument on this matter. Oral argument regarding production of the date in question will be heard at 10:00 A.M. on _____[date]____ in a hearing room of this Agency, _____

_____[place]_____, Washington, D.C. Other procedural dates will also be set at that time.

[Date] _____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This order is adapted from one used at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

INQUIRY re FURTHER PROCEEDINGS **FORM 18-a**

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

TRIAL DIVISION

No. _____

(Dated:

)
_____)

_____)
)
)

v.
)
)
The United States)

Since issue has now been joined, this inquiry is made to determine what steps should henceforth be taken to expedite the disposition of this case.

If a trial is to be held, normal procedure calls for the issuance of a Standard Pretrial Order on Liability under which the parties are required to submit to each other (with plaintiff making the first submission) statements setting forth the facts which they believe are not in dispute, the issues of fact and law as they perceive them to be, the exhibits they propose to introduce into evidence, and the witnesses whose testimony they propose to take, together with an indication of the issues to which the testimony of each witness will relate.

However, if the parties contemplate the disposition of the case by means other than a trial, it may not be necessary to invoke such formal pretrial procedures. For instance, if the parties will proceed by a dispositive motion (such as a motion for summary judgement), or if they intend to stipulate all of the material facts (assuming the case lends itself to such a stipulation), or if they propose to dispose of the case by way of a settlement, the issuance of the Standard Pretrial Order may be withheld. In some cases, where justified, the issuance of the Order may be postponed pending the completion of necessary discovery proceedings (see Rule 71(a)).

Accordingly, in order that a determination may be made concerning the nature, extend and timing of further proceedings, counsel for each of the parties is directed to respond to this Inquiry (by letter, with a copy to opposing counsel) within ___ days, by advising whether [s]he presently intends (1) to file a dispositive motion; (2) to undertake a stipulation of all of the facts (experience has indicated that such a stipulation sometimes evolves more expeditiously as a result of complying with the Standard Pretrial Order); (3) to initiate settlement negotiations; or (4) to engage in such discovery proceedings as would, in counsel's opinion, justify the postponement of the Standard Pretrial Order until the completion of such proceedings.

If either counsel intends to pursue one or more of the above courses of actions, the response should be accompanied by a request for a deferral of the issuance of the Standard Pretrial Order for a stated reasonable time, and upon condition that within such time counsel will pursue the indicated courses of action.

_____

Trial Judge

PRETRIAL INSTRUCTIONS **Form 18-b**

UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS
717 Madison Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

PRETRIAL INSTRUCTIONS

The accompanying pretrial order is issued with a view to securing just and inexpensive determination of litigation, without unnecessary delay, it is designed to explore:

(a) simplification and clarification of the issue;

(b) the possibility of obtaining stipulations, admissions, agreements on documents, understandings on matters already of record, or similar agreements which will avoid unnecessary proof;

(c) limitation of the number of expert or other witnesses, and avoidance of cumulative evidence, should the case go to trial;

(d) the possibility of agreement disposing of all or any of the issues in the case; and

(e) such other matters as may aid in the disposition of this litigation.

In following the instructions contained in this order, counsel should bear these purposes in mind. Your full cooperation is essential if pretrial proceedings are to be effective. Time spent on through pretrial not only saves an equivalent or greater period of time during the course of the trial for the court, counsel, and witnesses, but reduces costs.

Counsel are therefore asked to approach their respective obligations in a genuine and sincere spirit of cooperation, both in the preparation of their submissions, and in their assessment of and comment on submissions of opposing counsel. Settlement possibilities should be thoroughly and conscientiously assessed, without unduly delaying the pretrial procedures. The possibility of voluntary disclosure of discoverable information should be explored before resort is had to compulsory process. The latter, if required, is to be initiated without delay and concluded prior to response to the pretrial order.

With the full cooperation of counsel, it should not be necessary to impose the sanctions provided by Rule 114(b) for

failure or refusal to comply with the requirements of the pretrial order.

STANDARD PRETRIAL ORDER ON LIABILITY **Form 18-c**

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

TRIAL DIVISION

No. _____

(Filed:)

_____

_____)
)
)

_____)
) Standard Pretrial Order
on Liability
(Rule 111)

Plaintiff,*

v.

The United States

Defendant.

_____

IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. Plaintiff's Submission. On or before _____ 19_____, the plaintiff* shall furnish the following to the attorney of record for the defendant and to the trial judge:

(a) A list accurately describing the documents that are relied on and are to be offered in evidence. The documents shall be numbered; and the list shall be accompanied by a copy of each document referred to therein, except that (1) no copy need be supplied to defendant's counsel where the plaintiff reasonably believes that the defendant already has the original or a copy, and (2) the trial judge need not be provided a copy of any exhibit unless its admissibility is put in issue.

(b) A statement of the material matters of fact as to which it is believed that there is no substantial controversy between the parties, or which have been agreed to by the parties. The paragraphs of this statement shall be numbered.

(c) A memorandum of contentions of fact and law, which shall comply with the following requirements:

(1) The contentions of fact shall consist of a concise statement of the ultimate, material facts which the plaintiff expects to establish, rather than a general statement of the claim or a repetition of the pleadings.

(2) The contentions of law shall be in the form of conclusions of law based on the ultimate facts which the plaintiff expects to establish, and, in addition, shall contain a brief statement of the points of law and a citation of the authorities relied upon in support of each point.

(d) (1) A list setting forth the name, address, and occupation of each of the witnesses whom the plaintiff proposes to call, and a succinct statement of the issue or issues to which the testimony of each witness will relate.

(2) The preferred date for the beginning of the trial, and the preferred place or places therefor.

(3) An approximation of the time that will be required for the direct examination of the plaintiff's witnesses at each place.

2. Defendant's Response. Within ____days after receiving the data referred to in paragraph 1 of this order, the defendant shall furnish the following to the attorney or record for the plaintiff to the trial judge:

(a) A statement admitting or denying the admissibility of each document listed under paragraph 1(a) of this order, together with the reasons for any denial of admissibility, and a further statement admitting or denying the genuineness of any documents the admissibility of which is disputed.

(b) A statement (arranged in numbered paragraphs) agreeing to, denying, revising or otherwise commenting on the factual data submitted under paragraph 1(b) of this order.

(c) A list of the proposed defense exhibits, meeting the

requirements of paragraph 1(a) of this order.

(d) A statement setting out any further material matters of fact as to which the defendant believes that there is no substantial controversy between the parties. the paragraphs of this statement shall be numbered.

(e) A memorandum of contentions of fact and law, which shall comply with the requirements set forth in paragraph 1(c) of this order.

(f) A list of the proposed defense witnesses, complying with the requirements of paragraph 1(d)(1) OF this order.

(g) A statement indicating the defendant's preferences as to the date and location of the trial.

(h) An estimate of the time likely to be required for the presentation of the direct testimony of the defendant's witnesses, and the cross-examination of the plaintiff's witnesses, at each preferred location.

3. Plaintiff's Reply. Within _____days after receiving the data referred to in paragraph 2 of this order, the plaintiff shall furnish the following to he attorney of record for the defendant and to the trial judge:

(a) A statement agreeing to, denying, or otherwise commenting on any revised or additional factual data submitted under paragraph 2(b) an (d) of this order.

(b) Such observations in rebuttal as the plaintiff may wish to offer respecting the defendant's contentions of fact and law submitted under paragraph 2(e) of this order.

(c) A statement admitting or denying the admissibility of each of the documents listed under paragraph 2(c) of this order, together with the reasons for any denial of admissibility, and a further statement admitting or denying the genuineness of any documents the admissibility of which is disputed.

(d) An estimate of the time likely to be required for the cross-examination of defendant's proposed witness at each preferred location.

4. Form of Compliance. for convenient of reference,

submissions in compliance with this order shall follow the format of the order by citing the numbered paragraph pursuant to which each portion of a particular submission has been prepared.

5. Sanctions. Rule 114(b) provides sanctions for failure or refusal to comply with the requirements of this order.

_____

Trial Judge

STANDARD PRETRIAL ORDER ON ACCOUNTING **FORM 18-d**

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

No. _____

(Filed)

_____

_____

_____,

Plaintiff, * Standard Pretrial Order
On Accounting
(Rule 111)

v.

THE UNITED STATES,
Defendant.

_____

IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. **Plaintiff's Statement.** On or before ____, 19___, the plaintiff* shall furnish to the attorney of record for the defendant and to the commissioner a statement in schedule form showing all the items and figures which the plaintiff intends to prove from books of account or other records. Such statement shall be prepared in accordance with the requirements set out in the following subparagraphs of this paragraph 1:

(a) The basic figures, costs, and rates from which any claim is computed shall be tabulated in such detail that the statement may be admitted in evidence in lieu of producing the books and records from which the pertinent data were taken.

(b) The statement shall include a complete computation of the total amount of each claim that is based upon or derived from book of account or other records.

(c) Each separate portion of the statement shall contain a reference showing the particular books and records from

which it was taken.

(d) Where the statement includes a claim for overhead, factory burden, general expense, or similar items based upon allocations of entries shown in the books or records, the statement shall itemize such indirect expenses for the period involved, and shall show the accounting method or principle upon which the allocations were made.

(e) Where a claim includes an item of damages for machinery or equipment expense, the statement shall show the type, class, capacity, or other identifying description of each major piece of machinery or equipment involved, and the book value of each item. If book values are not separately shown in the records, or if some basis of value other than book value is used, the statement shall show how the value was determined. The statement shall contain a complete computation of the equipment expenses claimed; and unless the costs incurred or the expenses claimed are fully set forth in the books or records, the statement shall show the accounting method, principle, or authority upon which such computation is based.

(f) The statement shall be accompanied by:

(i) a declaration that the books and records, or any part thereof, upon which the statement is based (including ledgers, journals, payrolls, and the original invoices, vouchers, checks, and other records and documents needed for a verification of the amount claimed or for a determination of the basis upon which the claim is computed) will be made available to the defendant for examination; and

(ii) a notice showing the address where such books and records may be examined by the defendant, together with the name and address of the bookkeeper or accountant who prepared the statement and who will be made available for the furnishing of information regarding such books and records in connection with the defendant's examination

2. **Defendant's Response.** Within ____days after receiving the plaintiff's statement in accordance with paragraph 1 of this order, the defendant shall make an examination of the pertinent books of account and other records, and shall furnish to the attorney of record for the plaintiff and to the commissioner a statement showing the results of such examination, or waive challenge of the accuracy of the statement submitted by the

plaintiff as reflecting the contents of such books and records and the accuracy of the computations, including allocations, made therefrom. The defendant's statement shall be prepared in accordance with the requirements set out in the following subparagraphs of this paragraph 2:

(a) If the defendant verifies the items and figures (or any of them) contained in the plaintiff's statement, including the plaintiff's computations and allocations, the defendant shall so report in its statement. Such a report shall not be deemed to be an admission by the defendant of anything more than the accuracy of-

(i) the statement examined as reflecting the contents of the books and records, and

(ii) the allocations and computations based thereon.

(b) If the defendant's examination fails to verify any of the items, figures, allocations, or computations contained in the plaintiff's statement as submitted, the defendant shall specify in its statement each item, figure, allocation or computation not verified, together with such different item, figure, allocation, or computation, if any, derived by the defendant from its examination. The defendant shall set forth in its statement a complete explanation of each exception, and shall specify any alternative methods or theories of accounting upon which the exceptions are based.

(c) The defendant shall be deemed to have waived challenge of the accuracy of all items, figures, allocations, and computations contained in the plaintiff's statement, as submitted, that are not specified in the defendant's statement as the subject of exceptions.

3. **Defendant's Cross-Statement.** In a situation where the defendant (a) has derived any items, figures, allocations, or computations from its examination of the plaintiff's books and records, and (b) intends to offer evidence based upon the material so derived in reduction of any portion of the amount claimed by the plaintiff, or in support of a counterclaim or offset or affirmative defense, or in support of a theory of damages different from that of the plaintiff, the defendant shall prepare a cross-statement reflecting such items, figures, allocations, or computations. The cross-statement shall be prepared in conformity with the requirements set out in subparagraphs (a)-(e) of paragraph 1 of this order, and it shall

be furnished to the attorney of record for the plaintiff and to the commissioner within the period prescribed in paragraph 2 of this order.

4. **Counterclaim or Offset Based on Defendant's Records.** (a) If the defendant has filed, or intends to file, a counterclaim or offset based on its own books of account or other records, the defendant, within the time prescribed in paragraph 2 of this order, shall furnish to the attorney of record for the plaintiff and to the commissioner a statement prepared in accordance with the requirements set out in paragraph 1 of this order.

(b) Within _____days after receiving the statement referred to in subparagraph (1) of this paragraph 4, the plaintiff shall make an examination of the pertinent books and records of the defendant and shall furnish to the attorney of record for the defendant and to the commissioner a statement showing the results of such examination, or waiver challenge of the accuracy of the defendant's statement as reflecting the contents of such books and records and the accuracy of the computation, including allocations, made therefrom. The provisions of paragraph 2 of this order shall be applicable to the plaintiff's statement.

_____

Commissioner

STANDARD ORDER SCHEDULING PRETRIAL CONFERENCE **Form 18-e**

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

Trial Division

No. _____

Filed _____

_____

_____

Plaintiff(s),

v. Standard Order Scheduling Pretrial Conference

The United States (Rule 112)

Defendant.

_____

IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. The attorneys for the parties* are directed to appear before me in room _____, U.S. Court of Claims Building, 717 Madison Place, N.W. (Lafayette Square), Washington, D.C., at _____ _____ o'clock on _____19____, for pretrial conference.

2. The pretrial conference will deal with the following matters:

(a) incorporating the agreed facts in the record;

(b) admitting in evidence, or marking for identification, the documentary exhibits which the parties wish to offer (such exhibits should be numbered prior to the conference);

(c) defining the legal issues that are involved in the litigation;

(d) defining the factual issues that are to be tried;

(e) fixing a time and place for the trial;

(f) limiting the number of expert witness and providing for the exchange between the parties prior to the trial of written documents, in narrative or question-and-answer form, by such witnesses comprising their proposed direct testimony; and

(g) such other matters as may aid in the disposition of the case.

3. An attorney appearing at the pretrial conference on behalf of a party should preferably be the attorney who will try the case for such party, be thoroughly familiar with the case, and be authorized to act for his principal

4. Unless the attorneys for the parties have furnished to each other, in accordance with a previous pretrial order (or otherwise), lists of prospective witnesses, lists of proposed documentary exhibits, statements of supposedly uncontroverted facts, and statements of their contentions concerning the factual and legal issues involved in the case, the attorneys are directed to confer with each other before the pretrial conference and to:

(a) exchange lists containing the names and addresses of all witnesses whom they respectively expect to call at the trial, and indicating as to each witness the issue or issues of fact to which his testimony will be directed (this subparagraph does not apply to witnesses who are to be used solely for the purpose of impeachment or rebuttal);

(b) exchange lists of the documentary exhibits which they respectively intend to offer at the trial, each list to be accompanied by copies of the exhibits listed unless the originals or copies thereof are already in the possession of the opposing party;

(c) prepare a written statement of the agreed facts;

(d) attempt to reach agreement on written statements of the factual and legal issues that are involved in the case.

_____

Trial Judge

PROTECTIVE ORDER* **Form 19-a**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

PROTECTIVE ORDER

Upon consideration of respondent's motion for a protective order filed on ___[date]____, with respect to data collected by complaint counsel showing payments by _____to respondent, and complaint counsel's answer, it is hereby ordered that:

All documents submitted by _____, whether supplied voluntarily or pursuant to subpoena duces tecum, containing data showing payments by _____to respondent and any compilations or summaries of such data, shall be subject to the following terms and conditions for the purpose of protecting the confidentiality of such information (referred to as "confidential financial information"):

(a) confidential financial information and all documents containing confidential financial information shall be disclosed only to the staff of the Commission formally assigned to this proceeding and to respondent's counsel.

(b) Disclosure of confidential financial information to any person described in Paragraph (a) of this order shall be only for the purpose of this proceeding and for no other purpose.

(c) All such confidential financial information shall be prominently marked by complaint counsel as "Confidential-Subject to Protective Order," and shall be kept by complaint counsel in secure, segregated facilities. Access to those facilities shall be permitted only to persons designated in Paragraph (a) of this order.

(d) No portion of the confidential financial information will be copied or recorded in any manner, other than in the work papers, notes, or memoranda of person designated in Paragraph (a) of this order, and all such work papers shall be treated as confidential financial information.

(e) Confidential financial information shall not be

disclosed by complaint counsel to any other person employed by the Commission until such person has executed an affidavit stating the he has read and understood this protective order and agrees to be bound by the terms thereof. Copies of any such affidavits shall be filed with the Secretary and served upon respondent.

(f) In the event complaint counsel desires that any confidential financial information be divulged to any person who is not an employee of the Commission, complaint counsel shall make written application to the Administrative Law Judge for modification of this protective order and respondent shall be granted ten (10) days after receipt of notice to oppose or otherwise answer said application. The persons to be granted access to the documents and information will be identified in any order granting modification of this protective order.

(g) In the event complaint counsel desires to introduce into evidence by way of documents or testimony any confidential financial information subject to this protective order, complaint counsel shall provide respondent with ten (10) days prior notice to the intent to make such offer so that respondent may seek in camera treatment of said confidential financial information. If advance notice cannot be provided pursuant to this order, respondent shall be so notified at the time of introduction of such documents and the document shall be accorded in camera treatment pending a ruling by the Administrative Law Judge upon any request by respondent for such treatment, which request must be filed within ten (10) days of receipt of such notice.

(h) In the event this proceeding is resolved by means of a consent order or otherwise disposed of prior to an adjudicative hearing on the merits, all confidential financial information shall be destroyed forthwith. Should this proceeding not be so resolved, at such time thereafter (including the completion of any appeals procedures) as this proceeding is finally resolved, the original and all copies of work papers reflecting confidential information, except that which may have been incorporated into the record in this case, shall be destroyed forthwith.

(i) Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the Administrative Law Judge or any reviewing authority from disclosing such confidential information as may be necessary to reach a decision on any matter raised in connection with this litigation.

[Date]

_____
Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This order is adapted from a Federal Trade Commission protective order.

* For protective orders involving confidential commercial information, Executive Order No. 12600 of June 23, 1987 (52 F.R. 23781), and any agency implementing rules should be consulted.

PROTECTIVE ORDER **Form 19-b**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____

PROTECTIVE ORDER

_____ having requested the issuance of a protective order with regard to [exhibits they propose to offer in their case in defense and [other party/parties] having stated no objection to such request], IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

(1) All of the documents listed below and the information contained therein shall not be disclosed to anyone except the following persons: Respondents and their employees; Respondent's counsel of record; experts retained by Respondent's counsel for purposes of this litigation; [complainant's] counsel of record in this litigation; experts used by [complainant's] counsel for purposes of this litigation; a committee or subcommittee of Congress, in response to official request; or a court, in response to compulsory process. Those persons to whom disclosure is permitted under this Order shall not make further disclosure to anyone.

(2) The documents and information furnished shall be used only in connection with this proceeding. All copies of such documents, together with all notes, memoranda, and other papers reflecting the documents and information, or any part thereof, shall be returned to _____'s counsel at the termination of this proceeding.

(3) In the event [complainant's] counsel desire to offer into evidence any document or information subject to this Protective Order. [complainant's] counsel shall provide _____ _____ with no less than fifteen (15) days prior notice of their intention to make such offer so that _____ may seek in camera treatment of said documents or information pursuant to _ _____ of the _____'s Rules of Practice .

(4) In the event the documents or information are officially requested by a Committee or subcommittee of Congress, or demanded by compulsory process of a court, the court or committee or subcommittee will be advised that _____ considers the information to be confidential, and _____ will be

provided with thirty (30) days prior notice where possible, and in any event, as much prior notice as can reasonably be given.

The following [proposed exhibits] are covered by this Protective Order

EX Number	Description
. . . .	
205	Reported 1978 Advertising Expenditures for _____ manufacturers
206	_____'s Corporation Statement of Income, Years Ended October 31, 1979, 1980.

IT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD THAT THIS PROTECTIVE ORDER COVERS THE PRE-HEARING STAGE OF THIS PROCEEDING ONLY, AND IN NO WAY INTIMATE'S THE JUDGE'S RULINGS WHEN AND IF CERTAIN EXHIBITS ARE OFFERED, AND THE APPLICABILITY OF §[ ] of the [Commission's] Rules is raised. MOREOVER, this protective order is not intended to impede proper preparation of this case and if any provision in this order seriously interferes with [complainant's] [intervenor's] [other parties'/participants'] preparation, relief may be sought.

NOTE: This order is adapted from a Federal Trade Commission protective order.

PROTECTIVE ORDER, Re: DEPOSITION **Form 19-c**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agency
Washington, D.C.

[Name of Case] Docket No. _____
[or other identification]

[PROTECTIVE ORDER/HEADING]

Certain documents furnished by deponents pursuant to the subpoenas, identified hereinafter by the Exhibit Number which was assigned at the depositions, are hereby placed under a protective order. The terms of the protective order are set forth herein following the identification of the documents which are covered by the order.

[Sancho Panza] Deposition Exhibits 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 23, ...

[Dulcinea] Deposition Exhibits 1, 2, 7 . . . .

. . . .

IT IS ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

1. The above identified exhibits shall be maintained in confidence by the [LaMancha] [Regional Office] of the [Federal Windmill Commission] and be made available only to the following employees of that Office: [Attorney Don Quixote, Investigator Quasimodo Jones, Secretary Earnest Torquimada], _____. The foregoing persons shall use the identified documents only for purposes of this proceeding and such documents shall be made available to other persons within the [Federal Windmill Commission] only on written authorization of the assigned Administrative Law Judge.

2. All copies of the identified documents shall be returned to each deponent who produced the identified documents pursuant to subpoena, or to counsel for each deponent, at the conclusion of this proceeding. For purposes of this protective order, this proceeding shall be deemed concluded when a final order of the

[Commission] shall have been served upon respondents herein.

3. Copies of any identified exhibits offered or received in evidence during formal trial of this matter shall not thereafter be subject to the terms of this protective order.

Date:_____

_____

Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: This order is adapted from a Federal Trade Commission protective order.

PROTECTIVE ORDER **Form 19-d**

Stipulated Protective Order

The Commission Trial Staff ("Staff") and Intervener, _____ _____ have sought to obtain certain documents and information from _____ Corporation and certain of its affiliates ("the Companies") in this proceeding. The Companies assert that certain of the documents and information requested contain confidential and proprietary information. This Stipulated Protective Order is a device to facilitate and expedite the handling of this proceeding and it merely reflects agreement by counsel for the active participants at this point as to the manner in which "PROTECTED MATERIALS," as that term is defined in this order, are to be treated. This action is not intended to constitute an agreement on the merits concerning confidentiality of any of the "PROTECTED MATERIALS," and the parties shall not be deemed by taking such action to have waived any arguments with respect to whether the "PROTECTED MATERIALS" are confidential or proprietary in nature.

1. All documents and information furnished subject to the terms of this order hereinafter shall be referred to as "PROTECTED MATERIALS." However, "PROTECTED MATERIALS" shall not include any information or document contained in the public files of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("the Commission") or any other federal or state agency. "PROTECTED MATERIALS" also shall not include documents or information which at, or prior to, disclosure in these proceedings, is or was public knowledge, or which becomes public knowledge as a result of publication or disclosure by the Companies.

2. The Companies may designate as "PROTECTED MATERIALS" those documents or discovery materials or portions thereof produced by them which in good faith they believe contain confidential or proprietary information. Designation shall be accomplished by marking the documents or other discovery materials or portions thereof with the words "PROTECTED MATERIALS, FERC DOCKET NO. _____." Any notes, memoranda, summaries, abstracts, studies or other information derived from such "PROTECTED MATERIALS" or portions thereof, other than a list of the "PROTECTED MATERIALS," shall be similarly marked, and reasonable precautions shall be taken to ensure that any such notes, memoranda, summaries, abstracts, studies or other information are not viewed by any persons except those to whom "PROTECTED MATERIALS" may be disclosed under paragraph 4. Upon request of the Staff, or _____, the Companies shall state

the reason for designating as "PROTECTED MATERIALS" documents or discovery materials or portions thereof and shall provide a sworn affidavit stating that, to their knowledge and belief, the "PROTECTED MATERIALS" or portions thereof are not already on file with the Commission or any other federal or state agency or otherwise available to the public.

3. Unless and until otherwise agreed or otherwise ordered by the Presiding Judge, the Commission, or a court of competent jurisdiction, all documents and other discovery materials or portions thereof that have been designated "PROTECTED MATERIALS," and any notes, memoranda, summaries, abstracts, studies or other information derived therefrom, shall be used only in connection with this litigation in accordance with this Stipulated Protective Order and may be inspected by or disclosed to only the persons described in Paragraph 4 under the conditions herein established.

4. a. "PROTECTED MATERIALS" may be disclosed to and used by attorneys of record for Staff and _____ in this proceeding or in any appellate proceeding resulting from this proceeding and persons who are regularly employed in such attorneys' offices and engaged in or supervising the conduct of this proceeding in accordance with this Stipulated Protective Order.

b. "PROTECTED MATERIALS" also may be disclosed to and used by Staff's and _____ technical experts, consultants, expert witnesses, other witnesses, and persons regularly employed in their respective offices who are involved in this proceeding in accordance with this Stipulated Protective Order. The attorney for Staff or _____ _____ shall secure and provide to counsel for the Companies a certificate from each such person in the form attached hereto stating that he or she has read this Stipulated Protective Order, and that he or she may not divulge any "PROTECTED MATERIALS," or any portion thereof, or any information derived therefrom, except in accordance with this Stipulated Protective Order.

In the event that any person to whom disclosure of "PROTECTED MATERIALS" has been made ceases to be engaged in this proceeding, access to such materials by such person shall be terminated. However, any person who has executed the certificate in the form attached hereto shall continue to be bound by the provisions of this Stipulated Protective Order even if no longer so engaged.

c. Any party or participant who receives "PROTECTED MATERIALS" pursuant to this Stipulated Protective Order will make no more than five copies of each document. Such party or participant will keep a log which sets forth the number of copies of each document which were made, and will provide a copy of that log to the Companies at the termination of this proceeding and any related appellate litigation. The parties or participants will negotiate in good faith concerning the reproduction of additional copies of "PROTECTED MATERIALS" for use as exhibits in depositions, in testimony or during the hearing.

5. a. If a reviewing party tenders for filing with the Presiding Administrative Law Judge, the Commission or any court, any written testimony, exhibit, brief or other submission that includes, incorporates, or refers to "PROTECTED MATERIALS," all portions thereof referring to such materials shall be marked "PROTECTED MATERIALS" and filed and served in sealed envelopes or other appropriate containers endorsed to the effect that they are sealed pursuant to this Stipulated Protective Order.

b. Unless objection to disclosure is waived by counsel for the Companies, "PROTECTED MATERIALS" or portions thereof may be served, offered, or introduced into evidence, or otherwise disclosed only in an in camera portion of this proceeding closed to all persons except those listed in paragraph 4.

The Presiding Judge shall determine, subject to such review as may be provided by the Commission's regulations and by any applicable law, whether or to what extent the "PROTECTED MATERIALS" or portions thereof will remain in camera, will be made public, or will be stricken or excluded from the record. Pending such determination, which shall be subject to such review as may be provided by Commission regulations and by any applicable law, any submission that is served, offered, or introduced in camera shall be subject to the provisions of this Stipulated Protective Order. That portion of the hearing transcript relating to in camera proceedings conducted pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order shall be sealed and subject to this Stipulated Protective Order, unless otherwise ordered by the Presiding Judge.

6. "PROTECTED MATERIALS" may be disclosed to employees of the Commission's Assistant General Counsel for General Legal Services and the Office of Public Information for purposes of review pursuant to requests filed under the Freedom of Information Act,

5 U.S.C. @ 552(a). Such employees shall thoroughly review all "PROTECTED MATERIALS" covered by requests filed under the Freedom of Information Act and determine whether the exemptions listed in 5 U.S.C. @ 552(b) apply. Documents covered by any such exemption shall not be released. In addition, such employees shall not authorize the release of such "PROTECTED MATERIALS" to any other person without first providing the Companies notice in writing at least five working days prior to such release of the intention to release such "PROTECTED MATERIALS." In the event of such notice, the Companies shall have the right to apply to the Commission for a determination that the "PROTECTED MATERIALS" come within the exceptions listed in 5 U.S.C. @ 552(b) and should not be released or to take such other action as they deem appropriate.

7. a. In the event that Staff or intervenors wish to disclose "PROTECTED MATERIALS" to any person to whom disclosure is not authorized by this Stipulated Protective Order, or wish to object to the designation of certain information or material as "PROTECTED MATERIALS," Staff or intervenors will first notify in writing counsel for the Companies and the Presiding Judge, identifying with particularity each of such "PROTECTED MATERIALS" and state the reason for the intended disclosure or objection. Staff, intervenors and the Companies will then undertake good faith negotiations in order to resolve any disputes as to such disclosures or the validity of the claim to protection.

Where these negotiations produce agreement, such agreement will be filed with the Presiding Judge, and other reviewing parties may make use of these materials, provided that they enter into similar agreements with the Companies.

b. If the Staff, intervenors and the Companies fail to reach agreement with respect to the disclosure reference in paragraph 7a, or the Companies otherwise maintain that the information should continue to be classified as "PROTECTED MATERIALS," the Companies shall notify in writing the Staff and intervenors of their position within five days of the notice in paragraph 7a. The Staff or intervenors shall then file, within ten days of such notice, a motion requesting that the Presiding Judge review the documents in camera and determine whether they should be protected from disclosure. The Companies shall file a response to such motion within ten days after the motion is filed. This Stipulated Protective Order does not change the burden of proof under applicable law in determining whether designated documents or information or portions thereof are entitled to be so protected.

8. In the event that the Presiding Judge at any time in the course of this proceeding finds sua sponte or in response to a motion that all or part of the "PROTECTED MATERIALS" are not confidential or proprietary, those materials shall nevertheless be subject to the protection afforded by this order for ten working days, unless otherwise ordered, from the date of issuance of the Judge's decision. Neither the Companies, Staff or intervenors waive their rights to seek additional administrative or judicial remedies after the Presiding Judge's decision.

9. Nothing in the foregoing provisions of this Stipulated Protective Order shall be deemed to preclude any person from seeking and obtaining, on an appropriate showing, such additional protection or relief as may be available under applicable law.

10. All "PROTECTED MATERIALS" in the possession of Staff or intervenors and all copies made thereof shall be returned to the Companies at the termination of this proceeding and any related appellate litigation, except to the extent that Staff, intervenors and the Companies shall agree otherwise. In addition, at the termination of this proceeding and any related appellate litigation, the Staff and intervenors shall destroy any notes, memoranda, and other documents and information derived from "PROTECTED MATERIALS," other than lists of such "PROTECTED MATERIALS," and certify in writing to counsel for the Companies that such destruction has been accomplished. Staff and intervenors shall have no obligation to return any material which was originally designated as "PROTECTED MATERIALS" under this Stipulated Protective Order but as to which a final order, no longer subject to review, has been issued which concludes that the material in question is not confidential or proprietary.

11. Nothing in this Stipulated Protective Order shall be construed to prevent the parties from attempting to obtain through discovery in any other judicial or administrative action or proceeding all or any of the "PROTECTED MATERIALS" returned to the Company pursuant to paragraph 10, above.

12. In the event that a document is supplied by the Companies which the Companies inadvertently failed to mark as "PROTECTED MATERIALS," upon request, FERC and _____ shall mark any such document as "PROTECTED MATERIALS" and the document and all copies thereof shall be subject to the provisions of this Stipulated Protective Order.

APPENDIX I - FORMS

NOTE: This is adapted from an opinion/protective order issued by an ALJ of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. (*See*, 32 F.E.R.C. P63,091; 1985 FERC LEXIS 1377 (1985).

Judge's Docket Sheet **Form 20**

AGENCY

JUDGE'S DOCKET SHEET

Judge _____

Case Name[Caption] _____

Item Number	Date	Entry
J-1	3/12/89	Notice of Assignment
J-2	. . . .	
J-6	4/7/89	Complainant's motion to Vacate Order Granting Simplified Proceedings
J-7	4/11/89	Order Vacating Order Granting Simplified Proceedings
J-8	4/15/89	Motion for Continuance
J-9	4/19/89	Order Rescheduling Hearing
J-10	4/19/89	Letter from Judge stating that no further continuances should be requested.
J-11	5/14	Complainant's Requests for Admission
J-12	. . . .	
_____	. . . .	

NOTE: Adapted from Judge's Docket Sheet used by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.

Notice of Judge's Decision **Form 21-a**

NOTICE OF DECISION

In Reference To:

Caption of case

Docket No.

Enclosed is a copy of my decision. It will be submitted to the [Commission's Executive Secretary] on date . The decision will become the final order of the [Commission] at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of docketing by the [Executive Secretary], unless within that time [a Member of the Commission] directs that it be reviewed. All parties will be notified of the date of docketing.

Any party adversely affected or aggrieved by the decision may file a petition for discretionary review. *A petition may be filed with this Judge within twenty (20) days from the date of this notice. Thereafter, any petition must be filed with the [Commission's] [Executive Secretary] within twenty (20) days from the date of the Executive Secretary's notice of docketing.* The [Executive Secretary's address is as follows:

[Executive Secretary]
. . . .
[Washington, DC 20006-1246]

The full text of the rule governing the filing of a petition for discretionary review is [29 C.F.R. § 2200.91. It is appended hereto for easy reference. The rule also prescribes requirements concerning: (a) any cross-petition for discretionary review; (b) the contents of a petition; (c) the effect of a failure to file a petition; (d) statements in opposition to a petition, and (e) the number of copies of any document that may be filed. There are closely related rules which are published in 29 C.F.R. § 2200.90 and _____. Rule 90 concerns the contents of a decision of this kind; the aforementioned docketing of this Judge's report by the Executive Secretary; and the correction of errors and relief from default. Rule ____ describes review by the [Commission] -- its jurisdiction and the standards that are applied concerning issues that are raised by the parties or otherwise may exist. The text of these rules is also appended.

Date _____ .

_____
Judge, OSHRC

NOTE: Adapted from Notice used by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.

Notice of Judge's DecisionForm 21-b
(Unfavorable decision, court remand case)

Notice of Administrative Law Judge Decision -- Denial

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

Name of Claimant
Street Address
City, State

Enclosed is the Administrative Law Judge's decision on your claim. This notice gives you information about what you can do if you disagree with the decision. Please rad this notice and the decision carefully.

If You Disagree With This Decision:

If you disagree with this decision, you may appeal to the Appeals Counsel. You must do this by filing written Exceptions. Exceptions are your statements explaining why you disagree with the decision of the Administrative Law Judge.

Mail the written statement of your exceptions to the Appeals Council, Office of Hearings and Appeals . . . .

You must file your written exceptions within 30 days from the date you receive this notice. The Appeals Council assumes that you receive this notice within five days after the date at the end of this notice unless you show that you did not receive it within the five day period.

If you need more time to file your written exceptions, you must file a written request for additional time with the Appeals Council within 30 days of the date you receive this notice. If you request more than a 30-day extension of time, you must explain why you need the extra time.

Please include the Social Security Number(s) shown on the decision on any paper you send to the Appeals Council.

The Appeals Council will consider your exceptions and the parts of the decision that you disagree with. The Appeals Council may also consider those parts which you do not disagree with.

If the Appeals Council concludes that further action is necessary, it will either return your case to an Administrative Law Judge, for further action or issue a decision. If the Appeals Council issues a decision, that decision may be either more or less favorable to you than the decision of the Administrative Law Judge.

If the Appeals Council concludes that there is no reason to change the Administrative Law Judge's decision, it will notify you in writing why your exceptions do not warrant a change.

If you submit written exceptions and the Appeals Council does not change the decision of the Administrative Law Judge, that decision becomes the final decision of the Secretary after remand.

Any future claims you may file will not change a final decision on this claim if the facts and issues are the same.

If You Do Not File Written Exceptions:

Even if you do not file written exceptions within 60 days from the date shown below, the Appeals Council may review your case on its own motion. The Appeals Council will notify you if it decides to review your case and will advise you what action it proposes to take.

If the Appeals Council does not review your case on its own motion and you do not submit exceptions, we will forward a copy of the decision and transcript of the record in your case to the United States Attorney, for filing with the court.

You have the right to pursue your civil action with the court.

New Application:

You have the right to file a new application at any time, but filing a new application is not the same as filing exceptions to this decision. You might lose benefits if you file a new application instead of filing written exceptions to this decision. Therefore, if you disagree with this decision, you should file your exceptions within 30 days.

If you have any questions, please contact _____ _____.

This Notice and enclosed copy of decision mailed _____.

cc. Name & Address of Representative
cc. [as applicable]
NOTE: This form is adapted from a notice used by the Social Security Administration.

Order Appointing Settlement Judge **Form 22**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AGENCY

[Case Caption/Title]

Docket No.

ORDER

1. There being no objection, the Secretary of/complainant's/respondent's _____ motion for the appointment of a settlement judge pursuant to [29 C.F.R. § 2200.101] is hereby granted. [Because there has been no objection, there is an implied consent for the use of the settlement judge procedure.] _____. It is therefore determined that there is a reasonable prospect of settlement of at least a substantial portion of this case with the assistance of mediation by a settlement judge.

2. The case is hereby assigned to Administrative Law Judge _____, who will serve as the settlement judge, pursuant to applicable rules and regulations. Judge _____'s service as settlement judge in this case and related negotiations will be for a period not to exceed 45 days, unless such period is extended pursuant to applicable rules and regulations.

_____

[Chief Administrative Law Judge]

Date: _____.

NOTE: Adapted from an Order issued by the Chief Administrative Law Judge of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.

Order re: Filing of Electronic Word Processing Files in Complex Case **Form 23**

Caption

ORDER

A review of the complaint in this case indicates a likelihood that this case could become factually and legally complex. Therefore, in order to address the issues more readily, the parties are directed to provide the Judge, for each document greater than two (2) pages in length, an electronic copy of the document on a MS/Dos $5^{1/4}$ or other suitable floppy diskette in WordPerfect 5.0 format, or in a format capable of being converted by WordPerfect 5.0. Diskettes need not be furnished for complaint and answer. The diskette(s) shall be transmitted to the _____ in an envelope or mailer, designed for that purpose, at the time of filing the printed document. Receipt of the diskette does not constitute filing or affect the time of the filing of the document (hard copy).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

_____

Administrative Law Judge

NOTE: Adapted from an order used by a Judge of the United States Claims Court.

APPENDIX II

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY: ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (including websites)

Administrative Conference of the United States (Milhauser & Pou eds.). *Sourcebook, Federal Agency Use of Alternative Means of Dispute Resolution*. Washington, DC: 1987.

American Bar Association, Standing Committee on Dispute Resolution. *Alternative Dispute Resolution: An ADR Primer*, 3rd ed. Washington, DC: ABA Standing Committee on Dispute Resolution, 1989.

American Bar Association, Section of Administrative Law & Regulatory Practice (Marshall J. Berger, Deborah Schick Laufer, and Gerald S. Schatz, eds.), *Federal Administrative Dispute Resolution Deskbook*. ABA 2001

Brett, Jeanne, Stephen B. Goldberg and William Ury, *Designing Systems for Resolving Disputes in Organizations*," The American Psychologist, February 1990

Bush, Robert A. Baruch, and, Joseph P Folger, *The Promise of Mediation*, Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 1994

CPR Legal Program. *CPR Practice Guide: Confidentiality in ADR*. New York: Center for Public Resources, 1989.

Coglianese, Cary, *Assessing Consensus: The Promise and Performance of Negotiated Rulemaking*, 46 Duke L.J. 1255 (1997).

Crowell, Eldon H. and Charles Pou, Jr. *Appealing Government Contract Decisions: Reducing the Cost and Delay of Procurement Litigation with Alternative Dispute Resolution Techniques*. 1987 Recommendations and Reports of the Administrative Conference ("ACUS") 1139, reprinted in 49 Maryland Law Review 183-254 (1990).

Edward A. Dauer, et al., *Manual of Dispute Resolution: ADR Law & Practice*. Clark Boardman Callaghan, 1996.

Fine, Erika S., and Elizabeth S. Plapinger, eds. for the CPR Legal Program. *Containing Legal Costs: ADR Strategies for Corporations, Law Firms, and Government*. Butterworth Legal Publishers, 1988.

Fisher, Roger, and William Ury. *Getting to YES: Negotiation Agreement without Giving In.* 2d ed. (Penguin 1991).

Fisher, Roger and Danny Ertel, Getting Ready to Negotiate, The Getting to Yes® Workbook, a Step-by-Step Guide to Preparing for Any Negotiation (Penguin, 1995).

Claire B. Gallant, Mediation in Special Education Disputes (National Association of Social Workers 1982).

Goldberg, Stephen B., Frank E.A. Sander, and Nancy H. Rogers. *Dispute Resolution.* 3d ed., Panel Pubs.1999.

Grassley, Senator Charles E. and Pou, Charles Jr., *Congress, the Executive Branch and the Dispute Resolution Process*, 1992 J. Disp. Resol. 1 (1992) (addressing the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act and other agency dispute resolution matters).

Gring, Pamela, *The Special Master's Role as Mediator*, 6 Ohio St. J. Dispute Resol. 21 (1990)

Harter, Phillip J. *Neither Cop Nor Collection Agency: Encouraging Administrative Settlements by Ensuring Mediator Confidentiality,* Report to the Administrative Conference of the U.S. of the U.S., 1988 ACUS 839.

Harter, Phillip J. *Points on a Continuum: Dispute Resolution Procedures and the Administrative Process,* Report to the Administrative Conference of the U.S.. 1986 ACUS 165, *reprinted*

in 1 Admin. L. J. 141 (1987).

Heifetz, Alan W., *ALJs, ADR, and ADP: The Future of Administrative Adjudication*, 1 Widener Journal of Public Law 13 (1992) (Symposium: Administrative Law in the Twenty-First Century).

Herrman, M.S., *On Balance: Promoting Integrity Under Conflicted Mandates*, Mediation Quarterly, Volume 11, Number 2, (Winter 1993): 123-138.

Joseph, Daniel & Michelle L. Gilbert. *Breaking the Settlement Ice: The Use of Settlement Judges in Administrative Proceedings*, Report to the Administrative Conference of the U.S. 1988 ACUS 281, *reprinted in* 3 Admin. L. J. 571 (1990).

Hinchcliff, Carole L. *Dispute Resolution: A Selected Bibliography, 1987-88.* Washington, DC: American Bar Association, Standing Committee on Dispute Resolution.

Model Standards of Conduct for Mediators: American Arbitration Association American Bar Association Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution, 17 J. NAALJ 323 (1997).

Mullins, Morell. *The Use of Settlement Judges and Simplified Proceedings before the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission*. Report to the Administrative Conference of the U.S. 1990 ACUS 495, *reprinted, with some revisions in,* 5 Admin. L. J. 555 (1991).

Patterson, Roger. *Dispute Resolution in a World of Alternatives*, 37 Catholic University Law Review 591-604 (1988).

Pritzker et al., eds., *Negotiated Rulemaking Sourcebook* (US GPO 1990)

Ray, Larry. "Emerging Options in Dispute Resolution." *ABA Journal*

75, (June 1989): 66-68.

Riskin, L.L. *Two Concepts of Mediation in the FHMA's Farmer-Lender Mediation Program*" 45 Administrative Law Review 21-64 (1993).

Rogers, Nancy, and Craig McEwen, *Mediation: Law, Policy and Practice,* Second Edition, Clark Boardman Callaghan: Deerfield, Illinois, 1994

Stewart, Kenneth P., *Take the "Alternative" Out of Alternative Dispute Resolution; Results of an ADR Survey of Administrative J udges*, 62 The Journal of the Kansas Bar Association 14 (Jan. 1993).

Susskind, Lawrence E, and Patrick Field, *Dealing with an Angry Public: The Mutual Gains Approach to Resolving Disputes* (Free Press 1996).

Warfield, Wallace, *The Implications of ADR Processes for Decisionmaking in Administrative Disputes*, 16 Pepperdine Law Review S93 (1989).

SELECTED FEDERAL ADR WEBSITES

(As with all websites and web pages, changes may occur without notice. The websites below were provided by Deborah Schick Laufer. Ms. Laufer (BA, Barnard College, Columbia University; JD, Georgetown University Law Center) is an attorney and mediator, who also is Director of the Federal ADR Network and is co-editor of the Federal Administrative Dispute Resolution Deskbook (ABA 2001)

FEDERAL ADR RESOURCES

Army Corps of Engineers - Early Resolution Program
http://144.3.144.209/corpusdata/usace/inet/usace-docs/eng-regs/er690-1-693/basdoc.pdf

Army Corps of Engineers - Institute for Water Resources

Appendix II - Selected Bibliography: Alternative Dispute Resolution (including websites)

Alternative Dispute Resolution
http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/AlternativeDisputeResolution/ADR.htm

ACE -- Interest-Based Negotiation
http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/AlternativeDisputeResolution/ADRibn.htm

ACE -- ADR Continuum - Description of Methods
http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/AlternativeDisputeResolution/ADRom.htm

Army Corps of Engineers - Partnering
http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cemp/c/partner.htm
http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cepa/pubs/partner.htm
http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cemp/c/partgui8.wpd

Army Materiel Command
Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Program
http://www.amc.army.mil/amc/command_counsel/index.htm
(Select "ADR" on the site index.)

Council of Federal EEO and Civil Rights Executives
http://www.fedcivilrights.org

Defense Logistics Agency, ADR Home Page
http://www.dscc.dla.mil/offices/doccr/adr/adr.html

DLA ADR Specialist's Training Manual
http://www.dscc.dla.mil/downloads/doccr/adr/adrtrain.doc

Department of Agriculture
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Agency
(APHIS); Conflict Prevention and Resolution Homepage
http://www.aphis.usda.gov/opd/cpr.html

Department of Agriculture
Conflict Prevention and Resolution Center
http://www.usda.gov/cprc/

Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency
Agricultural Mediation Program
http://www.fsa.usda.gov/pas/publications/facts/html/mediate01.htm

Department of Agriculture: Research, Education, and Economics,
Cooperative Resolution Program
http://www.ars.usda.gov/afm2/coopres/

Department of the Air Force, ADR Home Page
http://www.adr.af.mil./
Department of the Air Force, ADR Guidance for Air Force
Acquisitions
http://www.adr.af.mil/acquisition/index.html

Department of Energy, Office of Dispute Resolution
http://www.gc.doe.gov/adr/index.html

Department of Health and Human Services, Departmental Appeals
Board, ADR Division
http://www.os.dhhs.gov/progorg/dab/

Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
Alternative Dispute Resolution Page
http://www-a.blm.gov/nradr/

Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
Conflict Management Guidebook
http://www.usbr.gov/hr/conflict/

Department of Justice, ADR Homepage
http://www.usdoj.gov/disputeresolution.htm

Department of Justice,
Americans with Disabilities Act Mediation Program
http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/ada/mediate.htm

Department of Justice, Office of Dispute Resolution

http://www.usdoj.gov/odr/

Department of Justice, Report to the President on Alternative Dispute Resolution (January 2001)
http://www.financenet.gov/financenet/fed/iadrwg/presi-report.htm

Department of Justice, Voluntary Civil Dispute Resolution Policy, Issued March 1999
http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/adr/broch.html

Department of Labor, Alternative Dispute Resolution
http://www.dol.gov/dol/asp/public/programs/adr/main.htm

Department of Labor, Early Resolution of EEO Complaints Program (EREC)
http://www.dol.gov/dol/oasam/public/regs/compliance/erec_pol.htm

Department of Labor, Settlement Judge Program
http://www.oalj.dol.gov/settlement_judge.htm

Department of the Navy, ADR Website
http://ogc.navy.mil/ogcwww/adr/

Department of the Navy, ADR Lessons Learned
http://ogc.navy.mil/ogcwww/adr/LessonsLearned.html

Department of the Navy, Mediator Certification
http://ogc.navy.mil/adr/Mediacert.html

Department of the Navy, Principles of Conflict Resolution
http://ogc.navy.mil/principles.html

Department of Transportation, ADR Homepage
http://www.dot.gov/adr

Department of Veterans Affairs, Dispute Resolution Programs
http://www.va.gov/adr/descript.htm

Environmental Protection Agency, Administrative Law Judges, ADR Neutrals for Superfund Cases
http://www.epa.gov/aljhomep/about.htm

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1, ADR Page
http://www.epa.gov/region01/steward/adr/index.html
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Mediation
http://www.eeoc.gov/mediate/index.html

Federal ADR Program Managers' Resource Manual
http://www.financenet.gov/financenet/fed/iadrwg/manual/

Federal ADR Steering Committee
Confidentiality in Federal ADR Programs,
http://www.financenet.gov/financenet/fed/iadrwg/conpubrt.htm

Federal ADR Steering Committee
Evaluation of Federal ADR Programs
http://www.financenet.gov/financenet/fed/iadrwg/conpubrt.htm

Federal Aviation Administration
Office of Dispute Resolution for Acquisition
http://www.faa.gov/agc/

Federal Dispute Resolution Conference
(Participating Agencies: DoD, EEOC, FMCS, GAO, HHS, MSPB, NASA, NAVY, OPM, OSC, USDA, USPS, VA)
http://www.fdr-conference.org/

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, ADR Page
http://www.ferc.fed.us/ogc/adr/adr.htm

Federal Executive Board, Atlanta
Alternative Dispute Resolution Shared Neutrals
http://r4.gsa.gov/febatlhralternativedisputes.htm

Federal Executive Board, Denver
ADR, Shared Neutrals Information Page
http://www.dfeb.mms.gov/mediation.htm

Federal Executive Board, Pittsburgh
Alternative Dispute Resolution Consortium
http://www.pittsburgh.feb.gov/pitadr.htm

Federal Executive Board, Seattle
Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee
http://www.northwest.gsa.gov/sfeb/sfebadr.htm

Federal Judicial Center
ADR and Settlement Programs in the Federal District Courts: A Sourcebook for Judges and Lawyers (1996)
http://www.fjc.gov/ALTDISRES/adrsource/adrblurb.html

Federal Labor Relations Authority
Collaboration and ADR Program
http://www.flra.gov/24.html

Federal Labor Relations Authority, Office of General Counsel
Alternative Dispute Resolution
http://www.flra.gov/gc/adr/adr_faq.html

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service
http://www.fmcs.gov

Federal Service Impasses Panel (FLRA)
A Guide to Dispute Resolution Procedures Used by the Federal Service Impasses Panel
http://www.flra.gov/fsip/fsip_drp.html

Federal Trade Commission
Resolving Consumer Disputes
http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/conline/pubs/general/dispute.htm

Federal Trade Commission
ADR for Online Consumer Transactions (comments)
http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/altdisresolution/comments/index.htm

Finding and Hiring Quality Neutrals: What Every Government Official Needs to Know (1996) Pou and Honeyman.
http://www.convenor.com/madison/fh.htm

General Services Administration, Arbitration and Mediation Resources
http://fedlaw.gsa.gov/legal89.htm

General Services Administration Board of Contract Appeals
Rules for Alternative Dispute Resolution
http://www.gsbca.gsa.gov/ADRules.htm

For the GSBCA, see also: Private Website maintained by GSBCA Judge Allan H. Goodman
http://users.erols.com/arbmed/gsbca.htm

Government Information Locator Service (GILS)
For Federal Register and Presidential Documents on ADR,
http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/gils/gils.html

Graduate School USDA
Conflict Management Certificate Program
http://www.grad.usda.gov/

Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
http://www.ecr.gov/

ECR's Roster of Environmental Neutrals
http://www.ecr.gov/roster.htm

Interagency ADR Working Groups
http://www.financenet.gov/iadrwg.htm

Interagency ADR Working Group, Contract and Procurement Section, Electronic Guide to Federal Procurement ADR
http://www.adr.af.mil/iadrwg/

Interagency Shared Neutrals Program (Washington, DC Metro area) (administered by HHS-DAB)
http://www.os.dhhs.gov/progorg/dab/

Internal Revenue Service, Dept. of the Treasury
Appeals and Alternative Dispute Resolution
http://www.irs.ustreas.gov/ind_info/appeals/appeals-201.html

Internal Revenue Service, Dept. of the Treasury
Fast Track Mediation
http://www.irs.ustreas.gov/ind_info/appeals/appeals-202.html

International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce
Primer on International Alternative Dispute Resolution
http://www.ita.doc.gov/legal/adr.html

National Institutes of Health, Center for Alternative Dispute Resolution
http://www.nih.gov/od/ors/od/cadr.htm

National Institutes of Health, Center for Cooperative Resolution
http://www4.od.nih.gov/ccr/

National Institutes of Health, Peer Resolution Panels
http://www4.od.nih.gov/ccr/menu.html

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
Department of Commerce
Alternative Dispute Resolution Website
http://www.adr.noaa.gov/

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
Western Administrative Support Center, Human Resources Services,
Department of Commerce
http://www.wasc.noaa.gov/wasc/HRD/adr.htm

Office of Personnel Management, ADR Resource Guide
http://www.opm.gov/er/adrguide/adrhome.html-ssi

Office of Personnel Management
Federal Executive Institute and Management Development Centers,
Course on Alternative Dispute Resolution
http://www.leadership.opm.gov/fs33.html

Office of Special Counsel Mediation Program
http://www.osc.gov/adr.htm

APPENDIX III

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TRIAL MANUALS, STYLE MANUALS, AND WORKS ON WRITING

G. Basham, Hearing Examiners Manual, Federal Maritime Commission (1968).

G. Block, Effective Legal Writing (4th ed. 1992).

Bureau of Administrative Law Judge, Civil Aeronautics Board, Judge's Manual (1975) and Form Book for Judge's Manual (1975).

Committee on Information and Education, Administrative conference of the United States, Recommended Procedures for Protracted Hearings before Administrative Agencies (2d draft, 1963).

Department of Health and Human Services, Social Security Administration, Hearings, Appeals, Litigation and Law (LEX) Manual (HALLEX) (1990)

A. Dworsky, The Little Book on Legal Writing (1990).

L. Ede, Work in Progress: A Guide to Writing and Revising (1989).

B. Garner, The Elements of Legal Style (1991).

G. Gopen, Writing from a Legal Perspective (1981).

M. Maron, Guidelines for Formal Contested Administrative Proceedings: A Handbook for Members of State Occupational Licensing Board (California Office of Administrative Hearings, Department of General Services).

L. Naftalison, Manual for Hearing Officers in Administrative Adjudication in the State of New York (Rev. Manual No. 16, 1972).

National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Due Process in Special Education-A Step-by-Step Resource Manual for Hearing Officers (1978).

National Labor Relations Board, NLRB STYLE MANUAL: A GUIDE FOR LEGAL WRITING IN PLAIN ENGLISH (Revised, January 2000).

M. Ray & J. Ramsfield, Legal Writing: Getting It Right and Getting It Written (1987).

R. Smith, The Literate Lawyer (1986).

L. Squires & M. Rombauer, Legal Writing in a Nutshell (1982).

Strunk & White, The Elements of Style (3d ed. 1979).

Virginia Board of commerce, Agency Rules of Practice for Hearing Officers (1977) [published by the Virginia Department of Commerce, Richmond, Virginia].

C. Wagner, Office of Administrative Law Judges, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Policy and Procedures Manual (1980) [revised @ 1987]

K. Woolever, Untangling the Law (1987).

R. Wydick, Plain English for Lawyers (2d ed. 1985).

APPENDIX IV

BIBLIOGRAPHY Books, Articles (Federal & State) & State (Books & Articles)

BOOKS

BERNSTEIN, MARVER H., REGULATING BUSINESS BY INDEPENDENT COMMISSION. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1955.

BORCHERS, ET AL., FUNDAMENTALS OF ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUDICATION. Government Law Center of Albany Law School, Albany NY, 1997.

BURGER, PAULA, JUDGES IN SEARCH OF A COURT: CHARACTERISTICS, FUNCTIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES. University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, MI, 1984. (Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1984.)

CHAMBERLAIN, JOSEPH; DOWLING, NOEL; AND HAYS, PAUL, THE JUDICIAL FUNCTION IN FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES, The Commonwealth Fund, 1942; reprinted by Books for Libraries Press, Freeport, NY, 1970.

COFER, DONNA, JUDGES, BUREAUCRATS AND THE QUESTION OF INDEPENDENCE: A STUDY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION HEARING PROCESS, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, 1985.

DIXON, ROBERT G., JR., SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY AND MASS JUSTICE: A PROBLEM IN WELFARE ADMINISTRATION. Praeger Publishers, New York, NY, 1973.

GOLDBERG, MELVIN D., GOLDBERG'S DESKBOOK ON EVIDENCE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES. National Judicial College, Reno, NV. 1993

MASHAW, JERRY L., BUREAUCRATIC JUSTICE: MANAGING SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY CLAIMS. New Haven: Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 1983.

MASHAW, JERRY L., ET. AL., SOCIAL SECURITY HEARINGS AND APPEALS, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, 1978.

MILLER, EDWARD, AN ADMINISTRATIVE APPRAISAL OF THE NLRB, University of Pennsylvania, The Wharton School, Industrial Research Unit, Labor Relations and Public Policy Series No. 16, 1977.

MUSOLF, LLOYD D., FEDERAL EXAMINERS AND THE CONFLICT OF LAW AND ADMINISTRATION. The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXX, Number 1, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1953; reprinted by Greenwood Press, Inc., Westport, CT, 1979.

RICH, MALCOLM C., AND BRUCAR, WAYNE E., THE CENTRAL PANEL SYSTEM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES: A SURVEY OF SEVEN STATES. American Judicature Society; University Publications of America, Inc., Frederick, MD, 1983.

RUHLEN, MERRITT, MANUAL FOR ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES, rev., ed. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1982. Prepared for the Administrative Conference of the United States.

Articles: Federal and State

Abrams, Norman, *Administrative Law Judge Systems: The California View*, 20 Admin. L. Rev. 487 (1977).

Ames, H.C., *The Hearing Examiner and the Riss Decision*, 18 ICC Prac. J. 729 (1951).

Asimow, Michael, *The Administrative Judiciary: ALJ's in Historical Perspective*, 19 J. NAALJ 25 (1999).

Asimow, Michael, *When the Curtain Falls: Separation of Functions in the Federal Administrative Agencies*, 81 Colum. L. Rev. 759 (1981).

Asimow, Michael, *Toward a New California Administrative Procedure Act: Adjudication Fundamentals* (Symposium: Contemporary Issues in Administrative Adjudication), 39 UCLA L. Rev. 1067 (1992).

Auerbach, Carl A., *Scope of Authority of Federal Administrative Agencies to Delegate Decision-Making to Hearing Examiners*, 48 Minn. L. Rev. 823 (1964).

Barlow, Joyce Krutick, Contempt Powers of the Administrative Law Judge, 12 J. NAALJ 4 (1992).

Benkin, Isaac D., *The Shadow World of Administrative Law Judges*, 22 Judges J. 20 (Fall 1983).

Berg, Richard, *Re-examining Policy Procedures: The Choice Between Rulemaking and Adjudication*, 38 Admin. L. Rev. 149 (1986).

Birch, Adolph A., Jr., *Equal Justice and the ALJ*, 16 J. NAALJ 169 (1996)

Bloomfield, David S., *Disability Claims Under the Social Security Act: A Practitioner's Guide to Administrative Procedures*, 6 Cap. U.L. Rev. 371 (1977).

Bok, Derek C., *A Flawed System*, Howard Magazine, May-June 1983, p. 38.

Bono, Charles N., *The Evolution and Role of the Administrative Law Judge at the Office of Hearings and Appeals in the Social Security Administration*, 15 J. NAALJ 213 (1995)

Borchers, Patrick, Making Findings of Fact and Preparing a Decision, 11 J.NAALS 85 (1991) [cited in Frost, *The Unseen Hand in Administrative Law Decisions: Organizing Principles for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 151, 171, n. 7 (1997)].

Boyd, Robert R., *A Hearing Examiner Comments on the APA and the Rule-Making or Adjudication Controversy*, 11 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 424 (1969).

Caccavelli, Michael J., *A Too Quick Fix: NLRB One Year Experimental Regulations Granting ALJs the Power to Dispense with Briefs and Decide Cases from the Bench*, 9 Admin. L. J. Am. U. 791 (1995).

Caldwell, Louis G., *A Federal Administrative Court*, 84 U. Pa. L. Rev. 970 (1936).

Cary, William L., *Why I Oppose the Divorce of the Judicial Function from Federal Regulatory Agencies*, 51 A.B.A.J. 33 (1965).

Cass, Ronald, *Allocation of Authority Within Bureaucracies: Empirical Evidence and Normative Analysis*, 66 B.U.L. Rev. 1 (1986).

Champagne, Anthony and Danube, Amos, *An Empirical Analysis of Decisions of Administrative Law Judges in the Social Security*

Disability Programs, 64 Geo. L.J. 43 (1975).

Cleary, Timothy F., *Some Aspects of Agency Review of Initial Decisions of Administrative Law Judges*, 31 Lab. L.J. 531 (1980).

Comment, *Social Security Hearings for the Disabled--Who Decides: Trial Examiners or Administrative Law Judges*? 69 Nw. U.L. Rev. 915 (1975).

Comment, *Administrative Law Judges and the Code of Judicial Conduct: A Need for Regulated Ethics*, 94 Dickinson L. Rev. 929 (1990).

Cox, Michael P., *The Model Adjudication Rules* (MARs), 11 T.M. Cooley L. Rev. 75 (1994).

Cramton, Roger C., *A Title Change for Federal Hearing Examiners? 'A Rose by Any Other Name. . . '*, 40 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 918 (1972).

Cross, Hugh W., *Statement to the President's Conference on Administrative Procedure Concerning Appointment and Status of Federal Hearing Officers*, 22 ICC Prac. J. 120 (1954).

Cygan, Stanley J., *Development of the Model Code of Judicial Conduct for State Administrative Law Judges*, 14 J. NAALJ 269 (1994)

Davis, Frederick, *Judicialization of Administrative Law: The Trial-Type Hearing and the Changing Status of the Hearing Officer*, 1977 Duke L.J. 389.

De Seife, Rudolphe J.A., *Administrative Law Reform: A Focus on the Administrative Law Judge*, 13 Val. U.L. Rev. 229 (1979).

Dixon, Robert G. Jr., *The Welfare State and Mass Justice: A Warning from the Social Security Disability Program*, 1972 Duke L.J. 681.

Dorsey, William R., *Florida's Continuing Experiment with the Central Panel Process: The Division of Administrative Hearings*, 15 J. NAALJ 77 (1995).

Dullea, Charles J., *Development of the Personnel Program for Administrative Law Judges*, 25 Admin. L. Rev. 41 (1973).

Edles, Gary, *The ICC Hearing Process: A Cost-Benefit Approach to Administrative Agency Alternative Dispute Resolution*, 16 Trans. L. J. 99 (1987).

Etelson, Jesse, *The New ALJ Examination: A Bright, Shining Lie Redux*, 43 Admin. L. Rev. 185 (1991).

Fallon, Richard, *Enforcing Aviation Safety Regulations: The Case for a Split-Enforcement Model of Agency Adjudication*, 4 Admin. L. J. 389 (1991).

Fallon, Richard, *Of Legislative Courts, Administrative Agencies and Article III*, 101 Harv. L. Rev. 915 (1988).

Fauver, William, *An Agenda for Investigation: Should the APA Be Amended to Provide Standards for Agency Review of Administrative Trials*? 1973 Duke L.J. 135.

Felter, Edwin L., Jr., *The Hidden Executive Branch Judiciary: Colorado's Central Panel Experience - Lessons for the Feds*, 14 J. NAALJ 95 (1994).

Felter, Edwin L., Jr. *Maintaining the Balance Between Judicial Independence and Judicial Accountability in Administrative Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 89 (1997).

Fennell, Wendell, and Young, Fred, *Judicial Independence Under Siege*, 17 J. NAALJ 211 (1997).

Freedman, James O., *Review Boards in the Administrative Process*, 117 U. Pa. L. Rev. 546 (1969).

Friendly, Henry J., *Some Kind of Hearing*, 123 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1267 (1975).

Frost, Michael, *The Unseen Hand in Administrative Law Decisions: Organizing Principles for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 151 (1997).

Fuchs, Ralph F., *The Hearing Examiner Fiasco Under The Administrative Procedure Act*, 63 Harv. L. Rev. 737 (1950).

Fuchs, Ralph F., *Hearing Commissioners*, 30 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1342 (1955).

Fuchs, Ralph F., *The Hearing Officer Problem--Symptom and Symbol*, 40 Cornell L.J. 281 (1955).

Funk, William F., *Close Enough for Government Work? Using Informal Procedures for Imposing Administrative Penalties*, 24 Set on Hall L. Rev. 1 (1993)

Gardner, Warner, *The Procedures by Which Informal Action is Taken*, 24 Admin. L. Rev. 155 (1972).

Gelder, Larry, and Hemingway, Peter, *Argument and Courtroom Theatrics*, 16 J. NAALJ 175 (1996)

Gifford, Daniel, *Adjudication in Independent Tribunals: The Role of an Alternative Agency Structure*, 66 Notre Dame L. Rev. 965 (1991).

Gifford, Daniel, *Federal Administrative Law Judges: The Relevance of Past Choices to Future Decisions*, 49 Administrative Law Review 1 (1997)

Gilboy, Janet, *Regulatory and Administrative Agency Behavior: Accommodation, Amplification, and Assimilation*, 17 Law & Policy 3 (1995)

Gladstone, Arthur A., *Commentary: The Adjudication Process in Administrative Law*, 31 Admin. L. Rev. 237 (1979).

Golin, Elain, *Solving the Problem of Gender and Racial Bias in Administrative Action*," 95 Colum. L. Rev. 1532 (1995)

Graham, Michael, *Application of the Rules of Evidence in Administrative Agency Formal Adversarial Adjudications: A New Approach*, 1991 U. Ill. L. Rev. 353 (1991).

Greer, C. Stuart, *Expanding the Judicial Power of the Administrative Law Judge to Establish Efficiency and Fairness in Administrative Adjudication*, 27 U. Rich. L. Rev. 103 (1992).

Habermann, Robert S., Kalet, Linda, Kobin, Nathan, Lamb, Steve, Lohans, Ellen, and Tapp, Rodney, *A Synopsis of the ACUS Report on the Federal Administrative Judiciary*, 39 Federal Bar News & Journal, 428 (August 1992) [synopsis of Changing Roles, Changing Attitudes: The New Look of Today's Federal Judiciary).

Hantman, Jack H., *For an Administrative Court*, 62 A.B.A.J. 360 (1976).

Hale, Gina L., *Professionalism: A Call to Excellence*, 15 J. NAALJ 6 (1996)

Harders, R. Terrence, *Striking a Balance: Administrative Law Judge Independence and Accountability*, 19 J. NAALJ 1 (1999).

Hardwicke, John W., *The Central Hearing Agency: Theory and Implementation in Maryland*, 14 J. NAALJ 5 (1994).

Hardwicke, John, and Yoder, Ronnie A., *Does Mandatory Quality Assurance Oversight of ALJ Decisions Violate ALJ Decisional Independence, Due Process or Ex Parte Prohibitions?* 17 J. N.A.A.L.J. 75 (1997).

Harves, Duane, *The 1981 Model State Administrative Procedure Act: The Impact on Central Panel States*, 6 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 661 (1984).

Harwood, Gerald, *How Necessary is the Administrative Law Judge*? 6 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 793 (1984).

Hayes, *Social Security Disability and the Administrative Law Judges*, 17 A.F. L. Rev. 73 (1975).

Hayes, *Hearing Examiner Regulations Promulgated Under Section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act*, 18 ICC Prac. J. 189 (1951).

Hayes, *Hearing Examiner Status--A Recurrent Problem in Administrative Law*, 1954 Ind. L. J. 86 (1954).

Hector, Louis J., *Problems of the CAB and the Independent Regulatory Commission*, 69 Yale L.J. 931 (1960).

Hector, Louis J., *The Hidden Judiciary and What It Does*, U.S. News & World Report, Nov. 1, 1982.

Heifetz, Alan W., *ALJs, ADR, and ADP: The Future of Administrative Adjudication*, 1 Widener Journal of Public Law 13 (1992) (Symposium: Administrative Law in the Twenty-First Century).

Hoberg, Allen, *Administrative Hearings: State Central Panels in*

the 1990s, 46 Admin. L. Rev. 75 (1994).

Hoberg, Allen, *Administrative Hearings: State Central Panels in the 1990s*, 14 J. NAALJ 107 (1994).

Holmes, John C., *ALJ Update: A Review of the Current Role, Status and Demographics of the Corps of Administrative Law Judges*, 38 Fed. Bar News & J. 202 (May 1991).

Horne, Brockman, *Committee on Hearing Officers Asks for Help*, 37 J. of the Am. Judicature Soc., 182 (1954).

Hugg, Patrick, Professional Legal Writing: Declaring Your Independence, XI J. NAALS 114 (1991) [cited in Frost, *The Unseen Hand in Administrative Law Decisions: Organizing Principles for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 151, 171, n. 7 (1997)]

Hugg, Patrick R., *Professional Writing Methodology*, 14 J. NAALJ 165 (1994)

Huss, Erin Park, *Note: Response to the Experimental Role of Settlement Judges in Unfair Labor Practice Proceedings*, 37 ARIZ. L. REV. 895 (1995)

Improving the Administrative Process--Time for a New APA? Proceedings of the National Conference on Federal Regulation: Roads to Reform, 32 Admin. L. Rev. 357 (1980).

Independence and the Federal ALJ (Panel Discussion), 18 J. NAALJ 47 (1998)

Jaksetic, Emilio, *Computer Literacy for Administrative Law Judges*, J. NAALJ 185 (1996).

Jarvis, Donald B., What Does the Administrative Judiciary Do? Judges Journal, Vol. 38, #4 (Fall), p. 1 (1999).

Jones, John Paul, *Administrative Law Judges: Past, Present and Future*, 12 J. NAALJ 15 (1992).

Joost, Robert and Battaglia, Nancy, *The Board for Correction of Military Records of the Coast Guard: A Unique Dispute Resolution Mechanism*, 41 Admin. L. J. 441 (1989).

Judging the Judges - An Outsize Job - and Getting Bigger, Time, August 20, 1979, p. 49.

Katcher, Monroe I., *New York's Elusive Administrative Law Judge*, 54 N.Y. St.B.J. 80 (1982).

Kauper, Karen, *Protecting the Independence of Administrative Law Judges: A Model Administrative Law Judge Corps Statute*, 18 J. of Law Reform 537 (1985).

Kinnane, Charles H., *Administrative Law: Federal Trial Examiners and the Ramspeck Case*, 4 De Paul L. Rev. 1 (1954).

Klement, Alice, *'Hidden Judiciary' Fights Back*, Nat. L. J., September 24, 1979, p. 18.

Koch, Charles H., *Administrative Presiding Officials Today*, 46 Admin. L. Rev. 271 (1994).

Koch, Jr., Charles H. and Koplow, David A., *The Fourth Bite at the Apple: A Study of the Operation and Utility of the Social Security Administration's Appeals Council*, 17 Fla. St. L. Rev. 199 (1990).

Kolb, Harold H. Jr., *Res Ipsa Loquitur: The Writing of Opinions* XII J. NAALS 53 (1992). [cited in Frost, *The Unseen Hand in Administrative Law Decisions: Organizing Principles for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law*, 17 J. NAALJ 151, 171, n. 7 (1997)]

Lacy, Elizabeth B., *Administrative Law: Working Together for Professionalization; Administrative Law Judges, the Judiciary, and the Community*, 15 J. NAALJ 21 (1996).

Levant, Michael, *A Unified Corps of Administrative Law Judges -- The Transition From a Concept to an Eventual Reality*, 6 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 705 (1984).

Levin. A. Leo, and Kunz, Michael E., *Thinking About Judgeships*, 44 AM. U.L. REV. 1627 (1995).

Levinson, Harold, *Elements of the Administrative Process: Formal, Semi-Formal and Free-Form Models*, 26 Am. U. L. Rev. 872 (1977).

Levinson, Harold, *Professional Responsibility Issues in Administrative Adjudication*, 2 BYU J. of Pub. Law 219 (1988).

Levinson, Harold, *The Proposed Administrative Law Judge Corps: An Incomplete But Important Reform Effort*, 19 New Eng. L. Rev. 733 (1983-84).

Lewis, Karen S., *Administrative Law Judges and the Code of Judicial Conduct: A Need for Regulated Ethics*, 94 Dickinson L. Rev. 929 (1990)(Symposium Issue: Ethics).

Liebman, Ernst., *Quality Control for Administrative Law Judges*, 18 Judges J. 15 (1979).

Lindh, Frank, *An Examination of the Proposed "Closed Record" Administrative Law Judge Hearing in the Social Security Disability Program*, 6 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 745 (1984).

Litt, Nahum, *Doing It With Mirrors: The Illusion of Independence of Federal Administrative Law Judges*, Judges Journal, Vol. 36, #2, p. 27

Litt, Nahum and Simone, Joseph, *An Administrative Law Judge Corps: Its Value and Relation to the Traditional Justice System*, 11 Whittier L. Rev. 569 (1989).

Lorch, Robert S., *The Administrative Court Idea Before Congress*, 20 W. Pol. Q. 65 (1967).

Lorch, Robert S., *Administrative Court via the Independent Hearing Office*, 51 Judicature 114 (1967).

Lorch, Robert S., *Federal Administrative Court Idea*, 52 A.B.A.J. 635 (1966).

Lubbers, Jeffrey S., *The Federal Administrative Judiciary: Establishing an Appropriate System of Performance Evaluations for ALJs*, 7 Admin. L.J. Am. U. 589 (1994).

Lubbers, Jeffrey S., *Federal Administrative Law Judges: A Focus on Our Invisible Judiciary*, 31 Admin. L. Rev. 109 (1981).

Lubbers, Jeffrey S., *Federal Agency Adjudications: Trying to See the Forest and the Trees*, 33 Fed. Bar News and J. 388 (1984).

Lubbers, Jeffrey S., *A Unified Corps of ALJs: A Proposal to Test the Idea at the Federal Level*, 68 Judicature 266 (1981).

Lussier, Edward, *The Role of the Article I "Trial Judge"*, 6 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 775 (1984).

McCown, F. Scott, and Leo, Monica, *When Can an Agency Change the Findings or Conclusions of an Administrative Law Judge [Part One]*, 50 Baylor L. Rev. 65 (1998)

McCown, F. Scott, and Leo, Monica, *When Can an Agency Change the Findings or Conclusions of an Administrative Law Judge [Part Two]*, 51 Baylor L. Rev. 63 (1999).

McNeil, Christopher B., *The Administrative Hearing Officer and the National Appeals Division of the United States Department of Agriculture: A Brief History, A Contemporary Perspective, and Some Thoughts for the Future*, 19 J. NAALJ 75 (1999)

McNeil, Christopher B., *Similarities and Differences Between Judges in the Judicial Branch and the Executive Branch: The Further Evolution of Executive Adjudications Under the Administrative Central Panel*, 18 J. NAALJ 1 (1998).

Macy, John W., Jr., *The APA and the Hearing Examiner: Products of a Viable Political Society*, 27 Fed. Bar J. 351 (1967).

Mann, Julian III, *Striving for Efficiency in Administrative Litigation: North Carolina's Office of Administrative Hearings*, 15 J. NAALJ 151 (1995).

Mans, Thomas C., *Selecting the 'Hidden Judiciary': How the Merit Process Works in Choosing Administrative Law Judges*, (2 Parts), 63 Judicature 60, 130 (1979).

Marland, Melissa K., *Confessions of an Administrative law Judge: Ten Mistakes That Lawyers Make*, 8 Compleat Lawyer 34 (Spring 1991).

Marquardt, Ronald G. and Wheat, Edward M., *Case Processing by Administrative Agencies: Administrative Law Judge Perceptions vs. Reality*, Paper presented to Western Political Science Ass'n Convention (March 26, 1982).

Marquardt, Ronald G. and Wheat, Edward M., *The Developing Concept*

of an Administrative Court, 33 Admin. L.J. 301 (1981).

Marquardt, Ronald G. and Wheat, Edward M., *Hidden Allocators: Administrative Law Judges and Regulatory Reform*, 2 L. & Pol'y Q. 472 (1980).

Martin, *Reforming Asylum Adjudication: On Navigating the Coast of Bohemia*, 138 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1247 (1990).

Marzloff, George Ernest, *Delay in Review of Initial Decisions: The Case for Giving More Finality to the Findings of Fact of the Administrative Law Judge*, 35 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 393 (1978).

Mashaw, Jerry L., *Organizing Adjudication: Reflections on the Prospect for Artisans in the Age of Robots* (Symposium: Contemporary Issues in Administrative Adjudication), 39 UCLA L. Rev. 1055 (1992).

Meierhenry, Judith K., *The Due Process Right to an Unbiased Adjudicator in Administrative Proceedings*, 36 S.D. L. Rev. 551 (1991).

Miller, C.A., *Federal Trial Examiners Should Not Be Subject to Presidential Appointment; Address*, 21 ICC Prac. J. 4 (1953).

Miller, Edward B., *The Tangled Path to an Administrative Judgeship*, 25 Lab. L.J. 3 (1974).

Miller, John T., Jr., *The Civil Service Commission's New Hearing Examiner Recruitment Program*, 17 Admin. L. Rev. 104 (1964).

Miller, John T., Jr., *Continuing Forum for Reform of Administrative Process*, 27 Admin. L. Rev. 205 (1975).

Miller, John T., Jr., *The Education and Development of Administrative Law Judges*, 25 Admin. L. Rev. 7 (1973).

Miller, John T., Jr., *Hearing Cases Before Several Agencies--Odyssey of an Administrative Judge--Comment*, 27 Admin. L. Rev. 218 (1975).

Miller, John T., Jr., *The Need for Improvements in the Hearing Examiner Recruitment Program for the Civil Service Commission*, 19 Admin. L. Rev. 319 (1967).

Miller, John T., Jr., *The Vice of Selective Certification in the Appointment of Hearing Examiners*, 20 Admin. L. Rev. 477 (1968).

Minor, Robert W., *The Administrative Court: Variations on a Theme*, 19 Ohio St. L.J. 380 (1983).

Minow, Newton N., *Suggestions for Improvements in the Administrative Process*, 15 Admin. L. Rev. 146 (1963).

Model Act Creating a State Central Hearing Agency (Adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association), 17 J. NAALJ 3131 (1997).

Model Code of Judicial Conduct for Federal Administrative Law Judges, 10 J. NAALJ 131 (1990).

Model Code of Judicial Conduct for State Administrative Law Judges, 14 J. NAALJ 279 (1994).

Model Code of Judicial Conduct for State Administrative Law Judges, 15 J. NAALJ 251 (1995) (noting that it was adopted by the National Conference of Administrative Law Judges at the annual meeting on August 5, 1995).

Model Standards of Conduct for Mediators: American Arbitration Association American Bar Association Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution, 17 J. NAALJ 323 (1997).

Mogel, William A., *The Effect of a Claim of Privilege upon the Subpoena Power of an Administrative Law Judge*, 28 Drake L. Rev. 67 (1978-79).

Moore, Christine McKenna, *Evidence for Administrative Law Judges*, 15 J. NAALJ 201 (1995).

Morse, Marvin, *The Administrative Law Judge -- A New Direction For the Corps*? 30 Fed. Bar News & J. 398 (1983).

Mosher, Lawrence, *Here Come the Administrative Law Judges, Nat. L.J.*, July 28, 1979, p. 1247.

Moss, Debra C., *Judges Under Fire*, 77 A.B.A.J. 56 (November 1991).

Moss, Debra C., *Judges Under fire: ALJ Independence at Issue*, 12 J. NAALJ 32 (1992).

Muslof, Lloyd, *Administrative Law Judges: A 1948 Snapshot*, 46 Admin. L. Rev. 257 (1994).

Musolf, Lloyd D., *Independent Hearing Officers: The California Experiment*, 14 W. Pol. Q. 195 (1961).

Nathanson, Nathaniel L., *The Administrative Court Proposal*, 57 Va. L. Rev. 996 (1971).

Nathanson, Nathaniel L., *Proposals for an Administrative Appellate Court*, 25 Admin. L. Rev. 85 (1973).

Neslund, Nancy, *Dispute Resolution: A Matrix of Mechanisms*, 1990 J. of Dispute Resolution 212 (1990).

Note, *Administrative Law Judges, Performance Evaluation, and Production Standards: Judicial Independence Versus Employee Accountability*, 54 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 591 (1986).

Note, *Veterans' Preference in Public Employment: The History, Constitutionality and Effect on Federal Personnel Practices of Veterans' Preference Legislation*, 44 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 623 (1976).

Palmer, Victor, *The Evolving Role of Administrative Law Judges*, 19 New Eng. L. Rev. 755 (1983-84).

Palmer, Victor, and Bernstein, Edwin, *Establishing Federal Administrative Law Judges as an Independent Corps: The Heflin Bill*, 6 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 673 (1984).

Pfeiffer, Paul N., *Hearing Cases Before Several Agencies--Odyssey of an Administrative Law Judge*, 27 Admin. L. Rev. 217 (1975).

Pops, Gerald M., *Judicialization of Federal Administrative Law Judges: Implications for Policymaking*, 81 W. Va. L. Rev. 169 (1979).

Reflections on the Conduct of an Administrative Hearing, Panel Discussion, 20 Admin. L. Rev. 101 (1967).

Rhyne, Charles S., *Developing the Prestige of the Hearing Examiner*, 47 A.B.A.J. 184 (1961).

Rich, Malcolm C., ed., *The Central Panel System: A New Framework*

for the Use of Administrative Law Judges, 65 Judicature 232 (1981).

Rich, Malcolm C., *The Central Panel System and the Decisionmaking Independence of Administrative Law Judges: Lessons for a Proposed Federal Program*, 6 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 643 (1984).

Rippey, Charles P., *Undermining the Administrative Procedure Act: How ACUS Threatens the Independence and Merit Selection of Federal Administrative Law Judges*, 32 Judges Journal 12 (Spring, 1993).

Robie, William and Morse, Marvin, *The Federal Executive Branch Adjudicator: Alive (and) Well Outside the Administrative Procedure Act*? 33 Fed. Bar News & J. 133 (March 1986).

Rogers, James T., *Trial Examiners' Impact on Business Grows*, 21 ICC Prac. J. 187 (1953).

Rosenblum, Victor, *Changing Judicial Perceptions of Administrative Decision-Making and of the Status of Administrative Law Judges; Interrelations of Case Law with Statutory and Pragmatic Factors in Determining ALJ Roles*, 15 Judges J. 64 (1976).

Rosenblum, Victor, *Contexts and Contents of "For Good Cause" as Criterion for Removal of Administrative Law Judges: Legal and Policy Factors*, 6 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 593 (1984).

Rosenblum, Victor G., *Toward Heightening Impartiality in Social Security Agency Proceedings Involving Administrative Law Judges*,18 J. NAALJ 1 (1998).

Rossi, Jim, *ALJ Final Orders on Appeal: Balancing Independence with Accountability*, 19 J. NAALJ 1 (1999)

Ruth, Gerald E., *Unification of the Administrative Adjudicatory Process: An Emerging Framework to Increase "Judicialization" in Pennsylvania*, 16 J. NAALJ 221 (1996).

Rutledge, J.C., *Administrative Trial Examiners: The Anonymous Matters*, 30 Wash. L. Rev. 26 (1955).

Sahm, Henry S., *The Hearing Examiner's Roles in the Federal Administrative Process*, 20 Fed. Bar J. 74 (1960).

Scalia, Antonin, *The ALJ Fiasco--A Reprise*, 47 U. Chi. L. Rev. 57 (1979).

Scalia, Antonin, *The Hearing Examiner Loan Program*, 1971 Duke L.J. 319.

Schoenbaum, Edward J., *A Brief History of the Model Act to Create a State Central Hearing Agency*, 17 J. NAALJ 309 (1997).

Schoenbaum, Edward J. *Managing Your Docket Efficiently and Effectively*, 19 J. NAALJ 37 (1999)

Schoenberger, Allen E., *The Active Administrative Law Judge: Is There Harm in an ALJ Asking?*, 18 J. NAALJ 399 (1998)

Schoenberger, Allen, *Security of Tenure of Administrative Law Judges: How Much Can an ALJ Say and Stay an ALJ?* 17 J. NAALJ 219 (1997).

Schwartz, Bernard, *Adjudication and the Administrative Procedure Act*, 32 Tulsa L.J. 203 (1996) (Symposium)

Segal, Bernard G., *The Administrative Law Judge: Thirty Years of Progress and the Road Ahead*, 62 A.B.A.J. 1424 (1976).

Sharon, Amiel T., *The Measure of an Administrative Law Judge*, 19 Judges J. 20 (1980).

Sharon, Amiel and Pettibone, Craig, *Merit Selection of Federal Administrative Law Judges*, 70 Judicature 216 (1987).

Simeone, Joseph J., *The Function, Flexibility, and Future of United States Judges of the Executive Department*, 44 Admin. L. Rev. 159 (1992).

Simon, Ruth, *For ALJs, Obscurity Is Ending*, Nat. L. J., June 6, 1983.

Sippel, Richard L., *Collegiality Among Administrative Law Judges - As Well As Independence - Would Be Lost If Judges Are Evaluated By Chief Judges on Policy Correctness*, 17 J. NAALJ 97 (1997)

Skoler, Daniel L., *The Administrative Judiciary: Change, Challenge, and Choices*, 462 The Annals 34 (1982).

Skoler, Daniel L., *The Changing Role of Administrative Law Judges: Time to Shift Gears*, 22 Judges J. 24 (1983).
Status of the Trial Examiner in Administrative Agencies, 26 Harv. L. Rev. 51 (1974).

Skoler, Daniel L., *The Many Faces of High-Volume Administrative Adjudication: Structure, Organization, and Management*, 16 J. NAALJ 43 (1996).

Slavin, Edward A., Jr., *ALJ Independence Undermined; What the Interior Department Is Doing and Why*, 31 Judge's Journal 26 (Spring 1992).

Slavin, Edward A., Jr., *The Pecking Order*, 31 Judge's Journal 31 (Spring 1992).

Snider, Marshall A., *Pet Peeves and Other Musings of an Administrative Law Judge* , 26 Colorado Lawyer 17 (Dec. 1997).

Solomon, Daniel F., *Medical Expert Testimony in Administrative Hearings*, 17 J. NAALJ 285 (1997)

Stander, Irvin, *Administrative Decision Writing*, 10 J. NAALJ 149 (1990).

Stewart, Kenneth P., *Take the "Alternative" Out of Alternative Dispute Resolution; Results of an ADR Survey of Administrative Judges*, 62 The Journal of the Kansas Bar Association 14 (Jan. 1993).

Symposium: Administrative Law Judges, 6 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 587 (1984).

Symposium: Contemporary Issues in Administrative Adjudication, 39 UCLA L. Rev. 1055 (1992).

Symposium: The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Administrative Procedure Act, 32 Tulsa L. J. 203 (1996)

Symposium: Review of Administrative Adjudication, 26 Admin. L. Rev. 51 (1974).

Thomas, Morgan, *Tales from the Forgotten Judiciary*, 63 A.B.A.J. 301 (1977).

Thomas, Morgan, *The Selection of Federal Hearing Examiners: Pressure Groups and the Administrative Process*, 59 Yale L.J. 431 (1950).

Thomas, Morgan, *The 350 Hearing Examiners: Chairman Wiley Asks for Open Choice for Witness*, 33 A.B.A.J. 421 (1947).

Timony, James P., *Demeanor Credibility*, 49 Cath. U.L. Rev. 903 (2000)

Timony, James P., *Disciplinary Proceedings Against Federal Administrative Law Judges*, 6 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 807 (1984).

Timony, James P., *Performance Evaluation of Federal Administrative Law Judges*, 7 Admin. L.J. Am. U. 629 (1993-94).

Tuggle, Kenneth H., *Status of Federal Hearing Examiners*, 22 ICC Prac. J. 129 (1954).

Vera, Jorge J., *Social Security Disability Ping Pong and Contrasting Approaches in the Second Circuit: The Central Role of an Active ALJ* (Case Note), 16 J. NAALJ 300 (1996).

Verkuil, Paul, *A Study of Immigration Procedures*, 31 UCLA L. Rev. 1141 (1984).

Verkuil, Paul, *A Study of Informal Adjudication Procedures*, 43 U. Chi. L. Rev. 739 (1976).

Verkuil, Paul, *The Emerging Concept of Administrative Procedure*, 78 Colum. L. Rev. 258 (1978).

Verkuil, Paul, *Reflections Upon the Federal Administrative Judiciary*, 39 UCLA L. Rev. 1341 (1992) (Symposium)

Von Rintelin, Victor A., *Hearing Examiner Recruitment and the Government Lawyer*, 35 ICC Prac. J. 7 (1967).

Wagner, Warren H., *The Future of the Interstate Commerce Commission and Its Examiners*, 19 ICC Prac. J. 271 (1951).

Wald, Patricia, *Some Thoughts on Beginning and Ends: Court of Appeals Review of Administrative Law Judges' Findings and Opinions*, 67 Wash. U.L.Q. 661 (1989).

Weaver, Russell L., *ALJ Support Systems: Staff Attorneys and Decision Writers*, 15 J. NAALJ 89 (1996).

Weaver, Russell L., *Management of ALJ Offices in Executive Departments and Agencies*, 47 Admin. L. Rev. 303 (1995).

Westwood, Howard C., *Administrative Proceedings: Techniques of Presiding*, 50 A.B.A.J. 659 (1964).

Wheeler, Edd, *A Breach Too Far: The Assault on Judges' Professionalism by the Office of Hearings and Appeals*, 15 J. NAALJ 29 (1996).

Wheeler, Edd, *The Courting of Credibility*, 14 J. NAALJ 253 (1994).

White, Penny J., *Judicial Courage and Judicial Independence*, 16 J. NAALJ 161 (1996).

Wolfe, Jeffrey, and Proszek, Lisa B., *Interaction Dynamics in Federal Administrative Decision Making: The Role of the Inquisitorial judge and the Adversarial Lawyer*, 33 Tulsa L. J. 293 (1997)

Woodall, Emery J., *Appointment and Compensation of Federal Hearing Examiners*, 10 Fed. Bar J. 391 (1949).

Yoder, Ronnie A., *A Critique of the ACUS Report on the Federal Administrative Judiciary*, 39 Federal Bar News & Journal 423 (August 1992) [critique of Changing Roles, Changing Attitudes: The New Look of Today's Federal Judiciary)

Yoder, Ronnie A., *Evaluation: Where Are We? Where Are We Going?*, 14 J. NAALJ 303 (1994).

Yoder, Ronnie A., and Hardwicke, John, *Yoder-Hardwicke Dialogue: Does Mandatory Quality Assurance Oversight of ALJ Decisions Violate ALJ Decisional Independence, Due Process or Ex Parte Prohibitions?*, 17 J. NAALJ 75 (1997).

Young, Ann Marshall, *Evaluation of ALJ's: Premises, Means, and Ends*, 17 J. NAALJ 1 (Spring 1997).

Young, Ann Marshall, *Judicial Administration in Administrative Adjudication: Past, Present, and Future*, 19 J. NAALJ 101 (1999).

Zankel, Norman, *A Unified Corps of Federal Administrative Law Judges is Not Needed*, 6 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 723 (1984).

Zelenske, Ethel, and Udell, David S., *Defining and Addressing ALJ Bias and Unfitness in the Social Security System*, 27 Clearinghouse Review 1460 (1994).

Zwerdling, Joseph, *Reflections on the Role of an Administrative Law Judge*, 25 Admin. L. Rev. 9 (1973).

Zwerdling, Joseph, *The Role and Functions of Federal Hearing Examiners*, 400 The Annals 27 (1972).

State Adjudication: Books and Articles

Abrams, Norman, *Administrative Law Judge Systems: The California View*, 20 Admin. L. Rev. 487 (1977).

Asimow, Michael, *Toward a New California Administrative Procedure Act: Adjudication Fundamentals* (Symposium: Contemporary Issues in Administrative Adjudication), 39 UCLA L. Rev. 1067 (1992).

Asimow, Michael, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Administrative Procedure Act: Past and Prologue: The Influence of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act on California's New Administrative Procedure Act*, 32 Tulsa L.J. 297 (1996) (Symposium)

Bybee, J.S., *Agency Expertise, ALJ Independence, and Administrative Courts: The Recent Changes in Louisiana's Administrative Procedure Act*, 59 La. L. Rev. 431 (1999).

Dorsey, William R., *Florida's Continuing Experiment with the Central Panel Process: The Division of Administrative Hearings*, 15 J. NAALJ 77 (1995).

Endris, Lori Kyle, and Penrod, Wayne E., *Judicial Independence in Administrative Adjudication: Indiana's Environmental Solution*," 12 St. John's J. Legal Comment. 125 (1996)

Hardwicke, John W., *The Central Hearing Agency: Theory and Implementation in Maryland*, 14 J. NAALJ 5 (1994).

Hoberg, Allen, *Administrative Hearings: State Central Panels in*

the 1990s, 46 Admin. L. Rev. 75 (1994).

Hoberg, Allen, *Administrative Hearings: State Central Panels in the 1990s*, 14 J. NAALJ 107 (1994).

McNeil, Christopher B., *Due Process and the Ohio Administrative Procedure Act: The Central Panel Proposal* , 23 Ohio N.U.L. Rev. 783 (1997)

McNeil, Christopher B., *Similarities and Differences Between Judges in the Judicial Branch and the Executive Branch: The Further Evolution of Executive Adjudications Under the Administrative Central Panel*, 18 J. NAALJ 1 (1998).

Mann, Julian III, *Striving for Efficiency in Administrative Litigation: North Carolina's Office of Administrative Hearings*, 15 J. NAALJ 151 (1995).

Model Act Creating a State Central Hearing Agency (Adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association), 17 J. NAALJ 3131 (1997).

Model Code of Judicial Conduct for State Administrative Law Judges, 14 J. NAALJ 279 (1994).

Model Code of Judicial Conduct for State Administrative Law Judges, 15 J. NAALJ 251 (1995) (noting that it was adopted by the National Conference of Administrative Law Judges at the annual meeting on August 5, 1995).

National Conference of Administrative Law Judges, American Bar Association, A Model Code of Judical Conduct for State Administrative law Judges, 15 J. NAALJ 251 (1995).

Ruth, Gerald E., *Unification of the Administrative Adjudicatory Process: An Emerging Framework to Increase "Judicialization" in Pennsylvania*, 16 J. NAALJ 221 (1996).

Schoenbaum, Edward J., *A Brief History of the Model Act to Create a State Central Hearing Agency*, 17 J. NAALJ 309 (1997).

Sherrill, William C., *The Florida Division of Administrative Hearings*, 75 Fla. B. J. 22 (Jan. 2001).

Snider, Marshall A., *Pet Peeves and Other Musings of an Administrative Law Judge*, 26 Colorado Lawyer 17 (Dec 1997).

Swent, William B., *South Carolina's ALJ: Central Panel, Administrative Court, or a Little of Both?*" 48 S.C. L. Rev. 1 (1996).

Weaver, Russell, *Unification of the Administrative Adjudicatory Process: An Emerging Framework to Increase 'Judicialization' in Pennsylvania*, 5 Widener J. Pub. L. 297 (1995)

Government Reports

Administrative Conference of the United States.
Lester, *Report on Section II Hearing Examiners*, to the Committee on Personnel, Administrative Conference of the U.S. (August 23, 1962).

Name Change for Hearing Officers, Transcript of ACUS Plenary Session, October 22, 1969.

Park, Robert E., *Several Matters in Regard to Examiners and Government Attorneys: A Report for the Committee on Personnel on Its Current Recommendations*. 1 ACUS 281 424 (1971).

Rosenblum, Victor G., *The Administrative Law Judge in the Administrative Process: Interrelations of Case Law with Statutory and Pragmatic Factors in Determining ALJ Roles*. Reprinted in Recent Studies Relevant to the Disability Hearings and Appeals Crisis. U.S. Congress. House Committee on Ways and Means. Subcommittee on Social Security. 94th Cong., 1st Sess., December 20, 1975, pp. 171-245.

Federal Administrative Law Judge Hearings-Statistical Report for 1975. Wash., D.C., U.S. Gov't Printing Office (1977).

Federal Administrative Law Judge Hearings-Statistical Report for 1976-1978. Wash., D.C., U.S. Gov't Printing Office (1980). (See especially Lubbers, The Administrative Law Judge, Chapter 1, p.7.)
Administrative Law Judges: Should An Independent Corps Be Created? Transcript of ACUS Plenary Session, July 27, 1987.

Frye, John, *Study of Non-ALJ Hearing Programs*, Report to the Administrative Conference of the U.S. (August, 1991). [Reprinted

in 44 Admin. L. Rev. 261 (1992)]

ACUS Recommendations (Codified at 1 CFR §305)(until 1993):

* Recommendation 68-6, *Delegation of Final Decisional Authority Subject to Discretionary Review By the Agency*
* Recommendation 69-6, *Compilation of Statistics on Administrative Proceedings by Federal Departments and Agencies*
* Recommendation 69-9, *Recruitment and Selection of Hearing Examiners; Continuing Training for Government Attorneys and Hearing Examiners; Creation of a Center for Continuing Legal Education in Government*
* Recommendation 72-6, *Civil Money Penalties as a Sanction*
* Recommendation 74-1, *Subpena Power in Formal Rulemaking and Formal Adjudication*
* Recommendation 78-2, *Procedures for Determining Social Security Claims*
* Recommendation 78-3, *Time Limits on Agency Actions*
* Recommendation 79-3, *Agency Assessment and Mitigation of Civil Money Penalties*
* Recommendation 83-3, *Agency Structures for Review of Decisions of Presiding Officers Under the Administrative Procedure Act*
* Recommendation 86-2, *Use of Federal Rules of Evidence in Federal Agency Adjudications*
* Recommendation 86-3, *Agencies' Use of Alternative Means of Dispute Resolution*
* Recommendation 86-4, *The Split-Enforcement Model for Agency Adjudication*
* Recommendation 86-7, *Case Management as a Tool for Improving Agency Adjudication*
* Recommendation 87-12, *Adjudication Practices and Procedures of the Federal Bank Regulatory Agencies*
* Recommendation 88-5, *Agency Use of Settlement Judges*
* Recommendation 90-1, *Civil Money Penalties for Federal Aviation Violations*
* Recommendation 90-4, *Social Security Disability Program Appeals Process: Supplementary Recommendations*
* Recommendation 91-8, *Adjudication of Civil Penalties Under the Federal Aviation Act*

American Bar Association. Judicial Administration Division. Conference of Administrative Law Judges, *Symposium on a Unified Corps of Administrative Law Judges--How Will It Work*, Washington,

D.C., January 28, 1977.

Associated Staff Attorneys of the Office of Hearings and Appeals. National Treasury Employees Union, *Social Security Administrative Law Judges: The Need to Change The Administrative Law Judge Examination* (September 1989).

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Legal Services and Procedure*, Report to the Congress, Recommendation No. 52 (March 1955).

Committee on Administrative Procedure Appointed by the Attorney General, *Administrative Procedure in Government Agencies*, S. Doc. No. 8, 77th Cong., 1st Sess. (1941).
Development Dimensions International, *Development of Criteria and Procedures for Selection of Administrative Judge Positions*, Report to Department of the Army (January 31, 1981).

Federal Trial Examiners Conference. *The Case for Administrative Trial Judge*. Washington, D.C.: The Casillas Press, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1969.

Forum of U.S. Administrative Law Judges, *Administrative Law Judges: A Case Study of Recruitment and Retention Concerns*, March 25, 1990, reprinted in *Hearing to Consider S. 2274* before the Sen. Committee on Governmental Affairs, 101st Cong. 2d. Sess., S. Hrg.. 101-739 (March 21, 22 1990)

Government Law Center of Albany Law School, *Art of Administrative Practice I*, (Contains training materials on prehearing management, role of ALJ in settlement, conducting heairngs), Albany, NY, (February 1991).

Government Law Center of Albany Law School, *Ethical Considerations in Administrative Adjudication*, Albany, NY, (October 1990).

Horsky, Charles and Mahin, Amy, *The Operation of the Social Security Administration Hearing and Decisional Machinery*, Report to the Social Security Commission, Covington and Burling, (December 1968).

E. Kintner, R. Doyle, E. Reynolds, and Winings, L., *Appointment and Status of Federal Hearing Officers*, Report of Committee on Hearing Officers of the President's Conference on Administrative Procedure (August 10, 1954).

Lester, R., McElwain, J., Maloy, L., and Scharnikov, W., *Appointment and Status of Federal Hearing Officers*, Report to the President's Conference on Administrative Procedure (September 3, 1954).

Lewis, Floyd, *The Administrative Law Judge System*, Congressional Research Service, American Law Division, (September 9, 1982).

Social Security Administration, *Operational Analysis of the Office of Hearings and Appeals* (SSA Publication 70-032) (Annually through September 30, 1986).

Social Security Administration, *Key Workload Indicators*, Office of Hearings and Appeals (FY 1988-present).

Streb, Paul, *The ALJ Digest: A Summary of Statutes, Regulations of MSPB and OPM, and Decisions of MSPB and the Courts Concerning Disciplinary and Other Actions Affecting Administrative Law Judges*, Administrative Law Judge, MSPB, (July 6, 1990).

United States Civil Service Commission

Report to the Committee on Hearing Officers of the President's Conference on Administrative Procedure, U.S. Civil Service Commission, 1953.

Report of Advisory Committee for Hearing Examiners to United States Civil Service Commission, Office of Director, Office of Hearing Examiners, U.S. Civil Service Commission (July 2, 1963)

Material for the Advisory Committee on Hearing Examiners, U.S. Civil Service Commission (November 1967).

Park, *Selective Certification: A Study of the Arguments For and Against*, Paper submitted to the U.S. Civil Service Commission (September 11, 1968).

Report of the Committee on the Study of the Utilization of Administrative Law Judges. [The La Macchia Report.] (July 30, 1974.).

Final Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative Law Judges (February 14, 1978).

United States Congress. House of Representatives

Background Material on Social Security Hearings and Appeals, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, Committee Print 94-79, 94th Cong., 1st Sess. (September 17, 1975).

Recent Studies Relevant to the Disability Hearings and Appeals Crisis, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, 94th Cong., 1st Sess. (December 20, 1975).

Background Material on H.R. 5723: Conversion of Temporary Social Security ALJs, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, Committee Print 95-16, 95th Cong., 1st Sess., (April 18, 1977).

Administrative Law Judges, Hearing before the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on H.R. 865 (change of job title and other matters), 95th Cong., 1st Sess., Committee Serial No. 95-15 (June 21, 1977).

Conversion of Temporary Administrative Law Judges. Report 95-617, to accompany H.R. 5723, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. (October 31, 1977).

Social Security Administrative Law Judges: Survey and Issue Paper, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, Committee Print 96-2, 96th Cong., 1st Sess. (January 27, 1979).

Regulatory Reform Act of 1979, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations of the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee Serial No. 41, 96th Cong., 1st and 2d Sess. on H.R. 3263. Nov. 7, 13, 16, 29, Dec. 3, 5, 10, 1979; January 29, Feb. 1 and 5, 1980 (Parts 1 and 2).

Selection and Oversight of Administrative Law Judges, Hearings before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on H.R. 6768, 96th Cong., 2d Sess., Serial No. 96-79 (April 24, May 6, 1980).

Administrative Law Judge Program of the Federal Trade Commission, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Investigations, House Comm. on Post Office and Civil Service, 96th Cong., 2d Sess., Serial No. 96-94 (June 17, 1980).

Administrative Law Judges, Report No. 96-1186, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, H.R., 96th Cong., 2d Sess. (July 23, 1980).

Administrative Law Judge Corps Act, Hearing before the Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 1554 and H.R. 2726, 100th Cong., 2d Sess., Serial No. 57 (March 17, 1988).

Judicial Independence of Administrative Law Judges at the Social Security Administration, Hearing before the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means, 101st Cong., 2d Sess., Committee Serial No. 101-117 (June 13, 1990).
United States Congress. Senate

Study on Federal Regulation, 5 vols.; *Delay in the Regulatory Process*, Committee on Governmental Affairs, Vol. IV, Prepared Pursuant to S. Res. 71, 95th Cong., 1st Sess., July 1977.

Increase in Number of Administrative Law Judge Positions, Committee on Governmental Affairs Report to Accompany H.R. 6975, 95th Cong., 2d Sess., Rept. No. 95-697 (March 9, 1978).

Regulatory Reform Legislation, Hearings Before the Committee on Governmental Affairs on S. 262, S. 755, S. 445, S. 93, Committee on Governmental Affairs, pts. 1-2, 96th Cong., 1st Sess. (March-May 1979).

Hearings on S. 262 and S. 755, Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, Committee on the Judiciary, 96th Cong. (July 1979).

Administrative Law Judge System, Hearings, Subcommittee for Consumers, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. (September 4-5, 1980).

Reform of Federal Regulations, Joint Report of the Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary, to accompany S. 262 (Oct. 30, 1980) (Parts 1 and 2)

Social Security Disability Reviews: The Role of the Administrative Law Judge, Hearing before the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, 98th Cong., 1st Sess. (June 8, 1983).

Administrative Law Judge Corps Act, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1275, 98th Cong., 1st Sess., Serial No. J-98-45, (June 23, September 20, 1983).

The Role of the Administrative Law Judge in the Title II Social Security Disability Insurance Program, Report of the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, 98th Cong., 1st Sess., Committee Print 98-111 (October 1983).

Administrative Law Judge Corps Act S. 673, Hearing before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, Committee on the Judiciary, 99th Cong., 2d Sess., Committee Serial No. J-99-105 (May 13, 1986).

Administrative Law Judge Corps Act, Hearing before the Subcommittee on Courts and Administrative Practice, Committee on the Judiciary on S. 950, 100th Cong., 1st Sess., Committee Serial No. J-100-31 (June 21, 1987).

Administrative Law Judge Corps Act, Hearing before the Subcommittee on Courts and Administrative Practice, Committee on the Judiciary on S. 594, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., Serial No. J-101-22 (June 13, 1989).

Administrative Law Judge Corps Act, Committee on the Judiciary Report on S. 594, 101st Cong., 2d Sess., S. Rpt. 101-467 (September 19, 1990).

U.S. Department of Justice, *The Needs of the Federal Courts*, Report of Committee on Revision of the Federal Judicial System, (January 1977).

U.S. General Accounting Office

Social Security Administration Needs to Better Manage the Travel of Its Administrative Law Judges. Report of the Comptroller General of the United States, MWD-76-18 (December 5, 1975).

Administrative Law Process: Better Management is Needed, Report by the Comptroller General to the Congress. FPCD 78-25. (May 15, 1978).

Review of Administrative Law Judge Activities and the Hearing Process at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, G.A.O. Report to Hon. John D. Dingell, House of Representatives (February 13, 1979).

Management Improvements in the Administrative Process: Much Remains to Be Done, Report by the Comptroller General to the Congress. FPCD 79-44. (May 23, 1979).

Medicare Claims: HCFA Proposal to Establish an Administrative Law Judge Unit, U.S. G.A.O. Briefing Report to Congressional Committees, GAO/HRD-88-84 BR (April 1988).

Administrative Law Judges: Appointment of Women and Social Security Administration Staff Attorneys, G.A.O. Report to Hon. Sander M. Levin, House of Representatives, GAO/GGD-89-5 (October 1988).

United States Office of Personnel Management

U.S. Office of Personnel Management, *Administrative Law Judge*. Announcement No. 318. (various editions).

U.S. Office of Personnel Management, *Administrative Law Judge Program Handbook* (May 1989).

Sharon, Amiel T., *An Investigation of Reference Ratings for Applicants for Administrative Law Judge*. OPM Personnel Research Report 80-6 (May, 1980).

Sharon, Amiel T., *Validation of the Administrative Law Judge Examination*. OPM Personnel Research Report 80-15 (June 1980).

U.S. Office of Personnel Management, *Administrative Law Judge Program Handbook*, (May 1989).

U.S. Attorney General Opinions

Administrative Procedure Act, Promotion of Hearing Examiners, 41 Op. Att'y Gen. 74 (February 23, 1951).

Administrative Procedure Act, Promotion to Chief Hearing Examiner at Increased Compensation, 42 Op. Att'y Gen. 289 (November 24, 1964).

Administrative Procedure Act--Reprimand of Administrative Law Judge, 43 Op. Att'y Gen., No. 9 (January 18, 1977).

CULLS 2001

Allen, William, *Administrative Actions*, Paper delivered to [unidentified] Institute (November, 1981). [Mr. Allen is a partner, Covington and Burling, Washington, D.C.]

Caldwell, Louis G., *The Proposed Federal Administrative Court: The Arguments for Its Adoption*, 36 A.B.A.J. 13 (1950).

De Seife, Rudolphe J.A., *A Proposal for the Estabishment of an Administrative Court System*, Washington Legal Foundation, Critical Legal Issues: Working Paper Series No. 16 (July 1987).

Federal Trial Examiners Seek to Enjoin Civil Service Commission Regulations, 19 ICC Prac. J. 369 (1952).

Lubbers, Jeffrey S., *Management of Federal Agency Adjudication*, Paper presented at Symposium, American University School of Public Affairs, May 16, 1991.

Minor, Robert W., *The Administrative Court--Hear It Comes Again*, 24 ICC Prac. J. 807 (1957).

Schapiro, Mary, *Remarks Before the Twenty-Third Annual Rocky Mountain State-Federal-Provincial Securities Conference*, Denver, Colorado, (October 12, 1990). [Ms. Schapiro is an SEC Commissioner.]

APPENDIX V

Selected Agency Procedural Rules

(All citations are to the 2000 edition of the CFR, unless otherwise noted.)

Agriculture 7 CFR Part 1 Subparts H-K (various rules of practice), 7 CFR §§1.27 (rulemaking and other notice procedures), 1.130-.151 (formal adjudicative proceedings generally), Parts 47 (Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act), 50 (withdrawal of inspection and grading service), 202 (Federal Seed Act rules of practice).

Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board 36 CFR Part 1150 (procedures for compliance hearings)

Commerce

Bureau of Export Administration 15 CFR Part 766 (administrative enforcement proceedings)

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 15 CFR Part 904 (general civil procedures)

Commodity Futures Trading Commission 17 CFR Parts 10 (Rules of Practice), 12 (Reparations), 13 (rulemaking procedures)

Consumer Product Safety Commission 16 CFR Parts 1025 (rules of practice for adjudicative proceedings), 1051 (petitioning for rulemaking), 1052 (informal oral presentations in proceedings before the Consumer Product Safety Commission)

Environmental Protection Agency 40 CFR Parts 22 (rules of practice re: civil penalties, revocations of permits, etc.); Parts 104 (public hearings on effluent standards) and 108 (Water Programs, employee protection hearings); §124.71 (evidentiary hearings re: certain EPA-issued permits); Parts 164 (rules of practice under Federal Insecticide, Pesticide, and Rodenticide Act), and 209 (hearings under section 11(D) of the Noise Control Act)

Federal Communications Commission 47 CFR Part 1 (general rules of practice and procedure)

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation 12 CFR Part 308 (general rules of practice and procedure)

Federal Emergency Management Agency 44 CFR Parts 1 (rulemaking policies and procedures), and 68 (Insurance and Hazard Mitigation, administrative hearing procedures)

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 18 CFR Part 385 (rules of practice and procedure)

Federal Labor Relations Authority 5 CFR Parts 2422 (representation proceedings), 2423 (unfair labor practice proceedings)

Federal Maritime Commission 46 CFR Part 502 (general rules of procedure)

Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission 29 CFR Part 2700 (general rules of procedure)

Federal Reserve Board 12 CFR Parts 262 (rules of procedure), 263 (uniform rules of practice and procedure for adjudicative hearings)

Federal Trade Commission 16 CFR §§1.7-.26 (rules and rulemaking), Part 3 (rules for adjudicative proceedings) , §4.7 (ex parte communications)

Food and Drug Administration (HHS) 21 CFR Parts 10 (general administrative practice and procedures), 12 (formal evidentiary public hearing), and 16 (regulatory hearings)

Housing and Urban Development 24 CFR Parts 26 (hearings before hearings officers), and 1720 (rulemaking procedures); § 1720.105 *et seq.* (adjudication proceedings), §3282.152 (informal and formal presentation of views, hearings and investigations)

Interior 43 CFR Part 4 (Department hearings and appeals procedures); 50 CFR Part 11 (procedures re: possession, importation, etc. of wildlife and plants)

International Trade Commission 19 CFR Part 210 (unfair practices in import trade; adjudicative procedures).

Justice

Drug Enforcement Administration 21 CFR §§1301.51-.57 (modification, transfer, and termination of registration);

§§1303.31-37 (quotas), §§1312.41-.47 (importation and exportation of controlled substances: hearings)
Other 41 CFR Part 50-203 (Newspaper Preservation Act)

Labor
Black Lung Benefits Cases 20 CFR §§725.350-.483
Longshoremen's Compensation Cases 20 CFR §§702.301-.394
Office of Federal Contract Compliance 41 CFR §60-1.21-26, Part 60-30
Other Cases 29 CFR §4.10 (variances under service contract labor standards) ; Part 6 (labor standards in federal and federally assisted construction contracts);Part 580 (civil money penalties under Fair Labor Standards Act); 41 CFR Parts 50-203 (Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act)

Merit Systems Protection Board 5 CFR Parts 1201 (practice and procedure), 1203 (review of rules and regulations), and 1209 (personnel actions allegedly based on whistleblowing)

National Credit Union Administration 12 CFR Part 747 (administrative actions, adjudicative hearings, etc.)

National Labor Relations Board 29 CFR Parts 101 (Statements of Procedures regarding various types of proceedings), and 102 (rules and regulations , unfair labor practice proceedings, representation matters, etc.)

National Transportation Safety Board 49 CFR Part 821 (rules of practice in air safety proceedings)

Nuclear Regulatory Commission10 CFR Part 2 (rules of practice for domestic licensing proceedings)

Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Labor) 29 CFR Parts 1905 (rules of practice for variances, limitations, variations, etc. under the Occupational Safety & Health Act), and 1911 (procedures for promulgating, modifying, or revoking occupational safety and health standards)

Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission 29 CFR Part 2200 (general rules of procedure)

Postal Rate Commission 39 CFR Part 3001 (rules of practice and procedure)

Postal Service 39 CFR Parts 912-966 (various procedural rules)

Securities and Exchange Commission 17 CFR §§200.110-.114 (ex parte communications); Parts 202 (informal and other procedures)

Small Business Administration 13 CFR Part 134 (Office of Hearings and Appeals, rules of procedure)

Social Security Administration (HHS) 20 CFR §§404.900-.996 (determinations, administrative review process, etc.), §§410.601-.707 (disability and other determinations) , §§416.1400-.1494 (supplemental security income); 42 CFR §§405.701-.750 (reconsiderations and appeals under Medicare Part A), §§405.801-.872 (provider reimbursement determinations and appeals, Medicare Part B), §§405.1801-.1889 (Medicare provider reimbursement determinations and appeals)

Surface Transportation Board, 49 CFR Parts 1100-1118 (rules of practice)

Transportation

Coast Guard 46 CFR Part 5 (suspension or revocation of merchant mariner's license)

Federal Aviation Administration 14 CFR Parts 11(rulemaking), 13 (investigative and enforcement procedures).

Federal Highway Administration 49 CFR Parts 386 (rules of practice for motor carrier, hazardous materials, and other proceedings), 389 (rulemaking proceedings)

Maritime Administration 46 CFR Part 201 (rules of practice and procedure)

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 49 CFR Parts 511 (adjudicative procedures), 553 (rulemaking procedures)

Office of the Secretary 14 CFR Part 302 (aviation economic proceedings)

Treasury

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms 27 CFR §§178.71-.82 (commerce in firearms., licensing) , Part 200 (rules of practice in permit proceedings)

Comptroller of the Currency 12 CFR Part 19 (uniform rules of practice and procedure, adjudications)

Internal Revenue Service 26 CFR §601.601 (statement of procedural rules); 31 CFR Part 10 (practice before the Internal Revenue Service)