

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

<p>Fama Construction, LLC, <i>Petitioner,</i></p> <p>v.</p> <p>Secretary of Labor , United States Department of Labor, <i>Respondent.</i></p>
--

Docket No.

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Fama Construction, LLC Petitions the Court pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §660(a) for review of the Final Order of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission entered on June 12, 2023.

July 20, 2023

s/ Andrew N. Gross

Andrew N. Gross
Georgia Bar No. 313450

ANDREW N. GROSS, LLC
400 Colony Square, Suite 100
1201 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30361
(404) 877-9196
agross@skglaw.com

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

<p>Fama Construction, LLC, <i>Petitioner,</i></p> <p>v.</p> <p>Secretary of Labor , United States Department of Labor, <i>Respondent.</i></p>
--

Docket No.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served a true and correct copy of the Petition for Review, Corporate Disclosure Statement and Certificate of Interested Persons by first class mail to:

Louise M. Betts, Counsel for Appellate Litigation
Heather R. Phillips, Counsel for Appellate Litigation
Amy Tryon, Senior Attorney
Office of the Solicitor, U.S. DOL
Room S4004
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20210

July 20, 2023

s/ Andrew N. Gross

Andrew N. Gross
Attorney for Petitioner
Georgia Bar No. 313450

ANDREW N. GROSS, LLC
400 Colony Square, Suite 100
1201 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30361
(404) 877-9196
agross@skglaw.com



United States of America
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION
1120 20th Street, N.W., Ninth Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3457

Office of the
Executive Secretary

Phone: (202) 606-5400
Fax: (202) 606-5050

SECRETARY OF LABOR,

Complainant,

v.

FAMA CONSTRUCTION, LLC,

Respondent.

OSHRC Docket No. 19-1467

NOTICE OF FINAL ORDER

The Respondent's Petition for Discretionary Review in the above cited action was received by the Commission on May 4, 2023. The case was not directed for review. **Therefore, the decision of the Administrative Law Judge became a final order of the Commission on June 12, 2023.** Commission Rules 90(b)(2) and 90(d), 29 C.F.R. §§ 2200.90(b)(2) and 2200.90(d); Section 12(j) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, 29 U.S.C. § 661(j).

ANY PERSON ADVERSELY AFFECTED OR AGGRIEVED WHO WISHES TO OBTAIN REVIEW OF THE DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MUST FILE A PETITION FOR REVIEW WITH THE APPROPRIATE FEDERAL COURT OF APPEALS WITHIN 60 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE ABOVE FINAL ORDER DATE. See Section 11 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, 29 U.S.C. § 660; Fed. R. App. P. 15.

FOR THE COMMISSION,

John X. Cerveny
Executive Secretary

Dated: June 13, 2023

DOCKET NO. 19-1467

NOTICE IS GIVEN TO THE FOLLOWING:

Louise M. Betts, Counsel for Appellate Litigation
Heather R. Phillips, Counsel for Appellate Litigation
Amy S. Tryon, Senior Attorney
Office of the Solicitor, U.S. DOL
200 Constitution Ave., NW, Room S4004
Washington, DC 20210

Tremelle I. Howard, Regional Solicitor
Jeremy Dailey, Attorney
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, SW, Room 7T10
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8931

Andrew N. Gross, Esq.
400 Colony Square, Suite 100
1201 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30361

John B. Gatto, Administrative Law Judge
Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
100 Alabama Street, SW
Building 1924 Room 2R90
Atlanta, GA 30303-3104



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Complainant,

v.

FAMA CONSTRUCTION, LLC,
Respondent.

OSHRC Docket No. **19-1467**

NOTICE OF DECISION

1. *Decision.* Enclosed is a copy of my Memorandum Opinion and Order on Remand (decision). The entire record, including this decision, shall constitute my report pursuant to section 12(j) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the Act), 29 U.S.C. § 661(j). My report, which includes this decision, will be filed with the Commission's Executive Secretary on **Monday, April 24, 2023**. See Commission Rule 90(b), 29 C.F.R. § 2200.90(b). The Executive Secretary will then issue a "Notice of Docketing of Administrative Law Judge's Decision" that notifies all parties of the date that the Executive Secretary docketed my report, which will state the date by which a party must file a petition for discretionary review.
2. *Commission final order.* My decision shall become a final order of the Commission thirty (30) days from the date the Executive Secretary docketed the decision unless a Commission member directs review of the Decision within that time. See Section 12(j) of the Act; Commission Rule 90(f), 29 C.F.R. § 2200.90(f).
3. *Party adversely affected or aggrieved by the decision.* A party adversely affected or aggrieved by my decision may seek review by the Commission by filing a petition for discretionary review with the Executive Secretary at any time following the service of my decision on the parties but no later than 20 days after the date of docketing of my report. See Commission Rule 91(b), 29 C.F.R. § 2200.91(b). The Executive Secretary's address is as follows:

**Executive Secretary
Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission
One Lafayette Centre
1120 20th Street NW, Suite 980
Washington, D.C. 20036-3457**

The full text of the rule governing the filing of a petition for discretionary review is Commission Rule 91, 29 C.F.R. § 2200.91.

4. *Correction of errors in report.* Requests to correct clerical errors arising through oversight or inadvertence in the decision or in other parts of my report shall be filed with me, by motion, pursuant to Commission Rule 90(b)(4)(i), 29 C.F.R. § 2200.90(b)(4)(i). Motions shall conform to Commission Rule 40, 29 C.F.R. § 2200.40.

5. *Relief from default.* Requests for relief from default or for reinstatement of the proceeding may be filed with me, by motion, until the date the Executive Secretary docket my report. *See* Commission Rule 90(c), 29 C.F.R. § 2200.90(c). Motions shall conform to Commission Rule 40, 29 C.F.R. § 2200.40.

6. *Filing with Executive Secretary.* Except for motions filed to correct errors in my report as discussed in paragraph 4 above, on or after the date the Executive Secretary docket my report, all documents shall be filed with the Executive Secretary. *See* Commission Rule 90(d), 29 C.F.R. § 2200.90(d).


/s/ John B. Gatto
JOHN B. GATTO, Judge

Dated: April 13, 2023
Atlanta, GA



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Complainant,

v.

FAMA CONSTRUCTION, LLC,
Respondent.

OSHRC Docket No. **19-1467**

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER ON REMAND¹

Attorneys and Law firms

Rachel M. Bishop, Amy S. Tryon, Attorneys, Office of the Solicitor, U.S. Department of Labor, Atlanta, GA, and Washington, D.C., for Complainant.

Andrew N. Gross, Attorney, HB Next Corporation, Lawrenceville, GA, for Respondent.

JUDGE: John B. Gatto, United States Administrative Law Judge.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Commission remanded this case “to evaluate whether there are any issues of material fact regarding Fama's liability as a controlling employer under the correct legal framework” and “based only on the facts and record evidence in this case.” *Fama Construction, LLC*, No. 19-1467, 2023 WL 2837610, **3-4 (OSHRC Mar. 29, 2023). If the court “on remand determines that the violations should be affirmed after analyzing the record in this case under the correct legal framework,” the court “must then consider Fama's alleged economic infeasibility defense under the correct legal standard and determine whether the Secretary has met his burden of establishing that there are truly no disputed issues of material fact regarding the defense.” *Id.* at *5. For the reasons indicated *infra*, the court concludes the Secretary has shown there are no genuine issues of material fact in dispute regarding Fama’s liability as a controlling employer and has met his burden of establishing that there are truly no disputed issues of material fact regarding the defense. Therefore, the Secretary’s motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**.

¹ The court incorporates by reference its Memorandum Opinion and Order in *Fama Construction, LLC*, No. 19-1467 (OSHRC 2023) (ALJ), except for any parts that conflict with the Commission’s Remand Order or this Memorandum Opinion and Order on Remand.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Liability as a Controlling Employer

The Commission affirmed this court’s ruling that “there is no genuine issue of material fact in dispute that Fama is a controlling employer with regard to the cited worksite under the multi-employer worksite doctrine.” *Fama*, 2023 WL 2837610, at *3. Thus, on remand the first issue to be decided is “whether there are any issues of material fact regarding Fama's liability” as a controlling employer. *Id.* “On a multi-employer worksite, a controlling employer is liable for a contractor's violations if the Secretary shows that [the controlling employer] has not taken reasonable measures to ‘prevent or detect and abate the violations due to its supervisory authority and control over the worksite.’” *Suncor Energy (U.S.A.) Inc.*, No. 13-0900, 2019 WL 654129, at *4 (OSHR Feb. 1, 2019) (citing *Centex-Rooney Constr. Co.*, 16 BNA OSHC 2127, 2130 (No. 92-0851, 1994)); see *Am. Wrecking Corp.*, 19 BNA OSHC 1703, 1709 (No. 96-1330, 2001) (consolidated) (finding that a controlling employer at a multi-employer worksite is “responsible for taking reasonable steps to protect the exposed employees of subcontractors”), *aff'd in relevant part*, 351 F.3d 1254 (D.C. Cir. 2003).

“If a controlling employer has actual knowledge of a subcontractor's violation, the controlling employer has a duty to take reasonable measures to obtain abatement of that violation.” *Stormforce of Jacksonville, LLC*, No. 19-0593, 2021 WL 2582530, at *6 (OSHR Mar. 8, 2021). The Secretary argues the undisputed facts “establish that Fama had actual knowledge of its failure to inspect the worksite[.]” (Sec’y’s Renewed Mot. Summ. J. 15.) The court concludes that even if undisputed, this fact is not a material one since it does not establish there is no genuine dispute that Fama had actual knowledge of *its subcontractors violations*.

“In the absence of actual knowledge,” the court looks to whether Fama “met its obligation as a controlling employer to ‘exercise reasonable care,’ i.e., to take ‘reasonable measures’ to ‘prevent or detect’ the violative conditions.” *Stormforce*, 2021 WL 2582530, at *8 (quoting *Suncor*, 2019 WL 654129, at *6). However, “a controlling employer’s duty to exercise reasonable care ‘is less than what is required of an employer with respect to protecting its own employees.’” *Suncor*, 2019 WL 654129, at *6 (citation omitted). Therefore, the court must assess the extent of Fama’s “duty given its secondary safety role as a controlling employer in light of objective factors—the nature of the work, the scale of the project, and the safety history and experience of the contractors involved.” *Id.* at *7.

Here, the nature of the work was roofing work, which exposed Fama's subcontractors to fall hazards. The scale of the project was significant since Fama held the exclusive roofing contract with the builder of the new residential townhomes at the worksite. As to the safety history and experience of the subcontractors involved, since 2013, OSHA inspected Fama at least 7 separate times, including the March 20, 2019 inspection at issue, and in each inspection, OSHA issued a fall protection violation, some of which involved violations by Cardenas and Galicia, the subcontractors involved in this case. Therefore, even though Fama's subcontractors were experienced, they had a history of safety violations. Thus, more frequent inspections were required since Fama knew its subcontractors had a history of non-compliance. *Stormforce*, 2021 WL 2582530, at *8.

Rather than provide more frequent inspections, there is no genuine dispute that by March of 2019, Fama had changed its policy, ended its training program, and halted safety inspections of its worksites. (Sec'y's SUMF ¶ 26; Greenfield Decl. ¶16; Ex. C). Fama admits it does not conduct safety inspections of its worksites.² (Sec'y's SUMF ¶ 72; Osorio Dep. 76:13-77:2; Martinez Dep. 29:18-25).³ Given the nature of the work involved, the scale of the project, and history of safety violations by Fama's subcontractors, the court concludes there is no genuine dispute that Fama did not satisfy its secondary role as a controlling employer since there is no dispute that it halted its safety inspections. Fama did not just fail to exercise "reasonable care," it exercised "no care," when it stopped inspecting its worksites, even though it knew its roofing subcontractors had been previously cited for similar violations. Therefore, the court concludes the Secretary has shown that Fama is liable as a controlling employer since there is no genuine issue of material fact in dispute that Fama failed to meet its obligation to exercise reasonable care. Thus, the violations are affirmed.

B. Infeasibility Defense

Under Commission precedent, to establish an infeasibility defense, Fama "must prove: (1) means of compliance prescribed by the standard are technologically or economically infeasible,

² In an OSHA interview Osorio admitted Fama did not perform safety audits and no longer trained work crews, based on legal advice that work crew inspections and work crew training could be viewed as evidence of an employment relationship with the workers. (Greenfield Decl. ¶16.)

³ As indicated in its previous Memorandum Opinion and Order, since Fama's Response to the Secretary's Statement of Material Facts did not address Sec'y's SUMF ¶¶ 26 and 72, they are undisputed.

and (2) there are no feasible alternative means of protection.” *Centimark Corp.*, No. 20-0762, 2023 WL 2783505, at *21 (OSHC Mar. 29, 2023).⁴ Since the court on remand has concluded that the violations should be affirmed, the Commission has directed the court to “consider Fama's alleged economic infeasibility defense under the correct legal standard and determine whether the Secretary has met his burden of establishing that there are truly no disputed issues of material fact regarding the defense.” *Fama*, 2023 WL 2837610, at *5.

The Supreme Court has held that with respect to an issue on which the nonmoving party bears the burden of proof, such as Fama’s infeasibility defense, “we do not think ... that the burden is on the party moving for summary judgment to produce evidence showing the absence of a genuine issue of material fact, even with respect to an issue on which the nonmoving party bears the burden of proof. Instead, as we have explained, the burden on the moving party may be discharged by “showing”—that is, pointing out to the district court—that there is an absence of evidence to support the nonmoving party's case.” *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 325 (1986).

As the Supreme Court has also explained, the nonmoving party is not required to produce evidence “in a form that would be admissible at trial in order to avoid summary judgment.” *Id.* at 324. Rather, “Rule 56(e) permits a proper summary judgment motion to be opposed by any of the kinds of evidentiary materials listed in Rule 56(c), except the mere pleadings themselves, and it is from this list that one would normally expect the nonmoving party to make the showing to which we have referred.” *Id.*

Here, Fama asserts compliance with the cited provisions would require it to hire an additional supervisor at a cost of \$50,000 per year, an amount it claims would cause it to go out of business. (Resp’t’s Mem. Resp. to Sec’y’s Renewed Mot. Summ. J. 15-17; Martinez Decl. ¶6; Exs. B-D.) Although this is evidence regarding the first element of Fama’s infeasibility defense, as indicated *infra*, it is rendered immaterial by Fama’s complete failure of proof concerning the second element of its case.

⁴ In the Eleventh Circuit, to establish infeasibility, the employer must prove “(i) that compliance with a particular standard either is impossible or will render performance of the work impossible; and (ii) that it (the employer) undertook alternative steps to protect its workers (or that no such steps were available).” *M.C. Dean, Inc. v. Sec’y of Lab.*, 505 F. App’x 929, 936, 24 O.S.H. Cas. (BNA) 1001, 2013 WL 382824 (11th Cir. 2013).

The Secretary points out that Fama offered no evidence regarding the second element of its infeasibility defense. (Sec’y’s Renewed Mot. Summ. J. at 18.) After carefully reviewing the record evidence, the court agrees with the Secretary and concludes there is a complete failure of proof concerning the second element of Fama’s case, i.e., that there are no feasible alternative means of protection (or couched in terms of Eleventh Circuit precedent, that Fama undertook alternative steps to protect its subcontractors or that no such steps were available).

Summary judgment procedure is properly regarded not as a disfavored procedural shortcut, but rather as an integral part of the Federal Rules as a whole, which are designed ‘to secure the just, speedy and inexpensive determination of every action.’” *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 327 (quoting Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 1). “If the nonmoving party fails to make ‘a sufficient showing on an essential element of [its] case with respect to which [it] has the burden of proof,’ the moving party is entitled to summary judgment.” *Jackson v. Sara Lee Bakery Grp.*, 517 F. App’x 645, 646, (11th Cir. 2011) (quotation omitted). “In such a situation, there can be ‘no genuine issue as to any material fact,’ since a complete failure of proof concerning an essential element of the nonmoving party’s case necessarily renders all other facts immaterial.” *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 322,-23. Therefore, the Secretary has discharged his burden by “showing”—that is, pointing out to the court—that there is an absence of evidence to support Fama’s case and has “met his burden of establishing that there are truly no disputed issues of material fact regarding the defense.” *Fama*, 2023 WL 2837610, at *5. Accordingly,

III. ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERD THAT the Secretary’s motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**, the violations are **AFFIRMED**, and the court assesses penalties of \$5,834, \$4,167, and \$58,343 respectively for Citation 1, Item 1, Citation 1, Item 2, and Citation 2 Item 1.

SO ORDERED.



/s/ JOHN B. GATTO, Judge

Dated: _____
Atlanta, GA

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the Notice/Decision and Order was sent to the parties listed below electronically using the Commission's E-Filing System by first class mail on April 13, 2023.

Docket No. **19-1467**

For the Secretary:

Rachel M. Bishop, Esq.
Amy S. Tryon, Esq.
U.S. Department of Labor
Office of the Solicitor
Email: bishop.rachel.m@dol.gov
Email: tryon.amy.s@dol.gov
Email: graeber.rachel@dol.gov
Email: dailey.jeremy.b@dol.gov
Email: atl.fedcourt@dol.gov

For the Employer:

Andrew N. Gross, Esq.
HB Next Corporation
Email: agross@hbnext.com

/s/ Sherice M. Dunham
Sherice M. Dunham, Legal Asst.

Post Office Address:
Judge John B. Gatto
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
100 Alabama St. S.W
Building 1924 Room 2R90
Atlanta, GA 30303-3104
Phone: 404-562-1641
Email: sdunham@oshrc.gov

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

ELBERT PARR TUTTLE COURT OF APPEALS BUILDING
56 Forsyth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

David J. Smith
Clerk of Court

For rules and forms visit
www.call.uscourts.gov

July 21, 2023

Andrew N. Gross
Andrew N. Gross, LLC
1201 PEACHTREE ST NE STE 100
ATLANTA, GA 30361

Appeal Number: 23-12346-J
Case Style: FAMA Construction, LLC v. Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.
Agency Docket Number: 19-1467

Petition for Review/Application for Enforcement

Pursuant FRAP 15(c), you are hereby served with the following document that has been filed in this court:

All counsel must file documents electronically using the Electronic Case Files ("ECF") system, unless exempted for good cause. Although not required, non-incarcerated pro se parties are permitted to use the ECF system by registering for an account at www.pacer.gov. Information and training materials related to electronic filing are available on the Court's website.

Record

Pursuant to FRAP 17(a), an agency must file the record within 40 days after being served with the petition for review. See FRAP 16 and 17.

Certificate of Interested Persons and Corporate Disclosure Statement ("CIP")

Every motion, petition, brief, answer, response, and reply must contain a CIP. See FRAP 26.1; 11th Cir. R. 26.1-1. In addition:

- Appellants/Petitioners must file a CIP within 14 days after this letter's date.
- Appellees/Respondents/Intervenors/Other Parties must file a CIP within 28 days after this letter's date, regardless of whether Appellants/Petitioners have filed a CIP.
- Only parties represented by counsel must complete the web-based CIP. Counsel must complete the web-based CIP, through the [Web-Based CIP](#) link on the Court's website, on the same day the CIP is first filed.

The failure to comply with 11th Cir. Rules 26.1-1 through 26.1-4 may result in dismissal of the case or appeal under 11th Cir. R. 42-1(b), no action taken on deficient documents, or other sanctions on counsel, the party, or both. See 11th Cir. R. 26.1-5(c).

Attorney Admissions

Attorneys who wish to participate in this appeal must be properly admitted either to the bar of this court or for this particular proceeding, See 11th Cir. R. 46-1; 46-3; 46-4. In addition, all attorneys (except court-appointed attorneys) who wish to participate in this appeal must file an appearance form within fourteen (14) days after this letter's date. The [Application for Admission to the Bar](#) and [Appearance of Counsel Form](#) are available on the Court's website.

The clerk generally may not process filings from an attorney until that attorney files an appearance form. See 11th Cir. R. 46-6(b).

Obligation to Notify Court of Change of Addresses

Each pro se party and attorney has a continuing obligation to notify this Court of any changes to the party's or attorney's addresses during the pendency of the case. See 11th Cir. R. 25-7.

Clerk's Office Phone Numbers

General Information:	404-335-6100	Attorney Admissions:	404-335-6122
Case Administration:	404-335-6135	Capital Cases:	404-335-6200
CM/ECF Help Desk:	404-335-6125	Cases Set for Oral Argument:	404-335-6141

Enclosure(s)

DKT-8 Agency