

AGRICULTURE DECISIONS

Volume 56

January - June 1997
Part Two (P&S)
Pages 834 - 852



THIS IS A COMPILATION OF DECISIONS ISSUED BY THE
SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND THE COURTS
PERTAINING TO STATUTES ADMINISTERED BY THE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURE DECISIONS

AGRICULTURE DECISIONS is an official publication by the Secretary of Agriculture consisting of decisions and orders issued in formal adjudicatory administrative proceedings conducted for the Department under various statutes and regulations pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act. Selected court decisions concerning the Department's regulatory programs are also included. The Department is required to publish its rules and regulations in the *Federal Register* and, therefore, they are not included in AGRICULTURE DECISIONS.

Beginning in 1989, AGRICULTURE DECISIONS is comprised of three Parts, each of which is published every six months. Part One is organized alphabetically by statute and contains all decisions and orders other than those pertaining to the Packers and Stockyards Act and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, which are contained in Parts Two and Three, respectively.

The published decisions and orders may be cited by giving the volume number, page number and year, e.g., 1 Agric. Dec. 472 (1942). It is unnecessary to cite a decision's docket or decision numbers, e.g., D-578; S. 1150, and the use of such references generally indicates that the decision has not been published in AGRICULTURE DECISIONS.

Consent Decisions entered subsequent to December 31, 1986, are no longer published. However, a list of the decisions is included. The decisions are on file and may be inspected upon request made to the Hearing Clerk, Office of Administrative Law Judges.

Direct all inquiries regarding this publication to: Editors, Agriculture Decisions, Hearing Clerk Unit, Office of Administrative Law Judges, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 1081 South Building, Washington, D.C. 20250-9200, Telephone: (202) 720-4443.

LIST OF DECISIONS REPORTED

JANUARY - JUNE 1997

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS

ARIZONA LIVESTOCK AUCTION, INC.

P&S Docket No. D-96-0026.

Order Denying Petition for Reconsideration 834

LARRY EDMISTON.

P&S Docket No. D-96-0041.

Supplemental Order 837

GAYLON GEORGES.

P&S Docket No. D-95-0003.

Supplemental Order 838

CHUCK STAPLETON.

P&S Docket. No. D-94-0019.

Supplemental Order. 839

KIENE BROS., INC., ET AL.

P&S Docket No. D-95-0022.

Order Correcting Consent Decision 839

DEFAULT DECISIONS

JOHN MCINTYRE.

P&S Docket No. D-96-0031.

Decision and Order 841

PRYOR LIVESTOCK MARKET, INC., ET AL.

P&S Docket No. D-96-0045.

Decision and Order Without Hearing by Reason of
Admissions with Respect to Jim W. Deberry 843

RAYMOND PERKINS.
P&S Docket No. D-96-0025.
Decision and Order 847
CONSENT DECISIONS 852

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

DEFAULT DECISIONS

In re: JOHN McINTYRE d/b/a McINTYRE LIVESTOCK.

P&S Docket No. D-96-0031.

Decision and Order filed March 12, 1997.

Failure to file an answer - Failure to pay when due the full purchase price of livestock - Failure to pay the full purchase price of livestock - Issuing checks in payment for livestock without having sufficient funds on deposit - Suspension of registration - Cease and desist order.

Eric Paul, for Complainant.
Respondent, Pro se.

Decision and Order issued by Edwin S. Bernstein, Administrative Law Judge.

Preliminary Statement

This is a disciplinary proceeding under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended and supplemented (U.S.C. § 181 *et seq.*), herein referred to as the Act, instituted by a complaint filed by the Acting Deputy Administrator, Packers and Stockyards Programs, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA), United States Department of Agriculture, charging that the respondent wilfully violated the Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder (9 C.F.R. § 201.1 *et seq.*).

Copies of the complaint and the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.130 *et seq.*) governing proceedings under the Packers Stockyards Act were served upon respondent. Respondent filed a request for an extension of time, and an order was issued giving respondent until October 7, 1996, in which to file an answer.

Respondent has failed to file an answer within the time specified as prescribed in the Rules of Practice and the material facts alleged in the complaint, which are admitted by respondent's failure to file an answer, are adopted and set forth herein as findings of fact.

Findings of Fact

1. John McIntyre, hereinafter referred to as respondent, is an individual doing business as McIntyre Livestock, whose business mailing address is [REDACTED], [REDACTED], TN [REDACTED].
2. Respondent is, and at all times material herein was:

(a) Engaged in the business of buying and selling livestock in commerce for his own account or the accounts of others, and buying livestock in commerce on a commission basis; and

(b) Registered with the Secretary of Agriculture as a dealer to buy and sell livestock in commerce for his own account or the account of others, and as a market agency to buy livestock in commerce on a commission basis.

3. Respondent, on or about the dates and in the transactions set forth in paragraph II of the complaint, purchased livestock and failed to pay, when due, the full purchase price of such livestock.

4. Respondent has failed to pay \$5,014.05 for livestock purchased in the transactions set forth in paragraph II of the complaint.

5. Respondent, failed to make timely and full payment for livestock purchased in the transactions set forth in paragraph II if the complaint despite having been placed on notice by certified mail received June 10, 1993, that his payment practices were not in conformity with the requirements of section 409 of the Act (7 U.S.C. § 228b).

6. Respondent, in transactions set forth in paragraph II of the complaint, issued the five checks listed in paragraph III of the complaint in purported payment for livestock which were returned unpaid by the bank upon which they were drawn because respondent did not have sufficient funds on deposit and available in the accounts upon which such checks were drawn to pay such checks when presented.

Conclusion

By reason of facts found in Findings of Fact 3 through 6 above, respondent has wilfully violated sections 312(a) and 409 of the Act (7 U.S.C. §§ 213(a), 228b).

Order

Respondent John McIntyre, his agents and employees, directly, using the name McIntyre Livestock, or through any corporate or other device, in connection with his activities subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, shall cease and desist from:

1. Failing to pay, when due, the full purchase price of livestock;
2. Failing to pay the full purchase price of livestock; and
3. Issuing checks in payment for livestock without having sufficient funds on deposit and available in the accounts upon which such checks are drawn to pay such checks when presented.

Respondent John McIntyre is suspended as a registrant under the Act for a period of five years. Provided, however, that upon application to Packers and Stockyards Programs, GIPSA, a supplemental order may be issued terminating the suspension of respondent at any time after the expiration of the initial 90 days of this suspension term

upon demonstration by respondent that all livestock sellers identified in the complaint in this proceeding have been paid in full. Provided further that this order may be modified upon application to the Packers and Stockyards Programs, GIPSA, to permit the salaried employment of respondent by another registrant or packer after the initial 90 days of this suspension term upon demonstration of circumstances warranting modification of the order.

This decision shall become final and effective without further proceedings 35 days after the date of service upon the respondent, unless it is appealed to the Judicial Officer by a party to the proceeding within 30 days pursuant to section 1.145 of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. §§ 1.145).

Copies hereof shall be served upon the parties.

[This decision and order became final April 21, 1997.-Editor]

In re: PRYOR LIVESTOCK MARKET, INC., JIM W. DEBERRY and DOUGLAS A. LANDERS.

P&S Docket No. D-96-0045.

Decision and Order Without Hearing by Reason of Admissions with Respect to Jim W. Deberry filed January 7, 1997.

Admission to material allegations - Failure to maintain and use properly Custodial Account for Shippers' Proceeds - Failing to deposit in the Custodial Account for Shippers' Proceeds amounts equal to the outstanding proceeds receivable due from the sale of consigned livestock within the times prescribed - Using funds received from the sale of consigned livestock for improper purposes - Issuing checks in payment without maintaining sufficient funds on deposit - Failing to remit when due the net proceeds due from the sale price of consigned livestock - Suspension of registration - Cease and desist order.

Andre Allen Vitale, for Complainant.
Respondent, Pro se.

Decision and Order issued by James Hunt, Administrative Law Judge.

Preliminary Statement

This disciplinary proceeding was instituted under the Packers and Stockyards Act (7 U.S.C. § 181 *et seq.*), hereinafter referred to as the "Act", by a complaint filed on August 16, 1996, by the Acting Deputy Administrator, Packers and Stockyards Programs, GIPSA, United States Department of Agriculture. The complaint alleged that Respondent Deberry in his direction, management, and control of Pryor Livestock Market, Inc., hereinafter "Pryor Livestock", wilfully violated the Act and the regulations issued thereunder (9 C.F.R. § 201.1 *et seq.*), by: (1) failing to maintain and

use properly Pryor Livestock's Custodial Account for Shippers' Proceeds; (2) issuing checks which were returned unpaid by the bank upon which they were drawn because sufficient funds were not available in the account upon which such checks were drawn; and (3) failing to remit and failing to remit, when due, the net proceeds due from the sale price of livestock on a commission basis. Complainant requested a finding that respondent Deberry was the alter ego of Pryor Livestock and that respondent Deberry willfully violated sections 307 and 312(a) of the Act (7 U.S.C. §§ 208, 213(a)) and section 201.42 of the regulations (9 C.F.R. § 201.42) and section 312(a) of the Act (7 U.S.C. § 213(a)) and section 201.43 of the regulations (9 C.F.R. § 201.43). The complaint requested an order that Respondent Deberry cease and desist from the violations found to exist; that Respondent Deberry be suspended as a registrant under the Act; and the assessment of civil penalties.

A copy of the complaint was served on Pryor Livestock, on August 23, 1996. Service on respondent Deberry was accomplished on September 17, 1996, by regular mail to his last known mailing address of record. Respondent Deberry was informed in a letter of service that an answer should be filed pursuant to the Rules of Practice and that filing of an answer that does not deny the material allegations of the complaint shall constitute an admission of all the material allegations contained in the complaint.

Respondent Deberry submitted a response on September 30, 1996, on his own behalf. Respondent Deberry did not indicate that he was responding on behalf of or in the capacity as President of Pryor Livestock. In his reply letter, respondent Deberry indicated that there was money that was owed to customers and that money in excess of the claims in the custodial account was involved in litigation to which he was not a party. He stated that the customers would be paid upon the resolution of that litigation. Respondent Deberry did not offer any legitimate defense to the allegations in the complaint that during his direction, management, and control of Pryor Livestock, he failed to maintain and use properly Pryor Livestock's Custodial Account for Shippers' Proceeds, or that he failed to remit and failed to remit, when due, the net proceeds due from the sale price of livestock on a commission basis. The explanation that he offered in response to the complaint amounts to an admission to the factual assertions underlying these allegations.

Respondent Deberry did not admit, deny, or otherwise respond to the allegation that in his direction, management, and control of Pryor Livestock, he issued checks which were returned unpaid by the bank upon which they were drawn because of a lack of sufficient funds available in the account upon which such checks were drawn. He did not deny or otherwise respond to the remaining allegations of the complaint. He did not deny his ownership of fifty (50) percent of the stock of Pryor Livestock, Inc. or his status as alter ego, jointly with respondent Douglas A. Landers of Pryor Livestock, Inc. Section 1.136(c) of the Rules of Practice requires that the failure to

deny or otherwise respond to every material allegation in a complaint shall be deemed an admission of every allegation to which no denial or response is presented.

Respondent Deberry's reply letter constitutes an admission of all the material allegations of fact contained in the complaint. The admission of all of the material allegations of fact contained in a complaint shall constitute a waiver of hearing (7 C.F.R. § 1.139), pursuant to which complainant moved for the issuance of a Decision. Therefore, the following Decision and Order is issued without further investigation or hearing pursuant to Section 1.139 of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.139).

Findings of Fact

1. Jim W. Deberry, hereinafter referred to as Respondent Deberry, is an individual whose mailing address is [REDACTED] (b) (6)

2. Respondent Deberry is and at all times material herein was:

- a. President of Pryor Livestock;
- b. Owner of 50% of the stock of Pryor Livestock; and
- c. Responsible for the direction, management and control of Pryor Livestock in concert with Douglas A. Landers.

3. Respondent Deberry in his direction, management and control of Pryor Livestock, failed to maintain and use properly Pryor Livestock's Custodial Account for Shippers' Proceeds (hereinafter "custodial account"), thereby endangering the faithful and prompt accounting therefor and the payment of portions thereof due the owners and consignors of livestock, in that:

a. As of August 1, 1995, outstanding checks were drawn on the custodial account of Pryor Livestock in the amount of \$92,705.51, which were offset by a balance in the custodial account of \$0.00 and proceeds receivable of \$5,354.51, resulting in a shortage of \$87,351.00 in funds available to pay shippers their net proceeds.

b. Such deficiencies were due in part, to the failure of Respondent Deberry to deposit in the custodial account of Pryor Livestock, within the time prescribed in the regulations, an amount equal to the proceeds receivable from the sale of consigned livestock to the respondent and others. Such deficiencies were also due to respondent's failure to fully reimburse the custodial account by the close of the seventh day after each sale.

4. As set forth in paragraph III(a) of the complaint, Respondent Deberry in his direction, control, and management and control of Pryor Livestock, sold livestock on a commission basis and in purported payment of the net proceeds thereof, issued checks to consignors or shippers of such livestock which were returned unpaid by the

bank upon which they were drawn because sufficient funds were not available in the account upon which such checks were drawn to pay such checks when presented.

5. Respondent Deberry through his direction, management and control of Pryor Livestock on or about the dates and in the transactions set forth in (a) and (b) in paragraph III of the complaint, failed to remit, when due, the net proceeds due from the sale price of livestock on a commission basis.

6. As of June 18, 1996, \$92,183.11 in proceeds remained due to consignors for the sale of their livestock.

Conclusions

By reason of the facts in Finding of Fact 2, respondent Jim W. Deberry is the alter ego of Pryor Livestock Market, Inc.

By reason of the facts in Finding of Fact 3, Respondent Deberry wilfully violated sections 307 and 312(a) of the Act (7 U.S.C. §§ 208, 213(a)) and section 201.42 of the regulations (9 C.F.R. § 201.42).

By reason of the facts in Findings of Fact 4, 5, and 6, Respondent Deberry wilfully violated section 312(a) of the Act (7 U.S.C. § 213(a)) and section 201.43 of the regulations (9 C.F.R. § 201.43).

Order

Respondent Deberry, his agents and employees, directly or through any corporate device, in connection with his activities subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, shall cease and desist from:

1. Failing to deposit in the Custodial Account for Shippers' Proceeds, within the times prescribed in Section 201.42 of the regulations (9 C.F.R. § 201.42), amounts equal to the outstanding proceeds receivable due from the sale of consigned livestock;

2. Failing to otherwise maintain the Custodial Account for Shippers' Proceeds in strict conformity with the provisions of Section 201.42 of the regulations (9 C.F.R. § 201.42);

3. Using funds received from the sale of consigned livestock for his own purposes or for any purpose other than payment to consignors of the amount due from the sale of livestock and the payment of lawful marketing charges;

4. Issuing checks in payment for the net proceeds due consignors from the sale of livestock on a commission basis without maintaining sufficient funds on deposit and available in the account upon which such checks are drawn to pay such checks when presented;

5. Failing to remit, when due, the net proceeds due from the sale price of consigned livestock sold on a commission basis; and

6. Failing to remit the net proceeds due from the sale price of consigned livestock sold on a commission basis.

Respondent Deberry is suspended as a registrant under the Act for a period of five years (5) and thereafter until he demonstrates that the shortage in Pryor Livestock's Custodial Account for Shippers' Proceeds has been eliminated. Provided that, upon application to Packers and Stockyards Programs, GIPSA, a supplemental order may be issued terminating the suspension of respondent Deberry at any time after the expiration of the initial 150 days of this suspension term upon demonstration that all livestock consignors identified in the complaint have been paid in full. Provided further, that this order may be modified upon application to the Packers and Stockyards Programs, GIPSA, to permit the salaried employment of respondent Deberry by another registrant or packer after the expiration of the initial 150 days of this suspension term upon demonstration of circumstances warranting modification of the order.

This decision shall become final and effective without further proceedings 35 days after the date of service upon the respondent, unless it is appealed to the Judicial Officer by a party to the proceeding within 30 days pursuant to section 1.145 of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.145).

Copies hereof shall be served upon the parties.

[This Decision and Order became final February 20, 1997.-Editor]

**In re: RAYMOND PERKINS d/b/a SENECA PACKING CO.
P&S Docket No. D-96-0025.
Decision and Order filed April 21, 1997.**

Failure to file an answer - Engaging in the business of a packer without maintaining an adequate bond or its equivalent - Failure to pay when due the full purchase price of livestock - Failure to pay the purchase price of livestock - Willfulness - Sanctions - Civil penalty.

Eric Paul, for Complainant.
Respondent, Pro se.

Decision and Order issued by Victor W. Palmer, Chief Administrative Law Judge.

Preliminary Statement

This is a disciplinary proceeding under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. § 181 *et seq.*), herein referred to as the Act, instituted by a complaint and notice of hearing filed by the Acting Deputy Administrator, Packers and Stockyards Programs, Grain Inspection, Packers and

Stockyards Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, charging that the respondent wilfully violated the Act.

Copies of the complaint and notice of hearing and the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.130 *et seq.*) governing proceedings under the Act were served upon respondent by certified mail.

Respondent failed to file an answer within the time prescribed in the Rules of Practice. However on April 9, 1997, respondent filed a letter in response to complainant's Motion for Adoption of Proposed Decision. Respondent did not explain his failure to file an answer within the prescribed time period, and did not attempt to deny the principal allegations of the complaint. Under the Rules of Practice respondent's failure to file a timely answer constitutes an admission of the complaint's allegations that respondent purchased livestock for slaughter without a required bond after receiving notification on July 13, 1994, that he was required to obtain an adequate bond or its equivalent, and that there remains unpaid a total of \$95,833.30 for livestock purchases made between February 28, 1995, and April 4, 1995. (7 C.F.R. § 1.136(c)). Respondent instead asserted: (1) that he did not wilfully violate the Act; (2) that he was trying without success to obtain a bond while operating; (3) that P&S in Indianapolis (complainant) knew he was slaughtering cattle without a bond; (4) that Merlin Garver (the unpaid livestock seller) knew he was not bonded; (5) that he restarted operations on March 31, 1996, with an approved bond; and (6) that he ceased his resumed operations on July 31, 1996, and is now without funds and unemployed.

Findings of Fact

1. Respondent Raymond Perkins, doing business as Seneca Packing Co., is an individual whose business address is [REDACTED] Ohio [REDACTED]
2. Respondent is, and at all times material herein, was:
 - (a) Engaged in the business of buying livestock in commerce for purposes of slaughter; and
 - (b) A packer within the meaning of and subject to the provisions of the Act.
3. Respondent was notified by certified mail, received July 13, 1994, that he was required to obtain a \$100,000.00 surety bond or bond equivalent to secure the performance of his livestock buyer operations under the Act before commencing the purchase of livestock in commerce for purposes of slaughter. Notwithstanding such notice, respondent commenced and continued to engage in the business of a packer without maintaining an adequate bond or its equivalent as required by the Act and the regulations.
4. Respondent's average annual purchases of livestock for purposes of slaughter have exceeded \$500,000.00.

5. Respondent, on or about the dates and in the transactions set forth in paragraph III of the complaint, purchased from Merlin L. Garver, Inc., a dealer located in West Salem, Ohio, livestock on a dressed weight basis that had moved in commerce through posted stockyards in Ohio, Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Respondent failed to pay, when due, the full purchase price of the livestock.

6. There remains unpaid a total of \$95,833.30 for these livestock purchases.

Conclusions

Respondent has admitted allegations of purchasing livestock for slaughter as a packer without required bond coverage, failing to pay, and failing to pay when due, for substantial purchases of livestock by his failure to file a timely answer. A failure to file a timely answer constitutes an admission of the material allegations in the complaint. See 7 C.F.R. § 1.136(c); *In re Jeremy Byrd, d/b/a T Byrd Cattle Company*, 55 Agric. Dec. 443, 450 (1996). Respondent shall not now be permitted to contest the complaint after failing to file a timely answer without showing good cause for this failure. Respondents are required to deny or explain any allegations of the complaint and set forth any defense in a timely answer to enable the Department to handle its large caseload in an expeditious and economical manner; to provide some closure to the process; and to ensure that all parties are treated fairly under recognized rules that are uniformly applied.

Respondent has not asserted that the facts alleged in the complaint are untrue. Rather, respondent has asserted that there are other facts that should be considered in mitigation. Although respondent has failed to show why he did not assert the existence of such mitigating circumstances in a timely filed answer, we will briefly address respondent's points and show why their establishment would be unavailing.

It is well-settled that operating without a bond is a serious violation, and efforts to secure a bond do not mitigate the violation. See *In re Danny Cobb and Crockett Livestock Sales Company, Inc.*, 48 Agric. Dec. 234, 269 (1989), *aff'd*, 889 F.2d 724 (6th Cir. 1990). Respondent's failure to pay for his livestock purchases constitutes a serious violation of Sections 202(a) and 409 of the Act (7 U.S.C. §§ 192(a), 228b), and the fact that these were unexpected financial difficulties would not normally warrant the withholding or lessening of sanctions. See *In re Richard N. Garver*, 45 Agric. Dec. 1090, 1094-1095 (1986), *aff'd* 846 F.2d 1029 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied* 488 U.S. 820 (1988); *In re Rotches Pork Packers, Inc., et al*, 46 Agric. Dec. 573, 584 (1987).

Respondent has violated express bonding and payment provisions of the Act and the regulations, and his conduct was willful. A violation is willful, within the meaning of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. § 558(c)), if a person carelessly disregards regulatory requirements. See *Butz v. Glover Livestock Comm'n Co.*, 411

U.S. 182, 186-188 (1973); *Cox v. USDA*, 925 F.2d 1102, 1105 (8th Cir.), *cert. denied*. 112 S. Ct. 178 (1991); *Finer Foods Sales Co., Inc. v. Block*, 708 F.2d 774, 778 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

The \$10,500.00 civil penalty sought by complainant is an appropriate deterrent for the violations that are the subject of this proceeding. Complainant routinely requests a civil penalty equal to about ten percent of the unpaid livestock purchase amount from a packer, unless there is reason to believe that the assessment of such a penalty would adversely affect the interests of unpaid livestock sellers. The total civil penalty sought derives from this calculation and an additional amount, related to the amount of bond deficiency in the case, that is also sought as a standard deterrent. When a packer is no longer operating, the Secretary may assess an appropriate civil penalty without considering the effect of the penalty on the person's ability to continue in business as would otherwise be required under Section 203(b) of the Act (7 U.S.C. § 193(b)) when a proposed civil penalty is contested by a respondent who has filed a timely answer.

Respondent has asserted in his response to the pending motion that he is "financially broke and unemployed" (Respondent's letter). Respondent was advised by complainant's counsel that a substantial civil penalty was being sought when he was sent a proposed consent decision following service of the complaint. Respondent elected to ignore the proceeding until complainant filed its motion for a default decision and his present claim of financial distress in reduction of the civil penalty proposed by complainant comes too late.

By reason of the facts found in Findings of Fact 3 and 4 above, respondent wilfully violated section 202(a) of the Act (7 U.S.C. § 192 (a)), and sections 201.29 and 201.30 of the regulations (9 C.F.R. §§ 192 (a), 228b).

Order

Respondent Raymond Perkins, his agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with his operations as a packer, shall cease and desist from:

1. Engaging in business in any capacity for which bonding is required under the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended and supplemented, and the regulations, without filing and maintaining an adequate bond or its equivalent, as required by the Act and the regulations;

2. Failing to pay, when due, the full purchase price of livestock; and

3. Failing to pay the full purchase price of livestock.

In accordance with section 203(b) of the Act (7 U.S.C. § 913(b)), respondent is assessed a civil penalty in the amount of Ten Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$10,500.00).

This decision shall become final and effective without further proceedings 35 days after the date of service upon the respondent, unless it is appealed to the Judicial Officer by a party to the proceeding within 30 days pursuant to section 1.145 of the Rules of Practice (7 C.F.R. § 1.145).

Copies of this decision shall be served upon the parties.

[This Decision and Order became final June 2, 1997.-Editor]

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

CONSENT DECISIONS

(Not published herein-Editor)

Foxley Grain Company, Inc. G.S.A. Docket No. 96-0001. 8/26/96.

Rodney L. Kolander. P&S Docket No. D-94-0020. 1/31/97.

Harry Clifton Reed. P&S Docket No. D-97-0005. 2/10/97.

Kenneth W. Swiney. P&S Docket No. D-97-0004. 2/27/97.

David Riswold. P&S Docket No. D-97-0006. 3/17/97.

Gerald G. Milosevich. P&S Docket No. D-97-0013. 3/17/97.

Pasquale V. Leone. P&S Docket No. D-97-0014. 3/19/97.

Larry Wayne Reed. P&S Docket No. D-96-0010. 3/20/97.

Dodge County Stockyard, Inc., and Martin Burch. P&S Docket No. D-96-0011.
3/24/97.

Larreen Susan Becherer and Becherer Feeder Pig Company. P&S Docket No. D-97-
0012. 3/26/97.

Tommy Hanback, d/b/a H&H Livestock. P&S Docket No. D-97-0011. 3/31/97.

Robert W. Campbell and Gaines Hughes d/b/a Campbell & Hughes. P&S Docket No.
D-96-0014. 4/2/97.

Benita Robinson. P&S Docket No. D-97-0009. 5/6/97.

E. Bob Cody. P&S Docket No. D-96-0015. 5/22/97.

Kiran Enterprises, Inc. t/a Trenton Halal Meat Packing Company and Mohammad S.
Malik. P&S Docket No. D-97-0015. 6/24/97.
