



IN THE MATTER OF:

DANIEL DUGGAN,

ARB CASE NO. 2026-0048

COMPLAINANT,

ALJ CASE NO. 2026-CFP-00002

ALJ JASON A. GOLDEN

v.

DATE: June 29, 2026

FREEDOMROADS LLC.,

RESPONDENT.

Before BURRELL and KIKO, Administrative Appeals Judges

**ORDER REMANDING CASE TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE TO
RESOLVE PENDING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

This case arises under the employee protection provisions of the Consumer Financial Protection Act.¹ On May 20, 2026, Complainant Daniel Duggan filed a Petition for Review with the Administrative Review Board (Board) of Administrative Law Judge Jason A. Golden's Order of Dismissal, issued on May 6, 2026. On May 29, 2026, the Board issued an Order Remanding Case to Administrative Law Judge to Resolve Pending Motion for Reconsideration (Remand Order). In the Remand Order, the Board explained that the interest of judicial economy would be best served by remanding the case to the ALJ to permit him to rule on Complainant's pending motion for reconsideration.²

On June 1, 2026, the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) chambers emailed Complainant an email beginning with the word "ORDER" and informing him that his paper-mailed filing of his May 20th petition for review was rejected since the ALJ had already received an electronically filed copy of the same document.³ The

¹ 12 U.S.C. § 5567; 29 C.F.R. Part 1985 (2025).

² As stated in the Remand Order, on May 7, 2026, Complainant timely filed a Motion for Reconsideration with the ALJ pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 18.93 (2025).

³ See Ex. A to Petition for Review.

email concluded by stating “[n]o further Order will be issued on this action.”⁴ Complainant interpreted this email as potentially a final order disposing of his motion for reconsideration. On June 15, 2026, Complainant filed a new Petition for Review with the Board, seeking review of the email he called “the June 1, 2026 Order.”

After careful consideration of the Petition for Review and its attached exhibits, it appears to us that Complainant’s motion for reconsideration is still pending before the ALJ. As mentioned in the Remand Order, Complainant’s filing of a petition for review with the Board deprives the ALJ of authority to grant Complainant’s pending motion for reconsideration.⁵ Once again, we think the interest of judicial economy would be best served by remanding the case to the ALJ.⁶ Accordingly, we **REMAND** this case to permit the ALJ to decide Complainant’s motion for reconsideration.

SO ORDERED.

THOMAS H. BURRELL
Administrative Appeals Judge

PHILIP G. KIKO
Administrative Appeals Judge

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *See* 29 C.F.R. § 18.94.

⁶ *See Abdur-Rahman v. DeKalb Cnty.*, ARB Nos. 2012-0038, -0057, ALJ Nos. 2006-WPC-00002, -00003, slip op. at 2 (ARB Mar. 21, 2012) (Order Dismissing Appeals) (recognizing that an ALJ’s decision is not generally “ripe for review until the ALJ has resolved all timely motions for reconsideration.”).