

U.S. Department of Labor

Administrative Review Board
200 Constitution Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20210-0001



IN THE MATTER OF:

NATHANIEL MONK,

ARB CASE NO. 2025-0091

COMPLAINANT,

ALJ CASE NO. 2021-PSI-00003

ALJ JOHN P. SELLERS, III

v.

DATE: November 18, 2025

HUBBELL INC.,

RESPONDENT.

**Before JOHNSON, Chief Administrative Appeals Judge, and BURRELL,
Administrative Appeals Judge**

ORDER OF ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE

This case arises under the employee protection provisions of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (PSIA) and its implementing regulations.¹ Complainant Nathaniel Monk filed a complaint against Respondent Hubbell Inc. with the U.S. Department of Labor's Occupational Safety and Health Administration on October 12, 2020, alleging Respondent violated the PSIA. On August 27, 2025, a U.S. Department of Labor Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a Decision and Order Denying Complaint (D. & O.), ruling against Complainant and denying his Complaint. On September 11, 2025, Complainant filed a copy of the D. & O. with the Administrative Review Board (Board).

The Secretary of Labor has delegated authority to the Board to consider petitions for review under the PSIA.² Complainant, however, failed to file a petition for review. The PSIA's implementing regulations state that a party seeking review

¹ 49 U.S.C. § 60129; 29 C.F.R. Part 1981 (2025).

² Secretary's Order No. 01-2020 (Delegation of Authority and Assignment of Responsibility to the Administrative Review Board), 85 Fed. Reg. 13186 (Mar. 6, 2020); *see also* 29 C.F.R. § 1981.110(a).

of an ALJ's decision must file a "written petition for review" with the Board, that the petition for review "must specifically identify the findings, conclusions, or orders to which exception is taken," and that "[a]ny exception not specifically urged ordinarily will be deemed to have been waived by the parties."³ Filing a copy of the D. & O, without filing a separate written petition for review identifying exceptions to the ALJ's findings, conclusions, or orders, does not satisfy this regulatory requirement.

Accordingly, the Board issued an Order on September 22, 2025, directing Complainant to file a written petition for review in compliance with 29 C.F.R. § 1981.110(a) by October 2, 2025. The Board cautioned Complainant that if it did not receive a petition for review as ordered, it would administratively close this case.

As of the date of this Order, Complainant has not filed a petition for review or made any other response to or communication with the Board. Thus, no petition for review of the D. & O. has been filed. Consequently, the Board hereby **ORDERS** that this matter be **ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSED**.

SO ORDERED.

RANDEL K. JOHNSON
Chief Administrative Appeals Judge

THOMAS H. BURRELL
Administrative Appeals Judge

³ 29 C.F.R. § 1981.110(a).