## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR BEFORE THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

In the matter of:

SAPORITO ENERGY CONSULTANTS, INC.and THOMAS SAPORITOALJ NO. 2009-ERA-00016

Complainants,

DATE: 26 JAN 2010

v.

#### U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION,

Respondent.

# COMPLAINANTS' OBJECTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE RESPONDENT U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION RESPONSE TO COMPLAINANTS' REPLY TO SHOW CAUSE

Thomas Saporito, Complainant pro se, on behalf of [himself] and Saporito Energy Constants, Inc. (Complainants), hereby file Complainants' Objection and Motion to Strike Respondent U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Response to Complaintants' Reply to Show Cause (Reply), and state as follows:

On January 26, 2010, Complainants took receipt of U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (Respondent's) *Response* to (Complainants' Reply to Show Cause) (hereinafter "Response") which was apparently filed in response to Complainants' Reply to the Court's December 10, 2009 Order to Show Cause in the abovecaptioned matter. Complainants timely filed their Reply on

< 1/3 >

December 28, 2009. See, Respondent's Response at p.4.

Complainants aver here that Respondent's Response is <u>untimely</u> filed with this Court and should be striken from the record and not considered by this Court in reaching a decision in this matter. As Respondent is represented by qualified, trained, experienced, and polished legal counsel, the government is fully aware of the rules of practice and proceedure before the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), Office of Administrative Law Judges (OALJ) which require, in relative part, that the government's Response be made within 10-days of receipt of Complainant's Reply and no later than January 12, 2010. However, as clearly indicated on the government's Response, the document was filed on January 20, 2010 and some <u>8-days late</u>.

### CONCLUSION

FOR ALL THE ABOVE STATED REASONS, and because Respondent filed an <u>untimely</u> Response which is significantly prejudicial to *pro* se Complainants and a denial of [their] "due process" right to a fair and just ruling in this matter, this Court should <u>grant</u> Complainants' motion to strike Respondent's Response as a matter of law.

< 2/3 >

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Saporito, pro se Post Office Box 8413 Jupiter, Florida 33468-8413 Phone: 561-972-8363 Email: saporito3@gmail.com

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY, that a copy of the foregoing document was provided to those identified below by means indicated:

Hon. Paul C. Johnson, Jr. Administrative Law Judge U.S. Department of Labor Office of Administrative Law Judges 800 K Street, N.W., Suite 400-N Washington, D.C. 20001-8002 {Regular U.S. Mail + Fax}

Laura C. Zaccari Cousel for Respondent Office of General Counsel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Mailstop OWFN-15-D-21 Washington, D.C. 20555 {Regular U.S. Mail}

By: Thomas Sapø