

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	1
ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITIES	3
I. The ALJ erroneously denied Appellants Motion to Quash insufficient service of process.....	3
A. <i>Section 22.5 of the Consolidated Rules of Practice is not the applicable forum law in this case.</i>	4
B. <i>The Agency's service of process on Appellants' appointed domestic agent violates the due process clause, and therefore the Hague Convention applies.....</i> 52.	<u>Due process requires that the Complaint be translated.....</u> 8
C. <i>EPA regulations requiring foreign manufacturer's to appoint U.S. agents for service of process have no purpose other than to circumvent the Hague Convention.</i>	9
II. T-Group and JCXI are not “manufacturers” for the purpose of the CAA in this case.	10
III. The EPA did not meet its burden to prove that T-Group or JCXI violated the CAA, or any of the implementing regulations stated in the Complaint.	13
A. <i>All subject highway motorcycles were covered by their EPA-issued COCs.</i>	14
B. <i>All subject recreational vehicles were covered by their EPA-issued COCs.</i>	21
IV. The ALJ’s penalty decision exceeds the express limits of the CAA.	22
V. The ALJ’s penalty assessment ignores an Appellant-specific application of the statutory factors.	29
A. <i>The Penalty Policy did not provide an appropriate framework in the unique circumstances of this case.....</i>	30
B. <i>The ALJ’s penalty assessment is erroneous and exceeds the limits of the Penalty Policy itself.</i>	32
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	36
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	37

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

COURT CASES

<i>Allapattah Servs., Inc. v. EXXON Corp.</i> , 372 F.Supp. 2d 1344 (S.D. Fla. 2005)	35
<i>Brockmeyer v. May</i> , 383 F.3d 798 (9th Cir. 2004)	9
<i>Gateway Overseas, Inc. v. Nishat (Chunian) Ltd.</i> , No. 05 CV 4260 (GBD), 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 49272 (S.D.N.Y. July 13, 2006).....	6
<i>Int'l Shoe Co. v. Washington</i> , 326 U.S. 310 (1945).....	6, 8
<i>Julen v. Larson</i> , 25 Cal. App. 3d 325 (1972)	8
<i>Leonard v. USA Petroleum Corp.</i> , 829 F. Supp. 882 (S.D. Tex. 1993).	6, 7, 8
<i>Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co.</i> , 339 U.S. 306 (1950).....	4, 9
<i>New Hampshire v. Maine</i> , 532 U.S. 742 (2001).....	35
<i>Perkins v. Benguet Consol. Mining Co.</i> , 342 U.S. 437 (1952).....	6, 8
<i>Southway v. Central Bank of Nigeria</i> , 328 F.3d 1267 (10th Cir. 2003)	26
<i>Vazquez v. Sund Emba AB</i> , 152 A.D.2d 389 (App. Div. 1989).....	5, 8
<i>Volkswagenwerk Aktiengesellschaft v. Schlunk</i> , 486 U.S. 694 (1988),.....	3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10
<i>Wuxi Taihu Tractor Co. v. York Grp., Inc.</i> , No. 01-13-00016-CV, 2014 Tex. App. LEXIS 12888 (App. Dec. 2, 2014).	5

EAB CASES

<i>In re Britton Constr. Co.</i> , 8 E.A.D. 261 (EAB 1999)	30
<i>In re Chem Lab Prods., Inc.</i> , 10 E.A.D. 711 (EAB 2002).....	30
<i>In re Echevarria</i> , 5 E.A.D. 626 (EAB 1994);.....	10
<i>In re Employers Ins. of Wausau</i> , 6 E.A.D. 735 (EAB 1997).....	30
<i>In re John A. Biewer Co. of Toledo, Inc.</i> , 15 E.A.D. 772, (EAB 2013)	30
<i>In re Lyon County Landfill</i> , 8 E.A.D. 559 (EAB 1999).....	26, 27
<i>In re Mountain Village Parks, Inc.</i> , 15 E.A.D. 790 (EAB 2013)	29
<i>In re Peace Indus. Group (USA) Inc.</i> , 17 E.A.D. 348 (EAB 2006).....	29
<i>In re Phoenix Constr. Servs., Inc.</i> , 11 E.A.D. 379 (EAB 2004)	30

STATUTES

CAA § 203, 42 U.S.C. § 7522	1, 11, 12, 13, 14
CAA § 205, 42 U.S.C. § 7524.	22, 23, 29, 32
CAA § 216, 42 U.S.C. § 7550.	12

REGULATIONS

40 C.F.R. § 22.5	3, 4
40 C.F.R. § 22.24.....	13, 34
40 C.F.R. § 22.27.....	2
40 C.F.R. § 85.074-30 (1976).....	20
40 C.F.R. § 85.2305.....	14, 18
40 C.F.R. §§ 86.416-80	7, 9, 18
40 C.F.R. § 86.420-78	18
40 C.F.R. §§ 86.423-78	35
40 C.F.R. 86.431-78	35
40 C.F.R. § 86.437-78.	14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 35
40 C.F.R. §1051.205	7, 9
40 C.F.R. § 1068.101	14, 21
40 C.F.R. § 1068.103	14, 21