

## UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATOR

IN THE MATTER	OF	)
		)
DONALD CUTLER	2,	) DOCKET NO. CWA-10-2000-0188
		)
		)
	RESPONDENT	)

## **MEMORANDUM**

On March 6, 2001, I issued an order denying Complainant's motion for additional discovery relating to Respondent's "ability to pay" defense to the penalty sought by Complainant. A summary of the reasons for that order follows:

- 1. Respondent has previously provided a substantial amount of information concerning his financial situation, e.g., income tax returns for the years 1997 to 1999 inclusive and a signed portion of a Financial Data Request Form, and has been directed to provide a copy of his 2000 income tax return at least one week prior to the hearing scheduled to commence March 20, 2001.
- 2. I agree with Respondent that the Financial Data Request Form is burdensome and "obnoxious" in its detail concerning living expenses and certain other requested data.

- 3. The "loan package" in connection with the purchase of the John

  Deere loader can only be relevant on the theory that Respondent

  has some undisclosed source of income.
- 4. Lastly, once Complainant has made a prima facie case that Respondent has the ability to pay the penalty sought, the burden of production and the attendant risk on that issue shifts to Respondent.\*

Dated this  $7^{\text{th}}$  day of March 2001.

Original signed by undersigned
\_\_\_\_\_\_
Spencer T. Nissen

Administrative Law Judge

<sup>\*</sup> It is worthy of note that in <u>Chempace Corporation</u>, FIFRA Appeal Nos. 99-2 & 99-3, 2000 WL 696, 821 (EAB, May 18, 2000), a case cited by Complainant, Complainant's motion for additional discovery as to Chempace's ability to pay was denied.