## THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

SUN VALLEY ORCHARDS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 1:21-cv-16625-JHR-MJS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, et al.,

Defendants.

DEFENDANTS' MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION TO DISMISS, OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AND CROSS-MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTR	ODU	CTION	1	
BACK	KGRO	UND	3	
I.	The l	H-2A framework	3	
II.	The l	Labor Department's H-2A enforcement system	4	
III.	Sun Valley's H-2A violations and proceedings.			
LEGA	AL ST	ANDARDS	7	
ARG	UME	NT	8	
I.	The Department of Labor's adjudication does not violate Article III.			
	A.	The Department of Labor is not exercising "judicial Power" at all	8	
	В.	The Department of Labor is adjudicating only public rights that do not require an Article III tribunal.	. 11	
	C.	Sun Valley impliedly consented to the Labor Department's adjudication	17	
II.	The Department of Labor's Administrative Law Judges do not violate the Appointments Clause or the President's removal power.		19	
	A.	Plaintiff has forfeited its Appointments Clause and removal claims by failing to raise them with the agency.	19	
	В.	Either by proper appointment or ratification, the ALJ in Sun Valley's case did not violate the Appointments Clause.	21	
	C.	Proper appointment also vitiates Plaintiff's removal claim.	25	
	D.	The Department of Labor's ALJs are permissibly protected from removal	26	
III.		Department of Labor's adjudicatory system is authorized by the statute and tiff is not entitled to a trial de novo.	29	
IV.	The Department of Labor's imposition of back pay and penalties is fully supported by the record and is neither arbitrary nor capricious.			
	A.	The Labor department properly awarded back wages and penalties for Sun Valley's meal-plan and beverage violations	34	
	B.	The Labor Department reasonably found that Sun Valley improperly terminated nineteen workers in May 2015.	37	



	C.	The Labor Department is fully authorized to assess back wages	38
V.	The	Labor Department did not violate the Excessive Fines Clause	39
CON	CLU	SION	40



## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### **CASES**

Ableman v. Booth, 62 U.S. (21 How.) 506 (1859)	9
Advanced Disposal Servs. E., Inc. v. NLRB, 820 F.3d 592 (3d Cir. 2016)	. 22, 23
Am. Bioscience, Inc. v. Thompson, 269 F.3d 1077 (D.C. Cir. 2001)	7
Am. Steamship Owners Mut. Prot. & Indem. Ass'n, Inc. v. United States, 489 F. Supp. 3d 106 (E.D.N.Y. 2020)	8
Amin. v. Mayorkas, 24 F.4th 383 (5th Cir. 2022)	33
Anderson v. Yungkau, 329 U.S. 482 (1947)	31
Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc., 976 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	39
Arizona v. United States, 567 U.S. 387 (2012)	14
Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety & Health Rev. Comm'n, 430 U.S. 442 (1977)	.passim
Bd. of Trs. of Univ. of Ill. v. United States, 289 U.S. 48 (1933)	13
Beard v. Braunstein, 914 F.2d 434 (3d Cir. 1990)	15
Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	7
Bennett v. Panama Canal Co., 475 F.2d 1280 (D.C. Cir. 1973)	31
Bowsher v. Synar, 478 U.S. 714 (1986)	26
Bureau of Consumer Fin. Prot. v. Fair Collections & Outsourcing, Inc., 2020 WL 7043847 (D. Md. Nov. 30, 2020)	22



Camp v. Pitts, 411 U.S. 138 (1973)	
Carr v. Saul, 141 S. Ct. 1352 (2021)	19, 21
CFPB v. Gordon, 819 F.3d 1179 (9th Cir. 2016)	23
CFPB v. Seila Law LLC, 997 F.3d 837 (9th Cir. 2021)	25
CFTC v. Schor, 478 U.S. 833 (1986)	13, 17
Chicago & S. Air Lines v. Waterman S.S. Corp., 333 U.S. 103 (1948)	9
Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe, 401 U.S. 402 (1971)	33
City of Arlington v. FCC, 569 U.S. 290 (2013)	10
Collins v. Yellen, 141 S. Ct. 1761 (2021)	2, 25
Conn. Nat'l Bank v. Germain, 503 U.S. 249 (1992)	31
Crowell v. Benson, 285 U.S. 22 (1932)	10, 11, 16
Dareth T. v. Kijakazi, 2022 WL 671540 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 7, 2022)	22, 25
Decker Coal Co. v. Pehringer, 8 F.4th 1123 (9th Cir. 2021)	passim
Deron Sch. of N.J., Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Agric., 2012 WL 13187163 (D.N.J. July 16, 2012)	33
FCC v. Prometheus Radio Project, 141 S. Ct. 1150 (2021)	
Fed. Mar. Comm'n v. S.C. State Ports Auth.,	28



# DOCKET

## Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## **Real-Time Litigation Alerts**



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## **Advanced Docket Research**



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## **Analytics At Your Fingertips**



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

#### API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

#### **LAW FIRMS**

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

#### **FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

### **E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS**

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

