

U.S. Department of Labor

Office of Administrative Law Judges
John W. McCormack Post Office and Courthouse
Room 505
Boston, MA 02109

(617) 223-9355
(617) 223-4254 (FAX)



Issue date: 10Jul2001

CASE NO. 1999-DBA-20

IN THE MATTER OF:

Disputes concerning the payment of prevailing wage rates and proper classification by:

ABHE & SVOBODA, INC.

General Contractor,
and
JEWELL PAINTING, INC.
Subcontractor,
and
EDT CONSTRUCTION, INC.
Subcontractor
and

Proposed debarment for labor standards violations by:

JEWELL PAINTING, INC.

CASE NO. 1999-DBA-27

IN THE MATTER OF:

Disputes concerning the payment of prevailing wage rates and proper classification by:

ABHE & SVOBODA, INC.

General Contractor,
and
APPLIED COATINGS, INC.
Subcontractor,
and
BLAST ALL, INC.
Subcontractor

CASE NO. 1999-DBA-26

IN THE MATTER OF:

Disputes concerning the payment of prevailing wage rates and proper classification by:

ABHE & SVOBODA, INC.

General Contractor,
and
BLAST ALL, INC.
Subcontractor

CASE NO. 1999-DBA-25

IN THE MATTER OF:

Disputes concerning the payment of prevailing wage rates and proper classification by:

**SIPCO SERVICES & MARINE INC
MARINE INC**

General Contractor,
and
BLAST ALL, INC.
Subcontractor,
and
BLAST ALL, INC.
Subcontractor

CASE NO. 1999-DBA-23

IN THE MATTER OF:

Disputes concerning the payment of prevailing wage rates and proper classification by:

SIPCO SERVICES & MARINE INC

General Contractor,
and
A. LAUGENI & SON, INC.
Subcontractor,
and
BLAST ALL, INC.
Subcontractor

CASE NO. 1999-DBA-22

IN THE MATTER OF:

Disputes concerning the payment of prevailing wage rates and proper classification by:

SIPCO SERVICES &

General Contractor,
and
L.G. DEFELICE, INC.
Subcontractor
and
BLAST ALL, INC.
Subcontractor

CASE NO. 1999-DBA-24

IN THE MATTER OF:

Disputes concerning the payment of prevailing wage rates and proper classification by:

GEORGE CAMPBELL PAINTING CORP.

General Contractor,

and
E. DASKAL CORP.
Subcontractor,

CASE NO. 1999-DBA-21

IN THE MATTER OF:

Disputes concerning the payment of prevailing wage rates and proper classification by:

SHIPSVIEW CORP.

General Contractor,

and
Proposed Debarment for labor standards violations by:
SHIPSVIEW CORP.

RECOMMENDED DECISION ON MOTION FOR MODIFICATION

Complainant, by motion dated June 12, 2001 and filed on June 13, 2001, has timely moved for modification of appendix A contained as part of the **Decision and Order** issued by this Administrative Law Judge on May 17, 2001 in the above matter. Respondents have filed no response thereto.

This Administrative Law Judge, having again considered the matter, concludes that there is valid basis for modification of the Decision and Order. The Motion for Reconsideration is **GRANTED** and the changes are noted in boldface for ease of reference by the parties.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, I hereby modify such decision by issuing, as part of the Decision and Order, the following:

REVISED APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF BACK WAGES DUE

<u>Respondent (Project)</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Amount</u>
ABHE (ARRIGONI)	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 46 CX 61	\$407,139.84 \$ 29,609.16
EDT (ARRIGONI)	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 48 CX 63	\$ 84,624.67 \$ 6,662.17
JEWELL	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 47 CX 62	\$582,793.61 \$ 69,028.26
ABHE (OL/EL)	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 49 CX 64	\$ 33,218.34 \$ 2,469.24
ABHE (MILL RIVER)	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 52 CX 57	\$ 97,694.64 \$ 9,409.34
GCPC (GOLD STAR BRIDGE)	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 58 CX 73	\$251,586.40 \$ 19,256.50
ELLIOT DASKAL (GOLD STAR BRIDGE)	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 59 CA 73	\$242,135.11 \$ 8,779.05
BLAST ALL (OL/EL)	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 51 CX 54-57 CX 66	\$ 10,310.28 \$ 130.38

BLAST ALL (MILL RIVER)	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 54-57 CX 68	CX 51 \$	\$ 7,633.07 1,350.47
BLAST ALL (SIPCO)	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 54-57 CX 69	CX 51 \$	\$ 40,501.67 1,962.18
BLAST ALL (SOUTHINGTON/ GLASTONBURY)	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 54-57 CX 70	CX 51 \$	\$ 3,093.05 82.66
BLAST ALL (DEFELICE)	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 54-57 CX 71	CX 51 \$	\$ 265.20 26.85
SHIPSVIEW	DBRA CWHSSA	CX 231 CX 232	CX 60 \$	\$127,694.95 20,226.18
TOTAL				\$2,057,583.30

A
DAVID W. DI NARDI
Administrative Law Judge

Boston, Massachusetts
DWD:jl

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Within 40 days of the administrative law judge's decision, an aggrieved party shall file a petition for review with the Administrative Review Board under 29 C.F.R. §6.34 with a copy to the Chief Administrative Law Judge. If a Petition for Review of the administrative law judge's decision is filed with the Administrative Review Board, the Chief Administrative Law Judge shall promptly transmit the record of the proceeding.

If an aggrieved party files a petition for review with the Board, the judge's decision is inoperative unless and until the Administrative Review Board either declines to review the decision or issues an order affirming the decision.