

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES  
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Issue Date: 16 February 2022

CASE NO.: 2020-STA-00091

---

*In the Matter of:*

**CRAIG GOODMAN,**  
*Complainant,*

v.

**UNLIMITED FREIGHT, INC.,**  
*Respondent,*

*and*

**VICTOR MARENOVIC,**  
*Respondent.*

---

**DECISION AND ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT  
AND DISMISSING COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE**

This proceeding arises from a complaint filed under the Surface Transportation Assistance Act, 49 U.S.C. § 31105 (“STAA” or the “Act”), and the procedural regulations found at 29 C.F.R. Part 1978. On October 29, 2019, Complainant filed a complaint against Respondents, alleging that he was retaliated against in violation of STAA. On June 2, 2020, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor issued Secretary’s Findings, finding “OSHA is unable to conclude that there is a reasonable cause to believe that a violation of the statute occurred ....”

On June 25, 2020, Complainant filed his Objections to the Secretary’s Findings, and requested a formal hearing. The matter was referred to the Office of Administrative Law Judges (“OALJ”) and was assigned to me on August 26, 2020. The formal hearing in this matter was scheduled for February 8, 2022, but was cancelled after the parties filed a notice of settlement.

On January 31, 2022, Claimant filed its Unopposed Amended Motion to Approve Settlement and Dismiss Proceeding with Prejudice (“Motion”), together with the parties’ Settlement Agreement and General Release (“Settlement Agreement”), which is incorporated by

reference and made a part of the Order. The Settlement Agreement was signed by Complainant and by Victor Marenovic on behalf of himself and Unlimited Freight, Inc.

Pursuant to § 31105(b)(2)(C) of the STAA, “[b]efore the final order is issued, the proceeding may be ended by a settlement agreement made by the Secretary, the complainant, and the person alleged to have committed the violation.” Under regulations implementing the STAA, the parties may settle a case at any time after the filing of objections to the Assistant Secretary’s findings “if the participating parties agree to a settlement and the settlement is approved by the ALJ . . . or by the ARB.” 29 C.F.R. § 1978.111(d)(2). Under the STAA, a settlement agreement cannot become effective until its terms have been reviewed and determined to be fair, adequate, and reasonable. *Rantz v. The Blake School*, ARB No. 2019-0017, 2019 WL 3293947 at \*1 (Feb. 21, 2019) (per curiam). Consistent with that required review, the regulations direct the parties to file a copy of the settlement agreement “with the ALJ or the Administrative Review Board as the case may be.” *Id.*

I have carefully reviewed the parties’ Settlement Agreement and have determined that it constitutes a fair, adequate and reasonable settlement of the complaint.

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that that Settlement Agreement is **APPROVED** and the complaint is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

**SO ORDERED.**

**NORAN J. CAMP**  
Administrative Law Judge

Boston, Massachusetts