

**United States Department of Energy  
Office of Hearings and Appeals**

In the Matter of:

Ezelia US.

Filing Date: December 4, 2023

Case No.: EEE-24-0004

**Issued: March 12, 2024**

**Initial Decision  
Motion for Decision**

Steven L. Fine, Administrative Law Judge:

*On March 12, 2024, I issued a decision granting the Motion for Decision filed by the Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of the Assistant General Counsel for Enforcement. I subsequently noticed that the decision contained a mathematical error in calculating the maximum civil penalty that could have been assessed in this matter. This error would not have affected the outcome of this decision or my recommendation of the appropriate civil penalty. Nevertheless, I have modified this decision to reflect that the maximum civil penalty that could have been assessed was actually \$593,490 rather than \$1,780,470 as stated in the original decision. The outcome of the decision has not changed since the original decision recommended that a civil penalty of \$593,490 be assessed.*

This Initial Decision considers a Motion for Decision (MFD) filed on January 17, 2024, by the Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of the Assistant General Counsel for Enforcement (OGCE) concerning a complaint (Complaint) filed by OGCE on December 4, 2023, against Ezelia US (Respondent). The Complaint was filed under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, 42 U.S.C. § 6291 *et seq.* (the EPCA), DOE's implementing regulations codified at 10 C.F.R. Parts 429 and 430, and DOE's Procedures for Administrative Adjudication of Civil Penalty Actions (hereinafter referred to as the AACPA).<sup>1</sup> The Complaint alleges that Respondent violated the provisions of the EPCA and its implementing regulations by distributing three covered products, specifically three basic models of showerheads<sup>2</sup> (the Showerheads), in commerce in the United States without first

---

<sup>1</sup> The AACPA may be viewed at: <https://www.energy.gov/gc/doe-procedures-administrative-adjudication-civil-penalty-actions>.

<sup>2</sup> DOE's implementing regulations define a showerhead as "a component or set of components distributed in commerce for attachment to a single supply fitting, for spraying water onto a bather, typically from an overhead position, excluding safety shower showerheads." 10 C.F.R. § 430.2. A "[s]afety shower showerhead" is further defined as "a showerhead designed to meet the requirements of ISEA Z358.1." 10 C.F.R. § 430.2.

submitting reports to DOE certifying that each of the Showerheads complied with the applicable DOE energy conservation standard, as required by 10 C.F.R. § 429.12(a)–(d) and 10 C.F.R. § 429.102(a)(1).<sup>3</sup> The MFD requests that I issue a decision: (1) finding that Respondent violated the EPCA and its implementing regulations and (2) recommending that Respondent pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$593,490. For the reasons set forth below, I am granting OGCE’s motion.

## **I. Background**

On October 25, 2023, OGCE issued a Notice of Proposed Civil Penalty (NPCP) to Respondent, pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 429.122. MFD Ex. A at 1. The NPCP alleged that Respondent had manufactured and distributed the Showerheads in commerce in the United States after it had knowingly failed to submit mandatory certification reports to DOE certifying that the Showerheads met the applicable energy conservation standards set forth at 10 C.F.R. § 430.32(p) and 42 U.S.C. § 6295(j).<sup>4</sup> MFD Ex. A at 1. The NPCP proposed a civil penalty of \$593,490. MFD Ex. A at 1. Respondent failed to respond to the NPCP.

On December 4, 2023, pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 429.124(c), OGCE referred this case to an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) by filing a Complaint with DOE’s Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) and serving Respondent with a copy of the Complaint.<sup>5</sup> MFD Ex. D. I was appointed as the ALJ on that day. The Complaint alleged that Respondent violated 10 C.F.R. § 429.102(a)(1), when it knowingly failed to submit the certification reports required under 10 C.F.R. § 429.12(a) to the DOE certifying that the Showerheads met the applicable energy conservation standard, set forth at 10 C.F.R. § 430.32(p) and 42 U.S.C. § 6295(j), prior to manufacturing and distributing the Showerheads in commerce in the United States by making them available for sale in the United States on amazon.com. Complaint at 5.

On December 6, 2023, I issued an acknowledgement letter in which I reminded the parties that Respondent’s answer, or motion filed pursuant to § 18(f)(1)–(2) of the AACPA, was due by the 30th day after December 4, 2023, under § 8(a) of the AACPA. December 6, 2023, Letter from Steven L. Fine, Administrative Law Judge, to Respondent and OGCE at 1. Respondent failed to file any response to the Complaint. On January 17, 2024, after Respondent’s answer or motion pursuant to AACPA § 18(f)(1)–(2) was due, OGCE filed the present MFD. The deadline for Respondent’s response to the MFD elapsed on February 12, 2024, without any further response from Respondent. *See* AACPA at § 18(d) (providing 25 days for a response to a motion filed under § 18 of the AACPA).

---

<sup>3</sup> The Complaint identifies the Showerheads as (1) “21791,” (2) “14292,” and (3) “Ezelia High Pressure Shower Head with Pause Mode and Massage Spa, 5 Settings Handheld Showerhead Sprayer with 79” Stainless Steel Hose, Easy to Install, California Compliant 1.8 GPM.” Complaint at 4.

<sup>4</sup> The EPCA defines “[e]nergy conservation standard” as “a performance standard which prescribes a minimum level of energy efficiency or a maximum quantity of energy use, or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals, water use, for a covered product.” 42 U.S.C. § 6291(6)(A).

<sup>5</sup> 10 C.F.R. § 429.124(c) provides “if the respondent fails to respond to a notice issued under § 10 C.F.R. 429.120 or otherwise fails to indicate its election of procedures, DOE shall refer the civil penalty action to an ALJ for a hearing under § 429.126.”

## II. Analysis

Under the AACPA, a respondent is required to file either a written answer to the complaint, or a motion pursuant to § 18(f)(1)–(2), “not later than 30 days after service of the complaint.” AACPA at § 8(a). Respondent failed to comply with this requirement. The AACPA further provides that “[a] person’s failure to timely file an answer . . . will be deemed an admission of the truth of each allegation contained in the complaint.” AACPA at § 8(d).

OGCE requests that I invoke § 8(d) and consider Respondent’s failure to file either a written answer to the Complaint, or a motion pursuant to § 18(f)(1)–(2), an admission of the truth of each allegation contained in the Complaint. The MFD further requests that on the basis of those admissions, I issue a decision: (1) finding that Respondent violated the EPCA and its implementing regulations, and (2) recommending that Respondent pay a civil penalty of \$ 593,490. To this end, OGCE asserts that since each of the allegations set forth in the Complaint have been admitted, there remains no genuine issue of material fact and therefore OGCE is entitled to a decision in its favor as a matter of law. In support of this contention, OGCE cites the AACPA, which provides that an ALJ must grant an MFD if the moving party “show[s] that there is no genuine issue of material fact and that the party making the motion is entitled to a decision as a matter of law.” AACPA at § 18(f)(5).

Under the AACPA, Respondent’s failure to file a timely response to the Complaint serves as an admission that each of the Complaint’s allegations are true, unless good cause is shown for the failure to respond. AACPA at § 8(d). Respondent has not contended good cause exists for its failure to respond, and the existing record does not support such a conclusion. Accordingly, I find that each of the allegations set forth in the Complaint are admitted to be true.

Therefore, I have made the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

1. Respondent is a “person” under 10 C.F.R. § 430.2;<sup>6</sup>
2. Each of the Showerheads are “showerheads” as defined by 10 C.F.R § 430.2;
3. Each of the Showerheads are “covered products.” 42 U.S.C. § 6292(a)(15);
4. The Showerheads are therefore subject to the conservation standards set forth at 10 C.F.R. § 430.32(p) and 42 U.S.C. § 6295(j);
5. Respondent “manufactured, produced, assembled, or imported” the Showerheads, and was therefore the “manufacturer” of the Showerheads. 42 U.S.C. § 6291(10) and 6291(12); 10 C.F.R. § 430.2;

---

<sup>6</sup> A “person” is “any individual, corporation, company, association, firm, partnership, society, trust, joint venture or joint stock company, the government, and any agency of the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof.” 10 C.F.R. § 430.2; *accord* 42 U.S.C. § 6202(2).

6. For at least 365 days, Respondent knowingly distributed the Showerheads in commerce in the United States by making the Showerheads available for sale in the United States on amazon.com;
7. Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 429.12(a), Respondent was required to submit a certification report to DOE certifying that each of the Showerheads complied with the applicable DOE energy conservation standards, both before distributing the Showerheads, and annually thereafter;
8. Respondent has never submitted any certification reports certifying that the basic models containing the Showerheads complied with the relevant energy conservation standard to DOE;<sup>7</sup>
9. Respondent has been, at all times relevant to the present proceeding, subject to the requirements of 10 C.F.R. Parts 429 and 430 and the remedies of 10 C.F.R. Part 429, Subpart C;
10. Respondent knew or should have known that it had not submitted any certification reports to DOE certifying that each of the Showerheads met the applicable energy conservation standards before Respondent distributed the Showerheads in commerce in the United States;
11. Respondent violated 10 C.F.R. § 429.102(a)(1) by knowingly distributing the Showerheads in commerce in the United States for at least 365 days without submitting the certification reports required under 10 C.F.R. § 429.12(a) to DOE certifying that the basic models containing the Showerheads met the applicable energy conservation standards;
12. Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 429.120, Respondent is subject to a civil penalty for each knowing violation of 10 C.F.R. § 429.102(a)(1);
13. Under 10 C.F.R. § 429.120, each day of noncompliance with 10 C.F.R. § 429.102(a)(1) constitutes a separate violation for each model not certified according to DOE regulations;
14. Respondent has committed 1,095 knowing violations of 10 C.F.R. § 429.102(a)(1) (three products multiplied by 365 days);
15. Pursuant to Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties (the IACMP), 88 Fed. Reg. 2193 (Jan. 13, 2023); 10 C.F.R. § 429.120 (2023); and 28 U.S.C. § 2461 (amended 2015)

---

<sup>7</sup> The regulations define “basic model” as “all units of a given type of covered product (or class thereof) manufactured by one manufacturer; having the same primary energy source; and, which have essentially identical electrical, physical, and functional (or hydraulic) characteristics that affect energy consumption, energy efficiency, water consumption, or water efficiency;” . . . and “[w]ith respect to faucets and showerheads: Have the identical flow control mechanism attached to or installed within the fixture fittings, or the identical water-passage design features that use the same path of water in the highest flow mode.” 10 C.F.R. § 430.2.

Respondent is subject to a civil penalty of up to \$542 per basic model per day for each violation assessed after January 13, 2023;

16. A maximum civil penalty in the amount of \$593,490 (three products multiplied by 365 days multiplied by a penalty of \$542 per violation) would be allowed under the regulations and statutes;
17. A civil penalty in the amount of \$593,490 is therefore appropriate.

Based on the existing record, OGCE has shown there is no genuine issue of material fact and it is entitled to a decision as a matter of law. Accordingly, OGCE's MFD is granted. I recommend an assessment of a civil penalty in the amount of \$593,490 against Respondent.

For These Reasons:

- (1) The Motion for Decision filed by the Office of the Assistant General Counsel for Enforcement on January 17, 2024, is granted;
- (2) I recommend that Ezelia US be assessed a civil penalty of \$593,490, as requested by the Office of the Assistant General Counsel for Enforcement; and
- (3) This Initial Decision shall become the Final Decision of the Department of Energy if not appealed pursuant to § 32 of DOE's Procedures for Administrative Adjudication of Civil Penalty Actions within 10 days after service upon the parties.

Steven L. Fine  
Administrative Law Judge  
Office of Hearings and Appeals  
United States Department of Energy