| STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA) :SS | IN CIRCUIT COURT | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| COUNTY OF CODDINGTON) | | THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT |
| STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, | * | CIV. 13 |
| Plaintiff, vs. | * | |
| | * | COMPLAINT |
| STROMSETH CONSTRUCTION, INC., | | |
| Defendant. | * | |
| | | |

COMES NOW, Plaintiff, the State of South Dakota, through and by its undersigned Counsel, and states as follows:

- 1. Plaintiff brings this action by and through the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission (the "Commission"), an agency of the State of South Dakota created by SDCL 49-1-8.
- Defendant Stromseth Construction, Inc. is a South Dakota
 Corporation in delinquent standing with the South Dakota Secretary
 of State, as of February 11, 2013. Defendant's mailing address is:
 113 11th St. NE, Watertown, SD 57201.
- 3. This action is brought pursuant to SDCL 49-7A-28 to recover the civil penalty assessed against Defendant by the South Dakota One-Call Board ("One-Call").
- 4. One-Call is a board established by SDCL 49-7A-2. One-Call was established to provide a service through which a person can notify the operators of underground facilities of plans to excavate and to request the marking of the facilities. One-Call has promulgated rules and

- procedures pursuant to SDCL 49-7A-4 to regulate the notification process of the above, as provided by ARSD 20:25.
- 5. One-Call, pursuant to SDCL 49-7A-17, has the authority to receive complaints against persons who violate provisions of SDCL chapter 49-7A and rules promulgated by One-Call. Pursuant to SDCL 49-7A-18 and 49-7A-19, One-Call may assess civil penalties against persons found to have violated these laws.
- 6. On July 31, 2012, One-Call received a complaint against Defendant, pursuant to SDCL 49-7A-17. The complaint was filed by Watertown Municipal Utilities. The complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 7. Pursuant to SDCL 49-7A-22, a five member panel ("Panel") was appointed by the Chairman of One-Call to hear the complaint. The Panel found probable cause existed to believe violations of South Dakota One Call law occurred.
- 8. The Panel found probable cause existed to believe two separate violations of SDCL 49-7A-5 occurred. Specifically, the Panel found Defendant performed excavation without a valid ticket on Saturday, July 28, 2012, and Sunday, July 29, 2012. Based on the existence of previous complaints against Defendant, and its lack of response to the Complaint, the Panel found the violation to be intentional.
- 9. The Panel also found probable cause existed to believe a violation of ARSD 20:25:03:05.03 occurred. Specifically, the Panel found that Defendant failed to properly expose facilities in compliance with the

- administrative rule. Based on the existence of previous Complaints against Defendant and Defendant's lack of response to the Complaint, the Panel found the violation to be intentional.
- 10. For the July 28, 2012, violation of SDCL 49-7A-5, the Panel recommended a Five Thousand Dollar (\$5,000). The Panel found it proper, however, to suspend Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$2,500) on the condition that payment of the remaining amount be made within thirty days from the receipt of the One-Call Order, Defendant not be found guilty of a One Call violation within the next twelve months, Defendant conduct an in-house gas safety meeting, and Defendant attend a Spring 2013 South Dakota One Call excavator meeting.
- 11. For the July 29, 2012, violation of SDCL 49-7A-19, the Panel recommended a civil penalty be assessed against Defendant in the amount of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000).
- 12. For the violation of ARSD 20:25:03:05.03, the Panel recommended a civil penalty be assessed against Defendant in the amount of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000).
- 13. A copy of the Panel's recommendations was served on Defendant via first class mail. The Panel recommendations are attached hereto as Exhibit B. Defendant, however, failed to respond to the recommendations. Defendant's failure to respond and failure to

- request a hearing constitutes acceptance of the Panel's recommendations per SDCL 49-7A-27.
- 14. Based on Defendant's failure to respond or request a hearing, One-Call issued an Order on October 3, 2012. The One-Call Order was served on Defendant via first class mail on October 4, 2012. The One-Call Order is attached hereto as Exhibit C. The time for Defendant to appeal the decision of One-Call expired according to SDCL 1-26-31.
- 15. Defendant made one payment in the amount of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$2,500).
- 16. Defendant failed to pay the remainder of the civil penalty or comply with the conditions of the suspended penalty and now owes Twelve Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$12,500) in civil penalties.
- 17. One-Call made a written demand to Defendant for payment of the civil penalties pursuant to SDCL 49-7A-33. The demand was served on Defendant via first class mail. A copy of the demand is attached hereto as Exhibit D. More than thirty (30) days have elapsed since the demand letter was sent and Defendant failed to pay the prescribed civil penalties.
- 18. One-Call requested the Commission bring an action in the Court against Defendant to recover such penalty in accordance with SDCL 49-7A-28.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter judgment by default against Defendant as follows:

1. For a monetary judgment in the amount of \$12,500 against Defendant.

Dated this $13^{1/1}$ day of February, 2013.

Kristen N. Edwards

Special Assistant Attorney General

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

500 East Capitol Avenue

Pierre, SD 57501