

§ 19.28

under paragraph (b) or (c)(3) of this section, the subpoenaing party or other aggrieved party may, to the extent authorized by applicable law, apply to an appropriate United States district court for an order requiring compliance with the portions of the subpoena that the administrative law judge has ordered enforced. A party's right to seek court enforcement of a deposition subpoena in no way limits the sanctions that may be imposed by the administrative law judge on a party who fails to comply with, or procures a failure to comply with, a subpoena issued under this section.

§ 19.28 Interlocutory review.

(a) *General rule.* The Comptroller may review a ruling of the administrative law judge prior to the certification of the record to the Comptroller only in accordance with the procedures set forth in this section and § 19.23.

(b) *Scope of review.* The Comptroller may exercise interlocutory review of a ruling of the administrative law judge if the Comptroller finds that:

(1) The ruling involves a controlling question of law or policy as to which substantial grounds exist for a difference of opinion;

(2) Immediate review of the ruling may materially advance the ultimate termination of the proceeding;

(3) Subsequent modification of the ruling at the conclusion of the proceeding would be an inadequate remedy; or

(4) Subsequent modification of the ruling would cause unusual delay or expense.

(c) *Procedure.* Any request for interlocutory review shall be filed by a party with the administrative law judge within ten days of his or her ruling and shall otherwise comply with § 19.23. Any party may file a response to a request for interlocutory review in accordance with § 19.23(d). Upon the expiration of the time for filing all responses, the administrative law judge shall refer the matter to the Comptroller for final disposition.

(d) *Suspension of proceeding.* Neither a request for interlocutory review nor any disposition of such a request by the Comptroller under this section suspends or stays the proceeding unless

12 CFR Ch. I (1-1-01 Edition)

otherwise ordered by the administrative law judge or the Comptroller.

§ 19.29 Summary disposition.

(a) *In general.* The administrative law judge shall recommend that the Comptroller issue a final order granting a motion for summary disposition if the undisputed pleaded facts, admissions, affidavits, stipulations, documentary evidence, matters as to which official notice may be taken, and any other evidentiary materials properly submitted in connection with a motion for summary disposition show that:

(1) There is no genuine issue as to any material fact; and

(2) The moving party is entitled to a decision in its favor as a matter of law.

(b) *Filing of motions and responses.* (1) Any party who believes there is no genuine issue of material fact to be determined and that he or she is entitled to a decision as a matter of law may move at any time for summary disposition in its favor of all or any part of the proceeding. Any party, within 20 days after service of such a motion, or within such time period as allowed by the administrative law judge, may file a response to such motion.

(2) A motion for summary disposition must be accompanied by a statement of the material facts as to which the moving party contends there is no genuine issue. Such motion must be supported by documentary evidence, which may take the form of admissions in pleadings, stipulations, depositions, investigatory depositions, transcripts, affidavits and any other evidentiary materials that the moving party contends support his or her position. The motion must also be accompanied by a brief containing the points and authorities in support of the contention of the moving party. Any party opposing a motion for summary disposition must file a statement setting forth those material facts as to which he or she contends a genuine dispute exists. Such opposition must be supported by evidence of the same type as that submitted with the motion for summary disposition and a brief containing the points and authorities in support of the contention that summary disposition would be inappropriate.