

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
TK ACCESS SOLUTIONS CORP., f/k/a	)	
THYSSENKRUPP ACCESS CORP.	)	CPSC DOCKET NO.: 21-1
	)	
	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

**RESPONDENT’S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO COMPLAINT COUNSEL’S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY BRIEF**

Pursuant to 16 C.F.R. § 1025.23(c), Respondent TK Access Solutions Corp., formerly known as thyssenkrupp Access Corp. (hereinafter “Respondent” or “TKASC”), by and through undersigned counsel, hereby files this Memorandum in Opposition to Complaint Counsel’s Motion to for Leave to File Reply Brief (“Motion”) (filed April 18, 2022). In that Motion, Complaint Counsel represents that its reply “will not restate previous arguments raised in its Motion to Compel [but] instead will present the Court with new factual material and a prior order from a CPSA administrative litigation compelling discovery related to piercing the corporate veil.”

It is unclear what “new factual material” can plausibly have arisen between Respondent’s April 15, 2022, Memorandum in Opposition to Complaint Counsel’s Motion to Compel Discovery and Complaint Counsel’s current Motion. Moreover, Complaint Counsel, in its original Motion to Compel, had full opportunity to raise the “prior order from a CPSA administrative litigation compelling discovery related to piercing the corporate veil.” That

Complaint Counsel failed to do so does not merit further disruption<sup>1</sup> to the schedule for this litigation, a schedule that is already at risk of significant delays stemming from Complaint Counsel's blinkered pursuit of a corporate veil theory that, as articulated in Respondent's April 15 Memorandum,<sup>2</sup> would, even if merited,<sup>3</sup> require further discovery from non-parties, some of them non-United States entities, which both Respondent and, Respondent presumes, those non-parties would oppose. As such, Complaint Counsel's Motion should be denied, and the ordinary

---

<sup>1</sup> See Dkt. No. 83, Complaint Counsel's Motion to Extend Certain Discovery Deadlines, CPSC Docket No. 21-1 (Mar. 3, 2022); *see also* Dkt. No. 84, Order on Complaint Counsel's Motion to Extend Certain Discovery Deadlines (Mar. 4, 2022).

<sup>2</sup> See Respondent's Memorandum in Opposition to Complaint Counsel's Motion to Compel Discovery, CPSC Docket No. 21-1, 5 (Apr. 15, 2022) (filed *in camera*); *see also id.* at 27-28; *see also id.* at Note 106.

<sup>3</sup> As Respondent has made clear

- 1) TKASC exists as a legal, functioning entity that
- 2) CPSC has engaged with on the issue of excessive Gap Space for nearly a decade (without questioning TKASC's resources), and that
- 3) has launched two separate efforts to address the potential hazard associated with Gap Space (created by improper installation) that is the focus of the Complaint, including the prior homeSAFE Campaign (which CPSC approved without in 2014 asking about finances, even though the Company had ceased manufacturing and distributing residential elevator components in 2012) and
- 4) the ongoing Home Elevator Safety Program (which offers free inspections and, as needed, free installation of free Space Guards, in essence providing that portion of the remedies the Complaint seeks that are within CPSC's authority and offering as much as or more than four other manufacturers "recalls"), a Program that
- 5) TKASC has committed to continue operating through at least 2025, a commitment that TKASC is more than capable of fulfilling.

Moreover, as articulated in Respondent's April 15 Memorandum, the only operational entity to which TKASC reports (though TKASC retains full operational authority and financial resources to make all decisions necessary to the continuation of its Program) is a German company that, other than the Business Unit of which TKASC is the only domestic member, is primarily a manufacturer of elevators and other equipment for the *commercial* market and over which CPSC would not have jurisdiction even if the residential elevator components that are the subject of the Complaint were "consumer products" within the meaning of the CPSA. As such, there is no legal or factual basis to even permit Complaint Counsel to continue its fishing expedition, and, even if there were such basis, the only operational "bigger fish" in TKASC's corporate pond is one that is farther removed from the facts relevant to the potential hazard associated with excessive Gap Spaces and even farther removed from CPSC's lawful authority than TKASC is.

presumption in the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission's ("CPSC") Rules of Practice – that "there shall be no reply to the response expressing opposition to the motion" – should hold.

In the alternative, Respondent requests that, if the Presiding Officer grants Complaint Counsel's Motion, the Presiding Officer concurrently order that Respondent shall have three working days in which to file a surreply of no more than five pages and limited to the allegations of fact and law reflected in Complaint Counsel's reply. Permitting Complaint Counsel extraordinary leave to reply but not affording Respondent the opportunity to respond to "new factual material" and new (if tardy) reference to CPSC precedent would prejudice Respondent's ability to defend against Complaint Counsel's claims.

Dated: April 19, 2022



---

Sheila A. Millar (DC Bar 339341)  
202-434-4143 (direct dial)  
millar@khlaw.com

Eric P. Gotting (MD Bar 9612170350/DC Bar  
456406)  
202-434-4269 (direct dial)  
gotting@khlaw.com

S. Michael Gentine (MD Bar 1212110311/DC Bar  
1644540)  
202-434-4164 (direct dial)  
gentine@khlaw.com

Taylor D. Johnson (DC Bar 1616613)  
202-434-4255 (direct dial)  
johnsont@khlaw.com

Anushka N. Rahman (DC Bar 1048328/NY Bar  
5421433)  
202-434-4116 (direct dial)  
rahman@khlaw.com

KELLER AND HECKMAN LLP  
1001 G Street, N.W.  
Suite 500 West  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 434-4100

Michael J. Garnier (DC Bar 432819/VA Bar 23994)

mjgarnier@garnierlaw.com

GARNIER & GARNIER, P.C.

2579 John Milton Drive

Suite 200

Herndon, VA 20171

(703) 237-2010

Meredith M. Causey (AR Bar 2012265)

501-379-1743 (direct dial)

mcausey@qgtlaw.com

QUATTLEBAUM, GROOMS & TULL PLLC

111 Center Street

Suite 1900

Little Rock, AR 72201

(501) 379-1700

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT,

TK Access Solutions Corp.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to 16 C.F.R. § 1025.16, as adopted by the Presiding Officer in CPSC Docket No. 21-1, I hereby certify that on April 19, 2022, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Respondent's Notice of Intent to Respond was filed with the Secretary of the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission and served on all parties and participants of record in these proceedings in the following manner:

By electronic mail to the Secretary of the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission:

Alberta Mills  
Secretary  
U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission  
4330 East West Highway  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
amills@cpsc.gov

By electronic mail to the Presiding Officer:

The Honorable Mary Withum, Administrative Law Judge  
c/o Alberta E. Mills  
Secretary  
U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission  
4330 East West Highway  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
amills@cpsc.gov

By electronic mail to Complaint Counsel:

Mary B. Murphy  
Complaint Counsel  
Director  
Division of Enforcement and Litigation  
Office of Compliance and Field Operations  
U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission  
4330 East West Highway  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
mmurphy@cpsc.gov

Gregory M. Reyes, Trial Attorney  
Michael J. Rogal, Trial Attorney  
Frederick C. Millett, Trial Attorney

Joseph E. Kessler, Trial Attorney  
Nicholas J. Linn, Trial Attorney  
Complaint Counsel  
Division of Enforcement and Litigation  
Office of Compliance and Field Operations  
U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission  
4330 East West Highway  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
greyes@cpsc.gov  
mroga@cpsc.gov  
fmillett@cpsc.gov  
jkessler@cpsc.gov  
nlinn@cpsc.gov



Sheila A. Millar