



the § 61.15(a) charge could not stand if not tied to the falsification of the medical application.<sup>1</sup>

Consequently, footnote 3 on page 3 is hereby changed to replace "drug" with "theft" and remove the reference to dismissal of the § 61.15(a) charge. In its entirety, it will read:

3/ The details of the six traffic convictions, and another, are contained in the Administrator's complaint, ¶¶ 2-12. The law judge noted that the theft conviction occurred after the date of the medical application and, therefore, would not be considered. This does not compromise the revocation action, however, because one intentional falsification will support revocation. See, e.g., Administrator v. Cassis, 4 NTSB 555 (1982), reconsideration denied, 4 NTSB 562 (1983), aff'd Cassis v. Helms, Admr., FAA, et al., 737 F.2d 545 (6th Cir. 1984).

In addition, ordering paragraph 3 of our prior decision is stricken.

**ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

1. The Administrator's petition is granted; and
2. Our decision served April 29, 1993 is amended as set forth here.

VOGT, Chairman, COUGHLIN, Vice Chairman, LAUBER, HART and HAMMERSCHMIDT, Members of the Board, concurred in the above order.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Administrator is not too late in raising this issue. Although the law judge failed to discuss which facts of his analysis supported each violation found, the fact remains that the law judge did find that both rules were violated. Thus, contrary to the respondent's reply, the Administrator had no reason to appeal that ruling.