

SERVED: October 14, 2026

NTSB Order No. EA-6035

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD**  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Adopted by the NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD  
at its office in Washington, D.C.  
on the 13th day of October, 2026

|                                  |   |                 |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| _____                            | ) |                 |
| BRYAN BEDFORD, <sup>1</sup>      | ) |                 |
| Administrator,                   | ) |                 |
| Federal Aviation Administration, | ) |                 |
|                                  | ) |                 |
| Complainant,                     | ) |                 |
|                                  | ) |                 |
| v.                               | ) | Docket SE-30970 |
|                                  | ) |                 |
| ZACHARY E. BYERS,                | ) |                 |
|                                  | ) |                 |
| Respondent.                      | ) |                 |
| _____                            | ) |                 |

**ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

On August 27, 2026, respondent, through counsel, filed a timely petition for reconsideration (Petition) of NTSB Order No. EA-6030, served on July 28, 2026 (Decision), wherein the Board denied respondent's appeal and affirmed the law judge's order granting the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) motion for judgment on the pleadings. The FAA

---

<sup>1</sup> The original caption for this matter was *Stephen M. Dickson, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration v. Zachary E. Byers*.

filed a reply in opposition to respondent's motion on September 10, 2026. In his written initial decision, the law judge upheld the FAA's underlying Order of Suspension based on the conclusion that respondent failed to timely file an answer to the FAA's complaint. Respondent appealed, and the Board affirmed the law judge's conclusion in its Decision.

Section 821.50(c) of our Rules of Practice governs the submission and review of petitions for rehearing, reargument, reconsideration or modification of an order of the Board, and this provision states in pertinent part as follows:

The petition shall state briefly and specifically the matters of record alleged to have been erroneously decided, and the ground or grounds relied upon. If the petition is based, in whole or in part, upon new matter, it shall set forth such new matter and shall contain affidavits of prospective witnesses, authenticated documents, or both, or an explanation of why such substantiation is unavailable, and shall explain why such new matter could not have been discovered in the exercise of due diligence prior to the date on which the evidentiary record closed.

*To the extent the petition is not based upon new matter, the Board will not consider arguments that could have been made in the appeal or reply briefs received prior to the Board's decision.<sup>2</sup>*

In addition, § 821.50(d) states, "[r]epetitious petitions will not be entertained by the Board, and will be summarily dismissed."

In our Decision, we considered respondent's arguments on appeal relating to the

---

<sup>2</sup> 49 C.F.R. § 821.50(c) (emphasis added).

following: the validity of the service of the FAA's Order of Suspension; the proper application of 49 C.F.R. § 821.31(b) governing answers to FAA complaints; and, the applicability of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Pilot's Bill of Rights. We considered and rejected each of these in turn, and respondent's Petition merely reiterates these same arguments. Respondent's Petition thus warrants summary dismissal under 49 C.F.R. § 821.50(d).

**ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

Respondent's Petition is dismissed.

HOMENDY, Chairwoman; GRAHAM, Vice Chairman; CHAPMAN and DELEEUEW, Members of the Board, concurred in the above opinion and order.