

2005 OCT 7 AM 11 58

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE
STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF TWIN FALLS

In Re SRBA	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
	)	FILE LATE OBJECTION AND
Case No. 39576	)	SETTING DEADLINES
	)	
	)	SUBCASE NO.: 25-14070
_____	)	

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

An *Objection* was filed on September 14, 2005 by Robert L. Clark. The SRBA District court treated the *Objection* as a *Motion to File Late Objection*. The *Motion* seeks to amend the notice of claim for this water right by increasing the quantity element. A hearing was held on the *Motion* on September 28, 2005.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The SRBA Administrative Orders do not provide a standard to be applied for filing late objections. However, the court's administrative rules set forth that *Motions to File a Late Notice of Claim* are to be reviewed under the criteria of I.R.C.P. 55(c) and 60(b). *SRBA Administrative Order 1 (AO1)* § 4 (d)(2)(d).

According to case law and the Rules of Civil Procedure, a court applies the criteria of I.R.C.P. 55(c) when determining whether to allow the filing of a late answer. *Motions for Late Objection* have been reviewed in the SRBA under the same criteria of Rule 55(c). The proponent of a *Motion for Late Objection*, like a party seeking to file an untimely answer, must show both "good cause" for untimeliness and the existence of a "meritorious position." I.R.C.P. 55(c).

The SRBA has recently affirmed the legal standard of what must be shown to satisfy "good cause" and "meritorious position." The legal standard for "good cause" for untimeliness of an

objection is determined under the standard for setting aside the entry of a default under I.R.C.P. 55(c). The "good cause" standard under Rule 55(c) is more lenient than the standard under Rule 60(b). The I.R.C.P. 55(c) standard takes into account the following factors:

- 1) whether the default was willful;
- 2) whether setting aside the judgment would prejudice the opponent; and
- 3) whether a meritorious position has been presented.

Order on Motion to Set Aside Partial Decrees and File Late Objections (A.L. Cattle) (Jan. 31, 2001).

In support of the *Motion*, Mr. Clark explained that he thought he had filed an objection when he sent a Notice of Error to the Idaho Department of Water Resources. In addition, Mr. Clark asserts that he has historically used more water than the quantity recommended in the *Director's Report*. He seeks to increase quantity. No parties to the SRBA opposed Mr. Clark's *Motion*, and there is no showing prejudice would result from allowing the late objection.

III. FINDINGS

Mr. Clark failed to file a timely *Objection* to the *Director's Report* because he thought he had done so when he filed the Notice of Error. There was no opposition to the *Motion*. Therefore, the *Motion to File Late Objection* is **granted**. The *Objection* will be filed with the court dated September 28, 2005.

IT IS ORDERED that the following deadlines shall govern further proceedings:

November 25, 2005	5:00 pm	Deadline to file Response to Objection
June 14, 2006	10:00 am	Scheduling Conference
Location: Snake River Basin Adjudication 253 3 rd Ave. North Twin Falls, Idaho 83301		

Parties may participate by phone for the Status Conference by dialing 1-225-383-1099 and when prompted enter participant code 926509.

DATED October 7, 2005.


BRIGETTE BILYEU, Special Master
Snake River Basin Adjudication

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that a true and correct copy of the ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO FILE LATE OBJECTION AND SETTING DEADLINES was mailed on October 07, 2005, with sufficient first-class postage to the following:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Represented by:

US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ENVIRONMENT & NATL' RESOURCES

550 WEST FORT STREET, MSC 033

BOISE, ID 83724

DIRECTOR OF IDWR

PO BOX 83720

BOISE, ID 83720-0098

ROBERT L CLARK

3617 E 800 N

MENAN, ID 83434

Phone: 208-754-4238