

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2006

DEPARTMENT OF
WATER RESOURCES

2006 NOV 28 PM 4:19

DISTRICT COURT-SRBA
TWIN FALLS CO., IDAHO
FILED

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 NOS.: 27-7260

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

A *Motion to File Late Objection and Affidavit of Karin Scott* was filed by Brady and Karin Scott on October 13, 2006. A hearing was held on the *Motion* on November 8, 2006.

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 I (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*, the movants Brady and Karin Scott asserted that they have actually pursued a settlement on this matter and would have filed timely objections had they not believed their issues were essentially settled. The lateness of the objection was therefore, not willful. Counsel for the Scotts also asserted a meritorious position. No parties to the SRBA opposed the *Motion*, and there is no showing prejudice would result from allowing the late objection.

III. FINDINGS

The Scotts did not file a timely *Objection* to the *Director's Report* because they were pursuing settlement. The Scotts asserted a meritorious position. 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 November 8, 2006.

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

December 22, 2006	5:00 pm	Deadline to file Response
Before March 14, 2007		Deadline to hold informal Settlement Conference
March 14, 2007	9:30 am	Status 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: November 29, 2006.


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 November 28, 2006, with sufficient first-class postage to the following:

BRADY & KARIN SCOTT

Represented by:

JERRY R. RIGBY

25 N 2ND E

PO BOX 250

REXBURG, ID 83440-0250

Phone: 208-356-3633

DIRECTOR OF IDWR

PO BOX 83720

BOISE, ID 83720-0098