

2007 JUL 13 PM 3:08

DISTRICT COURT-SRBA
TWIN FALLS CO., IDAHO

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.: 21-13013
_____	)	

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

An *Objection* was filed by Donna T and Robert E. Fuchs on March 12, 2007. The Court treated the *Objection* as a *Motion to File a Late Objection*. A hearing was held on the *Motion* on June 27, 2007.

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*, counsel Ray Rigby explained that the objectors did not intentionally miss the *Objection* deadline. The lateness of the *Objection* was therefore, not willful. No parties to the SRBA opposed the *Motion*, and there is no showing prejudice would result from allowing the late objection.


III. FINDINGS

The Fuchses did not file a timely *Objection* to the *Director's Report* but did not intentionally miss the deadline. The Fuchses did assert 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 June 27, 2007.

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

July 27, 2007	5:00 pm	Deadline to file Response to Objection
September 27, 2007	10:30 am	Settlement Conference Location: IDWR Eastern Regional Office 900 N. Skyline Dr. Suite A Idaho Falls, Idaho
October 3, 2007	11:00 am	Status Conference Location: Snake River Basin Adjudication 253 3 rd Ave. North Twin Falls, Idaho 83301

DATED: July 13, 2007.


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 July 13, 2007, with sufficient first-class postage to the following:

DONNA & ROBERT FUCHS

Represented by:

RAY W. RIGBY

25 N 2ND E

PO BOX 250

REXBURG, ID 83440-0250

Phone: 208-356-3633

RLF I LLC RLF II LLC

RLF I LLC RLF II LLC ET AL

Represented by:

ROBERT L HARRIS

1000 RIVERWALK DR, STE 200

PO BOX 50130

IDAHO FALLS, ID 83405

Phone: 208-523-0620

DIRECTOR OF IDWR

PO BOX 83720

BOISE, ID 83720-0098