

RECEIVED

AUG 14 2008

DEPARTMENT OF
WATER RESOURCES

2008 AUG 12 AM 11:56
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 DEADLINE
	)	
	)	SUBCASE NO.: 37-2611C
	)	
_____	)	

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

A *Motion to File Late Objection* was filed by Collister, Inc. on May 12, 2008. A hearing was held on the *Motion* on August 6, 2008.

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*, Collister, Inc. explained that the untimeliness of the *Objection* was not willful. This right was a split from a root right which was split multiple times. It was not until recently that Collister, Inc. realized that the split parts did not add up to the total for the original right.

A meritorious position was alleged by Collister, Inc. based on the discovery that the split parts do not add up to the total for the original right. Thus, Collister, Inc. seeks to file a late *Objection*. No parties to the SRBA opposed the *Motion*, and there is no showing prejudice would result from allowing the late objection.

III. FINDINGS

There was no opposition to the *Motion*. Therefore, the *Motion to File Late Objection* is **granted**. IT IS ORDERED that the following deadline shall govern further proceedings:

September 29, 2008

5:00 pm

Deadline to file Response to Objection

Dated: August 12, 2008.


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 DEADLINE was mailed on August 12, 2008, with sufficient first-class postage to the following:

COLLISTER INC
Represented by:
MICHAEL P LAWRENCE
PO BOX 2720
BOISE, ID 83701
Phone: 208-388-1200

DIRECTOR OF IDWR
PO BOX 83720
BOISE, ID 83720-0098