

Time	Speake	Note
9:13:30 AM	J	BEGIN
9:13:54 AM		ASK FOR APPEARANCES
9:14:09 AM		CALLS CASE
9:15:11 AM		BACK TO APPEARANCES
9:18:29 AM	J	START WITH THE UNITS OF MEASUREMENT QUESTION
9:18:49 AM		NOTE STATES RESPONSE ABOUT TIMELINESS
9:19:01 AM		WANT TO ADDRESS THE MERITS OF IT RATHER THAN TECHNICAL
9:19:07 AM		WHAT IS THE NEED FOR THIS AT THIS TIME
9:19:19 AM	UNIDENTIFIED	OPENS
9:19:49 AM		LOOK AT D
9:20:14 AM		NEED THOSE CONVERSIONS IN ABLE TO BE ABLE TO JUGGLE BACK AND FORTH
9:20:41 AM		BOTH PARTIES HAVE USED THEM IN THEIR CALCULATIONS
9:20:57 AM		GO TO F
9:21:28 AM	J	HAVE YOU TRIED TO STIPULATE
9:21:36 AM	MARSHALL	YES THAT IS WHY WE FILED A REQUEST FOR ADMISSION AND A REQUEST FOR STIPULATION
9:22:00 AM	J	DO YOU NEED IT IN CONNECTION WITH THE MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
9:22:06 AM	MARSHALL	YES, GIVES EXAMPLES
9:23:00 AM	J	TURN TO THE STATE
9:23:05 AM	JOHN UTTON	THIS IS THE SAME ARGUMENT THAT MARSHALL ALREADY MADE PREVIOUSLY AND THE COURT DID NOT EXTEND THE TIME
9:23:28 AM		THERE IS A STATE STATUES 72-5-19 WHERE THE STATE LEGISLATURE SET FORTH
9:24:21 AM		THERE IS A NUMBER OF THESE ITEMS WHERE THERE IS ALREADY AUTHORITY
9:24:41 AM		LETTER C ON HIS LIST OF ITEMS WE DISAGREE WITH THAT IT IS A DIFFERENT NUMBER
9:25:28 AM		WEIGHT DEPENDS APOND A NUMBER OF FACTORS, WE HAVE NEVER CALCULATED THAT
9:26:00 AM		HE DOES NOT NEED US TO STIPULATE HE JUST NEEDS A REFERENCE THAT IS RELIABLE AND NOONE IS GOING TO ARGUE WITH HIM BUT TO CHACE US AROUND ABOUT TRYING TO STIPULATE STUFF IS NOT HELPFUL IT IS DISTRACTING

9:26:40 AM	J	I DO NOT REMEMBER ARGUING THIS MR UTTON, I THINK THAT IF I RECALL CORRECTLY THAT THE SUBJECT CAME UP AND THE STATE WANTED TO RESPOND TO IT... I DO NOT REMEMBER THAT WE ARGUED THIS ISSUE. THERE WAS NEVER A REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION GRANTED WITH RESPECT TO IT IN MY MIND NOR WAS THE TIME FOR THE SETTLING PARTIES WAS THERE A MOTION FOR THE TIME FOR THE SETTLING PARTIES RESPONSE TO BE SHORTENED BUT I DO NOT REMEMBER THE ISSUE BEING ARGUED BEFORE OR THE COURT RULING ON IT
9:27:34 AM	UTTON	I AM JUST TALKING ABOUT THE TIMELINESS OF IT...AT OUR LAST HEARING REGARDING DISCOVERY THIS WAS NOT ONE OF THE ITEMS
9:28:09 AM		THERE WAS NOT EXTENSION OF TIME
9:28:14 AM	J	MR MARSHALL DO YOU WANT TO RESPOND
9:28:18 AM	MARSH ALL	ON TIMELINESS WE FILED THIS REQUEST FOR ADMISSION AND STIPULATION ON FEB
9:28:23 AM	J	MAR MARSHALL I AMNOT INTERESTED IN THE TIMELINESS TO TELL YOU THE TRUTH AS I SAID AT THE OUTSET IN THE OVERALL SENCE I DO NOT THINK THAT WAS TIMELY...CUT THROUGH ALL OF THAT
9:29:03 AM		IF YOU COULD RESPOND TO WHAT MR UTTON SAID
9:29:04 AM	MARSH ALL	IF MR UTTON COULD REPEAT THAT NUMBER WE COULD STIPULATE HERE
9:29:42 AM	UTTON? ??	CITING NUMBERS WHAT HE WOULD STIPULATE
9:30:11 AM	J	MR MARSHAL WHAT I WOULD LIKE YOU TO DO IS GO TO THE SOURCES THAT MR UTTON HAS CITED THAT ARE THE STATE SOURCES AND COME UP WITH THE FIGURES THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE APPROPRIATE BASED ON THE STATE LAW OR REGUALTION AND PRESENT THAT TO THE SETTLING PARTIES FOR STIPULATION
9:30:47 AM	MARSH ALL	THERE IS ONE NUMBER THAT NEEDS COURTS ASSISTANCE, THE WEIGHT OF WATER
9:31:04 AM		ANY NUMBER WE PICK THEY WILL SAY THAT IS NOT RIGHT, WE NEED THEIR ASSISTANCE. THEY WANT TO PICK A REPRESENTATIVE NUMBER FOR THE DENSITY OF WATER, WE CAN NOT DO THAT FOR THEM
9:31:19 AM		WE NEED FOR THEM TO PICK A NUMBER FOR THE DENSITY OF WATER BECAUSE IT DOES VARY A LITTLE BIT DEPENDING ON THE TEMPERATURE
9:31:27 AM	J	DO YOU HAVE A SPECIFIC LOCATION THAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT
9:31:33 AM	MARSH ALL	IN A AND C
9:32:15 AM	J	I AM UNDERSTANDING THAT IT ALSO DEPENDS UPON THE LOCATION
9:32:31 AM		ARE YOU IN A POSITION TO STATE THE DENSITY OR WEIGHT THAT YOU BELIEVE IS APPROPRIATE
9:32:51 AM	UTTON	MR MARSHALL IS MIS PHRASING THE PURPOSE OF THIS SAYING HE IS HAPPY TO USE THE NUMBER THAT THE STATE WANTS TO USE. WE DO NOT INTEND TO USE ANY NUMBER

9:33:11 AM		THIS KIND OF PIA ANALYSIS THAT HE WANTS TO DO AT NIIP IS IRRELEVANT, CONGRESS HAS ALREADY APPROVED NIIP
9:33:29 AM		WE DO NOT HAVE A NUMBER FOR THE WEIGHT OF WATER AT NIIP, WE DO NOT HAVE AN INTENT TO CALCULATE THAT NUMBER
9:33:40 AM	POLLACK	I FEEL THAT WE ARE GOING DOWN A PATH THAT WE DO NOT NEED TO GO DOWN
9:33:51 AM		YOUR HONOR ASKED MR MARSHALL IF ANY OF THESE NUMBERS ARE RELEVANT TO ANY OF THE MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT. THEY ARE NOT
9:34:01 AM		THE WEIGHT OF WATER HAS NOT BEEN RAISED IN ANY MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
9:34:24 AM		HE IS SEEKING STIPULATION FOR SETTLING PARTIES
9:34:58 AM	MARSHALL	CLOSING
9:35:29 AM	J	I AGREE WITH WHAT MR UTTON HAS SAID WITH REGARD TO THE POSITION WHERE WE ARE RIGHT NOW, IF YOU CAN STIPULATE WITH RESPECT TO ALL OF THE OTHER ISSUES WITH THE SETTLING PARTIES AND YOU HAVE A WITNESS THAT CAN CALCULATE THAT AND GOING TO NEED TO USE THAT CALCULATION WE WILL GO FROM THERE
9:36:27 AM	MARSHALL	ARE THEY DISPUTING ANY OF THE OTHER CALCULATIONS SO WE CAN PUT THIS TO BED
9:36:36 AM	??	ANSWERS
9:37:16 AM	J	MOVE ON TO THE EVAPORATIVE ISSUE
9:37:33 AM	MARSHALL	THE FACT AND THE LAW IS THAT EVAPORATION FROM MAJOR COLORADO RIVER RESERVOIR OUTSIDE OF NM IS CHARGED TO NM AND REDUCES THE AMOUNT OF WATER AVAILABLE TO NM
9:37:50 AM		MOST PARTIES ACKNOWLEDGE THAT FACT IN THEIR CALC
9:38:10 AM		PRIMARY BEING LAKE POWELL NEXT BEING FLAMING GORGE
9:38:25 AM		THEIR OWN CALCULATIONS SHOW OTHERWISE
9:39:00 AM		POINTING TO HIS REPLY EXHIBIT 1
9:40:09 AM		IT LISTS ALL OF THE OUT OF STATE RESERVOIRS THAT ARE CHARGES PARTIALLY TO NM
9:40:21 AM		NM IS BEING CHARGED ABOUT 60,000 ACRE FEET PER YEAR
9:41:13 AM	J	WHAT IS AVAILABLE PUBLICALLY
9:41:22 AM	MARSHALL	THERE IS A LOT OF INFORMATION AVAILABLE....
9:41:48 AM	J	PLEASE RESPOND TO MY QUESTION, CHANGE QUESTION WHAT IS NOT AVAILABLE PUBLICALLY
9:42:12 AM	MARSHALL	THIS IS DISCOVERY FROM THE PARTIES WE DO NOT KNOW WHERE HE GOT THOSE NUMBERS
9:42:40 AM		THE INFORMATION THAT WE NEED IS AVAILABLE FROM MR WHIPPLE
9:42:46 AM	J	DID YOU NOT TAKE MR WHIPPLES DEPOSITION
9:42:50 AM	MARSHALL	NO

9:43:19 AM		TALKING ABOUT MOTION FILED BEFORE JUDGE SANCHEZ
9:43:38 AM		JUDGE SANCHEZ SAID YOU ARE ENTITLED TO THAT DISCOVERY BUT NOT NOW
9:43:45 AM		ONCE THEY FILE THEIR SETTLEMENT YOU CAN GO FORWARD, THEY FILED AND WE WERE NOT ALLOWED TO GO FORWARD FOR ANOTHER YEAR
9:44:19 AM		HOW THEY COME UP WITH THESE NUMBERS IS A BIGGER MISTERY THAT EVER
9:44:29 AM	J	CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT IT IS THAT YOU ARE ASKING FOR
9:44:36 AM	MARSH ALL	WE ARE ASKING THE COURT TO RECONSIDER HIS RULING WHICH WAS THAT EVAPORATION FROM THE OUT OF STATE RESERVOIRS IS BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DISCOVERY
9:44:53 AM	J	WHAT SPECIFIC INFORMATION ARE YOUR REQUESTING
9:45:04 AM	MARSH ALL	ANSWERS
9:45:55 AM		THIS IS WHAT WE CALL MR WHIPPLES LESS IS MORE THEORY
9:46:27 AM	J	MR GUARINO DO YOU WNAT TO RESPOND
9:46:30 AM	GUARIN O	I AM GOING TO ASK COURT TO PUT AN END TO THIS ARGUMENT
9:46:43 AM		MR MARSHALL HAS COME TO THIS COURT NO LESS THAN 3 TIMES TO ARGUE WHAT EVER HE WANTS
9:47:02 AM		HE POINTS TO NOTHING THAT WE HAVE SAID THAT IS A MISREPRESENTATION
9:47:11 AM		OUR POSITION HAS BEEN VERY CLEAR THROUGHOUT THIS PROCEEDING
9:47:11 AM		STATES POSITION
9:48:17 AM		THE INFORMATION THAT HE SEEKS IS NOT RELEVANT
9:49:29 AM	J	FOR LAKE POWELL AND THE FLAMING GORGE HOW DIFFICULT IS IT TO COME UP WITH EVAPORATION FIGURES
9:49:49 AM	GUARIN O	I HAVE NO IDEA BECAUSE THEY ARE WELL OUTSIDE NM
9:50:44 AM		I WOULD HAVE TO GO ENGAGE FEDERAL PERSONELL THROUGHOUT THE REGION TO MAKE THESE DETERMINATIONS BASED ON WHAT HE IS REQUESTING
9:50:57 AM	MARSH ALL	MR GUARINO IS BEING EVASIVE, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT MAJOR RESERVOIRS WHICH ARE CHARGED TO NM
9:51:37 AM		NAMING
9:52:36 AM	??	THIS IDEA THAT MR MARSHALL HAS BEEN DENIED DISCOVERY IS DISINGENIOUS, WE HAVE PROVIDED...
9:53:01 AM	J- SINGER	WHERE IS THAT
9:53:09 AM	SINGER	IDENTIFIES
9:53:30 AM		IT HAS BEEN AVAILABLE ONLINE SINCE MAY 2006
9:53:34 AM	J	IS THERE A MORE CURRENT DOCUMENT
9:53:43 AM	SINGER	DECMBER 2012

<u>9:54:15 AM</u>	HORNE R	IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT A LOT OF THIS STUFF IS PUBLICALLY AVAILABLE BUT THIS BRINGS UP A QUESTION AS FAR AS EVIDENCE GOES
<u>9:54:59 AM</u>		QUESTION REGARDING RELYING ON PUBLICALLY AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS AT TRIAL AND ADMITTING THEM OR STIPULATION TO THEM
<u>9:55:33 AM</u>	J	NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO GIVE YOU A RULING AT THIS TIME ON THAT. WHEN TIME COMES GOING TO HAVE TO LOOK AT EACH PIECE OF EVIDENCE AND DETERMINE WHAT IS APPROPRIATE FOR ADMISSION AS EVIDENCE
<u>9:56:09 AM</u>	MARSH ALL	CONCLUSION
<u>9:57:02 AM</u>	J	YES NIIP MOTION IS NEXT
<u>9:57:12 AM</u>	MARSH ALL	ASKED FOR PRODUCTION OF BASIC DOCUMENTS
<u>9:57:35 AM</u>		COURT OVERRULLED AND THEY PRODUCED THE DOCUEMNTS
<u>9:57:52 AM</u>		THE COURT SAID ROPOUND THEM IN INTERROGATORY FORMS WHICH WE DID
<u>9:59:53 AM</u>		WE HAD THE DEPOSITION IN ALBUQUERQUE
<u>10:00:10 AM</u>		TALKING ABOUT MR HASKIE TESTIMONY
<u>10:00:49 AM</u>		WE ARE STILL ENTITLED TO DISCOVERY ABOUT PIA WHETHER IT IS THEIR THEORY OR NOT
<u>10:01:12 AM</u>		THEY HAVE WITH SOME SUCCESS BEEN ABLE TO SAY THAT IS NOT OUR THEORY SO YOU CAN NOT ASK ABOUT IT
<u>10:01:35 AM</u>		TALKING ABOUT JURISDICTION
<u>10:01:53 AM</u>		WE ARE GOING TO PUT ON OUR THEORY OF THE CASE WHICH HAS A LOT MORE MERIT THAN THIERS
<u>10:02:04 AM</u>		GIVE EXAMPLE AT 10
<u>10:03:13 AM</u>		WE HAVE RAISED IN OUR OBJECTIONS THAT NIIP IS NOT PIA
<u>10:05:22 AM</u>	J	MR POLLACK
<u>10:05:28 AM</u>	POLLAC K	NO ONE IS STONEWALLING HERE AND MR MARSHALL HAS HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO GET THE INFORMATION. WE HAVE NEVER DENIED HIM ACCESS TO INFORMATION BASED ON THE FACT THAT HIS THEORY IS DIFFERENT FROM OURS
<u>10:05:54 AM</u>		THERE IS NOT A SINGLE PERSON THAT HAS ALL THE KNOWLEDGE OF ALL THE QUESTIONS THAT HE IS ASKING
<u>10:06:02 AM</u>		AS A RESULT WITH RESPECT TO NIIP. NIIP OPERATION, NIIP CONSTRUCTION BETWEEN THE US AND THE NN WE DESIGNATED 4 30-B-6 WITNESSES
<u>10:06:25 AM</u>		DURING THE DEPOSITION OF MR HASKIE MR MARSHALL CONTINUED TO REFER TO NIIP NAPI AS THOUGH THE TWO WERE ONE IN THE SAME. I OBJECTED AND ATTEMPTED TO EXPLAIN

<u>10:06:35</u> AM		NIIP IS A PROJECT, NAPI IS A OPERATOR
<u>10:07:15</u> AM		CONTINUES EXPLAINING WHERE INFORMATION WOULD COME FROM
<u>10:08:08</u> AM		DEPOSITIONS WERE NEVER SCHEDULED
<u>10:08:52</u> AM		THE 2 REPOSITORIES IN FARMINGTON WERE ESTABLISHED BY THE US
<u>10:09:22</u> AM		WITH RESPECT TO NOT BRINGING DOCUEMNTS TO THE DEPOSITION, THERE WERE NO DOCUMENTS TO BRING OTHER THAN THE ONES THAT MR HASKIE HAD PREVIOUSLY DISCLOSED IN RESPONSE TO DISCOVERY TO MR MARSHALL
<u>10:09:55</u> AM		THE COURT GAVE MR MARSHALL ADDITIONAL BECAUSE DEPOSITIONS HAD BEEN CANCELLED
<u>10:10:40</u> AM		THERE WERE 4 30-B-6 WITNESSES IDENTIFIED BETWEEN THE US AND THE NN AND MR MARSHALL CHOSE NOT TO DEPOSE THE WITNESS THAT MIGHT HAVE GOTTEN HIM THE ANSWERS THAT HE SOUGHT
<u>10:10:57</u> AM	MARSH ALL	THOSE REPRESENTATIONS ARE NOT ACCURATE
<u>10:11:27</u> AM		MR HASKIE WAS DESIGNATED AS A WITNESS ON THOSE TOPICE AND WAS NOT ABLE TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS
<u>10:11:44</u> AM	J	SPECIFICALLY CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT I SHOULD GO BACK AND TO FOR THE REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION AND THE DESIGNATION
<u>10:11:59</u> AM	MARSH ALL	START WITH OUR REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION APPROX 1 THROUGH 4
<u>10:12:31</u> AM	J	WHO MADE THE REQUEST AND WHAT FORM WAS THE REQUEST
<u>10:12:36</u> AM	MARSH ALL	WILL HAVE TO PULL IT UP
<u>10:12:46</u> AM	J	YOU SAID YOU ARE GOING TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THE EMAILS WILL YOU ALSO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THE REQUEST FOR A DESIGNATION AND THE DESIGNATION AND ANYTHING ELSE THAT YOU DEEM PERTINANT TO THAT ISSUE. JUST ASKING FOR THE DOCUMENTS, NOT ARGUMENT IN CONNECTION
<u>10:13:15</u> AM	MARSH ALL	I AM POINT TO MR HASKIES DEPOSITION (READING)
<u>10:13:51</u> AM		WE WERE GOING TO TRY TO DEPOSE MR LEEPER BUT AS THE COURT WILL RECALL OTHER PEOPLE WERE ...
<u>10:13:58</u> AM	J	YOU BROKE UP
<u>10:14:06</u> AM	MARSH ALL	CONTINES... WERE RELYING ON OTHERS TO DO IT AND HAD PROBLEMS WITH LOGISTICS
<u>10:14:34</u> AM		BURDEN OF PROOF

<u>10:14:52</u> AM		WE DO NOT HAVE THE MONEY TO KEEP PURSUING THIS
<u>10:15:07</u> AM		ASK THE COURT TO LOOK VERY CAREFULLY AT THE EXCERPTS THAT WE HAVE ALREADY PROVIDED FROM MR HASKIES DEPOSITION WHERE HE DID NOT BRING ANY OF THE THINGS THAT HE WAS ASKED TO BRING
<u>10:15:18</u> AM	J	I HAVE AND I WILL AGAIN
<u>10:15:25</u> AM	MARSH ALL	IF PIA IS OFF THE TABLE WE CAN MOVE FORWARD
<u>10:15:51</u> AM	J	MR POLLACK, ELABORATE FOR THE COURT WHAT IS THE NN POSITION WITH RESPECT TO THE MATTER OF PROVING ITS WATER RIGHTS TO NIIP
<u>10:16:24</u> AM	POLLAC K	WE DO NOT THINK IT IS THE COURTS ROLE HERE TO DETERMINE WHAT THE WATER RIGHTS ARE FOR NIIP. WE THINK WHAT THE COURT IS CHARGED WITH IS APPROVING AN OVERALL SETTLEMENT AND GETTING INTO PROOF OF EACH OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE WATER RIGHTS THAT ARE PROPOSED IN THE SETTLEMENT IS BEYOND WHAT THE COURT WAS INSTRUCTED TO DO
<u>10:16:58</u> AM		THE INITIAL ORDER BY JUDGE SANCHEZ SAYS THE PURPOSE OF THE NAVAJO INTER SE IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT TO APPROVE A SETTLEMENT THAT WAS RATIFIED BY CONGRESS IN 2009. IT IS NOT TO GO INTO THE MERITS THAT ARE IDENTIFIED IN THE SETTLEMENT DECREE
<u>10:17:28</u> AM		WITH RESPECT TO THE WATER RIGHTS FOR NIIP NO ONE HERE IS ARGUING THAT THE WATER RIGHTS FOR NIIP ARE BASED ON PIA AND WE HAVE BEEN CONSISTANT ON THAT FROM THE BEGINNING
<u>10:17:43</u> AM		THE COURT WILL RECALL THAT I DID ARGUE TO THE COURT WHEN I ASKED FOR A PROTECTEIVE ORDER TO PUT A STOP TO ALL OF THIS DISCOVERY ABOUT NIIP AND PIA, I ARGUED THAT WE WERE NOT BASING A WATER RIGHT FOR NIIP ON PIA WERE NOT BASING IT EITHER IN THE SETTLEMENT OR IN THE US STATEMENT OF CLAIMS BASED ON PIA AND THE WATER RIGHT FOR NIIP IS A WATER RIGHT THAT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS AND THAT THE COURT CAN NOT AGGRIVATE THE CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF WATER
<u>10:18:20</u> AM		CONGRESS SAID THE NN WILL HAVE THE RIGHT TO A DIVERSION OF 508,000 ACRE FEET TO IRRIGATE 110,630 ACRES OF NIIP
<u>10:18:34</u> AM		WITH RESPECT TO THE COURTS JURISDICTION ALL WE ARE SAYING IS THAT THE COURT DOES NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO CHANGE THE ACT OF CONGRESS
<u>10:18:51</u> AM		WE NEVER SAID THAT THE COURT HAS NO JUJRISDICTION OVER THE NN OR THE US
<u>10:19:04</u> AM	J	ANYTHING FURTHER WITH RESPECT TO THIS ISSUE

<u>10:19:09</u> <u>AM</u>	I AM GOING TO TAKE THESE LAST TWO ISSUES UNDER ADVISEMENT. MR MARSHALL WITH RESPECT TO THE LAST ONE YOU OFFERED TO PROVIDE THE COURT THE EMAILS THAT YOU WERE REFERRING TO AND EMAILS THAT WERE GOING TO COUNTER MR POLLACKS STATEMENTS AND ALSO YOU WERE GOING TO PROVIDE THE DOCUMENTS THAT WERE GOING TO BE PERTINENT TO THE QUESTION OF THE DESIGNATION OF MR HASKIE OF A 30-B-6 WITNESS AND WHAT RESPECT HE WAS IDENTIFIED
<u>10:19:59</u> <u>AM</u>	THE OTHER ISSUE WAS THE EVAPORATION ISSUE AND I WILL ALSO TAKE UNDER ADVISEMENT
<u>10:20:07</u> <u>AM</u>	ON THE FIRST ISSUE I WOULD ASK THAT THE PARTIES WORK TOGETHER TO STIPULATE TO THE EXTENT THAT YOU ARE ABLE TO STIPULATE
<u>10:20:18</u> <u>AM</u>	I HOPE THAT THERE IS NOT TOO MUCH FUSS BEING MADE HERE
<u>10:20:33</u> <u>AM</u>	I WOULD LIKE TO SEE YOU RESOLVE THIS BY STIPULATING TO THE EXTENT THAT YOU CAN
<u>10:21:06</u> <u>AM</u>	GREAT DEAL OF WORK TO DO WITH RESPECT TO THE MAY 10 DEADLINES
<u>10:21:16</u> <u>AM</u>	HAVE BEEN GOING THROUGH THE MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENTS
<u>10:21:24</u> <u>AM</u>	ADJOURNED