1	GOLDBERG, STINNETT, MEYERS & DAVIS A Professional Corporation MERLE C. MEYERS, ESQ. #066849						
3	KATHERINE D. RAY, ESO. #121002						
4	44 Montgomery Street, Suite 2900 San Francisco, California 94104 Telephone: (415) 362-5045	50-275/323					
5	Attorneys for Modesto Irrigation District, Movant						
6							
7	IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT						
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
9	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION						
10							
11	In re	Case No. 01-30923					
	PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.,	Chapter 11					
12	Debtor.	R.S. No					
13		Date: July 18, 2001 Time: 1:30 p.m.					
14		Place: 22 <sup>nd</sup> Floor					
15		235 Pine Street San Francisco, CA					
16	<u></u>	Judge: Hon. Dennis Montali					
١7	DECLARATION OF MAXWELL M. BLECHER IN SUPPORT OF MOTION OF MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT FOR RELIEF FROM STAY						
18							
19							
20	il .						
21	I am personally familiar with each of the facts stated herein, to which I could competently testify if						
22	called upon to do so in a court of law.						
23	2. Since its inception on August 3, 1998, I have acted as lead counsel for Modesto						
24							
25							
26							
27	3. On August 3, 1998, MID, a municipal utility district which provides electricity and						
8!	J. On August 3, 1990, Mid, a mu	incipal dunity district winch provides electricity and					

Add: Rids Oge Mail Center ADDI

other services to industrial, commercial and residential customers in the greater Modesto area, commenced an action against the Debtor in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, entitled *Modesto Irrigation District v. Pacific Gas & Electric and Dynegy Power Services, Inc.*, No. C-98-3009-MHP, seeking, *inter alia*, a monetary judgment and injunctive relief under the Sherman Antitrust Act for damages arising out of the Debtor's refusal to interconnect transmission lines with MID at a designated substation in Pittsburg, California. MID's original complaint was dismissed on motion of the defendants, and an amended complaint was filed by MID on March 4, 1999. The defendants, including the Debtor through retained counsel, Heller, Ehrman, White & McAuliffe, then moved to dismiss the action a second time, asserting, *inter alia*, that the amended complaint failed to properly allege a conspiracy and that, in any event, the defendants' conduct was protected by the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine which immunizes efforts to prevent competition by involving governmental or regulatory processes.

- 4. On August 20, 1999, the District Court granted the defendants' motion to dismiss without leave to amend, finding that MID, as plaintiff, had (1) failed to allege a conspiracy under Section 1 of the Sherman Act (although MID had in fact properly alleged such a conspiracy under Section 2 of the Sherman Act), (2) failed to adequately allege antitrust injury (i.e., harm to consumers), and (3) failed to negate the defendants' assertion of protection under the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine.
- 5. MID thereafter timely filed a notice of appeal of the dismissal of its amended complaint, commencing the Pending Appeal. The Pending Appeal was then fully briefed, and oral argument on the appeal took place before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in San Francisco on March 15, 2001. At the conclusion of argument, the Court of Appeals took the matter under submission.
- 6. On April 6, 2001, the Debtor commenced its within chapter 11 case, triggering the automatic stay provisions of Section 362(a) of the Bankruptcy Code. On the basis of that stay, on May 7, 2001, the Court of Appeals suspended consideration of the appeal and invited the parties to seek relief from that stay, stating the following:

08/75/01

The appeal is withdrawn from submission because of the automatic stay resulting from Pacific Gas & Electric Company's bankruptcy filing. Each of the parties is requested to advise this court if relief from the stay is obtained.

Order, filed in the Pending Appeal on May 7, 2001.

- 7. As a result, the Pending Appeal is presently suspended and the issues underlying that appeal remain unresolved, although the parties have fully briefed and argued the matter to the Court of Appeals.
- 8. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on June 21, 2001 at Los Angeles, California.

AXWELL M. BLECHER

## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

	re: ACIFIC GAS AND E	ELECTRIC CO.	R.S. No.:	Hearing Date:July 18, 2001		
		Relief	From Stay Cover Sheet			
veh	icles, and personal pro	perty. Complete Section C:	notions. Complete Section B for m for real property. Utilize Section I rize the nature of the motion in Sec	D as necessary. If		
A	Date Petition Filed: Prior hearings on this	04/06/01 s obligation: None	Chapter: 11 Last Date to File §523/§727	7 Complaints:		
<u>B</u>	Description of person	nal property collateral (e.g.	1983 Ford Taurus): N/A	·		
	Secured Creditor	or lessor	_			
	Fair market value:	\$	Source of value:			
	Contract Balance: Monthly Payment: Insurance Advance:	\$ \$ \$	Pre-Petition D No. of Mo Post-Petition De: No. of me	efault: \$		
<u>C</u>	Description of real property collateral (e.g. single family residence, Oakland, CA.): N/A					
	Fair market value:	\$	Source of value: \$  If appraisal, date:			
	Moving Party's posit	ion (first trust deed, second,	, abstract, etc.): N/A			
,	Approx. Bal: As of (date): No. payment:	\$	Pre-Petition Default No. of months	3:		
	Notice of Default (da Notice of Trustee's S		Post-Petition Default No. of months	3:		
pecify		***************************************	Advances Senior Liens if known (e.g. trust deeds, tax lien			
	Position 1 <sup>st</sup> Trust Deed: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Trust Deed		Amount	No. Payment	Defaults	
	•		<b>~</b> -			
D	Other pertinent inform	mation: Motion seeks relief	to prosecute pending lightly Circui			_ (Total
Dat	ed: June 27, 2001		Signature MERLE C. MEYERS, E	so.		

Attorney for Modesto Irrigation District