IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS 2 FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT 3 ROBERT L. FARMER, Petitioner, No. 05-70718 6 NRC No. NRC-030-07710-CO v. 7 District of Alaska, Fairbanks NUCLEAR REGULATORY 8 COMMISSION, Respondent, 10 and 11 STATE OF ALASKA, DEPARTMENT 12 OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC) FACILITIES, 13 14 Intervenor. ROBERT L. FARMER. 15 Petitioner, 16 No. 05-70725 17 LABR No. ARB 04-002 v. District of Alaska, Anchorage 18 ELAINE CHAO, Secretary of Labor, 19 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, 20 Defendant, 21 and 22 STATE OF ALASKA, DEPARTMENT 23 OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC 24 FACILITIES, 25 Intervenor. 26

Opposition by the State of Alaska to Petitioner's Motion to Withdraw

Page 1 of 4

Case Nos. 05-70718, 05-70725

Without Prejudice

Farmer v. NRC and Farmer v. Elaine Chao

DEPARTMENT OF LAW IFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ANCHORAGE BRANCH 1031 W. FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 200 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501 PHONE: (907) 269-5100

OPPOSITION BY THE STATE OF ALASKA TO PETITIONER'S MOTION TO WITHDRAW WITHOUT PREJUDICE

The State of Alaska, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities ("State") opposes Robert L. Farmer's ("Farmer's") motion to withdraw without prejudice. The two petitions filed by Farmer while represented by counsel are without merit. They were probably filed for tactical reasons, and should be dismissed with prejudice, either on the merits after briefing, or for failure to timely file and respond in accordance with Circuit Rule 31-2, or by voluntary dismissal in accordance with FRAP 42. The State respectfully suggests that the clerk issue an order for Farmer to show cause within thirty days why the matter should not be dismissed in accordance with Circuit Rule 31-2. Under such an order, Farmer would be allowed thirty days to show compliance with Circuit Rule 31-2, or face dismissal with prejudice.

Even a preliminary review of the facts shows that Farmer did not completely comply with Circuit Rule 31-2.2(a). Undersigned counsel was not given notice of any request by Farmer for an extension to file briefs as required by Circuit Rule 31-2.2(a). Moreover, it is unclear from Farmer's motion whether the clerk was notified by telephone as required by the rule. There is no docket entry confirming a telephonic request by Farmer for an extension of time for filing briefs.

There is a critical problem with service on the State of Alaska that should be addressed immediately by the clerk. The State was not served with Farmer's motion entitled "MOTION TO WITHDRAW WITHOUT PREJUDICE" as certified by Farmer

Opposition by the State of Alaska to Petitioner's Motion to Withdraw Without Prejudice
Farmer v. NRC and Farmer v. Elaine Chao

Page 2 of 4 Case Nos. 05-70718, 05-70725

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

on page 12 of said motion. Mr. Farmer specifically certified to the court that he served undersigned counsel by fax on November 15, 2005. This did not happen. The motion was delivered to undersigned counsel via fax by the Department of Labor attorney of record, Mary Rieser, on November 16, 2005. Therefore, the State requests that the clerk specifically direct Farmer to serve the State, which is a party to these two petitions as an intervenor, by both fax (at 907-279-5832) and by mail to: Gary W. Gantz, Assistant Attorney General for the State of Alaska, Department of Law, 1031 W. 4th Avenue, Suite 200, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.

If the clerk or the court decides to allow the withdrawal, it should be with prejudice rather than without prejudice, as a withdrawal without prejudice could conceivably allow Farmer to resurrect these two matters at a later time at his convenience. This is not in the interests of justice. Such an effort to dismiss without prejudice was attempted by Mr. Farmer once before in September, 2003 when he was A dismissal without prejudice was disallowed by Judge Gee, the Administrative Law Judge below, after the State objected and the court had reviewed the facts.

DATED: November 16, 2005.

DAVID W. MÁRQUEZ ATTORNEY GENERAL

By:

Assistant Attorney General

ABA No. 6811030

Opposition by the State of Alaska to Petitioner's Motion to Withdraw Without Prejudice Farmer v. NRC and Farmer v. Elaine Chao

Page 3 of 4 Case Nos. 05-70718, 05-70725 2

3

11

7

8

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on this date, a true and correct copy of OPPOSITION BY THE STATE OF ALASKA TO PETITIONER'S MOTION TO WITHDRAW WITHOUT PREJUDICE, and this CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE in this proceeding was served by first class U.S. Mail on the following:

Robert L. Farmer M
2707 Klamath Drive O
Anchorage, AK 99517 U

Mary Rieser, Esq.
Office of the Solicitor
_U.S. Department of Labor ____

200 Constitution Avenue NW Room N2716 Washington, DC 20210

Jared K. Heck, Esq. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Mail Stop 015 D21 Washington, DC 2055-0001

and by certified mail, return receipt requested to:

Robert L. Farmer 2707 Klamath Drive Anchorage, AK 99517 Article # 7003 2260 0001 0347 1554

Elizabeth Goodwin

11/16/05

Opposition by the State of Alaska to Petitioner's Motion to Withdraw Without Prejudice
Farmer v. NRC and Farmer v. Elaine Chao

Page 4 of 4 Case Nos. 05-70718, 05-70725

DEPARTMENT OF LAW
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
ANCHORAGE BRANCH
1031 W. FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
PHONE: (907) 269-5100