CAMEO DIAGNOSTIC CENTRE, INC.

SPECIALIZED MEDICAL IMAGING AND MEASUREMENTS

155 MAPLE STREET / SPRINGFIELD, MA 01105

(413) 788-7000

March 11, 1994

Honorable Ivan W. Smith, Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board RE: DOCKET NO. U.S.Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

030-29567

Dear Junge Smith.

In order to assure being in complete conformance with all regulations and requirements, submitted herewith are copies of two documents that may impact the above proceeding and therefore possibly be significant from a legal point of view.

Very truly yours,

Paul J. Rosenbaum

cc: C.L. Marco, ESQ.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CAMEO DIAGNOSTIC CENTRE, INC.

Plaintiff.

V.

Civil Action No. 94-30036-F

KEITH BROWN

Defendant.

MOTION TO DISMISS

The defendant the United States of America, pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, moves to dismiss the plaintiff's complaint. The defendant has submitted a memorandum of law in support of this motion.

In accordance with Local Rule 7.1, the undersigned Assistant U. S. Attorney states that she has discussed this motion with the pro se plaintiff, but was unable to resolve the issues.

Respectfully submitted,

DONALD K. STERN United States Attorney

By:

KAREN L. GOODWIN

Assistant U.S. Attorney

1550 Main Street

Springfield, MA 01103

Dated: March 1, 1994

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing has been served by first class mail on this date to Cameo Diagnostic Centre, Inc., 155 Maple Street, Springfield, MA 01105.

Karen L. Goodwin

Assistant U.S. Attorney

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CAMEO DIAGNOSTIC CENTRE, INC.

Plaintiff

V.

Civil Action No. 94-30036-F

KEITH BROWN

Defendant

MOTION TO DENY MOTION TO DISMISS

The plaintiff submits herein motion and states the following:

- 1. The defendant in this matter is not the United States of America.
- 2. The defendant is an inspector for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
- 3. The defendant, acting with demonstrable personal animus, did distort facts in a report that negatively impacted plaintiff.
- 4. The defendant acted outside the normal scope of his work.
- 5. The defendant's status as a federal employee does not have immunity from being held accountable for deliberate lying. Plaintiff pleads that its owner be given the opportunity to be heard and examine the defendant under oath.

Respectfully submitted.

Dated: March 3, 1994

Paul J. Rosenbaum

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing has been served by first class mail on this date to Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1550 Main Street, Springfield, MA 01103

Paul J. Rosenbaum