

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

Jack R. Willis
Mark S. Pollock

Law Offices of
Pollock & Willis
1724 North La Brea Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90046
Telephone (213) 876-4700

May 23, 1981

Mr. William Cormier, Esq.
Office of Administrative Vice
Chancellor
University of California
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

In the Matter of the
Regents of the University of California
(UCLA Research Reactor)
Docket No. 50-142
(Proposed Renewal of Facility License)



RE: FAILURE TO SERVE APPLICANT'S ANSWERS TO INTERVENOR'S INTERROGATORIES
OF APRIL 20, 1981

Dear Mr. Cormier:

By stipulated agreement among the parties, and by Order of the Board, answers to the first set of interrogatories were to be served by May 20, 1981. It is my understanding that as of May 22, 1981, Applicant's answers to Intervenor's interrogatories had not yet been served.

On May 19, 1981, you called my office requesting an extension of two days for the University to answer my client's interrogatories. After consultation with my client, our approval was granted on condition that the interrogatories be hand-delivered to my client on May 22. You agreed, stating that the interrogatory answers would be hand-delivered to my client's representatives during document inspection Friday afternoon.

I am informed that at 5:00 p.m., at close of document inspection Friday, Daniel Hirsch, representative of my client, Committee to Bridge the Gap, was informed that no interrogatory answers would be forthcoming at that time. Mr.Neill Ostrander, stating that he was passing on word from you, said he did not know when the answers would be forthcoming, but thought "perhaps Tuesday."

Should my client not be in receipt of Applicant's answers by 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, May 26, my client will have to consider this failure a breach of the Board's Order and the stipulated agreement regarding the discovery schedule, and will have to seriously consider requesting Board assistance in obtaining Applicant's compliance. As Applicant's failure to comply places a great burden on Intervenor, due to the nearness of the June 10 deadline for follow-up interrogatories, and as Applicant has failed to comply with previous Board Orders regarding discovery, Intervenor may feel compelled to request sanctions.

8106040 445

G

503
5/10

Law Office of
Pollock & Willis

Mr. William Cormier, Esq.
May 23, 1981

Should Applicant be unable to deliver to Intervenor by close of business Tuesday, May 26, said Answers, but have instead a proposal it requests Intervenor to consider regarding said Answers, that proposal should be likewise made by 5:00 p.m. May 26. As I will be in trial all day, contact should be made directly with Mr. Daniel Hirsch of the Committee to Bridge the Gap, 1637 Butler, #203, Los Angeles, CA 90025, (213) 478-0829.

Applicant should be on notice that if it wishes to request of Intervenor consideration of time extension in any future matter, such request should be made at least several days before the deadline in question.

Sincerely,



Mark Pollock
Attorney for Intervenor
COMMITTEE TO BRIDGE THE GAP

cc: service list