## **Brigham Young University Law School BYU Law Digital Commons**

**Utah Supreme Court Briefs** 

1986

## S & G v. Morgan : Supplemental Submission

Utah Supreme Court

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu sc1



Part of the Law Commons

Original Brief Submitted to the Utah Supreme Court; digitized by the Howard W. Hunter Law Library, J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors.

David L. Wilkinson; attorney general; Dallin W. Jensen; Solicitor General; Michael M. Quealy; assistant attorney general; attorneys for defendant.

Ken Chamberlain; Olsen, McIff and Chamberlain; attorneys for appellant.

## Recommended Citation

Supplemental Submission, S & G v. Morgan, No. 860555.00 (Utah Supreme Court, 1986). https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu\_sc1/1317

This Supplemental Submission is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Supreme Court Briefs by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. Policies regarding these Utah briefs are available at http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah court briefs/policies.html. Please contact the Repository Manager at hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu with questions or feedback.

HATU DOCUMENT KFU 45.9

.S9x R.

BRIEF.

860555 SOX R. OLSEN

Olsen, McIff & Chamberlain

ATTORNEYS AT LAW 225 NORTH 100 EAST POST OFFICE BOX 100 RICHFIELD, UTAH 84701

TELEPHONE 896-4461 AREA CODE BOI

June 16, 1989

Mr. Geoffrey J. Butler Clerk of the Supreme Court 332 State Capitol Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

S&G Inc. vs. Dee C. Hansen,

State Engineer of the State of Utah

Case No. 860555

Dear Geoff:

RICHARD K. CHAMBERLAIN

The above-referenced matter was argued before the Court on Tuesday, June 13. During the argument Justice Zimmerman made regarding participation of our client administrative level.

We responded by pointing out first that our position was advanced by the applicant Intermountain Power Agency, and second, that the applicable Utah Statute (73-3-14) authorizes a "plenary review" in the District Court by any person "aggrieved" by a decision of the State Engineer and does not impose a requirement of prior participation in the administrative process.

We suggested to the Court that if prior participation is to be required it is a matter that would require legislative action. What we failed to do, and for which we apologize, was to advise the Court that the legislature did in fact change this statute in The amended statute has deleted the reference to a "plenary review" and requires compliance with Chapter 46b of Title 63, the Administrative Procedures Act.

We did not cite nor discuss the amended statute in our brief since it was not in force at the time the action was filed in the However, in light of the question raised by District Court. Justice Zimmerman we think it is prudent for the Court's attention to be drawn to the amendment.

It will be greatly appreciated if you will alert the Court of this information. We are sending a copy hereof to counsel for the State Engineer, whom we presume would want the Court fully apprised of this information.

Mr. Geoffrey J. Butler June 16, 1989 Page 2

Sincerely,

OLSEN, McIFF & CHAMBERLAIN

Ву

Ken Chamberlain

Kay L. McIff

KLM/sc

cc: Michael M. Quealy