1	MICHAEL L. WILLIAMS (D.C. Bar 47161) Trial Attorney	8)	
2			
3	BETHANY J. HENNEMAN (MD Atty # 151 Trial Attorney	12150313)	
5	U.S. Department of Justice Civil Division, Environmental Tort		
6	Litigation Section P.O. Box 340, Ben Franklin Station Washington, D.C. 20044 Telephone: (202) 307-3839 Facsimile: (202) 616-4473		
7 8			
9 10	THOMAS J. ALFORD (MN Bar No. 038822 Trial Attorney	21)	
11	U.S. Department of Justice	·	
12	Environmental and Natural Resources Division, Environmental Defense Section		
1314	Washington, D.C. 20044 Telephone: (202) 514-0165 Facsimile No.: 202-514-8865		
15	Attorneys for United States of America		
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
17	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
18		01 01 01-11	
19	RIO LINDA ELVERTA COMMUNITY WATER DISTRICT,	No. 2:17-cv-01349 KJM GGH	
20	,		
21	Plaintiff,		
22	v.		
23	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ELEMENTIS		
2425	CHROMIUM INCORPORATED, OCCIDENTAL CHEMICAL		
26		AINTEES? COLINTS ACAINST	
27	STIPULATION TO STAY PLAINTIFFS' COUNTS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND SCHEDULING ORDER FOR		
28	DEFENDANT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA - 1		

	CORPORATION, HONEYWELL	
1	INCORPORATED, BASF CORPORATION, PPG	
2 3	INCORPORATED, E.I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY,	
4	UNIVAR INCORPORATED, LUXFER HOLDINGS PLC, SIGMA-	
5	ALDRICH CORPORATION, and DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY,	
6	Defendants.	
7		No. 2:17-cv-01353 KJM GGH
8	SACRAMENTO SUBURBAN WATER DISTRICT,	
9	Plaintiff,	
11	v.	
12	ELEMENTIS CHROMIUM INCORPORATED, OCCIDENTAL	
13	CHEMICAL CORPORATION,	
14	HONEYWELL INCORPORATED, BASF CORPORATION, PPG	
15	INCORPORATED, E.I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY,	
16	UNIVAR INCORPORATED, LUXFER HOLDINGS PLC, SIGMA-	
	ALDRICH CORPORATION, DOW	CTIDIU ATION TO CTAN
17	CHEMICAL COMPANY, and THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	STIPULATION TO STAY PLAINTIFFS' COUNTS AGAINST THE
18	Defendants.	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND PROPOSED SCHEDULING ORDER
19		FOR DEFENDANT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
20		OF AMERICA
21		
22		COUNTS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES
23	AND PROPOSED SCHEDULING ORD	ER FOR DEFENDANT UNITED STATES
24		
25		
26		
27		AINTIFFS' COUNTS AGAINST CA AND SCHEDULING ORDER FOR
28	DEFENDANT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
۷٥		- 2

Plaintiffs, Rio Linda Elverta Community Water District and Sacramento Suburban Water District, and Defendant, United States of America, in the above-captioned related matters, through their undersigned counsel hereby stipulate and agree to the following:

A. PLAINTIFFS' FIRST-FILED SUITS IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

- 1. Plaintiffs, Rio Linda Elverta Community Water District and Sacramento Suburban Water District, filed actions against the United States of America and the United States Department of the Air Force in the United States Court of Federal Claims on June 23, 2017. The Court of Federal Claims case numbers are: *Rio Linda Elverta Community Water District vs. The United States of America, et al.*, Case No. 1:17-cv-00859-VJW; and *Sacramento Suburban Water District vs. The United States of America, et al.*, Case No. 1:17-cv-00860-RHH.
- 2. Plaintiffs subsequently filed lawsuits in the Eastern District of California against the United States, Rio Linda Community Water District v. United States, et al., Case No. 2:17-cv-01349-WBS-GGH on June 30, 2017 and Sacramento Suburban Water District v. Elementis Chromium Inc., et al., Case No. 2:17-cv-01353-TLN-AC on July 12, 2017. Service on the United States has been effectuated pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4. The default deadline for the United States to answer or otherwise plead for the two District Court lawsuits is September 25, 2017.
- 3. Counsel for the United States in the above-captioned actions and separate Counsel for the United States in the parallel actions in the Court of Federal Claims met and conferred with Plaintiffs' counsel on September 14 and 20, 2017, concerning the overlapping issues in each case, means of litigating the matters efficiently without duplicating issues or needlessly burdening judicial resources. Counsel discussed the application of 28 U.S.C. section 1500 and the Supreme Court's most recent interpretation of that section in *U.S. v. Tohono O'Odham Nation*, 563 U.S. 307 (2011), as it related to parallel actions pending in the Court of Federal Claims and in

District Court. See, e.g. Tecon Engineers, Inc. v. U.S., 170 Ct.Cl. 389, 343 F.2d 943 (1965), cert. denied 382 U.S. 976 (announcing rule); Hardwick Bros. Co. II v. U.S., 72 F.3d 883 (Fed.Cir. 1995) (confirming Tecon after Federal Circuit and Supreme Court review of the order of filing rule); Brandt v. U.S., 710 F.3d 1369 (Fed.Cir. 2013) (interpreting Tecon's order of filing rule in context of post-judgment period before opportunity to appeal has expired). Counsel also discussed Ninth Circuit authority related to the first-to-file rule and federal comity. Alltrade v. Uniweld Prods., Inc., 946 F.2d 622, 625 (9th Cir. 1991); Pacific Coast Breaker, Inc. v. Connecticut Elec., Inc., Civ. No. 10-3134 KJM EFB, 2011 WL 2073796 (E.D. Cal. May 24, 2011).

- 4. Though Plaintiffs characterize their claims for relief as non-duplicative, Plaintiffs and Defendant, United States, have agreed that the United States Court of Federal Claims cases against the United States and Eastern District of California counts against the United States raise common core issues and should not proceed concurrently.
- 5. Plaintiffs proposed a joint stipulation to stay the Court of Federal Claims cases in favor of the District Court action for, among other reasons, the non-Government defendants would not have an opportunity to participate in the Court of Federal Claims proceedings and to avoid multiple proceedings on common issues recommending that the District Court action proceed first. The Government declined to stipulate. As such, Plaintiffs intend to file a motion to stay the Court of Federal Claims cases.
- 6. The United States has not agreed to join a request from Plaintiffs to stay the Court of Federal Claims cases.
- 7. The Court of Federal Claims has not yet received or ruled upon a request to stay the Court of Federal Claims cases.

B. CASE MANAGEMENT DEADLINES FOR DEFENDANT UNITED STATES IN THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

- 1. Plaintiffs and Defendant, United States, have agreed that Plaintiffs' counts against the United States in the Eastern District of California should be stayed at least for the period of time that may be required for Plaintiffs to obtain a ruling from the United States Court of Federal Claims on Plaintiffs' anticipated motions to stay Plaintiffs' concurrently pending United States Court of Federal Claims cases.
- 2. Plaintiffs and Defendant, United States, have agreed that if the United States Court of Federal Claims enters orders staying the United States Court of Federal Claims cases against the United States and the United States Air Force, then Plaintiffs' cases against the United States in the Eastern District of California should proceed.
- 3. Plaintiffs and Defendant, United States, have agreed upon and request that this Court order the following schedule:
 - a. Plaintiffs' counts against the United States in the Eastern District of California are stayed at least for the period of time that may be required for Plaintiffs to obtain a ruling from the United States Court of Federal Claims on Plaintiffs' anticipated motions to stay Plaintiffs' concurrently pending United States Court of Federal Claims cases.
 - b. If the United States Court of Federal Claims enters orders staying or dismissing Plaintiffs' United States Court of Federal Claims lawsuits against the United States and the United States Department of Air Force, then Plaintiffs' counsel will file a notice with the Eastern District of California of the orders.
 - c. If the United States Court of Federal Claims enters orders staying Plaintiffs' United States Court of Federal Claims lawsuits against the United States and the United States Department of Air Force, then the following filing deadlines will apply to Plaintiffs' counts against the United States:
 - i. Defendant, United States, will plead to or otherwise file a responsive pleading to any counts alleged against it in the District Court cases

1	within 60 days of Plaintiffs' notification that i Federal Claims cases have been stayed.
2	
3	ii. Plaintiffs will respond to any pleading motion
4	iii. Defendant, United States, will file a reply brie
5	pleading motion within 14 days thereafter.
6	4. So stipulated.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	STIPULATION TO STAY PLAINTIFFS' COUNTS A
27	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND SCHEDULING

its United States Court of

- by 28 days thereafter.
- ef in support of any

GAINST G ORDER FOR DEFENDANT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1	Pursuant to Local Rule 131(e), the undersigned Plaintiffs' counsel in the above-captioned		
2	related matters has authorized counsel for the United States, Michael L. Williams, to sign and		
3	submit this STIPULATION TO STAY PLAINTIFFS' COUNTS AGAINST THE UNITED		
4	STATES OF AMERICA AND PROPOSED ORDER FOR DEFENDANT UNITED STATES		
5	OF AMERICA on his behalf.		
6			
7			
8	Dated: September 21, 2017 /s/ Michael L. Williams MICHAEL L. WILLIAMS (D.C. Bar 471618)		
	Trial Attorney		
9	U.S. Department of Justice		
10	Civil Division, Environmental Tort Litigation P.O. Box 340, Ben Franklin Station		
11	Washington, D.C. 20044		
12	Telephone: (202) 307-3839		
12	Facsimile: (202) 616-4473		
13	Email: Michael.L.Williams@usdoj.gov		
14	Attorney for the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		
15	·		
16			
17	Dated: September 21, 2017 /s/ Matthew K. Edling		
18	As authorized on September 21, 2017		
19	Matthew K. Edling SHER EDLING LLP		
	100 Montgomery St., Ste. 1410		
20	San Francisco CA 94104		
21	Telephone: (628) 231-2500		
22	Facsimile: (628) 231-2929		
	Email:Matt@sheredling.com		
23	Attorney for Plaintiffs, RIO LINDA ELVERTA		
24	COMMUNITY WATER DISTRICT and		
25	SACRAMENTO SUBURBAN WATER DISTRICT		
26	STIDLIL ATION TO STAV DI AINTIEES' COLINTS ACAINST		
27	STIPULATION TO STAY PLAINTIFFS' COUNTS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND SCHEDULING ORDER FOR		
28	DEFENDANT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		
2.X	7		

ORDER

Pursuant to the above stipulation, and good cause appearing, the court orders the following:

Plaintiffs' counts against the United States in the Eastern District of California are stayed at least for the period of time that may be required for Plaintiffs to obtain a ruling from the United States Court of Federal Claims on Plaintiffs' anticipated motions to stay Plaintiffs' concurrently pending United States Court of Federal Claims cases.

If the United States Court of Federal Claims enters orders staying or dismissing Plaintiffs' United States Court of Federal Claims lawsuits against the United States and the United States Department of Air Force, then Plaintiffs' counsel will file a notice with the Eastern District of California of the orders within 48 hours, or 72 hours if the orders are issued on a Friday.

If the United States Court of Federal Claims enters orders staying Plaintiffs' United States Court of Federal Claims lawsuits against the United States and the United States Department of Air Force, then the following filing deadlines will apply to Plaintiffs' counts against the United States:

- 1) Defendant, United States, will plead to or otherwise file a responsive pleading to any counts alleged against it in the District Court cases within 60 days of Plaintiffs' notification that its United States Court of Federal Claims cases have been stayed.
 - 2) Plaintiffs will respond to any pleading motion by 28 days thereafter.
- 3) Defendant, United States, will file a reply brief in support of any pleading motion within 14 days thereafter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: September 25, 2017.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE