

1
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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA RIVER WATCH,
Plaintiff,
v.
FLUOR CORPORATION,
Defendant.

Case No. [10-cv-05105-WHO](#)

**FURTHER ORDER REGARDING
PROPOSED CONSENT JUDGMENT**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 194, 208

THE SHILOH GROUP,
Intervenor/Plaintiff,
v.
FLUOR CORPORATION,
Defendant.

FLUOR CORPORATION,
Third-Party Plaintiff,
v.
SHILOH ROAD, WEST COAST METALS,
INC., M&M SERVICES, INC.
Third-Party Defendants.

Plaintiff California River Watch and defendant Fluor Corporation presented a revised Proposed Consent Judgment (Dkt. No.212-1) for review at the Case Management Conference this afternoon. The revised Proposed Consent Judgment addresses the concerns I raised in the Order Regarding Consent Judgment (Dkt. No. 208) and I will enter it once River Watch and Fluor

1
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
27
28

execute it. In this regard, the parties brought to my attention a typo that created an ambiguity on page 3, line 14 of the Order Regarding Consent Judgment. The first “or” in that line should be deleted, so that the sentence reads: “As currently drafted, the proposed judgment may preclude the general public from bringing a RCRA or CWA suit in the future (i) based on facts not presently known or (ii) if conditions at the Site change.” I thank the parties for their diligence in raising that issue, and appreciate the manner in which River Watch and Fluor addressed my concerns about the Consent Judgment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 3, 2015



WILLIAM H. ORRICK
United States District Judge