BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

The Staff of the Missouri Public Service)
Commission,)
Complement)
Complainant,)
) <u>Case No. WC-2007-0452</u>
V.)
)
Suburban Water and Sewer Co. and Gordon)
Burnam,)
)
Respondents.)

STAFF'S RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT GORDON BURNAM'S OBJECTION TO STAFF'S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

COMES NOW the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Staff) and for its Response to Respondent Gordon Burnam's Objection to Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents respectfully states as follows:

- 1. Staff asserts that the Missouri Public Service Commission (Commission) does have subject matter jurisdiction over this matter, personal jurisdiction over Respondent Gordon Burnam (Burnam), and that Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not beyond the jurisdiction, power, and authority of the Commission.
- 2. If a party fails to admit or deny a request on the basis of a claim of privilege or the work product doctrine, the party failing to admit or deny a request must, without revealing the protected information, "state information that will permit others to assess the applicability of the privilege or work product doctrine." Missouri

Rule of Civil Procedure 59.01(3). Burnam has not stated such information that will allow others to assess the applicability of the claimed privileges or the work product doctrine.

- 3. Commission Rule 4 CSR 2.090(1) provides that "discovery may be obtained by the same means and under the same conditions as in civil actions in the circuit court." Rule 58 of the Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure governs the scope and issuance of requests for production of documents. Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents does not impose greater or different obligations in discovery than are required by applicable Commission Rules, the Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure, or case law.
- 4. Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents requests information that is relevant to the subject matter of this action, is relevant to Staff's claim, and is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague or ambiguous.
- 6. Staff submits that Burnam's ongoing discovery process should not operate to delay Staff's discovery in accordance with Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 56.01(d). Burnam has a duty to seasonably amend his responses to Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents "if the party learns that the response is in some material respect incomplete or incorrect and if the additional corrective information has not otherwise been made known to the other parties during the discovery process or in writing" in accordance with Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 56.01(e).
- 7. Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents does not call for legal argument, analysis, opinion, or conclusion.

8. Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents does not seek information that is a matter of public record or otherwise equally accessible to all parties. Burnam's claim that the information requested is publicly available is inconsistent with his claim of privilege and/or the work product doctrine.

Specific Objections

- 1. Paragraph 1 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 2. Paragraph 2 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 3. Paragraph 3 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 4. Paragraph 4 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 5. Paragraph 5 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 6 Paragraph 6 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 7. Paragraph 7 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 8. Paragraph 8 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 9. Paragraph 9 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.

- 10. Paragraph 10 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 11. Paragraph 11 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 12. Paragraph 12 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 13. Paragraph 13 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 14. Paragraph 14 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 15. Paragraph 15 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 16. Paragraph 16 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 17. Paragraph 17 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 18. Paragraph 18 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 19. Paragraph 19 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.
- 20. Paragraph 20 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.

21. Paragraph 21 of Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents is not vague, overbroad, or unduly burdensome.

22. Staff submits that a discovery conference the week of June 25 is the most expeditious way to resolve any remaining discovery disputes. Staff believes that a timely discovery conference is necessary because Staff has requested expedited treatment in this case. This conference cannot be scheduled on June 29, as undersigned counsel are scheduled to appear before Judge Crane in Boone County Circuit Court on that date.

WHEREFORE, Staff requests that the Commission overrule Gordon Burnam's Objections to Staff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents. Staff further requests a discovery conference be held prior to June 29, 2007 in order to resolve any additional discovery disputes.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jennifer Heintz

Jennifer Heintz Assistant General Counsel Missouri Bar No. 57128

Peggy A. Whipple Chief Litigation Counsel Missouri Bar No. 54758

Attorneys for the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission PO Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 751-8701 (Telephone)
(573) 751-9285 (Fax)
jennifer.heintz@psc.mo.gov
peggy.whipple@psc.mo.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been served via electronic mail to Christina Baker, Office of the Public Counsel, at Christina.Baker@ded.mo.gov; and to Thomas M. Harrison and Matthew S. Volkert, Attorneys for Respondent Suburban Water and Sewer Company, and for Respondent Gordon Burnam, at tom@vanmatre.com and <a href="mailto:mai

|--|--|