

MINUTE ITEM

40. STATUS OF MAJOR LITIGATION - W.O.s 3019, 2224, AND 2274.2.

The attached Calendar Item 53 was presented to the Commission for information.

Attachment

Calendar Item 53 (1 page)

CALENDAR ITEM

INFORMATIVE

53.

STATUS OF MAJOR LITIGATION - W.O.s 3019, 2224, AND 2274.2

1. Case No. 800-58 WM Civil W.O. 3019
U.S. vs. Anchor Oil Corporation, et al.
U.S.D.C., Southern District, Los Angeles County
(Long Beach Subsidence Matter)

(Request by U.S. for court order to shut down Wilmington Field if satisfactory subsurface repressuring programs for land-surface-subsidence alleviation are not put into operation.)

No change in status from the report given at the August meeting; i.e., on July 29, 1959, the State filed its Answer and Counterclaim. A copy of the plaintiff United States' reply to the State's Counterclaim was received August 12, 1959.

2. Case No. 683,824 W.O. 2224
People vs. City of Long Beach
Los Angeles County Superior Court
(Alamitos Bay Quitclaim Litigation)

(Resolution of question of whether title to oil and gas is vested in City or State in lands granted to City by State and subsequently quitclaimed to State by City.)

Trial of this case has been continued and is now set for November 24, 1959.

3. Case No. 70717 W.O. 2274.2
County of Orange vs. State of California, et al.
Orange County Superior Court

(Claim by Orange County that a legislative grant to the County of tide and submerged lands in Newport Bay conveyed to the County all tide and submerged lands within the County (with the exception of a grant to the City of Newport Beach.)

Since the time of the last report the deposition of the Assistant Executive Officer has been taken. The County appears to be interested in learning whether it has exhausted all records of the Commission which the Court had determined the County could examine. It is not clear at this time whether the County has concluded its depositions by staff members. It is possible that the County will seek a further order from the Court relating to examination of documents. The Attorney General had advised the staff that engineering, accounting, and production data should not be disclosed to the County.