

From: Pisarik, Holly <HollyPisarik@gov.sc.gov>
To: Glaccum, DavidDavidGlaccum@gov.sc.gov
CC: Adams, ChaneyChaneyAdams@gov.sc.gov
Godfrey, RobRobGodfrey@gov.sc.gov
Date: 4/7/2016 5:28:05 PM
Subject: Re: District Court lawsuit and summary judgement request

I've amended David's quote below. I would stick to the standard for a summary judgment motion and nothing more.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Apr 7, 2016, at 3:16 PM, Glaccum, David <DavidGlaccum@gov.sc.gov> wrote:

>

> I defer to Holly on whether we should respond, but if we do below is a suggested response. For what it's worth, I think the questions are silly and don't need to be responded to.

>

> Summary judgment was filed because we do not think there is any genuine issue of material fact, and therefore, we are entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Adams, Chaney

> Sent: Thursday, April 07, 2016 2:43 PM

> To: Glaccum, David; Pisarik, Holly

> Cc: Godfrey, Rob

> Subject: FW: District Court lawsuit and summary judgement request

>

> Holly and David,

>

> What do you all think here?

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Biles, DeDe [mailto:dbiles@aikenstandard.com]

> Sent: Thursday, April 07, 2016 2:28 PM

> To: Adams, Chaney

> Subject: District Court lawsuit and summary judgement request

>

> Hi Chaney,

>

> We are working on a story about the request by the State of South Carolina for summary judgement in its favor in the lawsuit concerning MOX, plutonium shipments and the fines that are continuing to accrue (Civil Action No. 1:16-00391-JMC).

> We have some questions:

>

> 1. Why was the decision made to ask for a summary judgement?

>

> 2. Do you think it is likely that these fines will ever be paid to the State of South Carolina ? Why or

why not?

>

> My telephone number is 803-644-2390. My email is dbiles@aikenstandard.com.

>

> Thank you,

>

> Dede Biles

> Reporter

> Aiken Standard

>

>

>