ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD April 4, 2017

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,)	
Complainant,)	
Comprandit,	í	
v.)	PCB 2012-035
)	(Enforcement - Water)
SIX M. CORPORATION, INC., an Illinois)	
Corporation, and WILLIAM MAXWELL,)	
)	
Respondents)	
)	
and)	
JAMES MCILVAINE,)	
)	
Necessary Party – Respondent)	

HEARING OFFICER ORDER

On March 15, 2017, the People filed a motion for leave to reopen discovery/amend discovery schedule. Respondents Six M. Corporation and William Maxwell filed a response on March 29, 2017. Respondent James McIlvaine did not respond. Today's order allows the People to conduct three depositions, and requires the People to respond to the motion for summary judgment by July 5, 2017.

According to the People, crucial gaps exist in the current record with respect to the operations of the Six M. Corporation and the Walker Service Station, as well as the individual respondents' respective roles. The People argue that the depositions of three witnesses, including respondents Maxwell and McIlvaine, are necessary for the People's response, and the Board's ruling, on respondent Maxwell's motion for summary judgment.

Respondents Six M. Corporation and William Maxwell object to additional discovery. Pursuant to the Hearing Officer Order dated August 8, 2016, the deadline for oral discovery was November 15, 2016. Furthermore, respondents argue that the People's motion does not comply with Illinois Supreme Court Rule 191(b).

Respondents cite two Board cases to argue that the People should file an Illinois Supreme Court Rule 191(b) affidavit. In White & Brewer Trucking, Inc. v. IEPA, PCB 96-250 (Nov. 21, 1996), the Board stated that if a party "believes that discovery of ...documents are needed for its response to the motion for summary judgment, [the party] should demonstrate that need through an affidavit with its response that meets the requirements of Illinois Supreme Court Rule 191(b)." *Id.* n.2.

Additionally, in <u>Des Plaines River Watershed Alliance v. IEPA</u>, PCB 04-88 (April 21, 2005), "[t]he Board has indicated that, if discovery is considered necessary to respond to a motion for summary judgment, then a party should demonstrate that need through an affidavit that meets the requirements of Illinois Supreme Court Rule 191(b).... That rule permits the court to grant a continuance for discovery if the affidavit names persons whose affidavits cannot be procured and what affiant believes they would testify to if sworn." *Id.* slip op.at 5.

In <u>Des Plaines</u>, the affidavit did not name a single person from whom discovery was sought and did not specifically indicate the sworn testimony it sought to elicit, so the affidavit did not comply with 191(b). The April 21, 2005 Board order found no valid reason to direct the parties to conduct discovery. It is worth noting that, subsequently on November 17, 2005, the Board denied the motion for summary judgment because it could not conclude that there were no issues of fact.

This docket is distinguishable from the two earlier cases in two significant ways. First, the two cases respondents cite are permit appeals. Permit appeals are decided on the administrative record, and the need for discovery outside the record is scrutinized. This docket is an enforcement matter where all relevant information is generally deemed admissible.

Second, unlike <u>Des Plaines</u>, the People do specifically name the three individuals to be deposed, and state that they will be asked about Six M. Corporation, Walker Service Station, as well as their respective roles.

The Board will not grant a motion for summary judgment if questions of fact exist. If respondents wish to avoid the expense of hearing regarding the case against Mr. Maxwell, resolving issues of fact now increases the likelihood of his case being resolved by summary judgment. Furthermore, if the summary judgment is denied, depositions may ultimately be needed for hearing preparation.

Accordingly, discovery is reopened on a limited basis to allow the People to depose the three individuals named in the motion. The deadline for the People's response to the motion for summary judgment is July 5, 2017.

The parties have consented to electronic service for this docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Carol Webb

Carol Webb Hearing Officer Illinois Pollution Control Board 1021 North Grand Avenue East P.O. Box 19274 Springfield, Illinois 62794-9274 217/524-8509 Carol.Webb@illinois.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that true copies of the foregoing order were e-mailed on April 4, 2017, to each of the persons on the attached service list.

It is hereby certified that a true copy of the foregoing order was e-mailed to the following on April 4, 2017:

Don Brown Illinois Pollution Control Board James R. Thompson Center 100 W. Randolph St., Ste. 11-500 Chicago, Illinois 60601

Carol Webb

Carol Webb Hearing Officer Illinois Pollution Control Board 1021 North Grand Avenue East P.O. Box 19274 Springfield, Illinois 62794-9274 217/524-8509 Carol.Webb@illinois.gov

@ Consents to electronic service

PCB 2012-035 @ Patrick D. Shaw Law Office of Patrick D. Shaw 80 Bellerive Road Springfield, IL 62704

PCB 2012-035 @ Christopher Grant Office of the Attorney General 69 W. Washington Street, Suite 1800 Chicago, IL 60602

PCB 2012-035@ Elizabeth Dubats Office of the Attorney General 69 W. Washington Street, Suite 1800 Chicago, IL 60602 PCB 2012-035 @ Phillip R. Van Ness Webber & Thies, P.C. 202 N. Lincoln Square P.O. Box 189 Urbana, IL 61801

PCB 2012-035@ Kyle Nash Davis IEPA 1021 North Grand Avenue East P.O. Box 19276 Springfield, IL 62794-9276