No. 111 Original

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1990

STATE OF DELAWARE,
Plaintiff,

STATE OF TEXAS,
Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Defendant.

MOTION OF THE STATES OF GEORGIA AND MAINE FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION; COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION; AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION

BERNARD NASH
(Counsel of Record)
ANDREW P. MILLER
LESLIE R. COHEN
JUDITH E. SCHAEFFER
DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO & MORIN
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 785-9700
Special Counsel for
Applicants for Intervention

June 3, 1991

[State Attorneys General Listed on Inside Cover]

WILSON - EPES PRINTING CO., INC. - 789-0096 - WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

ATTORNEYS GENERAL OF THE APPLICANTS FOR INTERVENTION

Michael J. Bowers, Attorney General
State of Georgia
Department of Law
132 State Judicial Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
(404) 656-4585

Michael E. Carpenter, Attorney General
State of Maine
State House
Augusta, Maine 04330
(207) 289-3661

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1990

No. 111 Original

STATE OF DELAWARE,
Plaintiff,

STATE OF TEXAS,
Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Defendant.

MOTION OF THE STATES OF GEORGIA AND MAINE FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION

Pursuant to Rule 17 of the Rules of the Supreme Court, the States of Georgia and Maine (hereinafter the "States"), sovereign states of the United States of America, by and through their Attorneys General and Special Counsel, move this Court for an order permitting them to intervene as Plaintiffs in the above-entitled case and permitting their proposed Complaint in Intervention, attached hereto, to be filed. In support of this motion, and as more fully set forth in the States' Brief in Support of Motion for Leave to File Complaint in Intervention, the States allege as follows:

I.

1. The States incorporate Paragraphs 1 through 9 of the Motion of the States of Arkansas, Florida, Iowa, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire and West Virginia (hereinafter "Arkansas, *et al.*") for Leave to File Complaint in Intervention.

2. In Litigation Management Order No. 1, dated as of October 18, 1989, the Special Master established a discovery schedule and a timetable for the filing of Motions for Leave to Intervene by prospective intervenors. He stated that "[p]arties not meeting this timetable will be required, absent compelling reasons, to fit in to ongoing discovery and motions without disruption of that scheduling track" (¶ 8).

3. In Litigation Management Order No. 4, dated as of November 30, 1990, the Special Master granted the State of Maryland's motion for intervention, effective 15 days after the Supreme Court order referring the motion to him, "unless a party presently before the court files a memorandum in opposition to intervention prior to the expiration of that period after the referral." The Special Master stated that "[a]ny further applications for intervention referred to me by the Court during the pendency of the motions currently being briefed will be treated in the same fashion." Furthermore, "[a]ny state permitted to intervene during this period may participate in the ongoing briefing and argument as scheduled, and all future proceedings in the action," but will have no right to reopen the discovery period previously concluded.

4. The States' Complaint in Intervention is identical to the Complaint in Intervention filed by the States of Alabama, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah and Washington, and the Commonwealths of Kentucky and Pennsylvania (hereinafter "Alabama, *et al.*"), the Complaint in Intervention filed by Arkansas, *et al.*, the Com-

plaint in Intervention filed by the States of New Jersey, North Dakota and Wyoming (hereinafter "New Jersey, *et al.*"), and the Complaint in Intervention filed by Alaska and Vermont. As referenced in the attached proposed Complaint in Intervention, the States seek a determination of their rights to certain unclaimed intangible personal property, as further described in Paragraphs 11 through 16 of the Motion of Arkansas, *et al.* for Leave to File Complaint in Intervention, which are adopted and incorporated herein.

5. The States' interests are not adequately represented by the original or intervening parties for the same reasons set forth in Paragraph 17 of the Motion of Arkansas, *et al.* for Leave to File Complaint in Intervention.

6. Intervention by the States will not delay the progress of this case, since the States are represented by the same counsel representing Alabama, *et al.*, Arkansas, *et al.*, New Jersey, *et al.* and Alaska and Vermont; they seek leave to file a Complaint in Intervention identical to that filed by Alabama, *et al.*, by Arkansas, *et al.*, by New Jersey, *et al.* and by Alaska and Vermont; and they agree to be bound by all proceedings held to date.

7. For the foregoing reasons, the States are entitled to intervene as a matter of right pursuant to Rule 24(a)(2), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

II.

8. Alternatively, the States adopt and incorporate herein Paragraphs 20 through 25 of the Motion of Arkansas, *et al.* for Leave to File Complaint in Intervention.

III.

9. The States also adopt and incorporate herein Paragraphs 26 and 27 of the Motion of Arkansas, *et al.* for Leave to File Complaint in Intervention.

10. Wherefore, the States pray that their Motion for Leave to File Complaint in Intervention be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

BERNARD NASH
(Counsel of Record)
ANDREW P. MILLER
LESLIE R. COHEN
JUDITH E. SCHAEFFER
DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO & MORIN
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 785-9700
Special Counsel for Applicants for Intervention

Michael J. Bowers, Attorney General
State of Georgia
Department of Law
132 State Judicial Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
(404) 656-4585

Michael E. Carpenter, Attorney General
State of Maine
State House
Augusta, Maine 04330
(207) 289-3661

June 3, 1991

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1990

No. 111 Original

STATE OF DELAWARE,
Plaintiff,

STATE OF TEXAS,
Plaintiff-Intervenor,

STATES OF GEORGIA AND MAINE,
Plaintiffs in Intervention,

v.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Defendant.

COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION OF THE STATES OF GEORGIA AND MAINE

The States of Georgia and Maine (hereinafter the "States"), Plaintiffs in Intervention, by and through their Attorneys General and Special Counsel, file this Complaint in Intervention and allege as follows:

1. The States incorporate by reference as though fully recited herein Paragraphs 1 through 8 and the Prayer for Relief of the Complaint in Intervention of the States of Arkansas, Florida, Iowa, Mississippi, Missouri, New

Hampshire and West Virginia, save for substituting their names as Plaintiffs in Intervention in Paragraph 4.

Respectfully submitted,

BERNARD NASH
(Counsel of Record)
ANDREW P. MILLER
LESLIE R. COHEN
JUDITH E. SCHAEFFER
DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO & MORIN
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 785-9700
Special Counsel for
Applicants for Intervention

Michael J. Bowers, Attorney General
State of Georgia
Department of Law
132 State Judicial Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
(404) 656-4585

Michael E. Carpenter, Attorney General
State of Maine
State House
Augusta, Maine 04330
(207) 289-3661

June 3, 1991

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1990

No. 111 Original

STATE OF DELAWARE,

Plaintiff,

STATE OF TEXAS,

Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

Defendant.

BRIEF OF THE STATES OF GEORGIA AND MAINE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION

The States of Georgia and Maine (hereinafter the "States"), by and through their Attorneys General and Special Counsel, hereby adopt and incorporate by reference as though fully recited herein, in support of their Motion for Leave to File Complaint in Intervention, the Brief filed with this Court on November 17, 1989, by the States of Arkansas, Florida, Iowa, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire and West Virginia (hereinafter "Arkansas, *et al.*") in Support of their Motion for Leave to File Complaint in Intervention.

In Litigation Management Order No. 1, dated as of October 18, 1989, the Special Master established a discovery schedule and a timetable for the filing of Motions

for Leave to Intervene by prospective intervenors. He stated that "[p]arties not meeting this timetable will be required, absent compelling reasons, to fit in to ongoing discovery and motions without disruption of that scheduling track" (¶ 8).

In Litigation Management Order No. 4, dated as of November 30, 1990, the Special Master granted the State of Maryland's motion for intervention, effective 15 days after the Supreme Court order referring the motion to him, "unless a party presently before the court files a memorandum in opposition to intervention prior to the expiration of that period after the referral." The Special Master stated that "[a]ny further applications for intervention referred to me by the Court during the pendency of the motions currently being briefed will be treated in the same fashion." Furthermore, "[a]ny state permitted to intervene during this period may participate in the ongoing briefing and argument as scheduled, and all future proceedings in the action," but will have no right to reopen the discovery period previously concluded.

The States' motion should be granted for the reasons set forth in the Brief of Arkansas, *et al.* Intervention by the States will not delay the progress of this case, since the States are represented by the same counsel representing the States of Alabama, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah and Washington, and the Commonwealths of Kentucky and Pennsylvania (hereinafter "Alabama, *et al.*"), Arkansas, *et al.*, the States of New Jersey, North Dakota and Wyoming (hereinafter "New Jersey, *et al.*") and the States of Alaska and Vermont; they seek leave to file a Complaint in Intervention identical to that filed by Alabama, *et al.*, by Arkansas, *et al.*, by New Jersey, *et al.* and by Alaska and Vermont; and they agree to be bound by all proceedings held to date.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, the Motion of the States of Georgia and Maine for Leave to File Complaint in Intervention should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

BERNARD NASH
(Counsel of Record)
ANDREW P. MILLER
LESLIE R. COHEN
JUDITH E. SCHAEFFER
DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO & MORIN
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 785-9700
Special Counsel for
Applicants for Intervention

Michael J. Bowers, Attorney General
State of Georgia
Department of Law
132 State Judicial Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
(404) 656-4585

Michael E. Carpenter, Attorney General
State of Maine
State House
Augusta, Maine 04330
(207) 289-3661

June 3, 1991