

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

JOHN W. HOWARD, Cal. State Bar No. 80200  
JW Howard/Attorneys, LTD.  
625 Broadway, Suite 1206  
San Diego, California 92101  
Telephone: (619) 234-2842  
Telefax: (619) 234-1716  
Pro Hac Vice Counsel for Joseph & Beverly Landolt

WILLIAM E. SCHAEFFER, Nev. State Bar No. 2789  
P.O. Box 936  
Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820  
Telephone: (775) 635-3227  
Telefax: (775) 635-3229  
Local Counsel for Joseph & Beverly Landolt

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
RENO, NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
Plaintiff,

WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,  
Plaintiff, Intervenor

v.

WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION  
DISTRICT, a corporation, et al.,  
Defendants.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE  
Counterclaimants,

vs.

WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION  
DISTRICT, et al.,  
Counterdefendants.

) In Equity No. C-125-ECR  
) Subfile No. C-125-B

)  
) REPLY TO RESPONSE TO OPENING  
) BRIEF ON APPEAL OF DENIAL OF  
) MOTION TO DISQUALIFY  
) COUNSEL, GORDON DePAOLI

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**REPLY TO RESPONSE TO OPENING BRIEF ON APPEAL OF DENIAL OF MOTION  
TO DISQUALIFY COUNSEL, GORDON DePAOLI**

Appellants fully briefed their position in their Opening Brief herein. The instant Reply will, therefore, be limited to responding to some of the points made in the Response.

**THERE IS A DIRECT CONFLICT BETWEEN THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE  
MEDIATION AND THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN DENIED A PLACE AT THAT TABLE.**

WRID asserts, repeatedly, that the water rights of the individual stakeholders have been adjudicated and will not be readjudicated in the instant action. In order to fully understand why this assertion is false, one must analyze what is at issue herein. The Tribe is requesting that this Court recognize the vesting of its rights at a time earlier than it has heretofore. It is asking, further, that this Court recognize a higher priority right to direct flow water than the 1936 Decree currently recognizes and increase the amount of such water that will be available to the Tribe under the decree.

There is a finite amount of water to be allocated in Northern Nevada and it is allocated according to vesting date and other factors. The Tribe is asking to be put at the head of the line which means that the rights it seeks, if granted and the decree modified accordingly, would result in less water available to those behind it in priority. While the relationship of those behind it would not change, the amount of water they would receive would. The truth of WRID's statement, then, is that the relationships as between the stakeholders other than the Tribe will not be readjudicated in this action. (Although there is no guarantee of that once the proceeding gets going and the Decree is reopened for modification.) The falsity of WRID's statement is in the implication that this action will not affect the water rights of the individual stakeholders.

1  
2 It is also not true, as WRID asserts at page 9 of its brief, at neither the federal government  
3 nor the Tribe are seeking to readjudicate the rights of the individual stakeholders. In seeking a  
4 larger percentage of the pie, they are certainly seeking to readjudicate what the individual  
5 stakeholders will receive by way of direct flow water. While it may not change the relationship  
6 of those behind the Tribe's rights, it certainly will change their relationship to the Tribe and the  
7 federal government.

8  
9 Where the conflict comes in is that virtually all of WRID's allocation is storage water as  
10 opposed to direct flow water. Its incentive to protect the priority rights of the individual  
11 stakeholders is significantly less than it is for the holders of those rights and it could easily  
12 concede points in mediation that individual stakeholders would not. The individual stakeholders  
13 would never know this, of course, since their attorney, Mr. DePaoli, who represents WRID in the  
14 mediation cannot tell them. WRID's statement in Response notwithstanding, this is a real and  
15 direct conflict.

16  
17 **WRID MUST WITHHOLD VIRTUALLY ALL INFORMATION EXCHANGED**  
18 **DURING THE MEDIATION PROCESS.**

19 WRID misrepresents the extent to which the individual stakeholders are to be  
20 denied information growing out of the mediation process. At page 14, line 14 of its Response, it  
21 asserts that under paragraph 8.3.4 of the *Mediation Process Agreement*, WRID it has the ability  
22 to communicate all sorts of things to its constituents. But what it can communicate is strictly  
23 limited. Let's start with observing that if 8.3.4 were as broad as WRID is attempting to suggest,  
24 there would be nothing confidential that cannot disclosed. But that is clearly untrue. If it were  
25 true, why would the mediating parties be struggling so mightily to maintain the confidentiality  
26 clause? Simply stated, 8.3.4 is just not that broad. It allows WRID to reveal three things and  
27  
28

1  
2 three things only: (1) when the next meeting is; (2) what proposals are being considered; and (3)  
3 what work assignments have been handed out to the participants. That's not much information.  
4 And it certainly is not nearly as broad as WRID would have this court believe.

5         The point is that the strict limitation of the information that can be disclosed to the non-  
6 mediating parties creates a conflict between those who are privy to the information exchanged  
7 during that process and those who are not and Mr. DePaoli represents both.

8  
9         **IT IS NOT JUST TO ASSERT THAT THE LANDOLTS CAN GIVE NO CONCRETE**  
10         **EXAMPLES OF IMPORTANT CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL WHEN THEY HAVE**  
11         **BEEN DENIED ACCESS TO ALL MATERIAL FLOWING FROM THE MEDIATION.**

12         In what must count as among the most cynical claims made by WRID in its opposition, it  
13 asserts that the Landolts have not given one concrete example of important information they are  
14 being denied by reason of the confidentiality of the mediation process. Of course they cannot.  
15 The information is not available to them. That's a little like telling someone he can drive your  
16 car anywhere but refusing to give him the keys. It is the very not knowing that creates the  
17 conflict. It is not enough for Mr. DePaoli to assure his individual clients that no information has  
18 been exchanged that they need to know. How can they give a knowing and intelligent waiver of  
19 a conflict if they are not even allowed to know what they are waiving?  
20

21         **THE FACT THAT MATERIALS GENERATED IN THE MEDIATION CANNOT BE**  
22         **USED IN THE LITIGATION IS IRRELEVANT.**

23  
24         WRID claims that if no one can use the information generated at mediation at trial  
25 because it is not admissible, then everyone is on an equal footing. Everyone is equally  
26 disadvantaged. But that is not so. Just because information is not admissible does not mean that  
27 it is not of interest and would not be helpful to a litigant. Many things in litigation are  
28

1  
2 confidential. Attorney work product, for example. But would anyone seriously deny that  
3 knowing an opposing lawyer's work product, even though inadmissible, would be helpful to the  
4 other side? Would anyone seriously deny that that knowledge would represent a tremendous  
5 advantage to the opposing party? Of course not. The notion is absurd on its face. The reason  
6 attorney work product is protected from discovery is just because it would give the opposing  
7 party a tremendous and unfair advantage over his adversary.

8  
9 And that is why the mere fact that the confidential information generated by the  
10 mediation process is inadmissible at trial does not, in any way, vitiate the tremendous advantage  
11 it gives those having it over those who do not. And how would an opposing party know to object  
12 to it when it is introduced anyway? How could he tell if it arose from the mediation or was just  
13 the result of good lawyering? He wouldn't. And that is why the fact of its inadmissibility is  
14 completely irrelevant.

15  
16 This is important because while Mr. DePaoli will learn that information wearing his  
17 WRID hat at the mediation, he will be able to use that information in behalf of his individual  
18 clients in the litigation while, at the same time, denying it to the other individual stakeholders.  
19 The disadvantage to the Landolts would be tremendous and deeply unfair.

20 **THE CONFLICT IS DIRECT.**

21 In its response, WRID writes that "Loyalty to a client is also impaired when a lawyer  
22 cannot consider, recommend or carry out an appropriate course of action for the client because of  
23 the lawyer's other responsibilities or interest." That is a correct statement and one this Court  
24 should consider carefully. The fact is that Mr. DePaoli cannot carry out the appropriate course of  
25 action of disclosing anything that would be important to his individual clients in this litigation  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

because of his responsibility to WRID to keep that information secret. That is the conflict and that is why Mr. DePaoli should be disqualified in this case.

Dated: June 21, 2006

*/s/ John W. Howard*

---

John W. Howard  
Attorney for Landolts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 21<sup>st</sup> day of June, 2006, I electronically filed the foregoing *Reply to Response to Opening Brief on Appeal of Denial of Motion to Disqualify Counsel, Gordon DePaoli* with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following via their e-mail addresses:

Marta Adams  
[maadams@ag.state.nv.us](mailto:maadams@ag.state.nv.us), [payoung@ag.state.nv.us](mailto:payoung@ag.state.nv.us)

Gregory W. Addington  
[greg.addington@usdoj.gov](mailto:greg.addington@usdoj.gov), [judy.farmer@usdoj.gov](mailto:judy.farmer@usdoj.gov), [joanie.silvershield@usdoj.gov](mailto:joanie.silvershield@usdoj.gov)

Linda Bowman  
[office@bowman.reno.nv.us](mailto:office@bowman.reno.nv.us)

Gordon H. DePaoli  
[gdepaoli@woodburnandwedge.com](mailto:gdepaoli@woodburnandwedge.com)

Ross E. de Lipkau  
[Rde-lipkau@parsonsbehle.com](mailto:Rde-lipkau@parsonsbehle.com)

Kirk C. Johnson  
[kirk@nvlawyers.com](mailto:kirk@nvlawyers.com)

Stephen M. MacFarlane  
[Stephen.Macfarlane@usdoj.gov](mailto:Stephen.Macfarlane@usdoj.gov), [deedee.sparks@usdoj.gov](mailto:deedee.sparks@usdoj.gov), [efile-sacramento.enrd@usdoj.gov](mailto:efile-sacramento.enrd@usdoj.gov)

G. David Robertson  
[gdauid@nvlawyers.com](mailto:gdauid@nvlawyers.com), [chris@nvlawyers.com](mailto:chris@nvlawyers.com), [kirk@nvlawyers.com](mailto:kirk@nvlawyers.com)

Susan L. Schneider  
[susan.schneider@usdoj.gov](mailto:susan.schneider@usdoj.gov)

Debbie Shosteck  
[dshosteck@mcdonalddcarano.com](mailto:dshosteck@mcdonalddcarano.com), [ssmithson@mcdonalddcarano.com](mailto:ssmithson@mcdonalddcarano.com)

Stephen R. Wassner  
[swassner@aol.com](mailto:swassner@aol.com), [wassner@sbcglobal.net](mailto:wassner@sbcglobal.net)

David L. Negri  
[david.negri@usdoj.gov](mailto:david.negri@usdoj.gov)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

and I further certify that I served a copy of the foregoing to the following non CM/ECF participants by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, this 21<sup>st</sup> day of June, 2006:

George Benesch, Esq.  
190 West Huffaker Lane, Ste 408  
Reno, NV 89511

Wes Williams Jr.  
Law Offices of Wes Williams Jr.  
P.O. Box 100  
Schurz, Nevada 89427

Wesley G. Beverlin  
Malissa Hathaway McKeith  
Lewis, Brisbois, Bisgaard & Smith LCP  
221 N. Figueroa St., Ste. 1200  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Cheri Emm-Smith  
Mineral County District Attorney  
PO Box 1210  
Hawthorne, NV 89415

Nathan Goedde  
Staff Counsel  
Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game  
1416 Ninth Street, Ste. 1335  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Hugh Ricci, P.E.  
Division of Water Resources  
State of Nevada  
901 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV 89701

Simeon Herskovits  
Courtney Brown  
Western Environment Law Center  
PO Box 1507  
Taos, NM 87571

Stephen B. Rye  
Chief Deputy District Attorney  
31 S. Main St.  
Yerington, NV 89447

John Kramer  
Department of Water Resources  
1416 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Scott H. Schackelton  
Silverado, Inc.  
4160 Long Knife Rd.  
Reno, NV 89509

Timothy A. Lukas  
P.O. Box 3237  
Reno, NV 89505

William E. Schaeffer  
PO Box 936  
Battle Mountain, NV 89820

Erin K.L. Mahaney  
Office of Chief Counsel  
State Water Resources Control Board  
1001 I Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Laura A. Schroeder  
P.O. Box 12527  
Portland, OR 97212-0527

Michael W. Neville  
DOJ, Office of the Atty General  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
Suite 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3664

James Shaw  
Water Master  
US Board of Water Commissioners  
P.O. Box 853  
Yerington, NV 89447



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Jeff Parker  
Deputy Atty General  
Office of the Attorney General  
100 N. Carson St.  
Carson City, NV 89701-4717

Todd Plimpton  
Belanger & Plimpton  
1135 Central Avenue  
P.O. Box 59  
Lovelock, NV 89419

William W. Quinn  
Office of the Field Solicitor  
Department of the Interior  
401 W. Washington St., SPC 44  
Phoenix, AZ 85003

Alan Biaggi  
Dir. Of Conservation & Natural Resources  
State of Nevada  
901 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV 89701

Tim Glidden  
U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Office of the  
Secretary, Div. Of Indian Affairs  
1849 C St. N.W.  
Mail Stop 6456  
Washington, DC 20240

Marshall S. Rudolph, Mono County Counsel  
Stacy Simon, Deputy County Counsel  
Mono County  
P.O. Box 2415  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546-2415

Walker River Irrigation District  
P.O. Box 820  
Yerington, NV 89447

Kenneth Spooner  
General Manager  
Walker River Irrigation District  
P.O. Box 820  
Yerington, NV 89447

Mary Hackenbracht  
Deputy Attorney General  
State of California  
1515 Clay St., 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612-1413

Garry Stone  
United States District Court Water Master  
290 S. Arlington Ave, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Reno, NV 89501

*/s/ Elisa Marino*

Elisa Marino