


1 GORDON H. DEPAOLI  
 Nevada State Bar 00195  
 2 SUELLEN FULSTONE  
 Nevada State Bar 1615  
 3 DALE E. FERGUSON  
 Nevada State Bar 04986  
 4 WOODBURN AND WEDGE  
 5 6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
 Post Office Box 2311  
 6 Reno, Nevada 89511  
 Telephone: (775) 688-3000  
 7

8 Attorneys for Defendant/Counterdefendant,  
 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT  
 9

FILED

01 AUG -3 PM 3:52

LANCE S. WILSON  
 CLERK  
 BY \_\_\_\_\_  
 DEPUTY



10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 11 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	In Equity No. C-125-ECR
	)	Subfile No. C-125-B
13 Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
14 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,	)	<b>STATEMENT OF THE WALKER</b>
	)	<b>RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT</b>
15 Plaintiff-Intervenor,	)	<b>REGARDING METHODS USED BY</b>
	)	<b>THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b>
16 v.	)	<b>AND WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE</b>
	)	<b>TO IDENTIFY PERSONS AND</b>
17 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,	)	<b>ENTITIES TO BE SERVED PURSUANT</b>
18 a corporation, et al.,	)	<b>TO PARAGRAPH 3 OF THE CASE</b>
	)	<b>MANAGEMENT ORDER</b>
19 Defendants.	)	
	)	
20	)	
21 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, WALKER	)	
22 RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,	)	
	)	
23 Counterclaimants,	)	
	)	
24 v.	)	
	)	
25 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,	)	
26 et al.,	)	
	)	
27 Counterdefendants.	)	
28	)	

159

1 **I. INTRODUCTION.**

2 At the status conference of May 30, 2001 the Court ordered the United States and the  
3 Walker River Paiute Tribe (the "Tribe") to describe the methods they have used to identify  
4 persons required to be joined and served under the Case Management Order. The other parties  
5 were given an opportunity to object or suggest additional methods. *May 30, 2001 Minute*  
6 *Order, (Doc. No. 521).*

7 Before providing the suggestions of the Walker River Irrigation District (the "District")  
8 it is useful to review the reasons why the Court and the parties should be concerned with the  
9 methods the United States and the Tribe have used in identifying the persons to be joined and  
10 served as defendants in this action. The reasons were expressed by the Court in the Mineral  
11 County subproceeding as follows:

12 This case is essentially an action *in rem* to quiet title to property – that property  
13 being the water (or rather, right to take the water) of the Walker River and its  
14 tributaries . . . . Without all the owners of the property properly joined in the  
15 case as defendants, any reallocation of water rights that might result from the  
16 case could be subject to future attack. *See March 2, 1999 Order at 4, Subfile C-*  
17 *125-C (Doc. No. 257).*

18 In short, any judgment entered in this matter must be binding on all affected water right  
19 holders.

20 In an action like this one, a plaintiff may acquire personal jurisdiction over unknown  
21 parties by service of a summons by publication. In that situation it must be established that the  
22 identity of such persons and their whereabouts could not be discovered after a diligent search.  
23 *See April 1, 1997 Minute Order at page 3, Subfile C-125-C (Doc. No. 99),* and cases cited  
24 therein. However, as the Supreme Court of the United States stated in *Walker v. Hutchinson,*  
25 352 U.S. 112, 115 (1956) "it is common knowledge that mere newspaper publication rarely  
26 informs a landowner of proceedings against his property." For that reason a judgment will not  
27 bind a person served by publication if that person's identity is a matter of public record and can  
28 be ascertained through reasonable diligence. A judgment so obtained is subject to collateral  
attack. *See, Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306 (1950); Mennonite*  
*Board of Missions v. Adams, 462 U.S. 791 (1983); Walker v. Hutchinson 352 U.S. 112 (1956);*  
*Benoit v. Panthaky 780 F.2d 336 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1985).*

1           Therefore, in assessing the methods used by the Tribe and the United States to identify  
2 the persons and entities described in the Case Management Order, the Court must consider  
3 whether they have failed to use a method of identification through which the identity of such a  
4 person or entity could have been ascertained with reasonable diligence. If they have so failed,  
5 persons or entities not joined will not be bound by any judgment the Court eventually enters.

6 **II. THE FAILURE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE TRIBE TO CONDUCT**  
7 **ANY RESEARCH WITHIN THE OFFICES OF THE COUNTY RECORDERS**  
8 **WITHIN THE WALKER RIVER BASIN PRESENTS THE VERY REAL**  
9 **POSSIBILITY THAT THEY WILL FAIL TO IDENTIFY A PERSON WHOSE**  
10 **RIGHTS ARE AFFECTED AND WHOSE IDENTITY AND WHEREABOUTS**  
11 **COULD HAVE BEEN DISCOVERED WITH REASONABLE DILIGENCE.**

12           It is apparent that the United States and Tribe have employed methods of identification  
13 directed at obtaining already existing lists or identifications of persons required to be joined.  
14 This has been particularly the case with respect to persons who are successors to parties to the  
15 Walker River Decree. They have studiously avoided bringing the tabulation of water rights and  
16 water rights holders in the Decree current through review of deeds in the offices of County  
17 Recorders. *See e.g., Status Report of United States and Tribe at 26, December 21, 2000;*  
18 *Affidavit of Elizabeth Rimer paras. 8-9, Exh. 2 to Memorandum of United States and Tribe,*  
19 *March 13, 2001.* Except for reviewing deeds obtained from the U.S. Board of Water  
20 Commissioners and the District with respect to the successors-in-interest category, the June 12,  
21 2001 Becker Affidavit makes no reference to having conducted any research within offices of  
22 County Recorders.

23           Paragraph 3 of the Case Management Order requires joinder and service on persons or  
24 entities who hold certain categories of water rights. Under Nevada and California law water  
25 rights in most of those categories will be appurtenant to the land on which they are used.  
26 Therefore, under Nevada and California law, absent something in a deed to the contrary,  
27 ownership of those water rights will pass with ownership of the land on which the water is  
28 used. *See Margrave v. Dermody Properties*, 110 Nev. 824, 828, 878 P.2d 291 (1994); N.R.S.  
§ 533.382; *Wetherill v. Brehm*, 240 P. 529, 532 (Cal. App. 1925).

1 Categories which include water rights likely to be appurtenant to real property are  
2 categories 3(a) (the successors-in-interest category), category 3(b) (holders of surface water  
3 rights under Nevada and California law not included in the Walker River Decree), category  
4 3(c) (holders of permits or certificates to pump groundwater issued by the State of Nevada and  
5 domestic users of groundwater in certain subbasins in Nevada), category 3(d) (holders of  
6 permits or certificates to pump groundwater issued by the State of Nevada within certain  
7 subbasins), category 3(e) (users of groundwater for irrigation in California), category 3(f) (all  
8 holders of vested rights to the use of groundwater under the laws of the State of Nevada), and  
9 category 3(i) (industrial users in Nevada).

10 From the material provided by the United States and the Tribe, it is clear that they have  
11 made no attempt to examine information available in Recorder's offices concerning ownership  
12 of water rights within the categories listed in the Case Management Order. This failure is  
13 mitigated somewhat with respect to category 3(a) by work which the United States Board of  
14 Water Commissioners and the District undertake in reviewing deeds provided to those entities  
15 by Lyon County. There is, however, no similar direct or indirect link between the information  
16 which the United States and Tribe have reviewed concerning other categories in the Case  
17 Management Order and County Recorders offices. There is no assurance, for example, that  
18 State Engineer well log information on a domestic wells represents the current owner of the  
19 land to which that domestic well is appurtenant or that State Engineer assignment information  
20 concerning an irrigation or industrial well represents the current owner of the land to which  
21 water rights from such wells are appurtenant. That failure is also mitigated somewhat by the  
22 fact that many of the persons with water rights in category 3(a) will also be persons with water  
23 rights in categories 3(b), 3(c), 3(d), 3(e), and 3(f). However, as the Becker Affidavit reflects,  
24 not all of the persons or entities have multiple water rights and claims to rights to water in more  
25 than one of the Case Management Order categories. *See June 12, 2001 Becker Affidavit at*  
26 *paragraphs 8, 17b, 18c, 20d and 24a.*

1 **III. EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY USERS OF GROUNDWATER FOR IRRIGATION IN**  
2 **CALIFORNIA IN THE WALKER RIVER BASIN ARE INADEQUATE.**

3 As the Becker Affidavit recognizes, the California State Water Resources Control  
4 Board does not maintain information on or regulate the use of groundwater for irrigation. Yet,  
5 the only information which Mr. Becker has examined with respect to this category appears to  
6 be information from the California State Water Resources Control Board. *See, Becker Affidavit*  
7 *at para. 19.* As noted in the Becker Affidavit, that information has not yielded any persons and  
8 entities in this category. Information provided by an entity which maintains no information on  
9 a category is not adequate.

10 **IV. THE UNITED STATES AND THE TRIBE SHOULD NOT RELY ON**  
11 **INFORMATION OR MATERIAL FILED BY MINERAL COUNTY.**

12 In a number of places, the Becker Affidavit references material obtained from Mineral  
13 County in the subfile C-125-C proceeding. In many instances the Becker Affidavit notes  
14 problems with these materials. *See, e.g., Becker Affidavit at paras. 15i, 15j, and 15k.* The  
15 Court is very familiar with Mineral County's approach to service and identification. Moreover,  
16 over six years have elapsed since Mineral County began to identify and serve water right  
17 holders. The United States and Tribe should not rely on work done by Mineral County as a  
18 method for identifying persons to be joined and served here.

19 **V. CONCLUSION.**

20 The efforts made by the United States and the Tribe to identify persons and entities to  
21 be served pursuant to Paragraph 3 of the Case Management Order have been substantial.  
22 However, without some work in the offices of County Recorders, it is possible, if not likely,  
23 that they will fail to join and serve persons whose rights will be affected, whose names are a  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 matter of public record and who therefore could have been ascertained with reasonable  
2 diligence.

3 Dated this 3rd day of August, 2001.

4  
5 WOODBURN AND WEDGE  
6 6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
7 Post Office Box 2311  
8 Reno, Nevada 89511

9 By: Gordon H. DePaoli

10 GORDON H. DEPAOLI  
11 Nevada State Bar 00195  
12 SUELLEN FULSTONE  
13 Nevada State Bar 1615  
14 DALE E. FERGUSON  
15 Nevada State Bar 04986  
16 Attorneys for Defendant/Counterdefendant  
17 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
C:\WP\WRID\0063\Comments of WRID re Methods.doc

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that I am an employee of Woodburn and Wedge and that on this date, I deposited in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **STATEMENT OF THE WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT REGARDING METHODS USED BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE TO IDENTIFY PERSONS AND ENTITIES TO BE SERVED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 3 OF THE CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER** in an envelope addressed to and where indicated by an asterisk by Federal Express also:

Shirley A. Smith  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
100 West Liberty Street, #600  
Reno, NV 89509

William Quinn  
Department of the Interior  
Two North Central Avenue, #500  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

George Benesch  
P.O. Box 3498  
Reno, NV 89505

Western Nevada Agency  
Bureau of Indian Affairs  
1677 Hot Springs Road  
Carson City, NV 89706

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

Hugh Ricci, P.E.  
Division of Water Resources  
State of Nevada  
123 West Nye Lane  
Carson City, NV 89710

Garry Stone  
United States District Court Water Master  
290 South Arlington Avenue  
Third Floor  
Reno, NV 89501

Alice E. Walker  
Greene, Meyer & McElroy  
1007 Pearl Street, Suite 220  
Boulder, CO 80302

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

Matthew R. Campbell, Esq.  
David Moser, Esq.  
McCutchen, Doyle, Brown & Enerson  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Michael W. Neville  
California Attorney General's Office  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
Suite 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3664

Ross E. de Lipkau  
Marshall, Hill, Cassas & de Lipkau  
P.O. Box 2790  
Reno, NV 89505

1 Susan Schneider  
Indian Resources Section  
2 U.S. Department of Justice  
999 18<sup>th</sup> Street  
3 Suite 945, North Tower  
4 Denver, CO 80202

Marta Adams  
Deputy Attorney General  
State of Nevada  
100 North Carson street  
Carson City, NV 89701

5 Mary Hackenbracht  
Deputy Attorney General  
6 State of California  
1515 Clay Street, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
7 Oakland, CA 94612-1413

Treva J. Hearne  
Zeh, Spoo, & Hearne  
575 Forest Service  
Reno, NV 89509

8 Roger Bezayiff  
9 Water Master  
U.S. Board of Water Commissioners  
10 P.O. Box 853  
11 Yerington, NV 89447

Hank Meshorer  
United States Department of Justice  
Natural Resources Division  
Ben Franklin Station  
P.O. Box 7611  
Washington, D.C. 20044

12 Kathryn E. Landreth  
13 United States Attorney  
100 West Liberty Street  
14 Suite 600  
15 Reno, NV 89501

Linda Bowman  
540 Hammill Lane  
Reno, NV 89511

16 Kelly R. Chase  
17 P.O. Box 2800  
Reno, NV 89423

18 Dated this 30<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2001.

Penelope H. Colter  
Penelope H. Colter

20 CAWP\WRID\0063\Comments of WRID re Methods.doc

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28