

1 SIMEON M. HERSKOVITS, *pro hac vice*  
New Mexico State Bar No.1686  
2 ADVOCATES FOR COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENT  
3 P.O. Box 1075  
El Prado, NM 87529  
4 Phone: (575) 758-7202  
5 Fax: (575) 758-7203  
E-mail: [simeon@communityandenvironment.net](mailto:simeon@communityandenvironment.net)

6 CHERI K. EMM-SMITH  
7 Nevada State Bar No. 3055  
8 MINERAL COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
P.O. Box 1210  
9 Hawthorne, NV 89415  
10 Phone: (775) 945-3636  
11 Fax: (775) 945-0700  
E-mail: [districtattorney@mineralcountynv.org](mailto:districtattorney@mineralcountynv.org)

12 Attorneys for MINERAL COUNTY, NEVADA

13  
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
15 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

16 \* \* \*

17 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
18 Plaintiff,	)	3:73-CV-0127-ECR-RAM
	)	
19 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,	)	In Equity No. C-125
	)	Subfile C-125-B
20 Plaintiff-Intervenor,	)	
	)	
21 vs.	)	
	)	<b>MINERAL COUNTY</b>
22 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,	)	<b>PRELIMINARY THRESHOLD</b>
23 a corporation, et al.,	)	<b>ISSUES RESPONSE BRIEF</b>
	)	
24 Defendants.	)	
25	)	

1  
2 ARGUMENT

3 I. The Court Should Address Limited Jurisdictional, Choice Of Law, And  
4 Procedural Issues As Threshold Issues Before Addressing Issues That Require  
5 Factual Development And Overlap With The Ultimate Merits

6  
7 As noted in Mineral County’s Opening Brief, designating and addressing an issue as a  
8 threshold issue is appropriate only when the issue is one that properly is decided at the outset of  
9 litigation in order, like other pretrial tools, to “aid the efficient presentation of a case in order to  
10 maximize the chances of a fair and just result.” Hon. Milton Pollack, *Pretrial Procedures More*  
11 *Effectively Handled*, 65 F.R.D. 475, 477 (1975). Generally, then, a threshold issue should be an  
12 issue of pure law or one that requires only minimal factual development through discovery or  
13 other means, not one that requires significant factual development and discovery or one that  
14 involves consideration of the ultimate merits of a claim. While the complexity of this case  
15 necessitates that efficiency be a primary concern, it must be balanced with the goals of  
16 thoroughness, fairness and reaching a sound result.  
17

18  
19 In their opening briefs on threshold issues, a number of the upstream defendants have  
20 advocated an approach to the identification and resolution of issues in this case as threshold  
21 issues that appears to be at once inappropriately expansive and unfairly slanted. For example,  
22 the Walker River Irrigation District (“WRID”) suggests that the Court not only designate as  
23 threshold issues, but also bifurcate for separate trial, a number of issues that go to the heart of the  
24 ultimate merits of the Tribal Claims, as defined in the CMO. In advocating for their treatment as  
25 threshold issues, WRID and other upstream defendants attempt to minimize the extent to which  
26 addressing these issues would require discovery and development of factual matters that overlap  
27  
28

1 with the ultimate fact issues underlying the Tribal Claims. At the same time, these upstream  
2 defendants either sidestep or argue against the CMO's suggested designation of hydrologic,  
3 choice of law, and jurisdictional issues concerning surface and groundwater in the Walker River  
4 basin as threshold issues, despite the fact that these issues, too, could prove to be dispositive and  
5 merely implicate other facets of ultimate fact development that could prove to be less favorable  
6 to the defendants' interests.

7  
8 In effect, these upstream defendants are urging the Court to treat as threshold issues those  
9 facets of the ultimate merits of the Tribal Claims that put the plaintiffs in the position of having  
10 to make defensive factual showings, while deferring consideration of those facets of the ultimate  
11 merits of the Tribal Claims that would require themselves to make such a showing. This seems  
12 simply unfair and prejudicial to the plaintiffs. Accordingly, the Court should decline these  
13 upstream defendants' invitation to selectively address those ultimate merits issues that favor  
14 them at this still preliminary stage of the litigation while deferring any consideration of those  
15 ultimate merits issues that might work to their disadvantage. Rather, Mineral County  
16 respectfully suggests that the Court first address genuine, undisputed threshold issues, such as  
17 those concerning the scope of the Court's jurisdiction, the proper choice of applicable law, and  
18 service. After those issues have been addressed, the Court could more efficiently provide for  
19 discovery and motion practice concerning all of the other more factual and merits-oriented issues  
20 that have been identified in the CMO and the parties' threshold issues briefing.

21  
22  
23  
24 II. Additional Bifurcation Is Not Called For In This Case

25 The Court already has addressed the question of bifurcation in this case, and in the CMO  
26 the Court bifurcated the Tribal Claims from the remaining federal agency claims. CMO at 1-3.  
27 In its Opening Brief WRID alludes to the bifurcation criteria considered under Federal Rule of  
28

1 Civil Procedure 42(b) in advocating for certain issues to be treated as threshold issues, despite  
2 the fact that they require factual development and address the ultimate merits of this case.  
3 WRID further asserts that those issues should be bifurcated from the consideration of other  
4 issues that require factual development and consideration of the case's merits. Mineral County  
5 agrees that, in making its determination as to threshold issues, it is appropriate for the Court to  
6 consider the types of factors considered by trial courts under Rule 42(b), which include  
7 "avoiding prejudice, separability of the issues, convenience, judicial economy, and reducing risk  
8 of confusion," *see Bates v. UPS*, 204 F.R.D. 440 (N.D. Cal. 2001) (citations omitted), and  
9 "complexity of issues, factual proof, risk of jury confusion, difference between the separated  
10 issues, the chance that separation will lead to economy in discovery and, the possibility that the  
11 first trial may be dispositive of the case." *Calmar, Inc. v. Emson Research, Inc.*, 850 F. Supp.  
12 861, 866 (C.D. Cal. 1994) (citations omitted).

13  
14  
15 However, Mineral County believes that the phased approach to the identification and  
16 resolution of threshold issues within the bifurcated Tribal Claims portion of this case, as outlined  
17 in the CMO, is sufficient for case management purposes, and that no further bifurcation is  
18 warranted. "The piecemeal trial of separate issues in a single suit is not to be the usual course. It  
19 should be resorted to only in the exercise of informed discretion when the court believes that  
20 separation will achieve the purposes of the rule." *Hangerter v. Provident Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*,  
21 236 F. Supp. 2d 1069, 1095 (N.D. Cal. 2002) (citing 9 Wright and Miller, Federal Practice and  
22 Procedure: Civil 2d, § 2388 (1995)), *affirmed in part, reversed in part on other grounds*,  
23 *Hangerter v. Provident Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 373 F.3d 998 (9th Cir. 2004). Where questions of  
24 fact overlap issues proposed for bifurcation, courts often have held that bifurcation is  
25 inappropriate. *See 9A Wright and Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil 3d*, § 2338  
26  
27  
28

1 (2008). As explained above, the issues that WRID asserts should be bifurcated are too factually  
2 and legally intertwined with the rest of the Tribal Claims' ultimate merits to be properly  
3 separated from the rest of the merits-oriented issues in terms of discovery and judicial resolution.  
4 Therefore, the Court should not bifurcate any of the putative threshold issues that have been  
5 identified from the rest of the issues involved in the Tribal Claims.  
6

7 ///

8 ///

9 ///

10 ///

11 ///

12 ///

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above and in Mineral County's Preliminary Threshold Issues Opening Brief, Mineral County respectfully suggests that at this stage of the case, the Court designate only the limited list of predominantly legal issues proposed by Mineral County as proper preliminary threshold issues in its Opening Brief.

Dated: October 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

SIMEON M. HERSKOVITS, *pro hac vice*  
New Mexico State Bar No.1686  
ADVOCATES FOR COMMUNITY AND  
ENVIRONMENT  
P.O. Box 1075  
El Prado, NM 87529  
Phone: (575) 758-7202  
Fax: (575) 758-7203  
E-mail: [simeon@communityandenvironment.net](mailto:simeon@communityandenvironment.net)

By /s/ Simeon M. Herskovits  
SIMEON M. HERSKOVITS

Dated: October 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

CHERI K. EMM-SMITH  
Nevada State Bar No. 3055  
MINERAL COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
P.O. Box 1210  
Hawthorne, NV 89415  
Phone: (775) 945-3636  
Fax: (775) 945-0700  
E-mail: [districtattorney@mineralcountynv.org](mailto:districtattorney@mineralcountynv.org)

By /s/ Cheri Emm Smith  
CHERI EMM SMITH

Attorneys for MINERAL COUNTY, NEVADA

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

1  
2  
3 I hereby certify that on this 10th day of October, 2008, I electronically filed the foregoing  
4 Mineral County Preliminary Threshold Issues Response Brief with the Clerk of the Court using  
5 the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following via their email  
6 addresses:

7  
8 Marta A. Adams  
[madams@ag.nv.gov](mailto:madams@ag.nv.gov) [pyoung@ag.nv.gov](mailto:pyoung@ag.nv.gov)

9  
10 Gregory W. Addington  
[greg.addington@usdoj.gov](mailto:greg.addington@usdoj.gov) [judy.farmer@usdoj.gov](mailto:judy.farmer@usdoj.gov) [joanie.silvershield@usdog.gov](mailto:joanie.silvershield@usdog.gov)

11  
12 George N. Benesch  
[gbenesch@sbcglobal.net](mailto:gbenesch@sbcglobal.net)

13  
14 Gordon H. DePaoli  
[gdepaoli@woodburnandwedge.com](mailto:gdepaoli@woodburnandwedge.com)

15  
16 Cheri Emm-Smith  
[districtattorney@mineralcountynv.org](mailto:districtattorney@mineralcountynv.org)

17  
18 Dale E. Ferguson  
[dferguson@woodburnandwedge.com](mailto:dferguson@woodburnandwedge.com)

19  
20 John W. Howard  
[john@jwhowardattorneys.com](mailto:john@jwhowardattorneys.com) [elisam@whowardattorneys.com](mailto:elisam@whowardattorneys.com)

21  
22 Erin K. L. Mahaney  
[emahaney@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:emahaney@waterboards.ca.gov)

23  
24 David L. Negri  
[David.negri@usdoj.gov](mailto:David.negri@usdoj.gov)

25  
26 Michael Neville  
[michael.neville@doj.ca.gov](mailto:michael.neville@doj.ca.gov) [cory.marcelino@doj.ca.gov](mailto:cory.marcelino@doj.ca.gov)

27  
28 Karen A. Peterson  
[kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com](mailto:kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com) [egarrison@allisonmackenzie.com](mailto:egarrison@allisonmackenzie.com)

Marshall Rudolph  
[mrudolph@mono.ca.gov](mailto:mrudolph@mono.ca.gov)

Mineral County Preliminary Threshold Issues Response Brief  
Page 7 of 9

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

3 William Schaeffer  
4 [Lander\\_lawyer@yahoo.com](mailto:Lander_lawyer@yahoo.com)

5 Laura A. Schroeder  
6 [counsel@water-law.com](mailto:counsel@water-law.com)

7 Stacey Simon  
8 [ssimon@mono.ca.gov](mailto:ssimon@mono.ca.gov)

9 Brian Stockton  
10 [bstockton@ag.nv.gov](mailto:bstockton@ag.nv.gov)

11 Wes Williams  
12 [wwilliams@standordalumni.org](mailto:wwilliams@standordalumni.org)

13 and I further certify that I served or caused to have served a true and correct copy of the  
14 foregoing Mineral County Preliminary Threshold Issues Response Brief on the following non-  
15 CM/ECF participants by U.S Mail, postage prepaid, this 10th day of October 2008:

16 Ken Spooner  
17 Walker River Irrigation District  
18 P.O. Box 820  
19 Yerington, NV 89447

Tracy Taylor  
State Engineer – Division of Water Resources  
State of Nevada  
901 S. Stewart Street  
Carson City, NV 89701

20 John Kramer  
21 Department of Water Resources  
22 1416 Ninth Street, Room 1118  
23 Sacramento, CA 94814

Jim Shaw  
Chief Dep. Water Commissioner  
U.S. Board of Water Commissioners  
P.O. Box 853  
Yerington, NV 89447

24 Robert L. Hunter, Superintendent  
25 Western Nevada Agency  
26 Bureau of Indian Affairs  
27 311 E. Washington Street  
28 Carson City, NV 89701-4065

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



1 Allen Biaggi  
2 Dept. of Conservation & Natural Resources  
3 State of Nevada  
4 901 S. Stewart Street  
5 Carson City, NV 89701

Michael F. Mackedon  
P.O. Box 1203  
179 South LaVerne Street  
Fallon, NV 89407

6 Nathan Goedde  
7 Staff Counsel  
8 California Dept. of Fish & Game  
9 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1335  
10 Sacramento, CA 95814

Kelly R. Chase  
1700 County Road, Suite A  
P.O. Box 2800  
Minden, NV 89423

11 Gary Stone  
12 290 South Arlington Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
13 Reno, NV 89501

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

14 Michael D. Hoy  
15 Bible Hoy & Trachok  
16 201 West Liberty Street, Third Floor  
17 Reno, NV 89511

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

18 Robert Auer  
19 District Attorney for Lyon County  
20 31 South Main Street  
21 Yerington, NV 89447

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

22 /s/ Noel Simmons  
23 NOEL SIMMONS  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28