

1 JOHN W. HOWARD, Cal. State Bar No. 80200  
 JW Howard/Attorneys, LTD.  
 2 625 Broadway, Suite 1206  
 San Diego, California 92101  
 3 Telephone: (619) 234-2842  
 Telefax: (619) 234-1716  
 4 Pro Hac Vice Counsel for Joseph & Beverly Landolt

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

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
 DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
 FILED

DEC - 6 2005

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

BY \_\_\_\_\_ DEPUTY

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 10 DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
 11 RENO, 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>NOTICE OF MOTION AND</b>
15 Plaintiff, Intervenor	)	<b>MOTION TO CLARIFY JUDGE</b>
	)	<b>REID'S CASE MANAGEMENT</b>
16 v.	)	<b>ORDER DATED APRIL 18, 2000</b>
	)	
17 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION	)	
18 DISTRICT, a corporation, et al.,	)	
	)	
19 Defendants.	)	
	)	
20 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	
21 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE	)	
	)	
22 Counterclaimants,	)	
	)	
23 vs.	)	
	)	
24 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION	)	
DISTRICT, et al.,	)	
	)	
25 Counterdefendants.	)	
	)	
26	)	
27	)	

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


PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendants Joseph and Beverly Landolt bring the instant Motion to Modify Judge Reid's Case Management Order dated April 18, 2000. Defendants request that this Motion be heard by Judge Reid, as he is the one who issued the order.

The Landolts seek an order clarifying the April 18, 2000 Case Management Order so that it clearly states that the litigation stay contained therein applies to issues that bear on the determination of the stakeholders' rights going forward but not to litigation over the rights and responsibilities existing under the operative Decree of 1936.

This motion is made on the grounds that good cause exists to either clarify or modify Judge Reid's Order. It is an inherent power of the court to clarify or modify any order issued by it. The existing order needs to be clarified because Judge McQuaid erroneously interpreted it to mean that defendants could not enforce their water rights under the existing Decree. Given this interpretation, defendants could not enforce their rights even though they have evidence that Walker River Paiute Tribe is appropriating significantly more water than was authorized under the 1936 Decree currently in effect. In order to protect their water rights, the existing order must be clarified as to enable the defendants to enforce the existing Decree of 1936.

This motion is based upon these points and authorities, any pleadings on file with the court and any oral or documentary evidence presented at the hearing.

Date: December 1, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John W. Howard

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

**BACKGROUND**

This case dates back to the beginning of the last century. It was resolved by a decree issued by this court in 1936 which determined the rights of the competing parties in certain water resources. The water resources were managed in accordance with the decree without apparent complaint until July 31, 1997. In that year, this case became active again because some of the parties wanted to change the decree to reflect what they claim is a change in circumstances between 1936 and the present day. The purpose of this action is to determine the rights of the parties going forward. That will, of course, require litigation. The parties who revived the case decided to conduct a mediation as among themselves, and only among themselves, to attempt to narrow the issues this Court must decide.

In furtherance of that effort, those parties requested an order from this Court which, among other things, stayed all litigation in this case until the mediation was either completed or abandoned. (See Case Management Order dated April 18, 2000.) The order reads in pertinent part: "All discovery and all other proceedings in this action included in or in connection with the said First Amended Counterclaims are stayed, until further order of the court, and except as provided in this order." (See Case Management Order dated April 18, 2000, page 4, lines 21-24.)

Since that time, those parties have, for several years, fruitlessly mediated. In addition, the number of parties to the action has expanded geometrically. The new parties have repeatedly requested a seat at the mediation table, which requests have been vigorously opposed by the mediating parties. The result is, of course, that the issues will not be narrowed; the disputes will not be resolved and the case will not settle. Therefore, after some delay, the case will be tried.

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

During the litigation, it became clear to some of the parties that the Walker River Paiute Tribe was appropriating significantly more water than was authorized under the decree and they requested an order to show cause why the Tribe should not be found in contempt for violating the Decree. The request was denied on the basis that the April 18, 2000 Case Management Order stayed litigation pending mediation.

Since the litigation is intended to modify the decree and determine the rights of the various stakeholders *going forward*, it is clear that the stay order was intended to apply to litigation geared toward resolving those issues. Equally clear is that it was not intended to prevent interested parties from enforcing their existing rights under the decree or to prevent others from acting in violation of it. Indeed the very wording of the stay that "All discovery and all other proceedings in this action included in or *in connection with the said First Amended Counterclaims* are stayed, ..." clearly indicates that the Court intended that only litigation undertaken in connection with the First Amended Counterclaims are stayed and not those connected to other things, such as enforcement of the existing decree. The words cited above are clearly words of limitation unintended as limiting the ability of any party to enforce existing rights. And the First Amended Counterclaims only speak in terms of modifying the decree going forward, not of adjudicating rights that currently exist.

Therefore, the Landolts seek an order clarifying the April 18, 2000 Case Management Order to indicate that the litigation stay contained therein applies to issues that bear on the determination to be made herein of the stakeholders' rights going forward but not to litigation over the rights and responsibilities existing under the operative Decree of 1936.

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

**GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO MODIFY THE APRIL 18, 2000 ORDER**


Under the circumstances, good cause exists to clarify Judge Reid's Case Management Order so that the Landolts can enforce the 1936 Decree as it stands today. Defendants Joseph & Beverly Landolt, and others similarly situated, have been and continue to be aggrieved as a result of the Walker River Paiute Tribe's violation of the 1936 Decree. Defendants know that the Paiute Tribe is appropriating significantly more water than was authorized under the decree. Yet, this Court will not permit the Landolts from enforcing the 1936 Decree on the grounds that Judge Reid's April 18, 2000 stayed all proceedings related to this case.

In order to enable the Landolts to enforce their water rights and prevent other's abuse of certain water rights under the Decree, the existing April 18, 2000 order must be rewritten to make clear that the only proceedings that are stayed are as to the future water rights of the parties.

**CONCLUSION**

Defendants respectfully request that the Court clarify Judge Reid's April 18, 2000 order so as to allow the defendants to enforce their rights under the 1936 Decree that is currently controlling.

Date: December 1, 2005



John W. Howard

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA	)		<i>USA v. Walker River Paiute Tribe</i>
	)	ss.	In Equity No. C-125-ECR
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO	)		Subfile No. C-125-B

I am over the age of 18 years, employed in the county of San Diego; my business address is 625 Broadway, Suite 1206, San Diego, CA 92101.

On December 2, 2005, I served the following documents:

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO CLARIFY JUDGE REID'S CASE  
MANAGEMENT ORDER DATED April 18, 2000**

in said action by placing a true copy thereof closed in a sealed envelope, addressed as follows and placing same in the U.S. mail, postage prepaid, to:

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of December 2005 at San Diego, California.



---

Elisa Marino

**SERVICE LIST**

Greg Addington  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
100 West Liberty Street, #600  
Reno, NV 89509

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

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

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

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

Susan Schneider  
Indian Resources Section  
US Department of Justice  
999 18<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 945, North Tower  
Denver, CO 80202

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

Linda Bowman  
540 Hammill Lane  
Reno, NV 89511

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

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

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

Marta Adams  
Deputy Attorney General  
State of Nevada  
100 North Carson St  
Carson City, NV 89701-4717

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

Gordon H. DePaoli, Esq.  
Dale E. Ferguson, Esq.  
Woodburn and Wedge  
6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
Reno, NV 89511

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

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

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

David L. Negri  
US Dept of Justice  
Environment and Natural Resources Div  
161 E. Mallard Dr., Suite A  
Boise, ID 83706

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

Kelly Chase, Esq.  
PO Box 2800  
Minden, NV 89423

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

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