

GORDON H. DePAOLI  
State Bar No. 000195  
DALE E. FERGUSON  
State Bar No. 004986  
WOODBURN and WEDGE  
One East First Street  
Suite 1600  
P.O. Box 2311  
Reno, Nevada 89505  
Telephone: (702) 688-3000  
Attorneys for the  
WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

FILED  
97 APR -2 PM 2:10  
LANOE S. WILSON  
CLERK  
DEPUTY

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

IN EQUITY NO. C-125-ECR  
SUBFILE NO. C-125-C

Plaintiff,

WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION  
DISTRICT'S REPLY  
IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO REQUIRE  
MINERAL COUNTY TO  
IDENTIFY AND FILE A  
REPORT CONCERNING THE  
STATUS OF SERVICE ON  
EACH INDIVIDUAL WALKER  
RIVER CLAIMANT

WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,

Plaintiff-Intervenor,

vs.

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

Defendants.

I. INTRODUCTION

In October of 1994, Mineral County filed documents with this Court in an attempt to intervene in the above-captioned lawsuit. Mineral County began service efforts with respect

1 to those documents in Spring of 1995. Since that time, Mineral County has repeatedly asked  
2 the Court to relieve it of any further service obligations in this matter. Recently, Mineral  
3 County filed a Motion for Order of Publication asking the Court to enter an order allowing it  
4 to complete service through publication. Mineral County has completely failed, however, to  
5 make the necessary showing to this Court to support a grant of the relief it continues to  
6 request.  
7

8 In order for this Court to relieve Mineral County of further service obligations or to  
9 order the completion of service through publication, Mineral County must: 1) identify the  
10 Claimants to the Waters of the Walker River and its tributaries (the "Walker River  
11 Claimants") that it proposes to assert claims against; and 2) establish completed service or  
12 offer reasons as to why service is not complete with respect to each individual and entity that  
13 it identifies as a Walker River Claimant.  
14

15 Realizing that Mineral County must accomplish these tasks before its proposed  
16 intervention may possibly move forward, on March 10, 1997, the Walker River Irrigation  
17 District (the "District") filed a Motion to Require Mineral County to Identify and File a  
18 Report Concerning the Status of Service on Each Individual Walker River Claimant (the  
19 "Report Motion"). The Report Motion requests that the Court enter an order: 1) requiring  
20 Mineral County by a date certain to identify, by name, all Walker River Claimants against  
21 whom it seeks permission to assert the claims set forth in its proposed Amended Complaint in  
22 Intervention; and 2) requiring Mineral County by a date certain to file a report concerning the  
23 status of service of its Intervention Documents with respect to each individual or entity it  
24 identifies as a Walker River Claimant which, in the event service is incomplete for a  
25 particular Walker River Claimant, states the reason as to why service has not been effected.  
26  
27  
28

On or about March 19, 1997, Mineral County filed a Reply to Opposition to Motion and Opposition to Motion of WRID to Require Mineral County to Identify and File a Report Concerning the Status of Service on Each Individual Walker River Claimant (the "Report Opposition"). The content of the Report Opposition further illustrates and establishes the need for this Court to enter an order granting the relief requested by the District in the Report Motion.

**II. THE COURT SHOULD REQUIRE MINERAL COUNTY TO FILE A REPORT CONCERNING THE STATUS OF SERVICE WITH RESPECT TO EACH INDIVIDUAL AND ENTITY LISTED IN ATTACHMENT NUMBER ONE TO THE REPORT OPPOSITION**

Mineral County has attached an extensive list of names to the Report Opposition as Attachment 1 ("Attachment 1"). Mineral County identifies these names as the "list from the County Records of Deeds."<sup>1</sup> Report Opposition at 4. This list apparently names all Walker River Claimants against whom Mineral County seeks to assert the claims contained in its Amended Complaint in Intervention. At the present time, the District will assume that Attachment 1 comprises the list of individuals and entities that Mineral County seeks to assert claims against and must therefore serve with its Intervention Documents.<sup>2</sup>

Assuming arguendo that Attachment 1 contains the names of the individuals and entities that Mineral County alleges comprises all Walker River Claimants, the Court should

---

<sup>1</sup>The District's review of the names contained in Attachment 1 revealed that several ditch companies within the District's boundaries which may hold title to water rights were not listed by Mineral County. The District notes that pursuant to N.R.S. § 533.387 transfers of water rights by these ditch companies may not appear in the records maintained at the county recorders' offices.

<sup>2</sup>The District does not concede that the list of names contained in Attachment 1 comprehensively identifies all Walker River Claimants. Furthermore, the District specifically reserves the right to file a motion in the future addressing any failure by Mineral County to join indispensable or necessary parties to this action.

1 require Mineral County to file a report concerning the status of service of its Intervention  
 2 Documents with respect to each.<sup>3</sup> The report should state whether service is complete or  
 3 incomplete for each name listed in Attachment 1 and in the event service is incomplete, state  
 4 the reason as to why service has not been effected. Until Mineral County submits this  
 5 information, this Court cannot possibly enter an order relieving Mineral County of further  
 6 service obligations or order the completion of service through publication.  
 7

8 **III. MINERAL COUNTY HAS FAILED TO OFFER ANY AUTHORITY**  
 9 **SUPPORTING ITS REQUEST FOR SERVICE BY PUBLICATION AND**  
 10 **IN THE REPORT OPPOSITION ADMITS THAT IT HAS NOT**  
 11 **SATISFIED THE REQUIREMENTS OF SERVICE BY PUBLICATION**

12 The requirements under Nevada and California law that must be satisfied before a  
 13 plaintiff may complete service through publication are set forth in detail at pages 6 - 7 of the  
 14 Publication Opposition. In Nevada, a plaintiff must establish that the "person on whom  
 15 service is to be made resides out of the state, or has departed from the state, or cannot, after  
 16 due diligence, be found within the state, or conceals himself to avoid the service of  
 17 summons." N.R.C.P. 4(e)(1)(i).

18 In the Report Opposition, Mineral County states the following:

19 It is true that Mineral County has not alleged that the defendants live  
 20 out of Nevada or have departed from Nevada. Mineral County cannot swear or  
 21 affirm to facts of which it has no knowledge. Mineral County has not alleged  
 22 that the defendants are concealing themselves in order to avoid service.

---

23 <sup>3</sup>Relying in part on an affidavit filed in February of 1996, in the Report Opposition  
 24 Mineral County states that it "has served the persons on the" list contained in Attachment 1.  
 25 Report Opposition at 4. Numerous persons and entities listed in Attachment 1, however, were  
 26 designated by the District as not having been served as a result of its service analysis conducted  
 27 in February of 1996. See Attachment One to the Walker River Irrigation District's Opposition  
 28 to Mineral County's Notice of Motion, Motion for Relief from Service of Process and Request  
 for Hearing, and Motion to Dispense with Service of Pleadings (Docket No. 67). Furthermore,  
 as explained at pages 5 and 6 of the Walker River Irrigation District's Opposition to Mineral  
 County's Motion for Order of Publication (the "Publication Opposition"), Mineral County has  
 done nothing further to complete service since February of 1996.

• • •

Report Opposition at 2. By these statements, Mineral County admits that it has not satisfied the requirements for service by publication or conducted the research necessary to make representations to the court that might enable it to enter an order authorizing the completion of service through publication.<sup>4</sup>

In the Report Opposition, Mineral County cites two cases in support of its request to complete service through publication. Neither case, however, even remotely addresses the issues before the Court concerning service by publication.

Desert Valley Water Co. v. State, 104 Nev. 718 (1988), involved the Nevada Supreme Court's interpretation of N.R.S. § 533.450(3). That section requires any person appealing from a decision of the Nevada State Engineer to serve their notice of appeal on "persons who may have been affected by such order or decision." The Nevada Supreme Court rejected an interpretation of this language that would have required an appellant to serve the notice of appeal on any party even "potentially" affected by the decision or order of the State Engineer appealed from. Id. at 720. The Desert Valley decision did not even remotely involve or address service of process by publication or otherwise.

<sup>4</sup>In the Report Opposition, Mineral County once again makes completely unsupported and erroneous allegations concerning notices the District provided to its members and blames those notices for the failure of individuals and entities to return Waiver of Service forms. Report Opposition at 2. Issues involving the notices, and any alleged interference with Mineral County's service efforts resulting from the notices, were fully briefed by Mineral County in a motion requesting sanctions (Docket No. 31), and by the District in an opposition to Mineral County's motion for sanctions and an affidavit in support thereof (Docket Nos. 39, 40). This Court denied Mineral County's request for sanctions in an order filed on or about August 16, 1995 (Docket No. 44).

1        United States v. Oregon Water Resources Dep't, 44 F.3d 758 (9th Cir. 1994) addressed  
2 several issues involving the mass adjudication of water rights in the Klamath River Basin in  
3 Oregon. For the most part, Oregon Water involved the issue of whether the State of Oregon,  
4 pursuant to the provisions of the McCarren Amendment (43 U.S.C. § 666), could compel the  
5 United States, Klamath Indian Tribe and certain other individuals to participate in the  
6 adjudication proceedings conducted pursuant to Oregon's statutory water law. Oregon Water  
7 did not involve service of process issues and is therefore irrelevant with respect to Mineral  
8 County's service of its Intervention Documents.  
9

10        Finally, Mineral County asserts that this Court's order permitting notice through  
11 publication of the filing of the stipulation resolving the issues in the C-125-A litigation  
12 somehow supports its request for by publication. Report Opposition at 7. Mineral County  
13 alleges that the issues involved in the C-125-A litigation were "no different in kind or effect"  
14 than the issues raised by its proposed intervention. Id. This is simply not true.  
15

16        The C-125-A proceedings involved questions concerning whether orders of the  
17 California State Water Resources Control Board were inconsistent with and interfered with  
18 the administration of the Walker River Decree. The only water rights affected by the  
19 stipulation terminating the C-125-A litigation were the District's storage rights in Bridgeport  
20 and Topaz Reservoirs. Nevertheless, because the stipulation amended the rules and  
21 regulations governing the administration of the Walker River Decree, the Court entered an  
22 order providing that notice of filing of the stipulation be accomplished through publication.  
23

24        In contrast, through its proposed intervention Mineral County seeks to establish a  
25 water right senior to and in derogation of all water rights held by the Walker River  
26 Claimants. If Mineral County is successful in establishing this water right, the real property  
27 interests of all Walker River Claimants will be substantially impacted. Therefore, Mineral  
28

1 County cannot legitimately argue that issues surrounding its proposed intervention are "no  
 2 different in kind or effect" than issues present in the C-125-A litigation. The issues are  
 3 substantially different and this Court's order concerning publication of the C-125-A stipulation  
 4 does not provide a basis for the Court to grant Mineral County's request to complete service  
 5 through publication in this matter.  
 6

7 In summary, by its own admission Mineral County has failed to satisfy the  
 8 requirements necessary for the Court to enter an order allowing it to complete service by  
 9 publication. Mineral County has also failed to offer any authority supporting its request for  
 10 an order allowing it to complete service by publication. Given these circumstances, the Court  
 11 must deny the relief requested by Mineral County in the Publication Motion.  
 12

#### 13 IV. CONCLUSION

14 Based on the foregoing, the District respectfully requests that the Court grant the relief  
 15 requested in its Report Motion. The Court should require Mineral County by a date certain to  
 16 identify, by name, each individual and entity it believes comprises the Walker River  
 17 Claimants. If Mineral County believes the list of names in Attachment 1 to the Report  
 18 Opposition correctly identifies the Walker River Claimants, the Court should require Mineral  
 19 County to affirmatively state this position. In addition, the Court should require Mineral  
 20 County by a date certain to file a report concerning the status of service of its Intervention  
 21 Documents with respect to each individual or entity it identifies as a Walker River Claimant.  
 22 In the event service is incomplete for a particular Walker River Claimant, Mineral County's  
 23

24 ////

25 ////

26 ////

27

28

1 report should state the reason as to why service has not been effected on that particular  
2 individual or entity.

3 DATED this 2nd day of April, 1997.

4 WOODBURN AND WEDGE  
5 P.O. Box 2311  
6 Reno, Nevada 89505

7 By Dale E. Ferguson  
8 GORDON H. DePAOLI  
9 DALE E. FERGUSON  
10 Attorneys for the Walker River  
11 Irrigation District  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the law firm of WOODBURN AND WEDGE and that on this 2nd day of April, 1997, I deposited for mailing at Reno, Nevada a true and correct copy of the foregoing document, to the following:

Shirley A. Smith  
Asst. U.S. Attorney  
100 W. Liberty St., #600  
Reno, Nevada 89509

Richard R. Greenfield  
Dept. of the Interior  
Two North Central Ave., #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

Jim Weishaupt, General Manager  
WRID  
P.O. Box 820  
Yerington, NV 89447

R. Michael Turnipseed, P.E.  
Division of Water Resources  
State of Nevada  
123 West Nye Lane  
Carson City, NV 89710

James T. Markle  
State Water Resources  
Control Board  
P.O. Box 100  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Scott McElroy  
Greene, Meyer & McElroy  
1007 Pearl Street  
Boulder, CO 80302

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

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

Richard E. Olson, Jr.  
Claassen and Olson  
P.O. Box 2101  
Carson City, NV 89702

John P. Lange  
Land and Natural Resources  
Federal Bldg., Dr. 3607  
999 18th Street, Ste. 945  
Denver, CO 80202

Ross E. deLipkau  
P.O. Box 2790  
Reno, Nevada 89505

Roger Johnson  
Water Resources Control Board  
State of California  
P.O. Box 2000  
Sacramento, CA 95810

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

Garry Stone  
290 South Arlington  
Reno, NV 89510


Linda Bowman  
Bowman and Robinson  
499 W. Plumb Lane, Ste. 4  
Reno, Nevada 89509

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

Jim Spoo  
Treva J. Hearne  
Zeh, Polaha, Spoo & Hearne  
575 Forest Street  
Reno, Nevada 89509

Mary Hackenbracht  
Deputy Attorney General  
State of California  
2101 Webster Street  
Oakland, CA 94612-3049

Roger Bezayiff  
Water Master  
U.S. Board of Water  
Commissioners  
P.O. Box 853  
Yerington, Nevada 89447

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
KELLY A. WHITE