

12

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

LANOE S. WILSON
CLERK
DEPUTY

97 APR -2 PM 2:10

FILED

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
13)
14)
15 Plaintiff,)
16)
17 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,)
18)
19)
20 Plaintiff-Intervenor,)
21 vs.)
22 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,)
23 a corporation, et al.,)
24 Defendants.)

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

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

25 I. INTRODUCTION

26 In October of 1994, Mineral County filed documents with this Court in an attempt to
27 intervene in the above-captioned lawsuit. Mineral County began service efforts with respect
28

100

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

1 On or about March 19, 1997, Mineral County filed a Reply to Opposition to Motion
2 and Opposition to Motion of WRID to Require Mineral County to Identify and File a Report
3 Concerning the Status of Service on Each Individual Walker River Claimant (the "Report
4 Opposition"). The content of the Report Opposition further illustrates and establishes the
5 need for this Court to enter an order granting the relief requested by the District in the Report
6 Motion.
7

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

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

19 Assuming arguendo that Attachment 1 contains the names of the individuals and
20 entities that Mineral County alleges comprises all Walker River Claimants, the Court should
21

22
23 ¹The District's review of the names contained in Attachment 1 revealed that several ditch
24 companies within the District's boundaries which may hold title to water rights were not listed
25 by Mineral County. The District notes that pursuant to N.R.S. § 533.387 transfers of water
26 rights by these ditch companies may not appear in the records maintained at the county
27 recorders' offices.

28 ²The 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.³ 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 ³Relying 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.

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

....
Mineral County does not have direct knowledge that potential defendants are concealing themselves in order to avoid service of process.

Report Opposition at 2. By these statements, Mineral County admits that is 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.⁴

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.

⁴In 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

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 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

 KELLY A. WHITE