

ORIGINAL

GORDON H. DEPAOLI  
Nevada State Bar 00195  
DALE E. FERGUSON  
Nevada State Bar 04986  
WOODBURN AND WEDGE  
6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
Post Office Box 2311  
Reno, Nevada 89511  
Telephone: (775) 688-3000

Attorneys for Defendant,  
WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,

Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v.

WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,  
et al.,

Defendants.

MINERAL COUNTY,

Proposed Plaintiff-  
Intervenor,

v.

WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,  
et al.,

Proposed Defendants.

) In Equity No. C-125-ECR  
) Subfile No. C-125-C

) **WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION**  
) **DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO MINERAL**  
) **COUNTY'S REQUEST FOR AN**  
) **EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH TO**  
) **COMPLETE SERVICE**

368

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 On or about October 20, 2000, Mineral County filed a Request for an Extension of  
3 Time in which to Complete Service (the "Request"). In the Request, Mineral County requested  
4 a 60-day extension of time to complete service and file motions addressing publication,  
5 dismissal and substitution. By order dated October 27, 2000, the Court granted Mineral County  
6 an additional 60 days to complete service and to file its motions with the Court.

7 The Walker River Irrigation District (the "District") has no objection to the 60 day  
8 extension of time, however, the District believes it is necessary to file this response to correct  
9 false statements made by Mineral County in the Request. The District's response is also  
10 necessary in order to discuss the content of Exhibits A and C to the Request and to inform the  
11 Court concerning the District's future response to the documents contained in those Exhibits.

12 **II. THE DISTRICT HAS COOPERATED WITH MINERAL COUNTY IN**  
13 **PROVIDING IT INFORMATION AS ORDERED BY THE COURT AND**  
14 **MINERAL COUNTY'S STATEMENTS TO THE CONTRARY ARE FALSE**

15 In the Request, Mineral Count states that it has faced a "lack of cooperation" by the  
16 District and that the District "finally furnished" Mineral County with an updated assessment list  
17 on October 12, 2000. Mineral County then argues that the District's alleged lack of  
18 cooperation is one of the reasons for it needing additional time to complete service and file  
19 motions concerning publication, dismissal and substitution. Mineral County's statements in  
20 this regard are not only false but truly incredible in light of the information that the District has  
21 provided to Mineral County since the inception of this matter.

22 Shortly after Mineral County filed its motion to intervene and related documents, the  
23 District provided Mineral County with a copy of its assessment role. Mineral County would  
24 later argue on numerous occasions that this list contained outdated or stale information. For  
25 example, the Request itself states that in 1995 the District "furnished a list in which some  
26 persons listed as water rights holders had been deceased for more than five years." Request at  
27 p.2, Ins. 15-18. The District, however, did not provide Mineral County with outdated  
28 information in 1995. Instead, Mineral County's allegations in this regard stem from its

1 continued misunderstanding concerning the nature of the information provided to it by the  
2 District.

3 The District has explained the nature of its assessment roll to Mineral County on  
4 numerous occasions to no avail. The District's assessment roll is maintained for purposes of  
5 levying and collecting assessments as provided for in the Nevada Irrigation District Act, NRS  
6 Chapter 539. It is not maintained nor should it be relied upon for purposes of identifying the  
7 current record title holder to a water right. The assessment roll is only updated as the District  
8 receives information from the Lyon County Recorder's Office or from some other source.  
9 Therefore, for example, it would not be unusual for the assessment roll to contain the name of a  
10 deceased individual if the District had not received information to update the roll with respect  
11 to that individual. In essence, the District's assessment roll provides a good source of  
12 information to begin the research necessary to identify the name and address of a particular  
13 water right holder. It is not, however, the end source of that information. The District has  
14 explained all of this to Mineral County on numerous occasions, however, Mineral County  
15 continually accuses the District of providing it with stale information instead of conducting the  
16 necessary research to obtain current information.

17 After filing its amended motion to intervene and related documents in 1995, Mineral  
18 County failed to name any individuals and entities as proposed defendants in the caption of its  
19 proposed complaint as required by Rule 10(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. By late  
20 1997, it became obvious that Mineral County would have to name the individuals and entities  
21 in a caption as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to move its motion to  
22 intervene forward. Once again, the District provided Mineral County with a copy of its  
23 assessment roll in October of 1997. Shortly thereafter, all parties met before the Magistrate on  
24 more than one occasion to assist Mineral County in compiling a caption. In January of 1998,  
25 Mineral County finally submitted a caption to the Court.

26 In 1998 and 1999, Mineral County continued its efforts to complete service. During  
27 this time period, Mineral County contacted the District's office on numerous occasions to

28

1 obtain information from the District's assessment roll. The District timely provided this  
2 information to Mineral County pursuant to its requests.

3 Mineral County's information requests of the District continued in late 1999 and early  
4 2000. As a result of Mineral County contacting the District's office with increasing frequency  
5 to obtain information and because Mineral County continually accused the District of providing  
6 it with stale or outdated information, the District's legal counsel requested that all further  
7 information requests be forwarded directly to it. Thereafter, Mineral County directed its  
8 information requests to the District's legal counsel as opposed to the District's office.

9 On April 3, 2000, the Court entered an order requiring Mineral County to serve, or,  
10 alternatively, supplement the record to establish proper service, with respect to numerous  
11 proposed defendants named in the caption. Shortly thereafter, Mineral County initiated several  
12 information requests from the District's legal counsel. The letters attached to the Request as  
13 Exhibit B describe these information requests and the District's response to those requests in  
14 detail, however, it is helpful to provide a summary of the content of those letters here.

15 Between July 26, 2000 and October 5, 2000, Mineral County requested information  
16 from the District concerning approximately 96 individuals and entities. The District timely  
17 provided Mineral County with information from its assessment roll in response to those  
18 requests. With respect to Mineral County's October requests, however, Mineral County began  
19 inquiring as to whether certain individuals and entities "still own water rights," inquiring as to  
20 "who is supposed to be served" with respect to certain proposed defendants, inquiring as to the  
21 name of registered agents and requesting "all information you have" with respect to other  
22 proposed defendants. Upon receiving these requests, the District's counsel informed Mineral  
23 County's counsel that it would not provide information that required the District to conduct  
24 research to identify registered agents, verify title to water rights, confirm names of proposed  
25 defendants and identify individuals Mineral County must serve pursuant to the Court's orders.  
26 Obviously, the District could incur substantial costs to research and provide this type of  
27 information to Mineral County.

28

1 The information provided to Mineral County in response to its numerous information  
2 requests was obtained from the District's assessment roll. Therefore, in an effort to provide  
3 Mineral County with a complete set of information in response to its on-going information  
4 requests, the District's counsel decided, on October 9, 2000, to once again offer to provide  
5 Mineral County with a copy of its assessment roll. Mineral County did not request a copy of  
6 the assessment roll as stated in the Request. Request p.2, Ins. 18-22. Mineral County accepted  
7 the District's offer and the District provided another copy of its assessment roll to Mineral  
8 County within 3 days on October 12, 2000.

9 In summary, Mineral County's assertions that the District has been uncooperative in  
10 providing it information are false. The District has continually cooperated with Mineral  
11 County by providing it information from its assessment roll as ordered by the Court. The  
12 County cannot legitimately blame the District for any delay encountered in completing service  
13 of process in this matter. That blame must lie, if anywhere, with Mineral County itself.

14 **III. THE DISTRICT WILL RESPOND TO THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN**  
15 **EXHIBITS A AND C TO THE REQUEST AFTER THE EXPIRATION OF THE**  
16 **60 DAY EXTENSION OF TIME OR AT ANOTHER APPROPRIATE TIME IN**  
**THE FUTURE.**

17 Exhibit A to the Request appears<sup>1</sup> to be a summary of Mineral County's recent service  
18 efforts and its position concerning the status of service with respect to several proposed  
19 defendants. The information contained in Exhibit C to the Request apparently contains service  
20 forms and other documentation that demonstrates Mineral County's service efforts since the  
21 Court's entry of the April 3, 2000 order. Mineral County will undoubtedly file additional  
22 documentation in this regard during the 60 day extension of time granted by the Court in its  
23 October 27, 2000, Order. It is logical for the District to postpone responding to the materials  
24 contained in Exhibits A and C until after Mineral County has filed all documentation to  
25 demonstrate service or to supplement the record. Therefore, the District will respond to the  
26

---

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> The Request does not identify or describe the content of the Exhibits attached to the Request.

1 materials contained in Exhibits A and C after the expiration of the 60 day extension or at  
2 another appropriate time in the future.

3 Dated this 7<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2000.

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

WOODBURN AND WEDGE  
6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
Post Office Box 2311  
Reno, Nevada 89511

By: 

GORDON H. DEPAOLI  
Nevada State Bar 00195  
DALE E. FERGUSON  
Nevada State Bar 04986

Attorneys for WALKER RIVER  
IRRIGATION DISTRICT

C:\WP\WRID\0083\Response to MC's Request for Extension.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 ***WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO MINERAL COUNTY'S REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH TO COMPLETE SERVICE*** in an envelope addressed to:

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

Richard R. Greenfield  
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

Ken Spooner  
Walker River Irrigation District  
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

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

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

Sharon E. Claassen  
P.O. Box 209  
Carson City, CA 89702

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

1 Susan L. 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

James Spoo  
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


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

12 William Hvidsten  
13 Decuir & Somach  
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1900  
14 Sacramento, CA 95814

Linda Bowman  
540 Hammill Lane  
Reno, NV 89511

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

19 Dated this 7<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2000.

20   
Tommie Kay Atkinson

21 C:\WP\WRID\0083\Response to MC's Request for Extension.doc