


ORIGINAL

1 TREVA J. HEARNE, ESQ. (SBN 4450)
2 JAMES SPOO, ESQ. (SBN 1018)
3 **ZEH, SAINT-AUBIN, SPOO & HEARNE**
4 575 Forest Street, Suite 200
5 Reno, Nevada 89509
6 Telephone: (775) 323-5700

7 Attorneys for Intervenor,
8 MINERAL COUNTY NEVADA

BY 
LARRY S. JOHNSON
02 JUL 31 PM 12:26
FILED

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

11 * * *

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)

13 Plaintiff,)

14 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,)

15 Plaintiff-Intervenor,)

16 vs.)

17 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,)
18 a corporation, et al.;)

19 Defendants.)

20 -----)
21 MINERAL COUNTY,)

22 Proposed-Plaintiff-Intervenor,)

23 vs.)

24 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,)
25 a corporation, et al.)

26 Proposed-Defendants)
27 -----)
28

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

REPLY TO RESPONSE TO
MOTION FOR ORDER OF
PUBLICATION
(FIFTH REQUEST)

ZEH, SAINT-AUBIN, SPOO & HEARNE
575 Forest Street, Suite 200
Reno, Nevada 89509
(775) 323-5700 FAX: (775) 786-8183

421

I.

THE HISTORY OF THIS CASE PUTS IN PERSPECTIVE
THE COURT'S EARLIER ORDER

On February 12, 1997, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed Mineral County's request to be relieved from service of process on individuals that held water rights in the Walker River. By that time, Mineral County had served approximately 407 persons with personal service. Mineral County did not believe that the cost and time involved in continuing to serve individuals was reasonable. Both the lower court and the 9th Circuit disagreed, however, the Court offered the opinion that: "with a properly supported motion for service by publication, the district court very well might grant Mineral County the relief it seeks. Indeed, this case could be a particularly attractive candidate for service by publication at the appropriate time." See, Order of the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, 2/12/97, Case No. 96-15885, page 2,3.

Circumstances are entirely different than in 1997. Mineral County has made more than 2000 services on individuals and entities. Mineral County has spent nearly five years since that date searching for persons and entities. Mineral County has discovered and could produce evidence that the only way to find persons not found earlier is by detective work in the field, by contact with the Sheriffs of the various counties, by contacting relatives and by information provided by the Walker River Irrigation District. The Court suggested means by which persons could be found but those means simply did not work. Mineral County spent many days at the offices of the County Recorder of both Mono County and Lyon County as indicated by the filings in this matter previously. The information from those

1 sources assisted Mineral County in finding persons if the deeds had been recorded, but if not,
2 the information was not available. Mineral County found absolutely no information from
3 the Office of the State Engineer in Carson City. The fastest and most efficient means of
4 finding any person or entity was to contact relatives on the telephone if they were found by
5 the sheriff.
6

7 Mineral County has spent many hours, many dollars and accomplished nearly all of
8 the service required by the Court. Mineral County can never accomplish every last bit of
9 service of process in this matter. As the Court has experienced, the situation changes too
10 often and the process of serving individuals and entities is too cumbersome and slow to ever
11 result in perfect service.
12

13 II.

14
15 TIME HAS RESULTED IN A SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION
16 OF SERVICE AND MINERAL COUNTY SHOULD BE ALLOWED
17 TO ARGUE ITS INTERVENTION ON THE MERITS
18

19 Mineral County has substantially completed service. Of the over 1200 serves, the
20 approximately 1000 persons and entities on the caption, only fifty-five service papers are
21 outstanding and Mineral County requests publication on a mere 18 persons. However, as
22 this matter is debated and pleadings are filed, Mineral County is certain that the persons who
23 should be served by publication has changed. That is why the publication should not name
24 individuals but should be to all persons with an interest in water rights in the Walker River
25 including but not limited to certain individuals and unnamed parties.
26

27 ///
28

1 Without reference to the fact that Mineral County was able to locate a substantial
2 majority of the persons to be served, the fact that so few cannot be found is support for the
3 due diligence of Mineral County. Mineral County has repeatedly requested that Walker
4 River Irrigation District provide any information it has on the location of these entities.
5 Walker River Irrigation District does not argue that these persons are available for service
6 because no information is available to it either regarding these persons.
7

8
9 The Court in its Order of June 13, 1997, provided that if Mineral County wanted a
10 modification of the terms of the Order allowing publication, then it had to do so by Motion.
11 Mineral County, thus, has requested by its Motion for Publication that the documents to be
12 published be reduced. Mineral County is not at this time pursuing the Motion for
13 Preliminary Injunction. Publishing that would serve no purpose other than to burden the
14 treasury of Mineral County. The matter presently before the Court to be set for hearing is
15 the intervention of Mineral County. The Notice in lieu of summons gives reasonable notice
16 to any party of the proposed intervention of Mineral County in this litigation. See, *Electrical*
17 *Specialty Company v. Road and Ranch Supply, Inc.*, 967 F.2d 309 (9th Cir. 1992). The Court
18 of appeals interpreted the sufficiency of process flexibly and noted that the most important
19 notice is the claim of the litigant giving the notice and the notice of the commencement of
20 the action.
21
22
23

24 III.

25 MINERAL COUNTY HAS EXERCISED DUE DILIGENCE IN ALL STATES

26 Mineral County has never recited that just because someone left the State of Nevada
27 that the search was complete. Mineral County has searched and found and served persons
28

1 in at least 15 different states. If Mineral County had an address, the service was sent to the
2 process server to be found. For WRID to allege that Mineral County was not applying
3 California law to those persons to be served in California is simply incorrect. Mineral
4 County applied the principles of California law to Nevada water rights holders and did not
5 let the simple fact of State lines deter the search if it was possible.
6

7 Mineral County has searched all the sources that the Court directed it to use. Mineral
8 County could fill the courthouse with the information now requested by WRID regarding the
9 times, dates, and persons contacted. Although much of this information has been filed in this
10 matter during the course of these proceedings, to file it again would be duplicative and time
11 consuming. The service in this matter has been long and burdensome and must be viewed
12 in light of the task required. The information requested by WRID is superfluous and
13 duplicative of the earlier filings by Mineral County.
14

15 The one condition that Mineral County has repeatedly offered cures all of the defects
16 or omissions. As the United States of America completes its service, Mineral County will
17 continue to serve its papers on persons who hold surface water rights in the Walker River and
18 who have not been served by Mineral County to the present. This process would cure any
19 possible omission. Mineral County has the right to be heard on its intervention and the
20 service must be declared as complete.
21
22

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///


27 ///

28 ///

1 WHEREFORE, Mineral County, Nevada, respectfully requests that the Court declare
2 its service complete, that the Court allow it to serve by publication all persons requested in
3 its Motion, and that the request for intervention be set for hearing, and, finally, that the Court
4 order Mineral County to serve any persons holding surface water rights in the Walker River
5 identified by the United States of America not yet served by Mineral County.
6

7 DATED this 30th day of July, 2002.
8

9 ZEH, SAINT-AUBIN, SPOO & HEARNE

10
11 By: 
12 TREVA J. HEARNE, ESQ.
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 SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of the Law Offices of ZEH, SAINT-AUBIN, SPOO & HEARNE, 575 Forest Street, Suite 200, Reno, Nevada; over the age eighteen years and not a party to the within action; that on this date I caused to be mailed via U.S. Mail, a true and correct copy of the foregoing *Reply to Response to Motion For Order Of Publication*, addressed as follows:

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

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

Western Nevada Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
1677 Hot Springs Road
Carson City, NV 89706

William W. Quinn
Office of the Field Solicitor
U. S. Dept. of the Interior
401 West Washington Street, SPC 44
Phoenix, AZ 85003

George Benesch
P.O. Box 3498
Reno, NV 89505

Gary Stone
290 South Arlington Avenue
Reno, NV 89510

Linda A. Bowman
540 Hammill Lane
Reno, NV 89511

Roger Bezayiff
Watermaster
P.O. Box 853
Yerington, Nevada 89447

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

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

Gordon H. DePaoli
Dale E. Ferguson
Woodburn & Wedge
6100 Neil Road, Suite 500
Reno, NV 89511-1149

Kathryn E. Landreth
United States Attorney
100 W. Liberty, Suite 600
Reno, NV 89501

1 Daniel N. Frink
2 State Water Resources Control Board
3 P.O. Box 100
4 Sacramento, CA 95814

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

4 Mary Hackenbracht
5 Deputy Attorney General
6 State of California
7 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor
8 Oakland, CA 94612-1413

Alex J. Flangas
Timothy A. Lukas
Robert C. Anderson
Hale, Lane, Peek, Dennison,
Howard, Anderson & Pearl
P.O. Box 3237
Reno, NV 89509

8 David Moser
9 McCutchen, Doyle, Brown & Enersen
10 Three Embarcadero Center
11 San Francisco, CA 94111


Michael W. Neville
Deputy Attorney General
Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, California 94102-3664

11 Shirley A. Smith
12 Assistant U.S. Attorney
13 100 W. Liberty, Suite 600
14 Reno, NV 89509

14 Susan L. Schneider
15 U.S. Department of Justice
16 Indian Resources Section
17 Environment & Natural
18 Resources Division
19 999 18th Street, Suite 945
20 Denver, CO 80202

19 Scott McElroy
20 Alice Walker
21 Greene, Meyer & McElroy
22 1007 Pearl Street
23 Boulder, CO 80302

22 Dated this 30th of July, 2002.


Martha Hauser