#### Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 150 Filed 09/16/1997 Page 1 of 6 RECEIVED IM DROP BOX 1 Linda A. Bowman, Esq. Debra B. Robinson, Esq. U.S. DISTRICT COURT BOWMAN & ROBINSON SEP 16 PM 5: 24 2 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 499 West Plumb Lane, Suite 4 FILED 3 Reno, NV 89509 (702) 334-1400 SEP 1 6 1997 4 Attorneys for UNITED STATES BOARD OF WATER COMMISSION NERS and CHIEF DEPUTY WATER COMMISSIONER, ROGER BEZATER, U.S. DISTRICT COURT 5 6 DEPUTY 7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA 9 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IN EOUITY NO. C-125 SUBFILE NO. C-125-C-ECR(RAM) 11 Plaintiff, 12 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE. 13 Plaintiff-Intervenor. UNITED STATES BOARD OF VS. WATER COMMISSIONERS' 14 BRIEF OF ISSUES TO BE SETTLED WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT. AT HEARING 15 a corporation, et al., 16 Defendant. 17 MINERAL COUNTY, 18 Proposed Plaintiff-Intervenor, 19 VS. 20 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT. 21 a corporation, et al., 22 Proposed Defendants. 23

### INTRODUCTION

The United States Board of Water Commissioners (hereinafter "Board of Water Commissioners") was created in 1936 by judicial order. The Board of Water Commissioners is obligated by its order of appointment to oversee the distribution of the waters of the Walker River to all who hold water rights thereon. The Board of Water Commissioners acts as a special master.

BOWMAN & ROBINSON ATTORNEYS AT LAW

24

25

26

27

28

150

## Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 150 Filed 09/16/1997 Page 2 of 6

In the instant law suit, Mineral County attempts to intervene for the purpose of securing for Mineral County substantial water rights and corresponding priority sufficient to create a minimum pool of water in the Walker Lake, which is located in Mineral County. The Walker River terminates in Walker Lake. Despite the fact that adjudication concerning the waters of the Walker River was initiated in 1926, this is the first time in seventy years that Mineral County has attempted to intervene and obtain water rights.

In order to intervene, Mineral County necessarily must provide notice and due process to the existing water right holders. Because the waters of the Walker River are fully allocated, any rights ultimately obtained by Mineral County through this lawsuit necessarily would alter the quantity of the rights available to the present water rights holders. The issue now before this Court concerns whether the actions that have been taken by Mineral County as to their intervention are sufficient to comply with the requirements of due process which must be accorded to the potential defendants, the present water right holders.

A hearing has been set for September 23, 1997 at which time the Court will consider whether Mineral County, the proposed intervenor, has in fact made proper service upon all identified holders of Walker River water rights. The Court has ordered the parties to file briefs regarding the issues to be settled concerning the sufficiency of the actions thus far undertaken by Mineral County, and regarding potential completion of service by publication.

#### STATEMENT OF FACTS

Rather than restate the facts and procedural posture of this case, the Board of Water Commissioners incorporates herein the statement of Background set forth in pages 1 through 3 of the State of Nevada's Memorandum of Points and Authorities Concerning Whether Mineral County has Properly Served All Identified Walker River Claimants.

### POSITION OF THE BOARD OF WATER COMMISSIONERS

The Board of Water Commissioners does not have any property right at stake. Rather, the Board's interest is in these proceedings is to see that due process is observed so that any potential reallocation of water rights which may result from this lawsuit properly will be enforceable by the Board of Water Commissioners. It is the Board's understanding that the Walker River Irrigation

## Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 150 Filed 09/16/1997 Page 3 of 6

District ("WRID"), which is more intimately involved with the property rights aspect of this case, will be submitting to the Court a detailed report on the status of service on each of the identified water rights users. The Board of Water Commissioners will not attempt to address herein the status of service on particular individuals, but rather, will set forth herein the general issues of concern to the Board as to why the requirements of due process have not been satisfied by Mineral County.

## I. IDENTIFIED WATER RIGHTS HOLDERS MUST BE PERSONALLY SERVED IN SATISFACTION OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF NRCP 4(d).

NRCP 4(d) governs personal service. Rule 4(d)(6) governs service upon most individuals living within Nevada, and presumably is applicable to the majority of the Walker River water rights holders who reside in Nevada. Pursuant to that rule, personal service is complete when the appropriate papers have been given to the defendant personally, left at the dwelling place with a person of suitable age and discretion who resides at the dwelling place; or by delivering the papers to an agent authorized to receive service on behalf of the intended defendant. NRCP 4(g) governs the return of service which is filed with the Court for the purpose of proving that service was completed. Where an individual completes the service, which seems to be the manner in which Mineral County has attempted to make service, NRCP 4(g)(2) requires that proof of service be made promptly to the court in the form of an affidavit by the person making the service, stating the date, place and manner in which the service was completed.

In the case at bar, Mineral County has not complied with the requirements of Rule 4(g). Thus, absent polling each of the potential defendants, it is impossible to ascertain whether service was properly accomplished on many of the identified potential defendants. As is detailed in the Brief submitted by WRID, it would appear that service was not performed in a manner which satisfies the requirements of Rule 4(d) with regard to numerous of the identified potential defendants. Areas of concern include whether the appropriate papers were included within the document "served; where substituted service was attempted, whether delivery was accomplished to a person suitable to accept service; and whether adequate service was made in situations where more than one water right holder resides in the same residence.

## Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 150 Filed 09/16/1997 Page 4 of 6

II. SERVICE BY PUBLICATION IS APPROPRIATE ONLY WHEN THE PROPOSED DEFENDANT		
RESIDES OUT OF STATE OR CANNOT, AFTER DUE DILIGENCE, BE LOCATED IN THE STATE.		
DOL DILIGENCE, BE LOCATED IN THE STATE.		
Service by publication is governed by NRCP 4(e). It is an appropriate mode of service upon		
potential defendants who reside outside the state, or cannot, after due diligence, be found within the		
state. Thus, it would appear that service by publication is not an appropriate form of service for		
"identified" defendants, if they reside in the state and can be located here.		
There appears to be confusion among the parties as to which potential defendants must be		
served by personal service, and which can be served by publication. The Board of Water		
Commissioners respectfully submits that this is an issue which needs to be resolved between the		
parties and the Court so that effort and funds are not wasted on forms of service which might be		
inappropriate for the particular potential defendant.		
Respectfully submitted this day of September, 1997.		
BOWMAN & ROBINSON		
By Suda a Dowman		
Linda A. Bowman, Esq.		
Debra B. Robinson, Esq. 499 West Plumb Lane, Suite 4		
Reno, NV 89509 (702) 334-1400		
Attorneys for UNITED STATES BOARD OF		
WATER COMMISSIONERS and CHIEF DEPUTY WATER COMMISSIONER, ROGER BEZAYIFF		

## Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 150 Filed 09/16/1997 Page 5 of 6

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
2	Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of Bowman & Robinson and		
3	that on September 16, 1997, I mailed a true and correct copy of the UNITED STATES BOARD OF		
4	WATER COMMISSIONERS' BRIEF OF ISSUES TO BE SETTLED AT HEARING, postage		
5	prepaid, addressed to:		
6			
7	Shirley A. Smith, Esq. Assistant U.S. Attorney	R. Michael Turnipseed, P.E. Division of Water Resources	
8	100 West Liberty, Suite 600 Reno, NV 89501	State of Nevada 123 West Nye Lane	
9	Marta Adams, Esq.	Carson City, NV 89710	
10	Deputy Attorney General 100 North Carson Street	Scott McElroy, Esq.	
11	Carson City, NV 89701-4717	Greene, Meyer & McElroy 1007 Pearl Street, Suite 220 Boulder, CO 80302	
12	Jim Weishaupt WRID	Mathew R. Campbell, Esq.	
13	Post Office Box 820 Yerington, NV 89447	McCutchen, Doyle, Brown, et al. Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800	
14	James T. Markle, Esq.	San Francisco, CA 94111	
15	State Water Resources Control Board	John P. Lange, Esq. U.S. Department of Justice	
16	Post Office Box 100 Sacramento, CA 95814	Environment & Natural Resources Division	
17	John Kramer	999 - 18th Street, Suite 945 Denver, CO 80202	
18	Dept. of Water Resources 1416 Ninth Street	Ross E. deLipkau, Esq.	
19	Sacramento, CA 95814	Marshall, Hill, Cassas & deLipkau	
20	Kelly R. Chase, Esq. P.O. Box 2800	Post Office Box 2790 Reno, NV 89505-2790	
21	Minden, NV 89423 Richard R. Greenfield, Esq.	Gordon H. DePaoli, Esq.	
22	Field Solicitor's Office Department of Interior	Woodburn and Wedge Post Office Box 2311	
23	Two North Central Avenue, Suite 500 Phoenix, AZ 85004	Reno, NV 89505-2790	
24	Robert L. Hunter	Garry Stone 290 South Arlington	
25	Superintendent Western Nevada Agency	Reno, NV 89501	
26	Bureau of Indian Affairs 1677 Hot Springs Road	James S. Spoo, Esq. Treva J. Hearne, Esq.	
27 28	Carson City, NV 89706	Zeh Polaha Spoo & Hearne 575 Forest Street Reno, NV 89509	

# Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 150 Filed 09/16/1997 Page 6 of 6

1 2	Roger Johnson Water Resources Control Board State of California Post Office Box 2000
3	Sacramento, CA 95810
4	Mary Hackenbracht, Esq. Deputy Attorney General
5	State of California 2101 Webster Street, 12th Floor
6	Oakland, CA 94612-3049
7	Roger E. Bezayiff Chief Deputy Water Commissioner
8	U.S. Bd. of Water Commissioners Post Office Box 853
9	Yerington, NV 89447
10	Michael Neville Deputy Attorney General
11	State of California 50 Freemont Street, #300
12	San Francisco, CA 94105
13	Stuart L. Somcah, Esq. Donald B. Gilbert
14	DeCuir & Somach 400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1900
15	Sacramento, CA 95814
16	Timothy A. Lukas, Esq. Hale, Lane, Peek, Dennison, Howard,
17	Anderson and Pearl 100 West Liberty Street, Tenth Floor
18 Post Office Box 3237	Post Office Box 3237 Reno, NV 89505
19	
20	. , the
21	DATED this day of September, 1997.
22	
23	DARCI BERTRAM
24	
25	
26	
27	