Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 528 Filed 01/31/2011 Page 1 of 4

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Greg Addington, Assistant U.S. Attorney Susan L. Schneider, Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Environment and Natural Resources Div. 999 – 18 th Street, Suite 370 Denver, Colorado 80202 (303) 844-1348 susan.schneider@usdoj.gov Attorneys for the United States of America Wes Williams, Jr., Nevada Bar No. 06864 3119 Pasture Rd. P.O. Box 100 Schurz, Nevada 89427 (775) 773-2838 wwilliams@stanfordalumni.org Attorney for the Walker River Paiute Tribe IN THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRIC	
10	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) IN EQUITY NO. C-125
12 13 14 15	Plaintiff, WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Plaintiff-Intervenor,) SUBFILE NO. C-125-B 3:73-cv-00127-ECR-LRL) SUBFILE NO. C-125-C) 3:73-cv-00128-ECR-LRL
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, a corporation, et al., Defendants. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Counterclaimants, v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,	UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPLIES TO MEMORANDA RELATED TO OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED SERVICE CUTOFF AND SUCCESSOR-IN-INTEREST ORDERS
2425262728	et al. Counterdefendants. Pursuant to Rule 6(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and LR 6-1 and LR 6-2, counsel for the United States of America, the Walker River Paiute Tribe, and Mineral County ("Plaintiff Parties") move the Court for an order extending the time for the Plaintiff Parties to	

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 528 Filed 01/31/2011 Page 2 of 4

in C-125-B) and successor-in-interest orders (Doc. 1614 in C-125-B; Doc. 516 in C-125-C) from on or before February 3, 2011 to on or before February 11, 2011.

file replies to memoranda related to objections to the proposed service cutoff order (Doc. 1613

In support of this Motion, counsel for the United States of America, the Walker River Paiute Tribe, and Mineral County represent the following to the Court:

- 1. Pursuant to the status conference held on October 19, 2010 and by Stipulation and Order dated December 9, 2010 and December 15, 2010 respectively, the Court established a schedule for filing proposed service cutoff and successor-in-interest orders in C-125-B and C-125-C as well as memoranda related to objections, if any, to the proposed orders. (Doc. 1616 in C-125-B; Doc. 518 in C-125-C). That schedule was as follows:
 - a. The United States shall lodge the Service Cut-Off Order in Subproceeding C 125-B with the Court on or before November 30, 2010;
 - b. The United States and Mineral County shall lodge the Successor-in-Interest
 Order in both Subproceeding C-125-B and Subproceeding C-125-C on
 November 30, 2010; and
 - c. The parties shall file memoranda related to objections, if any, to either or both such proposed orders on or before December 17, 2010.
- Pursuant to the Court's direction, on November 30, 2010, the United States, Walker
 River Paiute Tribe filed a proposed Service Cut-Off order in C-125-B and the United
 States, Walker River Paiute Tribe, and Mineral County filed proposed Successor-inInterest Orders in C-125-B and C-125-C. (C-125-B Docs. 1613 & 1614; C-125-C Doc.
 516).
- 3. By Stipulation and Order dated December 15, 2010, the Court extended the deadline to file memoranda related to objections, if any, to the proposed service cutoff and

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 528 Filed 01/31/2011 Page 3 of 4

successor-in-interest orders to on or before December 31, 2010, directed that the Plaintiff Parties and Primary Defendants in both cases confer before the Plaintiff Parties reply to those objections to determine, among other things, if the parties can agree on proposed language, or if there are additional procedures and forms that may assist with these issues, and further ordered that the Plaintiff Parties shall file any replies, including any revisions to proposed orders on or before January 27, 2011. (Doc. 1617 in C-125-B; Doc. 519 in C-125-C).

- 4. Pursuant to Order dated December 28, 2010, the Court again extended the deadline for Primary Defendants to file memoranda related to objections, if any, to the proposed service cutoff and successor-in-interest orders to on or before January 7, 2011 and further ordered that the Plaintiff Parties shall file any replies, including any revisions to proposed orders on or before February 3, 2011. (Doc. 1619 in C-125-B; Doc. 520 in C-125-C).
- 5. The parties have been in contact, but due to schedule conflicts are unable to set a conference call date to confer and discuss proposed language until the afternoon of February 3.
- 6. Because the conference call discussion may impact the language of their reply, Plaintiff
 Parties request an eight (8) day extension to February 11, 2011 in which to file a reply.
- 7. Counsel for Mineral County has contacted counsel for Primary Defendants concerning this request and they have no objections to it.

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 528 Filed 01/31/2011 Page 4 of 4

1	NOW, THEREFORE, based upon the foregoing, Plaintiff Parties respectfully request		
2	that the Court grant this Unopposed Motion, and extend the time for Plaintiff Parties to file any		
3	replies, including any revisions to the proposed orders, to on or before February 11, 2011.		
5	Respectfully submitted,		
6	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	ADVOCATES FOR COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT	
7	By: /s/ Susan L. Schneider, Trial Attorney		
8	Environment and Natural Resources Div. 999 18 th Street, Suite 370	By: /s/ Simeon M. Herskovits Nevada Bar No. 11155	
9	Denver, Colorado 80202 Attorneys for United States of America	P.O. Box 1075 El Prado, New Mexico 87529	
11	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE	Attorney for Mineral County	
12	By:/s/ Wes Williams, Jr.,		
13	Nevada Bar No. 06864 3119 Pasture Rd.		
14	P.O. Box 100		
15	Schurz, Nevada 89427 Attorney for the Walker River Paiute Tribe		
16 17	ORDER		
18	Dated: January 31 , 2011.		
19	TE IC CO OPPEDED		
20	4	Meanio	
21	Lawrence R. Leavitt United States Magistrate Judge		
22		oo zamoo maga	
23			
24			
25 26			
27			
28			