

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
400 SOUTH VIRGINIA ST., ROOM 301  
RENO, NEVADA 89501

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILED	RECEIVED
<input type="checkbox"/> ENTERED	SERVED ON
	COUNSEL PARTIES OF RECORD
<b>DEC 07 2011</b>	
CLERK US DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
BY:	DEPUTY

*Joel*  
Courtney Brown  
pro hac vice  
P.O. Box 1507


NIXIE

671 SE 1 00 12/11

RETURN TO SENDER  
IF VACANT  
UNABLE TO FORWARD

BC: 99501219576 \*2041-20469-C

875710950102195



IGNACIA S. MORENO  
Assistant Attorney General  
DANIEL G. BOGDEN  
United States Attorney  
Greg Addington, Assistant U.S. Attorney  
Susan L. Schneider, Trial Attorney  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Environment and Natural Resources Div.  
999 - 18<sup>th</sup> Street, South Tower 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 Lake Pasture Rd.  
P.O. Box 100  
Schurz, Nevada 89427  
(775) 773-2838  
wwilliams@stanfordalumni.org  
Attorney for the Walker River Paiute Tribe

Simeon M. Herskovits, Nevada Bar No. 11155  
Advocates for Community and Environment  
El Prado, New Mexico 87529  
P.O. Box 1075  
(575) 758-7202  
simeon@communityandenvironment.net  
Attorney for Mineral County, Nevada

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, )  
)  
Plaintiff-Intervenor, )  
)  
vs. )  
)  
WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, )  
a corporation, et al., )  
)  
Defendants. )  
)  
----- )  
MINERAL COUNTY, )  
)  
Proposed-Plaintiff-Intervenor, )  
)  
vs. )  
)  
WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT )  
a corporation, et al., )  
)  
Proposed Defendants. )  
----- )

IN EQUITY NO. C-125-ECR-WGC  
Subproceedings: C-125-B & C-125-C  
3:73-CV-00127-ECR- WGC &  
3:73-CV-00128-ECR- WGC

**ORDER GRANTING  
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR  
LEAVE TO FILE OVERSIZED  
BRIEF**

2. Plaintiff Parties have determined to file a single joint response in both C-125-B and C-125-C. LR-7-4 sets forth a limit of 30 pages for any responses in opposition to objections to a Magistrate Judge's order. If Plaintiff Parties filed separate briefs, these briefs could have totaled 60 pages. By consolidating their responses into a single brief, the Plaintiff Parties have both consolidated their arguments and reduced the total number of pages that might have been required for two separate briefs.

3. WRID's objections are set forth in a motion and lengthy brief of 30 pages that require a detailed response.

4. For all of the above reasons it is necessary to exceed the page limitations of LR 7-4 to present the Court with the information it needs to decide the issue before it.

5. Plaintiff Parties seek approval to file a joint brief of no more than forty-five (45) pages in length in response to *Walker River Irrigation District's Objections to Rulings of Magistrate Judge With Respect to Revised Proposed Orders and Amended Orders Concerning Service Issues Pertaining to Defendants Who have Been Served*. The responses to be filed in opposition to WRID's other objections will each meet the page limit set forth in LR-7-4.<sup>2</sup>

6. Undersigned counsel has contacted counsel for WRID, which filed the objections, and counsel for Circle Bar N Ranch LLC and Mica Farms LLC, which joined in WRID's objections, both of whom indicate that they will not oppose this request.

---

*Defendants Who Have Been Served* in C-125-C. (C-#542) The amended orders contain attachments omitted from the initial orders, but are otherwise identical.

<sup>2</sup> The other filings address the *Order Concerning Service Cut-Off Date* (Sept. 19, 2011, B-#1656), and the *Order* addressing Mineral County's 2008 Service Report (Sept. 27, 2011, C-#547).