

1 AARON D. FORD  
Attorney General  
2 ANTHONY J. WALSH (NV Bar #14128)  
Deputy Attorney General  
3 State of Nevada  
Office of the Attorney General  
4 100 North Carson Street  
Carson City, NV 89701-4717  
5 (775) 684-1213  
AJWalsh@ag.nv.gov

6 *Attorneys for Nevada Department of Wildlife*

7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*

11 Plaintiffs,

12 vs.

13 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,

14 Plaintiff-Intervenor,

15 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION  
DISTRICT, a Corporation, *et al.*,

16 Defendants.

17 MINERAL COUNTY,

18 Plaintiff-Intervenor,

19 vs.

20 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION  
DISTRICT, a corporation, *et al.*,

21 Defendants.

IN EQUITY NO. C-125-MMD

Subproceeding: 3:73-CV-00128-MMD-CSD

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT  
OF WILDLIFE'S,  
ANSWER TO MINERAL COUNTY'S  
SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT IN  
INTERVENTION**

22  
23 The Nevada Department of Wildlife (“NDOW”), by and through counsel, Attorney  
24 General for the State of Nevada AARON D. FORD, and Deputy Attorney General,  
25 ANTHONY J. WALSH, hereby answers the Second Amended Complaint in Intervention of  
26 Mineral County filed herein on June 30, 2021 (the “Second Amended Complaint”) as  
27 follows:

28 ///

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1  
2 1. The allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the Second Amended Complaint  
3 consist of legal conclusions that do not require a response. To the extent that a response is  
4 required, NDOW denies them.

**II. PARTIES**

5  
6 2. The allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the Second Amended Complaint  
7 consist of legal conclusions that do not require a response. To the extent that a response is  
8 required, NDOW is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of  
9 paragraph 2, and on that basis, denies them.

10 3. NDOW admits that it is a claimant to the surface water of the Walker River  
11 and its tributaries and also to groundwater for wildlife purposes. NDOW admits that it is  
12 the agency of the State of Nevada charged with administering the wildlife laws of the state.  
13 See NRS 501.331. However, NDOW denies that it has statutory or regulatory authority  
14 over the allocation and protection of the waters of the Walker River and of Walker Lake.  
15 NDOW is without sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of  
16 paragraph 3, and on that basis, denies them.

**III. JURISDICTION**

17  
18 4. NDOW admits that this Court retains continuing jurisdiction of the Court  
19 over the waters of the Walker River and its tributaries in California and Nevada under the  
20 Final Decree entered in *United States of America v. Walker River Irrigation District, et al.*,  
21 In Equity No. C-125 (D. Nev.) on April 14, 1936, as amended on April 24, 1940 (the “Final  
22 Decree”). The provisions of the Final Decree and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1367, 1651, and 1331 are the  
23 best evidence of their provisions. The remaining allegations contained in paragraph 4 of  
24 the Second Amended Complaint consist of legal conclusions that do not require a response.  
25 To the extent that a response is required, NDOW denies them.

**IV. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

26  
27 5. NDOW is without sufficient information to admit or deny the factual  
28 allegations of paragraph 5, and on that basis, denies them.

1           6.       Based on information and belief, NDOW admits that Walker Lake is an  
2 interstate stream system and that the Lake's primary source of water is inflow from the  
3 Walker River.

4           7.       Based on information and belief, NDOW admits that Walker Lake supported  
5 algae, zooplankton, small crustaceans, insects, and four native fish species: the tui chub,  
6 Lahontan cutthroat trout, speckled dace, and the Tahoe sucker. The remaining allegations  
7 contained in paragraph 7 of the Second Amended Complaint consist of legal conclusions  
8 that do not require a response. To the extent that a response is required, NDOW denies  
9 them.

10          8.       Based on information and belief, NDOW admits that Walker Lake provides  
11 habitat for migratory birds.

12          9.       Based on information and belief, NDOW admits the flows into Walker Lake  
13 have been inadequate to maintain the water quality necessary to support the fishery.  
14 NDOW is without sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining factual allegations  
15 of paragraph 9, and on that basis, denies them.

16          10.      The United States Geological Survey cited in paragraph 10 contains the best  
17 evidence of its provisions. NDOW is without sufficient information to admit or deny the  
18 remaining factual allegations of paragraph 10, and on that basis, denies them.

19          11.      The United States Geological Survey data cited in paragraph 11 contains the  
20 best evidence of its provisions. NDOW is without sufficient information to admit or deny  
21 the remaining factual allegations of paragraph 11, and on that basis, denies them.

22          12.      The United States Geological Survey Report cited in paragraph 12 contains  
23 the best evidence of its provisions. NDOW is without sufficient information to admit or  
24 deny the remaining factual allegations of paragraph 12, and on that basis, denies them.

25          13.      Based on information and belief, NDOW admits the reduced flows into Walker  
26 Lake have reduced the Lake's water quality.

27 ///

28 ///



1 further denies that Mineral County’s legal conclusions support any of the demands set forth  
2 following paragraph 23, at actions 1 through 24.

3 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

4 **First Affirmative Defense**

5 The Second Amended Complaint and each and every Claim for Relief stated therein  
6 fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

7 **Second Affirmative Defense**

8 The Second Amended Complaint and each and every claim for relief stated therein  
9 is, by reason of the Decree, barred by the doctrines of claim preclusion, issue preclusion  
10 and/or other principles of finality as set forth in *Nevada v. United States*, 463 U.S. 110  
11 (1983) and in *Arizona v. California*, 460 U.S. 605 (1983). See also *Five Star Capital Corp.*  
12 *v. Ruby*, 124 Nev. 1048, 1052, 194 P.3d 709, 711 (2008), *holding modified by Weddell v.*  
13 *Sharp*, 131 Nev. 233, 350 P.3d 80 (2015)

14 **Third Affirmative Defense**

15 Lack of jurisdiction due to “general Principles of finality and repose” that apply to  
16 water rights decrees, *Arizona v. California*, 460 U.S. 605, 619 (1983), preclude Paragraph  
17 XIV of the Decree from being construed as authorizing the modification of the Decree to  
18 recognize additional water rights that were not recognized and established in the Decree.

19 **Fourth Affirmative Defense**

20 The Failure to Join necessary and indispensable parties under F.R.C.P. Rule 19 due  
21 to the inability to provide relief against the existing parties and that the missing parties’  
22 interests will not be adequately protected or subject to a substantial risk of incurring  
23 obligations due to those interests. N 41.031(2) requires that any action against the State of  
24 Nevada must be brought in the name of the State of Nevada on relation of the particular  
25 department, commission, board or other agency of the State whose actions are the basis of  
26 the suit.

27 ///

28 ///

**Fifth Affirmative Defense**

1  
2 The Second Amended Complaint and each and every claim for relief stated therein  
3 is barred on the basis that it is nonjusticiable under the political question doctrine. *N. Lake*  
4 *Tahoe Fire v. Washoe Cnty. Comm'rs*, 129 Nev. 682, 686–88, 310 P.3d 583, 586–87 (2013),  
5 citing *United States v. Munoz–Flores*, 495 U.S. 385, 389–90, 110 S.Ct. 1964, 109 L.Ed.2d  
6 384 (1990) (quoting *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 217, 82 S.Ct. 691, 7 L.Ed.2d 663 (1962))  
7 (The features that characterize a case as being nonjusticiable includes “a textually  
8 demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to a coordinate political department;  
9 or a lack of judicially discoverable and manageable standards for resolving it; or the  
10 impossibility of deciding without an initial policy determination of a kind clearly for  
11 nonjudicial discretion; or the impossibility of a court's undertaking independent resolution  
12 without expressing lack of the respect due coordinate branches of government; or an  
13 unusual need for unquestioning adherence to a political decision already made; or the  
14 potentiality of embarrassment from multifarious pronouncements by various departments  
15 on one question.”).

**Sixth Affirmative Defense**

16  
17 The Second Amended Complaint and each and every claim for relief stated therein  
18 is barred by the Eleventh Amendment, which provides: “The Judicial power of the United  
19 States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or  
20 prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or  
21 Subjects of any Foreign State.” U.S. Const. amend. XI. The Supreme Court has recognized  
22 that the significance of the Amendment “lies in its affirmation that the fundamental  
23 principle of sovereign immunity limits the grant of judicial authority in Art. III” of the  
24 Constitution. . . . the Court long ago held that the Eleventh Amendment bars a citizen from  
25 bringing suit against the citizen's own State in federal court.” *Welch v. Texas Dept. of*  
26 *Highways & Pub. Transp.*, 107 S. Ct. 2941, 2945 (1987).

27 ///

28 ///

**Seventh Affirmative Defense**

The Second Amended Complaint seeks to have the Decree Court sit in judgment of itself. The relief sought by Mineral County would require this Court to rule that the Decree court has also violated the public trust doctrine.

**Eighth Affirmative Defense**

The Second Amended Complaint and each and every claim for relief stated therein is barred by the doctrine of estoppel.

**Ninth Affirmative Defense**

NDOW reserves the right to amend this answer as additional affirmative defenses are discovered.

WHEREFORE, the Nevada Department of Wildlife prays for judgment against Mineral County as follows:

1. That the Second Amended Complaint be dismissed;
2. For its costs of suit allowed by law; and
3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 18th day of August 2022.

AARON D. FORD  
Attorney General

By: /s/ Anthony J. Walsh  
ANTHONY J. WALSH, (NV Bar #14128)  
Deputy Attorney General  
State of Nevada  
Office of the Attorney General  
100 North Carson Street  
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717  
(775) 684-1213  
AJWalsh@ag.nv.gov

*Attorney for Nevada Department of Wildlife*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I am an employee of the State of Nevada, Office of the Attorney General, and that on this 18th day of August 2022, I electronically filed the foregoing document, with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the parties of record

/s/Aaron D. Van Sickle  
Employee of the  
State of Nevada  
Office of the Attorney General

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