

1 Frankie Sue Del Papa, ATTORNEY GENERAL  
2 Susan Joseph-Taylor, Deputy Attorney General  
3 198 South Carson  
4 Carson City, Nevada 89710  
5 Tel. (702) 687-7319  
6 Fax. (702) 687-5798  
7 Attorneys for Plaintiff, the STATE  
8 OF NEVADA, its Officers and Agencies

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
FILED  
BY: JPH  
JAN 3 1995  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
BY: JPH DEPUTY

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
12 Plaintiff,

IN EQUITY NO. C-125  
SUBFILE NO. C-125-B-  
C-125-C

13 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,  
14 Plaintiff-Intervenor,

15 v.

16 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,  
17 a corporation, et al.,  
18 Defendants.

19 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
20 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,  
21 Counterclaimant,

**STATE OF NEVADA'S REPORT  
RE MINERAL COUNTY'S  
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

22 v.

23 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,  
24 et al.,  
25 Counterdefendants.  
26 \_\_\_\_\_ /

27 The State of Nevada, by and through the undersigned counsel, files this Report pursuant  
28 to the Court's Minute Order approving the Stipulation and Order Concerning Mineral County's

1 Motion to Intervene and for Pretrial Conference Thereon, dated November 17, 1994.

2 **BACKGROUND**

3 On January 3, 1992, the Walker River Irrigation District ("WRID") filed a First Amended  
4 Petition for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Request for Order to Show Cause, or in the  
5 Alternative to Change Point of Diversion to Storage of Water from California to Nevada ("First  
6 Amended Petition").

7 On March 17, 1992, the Walker River Paiute Tribe ("Tribe") served its Answer to the  
8 First Amended Petition, and its Counterclaim and Cross-claim. In filing its Counterclaim, the  
9 Tribe greatly expanded the factual and legal issues raised in the First Amended Petition. On May  
10 21, 1992, the Court ordered that the Tribe's Counterclaim be set aside as a subaction identified  
11 as C-125-B.

12 In C-125-B, the Tribe alleged a claim against all the water users as counterdefendants for  
13 a right to store water in Weber Reservoir and for a water right in lands restored to the Walker  
14 River Paiute Reservation. The State of Nevada argued that all claimants to the waters of the  
15 Walker River or its tributaries had to be joined and served with process in compliance with the  
16 provisions of Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. All water users on the Walker  
17 River and its tributaries, as counterdefendants, were indispensable parties. Nevada argued that  
18 due to the time that had passed since the United States began the Walker River adjudication,  
19 many if not all of the named defendants in the Final Decree were dead and/or their decreed water  
20 rights had been transferred. Accordingly, the successors in interest to the decreed water rights  
21 who had not been parties before the decree Court, must be joined under Rule 19 of the Federal  
22 Rules of Civil Procedure.

23 Nevada also took the position that all other claimants to the waters of the Walker River  
24 and its tributaries, not included in the Final Decree, but authorized by either the California State  
25 Water Resources Control Board or the Nevada State Engineer to appropriate such waters, should  
26 likewise be joined. On October 27, 1992, the Court ruled that the Tribe and the United States  
27 were required to join as parties, and serve pursuant to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil  
28

1 Procedure, all existing claimants to waters of the Walker River and its tributaries.

2 On or about November 7, 1994, Mineral County moved to intervene in C-125-B pursuant  
3 to Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Mineral County claims it has an interest  
4 relating to the subject matter of the action and is so situated that disposition of the action may  
5 as a practical matter impair or impede its ability to protect that interest, which may not be  
6 adequately represented by the existing parties; or that, Mineral County's defense and the main  
7 action have a question of law or fact in common.

8 Nevada takes the same position in reference to Mineral County's Motion to Intervene that  
9 it took with regard to the joinder and service required by the Tribe in relation to the Tribe's  
10 Counterclaim asserting a right to additional waters from the Walker River. Every water right  
11 user on the Walker River must be notified of Mineral County's Motion to Intervene.

12 In seeking the recognition of the public trust doctrine as a limitation on the water rights  
13 granted pursuant to the Final Decree and state water law systems of appropriation, Mineral  
14 County seeks to amend or modify the Final Decree and impose a restriction on water rights not  
15 previously recognized under Nevada law. Application of the public trust doctrine could affect  
16 all water users on the Walker River and its tributaries, and could result in the water rights of  
17 various water users being significantly diminished in quantity. The holders of those water rights  
18 are entitled to adequate notice and a full opportunity to be heard and participate in any proceeding  
19 before the Court makes a determination whether to grant or deny Mineral County's Motion to  
20 Intervene.

21 The Court recognized in its October 27, 1992, Order that if the Court were to recognize  
22 additional water rights for the Tribe and integrate those rights into the Final Decree, such  
23 recognition might have the effect of reducing water allocation to other water right holders or  
24 altering the priority of the allocations. Thus, the claimants to the waters of the Walker River  
25 clearly had an interest in the action. Pursuant to the Court's Order of October 27, 1992, the  
26 Tribe and the United States were required to join as parties, and serve pursuant to Rule 4 of the  
27 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, all existing claimants to waters of the Walker River and its  
28

1 tributaries.

2 Mineral County's Motion to Intervene and present the public trust doctrine in the context  
3 of C-125-B has the same potential to effectively reduce water allocated to water right holders.  
4 The claimants to the waters of the Walker River clearly have a substantial interest in Mineral  
5 County's motion and allegations. Thus, service of Mineral County's Motion to Intervene is  
6 required on all claimants to the waters of the Walker River. If these water claimants are not  
7 served, their ability to protect their interests and oppose Mineral County's Motion to Intervene  
8 is impaired. Futhermore, Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that a  
9 "person desiring to intervene shall serve a motion to intervene upon the parties as provided in  
10 Rule 5." Fed.R.Civ.P.24(c).


11 **PROPOSED PROCEDURES**

12 The Tribe and the United States are in the process of serving all claimants to the waters  
13 of the Walker River and its tributaries with process. Pursuant to a Stipulation and Order dated  
14 November 17, 1994, the Tribe and the United States were given until March 24, 1995, within  
15 which to complete joinder of additional parties and service of process on claimants to the water  
16 of the Walker River and its tributaries.

17 The State of Nevada suggests that once service has been completed by the Tribe and the  
18 United States, further action on the Tribe's claims should be stayed pending Mineral County's  
19 service of its Motion to Intervene on all the claimants to the waters of the Walker River and its  
20 tributaries. The stay should continue through the Court's ruling on Mineral County's motion.

21 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of December, 1994.

22  
23 FRANKIE SUE DEL PAPA  
24 Attorney General

25 By:   
26 SUSAN JOSEPH-TAYLOR  
27 Deputy Attorney General  
28

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that I am an employee of the office of the Attorney General, State of Nevada, and that on this day, at Carson City, Nevada, I deposited for mailing, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document addressed as follows:

Gordon H. DePaoli, Esq.  
P.O. Box 2311  
Reno, NV 89505

David E. Moser, Esq.  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Mary E. Hackenbracht  
Deputy Attorney General  
2101 Webster St., 12th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612-3049

Linda Bowman, Esq.  
P.O. Box 281  
Reno, NV 89504

Scott McElroy, Esq.  
1007 Pearl St., #220  
Boulder, CO 80302

James Spoo, Esq.  
450 Marsh Ave.  
Reno, NV 89509

Kathryn Landreth  
John P. Lange  
U.S. Department of Justice  
999 18th St., #945  
Denver, CO 80202

Dated: 12-22-94

Sue Clugage  
Sue Clugage