

1 ROBERT E. DOUGHERTY [SBN 41317]
WILLIAM A. HAUCK [SBN 202669]

(SPACE BELOW FOR FILING STAMP ONLY)

2 **COVINGTON & CROWE, LLP**

3 **ATTORNEYS AT LAW**

4 1131 West Sixth Street, Suite 300

Ontario, California 91762

(909) 983-9393; Fax (909) 391-6762

5 Attorneys for White Fence Farms Mutual Water Co. Inc., El Dorado Mutual Water Co., West
6 Side Park Mutual Water Co., Shadow Acres Mutual Water Co., Antelope Park Mutual Water
7 Co., Averydale Mutual Water Co., Sundale Mutual Water Co., Evergreen Mutual Water Co.,
8 Aqua J Mutual Water Co., Bleigh Flat Mutual Water Co., Colorado Mutual Water Co.,
9 Sunnyside Farms Mutual Water Co., Land Projects Mutual Water Co., Tierra Bonita Mutual
10 Water Co. and Landale Mutual Water Co.; **collectively known as A.V. United Mutual Group**

11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

12 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT

13 **ANTELOPE VALLEY**
14 **GROUNDWATER CASES**

Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding
No. 4408

15 Included Actions:
16 Los Angeles County Waterworks District
17 No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior
18 Court of California, County of Los Angeles,
19 Case No.: BC 325201;

Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053
Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar

20 Los Angeles County Waterworks District
21 No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior
22 Court of California, County of Kern, Case
23 No.: S-1500-CV-254-348;

**ANSWER OF LANDALE MUTUAL
WATER COMPANY, AS A NEW MEMBER
OF A.V. UNITED MUTUAL GROUP, TO
FIRST-AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT
OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS**

24 Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of
25 Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. City of
26 Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v.
27 Palmdale Water Dist., Superior Court of
28 California, County of Riverside, Case Nos.:
RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668

AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS.

Landale Mutual Water Company, as a new member of A.V. United Mutual Group,
("AVUMG") hereby answers the First-Amended Cross-Complaint of the Public Water Suppliers

1 for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Adjudication of Water Rights, which has been filed as
2 of this date, specifically those of California Water Service Company, City of Lancaster, City of
3 Palmdale, Littlerock Creek Irrigation District, Los Angeles County Water Works District No. 40,
4 Palmdale Water District, Rosamond Community Services District, Palm Ranch Irrigation
5 District, and Quartz Hill Water District.
6

7 **GENERAL DENIAL**

8 1. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 431.30(d), Cross-Defendants hereby
9 generally deny each and every allegation set forth in the Cross-Complaint, and the whole thereof,
10 and further deny that Cross-Complainants are entitled to any relief against Cross-Defendants.

11 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

12 **First Affirmative Defense**

13 **(Failure to State a Cause of Action)**

14 2. The Cross-Complaint and every purported cause of action contained therein fail to
15 allege facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against these answering Cross-Defendants.

16 **Second Affirmative Defense**

17 **(Statute of Limitations)**

18 3. Each and every cause of action contained in the Cross-Complaint is barred, in
19 whole or in part, by the applicable statutes of limitation, including, but not limited to, sections
20 318, 319, 321, 338, and 343 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.

21 **Third Affirmative Defense**

22 **(Laches)**

23 4. The Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action contained therein, is
24 barred by the doctrine of laches.

25 **Fourth Affirmative Defense**

26 **(Estoppel)**

27 5. The Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action contained therein, is

1 barred by the doctrine of estoppel.

2 **Fifth Affirmative Defense**

3 **(Waiver)**

4 6. The Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action contained therein, is
5 barred by the doctrine of waiver.

6 **Sixth Affirmative Defense**

7 **(Self-Help)**

8 7. Cross-Defendants have, by virtue of the doctrine of self-help, preserved their
9 paramount overlying right to extract groundwater by continuing, during all times relevant hereto,
10 to extract groundwater and put it to reasonable and beneficial use on their properties.

11 **Seventh Affirmative Defense**

12 **(California Constitution Article X, Section 2)**

13 8. Cross-Complainants' methods of water use and storage are unreasonable and
14 wasteful in the arid conditions of the Antelope Valley and thereby violate Article X, Section 2 of
15 the California Constitution.

16 **Eighth Affirmative Defense**

17 **(Additional Defenses)**

18 9. The Cross-Complainants do not state their allegations with sufficient clarity to
19 enable these answering Cross-Defendants to determine what additional defenses may exist to
20 Cross-Complainants' causes of action. Cross-Defendants therefore reserve the right to assert all
21 other defenses which may pertain to the Cross-Complaint.

22 **Ninth Affirmative Defense**

23 10. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are
24 *ultra vires* and exceed the statutory authority by which each entity may acquire property as set
25 forth in Water Code sections 22456, 31040 and 55370.

26 **Tenth Affirmative Defense**

27 11. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are

1 barred by the provisions of Article 1 Section 19 of the California Constitution.

2 **Eleventh Affirmative Defense**

3 12. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are
4 barred by the provisions of the 5th Amendment to the United States Constitution as applied to the
5 states under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.

6 **Twelfth Affirmative Defense**

7 13. Cross-Complainants' prescriptive claims are barred due to their failure to take
8 affirmative steps that were reasonably calculated and intended to inform each overlying
9 landowner of Cross-Complainants' adverse and hostile claim as required by the due process
10 clause of the 5th and 14th Amendments of the United States Constitution.

11 **Thirteenth Affirmative Defense**

12 14. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are
13 barred by the provisions of Article 1 Section 7 of the California Constitution.

14 **Fourteenth Affirmative Defense**

15 15. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are
16 barred by the provisions of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

17 **Fifteenth Affirmative Defense**

18 16. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants were permissively pumping at all
19 times.

20 **Sixteenth Affirmative Defense**

21 17. The request for the court to use its injunctive powers to impose a physical solution
22 seeks a remedy that is in violation of the doctrine of separation of powers set forth in Article 3
23 Section 3 of the California Constitution.

24 **Seventeenth Affirmative Defense**

25 18. Cross-Complainants are barred from asserting their prescriptive claims by
26 operation of law as set forth in Civil Code sections 1007 and 1214.

27 ////

1 **Eighteenth Affirmative Defense**

2 19. Each Cross-Complainant is barred from recovery under each and every cause of
3 action contained in the Cross-Complaint by the doctrine of unclean hands and/or unjust
4 enrichment.

5 **Nineteenth Affirmative Defense**

6 20. The Cross-Complaint is defective because it fails to name indispensable parties in
7 violation of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 389(a).

8 **Twentieth Affirmative Defense**

9 21. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred from taking, possessing
10 or using Cross-Defendants' property without first paying just compensation. (United States
11 Constitution, Amendment 5; Article I Section 19 of the California Constitution; California Code
12 of Civil Procedure Section 1263.010(a)).

13 **Twenty-First Affirmative Defense**

14 22. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants are seeking to transfer water right
15 priorities and water usage which will have significant effects on the Antelope Valley
16 Groundwater basin and the Antelope Valley. Said actions are being done without complying
17 with and contrary to the provisions of California's Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
18 (Pub.Res.C. 2100 *et seq.*).

19 **Twenty-Second Affirmative Defense**

20 23. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants seek judicial ratifications of a
21 project that has had and will have a significant effect on the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin
22 and the Antelope Valley that was implemented without providing notice in contravention of the
23 provisions of California's Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub.Res.C. 2100 *et seq.*).

24 **Twenty-Third Affirmative Defense**

25 24. Any imposition by this court of a proposed physical solution that reallocates the
26 water right priorities and water usage within the Antelope Valley will be *ultra vires* as it will be
27 subverting the pre-project legislative requirements and protections of California's Environmental

1 Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub.Res.C. 2100 *et seq.*).

2 **Twenty-Fourth Affirmative Defense**

3 25. No well-defined community of interests exists among Defendants and Cross-
4 Defendants sufficient for this case to warrant class action status.

5 **Twenty-Fifth Affirmative Defense**


6 26. Each putative class member will not have common defenses against competing
7 water rights sufficient to certify either a Plaintiff or Defendant class.

8 **WHEREFORE**, these answering Cross-Defendants pray that judgment be entered as
9 follows:

- 10 1. That Cross-Complainants take nothing by reason of their Cross-Complaint;
- 11 2. That the Cross-Complaint be dismissed with prejudice;
- 12 3. For Cross-Defendants' costs incurred herein; and
- 13 4. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

14
15 Dated: February 14, 2008

COVINGTON & CROWE, LLP

17
18 By: 
19 **ROBERT E. DOUGHERTY**
20 **WILLIAM A. HAUCK**
21 Attorneys for Cross-Defendants and Cross-
22 Complainants A.V. United Mutual Group
23
24
25
26
27

1
2 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

4 I am employed in the County of San Bernardino, State of California. I am over the
5 age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is Covington & Crowe,
6 LLP, 1131 West Sixth Street, Suite 300, Ontario, California 91762.

7 On February 14, 2008, I served the foregoing document described as
8 **ANSWER OF LANDALE MUTUAL WATER COMPANY, AS A NEW MEMBER OF**
9 **A.V. UNITED MUTUAL GROUP, TO FIRST AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT OF**
10 **PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS** on the interested parties in this action:

11 by posting the document listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court e-
12 filing website under the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter pursuant to the
13 Court's Order dated October 27, 2005.

14 by placing the original a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope
15 addressed as follows:

16 BY MAIL


17 * I deposited such envelope in the mail at Ontario, California. The envelope
18 was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

19 As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and
20 processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with
21 U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Ontario,
22 California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party
23 served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is
24 more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

25 **BY PERSONAL SERVICE** I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of
26 the addressee.

27 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
28 foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on February 14, 2008, at Ontario, California.


DOLORES C. CRUZ