15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	EDWARD J. CASEY (State Bar No. 119571)	
2	TAMMY L. JONES (State Bar No. 232693) ALSTON & BIRD LLP	
3	333 South Hope Street Sixteenth Floor	
4	Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (213) 576-1000	
5	Facsimile: (213) 576-1100 ed.casey@alston.com	
6	tammy.jones@alston.com	
7	Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Defendant	
8	ENXCÓ DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (Sued Herein as Roe 452)	
	CLIDEDIOD COLUDE OF TWO	
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
11	ANTELOPE VALLEY	Judicial Council Coordination
12	GROUNDWATER CASES,	For filing purposes only:
13	Included Actions:	Case No.: 1-05-CV-049053 LASC Case No. BC 325201
	Los Angeles County Waterworks District	27150 Cuse 110. BC 323201

Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408

Assigned to the Honorable Jack Komar

ANSWER TO ALL COMPLAINTS AND FIRST AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT OF DEFENDANT AND CROSS-DEFENDANT ENXCO DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (Sued Herein as Roe 452)

No. 40 v. Diamond Fanning Co.

Case No. BC 325201

Los Angeles County Superior Court

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

I hereby answer all Complaints and the Cross-Complaints which have been filed as of this date, specifically those of Antelope Valley East-Kern Water Agency, Palmdale Water District & Quartz Hill Water District, Rosamond Community Services District and Waterworks District No. 40 of Los Angeles County. I do not intend to participate at trial or other proceedings unless ordered by the Court to do so, but I reserve the right to do so upon giving written notice to that effect to the Court and all parties. I own the following property(ies) located in the Antelope Valley: 10470 Cameron Canyon Road, Mojave, CA. APN is 224-311-42.

GENERAL DENIAL

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

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

First Affirmative Defense

(Failure to State a Cause of Action)

2. The Complaints and Cross-Complaint and every purported cause of action contained therein fail to allege facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against Defendant and Cross-Defendant.

Second Affirmative Defense

(Statute of Limitation)

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

27 ///

28

The Complaints and Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of

The Complaints and Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of

The Complaints and Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of

Defendant and Cross-Defendant has, by virtue of the doctrine of selfhelp, preserved its paramount overlying right to extract groundwater by continuing, during all times relevant hereto, to extract groundwater and put it to reasonable and beneficial use

Plaintiffs' and Cross-Complainants' methods of water use and storage are unreasonable and wasteful in the arid conditions of the Antelope Valley and thereby

The Plaintiffs and Cross-Complainants do not state their allegations with sufficient clarity to enable Defendant and Cross-Defendant to determine what

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

additional defenses may exist to Plaintiffs' and Cross-Complainants' causes of action, Defendant and Cross-defendant therefore reserves the right to assert all other defenses which may pertain to the Complaints and Cross-Complaint.

Ninth Affirmative Defense

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

Tenth Affirmative Defense

The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred by the provisions of Article 1 Section 19 of the California Constitution.

Eleventh Affirmative Defense

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

Twelfth Affirmative Defense

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

Thirteenth Affirmative Defense

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

Fourteenth Affirmative Defense

The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-15.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9
10
1.1
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Complainants are barred by the provisions of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Fifteenth Affirmative Defense

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

Sixteenth Affirmative Defense

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

Seventeenth Affirmative Defense

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

Eighteenth Affirmative Defense

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

Nineteenth Affirmative Defense

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

Twentieth Affirmative Defense

21. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred from taking, possessing or using cross-defendants' property without first paying just compensation.

Twenty-First Affirmative Defense

22. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants are seeking to transfer water right priorities and water usage which will have significant effects on the Antelope Valley Groundwater basin and the Antelope Valley. Said actions are being done without complying with and contrary to the provisions of California's Environmental Quality Act

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

(CEQA) (Pub.Res.C. 2100 et seq.).

Twenty-Second Affirmative Defense

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

Twenty-Third Affirmative Defense

24. Any imposition by this court of a proposed physical solution that reallocates the water right priorities and water usage within the Antelope Valley will be ultra vires as it will be subverting the pre-project legislative requirements and protections of California's Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub.Res.C. 2100 et seq.).

WHEREFORE, Defendant and Cross-Defendant prays that judgment be entered as follows:

- That Plaintiffs and Cross-Complainants take nothing by reason of their 1. Complaints or Cross-Complaint:
 - That the Complaints and Cross-Complaint be dismissed with prejudice; 2.
 - For Defendant and Cross-Defendant's costs incurred herein; and 3.
 - 4. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED: September 23, 2008 EDWARD J. CASEY TAMMY L. JONES ALSTON & BIRD LLP

Tammy L. Jones

Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Defendant ENXCÓ DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

(Sued Herein as Roe 452)

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Yolanda S. Ramos, declare:

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am	over
the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is Alston & Rird	333
South Hope Street, Sixteenth Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90071. I am over the age of eight	iteen
years and not a party to the action in which this service is made.	110011

On September 23, 2008, I served the document(s) described as ANSWER TO ALL COMPLAINTS AND FIRST AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT OF DEFENDANT AND CROSS-DEFENDANT ENXCO DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (Sued Herein as Roe 452) on the interested parties in this action by enclosing the document(s) in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

- BY MAIL: I am "readily familiar" with this firm's practice for the collection and the processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In the ordinary course of business, the correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal Service at 333 South Hope Street, Los Angeles, California 90071 with postage thereon fully prepaid the same day on which the correspondence was placed for collection and mailing at the firm. Following ordinary business practices, I placed for collection and mailing with the United States Postal Service such envelope at Alston & Bird, 333 South Hope Street, Los Angeles, California 90071.
- BY ELECTRONIC MAIL: By posting the document listed above to the Santa Clara Superior Court website: www.scefiling.org regarding the ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER matter.
- BY FACSIMILE: I telecopied a copy of said document(s) to the following addressee(s) at the following number(s) in accordance with the written confirmation of counsel in this action.
- [State] I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.
- ☐ [Federal] I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on September 23, 2008, at Los Angeles, California.

YOLANDA S. RAMOS

| | IMANDB/1256888v1