1		
2		
3		
4	MATTHEW J. MCKEOWN	
5	Acting Assistant Attorney General Environment and Natural Resources Division	
6	R. LEE LEININGER United States Department of Justice Environment and Natural Resources Division 1961 Stout St., Suite 800 Denver, Colorado 80294 lee.leininger@usdoj.gov	EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 6103
7		
8 9		
10	Phone: 303/844-1364 Fax: 303/844-1350 Attorneys for Federal Defendants	
11	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STA	TE OF CALIFORNIA
12	COUNTY OF LOS A	
13	Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule 1550(b))) Judicial Council Coordination) Proceeding No. 4408
14	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES)
15	Included actions:) UNITED STATES' ANSWER TO) FIRST AMENDED CROSS-
16	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v.) COMPLAINT OF PUBLIC) WATER SUPPLIERS FOR
17	Diamond Farming Co., et al. Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC 325 201	 DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND ADJUDICATION OF WATER RIGHTS
18	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., et al. Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV- 254-348	
19 20))
21)
		1
22	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. Polymodela Woter District)
22 23	Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water District Riverside County Superior Court, Consolidated)))
	<u>Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster</u> <u>Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water District</u>))))
23	Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water District Riverside County Superior Court, Consolidated Action, Case nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC)))))))))
23 24	Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water District Riverside County Superior Court, Consolidated Action, Case nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668	
232425	Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water District Riverside County Superior Court, Consolidated Action, Case nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668	

1	The United States of America hereby answers the First Amended Cross-Complaint of
2	Public Water Suppliers for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Adjudication of Water Rights
3	("First Amended Cross-Complaint") filed by the California Water Service Company, City of
4	Lancaster, City of Palmdale, Littlerock Creek Irrigation District, Los Angeles County Water
5	Works District No. 40, Palmdale Water District, Rosamond Community Services District, Palm
6	Ranch Irrigation District and Quartz Hill Water District (collectively, the "Public Water
7	Suppliers").
8	ANSWER
9	Paragraphs 1-12, 15-93: The United States hereby incorporates in this Answer the UNITED
10	STATES' ANSWER TO Cross-Complaint OF MUNICIPAL PURVEYORS FOR
11	DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND ADJUDICATION OF WATER RIGHTS,
12	filed in this action on February 15, 2006. The United States' previous answer addresses the
13	allegations contained in all paragraphs of the First Amended Cross-Complaint with the exception
14	of new paragraphs 13 and 14, titled the "Class Action Allegations."
15	Paragraphs 13 and 14: The United States responds to the Class Action allegations contained in
16	Paragraphs 13 and 14 of the First Amended Cross-Complaint as follows:
17	Paragraph 13. The United States denies the allegations contained in the first two
18	sentences of Paragraph 13. The United States lacks sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the
19	allegations contained in the third sentence of this paragraph, and denies them on that basis.
20	Paragraph 14. The United States denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 14.
21	
22	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES
23	<u>First Defense</u>
24	This Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. There is no waiver of the sovereign immunity of the
25	United States for this suit under the McCarran Amendment, 43 U.S.C. § 666, or any other
26	statute. <u>Second Defense</u>
27	The United States is immune from judgment for costs.
28	Third Defense

1	The First Amended Cross-Complaint asserts causes of action which are not part of a general
2	stream adjudication under state or federal law.
3	Fourth Defense
4	The Cross-Complainants have failed to join necessary and indispensable parties.
5	<u>Fifth Defense</u>
6	The Cross-Complainants have failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.
7	Sixth Defense
8	The Cross-Complainants, and other parties, are not entitled to prescription against the United
9	States' water rights.
10	Seventh Defense
11	The Cross-Complainants have failed to describe with specificity the groundwater basin or
12	aquifer or aquifers or pertinent sub-basins, if any, from which Cross-complainants and Cross-
13	defendants are extracting, or claim the right to extract, groundwater and their allegations are
14	therefore uncertain and defective.
15	Eighth Defense
16	The United States is owner of property overlying the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin and
17	thus holds overlying rights to the native water of the basin which are prior and paramount to the
18	rights claimed by Cross-Complainants.
19	Ninth Defense
20	The United States is owner of property within the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin and thus
21	holds federal reserved water rights which are prior and paramount to the rights claimed by
22	Cross-complainants.
23	<u>Tenth Defense</u>
24	The United States extracts water from the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin that is used, <i>inter</i>
25	alia, for domestic purposes. The United States is, therefore, entitled to any priority warranted by
26	California Water Code section 106.
27	Eleventh Defense
28	The First Amended Cross-Complaints are barred by applicable statutes of limitations, including
	Page 2 of 4

1	but not limited to sections 318, 319, 321, 338, and 343 of the California Code of Civil Procedure	
2	Twelfth Defense	
3	The First Amended Cross-Complaints, and each and every cause of action therein, are barred	
4	by the doctrine of laches.	
5	Thirteenth Defense	
6	The First Amended Cross-Complaints, and each and every cause of action therein, are barred	
7	by the doctrine of waiver.	
8	Fourteenth Defense	
9	The First Amended Cross-Complaints, and each and every cause of action therein, are barred	
10	by the doctrine of estoppel.	
11	<u>Fifteenth Defense</u>	
12	The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state its allegations with sufficient clarity to	
13	enable the United States to determine what additional defenses may exist to Cross-complainants'	
14	causes of action. The United States therefore reserves the right to assert all other defenses which	
15	may pertain to the First Amended Cross-Complaint.	
16		
17	WHEREFORE, the United States prays for judgment as follows:	
18	1. That Cross-Complainants take nothing by virtue of their First Amended Cross-Complaint;	
19	2. That the United States has rights, including federal reserved rights, to water within the	
20	groundwater basin which rights are prior and paramount to the rights of all other parties. That	
21	should the Court grant relief pursuant to the First Amended Cross-Complaint, the United States'	
22	water rights be determined as superior and senior to all those claimed by other parties;	
23	3. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.	
24		
25	Dated: April 13, 2007 /s/ R. Lee Leininger	
26	R. Lee Leininger Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice	
27	Autorney, O.S. Department of Justice	
20		

1	PROOF OF SERVICE			
2	I, Linda C. Shumard, declare:			
3	I am a resident of the State of Colorado and over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is U.S. Department of Justice, Environmental and Natural Resources Section, 1961 Stout Street, 8 th Floor, Denver, Colorado 80294. On April 13, 2007, I caused the foregoing documents described as UNITED STATES' ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND			
4				
5 6				
7 8	ADJUDICATION OF WATER RIGHTS AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINTS NOT PREVIOUSLY ANSWERED, to be served on the parties via the following service::			
9	BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE AS FOLLOWS by posting the documents(s) listed above to the Santa Clara website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter.			
1011	BY MAIL AS FOLLOWS (to parties so indicated on attached service list): By placing true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as indicated on the attached service list.			
12	☐ BY OVERNIGHT COURIER: I caused the above-referenced document(s)			
13 14	be delivered to FEDERAL EXPRESS for delivery to the above address(es)			
15				
16	Executed on April 13, 2007, at Denver, Colorado.			
17				
18	<u>/S/</u>			
19	Linda C. Shumard Legal Support Assistant			
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				