2	ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP DAVID J. ALESHIRE, Bar No. 65022 WILLIAM W. WYNDER, Bar No. 84753 WESLEY A. MILIBAND, Bar No. 241283		
3	18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700 Irvine, CA 92612		
	Telephone: (949) 223-1170 Facsimile: (949) 223-1180		
5 6	daleshire@awattorneys.com wwynder@awattorneys.com wmiliband@awattorneys.com		
7 8	Attorneys for Defendant, Cross-Complainant and Cross-Cross-Defendant, Phelan Piñon Hills Community Services District		
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA		
	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
10	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) - CENTRAL DISTRICT	
11		T. I'. I G. I'. I'. I'. I'. I'. Durantino	
12	Coordination Proceeding) Special Title (Rule 1550(b))	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408	
13	ANTELOPE VALLEY	(For Filing Purposes Only: Santa Clara	
14	GROUNDWATER CASES	County Case No.: 1-05-CV-049053)	
15	Included Actions:	Assigned for All Purposes To: Judge: Hon. Jack Komar	
16	Los Angeles County Waterworks District () No. 40 v.	(Filing Fees Exempt, Per Gov't Code § 6103)	
17	Diamond Farming Co., et al. Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case	ANSWER OF PHELAN PIÑON HILLS	
18	No. BC 325 201	COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT TO CROSS-COMPLAINT OF TEJON	
19	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v.	RANCH CORP	
20	Diamond Farming Co., et al. Kern County Superior Court, Case No.		
21	S-1500-CV-254-348		
22			
23	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of		
24	Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster		
25	Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist.		
26	Riverside County Superior Court, Consolidated Action, Case Nos. RIC 353		
27	840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668)	
28	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS		

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 1 (Waiver) 2 Cross-Complainant has knowingly and intentionally waived any right to assert some or all 3 of the claims set forth in each and every cause of action contained in the complaint. Acts 4 constituting waiver include but are not limited to the following: (a) failing to challenge the use of 5 water by overlyers once groundwater levels began dropping in some areas of the Basin; 6 (b) failing to challenge the use of water by the municipal water suppliers once groundwater 7 levels began dropping in some areas of the Basin; (c) failing to challenge any Urban Water 8 Management Plan issued by a municipal water supplier that relied on pumping from the area to be 9 adjudicated; and (d) failing to challenge water supply assessments and California Environmental 10 Quality Act compliance documents issued by an public agency that relied on pumping from the 11 area to be adjudicated to meet demand. 12 SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 13 (Physical Solution) 14 In the event of the imposition of a physical solution or some form of declaratory relief, due 15 regard must be given to the prior and paramount nature of Cross-Defendant's appropriative or 16 prescriptive water rights, as well as Cross-Defendant's intervening public use. 17 SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 18 (Waste) 19 Cross-Complainant is guilty of waste. 20 EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 21 (Unclean Hands) 22 Cross-Complainant is guilty of unclean hands because it seeks to restrict the pumping of 23 other users but not its own pumping. 24 /// 25 26 /// 27 28

1	NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
2	(California Constitution, article X, Section 2)	
3	Claims by Cross-Complainant of an absolute priority for overlying rights is barred because	
4	it is unreasonable pursuant to Article X, section 2 of the California Constitution in that it does not	
5	properly balance overlying uses with other reasonable and beneficial uses.	
6	TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
7	(Public Agency Discretion)	
8	Each and every cause of action in the complaint is barred because it improperly seeks to	
9	control the exercise of discretion of various public agencies and it improperly seeks to complete the	
10	exercise of discretion in a particular manner.	
11	ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
12	(Estoppel)	
13	Cross-Complainant by its acts and omissions is estopped from asserting any of the claims	
14	upon which it seeks relief.	
15	TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
16	(Doctrine of Unjust Enrichment)	
17	Cross-Complainant is barred from the relief it seeks by the doctrine of unjust enrichment.	
18	THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
19	(Failure to Name and Join Indispensable and Necessary Parties)	
20	Each and every cause of action contained in the complaint is barred in whole or in part in	
21	accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 389 inasmuch as Cross-Complainant has failed to	
22	name and join indispensable parties, including but not limited to producers of water from the Basin.	
23	FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
24	(Statute of Limitations)	
25	Each and every cause of action is barred, in whole or in part, by applicable statues of	
26	limitation including, but not limited to, sections 318, 319, 321, 337, 338, 339, 342, and 343 of the	
27	California Code of Civil Procedure.	
28		

11	l	
1	FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
2	(Right to Produce Groundwater is Usufructuary)	
3	The rights of Cross-Complainant to produce groundwater are usufructuary, and confer no	
4	right of private ownership in public waters.	
5	SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
6	(No Damages or Losses)	
7	Cross-Complainant is not entitled to recover monetary damages for any groundwater	
8	pumped by Cross-Defendant.	
9	SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
10	(Failure to Mitigate Any Damages)	
11	Cross-Complainant has failed and continues to fail to mitigate its damages, if any, and	
12	Cross-Complainant is barred from recovery against Cross-Defendant to the extent of such failure to	
13	mitigate.	
14	EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
15	(Actions of the Cross-Complainant Is the Proximate and Actual Cause of Any Damages)	
16	The damages alleged, if there were any, were proximately and actually caused by the	
17	voluntary actions of Cross-Complainant and not by any actions and/or omissions of Cross-	
18	Defendant.	
19	NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
20	(Tort Claims Act)	
21	To the extent the complaint could be construed to allege damages based upon anything	
22	other than a constitutional theory for just compensation, the claim of Cross-Complainant is barred	
23	due to the failure of Cross-Complainant to present a timely claim to Cross-Defendant under the	
24	Tort Claims Act, Government Code section 905 et seq.	
25	///	
26	///	
27		
28		

1	TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
2	(Failure to Exercise Reasonable Diligence)
3	The injuries and damages of Cross-Complainant, if any, have been aggravated as a result of
4	their failure to exercise reasonable diligence to minimize those damages, and Cross-Defendant's
5	liability, if any, is limited to the amount of damage which would have been suffered had Cross-
6	Complainant exercised the diligence required of them.
7	TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
8	(Doctrine of Laches)
9	Some or all of the claims of Cross-Complainant for relief are barred by the doctrine of
10	laches for failure to name Cross-Defendant until now.
11	TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
12	(Description of Land)
13	The complaint does not describe the property at issue with sufficient certainty as required
14	by Code of Civil Procedure section 455.
15	TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
16	(Uncertainty and Ambiguity)
17	The complaint and each and every purported cause of action contained therein are
18	uncertain, ambiguous and unintelligible.
19	TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
20	(Right to Assert Additional Affirmative Defenses)
21	Cross-Defendant reserves the right to assert additional affirmative defenses in the event
22	discovery indicates that they would be appropriate.
23	TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
24	(Incorporation By Reference)
25	As permitted by the Court's Appearance Form, Cross-Defendant incorporates by reference,
26	as if fully set forth herein, each and every affirmative defense raised by any other defendant or
27	cross-defendant to the complaints and cross-complaints on file in this coordinated proceeding
28	whether their answers are filed before or after the filing of this answer.

Į		i i
1	WHEREFORE, Cross-Defenda	ant prays for relief as follows:
2	1. That Cross-Complainar	nt take nothing by way of the complaint;
3	2. That Cross-Defendant	be awarded attorneys' fees and costs as may be allowed by
4	statute or law; and	
5	3. For such other and furth	her relief as the court may deem just and proper.
6	Dated: February 13, 2013	ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP
7		
8		By: Wesley A. Miliband
9		Attorneys for Cross-Defendant, Cross-Complainant and Cross-Cross-Defendant,
10		Phelan Piñon Hills Community Services District
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408 For Filing Purposes Only: Santa Clara County Case No.: 1-05-CV-049053			
2				
3	PROOF OF SERVICE			
4	I, Linda Yarvis,			
5	I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700, Irvine, CA 92612.			
7	On February 13, 2013, I served the within document(s) described as ANSWER OF PHELAN PIÑON HILLS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT TO CROSS-			
9	(ELECTRONIC SERVICE) By posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website in regard to Antelope Valley Groundwater matter pursuant to the Court's Clarification Order. Electronic service and electronic posting completed through www.scefiling.org.			
1112131415	(BY MAIL) By placing a true copy of the foregoing document(s) in a sealed envelope addressed as set forth above. I placed each such envelope for collection and mailing following ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this Firm's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, the correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal Service on that same day, with postage thereon fully prepaid at Irvine, California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more			
16 17 18	(BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY) I deposited in a box or other facility regularly maintained by Overnight Express, an express service carrier, or delivered to a courier or driver authorized by said express service carrier to receive documents, a true copy of the foregoing document(s) in a sealed envelope or package designated by the express service carrier, addressed as set forth above, with fees for overnight delivery paid or provided for.			
19	Executed on February 13, 2013, at Irvine, California.			
20	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.			
21	Linda Yarvis			
22	(Type or print name) (Signature)			
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	-1-			
	PROOF OF SERVICE 01133/0012/93114.01			