

ERIC L. GARNER, Bar No. 130665  
JEFFREY V. DUNN, Bar No. 131926  
MARC S. EHRLICH, Bar No. 198112  
JILL N. WILLIS, Bar No. 200121  
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP  
5 Park Plaza, Suite 1500  
Irvine, California 92614  
Telephone: (949) 263-2600  
Telecopier: (949) 260-0972

**EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES UNDER  
GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 6103**

Attorneys for Cross-Complainant  
ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES  
DISTRICT AND LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Coordination Proceeding  
Special Title (Rule 1550(b))

Judicial Council Coordination  
Proceeding No. 4408

ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER  
CASES

CROSS-COMPLAINT OF MUNICIPAL  
PURVEYORS FOR DECLARATORY AND  
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND  
ADJUDICATION OF WATER RIGHTS

Included Actions:

Los Angeles County Waterworks District  
No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co.  
Superior Court of California, County of  
Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325 201

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

Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of  
Lancaster  
Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster  
Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water  
Dist.  
Superior Court of California, County of  
Riverside, consolidated actions, Case Nos.  
RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668

ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES  
DISTRICT;  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40;

PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT;  
CITY OF LANCASTER;  
CITY OF PALMDALE,  
LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION  
DISTRICT,  
PALM RANCH IRRIGATION  
DISTRICT;  
QUARTZ HILL DISTRICT;  
CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE  
COMPANY,

Cross-Complainants,

v.

DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY;  
WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.;  
BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES LLC;  
ABC WILLIAMS ENTERPRISES LP;  
ACEH CAPITAL LLC;  
JACQUELINE ACKERMANN;  
CENON ADVINCULA;  
OLIVA M. ADVINCULA;  
MASHALLAH AFSHAR;  
ANTONIO U. AGUSTINES;  
AIRTRUST SINGAPORE PRIVATE  
LIMITED;  
MARWAN M. ALDAIS;  
ALLEN ALEVY;  
ALLEN ALEVY AND ALEVY FAMILY  
TRUST;  
GEORGINE J. ARCHER;  
GEORGINE J. ARCHER AS TRUSTEE  
FOR THE GEORGINE J. ARCHER  
TRUST;  
A V MATERIALS, INC.;  
GUSS A. BARKS, JR.;  
PETER G. BARKS;  
ILDEFONSO S. BAYANI;  
NILDA V. BAYANI;  
BIG WEST CORP;  
RANDALL Y. BLAYNEY;  
MELODY S. BLOOM;  
BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, INC.;  
DAVID L. BOWERS;  
RONALD E. BOWERS;  
LEROY DANIEL BRONSTON;  
MARILYN BURGESS;  
LAVERNE C. BURROUGHS;  
LAVERNE C. BURROUGHS, TRUSTEE  
OF THE BURROUGHS FAMILY  
IRREVOCABLE TRUST DATED  
AUGUST 1, 1995;  
BRUCE BURROWS;  
JOHN & B. CALANDRI 2001 TRUST;

1 CALIFORNIA PORTLAND CEMENT  
COMPANY;  
2 CALMAT LAND CO.;  
MELINDA E. CAMERON;  
3 CASTLE BUTTE DEV CORP;  
CATELLUS DEVELOPMENT  
4 CORPORATION;  
BONG S. CHANG;  
5 JEANNA Y. CHANG;  
MOON S. CHANG;  
6 JACOB CHETRIT;  
FRANK S. CHIODO;  
7 LEE S. CHIOU;  
M S CHUNG;  
8 CITY OF LOS ANGELES;  
CAROL K. CLAYPOOL;  
9 CLIFFORD N. CLAYPOOL;  
W. F. CLUNEN, JR.;  
10 W. F. CLUNEN, JR. AS TRUSTEE FOR  
THE P C REV INTER VIVOS TRUST;  
11 CONSOLIDATED ROCK PRODUCTS  
CO.;  
12 COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO.  
14 OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY;  
13 COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO.  
20 OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY;  
14 RUTH A. CUMMING;  
RUTH A. CUMMING AS TRUSTEE OF  
15 THE CUMMING FAMILY TRUST;  
CATHARINE M. DAVIS;  
16 MILTON S. DAVIS;  
DEL SUR RANCH LLC;  
17 DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY;  
SARKIS DJANIBEKYAN;  
18 HONG DONG;  
YING X DONG;  
19 DOROTHY DREIER;  
GEORGE E. DREIER;  
20 EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CA;  
MORTEZA M. FOROUGH;  
21 MORTEZA M. FOROUGH AS  
TRUSTEE OF THE FOROUGH  
22 FAMILY TRUST;  
LEWIS FREDRICHSEN;  
23 LEWIS FREDRICHSEN AS TRUSTEE  
OF THE FRIEDRICHSEN FAMILY  
24 TRUST;  
JOAN A. FUNK;  
25 EUGENE GABRYCH;  
MARIAN GABRYCH;  
26 AURORA P. GABUYA;  
RODRIGO L. GABUYA;  
27 GGF LLC;  
GENUS LP;  
28 BETTY GLUCKSTEIN;

1 JOSEPH H. GLUCKSTEIN;  
2 FORREST G. GODDE;  
3 FORREST G. GODDE AS TRUSTEE OF  
4 THE FORREST G. GODDE TRUST;  
5 LAWRENCE A. GODDE;  
6 LAWRENCE A. GODDE AND GODDE  
7 TRUST;  
8 MARIA B. GORRINDO;  
9 MARIA B. GORRINDO AS TRUSTEE  
10 FOR THE M. GORRINDO TRUST;  
11 WENDELL G. HANKS;  
12 ANDREAS HAUKE;  
13 MARILYN HAUKE;  
14 HEALY ENTERPRISES, INC.;  
15 WALTER E. HELMICK;  
16 DONNA L. HIGELMIRE;  
17 MICHAEL N. HIGELMIRE;  
18 DAVIS L. AND DIANA D. HINES  
19 FAMILY TRUST;  
20 HOOSHPACK DEV INC.;  
21 CHI S. HUANG;  
22 SUCHU T. HUANG;  
23 JOHN HUI;  
24 HYPERICUM INTERESTS LLC;  
25 DARYUSH IRANINEZHAD;  
26 MINOO IRANINEZHAD;  
27 ESFANDIAR KADIVAR;  
28 ESFANDIAR KADIVAR AS TRUSTEE  
OF THE KADIVAR FAMILY TRUST;  
A. DAVID KAGON;  
A. DAVID KAGON AS TRUSTEE FOR  
THE KAGON TRUST;  
JACK D. KAHLO;  
CHENG LIN KANG;  
HERBERT KATZ;  
HERBERT KATZ AS TRUSTEE FOR  
THE KATZ FAMILY TRUST;  
MARIANNE KATZ;  
LILIAN S. KAUFMAN;  
LILIAN S. KAUFMAN AS TRUSTEE  
FOR THE KAUFMAN FAMILY TRUST;  
KAZUKO YOSHIMATSU;  
BARBARA L. KEYS;  
BARBARA L. KEYS AS TRUSTEE OF  
THE BARBARA L. KEYS FAMILY  
TRUST;  
BILLY H. KIM;  
ILLY KING;  
ILLY KING AS TRUSTEE OF THE ILLY  
KING FAMILY TRUST;  
KOOTENAI PROPERTIES, INC.;  
KUTU INVESTMENT CO.;  
GAILEN KYLE;  
GAILEN KYLE AS TRUSTEE OF THE  
KYLE TRUST;



1 JAMES W. KYLE;  
2 JAMES W. KYLE AS TRUSTEE OF THE  
3 KYLE FAMILY TRUST;  
4 JULIA KYLE;  
5 WANDA E. KYLE;  
6 FARES A. LAHOUD;  
7 EVA LAI;  
8 PAUL LAI;  
9 YING WAH;  
10 LAND BUSINESS CORPORATION;  
11 RICHARD E. LANDFIELD;  
12 RICHARD E. LANDFIELD AS  
13 TRUSTEE OF THE RICHARD E.  
14 LANDFIELD TRUST;  
15 LAWRENCE CHARLES TRUST;  
16 WILLIAM LEWIS;  
17 MARY LEWIS;  
18 PEI CHI LIN;  
19 MAN C. LO;  
20 SHIUNG RU LO;  
21 LYMAN C. MILES;  
22 LYMAN C. MILES AS TRUSTEE FOR  
23 THE MILES FAMILY TRUST;  
24 MALLOY FAMILY PARTNERS LP;  
25 MISSION BELL RANCH  
26 DEVELOPMENT;  
27 BARRY S. MUNZ;  
28 KATHLEEN M. MUNZ;  
TERRY A. MUNZ;  
M.R. NASIR;  
SOUAD R. NASIR;  
EUGENE B. NEBEKER;  
SIMIN C. NEMAN;  
HENRY NGO;  
FRANK T. NGUYEN;  
JUANITA R. NICHOLS;  
OLIVER NICHOLS;  
OLIVER NICHOLS AS TRUSTEE OF  
THE NICHOLS FAMILY TRUST;  
OWL PROPERTIES, INC.;  
PALMDALE HILLS PROPERTY LLC;  
NORMAN L. POULSEN;  
MARILYN J. PREWOZNIK;  
MARILYN J. PREWOZNIK AS  
TRUSTEE OF THE MARILYN J.  
PREWOZNIK TRUST;  
ELIAS QARMOUT;  
VICTORIA RAHIMI;  
R AND M RANCH, INC.;  
PATRICIA A. RECHT;  
VERONIKA REINELT;  
REINELT ROSENLOECHER CORP.  
PSP;  
PATRICIA J. RIGGINS;  
PATRICIA J. RIGGINS AS TRUSTEE OF

1 THE RIGGINS FAMILY TRUST;  
2 EDGAR C. RITTER;  
3 PAULA E. RITTER;  
4 PAULA E. RITTER AS TRUSTEE OF  
5 THE RITTER FAMILY TRUST;  
6 ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF  
7 LOS ANGELES;  
8 ROMO LAKE LOS ANGELES  
9 PARTNERSHIP;  
10 ROSEMOUNT EQUITIES LLC SERIES;  
11 ROYAL INVESTORS GROUP;  
12 ROYAL WESTERN PROPERTIES LLC;  
13 OSCAR RUDNICK;  
14 REBECCA RUDNICK;  
15 SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS  
16 CONSERVANCY;  
17 MARYGRACE H. SANTORO;  
18 MARYGRACE H. SANTORO AS  
19 TRUSTEE FOR THE MARYGRACE H.  
20 SANTORO REV TRUST;  
21 SAN YU ENTERPRISES, INC.;  
22 DANIEL SAPARZADEH;  
23 HELEN STATHATOS;  
24 SAVAS STATHATOS;  
25 SAVAS STATHATOS AS TRUSTEE  
26 FOR THE STATHATOS FAMILY  
27 TRUST;  
28 SEVEN STAR UNITED LLC;  
MARK H. SHAFRON;  
ROBERT L. SHAFRON;  
KAMRAM S. SHAKIB;  
DONNA L. SIMPSON;  
GARETH L. SIMPSON;  
GARETH L. SIMPSON AS TRUSTEE OF  
THE SIMPSON FAMILY TRUST;  
SOARING VISTA PROPERTIES, INC.;  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA;  
GEORGE C. STEVENS, JR.;  
GEORGE C. STEVENS, JR. AS  
TRUSTEE OF THE GEORGE C.  
STEVENS, JR. TRUST;  
GEORGE L. STIMSON, JR.;  
GEORGE L. STIMSON, JR. AS  
TRUSTEE OF THE GEORGE L.  
STIMSON, JR. TRUST;  
TEJON RANCHCORP;  
MARK E. THOMPSON A P C PROFIT  
SHARING PLAN;  
TIERRA BONITA RANCH COMPANY;  
TIONG D. TIU;  
BEVERLY J. TOBIAS;  
BEVERLY J. TOBIAS AS TRUSTEE OF  
THE TOBIAS FAMILY TRUST;  
JUNG N. TOM;  
WILLIAM BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.;

1 WILMA D. TRUEBLOOD;  
2 WILMA D. TRUEBLOOD AS TRUSTEE  
3 OF THE TRUEBLOOD FAMILY  
4 TRUST;  
5 UNISON INVESTMENT CO., LLC;  
6 DELMAR D. VAN DAM;  
7 GERTRUDE J. VAN DAM;  
8 KEITH E. WALES;  
9 E C WHEELER LLC;  
10 ALEX WODCHIS;  
11 ELIZABETH WONG;  
12 MARY WONG;  
13 MIKE M. WU;  
14 MIKE M. WU AS TRUSTEE OF THE  
15 WU FAMILY TRUST;  
16 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 50TH  
17 DISTRICT AND AGRICULTURAL  
18 ASSOCIATION;  
19 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;  
20 U.S. BORAX, INC.; and ROES 1 through  
21 100,000 inclusive,

22 Cross-Defendants.

23 Cross-Complainants Rosamond Community Services District, Los Angeles County Water  
24 District No. 40, Palmdale Water District, City of Palmdale, City of Lancaster, Quartz Hill Water  
25 District, Little Rock Creek Irrigation District, and California Water Service Company,  
26 (collectively, the “Public Water Suppliers”) allege:

## 27 INTRODUCTION

28 1. This cross-complaint seeks a judicial determination of rights to all water within the  
Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin (the “Basin”). An adjudication is necessary to protect and  
conserve the limited water supply that is vital to the public health, safety and welfare of all  
persons and entities that depend upon water from the Public Water Suppliers. For these reasons,  
the Public Water Suppliers file this cross-complaint to promote the general public welfare in the  
Antelope Valley; protect the Public Water Suppliers’ rights to pump groundwater and provide  
water to the public; protect the Antelope Valley from a loss of the public’s water supply; prevent  
degradation of the quality of the public groundwater supply; stop land subsidence; and avoid  
higher water costs to the public.

**CROSS-COMPLAINANTS**

2. Rosamond Community Services District provides water to more than 3,500 residents of Kern County for domestic uses, fire protection, and irrigation. Rosamond has drilled and equipped wells to pump groundwater from the Basin. Rosamond has constructed, maintained and operated a public waterworks system to supply water to the public.

3. Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 is a public agency governed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. District 40 has been lawfully organized to perform numerous functions, including providing Basin groundwater to the public in a large portion of the Antelope Valley. To this end, District 40 has constructed, maintained and operated a public waterworks system to supply water to the public.

4. Palmdale Water District is an irrigation district organized and operating under Division 11 of the California Water Code. Palmdale Water District extracts groundwater from the Basin for delivery to customers.

5. Quartz Hill Water District is a county water district organized and operating under Division 12 of the California Water Code. Quartz Hill extracts groundwater from the Lancaster Sub-basin of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin for delivery to customers.

6. The City of Palmdale is a municipal corporation in the County of Los Angeles. The City of Palmdale receives water from the Basin.

7. The City of Lancaster is a municipal corporation located in the County of Los Angeles, and which produces and receives water for reasonable and beneficial uses, including overlying uses. The City of Lancaster further provides ministerial services to mutual water companies that produce groundwater from the Basin.

4           9.       Palm Ranch Irrigation District is a public agency which extracts groundwater from  
5       the Basin to serve customers within the Basin.

7           10.     California Water Service Company is a California corporation which extracts  
8     groundwater from the Basin to serve customers within the Basin.

11. The following persons and/or entities are the owners of, and/or are beneficial interest holders in real property within the geographic boundaries of the Basin. These persons and/or entitles claim overlying rights to extract water from the Basin, whether or not they have heretofore exercised such overlying rights: ABC Williams Enterprises LP, ACEH Capital, LLC, Jacqueline Ackermann, Cenon Advincula, Oliva M. Advincula, Mashallah Afshar, Antonio U. Agustines, Airtrust Singapore Private Limited, Marwan M. Aldais, Allen Alevy, Allen Alevy and Alevy Family Trust, Georgine J. Archer, Georgine J. Archer as Trustee for the Georgine J. Archer Trust, A V Materials, Inc., Guss A. Barks, Jr., Peter G. Barks, Ildefonso S. Bayani, Nilda V. Bayani, Big West Corp, Randall Y. Blayney, Melody S. Bloom, Bolthouse Properties, Inc., David L. Bowers, Ronald E. Bowers, Leroy Daniel Bronston, Marilyn Burgess, Laverne C. Burroughs, Laverne C. Burroughs, Trustee of the Burroughs Family Irrevocable Trust Dated August 1, 1995, Bruce Burrows, John and B. Calandri 2001 Trust, California Portland Cement Company, Calmat Land Co., Melinda E. Cameron, Castle Butte Dev Corp, Catellus Development Corporation, Bong S. Chang, Jeanna Y. Chang, Moon S. Chang, Jacob Chetrit, Frank S. Chiodo, Lee S. Chiou, M S Chung, City of Los Angeles, Carol K. Claypool, Clifford N. Claypool, W. F. Clunen, Jr., W. F. Clunen, Jr. as Trustee for the P C Rev Inter Vivos Trust, Consolidated Rock Products Co., County Sanitation District No. 14 of Los Angeles County, County Sanitation District No. 20 of

Los Angeles County, Ruth A. Cumming, Ruth A. Cumming as Trustee of the Cumming Family Trust, Catharine M. Davis, Milton S. Davis, Del Sur Ranch LLC, Diamond Farming Company, Sarkis Djanibekyan, Hong Dong, Ying X Dong, Dorothy Dreier, George E. Dreier, Morteza M. Foroughi, Morteza M. Foroughi as Trustee of the Foroughi Family Trust, Lewis Fredrichsen, Lewis Fredrichsen as Trustee of the Friedrichsen Family Trust, Joan A. Funk, Eugene Gabrych, Marian Gabrych, Aurora P. Gabuya, Rodrigo L. Gabuya, GGF LLC, Genus LP, Betty Gluckstein, Joseph H. Gluckstein, Forrest G. Godde, Forrest G. Godde as Trustee of the Forrest G. Godde Trust, Lawrence A. Godde, Lawrence A. Godde and Godde Trust, Maria B. Gorrindo, Maria B. Gorrindo as Trustee for the M. Gorrindo Trust, Wendell G. Hanks, Andreas Hauke, Marilyn Hauke, Healy Enterprises, Inc., Walter E. Helmick, Donna L. Higelmire, Michael N. Higelmire, Davis L. and Diana D. Hines Family Trust, Hooshpack Dev Inc., Chi S. Huang, Suchu T. Huang, John Hui, Hypericum Interests LLC, Daryush Iraninezhad, Minoo Iraninezhad, Esfandiar Kadivar, Esfandiar Kadivar as Trustee of the Kadivar Family Trust, A. David Kagon, A. David Kagon as Trustee for the Kagon Trust, Jack D. Kahlo, Cheng Lin Kang, Herbert Katz, Herbert Katz as Trustee for the Katz Family Trust, Marianne Katz, Lilian S. Kauffman, Lilian S. Kaufman as Trustee for the Kaufman Family Trust, Kazuko Yoshimatsu, Barbara L. Keys, Barbara L. Keys as Trustee of the Barbara L. Keys Family Trust, Billy H. Kim, Illy King, Illy King as Trustee of the Illy King Family Trust, Kootenai Properties, Inc., Kutu Investment Co., Gailen Kyle, Gailen Kyle as Trustee of the Kyle Trust, James W. Kyle, James W. Kyle as Trustee of the Kyle Family Trust, Julia Kyle, Wanda E. Kyle, Fares A. Lahoud, Eva Lai, Paul Lai, Ying Wah Lam, Land Business Corporation, Richard E. Landfield, Richard E. Landfield as Trustee of the Richard E. Landfield Trust, Lawrence Charles Trust, William Lewis, Mary Lewis, Pei Chi Lin, Man C. Lo, Shiung Ru Lo, Lyman C. Miles, Lyman C. Miles as Trustee for the Miles Family Trust, Malloy Family Partners LP, Mission Bell Ranch Development, Barry S. Munz, Kathleen M. Munz, Terry A. Munz, M.R. Nasir, Souad R. Nasir, Eugene B. Nebeker, Simin C. Neman, Henry Ngo, Frank T. Nguyen, Juanita R. Nichols, Oliver Nichols, Oliver Nichols as Trustee of the Nichols Family Trust, Owl Properties, Inc., Palmdale Hills Property LLC, Norman L. Poulsen, Marilyn J. Prewoznik, Marilyn J. Prewoznik as Trustee of the Marilyn J. Prewoznik

Trust, Elias Qarmout, Victoria Rahimi, R and M Ranch, Inc., Patricia A. Recht, Veronika Reinelt, Reinelt Rosenloecher Corp. PSP, Patricia J. Riggins, Patricia J. Riggins as Trustee of the Riggins Family Trust, Edgar C. Ritter, Paula E. Ritter, Paula E. Ritter as Trustee of the Ritter Family Trust, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles, Romo Lake Los Angeles Partnership, Rosemount Equities LLC Series, Royal Investors Group, Royal Western Properties LLC, Oscar Rudnick, Rebecca Rudnick, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, Marygrace H. Santoro, Marygrace H. Santoro as Trustee for the Marygrace H. Santoro Rev Trust, San Yu Enterprises, Inc., Daniel Saparzadeh, Helen Stathatos, Savas Stathatos, Savas Stathatos as Trustee for the Stathatos Family Trust, Seven Star United LLC, Mark H. Shafron, Robert L. Shafron, Kamram S. Shakib, Donna L. Simpson, Gareth L. Simpson, Gareth L. Simpson as Trustee of the Simpson Family Trust, Soaring Vista Properties, Inc., State of California, George C. Stevens, Jr., George C. Stevens, Jr. as Trustee of the George C. Stevens, Jr. Trust, George L. Stimson, Jr., George L. Stimson, Jr. as Trustee of the George L. Stimson, Jr. Trust, Tejon Ranch, Mark E. Thompson A P C Profit Sharing Plan, Tierra Bonita Ranch Company, Tiong D. Tiu, Beverly J. Tobias, Beverly J. Tobias as Trustee of the Tobias Family Trust, Jung N. Tom, Wilma D. Trueblood, Wilma D. Trueblood as Trustee of the Trueblood Family Trust, Unison Investment Co., LLC, Delmar D. Van Dam, Gertrude J. Van Dam, Keith E. Wales, E C Wheeler LLC, William Bolthouse Farms, Inc., Alex Wodchis, Elizabeth Wong, Mary Wong, Mike M. Wu, Mike M. Wu as Trustee of the Wu Family Trust, State of California 50<sup>th</sup> District and Agricultural Association, and U.S. Borax, Inc.

12. The Public Water Suppliers are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that cross-defendant Roes 1 through 100,000 are the owners, lessees or other persons or entities holding or claiming to hold ownership or possessory interests in real property within the boundaries of the Basin; extract water from the Basin; claim some right, title or interest to water located within the Basin; or that they have or assert claims adverse to the Public Water Suppliers' rights and claims. The Public Water Suppliers are presently unaware of the true names and capacities of the Roe cross-defendants, and therefore sue those cross-defendants by fictitious

1 names. The Public Water Suppliers will seek leave to amend this cross-complaint to add names  
2 and capacities when they are ascertained.

3  
4 **THE UNITED STATES IS A NECESSARY PARTY TO THIS ACTION**

5  
6 13. This is an action to comprehensively adjudicate the rights of all claimants to the  
7 use of a source of water located entirely within California, *i.e.*, the Basin, and for the ongoing  
8 administration of all such claimants' rights.

9  
10 14. The Public Water Suppliers are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that  
11 the United States claims rights to the Basin water subject to adjudication in this action by virtue  
12 of owning real property overlying the Basin, including Edwards Air Force Base.

13  
14 15. For the reasons expressed in this cross-complaint, the United States is a necessary  
15 party to this action pursuant to the McCarran Amendment, 43 U.S.C. § 666.

16  
17 16. Under the McCarran Amendment, the United States, as a necessary party to this  
18 action, is deemed to have waived any right to plead that the laws of California are not applicable,  
19 or that the United States is not subject to such laws by virtue of its sovereignty.

20  
21 17. Under the McCarran Amendment, the United States, as a necessary party to this  
22 action, is subject to the judgments, orders and decrees of this Court.

23  
24 **HISTORY OF THE ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER BASIN**

25  
26 18. For over a century, California courts have used the concept of a groundwater basin  
27 to resolve groundwater disputes. A groundwater basin is an alluvial aquifer with reasonably well-  
28 defined lateral and vertical boundaries.



1           19.     The Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin is located in an arid valley in the Mojave  
2 Desert, about 50 miles northeast of the City of Los Angeles. The Basin encompasses about 940  
3 square miles in both Los Angeles and Kern Counties, and is separated from the northern part of  
4 the Antelope Valley by faults and low-lying hills. The Basin is bounded on the south by the San  
5 Gabriel Mountains and on the northwest by the Tehachapi Mountains. The Basin generally  
6 includes the communities of Lancaster, Palmdale and Rosamond as well as Edwards Air Force  
7 Base.

8  
9           20.     Various investigators have studied the Antelope Valley and some have divided the  
10 Basin into “sub-basins.” According to the Public Water Suppliers’ information and belief, to the  
11 extent the Antelope Valley is composed of such “sub-basins,” they are sufficiently hydrologically  
12 connected to justify treating them as a single source of water for purposes of adjudicating the  
13 parties’ water rights.

14  
15           21.     Before public and private entities began pumping water from the Basin, its natural  
16 water recharge balanced with water discharged from the Basin. Its water levels generally  
17 remained in a state of long-term equilibrium. In approximately 1915, however, agricultural uses  
18 began to pump groundwater and since then, greatly increased agricultural pumping has upset the  
19 Basin’s groundwater equilibrium causing a continuous decline in the Basin’s groundwater  
20 storage.

21  
22           22.     Although private agricultural entities temporarily curtailed their pumping activities  
23 when groundwater levels were extremely low, agricultural pumping has increased overall during  
24 the past decade. During the same time, urbanization of the Antelope Valley has resulted in  
25 increased public demand for water.

26  
27           23.     Groundwater pumping in the Basin has never been subject to any limits. This lack  
28 of groundwater management caused the Basin to lose an estimated eight million acre feet of water

over the past eighty years.

24. Uncontrolled pumping caused repeated instances of land subsidence. It is the sinking of the Earth's surface due to subsurface movement of earth materials and is primarily caused by groundwater pumping. The Public Water Suppliers are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that portions of the Basin have subsided as much as six feet because of chronically low groundwater levels caused by unlimited pumping. The harmful effects of land subsidence observed in the Basin include loss of groundwater storage space, cracks and fissures on the ground's surface, and damage to real property. Land subsidence problems continue and will continue because of unlimited pumping.

25. The declining groundwater levels, diminished groundwater storage, and land subsidence damage the Basin, injure the public welfare, and threaten communities that depend upon the Basin as a reliable source of water. These damaging effects will continue, and likely worsen until the court establishes a safe yield for the Basin and limits pumping to the safe yield.

**PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS SUPPLEMENT AND COMMINGLE THEIR  
SUPPLEMENTAL SUPPLY OF WATER WITH BASIN WATER**

26. Due to the shortage of water in the Basin, certain Public Water Suppliers purchase State Water Project water from the Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency. State Project water originates in northern California and would not reach the Basin absent the Public Water Suppliers purchases.

27. Public Water Suppliers purchase State Project water each year. They deliver the State Project water to their customers through waterworks systems. The Public Water Suppliers' customers use the State Project water for irrigation, domestic, municipal and industrial uses. After the Public Water Suppliers' customers use the water, some of the imported State Project

1 water commingles with other percolating groundwater in the Basin. In this way, State Project  
2 water augments the natural supply of Basin water.

3  
4 28. Public Water Suppliers depend on the Basin as their source of water. But for the  
5 Public Water Suppliers' substantial investment in State Project water, they would need to pump  
6 additional groundwater each year. By storing State Project water or other imported water in the  
7 Basin, Public Water Suppliers can recover the stored water during times of drought, water supply  
8 emergencies, or other water shortages to ensure a safe and reliable supply of water to the public.

9  
10 **THE BASIN HAS BEEN IN A STATE OF OVER-DRAFT FOR OVER FIVE YEARS**

11  
12 29. The Public Water Providers are informed and believe, and upon that basis allege,  
13 that the Basin is and has been in an overdraft condition for more than five (5) consecutive years  
14 before the filing of this cross-complaint. During these time periods, the total annual demand on  
15 the Basin has exceeded the supply of water from natural sources. Consequently, there is and has  
16 been a progressive and chronic decline in Basin water levels and the available natural supply is  
17 being and has been chronically depleted. Based on the present trends, demand on the Basin will  
18 continue to exceed supply. Until limited by order and judgment of the court, potable Basin water  
19 will be exhausted and land subsidence will continue.

20  
21 30. Upon information and belief, the cross-defendants have, and continue to pump,  
22 appropriate and divert water from the natural supply of the Basin, and/or claim some interest in  
23 the Basin water. The Public Water Suppliers are informed and believe, and upon that basis  
24 allege, that cross-defendants' combined extraction of water exceeds the Basin's safe yield.

25  
26 31. Upon information and belief, each cross-defendant claims a right to take water and  
27 threatens to increase its taking of water without regard to the Public Water Suppliers' rights.  
28 Cross-defendants' pumping reduces Basin water tables and contributes to the deficiency of the

Basin water supply as a whole. The deficiency creates a public water shortage.

32. Cross-defendants' continued and increasing extraction of Basin water has resulted in, and will result in a diminution, reduction and impairment of the Basin's water supply, and land subsidence.

33. Cross-defendants' continued and increasing extraction of Basin water has and will deprive the Public Water Suppliers of their rights to provide water for the public health, welfare and benefit.

**THERE IS A DISPUTE AMONG THE PARTIES REGARDING THE EXTENT AND  
PRIORITY OF THEIR RESPECTIVE WATER RIGHTS**

34. The Public Water Suppliers are informed and believe, and thereon allege, there are conflicting claims of rights to the Basin and/or its water.

35. The Public Water Suppliers are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that cross-defendants who own real property in the Basin claim an overlying right to pump Basin water. The overlying right is limited to the native safe yield of the Basin. The Public Water Suppliers allege that, because subsidence is occurring in the Basin, cross-defendants have been pumping, and continue to pump water in amounts greater than the Basin's safe yield.

36. The Public Water Suppliers are informed and believe, and thereon allege, they have appropriative and prescriptive rights to groundwater in the Antelope Valley Basin. The Public Water Suppliers are informed and believe, and thereon allege, they and/or their predecessors-in-interest, have pumped water from the Antelope Valley Basin for more than five years prior to the filing of this cross-complaint.

1           37.     The Public Water Suppliers have pumped water from, and/or stored water in the  
2 Antelope Valley Basin, by reasonable extraction means. They have used the Basin and/or its  
3 water for reasonable and beneficial purposes; and they have done so under a claim of right in an  
4 actual, open, notorious, exclusive, continuous, uninterrupted, hostile, adverse use and/or manner  
5 for a period of time of at least five years and before filing this cross-complaint.  
6

7           38.     To provide water to the public, the Public Water Suppliers have and claim the  
8 following rights:  
9

10               (A)     The right to pump groundwater from the Antelope Valley Groundwater  
11 Basin in an annual amount equal to the highest volume of groundwater extracted by each of the  
12 Public Water Suppliers in any year preceding entry of judgment in this action;  
13

14               (B)     The right to pump or authorize others to extract from the Antelope Valley  
15 Groundwater Basin an amount of water equal in quantity to that amount of water previously  
16 purchased by each of the Public Water Suppliers from the Antelope Valley-East Kern Water  
17 Agency; and which has augmented the supply of water in the Basin in any year preceding entry of  
18 judgment in this action.  
19

20               (C)     The right to pump or authorize others to extract from the Antelope Valley  
21 Groundwater Basin an amount of water equal in quantity to that amount of water purchased in the  
22 future by each of the Public Water Suppliers from the Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency  
23 which augments the supply of water in the Basin; and  
24

25               (D)     The right to pump or authorize others to extract from the Antelope Valley  
26 Basin an amount of water equal in quantity to that volume of water injected into the Basin or  
27 placed within the Basin by each of the Public Water Suppliers or on behalf of any of them.  
28

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Declaratory Relief – Prescriptive Rights – Against All Cross-Defendants Except the United States And Other Public Entity Cross-Defendants)**

39. The Public Water Suppliers re-allege and incorporate by reference each and all of the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

40. For over fifty years, the California Supreme Court has recognized prescriptive water rights. The Public Water Suppliers allege that, for more than five years and before the date of this cross-complaint, they have pumped water from the Basin for reasonable and beneficial purposes, and done so under a claim of right in an actual, open, notorious, exclusive, continuous, hostile and adverse manner. The Public Water Suppliers further allege that each cross-defendant had actual and/or constructive notice of these activities, either of which is sufficient to establish the Public Water Suppliers' prescriptive rights.

41. Public Water Suppliers contend that each cross-defendant's rights to pump water from the Basin are subordinate to the Public Water Suppliers' prescriptive rights and to the general welfare of the citizens, inhabitants and customers within the Public Water Suppliers' respective service areas and/or jurisdictions.

42. An actual controversy has arisen between the Public Water Suppliers and cross-defendants, and each of them. Public Water Suppliers allege, on information and belief, that each cross-defendant disputes the Public Water Suppliers' contentions, as described in the immediately preceding paragraph.

43. Public Water Suppliers seek a judicial determination as to the correctness of their contentions and an *inter se* finding as to the priority and amount of water they and each cross-defendant are entitled to pump from the Basin.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Declaratory Relief – Appropriative Rights – Against All Cross-Defendants)**

44. The Public Water Suppliers re-allege and incorporate by reference each and all of the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

45. Public Water Suppliers allege that, in addition or alternatively to their prescriptive rights, they have appropriative rights to pump water from the Basin.

46. Appropriative rights attach to surplus water from the Basin.

47. Surplus water exists when the pumping from the Basin is less than the safe yield. It is the maximum quantity of water which can be withdrawn annually from a groundwater Basin under a given set of conditions without causing an undesirable result. “Undesirable results” generally refer to gradual lowering of the groundwater levels in the Basin, but also includes subsidence.

48. Persons and/or entities with overlying rights to water in the Basin are only entitled to make reasonable and beneficial use of the Basin’s native safe yield.

49. An actual controversy has arisen between the Public Water Suppliers and cross-defendants, and each of them. The Public Water Suppliers allege, on information and belief, that all cross-defendants, and each of them, seek to prevent the Public Water Suppliers from pumping surplus water.

50. The Public Water Suppliers seek a judicial determination as to the Basin’s safe yield, the quantity of surplus water available, if any, the correlative overlying rights of each cross-defendant to the safe yield and an *inter se* determination of the rights of persons an/or entities

1 with overlying, appropriative and prescriptive rights to pump water from the Basin.

2  
3 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Declaratory Relief – Physical Solution – Against All Cross-defendants)**

5 51. The Public Water Suppliers re-allege and incorporate by reference each and all of  
6 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.  
7

8 52. Upon information and belief, the Public Water Suppliers allege that cross-  
9 defendants, and each of them, claim an interest or right to Basin water; and further claim they can  
10 increase their pumping without regard to the rights of the Public Water Suppliers. Unless  
11 restrained by order of the court, cross-defendants will continue to take increasing amounts of  
12 water from the Basin, causing great and irreparable damage and injury to the Public Water  
13 Suppliers and to the Basin. Money damages cannot compensate for the damage and injury to the  
14 Basin.  
15

16 53. The amount of Basin water available to the Public Water Suppliers has been  
17 reduced because cross-defendants have extracted, and continue to extract increasingly large  
18 amounts of water from the Basin. Unless the court enjoins and restrains cross-defendants, and  
19 each of them, the aforementioned conditions will worsen. Consequently, the Basin's groundwater  
20 supply will be further depleted, thus reducing the amount of Basin water available to the public.  
21

22 54. California law makes it the duty of the trial court to consider a "physical solution"  
23 to water rights disputes. A physical solution is a common-sense approach to resolving water  
24 rights litigation that seeks to satisfy the reasonable and beneficial needs of all parties through  
25 augmenting the water supply or other practical measures. The physical solution is a practical way  
26 of fulfilling the mandate of the California Constitution (Article X, section 2) that the water  
27 resources of the State be put to use to the fullest extent of which they are capable.  
28



1           55.     This court must determine, impose and retain continuing jurisdiction in order to  
2     enforce a physical solution upon the parties who pump water from the Basin, and thereby prevent  
3     irreparable injury to the Basin. Available solutions to the Basin problems may include, but are  
4     not limited to, the court appointment of a watermaster, and monetary and metering and  
5     assessments upon water extraction from the Basin. Such assessments would pay for the purchase,  
6     delivery of supplemental supply of water to the Basin.

7  
8                                   **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9                   **(For Declaratory Relief – Municipal Priority – Against All Cross-Defendants)**

10           56.     The Public Water Suppliers re-allege and incorporate by reference each and all of  
11     the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

12  
13           57.     The Public Water Suppliers have rights to pump water from the Basin to meet  
14     existing public water needs, and also to take increased amounts of Basin water as necessary to  
15     meet future public needs. The Public Water Suppliers’ rights to Basin water exist both as a result  
16     of the priority and extent of their appropriative and prescriptive rights, and as a matter of law and  
17     public policy of the State of California: “It is hereby declared to be the established policy of this  
18     State that the use of water for domestic purposes is the highest use of water and that the next  
19     highest use is for irrigation.” (*Water Code* §106.)

20  
21           58.     *Water Code* Section 106.5 provides: “It is hereby declared to be the established  
22     policy of this State that the right of a municipality to acquire and hold rights to the use of water  
23     should be protected to the fullest extent necessary for existing and future uses. . . .”

24  
25           59.     Under *Water Code* sections 106 and 106.5, the Public Water Suppliers have a prior  
26     and paramount right to Basin water as against all non-municipal uses.

1           60.     An actual controversy has arisen between the Public Water Suppliers and cross-  
2 defendants. The Public Water Suppliers allege, on information and belief, that cross-defendants  
3 dispute the contentions in Paragraphs 1 through 43, inclusive, of this cross-complaint. The Public  
4 Water Suppliers are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that the majority of the cross-  
5 defendants pump groundwater from the Basin for agricultural purposes.

6  
7           61.     The Public Water Suppliers seek a judicial determination as to the correctness of  
8 their contentions and to the amount of water the parties may pump from the Basin. The Public  
9 Water Suppliers also seek a declaration of their right to pump water from the Basin to meet their  
10 reasonable present and future needs, and that such rights are prior and paramount to the rights, if  
11 any, of cross-defendants to use Basin water for irrigation purposes.

12  
13                   **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14                   **(Declaratory Relief – Storage Of Imported Water – Against All Cross-defendants)**

15           62.     The Public Water Suppliers re-allege and incorporate by reference each and all of  
16 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

17  
18           63.     The Public Water Suppliers purchase and use water from the State Water Project.  
19 State Project water is not native to the Basin. Importing State Project water decreases the Public  
20 Water Suppliers' need to pump water from the Basin. The Public Water Suppliers' purchase and  
21 delivery of State Project water is the reason it has been brought to the Basin. The Public Water  
22 Suppliers pay a substantial annual cost to import State Project water; this amount is subject to  
23 periodic increases.

24  
25           64.     The Public Water Suppliers allege there is underground space available in the  
26 Basin for storing imported State Project water.

1           65. As importers of State Project water, the Public Water Suppliers have the right to  
2 store imported State Project water underground in the Basin, and also have the sole right to pump  
3 or otherwise use such stored State Project water. The rights of cross-defendants, if any, are  
4 limited to the native supply of the Basin and to their own imported water. Cross-defendants'  
5 rights, if any, do not extend to water imported into the Basin by the Public Water Suppliers.

6  
7           66. An actual controversy has arisen between the Public Water Suppliers and cross-  
8 defendants. The Public Water Suppliers allege, on information and belief, that cross-defendants  
9 dispute their contentions in Paragraphs 1 through 39, of this cross-complaint.

10  
11           67. The Public Water Suppliers seek a judicial determination as to the correctness of  
12 their contentions that they may store imported State Project water in the Basin, recapture such  
13 imported State Project water, and that they have the sole right to pump or otherwise use such  
14 imported State Project water.

## 15 16 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### 17 **(Declaratory Relief – Recapture Of Return Flows**

#### 18 **From Imported Water Stored in The Basin – Against All Cross-defendants)**

19           68. The Public Water Suppliers re-allege and incorporate by reference each and all of  
20 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

21  
22           69. Some of the State Project water typically returns and/or enters the Basin, and will  
23 continue to do so. This water is commonly known as “return flows.” These return flows further  
24 augment the Basin’s water supply.

25  
26           70. The Public Water Suppliers allege there is underground space available in the  
27 Basin to store return flows from imported State Project water.  
28

1           71.     The Public Water Suppliers have the sole right to recapture return flows  
2     attributable to their State Project water, or such water imported on their behalf. The rights of  
3     cross-defendants, if any, are limited to the Basin's native supply and/or to their imported water,  
4     and do not extend to groundwater attributable to the Public Water Suppliers' return flows.

5  
6           72.     An actual controversy has arisen between the Public Water Suppliers and cross-  
7     defendants. The Public Water Suppliers allege, on information and belief, that cross-defendants  
8     dispute their contentions in Paragraphs 1 through 43 of this cross-complaint.

9  
10          73.     The Public Water Suppliers seek a judicial determination as to the correctness of  
11     their contentions, and that they have the sole right to recapture return flows in the Basin, both at  
12     present and in the future.

13  
14                   **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15           **(Unreasonable Use Of Water - Against All Cross-Defendants Except Public Entity Cross-**  
16                   **Defendants)**

17           74.     The Public Water Suppliers re-allege and incorporate by reference each and all of  
18     the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

19  
20           75.     The California Constitution (Article X, Section 2) provides the cardinal principle  
21     of California water law, superior to any water rights priorities and requires that water use not be  
22     unreasonable or wasteful. The reasonable use of water depends on the facts and circumstances of  
23     each case; what may be reasonable in areas of abundant water may be unreasonable in an area of  
24     scarcity; and, what is a beneficial use at one time may become a waste of water at a later time.

25  
26           76.     The Public Water Suppliers are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that  
27     some cross-defendants' use of water is unreasonable in the arid Antelope Valley and therefore  
28

1 constitutes waste, unreasonable use or an unreasonable method of diversion or use within the  
2 meaning of the California Constitution (Article X, section 2). Such uses are thereby unlawful.

3  
4 77. An actual controversy has arisen between the Public Water Suppliers and cross-  
5 defendants. The Public Water Suppliers allege, on information and belief, that the cross-  
6 defendants dispute their contentions in Paragraphs 1 through 43 of this Cross-Complaint.

7  
8 78. The Public Water Suppliers seek a judicial declaration that cross-defendants have  
9 no right to any unreasonable use, unreasonable methods of use, or waste of water. Cross-  
10 defendants' rights, if any, must be determined *inter se* based on the reasonable use of water in the  
11 Antelope Valley rather than upon the amount of water actually used.

12  
13 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Declaratory Relief Re Boundaries Of Basin)**

15 91. The Public Water Suppliers re-allege and incorporate by reference each and all of  
16 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

17  
18 92. An actual controversy has arisen between the Public Water Suppliers and cross-  
19 defendants, and each of them, regarding the actual physical dimensions and description of the  
20 Basin for purposes of determining the parties rights to water located therein. The Public Water  
21 Suppliers allege, on information and belief, that cross-defendants dispute the Public Water  
22 Suppliers' contentions, as set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 38, inclusive, of this cross-complaint.

23  
24 93. The Public Water Suppliers seek a judicial determination as to the correctness of  
25 their contentions and an *inter se* finding as to the actual physical dimensions and description of  
26 the Basin.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, the Public Water Suppliers pray for judgment as follows:

1. Judicial declarations consistent with the Public Water Suppliers' contentions in the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Causes of Action in this cross-complaint;
  2. For preliminary and permanent injunctions which prohibit cross-defendants, and each of them, from taking, wasting or failing to conserve water from the Basin in any manner which interferes with the rights of the Public Water Suppliers to take water from or store water in the Basin to meet their reasonable present and future needs;
  3. For prejudgment interest as permitted by law;
  4. For attorney, appraisal and expert witness fees and costs incurred in this action;
- and
5. Such other relief as the court deems just and proper.

Dated: January 18, 2006

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

By

\_\_\_\_\_  
ERIC L. GARNER  
JEFFREY V. DUNN  
MARC S. EHRLICH  
JILL N. WILLIS  
Attorneys for Cross-Complainants  
ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES  
DISTRICT, ET AL.