

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

(SPACE BELOW FOR FILING STAMP ONLY)

3 **COVINGTON & CROWE, LLP**

4 **ATTORNEYS AT LAW**

5 1131 West Sixth Street, Suite 300

6 Ontario, California 91762

7 (909) 983-9393; Fax (909) 391-6762

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

14 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

15 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT**

16 **ANTELOPE VALLEY**
17 **GROUNDWATER CASES**

Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding
No. 4408

18 **Included Actions:**

19 Los Angeles County Waterworks District
20 No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior
21 Court of California, County of Los Angeles,
22 Case No.: BC 325201;

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

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

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

**ANSWER OF WHITE FENCE FARMS
MUTUAL WATER CO. INC., EL DORADO
MUTUAL WATER CO., WEST SIDE PARK
MUTUAL WATER CO., SHADOW ACRES
MUTUAL WATER CO., ANTELOPE PARK
MUTUAL WATER CO., AVERYDALE
MUTUAL WATER CO., SUNDALE
MUTUAL WATER CO., EVERGREEN
MUTUAL WATER CO., AQUA J MUTUAL
WATER CO., BLEIGH FLAT MUTUAL
WATER CO., COLORADO MUTUAL
WATER CO., SUNNYSIDE FARMS
MUTUAL WATER CO., LAND PROJECTS
MUTUAL WATER CO., TIERRA BONITA
MUTUAL WATER CO. AND LANDALE
MUTUAL WATER CO., COLLECTIVELY
KNOWN AS A.V. UNITED MUTUAL
GROUP, TO CROSS-COMPLAINT OF
PHELAN PINON HILLS COMMUNITY
SERVICES DISTRICT**

29 **AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS.**

1 Cross-Defendants, White Fence Farms Mutual Water Co. Inc., El Dorado Mutual Water
2 Co., West Side Park Mutual Water Co., Shadow Acres Mutual Water Co., Antelope Park Mutual
3 Water Co., Averydale Mutual Water Co., Sundale Mutual Water Co., Evergreen Mutual Water
4 Co., Aqua J Mutual Water Co., Bleigh Flat Mutual Water Co., Colorado Mutual Water Co.,
5 Sunnyside Farms Mutual Water Co., Land Projects Mutual Water Co., Tierra Bonita Mutual
6 Water Co. and Landale Mutual Water Co., collectively known as A.V. UNITED MUTUAL
7 GROUP (“AVUMG”), hereby answers the unverified Cross-Complaint of the PHELAN PINON
8 HILLS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT, which has been filed as of this date.

9 **GENERAL DENIAL**

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

13 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

14 **First Affirmative Defense**

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

16 2. The Cross-Complaint and every purported cause of action contained therein fails
17 to allege facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against these answering Cross-
18 Defendants.

19 **Second Affirmative Defense**

20 **(Statute of Limitations)**

21 3. Each and every cause of action contained in the Cross-Complaint is barred, in
22 whole or in part, by the applicable statutes of limitation, including, but not limited to, sections
23 318, 319, 321, 338, and 343 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.

24 **Third Affirmative Defense**

25 **(Laches)**

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

1 **Fourth Affirmative Defense**

2 **(Estoppel)**

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

5 **Fifth Affirmative Defense**

6 **(Waiver)**

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

9 **Sixth Affirmative Defense**

10 **(Self-Help)**

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

14 **Seventh Affirmative Defense**

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

16 8. Cross-Complainant's methods of water use and storage are unreasonable and
17 wasteful in the arid conditions of the Antelope Valley and thereby violate Article X, Section 2 of
18 the California Constitution.

19 **Eighth Affirmative Defense**

20 **(Additional Defenses)**

21 9. The Cross-Complainant does not state its allegations with sufficient clarity to
22 enable these answering Cross-Defendants to determine what additional defenses may exist to
23 Cross-Complainants' causes of action. Cross-Defendants therefore reserve the right to assert all
24 other defenses which may pertain to the Cross-Complaint.

25 **Ninth Affirmative Defense**

26 10. The prescriptive claims asserted by the governmental entity Cross-Complainant
27 are *ultra vires* and exceed the statutory authority by which each entity may acquire property as
28

1 set forth in Water Code sections 22456, 31040 and 55370.

2 **Tenth Affirmative Defense**

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

5 **Eleventh Affirmative Defense**

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

9 **Twelfth Affirmative Defense**

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

14 **Thirteenth Affirmative Defense**

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

17 **Fourteenth Affirmative Defense**

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

20 **Fifteenth Affirmative Defense**

21 16. This governmental entity Cross-Complainant was permissively pumping at all
22 times.

23 **Sixteenth Affirmative Defense**

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

27 ///

1 **Seventeenth Affirmative Defense**

2 18. Cross-Complainant is barred from asserting its prescriptive claims by operation of
3 law as set forth in Civil Code sections 1007 and 1214.

4 **Eighteenth Affirmative Defense**

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

7 **Nineteenth Affirmative Defense**

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

10 **Twentieth Affirmative Defense**

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

15 **Twenty-First Affirmative Defense**

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

21 **Twenty-Second Affirmative Defense**

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

26 **Twenty-Third Affirmative Defense**

27 24. Any imposition by this court of a proposed physical solution that reallocates the
28

1 water right priorities and water usage within the Antelope Valley will be *ultra vires* as it will be
2 subverting the pre-project legislative requirements and protections of California's Environmental
3 Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub.Res.C. 2100 *et seq.*).

4 **Twenty-Fourth Affirmative Defense**

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

7 **Twenty-Fifth Affirmative Defense**

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

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

- 12 1. That Cross-Complainant take nothing by reason of its Cross-Complaint;
13 2. That the Cross-Complaint be dismissed with prejudice;
14 3. For Cross-Defendants' costs incurred herein; and
15 4. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.
16

17 Dated: March 9, 2009

COVINGTON & CROWE, LLP

18
19
20 By: 

ROBERT E. BOUGHERTY

WILLIAM A. HAUCK

Attorneys for Cross-Defendants and Cross-
Complainants A.V. United Mutual Group
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

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

On March 10, 2009, I served the foregoing document described as ANSWER OF WHITE FENCE FARMS MUTUAL WATER CO. INC., EL DORADO MUTUAL WATER CO., WEST SIDE PARK MUTUAL WATER CO., SHADOW ACRES MUTUAL WATER CO., ANTELOPE PARK MUTUAL WATER CO., AVERYDALE MUTUAL WATER CO., SUNDALE MUTUAL WATER CO., EVERGREEN MUTUAL WATER CO., AQUA J MUTUAL WATER CO., BLEIGH FLAT MUTUAL WATER CO., COLORADO MUTUAL WATER CO., SUNNYSIDE FARMS MUTUAL WATER CO., LAND PROJECTS MUTUAL WATER CO., TIERRA BONITA MUTUAL WATER CO. AND LANDALE MUTUAL WATER CO., COLLECTIVELY KNOWN AS A.V. UNITED MUTUAL GROUP, TO CROSS-COMPLAINT OF PHELAN PINON HILLS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT on the interested parties in this action:

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

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

☐ BY MAIL

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

☐ As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Ontario, 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 than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

☐ BY PERSONAL SERVICE I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of the addressee.

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

Executed on March 10, 2009, at Ontario, California.


DOLORES C. CRUZ