1	WAYNE K. LEMIEUX (SBN. 43501)		
2	W. KEITH LEMIEUX (SBN. 161850) LEMIEUX & O'NEILL		
3	2393 Townsgate Road, Suite 201		
4	Westlake Village, California 91361 Telephone: (805) 495-4770		
5	Facsimile: (805) 495-2787		
	Attorneys for Defendant		
6	PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT		
7			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA		
10			
11	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER )	CASE NO.: 1-05-CV-049053	
12	CASES )	[Assigned for All Purposes to the	
13	Included Actions:	Honorable Jack Komar – Dept. 17C]	
14	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. Superior Court of	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408	
15	California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC		
16	325201; Los Angeles County Waterworks District ) No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court	ANSWER OF DEFENDANT,	
17	of California, County of Kern, Case No. S-1500- CV-234348; Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City	PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT, TO COMPLAINT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY	
18	of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. City of	WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40	
19	Lancaster v. Palmdale Water District, Superior Court of California, County of Riverside,		
20	consolidated actions, Case Nos. RIC 353840, RIC 344436, RIC 344668		
21	Kie 544430, Kie 544000		
22			
23	PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT, hereinafter "Palm Ranch," responds to the Complaint		
	of Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 (hereinafter "District 40"), as follows:		
24	PRELIMINARY		
25	1. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the		
26	Complaint are true.		
27			
28	LC-PR\Pldg\Ans.PR.wkl.doc -	1 -	

ANSWER OF DEFENDANT, PALM RANCH CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT, TO COMPLAINT

- 2. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the Complaint, Palm Ranch lacks sufficient information or belief to determine whether the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin ("Basin") encompasses about 940 square miles and generally includes the communities of Lancaster, Palmdale and Rosamond, and on the basis of such lack of information and belief, denies such allegations. Except as provided herein, Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the Complaint are true.
  - 3. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 9 are true.
- 4. Palm Ranch lacks sufficient information or belief to respond to the allegations contained in paragraph 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the Complaint and on the basis of such lack of information and belief, denies such allegations.
  - 5. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 15 of the Complaint are true.
- 6. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 16 of the Complaint, Palm Ranch lacks sufficient information or belief to determine whether pumping has resulted in land subsidence, and on the basis of such lack of information and belief, denies such allegations. Except as provided herein, Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 16 of the Complaint are true.
  - 7. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of the Complaint are true.
- 8. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the Complaint, Palm Ranch lacks sufficient information or belief to determine whether land subsidence is occurring in the Basin, and on the basis of such lack of information and belief, denies such allegation. Except as provided herein, Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the Complaint are true.
- 9. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28 are true.

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

10. The allegations of the first cause of action are directed against all defendants, except public entity defendants. Palm Ranch is a public entity and is not required to respond to the first cause of action.

///

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

- 11. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 34 of the Complaint, Palm Ranch alleges and incorporates by reference, Palm Ranch's responses to the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 31, inclusive, of the Complaint.
- 12. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 35, 36, and 37 of the Complaint are true.
- 13. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 38 of the Complaint, Palm Ranch denies it seeks to prevent District 40 from pumping surplus water. Except as provided herein, Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 38 are true.
  - 14. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 39 are true.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

- 15. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 40 of the Complaint, Palm Ranch alleges and incorporates by reference herein, Palm Ranch's responses to the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 39, inclusive, of the Complaint.
- 16. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 41 of the Complaint, Palm Ranch denies Palm Ranch will continue to take and pump increasing amounts of water to the great and irreparable damage and injury of District 40 and the Basin. Except as provided herein, Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 41 of the Complaint are true.
- 17. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 42, 43, and 44 of the Complaint are true.

# FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 18. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 45 of the Complaint, Palm Ranch alleges and incorporates by reference herein, Palm Ranch's responses to the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 44, inclusive, of the Complaint.
  - 19. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 46, 47, and 48 are true.

LC-PR\Pldg\Ans.PR.wkl.doc

27

of action.

## EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION 1 The eight cause of action is directed against Diamond Farming and Bolthouse Properties, 2 31. 3 Inc. Palm Ranch is not required to response to the eighth cause of action. 4 FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 5 32. Palm Ranch has a right prior and paramount to the rights of District 40 to pump the portion 6 of the water percolated into the Basin which has been imported by Antelope Valley East Kern Water 7 Agency through the State Water Project and delivered to Palm Ranch. This right, sometimes referred to 8 as the "right to recapture return flows," exists as to percolating water which can be identified as return flow regardless of the length of time since the percolation, regardless of the number of times the water is 10 pumped and regardless whether the percolating water is commingled with the waters in the Basin. SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 11 12 33. Palm Ranch has a prior and paramount right to the rights of District 40 to pump the native 13 waters in the Basin because water and water rights belonging to the State of California within Palm Ranch 14 have been given, dedicated, and set apart for the use and purposes of Palm Ranch. 15 THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 16 34. Palm Ranch has an equal right to the rights of District 40 to use the native waters for 17 municipal purposes. **18** FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 19 35. Palm Ranch has an equal right to the rights of the public entity cross-defendants to the 20 native waters in the Basin by virtue of mutual prescription. 21 **PRAYER** 22 WHEREFORE, Palm Ranch Creek Irrigation District prays for the Court to: 1. 23 Declare Palm Ranch Creek Irrigation District's water rights as equal or paramount to the 24 water rights of District 40 as set forth in Palm Ranch Creek Irrigation District's affirmative defenses. 25 2. Award Palm Ranch Creek Irrigation District cost of suit. 3. 26 Award Palm Ranch Creek Irrigation District reasonable attorney fees.

4.

27

28

Impose such further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

This Answer is deemed verified pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 446. DATED: October 26, 2005 LEMIEUX & O'NEILL By: Wayne K. Lemieux WAYNE K. LEMIEUX 

LC-PR\Pldg\Ans.PR.wkl.doc

1	PROOF OF SERVICE	
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )	
3	) ss. COUNTY OF VENTURA )	
4		
5	I am employed in the County of Ventura, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 2393 Townsgate Road, Suite 201, Westlake Village, California 91361.	
6		
7	On October 26, 2005, I posted the following document(s) to the website <a href="http://www.scefiling.org">http://www.scefiling.org</a> ,	
8	a dedicated link to the Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases:	
9	ANSWER OF DEFENDANT, PALM RANCH CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT, TO COMPLAINT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40	
10 11	On <b>October 26, 2005</b> , I served the foregoing document described above on interested parties in this action be placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:	
12	See Attached Service List	
13	[X] (BY MAIL) 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 Westlake Village, California in the ordinary	
14 15	course of business.	
16	[ ] (BY FACSIMILE) from (805) 495-2787 to facsimile numbers listed herein.	
17 18	[ ] (BY OVERNIGHT MAIL\FEDERAL EXPRESS) I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice the sealed document has been deposited in the designated Federal Express Drop Box for overnight, next business day delivery.	
19 20	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the above is true and correct.	
21	Executed on October 26, 2005, in Westlake Village, California.	
22		
23		
24	Linda Stiegler	
25	LINDA STIEGLER	
26		

 $LC\text{-}PR\backslash Pldg\backslash Ans.PR.wkl.doc$ 

**27** 

## Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases: Case No. 1- 05-CV-049053 1 2 Henry Weinstock, Esq. Attorneys for Tejon Ranch Fred Fudacz, Esq. 3 NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX ELLIOTT 445 South Figueroa Street, 31st Floor 4 Los Angeles, CA 90071 Email: hweinstock@nossman.com Tel: (213) 612-7839 Email: ffudacz@nossaman.com 5 Fax: (213) 612-7801 6 Attorneys for Palmdale Water District and Thomas Bunn, Esq. 7 LAGERLOF, SENECAL, BRADLEY, Quartz Hill Water District GOSNEY & KRUSE 8 301 North Lake Avenue, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor Pasadena, CA 91101 Email: 9 Tel: Fax: (626) 793-5900 **10** 11 Christopher M. Sanders, Esq. Attorneys for Los Angeles County Sanitation EILLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS **Districts** 12 2015 H Street Sacramento, CA 95814 **13** Tel: Email: Fax: (916) 447-3512 14 **15 16** 17 **18** 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 **26**

27