\	WAYNE K. LEMIEUX (SBN. 43501) W. KEITH LEMIEUX (SBN. 161850)				
	LEMIEUX & O'NEILL 2393 Townsgate Road, Suite 201				
1	Westlake Village, California 91361				
	Felephone: (805) 495-4770 Facsimile: (805) 495-2787				
	Attorneys for Defendant/Cross-Defendant Littlerock Creek Irrigation District				
	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
	IN AND FOR THE COL	JNTY OF LOS ANGELES			
	Coordinated Proceeding) Judicial Council Coordination			
	Special Title (Rule 1550(b))	Proceeding No. 4408			
	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 Assigned to the Honorable Jack Komar – Dept.			
	Included Actions:				
		ANSWER OF CROSS-DEFENDANT			
	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. Los Angeles County	DISTRICT TO CROSS-COMPLAINTS (
	Superior Court Case No. BC 325201;	 PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT AND QUARTZ HILL WATER DISTRICT 			
	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40)			
	v. Diamond Farming Co., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-234348;				
	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster v.)			
	Palmdale Water District, Riverside County Superior Court, Consolidated Actions, Case Nos.)			
	RIC 353840, RIC 344436, RIC 344668)			
	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS)			
)			
	//				
/	//				
		1 -			

1	Cross-defendant, LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT, (hereinafter 'Littlerock				
2	Creek'), responds to the allegations of the Cross-Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief filed by				
3	Palmdale Water District ('Palmdale') and Quartz Hill Water District ('Quartz Hill'), as follows:				
4		PRELIMINARY			
5	1.	The allegations contained in paragraph 1 through 4, inclusive, of the Cross-Complaint are			
6	true.				
7	2.	In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Cross-Complaint, Littlerock			
8	Creek denies	Palmdale and Quartz Hill have acquired prescriptive rights as against Palm Ranch. Except			
9	as denied her	rein, Littlerock Creek admits the remaining allegations of paragraph 5 of the Cross-			
10	Complaint.				
11	3.	In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the Cross-Complaint, Littlerock			
12	Creek denies	Quartz Hill has imported water from outside the watershed and denies Quartz Hill has the			
13	right to pump return flow from water it imports. Except as denied herein, Littlerock Creek admits the				
14	remaining allegations of paragraph 6 of the Cross-Complaint.				
15	4.	The allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the Cross-Complaint are true.			
16	5.	The allegations contained in paragraph 8 are not true.			
17		FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION			
18	6.	In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the Cross-Complaint, Littlerock			
19	Creek allege	s and incorporates by reference Littlerock Creek's responses to paragraphs 1 through 8,			
20	inclusive, of	the cross-complaint.			
21	7.	Littlerock Creek admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Cross-			
22	Complaint a	re true.			
23		SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION			
24	8.	In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Cross-Complaint, Littlerock			
25	Creek allege	s and incorporates by reference Littlerock Creek's responses to the allegations in paragraphs 1			
26	through 8, in	clusive, of the Cross-Complaint.			
27					
28	LC-PR\Pldg\AnsX	-Compl.Palmdale.LC – 2 –			
	ANSWER	OF LITTLEROCK CREEK IRR. DST. TO PALMDALE & QUARTZ HILL CROSS-COMPLAINT			

9. Littlerock Creek lacks sufficient information or belief to respond to the allegations of
 paragraphs 13, 16 and 17 of the Cross-Complaint and on the basis of such lack of information and belief,
 denies the allegations contained therein.

10.Littlerock Creek admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 14 and 15 of the Cross-Complaint are true.

6

4

5

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

11. Littlerock Creek has a right prior and paramount to the rights of Palmdale and Quartz Hill
to pump the portion of the water percolated into the Basin which has been imported by Littlerock Creek
through the State Water Project. This right, sometimes referred to 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 pumped, and regardless of whether the
percolating water is commingled with the waters in the Basin.

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

12. Littlerock Creek has a prior and paramount right to the rights of Palmdale and Quartz Hill to pump the native waters in the Basin because water and water rights belonging to the State of California within Littlerock Creek have been given, dedicated, and set apart for the use and purposes of Littlerock Creek.

18

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

13. Littlerock Creek has an equal right to the rights of Palmdale and Quartz Hill to use the native waters for municipal purposes.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

14. Littlerock Creek has an equal right to the rights of the public entity cross-defendants to the
native waters in the Basin by virtue of mutual prescription.

PRAYER

25 26

24

WHEREFORE, Littlerock Creek Irrigation District prays for the Court to:

1. Declare Littlerock Creek Irrigation District's water rights as equal or paramount to the

27 || water rights of Palmdale and Quartz Hill.

28 LC-PR\Pldg\AnsX-Compl.Palmdale.LC

- 3 -

ANSWER OF LITTLEROCK CREEK IRR. DST. TO PALMDALE & QUARTZ HILL CROSS-COMPLAINT

1	2.	Award Littlerock C	Creek Irrigation District costs of suit.
2	3.	Award Littlerock C	Creek Irrigation District reasonable attorney fees.
3	4.	Impose such furthe	r relief as the Court deems appropriate.
4	DATED: O	ctober 11, 2006	LEMIEUX & ONEILL
5			
6			By: WAYNE K. LEMIEUX
7			Attorney for Cross-Defendant LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT
8			
9		Answer is deemed ve	rified pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 446.
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	LC-PR\Pldg\Ans	X-Compl.Palmdale.LC	- 4 -
	ANSWE	R OF LITTLEROCK CR	EEK IRR. DST. TO PALMDALE & QUARTZ HILL CROSS-COMPLAINT

PROOF (DF SERVICE		
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)) ss.			
COUNTY OF VENTURA)			
I am employed in the County of Ventu	ra, State of California. I am over the age of		
	siness address is 2393 Townsgate Road, Suite		
201, Westlake Village, California 91361.			
On October 11, 2006, I posted the following document(s) to the website			
http://www.scefiling.org, a dedicated link to	the Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases:		
	NDANT, LITTLEROCK CREEK		
	ON DISTRICT, OMPLAINTS OF		
PALMDALE WAT	TER DISTRICT AND		
QUARTZ HILL	WATER DISTRICT		
Honorable Jack Komar	By Mail		
Santa Clara County Superior Court	Tel: 508/882-2286		
191 North First Street, Dept. 17C San Jose, CA 95113	Fax: 408/882-2293 rwalker@scscourt.org		
Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles	Original Document(s) to be filed at this location.		
Stanley Mosk Courthouse—Dept. 1, Rm 534			
111 North Hill Street Los Angeles, CA, 90012			
Los Angeles, CA 90012	er the laws of the State of California that the		
Los Angeles, CA 90012 I declare under penalty of perjury und	er the laws of the State of California that the		
Los Angeles, CA 90012 I declare under penalty of perjury und above is true and correct.			
Los Angeles, CA 90012 I declare under penalty of perjury und			
Los Angeles, CA 90012 I declare under penalty of perjury und above is true and correct.			
Los Angeles, CA 90012 I declare under penalty of perjury und above is true and correct.			
Los Angeles, CA 90012 I declare under penalty of perjury und above is true and correct.			
Los Angeles, CA 90012 I declare under penalty of perjury und above is true and correct.	tlake Village, California.		
Los Angeles, CA 90012 I declare under penalty of perjury und above is true and correct.			
Los Angeles, CA 90012 I declare under penalty of perjury und above is true and correct.	tlake Village, California.		