1	WAYNE K. LEMIEUX (SBN. 43501)	
2	W. KEITH LEMIEUX (SBN. 161850) LEMIEUX & O'NEILL	
3	2393 Townsgate Road, Suite 201	
4	Westlake Village, CA 91361 Telephone: (805) 495-4770	
-	Facsimile: (805) 495-2787	
5	Attorneys for Defendant/Cross-Defendant	
6	Littlerock Creek Irrigation District	
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	IN AND FOR THE COU	INTY OF LOS ANGELES
10		
11	Coordinated Proceeding	Judicial Council Coordination
12	Special Title (Rule 1550(b))	Proceeding No. 4408
13	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER	Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 Assigned to the Honorable Jack Komar – Dept.
14		17
15	Included Actions:	
16	Los Angeles County Waterworks District	ANSWER OF CROSS-DEFENDANT
17	<u>No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co</u> . Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No.	LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT TO CROSS-COMPLAINT OF
	BC 325201;	THE CITY OF PALMDALE
18	Los Angeles County Waterworks District	
19	No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Kern	
20	County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500- CV-234348;	
21		
22	<u>Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of</u> <u>Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. City of</u>	
23	Lancaster v. Palmdale Water District,	
24	Riverside County Superior Court, Consolidated Actions, Case Nos. RIC	
	353840, RIC 344436, RIC 344668	
25	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS	
26		
27	/	

LC-PR\Pldg\AnsXC.CityPalmdale.LC

28

- 1 –

ANSWER OF LITTLEROCK CREEK IRR. DST. TO CITY OF PALMDALE CROSS-COMPLAINT

3.

Cross-defendant, LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT, (hereinafter "Littlerock Creek"), responds to the allegations of the Cross-Complaint filed by the City of Palmdale ("City"), as follows:

PRELIMINARY

1. The allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 27 of the Cross-Complaint are true.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

2. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 28 of the Cross-Complaint, Littlerock Creek alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in Littlerock Creek's responses to paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive, of the crosscomplaint.

The allegations contained in paragraphs 29, 31, 32, 33 and 34 are true.

4. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 30 of the Cross-Complaint, Littlerock Creek denies that Littlerock Creek's continued or increased extraction of water from the Basin will result in the diminution, reduction and impairment of the Basin water supply and will deprive the City of Palmdale of Basin water to which it is entitled. Except as expressly denied herein, the allegations contained in paragraph 30 of the Cross-Complaint are true.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

5. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 35 of the Cross-Complaint, Littlerock Creek alleges and incorporates by reference Littlerock Creek's responses to the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive, of the Cross-Complaint.

6. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 36 of the Cross-Complaint, Littlerock Creek denies that it has taken water from the Basin without regard to the water rights of the City and the long-term health of the Basin and that unless restrained, Littlerock Creek's pumping will cause irreparable damage and injury to the

LC-PR\Pldg\AnsXC.CityPalmdale.LC

ANSWER OF LITTLEROCK CREEK IRR. DST. TO CITY OF PALMDALE CROSS-COMPLAINT

Basin. Except as denied herein, the allegations contained in paragraph 36 of the Cross-2 Complaint are true.

7. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 37 of the Cross-Complaint, Littlerock Creek denies, unless its pumping is enjoined and restrained, overdraft will continue and it will become more severe and there will be a further depletion of water and increased incidents of adverse results. Except as denied herein, the allegations contained in paragraph 37 are true.

8. The allegations contained in paragraph 38 are true.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

9. Littlerock Creek has a right prior and paramount to the rights of City to pump the portion of the water percolated into the Basin which has been imported 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.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

10. Littlerock Creek has a prior and paramount right to the rights of the City 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.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

23 11. Littlerock Creek has an equal right to the rights of the City to use the native 24 waters for municipal purposes.

25

26

28

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

12. Littlerock Creek has an equal right to the rights of the public entity cross-

27 defendants to the native waters in the Basin by virtue of mutual prescription.

LC-PR\Pldg\AnsXC.CityPalmdale.LC

- 3 -

ANSWER OF LITTLEROCK CREEK IRR. DST. TO CITY OF PALMDALE CROSS-COMPLAINT

1		PRAYER		
2	WH	EREFORE, Littlero	ck Creek Irrigation District prays for the Court to:	
3	1.	Declare Littlerock	Creek Irrigation District's water rights as equal or	
4	paramount	paramount to the water rights of the City of Palmdale.		
5	2.	2. Award Littlerock Creek Irrigation District costs of suit.		
6	3.	Award Littlerock Creek Irrigation District reasonable attorney fees.		
7	4.	4. Impose such further relief as the Court deems appropriate.		
8				
9	DATED: O	ctober 11, 2006	LEMIEUX & O'NEILL	
10			By:	
11			WAYNE K. LEMIEUX	
12		Attorney for Cross-Defendant LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT		
13	This Answer is deemed verified pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 446.			
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	LC-PR\Pldg\AnsXC.(CityPalmdale.LC	- 4 —	
	ANSV	WER OF LITTLEROCK (CREEK IRR. DST. TO CITY OF PALMDALE CROSS-COMPLAINT	

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		
6	and not a party to the within action. My business address is 2393 Townsgate Road, Suite 201, Westlake Village, California 91361.		
7	On October 11 2006 I posted the follo	owing document(s) to the website	
8	On October 11, 2006 , I posted the following document(s) to the website <u>http://www.scefiling.org</u> , a dedicated link to the Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases:		
9	ANSWER OF CROSS-DEFENDANT, LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT,		
10		F THE CITY OF PALMDALE	
11			
12	Honorable Jack Komar Santa Clara County Superior Court	By Mail Tel: 508/882-2286	
13	191 North First Street, Dept. 17C San Jose, CA 95113	Fax: 408/882-2293 rwalker@scscourt.org	
14	Superior Court of California	Original Document(s) to be filed at this	
15	County of Los Angeles Stanley Mosk Courthouse—Dept. 1, Rm 534	location.	
16	111 North Hill Street		
17	Los Angeles, CA 90012		
18		or the laws of the State of California that the	
19	above is true and correct.		
20	Executed on October 11, 2006, in Westl	ake Village, California.	
21			
22			
23		LINDA M. STIEGLER	
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	LC-PR\Pldg\AnsXC.CityPalmdale.LC - 5 -		
	ANSWER OF LITTLEROCK CREEK IRR. DST. TO CITY OF PALMDALE CROSS-COMPLAINT		