1 2 3 4 5 6	WAYNE K. LEMIEUX (SBN. 43501) W. KEITH LEMIEUX (SBN. 161850) LEMIEUX & O'NEILL 2393 Townsgate Road, Suite 201 Westlake Village, California 91361 Telephone: (805) 495-4770 Facsimile: (805) 495-2787 Attorneys for Defendant/Cross-Defendant Palm Ranch Irrigation District		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9 10	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA		
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 15	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. Superior Court of	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408	
15 16	California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC) 325201; Los Angeles County Waterworks District)	ANSWER OF CROSS-DEFENDANT,	
17	No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Case No. S-1500-	PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT, TO CROSS-COMPLAINT OF ROSAMOND	
18	CV-234348; Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. City of		
19	Lancaster v. Palmdale Water District, Superior Court of California, County of Riverside,		
20	consolidated actions, Case Nos. RIC 353840, (2) RIC 344436, RIC 344668		
21			
22	DALM DANGH IDDICATION DISTRICT A	and a few "Dalos Danals" account to the Conse	
23	PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT, hereinafter "Palm Ranch," responds to the Cross-Complaint of Rosamond Community Services District (hereinafter "Rosamond"), as follows:		
24			
25	PRELIMINARY 1. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the		
26	Cross-Complaint are true.		
27			
28	LC-PR\Pldg\AnsX-Compl.Rosamond.PR.doc -	1 -	

- 2. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the Cross-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 Cross-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 Cross-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 Cross-Complaint are true.
- 6. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 16 of the Cross-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 Cross-Complaint are true.
- 7. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of the Cross-Complaint are true.
- 8. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the Cross-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 Cross-Complaint are true.
- 9. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28 of the Cross-Complaint are true.

1 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION 10. 2 The allegations of the first cause of action are directed against all defendants, except public 3 entity defendants. Palm Ranch is a public entity and is not required to respond to the first cause of action. 4 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION 5 11. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 34 of the Cross-Complaint, Palm 6 Ranch alleges and incorporates by reference, Palm Ranch's responses to the allegations in paragraphs 1 7 through 31, inclusive, of the Cross-Complaint. 8 12. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 35, 36, and 37 of the Cross-9 Complaint are true. 13. 10 In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 38 of the Cross-Complaint, Palm Ranch denies it seeks to prevent Rosamond from pumping surplus water. Except as provided herein, 11 12 Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 38 are true. 13 14. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 39 of the Cross-Complaint are 14 true. 15 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION **16** 15. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 40 of the Cross-Complaint, Palm 17 Ranch alleges and incorporates by reference herein, Palm Ranch's responses to the allegations in **18** paragraphs 1 through 39, inclusive, of the Cross-Complaint. 19 16. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 41 of the Cross-Complaint, Palm Ranch denies Palm Ranch will continue to take and pump increasing amounts of water to the great and 20 21 irreparable damage and injury of Rosamond and the Basin. Except as provided herein, Palm Ranch 22 admits the allegations contained in paragraph 41 of the Cross-Complaint are true. 17. 23 Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 42, 43, and 44 of the Cross-24 Complaint are true. 25 26 27 28

1 2 18. 3 4 paragraphs 1 through 44, inclusive, of the Cross-Complaint. 19. 5 6 20. 7 8 9 are true. 10 21. 11 true. 12 13 22. 14 15 through 50, inclusive, of the Cross-Complaint. 16 23. Complaint are true. 17 18 24.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 45 of the Cross-Complaint, Palm Ranch alleges and incorporates by reference herein, Palm Ranch's responses to the allegations in
 - Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 46, 47, and 48 are true.
- In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 49 of the Cross-Complaint, Palm Ranch denies Palm Ranch disputes Rosamond's contention as stated in the fourth cause of action. Except as provided herein, Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 49 of the Cross-Complaint
- Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 50 of the Cross-Complaint are

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 51 of the Cross-Complaint, Palm Ranch alleges and incorporates by reference, Palm Ranch's responses to the allegations in paragraphs 1
- Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 52, 53, and 54 of the Cross-
- In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 55 of the Cross-Complaint, Palm Ranch denies that Palm Ranch disputes Rosamond's contentions stated in the fifth cause of action. Except as provided herein, Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 55 of the Cross-Complaint are true.
- 25. Palm Ranch admits the allegations contained in paragraph 56 of the Cross-Complaint are true.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

26. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 57 of the Cross-Complaint, Palm Ranch alleges and incorporates by reference, Palm Ranch's responses to the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 56, inclusive, of the Cross-Complaint.

28 LC-PR\Pldg\AnsX-Compl.Rosamond.PR.doc

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

26

27

as the result of a diversion of surface water by Palm Ranch, regardless of the time since the diversion,

the Basin flowing in a known and definite channel. This right exists as long as the water can be identified

1	regardless of the number of times the water is pumped and regardless whether the diverted water is		
2	commingled with the waters in the Basin.		
3		THIRD AF	FIRMATIVE DEFENSE
4	34.	Palm Ranch has a prior and par	amount right to the rights of Rosamond to pump the native
5	waters in the	Basin because water and water ri	ghts belonging to the State of California within Palm Ranch
6	have been give	ven, dedicated, and set apart for the	ne use and purposes of Palm Ranch.
7		FOURTH AI	FFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
8	35.	Palm Ranch has an equal right	to the rights of Rosamond to use the native waters for
9	municipal pu	arposes.	
10		FIFTH AFI	FIRMATIVE DEFENSE
11	36.	Palm Ranch has an equal right	to the rights of the public entity cross-defendants to the
12	native waters	s in the Basin by virtue of mutual	prescription.
13			PRAYER
14	WHE	EREFORE, Palm Ranch Irrigatio	n District prays for the Court to:
15	1. Declare Palm Ranch Irrigation District's water rights as equal or paramount to the water		
16	rights of Rosamond as set forth in Palm Ranch Irrigation District's affirmative defenses.		
17	2.	Award Palm Ranch Irrigation I	District cost of suit.
18	3.	Award Palm Ranch Irrigation I	District reasonable attorney fees.
19	4.	Impose such further relief as the	e Court deems appropriate.
20	This Answer is deemed verified pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 446.		ant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 446.
21			
22	DATED: No	ovember 21, 2005 L	EMIEUX & O'NEILL
23			/s/
24			sy: VAYNE K. LEMIEUX
25		A	Attorney for Cross-Defendant ALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT
26		r	ALM KANCH IKKIGATION DISTRICT
27			
28	I C-PR\Pldg\AnsX.	C-Compl Rosamond PR doc	- 6 -

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,		
6	California 91361.		
7	On November 21, 2005 , I posted the following document(s) to the website http://www.scefiling.org , a dedicated link to the Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases:		
8	ANSWER OF CROSS-DEFENDANT, PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT,		
9	TO CROSS-COMPLAINT OF ROSAMOND		
10			
11	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.		
12	Executed on November 21, 2005, in Westlake Village, California.		
13			
14	/s/		
15	KATHI MIERS		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

28

SERVICE LIST

1

Antelope \	Vallev	Groundwater	Cases:	Case No.:	1-05-CV	049053
------------	--------	-------------	--------	-----------	---------	--------

2	Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases: Case No.: 1-05-CV 049053			
3 4	Eric L. Garner, Esq. Sandra M. Schwarzmann, Esq. BEST, BEST & KRIEGER	Attorneys for Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 and Rosamond Community Services District		
5 6	3750 University Avenue, Suite 400 P.O. Box 1028 Riverside, CA 92502-1028 Tel: (909) 686-1450 Fax:(909) 686-3083	Email: <u>ELGarner@bbklaw.com</u> Email: <u>Lynda.Serwy@bbklaw.com</u>		
7 8	Bob H. Joyce, Esq. LEBEAU · THELEN	Attorneys for Diamond Farming Co.		
9 10 11	5001 East Commercenter Drive #300 P.O. Box 12092 Bakersfield, CA 93389-2092 Tel: (661) 325-8962 Fax:(661) 325-1127	Email: bjoyce@lebeauthelen.com Email: DLuis@lebeauthelen.com		
12 13	Richard G. Zimmer, Esq. CLIFFORD & BROWN 1430 Truxtun Avenue, Suite 900	Attorneys for WM Bolthouse Farms		
14 15	Bakersfield, CA 93301-5230 Tel: (661) 322-6023 Fax(661) 322-3508	Email: rzimmer@clifford-brownlaw.com		
16 17	Douglas J. Evertz, Esq. STRADLING, YOCCA, CARLSON & RAUTH 660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1600	Attorneys for City of Lancaster		
18 19	Newport Beach, CA 92660-6522 Tel: (949) 725-4000 Fax:(949) 725-4100	Email: devertz@sycr.com		
20 21	John Tootle, Esq. CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY 3625 Del Amo Boulevard, Suite 350	Attorneys for Antelope Valley Water Company		
22 23	Torrance, CA 90503 Tel: (310) 257-1488 x 322 Fax: (310) 325-4691	Email: jtootle@calwater.com		
24 25	John A. Slezak, Esq. IVERSON, YOAKUM, PAPIANO & HATCH 624 South Grand Avenue, 27 th Floor	Attorneys for City of Los Angeles, Department of Airports		
26 27	Los Angeles, CA 90017 Tel: (213) 624-7444 Fax::(213) 629-4563	Email: jslesak@lyph.com		
28	LC-PR\Pldg\AnsX-Compl.Rosamond.PR.doc	- 8 -		

1 2 3 4 5	Eduardo Angeles, Esq. Managing City Attorney Attn: James Spitser, Esq. 1 World Way Los Angeles, CA 90009 Tel: (310) 646-3260 Fax:(310) 646-9617	Attorneys for City of Los Angeles – Airport Division
6	Janet Goldsmith, Esq.	Attorneys for City of Los Angeles
7	KRONICK, MOSKOWITZ, TIEDMANN & GIRARD	
8	400 Capitol Mall, 27 th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814-4417	
	Tel: (916) 321-4500 Fax:(916) 321-4555	
9		
10	Richard M. Brown, Esq. Department of Water and Power	Attorneys for Department of Water and Power
11	111 North Hope Street P.O. Box 111	
12	Los Angeles, CA 90012	
13	Tel: (213) 367-4598 Fax: (213) 367-4588	
14	Wm. Matthew Ditzhazy, Esq.	Attorneys for City of Palmdale
15	CITY OF PALMDALE – Legal Dept.	Thomeys for City of Lumidate
16	38300 North Sierra Hwy Palmdale, CA 93550	
17	Tel: (805) 267-5108 Fax: (805) 267-5178	Email: mditzhazy@cityofpalmdale.com
18	James L. Markman, Esq,	Attorneys for City of Palmdale
19	RICHARDS, WATSON & GERSHON P.O. Box 1059	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
20	Brea, CA 92822-1059	Email: jmarkman@rwglaw.com
21	Tel: (714) 990-0901 Fax: (714) 990-6230	
22	Steve Orr, Esq.	Attorneys for City of Palmdale
23	RICHARDS, WATSON & GERSHON	Thomeys for City of Lamidate
24	355 S. Grand Avenue, 40 th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-3101	Email:
25	Tel: (213) 626-8484 Fax:(213) 626-0078	
26		
27		
28	LC-PR\Pldg\AnsX-Compl.Rosamond.PR.doc	- 9 -
	-	

1	Henry Weinstock, Esq.	Attorneys for Tejon Ranch
2	Fred Fudacz, Esq. NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX ELLIOTT	
3	445 South Figueroa Street, 31 st Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071	Email: hweinstock@nossman.com
4	Tel: (213) 612-7839	Email: ffudacz@nossaman.com
5	Fax: (213) 612-7801	
	Michael T. Fife, Esq.	Attorneys for Antelope Valley Groundwater
6	HATCH & PARENT 21 East Carrillo Street	Association
7	Santa Barbara, CA 93101	
8	Tel: (805) 963-7000 Fax: (805) 965-4333	Email: Mfife@hatchparent.com Email: Karce@hatchparent.com
9	1 ax. (603) 703-4333	Eman. Karee whatenparent.com
10	Thomas Bunn, Esq. LAGERLOF, SENECAL, BRADLEY,	Attorneys for Palmdale Water District and Quartz Hill Water District
	GOSNEY & KRUSE	Quartz Tilli Water District
11	301 North Lake Avenue, 10 th Floor Pasadena, CA 91101	Email:
12	Tel:	Eman.
13	Fax: (626) 793-5900	
14	Christopher M. Sanders, Esq.	Attorneys for Los Angeles County Sanitation
15	EILLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS 2015 H Street	Districts
16	Sacramento, CA 95814	
	Tel: Fax: (916) 447-3512	Email:
17		
18	Debra W. Yang, United States Attorney United States Attorney's Office	
19	Central District of California	
20	300 North Los Angeles Street Los Angeles, CA 90012	
21	Tel:	
	Fax:	
22	Robert J. Spagnoletti	
23	Office of the Attorney General District of Columbia	
24	1350 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 409	
25	Washington, DC 20004 Tel:	
26	Fax:	
27		
20		

- 10 -

ANSWER OF PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT TO ROSAMOND'S CROSS-COMPLAINT

 $LC\text{-}PR\ | Pldg\ | AnsX\text{-}Compl.Rosamond.PR.doc$

1 2 3 4	Judy Jagdmann Office of the Attorney General of Virginia 900 East Main Street Richmond, Virginia 23219 Tel: Fax:	
5 6	Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Of California, County of Los Angeles 111 N. Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90012-3014	CRC Rules 1501(17) and 1540: Coordination trial Judge
7 8 9 10	* Chair, Judicial Council of California Administrative Office of the Courts Attn: Appellate & Trial Court Judicial Services (Civil Case Coordination) 455 Golden Gate Avenue	CRC Rule 1511: * Serve only when required to be transmitted to Judicial Council
11 12 13	San Francisco, CA 94102-3688 Honorable Jack Komar Santa Clara County Superior Court 191 North First Street, Dept. 17C	By Mail
14 15	San Jose, CA 95113 Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles	Original Document(s) to be filed at this location
16 17	Stanley Mosk Courthouse – Dept. 1, Room 534 111 N. Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90012	
18 19		
20 21		
22		
23 24		
25		
26 27		
28	LC-PR\Pldg\AnsX-Compl.Rosamond.PR.doc	- 11 -