1 JINSERT NAME OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY 2 FRANK S CHIOd 3 17030 SIMUNDS 4 HILLS, CA 5 APN 3256-007 -002 6 [Insert address, phone number, fax number, and e-7 mail address] 8 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 11 12 ANTELOPE VALLEY Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408 GROUNDWATER CASES 13 For filing purposes only: Included Actions: Santa Clara County Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 14 Los Angeles County Waterworks District Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar 15 No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. Los Angeles County Superior Court 16 Case No. BC 325201 MODEL ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINTS 17 Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. 18 Kem County Superior Court Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348 19 Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of 20 Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. 21 Palmdale Water Dist. Riverside County Superior Court 22 Consolidated actions Case Nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 23 344 668 24 25 26 27 28 Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases (JCCP 4408)

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINTS (MODEL APPROVED BY THE COURT)

1	I hereby answer the Complaint and all Cross-Complaints which have been filed as of this		
2	date, specifically those of Antelope Valley East-Kern Water Agency, Palmdale Water District &		
3	Quartz Hill Water District, Rosamond Community Services District and Waterworks District No.		
4	40 of Los Angeles County. I do not intend to participate at trial or other proceedings unless		
5	ordered by the Court to do so, but I reserve the right to do so upon giving written notice to that		
6	effect to the Court and all parties. I own the following property(ies) located in the Antelope		
7	Valley:		
8	APN 3256 - 007-002		
9	19720 W AVE B LANCASTER 93536		
10	[Insert address and/or APN Number]		
11			
12	GENERAL DENIAL		
13	1. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 431.30(d), Defendant and Cross-		
14	Defendant hereby generally denies each and every allegation set forth in the Complaint and		
15	Cross-Complaint, and the whole thereof, and further denies that Plaintiff and Cross-Complainant		
16	are entitled to any relief against Defendant and Cross-Defendant.		
17	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES		
18	First Affirmative Desense		
19	(Failure to State a Cause of Action)		
20	2. The Complaint and Cross-Complaint and every purported cause of action		
21	contained therein fail to allege facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against Defendant		
22	and Cross-Defendant.		
23	Second Affirmative Defense		
24	(Statute of Limitation)		
25	3. Each and every cause of action contained in the Complaint and Cross-Complaint is		
26	barred, in whole or in part, by the applicable statutes of limitation, including, but not limited to,		
27	sections 318, 319, 321, 338, and 343 of the Culifornia Code of Civil Procedure.		
8			
-	Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases (JCCP 4408)		
	ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINTS (MODEL APPROVED BY THE COURT)		

1	Third Affirmative Defense
2	(Laches)
3	4. The Complaint and Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action
4	contained therein, is barred by the doctrine of laches.
5	Fourth Affirmative Defense
6	(Estoppel)
7	5. The Complaint and Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action
8	contained therein, is barred by the doctrine of estoppel.
9	Fifth Affirmative Defense
10	(Waiver)
11	6. The Complaint and Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action
12	contained therein, is barred by the doctrine of waiver.
13	Sixth Affirmative Defense
14	(Self-Help)
15	7. Defendant and Cross-Defendant has, by virtue of the doctrine of self-help,
16	preserved its paramount overlying right to extract groundwater by continuing, during all times
17	relevant hereto, to extract groundwater and put it to reasonable and beneficial use on its property.
18	Seventh Affirmative Defense
19	(California Constitution Article X, Section 2)
20	8. Plaintiff and Cross-Complainant's methods of water use and storage are
21	unreasonable and wasteful in the arid conditions of the Antelope Valley and thereby violate
22	Article X, Section 2 of the California Constitution.
23	Eighth Affirmative Defense
24	(Additional Defenses)
25	9. The Complaint and Cross-Complaint do not state their allegations with sufficient
26	clarity to enable defendant and cross-defendant to determine what additional defenses may exist
27	to Plaintiff and Cross-Complainant's causes of action. Defendant and Cross-defendant therefore
28	reserve the right to assert all other defenses which may pertain to the Complaint and Cross-
	Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases (JCCP 4408)  ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINTS (MODEL APPROVED BY THE COURT)

1	Complaint.
2	Ninth Affirmative Defense
3	10. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are
4	ultra vires and exceed the statutory authority by which each entity may acquire property as set
5	forth in Water Code sections 22456, 31040 and 55370.
6	Tenth Affirmative Defense
7	11. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are
8	barred by the provisions of Article 1 Section 19 of the California Constitution.
9	Eleventh Affirmative Defense
10	12. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are
11	barred by the provisions of the 5th Amendment to the United States Constitution as applied to the
12	states under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.
13	Twelfth Affirmative Defense
14	13. Cross-Complainants' prescriptive claims are barred due to their failure to take
15	affirmative steps that were reasonably calculated and intended to inform each overlying
16	landowner of cross-complainants' adverse and hostile claim as required by the due process clause
17	of the 5th and 14th Amendments of the United States Constitution.
18	Thirteenth Affirmative Defense
19	14. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are
20	barred by the provisions of Article 1 Section 7 of the California Constitution.
21	Fourteenth Affirmative Defense
22	15. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are
23	barred by the provisions of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.
24	Fifteenth Affirmative Defense
25	16. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants were permissively pumping at all
26	times.
27	Sixteenth Affirmative Defense
28	17. The request for the court to use its injunctive powers to impose a physical solution  4
	Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases (JCCP 4408) ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINTS (MODEL APPROVED BY THE COURT)

## LAW OFFICES OF BESTBESTÄ KRIEGER LLP 5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE I 500 IRWNE, CALIFORNIA 9261 4

## PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Kerry V. Keefe, declare:

I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action; my business address is Best & Krieger LLP, 5 Park Plaza, Suite 1500, Irvine, California 92614. On December 27, 2006, I served the within document(s):

## MODEL ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINTS (Frank S. Chiodo)

×	by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter.
	by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Irvine, California addressed as set forth below.
	by causing personal delivery by ASAP Corporate Services of the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.
	by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.
	I caused such envelope to be delivered via overnight delivery addressed as indicated on the attached service list. Such envelope was deposited for delivery by Federal Express following the firm's ordinary business practices.

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid 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.

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

Executed on December 27, 2006, at Irvine, California.

Kerry V. Keefe

ORANGE\KKEEFE\24201.1