1 2 3 4 5 6	Walter J. Wilson (SBN 68040) LAW OFFICES OF WALTER J. WILSON 333 West Broadway, Suite 200 Long Beach, CA 90802 Tel: (562) 432-3388 Fax: (562) 432-2969 Email: walterwl@aol.com Attorney for Antelope Valley Mobile Estates,	LLC			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
9	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES				
10					
11	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408			
12	Included Actions:	For filing purposes only: Santa Clara County Case No. 1-05-CV-049053			
13 14 15	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC 325201	Assigned to the Honorable Jack Komar  MODEL ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINTS BY ANTELOPE VALLEY MOBILE ESTATES, LLC			
16 17	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. Kern County Superior Court Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348				
18 19 20 21 22	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist. Riverside County Superior Court Consolidated actions Case Nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668				
23		)			
24	//				
25	//				
26	//				
27	//				
28	//				

I hereby answer the Complaint and all Cross-Complaints which have been filed as of this date, specifically those of Antelope Valley East-Kern Water Agency, Palmdale Water District & Quartz Hill Water District, Rosamond Community Services District and Waterworks District No. 40 of Los Angeles County. I do not intend to participate at trial or other proceedings unless ordered by the Court to do so, but I reserve the right to do so upon giving written notice to that effect to the Court and all parties. I own the following property(ies) located in the Antelope Valley:

the Northwest quarter of the Northwest quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 33, Township 9 North, Range 12 West, San Bernardino Base Meridian, in the unincorporated area of the County of Kern, State of California, as per to the Official Plat thereof on file in the Office of the Surveyor General. Assessor's Parcel No.: 473-110-02-00

## **GENERAL DENIAL**

1. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 431.30(d), Defendant and Cross-Defendant hereby generally denies each and every allegation set forth in the Complaint and Cross-Complaint, and the whole thereof, and further denies that Plaintiff and Cross-Complainant are entitled to any relief against Defendant and Cross-Defendant.

## **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

#### **First Affirmative Defense**

(Failure to State a Cause of Action)

2. The Complaint and Cross-Complaint and every purported cause of action contained therein fail to allege facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against Defendant and Cross-Defendant.

#### Second Affirmative Defense

(Statute of Limitation)

3. Each and every cause of action contained in the Complaint and Cross-Complaint is barred, in whole or in part, by the applicable statutes of limitations, including, but not limited to, sections 318, 319, 321, 338, and 343 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.

1	Third Affirmative Defense		
2	(Laches)		
3	4. The Complaint and Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action containe		
4	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 conta	ined	
8	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 conta	ined	
12	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, prese	rved	
16	its paramount overlying right to extract groundwater by continuing, during all times relevant hereto		
17	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 unreason	able	
21	and wasteful in the arid conditions of the Antelope Valley and thereby violate Article X, Section 2		
22	of the California Constitution.		
23	Eighth Affirmative Defense		
24	(Additional Defenses)		
25	9. The Complaint and Cross-Complaint do not state their allegations with suffice	eient	
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 Cr	oss-	
l l			

1	Complaint.			
2	Ninth Affirmative Defense			
3	10. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are <i>ultra</i>			
4	vires and exceed the statutory authority by which each entity may acquire property as set forth in			
5	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	The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are			
1	barred by the provisions of the 5 <sup>th</sup> Amendment to the United States Constitution as applied to the			
2	states under the 14 <sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States Constitution.			
3	Twelfth Affirmative Defense			
4	13. Cross-Complainants' prescriptive claims are barred due to their failure to take			
.5	affirmative steps that were reasonably calculated and intended to inform each overlying landowner			
6	of Cross-Complainants' adverse and hostile claim as required by the due process clause of the 5th and			
7	14 <sup>th</sup> Amendments of the United States Constitution.			
8	Thirteenth Affirmative Defense			
9	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.			
1	Fourteenth Affirmative Defense			
22	15. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are			
23	barred by the provisions of the 14 <sup>th</sup> Amendment to the United States Constitution.			
24	Fifteenth Affirmative Defense			
25	16. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants were permissively pumping at all times.			
26	Sixteenth Affirmative Defense			
27	17. The request for the court to use its injunctive powers to impose a physical solution			
28	seeks a remedy that is in violation of the doctrine of separation of powers set forth in Article 3			
- 1				

1	Section 3 of the California Constitution.		
2	Seventeenth Affirmative Defense		
3	18. Cross-Complainants are barred from asserting their prescriptive claims by operation		
4	of law as set forth in Civil Code sections 1007 and 1214.		
5	Eighteenth Affirmative Defense		
6	19. Each Cross-Complainant is barred from recovery under each and every cause of		
7	action contained in the Cross-Complaint by the doctrine of unclean hands and/or unjust enrichment		
8	Nineteenth Affirmative Defense		
9	20. The Cross-Complaint is defective because it fails to name indispensable parties in		
10	violation of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 389(a).		
11	Twentieth Affirmative Defense		
12	The governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred from taking, possessing or		
13	using Cross-Defendants' property without first paying just compensation.		
14	Twenty-First Affirmative Defense		
15	22. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants are seeking to transfer water right		
16	priorities and water usage which will have significant effects on the Antelope Valley Groundwate		
17	Basin and the Antelope Valley. Said actions are being done without complying with and contrary		
18	to the provisions of California's Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub.Res.C. 2100 et seq.).		
19	Twenty-Second Affirmative Defense		
20	23. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants seek judicial ratification of a project		
21	that has had and will have significant effect on the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin and the		
22	Antelope Valley that was implemented without providing notice in contravention of the provisions		
23	of California's Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub.Res.C. 2100 et seq.).		
24	Twenty-Third Affirmative Defense		
25	24. Any imposition by this court of a proposed physical solution that reallocates the water		
26	right priorities and water usage within the Antelope Valley will be ultra vires as it will be subverting		
27	the pre-project legislative requirements and protections of California's Environmental Quality Ac		
28	(CEQA) (Pub.Res.C. 2100 et seq.).		

1	WHEREFORE, Defendant and Cross-Defendant prays that judgment be entered as follow			
2	1.	That Plaintiff and Cross-Complainants take nothing by reason of its Complaint or		
3	Cross-Compl	s-Complaint;		
4	2.	That the Complaint and Cross-Complaints be dismissed with prejudice;		
5	3.	For Defendant and Cross-Defendant's costs incurred herein; and		
6	4.	For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.		
7				
8		1 -		
9	Dated:	yust 5, 2014	Respectfully submitted,	
10	(	O	LAW OFFICES OF WALTER J. WILSON	
11			11 th 11 11.	
12			Will Julian Walter J. Wilson, Attorney for	
13			Antelope Valley Mobile Estates, LLC	
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

## PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Walter J. Wilson, 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 Law Offices of Walter J. Wilson, 333 West Broadway, Suite 200 Long Beach, CA 90802.

On August 5, 2014, I served the within document(s):

# MODEL ANSER TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINTS BY ANTELOPE VALLEY MOBILE ESTATES, LLC

- 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 Unites States mail at Long Beach, California addressed as set forth below.
- by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.

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 dare or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing affidavit.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on August 5, 2014, at Long Beach, California.

Walter J. Wilson

u / lulson