1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Vernon L. Putnam, SB# 54363 Soby M. Mathews, SB# 208317 AVILA & PUTNAM Professional Law Corporation 515 So. Figueroa Street, Suite 1550 Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (213) 892-1444 Facsimile: (213) 892-1555  Attorneys for Defendant and Cross Defendant, David S. Mason, Co-trustee of the Mason Family 1993 Trust, erroneously sued herein as David S. Mason, Co-trustee
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 1222	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES  Included Actions:  Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court, County of Los Angeles Case No. BC 325201;  Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348;  Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist., Superior Court of California, County of Riverside Case Nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668  Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408  CLASS ACTION  Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053  Assigned to the Honorable Jack Komar  LASC Case No. BC 325201  ANSWER OF DOE 335: DAVID S. MASON, CO-TRUSTEE OF THE MASON FAMILY 1993 TRUST, TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINANTS
223 224 225 226 227 28	Defendant and Cross-Defendant, Doe 335: DAVID S. MASON, CO-TRUSTEE OF THE  MASON FAMILY 1993 TRUST, erroneously sued herein as DAVID S. MASON, CO-TRUSTEE  ("MASON"), 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  Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases (JCCP 4408)  ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINTS (MODEL APPROVED BY THE COURT)

28

Angeles County. MASON does not intend to participate at trial or other proceedings unless ordered by the Court to do so, but MASON reserves the right to do so upon giving written notice to that effect to the Court and all parties. MASON owns the following Property located in the Antelope Valley: APN 3062-008-076; formerly APN's 3062-008-010, 3062-008-011, 3062-008-024, 3062-008-028, 3062-008-035, 3062-008-036, 3062-008-057, 3062-008-058, 3062-008-059, 3062-008-060, 3062-008-061, 3062-008-070, 3062-008-071, 3062-008-073, & 3062-008-074.

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)

 The Complaint and Cross-Complainant 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)

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

### Third Affirmative Defense

(Laches)

4. The Complaint and Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action contained herein, is barred by the doctrine of laches.

///

## Ninth Affirmative Defense

10. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are *ultra* vires and exceed the statutory authority by which each entity may acquire property as set forth in Water Code sections 22456, 31040 and 55370.

# Tenth Affirmative Defense

11. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred by the provisions of Article 1 Section 19 of the California Constitution.

# Eleventh Affirmative Defense

12. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred by the provisions of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the United States Constitution as applied to the states under the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States Constitution.

## Twelfth Affirmative Defense

13. Cross-Complainants' prescriptive claims are barred due to their failure to take affirmative steps that were reasonably calculated and intended to inform each overlying landowner of cross-complainants' adverse and hostile claim as required by the due process clause of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments of the United States Constitution.

### Thirteenth Affirmative Defense

14. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred by the provisions of Article 1 Section 7 of the California Constitution.

#### Fourteenth Affirmative Defense

15. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred by the provisions of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the United States Constitution.

#### Fifteenth Affirmative Defense

16. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants were permissively pumping at all times.

# Sixteenth Affirmative Defense

17. The request for the court to use its injunctive powers to impose a physical solution seeks a remedy that is in violation of the doctrine of separation of powers set forth in Article 3 section 3 of the California Constitution.

# Seventeenth Affirmative Defense

18. Cross-Complainants are barred from asserting their prescriptive claims by operation of law as set forth in Civil Code sections 1007 and 1214.

# Eighteenth Affirmative Defense

19. Each Cross-Complainant is barred from recovery under each and every cause of action contained in the Cross-Complaint by the doctrine of unclean hands and/or unjust enrichment.

## Nineteenth Affirmative Defense

20. The Cross-Complaint is defective because it fails to name indispensable parties in violation of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 389(a).

## Twentieth Affirmative Defense

21. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred from taking, possessing or using cross-defendants' property without first paying just compensation.

# Twenty-First Affirmative Defense

22. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants are seeking to transfer water right priorities and water usage which will have significant effects on the Antelope Valley Groundwater basin and the Antelope Valley. Said actions are being done without complying with and contrary to the provisions of California's Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pub.Res.C. 2100 et seq.).

# Twenty-Second Affirmative Defense

23. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants seek judicial ratification of a project that has had and will have a significant effect on the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin and the Antelope Valley that was implemented without providing notice in contravention of the provisions of California's Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pub.Res.C. 2100 et seq.)

///

# Twenty-Third Affirmative Defense

24. Any imposition by this court of a proposed physical solution that reallocates the water right priorities and water usage within the Antelope Valley will be *ultra vires* as it will be subverting the pre-project legislative requirements and protections of California's Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub.Res.C. 2100 *et seq.*).

WHEREFORE, Defendant and Cross-defendant prays that judgment be entered as follows:

- That Plaintiff and Cross-Complainant take nothing by reason of its Complaint or Cross-Complaint;
  - 2. That the Complaint and Cross-Complaints be dismissed with prejudice;
  - 3. For Defendant and Cross-Defendants's costs incurred herein; and
  - 4. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: July 18, 2007

**AVILA & PUTNAM** 

PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

By:

Vernon L. Putnam,

Soby M. Mathews,

Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Defendant, Doe 335: David S. Mason, Co-trustee of the Mason Family 1993 Trust, erroneously sued herein as David S. Mason, Co-

trustee

#### PROOF OF SERVICE 1 I, Darlene Martinez, declare: 2 I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within 3 action; my business address is Avila & Putnam, Professional Law Corporation, 515 South Figueroa Street, Suite 1550, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3332. 4 5 On July 18, 2007, I served the within document(s): 6 ANSWER OF DOE 335: DAVID S. MASON, CO-TRUSTEE OF THE MASON FAMILY 1993 TRUST, TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINANTS 7 by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website in [X]8 regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter. 9 by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, [] in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California addressed as set forth below 10 by causing personal delivery by O'Mally & Associates, Attorney Service of the document(s) listed [] 11 above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below. 12 by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth helow 13 I caused such envelope to be delivered via overnight delivery addressed as indicated on the 14 attached service list. Such envelope was deposited for delivery by Via Overnite Express following the firm's ordinary business practices. 15 (MAIL) I am readily familiar with Avila & Putnam's practice of collection and 16 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 17 business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is ore than one day after date of deposit for mailing in 18 affidavit. 19 [X] (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. 20 21 Executed on July 18, 2007, at Los Angeles, California. 22 Darlene Martinez 23 24

25

26

27

28