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

1	
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	KERN County 346-062-11-00-5 L.A. County 3113-003-013
9	L.A. County 3/13-003-013
10	[Insert address and/or APN Number]
11	
12	GENERAL DENIAL
13	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 Defense
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	
25	3. Each and every cause of action contained in the Complaint and Cross-Complaint is
26	
27	sections 318, 319, 321, 338, and 343 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.
28	

	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
o	(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-
	Antelone Valley Groundwater Cases (JCCP 4408)

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
	Antclope Valley Groundwater Cases (JCCP 4408)  ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND ALL CROSS-COMPLAINTS (MODEL APPROVED BY THE COURT)

seeks a remedy tha	at 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. Cro	ss-Complainants are barred from asserting their prescriptive claims by	
operation of law as	s set forth in Civil Code sections 1007 and 1214.	
	Eighteenth Affirmative Defense	
19. Eac	h 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 Califor	mia Code of Civil Procedure Section 389(a).	
	Twentieth Affirmative Defense	
21. The	governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred from taking, possessing	
or using cross-defe	ndants' 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 wi	ll 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 Califo	ornia's Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub.Res.C. 2100 et seq.).	
	Twenty-Third Affirmative Defense	

ŀ	
1	water right priorities and water usage within the Antelope Valley will be ultra vires as it will be
2	subverting the pre-project legislative requirements and protections of California's Environmental
3	Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub.Res.C. 2100 et seq.).
4	$\cdot$
5	WHEREFORE, Defendant and Cross-defendant prays that judgment be entered as
6	follows:
7	<ol> <li>That Plaintiff and Cross-Complainant take nothing by reason of its Complaint or</li> </ol>
8	Cross-Complaint;
9	<ol> <li>That the Complaint and Cross-Complaints be dismissed with prejudice;</li> </ol>
10	<ol> <li>For Defendant and Cross-Defendant's costs incurred herein; and</li> </ol>
11	4. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.
12	Q 1. 5 10
13	Dated: 73 ,2008 Signature Castle
14	[Print name of party and/or attorney]
15	Philipterson
16	IFILE IN LA SUPERIOR COURT AND POST ON COURT WEBSITE - FOR E-FILING
17	INSTRUCTIONS, PLEASE GO TO <u>WWW.SCEFILING.ORG/FAQ</u> OR CONTACT GLOTRANS
18	AT (510) 208-4775.]
19	A1 (310) 200-4773.j
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	ORANGEVDUNNY2353.1
25	
26	
27	
28	6
	Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases (JCCP 4408)

September 20, 2008

Mr. Hadley Scott Roth Commercial Realty Partners 9601 Wilshire Blvd, Ste 890 Beverly Hills, CA 90210

RE: 4532 Sherman Oaks Ave.

Dear Mr. Roth,

Thank you for your proposal, on behalf of Dr. Schneider, for the premises at 4532 Sherman Oaks Ave.

The deal points are acceptable with the exception of the sublease and assignment language, the Use provision and the toxic material language.

As well, I need to have an accurate drawing of the walls that your client wishes to have constructed.

The toxic material language appears to be over broad in the context that many of the building materials commonly used today contain toxic substances ie, the formaldehyde in particle board, the methyl ethyl keytone in construction adhesives etc. I use a California Real Estate Association Manufacturers Lease that has commonly accepted language relating to toxic materials.

This document will serve to facilitate our negotiation but should not be considered binding in any way until a LEASE is executed by both parties.

Thank you and I look forward to consummating this transaction.

Philip Eastley

Sincerely,