| 1  | STEVEN B. ABBOTT (SBN 125270)<br>sabbott@redwineandsherrill.com            |  |
|----|--|--|
| 2  | GERALD D. SHOAF (SBN 41084)  |  |
| 3  | <u>gshoaf@redwineandhserrill.com</u>                                       |  |
| 4  | JULIANNA K. TILLQUIST (SBN 180552)<br>jtillquist@redwineandsherrill.com    |  |
| 5  | REDWINE AND SHERRILL   |  |
| 6  | ATTORNEYS AT LAW   |  |
| 7  | 1950 MARKET STREET<br>RIVERSIDE, CA 92501                                  |  |
| 8  | PHONE (951) 684-2520   |  |
| 9  | FACSIMILE (951) 684-9583   |  |
| 10 | Attorneys for Defendants,  |  |
| 11 | COACHELLA VALLEY WATER<br>DISTRICT, G. PATRICK O'DOWD, ED PA               | CY                                       |
| 12 | JOHN POWELL, JR., PETER NELSON,  | CK,                                      |
|    | and CASTULO R. ESTRADA, in their offic                                     | ial                                      |
| 13 | capacities as members of the Board of<br>Directors of the COACHELLA VALLEY |  |
| 14 | WATER DISTRICT   |  |
| 15 | UNITED STATES D  |  |
| 16 | UNITED STATES D  | ISTRICT COURT                            |
| 17 | CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFO   | ORNIA – EASTERN DIVISION                 |
| 18 |  |  |
| 19 | AGUA CALIENTE BAND OF  | ED CV 13-00883 JGB-(SPx)                 |
| 20 | CAHUILLA INDIANS,  | Action Filed May 14, 2013                |
| 21 | Plaintiff,   | CVWD DEFENDANTS' REPLY                   |
| 22 | VS.  | TO OPPOSITION BY                         |
| 23 | COACHELLA VALLEY WATER   | ) PLAINTIFF-IN-<br>) INTERVENTION UNITED |
| 24 | DISTRICT, et al.   | STATES TO DEFENDANTS'                    |
| 25 | Defendants.  | ) PHASE I SUMMARY<br>JUDGMENT MOTION     |
| 26 |  |  |
| 27 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA   | Date: February 9, 2015                   |
| 28 | Plaintiff-in-Intervention  | ) Time: 9:00 a.m.<br>Courtroom 1         |
|    |  |  |
|    | REPLY BY CVWD TO OPP BY US   |  |
|    |  |  |

| Case 5   | 13-cv-00883-JGB-SP | Document 106 | Filed 01/09/15 | Page 2 of 12 | Page ID #:6334 |
|----------|--------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
|          |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 1        |                    | ТА           | ABLE OF CON    | TENTS        |                |
| 2<br>3   |                    |              |                |              | 1              |
| 4        | I. INTRODUCT       | <u>ION</u>   |                |              |                |
| 5        | II. THE TRIBE D    | OES NOT HA   | VE ABORIGI     | INAL         |                |
| 6        | RIGHTS TO (        | GROUNDWA     | <u>ΓΕR</u>     |              | 2              |
| 7        |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 8        |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 9        |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 10       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 11       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 12       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 13       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 14       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 15       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 16       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 17       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 18       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 19<br>20 |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 20<br>21 |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 21       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 23       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 24       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 25       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 26       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 27       |                    |              |                |              |                |
| 28       |                    |              |                |              |                |
|          |                    |              |                |              |                |
|          | REPLY BY CVWD TO O | ьь bi n2     |                |              |                |

| 1        | TABLE OF AUTHORITIES  |  |  |  |  |
|----------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 2<br>3   | FEDERAL CASES   |  |  |  |  |
| 4        | Barker v. Harvey, 181 U.S. 481, 21 S. Ct. 690, 45 L. Ed. 963 (1901) 3, 5, 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 5        | Johnson v. M'Intosh, 21 U.S. 543, 5 L. Ed. 681 (1823)                       |  |  |  |  |
| 6        | Jones v. Meehan, 175 U.S. 1, 20 S. Ct. 1, 44 L. Ed. 49 (1899)               |  |  |  |  |
| 7<br>8   | Minnesota v. Mille Lacs Band of Chippewa Indians, 526 U.S. 172,             |  |  |  |  |
| 9        | 119 S. Ct. 1187, 143 L. Ed. 2d 270 (1999)                                   |  |  |  |  |
| 10       | <i>Thompson v. United States</i> , 13 Indian Claims Commission at 385-86    |  |  |  |  |
| 11<br>12 | <i>United States v. New Mexico</i> , 438 U.S. 696, 98 S. Ct. 3012           |  |  |  |  |
| 12       | U.S. v. Title Ins. & Trust Co., 265 U.S. 472, 486, 44 S. Ct. 621,           |  |  |  |  |
| 14       | 68 L. Ed. 1110 (1924)   |  |  |  |  |
| 15       |   |  |  |  |  |
| 16<br>17 |   |  |  |  |  |
|          | STATE CASES   |  |  |  |  |
| 18<br>19 | Hill v. Newman, 5 Cal. 445, 446 (1855) 3                                    |  |  |  |  |
| 20       | <i>In re Sutherland</i> , 53 Fed. 551, (D. Ore. 1892)                       |  |  |  |  |
| 21       |   |  |  |  |  |
| 22       |   |  |  |  |  |
| 23       | <u>U.S.CONSTITUTION</u>   |  |  |  |  |
| 24       | U.S. Const., art. II, § 2   |  |  |  |  |
| 25       |   |  |  |  |  |
| 26       |   |  |  |  |  |
|          |   |  |  |  |  |
| 27       |   |  |  |  |  |
| 28       |   |  |  |  |  |
|          | REPLY BY CVWD TO OPP BY US  |  |  |  |  |

| 1        | FEDERAL STATUTES   |
|----------|--|
| 23       | Act to Ascertain and Settle the Land Claims in the State of California Land (1851) |
| 3<br>4   | §13, 9 Stat. 631   |
| 5        | Act to Provide for the Survey of the Public Lands in California and the            |
| 6        | granting of Preemption Rights therein and for other purposes                       |
| 7<br>8   | (1853) 10 Sta. 246-247) 6, 7   |
| 9        | Act to Provide for the better Organization on Indian Affairs in                    |
| 10       | California (1864) §2. 13 Stat. 39  |
| 11<br>12 | Mission Indian Relief Act (1891) 26 Stat. 712-14                                   |
| 12       |  |
| 14       |  |
| 15       | <u>OTHERS</u>  |
| 16       | Fleishmann and Barbieri, Aboriginal Title: The Special Case of California,         |
| 17       | 17 Pac. L. J. 391, 450-51 (1986) 7   |
| 18       |  |
| 19       |  |
| 20       |  |
| 21       |  |
| 22       |  |
| 23       |  |
| 24       |  |
| 25<br>26 |  |
| 20       |  |
| 28       |  |
|          |  |
|          | REPLY BY CVWD TO OPP BY US   |
|          |  |

1

7

Defendants, COACHELLA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT and its Defendant
 Directors ("CVWD") respectfully submit this response to Plaintiff-in-Intervention the
 United States of America's ("U.S.") Opposition to CVWD's Motion for Summary
 Judgment. (Doc. 93.)

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

8 The U.S.'s Opposition echoes the themes set out in its Motion for Summary 9 Judgment and in Plaintiff, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians's ("Tribe") 10 11 Motion for Summary Judgment and the Tribe's Opposition to CVWD's Motion for 12 Summary Judgment. To avoid repetition, CVWD incorporates herein by reference 13 and respectfully directs the Court's attention to the following portions of CVWD's 14 15 Reply to the Tribe's Opposition which address the following arguments: 16 (1) That reserved rights are automatically included in the creation of a reservation 17 (CVWD Reply, pp. 2-4, 7-8); 18 19 (2) That reserved rights apply to groundwater in this case (CVWD Reply, pp. 4-20 5); 21 (3) That the New Mexico decision only addresses the issue of quantification of 22 23 reserved rights, not whether they exist (CVWD Reply, pp. 7-8); 24 (4) The purposes of Plaintiff's Reservation requires the use of groundwater 25 (CVWD Reply, pp. 4-5); and 26 27 (5) State rights do not supplant federal reserved rights (CVWD Reply, pp. 5-8). 28

This Reply is limited to addressing points and issues in the U.S. brief not
 addressed above and addressing the U.S. argument that the Tribe continues to have
 aboriginal rights.

## **II. THE TRIBE DOES NOT HAVE ABORIGINAL**

## **<u>RIGHTS TO GROUNDWATER</u>**

The U.S. Complaint in Intervention does not make a claim that the Tribe has 8 9 aboriginal rights to groundwater and instead claims only reserved rights to 10 groundwater. (Doc. 71, pp. 7-10.) Only the Tribe made a claim for aboriginal rights 11 to groundwater, with a priority date of time immemorial. (Doc. 1, pp. 15,  $\P$  58 – 59) 12 13 CVWD has moved for summary judgment/partial summary judgment on that 14 aboriginal rights claim, and on the reserved rights claim by both the Tribe and the 15 U.S. (Doc. 82, pp. 2-3.) The U.S. has briefed the issue of aboriginal rights at length 16 17 in its Opposition, and has also joined in the Tribe's response to CVWD's Statement 18 of Undisputed Facts. (Doc. 93-1). The facts conceded by the Tribe in its response 19 establish that CVWD is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on the Tribe's claim 20 21 of aboriginal rights to groundwater on two separate bases. First, the Tribe concedes 22 that there is no proof siting prehistoric hand dug groundwater wells on the current 23 reservation lands. (Response to CVWD SUF 5, Doc. 97-9, p. 4.) This absence of 24 25 proof defeats any claim for aboriginal rights to groundwater with a priority date of 26 | | | | 27

28

5

6

time immemorial because there is no proof of aboriginal occupancy of groundwater
 rights on current reservation lands.

| 5        |  | L |
|----------|--|---|
| 4        | Second, the Tribe concedes that no claim was presented to the Commission                     |   |
| 5        | established by the 1851 Act. (Response to CVWD SUF 4, Doc. 97-9, p. 2.) This fact            |   |
| 6        | defeats any claim for aboriginal rights to groundwater for any rights that may have          |   |
| 7<br>8   | existed were legally extinguished due to the failure to present a claim. (1851 Act, §        |   |
| 9        | 13, 9 Stat. 633.) None of the arguments made by the Tribe or the U.S. overcome               |   |
| 10       | these conclusions.   |   |
| 11       |  |   |
| 12       | The United States, like the Tribe, in dealing with the aboriginal rights claim, takes        |   |
| 13       | the same tack as it did with the reserved rights portion of its Opposition, i.e., ignoring   |   |
| 14       | the key Supreme Court decisions or arguing that those decisions, as well as the key          |   |
| 15       |  |   |
| 16       | Congressional 1851 Act, do not apply in this case.   |   |
| 17       | The U.S., in addition to arguing that <i>Barker v. Harvey</i> , 181 U.S. 481, 21 S. Ct.      |   |
| 18<br>19 | 690, 45 L. Ed. 963 (1901) does not apply, tries a different approach by arguing that         |   |
| 20       | the 1851 Act did not apply to the Tribe's aboriginal rights at all. Or at least to the use   |   |
| 21       | of groundwater, as opposed to rights of occupancy of the land. (Doc. 93, pp. 11, 14          |   |
| 22       |  |   |
| 23       | and 16.) The U.S. cites no authority for either assertion, each of which is nonsensical      |   |
| 24       | in light of Congress's express purpose in enacting the 1851 Act, to provide land title       |   |
| 25       | stability in California. Water rights are part of the real property to which they are        |   |
| 26       | appurtament See Hills Nouman 5 Col 145 146 (1955) And it is not recorded by                  |   |
| 27       | appurtenant. See <i>Hill v. Newman</i> , 5 Cal. 445, 446 (1855). And it is not reasonable to |   |
| 28       |  |   |
| -0       |  |   |

assume that in enacting the 1851 Act, Congress intended only to extinguish rights to occupy the land but not to also extinguish rights to uses of the natural resources appurtenant to that property, including water.

5 The U.S. cites three cases (Minnesota v. Mille Lacs Band of Chippewa Indians, 6 526 U.S. 172, 202, 119 S. Ct. 1187, 143 L. Ed. 2d 270 (1999); Jones v. Meehan, 175 7 U.S. 1, 20 S. Ct. 1, 44 L. Ed. 49 (1899); Johnson v. M'Intosh, 21 U.S. 543, 5 L. Ed. 8 9 681 (1823)) for the proposition that federal intent to extinguish aboriginal rights 10 "must be clearly expressed on the face of a treaty or statute." (Doc. 97, p.12.) None 11 of these cases support that proposition. *M'Intosh* held that the U.S., by virtue of 12 13 European discovery and conquest, held exclusive title to Indian lands and was free to 14 grant it to others, subject to the Indian right of occupancy. 21 U.S. at 574 and 587-15 588. *Minnesota* and *Jones* both considered whether rights granted by treaty (not 16 17 aboriginal rights) had been abrogated. In Minnesota, the Court carefully traced the 18 history of usufructuary rights (hunting, fishing and gathering) granted by treaty 19 through subsequent acts, including an Executive Order, another treaty, and 20 21 Minnesota's admission to the Union. 526 U.S. at 196-200. In holding that the 22 Band's rights had not been abrogated, the Court observed that "review of the history 23 and the negotiations of the agreements is central to the interpretation of treaties," and 24 25 that the Court's conclusion was based on "an analysis of the history, purpose, and 26 negotiations of this Treaty." Id. at 202 (italics in original). 27

28

1

2

3

Here, Section 13 of the 1851 Act expressly states that "all lands the claims to 1 2 which shall not have been presented to the said commissioners within two years after 3 the date of this act, shall be deemed, held, and considered as part of the public 4 5 domain of the United States," (9 Stat. 633, emphasis added) and the Court has given 6 broad construction to this provision to hold that it extends to and applies to Indian 7 aboriginal claims (Barker v. Harvey 181 U.S. at 490), and has reaffirmed that holding 8 9 and held that it is a rule of property to be respected under stare decisis, noting that the 10 Government and the Mission Indians have "adjusted their situation to it in many 11 instances." U.S. v. Title Ins. & Trust Co., 265 U.S. 472, 486, 44 S. Ct. 621, 68 L. Ed. 12 13 1110 (1924). The 1864 Act, the Mission Indian Relief Act, and the Executive Orders 14 and patents issued pursuant to those Acts at issue here are the proof of that 15 adjustment. Far from confirming aboriginal title, they demonstrate the efforts the 16 17 Government made in response to the absence of aboriginal title to reserve lands to 18 provide a homeland for the Tribe. The U.S. is simply twisting history out of context 19 with its argument in suggesting otherwise. 20

The United States offers unsubstantiated factual excuses for the Tribe's failure to file a claim to validate its aboriginal rights (Doc. 97, p. 13), but those excuses cannot escape the holding of the Supreme Court that the Act extinguished aboriginal title when no claim was presented. The U.S. also makes inconsistent arguments in an attempt to demonstrate that the 1851 Act does not apply at all. The US argues that

the 1891 Mission Indian Relief Act authorized the Attorney General to defend
Indians' rights to possession given to them by the Mexican Government, which the
US asserts shows that the 1851 Act was not intended to apply to their aboriginal
rights (Doc. 97, pp. 13-14), then states "the Tribe's lands were never part of a
Mexican Land Grant," in trying to show why the *Barker* case does not apply. (Doc.
97, p. 15.)

<sup>9</sup> The U.S.'s reliance on an 1852 Treaty, which it admits the Senate did not ratify, is
<sup>10</sup> misplaced. A treaty to which the Senate has not given advice and consent "has no
<sup>11</sup> legal force." (*In re Sutherland*, 53 Fed. 551, 552 (D. Ore. 1892); U.S. Const., art. II, §
<sup>13</sup> 2.)

14 Lastly, the United States argues that the 1853 Act validated the Tribe's claimed 15 aboriginal rights because the Tribe remained in possession of the land and because 16 17 the 1853 Act did not allow settlement of public lands "in the occupancy or possession 18 of an Indian Tribe." (Doc. 97, p. 17.) Section 6 of the Act to provide for the Survey 19 of the Public Lands in California and the granting of Preemption Rights therein and 20 21 for other purposes, offered for sale various public lands in California, with a very 22 long list of exceptions, including a proviso "That this act shall not be construed to 23 authorize any settlement to be made on any tract of land in the occupation or 24 25 possession of any Indian tribe, or to grant any preemption right to the same." (10 Stat. 26 246-247.) The proviso merely restricts sales of land under section 6; it did not repeal 27

| 1        | the provisions of the 1851 Act extinguishing aboriginal title for failure to present a      |
|----------|---|
| 2        |   |
| 3        | claim. It is also not proof that the groundwater was used by the Tribe in 1853 or at a      |
| 4        | later date preceding the Executive Orders on current reservation lands. The evidence        |
| 5        | shows no wells on those lands. (CVWD SUF 5, 28, 28e.). The 1853 Act is therefore            |
| 6        | no basis for claiming a "re-established" right of occupancy; the Indian Claims              |
| 7<br>8   | Commission found that the 1851 Act constituted a "taking" of the aboriginal rights          |
| 9        | held by California Indians that had not filed claims for validation thereof and,            |
| 10       | pursuant to a Stipulated Settlement, the California Indians were awarded                    |
| 11       |   |
| 12       | compensation by the Commission for the "taking" of their aboriginal rights. See             |
| 13       | Thompson v. United States, 13 Indian Claims Commission at 385-86; Fleishmann and            |
| 14<br>15 | Barbieri, Aboriginal Title: The Special Case of California, 17 Pac. L. J. 391, 450-51       |
| 16       | (1986).   |
| 17       | The U.S. has not produced any legal or factual basis for the claim that the Tribe's         |
| 18<br>19 | failure to file a claim for validation of its aboriginal rights either did not result in an |
| 20       | extinguishment of those rights pursuant to the 1851 Act or that if extinguished, the        |
| 21       |   |
| 22       |   |
| 23       |   |
| 24       | ////  |
| 25       | ////  |
| 26       |   |
| 27       |   |
| 28       |   |
|          | REPLY BY CVWD TO OPP BY US Page 7   |
|          |   |

rights were subsequently "re-established." CVWD is entitled to summary judgment 1 2 on that issue, and on the claim of reserved rights to groundwater. 3 4 Dated: January 9, 2015 Respectfully submitted, 5 **REDWINE AND SHERRILL** 6 7 /s/ Steven B. Abbott By: 8 STEVEN B. ABBOTT sabbott@redwineandsherrill.com 9 Attorney for Defendants COACHELLA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT, 10 G. PATRICK O'DOWD, ED PACK, 11 JOHN POWELL, JR., PETER NELSON, and CASTULO R. ESTRADA, in their 12 official capacities as members of the Board of 13 Directors of the COACHELLA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT 14 1950 Market Street 15 Riverside, CA 92501 (951) 682-7838 Telephone 16 (951) 684-9583 Facsimile 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 **REPLY BY CVWD TO OPP BY US** Page 8