

John K. Simpson, ISB #4242
 Travis L. Thompson, ISB #6168
 Paul L. Arrington, ISB #7198
 Sarah W. Higer, ISB #8012
BARKER ROSHOLT & SIMPSON LLP
 113 Main Avenue West, Suite 303
 P.O. Box 485
 Twin Falls, Idaho 83303-0485
 Telephone: (208) 733-0700
 Facsimile: (208) 735-2444

Attorneys for Petitioner-Appellant A&B Irrigation District

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION FOR)	
DELIVERY CALL OF A&B IRRIGATION)	Supreme Court Docket No. 38403-2011
DISTRICT FOR THE DELIVERY OF)	Minidoka County District Court No.
GROUND WATER AND FOR THE)	2009-647
CREATION OF A GROUND WATER)	
MANAGEMENT AREA.)	Supreme Court Docket No. 38421-2011
_____)	Minidoka County District Court No.
A&B IRRIGATION DISTRICT,)	2009-647
)	
Petitioner-Appellant,)	Supreme Court Docket No. 38422-2011
)	Minidoka County District Court No.
v.)	2009-647
)	
THE IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF WATER)	A&B IRRIGATION DISTRICT'S
RESOURCES, and GARY SPACKMAN, in)	MOTION TO STRIKE PARTS OF
his official capacity as Interim Director of the)	CROSS-APPELLANTS' REPLY
Idaho Department of Water Resources,)	BRIEFS
)	
Defendants-Respondents.)	
)	
and)	
)	
THE IDAHO GROUND WATER)	
APPROPRIATORS, INC.; THE CITY OF)	
POCATELLO;)	
)	
Respondents-Cross Appellants,)	
)	
and)	

FREMONT-MADISON IRRIGATION)
DISTRICT; ROBERT & SUE HUSKINSON;)
SUN-GLO INDUSTRIES; VAL)
SCHWENDIMAN FARMS, INC.; DAVID)
SCHWENDIMAN FARMS, INC.;)
DARRELL C. NEVILLE; SCOTT C.)
NEVILLE; STAN D. NEVILLE,)
District Court Intervenor.)

COMES NOW, Petitioner-Appellant, A&B Irrigation District (“A&B”), by and through counsel of record, and moves this Court for an order striking parts of the reply briefs filed by Cross-Appellants the Idaho Ground Water Appropriators, Inc. (“IGWA”) and the City of Pocatello (“Pocatello”). The bases for A&B’s motion are set forth below.

BACKGROUND

A&B filed a notice of appeal in this matter on December 29, 2010. Pocatello filed a notice of appeal on December 30, 2010. IGWA filed a notice of appeal on January 4, 2011. The Court consolidated the appeals for all purposes on March 16, 2011. *See Order to Consolidate Appeals for All Purposes*. On June 23, 2011 the Court entered an *Amended Order re: Briefing in These Consolidated Appeals and Consolidating and Amending Titles* (“*Briefing Order*”). The Court clarified the parties’ roles and ordered A&B to be classified as “Appellant” and IGWA and Pocatello as “Cross-Appellants.” *Briefing Order* at 4.

A&B filed its opening brief on July 1, 2011. IGWA and Pocatello filed their opening briefs on July 29, 2011. In addition to arguing their sole issue on appeal, IGWA and Pocatello also responded to A&B’s opening brief. *See Cross-Appellant Idaho Ground Water Appropriators, Inc.’s Opening Brief and Response Brief* at 33-48 (“*IGWA Opening Br.*”); *Respondent-Cross Appellant City of Pocatello’s Brief* at 11-25 (“*Poc. Opening Br.*”). IDWR responded to all parties’ opening briefs on August 26, 2011. *See IDWR Defendants-*

Respondents' Brief. A&B then filed a reply brief that included a response to IGWA's and Pocatello's issues on appeal on September 16, 2011. *See A&B Irrigation District's Reply Brief.* Finally, IGWA and Pocatello filed reply briefs on October 11, 2011.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

Idaho Appellate Rule 35 defines the content and arrangement of briefs on appeal. The process is straight forward and allows for an opening brief, response, and reply. The rule allows the appellant or cross-appellant to file a "brief in reply to the brief of respondent . . . which may contain additional argument in rebuttal to the contentions of the respondent." I.A.R. 35(c). Consistent with the rule, IGWA and Pocatello replied to the responses filed by IDWR and A&B. *See IGWA's Reply Br.* at 14; *Poc. Reply Br.* at 16-18. However, contrary to Rule 35(c), IGWA and Pocatello also improperly "responded" to A&B's reply brief and A&B's issues on appeal. *See IGWA's Reply Br.* at 5-14, 15; *Poc. Reply Br.* at 1-15. The Court's rules do not allow a party to further respond to an appellant's reply brief.

IGWA and Pocatello only raised one issue in their notices of appeal and opening briefs, the District Court's finding that the Director erred in failing to apply the proper evidentiary standard in evaluating injury to A&B's senior water right. *IGWA Opening Br.* at 14; *Poc. Opening Br.* at 11. Consequently, IGWA and Pocatello were prohibited from raising additional issues in their reply briefs. *Myers v. Workmen's Auto Ins. Co.*, 140 Idaho 495, 508 (2004). Since a brief on reply is limited to the issues addressed in the party's opening brief, or "in rebuttal to the contentions of the respondent," IGWA and Pocatello have no legal basis to further respond to A&B's issues on appeal in their reply briefs. *See Suitts v. Nix*, 141 Idaho 706, 708 (2005) ("A reviewing court looks only to the initial brief on appeal for the issues presented because those are the arguments and authority to which the respondent has an opportunity to

respond in the respondent's brief.”); *see also, In re Board of Psychologist Examiners’ Final Order Case No. PSY-PB4-01-010-002 ex rel. Wright*, 148 Idaho 542, 546 (2010).

Moreover, both IGWA and Pocatello already responded to A&B’s issues on appeal. *See Cross-Appellant Idaho Ground Water Appropriators, Inc.’s Opening Brief and Response Brief* at 33-48; *Respondent-Cross Appellant City of Pocatello’s Brief* at 11-25. Therefore, any further response to A&B’s appeal is prejudicial, untimely, and prohibited by the Appellate Rules. I.A.R. 35; *see also, Briefing Order* at 4. A&B respectfully requests the Court to strike those parts of *IGWA’s Reply Brief* (pp. 5-14, 15) and *Pocatello’s Reply Brief* (pp. 1-15) that improperly respond to A&B’s reply and do not address IGWA’s and Pocatello’s issues on appeal set forth in their opening briefs.

CONCLUSION

The Appellate Rules clearly define the content and arrangement of briefs filed with the Idaho Supreme Court. An appellant or cross-appellant is permitted to file a reply brief in support of that party’s issues identified in the opening brief and to rebut the contentions of a respondent. I.A.R. 35(c). IGWA and Pocatello have violated Rule 35 by further responding to A&B’s reply brief and attempting to raise issues beyond the scope of their opening briefs. Therefore, the parts of IGWA’s and Pocatello’s reply briefs that do not address their sole issue on appeal should be stricken pursuant to Idaho law.

DATED this 12th day of October, 2011.

BARKER ROSHOLT & SIMPSON LLP



Travis L. Thompson

Attorneys for A&B Irrigation District

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 12th day of October, 2011, I served true and correct copies of the foregoing upon the following by the method indicated:

Idaho Supreme Court
Clerk of the Court
P.O. Box 83720
451 W. State St.
Boise, ID 83720

☐ U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
☒ Hand Delivery
☐ Overnight Mail
☐ Facsimile
☐ Email

Garrick Baxter
Chris Bromley
Deputy Attorneys General
Idaho Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720-0098
garrick.baxter@idwr.idaho.gov
chris.bromley@idwr.idaho.gov

☒ U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
☐ Hand Delivery
☐ Overnight Mail
☐ Facsimile
☒ Email

Randy Budge
Candice M. McHugh
T.J. Budge
RACINE OLSON
P.O. Box 1391
Pocatello, Idaho 83204-1391
rcb@racinelaw.net
cmm@racinelaw.net

☒ U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
☐ Hand Delivery
☐ Overnight Mail
☐ Facsimile
☒ Email

Sarah Klahn
Mitra Pemberton
WHITE & JANKOWSKI, LLP
511 16th St., Suite 500
Denver, CO 80202
sarahk@white-jankowski.com
mitrap@white-jankowski.com

☒ U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
☐ Hand Delivery
☐ Overnight Mail
☐ Facsimile
☒ Email

Dean Tranmer
CITY OF POCATELLO
P.O. Box 4169
Pocatello, Idaho 83205
dtranmer@pocatello.us

☒ U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
☐ Hand Delivery
☐ Overnight Mail
☐ Facsimile
☒ Email

Jerry R. Rigby
RIGBY ANDRUS & RIGBY
25 N. 2ND East
P.O. Box 250
Rexburg, Idaho 83440-0250
jrigby@rex-law.com

☒ U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
☐ Hand Delivery
☐ Overnight Mail
☐ Facsimile
☒ Email


Travis L. Thompson