

1 IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
2  
IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF IOWA.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

3 Plaintiff,

6

-71-

7 VALLEY RIVER IRRIGATION  
8 DISTRICT, a corporation,  
et al.,

Dependente.

2000

H. D. G. - C. H. H. S.

Filed April 15th 1936  
J. E. Bonham, Clerk

**13** MILLIONS OF FARM AND CONSTRUCTION JOBS

the above entitled cause having been called for  
decision on January 10, 1930, and the Court having considered  
the law and the evidence, finds as follows:

19       I. Walker River Indian Reservation, hereinbefore re-  
20 ferred to as "Reservation", was set aside by the United States  
21 of America on November 29, 1866, for the use of the Shoshone  
22 tribe of Indians. In setting aside said Reservation the  
23 United States of America made no express reservation of any  
24 water rights for the irrigation of the lands thereof.

**RECEIVED**

FEB 14 2013

STATE ENGINEER'S OFFICE

BOARD 'S EXHIBITS 1052

DATE:

1       II. Walker River is an unnavigable, interstate stream  
2 consisting of two main branches, the East and West Walker  
3 Rivers, which are fed by many small streams most of which  
4 rise on the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in  
5 Alpine and Mono Counties, California. The West Walker River  
6 flows through Leavitt and Middle Meadows, two high mountain  
7 valleys, thence through a canyon with practically no cultivated  
8 areas, thence northerly and northwesterly through Antelope  
9 Valley into the State of Nevada, thence through Smith  
10 Valley to the head of Mason Valley where it joins the East  
11 Walker River. The principal streams forming the East Walker  
12 River combine in Bridgeret Meadows, which is a large area  
13 devoted to the raising of wild grasses and pasturage at an  
14 elevation of about sixty-eight hundred feet above sea level.  
15 The East Walker River flows northerly and northwesterly  
16 through canyons and sparsely populated valleys to Mason Valley,  
17 where it joins the West Walker River and forms the main Walker  
18 River. This river flows northerly and northwesterly through  
19 Mason Valley to near the town of Webster, where it turns ab-  
20 ruptly to the southeast and flows through the Reservation and  
21 thence into Walker Lake. The mountains at the source of  
22 these streams are sparsely forested and afford little protec-  
23 tion for the snows which melt rapidly in the spring months re-  
24 sulting in a rapid runoff of the water. From the source of  
25 the West Walker River to its junction with the East Walker  
26 River the distance is approximately sixty-six miles; from  
27 the source of the East Walker River to its junction with the  
28 West Walker River the distance is approximately seventy-four  
29 miles; and from the junction through Mason Valley to the  
30 point of diversion on the Reservation the distance is approx-  
31 imately thirty-seven miles; and from the latter point to  
32

1 Walker Lake the distance is approximately twelve miles. The  
2 flow of said river is variable from day to day, from month to  
3 month and from year to year. The peak flow occurs late in  
4 May or early in June and thereafter the water subsides rapidly  
5 so that in most years the flow by the middle of July is in-  
6 sufficient, without storage facilities, to meet the require-  
7 ments of the lands along the river which have been brought  
8 under cultivation. Even under natural conditions, that is,  
9 without upstream diversions, the water would not, in some  
10 years of low flow, reach the lands of the Reservation by the  
11 end of July by reason of seepage and high evaporation loss.

12 III. The lands along Walker River, including the  
13 lands in the Reservation, are arid and incapable of producing  
14 crops without artificial irrigation and there is no source of  
15 supply for the irrigation of the lands of the parties to this  
16 suit except Walker River and its tributaries.

17 IV. The first use of water from said river by the  
18 plaintiff and by the predecessors of the defendants was by  
19 means of the overflow of the river in periods of high water,  
20 but within a few years after said reservation was set aside  
21 the plaintiff and the settlers upstream commenced the construc-  
22 tion of ditches and dams for the diversion of the water upon  
23 their lands. The plaintiff from time to time enlarged and  
24 extended the irrigation ditches upon said reservation until  
25 there are now two canals thereon having a combined length of  
26 seventeen miles, a combined capacity of one hundred million  
27 cubic feet per second and lateral ditches having a combined  
28 length of thirteen miles. There are approximately two thou-  
29 sand one hundred acres of said Reservation under cultivation  
30 and irrigation and the Indians produce thereon valuable crops  
31 of alfalfa hay, grain, vegetables, fowl and livestock, part  
32 of which they are enabled to sell.

1        V. There are upon said Reservation approximately five  
2 hundred Indians. Ninety-six individual Indians are farming  
3 parts of one hundred forty allotments of twenty acres each and  
4 ninety-six allotments have homes on them. The Indians generally  
5 refuse to irrigate at night and there results a considerable  
6 loss of water by reason thereof. The number of Indians upon  
7 said Reservation is not increasing and it has not been shown  
8 that there is the necessity or demand by the Indians for the  
9 cultivation of a larger area of land than two thousand one  
10 hundred acres.

11        VI. The lands along Walker River and its tributaries  
12 above the Reservation were purchased from the United States  
13 under acts of Congress by the white settlers, the earliest  
14 title originating shortly after the establishment of said Re-  
15 servation and the water of Walker River was applied to benefi-  
16 cial use upon said lands by successive appropriations, the  
17 earliest appropriation being in 1860. In order to supplement  
18 the supply for irrigation purposes the settlers through the  
19 defendant, Walker River Irrigation District, constructed in  
20 1922 Topaz Lake Reservoir having a capacity of approximately  
21 fifty thousand acre feet and in 1924-25 Ridgeport Reservoir  
22 having a capacity of approximately forty-two thousand acre feet  
23 and is storing therein the surplus or flood waters of said  
24 river. The aggregate cost of these reservoirs was over Eight  
25 Hundred Thousand Dollars. No objection was made by the United  
26 States of America to the appropriation of water by the white  
27 settlers or their construction of expensive irrigation works  
28 and no proceedings were taken to determine or preserve the ran-  
29 gutive rights of the United States of America and the white  
30 settlers along said river until the commencement of this suit,  
31 notwithstanding the United States of America was given an op-  
32 portunity to become a party to the suit in this court entitled

1        "Pacific Livestock Company, a corporation, plaintiff, vs. T.  
2        B. Rickey, et al., defendants," No. 781 (hereinafter referred  
3        to as suit No. 781), which suit was brought for the purpose  
4        of determining all of the water rights in and to the waters of  
5        Walker River and its tributaries, commenced in 1904 and decided  
6        March 22, 1919, and was invited to file its pleadings in  
7        said suit as stipulated by nearly all of the parties thereto  
8        under date of May, 1907. The United States of America as  
9        late as 1910 relied upon the doctrine of appropriation for  
10       its rights, in which year the superintendent of the reservation,  
11       on behalf of the Indians, made application to appropriate  
12       public waters of the state of Nevada. The Sixty-ninth  
13       Congress authorized a reconnaissance in Seburz Canyon to de-  
14       termine to what extent the water supply of Walker River might  
15       be augmented, the feasibility of reservoir sites, the cost of  
16       rights of way, etc. Pursuant to this authorization, a com-  
17       prehensive report known as the Elmgren report was made Decem-  
18       ber 22, 1926, and the supervising engineer recommended to  
19       the government as follows:

20        1. That water rights be adjudicated at the earliest  
21        possible date.

22        2. That the entire river system be placed in  
23        charge of a water commissioner appointed by the Federal  
24        court, with instructions to require the installa-  
25        tion of suitable weirs, headgates, and measuring  
26        devices by all diverters.

27        3. That a storage reservoir be created for the  
28        Indian land of Walker River Indian Reservation by the  
29        construction of a dam at the Rio Vista site, and that  
30        the irrigation system be extended to cover the entire  
31        irrigable area of the reservation."

32        It was found by Special Master Harry Chaffell in said

1 suit No. 731 and conceded by the defendants in this suit that  
2 the United States of America had appropriated from the Walker  
3 River and applied to beneficial use upon the lands of the  
4 Reservation for the use of the Indians, the quantities of  
5 water in cubic feet per second with dates of priority and the  
6 number of acres irrigated thereby, as follows:

Priority	c.f.s.	Acre
1868	4.70	305.95
1872	5.55	295.80
1875	6.15	512.80
1883	7.50	625.80
1886	1.05	65.80

7 VII. The areas irrigated from said river, exclusive  
8 of the irrigated lands in the Reservation, are approximately  
9 as follows:

Bridgewater Meadow	20,000 acres
Narrow valleys on East Walker	16,000 acres
Antelope Valley	13,000 acres
Smith Valley	15,000 acres
Mason Valley	40,000 acres

10 VIII. There is a considerable return flow into Walker  
11 River from the water diverted for irrigation in the valleys  
12 above said Reservation, which augments to a certain extent  
13 the flow in the river at said Reservation, but the data fur-  
14 nished in the evidence is insufficient upon which to base any  
15 findings as to the quantity of such return flow.

16 IX. The assessed valuation of the lands in Walker  
17 River Irrigation District is approximately Four Millions Dol-  
18 lars. The annual production consisting of alfalfa hay, vege-  
19 tables, grain, dairy products, wool, eggs, fowl and livestock  
20 produced upon the lands watered by said river, exclusive of  
21 the lands of said Reservation, are of the value of upwards of  
22

1 Two Million Dollars. Walker River Irrigation District covers  
2 an area of one hundred sixty thousand acres of irrigable land,  
3 not all of which is irrigated, and extends up Walker River and  
4 its tributaries to the California State Line. The population  
5 of the District is approximately three thousand and that of  
6 Bridgeport and Antelope Valleys, in California, approximately  
7 six hundred.

8 X. The parties to this suit in their pleadings have  
9 recognized as effective and binding the water and ditch rights  
10 along Walker River with the priorities which were adjudicated  
11 by the final decree of this Court in the cause entitled "Sierra  
12 Pacific Livestock Company, a corporation, plaintiff, vs. T. D.  
13 Rickey, et al, defendants," in Equity No. 731, but subject to  
14 the rights and priorities which the Court shall find the plain-  
15 tiff and Sierra Pacific Power Company shall be entitled to,  
16 which adjudicated rights are set forth in detail in the decree  
17 accompanying these findings and which description in said de-  
18 crece is made a part hereof by reference as fully as though  
19 said description were fully set forth herein.

20 XI. The parties to this suit have stipulated as fol-  
21 lows respecting the relative water rights other than those of  
22 the plaintiff and Sierra Pacific Power Company, of the water  
23 users along the Walker River and its tributaries, which were  
24 not adjudicated by said decree in said Suit No. 731:

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

UNITED STATES v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, ET AL.,  
C. - 126

In order to shorten the trial of this case, and to facilitate its early determination, the plaintiff is willing to make concessions to certain defendants provided they are assented to by the other parties hereto.

The plaintiff concedes to the defendants herein-after named for and appurtenant to the lands belonging to said defendants respectively, the following water rights on and along the Walker River and its tributaries in Nevada and in California, with the priorities also hereafter named in connection therewith; except that the priorities and water rights of the plaintiff, United States of America, as they may be fixed and determined by the court shall take their places in the order of priorities so that said defendants' rights as so conceded, which are subsequent to the rights of the United States as they may be fixed and determined by the court herein shall be subordinate to the rights of the United States.

All the rights of the defendants as hereby conceded shall be fixed and determined upon the basis of the doctrine or law of appropriation and not upon the doctrine or law of riparian rights.

The duty of water shall be at the rate of .016 cubic feet of water per second of time per acre foot.

1       each acre of land irrigated during the irrigation  
2       season. In Bridgeport Valley on the West Fork of  
3       the Walker River, and at all points above Coleville,  
4       Gauging Station on the West Fork of the Walker River,  
5       the irrigation season covers the period from March  
6       1st to September 15th in each year, and at other  
7       points on said river the irrigation season shall con-  
8       form to the season fixed in Decree #731. The water  
9       shall be measured at the point of diversion from the  
10      river.

11      The names of the defendants included in this con-  
12      cession; the description of the lands; the dates of  
13      priorities, and the areas are as follows:

14  
15      (For the sake of brevity the schedule of the rights  
16      covered by this stipulation is not set forth herein, but is  
17      set forth in detail in the decree accompanying these findings  
18      under the head of "Rights of Other Defendants not included in  
19      the Decree in said suit No. 731," which schedule in said de-  
20      cree is made a part hereof by reference as fully as though  
21      said description were fully set forth herein.)

22  
23      "The irrigated areas and reservoir capacities re-  
24      ferred to in the foregoing tabulation shall be verified  
25      by rough survey made by the engineers or representa-  
26      tives of the said defendants above named, and checked  
27      and approved by the engineers or representatives of  
28      the plaintiff prior to insertion in any final decree  
29      entered herein. In the preparation of the recommended  
30      and final decree in this cause, the plaintiff shall

31  
32

1                   not be precluded from correcting any errors, omissions,  
2                   mis-calculations, land descriptions or duplications  
3                   of lands or water rights contained in the foregoing  
4                   tabulations.

5                   The court shall retain jurisdiction of this cause  
6                   for the purpose of changing the duty of water or for  
7                   correcting or modifying the decree to be entered; al-  
8                   so for other regulatory purposes, including a change  
9                   of the place of use of any water user, but no water  
10                  shall be sold or delivered outside of the basin of the  
11                  Walker River (except that appurtenant to the lands of  
12                  Eres. J. A. Conway and R. P. Conway, referred to in the  
13                  foregoing tabulation). The decree shall provide for  
14                  the method and character of notice to be given respecting  
15                  any proposed changes or modifications thereof.  
16                  The decree shall contain such other provisions as  
17                  may be determined proper by the court for the ad-  
18                  ministration of the decree and the distribution of  
19                  water thereunder.

20                  All the foregoing is subject to such rights and  
21                  priority or priorities for the plaintiff's lands,  
22                  and water rights as may be determined by the court.

23                  This, and the foregoing concession and tabula-  
24                  tion does not include and does not refer to the  
25                  lands and water rights of the Sierra Pacific Lumber  
26                  Company, and is without prejudice to their claim  
27                  of riparian rights. Whatever rights are claimed  
28                  by said Sierra Pacific Company are unaffected  
29                  by this concession to the other defendants, and are  
30                  unaffected by their assent thereto."

31  
32

1           XII. The irrigation season along the Walker River,  
2 its branches and its tributaries, extends from the first day  
3 of March to the thirtieth day of September of each year, ex-  
4 cept that in Bridgeport Valley on the East Walker River and  
5 at all points above Coleville Gauging station on the West  
6 Walker River the irrigation season covers the period from  
7 March first to September fifteenth of each year.

8           XIII. Sierra Pacific Power Company is the owner of  
9 2638.94 acres of land in Mono County, California, at the head  
10 waters of West Walker River, described as follows:

11           SWAMP LANDS acquired under the Act of Congress of  
12 September 28, 1850,

13            $\frac{3}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of Sec. 23;  
14            $\frac{3}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , of Sec. 24;  $\frac{3}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of  
Sec. 25;  $\frac{1}{4}$  of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  $\frac{1}{4}$  of  
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 26;  $\frac{1}{4}$  of SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
Sec. 27; T. 6 N., R. 23 E.

15           NE $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec.  
16           18; NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 22; NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
Sec. 20; T. 6 N., R. 23 E. M. D. E.  
& M.

17           SCHOOL LANDS acquired under the Act of Congress of  
18 March 3, 1853, described as follows;

19            $\frac{3}{4}$  of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
Sec. 16; T. 7 N., R. 23 E. M. D. E.  
& M. Surveyed March 30, 1860.

20           SCHOOL LANDS acquired under the Act of Congress  
21 of March 3, 1853, with certificate numbers of selection by  
22 the State of California and the date of approval by the Sec-  
23 retary of the Interior as follows:

24           SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 10; T. 6 N., R. 23 E.  
25           SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ; Sec. 22;  $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , NW $\frac{1}{4}$   
26           of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 27; T. 7 N., R. 23 E.  
M. D. E. & M.  
27           Acquired under certificate 12,717, ap-  
28           proved June 25, 1896.

1           SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 4; W $\frac{1}{2}$  of  
2           NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , W $\frac{1}{2}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 5; E $\frac{1}{2}$   
3           of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 21; T. 7 N., R. 23 E.,  
M. D. B. & M.  
Acquired under certificate 12,165, ap-  
proved June 25, 1896.

4           Lots 2 and 3 of Section 4; T. 7 N., R.  
5           23 E., M. D. B. & M.  
Acquired under certificate 13,549, ap-  
proved June 25, 1896.

6           W $\frac{1}{2}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 23; T. 8  
7           N., R. 23 E., M. D. B. & M.  
Acquired under certificate 12,513, ap-  
proved June 25, 1896.

8           W $\frac{1}{2}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 15; T. 6  
9           E., R. 23 E.  
10          NE $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 28; T. 8 N., R. 23  
11          E., M. D. B. & M.  
12          Acquired under certificate 12,045, ap-  
proved June 15, 1896.

13          NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 28; T. 8 E., R. 23 N.,  
14          excepting 3.72 acres, rectangular in form,  
15          at the Northwest corner of said NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of  
16          NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , M. D. B. & M.  
17          Acquired under certificate 17,405, ap-  
18          proved June 15, 1896.

19          SE $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 4; T. 6 N., R. 23 W.  
20          SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 21; NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec.  
21          28; T. 7 N., R. 23 E., M. D. B. & M.  
22          Acquired under certificate 12,157, ap-  
23          proved January 2, 1902.

24          The above described lands are riparian to West Cal-  
25          ker River and its tributaries at the head waters thereof in  
26          that each separate tract originally acquired under a single  
27          title borders on said river or its tributaries. The water  
28          has been diverted from said river and its tributaries, Green  
29          Creek and Poor Creek, by said Sierra Pacific Power Company  
30          and its predecessors in interest from the year 1901 and for  
31          sometime prior thereto by means of nine small ditches and  
32          applied to the lands for the irrigation thereof. The lands  
so irrigated comprise three hundred twenty-two acres of ir-  
rigated land and twelve acres of natural overflowed land  
situated in the following described parcels in Pickle Meadows,

Mono County, California

CH. of M.D., Bk. of SWL, SEI, Sec. 26;  
CH. of M.D., Sec. 24; Wk. of M.D., Bk.  
of SWL, KNA of SWL, Sec.  
26; T. 6 N., R. 22 E.;  
NE. of SWL, SWL of SEI, CH. of SWL,  
Sec. 18; T. 6 N., R. 26 E., H. D.  
B. A. H.

The time of the diversion of said waters and putting  
same to a beneficial use for irrigation prior to 1901 was not  
established by the evidence. The irrigating season in said  
Pickle Meadow was stipulated to be from April first to Sep-  
tember fifteenth of each year. One-fortieth of a cubic foot  
of water per second is necessary for the irrigation of each  
of said three hundred twenty-two acres of land, or a total of  
8.05 cubic feet per second for all of said land.

15 By reason of the situation of said lands and the  
16 fall of the waters flowing over and across the same, said  
17 lands are adaptable, and said waters can be beneficially used  
18 by said Sierra Pacific Power Company for the hydraulic effect  
19 of the same in the production of power and in the generation  
20 of electricity.

XIV. During the final hearings before the Master, it was stipulated by counsel representing all of the parties to the suit that W. S. Morgan, successor to Spence L. Gregory, by his predecessors in interest, appropriated in 1850 and beneficially used thereafter from the waters of Rough Creek and its tributaries 1.20 a. f. s. of water for the irrigation of seventy-five acres of land out of the following described parcels situated in Township 5 North, Range 27 West.

1                          SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of Section 8;  
2                          SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of Section 9;  
3                          NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NE $\frac{1}{4}$  of Section 16;  
4                          NW $\frac{1}{4}$  or NE $\frac{1}{4}$  of Section 17;

5 and it was further stipulated that a supplemental answer and  
6 counterclaim of H. S. Morgan setting forth such rights be  
7 waived and that he be adjudged to have such rights.

8                          XV. It was also stipulated that as to the rights of  
9 Ira Fallon set forth in the stipulation respecting the rights  
10 other than those covered by said decree No. 731, a duplication  
11 of rights amounting to 4.63 c. f. s. had been included in  
12 said stipulation and that 4.63 c. f. s. of water should be  
13 deducted from the stipulated rights so that the allotment to  
14 him under said last mentioned stipulation should stand as  
15 follows:

Date	Water used for Irrigation in c. f. s.	Acrea irrigated	Stream
1874	5.14	428	
1880	2.644	220	
1891	.936	78	

16 for use upon the following described lands:

17                          NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 2; T. 14 N., R. 26 E.  
18                          SW $\frac{1}{4}$  or SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 20; NE $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
19                          Sec. 24; NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ; SW $\frac{1}{4}$  or SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
20                          NE $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 26; NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
21                          EW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 26; NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NE $\frac{1}{4}$  of  
22                          NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NE $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ; NE $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$   
23                          of SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 26; NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec.  
24                          26; T. 15 N., R. 26 E.

25                          XVI. It was also stipulated that Joe Scierung acquired  
26 from Mono County, California, under date of May 6, 1929, since  
27 the commencement of this suit, the following described lands  
28 and the water rights for the irrigation thereof from Virginia  
29 and Dogtown Creeks, to-wit:

1	Date	Water used for irriga- tion in c. f. s.	Acres irri- gated	Description
2	1861	1.28	80	N <sup>W</sup> of NE <sup>1/4</sup> , SE <sup>1/4</sup> of NW <sup>1/4</sup> , NW <sup>1/4</sup> of SW <sup>1/4</sup> , Sec. 21; SW <sup>1/4</sup> of NW <sup>1/4</sup> , Sec. 22; T. 4 N., R. 25 E., N. P. B. & M.
3	1863	1.28	80	
4				
5				and it was further stipulated that the filing of a supplement- al answer and cross complaint by said Joe Scierine be waived and that he be entitled to said claim in the decree.
6				
7				XVII. Antelope Valley Mutual Water Company is a cor- poration organized under the laws of the State of Nevada.
8				It is the successor in interest of all the rights of Ante- lope Valley Land and Cattle Company in and to the waters of
9				West Walker River and its tributaries except certain rights
10				conveyed to A. A. Pitt, Edmond Powell, J. A. McAllister and
11				Bruce Chichester, aggregating 5.26 c. f. s. It has no in- terest in the lands upon which said water is used but acts
12				as an agent for the distribution of such water to the
13				owners of the lands who in the main acquired them from Ante- lope Valley Land and Cattle Company. Antelope Valley Mutual
14				Water Company has changed its application of the water under
15				its priority of 1864 for 17,60 cubic feet of water per sec- ond for the irrigation of eleven hundred acres of land along
16				the West Walker River known as the Nevada Lands, Rickett Ranch,
17				as shown in said suit No. 781, to the following described
18				lands and that such substitution does not impair the rights
19				of other parties to this suit.
20				
21				N <sup>W</sup> of NW <sup>1/4</sup> , Sec. 4; E <sup>1/2</sup> of SE <sup>1/4</sup> , SW <sup>1/4</sup> of NW <sup>1/4</sup> , SW <sup>1/4</sup> of NW <sup>1/4</sup> , NW <sup>1/4</sup> of SW <sup>1/4</sup> , Sec. 5; SE <sup>1/4</sup> of NW <sup>1/4</sup> , W <sup>1/2</sup> of SW <sup>1/4</sup> , Sec. 6; T. 9 N., R. 25 E.
22				N <sup>W</sup> of NW <sup>1/4</sup> , Sec. 31; T. 9 N., R. 25 E.
23				SE <sup>1/4</sup> of NW <sup>1/4</sup> , SW <sup>1/4</sup> of SW <sup>1/4</sup> , Sec. 18; NE <sup>1/4</sup> of NW <sup>1/4</sup> , SW <sup>1/4</sup> of SW <sup>1/4</sup> , Sec. 19; SE <sup>1/4</sup> of NW <sup>1/4</sup> , Sec. 30; T. 9 N., R. 25 E.
24				SW <sup>1/4</sup> of NW <sup>1/4</sup> , Sec. 7; W <sup>1/2</sup> of SW <sup>1/4</sup> , Sec.
25				

1                 16; SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , W $\frac{1}{2}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 55;  
2  
3

4                 XVIII. The defendant, Walker River Irrigation Dis-  
5                 trict, a corporation, is the owner of Bridgeport Reservoir,  
6                 having a present capacity of forty-two thousand acre feet,  
7                 situated on the East Walker River below the town of bridge-  
8                 port, and had made application to the State Water Commission  
9                 of the State of California for water appropriation from the  
10                 flood and unappropriated waters of East Walker River and  
11                 its tributaries for the purpose of storing said water in  
12                 said reservoir and distributing the same to its shareholders,  
13                 to supplement the use of water to which they are entitled  
14                 under the decree in case No. 731 as recognized by the stipu-  
15                 lations hereinbefore set forth when the flow of water in  
16                 said river is insufficient to meet their several recognized  
17                 rights.

18                 Said appropriation is as follows:

19                 Amended application number 1269, permit number 2536,  
20                 received by said Commission March 11, 1925, for sixty-three  
21                 thousand acre feet per annum, approved June 18, 1926, for the  
22                 amount of water applied for which can be beneficially used,  
23                 not to exceed fifty-seven thousand acre feet per annum, sub-  
24                 ject to vested rights, for storage to be collected from East  
25                 Walker River from September first to about July twentieth  
26                 of each season, the construction work was required to be  
27                 completed thereunder on or before July 1, 1927, and complete  
28                 application of the water to the proposed uses to be made on  
29                 or before August 1, 1929.

30                 And said Walker River Irrigation District is the owner  
31                 of Topaz Lake Reservoir, having a present capacity of fifty  
32                 thousand acre feet, situated near West Walker River below  
Antelope Valley and has made applications to the State Water  
Commission of the State of California for appropriations

1 from the flood and unappropriated waters of West Walker  
2 River and its tributaries for the purpose of storing said  
3 water in said reservoir and distributing the same to its  
4 shareholders, to supplement the use of water to which they  
5 are entitled under the decree in case No. 731 as recognized  
6 by the stipulations hereinbefore set forth when the flow  
7 of water in said river is insufficient to meet their several  
8 recognized rights.

9 Said appropriations are as follows:

10 Amended application number 2221, permit number 2507,  
11 received by said Commission March 11, 1925, for eighty-five  
12 thousand acre feet per annum, approved June 10, 1926, for  
13 the amount of water which can be beneficially used, not to  
14 exceed eighty-five thousand acre feet per annum, subject to  
15 vested rights, for storage in Topaz Lake Reservoir, to be  
16 collected from West Walker River from about October first to  
17 July fifteenth of each season, the construction work was  
18 required to be completed thereunder on or before January  
19 1, 1930.

20 Amended application number 2615, permit number 2530,  
21 received by said Commission April 26, 1926, for two hundred  
22 more feet per annum, approved June 10, 1926, for the amount  
23 of water which can be beneficially used, not to exceed two  
24 hundred acre feet per annum, subject to vested rights for  
25 storage in Topaz Lake Reservoir, to be collected from an  
26 unnamed stream, tributary of Topaz (formerly Alkali) Lake,  
27 from January first to December thirty-first of each season,  
28 construction work was required to be completed thereunder  
29 on or before June 1, 1930, and complete application of the  
30 water to the proposed use to be made on or before August 1,  
31 1933.

32 Said defendant, Walker River Irrigation District, has  
also made application to the State Water Commission of the

1 State of California for water appropriation for storage pur-  
2 poses as follows;

3 Amended application number 1097, permit number 2654,  
4 received by said Commission March 11, 1926, for thirty-five  
5 thousand acre feet per annum, approved June 18, 1926, for the  
6 amount of water which can be beneficially used, not to exceed  
7 thirty-five thousand acre feet per annum, subject to vested  
8 rights, for storage in Leavitt Meadows, to be collected from  
9 West Walker River from about January first to December thirty-  
10 first of each season, the construction work was required to  
11 be completed thereunder on or before December 1, 1929, and  
12 complete application of the water to the proposed use to be  
13 made on or before August 1, 1930,

14 Amended application number 1098, permit number 2656,  
15 received by said Commission March 11, 1926, for one hundred  
16 fifteen thousand acre feet per annum, approved June 18, 1926,  
17 for the amount of water which can be beneficially used, not  
18 to exceed one hundred fifteen thousand acre feet per annum,  
19 subject to vested rights, for storage in Pickle Meadows to  
20 be collected from West Walker River from January first to Dec-  
21 ember thirty-first of each season, the construction work was  
22 required to be completed thereunder on or before December 1,  
23 1929, and complete application of the water to the proposed  
24 use to be made on or before August 1, 1930.

25 The storage of water in said reservoirs between the  
26 first of November and the first of the succeeding March  
27 will not interfere with the water required for irrigation  
28 purposes by the other parties to this suit and the storage  
29 of water in said reservoirs from the water in said river in  
30 excess of the amounts adjudicated to the parties hereto under  
31 the decree in said suit No. 731 and recognized in the stipu-  
32

1 lations hereinbefore contained, and found herein for the  
2 United States of America and Sierra Pacific Power Company,  
3 will not interfere with the rights of the parties to this  
4 suit.

5 XIX. During the final hearings before the Master, it  
6 was stipulated by the attorneys for the parties to this suit  
7 that the applicants for permits filed with the State Engineer  
8 of Nevada for the use of water from Walker River and its  
9 tributaries so far as the applications therefore are in force  
10 may be decreed such rights in such waters as they may have,  
11 subject to vested rights and subject to final action thereon  
12 by said State Engineer.

13 The following is a schedule of such applications, so  
14 far as the same were presented, showing the name of the ap-  
15 plicant, the stream from which the water is to be diverted,  
16 the number of the application, the date of the application,  
17 the amount of water applied for in cubic feet per second,  
18 the number of acres to be irrigated, a description of the  
19 land in which the amount of land to be irrigated is to be  
20 found, the quantity of water allowed by the State Engineer  
21 and the number of acres to be irrigated thereby:

Name	Stream	Number	Date	Water applied	No. of acres	Description
				for		

22 Argus, Frank A.,

23	1259	January 20, 1909	.8	60	21.5 acres in SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ; 21.1 acres in SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ; Sec. 28; 4.7 acres in NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ; 32.7 acres in NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ; Sec. 32; T. 12 N., R. 30 E.
----	------	------------------	----	----	---

24 Approved for \_\_\_\_\_ 0,000.00 25 acres,

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

1 Regli, Paul,  
 2 West 1476 October 8.66 820 4 acres in NW<sub>1</sub> of  
 3 Walker 25,1900 NE<sub>1</sub>, 20 acres in  
 4 NE<sub>1</sub> of NE<sub>1</sub>, 7 acres  
 5 in SW<sub>1</sub> of NE<sub>1</sub>, 26  
 6 acres in SE<sub>1</sub> of NW<sub>1</sub>,  
 7 36 acres in NW<sub>1</sub> of  
 8 SW<sub>1</sub>, 14 acres in  
 9 NE<sub>1</sub> of SW<sub>1</sub>, 38 acres  
 10 in SW<sub>1</sub> of SW<sub>1</sub>, 10  
 11 acres in SE<sub>1</sub> of SW<sub>1</sub>,  
 12 Sec. 25; T. 12 R.  
 13 R. 23 E.  
 14 Approved for 1,67 c.f.s. and 157 acres.  
 15  
 16 Yeager, J. D., et al.,  
 17 West 1619 February 8.66 830  
 18 Walker 25,1910  
 19 River  
 20 Approved for 1,6200 c.f.s. and 152,02 acres.  
 21 Approved for .6304 c.f.s. and 63,04 acres.  
 22 Garney, Henry, Succeeded by L. E. Wedertz,  
 23 Succeeded by F. E. Wedertz, Succeeded by  
 24 C. E. Wedertz,  
 25 West 1630 March 1.53 160 60 acres in S<sub>1</sub> of  
 26 Walker 25,1910 SE<sub>1</sub>, Sec. 16; 60  
 27 River acres in NW<sub>1</sub> of NE<sub>1</sub>,  
 28 Sec. 23; T. 11 R.  
 29 R. 23 E.  
 30 Approved for 1,64 c.f.s. and 160 acres.  
 31 Arenz, Samuel,  
 32 West 1776 August  
 33 10, 1914  
 34 Approved for 3.2 c.f.s. and 320 acres.  
 35 Butler, J. D., Succeeded by Ugo  
 36 and Giulio Giorgi,  
 37 West 2040 May 9.6 960  
 38 Walker 25, 1911  
 39 River  
 40 Approved under certificate 1200 for  
 41 79 c.f.s. and 79 acres  
 42 39.5 acres in SW<sub>1</sub>  
 43 of SE<sub>1</sub>, Sec. 21;  
 44 39.5 acres in SE<sub>1</sub>

1						
2						
3	Butler, J. D., Succeeded by Isabel Foster Bernard,					
4	East 2040 May 9.6 960					
5	Walker 8, 1911					
6	River					
7	Approved under certificate 1801 for 1.5656 c.f.s. and 158.56 acres					
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15	Butler, J. D., Succeeded by Joseph Traille,					
16	East 2040 May 9.6 960					
17	Walker 8, 1911					
18	River					
19	Approved under certificate 1802 for 1.3056 c.f.s. and 130.56 acres.					
20						
21						
22						
23	Butler, J. D., Succeeded by D. J. Kennahan,					
24	East 2040 May 9.6 960					
25	Walker 8, 1911					
26	River					
27	Approved under certificate 1803 for 1.707 c.f.s. and 170.7 acres.					
28						
29						
30						
31	Butler, J. D. Succeeded by Leslie A. L. Green,					
32	East 2040 May 9.6 960					
33	Walker 8, 1911					
34	River					

1 Approved under certificate 1804 for  
 2 .3566 c.f.s. and 39.66 acres.  
 3 SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 32;  
 4 Approved under certificate 1804 for  
 5 .3904 c.f.s. and 39.04 acres.  
 6 SE $\frac{1}{4}$  of SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 31;  
 7 T. 13 N., R. 36 E.  
 8 Arenz, Franklin, succeeded by  
 9 Mason Valley Bank,  
 10 West 2523 October 2.3 220  
 11 Walker 9, 1912  
 12 Approved under certificate 664 for  
 13 1.851 c.f.s. and 165.1 acres.  
 14 40 acres in NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of  
 15 NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 40 acres in  
 16 SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 37.6  
 17 acres in NE $\frac{1}{4}$  of  
 18 SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 40 acres in  
 19 NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 9.6  
 20 acres in SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of  
 21 SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 17.9 acres in  
 22 SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 29;  
 23 T. 13 N., R. 36 E.  
 24 Penny, Oliver, A.,  
 25 West 3269 April 3.4 340  
 26 Walker 26, 1915  
 27 River  
 28 Approved for c.f.s. and acres.  
 29 Penny, Charles G.,  
 30 West 3570 April 2 200  
 31 Walker 26, 1915  
 32 River  
 33 Approved for c.f.s. and acres.  
 34 Lewis, Annette D.  
 35 West 4381 April 1 100  
 36 Walker 9, 1917  
 37 River  
 38 Approved for 1 c.f.s. and 95 acres.  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52

1      Nogli, Paul,  
 2      West 4391      April  
 3      Walker      10, 1917  
 4      River  
 5      No action by State Engineer.  
 6      Allup, R. W. and W. G.  
 7      4866      January 2, 1916      240      9 $\frac{1}{2}$  of SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 1;  
 8      SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of  
 9      NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec.  
 10      12; T. 12 R., R.  
 11      25 E.  
 12      Approved for c.f.s. and acres.  
 13      Lewis, Armette D.,  
 14      East 5052      May 1      100  
 15      Walker      4, 1916  
 16      River  
 17      Approved for c.f.s. and acres.  
 18      Wickman, John H. and James H.,  
 19      East 4694      December 4768      47.60      4.3 acres in NW $\frac{1}{4}$   
 20      Walker superseded 12  
 21      River      4296      1916      of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 8;  
 22      13.10 acres in  
 23      NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , .75  
 24      acres in NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of  
 25      SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 7.9 acres  
 26      in NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
 27      1.17 acres in  
 28      SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 1.9  
 29      acres in SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of  
 30      SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 6.10 acres  
 31      in SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
 32      6.41 acres in  
 33      SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 4  
 34      acres in SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of  
 35      SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Sec. 9; T.  
 36      8 R., R. 27 E.  
 37      Approved for 4768 c.f.s. and 47.60 acres  
 38      with priority of filing application  
 39      number 4346, December 13, 1916.  
 40      Parker, George,  
 41      Birmingham 3850      March 4782      66.88      12.56 acres in  
 42      Slough      13, 1916      NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
 43      (a part of  
 44      Walker  
 45      River)  
 46      10.50 acres in  
 47      SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
 48      25.60 acres in  
 49      SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
 50      13.94 acres in  
 51      NW $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  
 52

S. 56 acres in H.P.  
of S.E. 19.66 acre  
in S.E. of H.P., Sec.  
20, T. 15 R., R. 2  
S.

Approved for 0.6703 c,f,s, and 07.03 p,r,m.

All of the land hereinabove described is situated in townships north and ranges east of Mount Diablo base and meridian and the designation S.E., S., W., & NW is hereby made a part of each description of land as fully as if specifically set forth.

### **SOURCE OF TAX**

Even if a reservation of water may be implied in the executive order of 1859, yet the facts and circumstances have shown it to be the conclusion that the interests of the white settlers, enjoyed without challenge for more than fifty years, should not be disturbed.

Upon the facts found, the Court concludes as follows:

1. The law or doctrine of appropriation did not ord  
riparian rights applies to all the claims of all the parties  
to this suit in and to the waters of Walker River and its tri-  
butaries, save and except defendant, Sierra Pacific Power  
Company, whose rights shall be determined by the doctrine or  
law of riparian rights, as recognized by statute and decisions  
in the State of California.

87           II. The plaintiff, the United States of America, is  
88 entitled to a decree that it is the owner and entitled to the  
89 use of, upon the Reservation, by right of appropriation, the

1 amounts of water from Walker River, at the points of diversion,  
2 with priorities and acreage to be irrigated as set forth in  
3 the aforesaid findings of fact.

4 III. Sierra Pacific Power Company, a corporation, is  
5 entitled to a decree that it is the owner of the lands in the  
6 State of California described in paragraph XIII. of the afore-  
7 said findings of fact and that said corporation is the owner  
8 of and entitled to the use of a flow of 0.05 s. f. c. under  
9 its riparian rights in and to the waters of West Walker River,  
10 Green Creek and Poor Creek, tributaries of West Walker River,  
11 for the irrigation of three hundred twenty-five acres of land  
12 in Pickle Meadows, Mono County, California, and embraced  
13 within the land specifically described in paragraph XIII. of  
14 the aforesaid findings of fact. That said Sierra Pacific  
15 Power Company, a corporation, as a riparian owner is entitled  
16 to a decree to the use of the hydraulic effect of the waters  
17 of the said West Walker River for power purposes for the gen-  
18 eration of electricity and has the right for such purpose to  
19 divert said waters by means of a dam or flume across said  
20 stream on its own land, and to erect flumes or conduits, and  
21 such machinery as the stream at ordinary stages is adequate  
22 for such purpose to propel said machinery and produce power  
23 and electricity and after such use shall return such waters  
24 to the natural channel of said stream without unreasonable de-  
25 tention or substantial diminution in quantity or quality.

26 IV. The parties to this suit and their successors in  
27 interest claiming rights under the decree in suit No. 731 in  
28 this Court, are entitled to a decree that they are the owners  
29 and entitled to the use of the several quantities of water  
30 from Walker River and its tributaries under the priorities  
31 and applicable to the lands as found in paragraph X. of the  
32 aforesaid findings of fact and as set forth in the tabulations  
revised to show the present ownership specifically set forth

1       in the decrees accompanying the findings of fact aforesaid and  
2       these conclusions of law,

3              V. The parties defendant to this suit other than  
4       those whose rights were adjudicated under said decree No. 731,  
5       are entitled to a decree that they are the owners and en-  
6       titled to the use of the several quantities of water under the  
7       priorities and applicable to the lands described in the stip-  
8       ulation set forth in paragraph XI, of the aforesaid find-  
9       ings of fact with the specific amounts of water, priorities  
10      and land to which applicable, included in the stipulation  
11      and set forth in detail in the decree accompanying the find-  
12      ings of fact aforesaid and these conclusions of law.

13             VI. W. S. Morgan is entitled to a decree adjudging him  
14      to be the owner and entitled to the use of 1.2 c.f.s. of the  
15      water of Rough Creek, a tributary of East Walker River, with  
16      a priority of 1860, for the irrigation of seventy-two acres  
17      of land described in paragraph XIV, of the aforesaid find-  
18      ings of fact.

19             VII. Ira Fallon is entitled to a decree adjudging  
20      him to be the owner of and entitled to the use of 5.14 c.f.s.  
21      of the priority of 1874, 2.614 c.f.s. of the priority of  
22      1880 and .936 c.f.s. of the priority of 1891, of the waters  
23      of Walker River, in addition to the water allocated to him  
24      under said decree No. 731, for use upon the lands specific-  
25      ally described in paragraph XV, of the aforesaid findings of  
26      fact.

27             VIII. Joe Scierine, as the successor of Mono County,  
28      California, in the lands hereinafter referred to, is entitled  
29      to a decree adjudging him to be the owner and entitled to the  
30      use of 1.28 c.f.s. of the priority of 1861 and 1.26 c.f.s. of  
31      the priority of 1863, of the waters of Virginia and Dogtown  
32      Creeks for application upon the lands specifically described

1 in paragraph XVI. of the aforesaid findings of fact.

3 The Walker River Irrigation District, a corporation,  
4 is entitled to a decree adjudging it to be the owner of  
5 Peidaport Reservoir on East Walker River, having a present  
6 capacity of forty-two thousand acre feet and to be the owner  
7 of Topaz Lake Reservoir near West Walker River, having a  
8 present capacity of fifty thousand acre feet and authorized  
9 to divert and store in said reservoirs from the East and  
10 West Walker Rivers, respectively, and their tributaries,  
11 flood and unappropriated waters of said streams to the  
12 extent of the respective capacities of said reservoirs for  
13 the use of its shareholders, such diversion to be made annually  
14 during the season from November first to March first  
15 and at other times when there is an excess of water in said  
16 rivers over the amounts severally adjudicated to the other  
17 parties to this suit, but such diversion should not be permitted  
18 to the extent of depriving each party of water for  
19 stock watering and for domestic purposes and/or water now  
in use for power purposes.

Said Walker River Irrigation District is entitled to a decree for storage purposes of flood and unappropriated waters under applications made to and approved by the State Water Commission of the State of California for fifteen thousand acre feet per annum from East Walker River for storage in Bridgeport Reservoir; being the difference between the quantity approved by said Commission under permit No. 2536 and the present capacity of said reservoir; thirty-five thousand acre feet per annum from West Walker River for storage in Topaz Lake Reservoir, being the difference between the quantity approved by said Commission under permit No. 2657 and the present capacity of said reservoir; two hundred acre feet per annum from an unnamed stream flowing into

1 Topaz Lake Reservoir, formerly Alkali Lake, for storage in  
2 said reservoir; thirty-five thousand acre feet per annum  
3 from West Walker River for storage in a reservoir to be  
4 constructed in Leavitt Meadows and one hundred thirteen  
5 thousand acre feet per annum from West Walker River for  
6 storage in a reservoir to be constructed in Pickle Meadow,  
7 subject to vested rights and subject to prior appropriation  
8 made under permits issued by the State Engineer of the State  
9 of Nevada and subject to final action on said application  
10 made by said Walker River Irrigation District to the State  
11 Water Commission of the State of California.

12                   X. The following persons:

13                   Frank A. Arntz  
14                   Paul Becht  
15                   J. D. Yeager  
16                   Henry Carnoy  
17                   Samuel Arntz  
18                   J. B. Ratlee  
19                   Franklin Arntz  
20                   Oliver A. Perry  
21                   Charles D. Perry  
22                   Annette D. Lewis  
23                   R. W. Allman  
24                   John H. and James H. Micham

25 who have made application to the State Engineer of the State  
26 of Nevada for permits for use of water of Walker River and  
27 its tributaries specifically set forth in the findings of  
28 fact aforesaid, are entitled to a decree adjudging them to  
29 be severally the owners and entitled to the use of the  
30 amounts of water, the land to which the water is to be ap-  
31 plied and the priorities allowed by said State Engineer, sub-  
32 ject to compliance with the requirements under the respective  
33 permits issued to them and to final action thereon by said  
34 State Engineer, and subject to prior vested rights.

35                   DONE IN OPEN COURT this 14th day of April, 1938.

36

37

A. F. ST. GERS  
United States District Judge,