




Page - 1

To SRBA: District Court, with att.
to ~~Deputy Attorney General~~ Mr. Nick Spencer
and to Mr. ERIC J. Wildman, Presiding Judge
Snake River Basin Adjudication.

I which I do not have an address for on the
last 2 two parties. So I will Fax these
to the SRBA, on Case # 39576 - Subcase -
#63,32533. This is pertaining to Our
original water right # 63,4035, Established
in 1933 By my Grandfather, and approved
By the State of Idaho. Which is stated
By Idaho Dept of Water Resources, Boise, ID,
and prepared and given to SRBA, Old Recommendations
extended use of this water ~~Right~~ Rights.

In this document it clearly states
a Priority Date of 11-04-1933, this property
is a homestead or it was homesteaded By
My Grandfather.

Date of Priority means to me
that under State Law, anyone trying
or giving Rights to this water after
this date ¹⁹³³ we carry or obtain the
Right to ask them to Cease using this
Water By means of Pivots Pumps Ect., until
I can irrigate this portion of the 6.75 acre field
a 1 1/2 day Job. not a phase. Shut your water
off in the next 11:00 hour.

continued ->

100 #2

This is why the State of Idaho Made
this Law I am pretty sure, I'm meaning
to protect our interest in Crops, and or
live stock, from drying up and not
being able to produce. Note. Under Water
Rights, Paper work, It States Water is a
publicly owned resource, But water Rights to
use water is privately owned, which has been
proven this was done, on the part of Privately
owned "Molybe By the state". By I legally by getting
and given By the State of Idaho this water
Right # original # 634035 and updated By
Right # or Subcase # 63-32533. Which should
Remain the same Water Right Just as the
original water Right in 1933.

Which should State and Does state,
under Water Rights, "Paragraph" What are the elements
of a water Right, "Priority Date" - Seniority
date of Right. Idaho follows the Appropriation
Doctrine for older Rights to be satisfied before
younger Rights can be used, ("First in time, first
rights?") Priority is key to using water rights.

Another issue I have is that
The Lawyers or whoever that I stated
about that My Riverside Water Right
should not be allowed to be
Entered into this correspondence
is because this is not what
is being disputed. The Casodiam is.

50 please let me explain, #3
This River Side Right, is only part
of what this other Water Right is
Consistent with to irrigate this
6.75 Acre Field # old 634035 new 63-3253
as Reference to. Which I feel might
be taking place by setting this
River side Right into for open For discussion
Maybe be a description in a disagreement
with People and Myself: People meaning
SRBA, Wilder & Ingerton, there lawyers,
ect ect.. making a false discussion.

Why I say this is Because I
have tried to get Bous a number
of times to come down, besides,
the time only once they did to
Present a reconcondition to the SRBA.
And they tell me they cant, there
hands are tied, by only the SRBA
giving them permission. they meaning
IDWR..

So about 7 or 50 days ago I
walked 1 1/2 miles down this drain
and shot 120 Pictures of this
Core drain. This is dead of Winter
Pictures, showing Live Water running
the entire way and its Clearness
Vissability, and Rippling movement
on said Drain. And all Corrugated Pipe
all old Field come into this. cont.

Case Drain which we retain a water Right For #6332533.

These Corrugated Pipes of all fields show no Draining what so ever, this is Live Running Water. The only Way this Will Stop could Be Earthquakes younger Pivots Sprinkler Systems or Wilder Irrigation Deferring this water.

I feel that Wilder Irrigation is trying to get the wording just such as they state, if it goes dry we dont have to supply you with this water. It is no going to go dry unless the situations that I have described.

"I have a Big Problem With this."

and there I am trying to get this, and make anyone Believe this, such as SRBA, or any other entities involved.

I feel that they have tried desperately to do so By saying I havent Responded to some Sort or another so they want it to lean in there favor.

cont,

Why I have said this and the #1 Reason I am saying this. Is because I feel I am being con yourself misled. By wilders Lawing to get this wordy, which infringes upon my Rights.

Example. Have them prove that I Received this mail they desperately lean on saying I haven't Responded.

I say this because I can prove through Many Many Neibours that there Mail has ended up in my Mailbox and I have personally have taken By My Car and Found these people and told them there is your mail. I believe it was put into my Box. They say thank you.

Where my mail has gone that I have been missing I have no Idea. Maybe they say that mine 'Grash' I am missing important mail for other Business Dealings also. To prove this I need to ~~scrap~~ Call into Court to prove to you this is not Test words. I hold merrett. We have had many Problems with Postal cont.

Service before and Sense they#6
Changed officium Wilder Id.

But I cant because
I cant have anyone speak
as SRBA, stated other than
my self.

So in this I ask is this
fare?

This is why I have
written my alter to amend.
and 2 other letter from the
very beginning.

These letters I ask
to have a trial by a Judge
with the option to elect a Jury
to be assembled. "Probably my Court"
No problem!

But I have been denied
the ability to so, or have
witnesses to testify in my behalf
or the right to cross examine
the lawyers or any Real trial
No disrespect. So I feel cornered
in this line with not one
thing I can do. Jury of my peers
which I also get to say yes or no
to. My peers would to to get
selected would be farmers not
city people. Scary. To decide this
Cont

matter, this means because of the deception I feel should have taken place.

I also could prove by trial that employees of the State maybe an State. But they are people that carry out your order I think

Board Member, Ext, ext, ext in my area. Not Iron twin fall. You folks have been very helpful in helping me in questions and such. But in my area of Wilder Irrigation and Riverside Irrigation. But in my area deception and conduct. You would not believe. That's all I better say. I can't apparently get this before a Jury. But I have ask to close so for many many reasons. To show problems which makes me ask for Judge & Jury.

I am going to send a picture of the ground in question. Areal Photo, to show what I think over

is problems that should of
 been addressed, River Side ditch,
 I've ask. And told No way
 this also Needs to be in
 Court with a Jury. That is only
 my opinion No accusations
 other than opinion.

If you see that you
 might need more information
 I might not of answered in
 your eyes, please feel free to
 say so, and possibly give
 me an Extension to get
 any information to you.

Thank you
 Joel Allen
 Maria Morales
 Bill Allen
 Matthew Allen



Idaho Department of Water Resources #9

SRBA Recommendation:

63-4035

(Irrigation)

*Water check
in River side
ditch*

Legend


○ Point of Diversion

□ Place of Use

□ Townships

□ PLS Sections

□ Quarter Quarters



Canyon County
IDWR Basin 63


Prepared by K. Walker

On Monday, October 16, 2006

1987/88 Aerial Photography

*Should Be
Here in*

*This should of been done in the beginning so that
my grandfather could navigate. Wasnt done so it right #634035 was
not done in the beginning, also in 1988.*



0 0.1 0.2 Miles