

JAN 5 1999

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 126, Original

In The  
Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1998

STATE OF KANSAS,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,  
and STATE OF COLORADO.

On Motion For Leave To File Bill Of Complaint

NEBRASKA'S REPLY TO BRIEF FOR THE  
UNITED STATES AS AMICUS CURIAE

DON STENBERG

Attorney General of Nebraska

MARIE C. PAWOL

Assistant Attorney General

*Counsel of Record*

Post Office Box 98920

Lincoln, Nebraska 68509-8920

Tel: (402) 471-2682

BARTHOLOMEW L. MCLEAY

Special Assistant Attorney General

KUTAK ROCK

The Omaha Building

1650 Farnam Street

Omaha, Nebraska 68102-2186

(402) 346-6000

*Attorneys for State of Nebraska*



## ARGUMENT

The United States recommends that this Court grant the motion of the State of Kansas for leave to file its Bill of Complaint. In making this recommendation, the United States fails to address the decisive point that Kansas does not plead any facts which establish that its rights have been violated or that it has been injured by the State of Nebraska.

The key question before the Court at this time is whether it should grant original jurisdiction where the plaintiff fails to allege any specific facts in support of its position and the named defendant cites specific government data showing that no substantial violation of the Compact has occurred.

The State of Kansas pleads no facts, only general conclusions of unspecified amounts of overuse by the State of Nebraska. *See* Kansas Complaint ¶ 7. On the other hand, the State of Nebraska, through an affidavit and charts based upon official Republican River Compact data, adopted unanimously by the States of Kansas, Nebraska and Colorado each and every year from 1959 through 1994, clearly establishes that Kansas has received its allocations each and every year except one. Significantly, the United States does not dispute that the State of Nebraska has accurately presented the official Republican River Compact data. Instead, the United States recommends that the Court disregard this data as not being relevant. *See* Brief of United States, pp. 12-15.

The United States misses the point. The point is that the State of Nebraska should not be forced to expend millions of dollars defending a lawsuit in the Supreme Court of the United States when the State of Kansas

pleads no specific facts establishing Compact violations and the official Compact data unanimously adopted by the Compact Commission for 35 years show that no serious violation of the Compact has occurred.

---

◆

## CONCLUSION

The State of Nebraska renews its request that this Court not grant original jurisdiction at this time based upon the Bill of Complaint presented to it. If Kansas has specific facts to establish violations by Nebraska, it can easily file a new motion and Bill of Complaint for this Court's consideration. If it does not have such facts, then in fairness to its sister states, the State of Kansas should be required to develop those facts before litigation is commenced in this Court.

Respectfully submitted,

DON STENBERG  
Attorney General of Nebraska  
MARIE C. PAWOL  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Post Office Box 98920  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509-8920  
Tel: (402) 471-2682

BARTHOLOMEW L. MCLEAY  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
KUTAK ROCK  
The Omaha Building  
1650 Farnam Street  
Omaha, Nebraska 68102-2186  
(402) 346-6000

*Attorneys for State of Nebraska*

January 1999







