1 ROBERT E. DOUGHERTY [SBN 41317] (SPACE BELOW FOR FILING STAMP ONLY) WILLIAM A. HAUCK [SBN 202669] 2 JESSE T. MORRISON [SBN 247185] **COVINGTON & CROWE, LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW** 3 1131 West Sixth Street, Suite 300 Ontario, California 91762 4 (909) 983-9393; Fax (909) 391-6762 5 Attorneys for White Fence Farms Mutual Water Co. Inc., El Dorado Mutual Water Co., West 6 Side Park Mutual Water Co., Shadow Acres Mutual Water Co., Antelope Park Mutual Water Co., Averydale Mutual Water Co., Sundale Mutual Water Co., Evergreen Mutual Water Co., Agua J Mutual Water Co., Bleich Flat Mutual Water Co., Colorado Mutual Water Co., 7 Sunnyside Farms Mutual Water Co., Land Projects Mutual Water Co., Tierra Bonita Mutual Water Co. and Landale Mutual Water Co.; collectively known as A.V. United Mutual Group 8 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT 11 12 ANTELOPE VALLEY Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding **GROUNDWATER CASES** No. 4408 13 Included Actions: Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 Los Angeles County Waterworks District Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar 14 No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior 15 Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No.: BC 325201: 16 Los Angeles County Waterworks District A.V. UNITED MUTUAL GROUP'S 17 No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior **OBJECTION TO PURVEYORS'** Court of California, County of Kern, Case [PROPOSED] CASE MANAGEMENT No.: S-1500-CV-254-348; ORDER FOR PHASE 2 TRIAL 18 Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of 19 Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. 20 Palmdale Water Dist., Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, Case Nos.: 21 RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668 22 Rebecca Lee Willis v. Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, et al. 23 24 25 A.V. United Mutual Group hereby objects to Paragraph 6 of the [PROPOSED] CASE 26 MANAGEMENT ORDER submitted by Richards, Watson & Gershon which contains the directive that "a coordination or liaison committee" be formed for the Phase 2 trial. 27 28

formation of any Designated Counsel among the non-purveyor parties would be cataclysmic for their procedural due process rights and should be stricken from any Case Management Order. In this litigation the purveyors present a united front. Their stance on issues concerning the existence of sub-basins, overdraft and prescription are all the same. If they choose to form litigation committees to streamline their presentations at trial, they should.

The non-purveyor parties, conversely, differ considerably on many issues, and due process would not be served if they all were unable to present their cases individually. As an example, in the upcoming Trial Phase 2A, three or four of the non-purveyor parties believe there are distinct sub-basins in the Antelope Valley, while many other non-purveyor parties do not believe such sub-basins exist. In order to provide each party interested in the issue to have an opportunity to be heard, participation must be more than simply "raising issues or concerns to the other parties." Any type of Designated Counsel, whether Liaison, Lead or Trial, is a threat to the due process rights of the non-purveyor parties, and appears to be a "divide and conquer" strategy proposed by the purveyors. The Court should not countenance this type of maneuvering.

CONCLUSION

Due to serious issues concerning the due process rights of the non-purveyor parties, and the potential for conflicts of interest among the members of that group, A.V. United Mutual Group opposes the nomination of any Designated Counsel for the non-purveyor group of parties in this action. Paragraph 6 of the [PROPOSED] CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER FOR PHASE 2 TRIAL should be stricken. If Paragraph 6 is removed from the Order, A.V. United Mutual Group withdraws its objection.

Dated: August 13, 2008 COVINGTON & CROWE, LLP

By: UN A HAV.

ROBERT E. DOUGHERTY WILLIAM A. HAUCK JESSE T. MORRISON

Attorneys for Cross-Defendants and Cross-Complainants A.V. United Mutual Group

ONTARIO, CA 91762

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

I am employed in the County of San Bernardino, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is Covington & Crowe, LLP, 1131 West Sixth Street, Suite 300, Ontario, California 91762.

On August 13, 2008, I served the foregoing document described as A.V. UNITED MUTUAL GROUP'S OBJECTION TO PURVEYORS' [PROPOSED] CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER FOR PHASE 2 TRIAL on the interested parties in this action:

by posting the document listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court effling website under the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter pursuant to the Court's Order dated October 27, 2005.

 \square by placing \square the original \square a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

□ BY MAIL

□ * I deposited such envelope in the mail at Ontario, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Ontario, California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

BY PERSONAL SERVICE I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of the addressee.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on August 13, 2008, at Ontario, California.

Folores C. CRUZ