1	WAYNE K. LEMIEUX (SBN. 43501) W. KEITH LEMIEUX (SBN. 161850)	
2	LEMIEUX & O'NEILL	
3	2393 Townsgate Road, Suite 201 Westlake Village, California 91361	
4	Telephone: (805) 495-4770 Facsimile: (805) 495-2787	
5		
6	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant LLANO-DEL RIO WATER COMPANY	
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	IN AND FOR THE COU	JNTY OF LOS ANGELES
10		
11	Coordinated Proceeding Special Title (Rule 1550(b))	 Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408
12	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER) Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053
13	CASES	Assigned to the Honorable Jack Komar – Dept. 17
14	Included Actions:	ý))
15	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40	ANSWER OF CROSS-DEFENDANT LLANO- DEL RIO WATER COMPANY TO FIRST
16	v. Diamond Farming Co. Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC 325201;	AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS FOR
17		DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
18	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Kern County Superior	AND ADJUDICATION OF WATER RIGHTS
19	Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-234348;	
20	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster	
20	Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster v. Palmdale Water District, Riverside County)
21	Superior Court, Consolidated Actions, Case Nos. RIC 353840, RIC 344436, RIC 344668)
22	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS)
23)
25	LI ANO DEL DIO WATED COMDANY ha	raby answers the First Amended Cross Complaint of
26		reby answers the First Amended Cross-Complaint of
20	Public Water Suppliers for Declaratory and Injunctiv	ve Kener and Aujudication of water Rights as
27	follows:	
20	Ans.LDRWC.WatSuppl1stAm.XComp.doc - 1	
	ANSWER OF LDRWC TO FIRST AMENDED CRO	DSS-COMPLAINT OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS

	GENERAL DENIAL	
	1. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 431.30(d), Llano-Del Rio Water Company	
generally and specifically deny each and every allegation contained in the First Amended Cross-		
	Complaint of Public Water Suppliers for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Adjudication of Water	
	Rights, and further denies that Cross-Complainants are entitled to any relief against Cross-Defendant.	
	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES	
	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
	(Failure to State a Cause of Action)	
	2. The First Amended Cross-Complaint and every purported cause of action contained ther	
f	fail to allege facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against answering Cross-Defendant.	
	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
	(Statute of Limitations)	
	3. Each and every cause of action contained in the First Amended Cross-Complaint is barre	
in whole or in part, by the applicable statute of limitations, including, but not limited to, sections 318,		
3	319, 321, 338, 343 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.	
	THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
	(Laches)	
	4. The First Amended Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action contained	
ť	therein, is barred by the doctrine of laches.	
	FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
	(Estoppel)	
	5. The First Amended Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action contained	
ť	therein, is barred by the doctrine of estoppel.	
/.	//	
1.	//	
Α	Ans.LDRWC.WatSuppl1stAm.XComp.doc – 2 –	

1	FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
2	(Waiver)		
3	6. The First Amended Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action contained		
4	therein, is barred by the doctrine of waiver.		
5	SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
6	(Self-Help)		
7	7. Cross-Defendant has, by virtue of the doctrine of self-help, preserved its paramount		
8	overlying right to extract groundwater by continuing, during all times relevant hereto, to extract		
9	groundwater and put it to reasonable and beneficial use on its property.		
10	SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
11	(California Constitution Article X, Section 2)		
12	8. Cross-Complainants' methods of water use and storage are unreasonable and wasteful in		
13	the arid conditions of the Antelope Valley and thereby violate Article X, Section 2 of the California		
14	Constitution.		
15	EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
16	(Additional Defenses)		
10	(Auditional Defenses)		
10 17	 9. The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state their allegations with sufficient clarity 		
17	9. The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state their allegations with sufficient clarity		
17 18	9. The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state their allegations with sufficient clarity to enable Cross-Defendant to determine what additional defenses may exist to Cross-Complainants'		
17 18 19	9. The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state their allegations with sufficient clarity to enable Cross-Defendant to determine what additional defenses may exist to Cross-Complainants' causes of action. Cross-Defendant therefore reserves the right to assert all other defenses which may		
17 18 19 20	9. The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state their allegations with sufficient clarity to enable Cross-Defendant to determine what additional defenses may exist to Cross-Complainants' causes of action. Cross-Defendant therefore reserves the right to assert all other defenses which may pertain to the First Amended Cross-Complaint.		
17 18 19 20 21	9. The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state their allegations with sufficient clarity to enable Cross-Defendant to determine what additional defenses may exist to Cross-Complainants' causes of action. Cross-Defendant therefore reserves the right to assert all other defenses which may pertain to the First Amended Cross-Complaint. NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 	 9. The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state their allegations with sufficient clarity to enable Cross-Defendant to determine what additional defenses may exist to Cross-Complainants' causes of action. Cross-Defendant therefore reserves the right to assert all other defenses which may pertain to the First Amended Cross-Complaint. NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 10. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are <i>ultra</i> 		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	 9. The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state their allegations with sufficient clarity to enable Cross-Defendant to determine what additional defenses may exist to Cross-Complainants' causes of action. Cross-Defendant therefore reserves the right to assert all other defenses which may pertain to the First Amended Cross-Complaint. NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 10. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are <i>ultra vires</i> and exceed the statutory authority by which each entity may acquire property as set forth in Water 		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	 9. The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state their allegations with sufficient clarity to enable Cross-Defendant to determine what additional defenses may exist to Cross-Complainants' causes of action. Cross-Defendant therefore reserves the right to assert all other defenses which may pertain to the First Amended Cross-Complaint. NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 10. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are <i>ultra vires</i> and exceed the statutory authority by which each entity may acquire property as set forth in Water Code section 22456, 31040 and 55370. 		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	 9. The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state their allegations with sufficient clarity to enable Cross-Defendant to determine what additional defenses may exist to Cross-Complainants' causes of action. Cross-Defendant therefore reserves the right to assert all other defenses which may pertain to the First Amended Cross-Complaint. NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 10. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are <i>ultra vires</i> and exceed the statutory authority by which each entity may acquire property as set forth in Water Code section 22456, 31040 and 55370. ENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	 9. The First Amended Cross-Complaint does not state their allegations with sufficient clarity to enable Cross-Defendant to determine what additional defenses may exist to Cross-Complainants' causes of action. Cross-Defendant therefore reserves the right to assert all other defenses which may pertain to the First Amended Cross-Complaint. NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 10. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are <i>ultra vires</i> and exceed the statutory authority by which each entity may acquire property as set forth in Water Code section 22456, 31040 and 55370. TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 11. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred by governmental entity		

Ш

1	ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
2	12. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred	by
3	the provisions of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution as applied to the States under the	
4	Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.	
5	TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
6	13. Cross-Complainants' prescriptive claims are barred due to their failure to take affirmativ	ve
7	steps that were reasonably calculated and intended to inform each overlying landowner of Cross-	
8	Complainants' adverse and hostile claims as required by the due process clause of the Fifth and	
9	Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.	
10	THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
11	14. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred	by
12	the provisions of Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution.	
13	FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
14	15. The prescriptive claims asserted by governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred	by
15	the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.	
16	FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
17	16. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants were permissively pumping at all times.	
18	SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
19	17. The request for the court to use its injunctive powers to impose a physical solution seek	s a
20	remedy that is in violation of the doctrine of separation of powers set forth in Article 3, Section 3 of the	e
21	California Constitution.	
22	SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
23	18. Cross-Complainants are barred from asserting their prescriptive claims by operation of	
24	laws as set forth in Civil Code sections 1007 and 1214.	
25	//	
26	//	
27		
28	Ans.LDRWC.WatSuppl1stAm.XComp.doc – 4 –	
	ANSWER OF LDRWC TO FIRST AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS	\neg

1	EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
2	19. Each Cross-Complainant is barred from recovery under each and every cause of action		
3	contained in the First Amended Cross-Complaint by the doctrine of unclean hands and/or unjust		
4	enrichment.		
5	NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
6	20. The First Amended Cross-Complaint is defective because it fails to name indispensable		
7	parties in violation of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 389(a).		
8	TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
9	21. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants are barred from taking, possessing or using		
10	Cross-Defendant's property without first paying just compensation.		
11	TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
12	22. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants are seeking to transfer water right priorities		
13	and water usage which will have significant effects on the Antelope Valley Groundwater basin and the		
14	Antelope Valley. Said actions are being done without complying with and contrary to the provisions of		
15	the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub.Res.C. 2100 et seq.)		
16	TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
17	23. The governmental entity Cross-Complainants seek judicial ratification of a project that has		
18	had and will have a significant effect on the Antelope Valley Groundwater basin and the Antelope Valley		
19	that was implemented without providing notice in contravention of the provision of the California		
20	Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub.Res.C. 2100 et seq.)		
21	TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
22	24. Amy imposition by this court of a proposed physical solution that reallocates the water		
23	right priorities and water usage within the Antelope Valley will be <i>ultra vires</i> as it will be subverting the		
24	pre-project legislative requirements and protections of the California Environmental Quality Act		
25	("CEQA") (Pub.Res.C. 2100 <i>et seq.</i>)		
26	//		
27	//		
28	Ans.LDRWC.WatSuppl1stAm.XComp.doc – 5 –		
	ANSWER OF LDRWC TO FIRST AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS		

1	WHEREFORE, Cross-Defendant prays that judgment be entered as follows:		
2	1.	1. That Cross-Complainants take nothing by reason of its First Amended Cross-Complaint	
3	2.	That the First Amended Cross-Complaint be dismissed with prejudice;	
4	3.	For Cross-Defendant's costs incurred herein; and	
5	4. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.		urther relief as the Court deems just and proper.
6		ptember 26, 2007	LEMIEUX & O'NEILL
7	DATED. Se	ptember 20, 2007	
8			/s/ By
9			W. KEITH LEMIEUX Attorneys for Llano-Del Rio Water Company
10			5 1 5
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	Ans.LDRWC.Wat	Suppl1stAm.XComp.doc	- 6 -
	ANSWE	ER OF LDRWC TO FIRS	Γ AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS

1	PROOF OF SERVICE	
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)	
3) ss. COUNTY OF VENTURA)	
4		
5 6	I am employed in the County of Ventura, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 2393 Townsgate Road, Suite 201, Westlake Village, California 91361.	
7	On September 26, 2007 , I posted the following document(s) to the website	
8	http://www.scefiling.org, a dedicated link to the Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases:	
9	ANSWER OF CROSS-DEFENDANT LLANO-DEL RIO WATER COMPANY TO FIRST	
10	AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND ADJUDICATION OF WATER RIGHTS	
11		
12	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United State of America that the above is true and correct.	
13	Executed on September 26, 2007, in Westlake Village, California.	
14		
15	/s/	
16	KATHI MIERS	
17		
18		
19 20		
20 21		
21		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	Ans.LDRWC.WatSuppl1stAm.XComp.doc – 7 –	
	ANSWER OF LDRWC TO FIRST AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS	

CFDVI	ICE LIST
Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases: Case No. 1: 05-CV-049053	
MANAGING CITY ATTORNEY	Division
1 World Way Los Angeles, CA 90009	Tel: 310/646-3260 Fax: 310/646-9617
Los Angeles, CA 90009	Eangeles@lawa.org
Distant M. Durana, Fra	Attended for Deat Of Weter & Dear
Richard M. Brown, Esq. Department of Water & Power	Attorneys for Dept. Of Water & Power
111 North Hope St.	
P. O. Box 111	Tel: 213/367-4598
Los Angeles, CA 90012	Fax: 213/367-4588 Richard.Brown@ladwp.com
Thomas Bunn, Esq.	Attorneys for Palmdale Water District and
LAGERLOF, SENECAL, BRADLEY, GOSNEY & KRUSE	Quartz Hill Water District Tel: 626/793-9400
301 North Lake Ave., 10 th Floor	Fax: 626/793-6900
Pasadena, CA 91101-4108	TomBunn@lagerlof.com
Marvin G. Burns, Esq.	Attorneys for George Stevens, Jr., &
Marvin G. Burns, A Law Corporation	George C. Stevens, Jr., Trust
9107 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 800 Beverly Hills, CA 90210-5533	Tel: 310/278-6500 Fax: 310/203-9608
	<u>MBurns@lurie-zepeda.com</u>
Edward J. Casey, Esq.	Attorneys for Palmdale Hills Property LLC
WESTON BENSHOOF ROCHEFORT	Tel: 213/576-1005
RUBALCAVA MacCUISH LLP	Fax: 213/576-1100
333 So. Hope St., 16 th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071	ECasey@wbcounsel.com
Julie A. Conboy, Deputy City Attorney	Attorneys for Department of Water & Power
Department of Water and Power	
111 North Hope Street	Tel: 213/367-4513
P.O. Box 111	Fax: 213/241-1409
Los Angeles, CA 90012	Julie.Conboy@ladwp.com
Wm. Matthew Ditzhazy, Esq.	Attorney for City of Palmdale
CITY OF PALMDALE – Legal Dept.	Tel: 805/267-5108
38300 North Sierra Hwy. Palmdale, CA 93550	Fax: 805/267-5178 mditzhazy@cityofpalmdale.com
Ans.LDRWC.WatSuppl1stAm.XComp.doc - 8	-
ANSWER OF LDRWC TO FIRST AMENDED CRO	OSS-COMPLAINT OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS
ANSWER OF LDRWC TO FIRST AMENDED CRO	DSS-COMPLAINT OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIER

Jeff Dunn, Esq. BEST, BEST & KRIEGER 5 Park Plaza, Suite 1500 Irvine, CA 92614	Attorneys for Los Angeles County Waterwork District No. 40 and Rosamond Community Tel: 949/263-2600 Fax: 949/260-0972 Jeff.dunn@bbklaw.com
Douglas J. Evertz, Esq. STRADLING, YOCCA, CARLSON & RAUTH 660 Newport Center Dr., Suite 1600 Newport Beach, CA 92660-6522	Attorney for City of Lancaster Tel: 949/725-4000 Fax: 949/725-4100 Devertz@sycr.com
Michael T. Fife, Esq. HATCH & PARENT 21 East Carrillo Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101	Attorney for Eugene B. Nebeker on behalf of Nebeker Ranch, Inc., Bob Jones on behalf of R&M Ranch, Inc., Forrest G. Godde and Stev Godde, Gailen Kyle on behalf of Kyle & Kyle Ranch, Inc., and John Calandri on behalf of Calandri/ Sonrise Farms, collectively known a the Antelope Valley Groundwater Association ("AGWA") Tel: 805/963-7000 Fax: 805/965-4333 <u>Mfife@hatchparent.com</u>
Eric L. Garner, Esq. BEST, BEST & KRIEGER 3750 University Ave., Suite 400 P. O. Box 1028 Riverside, CA 92602-1028	Attorneys for Los Angeles County Waterwork District No. 40 and Rosamond Community Services District Tel: 951/686-1450 Fax: 951/686-3083 <u>Eric.garner@bbklaw.com</u>
Janet Goldsmith, Esq. KRONICK, MOSKOWITZ, TIEDMANN & GIRARD 400 Capitol Mall, 27 th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814-4417	Attorneys for City of Los Angeles Tel: 916/321-4500 Fax: 916/321-4555 jgoldsmith@KMTG.com
Mark J. Hattam, Esq. ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE & MALLORY LLP 501 West Broadway, 15 th Floor San Diego, CA 921010-3541	Attorneys for SPC Del Sur Ranch LLC Tel: 619/233-1155 Fax: 619/233-1158 <u>Mhattam@allenmatkins.com</u>
Tammy L. Jones, Esq. WESTON BENSHOOF ROCHEFORT RUBALCAVA MacCUISH LLP 333 S. Hope St., 16 th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071	Attorneys for Palmdale Hills Property LLC Tel: 213/576-1000 Fax: 213/ 576-1100 tjones@wbcounsel.com
Ans.LDRWC.WatSuppl1stAm.XComp.doc – 9	<u> </u>

Bob H. Joyce, Esq.	Attorneys for Diamond Farming Co.	
LEBEAU – THELEN	Tel: 661/325-8962 Fax: 661/325-1127 bjoyce@lebeauthelen.com	
5001 East Commercenter Dr., #300 P. O. Box 12092		
Bakersfield, CA 93389-2092		
Dakersneid, CA 35365-2032	<u>bjoyce@iebeautileien.com</u>	
Steven M. Kennedy, Esq.	Attorneys for Antelope Valley East Kern Wate	
RUNICK, McELHANEY & BECKETT	Agency	
1839 Commercenter West	Tel: 909/889-8301	
San Bernardino, CA 92408	Fax: 090/388-1889	
	skennedy@bbmblaw.com	
Scott K. Kuney, Esq.	Attorneys for Gertrude J. Van Dam and Delm	
YOUNG WOOLDRIDGE	D. Van Dam	
1800 30 TH Street, 4 th Floor	Tel: 661/327-9661	
Bakersfield, CA 93301	Fax: 661/327-0720	
	skuney@youngwooldridge.com	
James L. Markman, Esq.	Attorneys for City of Palmdale	
RICHARDS, WATSON & GERSHON	Tel: 714/990-0901	
P. O. Box 1059	Fax: 714/990-6230	
Brea, CA 92822-1059	jmarkman@rwglaw.com	
· · · · ·		
Dale Murad, Esq.	Attorneys for U. S. Department of the Air Ford	
AFLSA/JACE	– Edwards Air Force Base Tel: 703/696-9166 Fax: 703/696-9184	
1501 Wilson Blvd., Suite 629		
Arlington, VA 22209-2403		
	[no email]	
Steven R. Orr, Esq.	Attorneys for City of Palmdale	
RICHARDS, WATSON & GERSHON	Tel: 213/626-8484	
355 S. Grand Ave., 40 th Floor	Fax: 213/626-0078	
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3101	Sorr@rwglaw.com	
Jeffrey Robbins, Esq.	Attorneys of City of Lancaster	
STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH	Tel: 949/737-4720	
660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1600	Fax: 916/823-6720	
Newport Beach, CA 92660	JRobbins@sycr.com	
Christopher M. Sanders, Esq.	Attorneys for County Sanitation Districts Nos	
EILLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS	14 and 20 of Los Angeles County	
2015 "H" Street	Tel: 916/447-2166	
Sacramento, CA 95814	Fax: 916/447-3512	
ouoramonio, 011 00017	cms@eslawfirm.com	
Robert B. Schachter, Esq.	Attorneys for Guss A. Barks and Peter G. Bar	
HITCHCOCK, BOWMAN & SCHACHTER	Tel: 310/540-2202	
21515 Hawthorne Blvd., Suite 1030	Fax: 310/540-8734	
Torrance, CA 90503-6579	HBSattylaw@aol.com	
Ans.LDRWC.WatSuppl1stAm.XComp.doc - 10	, —	

Loretta Slaton, Esq.	Attorneys for Air Trust Singaport Limited
Law Office of Loretta Slaton	Tel: 949/587-2832
2294 Via Puerta, Suite O	Fax: 949/855-1959
Laguna Hills, CA 92653	Lslaton81@aol.com
Jon A. Slezak, Esq.	Attorneys for City of Los Angeles, Dept. of
IVERSON, YOAKUM, PAPIANO & HATCH	Airports
624 South Grand Ave., 27 th Floor	Tel: 213/624-7444
Los Angeles, CA 90017	Fax: 213/629-4563
	jslesak@lyph.com
William Sloan, Esq.	Attorneys for U. S. Borax, Inc.
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP	Tel: 415/268-6127
425 Market Street	Fax: 415/276-7545
San Francisco, CA 94105	wsloan@mofo.com
John Tootle, Esq.	Attorneys for Antelope Valley Water Company
CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY	Tel: 310/257-1488 x 322
3625 Del Amo Blvd., Suite 350	Fax: 310/325-4691
Torrance, CA 90503	jtootle@calwater.com
Henry Weinstock, Esq. Fred Fudacz, Esq.	Attorney for Tejon Ranch
NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX, ELLIOTT,	Tel: 213/612-7839
LLP	Fax: 213/612-7801
445 South Figueroa St., 31 st Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071	hweinstock@nossaman.com
Richard G. Zimmer, Esq.	Attorneys for Wm Bolthouse Farms, Inc.
CLIFFORD & BROWN	Tel: 661/322-6023
1430 Truxtun Ave., Suite 900	Fax: 661/322-3508
Bakersfield, CA 93301-5230	<u>rzimmer@clifford-brownlaw.com</u>
AG and DOJ:	
Michael Crow, Esq.	Parties: State of California; Santa Monica
Office of the California Attorney General	Mountains Conservancy; 50 th District
1300 "I" Street Sacramento, CA 95814	Agricultural Association Tel: 916/327-7856 Fax: 916/327-2319 <u>Michael.Crow@doj.ca.gov</u>
Lee Leininger, Esq. U.S. Department of Justice	Parties: United States of America
Envinonmental & Natural Resources Section	Tel: 303/312-7322
999 – 18 th Street, Suite 945, North Tower	Fax: 303/312-7379
Denver, CO 80202	Lee.leininger@usdoj.gov
Debra W. Yang, United States Attorney	
Ans.LDRWC.WatSuppl1stAm.XComp.doc – 11	_
ANSWER OF LDRWC TO FIRST AMENDED CR	

United States Attorney's Office, Central District	Tel: 213/894-2474
of CA	Fax: 213/894-2380
300 North Los Angeles St., Rm 7516, Fed. Bldg.	[no email]
Los Angeles, CA 90012	
Robert J. Spagnoletti, Esq.	
Attorney General for the District of Columbia	Tel: 202/727-6248
441 Fourth St., NW, 6 th Floor South	Fax: 202/
Washington, DC 20001	[no email]
Robert S. McDonnell, Esq.	
Attorney General of Virginia	Tel: 804/786-2071
900 East Main Street	Fax: 804/786-1991
Richmond, VA 23219	mail@oag.state.va.us
Court Personnel:	
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of	CRC Rules 1501(17) and 1540:
California, County of Los Angeles	Coordination Trial Judge
111 N. Hill Street	-
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3014	
	D M-21
Honorable Jack Komar	
Santa Clara County Superior Court 191 North First Street, Dept. 17C	Tel: 508/882-2286 Fax: 408/882-2293
San Jose, CA 95113	rwalker@scscourt.org
San Jose, CA 35115	
Superior Court of California	Original Document(s) to be filed at this
County of Los Angeles	location.
Stanley Mosk Courthouse—Dept. 1, Rm 534	
111 North Hill Street	
Los Angeles, CA 90012	
*Chair, Judicial Council of California	CRC Rule 1511: *Serve only when required to
Administrative Office of the Courts	transmitted to Judicial Council.
Attn: Appellate & Trial Court Judicial Services	
(Civil Case Coordination)	
455 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102-3688	
San Francisco, CA 94102-3088	<u> </u>
Ans.LDRWC.WatSuppl1stAm.XComp.doc - 12	_