

1 Ralph B. Kalfayan, SBN133464  
David B. Zlotnick, SBN 195607  
2 KRAUSE, KALFAYAN, BENINK  
& SLAVENS LLP  
3 625 Broadway, Suite 635  
San Diego, CA 92101  
4 Tel: (619) 232-0331  
Fax: (619) 232-4019

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class  
6  
7  
8

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
10 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

11 **ANTELOPE VALLEY**  
12 **GROUNDWATER CASES**

) RELATED CASE TO JUDICIAL  
) COUNCIL COORDINATION  
) PROCEEDING NO. 4408  
)

13 This Pleading Relates to Included Action:  
14 REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself  
and all others similarly situated,

)  
) PLAINTIFF REBECCA WILLIS' CASE  
) MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE  
) STATEMENT  
)

15 Plaintiff,  
16

17 vs.  
18

18 LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS  
DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER;  
19 CITY OF LOS ANGELES; CITY OF  
PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER  
DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK  
20 IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH  
IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL  
21 WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY  
WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY  
22 SERVICE DISTRICT; MOJAVE PUBLIC  
UTILITY DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through  
23 1,000;

) Date: October 13, 2009  
) Time: 10:00 a.m.  
) Dept: 17 (Santa Clara)  
) Judge: Hon. Jack Komar  
) Coordination Trial Judge  
)  
)  
)

24 Defendants.  
25

26 The Willis Class respectfully submits the following status conference statement.

27 As we have previously advised the Court, the Willis Class has reached an agreement in  
28 principal to settle this litigation with all the public water suppliers (Suppliers) and the United

1 States.

2 That agreement in principal is currently being reviewed by the various public entities. Although  
3 the agreement, if finalized and approved, will settle the Willis Class' claims in their entirety, we  
4 understand that the Class must remain subject to the Court's jurisdiction for purposes of future  
5 proceedings.

6 Willis has opposed the pending consolidation motion because we view consolidation as  
7 unnecessary, especially in light of the pending settlement. Willis has no other claims to litigate.  
8 Moreover, because it will take at least six months to send notice and have a final settlement  
9 hearing, consolidation would place Willis in an awkward position. More specifically, the  
10 Suppliers understandably want Class counsel to cease further efforts on the merits of the case.  
11 But consolidation coupled with the risk that the settlement may not be consummated makes it  
12 difficult for Willis counsel to not participate, consistent with our duties to the Class.

13 With that caveat, Willis does not strongly oppose consolidation as long as (1) it does not  
14 preclude the entry of judgment between and among the settling parties as expeditiously as  
15 possible, without awaiting the resolution of claims of other parties, and (2) it is not seen to  
16 expand the claims asserted by the Willis Class in its pleadings or create claims against the Class.  
17 We would appreciate the Court's assurance that consolidation will not result in such a result,  
18 which would complicate and/or delay the proposed settlement, which we believe should be  
19 consummated as promptly as possible.

20 Dated: October 5, 2009

KRAUSE KALFAYAN BENINK  
& SLAVENS LLP

21  
22  
23  
24 /s/Ralph B. Kalfayan  
Ralph B. Kalfayan, Esq.  
David B. Zlotnick, Esq.  
Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class  
25  
26  
27  
28