

1 Ralph B. Kalfayan, SBN133464  
2 KRAUSE, KALFAYAN, BENINK  
3 & SLAVENS LLP  
4 550 West "C" Street, Suite 530  
5 San Diego, CA 92101  
6 Tel: (619) 232-0331  
7 Fax: (619) 232-4019

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

10 ANTELOPE VALLEY )  
11 GROUNDWATER CASES )

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

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

) The Honorable Jack Komar  
) Coordination Trial Judge

14 Plaintiff,

) REBECCA LEE WILLIS' NOTICE OF  
) INTENT TO MONITOR THE PROGRESS  
) OF THE PHASE IV TRIAL

15 vs.

16 LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS )  
17 DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; )  
18 CITY OF LOS ANGELES; CITY OF )  
19 PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER )  
20 DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK )  
21 IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH )  
22 IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL )  
23 WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY )  
24 WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY )  
25 SERVICE DISTRICT; MOJAVE PUBLIC )  
26 UTILITY DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through )  
27 1,000; )

) DATE: February 11, 2013  
) TIME: 9:00 am  
) PLACE: Santa Clara Superior Court  
)  
) JUDGE: Hon. Jack Komar

23 Defendants. )

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD**

2 The Court has clarified that the Willis class is not subject to the Discovery Order entered  
3 on December 12, 2012, as they are presently non-pumpers. The Court has also clarified that the  
4 next phase of trial will address the issue of current groundwater production of all parties for the  
5 calendar year 2011 and January 1 through November 30, 2012, proof of claimed reasonable and  
6 beneficial use of water for each parcel to be adjudicated, claimed return flows from imported  
7 water, and federal reserved rights. Given that (1) the Willis Class entered into a Stipulation of  
8 Settlement (“Settlement”) with the Public Water Suppliers (“Appropriators”) in July 2010, which  
9 Settlement was approved by the Court in February 2011 and entered as a Final Judgment on May  
10 13, 2011; (2) the Settlement resolved all claims that the Willis Class had asserted in this  
11 litigation; and, (3) Willis is not aware of any party that is adverse to the Class nor of any Party  
12 who has asserted a claim seeking to reduce or eliminate the correlative groundwater rights of the  
13 Class, the Willis class plans to only monitor the progress of the Phase 4 trial and reserves the  
14 right to participate if or when necessary.

15 Dated: December 18, 2012

KRAUSE KALFAYAN BENINK  
& SLAVENS LLP

18 /s/ Ralph Kalfayan  
19 Ralph B. Kalfayan, Esq.

20 Attorney for Plaintiff and the Class

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Ashley Polyascko, declare:

I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action; my business address is 625 Broadway, Suite 635, San Diego, California, 92101. On **December 18, 2012**, I served the within document(s):

**REBECCA LEE WILLIS' NOTICE OF INTENT TO MONITOR THE PROGRESS OF THE PHASE IV TRIAL.**

by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter.

by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at San Diego, California addressed as set forth below:

by causing personal delivery by Cal Express of the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.


by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.

I caused such envelope to be delivered via overnight delivery addressed as indicated on the attached service list. Such envelope was deposited for delivery by UPS following the firm's ordinary business practices.

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with the postage thereon fully prepaid 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.

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

Executed on **December 18, 2012**, at San Diego, California.

  
Ashley Polyascko