1	Michael D. McLachlan (State Bar No. 18170	5)	
2	LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. McLA 10490 Santa Monica Boulevard	CHLAN, APC	
3	Los Angeles, California 90025 Telephone: (310) 954-8270		
4	Facsimile: (310) 954-8271 mike@mclachlanlaw.com		
5	Daniel M. O'Leary (State Bar No. 175128) LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL M. O'LEAR	V	
6	10490 Santa Monica Boulevard		
7	Los Angeles, California 90025 Telephone: (310) 481-2020		
8	Facsimile: (310) 481-0049 dan@danolearylaw.com		
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
10			
11			
12	SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
13	COUNTY OF I	LOS ANGELES	
14 15	Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule 1550(b))	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408	
15	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	(Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053, Honorable Jack Komar)	
17	RICHARD A. WOOD, an individual, on	Case No.: BC 391869	
18	behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,	RICHARD WOOD'S OBJECTION TO	
19	Plaintiff,	PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO SIGN PROPOSED	
20	v.	ORDER RE JURISDICTION OVER TRANSFEREES	
21	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	Date: June 14, 2010	
22	WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; et al.	Time: 9:00 a.m. Dept.: 1	
23 24	Defendants.		
25			
26			
27			
28		PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' REPLY TO SIGN PROPOSED ORDER RE	
	JURISDICTION OVER TRANSFEREES		

On June 7, 2010, the public water suppliers ("PWS") filed their Reply brief regarding the issue of jurisdiction over the transferees. In that Reply, the PWS changed the scope of the pending Motion by submitting a new proposed order for consideration. The other parties have not had the opportunity to brief the new proposed order, so it should not be considered.

6 In addition to the several typographical errors, the new proposed order adds further 7 provisions that the Small Pumper Class finds objectionable. In particular, paragraph 6 8 states that "Counsel for all parties shall advise their clients, both individuals and class 9 members, of the requirements of this order." This language requires class counsel to bear 10 the cost of mailing additional notice to the class members. In other words, the PWS have 11 made a big mistake, and now they want the class counsel to pay to clean up the mess. 12 This is inconsistent with the Court's prior orders instructing the PWS to pay for class 13 notice, and not acceptable to counsel for the Small Pumper Class.

14

15 Additionally, the contention that C.C.P. section 368.5 solves the problem is simply 16 wrong. By its own terms, Section 368.5 is entirely discretionary: "the court may allow 17 the person ... " (Ruby v. Superior Court (1951) 104 Cal.App.2d 175, 176.) This section 18 does not provide a blanket jurisdictional solution by way of an order. The transferees 19 must be identified by name, brought to the Court's attention by way of a motion, and properly served with process or class notice. (Witkin, California Procedure 5<sup>th</sup> Ed., 20 21 Pleading § 265.) A transferor's service of a notice or failure to do so has no impact on 22 this Court's jurisdiction over non-parties who obtain title to real property in the 23 adjudication area. The contrary suggestion is patently wrong under both State and 24 Federal Constitutional and real property law.

What the Court should do instead is to require the PWS to take control over their
 pleading, which purports to bring all landowners in the adjudication area into this lawsuit.

- 27
- 28

## RICHARD WOOD'S OBJECTION TO PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO SIGN PROPOSED ORDER RE JURISDICTION OVER TRANSFEREES

1	The Court should order the PWS to use their databases to identify transferees. Those	
2	names should then be filed with the Court. New class members on that list should be	
3	given notice of the action, and all other parties should be served with the summons and	
4	cross-complaint.	
5		
6	DATED: June 8, 2010 LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. McLACHLAN	
7	LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL M. O'LEARY	
8		
9	By://s//	
10	Michael D. McLachlan	
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
20		
28	RICHARD WOOD'S OBJECTION TO PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' REPLY	
20	BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO SIGN PROPOSED ORDER RE JURISDICTION OVER TRANSFEREES	

1	PROOF OF SERVICE		
2			
3	I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and am not a party to the within action. My business address is 10490 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90025.		
4			
5	On June 8, 2010, I caused the foregoing document(s) described as <b>RICHARD WOOD'S</b> <b>OBJECTION TO PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT</b> <b>OF MOTION TO SIGN PROPOSED ORDER RE JURISDICTION OVER</b>		
6 7	TRANSFEREES		
8	to be served on the parties in this action, as follows:		
9 10	(X) (BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE) by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website: <u>www.scefiling.org</u> regarding the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter.		
11	() ( <b>PV US MAU</b> ) I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and		
12	<ul> <li>(BY U.S. MAIL) I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing of documents for mailing. Under that practice, the above-referenced document(s) were placed in sealed envelope(s) addressed to the parties as noted above,</li> </ul>		
13	with postage thereon fully prepaid and deposited such envelope(s) with the United States Postal Service on the same date at Los Angeles, California, addressed to:		
14	() (BY FEDERAL EXPRESS) I served a true and correct copy by Federal Express or other		
15 16	overnight delivery service, for delivery on the next business day. Each copy was enclosed in an envelope or package designed by the express service carrier; deposited in a		
17 18	facility regularly maintained by the express service carrier or delivered to a courier or driver authorized to receive documents on its behalf; with delivery fees paid or provided for; addressed as shown on the accompanying service list.		
19 20	() (BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION) I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of facsimile transmission of documents. It is transmitted to the recipient on the same day in the ordinary course of business.		
21	(X) (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.		
22	() (FEDERAL) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of		
23 24	() (FEDERAL) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.		
	//s//		
25	Ana Horga		
26			
27	4 DICUADD WAAD'S AD JECTIAN TA DIIDI IC WATED SUDDI JEDS' DEDI V		
28	RICHARD WOOD'S OBJECTION TO PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO SIGN PROPOSED ORDER RE JURISDICTION OVER TRANSFEREES		

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	
25 26	
20	
28	5 RICHARD WOOD'S OBJECTION TO PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' REPLY
	RICHARD WOOD'S OBJECTION TO PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO SIGN PROPOSED ORDER RE JURISDICTION OVER TRANSFEREES