-	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP FRED A. FUDACZ (SBN 050546) HENRY S. WEINSTOCK (SBN 089765) 445 S. Figueroa Street, 31st Floor Los Angeles, California, 20071-1602 Telephone: (213) 612-7800 Facsimile: (213) 612-7801 Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Complainant Tejon Ranchcorp SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ANTELOPE VALLEY Included Actions: Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of Superior Court of Court of California, County of Kern, Case No. S- District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Case No. S- 1500-CV-254-348; Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. V. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmadale Water Dist., Superior Court of Palmond Farming Co. v. Palmadale Water Dist., Superior Court of Palmadale Water Dist., S
19	RECITALS
20	A. In order to fairly conduct trials, discovery, and settlement negotiations in this
21	groundwater adjudication, it is necessary for the parties to disclose and exchange many types of private
22	and confidential information, including without limitation: well level data, pumping records, land use
23	information, groundwater chemistry data, etc. The above information is necessary to resolve
24	hydrological, geological, and other issues central to these cases.
25	B. Some requested documents and information may be confidential, private, a trade
26	secret, or subject to other objections and limitations on disclosure.
27	C. Such information must be disclosed to advance the litigation and settlement
28	negotiations, but its use and disclosure should be limited as set forth herein.          336290_1 DOC       1         PROTECTIVE ORDER RE DISCLOSURE OF PRIVATE INFORMATION OTHER THAN WELL REPORTS

1	NOW, THEREFORE, the Court Orders as follows:
2	1. All documents and data that are relevant to proving the hydrology, geology, water
3	use, and water quality of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin shall be discoverable in these
4	consolidated cases, notwithstanding any objections based on privacy, confidentiality, or other similar
5	limitations.
6	2. Any party may mark any documents or data that it produces as
7	"CONFIDENTIAL" on the front page of each such document.
8	3. Any documents or data marked "CONFIDENTIAL" shall be treated as follows:
9	(a) the documents or data may be used only for purposes of this litigation;
10	(b) they may not be disclosed to anyone who is not a party to this litigation, an expert or a consultant
11	retained by a party to this litigation, an attorney for a party, or an employee of one of the above,
12	notwithstanding a request under a Freedom of Information law.
13	4. Upon motion of any party, the Court will determine whether documents or data
14	marked "CONFIDENTIAL" should be deemed confidential and restricted in the manner set forth above.
15	5. In accordance with the "Protective Order Re Confidentiality Of Settlement
16	Discussions" dated March 24, 2006, the parties and their experts/consultants may freely discuss the
17	confidential documents and data described above in their settlement discussions and communications;
18	and such discussions and communications shall continue to be non-discoverable, inadmissible, and
19	subject to all protections and privileges accorded settlement discussions by California law.
20	6. This Order has no effect on the discoverability of any document withheld based
21	on the attorney-client privilege or work-product protection; and it shall not preclude objections based on
22	the form of any document request, unreasonable burden, or other objections unrelated to privacy, trade
23	secrets, and confidentiality.
24	7. This Protective Order shall be binding on all current and future parties to these
25	cases.
26	MAR - 8 2007
27	Date: February, 2007-
28	Judge of the Superior Court
	2 PROTECTIVE ORDER RE DISCLOSURE OF PRIVATE INFORMATION OTHER THAN WELL REPORTS

. . . . .