1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 10 11 ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408 **CASES** 12 **Included Consolidated Actions:** 13 Lead Case No. BC 325 201 14 Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. 15 ORDER AFTER PRE-TRIAL Superior Court of California CONFERENCE HELD ON County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325 201 16 **DECEMBER 15, 2010** 17 Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. 18 Hearing Date(s): December 15, 2010 Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Time: 9:00 a.m. Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348 19 Location: Department 1, LASC 20 Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster 21 Honorable Jack Komar Judge: Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist. Superior Court of California, County of 22 Riverside, consolidated actions, Case Nos. 23 RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668 24 Rebecca Lee Willis v. Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 25 Superior Court of California, County of Los 26 Angeles, Case No. BC 364 553 27 Richard A. Wood v. Los Angeles County 28 Waterworks District No. 40 Superior Court of California, County of Los

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27 28 Department 1 of the Los Angeles County Superior Court, the Honorable Jack Komar presiding. Counsel who appeared in person and by telephone are listed in the clerk's minutes.

A Pre-Trial Conference was noticed and heard on December 15, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. in

The Court heard and ruled upon the following motions In Limine. The Court made the following Orders:

- 1. Motion by Willis Class for approval of Class Notice. The motion is granted in a separate detailed order. The "suggestion" by counsel for a party not a party to the settlement that class members be provided a separate, second opportunity to opt out of the proposed settlement is denied for the reasons stated on the record at the time of the hearing.
- 2. Motion In Limine by Bolthouse Properties to preclude expert witnesses from testifying to hearsay statements made by other experts is denied without prejudice for the reasons stated on the record at the hearing on the motion.
- 3. Motion In Limine Number One by Antelope Valley Ground Water Association counsel to have the court in advance of trial define safe yield and overdraft and to exclude evidence during trial inconsistent with the definitions is denied as not being a proper Motion in Limine for the reasons stated on the record by the court at the time of hearing the motion. Motion In Limine Number Two by Antelope Valley Ground Water Association requesting that the court make a finding that whatever the court finds as a "safe Yield" is subject to future redetermination is denied as not being a proper Motion in Limine for the reasons stated on the record at the time of the hearing. Antelope Valley Ground Water Association Motion Number Three for a finding that "overdraft" is not necessary to a finding of a need for a physical solution is denied as not being a proper motion In limine and for the reasons stated on the record at the time of the hearing. Motion *In Limine* Number Four by Antelope Valley Ground Water Association seeking to limit testimony concerning ground