1 2	BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP ERIC L. GARNER, Bar No. 130665 JEFFREY V. DUNN, Bar No. 131926	EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 6103		
3	STEFANIE D. HEDLUND, Bar No. 239787 5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500			
	IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614			
4	TELEPHONE: (949) 263-2600 TELECOPIER: (949) 260-0972			
5	OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL			
6	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ANDREA ORDIN, Bar No. 38235			
7	COUNTY COUNSEL			
8	WARREN WELLEN, Bar No. 139152 PRINCIPAL DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL			
9	500 WEST TEMPLE STREET LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012			
10	TELEPHONE: (213) 974-8407 TELECOPIER: (213) 687-7337			
11	Attorneys for Cross-Complainant LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40			
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
13	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT			
14				
15	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	RELATED CASE TO JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION		
16	Included Actions:	PROCEEDING NO. 4408		
17	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No.	[PROPOSED] ORDER RE APPLICATION AND REQUEST		
18	40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325201;	UNDER CALIFORNIA RULE OF COURT 1.100 AND THE AMERICANS		
19	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No.	WITH DISABILITIES ACT BY THE PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS AND		
20	40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of	THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES,		
21	California, County of Kern, Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348;	DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER		
22	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. City of			
23	Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist., Superior Court of California,			
24	County of Riverside, Case Nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668			
25				
26				
27				
28				

[PROPOSED ORDER]

ORDER

Having read and considered the Application and Request under California Rule of Court 1.100 and the Americans with Disabilities Act by the Public Water Suppliers and the City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power, and having heard oral argument on January 4, 2011, the Court hereby orders as follows:

The Court denies the requested modification of court processes as being unreasonable for the reasons stated on the record at the time of the hearing on the request. The requested accommodation would materially alter the ability of the court to control the proceedings, would alter the normal processes of the court, would severely prejudice the other parties to the litigation, would unduly lengthen court time for this proceeding, and would preclude a continuous and coherent presentation of other expert witness testimony.

The Court orders that Joseph Scalmanini's direct and cross examination testimony be preserved by a videotaped deposition as an unavailable witness pursuant to the procedure set forth in Code of Civil Procedure Section 2035 and the California Rules of Court and that it thereafter be presented at trial.

The videotape schedule is as follows: Monday through Thursday each week beginning January 10, 2011. The videotape deposition schedule will be start at 10:30 a.m. until 12:00 p.m. and resume from 1:30 p.m. until 3:00 p.m. each day.

Counsel may telephonically contact the court during the deposition by way of a conference call for evidentiary rulings upon notice to all counsel appearing at the deposition.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

	JAN 1	3	2011
Dated:			

26345.0000A\5809972.1