

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

**ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER  
CASES**

Included Consolidated Actions:

Los Angeles County Waterworks District No.  
40 v. Diamond Farming Co.  
Superior Court of California  
County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325 201

Los Angeles County Waterworks 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. City of Lancaster  
Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist.  
Superior Court of California, County of  
Riverside, consolidated actions, Case Nos.  
RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668

Rebecca Lee Willis v. Los Angeles County  
Waterworks District No. 40  
Superior Court of California, County of Los  
Angeles, Case No. BC 364 553

Judicial Council Coordination  
Proceeding No. 4408

Lead Case No. BC 325 201

**ORDER AFTER CASE  
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE  
ON JULY 29, 2013**

Hearing Date(s): July 29, 2013  
Time: 10:30 a.m.  
Location: Department 48  
LASC (Mosk)

Judge: Honorable Jack Komar

1 Richard A. Wood v. Los Angeles County  
2 Waterworks District No. 40  
3 Superior Court of California, County of Los  
4 Angeles, Case No. BC 391 869

4 Richard A. Wood v. A.V. Material  
5 Superior Court of California, County of Los  
6 Angeles, Case No. BC509546

9 On July 29, 2013, a Case Management Conference regarding Phase V trial issues was  
10 held in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Department 48, 111 North  
11 Hill Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, the Honorable Jack Komar presiding. The  
12 appearances are as stated in the record. The Court, having read and considered the supporting  
13 and opposing papers, and having heard and considered the arguments of counsel, and good  
14 cause appearing therefore, makes the following order:

15 In order to assist in framing up Phase V trial issues, the purveyor parties claiming  
16 prescription are ordered to identify the legal theory, timeframe, factual and legal basis for each  
17 purveyor claim as against each landowner, along with any other purveyor claim to  
18 groundwater, such as purveyor overlying rights.


19 The parties are ordered to brief and file, no later than August 16, 2013, the right to jury  
20 issues in a groundwater prescription case and whether jury trial rights are the same or different  
21 in groundwater versus riparian prescriptive claims.

22 A Further Case Management Conference is set for September 6, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. in  
23 the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles (courtroom to be determined).

24 Finally, the parties are ordered to meet and confer regarding a form of court ordered  
25 discovery to clarify the legal theory, timeframe and factual and legal basis supporting the  
26 prescription claims of each purveyor as against each landowner, along with any other purveyor  
27 claim to groundwater, such as purveyor overlying rights. Once agreed to by the parties and  
28 ordered by the Court, the court-ordered discovery will be subject to a separate order.

1 Finally, the Court urged the parties to continue with mediator efforts in an attempt to  
2 resolve the case.

3  
4 Dated: 8-14-2013

  
5 \_\_\_\_\_  
6 Hon. Jack Komar  
7 Judge of the Superior Court  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28