MICHAEL T. FIFE (State Bar No. 203025) 1 BRADLEY J. HERREMA (State Bar No. 228976) HATCH & PARENT, A LAW CORPORATION 21 East Carrillo Street 3 Santa Barbara, CA 93101 Telephone No. (805) 963-7000 Facsimile No: (805) 965-4333 4 Attorneys for: B.J. Calandri, John Calandri, John Calandri as Trustee of the John and B.J. Calandri 5 2001 Trust, Forrest G. Godde, Forrest G. Godde as Trustee of the Forrest G. Godde Trust, Lawrence A. Godde, Lawrence A. Godde and Godde Trust, Kootenai Properties, Inc., Gailen Kyle, Gailen 6 Kyle as Trustee of the Kyle Trust, James W. Kyle, James W. Kyle as Trustee of the Kyle Family Trust, Julia Kyle, Wanda E. Kyle, Eugene B. Nebeker, R and M Ranch, Edgar C. Ritter, Paula E. Ritter, Paula E. Ritter as Trustee of the Ritter Family Trust, Trust, Hines Family Trust, Malloy Family Partners, Consolidated Rock Products, Calmat Land Company, Marygrace H. Santoro as 8 Trustee for the Marygrace H. Santoro Rev Trust, Marygrace H. Santoro, Helen Stathatos, Savas Stathatos, Savas Stathatos as Trustee for the Stathatos Family Trust, collectively known as the Antelope Valley Ground Water Agreement Association ( AGWA ) 10 11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA 12 13 ANTELOPE VALLEY Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. **GROUNDWATER CASES** 14 4408 15 Included Actions: Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar 16 Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. Superior Court of 17 OBJECTION TO SUBMISSION OF FORM California County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC PLEADINGS AND CASE MANAGEMENT 325 201Los Angeles County Waterworks 18 STATEMENT OF AGWA District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming 19 Co. Superior Court of California, County of Date: April 28, 2006 Kern, Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348Wm. Time: 10:00 A.M. 20 Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster Dept: 17 Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster 21 Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist. Superior Court of California, County of 22 Riverside, consolidated actions, Case Nos. RIC 23 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668 24 On November 14, 2003, several members of AGWA made an appearance in the case 25 Diamond Farming Co., et al. v. City of Lancaster, et al., Riverside Superior Court Case No. RIC 26 344668, in order to object that it was improper for the Riverside Court to adjudicate various parties' 27 28 OBJECTION TO SUBMISSION OF FORM PLEADINGS AND CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT OF AGWA

SB 391571 V1:007966 0001

rights to the groundwater of the Antelope Valley in the absence of the real parties in interest – the landowners who hold the overlying rights to the groundwater.

Unfortunately, over two years later, we find ourselves required to raise the same objections. The water purveyors are doing everything in their power to limit the involvement of the local landowners and to advance the litigation both substantively and procedurally prior to the involvement of these parties.

A small percentage of the Antelope Valley's landowners have been named and served with LA County Waterworks' Cross Complaint. A small number of those parties have responded to the complaint. AGWA, as liaison counsel, would like to contact the other parties, but LA County Waterworks continues to refuse to provide the contact information which it has in its possession.

Thus, very few of the local landowners have any idea of the nature of the proceedings before the Court.

Despite this, the water purveyors feel perfectly at ease devising model answers and cross-complaints in order to determine the nature of the responses and allegations that will be available to the local landowners. Little Rock Creek Irrigation District and Palm Ranch Irrigation District submitted a set of such model pleadings to the Court. In their transmittal pleading they describe the circulation process for these documents. (CMC Statement of Littlerock Creek Irrigation District and Palm Ranch Irrigation District 2:7.) This circulation began on March 30, 2006. AGWA was not included on any of the listed distributions of drafts. None of the model pleadings was shown to AGWA until April 19, 2006. AGWA provided comments to these draft pleadings 48 hours later on April 21, 2006, but was told by Mr. Lemieux's office that they could not, "do anything about your comments." Mr. Lemieux's transmittal pleading to the Court then inaccurately alleges that the documents submitted to the Court reflect all comments received prior to close of business on April 21, 2006.

Apparently the purveyors believe that input from the landowners is not very important when devising the model pleadings to be used by the landowners.

AGWA objects to the model pleadings submitted to the Court. The model pleadings are overly complex to be understood by parties without the advice of counsel, appear designed to lead

28

parties to commit to substantive legal positions advantageous to the water purveyors, and in no way provide any type of guidance concerning the legal consequences to the parties of using the pleadings. AGWA would like to consult with the other local landowner parties about alternative model pleadings, but at the time of filing this CMC Statement it has been in possession of the draft model pleadings for only four days, and, as described above, LA County Waterworks continues to refuse to provide contact information that would enable AGWA to communicate with the local landowners.

The remedy to this situation is the remedy that the Court has already identified: the boundaries of the Basin need to be established at the earliest possible date so that the relevant parties to this litigation can be brought in to the case to protect their water rights. AGWA was in attendance at the April 10, 2006 experts meeting, and based on the positions expressed by the parties at the meeting, believes that the earlier the Court can set a hearing date, the better.

Once the basin boundaries are established, LA County Waterworks should name and serve the remaining landowners that are to be brought in to the case. Only then, when all of the interested parties are in the case and engaged in the process, should the Court entertain recommendations concerning Answers, Cross-Complaints and Discovery.

HATCH & PARENT, A LAW CORPORATION

m. Sharlpih

BRADLEY J. HERREMA ATTORNEYS FOR AGWA

## 1 PROOF OF SERVICE 2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA 3 I am employed in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California. I am over the age of 18 4 and not a party to the within action, my business address is: 21 E. Carrillo Street, Santa Barbara, 5 California 93101. On April 24, 2006, I served the foregoing document described as: 6 7 **OBJECTION TO SUBMISSION OF FORM PLEADINGS AND CASE** MANAGEMENT STATEMENT OF AGWA AND DECLARATION OF MICHAEL T. FIFE IN SUPPORT OF OBJECTION TO SUBMISSION OF 8 FORM PLEADINGS AND CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT OF 9 **AGWA** on the interested parties in this action. 10 11 X By sending an electronic copy to the court to be filed the filing will be posted to the courts website. All parties will receive an electronic copy via e-mail from the court 12 The electronic filing was transmitted at 2.000 p.m. a.m. on April 24, 2006. The electronic transmission was reported as complete and without error. 13 by U.S. Mail to the three courts listed on the attached service list. I am readily 14 familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence on the same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Santa Barbara, California, in the 15 ordinary course of business. 16 (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California 17 that the above is true and correct. 18 (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California 19 that the above is true and correct. 20 Executed at Santa Barbara, California, on April 24, 2006. 21 22 bel Rollinto 23 24 25 26 27 28

1 2	Robert H. Joyce, Esq. LEBEAU, THELEN, LAMPE, MCINTOSH & CREAR, LLP	Attorneys for Diamond Farming
3	5001 East Commercenter Drive, Ste 300 Bakersfield, CA 93389-2092	
4	Fax (661) 325-1127 Addresses for electronic service:	
5	bjoyce@lebeauthelen.com, DLuis@Lebeauthelen.com	
6	James L. Markman, Esq. Steve Orr, Esq.	Attorneys for City of Palmdale
7	RICHARDS, WATSON & GERSHON P.O. Box 1059	
8	Brea, CA 92822-1059 (714) 990-0901; FAX (714) 990-2308	
9	Addresses for electronic service:   jmarkman@rwglaw.com, sorr@rwglaw.com	
10	Janet Goldsmith, Esq.	Attorneys for City of Los Angeles
11	KRONICK, MOSKOWITZ, TIEDEMANN & GIRARD	
12	400 Capital Mall, 27 <sup>th</sup> Floor Sacramento, CA 95814-4417	
13	FAX: (916) 321-4555 Address for electronic service: igoldsmith@kmtg.com	
14	John Slezak, Esq.	Attorneys for Los Angeles Department of Water
15	IVERSON, YOAKUM, PAPIANO & HATCH One Wilshire Blvd., 27th Floor	and Power
16	624 S. Grand Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90017	
17	(213) 624-7444; FAX: (213).629-4563 Address for electronic service:	
18	Jslezak@iyph.com	
19	Julie A. Conboy Deputy City Attorney	Attorneys for Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
20	Department of Water and Power 111 North Hope Street	
21	P.O. Box 111 Los Angeles, CA 90012	
22	213-367-4513; FAX: (213) 241-1416 Address for electronic service:	
23	Julie.Conboy@ladwp.com	
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		6 S AND CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT OF AGWA
	SB 391571 V1:007966 0001	AND GASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT OF AGWA

1 2 3	Henry Weinstock, Esq. Fred Fudacz, Esq. NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX, ELLIOTT LLP 445 South Figueroa Street, 31 <sup>st</sup> Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 (213) 612-7839; FAX (213) 612-7801 Addresses for electronic service: <a href="mailto:hweinstock@nossaman.com">hweinstock@nossaman.com</a> ,  ffudacz@nossaman.com	Attorneys for Tejon Ranch	
4	(213) 612-7839; FAX (213) 612-7801		
5	hweinstock@nossaman.com,		
6	Trudaezsastossarian.com		
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28		7	
	OBJECTION TO SUBMISSION OF FORM PLEADINGS AND CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT OF AGWA SB 391571 V1:007966 0001		