1 2 3 4 5	NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, L FRED A. FUDACZ (SBN 050546) HENRY S. WEINSTOCK (SBN 089765) 445 S. Figueroa Street, 31st Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1602 Telephone: (213) 612-7800 Facsimile: (213) 612-7801			
6	Attorneys for Boronaum and cross complainant re	gon italioneo.p		
7				
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES			
10	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408		
11	Included Actions:	)		
12	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40	) Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 ) Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar		
13	v. Diamond Farming Co.			
14	Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325 201	OF TEJON RANCHCORP, CITY OF LOS		
15	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co.	ANGELES, CITY OF LANCASTER, CITY OF PALMDALE, AND NORTHROP GRUMMAN CORPORATION		
16	Superior Court of California, County of Kern,	)		
17	Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348	) Date: December 18, 2007 ) Time: 9:00 a.m.		
18	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster	Department: 1		
19	Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist. Superior Court of California, County of Riverside,	) )		
20	consolidated actions, Case Nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668			
21	RIC 333 840, RIC 344 430, RIC 344 008	,		
22	Tejon Ranchcorp, City of Palmdale, City of Los Angeles, City of Lancaster, and			
23	Northrop Grumman Corporation 1 make the followi	ng case management proposal:		
24	I. PHASE 2 TRIALS RE PRI	ESCRIPTION – JUNE & OCTOBER 2008.		
25	Progress in the litigation and mediat	ion efforts requires that the case move forward		
26	toward a resolution. At the Case Management Con	ference on October 16, Tejon Ranchcorp again		
27				
28	Counsel for these parties notified Tejon Ranch counsels	sel that they join in this Case Management Proposal.		
	351035_1.DOC			
	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL OF TEJON RANCHCORP, CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CITY OF LANCASTER, CITY OF PALMDALE, AND NORTHROP GRUMMAN CORPORATION			

1	proposed scheduling the next trial in Spring 2008 to adjudicate the purveyors' prescription claims. The			
2	Court instructed counsel to confer re trial-phasing and other issues. We had an attorneys' conference o			
3	October 23, followed by additional discussions and negotiations. As a result of those negotiations, we			
4	have modified the trial-phasing proposal to delay and bifurcate the trial of the prescription-related issue			
5	as follows:			
6	Part A – Yield of the Basin and other information about the hydrogeological "character" of the Basin.			
7	Proposed Date – June 2008.			
8	Part B – All other elements of prescription (overdraft, notice, etc.), excluding the defense of self-help.			
9	Proposed Date – October 2008.			
10	This proposal gives all parties sufficient time to conduct discovery and prepare for trial.			
11	The Court should exclude from the prescription trial only the landowners' affirmative			
12	defense of "Self Help" for three reasons:			
13	(1) It would be a waste of time to present evidence regarding self help unless specific purveyors			
14	prevail and establish prescriptive rights for specified years against identified landowners.			
15	(2) Given the enormous number of Antelope Valley landowners, proof of self help could add months			
16	of percipient witness testimony to this trial.			
17	(3) If the Court initially made findings of prescriptive rights, the parties may negotiate stipulations			
18	regarding self help.			
19	II. ORDER RE JURISDICTION OVER TRANSFEREES.			
20	Prior to the May 21, 2007 Case Management Conference, the Court asked Tejon			
21	Ranchcorp counsel to brief the question of how best to obtain jurisdiction over transferees of Antelope			
22	Valley land so that the Court's judgment will be binding on them. In its brief dated May 11, 2007,			
23	Tejon Ranchcorp discussed these issues, including the inadvisability of relying on a lis pendens; and it			
24	recommended that the Court order the following:			
25	"1. That landowner parties (individuals and class members) do the following:			
26	(a) post notice of transfer on the Court website within 10 days			
27	after any transfer of their property, stating the name, address, and other contact information of the transferee; and			
28	(b) notify their transferees of this litigation and provide them a copy of the public water suppliers' Cross-Complaint; and			
1				

That the public water suppliers promptly serve their Cross-Complaint on transferees, substituting the transferees as cross-defendants per CCP § 368.5." At the May 21, 2007 Case Management Conference, the Court noted that no party had objected to or opposed these recommendations, but the Court deferred making any rulings on this subject. We propose that the Court issue the above order, subject to any further discussion and proposals the Court deems appropriate, e.g., dealing with transferees of class members. Dated: December 13, 2007 NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP FREDRIC A. FUDACZ HENRY S. WEINSTOCK Attorneys for Tejon Ranchcorp 

l	PROOF OF SERVICE		
2			
3	The u	ndersigned declares:	
4	I am employed in the County of, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and am not a part to the within action; my business address is c/o Nossaman, Guthner, Knox & Elliott, LLP, 445 S.		
5	Figuer	roa Street, 31st Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1602.	
7	On December 13, 2007, I served the foregoing JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL OF TEJON RANCHCORP, CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CITY OF LANCASTER, CITY OF PALMDALE, AND NORTHROP GRUMMAN CORPORATION on all interested parties:		
8	(X)	(By U.S. Mail) On the same date, at my said place of business, said correspondence was sealed	
9		and placed for collection and mailing following the usual business practice of my said employer. I am readily familiar with my said employer's business practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, and, pursuant to that practice,	
10		the correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal Service, with postage thereon fully prepaid, on the same date at Los Angeles, California, addressed to:	
11		Honorable Jack Komar	
12		Judge of the Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara	
13		191 North First Street, Department 17C	
14		San Jose, CA 95113	
15 16	(X)	(By E-Filing) I posted the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter in compliance with the Court's electronic posting instructions and the Court's Clarification Order dated October 27, 2005.	
	$ _{O}$	(By Federal Express) I served a true and correct copy by Federal Express or other overnight	
17 18		delivery service, for delivery on the next business day. Each copy was enclosed in an envelope or package designated by the express service carrier; deposited in a facility regularly maintained by the express service carrier or delivered to a courier or driver authorized to receive documents	
19	on its hehalf: with delivery fees naid or provi	on its behalf; with delivery fees paid or provided for; addressed as shown on the accompanying	
20		Executed on December 13, 2007 at Los Angeles, California.	
21	(X)	(STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the	
22	If foregoing is true and correct		
23	()	(FEDERAL) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.	
24			
25		10.11011	
26		Mitchi Shibata	
27			

351035\_1.DOC

28