1 2 3 4 5	NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, I FRED A. FUDACZ (SBN 050546) HENRY S. WEINSTOCK (SBN 089765) ALFRED E. SMITH (SBN 186257) 445 S. Figueroa Street, 31st Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1602 Telephone: (213) 612-7800 Facsimile: (213) 612-7801	_LP
6	Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Complainant Tejon Ranchcorp	
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
10		
11	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES:	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408
12	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. ) 40 v. Diamond Farming Co.	Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053
13	Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325 201)	Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar
14 15 16	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	TEJON RANCHCORP'S BRIEF RE: JUDGE'S REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION RE: CONTINUING JURISDICTION, NEW PARTIES, CLAIMS AND CHANGED CONDITIONS
17 18 19 20 21 22	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	Trial Date: October 10, 2006 Time: 10:00 a.m. Department: 1
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	331008_1.DOC	
	TEJON RANCHCORP'S BRIEF RE: JUDGE'S REQUE JURISDICTION, NEW PARTIES, CLAIMS AND CHANC	

## I. <u>INTRODUCTION.</u>

This brief responds to the Honorable Jack Komar's request for a brief addressing the impact of continuing jurisdiction, new parties, claims and changed conditions on this action. This brief discusses how various groundwater judgments throughout California have addressed these issues in prior proceedings.

## II. PHYSICAL SOLUTION.

The physical solution is a remedy employed in water rights litigation that enables the court to order a practical, flexible solution that maximizes the reasonable beneficial use of available waters to all parties, and allows for a single court to comprehensively and consistently address changed conditions and new claims. (*Montecito Valley Water Co. v. Santa Barbara* (1904) 144 Cal. 578, 592). A physical solution involves the application of general equitable principles to "achieve practical allocation of water to competing interests so that a reasonable accommodation of demands upon a water source can be achieved." (*Imperial Irrigation District v. State Water Resources Control Board* (1990) 225 Cal.App.3d 548, 572).

The physical solution doctrine originally emerged in California as a response to concerns that traditional remedies for water rights infringement were too harsh; traditional remedies typically involved an injunction prohibiting continued use of subordinate water claims. (City of Lodi v. East Bay Municipal Water District (1936) 7 Cal.2d 316, 337). Courts were reluctant to prohibit a party's continued access to water resources when a less drastic remedy was available. (Montecito Valley Water Co. v. Santa Barbara, supra, 144 Cal. 578, 592).

With the addition of the 1928 amendment to the California Constitution, now Article X, Section 2, courts must consider physical solutions in water rights cases:

"Since the adoption of the 1928 constitutional amendment, it is not only within the power but it is also the duty of the trial court to admit evidence relating to possible physical solutions, and if none is satisfactory to it to suggest on its own motion such physical solution." (City of Lodi v. East Bay Municipal Utility District, supra, 7 Cal.2d 316, 341).

- 11

1 | 2 | inv 3 | in 4 | (S 5 | Up 6 | Ar 7 | Ba 8 | 19 9 | v. 10 | Ju

In complex groundwater adjudications over the past few decades, many of which involve large areas with dozens of parties, the doctrine of physical solution has been employed in the judgments reached by the trial court. (*City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando, et al.* (Superior Court, Los Angeles County, 1979, No. 650079) ("San Fernando Basin Judgment"); *Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District v. City of Alhambra, et al.* (Superior Ct. Los Angeles County, 1972 (amended 1989), No. 924128) ("San Gabriel Basin Judgment"); *Chino Basin Municipal Water District v. City of Chino, et al.* (Superior Ct. San Bernardino County, 1978, No. RCV 51010, formerly No. 164327) ("Chino Basin Judgment"); *City of Barstow, et al., v. City of Adelanto, et al.* (Superior Ct. Riverside County, 1996, No. 208568) ("Mojave Basin Judgment"); *City of Pasadena v. City of Alhambra* (Superior Ct. Los Angeles County, 1984 (modified and restated), No. Pasadena C-1323) ("Raymond Basin Judgment"). <sup>1</sup>

In each of these cases, pumpers were required to reduce their production of native groundwater. However, practical solutions were reached under the physical solution doctrine to mitigate the impact of such reductions, address changed conditions, maximize the number of users, avoid waste, and provide for maximum beneficial use of available water.

## III. CONTINUING JURISDICTION AND WATERMASTERS.

Under the physical solution entered in most groundwater judgments, the courts reserve continuing jurisdiction to address future changed conditions and ensure that the Basin's groundwater supplies are fully utilized to the maximum extent possible pursuant to Cal. Const. Art. X, Sec. 2.

Courts regularly affirm the expansive retention of jurisdiction in cases involving water rights. (*City of Pasadena v. City of Alhambra* (1949) 33 Cal.2d 908, 937). As the California Supreme Court explained in *City of Los Angeles v. City of Glendale* (1943) 23 Cal.2d 68, 81:

"[t]he retention of jurisdiction to meet future problems is regarded as an appropriate exercise of equitable jurisdiction in litigation over

<sup>1</sup> Relevant excerpts of the San Fernando Basin, San Gabriel Basin, Chino Basin, Mojave Basin and Raymond Basin Judgments are attached, as Exhibits "A" – "E," respectively, to Tejon Ranchcorp's Request For Judicial Notice ("RFJN"), filed concurrently herewith.

water rights, particularly when the adjustment of substantial public interests is involved." <sup>2</sup>

By retaining broad continuing jurisdiction, a single court can oversee a comprehensive, thoughtful, efficient and consistent review of related matters. This also enables the court to comprehensively and consistently address changed conditions affecting interested parties including, *inter alia*, safe yield variations, hydrologic balance issues, water quality, new claims, and new parties. It enables the court to determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether and to what extent, new or changed uses are reasonable and beneficial.

It further enables the court to consider the impact of new or changed conditions on existing rights and make corresponding adjustments. As stated by the California Supreme Court in City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando (1975) 14 Cal.3d 199, 287: "Moreover, since the trial court retained jurisdiction, it has the power to redetermine safe yield in accordance with changed hydrologic condition, if necessary, either on remand or in the future."

The reservation of continuing jurisdiction is a common feature in groundwater judgments throughout California. As part of the court's retention of continuing jurisdiction, Courts often appoint Watermasters to: (1) assist the Court in the ongoing administration and enforcement of the Judgment, and (2) help the Court in managing the resource for the benefit of the Basin and water right holders. This includes power of the Watermaster to: (1) petition

<sup>2</sup> Central and West Basin Water Replenishment Dist. v. Southern California Water Company (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 891, 903 ("Courts regularly affirm the expansive retention of jurisdiction in cases involving water rights. (City of Pasadena v. City of Alhambra (1949) 33 Cal.2d 908, 937, City of L. A. v. City of Glendale (1943) 23 Cal.2d 68, 81). 'The retention of jurisdiction to meet future problems is regarded as an appropriate exercise of equitable jurisdiction in litigation over water rights, particularly when the adjustment of substantial public interests is involved.' (City of L. A. v. City of Glendale, supra, 23 Cal.2d at p. 81). That is exactly what happened here; the Judgment reserved jurisdiction to meet future problems and adapt to changed circumstances. Specifically, the court reserved jurisdiction '[t]o provide for such other matters as are not contemplated by the judgment and which might occur in the future, and which if not provided for would defeat any or all of the purposes of this judgment to assure a balanced Central Basin subject to the requirements of Central Basin Area for water required for its needs, growth and development."")

<sup>3</sup> See also CCP Section 664.6 ("If parties to pending litigation stipulate, in a writing signed by the parties outside the presence of the court or orally before the court, for settlement of the case, or part thereof, the court, upon motion, may enter judgment pursuant to the terms of the settlement. If requested by the parties, the court may retain jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the settlement until performance in full of the terms of the settlement." Emphasis added.)

the Court for further or supplemental orders, and (2) modify, amend or amplify provisions of the Judgment. These procedures enable the existing judgment to be utilized to conform to changed conditions as necessary and consistent with Cal. Const. Art. X, Sec 2. For example, paragraph 7.1 of the trial court's judgment entered in *City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando*, *supra*, 14 Cal.3d 199, provides:

"Full jurisdiction, power and authority are retained by and reserved to the Court for purposes of enabling the Court upon application of any party or of the Watermaster by motion and upon at least 30 days' notice thereof, and after hearing thereon, to make such further or supplemental orders or directions as may be necessary or appropriate, for interpretation, enforcement or carrying out of this Judgment, and to modify, amend or amplify any of the provisions of the Judgment or to add to the provisions thereof consistent with the rights herein decreed. . . . " (RFJN, Exhibit "A").

Paragraph XXII of the Raymond Basin Judgment provides:

"The Court hereby reserves jurisdiction and authority at any time, upon application of any party, the Watermaster, or upon its own motion, to make such modifications of, or such additions to, the provisions of this Judgment, or to make such further order or orders, as may be necessary or desirable for the adequate enforcement, protection or preservation of the rights of the respective parties as declared in this Judgment or as provided in said Agreement and amendment thereto. The Court further reserves jurisdiction to make any other and/or additional orders of sufficient kind and nature to protect the waters in said Raymond Basin Area or any portion thereof from contamination of the groundwater supply from cesspool effluent or surface waters." (RFJN, Exhibit "E").

There is substantial authority supporting the use of a court-appointed Watermaster to assist the court in the exercise of its continuing jurisdiction to address changed conditions. Watermasters can file motions and seek Orders to Show Cause in the existing action against parties and their successors-in-interest who produce groundwater in contravention of the Judgment. Pursuant to the Judgment in *City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando, et al., supra*, 14 Cal.3d 199, the court under its continuing jurisdiction entered orders enjoining successors-in-interest from producing water upon a motion brought by the Watermaster. (RFJN, Exhibits "F" – "G").

The decisions of other courts support this result. In *McKinley Brothers v.*McCauley (1932) 215 Cal. 229, an injunction entered in 1886 to perpetually enjoin

331008 1.DOC

1 interference with plaintiff's right in a stream was enforced 46 years later against the successors in interest of the defendants. In Adams v. Barber (1913) 21 Cal.App. 503, the 2 3 court also enforced an injunction entered against the successors in interest to the defendant. The court stated: 4 5 "By that judgment the superior rights of the original grantors of the plaintiffs to all the water of said creek . . . were conclusively established, and by that judgment Freeman, the defendant in the 6 action in which it was entered, and his privies or successors in interest by title subsequent to the commencement of said action are 7 bound and estopped in this action from asserting any right to any of 8 the water flowing in said creek based upon any claim alleged to have existed anterior to the entry of said judgment." (Id. at 513-9 514.) 10 Indeed, the trial court has inherent authority to modify an injunction where there are changed conditions, or where the modification is necessary to serve the ends of justice. 11 As stated by the court in Mendly v. County of Los Angeles (1994) 23 Cal.App.4th 1193, 1207: 12 13 "It is settled that where there has been a change in the controlling facts upon which a permanent injunction was granted, or the law has been changed, modified or extended, or where the ends of 14 justice would be served by modification or dissolution, the court has the inherent power to vacate or modify an injunction where the 15 circumstances and situation of the parties have so changed as to render such action just and equitable. This principle governs even 16 though the judgment providing the injunctive relief is predicated 17 upon stipulation of the parties." 18 The reservation of continuing jurisdiction has become a common tool to minimize costs, expenses and conflicting rulings that would otherwise develop from piecemeal water 19 20 rights litigation. It allows a court to deal with changed conditions affecting previously 21 adjudicated rights without the filing of entirely new actions. 22 IV. NEW PARTIES. 23 Typically superior court litigation binds only those parties to the proceeding. In 24 the water rights context, courts recognize that practical considerations require equitable 25 26 27  $\frac{4}{3}$  See also Peabody v. Vallejo (1935) 2 Cal.2d 351, 383-384 ("the court has the power to and should reserve unto 28 itself the right to change and modify its orders and decree as occasion may demand either on its own motion or on motion of any party . . . . ") 331008 1.DOC

TEJON RANCHCORP'S BRIEF RE: JUDGE'S REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION RE: CONTINUING

JURISDICTION, NEW PARTIES, CLAIMS AND CHANGED CONDITIONS

solutions that sometimes require the joinder of less than all parties. In *Pasadena v. Alhambra*, (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 908, 919-920, the court stated:

"The objection is also made that the court erred in allocating water without the joinder of a number of private users who pumped comparatively small amounts. The referee filed a preliminary report which stated that it would be impracticable to attempt to include all such parties. It recommended, however, that certain named parties who used fairly substantial amounts be joined in the action, and the court ordered them brought in over the objections of appellant. No request was made by appellant for the inclusion of any party who had not been joined, and there is no showing that its interest was injuriously affected by the failure to require the joinder of all possible claimants. (See Smith v. Cucamonga Water Co., 160 Cal. 611, 617). The line must be drawn somewhere in order to bring the proceeding within practical bounds, and it would have been impossible to reach a solution of the problems involved and to render a valid judgment if jurisdiction to make an allocation depended upon the joinder of every person having some actual or potential right to the water in the basin and its sources of supply. The persons not made parties are, of course, not bound by the judgment, nor are they injured by the injunction." (Id.; emphasis added).

The physical solution doctrine, the court's exercise of continuing jurisdiction, and the court's appointment of a Watermaster, enable the court to accommodate new conditions, claims and parties without disrupting the prior Stipulation or Judgment.

Judgments may provide for nonparties to subsequently join or intervene in the existing action. As a practical matter, experience has shown that a nonparty is far less likely to engage in the expense of an entirely separate action when an existing judgment allows for an expedited process whereby that party can obtain the benefits of a Judgment by simple intervention.

Section 57 of the Judgment entered in the Main San Gabriel Basin allows nonparties to become parties to the Judgment by executing a Stipulation for Intervention with Watermaster. Due process concerns are addressed by including this provision in the Judgment and requiring approval by Watermaster and the Court. After the Stipulation is approved, the party is bound by the terms and conditions of the Judgment and entitled to the rights and privileges accorded under the Judgment's physical solution provisions. Paragraph 57 of the Main San Gabriel Basin Judgment provides:

331008 1.DOC

6

TEJON RANCHCORP'S BRIEF RE: JUDGE'S REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION RE: CONTINUING JURISDICTION, NEW PARTIES, CLAIMS AND CHANGED CONDITIONS

567

1

2

3

4

8 9

11

10

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

26

27

28

"Any person who is not a party or successor to a party and who proposes to Produce water from the Basin or Relevant Watershed, may seek to become a party to this Judgment through a Stipulation For Intervention entered into with Watermaster. Watermaster may execute said Stipulation on behalf of the other parties herein but such Stipulation shall not preclude a party from opposing such Intervention at the time of the Court hearing thereon. Said Stipulation For Intervention must thereupon be filed with the Court, which will consider an order confirming said Intervention following thirty (30) days' notice to the parties. Thereafter, if approved by the Court, such Intervenor shall be a party bound by this Judgment and entitled to the rights and privileges accorded under the Physical Solution herein." (RFJN, Exhibit "B").

Paragraph 40 of the judgment entered in the Mojave Groundwater Basin contains a substantially identical provision. (RFJN, Exhibit "D"). Similarly, paragraph 60 of the Judgment entered in the Chino Groundwater Basin provides:

"Any non-party assignee of the adjudicated appropriative rights of any appropriator, or any other person newly proposing to produce water from Chino Basin, may become a party to this judgment upon filing a petition in intervention. Said intervention must be confirmed by order of this Court. Such intervenor shall thereafter be a party bound by this judgment and entitled to the rights and privileges accorded under the Physical Solution herein, through the pool to which the Court shall assign such intervenor." (RFJN, Exhibit "C").

The physical solution may authorize the Watermaster to sue non-parties to protect rights decreed under the Judgment, support the Judgment, and support the physical solution. This is consistent with the law as applied to other court-appointed agents, such as receivers. For example, receivers are court-appointed agents authorized to initiate litigation as a party. The court in *Klopstock v. Superior Court* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 13, held that a court-appointed receiver has a right to initiate litigation notwithstanding the challenge of a petitioner alleging the receiver's lack of capacity to file the complaint and summons. The court in *Klopstock* stated:

"The plaintiff was duly appointed receiver and has legal capacity to sue as such and, hence could bring the defendants into court by the service of summons upon them even if he had no cause of action against them." (*Id.* at 18).

As a court-appointed entity, the Watermaster may also sue non-parties that interfere with the exercise of rights granted under the Judgment. In *Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster v. Azusa Land Reclamation Company* (1993) 12 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 1371, a landfill's

331008 1.DOC

operations polluted the local water supply. To protect adjudicated resources within the groundwater basin, the court-appointed Watermaster initiated litigation to protect against degradation and contamination of the groundwater supply.

Provisions may be included in the Judgment that authorize Watermaster to bring an action or motion to enjoin production in contravention of the Judgment. Paragraph 12 of the Judgment entered in the Mojave Groundwater Basin provides:

"This Judgment, and the Physical Solution decreed herein, addresses all Production within the Mojave Basin Area. Because of the existence of Overdraft, any Production outside the framework of this Judgment and Physical Solution will contribute to an increased Overdraft, potentially damage the Mojave Basin Area and public interests in the Basin Area, injure the rights of all Parties, and interfere with the Physical Solution. Watermaster shall bring an action or a motion to enjoin any Production that is not pursuant to the terms of this Judgment." (RFJN, Exhibit "D").

In addition, trial courts may take advantage of the "related cases" provisions, such as those found at Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 7.3. This Local Rule empowers a trial court to order cases related, even if the prior case has been dismissed. Under this provision, a future action involving a new defendant could be transferred to the judge presiding over the groundwater adjudication under his or her continuing jurisdiction. Local Rule 7.3(f)(1) provides:

- "A civil case may be ordered related to other case(s), including Probate and Domestic (Family Law) cases, by the court when it appears that the cases:
- a) Arise from the same or substantially identical transactions, happenings or events; or
- b) Require a determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law and/or fact; or
- c) Are likely for other good reasons to require substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.
- d) Are the same or substantially similar to a prior case in the Superior Court that has been dismissed, either with or without prejudice."

Thus, even if new claims arise against new users of surface or groundwater, the court and watermaster can address them under the court's continuing jurisdiction.

331008 1.DOC

## V. CONCLUSION.

The physical solution doctrine and the court's reservation of continuing jurisdiction have enabled judgments to evolve over time, add new parties, and address changed conditions. With the assistance of court-appointed Watermasters, courts with responsibility for groundwater judgments throughout California have addressed these issues in a comprehensive, efficient and consistent manner within the context of the court's continuing jurisdiction.

Dated: October 6, 2006

NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP FREDRIC A. FUDACZ

HENRY S. WEINSTOCK ALFRED E. SMITH

Ву:

FREDERIC A. FUDACZ Attorneys for Tejon Ranchcorp

1 /