1 2 3 4 5	RICHARD G. ZIMMER - SBN 107263 T. MARK SMITH - SBN 162370 CLIFFORD & BROWN A Professional Corporation Attorneys at Law Bank of America Building 1430 Truxtun Avenue, Suite 900 Bakersfield, CA 93301-5230 (661) 322-6023	
6 7	Attorneys for Cross-Defendants, I Bolthouse Farms, Inc.,	Bolthouse Properties, LLC and Wm.
8	SUPERIOR COURT	OF CALIFORNIA
9	COUNTY OF	SANTA CLARA
10	* 1	* *
11	COORDINATION PROCEEDING SPECIAL TITLE (Rule 1550(b))	Judicial Council Coordination
12	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES) CASE NO. 1-05-CV-409053
13) CASE NO. 1-05-CV-409055
14	INCLUDED ACTIONS:	
15 16	LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS) DISTRICT NO. 40 v. DIAMOND) FARMING COMPANY, et al.,	BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC'S AND
17	Los Angeles Superior Court)	WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.'S RESPONSE TO APPLICATION OF
18	LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS	
19	DISTRICT NO. 40 v. DIAMOND) FARMING COMPANY, et al., Kern County Superior Court)	ORDER THEREON
20	Case No. S-1500-CV-254348	PHASE 2 TRIAL DATE: October 6, 2008
21	DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, and) W.M. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC., v.)	
22	CITY OF LANCASTER, et al., () Riverside Superior Court ()	
23	Case No. RIC 344436 [c/w case) no. RIC 344668 and 353840]	
24	-))	
25))	
26)	

In summary, BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC'S AND WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC. cannot present expert testimony during the last two weeks of October. BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC'S AND WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC. can present expert testimony during the week of the October 6th assuming other party experts claiming the existence of sub basins complete their testimony first, which is doubtful. If Bolthouse expert testimony cannot be completed by October 10th, and if we believe his testimony is necessary based on the evidence presented by sub basin proponents, we could have him testify sometime during the last two weeks of November.

COURT ORDER AND PRIOR COMMUNICATIONS

In response to Mr. Kuhs' letter dated August 22, 2008, we advised that we would agree to allow Mr. Kuhs' expert to testify at a later time. However, consistent with the Court's Order regarding trying the case in one week increments and availability of counsel for Bolthouse, we advised we could not proceed during the two week period following October 10th.

In the recent telephone conversation with Mr. Kuhs, Bolthouse counsel reiterated the comments in the previous letter to Mr. Kuhs and the Court, that Mr. Sheahan's testimony may or may not be necessary based upon testimony of Los Angeles County experts and the testimony of Mr. Kuhs' experts. We also reiterated the comments in the previous letter to Mr. Kuhs that it was our understanding either Los Angeles County and/or Tejon

would present expert testimony first which would probably take fill the first week of trial starting on the 6th.

We also advised Mr. Kuhs that it was our intent to have Mr.Sheahan testify after Los Angeles County, Tejon and other sub basin expert proponents testify, if at all, and that he would be available to do so in the second half of November assuming there was not time during the first week of trial.

We did not agree to start the further Phase 2 Trial on October 16th, nor did we agree to produce Mr. Sheahan before Tejon's experts testify. As noted above, there may be no need to incur the cost of doing so. We remain willing to schedule the continued Phase 2 Trial for the end of November should any further expert testimony need to be presented by Mr. Sheahan or otherwise.

CONCLUSION

BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC'S AND WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC. cannot present expert testimony during the last two weeks of October. BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC'S AND WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC. can present expert testimony during the week of the October 6th assuming other party experts claiming the existence of sub basins complete their testimony first. If Bolthouse expert testimony cannot be completed by October 10th, and if we believe his testimony is necessary based on the evidence presented by sub basin proponents, we could have him testify sometime during the last two weeks of November.

1	If the Court is inclined to proceed as set forth above, we
2	have no objection to doing so. If not, we suggest a trial
3	scheduling conference be held with the Court to clarify how we
4	will proceed.
5	
6	DATED: August 27, 2008 Respectfully submitted,
7	CLIFFORD & BROWN
8	
9	By: RICHARD G. ZIMMER, ESQ.
10	T. MARK SMITH, ESQ. Attorneys for plaintiff/defendant,
11	W. M. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

1	PROOF OF SERVICE (C.C.P. §1013a, 2015.5) Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases Judicial Counsel Coordination Proceeding No. 4408	
2		
3	Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 1-05-CV-049053	
4	I am employed in the County of Kern, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a	
5	party to the within action; my business address is 1430 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, CA 93301.	
6	On August 27, 2008, I served the foregoing document(s) entitled:	
7	BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC'S AND WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.'S RESPONSE TO APPLICATION OF TEJON RANCHCORP FOR EXPERT WITNESS SCHEDULING ORDER AND ORDER THEREON	
8	SCHEDOLING ORDER AND CIVER INDICES	
9	by placing the true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes	
10	addressed as stated on the attached mailing list.	
11	by placing _ the original, _ a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed enveloped addressed as follows:	
12	X BY SANTA CLARA SUPERIOR COURT E-FILING IN COMPLEX	
13	LITIGATION PURSUANT TO CLARIFICATION ORDER DATED OCTOBER	
14	27, 2005.	
15	Executed on August 27, 2008, at Bakersfield, California.	
16 17	_X_ (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.	
18	(Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made.	
19		
20	Manette Maxey	
21	NANETTE MAXEY 2455-2	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		