1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		
10		
11	COORDINATION PROCEEDING, SPECIAL TITLE (Rule 1550 (b)),	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408
12	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER	CASE NO.: 1-05-CV-049053
13	CASES,	·
14	INCLUDED ACTIONS: LOS ANGELES	BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES LLC'S AND
15 16	COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 v. DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, et	WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.'S JOINDER AND REPLY TO OBJECTIONS BY OTHER PARTIES TO
17	al.,, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC325201,	WOOD CLASS REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT
18		
19	LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 v. DIAMOND FARMING	<b>DATE</b> : MAY 24, 2011
20   21	COMPANY, et al., Kern County Superior Court Case No. S-1500- CV-254348,	TIME: 0:00 a.m. DEPT: 316 JUDGE: Hon. J. Komar
22		
23	DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, and W.M. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC., v. CITY	
24	OF LANCASTER, et al., Riverside Superior Court Case No. RIC	
25	344436 [c/w case no. RIC 344668 and 353840],	
26		
27		
28		

Bolthouse Properties, LLC and Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. (hereinafter "Bolthouse") hereby join in and reply to the objections by other parties to the Wood Class request for preliminary approval of settlement, including, but not limited to, objections filed by Antelope Valley Ground Water Agreement Association ("AGWA"), Tejon Ranchcorp and Copa De Oro Land Company.

Bolthouse further refers the Court and all parties to *Water Code*, Section 103, which provides as follows:

"In the enactment of this code, the Legislature does not intend thereby to effect any change in the law relating to water rights."

The correlative overlying water right existed in case law prior to enactment of *Water Code*, Section 106, which was enacted along with Section 103 on or about 1943. The overlying correlative water right has been recognized many times since 1943 in case law which does not recognize any alleged priority overlying right based upon domestic use. A review of the annotations following *Water Code*, Section 106 reveals that cases involving a priority for domestic use involve riparian water use, not groundwater use. For example, the *Deetz* case cited by other counsel was a riparian case. Accordingly, there is no legal basis for the claimed priority. Further, any claimed priority must be litigated, not simply created in a Settlement Agreement.

Further, as numerous other parties have pointed out, the Class includes individuals and entities, as well as numerous different types of water usage. Notwithstanding the fact that there is no legal basis to claim the priority, and given the reality that no appropriate definition has been provided for domestic use, the Class clearly includes parties who may or may not meet that definition, either as an entity or as an individual, and depending upon the particular type of water use involved. Accordingly, not only must the legal right to the priority be adjudicated, the factual basis for the priority must be litigated and proved. Neither has occurred and the parties to the Settlement cannot create and/or agree to such a right to the detriment of other

\\\\

1	Overlying Landowners in the litigate	ation.	
2			
3	DATED: May 12, 2011		Respectfully submitted,
4			CLIFFORD & BROWN
5			OBILITORE WESTERNING
6		ار.	
7	·	By:	RICHARD G. ZIMMER, ESQ.
8			Attorneys for
9			BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC and WM BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			. •
15			
16			
17		•	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	·		
20			
	[ ]		·

1	PROOF OF SERVICE (C.C.P. §1013a, 2015.5)		
2	Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases		
	Judicial Counsel Coordination Proceeding No. 4408 Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 1-05-CV-049053		
3			
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 May 12, 2011, I served the foregoing document(s) entitled:		
7	BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES LLC'S AND WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.'S JOINDER AND REPLY TO OBJECTIONS BY OTHER PARTIES TO WOOD CLASS REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT		
8 9	by placing the true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as stated on the attached mailing list.		
10 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 LITIGATION PURSUANT TO CLARIFICATION ORDER DATED OCTOBER		
13	27, 2005.		
14	Executed on May 12, 2011, at Bakersfield, California.		
15 16	X (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.		
17 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	Manalle Marcay		
20	NANETTE MAXEY		
21	2455-2		
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
ا ن د	$\mathbf{I}$		