1	RICHARD G. ZIMMER - SBN 107263	
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	T. MARK SMITH - SBN 162370 CLIFFORD & BROWN	
3	A Professional Corporation Attorneys at Law	
4	Bank of America Building 1430 Truxtun Avenue, Suite 900	
5	Bakersfield, CA 93301-5230 (661) 322-6023	
6	Attorneys for Bolthouse Properties, LLC	
7	and Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc.	
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA	
9	COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA	
10	COORDINATION PROCEEDING	T. I. J. G. C. L. C. C. Duran Han No.
11	SPECIAL TITLE (Rule 1550(b))	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No.4408
12	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	CASE NO. 1-05-CV-049053
13	INCLUDED ACTIONS:	OBJECTION TO [PROPOSED] FOURTH
14	LOS ANGELES COUNTY) AMENDMENT TO CASE) MANAGEMENT ORDER FOR PHASE
15	WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 v. DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No.	FOUR TRIAL
16	BC325201	
17	LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 v.)
18	DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, et al., Kern County Superior Court Case No. S-) Trial Date: May 28, 2013) Action Filed: October 26, 2005
19	1500-CV-254348)
20	DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, and W.M. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC., v.	
21	CITY OF LANCASTER, et al., Riverside Superior Court)
22	Case No. RIC 344436 [c/w case no. RIC 344668 and 353840])
23)
24	AND RELATED ACTIONS)
25		
26	/ / /	
27	/// ·	
28	1	
	OBJECTION TO [PROPOSED] FOURTH AMENDMENT TO CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER FOR PHASE FOUR TRIAL	

28 ||

///

///

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. and Bolthouse Properties, LLC, (hereinafter "Bolthouse") object to the [Proposed] Fourth Amendment to Case Management Order for Phase Four Trial on the grounds that the proposed amendment does not meet the requirements of Civil Procedure Sections 187 and 404.7 and Rule of Court 3.504(c) and on the grounds that the date set to "require parties to indicate whether they dispute information provided by the parties in response to those orders" is premature.

The Stipulations propose that failure to stipulate is the equivalent to proof of an adjudicated fact or a prima facia case, which is inappropriate under the Code of Civil Procedure. Rule 3.504(c), Code of Civil Procedure Sections 187 and 404.7 do not apply since the Code of Civil Procedure sets forth the appropriate methods for summary adjudication of issues. Further, the April 15, 2013 "date by which to require parties to indicate whether they dispute information provided by their parties in response to those orders" is premature. Depositions are continuing. Specifically, depositions of Bolthouse witnesses are not scheduled until April 22, 2013 and other depositions have not yet been completed. Requiring that parties indicate whether they dispute information provided in other parties responses or stipulations cannot possibly occur when the date to do so is before discovery is completed. Further, appropriate time to evaluate information submitted by other parties must be allowed after the submission of the information, in order to allow time for parties to engage in any meaningful evaluation of this information.

Bolthouse does not object to any party stipulating with another party regarding disputed facts as between those parties. However, such a stipulation cannot bind other non-stipulating parties and stipulating parties cannot by stipulation settle rights which the stipulating parties do not have the right to settle, or settle rights which the stipulating party does not by itself have the ability to separately settle, such as correlative groundwater rights. Such stipulations cannot

properly convert the usufructuary correlative groundwater right into a quantified groundwater right. Finally, the rules for trial of disputed issues likewise are set forth in the Code of Civil Procedure and case law. Respectfully submitted. DATED: April 2, 2013 **CLIFFORD & BROWN** By: CHARD G. ZIMMER, ESQ. Attorneys for BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC and WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.

PROOF OF SERVICE (C.C.P. §1013a, 2015.5)
Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases
Judicial Counsel Coordination Proceeding No. 4408
Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 1-05-CV-049053

I am employed in the County of Kern, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 1430 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, CA 93301.

On April 2, 2013, I served the foregoing document(s) entitled:

OBJECTION TO [PROPOSED] FOURTH AMENDMENT TO CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER FOR PHASE FOUR TRIAL

by uploading the document listed above to the Santa Clara Superior Court website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater Matter. All parties listed on the Santa Clara Superior Court in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater Matter are hereby incorporated within by this reference.

X BY SANTA CLARA SUPERIOR COURT E-FILING IN COMPLEX LITIGATION PURSUANT TO CLARIFICATION ORDER DATED OCTOBER 27, 2005.

Executed on April 2, 2013, at Bakersfield, California.

X (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

VICKI STREET 2455-2