| 1 2 3 4 5 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 Plaintiff/defendant, Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc., a Michigan corporation | | |
| 8 | SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 9 | COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA | | |
| 10 | * 1 | * * | |
| 11 | COORDINATION PROCEEDING SPECIAL TITLE (Rule 1550(b)) | Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408 | |
| 12 13 | ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES | CASE NO. 1-05-CV-409053 | |
| 14 | INCLUDED ACTIONS: | | |
| 15 | LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS | | |
| 16 17 | DISTRICT NO. 40 v. DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC325201 | OBJECTION TO [PROPOSED] ORDER CERTIFYING PLAINTIFF CLASS | |
| 18 | LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS | | |
| 19 | DISTRICT NO. 40 v. DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, et al., | | |
| 20 | Kern County Superior Court Case No. S-1500-CV-254348 | | |
| 21 | DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, and | | |
| 22 | W.M. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC., v. CITY OF LANCASTER, et al., | | |
| 23 | Riverside Superior Court Case No. RIC 344436 [c/w case no. RIC 344668 and 353840] | | |
| 24 | 110. KIC 344000 and 333040] | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Bolthouse Properties, Inc. and Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. hereby object to the [Proposed] Order Certifying Plaintiff Class on the following grounds:

The Motion for Class Certification was withdrawn prior to the hearing on August 20, 2007. Accordingly, there was no reason to believe that any Motion for Class Certification would be heard. Further, the potential classes were not identified for motion prior to the hearing. Finally, given the fact that the Motion purportedly was off calendar and the fact that the proposed classes were not identified, no party was aware that a motion would be made. Finally, no evidentiary hearing was afforded to the parties regarding the proposed class which the Court previously advised would occur before certification of the class.

Responding parties also object strongly to the proposed exclusion on Page 2, Lines 25 through 28 of "all persons to the extent their properties are connected to a municipal water system, public utility, or mutual water company from which they receive or are able to receive water service, as well as owners of properties within the service areas of the foregoing water purveyors as to which there is a water system agreement or water service agreement providing for the provision of water service by such purveyors." These parties are overlying land owners. In order to obtain the relief requested in the operative pleadings of the water producers, seeking adjudication of all water rights,

1

2

3 4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

and to satisfy the McCarren Act, these parties must be included in the action.

A physical solution would not be appropriate as against only some land owners and not others simply because they happen to be in a water district. Nothing prevents well permits from being In fact, public water producers appear to be issuing well serve permits for wells notwithstanding alleged overdraft. Additionally, alleged prescription must apply to all land owners in the Antelope Valley and be apportioned accordingly whether or not they are in a water service district and whether or not they receive or could receive water from a municipal provider.

The municipal providers derailed the Riverside action which was a limited action to quiet title as to certain properties as between certain limited parties. By broadening the action and filing a lawsuit in Los Angeles County and Kern County to adjudicate all water rights, the water purveyors must now properly plead, serve and prove these actions against all parties necessary to obtain the relief they have requested and to avoid problems of equal protection, McCarren Act issues and to achieve a meaningful adjudication.

DATED: September 21, 2007 Respectfully submitted,

CLIFFORD & BROWN

By:

CHARD G. ZIMMER, ESO.

MARK SMITH, ESQ.

Attorneys for plaintiff/defendant, W. M. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.