1 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP **EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES** ERIC L. GARNER, Bar No. 130665 UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE 2 JEFFREY V. DUNN, Bar No. 131926 **SECTION 6103** DANIEL S. ROBERTS, Bar No. 205535 3 5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614 4 TELEPHONE: (949) 263-2600 TELECOPIER: (949) 260-0972 5 Attorneys for Cross-Complainants ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT and LOS ANGELES COUNTY 6 WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 7 OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL 8 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES JOHN F. KRATTLI, Bar No. 82149 9 SENIOR ASSISTANT COUNTY COUNSEL MICHAEL L. MOORE, Bar No. 175599 10 SENIOR DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL 500 WEST TEMPLE STREET 11 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 TELEPHONE: (213) 974-8407 12 TELECOPIER: (213) 687-7337 Attorneys for Cross-Complainant LOS ANGELES 13 COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 14 [See Next Page For Additional Counsel] 15 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - CENTRAL DISTRICT 16 17 ANTELOPE VALLEY 18 Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408 **GROUNDWATER CASES** 19 **CLASS ACTION** Included Actions: Los Angeles County Waterworks District 20 Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar Court of California, County of Los 21 Angeles, Case No. BC 325201; 22 AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC WATER Los Angeles County Waterworks District SUPPLIERS' FIRST AMENDED CROSS-No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior 23 **COMPLAINT (FICTITIOUS NAME)** Court of California, County of Kern, Case [ROE 2296] No. S-1500-CV-254-348; 24 Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of 25 Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. 26 Palmdale Water Dist., Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, Case Nos. 27 RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668 28

AMENDMENT TO FIRST AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT

LAW OFFICES OF BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP 5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614

28

LAW OFFICES OF BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP 5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614

Upon the filing of the First Amended Cross-Complaint, the Public Water Suppliers, being unaware of the true names of certain cross-defendants, designated those cross-defendants in the First Amended Cross-Complaint by the fictitious names of Roes 1 - 100,000. Now, the Public Water Suppliers have discovered the true names of those cross-defendants as follows: Roe No. True and Correct Name of Roe Cross-Defendant Roe 2296 METTLER VALLEY MUTUAL WATER COMPANY Accordingly, the Public Water Suppliers amend the First Amended Cross-complaint by substituting the true name for the fictitious name wherever it appears in the First Amended Crosscomplaint. Dated: December 11, 2009 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP By **ERIC L. GARNER** JEFFREY V. DUNN DANIEL S. ROBERTS Attorneys for Cross-Complainants ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT and LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 ORANGE\DROBERTS\63503.1

LAW OFFICES OF BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP 5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Kerry V. Keefe, declare:

I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action; my business address is Best & Krieger LLP, 5 Park Plaza, Suite 1500, Irvine, California 92614. On December 17, 2009, I served the within document(s):

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' FIRST AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT (FICTITIOUS NAME) [ROE 2296]

×	by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter.
	by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Irvine, California addressed as set forth below.
	by causing personal delivery by ASAP Corporate Services of the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.
	by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.
	I caused such envelope to be delivered via overnight delivery addressed as indicated on the attached service list. Such envelope was deposited for delivery by Federal Express following the firm's ordinary business practices.
	I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

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

Executed on December 17, 2009, at Irvine, California.

Kerry V. Keefe

ORANGE\KKEEFE\24201.1