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** STEFANIE D. HEDLUND, Bar No. 239787 3 JESSICA L. HIRSCH, Bar No. 254703 5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500 4 **IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614** TELEPHONE: (949) 263-2600 5 TELECOPIER: (949) 260-0972 Attorneys for Cross-Complainant LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS 6 DISTRICT NO. 40 7 OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL 8 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ANDREA ORDIN, Bar No. 38235 9 COUNTY COUNSEL WARREN WELLEN, Bar No. 139152 10 PRINCIPAL 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 COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 13 14 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 15 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT 16 17 ANTELOPE VALLEY Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408 18 **GROUNDWATER CASES CLASS ACTION** 19 **Included Actions:** Los Angeles County Waterworks District Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 20 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 Los Angeles County Waterworks District PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior OPPOSITION TO AGWA'S MOTION IN 23 Court of California, County of Kern, Case LIMINE NO. 3 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

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

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

In its Motion in Limine Number 3, the self-designated "Antelope Valley Ground Water Agreement Association" ("AGWA") seeks a ruling from this court stating that its continuing jurisdiction to implement a physical solution (or a basin management program) is not conditioned on a finding that the basin is in overdraft. More specifically, AGWA contends that the court may exercise its ongoing jurisdiction to implement a physical solution in the absence of overdraft, and asks that this court find the same, and exclude evidence from the Phase III trial that could contradict AGWA's requested finding. For the reasons set forth below, the motion be denied.

II. ARGUMENT

AGWA's motion would require the court to prematurely exclude evidence relevant to the implementation of a physical solution or basin management program. The relevancy of such evidence, however, may not become known until its context is established during the trial. (See, Kelly v. New West Federal Savings (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 659, 671 ["[u]ntil the evidence is actually offered, and the court is aware of its relevance in context, its probative value, and its potential for prejudice, matters related to the state of the evidence at the time an objection is made, the court cannot intelligently rule on admissibility."].) The court should consider all of the evidence during trial and can disallow evidence not relevant upon proper objection at that time.

There is no legal justification for granting this motion now, and AGWA offers none. A motion in limine lacking factual and legal support would ask the court to make evidentiary rulings in an evidentiary vacuum, and thus, is improper and should be denied. (*C.f.*, *Kelly v. New West Fed. Sav.* (1996) 49 Cal.App.4th 659, 670.) Moreover, the motion improperly and prematurely asks this court to decide a question of law, *viz.* the scope of the court's continuing jurisdiction relative to the implementation of a physical solution in the absence of overdraft, which is not an appropriate use of this evidentiary device. (*C.f.*, *Kelly v. New West Federal Savings* (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 659, 669.)

| | 1 | For all these reasons, this motion should be denied. | | |
|--|----|--|---|--|
| | 2 | | | |
| | 3 | 3 | | |
| | 4 | Dated: December 14, 2010 BEST BEST & | KRIEGER LLP | |
| | 5 | | | |
| | 6 | By ERICA, GA | ARNER | |
| | 7 | JE FF REY V | 7. DUNN D. HEDLUND | |
| | 8 | IESSICA I | HIRSCH | |
| | 9 | LOS ANGE WATERWO | or Cross-Complainant ELES COUNTY ORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 | |
| | 10 | | | |
| | 11 | | | |
| | 12 | | | |
| | 13 | 3 | | |
| | 14 | 1 | | |
| | 15 | 5 | | |
| | 16 | 5 | | |
| | 17 | 7 | | |
| | 18 | 3 | | |
| | 19 | | | |
| | 20 | | | |
| | 21 | | | |
| | 22 | | | |
| | 23 | | | |
| | 24 | | | |
| | 25 | | | |
| | 26 | | | |
| | 27 | | | |
| | 28 | 26345.0000A\5780550.1 | | |

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 14, 2010, I served the within document(s):

PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' OPPOSITION TO AGWA'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 3

| × | by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Counwebsite in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter. | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereo fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Irvine, California addressed as set fort 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. | |
| Service on that am aware that | I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing ce for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal at same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation e meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit. | |
| above is true a | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the and correct. | |
| | Executed on December 14, 2010, at Irvine, California. | |
| | Kerry V. Keefe | |
| 26245 0000 4\202426 | nı ı | |

26345.0000A\2924201.1