II		
1 2	BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP ERIC L. GARNER, Bar No. 130665 JEFFREY V. DUNN, Bar No. 131926	EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 6103
3	STEFANIE D. HEDLUND, Bar No. 239787 18101 VON KARMAN AVENUE, SUITE 1000	
	IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92612	
4	TELEPHONE: (949) 263-2600 FACSIMILE: (949) 260-0972	
5	Attorneys for Cross-Complainant LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS	S
6	DISTRICT NO. 40	
7	OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
8	JOHN F. KRATTLI, Bar No. 82149 COUNTY COUNSEL	
9	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	
13	Attorneys for Cross-Complainant LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40	
14	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
15	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
16	COUNTY	OF LOS ANGELES
17		I 11 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 A 10 A 10 A 10 A 1
18	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408
19	Included Actions:	CLASS ACTION
	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior	Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar
20	Court of California, County of Los	<u> </u>
21	Angeles, Case No. BC 325201;	OBJECTIONS TO BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC AND WM. BOLTHOUSE
22	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior	FARMS, INC.'S NOTICE TO APPEAR AND PRODUCE DOCUMENTS
23	Court of California, County of Kern, Case 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		
	26345.00000\7980654.1	

OBJECTION TO NOTICE TO APPEAR AND PRODUCE DOCUMENTS

28

REQUEST NO. 4:

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

27

Any and all WRITINGS, as defined by Evidence Code Section 250, documenting any and all actions at any time by Los Angeles County and Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 that demonstrate the physical capability to re-capture or use RETURN FLOWS in the ANTELOPE VALLEY.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 4:

This request is overbroad, oppressive, burdensome, vague and ambiguous. This request also seeks irrelevant information and documents that exceed the scope of the Phase 4 trial.

REQUEST NO. 5:

Any and all WRITINGS, as defined by Evidence Code Section 250, documenting any water supply assessments related to the ANTELOPE VALLEY.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 5:

This request is overbroad, oppressive, burdensome, vague and ambiguous. This request also seeks irrelevant information and documents that exceed the scope of the Phase 4 trial.

REQUEST NO. 6:

Any and all WRITINGS, as defined by Evidence Code Section 250, documenting all will serve notices related to the ANTELOPE VALLEY issued by Los Angeles County and Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 over the last twenty years.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 6:

This request is overbroad, oppressive, burdensome, vague and ambiguous. This request also seeks irrelevant information and documents that exceed the scope of the Phase 4 trial.

REQUEST NO. 7:

Any and all WRITINGS, as defined by Evidence Code Section 250, documenting all water management plans or similar plans related to the ANTELOPE VALLEY.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 7:

This request is overbroad, oppressive, burdensome, vague and ambiguous. This request also seeks irrelevant information and documents that exceed the scope of the Phase 4 trial.

28

REQUEST NO. 8:

Any and all WRITINGS, as defined by Evidence Code Section 250, documenting all actions taken by Los Angeles County and Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 over the past twenty years to confirm an adequate water supply for new development.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 8:

This request is overbroad, oppressive, burdensome, vague and ambiguous. This request also seeks irrelevant information and documents that exceed the scope of the Phase 4 trial.

REQUEST NO. 9:

Any and all WRITINGS, as defined by Evidence Code Section 250, documenting any engineering or study conducted by Los Angeles County and Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 regarding RETURN FLOWS or any migration of RETURN FLOWS within the ANTELOPE VALLEY.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 9:

This request is overbroad, oppressive, burdensome, vague and ambiguous. This request also seeks irrelevant information and documents that exceed the scope of the Phase 4 trial.

REQUEST NO. 10:

Any and all WRITINGS, as defined by Evidence Code Section 250, documenting the breakdown, if any, and evaluation of RETURN FLOWS in the ANTELOPE VALLEY from different water uses, including but not limited to, municipal, industrial, irrigation, septic tank, municipal sewage system, and any other source.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 10:

This request is overbroad, oppressive, burdensome, vague and ambiguous. This request also seeks irrelevant information and documents that exceed the scope of the Phase 4 trial.

REQUEST NO. 11:

Any and all WRITINGS, as defined by Evidence Code Section 250, documenting the percentage or amount of RETURN FLOWS to the ANTELOPE VALLEY from various types of water use being claimed in this litigation and calculation of transmission losses affecting the claimed amounts of such RETURN FLOWS.

26345.00000\7980654.1

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11: 1 This request is overbroad, oppressive, burdensome, vague and ambiguous. This request 2 also seeks irrelevant information and documents that exceed the scope of the Phase 4 trial. 3 4 **REQUEST NO. 12:** Any and all WRITINGS, as defined by Evidence Code Section 250, documenting any 5 engineering or other analysis of RETURN FLOWS derived from initial RETURN FLOWS in the 6 7 ANTELOPE VALLEY. **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:** 8 This request is overbroad, oppressive, burdensome, vague and ambiguous. This request 9 also seeks irrelevant information and documents that exceed the scope of the Phase 4 trial. 10 11 **REQUEST NO. 13:** 12 13 14

Any and all WRITINGS, as defined by Evidence Code Section 250, documenting all presentations, including written documents and or bullet point presentations related to the availability of groundwater for existing and/or future residential development, RETURN FLOWS and/or the extent to which RETURN FLOWS have been relied upon to demonstrate an existing or future water supply, whether or not such writings or documents have been provided to the public.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:

This request is overbroad, oppressive, burdensome, vague and ambiguous. This request also seeks irrelevant information and documents that exceed the scope of the Phase 4 trial.

Dated: May 22, 2013 21

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

EFANIE D. HEDLUND

Attorneys for Cross-Complainant

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40

27

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

28

PROOF OF SERVICE 1 2 I. Sandra K. Sandoval, declare: I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and 3 not a party to the within action; my business address is Best Best & Krieger LLP,300 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90071. On May 22, 2013, I served the within 4 document(s): 5 OBJECTIONS TO BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC AND WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.'S NOTICE TO APPEAR AND PRODUCE DOCUMENTS 6 by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court 7 X website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter. 8 by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon 9 fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Irvine, California addressed as set forth below. 10 by causing personal delivery by ASAP Corporate Services of the document(s) 11 listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below. 12 by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the 13 address(es) set forth below. 14 I caused such envelope to be delivered via overnight delivery addressed as indicated on the attached service list. Such envelope was deposited for delivery 15 by Federal Express following the firm's ordinary business practices. 16 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 17 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 18 date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit. 19 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. 20 Executed on May 22, 2013, at Los Angeles, California 21 22 Sandra K. Sandoval 23 24 25 26 27 28 26345.00000\7980654.1 PROOF OF SERVICE OF OBJECTION TO NOTICE TO APPEAR AND PRODUCE DOCUMENTS