1	BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP ERIC L. GARNER, Bar No. 130665		PT FROM FILE
2	JEFFREY V. DUNN, Bar No. 131926 WENDY Y. WANG, Bar No. 228923		R GOVERNME ON 6103
3	18101 VON KARMAN AVENUE, SUITE 1000		
4	IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92612 TELEPHONE: (949) 263-2600		
5	TELECOPIER: (949) 260-0972 Attorneys for Cross-Complainant		
6	LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40		
	DISTRICT NO. 40		
7	OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
8	MARK J. SALADINO, BAR NO. 118305		
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		
13	LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40		
14	[See Next Page For Additional Counsel]		
15	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
16	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT		
	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES		Council Cool
17	Included Actions: Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v.		ing No. 4408
18	Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC	CLASS	ACTION
19	325201;		lara Case No. d to the Hono
20	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v.		
21	Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Case No. S-1500-CV-		NGELES CO RWORKS D
22	254-348;	40'S OI	BJECTIONS
23	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster,	MOTIC	' REPLY IN ON TO ENFO
24	Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist.,		EMENT AN ARATION O
25	Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, Case Nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668	LEWIS	
26	RICHARD WOOD, on behalf of himself and all	Date: Time:	June 15, 20 1:30 p.m.
	other similarly situated v. A.V. Materials, Inc., et al., Superior Court of California, County of Los	Dept.:	1 of Ŝanta (
27	Angeles, Case No. BC509546	Judge:	Superior Co Hon. Jack I
28			

EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 6103

CENTRAL DISTRICT

Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408 **CLASS ACTION**

Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 Assigned to the Honorable Jack Komar

LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. **40'S OBJECTIONS TO WILLIS** CLASS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT AND REPLY **DECLARATION OF LLOYD E. LEWIS**

June 15, 2015 Date: 1:30 p.m. Time:

1 of Santa Clara County Dept.:

Superior Court Hon. Jack Komar Judge:

DISTRICT NO. 40'S OBJECTIONS TO WILLIS CLASS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT AND REPLY DECLARATION OF LLOYD E. LEWIS

Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 ("District No. 40") objects to Willis Class' Reply in Support of Motion to Enforce Settlement ("Reply Brief") and Reply Declaration of Lloyd E. Lewis ("Lewis Declaration") on the following ground:

The Reply Brief inappropriately references and relies upon Lewis Declaration, which contains inadmissible and irrelevant hearsay that cannot be considered by the Court. (See Reply Brief at 2:24-3:10; Lewis Declaration at ¶¶5-8.) Specifically, the Lewis Declaration contains statements purportedly made by Mr. Michael McLachlan (counsel for the Wood Class) regarding land purchase, Mr. Norm Hickling (of County Supervisor Michael Antonovich's office) regarding well permits, and Mr. Eugene Nebeker (of Farm Bureau) regarding Willis Class' rights under the Proposed Judgment and Physical Solution ("Proposed Judgment"). (*Id.*)

To avoid an objection, the declaration must show the declarant's personal knowledge, state facts, not conclusions and not contain inadmissible hearsay or opinions. (*Hayman v. Block* (1986) 176 Cal.App.3d 629, 638-639.) Statements by individuals concerning their opinions of parties' water rights under the Proposed Judgment or the adjudication are irrelevant and inadmissible. (Evid. Code §350.)

Moreover, such alleged statements as declared by Mr. Lewis constitute inadmissible hearsay for which no exception applies. (Evid. Code §1200.)

This Court cannot and should not consider the portion of the Lewis Declaration containing inadmissible lay opinion and hearsay nor any arguments contained in the Reply Brief which reference or are dependent thereon.

Dated: June 12, 2015 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

ERIC L GARNER
JEFFREY V. DUNN
WENDY Y. WANG
Attorneys for

LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40

LAW OFFICES OF BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP 18101 VON KARMAN AVENUE, SUITE 1000 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92612

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Rosanna R. Pérez, 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, 300 S. Grand Avenue, 25th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90071. On June 12, 2015, I served the within document(s):

LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40'S OBJECTIONS TO WILLIS CLASS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT AND REPLY DECLARATION OF LLOYD E. LEWIS

by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on June 12, 2015, at Los Angeles, California.

Rosanna R. Pérez

26345.00000\10547276.1