| 1 | Ralph B. Kalfayan (SBN 133464) Lynne M. Brennan (SBN 149131) | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | KRAUSE KALFAYAN BENINK & SLAVENS, LLP | | | | |
| 3 | 550 West C Street, Suite 530 San Diego, CA 92101 | | | | |
| 4 | Tel: (619) 232-0331 Fax: (619) 232-4019 | | | | |
| 5 | Class Counsel for the Willis Class | | | | |
| 6 | Class Country III Will Class | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA | | | | |
| 9 | FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES | | | | |
| 10 | ANTELOPE VALLEY | RELATED CASE TO JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION PROCEEDING NO. 4408 | | | |
| 11 | GROUNDWATER CASES | COORDINATION PROCEEDING NO. 4408 | | | |
| 12 | This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS and DAVID | | | | |
| 13 | ESTRADA, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, | WILLIS CLASS' WITHDRAWAL OF OBJECTION TO REQUEST OF UNITED | | | |
| 14 | | STATES FOR CONFIRMATION FROM THE COURT THAT RESUBMISSION OF THE | | | |
| 15 | Plaintiffs, | PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED EVIDENCE OF FEDERAL RESERVE RIGHT IS | | | |
| 16 | V. | REDUNDANT AND UNNECESSARY | | | |
| 17 | LOS ANGELES COUNTY | Judge: Hon. Jack Komar | | | |
| 18 | WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF | | | | |
| 19 | PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK | | | | |
| 20 | IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM | | | | |
| 21 | RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL WATER DISTRICT; | | | | |
| 22 | ANTELOPE VALLEY WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE | | | | |
| 23 | DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON HILL | | | | |
| 24 | COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000; | | | | |
| 25 | Defendants. | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | |
| 28 | | 1 | | | |

On May 14, 2015, the Willis Class filed a "Response to Case Management Statement of United States" wherein the Willis Class objected to the United States' request for "confirmation from the Court that resubmission of the previously presented evidence is redundant and unnecessary for the next phase of hearings." The Willis Class objected to the United States' request based on grounds that permitting the United States' request would impair the due process rights of the Willis Class to cross-examine the United States regarding the amount of its alleged Federal Reserve Right.

During the May 15, 2015, telephonic status conference, the Court overruled the Willis Class' objections based on the Court's enforcement of Paragraph C of the Willis Stipulation of Settlement and Willis Judgment which states that the Willis Class agreed to be bound by the Court's determination of the Federal Reserve Right. The Federal Reserve Right was incorporated into the Stipulated Judgment and proposed Physical Solution ("SPPS") at Paragraph 5.1.4. Willis Class Counsel accepted the ruling of the Court and agreed to be bound by the Court's ruling without further objection or opposition. Perhaps based on a misunderstanding of Willis Class Counsel's agreement to be bound by the Court's ruling without further opposition, the United States offered to brief this issue for the Court.

The Court granted the United States' request based on the Court's enforcement of Paragraph C of the Willis Stipulation of Settlement and Willis Judgment. The Willis Class hereby officially withdraws its opposition and objection to the United States' request for confirmation from the Court that resubmission of the previously presented evidence is redundant and unnecessary for the next phase of hearings. There is no need for further briefing on this issue. Such briefing

¹ The Willis Class does not waive its right to object to other Paragraphs of the SPPS such as Paragraph 5.1.4.1 which transfers rights to the unused portions of the Federal Reservé Right to other Stipulating Parties, including District 40.
WILLIS CLASS' WITHDRAWAL OF OBJECTION TO REQUEST OF UNITED STATES FOR CONFIRMATION FROM THE COURT THAT RESUBMISSION OF THE PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED EVIDENCE OF FEDERAL RESERVE RIGHT IS

| 1 | would result in the unnecessary expenditure of attorneys' fees and a waste of judicial resources. | | | | |
|----|---|-----|---|---|--|
| 2 | Dated: May 15, 2015 | | Respectfully submitted, | | |
| 3 | | | KRAUSE KALFAYAN BENINK | & | |
| 4 | | | SLAVENS, LLP | | |
| 5 | | Dru | | | |
| 6 | | By: | Ralph B. Kalfayan, Esq. | | |
| 7 | | | Ralph B. Kalfayan, Esq. Lynne M. Brennan, Esq. Class Counsel for the Willis Class | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | |
| 28 | | 3 | | | |

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Lynne M. Brennan, declare:

-

I am a citizen of the United States and employed in San Diego County, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is Krause Kalfayan Benink & Slavens, LLP 550 West C Street, Suite 530, San Diego, California 92101. On May 15, 2015, I caused the following document(s):

WILLIS CLASS' WITHDRAWAL OF OBJECTION TO REQUEST OF UNITED STATES FOR CONFIRMATION FROM THE COURT THAT RESUBMISSION OF THE PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED EVIDENCE OF FEDERAL RESERVE RIGHT IS REDUNDANT AND UNNECESSARY

to be served on the parties in this action, as follows:

- (X) (BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE) by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website: www.scefiling.org regarding the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter.
- () (BY U.S. Mail) I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing of documents for mailing. Under that practice, the above-referenced documents(s) were placed in sealed envelope(s) addressed to the parties as noted above, with postage thereon fully prepaid and deposited such envelope(s) with the United States Postal Service on the same date at San Diego, California, addressed to:
- () (BY FEDERAL EXPRESS) I served a true and correct copy by Federal Express or other overnight delivery service, for the delivery on the next business day. Each copy was enclosed in an envelope or package designed by the express service carrier; deposited in a facility regularly maintained by the express service carrier or delivered to a courier or driver authorized to receive documents on its behalf; with delivery fees paid or provided for; addressed as shown on the accompanying service list.
- () (BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION) I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of facsimile transmission of documents. It is transmitted to the recipient on the same day in the ordinary course of business.
- (X) (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.
- () (FEDERAL) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Lynne M. Brennan