ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION A TTORNEYS ATLAW 201 SOUTH LAKE AYENUE, SUITE 300 PASADEMA, CALIFORNIA 91101-4869 TELEPHONE: (622) 583-8600 FAX: (626) 583-8610	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		241283
	 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 		Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No.: 4408 LASC Case No. BC325201 Santa Clara Sup. Court Case No.: 1-05-CV 049053 Assigned to Hon. Jack Komar, Judge of the Santa Clara County Superior Court OBJECTION/OPPOSITION TO WATERMASTER'S RENEWED MOTION FOR MONETARY, DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AGAINST ZAMRZLAS AND REQUEST FOR HEARING; DECLARATION OF WESLEY A. MILLIBAND
	19 20	TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD:	
	 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 	Johnny Zamrzla, Johnny Lee Zamrzla and Jeanette Zamrzla (collectively "Zamrzlas") hereby submit this Objection/Opposition to the Watermaster's Renewed Motion for Monetary, Declaratory or Injunctive Relief and Request for Hearing. This matter is stayed pending appeal. Accordingly, this court lacks jurisdiction to set a hearing and/or rule on the Watermaster's motion. ¹	
		OBJECTION/OPPOSITION TO WATERM	ASTER'S RENEWED MOTION FOR MONETARY,

DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AGAINST ZAMRZLAS

1 I. THIS MATTER IS AUTOMATICALLY STAYED DURING THE PENDING 2 APPEAL

On June 9, 2023, this Court issued its Order Denying Zamrzla's Motion to Modify and
Vacate the Judgment. On the same date, a Notice of Entry of Order was filed and served on the
Zamrzlas. On July 3, 2023, the Zamrzlas filed a timely Notice of Appeal of the Court's June 9, 2023
Order. (Declaration of Wesley Miliband ["Miliband Decl."] at ¶ 2.) On July 12, 2023, the Notice of
Filing of the Notice of Appeal was filed. (Miliband Decl. at ¶ 3.)

8 Generally, the filing of a notice of appeal "divests the trial court of further jurisdiction in the 9 cause." (In re Estate of Waters (1919) 181 Cal. 584, 585; see generally Varian Medical Systems, 10 Inc. v. Delfino (2005) 35 Cal.4th 180 [explicating Code Civ. Proc., § 916].) Code of Civil Procedure² 11 section 916(a) sets forth the general rule that, except as provided in specified actions, all of which 12 appear inapplicable here, "the perfecting of an appeal stays proceedings in the trial court upon 13 judgment or order appealed from or upon matters embraced therein or affected thereby, including 14 the enforcement of the judgment or order" (See also Marriage of Varner (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 15 932, 936; Daly v. San Bernardino County Bd. of Supervisors (2021) 11 Cal.5th 1030, 1039 ["Today, 16 Code of Civil Procedure section 916 continues to make stay pending appeal the default, ..."].)

17 The purpose of the rule depriving the trial court of jurisdiction during a pending appeal is to 18 protect the appellate court's jurisdiction by preserving the status quo until the appeal is decided. 19 (Elsea v. Saberi (1992) 4 Cal.App.4th 625, 629.) "The rule prevents the trial court from rendering 20 an appeal futile by altering the appealed judgment or order by conducting other proceedings that 21 may affect it. [Citation.]" (Id.) Whether a matter is "embraced" by the action or "affected" depends 22 upon the impact of the particular proceeding on the effectiveness of the appeal. A stay prevents the 23 trial court from rendering an appeal futile by conducting other proceedings that may affect it. (Betz. 24 Pankow (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 931, 938.)

Here, proceeding on the Watermaster's Motion for Monetary, Declaratory and Injunctive
Relief would impact the effectiveness of the appeal as it seeks to enforce the very judgment that the

27

42793782.1

OBJECTION/OPPOSITION TO WATERMASTER'S RENEWED MOTION FOR MONETARY, DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AGAINST ZAMRZLAS

²⁸ ² Unless indicated otherwise, all statutory references are to the Code of Civil Procedure.

Zamrzlas are appealing. Indeed, the Watermaster's motion concedes this. It states that the motion
 "sought this relief on the basis that the Zamrzlas are members of the Small Pumper Class under the
 Judgment and subject to the Jurisdiction of this Court ..." (Watermaster's Renewed Motion at p.
 2:17-18.) Accordingly, action on the Watermaster's motion, which seeks to impose damages against
 the Zamrzlas based on the judgment would render the appeal futile.

Notably, the filing of the Watermaster's motion itself contradicts the Watermaster's
contention that the judgment is self-executing and, thus, not automatically stayed. A judgment is
self-executing if it requires no process for enforcement. (*Veyna v. Orange County Nursery, Inc.*(2009) 170 Cal.App.4th 146, 156.) However, the Watermaster's motion is its process in enforcing
the judgment against the Zamrzlas. The judgment is not self-executing.

Moreover, contrary to the Watermaster's contention, enforcement of the underlying judgment is stayed in this matter for the reasons set forth above. The cases relied on by the Watermaster involve money judgments and bonds that are distinguishable from the facts of this case.

Finally, the dialogue between the parties and this Court during the March 4, 2022 hearing does not restore this court's jurisdiction during the pending appeal. While the court denied the Zamrzlas' motion to modify or vacate the judgment, the dispute regarding the Zamrzlas' status as members of the small pumper class and whether they are subject to the judgment has not been resolved as the Zamrzlas' are appealing that order and judgment. The outcome of the appeal may directly affect the matters before this court. Accordingly, this matter is stayed during the pending appeal and the court should deny the Watermaster's request for a ruling on its renewed motion.

²² II. <u>ALTERNATIVELY, THIS COURT HAS DISCRETION TO STAY THE MATTER</u> ²³ <u>DURING THE PENDING APPEAL</u>

11

12

13

14

42793782.1

proceedings when the interests of justice require a stay. (*Avant! Corp. v. Superior Court* (2000) 79
Cal.App.4th 876, 885.) The court also has the statutory power to "stay the enforcement of any
judgment or order." (Code Civ. Proc., § 918(a).) Accordingly, even if this court finds that the filing
of the Notice of Appeal did not automatically stay the case as a matter of law, it should exercise its
discretion in favor of a stay. A stay of the proceedings during the appeal promotes judicial efficiency
and economy.

Here, a hearing on the Watermaster's motion during the pending appeal would be premature and unduly and severely harmful to the Zamrzlas for the hundreds of thousands of dollars sought by the Watermaster's requested relief based on the precise issues pending on appeal. It would also be prejudicial to the parties. While the Watermaster is correct that an Opposition and Reply has already been filed on its motion, there has been no evidentiary hearing on the issues relating to the quantity of water the Zamrzlas may be allowed to produce pursuant to the judgment and the monetary, injunctive and declaratory relief to which the Watermaster is claiming it is entitled to. Indeed, on October 7, 2022, the Watermaster, Settling Parties and Zamrzlas stipulated that "[t]he scope of issues for discovery and to be tried at the hearing [of the Zamrzlas' motions] will be limited to whether the Zamrzlas are bound by the Judgement and Physical Solution entered on December 28, 2015. ... All issues relating to the quantity of water the Zamrzlas' may be allowed to produce, if any, are deferred to a later hearing." (Miliband Decl. at ¶ 4.)

The Watermaster's renewed motion appears to assume or suggest that this court will merely rubberstamp its motion. However, even assuming arguendo that the Zamrzlas are members of the Small Pumpers Class and are bound to the judgment (they maintain they are not, and this issue remains disputed), the amounts the Watermaster claims the Zamrzlas owe are not correct. Accordingly, if the Court proceeds with the hearing on the Watermaster's motion, the parties will be required to undergo further discovery and litigation *prior* to a final determination as to whether the Zamrzlas are even bound to the judgment.

Additionally, while the Watermaster claims it "will agree not to seek to enforce the money
judgment against the Zamrzlas during the pendency of the appeal," (Renewed Motion at p. 6:17-19)
it still seeks "declaratory and injunctive relief ... to prohibit the Zamrzlas from producing any further

1 groundwater from the Basin until all such delinquent 2018 RWAs with interest and fees are paid in 2 full, the Zamrzlas each install water flow meters on all of their respective wells, submit Annual 3 Water Production Reports for years 2016 through 2020, and pay RWAs and Administrative 4 Assessments ("AAs") for their respective annual production for the years 2016 through 2020, plus 5 accrued interest thereon." (Renewed Motion at p. 2:11-16.) As stated above, this would require the 6 Zamrzlas to not only undergo further discovery but fully litigate their liability under the judgment 7 prior to a final determination as to whether they are bound to the judgment in the first place. If the 8 appeal is granted, the parties would have wasted time and resources on a moot issue.

9 Equity and the fair and orderly administration of justice requires that this matter be stayed 10 during the appeal of this matter. A stay of this matter also promotes judicial efficiency and economy. 11 To allow the Watermaster's motion to proceed without the related appeal resolved would result ina 12 gross miscarriage of justice. Accordingly, the Court should deny the Watermaster's request for a 13 ruling on its motion and vacate the November 17, 2023 hearing.

Dated: October 20, 2023

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO

Bv:

Wesley A. Miliband Attorneys for Defendants JOHNNY ZAMRZLA, PAMELLA ZAMRZLA, JOHNNY LEE ZAMRZLA AND JEANETTE ZAMRZLA (collectively "ZAMRZLAS")

OBJECTION/OPPOSITION TO WATERMASTER'S RENEWED MOTION FOR MONETARY, DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AGAINST ZAMRZLAS

- 5 -

FAX: (626) 583-8610 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

42793782.1

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION ATTORNEYS ATLAW 201 SOUTH LAKE AVENUE, SUITE 300 PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91101-4869 TELEPHONE: (220) 583-8600 FAX: (626) 583-8610	1	PROOF OF SERVICE
	2	(CODE CIV. PROC. § 1013A(3))
	3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
	4	I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and am not a party to the within action; my business address is 201 South Lake Avenue, Suite
	5	300, Pasadena, California 91101-4869.
	6	On October 20, 2023, I served the following document(s) described as OBJECTION/OPPOSITION TO WATERMASTER'S RENEWED MOTION FOR
	7	MONETARY, DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AGAINST ZAMRZLAS AND REQUEST FOR HEARING; DECLARATION OF WESLEY A. MILIBAND on the
	8	interested parties in this action as follows:
	9	
	10	
	11	BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE: by posting the document(s) listed above to the Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases to all parties listed on the Santa Clara Superior
	12	Court Service List as maintained via Glotrans. Electronic service completed through <u>http://www.avwatermaster.org</u> .
	13	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
	14	is true and correct.
	15 16	Executed on October 20, 2023, at Pasadena, California.
	10	A this format
	18	Ashlie T. Kennedy
	10	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	
		PROOF OF SERVICE 42793782.1