

EXHIBIT H

Michael D. McLachlan (State Bar No. 181705)
LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. McLACHLAN, APC
523 West Sixth Street, Suite 215
Los Angeles, California 90014
Telephone: (213) 630-2884
Facsimile: (213) 630-2886
mike@mclachlanlaw.com

Daniel M. O'Leary (State Bar No. 175128)
LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL M. O'LEARY
523 West Sixth Street, Suite 215
Los Angeles, California 90014
Telephone: (213) 630-2880
Facsimile: (213) 630-2886
dan@danolearylaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Coordination Proceeding
Special Title (Rule 1550(b))

ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER
CASES

RICHARD A. WOOD, an individual, on
behalf of himself and all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; et al.

Defendants.

Judicial Council Coordination
Proceeding No. 4408

(Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053,
Honorable Jack Komar)

Case No.: BC 391869

**RICHARD WOOD'S NOTICE OF
MOTION AND MOTION FOR
ORDER ALLOCATING COSTS OF
COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT
WITNESS**

Date: June 5, 2009
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Dept.: 17C

TO THE COURT AND ALL INTERESTED PARTIES:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on June 5, 2009, at 2:00 p.m., in Department 17C
of the Santa Clara Superior Court, located at 161 North First Street, San Jose, California

1 95113, a hearing will be held on plaintiff Richard A. Wood's Motion for Order
2 Allocating Costs of Court-Appointed Expert.

3 The motion is based on this Notice, the attached Memorandum of Points and
4 Authorities, the attached exhibits, Evidence Code section 731, and such other and further
5 evidence as the Court adduces at the hearing.

6
7 DATED: May 12, 2009

LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. McLACHLAN
LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL M. O'LEARY

8
9
10 By: _____//s//

11 Daniel M. O'Leary
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **I. APPLICABLE LAW**

2 Evidence Code section 730 grants the Court authority to appoint an expert witness
3 under appropriate circumstances. As is relevant to this motion, it states “The Court may
4 fix the compensation for these services, if any, rendered by any person appointed under
5 this section, in addition to any service as a witness, at the amount as seems reasonable to
6 the court.” Evidence Code section 731 provides that “in all civil cases, the compensation
7 fixed under Section 730 shall, in the first instance, be apportioned and charged to the
8 several parties in such proportion as the court may determine and may thereafter be taxed
9 and allowed in like manner as other costs.”

10 **II. APPLICABLE FACTS**

11 The Court granted Richard Wood’s motion for the appointment of an expert
12 witness, but initially stayed its order pending the Phase III trial. Counsel for Mr. Wood
13 and counsel for the Public Water Purveyors subsequently entered into a stipulation lifting
14 the stay to allow for the expert’s service to conduct data-gathering and field services in
15 connection with water usage by small groundwater pumpers within the area of
16 adjudication. The Court entered an order on this stipulation on May 6, 2009.

17
18 **III. THE COURT SHOULD ALLOCATE THE EXPERTS COSTS,**
19 **INCLUDING FEES, TO THE PUBLIC WATER PURVEYORS.**

20 Mr. Wood now moves for an order apportioning the costs of the court-appointed
21 expert among the Public Water Suppliers,¹ or, more specifically, the Public Water
22 Suppliers that are the defendants in Mr. Wood’s complaint. These are the parties in the
23 entire proceeding who are most directly affected by the Wood class of small groundwater

24 1 The Public Water Suppliers are Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40; City Of
25 Lancaster; City Of Los Angeles; City Of Palmdale; Palmdale Water District; Littlerock Creek
26 Irrigation District; Palm Ranch Irrigation District; Quartz Hill Water District; Antelope Valley
27 Water Co.; Rosamond Community Service District; Mojave Public Utility District; California
28 Water Service Company, Desert Lake Community Service District, North Edwards Water
District, and Phelan Pinon Hills Community Service District.

pumpers. The allocation among the Public Water Suppliers should be either equal or proportionate to their current respective pumping volumes.

While Wood is cognizant that the Court has articulated an intention to allocate the expert costs across both the water purveyors and landowner parties, the landowners are not parties to the Wood action. Wood has not sued them; the class has not sued them; and they have not sued the class. While the Court may ultimately fashion a physical solution that affects their respective rights, they have not brought any claims against one another.

Under Evidence Code section 731(c), the allocation of the expert costs to the Public Water Suppliers would be a recoverable cost in the event the small pumper class ends up in a contested trial in which the Public Water Suppliers prevail. But, at least as the pleadings currently exist, it could not be a recoverable cost since there are no claims in which the small pumper class and other overlying landowners are adverse. And while it is conceivable that the court-appointed expert could testify in a trial that did not involve class claims, such is not likely given the anticipated scope of work.

Thus, it makes sense to allocate the expert costs to the Public Water Purveyors.

DATED: May 12, 2009

LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. McLACHLAN
LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL M. O'LEARY

By: _____//s//

Daniel M. O’Leary
Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18
3 and am not a party to the within action. My business address is 523 West Sixth Street, Suite 215,
4 Los Angeles, California 90014.

5 On May 12, 2009, I caused the foregoing document(s) described as **RICHARD WOOD'S**
6 **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR ORDER ALLOCATING COSTS**
7 **OF COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT WITNESS**

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

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

//s//
Carol Delgado