2	RYAN S. BEZERRA, State Bar No. 178048 JOSHUA M. HOROWITZ, State Bar No. 186 KATRINA C. GONZALES, State Bar No. 258 BARTKIEWICZ, KRONICK & SHANAHAN A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION	841 2
5	1011 TWENTY-SECOND STREET SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95816-4907 TELEPHONE: (916) 446-4254 TELECOPIER: (916) 446-4018 E-MAIL: rsb@bkslawfirm.com	
7	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Copa De Oro Land Company	
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE COUNTY OF LO	
10	Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule 1550(b))	JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION PROCEEDING NO. 4408
12 13 14	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	Case No. BC 391869 Assigned to Hon. Jack Komar (Santa Clara Case No. 01-05-CV-049053)
15 16 17	Included Actions: Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325 201;	COPA DE ORO LAND COMPANY'S TRIAL SETTING CONFERENCE STATEMENT BY FAX
18 19 20	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348;	Date: July 9, 2012 Time: 9 a.m. Dept: 316, Room 1515 Judge: Hon. Jack Komar
21 22 23 24 25	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist., Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, Case No. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668	
26 27	· 	

TRIAL SETTING CONFERENCE STATEMENT

Cross-defendant Copa de Oro Land Company ("Copa de Oro") respectfully submits this trial setting conference statement for the conference on July 9, 2012.

I. INTRODUCTION

The parties have made substantial progress toward a proposed Stipulated Judgment and Physical Solution. The parties continue to participate in mediation sessions with Justice Robie and are engaged in settlement discussions regarding the terms of the proposed Stipulated Judgment and Physical Solution. Given the complexities of this case, these discussions have taken substantial time, but a global settlement appears to be possible.

Accordingly, in setting the next phase of trial, the Court should seek to limit the risk that global litigation among the parties would reverse the parties' progress in reaching a settlement. Specifically, the Court should:

- (A) Set, for trial, narrowly drawn issues that can be severed, to at least some degree, from the broader issues being negotiated and discussed by the parties as part of their settlement discussions; and
- (B) Establish discovery procedures that will limit the frequency and scope of discovery disputes.

Such measures would be consistent with the Court's authority to manage complex and coordinated cases. (See Cal. Rules of Ct., rules 3.541(b), 3.750(b)(10); Lu v. Superior Court (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1264, 1267-1271.)

II. ISSUES FOR THE NEXT PHASE OF TRIAL

The next phase of trial could present a serious risk to the parties' progress toward a settlement if that phase were to involve complete litigation of the public water suppliers' prescription claim. For example, if that trial were to require litigation of the landowners' self-help defense, the public water suppliers might seek to litigate essentially every individual landowner's water-use history, resulting in massive discovery consuming at the very least several months and a similarly lengthy trial. In turn, landowners might seek to litigate,

pursuant to Article X, section 2 of the California Constitution, the reasonableness of the water uses on which the public water suppliers would rely in asserting prescription. The conflicts resulting from such global litigation could reverse the progress toward settlement that the parties have made through the many mediation sessions with Justice Robie.

The Court accordingly should set, for the next phase of trial, discrete issues that are largely legal in nature. These issues could include, for example, the status and priority of the federal government's claimed reserved right, the ownership of return flows from the use of State Water Project water and the notice element of the public water suppliers' prescription claim. In addition, to the extent that any future phase of trial would involve the examination of individual parties' water use, the Court should consider appointing a special master to conduct a preliminary examination that would be presented to the Court.

III. DISCOVERY PROCEDURES

Pursuant to the Court's authority over this complex case (Cal. Rules of Ct., rule 3.541(b), 3.750), Copa de Oro respectfully requests that the Court actively manage discovery in the next phase of litigation. Copa de Oro has two specific proposals and is submitting, with this statement, a proposed order that reflects these proposals.

First, for lay discovery, the Court should require parties to consult with the Court before propounding lay discovery requests. The Court should require that a party proposing to propound lay discovery schedule a conference with the Court, and give parties all notice at least ten days' notice of the proposed discovery and the conference, before serving lay discovery requests. The Court should order that any oppositions to the proposed discovery be filed and served at least five days before the conference and that all parties may appear at such a conference by CourtCall.

Second, for expert discovery, the Court should require the parties to disclose their experts in conformity with Rule 26(a)(2)(B) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which requires an expert witness to provide a written report containing the following: (i) a complete statement of the opinions the witness will express and the basis and reasons for them; (ii) the

1	facts or data considered by the witness in forming them; (iii) any exhibits that will be used to			
2	summarize or support them; (iv) the witness's qualifications; (v) a list of all other cases, during			
3	the previous four years, in which the witness testified as an exper	the previous four years, in which the witness testified as an expert at trial or by deposition; and		
4	4 (vi) a statement of the compensation to be paid for the study	(vi) a statement of the compensation to be paid for the study and testimony in the case.		
5	Disclosure of such reports should simplify and expedite any expert testimony required for the			
6	next phase of trial.			
7	7			
8	8 Dated: July 6, 2012 Respectfully submitt	ed,		
9		RONICK & SHANAHAN		
10	A Professional Corpo	oration)		
11	By: Wegon	za la /		
12	Katrina C./Gon			
13	Attorneys for Copa of	e Oro Land Company		
14	14			
15	15			
16	16			
17	17	6		
18	18			
19	19			
20	20			
21	21			
22	22			
23	23			
24	24			
25	25			
26	26			
27	27			
28	28 -3-	8792/P070612kcg		
- 11		JIJZII VI VULIZACE		

PROOF OF SERVICE I, Terry M. Olson, declare as follows:

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of Sacramento County. I am over the age of 18, not a party to this action and am employed at Bartkiewicz, Kronick & Shanahan, 1011 Twenty-Second Street, Sacramento, California 95816. On July 6, 2012, I served, in the manner described below, the following document:

COPA DE ORO LAND COMPANY'S TRIAL SETTING CONFERENCE STATEMENT

I posted this document to the Court's World Wide Website located at www.scefiling.org.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at Sacramento, California on July 6, 2012.

Jury M. Olson

8792/P070612kcg

RYAN S. BEZERRA, State Bar No. 178048		
JOSHUA M. HOROWITZ, State Bar No. 186866 KATRINA C. GONZALES, State Bar No. 258412		
BARTKIEWICZ, KRONIĆK & SHANAHAN A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 1011 TWENTY-SECOND STREET	N .	
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95816-4907		
TELEPHONE: (916) 446-4254 TELECOPIER: (916) 446-4018		
E-MAIL: rsb@bkslawfirm.com		
Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Copa De Oro Land Company		
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
Coordination Proceeding Special Title	JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION	
(Rule 1550(b))	PROCEEDING NO. 4408	
	Case No. BC 391869	
ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	Assigned to Hon. Jack Komar	
You also died Anddones	(Santa Clara Case No. 01-05-CV-049053)	
Included Actions: Los Angeles County Waterworks District	[PROPOSED] ORDER AFTER TRIAL SETTING CONFERENCE	
No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles,	i	
Case No. BC 325 201;		
Los Angeles County Waterworks District		
No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Case		
No. S-1500-CV-254-348;		
Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of		
Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v.		
Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist., Superior Court of		
California, County of Riverside, Case No.		
RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668		
7-74-1-1-		

the

8792/P070612kcg

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Terry M. Olson, declare as follows:

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of Sacramento County. I am over the age of 18, not a party to this action and am employed at Bartkiewicz, Kronick & Shanahan, 1011 Twenty-Second Street, Sacramento, California 95816. On July 6, 2012, I served, in the manner described below, the following document:

[PROPOSED] ORDER AFTER TRIAL SETTING CONFERENCE

I posted this document to the Court's World Wide Website located at www.scefiling.org.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at Sacramento, California on July 6, 2012.

Jerry M. Olson