1	Ralph B. Kalfayan, SBN133464	
2	David B. Zlotnick, SBN 195607 KRAUSE, KALFAYAN, BENINK & SLAVENS LLP	
3	625 Broadway, Suite 635	
4	San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 232-0331	
5	Fax: (619) 232-4019	
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class	
7		
8	·	
9		
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
12	A NUMBER OF STATE OF	HIDIOIAI GOIDIGH
13	ANTELOPE VALLEY   )   GROUNDWATER CASES   )	JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION PROCEEDING NO. 4408
14 15	This Pleading Relates to Included Action:  REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself  of the second streets of	OBJECTION OF PLAINTIFF WILLIS AND THE DORMANT LANDOWNER
16	and all others similarly situated,	CLASS TO THE PUBLIC WATER
17	Plaintiff,	SUPPLIERS' REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF ORDER GOVERNING TRANSFEREES OF PROPERTIES
18	VS. )	OF FROFERTIES
19	LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; OF LOS ANGELES: CITY OF	
20	CITY OF LOS ANGELES; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK	JUDGE: HONORABLE JACK KOMAR
21	IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH )	JODGE. HONORABLE JACK KOMAK
22	IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL   WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY   WATER CO. P.OS. AMOND COMMUNITY	
23	WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; MOJAVE PUBLIC  LITH TTY DISTRICT: and DOES 1 drawnsh	DATE: May 6, 2010 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
24	UTILITY DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;	DEPT: 1
25	Defendants.	
26	District Dis	
27	Plaintiff Rebecca Willis and the dormant landowner class hereby object to the request by	
28	the Public Water Suppliers for entry of the [Propos	sed] Order re Jurisdiction Over Transferees of - 1 -

Property, which was lodged in January 2008 by (former) counsel for Tejon Ranchcorp. The request is not only procedurally improper, but is also based on the erroneous suggestion that the Court intended to enter the Proposed Order, but inadvertently failed to do so. In fact, the Court's Minute Order of January 14, 2008 makes clear that the Court recognized that there were substantial problems with the Proposed Order and deliberately declined to enter it and instead continued consideration of the underlying issues. Finally, to the extent the Proposed Order purports to govern absent Class Members, it is improper for many reasons – including that the Public Water Suppliers never gave notice of that Order to such Class Members.

1. The Suppliers' Request is Procedurally Improper.

The Proposed Order affects significant substantive rights of the parties as well as rights of potential transferees of properties within the Basin. It was submitted only three days before the upcoming Case Management Conference and was not supported by a Motion or any points and authorities. A matter of this significance must be decided based on a duly noticed Motion, not by way of an offhand suggestion on minimal notice.

2. The Court Deliberately Declined to Enter The Proposed Order.

The Suppliers' papers erroneously imply that the Court approved the of the Proposed Order and inadvertently failed to enter it. That is not the case. The Proposed Order was opposed by many parties, and the problems with it were discussed at length at a Hearing on January 14, 2008. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a copy of the Minute Order following that Hearing, which makes clear that the Court did not approve the Proposed Order, but rather continued consideration of it. To the best of our knowledge, the Court never approved the Proposed Order.

3. The Proposed Order Is Not Appropriate to the Extent it Purports to Govern Members of the Willis Class.

For at least two reasons, the Proposed Order is inappropriate to the extent that it purports to govern the members of the Willis Class. First, the California Courts have consistently

-			
1	recognized that absent Class members are not "parties." The Proposed Order is improper in that		
2	it would treat Class Members as if they were parties and subject them to potential contempt		
3	findings without adequate safeguards. Second, the Proposed Order directs the Suppliers to		
4	provide a copy of the Order with the Notice to the Class, which the Suppliers failed to do. At a		
5	bare minimum, the Suppliers must be required to re-notice the Class in order to provide Class		
6	Members with notice of the terms of the Proposed Order.		
7	For all of the above reasons, the Court should deny the Suppliers' request that it enter the		
8	Proposed Order.		
10			
11	Dated: May 5, 2010	KRAUSE KALFAYAN BENINK & SLAVENS LLP	
12			
13		/ /D	
14		/s/Ralph B. Kalfayan, Esq. Ralph B. Kalfayan, Esq.	
15		David B. Zlotnick, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class	
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23 24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

- 3 -