& SLAVENS LLP 625 Broadway, Suite 635 San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 232-0331 Fax: (619) 232-4019 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class  SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES  This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff,  vs.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS, DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE RIGATION DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000; Defendants.	1	Ralph B. Kalfayan, SBN133464 David B. Zlotnick, SBN 195607 KRAUSE, KALFAYAN, BENINK		
San Diego, CA 92:101 Tel: (0:19) 232-0331 Fax: (6:19) 232-40:19 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class  SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff,  vs.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE; WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY WATER CO; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000; Defendants.	2	& SLAVENS LLP		
Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class  SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES  This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff,  vs.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH) IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000; Defendants.		San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 232-0331		
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES  This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,  Plaintiff,  vs.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.	5			
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES  This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,  Plaintiff,  vs.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES I through 1,000;  Defendants.				
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES  This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,  Plaintiff,  vs.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; OLARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY) SERVICE DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.				
ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES  This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,  Plaintiff,  vs.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; P		SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES  This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,  Plaintiff,  vs.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE; WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH) RRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.	9	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES  This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,  Plaintiff,  vs.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.  JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION PROCEEDING NO. 4408  CASE NO. BC 364553  Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar  PROOF OF SERVICE				
This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,  Plaintiff,  vs.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.  CASE NO. BC 364553  Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar  PROOF OF SERVICE  PROOF OF SERVICE		1 = 1 = 1		
REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,  Plaintiff,  Vs.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.  Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar PROOF OF SERVICE  P	12	This Pleading Relates to Included Action:	CASE NO. BC 364553	
Plaintiff,  vs.  16  LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY) WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.	13	REBECCA LEE WILLIS, on behalf of herself \		
15 Vs.  16 LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH) IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY) WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.  Defendants.	14	Plaintiff.	PROOF OF SERVICE	
LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH) IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY) WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.	15	)		
DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE; WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK; IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH; IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL; WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY; WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY; SERVICE DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON; HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.	16			
WATER DISTRICT; LITTLÉROCK CREEK) IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH) IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY) WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY) SERVICE DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.	17	DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER;		
IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL) WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY) WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY) SERVICE DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.	18	WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEKS		
WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY) SERVICE DISTRICT; PHELAN PINON HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.	19	IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL)		
HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000;  Defendants.	20	WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY	) )	
22   Defendants. )	21	HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT;		
23	22			
24 I Ashley Polyasoko declare:	23			
i, risiney i oryasoko, decidie.	24	I, Ashley Polyascko, declare:		
I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and not a	25			
party to the within action; my business address is 625 Broadway, Suite 635, San Diego,	26			
California, 92101. On <b>February 22, 2011</b> , I served the within document(s):	27			
.	28			
98	20			

1	1 REBECCA WILLIS' AND THE NON-PUMPING LANDO EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOT			
2 3	HEARING ON MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY; M	EMORANDUM		
$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 4 \end{vmatrix}$		,		
5	PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER SHORTENING T			
6	3. APPENDIX OF NON-CALIFORNIA CASES IN SUPPOR	T OF EX PARTE		
7	APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION TO CO DISCOVERY AND FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME I	OMPEL		
8	8 ON MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY; and			
9	HEARING ON MOTION TO COMPEL.	VING TIME FOR		
$\begin{bmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \end{bmatrix}$	Superior Court website in regard to the Antelone Valle			
13				
$_{14}$				
15	Tam readily familiar with the firm's practice of concentration and process	sing correspondence		
	for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal S	Service on that same		
16	day with the postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business.	I am aware that on		
$\begin{vmatrix} 17 \\ 18 \end{vmatrix}$	motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellat	motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage		
19	meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.			
20	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above			
21	is true and correct.			
22				
$_{23}$	Executed on February 22, 2011, at San Diego, California.  Oblighed Polyacko  Ashley Polyacko			
24				
25		)		
26	26			
27	27			
28	28			