1	Michael D. McLachlan (State Bar No. 18170	
2	LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. McLA 10490 Santa Monica Boulevard	CHLAN, APC
3	Los Angeles, California 90025 Telephone: (310) 954-8270	
4	Facsimile: (310) 954-8271 mike@mclachlanlaw.com	
5	Daniel M. O'Leary (State Bar No. 175128)	
6	LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL M. O'LEÁRY 10490 Santa Monica Boulevard	¥
7	Los Angeles, California 90025 Telephone: (310) 481-2020	
8	Facsimile: (310) 481-0049 dan@danolearylaw.com	
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
10		
11		
12	SUPERIOR COURT FOR TH	IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
13	COUNTY OF I	LOS ANGELES
14 15	Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule 1550(b))	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408
15	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	(Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053, Honorable Jack Komar)
17	RICHARD A. WOOD, an individual, on	Case No.: BC 391869
18	behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,	RICHARD WOOD'S REPLY IN
19 20	Plaintiff,	SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER AUTHORIZING COURT- APPOINTED EXPERT WITNESS
20	v.	WORK
21	LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; et al.	Date: April 17, 2012 Time: 8:30 a.m.
23		Dept.: 316 (Room 1515)
24	Defendants.	
25		
26		
27		
28	RICHARD WOOD'S NOTICE OF M	IOTION AND MOTION FOR ORDER
		NTED EXPERT WITNESS WORK

1	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES	
2	Richard Wood submits the following reply brief in support of his motion to	
3	authorize the court-appointed expert to commence work.	
4	The Public Water Suppliers' acknowledge the stipulation and order authorizing the	
5	expert work of Entrix to proceed. (Exhibit 1.) That Stipulation is still operative, as are	
6	this Court's orders appointing Entrix as a court-appointed expert. (Exhibit 2.) But due	
7	the stay on this work, none of the substantive work has been conducted to date.	
8	The suppliers next argue that the Entrix is not neutral. This Court's prior orders	
9	appointing Mr. Thompson and Entrix as a court-appointed expert dispose of these	
10	arguments. (Exhibit 1.)	
11	The suppliers and a number of other parties have suggested that the next phase of	
12	trial involve allocation of water rights or a prove-up of such rights a set forth in a	
13	settlement agreement potentially in the offing. Either scenario involves the determination	
14	of water rights of the Class, unless the parties and the Court would agree to a <i>de minimis</i>	
15	exemption. As noted many times from May of 2008 going forward, the expert issue puts	
16	class counsel at risk per the holding of Olson v. Automobile Club of Southern California,	
17	42 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1142, 1150-51 ( <i>citing</i> C.C.P. § 1033.5(b)(1).)	
18	Finally, the Class has only sued the water suppliers. These are the parties who	
19	should pay these costs, consistent with the Court's prior orders in this case, and the Willis	
20	case.	
21		
22	DATED: April 12, 2012 LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. McLACHLAN LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL M. O'LEARY	
23		
24	By://s//	
25	Michael D. McLachlan	
26	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
27		
28	RICHARD WOOD'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR ORDER	
	AUTHORIZING COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT WITNESS WORK	

1	PROOF OF SERVICE	
2 3 4	I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and am not a party to the within action. My business address is 10490 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, California.	
5	On April 12, 2012, I caused the foregoing document(s) described as <b>RICHARD WOOD'S</b> <b>REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER AUTHORIZING COURT-</b> <b>APPOINTED EXPERT WITNESS WORK</b>	
6	to be served on the parties in this action, as follows:	
7 8 9	(X) (BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE) by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website: <u>www.scefiling.org</u> regarding the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter.	
10 11 12	<ul> <li>( ) (BY U.S. MAIL) I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing of documents for mailing. Under that practice, the above-referenced document(s) were placed in sealed envelope(s) addressed to the parties as noted above, with postage thereon fully prepaid and deposited such envelope(s) with the United States Postal Service on the same date at Los Angeles, California, addressed to:</li> </ul>	
13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>( ) (BY FEDERAL EXPRESS) I served a true and correct copy by Federal Express or other overnight delivery service, for delivery on the next business day. Each copy was enclosed in an envelope or package designed by the express service carrier; deposited in a facility regularly maintained by the express service carrier or delivered to a courier or driver authorized to receive documents on its behalf; with delivery fees paid or provided for; addressed as shown on the accompanying service list.</li> </ul>	
17 18	<ul> <li>( ) (BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION) I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of facsimile transmission of documents. It is transmitted to the recipient on the same day in the ordinary course of business.</li> </ul>	
19 20	(X) (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.	
21		
22	//s// Michael McLachlan	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	3	
28	RICHARD WOOD'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR ORDER AUTHORIZING COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT WITNESS WORK	