

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT 1

HON. JACK KOMAR, JUDGE

COORDINATION PROCEEDING
SPECIAL TITLE
(RULE 1550(B))

PLAINTIFF,

ANTELOPE VALLEY
GROUNDWATER CASES

JCCP4408

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 2ND, 2005

APPEARANCES:

(SEE APPEARANCE PAGE)

LISA C. RIDLEY
OFFICIAL REPORTER
111 N. HILL ST.
DEPT 1
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

1 LAND THAT IS CONTAINED IN THAT.

2 MR. JOYCE: ACTUALLY, I AM GOING TO DISAGREE
3 WITH THE COURT, YOUR HONOR. A SIMPLE VISIT TO THE LOCAL
4 ASSESSOR'S OFFICE AND A REVIEW OF THE ROLES WITHIN WHAT
5 THEY PERCEIVE TO BE THE BOUNDARY LINES OF THE BASIN
6 WOULD BE MORE THAN ADEQUATE TO DO SO.

7 THE COURT: IT WOULD HAVE TO BE RECORDED.

8 MR. JOYCE: THAT IS A TRUISM AS WELL.

9 THE COURT: AND THAT'S AN ENORMOUS TASK.

10 I AM NOT GOING TO ORDER THAT AT THIS
11 TIME BUT LET'S SEE WHAT YOUR PLEADINGS LOOK LIKE WHEN
12 YOU GET THESE ISSUES CLEARLY DEFINED. AND IT SOUNDS TO
13 ME AS THOUGH THERE ARE ESSENTIALLY THREE GROUPS HERE.
14 IS THAT RIGHT?

15 MR. JOYCE: YOUR HONOR, AT THIS POINT I AM NOT
16 CERTAIN HOW MANY GROUPS ARE HERE. I AM NOT SURE WHO IS
17 ON WHICH SIDE OF WHAT FENCE.

18 THE COURT: THE DIFFICULTY IS THAT THERE ARE
19 COMPETING PLAINTIFFS BECAUSE OF THE WAY THE PLEADINGS
20 ARE HEARD WITHOUT THE CROSS-COMPLAINT REQUIREMENT. SO I
21 THINK WHAT I AM GOING TO DO IS DESIGNATE THE -- I AM
22 GOING TO CALL HIM THE L.A. WATER WORKS PLAINTIFFS TO
23 STYLE THEIR PLEADINGS AS A CROSS-COMPLAINT. I THINK
24 THAT WILL HELP US TO DIFFERENTIATE VARIOUS PARTIES, IF
25 IT IS STYLED IN THAT FASHION THEN WE KNOW WHAT THEIR
26 BURDENS ARE SO THEY ARE GENERICALLY PLAINTIFFS. CAN YOU
27 DO THAT?

28 MR. DUNN: I CAN, YOUR HONOR. AND IT MAY BE

1 APPROPRIATE, BECAUSE OF THE COURT'S DIRECTION TO STYLE
2 THE COMPLAINT, THE COMPLAINT AS A CROSS-COMPLAINT, TO
3 RAISE THE ISSUE OF CONSOLIDATION.

4 THE COURT: YOUR COMPLAINT?

5 MR. DUNN: YES.

6 THE COURT: I THINK THAT'S A GOOD THING TO DO.
7 IT WILL ALLOW US TO FOCUS WHOSE DOING WHAT TO WHOM.

8 NOW, WE DO NEED ADDITIONAL TIME TO GET
9 EVERYBODY SERVED AND I SUPPOSE THAT THE BETTER PRACTICE
10 HERE WILL BE TO, ONCE YOUR PLEADINGS ARE IN ORDER, TO
11 THEN SERVE BOTH PLEADINGS RATHER THAN TRYING TO SERVE
12 THE EXISTING COMPLAINT BECAUSE IT IS GOING TO GET
13 MODIFIED AND BLENDED AND HAVE TO BE RESERVED.

14 SO WHY DON'T WE REQUIRE YOU TO MEET WITH
15 YOUR GROUP, YOUR RESPECTIVE GROUPS, TO THE EXTENT THAT
16 YOU CAN CALL YOURSELF A GROUP, AND DO THAT WITHIN THE
17 NEXT 30 DAYS. THIS IS THE -- GIVE YOU TO THE 2ND OF
18 JANUARY. CAN WE HAVE SOMETHING ON FILE BY THE 15TH OF
19 JANUARY?

20 MR. DUNN: YES, YOUR HONOR.

21 THE COURT: I THINK THAT'S THE THING TO DO AND
22 THEN I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE -- HOW MUCH TIME DO YOU NEED
23 TO SERVE THOSE AMENDED PLEADINGS AND TO BRING IN NEW
24 PARTIES, DOES?

25 MR. DUNN: WELL, THERE WOULD BE, THERE ARE
26 THREE GROUPS THAT WE HAVE IDENTIFIED FOR SERVICE. ONE
27 GROUP IS ALREADY IN PROCESS. THAT'S THE 100 ACRE PLUS
28 GROUP. AND OUR CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE STATEMENT