1 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 2 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 3 DEPARTMENT 1 HON. JACK KOMAR, JUDGE COORDINATION PROCEEDING SPECIAL TITLE 5 (RULE 1550(B)) MAR 1 5 2006 6 PLAINTIFF, ANTELOPE VALLEY JCCP4408 GROUNDWATER CASES 8 9. REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10 11 FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17TH, 2006 12 13 APPEARANCES: (SEE APPEARANCE PAGE) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 LISA C. RIDLEY 26 OFFICIAL REPORTER 111 N. HILL ST. 27 DEPT 1 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012 28

7

MR. JOYCE: ALL I AM ASKING IS THAT IF COUNSEL WHO REPRESENTS THE OTHER IDENTIFIED CROSS-COMPLAINANTS, THAT THEY EITHER CONFIRM OR RENOUNCE THE EFFICACY OF THAT DOCUMENT AS A CROSS-COMPLAINT, THEN I CAN RESPOND ACCORDINGLY.

1

2

31

51

6

8

9

101

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

27

MR. ZIMMER: I WASN'T SURE, THE COURT, IN THE LAST HEARING, HAD EXPRESSED SOME POTENTIAL INTEREST IN HAVING SOME PART OF THE RIVERSIDE ACTION HEARD FIRST AND I WASN'T SURE WHETHER YOUR INTENTION WAS THAT THE CROSS-COMPLAINT BE ONLY BY RIVERSIDE PARTIES AGAINST BOLTHOUSE AND DIAMOND FARMING BECAUSE OF THAT REASON, IN ORDER TO KEEP THAT SEPARATE.

THE COURT: I WAS ONLY CONCERNED WITH THE. WITH THE PLEADINGS THAT HAD ACTUALLY BEEN FILED AND WHICH SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN FILED AS A SEPARATE COMPLAINT, SHOULD HAVE BEEN FILED AS A CROSS-COMPLAINT.

AND SO THAT THE ORDER WAS THAT, ESSENTIALLY, HE RE-PLED, WAS NOT TALKED ABOUT ADDING ANY ADDITIONAL PARTIES, OR EXPANDING THE SCOPE OF THAT CROSS-COMPLAINT, HOWEVER, IF COUNSEL WISH TO DO THAT, THEY CERTAINLY COULD, UNDER THE ORDER AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF THE AMENDED PLEADING.

MR. JOYCE: I THINK, YOUR HONOR, IN ORDER TO MAKE IT CLEAR, THAT PROBABLY WHAT WOULD SUFFICE IS IF THE OTHER NAMED PURVEYOR CROSS-COMPLAINANTS WERE TO AT LEAST, IN SOME WRITTEN FORMAT, ADVISE ME AS TO THE FACT THAT, YES, THAT IS INTENDED TO BE A CROSS-COMPLAINT THAT 28 MY CLIENT HAS AGAINST YOUR CLIENT, SO I DO KNOW THAT, IN