1 2 3 4	ANDREW D. STEIN, SBN 35717 REBECCA DAVIS-STEIN, SBN 193141 ANDREW D. STEIN & ASSOCIATES, INC 470 South San Vicente Blvd., Second Floor Los Angeles, CA 90048 (323) 852-1507 Facsimile (323) 852-0104		
5	Attorneys for defendant, RANDALL BLAYNEY		
6	KANDALL BLATNET		
7	CURRENCE COURT OF THE CTATE OF CALLEONALA		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	FOR THE COUNTY (OF LOS ANGELES	
10			
	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUND	Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408	
	WATER CASES	For filing purposes only: Santa Clara County Case No. 1-05-CV-	
	Included Actions:	049053	
13	Los Angeles County Waterworks District		
	No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC 325201	CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT BY DEFENDANT RANDALL BLAYNEY	
16	Los Angeles county Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. Kern County Superior Court Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348	Date: November 25, 2008 Time: 10:30 a.m.	
18	Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348) Dept.: Santa Clara - Dept. 17) Judge: Honorable Jack Komar	
	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. V. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. V. City of))	
20	Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. V. Palmdale Water District		
21	Riverside County Superior Court Consolidated Actions: Case Nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668		
22			
23	Pursuant to this Court's ORDER AFTER PHASE TWO TRIAL ON HYDROLOGIC		
24	NATURE OF ANTELOPE VALLEY entered on November 5, 2008, Defendant RANDALL		
25	BLAYNEY, hereby submits the following narrative Case Management Statement to address		
26	service of class notices in these coordinated proceedings.		
27	At the onset of this litigation, defendant Blayney was encouraged, as were other		
28	individual parties, to appear and file generic answers to the complaint which had been		
	1		
•	BLAYNEY CASE MANAG	EMENT STATEMENT	

served in these coordinated proceedings. At that time, defendant Blayney and his counsel were advised that, fairly soon thereafter, parties such as defendant Blayney would be permitted to opt out of the everyday litigation by joining defendant or plaintiff class actions. Defendant Blayney and counsel were further advised that filing an answer was nonetheless necessary to avoid the entry of defaults and to ensure that the Court obtained personal jurisdiction over all potentially interested parties.

On or about September 22, 2008, defendant Blayney filed his generic Answer and tendered payment for his first appearance fees as well as e-filing fees. Notwithstanding his general appearance, the generic Answer expressly alleged "I do not intend to participate at trial or other proceedings unless ordered by the Court to do so." However, defendant Blayney will be appearing via court call at the Case Management Conference on November 25, 2008 and incurring attorney fees.

On September 2, 2008, the Court certified the "Small Pumpers Class" defined as property owners "that have been pumping less that 25 acre-feet per year on their property during any year from 1946 to present." Defendant Blayney believes he was and remains a member of the "Small Pumpers Class"

Throughout this litigation, defendant Blayney has been assured that he would not be required to actively participate in the action or suffer a prejudicial default once the various classes including "Small Pumpers Class" were certified. Defendant Blayney was assured that once the classes were certified and class notice served, he would be afforded the opportunity to opt in to the Small Pumpers Class, his Answer would be stricken without prejudice to his rights as a class member; and his right would be defended and determined through the class process. Instead litigation has proceeded on the merits. Most recently, the Court concluded the phase two trial regarding hydrologic nature of the Antelope Valley.

It is imperative that the class notices be served as soon as possible so that defendant Blayney and others similarly situated, can be afforded the promised opportunity to opt in to the Small Pumpers Class and enjoy the benefit of the class action without the vulnerability of interlocutory or final judgments being set aside, and, perhaps most importantly, stop

1	incurring the ongoing expense of having generally appeared. Indeed, defendant Blayney		
2	had concerns that this litigation cannot proceed further on the merits, lest adjudications -		
3	particularly those in favor of class members, are impaired or invalidated due to one-way due		
4	intervention or other due process errors. (Fireside Bank v. Superior Court (2007) 40 Cal.		
5	4th 1069, 1080-1087 [155 P.3d 268] error to grant judgment on the pleadings before class		
6	was certified and notice served because absent class members might elect to stay in a class		
7	after favorable merits ruling but opt out after unfavorable ones, accord Home Savings &		
8	Loan Association v. Superior Court (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1010-1011 [117 Cal.Rptr.		
9	485].)		
10	For these reasons, defendant Blayney respectfully requests that the Court direct that		
11	the class notices be served forthwith and, in any event, prior to any further adjudications		
12	regarding the merits of the parties' claims and defenses.		
13	DATED: November 20, 2008 ANDREW D. STEIN & ASSOCIATES		
14			
15	BY: Shulltein		
16	ANDREW D. STEIN, ESQ. Attorneys for defendant,		
17	RANDALL BLAYNEY		
18			
19			
20			
21	Di CMC Santumi		
22	Blayney CMC Stmt.wpd		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			