DOUGLAS J. EVERTZ, State Bar No. 123066 Exempt from filing fee STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH Government Code § 6103 2 A Professional Corporation 660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1600 3 Newport Beach, California 92660-6441 Telephone: (949) 725-4000 4 Fax: (949) 725-4100 5 Attorneys for Defendant/Cross-Complainant and Cross-Defendant CITY OF LANCASTER 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 10 11 ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER **Judicial Council Coordination CASES** Proceeding No. 4408 12 Included Actions: **CLASS ACTION** 13 Los Angeles County Waterworks District Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV 049053 14 No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar Superior Court of California 15 County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325 201; CITY OF LANCASTER'S 16 Los Angeles County Waterworks District **OBJECTIONS TO DIAMOND** No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co. FARMING COMPANY'S 17 Superior Court of California, County of Kern, REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348 OF DOCUMENTS, SET ONE 18 Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster 19 Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist. Superior Court of California, County of 20 Riverside, consolidated actions: Case Nos. 21 RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668. 22 23 24 25 III26 /// 27 28 STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH Lawyers Newport Beach

CITY OF LANCASTER'S OBJECTIONS TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION, SET ONE

DOCSOC/1231311v1/022283-0372

PROPOUNDING PARTY:	DILLYOND BUDGES ON MINTE
I KOI OUNDING I AKI I.	DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY
RESPONDING PARTY:	CITY OF LANCASTER ("CITY")
SET NO.:	ONE
	CENTED AT OD TECOPIONO
<u></u>	SENERAL OBJECTIONS
	this first set of demand for inspection of documents and confidential communications covered by the attorney-client
privilege and they intrude into co	onfidential material covered by the attorney work-product
privilege. This objection applies eq	ually to each and every request served on the City.
OBJECTIONS	TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION
OBJECTION TO REQUEST NO	<u>. 1</u> :
Objection. The request is	premature, burdensome and oppressive. This request seek
	pers and the court has not yet completed its class certification
process. No class representative has	s yet been approved by the court.
OBJECTION TO REQUEST NO	<u>. 2</u> :
Objection. The request is	premature, burdensome and oppressive. This request seeks
information concerning class memb	ers and the court has not yet completed its class certification
process. No class representative has	s yet been approved by the court.
OBJECTION TO REQUEST NO	<u>. 3</u> :
Objection. The request is	premature, burdensome and oppressive. This request seeks
information concerning class memb	ers and the court has not yet completed its class certification
process. No class representative has	s yet been approved by the court.
	A. The City objects to things to the extent they intrude into privilege and they intrude into corprivilege. This objection applies equivilege. This objection applies equivilege. The objection objection. The request is information concerning class membrates. No class representative has objection. The request is information concerning class membrates. No class representative has objection. The request is information concerning class membrates. No class representative has objection. The request is process. No class representative has objection. The request is process. No class representative has objection. The request is process. No class representative has objection. The request is process.

1 **OBJECTION TO REQUEST NO. 4:** Objection. The request is premature, burdensome and oppressive. This request seeks 2 3 information concerning class members and the court has not yet completed its class certification 4 process. No class representative has yet been approved by the court. 5 6 **OBJECTION TO REQUEST NO. 5:** 7 Objection. The request is premature, burdensome and oppressive. This request seeks information concerning class members and the court has not yet completed its class certification 8 9 process. No class representative has yet been approved by the court. 10 11 **OBJECTION TO REQUEST NO. 6:** 12 Objection. The request is premature, burdensome and oppressive. This request seeks 13 information concerning class members and the court has not yet completed its class certification 14 process. No class representative has yet been approved by the court. 15 DATED: June 26, 2007 16 STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH A Professional Corporation 17 18 19 Douglas J. Evertz, Attorneys for Defendant/ Cross-Complainant and Cross-Defendant 20 CITY OF LANCASTER 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH LAWYERS NEWFORT BEACH

1	PROOF OF SERVICE	
2 3	I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action; my business address is 660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1600, Newport Beach, California 92660. On June 2007, I served the within document(s):	
4 5	CITY OF LANCASTER'S OBJECTIONS TO DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, SET ONE	
6	by posting the document(s) list above to the website http://www.scefiling.org , a dedicated link to the Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases; Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV 049053, Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar.	
8 9	by transmitting via facsimile the document(s) listed above to the fax number(s) set forth below on this date before 5:00 p.m.	
10	by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope, fully prepaid, via United States Mail addressed as set forth below.	
11	by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed FEDERAL EXPRESS package for overnight delivery at Newport Beach, California addressed as set	
12	forth below.	
13		
14	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above	
15	is true and correct.	
16	Executed on June 1/2, 2007, at Newport Beach, California.	
17	LORIN MORENO.	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH LAWYERS		
Newport Beach	PROOF OF SERVICE	

DOCSOC/1231311v1/022283-0372