1	Musick, Peeler & Garrett llp	
2	ATTORNEYS AT LAW ONE WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2000 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-3383 TELEPHONE (213) 629-7600	
3	Theodore A. Chastar Ir. (State Der No. 10540	5)
4	Theodore A. Chester, Jr. (State Bar No. 10540 t.chester@mpglaw.com	3)
5	Steven Casselberry (State Bar No. 74234) s.casselberry@mpglaw.com	
6	Stephen R. Isbell (State Bar No. 247151) s.isbell@mpglaw.com	
7	Attorneys for LITTLE ROCK SAND AND GRA	AVEL, INC.
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	COLINER OF LOCANICELES CENTRE LA PAGENTACE	
10	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	Judicial Counsel Coordination No. 4408
11		Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053
12	INCLUDED ACTIONS: Los Angeles County Waterworks District No.	Assigned to Honorable Jack Komar
13	40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No.	
14	BC325201;	RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, SET
	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No	ONE, PROPOUNDED BY GRANITE
15	40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Case No. S-1500-	CONSTRUCTION COMPANY
16	CV-254348;	
17	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of	
18	Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water	
19	Dist., Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, Case Nos. RIC 353840, RIC	
20	344436, RIC 344668;	
21	Rebecca Lee Willis v. Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40	
22	Superior Court of California, County of Los	
ľ	Angeles, Case No. BC364553;	
23	Wood v. A.V. Materials, Inc., et al. v. Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles,	
24	Case No. BC 509546; and	
25	Little Rock Sand and Gravel, Inc. v. Granite	
26	Construction Co., Superior Court of	
27	California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. MC026932	
28	1073910.1	
- 11	10/3/10,1	1

23

24

25

26

27

28

PROPOUNDING PARTY: GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY

RESPONDING PARTY: LITTLE ROCK SAND AND GRAVEL, INC.

SET NO.: ONE

Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 2031.010, et seq., LITTLE ROCK SAND AND GRAVEL, INC. ("Responding Party" or "Little Rock") responds to GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY's ("Requesting Party" or "Granite") Request for Production of Documents, Set One, as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The following responses are made solely for the purpose of the above-captioned action. Each response is subject to any and all objections to competency, relevancy, materiality, propriety, and admissibility, and any and all other objections and grounds which would require the exclusion of any response herein if the requests were asked of, or if any statement contained herein was made by, a witness present and testifying in Court, all of which objections and grounds may be interposed at the appropriate time.

The following responses and objections are based upon the facts and information now known to Responding Party and shall not in any way be deemed admissions or representations that further facts, information, or witnesses having knowledge relevant to the subject matter of these requests do not exist. As discovery proceeds, Responding Party anticipates that further facts, information, documents and witnesses may be discovered by it or may be determined to be relevant. Without in any way obligating itself to do so, Responding Party reserves the right to alter, supplement, amend or otherwise modify these responses in any way at any time based on facts determined to be relevant or revealed to Responding Party through discovery and further investigation.

This Preliminary Statement is incorporated in its entirety into each and every Response and is further incorporated by reference as part of the General Objections.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Responding Party objects to each and every request to the extent that it seeks, in whole or in part, information constituting or relating to attorney-privilege communications 1073910.1

between Responding Party and its counsel, or information within the scope of the attorney work product doctrine, including the opinions, conclusions, thoughts, legal research, strategies, theories and/or mental impressions of Responding Party's attorneys.

- 2. Responding Party objects to each and every request to the extent it seeks information neither relevant to the subject matter of this litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- 3. Responding Party objects to these Requests to the extent that they are overbroad, oppressive, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial, meant to harass, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:**

All DOCUMENTS identified in YOUR Responses to Form Interrogatories, Set One.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it demands documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite. Without waiving this objection, Little Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all responsive documents in possession, custody or control that are not already in the possession of or equally available to Granite, whether through the Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases ("AVG Cases"), in connection with the parties' Lease or otherwise.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it demands documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite. Without waiving this objection, Little Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all responsive documents in possession,

28 111 1073910.1

25

27

1	custody or control that are not already in the possession of or equally available to Granite, whether	
2	through the AVG Cases, in connection with the parties' Lease or otherwise.	
3	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:	
4	All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the	
5	COMPLAINT.	
6	RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:	
7	Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it demands documents that are	
8	equally available to or already in the possession of Granite. Without waiving this objection, Little	
9	Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all responsive documents in possession,	
10	custody or control that are not already in the possession of or equally available to Granite, whether	
11	through the AVG Cases, in connection with the parties' Lease or otherwise.	
12	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:	
13	All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 15 of the	
14	COMPLAINT.	
15	RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:	
16	Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it demands documents that are	
17	equally available to or already in the possession of Granite.	
18	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:	
19	All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 19 of the	
20	COMPLAINT.	
21	RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:	
22	Little Rock objects to this Request on the following grounds: (1) it demands documents	
23	that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly	
24	burdensome and oppressive; (2) it calls for the production of documents that are protected from	
25	disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine; and (3) it	
26	demands documents that contain settlement communications that are confidential under Evidence	
27	Code section 1152.	

MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP

28

/// 1073910.1

$_{2}$

COMPLAINT.

Code section 1152.

COMPLAINT.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

41

28

1073910.1

111

COMPLAINT.

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 20 of the

Little Rock objects to this Request on the following grounds: (1) it demands documents

that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly

burdensome and oppressive; (2) it calls for the production of documents that are protected from

demands documents that contain settlement communications that are confidential under Evidence

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the

Little Rock objects to this Request on the following grounds: (1) it demands documents

communications that are confidential under Evidence Code section 1152. Without waiving these

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 23 of the

Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it demands documents that are

equally available to or already in the possession of Granite. Without waiving this objection, Little

that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly

objections, Little Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all non-confidential

burdensome and oppressive; and (2) it demands documents that contain settlement

documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine; and (3) it

Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all responsive documents in possession,

1	custody or control that are not already in the possession of or equally available to Granite, whether	
2	through the AVG Cases, in connection with the parties' Lease or otherwise.	
3	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:	
4	All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 24 of the	
5	COMPLAINT.	
6	RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:	
7	Little Rock objects to this Request on the following grounds: (1) it demands documents	
8	that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly	
9	burdensome and oppressive; and (2) it demands documents that contain settlement	
10	communications that are confidential under <i>Evidence Code</i> section 1152. Without waiving these	
11	objections, Little Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all non-confidential	
12	documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.	
13	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:	
14	All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 25 of the	
15	COMPLAINT.	
16	RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:	
17	Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome, oppressive	
18	and demands a document that is already in the possession of Granite, specifically, Little Rock's	
19	First Amended Complaint for Quiet Title and Declaratory Relief.	
20	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:	
21	All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the	
22	COMPLAINT.	
23	RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:	
24	Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome, oppressive	
25	and demands a document that is already in the possession of Granite, specifically, Little Rock's	
26	First Amended Complaint for Quiet Title and Declaratory Relief.	
27		
28	/ / / 1073910.1 6	

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

21

20

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

111

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 27 of the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome, oppressive and demands a document that is already in the possession of Granite, specifically, Little Rock's First Amended Complaint for Quiet Title and Declaratory Relief.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 29 of the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the following grounds: (1) it demands documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly burdensome and oppressive; and (2) it demands documents that contain settlement communications that are confidential under Evidence Code section 1152. Without waiving these objections, Little Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all non-confidential documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 30 of the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the following grounds: (1) it demands documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly burdensome and oppressive; and (2) it demands documents that contain settlement communications that are confidential under Evidence Code section 1152. Without waiving these objections, Little Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all non-confidential responsive documents in possession, custody or control that are not already in the possession of or

equally available to Granite, whether through the AVG Cases, in connection with the parties' Lease or otherwise.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the allegations contained in paragraph 31 of the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it demands documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly burdensome and oppressive. Without waiving this objection, Little Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all responsive documents in possession, custody or control that are not already in the possession of or equally available to Granite, whether through the AVG Cases, in connection with the parties' Lease or otherwise.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO communications between YOU and any other person regarding the allocation of groundwater rights as between GRANITE and YOU.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the following grounds: (1) it demands documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly burdensome and oppressive; (2) it calls for the production of documents that are protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine; (3) it demands documents that contain settlement communications that are confidential under *Evidence Code* section 1152; and (4) overbroad.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO communications, whether oral or in writing, regarding settlement of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases, including without limitation communications regarding the allocations reflected on Exhibit 4 to Exhibit A to the Judgment entered in the Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases.

2

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the following grounds: (1) it demands documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly burdensome and oppressive; (2) it calls for the production of documents that are protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine; and (3) it demands documents that contain settlement communications that are confidential under *Evidence Code* section 1152.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO formation of the LEASE.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it demands documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly burdensome and oppressive. Without waiving this objections, Little Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all responsive documents in possession, custody or control that are not already in the possession of or equally available to Granite, whether through the AVG Cases, in connection with the parties' Lease or otherwise.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the parties' performance under the LEASE.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the grounds that (1) it demands 30 plus years of documents that are already in the possession of or equally available to Granite and, thus, is unduly burdensome and oppressive; and (2) overbroad.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

ALL DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO formation of the First Amendment to LEASE between GRANITE and LITTLE ROCK entered into in 2010

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it demands documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly burdensome and 9

oppressive. Without waiving this objection, Little Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all responsive documents in possession, custody or control that are not already in the possession of or equally available to Granite, whether through the AVG Cases, in connection with the parties' Lease or otherwise.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO the parties' performance under the First Amendment to Lease between GRANITE and LITTLE ROCK entered into in 2010.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the grounds that (1) it demands 17 plus years of documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly burdensome and oppressive; and (2) overbroad.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO communications, whether oral or in writing, with GRANITE or any other person regarding the LEASE and the parties' duties and performance under the LEASE.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the following grounds: (1) it demands documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly burdensome and oppressive; (2) compound; and (3) overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving these objections, Little Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all responsive documents in possession, custody or control that are not already in the possession of or equally available to Granite, whether through the AVG Cases, in connection with the parties' Lease or otherwise.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:

All DOCUMENTS that RELATE TO GRANITE'S use of the wells located on the LEASE PROPERTY.

27

25

26

28 11 / / /

111

1073910.1

-10

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:

Little Rock objects to this Request on the ground that it demands documents that are equally available to or already in the possession of Granite and, thus, is unduly burdensome and oppressive. Without waiving this objection, Little Rock responds as follows: Little Rock will produce all responsive documents in possession, custody or control that are not already in the possession of or equally available to Granite, whether through the AVG Cases, in connection with the parties' Lease or otherwise.

By:

DATED: November **17**, 2017

MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP

Theodore A. Chester, Jr.

AND GRAVEL, INC.

Attorneys for Plaintiff LITTLE ROCK SAND

Stephen R. Isbell

VERIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I have read the foregoing RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, SET ONE PROPOUNDED BY GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY and know its contents.

I am, President of Little Rock Sand and Gravel, Inc., a party to this action, and am authorized to make this verification for and on its behalf. I am informed and believe that the matters stated therein are true.

Executed on November 13, 2017, at Lancaster, California.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

George M. Lane
Print Name of Signator
Signature

1078121.1

1 PROOF OF SERVICE Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases 2 Santa Clara County Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 Judicial Council Coordination ("JCCP") No. 4408 3 California Court of Appeal, Fourth District, Division Two, Case No. E065512 4 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 5 COUNTY OF ORANGE 6 At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. My business address is Musick Peeler & 7 Garrett LLP, 650 Town Center Drive, Suite 1200, Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1925. 8 On November 17, 2017, I served the foregoing document described as: RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, SET ONE, PROPOUNDED BY GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY on the interested parties in this action by posting the document listed above to the http://www.aywatermaster.org website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater Adjudication matter, pursuant to the Electronic Filing and Service Standing 11 Order of Judge Komar and through the OneLegal website (www.onelegal.com). 12 The file transmission was reported as complete to all parties appearing on the http://www.avwatermaster.org electronic service list and (www.onelegal.com) for the Antelope 13 Valley Groundwater Cases, Case No. 2005-1-CV-049053; JCCP 4408. 14 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the 15 foregoing is true and correct. 16 Executed on November 17. 2017, at Costa Mesa, California. 17 18 Judy Jacobs /s/Judy Jacobs 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28