SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 4 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO 2 3 CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL 4 WATER DISTRICT, 5 Plaintiffs,) 6 -vs-No. 164327 7 CITY OF CHINO, et al., 8 Defendants. 9 10 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL PROCEEDINGS 11 BEFORE HON. HOWARD B. WIENER, JUDGE, DEPARTMENT 12

San Bernardino, California, October 21, 1977

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

DONALD D. STARK and GUIDO R. SMITH ATTORNEYS AT LAW Airport Plaza, Suite 201 2061 Business Center Drive Irvine, California 92715

20

For Defendant, Monte Vista County Water District:

MARTIN E. WHELAN, JR. ATTORNEY AT LAW 7915 South Painter Avenue Whittier, California 90607

23 24

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

25

26

ROSE HENDERSON, CSR #3616 Official Reporter

APPEARANCES [Cont'd] STANFORD C. SHAW For Defendant, Marigold ATTORNEY AT LAW 47038 Mojave Trail Mutual Water County: Newberry Springs, California 92365 For Defendant, State Attorney General's Office of California: Department of Justice 3580 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, California 90010 BY: EDWIN J. DUBIEL and ANITA E. RUUD Deputy Attorney Generals

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1977
9:15 A.M.

THE COURT: In the matter of Chino Basin
Water District and the City of Chino, Case Number
164327, the record should indicate that the Plaintiff
is appearing through its counsel Donald D. Stark and
Guido Smith, Martin E. Whelan is appearing for Monte
Vista County Water District, Stanford Shaw for
Marigold Mutual Water Company, and the Attorney
General's Office through Edwin J. Dubiel and Anita E.
Ruud.

Any other appearances that I omitted.
You may proceed, Mr. Stark.

MR. STARK: Well, if I may, your Honor, I didn't realize that we had the Reporter here. Perhaps we can just as well handle the entire matter rather

than continue as we had discussed.

The first item, your Honor, is a motion for sanctions, if I can indicate the background of it.

There are stipulations on file by all of the active parties. There have been defaults entered by -- for about fifty parties. There are four answering Defendants represented by Mr. C. Loy Mason in Los Angeles, and then there is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and Dow Chemical who are in

the process, according to their attorneys, of getting authorization for stipulation, so that in terms of contesting parties at the moment, the four individuals represented by Mr. Mason constitute the main at issue Defendants.

To put it in perspective, our information is that the clients that Mr. Mason represents are what are known as minimal producers under the judgment, and they would be incurring an aggregate potential.

liability under the judgment of ten dollars per year, being two five dollar a year minimum administrative assessments.

was in view of the fairly minimal involvement of his clients. Being unable to do that, we set down a deposition of the clients as his and his secretary's declarations, which are in the file, indicate we set the deposition.

called and asked for or his secretary called and asked for alternate dates. We agreed to an alternate date. He then had her call back and say that he wouldn't be able to take the depositions before late November. I indicated that that was not practical in view of the state of the case and that he should

either move for a protective order if he wanted additional time or we would stay with the depositions as noticed.

We heard nothing further from him and when we appeared for the deposition neither Mr. Mason nor the parties were present. According to his declaration he did not in fact inform the parties of the schedule for the depositions.

Accordingly, we have made a motion for sanctions which it seems to me should be directed to Mr. Mason if his declaration is taken at its face value.

We had hoped that through some kind a communication we could clarify and eliminate the party contention. I suspect at this point we will seek now to serve Request for Admissions and with the potential sanctions in that regard that proof of facts raised by general denials would be at the expense of the party.

It is an unfortunate circumstance, and I'm not really able to explain how we proceed from here, but Mr. Mason, your Honor will recall, was at the last hearing we had in Ontario and was the elderly gentleman who stood up and had some objections that he raised at that time, and the Court indicated that if he wished to support them by affidavits or so forth,

he could renew the objections; but the position we are in is that we have in fact had the expense of preparing for and having the court reporter attending for the deposition and then making this motion.

We have as yet been unable to get any direct communication with Mr. Mason. I have talked with his secretary on numerous occasions, but he is not available, and under the circumstances we believe it is both appropriate and proper that the Court exterman order awarding the requested sanction order against Mr. Mason.

THE COURT: Assuming that I were to make an order that is contingent upon your giving resident of depositions again, in the event that they failed to attend this time, I would grant to strike their Answer.

What kind of time pressure are you in?

MR. STARK: Our basic problem is that the stipulations require that the matter be brought to trial by the end of the year. We appear to be essentially at issue. We are not yet ready to file an at issue memorandum. There are two problems.

One is we have served some newly discovered parties fairly recently, and the time has not run for appearance or answer in those cases. Most of those are small producers, and the more recent

practice is they have had the defaults entered although they are treated the same as parties who are stipulating.

Mr. Whelan this morning raised a question which we are going to have to investigate. Assuming him to be correct, as I find him to be a good deal of the time, we may have some correction to make and that is he raises a question as to whether a corporation can properly appear by stipulation without counsel.

I was not aware that there was a restriction that prevented it, but I should say that of the stipulations on file, a number of them are by corporations who have simply stipulated through their corporate officers without representation of counsel.

We will check out the point that Mr. Whelan raises and we may have to go back and get an appearance by counsel to be sure that those stipulations are valid.

We have other house cleaning matters and accordingly, I would say if the Court would indicate if we have a deposition from them by the 3rd, which would give us time to renotice, that that probably would be sufficient if we got the notice out today.

THE COURT: How much is the time requirement for depositions? Twenty days?

MR. STARK: Ten days.

MR. WHELAN: Just for the record, your Honor, I am not stating -- I'm not trying to be obstructive. I am trying to see the judgment entered is valid.

It is my understanding that really before
the clerk can say to the Court we are ready to go
to trial or pretrial, we have to either have
dismissals or defaults entered or proper appearances
which is either in pro per or by counsel, and I would
like to see the housekeeping clean so we don't have
problems two years down the line.

THE COURT: As to the motion, I'm so conscious of a record all of the sudden. After reading this, I'm tongue-tied.

MR. STARK: Maybe as late as Monday, the
7th. There isn't that much difference and that gives
us --

THE COURT: The order made herein in reference to the motion involving Warren Bain, Cheryl L. Bain, Frank E. Martin, and Ruth C. Martin that Plaintiffs' Counsel shall give notice for the taking of a deposition of each of said parties on a date on or prior to November 7, 1977, at the time for the taking of the deposition. Time for notice for the taking of deposition is on the Court's own motion

4 5

reduced to five days.

That in the event parties fail to appear for the taking of said deposition as then noticed, as to any party failing to appear, that person's Answer shall be stricken and a default in accordance with law may be entered.

That for sanctions on the failure of parties to appear at the deposition previously noticed,

Counsel C. Loy Mason shall pay the actual costs incurred for the court reporter.

I'm restricting it to costs only, Mr. Stark.

MR. STARK: Thank you, your Honor.

Now, on the --

THE COURT: You'll have to give notice of that.

MR. STARK: Yes, we will. We will try to get a formal order to your Honor.

THE COURT: Again, you know where I am so in case of ease, give me an envelope so Teresa can get it back here, and I will just sign it and mail it out.

MR. STARK: If it's appropriate, we can deliver it in Los Angeles to you.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. STARK: With regard to the status

4

3

5

6 7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

hearing suggested in the -- this same time, we have filed subsequent to the last hearing with the Court some eleven hundred and fifty odd stipulations of the parties in the action. Subject to the qualification that I have already mentioned that Mr. Whelan raises which we will check out -- and if there is a defect as to any corporate stipulations we will seek to have those cured within the next week to ten days -- we essentially now have the stipulations of all parties other than Mr. Mason's clients, and the Federal Deposi Insurance we confirmed by telephone yesterday that it was appropriate to represent as we have represented in the status report that they proposed to sig stipulation but they are still trying to get authority out of Washington, and the Dow Chemical Company who have been studying the matter and who have indicated they will sign the stipulation although we do not have it in hand.

The only other area that we have potential contention is in taking defaults. We have indicated that any party as to whom we took defaults who might desire to move to vacate the default and file an Answer, that we would stipulate to the vacation of the default. That was of particular relevance to three, four Mutual Water Companies, small Mutual Water Companies, three of whom are represented by Mr. Shaw

who have the -- the defaults have been taken but

because Mr. Shaw has been following it, we have been
in communication with him and have extended the

statement that we would entertain a motion to file an

Answer if they desired to.

We have suggested, however, that we would like to have the Court set a pretrial date and in connection therewith to set a date past which the Court would not look with favor on vacating defaults.

In other words, if Mr. Shaw's clients or any others want to file an Answer to put something in issue, we have no objection to doing that and to trying the issue, but we think there ought to be some reasonable cutoff date prior to the pretrial so we are in a position to bring the order in.

We anticipate an at issue memo being filed within a week, and we would hope that we could schedule an hour to two hour pretrial hearing some place in the latter part of November, hopefully looking to an initial trial setting some place in the second week of December.

As the matter now stands, it would appear that the trial will be essentially a matter of putting in proof as to the defaulted defendants. I think a day is more than enough to introduce the basic hydrologic and related testimony for purposes

red indicates holidays, that is a short week.

MR. STARK: Oh, that is Thanksgiving.

I picked that because we got another pretrial on that Friday.

What about the 18th?

What day is least -- do you not have conferences and that sort of thing?

THE COURT: On the Ontario Motor Speedway case which I had in Ontario, I recall I set that over to the 18th. Hopefully that is not going to take too long, but I don't know. There is a number of parties involved and a number of documents that I assume have all been prepared and we may have to sign.

How long is this conference going to be?

MR. STARK: I wouldn't anticipate that it
should be more than an hour for -- the stipulation
provides that it shall constitute the pretrial
statement of the stipulating parties and so all we have
as far as I can see is a determination of what, if any,
issues remain to try.

THE COURT: Is there any, putting aside the formality of the courtroom, a reporter, and a clerk, any reason we can't do that in L.A. also?

MR. STARK: I have no problem with that if we can clarify that we don't have any jurisdictional

 of the judgment in the absence of any serious opposition.

We find it frankly somewhat incredible that we are in this position, but I think we do -- I think we do have substantial concurrence in the judgment out of some twelve hundred parties. The status report also in -- to some extent Mr. Smith in preparing it has set forth some of the additional accounting we are trying to get out of the way.

We started out with a total of some twentysix hundred names, and we are still auditing between a
the staff and our office to be sure that everyone is
accounted for, but in terms of active parties,
to be bound by the judgment, we are at essentially a
totally stipulated stage subject to Mr. Whelan's
point as to the validity of corporate stipulations
where there are no counsel.

There is quite a few of the dairy farms, for instance, that are incorporated but have not utilized counsel, and we would have to clarify that.

THE COURT: Do you want to pick a date now?

MR. STARK: If your Honor would care to, if we could pick a date for a pretrial hearing in the week say of the 21st of November?

THE COURT: Looking at that calendar if

problems.

and --

THE COURT: Well, the 17th of November

MR. STARK: Your Honor, it --

THE COURT: And Teresa, as you know, guides me through the thicket of procedural problems that I am sure I create for myself, but if we want to set that, we will say on the 17th at 3:30 in the Attorney General's Office, and if you can assure me that we would have a secretary so that he or she could take down everything that we need to —

MR. STARK: Subject to clarifying the procedure, your Honor, that would be satisfacted and if for some reason we find we can't do that, then we will come for a modification.

THE COURT: Okay.

Is that date okay with you?

MR. WHELAN: Your Honor, I have some resumed continued hearings before the Public Utilities
Commission.

THE COURT: Why don't we go off the record and pick a date as among everybody and once we get that date, we will put it on the record.

[Whereupon, at this time there was an off-the-record discussion.]

THE COURT: On the record.

-14

In this case, we will tentatively set a pretrial conference at 3:00 p.m. on November 21, 1977, and subject to clarification as to jurisdictional issues that hearing will be at 3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, all to be set out in the notice to be given by Counsel.

MR. STARK: Could we similarly, your Honor, reserve December 13 or 14 for trial tentatively? My anticipation is that we are talking about a day. I don't know how that will --

THE COURT: I prefer December 16.

MR. STARK: December 16?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STARK: All right.

May we include in the order then the trial on December 16?

THE COURT: In this department.

MR. STARK: In this department.

THE COURT: But there is a caveat on it which is that assuming for the purpose of discussion only that my assignment continues at the Court of Appeal, I would come out and start the trial and work as diligently as we can in light of other matters I may have on the calendar.

MR. STARK: I understand.

THE COURT: But if I read the status report

correctly, you're under no commitment to conclude the trial?

MR. STARK: No. It's to commence the trial at least at that time.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. STARK: But I think we will be relatively short. The main thing I was concerned is our principal hydrologic witness in reserving his time and he is available during that week and he has some commitments in the Philippines.

THE COURT: At 9:30 for trial?

MR. STARK: 9:30. Very good, your Heater.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. SHAW: One of the apparent issues before us here was some sort of time limitation in which people might avail themselves of this agreement whereby we can plead to the case and our defaults be set aside.

THE COURT: What does the stipulation provide for? Is there a stipulation in the file?

MR. STARK: No. It's -- this is an agreement -- what we were suggesting is that the Court include in this order an indication that it would not view with favor a motion or stipulation to vacate defaults in the absence of extraordinary circumstances if it were filed after, and I would say a time ten

days before the -- now the pretrial was the 21st.

After the 10th we will say, so that we have a ten-day period prior to the pretrial to be sure that we are not getting additional answers is all that I am -- is that satisfactory, Stan?

MR. SHAW: No it isn't. I would like to explain why.

I think that the case is not in a condition to properly make this requirement on the Defendants

I represent --

THE COURT: Mr. Shaw, I don't want to cut you off, but I will confess that I would be refuctant to tell anybody at this juncture as to how I will view a motion to set aside a default. I understand the posture is that this is an informal agreement now that they will be set aside.

Whether they will be looked upon with favor, great favor, or little favor, I would be reluctant to set that out --

MR. STARK: The simplest thing, your Honor -MR. SHAW: May I respond?

If that is your disposition, I have nothing to say.

MR. STARK: May I then for the record, your Honor, indicate that the Plaintiff has heretofore indicated that it would stipulate to such a motion to

1 2 3

to clarify that the Plaintiff intends to oppose any motion to set aside defaults under normal circumstances if it is made returnable after the 10th of November.

set aside the default and for the record I would like

Just as -- so that it's clear what -- not what the Court's intent would be, but what the Plaintiffs' intent would be.

We want to accommodate people who want to raise issues, but we do feel compelled to bring the matter to trial as rapidly as possible, so for Mr. Shaw's or anyone else's purposes, we would be prepart to stipulate to the vacation of a default and entire of an Answer at any time prior to the 10th of November.

Thereafter we would require a motion to vacate and would contemplate opposition to the motion.

may have had the stipulation, you of course would give notice for the modification.

MR. STARK: In fact, your Honor, the stipulation was nothing formal. It was in the course of discussions and was primarily directed to Mr. Shaw and to his clients. We have said the same thing would be true for individuals, but there has been no

-

 occasion to extend it beyond that.

MR. SHAW: Well, I would like to be heard briefly.

I think that it's well understood that the concern of my clients is that if this case is going to be contested, we should like to file pleadings and be in court with status before the Court to be heard and watch our rights so to speak.

essentially uncontested, but that is not too resonant this moment. There are too many loose ends and don't want to appear to be indicating to Counsant the should run his case, but it just seems to me the calendar is closing in on this case in such a fashion that what he should do is to contact his stipulating parties and change the arrangement where the stipulation is by its own terms terminated on a given date and much as with escrow instructions instead of an arrangement where the stipulations will continue through such and such a date and thereafter unless they are withdrawn by the parties.

He has a deadline now that I am afraid may turn out to be unrealistic. Be that as it may, to crowd the decision of parties like mine is to generate a likelihood of contest that seems to me unnecessary and, well, this matter of saying that the case is

essentially uncontested is like your doctor saying that the wife is essentially not pregnant.

It remains to be seen, I take it, and if this is going to be contested, we want to withdraw our -- we want to get out of our default position and plead to the case.

MR. STARK: Well, your Honor, first of all, the stipulation is a -- gives a form of judgment, and if the Court is unable to enter judgment in substantially that form, everyone is released because the stipulation is for judgment in substantially that form, so Mr. Whelan, Mr. Shaw, anybody else is in the same position there.

I have no objection if Mr. Shaw wants to raise issues and wants them tried. I want to get the case to trial. We have spent five years and almost three-quarters of a million dollars in bringing this matter to this stage. We have twelve hundred -- or eleven hundred and fifty stipulations. I know of the filing fee in this case, I think, is a record in the State of California.

THE COURT: How much is it?

MR. STARK: The filing fee was sixteen

thousand dollars.

We simply are ready to go. We have a major ground water basin which has a plan prepared under

. 14

which it can be operated and replenished; so Mr.

Shaw has behind him the successful experience of

stopping the Mojave adjudication.

We have discussed for a long time that this Plaintiff is going to do everything in its power to be sure this adjudication is not stopped. We don't object to him filing an Answer. We're glad to try the case as to his clients or to take their stipulation. We want to be reasonable about it, but we want in the interests of the eleven hundred and fifty people who have stipulated, we want to move the case forward.

MR. WHELAN: Your Honor, I would like a see if my understanding is correct, which I think might also solve Mr. Shaw's problems.

My understanding is the intent if the

Court cannot enter judgment in accordance with the

stipulation that all of the parties would be relieved

and would be given time then in which to file any

appropriate pleadings that they wish to file before

the matter, the trial on the matter is concluded; is

that correct?

MR. STARK: That's correct.

MR. WHELAN: So that everyone would then have an opportunity including my client to file an Answer and raise any issues or any cross-complaints

for the record.

If someone moves to set aside a default, well maybe you're on notice, maybe you're not. I don't know.

THE COURT: I think you have said it correctly.

Why don't we stand in recess then until the next occasion we have to meet which at this juncture then is November 21st.

Thank you, Gentlemen.

MR. STARK: Thank you, your Honor.

[Whereupon, at this time the foregoing proceedings were concluded.]

--000--

indeed that might have to be raised at that point.
MR. STARK: Yes.

MR. WHELAN: So I think that if that is the clear understanding of Counsel for the Plaintiff and reflected on the record, hopefully that might solve Mr. Shaw's problems of an Answer if someone comes in and contends — and excuse me for using the first name — if they come in and contest it and are unsuccessful then you are in a position of having the judgment put into effect and if they are successful you are then relieved and can file any issues you want to try them.

That is my understanding at least.

Mr. Stark, is that correct for the record?

MR. STARK: That's right.

MR. SHAW: That's an ingenious observation, but we would still have facing us this matter of if we are to avail ourselves of this existing opportunity which is being unilaterally terminated of withdrawal of our default and opportunity to meet by November 10th, we have even mechanical problems of getting authority from the respective boards of directors.

I suggest that this is too early a date.

However, I understand that it's -- it's essentially

not a matter for your Honor to decide anything. The

statements are made for the record. I made something

BOME

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) , ss COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO)

I, ROSE HENDERSON, official reporter of the Superior Court, County of San Bernardino, State of California, do hereby certify to the best of meknowledge and belief that the foregoing 21 pages comprise a full, true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in this matter.

Dated at San Bernardino, California, this 27th day of October, 1977.

Nose Gendewer Official Reporter CSR #3616