California Water Service Company ("Responding Party"), hereby responds as follows to TEJON RANCHCORP AND TEJON RANCH COMPANY ("Propounding Party")
Form Interrogatories, Set One.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT AND GENERAL OBJECTIONS.

Each of the following responses and/or objections is based on information presently known by or reasonably available to the Responding Party at the time of preparation of these responses and/or objections. The Responding Party has not yet completed its discovery or investigation or the preparation of this case for trial. Accordingly, the responses set forth herein are provided without prejudice to the Responding Party's rights to produce evidence of any subsequently discovered facts or interpretations thereof, and/or to add or to modify or otherwise change or amend the responses herein. The Responding Party assumes no obligation to voluntarily supplement or amend this response to reflect such facts, testimony or other evidence. The information hereinafter set forth is true and correct to the best of the Responding Party's knowledge at this particular time, but is subject to correction for inadvertent errors or omissions, if any errors or omissions shall be found to exist.

By these responses, Responding Party makes no representation concerning the relevance or admissibility of any of the evidence cited, and further reserves the right to make all pertinent evidentiary objections at trial or at any other stage of the proceedings.

The Responding Party objects to each and every interrogatory insofar as it calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work production doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the official information privilege, the right of privacy or any other
applicable privilege. The Responding Party objects to each and every
interrogatory insofar as it seeks privileged information protected from
disclosure by the privacy interests of the individuals involved, as well as
by applicable evidentiary rules. The Responding Party does not intend to
waive such privileges, and responses to those interrogatories are not
intended and should not be construed as a waiver.
Each of the foregoing general objections and qualifications are incorporated
in full in each of the responses set forth below, as if fully set forth
therein, and each of the responses below are provided subject to, and without
waiving, the general objections and qualifications asserted herein.

RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES

FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 1.1:
State the name, ADDRESS, telephone number, and relationship to you of each
PERSON who prepared or assisted in the in the preparation of the responses to
these interrogatories.

RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 1.1:
Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and
General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Without waiving the
foregoing objections, Responding Party responds as follows: John S. Tootle;
California Water Service Company, 2632 West 237th Street, Torrance, California
90505; (310) 257-1400; and Counsel for California Water Service Company.

FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:
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Is your response to each request for admission served with these interrogatories an unqualified admission? If not, for each response that is not an unqualified admission:

a. State the number of the request;

b. State all facts upon which you base your response;

c. State the name, addresses, and telephone numbers of all persons who have knowledge of those facts; and

d. Identify all documents and other tangible things that support your response and state the name, address, and telephone number of the person who has each document or thing.

**RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:**

**Request for Admission No. 1:**

YOU have not acquired any prescriptive rights as against TEJON.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:**

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 1. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020 and 2018.030. Furthermore, subparts B and D would necessitate the preparation of a
compilation, abstract, audit or summary from documents in Responding party’s
objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the
Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.

Request for Admission No. 2:

YOU have not alleged any prescriptive claims against any real property owned
by TEJON.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and
General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party
also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission
No. 2. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls
for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege,
the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of
privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks
premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil
Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in
Furthermore, subparts B and D would necessitate the preparation of a
compilation, abstract, audit or summary from documents in Responding party’s
possession. (Code of Civ. Proc. § 2030.230.) Such summary, abstract,
compilation, or audit does not presently exist. Responding Party further
objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the
Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.
Request for Admission No. 3:

YOU have not acquired any prescriptive rights against any real property owned by TEJON.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 3. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020 and 2018.030.

Furthermore, subparts B and D would necessitate the preparation of a compilation, abstract, audit or summary from documents in Responding party’s possession. (Code of Civ. Proc. § 2030.230.) Such summary, abstract, compilation, or audit does not presently exist. Responding Party further objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.

Request for Admission No. 4:

YOU have not filed an 'in rem' action for prescription.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and
General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 4. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020 and 2018.030.

Responding Party further objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.

**Request for Admission No. 5:**

TEJON did not have actual notice that YOU were pumping water from the Antelope Valley adjudication area as defined by the court ("AVAA") "under a claim of right" against TEJON.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:**

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 5. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270.
Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020 and 2018.030. Furthermore, subparts B and D would necessitate the preparation of a compilation, abstract, audit or summary from documents in Responding party’s possession. (Code of Civ. Proc. § 2030.230.) Such summary, abstract, compilation, or audit does not presently exist. Responding Party further objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.

Request for Admission No. 6:

TEJON did not have actual notice that YOU were pumping water from the AVAA in a “notorious” manner against TEJON.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 6. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020 and 2018.030. Furthermore, subparts B and D would necessitate the preparation of a compilation, abstract, audit or summary from documents in Responding party’s
possession. (Code of Civ. Proc. § 2030.230.) Such summary, abstract, compilation, or audit does not presently exist. Responding Party further objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.

Request for Admission No. 7:

TEJON did not have actual notice that YOU were pumping water from the AVAA in an “exclusive” manner against TEJON.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 7. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020 and 2018.030. Furthermore, subparts B and D would necessitate the preparation of a compilation, abstract, audit or summary from documents in Responding party’s possession. (Code of Civ. Proc. § 2030.230.) Such summary, abstract, compilation, or audit does not presently exist. Responding Party further objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.
1 Request for Admission No. 8:
2 TEJON did not have actual notice that YOU were pumping water from the AVAA in
3 a "continuous" manner against TEJON.
4
5 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:
6 Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and
7 General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party
8 also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission
9 No. 8. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls
10 for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege,
11 the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of
12 privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks
13 premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil
14 Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in
16 Furthermore, subparts B and D would necessitate the preparation of a
17 compilation, abstract, audit or summary from documents in Responding party’s
18 possession. (Code of Civ. Proc. § 2030.230.) Such summary, abstract,
19 compilation, or audit does not presently exist. Responding Party further
20 objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the
21 Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.
22
23 Request for Admission No. 9:
24 TEJON did not have actual notice that YOU were pumping water from the AVAA in
25 a "hostile and adverse" manner against TEJON.
26
27 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:
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Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 9. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020 and 2018.030.

Furthermore, subparts B and D would necessitate the preparation of a compilation, abstract, audit or summary from documents in Responding party's possession. (Code of Civ. Proc. § 2030.230.) Such summary, abstract, compilation, or audit does not presently exist. Responding Party further objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.

**Request for Admission No. 10:**

YOU have never pumped groundwater west of the Bedrock Ridge.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:**

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 10. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege,
the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020 and 2018.030. Responding Party further objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the Court's Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.

Request for Admission No. 11:

YOUR wells are down-gradient of TEJON's wells.

Response to Interrogatory No. 17.1:

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 11. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020 and 2018.030. Responding Party further objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the Court's Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.

Request for Admission No. 12:

YOUR pumping of groundwater has never had an impact on groundwater levels in any well owned by TEJON.
RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 12. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020 and 2018.030. Furthermore, subparts B and D would necessitate the preparation of a compilation, abstract, audit or summary from documents in Responding party’s possession. (Code of Civ. Proc. § 2030.230.) Such summary, abstract, compilation, or audit does not presently exist. Responding Party further objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.

Request for Admission No. 13:

YOUR pumping of groundwater has never interfered with TEJON’s exercise of its groundwater rights.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 13. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls
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for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020 and 2018.030. Furthermore, subparts B and D would necessitate the preparation of a compilation, abstract, audit or summary from documents in Responding party’s possession. (Code of Civ. Proc. § 2030.230.) Such summary, abstract, compilation, or audit does not presently exist. Responding Party further objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.

Request for Admission No. 14:

Operation of YOUR wells has never interfered with operation of TEJON’s wells.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:

Responding Party incorporates by this reference the Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though expressly set forth herein. Responding Party also incorporates by this reference its objections to Request for Admission No. 14. The Responding Party objects to the extent the interrogatory calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, the right of privacy or any other applicable privilege. This interrogatory also seeks premature disclosure of expert opinion in violation of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2034.210, 2034.220 and 2034.270 and work product in

Responding Party further objects to this interrogatory as this interrogatory is superseded by the Court’s Phase 6 Discovery Order, dated January 27, 2014.

DATED: January 27, 2014

CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY

By: __________________________

JOHN S. TOOTLE, ESQ.
PROOF OF SERVICE (C.C.P. §1013a, 2015.5)
Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases
Judicial Counsel Proceeding No. 4408
Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 1-05-CV-049053

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 2632 West 237th Street, Torrance, CA 90505.

On January 21, 2014, I served the foregoing document(s) entitled:

CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORIES BY TEJON RANCHCORP AND TEJON RANCH COMPANY, SET ONE

by placing the true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as stated on the attached mailing list.

by placing _ the original, _ a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed enveloped addressed as follows:

BY SANTA CLARA SUPERIOR COURT E-FILING IN COMPLEX LITIGATION PURSUANT TO CLARIFICATION ORDER DATED OCTOBER 27, 2005.

Executed on January 27, 2014, at Torrance, California

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

(Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made.

Michael Duque