

1 SHAWN D. HAGERTY, Bar No. 182435
shawn.hagerty@bbkllaw.com
2 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
655 West Broadway, 15th Floor
3 San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 525-1300
4 Facsimile: (619) 233-6118

EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES PURSUANT
TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 6103

5 CHRISTOPHER MARK PISANO, Bar No. 192831
christopher.pisano@bbkllaw.com
6 SARAH CHRISTOPHER FOLEY, Bar No. 277223
sarah.foley@bbkllaw.com
7 PATRICK D. SKAHAN, Bar No. 286140
patrick.skahan@bbkllaw.com
8 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
300 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor
9 Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 617-8100
10 Facsimile: (619) 617-7480

11 Attorneys for Respondent and Cross-Complainant
12 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA

13 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

14 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

15 SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER, a
16 California non-profit corporation,

Case No. 19STCP01176

17 Petitioner,

Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger

18 v.

RESPONDENT AND CROSS-
COMPLAINANT CITY OF SAN
BUENAVENTURA'S SUPPLEMENTAL
OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR COURT-
APPOINTED SCIENTIFIC EXPERT

19 STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL
20 BOARD, etc., et al.,

21 Respondents.

Date: July 19, 2021
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Dept: SS10

22
23 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, etc.,

Action Filed: Sept. 19, 2014

Trial Date: Feb. 14, 2022

24 Cross-Complainant,

25 v.

26 DUNCAN ABBOTT, an individual, et al.,

27 Cross-Defendants.
28


1 Cross-Defendants Garrisons and Baggerly want is not a neutral expert but someone who will
2 argue against the City’s position. This is not a legal basis for the Court to appoint an expert,
3 particularly because the Court does not yet know the range of opinions that will be expressed by
4 the different experts representing a range of parties.

5 Notwithstanding Cross-Defendants Garrisons’ objections, and the inappropriate,
6 accusatory language in Cross-Defendant Baggerly’s originally filed reply regarding the City’s
7 expert, Cross-Defendants cannot make a showing at this stage that the Court requires an
8 independent expert rather than the use of expert witnesses called by the parties in order to make
9 findings. The Court should deny the motion for a court-appointed scientific expert because
10 Cross-Defendants have made an improper and unsupported request for the appointment of an
11 expert to represent their own interests – at the expense of the other parties to the litigation – but
12 have failed to demonstrate any need at this time for the Court to appoint a neutral expert witness.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: July 8, 2021

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

By: 
SHAWN D. HAGERTY
CHRISTOPHER MARK PISANO
SARAH CHRISTOPHER FOLEY
PATRICK D. SKAHAN
Attorneys for Respondent and Cross-
Complainant
CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA