1	SOMACH, SIMMONS & DUNN			
2	A Professional Corporation NICHOLAS A. JACOBS (SBN 210091)			
3	MAXIMILIAN C. BRICKER (SBN 350150) 500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000			
4	Sacramento, CA 95814 Phone: (916) 446-7979			
5	Fax: (916) 446-8199 njacobs@somachlaw.com			
6	mbricker@somachlaw.com			
7	Special Counsel for Real Party in Interest KERN COUNTY WATER AGENCY			
8	JAMES CIAMPA (SBN 162280)			
9	LAGERLOF, LLP 155 North Lake Avenue			
10	Pasadena, CA 91101 Phone: (626) 793-9400			
11	jciampa@lagerlof.com Congrel Councel for Real Ports in Interest	E ₂₄	ownt Enous Eiling Eoog	D. mari and
12	General Counsel for Real Party in Interest KERN COUNTY WATER AGENCY		empt From Filing Fees Government Code Sect	
13				
14	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF T	HE STATE OF	CALIFORNIA	
15	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN			
16	BRING BACK THE KERN; WATER AUDIT	Case No. BCV-22-103220-GAP Currently Assigned for All Purposes to		
17	CALIFORNIA; KERN RIVER PARKWAY FOUNDATION; KERN AUDUBON SOCIETY; SIERRA CLUB; and CENTER FOR	•	A. Pulskamp, Division	
18	BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY,	MOTION FO	OR PEREMPTORY	
19	Plaintiffs and Petitioners,		E [C.C.P. § 170.6]	
20	V.			
21	CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, and DOES 1-500,	JUDGE:	Hon. John W. Lua, Presiding Judge	
22	Defendants and Respondents,	DEPT:	1	
23	DUENA MICTA WATER CTORACE DICTRICT.	A -41 17:1 - 4.	N	
24	BUENA VISTA WATER STORAGE DISTRICT; KERN DELTA WATER DISTRICT; NORTH KERN WATER STORAGE DISTRCT;	Action Filed:	November 30, 2022	
25	ROSEDALE-RIO BRAVO WATER STORAGE DISTRICT; KERN COUNTY WATER			
26	AGENCY; and DOES 501-999,			
27	Real Parties in Interest.			
28		J		

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. LUA, PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE KERN COUNTY **SUPERIOR COURT:**

Real Party in Interest Kern County Water Agency (KCWA) hereby moves that this matter, which has been assigned to the Honorable Gregory A. Pulskamp, be reassigned to another judge of the Kern County Superior Court, and that no matters hereinafter arising in this cause be heard or assigned to Judge Pulskamp on the grounds that said judge is prejudiced against KCWA. A peremptory challenge "may be made following reversal on appeal of a trial court's decision, or following reversal on appeal of a trial court's final judgment, if the trial judge in the prior proceeding is assigned to conduct a new trial on the matter." (Code Civ. Proc., § 170.6(a)(2).) "A new trial is a re-examination of an issue of fact in the same court after a trial and decision by a jury, court, or referee." (Code Civ. Proc., § 656.)

The term "new trial" is interpreted broadly to include any reexamination of factual or legal issues in controversy in the prior proceeding. (Paterno v. Superior Court (2004) 123 Cal.App.4th 548, 560; Geddes v. Superior Court (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 417, 424.) The reversal, remand, and "new trial" must be on the merits and require "a 'reexamination' of a factual or legal issue that was in controversy in the prior proceeding." (C.C. v. Superior Court (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 1019, 1022 (C.C.), quoting Geddes, supra, at p. 424.) "In order to conduct a reexamination, a court must revisit some factual or legal issue that was in controversy in the prior proceeding." (Paterno v. Superior Court (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 548, 560.) Remands requiring only ministerial actions or reconsideration of a motion not involving the merits of the underlying proceeding do not trigger the "new trial" provision. (C.C., supra, at p. 1022 [ministerial act]; Karlsen v. Superior Court (2006) 139 Cal.App.4th 1526, 1530 [remand to prepare statement of decision]; Akopyan v. Superior Court (2020) 53 Cal. App. 5th 1094, 1096 [reconsideration of Batson/Wheeler motion].) "[S]ection 170.6 is to be liberally construed in favor of allowing a peremptory challenge, and a challenge should be denied only if the statute absolutely forbids it." (Maas v. Superior Court (2016) 1 Cal.5th 962, 973, quoting Stephens v. Superior Court (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 54, 61-62, internal quotes omitted; accord, Int'l Union of Operating Eng'rs v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal.App.3d 340, 349.)

SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN A Professional Corporation This motion is timely and appropriately filed following the Fifth District Court of Appeal's decision to reverse both Judge Pulskamp's November 9, 2023 order granting the motion for preliminary injunction and setting a nominal bond (Declaration of Nicholas A. Jacobs in Support of Motion for Peremptory Challenge ("Jacobs Decl.") Exh. A), and the November 14, 2023 stipulation and implementation order (Jacobs Decl. Exh. B), along with directions that this "matter is remanded for proceedings consistent with the views expressed in this opinion." (*Bring Back the Kern v. City of Bakersfield* (2025) 110 Cal.App.5th 322, 368-369 (*Bring Back the Kern*); Code Civ. Proc., § 170.6(a)(2).) Among other rulings, the appellate opinion directed this Court to "determine whether and to what extent using the waters of the Kern River to keep fish in good condition is a reasonable and beneficial use of water under California Constitution, article X, section 2." (*Bring Back the Kern, supra*, at p. 356.) Resolution of this issue will involve new proceedings that are both factual and legal in nature; such proceedings will occur in the context of a subsequent motion for preliminary injunction and a trial on the merits.

The appellate opinion also directed that any subsequent preliminary injunction issued after remand must "immediately set an objective standard for compliance upon a proper showing by the moving parties." (*Bring Back the Kern, supra*, 110 Cal.App.5th at p. 358.) The Court of Appeal found error in the nominal bond imposed on the Plaintiffs, and directed that:

[N]o further preliminary injunction shall be issued unless its issuance is conditioned upon the furnishing of an adequate undertaking. We do not purport to determine what an adequate amount would be. Rather, we leave that determination to the trial court.

(*Id.* at p. 361, quoting *Abba Rubber Co. v. Seaquist* (1991) 235 Cal.App.3d 1, 22, internal quotes omitted.) Finally, the Court of Appeal found that the "Implementation Order" violated the due process rights of KCWA and the other Real Parties in Interest (*Bring Back the Kern, supra*, at pp. 361-365) and conflicted with established water right priorities (*id.* at pp. 365-366).

Whether arising in a subsequent motion for preliminary injunction or at trial, these proceedings constitute a "new trial" on the same issues. As set forth in the attached Jacobs

¹ The *Bring Back the Kern* decision to remand the matter back to the Kern Superior Court was filed April 2, 2025. (Jacobs Decl. Exh. C.) Subsequently, on May 12, 2025, plaintiffs in this action filed a Petition for Review in the California Supreme Court (Case No. S290840).

Declaration, KCWA alleges that Judge Pulskamp is prejudiced against KCWA so that KCWA
cannot have a fair and impartial trial or hearing before the judicial officer. Granting this
peremptory challenge would be "consistent 'with the established rule that section 170.6, in
guaranteeing a litigant the extraordinary right to disqualify a judge, should be liberally construed
to effect its objects and to promote justice." (Ghaffarpour v. Superior Court (2012)
202 Cal.App.4th 1463, 1471, quoting <i>Hendershot v. Superior Court</i> (1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 860,
865; accord, Ziesmer v. Superior Court (2003) 107 Cal.App.4th 360, 366.)

Finally, Code of Civil Procedure section 170.6(a)(2) provides that this motion "shall be made within 60 days after the party or the party's attorney has been notified of the assignment." Exactly what constitutes "notification of the assignment" is not clear in the context of the instant action, where Judge Pulskamp has been assigned as the trial judge for all purposes. One interpretation of this time period is that it begins to run on April 2, 2025 – the date on which the Fifth District Court of Appeal published its *Bring Back the Kern* opinion. Although the remittitur has not yet issued in this matter, out of an abundance of caution, KCWA files this motion now in order to demonstrate clear compliance with the 60-day period. As such, if this Court determines that it lacks jurisdiction to rule on this motion until such time as the remittitur issues, KCWA respectfully requests that the Court hold this motion in abeyance and rule on it when jurisdiction has been returned to the Court.

By:

SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN A Professional Corporation

Dated: May 30, 2025

Nicholas A. Jacobs

Attorneys for Real Party in Interest KERN COUNTY WATER AGENCY

1	Bring Back the Kern, et al. v. City of Bakersfield Kern County Superior Court Case No. BCV-22-103220-GAP		
2			
3	PROOF OF SERVICE		
4 5	I am employed in the County of Sacramento; my business address is 500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000, Sacramento, California; my electronic service address is jestabrook@somachlaw.com ; I am over the age of 18 years and am not a party to the foregoing action.		
6	On May 30, 2025, I served the following document(s):		
7	MOTION FOR PEREMPTORY CHALLENGE [C.C.P. § 170.6]		
8			
9	on the following persons or parties:		
10	XX: (By Mail): I enclosed the document(s) in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the person at the address set forth below and placed the envelope in the area designated for		
11	collection and mailing. Following our ordinary business practices, on the same day that the correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course		
12	of business with the United States Postal Service.		
13	Hon. Gregory A. Pulskamp Kern County Superior Court, Dept. J Metro Justice Building		
14			
15	1415 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301		
16			
17	XX: (Via Electronic Service): I transmitted the document(s) listed above to the email address(es) of the person(s) set forth on the attached service list. My electronic service		
18	address is: <u>jestabrook@somachlaw.com</u> . Service is deemed complete at the time of transmission of the document or at the time the electronic notification of service of the		
19	document is sent.		
20	SEE SERVICE LIST ATTACHED		
21	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on		
22	May 30, 2025, at Sacramento, California.		
23	Ja ille Estaband		
24	Jennifer Estabrook		
25			
26			
27			

PROOF OF SERVICE -1-

28

SERVICE LIST

•		SERVICE EIST	
2	Counsel	Parties Represented	Email
3	Adam F. Keats LAW OFFICE OF ADAM KEATS	Plaintiffs/Petitioners: Bring Back the Kern,	adam@keatslaw.org
5	2489 Mission Street, Suite 16 San Francisco, CA 94110 Telephone: (415) 964-0070	Kern River Parkway Foundation, Kern Audubon Society, Sierra Club, and	
6	Telephone. (415) 504-0070	Center for Biological Diversity	
7	William McKinnon, Esq. Attorney At Law	Plaintiff/Petitioner Water Audit California	legal@waterauditca.org Linda.asc@sbcglobal.net
8	952 School Street, PMB 316 Napa, California 94559		vstephan@waterauditca.org
9	Telephone: (530) 575-5335		
10	Bryan Wilson Chelsea Caylin Kehrer MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP	Plaintiff/Petitioner Bring Back the Kern	BWilson@mofo.com CKehrer@mofo.com MoFo_BBtK_Kern@mofo.com
11 12	755 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304-1018 Telephone: (650) 813-5600		
13	William Frentzen Anissa Chitour		WFrentzen@mofo.com AChitour@mofo.com
14	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 425 Market Street		Acinoun@inoto.com
15	San Francisco, CA 94105-2482 Telephone: (415) 268-7000		
16	Mehran Arjomand Matt Robinson		MArjomand@mofo.com MRobinson@mofo.com
17 18	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100		
19	San Diego, CA 92130-2040 Telephone: (858) 720-5100		
20	Colin L. Pearce Jolie-Anne S. Ansley Ashley L. Barton	Defendant/Respondent: City of Bakersfield	<u>clpearce@duanemorris.com</u> <u>jsansley@duanemorris.com</u> abarton@duanemorris.com
21	DUANE MORRIS LLP One Market Plaza, Suite 2200		baherrera@duanemorris.com
22	San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 957-3000		
2324	Virginia A. Gennaro Matthew S. Collom		vgennaro@bakersfieldcity.us mcollom@bakersfieldcity.us
25	CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE City of Bakersfield		132
26	1600 Truxtun Avenue, Fourth Floor Bakersfield, CA 93301 Telephone: (661) 326-3721		
27			
28			

PROOF OF SERVICE -2-

1	Counsel	Parties Represented	Email
2	Robert E. Donlan Craig a. Carnes, Jr.	Intervenor: Kern Delta Water District	rdonlan@wjhattorneys.com ccarnes@wjhattorneys.com
3	Shawnda M. Grady Kevin William Bursey		sgrady@wjhattorneys.com kbursey@wjhattorneys.com
4	WANGER JONES HELSLEY PC 265 E. River Park Circle, Suite 310		dwittenborn@wjhattorneys.com
5	Fresno, CA 93720 Telephone: (559) 233-4800		
6	Richard Iger General Counsel		richard@kerndelta.org
7	KERN DELTA WATER DISTRICT 501 Taft Highway		
8	Bakersfield, CA 93307		
9	Scott K. Kuney Brett A. Stroud	Intervenor: North Kern Water Storage	skuney@youngwooldridge.com bstroud@youngwooldridge.com
10	YOUNG WOOLDRIDGE, LLP 10800 Stockdale Hwy, Suite 202 Bakersfield, CA 93311	District	pbanda@youngwooldridge.com
11	Telephone: (661) 327-9661		
12	Isaac St. Lawrence James A. Worth	Real Party in Interest: Buena Vista Water Storage	isaac@mhwslegal.com jim@mhwslegal.com
13	Amanda M. Rodriguez MCMURTREY HARTSOCK	District	amanda@mhwslegal.com
14	WORTH & ST. LAWRENCE 2001 22 nd Street, Suite 100		
15	Bakersfield, CA 93301 Telephone: 661-322-4417		
16	Facsimile: 661-322-8123 Daniel N. Raytis	Intervenor:	dan@bbr.law
17	Daniel M. Root BELDEN BLAINE RAYTIS LLP	Rosedale-Rio Bravo Water Storage District	droot@bbr.law heather@bbr.law
18	5016 California Avenue, Suite 3 Bakersfield, CA 93309	Storing District	article (c) contains
19	Telephone: (661) 864-7826		u a maani
20	Jennifer Spaletta STOEL RIVES LLP		Jennifer.spaletta@stoel.com
22	500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1600 Sacramento, CA 95814		
23	Telephone: (916) 319-4788		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

PROOF OF SERVICE -3-

1	Counsel	Parties Represented	Email
2	Nicholas A. Jacobs Max C. Bricker SOMACH, SIMMONS & DUNN	Defendant and Respondent: Kern County Water Agency	njacobs@somachlaw.com mbricker@somachlaw.com pmacpherson@somachlaw.com
3	500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000 Sacramento, CA 95814		jestabrook@somachlaw.com
5	Phone: (916) 446-7979 James Ciampa		jciampa@lagerlof.com
6	LAGERLOF, LLP 155 North Lake Avenue		
7	Pasadena, CA 91101 Telephone: (626) 793-9400		
8	Gary A. Watt Nathan A. Metcalf	Intervenor-Defendant: J.G. Boswell	gwatt@hansonbridgett.com nmetcalf@hansonbridgett.com
9	Sean G. Herman Jillian E. Ames		sherman@hansonbridgett.com james@hansonbridgett.com
10	HANSON BRIDGETT LLP 425 Market Street, 26th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105		
11	Telephone: (415) 777-3200		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16 17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

PROOF OF SERVICE -4-