	William M. White Sherrie M. Flynn	#152214 #240215		
1	BAKER, MANOCK & JENSEN			
2	FIG GARDEN FINANCIAL CENTER 5260 NORTH PALM AVENUE, FOURTH FLOOR			
3	FRESNO, CALIFORNIA 93704-2209 Telephone (559) 432-5400 Telecopier (559) 432-5620			
4	Defendent CHARLES LICHUL OUL M.D.			
5	Defendant CHARLES UGWU-OJU, M.D. Attorneys for			
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - FRESNO DIVISION			
10				
11	KELLI THOMAS,		) Case No. 1:06-CV-00215-OWW	
12		Plaintiff,	) ) ) ORDER ON DEFENDANT CHARLES	
13	v.		<ul> <li>OKDER ON DEFENDANT CHARLES</li> <li>UGWU-OJU, M.D.'S MOTIONS IN</li> <li>LIMINE NOS. 1 THROUGH 11</li> </ul>	
14	SAMPATH SURYADE		)	
15	SHELLY KRUSE, M.D. M.D.; LORAINE GOOD	DWIN, M.D.;	)	
16	CHARLES UGWU-OJU COMMUNITY HOSPIT	J, M.D.; MADERA	) ACTION FILED: February 24, 2006	
17	Corporation,	Defendants.	) TRIAL DATE: September 1, 2009	
18				
19				
20	On August 17, 2009, the matter of Defendant Charles Ugwu-Oju, M.D.'s			
21	("Defendant") Motions in Limine Nos. 1 through 11 came on for hearing in Department 3 of the			
22	above-entitled court. Jennifer B. MikoLevine of the law firm of Bingham McCutchen LLP			
23	appeared on behalf of Plaintiff Kelli Thomas ("Plaintiff"). William M. White and Sherrie M.			
24	Flynn of the law firm of Baker Manock & Jensen, PC appeared on behalf of Defendant.			
25	After full consideration of the written and oral submissions of the parties			
26	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that			
27	1. De	efendant's Motion in L	imine No. 1 to Preclude Reference to Insurance is	
28	<b>GRANTED</b> and Plaintiff is prohibited from introducing testimony, documents, or other			
			T CHARLES UGWU-OJU'S	
l	l	MOTIONS IN LIMI	NE NOS. 1 THROUGH 11 Dockets Justia	

evidentiary materials that make reference to or would suggest that Defendant has medical malpractice insurance or that Defendant's witnesses have been hired or contacted by her insurance company. Plaintiff's counsel shall instruct Plaintiff's witnesses accordingly.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2. Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 2 to Preclude Any Reference During Trial to the \$250,000.00 Limit on Non-Economic Damages is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff is prohibited from introducing at trial testimony, documents, or other evidentiary materials that make reference to, or would suggest, that California Civil Code section 3333.2, subdivision (b) provides that in any action for injury against a health care provider based on professional negligence, the injured plaintiff shall not be entitled to recover noneconomic damages in excess of \$250,000.00. Plaintiff's counsel shall instruct Plaintiff's witnesses accordingly;

3. Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 3 to Preclude Reference to Any Other Medical Malpractice Action is **GRANTED**, without prejudice. Unless and until such time that Plaintiff is able to show some permissible basis for allowing such reference, Plaintiff is prohibited from introducing testimony or other evidence regarding prior or current medical malpractice cases involving Defendant. Plaintiff's counsel shall instruct Plaintiff's witnesses accordingly;

4. Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 4 to Preclude Evidence of Reputation or Specific Past Instances of Conduct is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff is prohibited from introducing testimony or offering other evidence relating to the Defendant's reputation and/or specific instances of prior conduct involving third parties. Plaintiff's counsel shall instruct Plaintiff's witnesses accordingly;

5. Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 5 to Preclude Reference During Trial to
 Personal Preferences of Treatment of Expert Medical Witnesses is GRANTED and
 Plaintiff is prohibited from introducing testimony or other evidence regarding individual
 personal preferences for care and treatment of designated experts that could have been used
 in the care and treatment of Plaintiff. Plaintiff's counsel shall instruct Plaintiff's witnesses
 accordingly;

6. Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 6 to Exclude Expert Opinions and Conclusions Not Included in an Expert Report or Deposition is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff and her experts are precluded from mentioning or conveying to the jury any expert opinions and conclusions not previously testified to in an expert report or in a deposition, excepting that Plaintiff's expert, Dr. Anne Foster-Rosales may testify to the opinions disclosed in her declaration submitted in support of Plaintiff's opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff's counsel shall instruct Plaintiff's witnesses accordingly;

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

7. Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 7 to Preclude Plaintiff's Claim as an Abused Spouse is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff and Plaintiff's attorney are precluded from claiming, or depicting the Plaintiff as being an abused spouse. Further, Defendant may question Plaintiff regarding the fact that she was incarcerated on a felony conviction, only as to court,date of conviction, and crime, but is precluded from offering evidence or questioning Plaintiff regarding the specific crime Plaintiff committed or the details thereof; Plaintiff's counsel and Defendant's counsel shall instruct their witnesses accordingly;

8. Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 8 to Exclude Hearsay Statements by Kathy Hill is **DENIED** to the extent that Plaintiff may offer the hearsay statements for the limited purposes of showing knowledge and/or notice or bias, but may not offer the statements for the truth of the matter asserted;

9. Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 9 to Preclude Non-Disclosed Witnesses From Testifying at Trial and to Preclude Reliance on Any Documents or Hearsay Opinions From Such Witnesses is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff is prohibited from introducing at trial witnesses that have not been disclosed to Defendant during pre-trial discovery. Plaintiff's counsel shall instruct their witnesses accordingly;

10. Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 10 to Preclude Damage Claims Plaintiff
 Cannot Causally Support With Expert Testimony is GRANTED and Plaintiff may only
 testify about things observable to and within a layperson's knowledge, such as her own
 sensations related to the surgery, but may not opine on the cause of her alleged injuries.

Plaintiff's counsel shall instruct their witnesses accordingly;

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11. Defendant's Motoin in Limine No. 11 to Preclude Evidence Related to Plaintiff's Claims or Contentions That Defendant Caused Plaintiff Injury or Damage by Prescribing Premarin is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff may not offer evidence or make reference to Premarin as bearing on the standard of care or causation. However, parties may introduce Defendant's prescription of Premarin for other purposes, including but not limited to demonstrating Defendant's knowledge of Plaintiff's post-surgery menopausal condition. Plaintiff's counsel shall instruct Plaintiff's witnesses accordingly; and 12. Defendant's Objections to Plaintiff's Rule 26(a)(3) Pretrial Disclosures are

10SUSTAINED and Plaintiff may not offer deposition testimony set forth in Plaintiff's Rule1126(a)(3) Pretrial Disclosures as evidence at trial except for the limited purposes of12contradiction or impeachment of witnesses, unless and until Plaintiff makes a showing of13unavailability of the witness or some other permitted use of such testimony at trial pursuant14to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Ev;idence and, if and when Plaintiff makes15such showing, Defendant may introduce other parts of the deposition testimony of Sampath16Suryadevara, M.D. in rebuttal, as designated by Defendant on or before August 18, 2009.

17	IT IS SO ORDERED.
18	Dated:August 29, 2009/s/ Oliver W. WangerUNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	4
	ORDER ON DEFENDANT CHARLES UGWU-OJU'S MOTIONS IN LIMINE NOS. 1 THROUGH 11