

1 B. CLYDE HUTCHINSON, State Bar No. 037526  
bch@llcllp.com  
2 VINCENT CASTILLO, State Bar No. 209298  
vcastillo@llcllp.com  
3 JASON B. SHANE, State Bar No. 253908  
jshane@llcllp.com  
4 LOMBARDI, LOPER & CONANT, LLP  
Lake Merritt Plaza  
5 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 2600  
Oakland, CA 94612-3541  
6 Telephone: (510) 433-2600  
Facsimile: (510) 433-2699

7 Attorneys for Defendants  
8 NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER  
CORPORATION (erroneously sued herein as  
9 AMTRAK CALIFORNIA), BNSF RAILWAY  
COMPANY (erroneously sued herein as  
10 BURLINGTON NORTHERN SANTA FE  
RAILWAY), and STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
11 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
13 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – FRESNO DIVISION

15 LUCIO CORRAL RODRIGUEZ,  
individually and as Successor in Interest to  
16 the decedents, MARICRUZ CORRAL,  
IVAN ALEXANDER CORRAL, and  
17 LUCIO ANTHONY CORRAL,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 COUNTY OF STANISLAUS; CITY OF  
MODESTO; CITY OF RIVERBANK;  
21 STATE OF CALIFORNIA; AMTRAK  
CALIFORNIA; BURLINGTON  
22 NORTHERN SANTA FE RAILWAY; and  
DOES 1 to 200,

23 Defendants.

24  
25 AND ALL RELATED ACTIONS.

Case No. 1:08-cv-00856 OWW GSA

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS  
NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER  
CORPORATION’S, BNSF RAILWAY  
COMPANY’S, AND STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION’S MOTION *IN  
LIMINE* NO. 13 TO LIMIT OR EXCLUDE  
EVIDENCE OF AMTRAK DELAY  
REPORTS OTHER THAN THAT FOR  
THE SUBJECT TRAIN**

26  
27 The Motion *In Limine* of Defendants National Railroad Passenger Corporation, BNSF  
28 Railway Company, and State of California, (hereinafter “NRPC, BNSF and California”) to Limit

1 or Exclude Evidence of Amtrak Delay Reports Other than That for the Subject Train came on  
2 regularly for hearing on December 1, 2010, in Department 3 of the above-captioned Court.  
3 Plaintiff Lucio Corral Rodriguez was represented by Aaron Markowitz, Esq. Defendants NRPC,  
4 BNSF and California were represented by Clyde Hutchinson and Vincent Castillo. The County of  
5 Stanislaus was represented by Dan Farrar. Having considered the moving papers, any opposition  
6 filed, and following oral argument, the Court orders as follows:

7 The Motion In Limine is GRANTED.

8 1. Plaintiff is barred from presenting evidence of any kind regarding NRPC delay  
9 reports other than that for the subject train on the date of the subject accident. The Court finds  
10 that any suggestion, argument, testimony, or presentation of evidence regarding NRPC delay  
11 reports other than that for the subject train on the date of the subject accident is irrelevant.

12 Plaintiff is not permitted to make reference in the selection of a jury, presentation of  
13 evidence, reference to evidence, testimony, or argument of the matters precluded above.

14  
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: December 9, 2010

/s/ Oliver W. Wanger  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28