Weaver v. USDA Forest Doc. 49

2

1

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

⊥ *Э*

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff,

VS.

DAVID LEE WEAVER,

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE; FOREST SERVICE; MICHAEL JAMES RYAN, AND DOES 1 THROUGH 100

Defendants.

CV 10-1523 RSWL

ORDER RE Defendants' Motion in Limine To Exclude Undisclosed Evidence [43]

Currently before the Court is Defendants' Motion in Limine To Exclude Undisclosed Evidence [43]. Having reviewed all the papers pertaining to these Motions, the Court HEREBY RULES AS FOLLOWS:

The Court GRANTS Defendants' Motion.

Plaintiff is advised that he cannot present any evidence that was not disclosed during discovery.

Under FRCP 26(a), each party must provide as part of its initial disclosures

- (i) the name and, if known, the address and telephone number of each individual likely to have discoverable information—along with the subjects of that information—that the disclosing party may use to support its claims or defenses, unless the use would be solely for impeachment;
- (ii) a copy--or a description by category and location--of all documents, electronically stored information, and tangible things that the disclosing party has in its possession, custody, or control and may use to support its claims or defenses, unless the use would be solely for impeachment;
- (iii) a computation of each category of damages claimed by the disclosing party--who must also make available for inspection and copying as under Rule 34 the documents or other evidentiary material, unless privileged or protected from disclosure, on which each computation is based, including materials bearing on the nature and extent of injuries suffered. . . .
- FRCP 37(c) states that if a party fails to provide information required by FRCP 26(a), the party is not allowed to use that information to supply evidence at trial. The information may be introduced only if the party's failure to disclose the required information is

substantially justified or harmless. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c)(1); Yeti by Molly, Ltd. v. Deckers Outdoor Corp., 259 F.3d 1101, 1106 (9th Cir. 2001). The burden to prove substantial justification or harmlessness lies with the party facing sanctions. Yeti by Molly Ltd., 259 F.3d at 1106-07. In determining whether to preclude introduction of evidence pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37, courts consider (1) the surprise to the party against whom the evidence would be offered; (2) the ability of that party to cure the surprise; (3) the extent to which allowing the evidence would disrupt the trial; (4) the importance of the evidence, and (5) the nondisclosing party's explanation for it failure to disclose the evidence. See Southern States Rack & Fixture, Inc. v. Sherwin-Williams Co., 318 F.3d 592, 596 (4th Cir. 2003). District courts are given "particularly wide latitude" to issue sanctions under Rule 37(c)(1) and such sanctions may only be reviewed for abuse of discretion. Yeti by Molly Ltd., 259 F.3d at 1106.

Should Plaintiff seek to introduce any evidence that he has failed to disclose during discovery, he must make a showing that his failure is substantially justified or harmless.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

26

27

28 ///

For the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS Defendants' Motion. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: March 1, 2013. RONALD S.W. LEW HONORABLE RONALD S.W. LEW Senior, U.S. District Court Judge