

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GERAWAN FARMING, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
REHRIG PACIFIC COMPANY,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:11-cv-01273 LJO BAM
ORDER STRIKING DEFENDANT’S
PROPOSED “CORRECTIVE” JURY
INSTRUCTIONS
(Doc. 188)

On May 28, 2013, Defendant Rehrig Pacific Company (“Defendant”) filed three “corrective” jury instructions in addition to eight other disputed jury instructions. The Court will not consider the three “corrective” jury instructions. The final pretrial order limited each party to eight disputed jury instructions and stated that without a prior order the Court will not consider the additional proposed jury instructions.¹ In addition, it is premature to consider corrective instruction, especially in light of the Order that is being issued concurrently. (see end of other order dealing with jury instructions).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 3, 2013

/s/ Lawrence J. O’Neill
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The final pretrial order stated that the court will disregard jury instructions past the first ten; however, it is evident from the rest of the order that the parties were actually limited to eight disputed jury instructions. (See Doc. 167 at 26.)

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