

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,
Defendants.

No. CIV. S-90-520 LKK/DAD (PC)

ORDER

The court is in receipt of the parties motions in limine concerning evidence sought to be introduced in the coming evidentiary hearing relative to the treatment of the mentally ill in ad seg. The court has ordered a reply to the plaintiffs' motion concerning nonretained witnesses. Except as to that motion, the court now denies all other motions in limine, essentially for the reasons set forth in the relevant opposition to those motions.

One additional comment may be appropriate as to the motion concerning attorney witnesses. That rule is embodied in California's Rule of Professional Conduct 5-210, which has been adopted as this court's standard of practice for attorneys

1 practicing in this court. See Local Rule 180(e). That rule
2 specifically limits its applicability to jury trials.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: November 14, 2013.


5

6

7

8

9


LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28