

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

MARY ALLISON,  
  
  Plaintiff,  
  
                        v.  
  
E CENTER,  
  
  Defendant.

No. 2:12-cv-00455-MCE-CMK

ORDER

On May 21, 2012, this Court issued its Pretrial Scheduling Order (“PTSO” or “Order”). Presently before the Court are Plaintiff’s Objections (“Objections”) to that Order. Plaintiff has identified for the Court a latent ambiguity within the PTSO that makes the Order susceptible to the interpretation that the Court intends to depart from the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure with respect to the exchange of expert witness reports. That is not the Court’s intention. Accordingly, the Court now clarifies that, in conformity with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2)(B), the parties to this case are not required to exchange expert reports drafted by percipient experts.


///  
///  
///  
///

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

Rather, in conformity with Rule 26, the designation of each retained expert shall be accompanied by a written report prepared and signed by the witness. Plaintiff's Objections (ECF No. 10) are thus sustained.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 31, 2012

  
MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE