

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAJAMES JENKINS, *et al.*,

No. C-08-3401 EMC

Plaintiffs,

v.

**ORDER RE CO-PLAINTIFF
TESTIMONY AND INCIDENTS**

CITY OF RICHMOND,

Defendant.

On December 12, 2013, this Court ordered Plaintiff to file a statement in which he was to list “the co-Plaintiff witnesses he intends to call at trial and the specific incidents about which he anticipates eliciting testimony.” Dkt. No. 579. Plaintiff filed this statement on December 14, 2013. Dkt. No. 583.

Plaintiff’s statement entirely omits one of his former co-Plaintiffs (Jenkins) and fails to list a number of post-March 2007 incidents about which Plaintiff has provided exhibits. It is, accordingly, unclear to the Court what evidence Plaintiff seeks to introduce at trial about his co-Plaintiffs.

Accordingly, Plaintiff is again **ORDERED** to file a statement in which he lists *in detail*: (1) Which former co-Plaintiffs will testify at trial; (2) *every* specific incidents (regardless of time) about which they intend to testify (what Plaintiff has referred to as “me too” evidence); and (3) The facts that Plaintiff asserts the evidence will show about each of these specific incidents.

If Plaintiff does not provide sufficient detail for the Court to determine the admissibility of this so called “me too” evidence, it will be excluded. Further, any “me too” incident that is not


1 discussed in this statement will be excluded. Plaintiff shall file this revised statement no later than
2 noon, Tuesday, December 17, 2013.

3

4 Dated: December 15, 2013

5

6


EDWARD M. CHEN
United States District Judge

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28