Case No. 12-cv-03922 NC

ORDER RE REBUTTAL EVIDENCE

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 10 11 12 GARDENSENSOR, INC., a Delaware Case No. 12-cv-03922 NC Corporation, formerly known as 13 AMENDED TENTATIVE RULING PLÁNTSENSE, INC., a Delaware ON PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY BY Corporation, 14 Plaintiff. EXPERT MARK BRINKERHOFF 15 v. 16 BLACK & DECKER (U.S.), INC., a 17 Maryland Corporation, 18 Defendant. 19 20 Today after the presentation of evidence to the jury, the parties discussed whether 21 plaintiff would be permitted to call expert Mark Brinkerhoff as a rebuttal expert. The 22 Court has further considered Brinkerhoff's report and amends its tentative ruling as 23 follows: if Black & Decker does not call Samuel Phillips as a witness, then Brinkerhoff 24 will not be permitted to present rebuttal testimony. This is because his previously 25 disclosed opinions were almost all in response to Phillips. And to the extent Brinkerhoff 26 has an independent opinion, that opinion would be cumulative of the testimony today from 27 plaintiff's COO, Andrew Hill. Hill, over the objection of Black & Decker, was permitted 28 to opine as to his failure analysis. Plaintiff does not need to rebut the testimony of its own

1	COO.	
2		
3		Nexe
4		Nathanael M. Cousins United States Magistrate Judge
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		