

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAARMAN CONSTRUCTION, LTD,
Plaintiff,
v.
IRONSHORE SPECIALTY INSURANCE
COMPANY,
Defendant.

Case No. 15-cv-03548-JST

PRETRIAL ORDER

United States District Court
Northern District of California

The Court now has before it the parties' August 23, 2016 pretrial statement. ECF No. 90. The statement lists the model jury instructions each party requests, but does not provide the actual instructions. The parties are ordered to file such instructions by August 26, 2016 at 12:00 p.m.; to bring a courtesy copy of the instructions to court on August 26; and to e-mail the set in Microsoft Word format to the Courtroom Deputy at jstcrd@cand.uscourts.gov. The set should begin with the instructions to which the parties agree, in the order they are to be read to the jury, followed by the instructions proposed by plaintiff and objected to by defendant, followed by the instructions proposed only by defendant and objected to by plaintiff. The proposed instructions must be in final form, must use the precise words appropriate to the case, and must not include blanks. As set forth in the Court's standing order for Civil Jury Trials, the parties must clearly indicate any modifications to pattern instructions.

The parties also dispute whether certain witnesses were disclose in the parties' initial disclosures or in response to discovery requests. See, e.g., ECF No. 90 at 19-20. The parties are ordered to bring copies of their initial disclosures, any supplemental disclosures, any relevant

///


///

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

discovery requests, and the responses to those requests to the pretrial conference so that their objections may be resolved.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 24, 2016



JON S. TIGAR
United States District Judge