1		*E-filed: November 1, 2012*	
2			
3			
4			
5	NOT FOR CITATION		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
9	AREAS USA SJC, LLC,	No. C11-04487 HRL	
10	Plaintiff, v.	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE	
11	MISSION SAN JOSE AIRPORT, LLC; ET	DEFENDANTS' EXPERT WITNESSES	
12	AL.,	[Dkt. 92]	
13	Defendants.		
14	Areas USA SJC, LLC ("Areas") moves the Court for an order barring defendants Mission		
15	San Jose Airport, LLC and Mission Yogurt, Inc. (collectively "Mission") from presenting any		
16	expert witness testimony from Stanley Jackson, Dan Ludwig, Rod Tafoya, or Mark Schafer.		
17 18	Mission opposes the motion. The matter is deemed submitted without oral argument. See Civ. L.		
18 19	R. 7-1(b). Upon consideration of the moving and responding papers, Areas' motion is denied.		
20	As a basis for its motion, Areas claims that Mission failed to provide expert reports for these		
20	witnesses, as required by Rule 26(a)(2)(B) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Mission		
21	counters that Rule 26(a)(2)(C), not Rule 26(a)(2)(B), governs these witnesses and that Rule		
22	26(a)(2)(C) does not require the submission of expert reports. Rule 26(a)(2)(B) requires a witness		
23 24	to provide a written report "if the witness is one	retained or specially employed to provide expert	
24	testimony in the case or one whose duties as the party's employee regularly involve giving expert		
23 26	testimony." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(B). The pa	rties do not dispute that Jackson and Ludwig work	
20 27	for Legends Group and that Mission hired Legends Group as a project manager before this litigation		
27	began. These individuals were therefore <i>not</i> retained to provide expert testimony and their duties do		
20	<i>not</i> regularly involve giving expert testimony. T	he same goes for Tafoya and Schafer, who work for	

Dockets.Justia.com

Mission itself. Accordingly, the expert testimony of these individuals is governed by Rule
26(a)(2)(C), which requires a disclosure, but no written reports. Areas does not dispute the
sufficiency of Mission's disclosures under Rule 26(a)(2)(C). As Mission's expert disclosures did
not run afoul of any duty to provide written reports, Areas' motion to exclude witnesses on that
basis is DENIED.
IT IS SO ORDERED.
Dated: November 1, 2012
HOWARD R. LLOYD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

1	C11-04487 HRL Notice will be electronically mailed to:	
2	Karin Bohmholdt Scott Bertzyk	bohmholdtk@gtlaw.com
3	Denise Mayo Daniel Rockey	bohmholdtk@gtlaw.com bertzyks@gtlaw.com mayod@gtlaw.com daniel.rockey@hro.com meryl.macklin@bryancave.com
4	Meryl Macklin	meryl.macklin@bryancave.com
5	Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.	
6		real contraction of the second s
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15 16		
10		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		3

United States District Court For the Northern District of California