Northern District of California

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

NICOLAS AQUINO,

Plaintiff,

v.

COUNTY OF MONTEREY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:14-cv-03387-EJD

ORDER RE: TRIAL BIFURCATION AND OUTSTANDING EVIDENTIARY DISPUTES

Re: Dkt. Nos. 205, 206, 210, 212

The Court appreciates the parties' supplemental briefing regarding trial bifurcation (Dkt. Nos. 210, 212). After carefully considering the parties' arguments, the Court will not bifurcate trial. The parties are cautioned that evidence and testimony should be offered only in a manner consistent with the Court's motion in limine rulings, and the Court will provide limiting instructions to the jury as needed.

Based on the parties' submissions regarding evidentiary disputes that remain in this case (Dkt. Nos. 205, 206), the Court rules as follows:

1. Plaintiff's Second and Fourth Motions in Limine Regarding Mr. Cameron:

Testimony from Mr. Cameron's March 20, 2018 deposition at 17:22-18:8, 23:16-25, and 24:15-18 beginning with "through" will be excluded for the same reasons discussed in the Court's order on Plaintiff's Second and Fourth Motions in Limine. The remaining disputed testimony from Mr. Cameron's March 20, 2018 deposition will be allowed.

26

27

28

ORDER RE: TRIAL BIFURCATION AND OUTSTANDING EVIDENTIARY DISPUTES

If it is not possible to strike Mr. Cameron's testimony mid-line, the entirety of his testimony at 24:12-18 will be excluded.

Case No.: 5:14-cv-03387-EJD

	8
	9
Northern District of California	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

2. Plaintiff's Eighth Motion in Limine Regarding Defense Exhibit 1032 (Dr.	
Roberts's Report): Upon further consideration, the Court finds that none of the proposed	
excerpts from Dr. Roberts's report qualifies as "facts or data" whose "probative value in help	ing
the jury evaluate the opinion substantially outweighs their prejudicial effect," and would thus	be
admissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 703. Thus, the report will be excluded in its entire	etv

- 3. **Plaintiff's Seventh Motion** *in Limine* **Regarding Dr. Herrick:** The phrase "when there was a missed court date" will be excluded from Mr. Herrick's deposition testimony at 27:18-19, as it is not relevant.² Fed. R. Evid. 401. The remaining disputed testimony from Mr. Herrick's deposition testimony will be allowed.
- 4. Plaintiff's Ninth Motion in Limine Regarding Defense Exhibit 1008 (Letter of Reprimand by Col. Sandlin): In addition to the redactions proposed by Defendants, the Court will additionally exclude the following: "you obstructed" from ¶ 1; "and then resisted . . . home in question" from ¶ 1; "lawfully" from the first sentence of ¶ 2; and "lawfully" from the fourth to last sentence of ¶ 4. The remainder will be permitted. Defendants shall prepare a redacted version of Defense Exhibit 1008 that is consistent with this ruling.
- 5. **Defendants' First Motion** *in Limine* **Regarding Evidence that is Too Remote in Time or Space:** The Court will allow Exhibit Nos. 5, 7(f),(n),(p),(q)-(r), and 9. The Court will exclude the remainder of the exhibits challenged in Defendant's motion.
- 6. Defendants' Fifth Motion in Limine Regarding Promotional or Recruiting Videos: The parties shall be prepared to play the disputed video to the Court on July 31, 2018, and the Court will rule on its admissibility thereafter.
- 7. **Defendants' Objections Regarding Mr. Glazier:** The Court will not preclude Mr. Glazier from testifying. To the extent Defendants request the Court reconsider its ruling on Defendants' Ninth Motion *in Limine*, the Court declines this invitation.

² If it is not possible to strike Mr. Herrick's testimony mid-line, the entirety of his testimony at 27:16-20 will be excluded.

Case No.: 5:14-cv-03387-EJD

Northern District of California United States District Court

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 30, 2018

EDWARD J. DAVILA United States District Judge

Case No.: <u>5:14-cv-03387-EJD</u> ORDER RE: TRIAL BIFURCATION AND OUTSTANDING EVIDENTIARY DISPUTES 3