

Dockets.Justia.com

1 7.) Based on the foregoing, the proposed pretrial order, as drafted, does not define the issues for
2 trial in a useful manner and is therefore **REJECTED**.

3 Furthermore, based on the proposed pretrial order, Plaintiff intends to introduce 294
4 exhibits and Defendant intends to introduce 95. The parties together intend to call more than 30
5 witnesses. Given the issues which remain in this case (*see* Order filed March 28, 2011), this
6 appears excessive.

7 In light of the foregoing, the parties shall meet and confer in person to draft a new
8 proposed pretrial order and examine their proposed witness and exhibit lists with a view to
9 significantly paring them down. With respect to the exhibits, the parties are also encouraged to
10 resolve any admissibility issues which may be susceptible to resolution ahead of time, such as,
11 for example, authenticity and business records exception. In the revised exhibit list, the parties
12 shall not include multiple documents in the same exhibit; and they must follow Civil Local Rule
13 16.1(f)(6)(c)(VII).

14 Based on the foregoing, it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

15 1. The proposed pretrial order dated June 30, 2011 is hereby **REJECTED**.

16 2. The parties shall meet and confer in person to prepare a revised proposed pretrial order
17 in compliance with Civil Local Rule 16.1(f)(6)(c) and this order.

18 3. No later than **August 8, 2011**, Plaintiff shall deliver to chambers three copies of a fully
19 executed revised proposed pretrial order.

20 4. The final pretrial conference currently set on this court's calendar for July 11, 2011 at
21 11:00 a.m. is hereby **CONTINUED** to **August 15, 2011 at 11:00 a.m.**

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23 DATED: July 6, 2011

24 
25 M. James Lorenz
26 United States District Court Judge

27 COPY TO:

28 HON. JAN M. ADLER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

ALL PARTIES/COUNSEL