

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO**

Civil Action No. 14-cv-02667-REB-NYW

ALFONSO A. ALARID,

Plaintiff,

v.

BIOMET, INC., BIOMET ORTHOPEDICS, LLC, and BIOMET MANUFACTURING, LLC,
Defendants.

ORDER DENYING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE

Blackburn, J.

The matter before me is **Plaintiff's Motion in Limine To Exclude Collateral Sources** [#104],¹ filed January 14, 2016. By their response ([#124], filed February 1, 2016), defendants state they agree that evidence of collateral sources of benefits is not admissible, a position of which they informed plaintiff's counsel well prior to the filing of this motion.² The motion therefore is moot and will be denied on that basis.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that **Plaintiff's Motion in Limine To Exclude Collateral Sources** [#104], filed January 14, 2016, is denied as moot.

Dated February 3, 2016, at Denver, Colorado.

BY THE COURT:



Robert E. Blackburn
United States District Judge

¹ “[#104]” is an example of the convention I use to identify the docket number assigned to a specific paper by the court's case management and electronic case filing system (CM/ECF). I use this convention throughout this order.

² Given defendants' concession, it is unclear why plaintiff felt compelled to file a motion. Seeking affirmative relief from the court under these circumstances wastes both party and judicial resources at a critical point in the case. Thus, and aside from the fact that the court strongly discourages motions *in limine* in general, **see** REB Civ. Practice Standard IV.E.1., this motion in particular appears to have been wholly unnecessary.