

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

CATHERINE WILLIAMS

CIVIL ACTION

VERSUS

STATE OF LOUISIANA

No. 14-00154-BAJ-RLB

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion in Limine (Doc. 77) filed by the State of Louisiana (“Defendant”) is hereby **DENIED** with leave to refile pursuant to this Order.

Defendant shall identify the disputed exhibits set forth in its motion in limine (Doc. 77) by referencing their corresponding numbers as contained in *Plaintiff’s bench book*.¹ Defendant shall make specific objections to each exhibit in dispute, citing the rules of evidence and, if possible, instructive jurisprudence. Furthermore, Defendant shall clearly state whether an objection applies to each page or document contained in an exhibit, or if the objection applies only to certain pages or documents contained therein. Defendant shall file this amended motion in limine **on or before Tuesday, June 30, 2016.**

Plaintiff shall respond to each objection raised by Defendant, citing the rules of evidence and, if possible, instructive jurisprudence. When necessary, Plaintiff shall explain with sufficient detail why a disputed exhibit—or specific pages and documents contained therein—is relevant; simply stating that an exhibit or portions

¹ Defendant shall not object to any exhibit that was not objected to in its motion in limine (Doc. 77).

thereof will be used, generally, to show pretext may not be adequate. Likewise, when necessary, Plaintiff shall identify any exception to the rules against hearsay that apply to disputed exhibits—or specific pages and documents contained therein—and explain why the exception applies. Plaintiff shall file her response on or before Monday, July 11, 2016.

To the extent practical, the parties shall follow the format outlined below:

**The State of Louisiana’s Amended Motion in Limine filed in
compliance with the Court’s Order**

Defendant’s Objection 1; Plaintiff’s Exhibit A²
Description of Exhibit and its contents.
Argument.

Defendant’s Objection 2; Plaintiff’s Exhibit B
Description of Exhibit and its contents.
Argument.

Defendant’s Objection 3; Plaintiff’s Exhibit C
Description of Exhibit and its contents.
Argument.³

**Catherine Williams’s Response to the State of Louisiana’s
Amended Motion in Limine filed in compliance with the
Court’s Order**

Plaintiff’s Response to Defendant’s Objection 1; Plaintiff’s Exhibit A
Description of Exhibit and its contents.
Argument.

Plaintiff’s Response to Defendant’s Objection 2; Plaintiff’s Exhibit B
Description of Exhibits and its contents.

² Include specific page numbers or documents if appropriate.

³ And so on.

Argument.

Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Objection 2; Plaintiff's Exhibit C
Description of Exhibit and its contents.
Argument.⁴

Lastly, the parties shall confer⁵ **on or before Friday, June 24, 2016** in an effort to: 1) reach an agreement regarding stipulations of fact and 2) determine whether omission of certain pages or documents of any given exhibit may remove it from contention.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, this 20th day of June, 2016.



**BRIAN A. JACKSON, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

⁴ And so on.

⁵ During the hearing on Defendant's motion, the Court was able to identify at least *some* facts that are listed in the amended pretrial order as disputed that Defendant concedes are not in dispute. On the other hand, Plaintiff had difficulty explaining the relevancy of at least *some* of the documents contained in Exhibit 1 upon questioning by the Court. The Court urges the parties to quit caviling over pedantic issues of fact that are best addressed by way of stipulation. The Court further urges the parties to reach an agreement to at least *some* of the documents contained in the exhibits that remain in dispute.