

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

AMIT SHARMA,

*

Plaintiff

*

v.

*

CIVIL No. JKB-12-2269

HOWARD COUNTY, et al.

*

Defendants.

*

*

* * * * *

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Presently pending before the Court is Defendants’ motion to strike Plaintiff’s expert witness disclosure (ECF No. 50). Having carefully considered the arguments of counsel in their filings with regard to this motion (ECF Nos. 50, 54, and 58), the motion is DENIED. Further, upon reconsideration, Plaintiff’s motion for extension of time (ECF No.49) is GRANTED and the Court’s prior order (ECF No. 52) is VACATED.

The issue now before the Court stems from Plaintiff’s disclosure of Stephen Windsor as a computer expert on March 24, 2014. (ECF No. 50-6.) While Plaintiff appears to have initially identified Mr. Windsor as a case-in-chief expert (*see* ECF No. 50 at 1), he now concedes that “Mr. Windsor’s designation should be solely for rebuttal purposes.” (ECF No. 54 at 1.) In light of this concession, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s disclosure of Mr. Windsor, *as a rebuttal expert*, was timely. Further, having noted Defendants’ argument that the disclosure lacks the essential content required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2) (*see* ECF Nos. 50 at 49, 51-52 and 58 at 2), the Court nonetheless concludes that striking Plaintiff’s *rebuttal* expert witness disclosure is not justified. The Court emphasizes, however, that should Mr. Windsor testify at trial, it will be

