## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

CHAMBERS OF CHARLES B. DAY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE U.S. COURTHOUSE 6500 CHERRYWOOD LANE GREENBELT, MARYLAND 20770 (301) 344-0393 FAX (301) 344-0394

October 3, 2016

## Via Electronic Filing and Regular Mail

Andrew Charles Aitken, Esquire Aitken Law Offices P.O. Box 1810 Wheaton, MD 20915 Charles M Maynard, Esquire Law Offices of Charles M Maynard LLC 401 E Jefferson St Ste 208 Rockville, MD 20850

Ms. Mansoureh Pirnia 14900 Talking Rock Court, Suite B Potomac, Maryland 20878

Subject: Reza Hazeli v. Mehriran Publishing Co., et al. Civil No. CBD-15-1690

Dear Counsel and Ms. Pirnia:

As stated on the record at today's hearing, the following deadlines now apply in this matter. Dispositive Motions are to be filed on or before **October 7, 2016**. Per Defendants' representations in open court, no opposition will be filed. Defendants are required to file Amended Answers to the Complaint on or before **October 7. 2016**. The parties shall notify the Court if they would like this matter to be referred to another Magistrate Judge for a settlement conference. All parties have waived their right to a jury trial.

This case is scheduled for one-day bench trial beginning at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, February 3 2017. On or before January 20, 2017, the parties are instructed to provide their respective proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, and a copy of all exhibits in an exhibit binder for the bench. The documents in the exhibit binder should be pre-marked and with an index.

Motions in limine are to be filed on or before **January 6, 2017.** Opposition to motions in limine are to be filed on or before **January 20, 2017.** Similarly, the deadline for raising a <u>Daubert</u> challenge to the admissibility of expert evidence is **January 6, 2017**, a worksheet is attached for your use. Opposition to said challenges are to be filed on or before, **January 20, 2017**.



Hazeli v. Mehriran Publishing, et al. October 3, 2016 Page 2 of 2

Despite the informal nature of this letter, it is nonetheless an order of the Court and the Clerk is directed to docket it as such.

Sincerely yours,

Charles B. Day

United States Magistrate Judge

Attachments

## Daubert/Kumho Worksheet

- 1. Name of Expert Challenged.
- 2. Brief summary of opinion(s) challenged (if more than one, designate separately), including reference to the source of the opinion (i.e., Rule 26(a)(2)(B) disclosure, deposition transcript references, interrogatory answers). Attach highlighted copy of source materials as exhibit.
- 3. Briefly describe methodology/reasoning used by expert to reach each opinion which is challenged. Include reference to source of challenged methodology/reasoning, and attach a highlighted copy as an exhibit.
- 4. Briefly describe the basis for the challenge to the reasoning/methodology used by the expert (for example, methodology unreliable; methodology reliable, but not valid for application to this case; failure to use standardized or accepted methodology (for example, with a standardized test); etc.) Attach a highlighted copy of affidavit or other source material supporting challenge to methodology/reasoning as an exhibit.
- 5. Is the challenged methodology/reasoning subject to a known or potential error rate? If so, briefly describe it, and attach a highlighted copy of any relevant source material as an exhibit.
- 6. Summarize relevant peer review materials relating to methodology/reasoning challenged, and attach a highlighted copy of any relevant source material as an exhibit.
- 7. If the challenge to the opinion is based upon a contention that the methodology/reasoning has not been generally accepted within the relevant scientific or technical community, briefly explain the basis for this contention. Attach highlighted copy of any relevant supporting materials as an exhibit.