### IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI CENTRAL DIVISION

TODD JANSON, et al., on behalf of	)
themselves and on behalf of all others	)
similarly situated,	)
	)
	)
Plaintiffs,	)
	)
v.	) Case No. 2:10-cv-04018-NKL
	)
LEGALZOOM.COM, INC.	)
	)
	)
Defendant.	

# PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN LIMINE REGARDING STATEMENTS OR ARGUMENTS THAT LEGALZOOM.COM'S BUSINESS OPERATES IN OR IS APPROVED IN OTHER STATES

Come Now, Plaintiffs, by and through counsel, and for their Motion in Limine to exclude any evidence of statements or arguments that Legalzoom.com's (hereinafter "Legalzoom") business operates or is approved in other states, states as follows:

#### I. Introduction

Plaintiffs have reason to believe that Legalzoom will attempt to introduce statements or evidence that it operates in and/or is approved to conduct its business in other states throughout the country. See, Legalzoom's Motion for Summary Judgment, paragraph 1. It is anticipated Legalzoom will attempt to introduce evidence or argue that because their business model is used and in some cases accepted elsewhere in the country, it is presumably lawful for them to operate the same way in Missouri. Obviously, the only laws that are relevant in this case are the laws of the state of Missouri. What has or has not happened in other states or may or may not be permitted by other states' laws or regulatory authorities is simply not relevant to this case and

would only serve to confuse the jury about what basis upon which they should decide this case.

#### II. Argument

"Federal Rule of Evidence 402 provides that irrelevant evidence is inadmissible." *Wright* v. Ark. & Mo. R.R. Co., 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 16719, \*12 (8th Cir. July 29, 2009). "Evidence is relevant if it has 'any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence." *Id.* at \*12-13 (quoting Fed. R. Evid. 401). "A district court is given broad discretion to determine the relevance of evidentiary matters." *Id.* at 13.

Rule 403 of the Federal Rules of Evidence provides "[a]lthough relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence." Fed.R.Evid. 403. "Confusion of the issues warrants exclusion of relevant evidence if admission of the evidence would lead to litigation of collateral issues." *Firemen's Fund Ins. Co. v. Thien*, 63 F.3d 754 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995). Rule 403 is concerned with unfair prejudice that has an undue tendency to suggest decision on an improper basis. *Probatter Sports, LLC v. Joyner Technologies, Inc.*, 2007 WL 3285799 (N.D.Iowa, October 18, 2007).

Other states' laws and regulatory approvals are not relevant in this case. In addition, the introduction of evidence about what may have happened in other states would be improper as it could confuse the jury and suggest to them that they should decide this case based on something other than the laws of the state of Missouri. The introduction of the actions or inaction in other states would lead to plaintiffs (and perhaps the Court in jury instructions) to have to explain that those states all have different statutes dealing with the unauthorized practice of law and, thus,

what happened or didn't happen in those states does not mean that what LegalZoom is doing in Missouri is lawful. Accordingly, plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court issue an Order to exclude any testimony, argument, or reference about Legalzoom's business being conducted in other states or being approved or permitted in other states; including by other bar associations or similar entities.

#### Respectfully submitted,

/s/Timothy VanRonzelen

Timothy Van Ronzelen, #44382 Matthew A. Clement, #43833 Kari A. Schulte, #57739 COOK, VETTER, DOERHOFF & LANDWEHR 231 Madison Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Telephone: 573-635-7977
Facsimile: 573-635-7414
tvanronzelen@cvdl.net
mclement@cvdl.net
kschulte@cvdl.net

and

Edward D. Robertson, Jr., # 27183 Mary Doerhoff Winter, # 38328 BARTIMUS, FRICKLETON, ROBERTSON

BARTIMUS, FRICKLETON, ROBERTSON

& GORNY

715 Swifts Highway

Jefferson City, MO 65109 Telephone: 573-659-4454

Facsimile: 573 659-4460 chiprob@earthlink.net

marywinter@earthlink.net

David T. Butsch, # 37539 James J. Simeri, #52506

BUTSCH SIMERI FIELDS LLC

231 S. Bemiston Ave., Ste. 260

Clayton, MO 63105

Telephone: 314-863-5700 Facsimile: 314-863-5711

Facsimile: 314-863-5/11 butsch@bsflawfirm.com

simeri@bsflawfirm.com

Randall O. Barnes, #39884
RANDALL O. BARNES & ASSOCIATES

Steven E. Dyer, #45397

LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN DYER

219 East Dunklin Street, Suite A Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Telephone: 573-634-8884

Facsimile: 573-635-6291 rbarnesjclaw@aol.com

10850 Sunset Office Drive, Ste. 300

St. Louis, MO 63127 Telephone: 314-898-6715 jdcpamba@gmail.com

#### ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on August 2, 2011, I served this paper upon the following via this Court's ECF system:

Party	Counsel
	Robert M. Thompson James T. Wicks Christopher C. Grenz BRYAN CAVE LLP One Kansas City Place
	1200 Main Street, Ste. 3500 Kansas City, MO 64105 816.374.3200, 816.374.3300 (fax)
Defendant LegalZoom.com, Inc.	John Michael Clear Michael Biggers James Wyrsch BRYAN CAVE LLP One Metropolitan Square – Ste. 3600 211 N. Broadway St. Louis, MO 63102 314.250.2000, 314.259.2020 (fax)

/s/ Timothy VanRonzelen