

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

DAVID FIKE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHARLES E. THORTON, PRODUCTS
UNLIMITED, INC., COVENANT
TRANSPORT, INC.;

Defendants.

8:12CV113

ORDER

This matter is before the court on defendants' motion in limine, [Filing No. 61](#). Defendants submit a brief in support and an index in support of this motion. [Filing Nos. 62](#) and [63](#). This case involves a car accident wherein plaintiff was injured when he was pinned between the back of his empty trailer and the back of the full Products Unlimited trailer. The court has carefully reviewed the motion in limine, including requests "A" through "O." The plaintiff has not responded to this motion. The court finds the majority of these requests can be determined during the trial as the evidence is presented. Accordingly, the court will not rule on those motions at this time. However, any statements regarding insurance coverages are generally not admissible at trial. See [Fed. R. Evid. 411](#). So, absent a compelling circumstance, the court will grant the motion in limine as to insurance coverages. The court will likewise grant the motion as to the police report made by the Omaha Police Department, as it appears to be inadmissible hearsay under [Fed. R. Evid. 802](#), and it contains information about Unlimited's insurance coverage. All other issues may be raised at trial, if indeed they

arise, and the court will determine what is relevant at that time. See [Fed. R. Evid. 401-403](#).

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that defendants' motion in limine, [Filing No. 61](#), is granted in part and denied in part as set forth herein.

Dated this 30th day of January, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Joseph F. Bataillon

United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.