

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

CHARLES WILLIAMS, M.D., et al.,)	2:09-CV-00554-PMP-PAL
Plaintiffs,)	
vs.)	<u>ORDER</u>
UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER OF)	
SOUTHERN NEVADA, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

On May 3, 2011, the Court conducted a hearing regarding Defendants’ Motion in Limine No. 1 to exclude certain types of evidence (Doc. #150). The Court took under advisement subpart (G) of Defendants’ Motion, which seeks to exclude any testimony regarding economic damages offered by Plaintiff at trial because Plaintiff has not disclosed an economic expert who can testify to economic loss, future lost wages, present value and work expectancy.

Defendants’ motion goes too far. Clearly, Plaintiff can testify regarding his earnings before and after the events giving rise to his lawsuit. Moreover, Plaintiff can testify to his efforts to obtain employment since that time and can offer documents previously produced and identified in the Joint Pretrial Order which support his testimony.

///
///

1 Moreover, the fact that Plaintiff has not identified an economic expert does
2 not preclude Plaintiff from offering the testimony of hospital executives or others
3 who have suspended Plaintiff's medical privileges because of the NPDB report filed
4 by Defendants.

5 Finally, the Court finds Plaintiff should be permitted to offer the testimony
6 of employment agency personnel regarding Plaintiff's job search and inability to
7 obtain employment following his suspension.

8 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that subpart (G) of Defendants' Motion
9 in Limine (Doc. #150) is **DENIED**.

10
11 DATED: May 9, 2011.

12
13 
14 _____
15 PHILIP M. PRO
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26