18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	Marquis Aurbach Coffing			
2	CRAIG R. ANDERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 6882 10001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89145			
3				
4	Telephone: (702) 382-0711			
5	Facsimile: (702) 382-5816 <u>canderson@maclaw.com</u>			
6	Attorneys for Defendants			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA			
9	RAYMOND ROMERO,			
10	Plaintiff,	Case No:	2:10-cv-00537-RLH-RJJ	
11	vs.			
12	LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE			
13	DEPARTMENT; OFFICER RICARDO LARA, individually and in his official capacity;			
14	OFFICER JOEY HERNANDEZ, individually and in his official capacity; DOES III through X,			
15	DOES XI through XX,			
16	Defendants.			

# JOINT PRE-TRIAL ORDER

I.

# NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 lawsuit. Plaintiff's remaining allegations are: (1) whether the Defendant officers violated Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment rights by using excessive force when the Defendant Officers detained Plaintiff on August 29, 2008; (2) whether the Defendant officers violated Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment equal protection rights by discriminating against him based upon his race; (3) whether the Defendant officers committed the state law tort of battery; and (4) whether the Defendant officers were negligent.

Page 1 of 10

M&A:05166-411 1355871\_1.DOC 5/23/2011 3:52 PM

10001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 (702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-3816 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

27

28

II.

## STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

Plaintiff's federal claims are brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff's state law claims are properly before this Court under the doctrine of pendant jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

III.

# STATEMENT OF ADMITTED FACTS

The following relevant facts are admitted by the parties and require no proof:

- 1. Plaintiff demands a jury trial.
- 2. On or around August 29, 2008, Plaintiff was a visitor to Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 3. On August 29, 2008, Ofc. Ricardo Lara was a police officer with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and operating in the course and scope of his employment.
- 4. On August 29, 2008, Ofc. Joey Hernandez was a police officer with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and operating in the course and scope of his employment.
  - 5. LVMPD is a municipality in Clark County, Nevada.

IV.

# STATEMENT OF UNCONTESTED FACTS

The following facts, though not admitted, will not be contested at trial by evidence to the contrary:

- 1. Plaintiff suffered a broken ankle on August 29, 2008.
- 2. Plaintiff required emergency medical care on August 29, 2008 and was taken to Sunrise hospital by ambulance, with the ambulance being summonsed by the LVMPD.
- 3. According to Plaintiff's medical records, on August 29, 2008, Sunrise Hospital Medical Center lists Plaintiff's blood alcohol at .21 percent.
  - 4. Plaintiff was not arrested or cited by Defendants on August 29, 2008.
  - 5. Both Defendant Officers are Hispanic.

10001 Fark Kun Drive	Las Vegas, Nevada 89145	(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816	

6.	Plaintiff is His	spanic.
----	------------------	---------

- 7. Defendant Officer Hernandez punched Plaintiff with a closed fist on August 29, 2008.
- 8. Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Fourteenth Amendment due process claim against the Defendant officers was dismissed by the Court.
- 9. All Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims against LVMPD were dismissed by the Court.
- 10. Plaintiff's state law negligent hiring, training, and supervising claims were dismissed by the Court.
- 11. Plaintiff's state law intentional infliction of emotional distress claim was dismissed by the Court.

## V.

# STATEMENT OF CONTESTED ISSUES OF FACT

The following are the issues of fact to be tried and determined upon trial.

- 1. The uniforms the Defendant officers were wearing.
- 2. Whether the Defendant officers announced their presence prior making physical contact with Plaintiff.
- 3. Whether a reasonable officer could have concluded that the circumstances surrounding the disturbance warranted immediate intervention by the Defendant officers.
- 4. Whether the Defendant officers had reasonable suspicion to take Plaintiff into custody and, if so, whether the Defendant officers used reasonable force in taking Plaintiff into custody.
- 5. Whether the Defendant officers issued verbal commands, and if so, whether Plaintiff ignored the commands or was given an opportunity to comply.

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

27

28

	6.	Whether the Defendant officers approached Plaintiff from behind, without his		
knowledge or any warning.				
	7.	How Plaintiff was taken to the ground.		
	8.	What happened once Plaintiff went to the ground.		
	9.	Whether Plaintiff was ever up on top of Defendant Lara while on the ground.		
	10.	Whether Defendant Hernandez punched Plaintiff on the side or in the face.		

- 11. Whether Defendant Hernandez gave Plaintiff instructions to quit resisting.
- 12. Whether Plaintiff ignored any instructions to quit resisting.
- 13. Whether any of the Defendant officers' actions were racially motivated.
- 14. The extent of Plaintiff's pain and suffering.
- 15. Whether Plaintiff requires future medical care and treatment.
- 16. Whether Plaintiff's medical care and treatment was reasonable.

### VI.

# STATEMENT OF CONTESTED ISSUES OF LAW

The following are the issues of law to be tried and determined upon trial.

- Whether the Defendant officers had reasonable suspicion to take Plaintiff into 1. custody.
  - 2. Whether Plaintiff was detained lawfully.
- 3. Whether the force used by the officers to take Plaintiff into custody was reasonable or excessive.
  - 4. Whether the Defendant officers racially discriminated against the Plaintiff.
- 5. Whether the Defendant officers are protected by the doctrine of qualified immunity.
  - 6. Whether an unprivileged battery of Plaintiff occurred.

7.

1

2 VII. 3 **EXHIBITS** 4 THE FOLLOWING EXHIBITS ARE STIPULATED INTO EVIDENCE IN A. THIS CASE AND MAY BE SO MARKED BY THE CLERK: 5 1. Plaintiff's exhibits: 6 Sunrise Medical Center Medical Records (Pltf 0034-42; 0077-97) a. 7 Photos of Plaintiff's injuries (Pltf 0001-04) b. 8 9 Score Physical Therapy medical report (Pltf 0056-62)\* c. 10 Northwest Tucson Surgery Center medical report (Pltf 0042; 0063d. 11 76)\*1 12 One page from Use of Force Report of Ricardo Lara (LVMPD e. 13 0005) 14 f. One page from Use of Force Report of Joey Hernandez (LVMPD 15 0013) 16 17 Voluntary Statement of Sean Brown (LVMPD 0002) g. 18 2. Defendants' exhibits: 19 Officer's Report of Ricardo Lara (LVMPD 0005) a. 20 Officer's Report of Joey Hernandez (LVMPD 0013) b. 21 Voluntary statement of Frances Martinez (LVMPD 0003) c. 22 LVMPD Incident Recall Sheet (LVMPD 0001) d. 23 24 LVMPD's Use of Force Policies and Procedures (LVMPD 0021e. 25 48) 26 27 Records Certificates are provided by the time of trial. 28 Page 5 of 10

Whether Plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages.

<sup>\*</sup>Defendants agree to stipulate to the authenticity of Plaintiff's listed medical records if Custodian of

1	The state of the s		f.	LVMPD's Arrest Policy and Procedures (LVMPD 0050-57)
2			g.	LVMPD's policies regarding requesting medical (LVMPD 0058)
3			h.	Plaintiff's answers to interrogatories
4	В.	A C T	o Tui	E FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS THE PARTIES
5	D.			CHED THE STIPULATIONS STATED:
6		1.	Plain	tiff's exhibits: None
7		2.	Defe	ndants' exhibits: None
8	C.	AS T THE UPO	O THI SAME N THE	E FOLLOWING EXHIBITS, THE PARTY AGAINST WHOM WILL BE OFFERED OBJECTS TO THEIR ADMISSION GROUNDS STATED:
10		1.	Plain	tiff's exhibits:
11			a.	Plaintiff's unofficial transcripts (Pltf 0005-09). Objection:
12	authenticity, foundation, relevance, and best evidence.			
13			b.	Plaintiff's work history (Pltf 0010-11). Objection: relevance,
14	foundation an	d best	evidenc	ee.
15			c.	Plaintiff's medical care statements (Pltf 0013-34). Objection:
16	Collateral sou	ırce, be	st evide	ence, and authentication.
17			d.	Remaining pages from Use of Force Report of Ricardo Lara
18	(LVMPD 0006-0011). Objection: Relevance, speculation, subsequent remedial measure, and			
19	more prejudicial than probative.			
20			e.	Remaining pages from Use of Force Report of Joey Hernandez
21	(0014-0020).	Object	tion: R	elevance, speculation, subsequent remedial measure, and more
22	prejudicial than probative.			
23		2.	Defe	ndants' exhibits:
24	None.			
25	D.	DEPO	OSITIC	DNS:
26		1.	Plain	tiff will offer the following depositions: Plaintiff will offer the
27	depositions of any witness unavailable at the time of trial or for impeachment purposes.			
28		2.	Defe	ndants will offer the following depositions: Defendants will offer the

Page 6 of 10

M&A:05166-411 1355871\_1.DOC 5/23/2011 3:52 PM

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

27

28

depositions of any witness unavailable at the time of trial or for impeachment purposes.

#### E. **OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSITIONS:**

- 1. Defendants object to plaintiff's depositions as follows: Defendants object to the use of Sgt. Norm Jahn's depositions except as to the portions regarding his personal involvement in the events of August 28, 2009. Defendants object to plaintiff using any portions of Sgt. Jahn's deposition regarding his subsequent investigation and any opinions that contain subsequent remedial measures.
  - 2. Plaintiff objects to defendant's depositions as follows: None.

# VIII.

# WITNESSES

The following witnesses may be called by the parties upon trial:

### STATE THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES: A.

- 1. Raymond Romero, c/o McFarling Benson, 2800 W. Sahara Ave., #6G, Las Vegas, NV 89102.
- 2. Francis Martinez, c/o McFarling Benson, 2800 W. Sahara Ave., #6G, Las Vegas, NV 89102.
- 3. Kevin P. Moore, M.D., c/o Sunrise Hospital, 3186 South Maryland Pkwy., Las Vegas, NV 89109.
- 4. Geoffrey Landis, D.O., c/o Tucson Orthopaedic Institute, 1521 E. Tangerine Rd., Ste. 101, Oro Valley, AZ 85737.
- 5. Sgt. Norman Jahn, c/o Marquis Aurbach Coffing, 10001 Park Run Drive. Las Vegas, NV 89145.
- 6. Ofc. Ricardo Lara, c/o Marquis Aurbach Coffing, 10001 Park Run Drive, Las Vegas, NV 89145.

1		
	7.	Ofc. Joey Hernandez, c/o Marquis Aurbach Coffing, 10001 Park Run
Drive, Las V	egas, N	IV 89145.
	8.	Sean Brown, 4116 Spring Crest, Las Vegas, NV 89129.
	9.	PMK LVMPD, c/o Marquis Aurbach Coffing, 10001 Park Run Drive, Las
Vegas, NV 8	9145.	
	10.	D.P. Van Blaricom, MPA, 835-91st Lane, N.E., Bellevue, Washington
98004.		
	11.	Dr. Michael Robak, 315 Silver Hill Road, Easton, Connecticut 06612.
	12.	Custodian of Records, Score Physical Therapy, 6420 E. Tanque Verde Ste
100 Tucson,	AZ 857	715.
	13.	Custodian of Records, Northwest Tucson Surgery Center, 1550 E.
Tangerine Ro	l. Oro V	Valley, AZ 85737
В.	STA	TE THE NAME AND ADDRESSES OF DEFENDANTS' WITNESSES
	1.	Ofc. Ricardo Lara, c/o Marquis Aurbach Coffing, 10001 Park Run Drive,
Las Vegas, N	IV 8914	<b>1</b> 5.
	2.	Ofc. Joey Hernandez, c/o Marquis Aurbach Coffing, 10001 Park Run
Drive, Las V	egas, N	V 89145.
	3.	Sgt. Norman Jahn, c/o Marquis Aurbach Coffing, 10001 Park Run Drive,
Las Vegas, N	IV 8914	<b>15.</b>
	4.	Calvin D. Wandick, P#9174, c/o Marquis Aurbach Coffing, 10001 Park
Run Drive, L	as Vega	as, NV 89145.
	5.	Sean Brown, 4116 Spring Crest, Las Vegas, NV 89129.
	6.	Francis Martinez, c/o McFarling Benson, 2800 W. Sahara Ave., #6G, Las
Vegas, NV 8	9102.	

1	7. Jack Ryan, Legal and Liability Risk Management Institute, Public Agency			
2	Training Counsel, Inc., 5325 Decatur Boulevard, Indianapolis, IN 46241.			
3	IX.			
4	Counsel have met and herewith submit a list of three (3) agreed-upon trial dates:			
5	November 1, 2011, November 14, 2011 and December 5, 2011			
6	X.			
7	It is estimated that the trial herein will take a total of 4 days.			
8	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:			
9	MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING MCFARLING BENSON			
10				
11	By:			
12	Nevada Bar No. 6882 Nevada Bar No. 8567 10001 Park Run Drive 2800 W. Sahara Ave., #6G			
13 14	Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Las Vegas, NV 89102 Attorney for Defendants Attorney for Plaintiff			
15				
16	Х.			
17	ACTION BY THE COURT			
18	a. This case is set for 'jury trial on the 'stacked calendar on			
19	November 14, 2011, 8:30 a.m. Calendar call shall be held on November 9, 2011, 8:45 a.m.			
20	b. Trial briefs, proposed jury instructions and proposed <i>voir dire</i> questions			
21	shall be filed electronically no later than 12:00 p.m., November 9, 2011.			
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	Page 9 of 10  M&A:05166-411 1355871_1.DOC 5/23/2011 3:52 PM			

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

27

28

The foregoing pretrial order has been approved by the parties to this action as evidenced by the signatures of their counsel hereon, and the order is hereby entered and will govern the trial of this case. This order shall not be amended except by order of the court pursuant to agreement of the parties or to prevent manifest injustice.

Dated: June 1, 2011

UNITED STATES DISTRICT

**JUDGE** 

(NOTE: Due to the unusually large number of complex criminal cases set for lengthy trials before this Court, civil trials may possibly be held in a "trailing status" for weeks or months, or they may be assigned to another trial Judge, who will be identified at calendar call. Therefore, the Court strongly urges the parties to consider their option to proceed before a U.S. Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule IB 2-2, in accordance with 28 USC Section 636(c) and FRCP 73.) "AO 85 Notice of Availability, Consent and Order of Reference Exercise of Jurisdiction by a U.S. Magistrate Judge" form is available on the Court's website <a href="https://www.nvd.uscourts.gov">www.nvd.uscourts.gov</a>. Consent forms should NOT be electronically filed. Upon consent of all the parties, counsel are advised to manually file the form with the Clerk's Office.