1	
2	
3	
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA
5	
6	
7	ANGELA INGRAM,) 2:10-cv-01813-ECR-RJJ
8	Plaintiff,
9	vs.) <u>Order</u>
	WALGREEN CO.; DOES 1 through 10) Inclusive; ROE CORPORATIONS 11)
	through 20, inclusive,))
12	Defendants.)
13)
14	On December 27, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion entitled
15	"Omnibus Motions in Limine" (#47). The Motion (#47) requests (1) an
16 17	order precluding closing argument that Plaintiff asked for a greater
17	amount of money than was expected, (2) an order that the defense be
10	precluded from referring to case as attorney-driven litigation or a
	medical buildup case, (3) an order that the defense be precluded
	from inquiring when counsel was obtained, (4) an order excluding
22	testimony or documentary evidence regarding a prior or subsequent
	motor vehicle accident and subsequent settlement, (5) exclusion of
24	criminal history, (6) and limiting closing arguments to evidence
25	presented at trial.
26	Plaintiff attempts to anticipate issues that may or may not be
27	raised at trial. It is unknown at this time whether such issues
28	would have to be faced, or the circumstances in which the Court

1 would face them. Therefore, the Motion (#47) is premature and must 2 be <u>DENIED</u> in part as to items 1-3 and 6, with the possibility of 3 renewal.

4	There is some indication that the issues contained in 4 $\&$ 5
5	pertain to the trial, and the Court will not rule on 4 & 5 at this
6	time. The Court will issue its ruling on items 4 & 5 once a
7	response is filed to the Motion (#47), and any further proceedings
8	with respect to that Motion ($\#47$) are had as determined by the
9	Court.
10	
11	
12	
13	DATED: January 9, 2012.
14	Edward C. Keed.
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
26 27	
27 28	
20	2