

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

ARTANO AIDINI, individually,

Plaintiff,

v.

COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION,  
a foreign corporation; DOES I through V,  
inclusive; and ROE CORPORATIONS I  
through V, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:15-cv-0505-APG-GWF

**Order Rejecting Joint Pretrial Order**

(ECF No. 33)

12 The parties' proposed Joint Pretrial Order (ECF No. 33) does not comply with Local Rule  
13 16-4. For example, in section VII(c), the parties offer generic objections to all of each other's  
14 exhibits, without specifying which objections apply to which exhibits. The Local Rule requires  
15 the parties to specify their objections.

16 Further, both parties designate entire deposition transcripts, including transcripts for  
17 witnesses that will testify at trial. Neither party explains why depositions would be used for  
18 witnesses who testify at trial, and neither party provides specific page and line designations.  
19 Broad designations of deposition transcripts make it impossible for the other party to object.

20 The parties do not state whether they intend to present electronic evidence for purposes of  
21 jury deliberations. LR 16-3(b)(9), LR 16-4(VI)(d).

22 With regard to witnesses, both parties list "person most knowledgeable" for several  
23 entities without designating what topics the witness is knowledgeable about. Thus, the other  
24 party cannot adequately prepare for cross-examinations of those witnesses. Also, the defendant  
25 improperly "reserves the right to call any witnesses and expert identified by any party to this  
26 action [and] further reserves the right to amend/supplement this foregoing list of witnesses."

27

28

1 Parties are required to disclose all of their trial witnesses and cannot “reserve their rights” to call  
2 “all witnesses and experts.” Neither can parties “reserve the right to supplement.”

3 The proposed Order is replete with additional inadequacies; I will not catalog those for the  
4 parties.

5 Local Rule 16-3 requires the parties to personally discuss these and other issues. The  
6 requirements set forth in Local Rules 16-3 and 16-4 are designed to streamline the trial  
7 preparation and presentation, and to foster settlement. The proposed Joint Pretrial Order does not  
8 comply with Local Rules 16-3 and 16-4. Accordingly,

9 IT IS ORDERED that the parties’ Joint Pretrial Order (**ECF No. 33**) is **REJECTED**. The  
10 parties shall personally confer as required in Local Rule 16-3, and submit a Joint Pretrial Order  
11 that complies with Local Rule 16-4 within 21 days of entry of this Order.

12 Dated: this 16<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2016.

13  
14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 ANDREW P. GORDON  
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28