1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
3	Pamela Dittmar,	Case No.: 2:17-cv-02916-JAD-BNW	
4	Plaintiff	Ouder Amending Count's Duling Possiving	
5	v.	Order Amending Court's Ruling Resolving Defendant's Objections to Designated Denosition Testimony	
6	City of North Las Vegas,	Designated Deposition Testimony	
7	Defendant	[ECF No. 186]	
8	During today's pretrial conference, plaintiff Pamela Dittmar's counsel argued that		
9	defendant City of North Las Vegas had waived many of its objections to the designated		
10	deposition testimony of Dr. Qiong Liu. After reviewing Federal Rule of Civil Procedure		
11	32(d)(3) and the deposition transcript, the court hereby revises and provides amended rulings in		
12	light of the fact that the City did waive many of its objections by failing to raise them at Dr.		
13	Liu's deposition.		
14	A WORK		
15	U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorse February 5, 202		
16		1 cordary 5, 202 i	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			

1 KAMER ZUCKER ABBOTT R. Todd Creer #10016 Kaitlin H. Paxton #13625 6325 South Jones Boulevard, Suite 300 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102-1990 3 Tel: (702) 259-8640 Fax: (702) 259-8646 tcreer@kzalaw.com kpaxton@kzalaw.com 5 6 Attorneys for Defendant City of North Las Vegas 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA 8 PAMELA DITTMAR, 9 Case No. 2:17-cv-02916-JAD-BNW Plaintiff, COURT'S AMENDED RULING ON 10 **DEFENDANT CITY OF NORTH LAS** 11 **VEGAS'S OBJECTIONS TO** vs. **PLAINTIFF'S TRANSCRIPT** 12 CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS, a municipal **DESIGNATIONS FOR QIONG LIU'S** FEBRUARY 26, 2019 DEPOSITION corporation, 13 Defendant. 14 15 Pursuant to the Court's January 17, 2024 Order Regarding Trial [ECF No. 163], Defendant 16 City of North Las Vegas ("the City" or "Defendant"), by and through its counsel of record, the law 17 firm of Kamer Zucker Abbott, submits the following objections to Plaintiff Pamela Dittmar's 18 deposition designations for former City Manager for Defendant Qiong Liu [ECF No. 178]. 19 As raised in the City's Transcript Designations for Qiong Liu's Deposition [ECF No. 169] and 20 its Trial Brief [ECF No. 168], Defendant objects to the submission of Liu's deposition transcript at 21 trial, as Plaintiff's sole reason for requesting the trial be continued from its September 2023 date was 22 due to Liu's unavailability for the entire month of September, and Liu's designation by Plaintiff as her 23 "key witness." If, in fact, Liu never intended to make herself available for the trial while residing out 24 of state, the trial was unnecessarily delayed. Defendant has been prejudiced by that delay, resulting in

20

21

22

23

24

additional costs for trial preparation. OVERRULED as stated on the record 2/5/24.

Further, Plaintiff's designations should be excluded from trial because she missed the filing deadline of Monday, January 29, 2024 at 12:00 p.m. by more than a day. Indeed, Plaintiff's designations were not filed until Tuesday, January 30, 2024 at 9:37 p.m. The parties were expressly cautioned in the Order Regarding Trial that failure to provide the designations by the deadline could result in exclusion of the testimony from trial. ECF No. 163 at 2-3. Further, such delay resulted in Defendant having significantly less time to review the designations and prepare these objections.

OVERRULED as stated on the record 2/5/24.

Notwithstanding Defendant's general concerns with the use of Liu's deposition testimony at trial, Defendant offers the following objections to Plaintiff's designations:

- 1. P. 15, ll. 13-15 Leading; **OVERRULED (waived)**
- 2. P. 15, ll. 16-18 Asked and Answered; **OVERRULED (waived)**
- 3. P. 15, l. 19 through p. 16, l. 6 Leading; **OVERRULED (waived)**
- 4. P. 18, l. 22 through p. 19, l. 1 Improper characterization of evidence; **OVERRULED**
- 5. P. 19, ll. 2-8 Leading; **OVERRULED (waived)**
- 6. P. 19, ll. 9-21 Leading; improper characterization of evidence; calls for legal conclusion; **OVERRULED** (waived)
- 7. P. 20, ll. 5-8 Improper characterization of evidence; **OVERRULED (waived)**
- 8. P. 20, ll. 9-24 Leading; improper characterization of evidence; calls for legal conclusion; **OVERRULED** (waived)
- 9. P. 20, l. 25 through p. 21, l. 2 Leading; misstates testimony; **OVERRULED** (waived)
- 10. P. 22, ll. 19-21 Leading, asked and answered; **OVERRULED (waived)**
- 11. P. 23, ll. 3-7 Hearsay within hearsay; **SUSTAINED**
- 12. P. 23, ll. 13-14 Hearsay; **SUSTAINED**
- 13. P. 23, Il. 15-19 Hearsay within hearsay; **SUSTAINED**

24

transcript. To the extent she intended to include the additional highlighted lines, Defendant includes objections to certain lines.

1	35. P. 40, ll. 4-12 – Unresponsive; speculative; OVERRULED (waived)
2	36. P. 40, ll. 13-19 – Leading; OVERRULED (waived)
3	37. P. 40, l. 20 through p. 41, l. 1 – Speculative; OVERRULED (waived)
4	38. P. 41, ll. 1-4 – Leading; OVERRULED (waived)
5	39. P. 42, l. 24 through 43, l. 4 – Leading; calls for a legal conclusion; imprope
6	characterization of evidence; OVERRULED (waived)
7	40. P. 43, ll. 12-13 – Unresponsive; OVERRULED (waived)
8	41. P. 43, l. 24 through p. 44, l. 14 – Leading; misstates testimony; OVERRULED (waived)
10	42. P. 45, ll. 1-13 – Leading; speculative; OVERRULED (waived)
11	43. P. 47, ll. 4-9 – Leading; OVERRULED (waived)
12	44. P. 47, ll. 10-19 – Calls for speculation; SUSTAINED
13	45. P. 47, ll. 20-22 – Leading; argumentative; OVERRULED (waived)
14	46. P. 48, ll. 3-11 – Hearsay; asked and answered; OVERRULED
15	47. P. 48, ll. 12-21 – Leading; OVERRULED (waived)
16	48. P. 49, ll. 5-20 – Misstates testimony; speculative; OVERRULED
17	49. P. 49, ll. 21-24 – Leading; OVERRULED (waived)
18	50. P. 49, l. 25 through p. 50, l. 6 – Calls for speculation; OVERRULED (waived)
19	51. P. 50, l. 19 through p. 51, l. 9 – Hearsay; speculative; OVERRULED (waived)
20	52. P. 51, ll. 20-21 – Speculative; SUSTAINED
21	53. P. 53; ll. 10-21 – Irrelevant; unresponsive; hearsay; OVERRULED
22	54. P. 55, ll. 6-11 – Incomplete designation that is lacking the question for context
23	speculative; OVERRULED (waived)
24	55. P. 55, ll. 12-13 – Attorney is testifying for the witness; OVERRULED (waived)
	56. P. 55, ll. 14-19 – Speculative; OVERRULED (waived)

1	57. P. 56, 11. 6-10 – Leading, argumentative; OVERRULED (waived)	
2	58. P. 57, 1l. 1-4 – Unresponsive; OVERRULED (waived)	
3	59. P. 58, ll. 14-17 – Compound; Leading; OVERRULED (waived)	
4	60. P. 58, 1. 18 through p. 60, 1. 6 – Unresponsive; OVERRULED (waived)	
5	61. P. 61, ll. 2-11 – Leading; calls for speculation; SUSTAINED	
6	62. P. 61, ll. 16-21 – Leading; unresponsive; OVERRULED (waived)	
7	63. P. 62, ll. 1-6 – Calls for speculation; OVERRULED (waived)	
8	64. P. 62, 7-19 – Leading; unresponsive; speculative; assumes facts not in evidence; OVERRULED (waived)	
9	65. P. 62, 1. 20 through p. 63, 1. 6 – Leading; speculative; assumes facts not in evidence; SUSTAINED as to 62:20 - 63:2 (calls for speculation); OVERRULED as to rest.	
10	66. P. 63, l. 14 through p. 64, l. 2 – Calls for speculation; asked and answered;	
11	OVERRULED (waived)	
12	67. P. 64, 1l. 10-16 – Leading; OVERRULED (waived)	
13	68. P. 65, 1. 22 through p. 66, 1. 7 – Leading; OVERRULED (waived)	
14	69. P. 67, 1. 22 through p. 68, 1. 11 – Unresponsive; OVERRULED (waived)	
15	70. P. 68, 1l. 16-19 – Unresponsive; OVERRULED (waived)	
16	71. P. 68, 1. 20 through p. 69, 1. 7 – Leading; OVERRULED (waived)	
17	72. P. 69, ll. 15-25 – Hearsay within hearsay; speculative; SUSTAINED as to hearsay	
18	73. P. 70, ll. 3-10 – Leading, calls for legal conclusion; calls for speculation; SUSTAINED (calls for legal conclusion)	
19	74. P. 70, 1l. 14-22 – Unresponsive; OVERRULED (waived)	
20	75. P. 70, 1. 23 through p. 71, 1. 8 – Leading; OVERRULED (waived)	
21	76. P. 71, 1l. 9-13 – Leading; calls for legal conclusion; SUSTAINED (calls for legal conclusion)	
22	77. P. 71, 1. 14 through p. 72, 1. 21 – Leading; OVERRULED (waived)	
23	78. P. 72, 1. 23 through p. 73, 1. 9 – Unresponsive; OVERRULED (waived)	
24	79. P. 73, 11. 10-21 – Irrelevant; hearsay; SUSTAINED	
	80. P. 73. 1. 22 through p. 75. 1. 22 – Assumes facts not in evidence: calls for speculation:	

1	unresponsive; hearsay; SUSTAINED (calls for legal conclusion)
2	81. P. 75, 1. 23 through p. 76, 1. 5 – Hearsay; OVERRULED
3	82. P. 76; 11. 6-7 – Unresponsive; OVERRULED (waived)
4	83. P. 77, 1. 7 through p. 78, 1. 8 – Topic of spoliation subject to dispute argued within trial briefs
5	irrelevant; more prejudicial than probative; OVERRULED
6	84. P. 79, 11. 2-12 – Hearsay; SUSTAINED
7	85. P. 80, ll. 15-25 – Hearsay; leading; lacks foundation; more prejudicial than probative; OVERRULED
8	86. P. 81, 11. 12-20 – Hearsay; leading; SUSTAIN (hearsay)
9	87. P. 83, Il. 1-11 – Hearsay within hearsay; OVERRULED
10	88. P. 83, 1. 22 through p. 84, 1. 6 – Hearsay; leading; irrelevant; speculative; in violation of the
11	order on motion in limine as it is lacking presentation of proof SUSTAINED as to 84:4-6
12	(calls for speculation); OVERRULED &/or waived as to rest
13	89. P. 84, 1. 20 through p. 85, 1. 5 – Hearsay; leading; irrelevant; speculative; in violation of the
14	order on motion in limine as it is lacking presentation of proof; OVERRULED
15	90. P. 85, 1. 24 through p. 86, 1. 3 – Hearsay OVR; leading/lacks foundationWAIVED
16	91. P. 88, 1. 22 through p. 89, 1. 3 – Hearsay; leading; irrelevant; speculative; in violation of the
17	order on motion in limine as it is lacking presentation of proof and references the EMRB
18	trasncript; lacks foundation from prior lines that are also in violation; SUSTAINED based
19	on MIL ruling
20	92. P. 90, 1. 19 through p. 91, 1. 6 – Calls for speculation; leading; assumes facts not in
21	evidence; unresponsive; SUSTAINED (calls for speculation/assumes facts)
	93. P. 91, Il. 18-23 — Calls for speculation; SUSTAINED
22	94. P. 94, Il. 14-22 – Unresponsive; speculative; OVERRULED (waived)
23	95. P. 99, Il. 16-23 – Speculative WAIVED; hearsay OVERRULED
24	96. P. 109, 1. 20 through p. 110, 1. 25 – Unresponsive; OVERRULED (waived)
	97. P. 111, 1. 17 through p. 112, 1. 24 – Unresponsive; OVERRULED as to 111:17 - 112:3 ;