Wilson v. Unite		tes of America et al Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 12	24 Filed 05/20	0/22 Page 1 of 65	Doc.	124		
	1	BRADLEY S. MAINOR, ESQ.						
	2	Nevada Bar No. 7434 ASH MARIE BLACKURN, ESQ.						
	3	Nevada Bar No. 14712 MAINOR WIRTH, LLP						
	4	6018 S. Fort Apache Road, Ste. 150						
	5	Las Vegas, NV 89148-5652 Tel: (702) 464-5000						
	6	Fax: (702) 463-4440 ash@mwinjury.com						
	7	Counsel for Plaintiff						
	8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
	9	DISTRICT	OF NEVADA					
	10	SONALOLITA WILSON	CASE NO.:	2:18-CV-01241-JCM-NJK				
MAINOR WIRTH, LLP 6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 Phone: (702) 464-5000 Fax: (702) 463-4440	11	Plaintiff						
, NV 3-444	12	VS.	 ORDER	JOINT PRETRIAL				
LLP Vegas 02) 46	13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ; LICETH DEMHA-SANTIAGO; JUAN DEMHA;						
AINOR WIRTH, LLP che Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas 2) 464-5000 Fax: (702) 46	14	DOES I THROUGH X; AND ROE						
WIR te. 15(0 F	15	CORPORATIONS 1 THROUGH X,						
IOR Rd., Si 64-500	16	Defendants.						
IAIN ache I 02) 46	17	COMES NOW Plaintiff, SONALOLITA WILSON ("Plaintiff" or "Wilson"), by and						
M <i>I</i> Ft. Apac ne: (702	18	through her attorneys, BRADLEY S. MAINOR, ESQ., and ASH MARIE BLACKBURN, ESQ.,						
18 S.] Pho	19	of MAINOR WIRTH LLP; and Defendants UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, LLC ("USA"), by						
60	20	and through their attorneys, SKYLER PEARSON, ESQ., and PATRICK ROSE, ESQ., of OFFICE						
	21	OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEY DISTRICT OF NEVADA, Defendants LICETH DEMHA-						
	22	SANTIAGO ('SANTIAGO") and JUAN DEMI	HA ("DEMHA	") by and through their attor	neys,			
	23	STEVEN T. JAFFE, ESQ. AND JAN K. TOMA	SIK, ESQ. of H	HALL JAFFE & CLAYTON,	LLP;			
	24	and submit the Joint Pretrial Order pursuant to LR 16-3.						
	25		I.					
	26	A. Summary of Action						
	27	This is a personal injury action arising ou	it of two motor	vehicle collisions that occurre	ed on			
	28	September 1, 2016, between Plaintiff WILSON	and Defendan	t USA and Plaintiff WILSON	I and			

DEMHA-SANTIAGO and DEMHA. Plaintiff was traveling eastbound on Washington Avenue, approaching Saylor Avenue, in the eastbound lanes. Plaintiff alleges Nakia McCloud, while in the course and scope of her employment with Defendant USA, in its Department of the Treasury, IRS, was also traveling eastbound on Washington Avenue, directly behind Plaintiff.

Plaintiff alleges to have stopped in the eastbound travel lane for pedestrians who were crossing Washington Avenue. Plaintiff avers that Nakia McCloud then rear-ended Plaintiff's vehicle.

Following the first collision, Nakia McCloud pulled her vehicle off to the right side of the road. Plaintiff's vehicle remained in the roadway. As Nakia McCloud was on the phone with emergency services, while Plaintiff sat in her disabled car, her vehicle was struck again by a different vehicle, driven by Defendant DEMHA SANTIAGO. Plaintiff further contends she was injured as a result of the September 1, 2016 motor vehicle collisions.

B. Relief Sought

Plaintiff seeks past medical specials in an amount in excess of \$1,661,262.05. Plaintiff is continuing her medical treatment. She is also seeking the present-day value of future medical expenses in the amount of \$386,938.00, loss of earning capacity in the amount of \$805,038.85, and past and future pain and suffering.

Plaintiff presented claims for future medical specials between \$1,504,780.00 and \$2,238,876.00 during discovery. Thereafter, Defendant USA filed a Motion to Strike Untimely Disclosure of Plaintiff's Expert's Life Care Plan Opinions, which was granted by the Court.

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP

Phone: (702) 464-5000 | Fax: (702) 463-4440

C. Contentions of the Parties

1. Plaintiff's Contentions:

Plaintiff contends that Defendants were the sole cause of the subject collisions by failing to
pay full attention to their surroundings, failing to reduce their speed, and striking the rear of
Plaintiff's vehicle. Plaintiff further contends that the motor vehicle collisions caused her significant
injuries and the resulting damages that are the subject of this lawsuit.

- 2. Defendant USA's Contentions:
- 28

27

Page 2 of 39

Defendant, USA contends that Plaintiff cannot establish her burden of proof as to causation or damages (if any) as to the USA in the first accident

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

2

3. Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO and DEMHA's Contentions:

Defendants LICETH DEMHA-SANTIAGO and JUAN DEMHA ("Defendants") contend that Defendant USA and Plaintiff are the sole and proximate cause of the subject incident and of Plaintiff's alleged injuries and damages, i.e., both collisions. Nakia McCloud, while in the course and scope of her employment with Defendant USA (in its Department of the Treasury, IRS), was driving directly behind Plaintiff prior to the initial collision. As a result of McCloud's failure to pay full attention to traffic in front of her, failure to keep a proper distance, and failure to reduce speed pursuant to the traffic conditions ahead of her, McCloud drove her vehicle into the rear-end of Plaintiff's vehicle. Following the initial collision, rather than exiting the roadway to her safety, Plaintiff exited her vehicle, inspected it for damage, then re-entered her vehicle which remained disabled in the roadway. While she remained in her vehicle, Plaintiff also failed to fasten her seatbelt. As a result, Plaintiff's own negligent actions combined Defendant USA's initial collision, caused the second collision to take place. Defendants contend that Plaintiff's claimed injures and damages are the result of Defendant USA and Plaintiff's negligence. Defendants further contend that but for the collision caused by McCloud, these Defendants never would have been involved in a collision with the Plaintiff.

II.

Statement of Jurisdiction

As against the United States, this Court has exclusive jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1346(b)(1), which provides that federal courts "shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions on claims against the United States... for injury or loss of property, or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred."

28

	V 89148 440	
MAINOR WIRTH, LLP	6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 Phone: (702) 464-5000 Fax: (702) 463-4440	

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

III.

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

- Nakia McCloud was an employee of the Department of the Treasury, IRS, on September 1, 2016 and she was acting within the course and scope of her employment with the United States at the time of the motor vehicle accident.
- On September 1, 2016, Plaintiff WILSON was operating a 2005 Toyota Corolla, traveling eastbound on Washington Avenue, approaching Saylor Avenue, in Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 3. On September 1, 2016,. Nakia McCloud was operating a General Motors Terrain SLE, traveling eastbound on Washington Avenue.
- 4. On September 1, 2016, Defendant DEMHA-SANTIAGO, was operating a 2006 Acura3.2 TL, traveling eastbound on Washington Avenue.
- 5. The vehicle operated by Defendant DEMHA-SANTIAGO was owned by Defendant DEMHA.
- 6. The front of Nakia McCloud's vehicle collided with the rear of Plaintiff WILSON's vehicle.
- 7. The front of Defendant DEMHA-SANTIAGO's vehicle collided with the rear of Plaintiff WILSON's vehicle.
- 8. The collision between DEMHA-SANTIAGO and Plaintiff did not occur until after McCloud's vehicle collided with the Plaintiff's vehicle.

IV.

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

None.

1.

V.

The following are Plaintiff's issues of fact to be tried and determined at trial:

Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in a safe

27 28

Page 4 of 39

	Case 2:18-cv-	01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 5 of 69
1		and reasonable manner at the time of the incident.
2	2.	Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McCloud's
3		breach of duty.
4	3.	Whether Defendant DEMHA-SANTIAGO failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and
5		reasonable manner at the time of the incident.
6	4.	Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virtue of
7		NRS 41.440.
8	5.	Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to Defendant
9		DEMHA-SANTIAGO.
10	6.	Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second collision
11		pursuant to the Court's Order (ECF 113).
12	7.	Whether the subject collisions proximately caused injuries to Plaintiff.
13	8.	Whether the subject collisions proximately caused damages to Plaintiff.
14	9.	Whether the medical treatment claimed was/is reasonable, necessary, and related to
15		the alleged collisions.
16	10.	Whether the Plaintiff will have future symptoms related to the alleged collisions.
17	11.	Whether the Plaintiff will incur future treatments related to the alleged collisions.
18	12.	Whether the Plaintiff suffered a loss of earning capacity related to the alleged
19		collisions.
20	13.	Whether the Plaintiff has mitigated her damages that she relates to the alleged
21		collisions.
22	14.	The monetary value of Plaintiff's damages, including pain and suffering, if any.
23	The followin	g are Defendant USA's issues of fact to be tried and determined at trial.
24	1.	Whether Plaintiff should have stopped at the intersection given that the
25		pedestrians never entered the intersection and, even if they did, the pedestrians
26		were not in immediate harm or danger given that they were on the other side of the
27		street and nowhere near Plaintiff's vehicle.
28		
		Page 5 of 39

 injuries due to the second accident. Whether the United States is liable to Plaintiff and if so, to what extent. Whether the United States' employee's actions caused Plaintiff's injuries Whether and the extent to which Plaintiff was injured as a result of the finaccident involving the United States' employee. Whether Plaintiff or any other party's negligence contributed to the accident and/or Plaintiff's injuries. The following are Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's issues of fact and determined at trial. Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in reasonable manner at the time of the incident. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McCloud of duty. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 		Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 6 of 89				
 Whether the United States is liable to Plaintiff and if so, to what extent. Whether the United States' employee's actions caused Plaintiff's injuries Whether and the extent to which Plaintiff was injured as a result of the fraccident involving the United States' employee. Whether Plaintiff or any other party's negligence contributed to the accident and/or Plaintiff's injuries. The following are Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's issues of fact and determined at trial. Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in reasonable manner at the time of the incident. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McCloud of duty. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 20 						
 Whether the United States' employee's actions caused Plaintiff's injuries Whether and the extent to which Plaintiff was injured as a result of the fraccident involving the United States' employee. Whether Plaintiff or any other party's negligence contributed to the accide and/or Plaintiff's injuries. The following are Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's issues of fact and determined at trial. Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in reasonable manner at the time of the incident. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McCloud of duty. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collision soccurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 						
5 Whether and the extent to which Plaintiff was injured as a result of the friend accident involving the United States' employee. 7 6. Whether Plaintiff or any other party's negligence contributed to the accident and/or Plaintiff's injuries. 9 The following are Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's issues of fact and determined at trial. 11 1. Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in reasonable manner at the time of the incident. 12 2. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McCloud of duty. 15 3. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. 17 4. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. 19 5. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and DemII 21 6. Whether the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. 23 7. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. 24 8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 26 0. 27 9. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his second DEMHA-SANTIAGO.						
6 accident involving the United States' employee. 7 6. Whether Plaintiff or any other party's negligence contributed to the accident and/or Plaintiff's injuries. 9 The following are Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's issues of fact and determined at trial. 11 1. Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in reasonable manner at the time of the incident. 13 2. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McCloud of duty. 15 3. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. 17 4. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. 19 5. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml 20 i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml 21 6. Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. 23 7. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virte 41.440. 25 8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 26 0. 27 9. Whet						
 Whether Plaintiff or any other party's negligence contributed to the accident and/or Plaintiff's injuries. The following are Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's issues of fact and determined at trial. Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in reasonable manner at the time of the incident. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McCloud of duty. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and DeMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 		5				
8 and/or Plaintiff's injurics. 9 The following are Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's issues of fact 10 and determined at trial. 11 1. Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in 12 reasonable manner at the time of the incident. 13 2. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McCloud 14 of duty. 15 3. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner 16 of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. 17 4. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. 19 5. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml 20 i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml 21 6. Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. 23 7. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. 25 8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 26 DEMHA-SANTIAGO.	6	accident involving the United States' employee.				
 The following are Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's issues of fact and determined at trial. 1. Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in reasonable manner at the time of the incident. 2. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McClou of duty. 3. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. 4. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. 5. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml 6. Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would hav but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. 7. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. 8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 9. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	7	6. Whether Plaintiff or any other party's negligence contributed to the accidents				
 and determined at trial. 1. Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in reasonable manner at the time of the incident. 2. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McClou of duty. 3. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. 4. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. 5. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would hav but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. 7. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. 8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 9. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	8	and/or Plaintiff's injuries.				
 Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in reasonable manner at the time of the incident. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McClou of duty. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would hav but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	9	The following are Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's issues of fact to be tried				
 reasonable manner at the time of the incident. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McClou of duty. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml 6. Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would hav but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	10	and determined at trial.				
 Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McClou of duty. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would hav but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	11	1. Whether Nakia McCloud was negligent in her failure to operate her vehicle in a safe and				
 of duty. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virt 41.440. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	12	reasonable manner at the time of the incident.				
 Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virtual 41.440. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	13	2. Whether Defendant USA is liable for Plaintiff's injuries in light of Nakia McCloud's breach				
 of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virte 41.440. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	14	of duty.				
 Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virtual 41.440. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	15	3. Whether Plaintiff failed to operate her vehicle in a safe and reasonable manner at the time				
 fault for the collision between herself and McCloud. 5. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Demil 6. Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. 7. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virte 41.440. 8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 9. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	16	of the subject incident, at times preceding both collisions.				
 Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's of i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Demil Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virtue 41.440. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	17	4. Whether Plaintiff contributed to the initial collisions occurrence, i.e. Plaintiff's degree of				
 i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Deml Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. 7. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virter 41.440. 8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 9. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	18					
 Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virte 41.440. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	19	5. Whether, after the first collision, Plaintiff contributed to the second collision's occurrence,				
 but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud. 7. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virte 41.440. 8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 9. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	20	i.e. Plaintiff's degree of fault for the second collision between herself and Demha.				
 7. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virte 41.440. 8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 9. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	21	6. Whether the collision between Plaintiff and DEMHA-SANTIAGO would have occurred				
 24 41.440. 25 8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 27 9. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	22	but for the collision between Plaintiff and McCloud.				
 8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 9. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	23	7. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA is liable for the subject collision by virtue of NRS				
 26 DEMHA-SANTIAGO. 27 9. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second 28 	24	41.440.				
9. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second	25	8. Whether Defendant JUAN DEMHA negligently entrusted his vehicle to Defendant				
28	26	DEMHA-SANTIAGO.				
28	27	9. Whether Plaintiff could have reasonably been expected to avoid the second collision				
Page 6 of 39	28					
		Page 6 of 39				

		Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 12 ² Filed 05/20/22 Page 7 of 69					
	1	pursuant to the Court's Order (ECF 113).					
	2	10. Whether Plaintiff assumed the risk of reentering her vehicle following the initial collisio					
	3	11. Whether the subject collisions proximately caused injuries to Plaintiff.					
	4	12. Whether the subject collisions proximately caused damages to Plaintiff.					
	5	13. Whether Plaintiff had preexisting conditions related to the body parts complained of					
	6	resulting from the subject accident, and any apportionment thereof.					
	7	14. Whether the medical treatment claimed was/is reasonable, necessary, and related to the					
	8	alleged collisions.					
	9	15. Whether the Plaintiff will have future symptoms related to the alleged collisions.					
	10	16. Whether the Plaintiff will incur future treatments related to the alleged collisions.					
40	11	17. Whether the Plaintiff suffered a loss of earning capacity related to the alleged collisions.					
63-44	12	18. Whether the Plaintiff has mitigated her damages that she relates to the alleged collisions.					
702) 4	13	19. The monetary value of Plaintiff's damages, including pain and suffering, if any.					
-ax: (14	VI.					
							
1 000	15	(a) The following exhibits are stipulated into evidence in this case and may be so marked					
464-5000 F	15 16	(a) The following exhibits are stipulated into evidence in this case and may be so marked by the clerk:					
4							
4	16	by the clerk:					
4	16 17	by the clerk: See "Exhibit A-1" of this document					
4	16 17 18	 by the clerk: See "Exhibit A-1" of this document (b) The parties agree the following exhibits will be available for use at the time of trial but 					
4	16 17 18 19	by the clerk: See " Exhibit A-1 " of this document (b) The parties agree the following exhibits will be available for use at the time of trial but are not currently admitted:					
4	16 17 18 19 20	by the clerk: See "Exhibit A-1" of this document (b) The parties agree the following exhibits will be available for use at the time of trial but are not currently admitted: See "Exhibit A" of this document					
4	16 17 18 19 20 21	by the clerk: See "Exhibit A-1" of this document (b) The parties agree the following exhibits will be available for use at the time of trial but are not currently admitted: See "Exhibit A" of this document (c) As to the following additional exhibits the parties propose the following:					
4	 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	by the clerk: See "Exhibit A-1" of this document (b) The parties agree the following exhibits will be available for use at the time of trial but are not currently admitted: See "Exhibit A" of this document (c) As to the following additional exhibits the parties propose the following: (1) Plaintiff's exhibits:					
4	 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	by the clerk: See "Exhibit A-1" of this document (b) The parties agree the following exhibits will be available for use at the time of trial but are not currently admitted: See "Exhibit A" of this document (c) As to the following additional exhibits the parties propose the following: (1) Plaintiff's exhibits: See "Exhibit B" of this document.					
4	 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	 by the clerk: See "Exhibit A-1" of this document (b) The parties agree the following exhibits will be available for use at the time of trial but are not currently admitted: See "Exhibit A" of this document (c) As to the following additional exhibits the parties propose the following: (1) Plaintiff's exhibits: See "Exhibit B" of this document. Plaintiff reserves the right to use any documents disclosed by Defendants, including those 					
Phone: (702) 464-5000 Fax: (702) 463-4440	 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	by the clerk: See "Exhibit A-1" of this document (b) The parties agree the following exhibits will be available for use at the time of trial but are not currently admitted: See "Exhibit A" of this document (c) As to the following additional exhibits the parties propose the following: (1) Plaintiff's exhibits: See "Exhibit B" of this document. Plaintiff reserves the right to use any documents disclosed by Defendants, including those which experts have reviewed and formed opinions, such as reports; pleadings; correspondence;					
4	 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	by the clerk: See "Exhibit A-1" of this document (b) The parties agree the following exhibits will be available for use at the time of trial but are not currently admitted: See "Exhibit A" of this document (c) As to the following additional exhibits the parties propose the following: (1) Plaintiff's exhibits: See "Exhibit B" of this document. Plaintiff reserves the right to use any documents disclosed by Defendants, including those which experts have reviewed and formed opinions, such as reports; pleadings; correspondence; notes and medical records and billing.					

affidavits, films, drawings, graphs, charts, photographs, reports, computer tapes, computer discs, and other data compilations, and other medical reference materials which Plaintiff and/or Plaintiff's expert(s) use in support of Plaintiff's allegations. By disclosing documents, Plaintiff does not waive the right to challenge and exclude documents, or portions thereof, on any basis.

Plaintiff may offer documents needed for rebuttal or impeachment purposes, including, but not limited to, discovery obtained during the course of litigation as permitted; pleadings; and other documentation in accordance with admissible evidence. There may be additional exhibits which Plaintiff may wish to offer at the time of trial, not listed above. When and if that determination is made, notice will be given immediately and supplied to the Court and to Defendants.

(1) Defendant USA's exhibits:

See "Exhibit C" of this document.

Defendant reserves the right to use any document including but not limited to discovery responses and/or deposition testimony by Plaintiff or co-defendants for impeachment and/or substantively as party admissions, as may be relevant at trial. Defendant reserves the right to use demonstrative evidence. Defendant also reserves the right to use any exhibit listed or introduced by Plaintiff or co-defendants, or as previously produced by the parties.

(1) Defendant DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's exhibits:

See "Exhibit D" of this document.

Defendants reserve the right to use any discovery responses and/or deposition testimony by any party for impeachment and/or substantively as party admissions, as may be relevant at trial. Defendants reserve the right to use demonstrative evidence. Defendants also reserve the right to use any exhibit listed or introduced by any party.

As to the medical records listed separately in the parties' list of exhibits, the parties were unable to meet in person to review the same in light of the volume of records, Plaintiff's continued treatment, and the time permitted to submit the Proposed Joint Pre-Trial Order. However, the parties will endeavor to do so prior to trial and identify which portions of said records may be stipulated to and which may not.

28

20

21

22

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP 6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 Phone: (702) 464-5000 | Fax: (702) 463-4440 61 81 21 91 51 712 712 463-4440

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1

(c) **Electronic evidence**:

1. The parties may offer Power Point images/drawings/diagrams/animations/story boards depicting the facts and circumstance of the accident, information relevant to communications between the parties, and/or deposition testimony.

5 2. The parties do intend to present electronic evidence for purposes of jury6 deliberations.

(d) **Depositions**:

1. Plaintiff will offer the following deposition testimony at trial:

9	Deponent	Offered Testimony
10	Liceth Demha	10:24-11:20, 21:1-19, 22:18-23:4, 27:22-28:8, 28:24-31:16, 35:20-
10		49:24, 52:16-53:15, 57:14-62:4
11	Nakia McCloud	12:21-13:14, 27:4-28:16, 32:8-34:11, 34:25-35:23, 39:8-47:20, 48:22-
11		54:22, 57:15-62:22, 65:3-72:6, 73:14-75:25, 76:24-78:15, 83:17-85:6,
12		92:13-93:19, 96:9-96:14
	Sonalolita Wilson	13:2-13:22, 15:3-15:10, 15:15-16:15, 17:4-17:12, 19:8-19:14, 19:20-
13		22:23, 23:9-26:10, 27:7-29:18, 34:14-35:9, 35:25-38:10, 38:24-40:25,
14		42:5-54:1, 54:9-60:2, 65:5-66:18,67:17-69:17, 71:6-75:23, 80:15-
14		82:16, 86:8-88:3, 88:17-89:15, 89:25-90:13, 93:8-96:10, 97:10-101:20,
15		102:14-103:1, 105:18-106:18, 107:11-109:10, 109:25-111:12, 111:19-
		112:6, 112:19-119:4, 123:12-125:5, 125:20-135:15, 136:5-138:13
16	Baduk Ghuman	18:14 - 20:6, 21:9 - 22:22, 27:16 - 28:25, 30:8 - 33:11, 35:1-41:9,
17		44:9–49:5, 49:6-50:8, 50:14-55:3, 55:5-56:1, 56:25-58:7, 59:2-60:23,
1/		60:24-64:15, 64:16-67:9, 68:6-71:9, 75:11-76:25, 82:7-84:5, 84:11-
18		88:18, 89:3-91:16, 94:19-96:12, 100:6-103:25, 108:7-110:22, 111:16-
	DCCH	112:25, 113:21-115:25
19	Duff Kaster	15:3-15:22, 21:12-23:11, 24:9-25:1, 25:16-26:13, 26:24-27:12, 28:4-
20		29:24, 32:21-33:23, 34:6-34:16, 35:1-35:18
20	Robert Hinton	10:4 - 11:15, 12:17 - 13:1, 14:7-15:4, 15:9-16:16, 16:20-17:12, 21:10-
21		23:19, 24:12-25:12, 26:1-30:14, 31:1-32:2, 33:9-40:23
	Mark Glyman	11:25-12:21, 14:10-15:1, 19:1-22:4, 22:18-23:16, 24:4-31:16, 33:3-
22	The second Decourt	33:20, 34:13-37:13,37:20-41:16, 41:22-43:9, 44:1-44:23
23	Thomas Dunn	7:12-9:12, 19:13-20:16, 23:5-24:2, 25:4-25:22, 26:18-31:19, 33:20-
23		35:10, 35:17-39:10, 39:21-44:20, 48:25-50:11, 52:20-55:5, 56:7-57:7, 57:20-60:2, 60:23-61:6, 61:21-62:20, 63:19-66:3, 66:14-67:19
24	Rick Chavez	10:16-11:6, 20:6-20:18, 22:21-24:22, 25:3-25:14, 29:16-31:21, 41:3-
	RICK Chavez	42:19,45:9-46:1, 47:23-50:5, 51:1-53:9, 59:13-60:21, 63:14-63:25,
25		42.19,45.9-40.1, 47.25-50.5, 51.1-55.9, 59.15-60.21, 05.14-05.25, 64:24-70:10, 71:10-72:24, 73:9-74:14, 75:25-76:17, 77:17-78:12, 79:1-
26		81:14, 82:8-83:2,84:13-86:9, 87:6-87:24, 94:19-96:9, 102:21-103:19,
26		106:7-107:10,108:17-109:18, 110:1-112:2, 114:9-118:17
27	Kim Balogh	12:24-14:4, 18:3-19:2, 19:11-20:24, 22:4-25:20, 26:22-29:15, 30:9-
		33:5, 33:14-33:23
28		

Page 9 of 39

0	Ca	ase 2:18-cv-01241-JC	M-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 10 of 69
1		David John Oliveri	11:24-14:2, 14:14-15:15, 16:25-17:16, 20:1-20:16, 24:4-24:25, 26:2-
•			26:24, 28:3-28:10, 30:3-30:17, 31:14-32:4, 32:17-36:1, 36:7-37:14,
2			37:22-42:1, 42:15-43:15, 44:2-45:7, 49:7-50:7, 51:8-51:16, 52:19-53:5,
3			53:18-54:14, 55:19-57:12, 57:21-58:20, 61:3-62:3, 64:14-64:22, 65:11-
5			66:21, 71:8-73:5, 77:6-77:13, 77:19-78:5
4		Robert Simmons	13:3-13:15, 14:24-15:4, 19:21-20:14, 23:3-25:10, 28:3-29:11, 30:6-
_			31:9, 34:25-37:8, 38:24-39:22, 41:10-42:14
5		Jaswinder Grover	11:23-13:13, 17:6-17:22, 20:5-21:8, 21:21-22:13, 23:1-24:11, 25:2-
6			27:18, 29:18-31:3, 32:3-33:1, 35:18-38:21, 39:2-41:20, 43:2-43:6,
0			44:16-48:25, 49:1-49:25, 50:8-52:5, 53:3-55:14, 59:5-61:4, 62:10-64:7,
7			66:2-68:17, 70:4-74:6, 74:23-76:9, 77:7-78:15, 80:3-81:25, 84:11-85:3,
			89:4-93:12, 94:6-94:13, 94:14-96:18, 96:21-97:14, 98:3-102:14, 104:7-
8			105:16, 106:6-111:21

157:1-164:11, 170:8-180:1, 182:14-183:8, 184:2-185:5, 185:6-186:17,

6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 Phone: (702) 464-5000 | Fax: (702) 463-4440 **MAINOR WIRTH, LLP**

20

21

9 Π 187:18-191:4, 191:15-192:8, 196:23-198:7, 201:8-202:7, 205:1-207:17, 209:24-217:17, 218:22-220:11, 222:1-223:20, 225:3-227:8, 233:14-10 236:15, 237:14-239:14, 241:7-245:4, 248:3-249:4 Plaintiff anticipates reading depositions into the records and reserve the right to use all 11 depositions which have been conducted in this action due to witness unavailability, if allowed under 12 FRCP 32(a)(4)(B), to refresh recollection and/or to impeach a witness, as well as any other 13 permitted use under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Federal Rules of Evidence. 14 2. Defendant USA does not intend, at this time to offer page and line designations for 15 16 17 18 19

Sonalolita Wilson pt.

any deposition transcripts. In the event Defendant USA learns that a witness is unavailable to testify at trial, Defendant USA will notify all parties and the Court of page and line designations of the unavailable witness's deposition transcript to offer at trial. Defendant USA reserves the right to use all depositions which have been conducted in this action to refresh recollection and/or to impeach a witness, and otherwise use at trial in accordance with the applicable rules, *i.e.*, Fed. R. Civ. P. 32; Fed. R. Evid. 801(d).

3. Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA will offer the following 22 depositions: 23

24	Deponent	Offered Testimony
	Liceth Demha	10:5-11:20, 15:7-8, 17:7-21, 20:9-13, 20:20-25, 23:15-16, 24:11-16,
25		27:22-28:8, 28:24-31:7, 35:20-36:12, 40:14-16, 47:14-19, 52:16-53:15,
26		54:20-25, 57:14-23, 58:14-20, 59:23-60:5, 61:16-20
26	Nakia McCloud	12:21-13:14, 24:14-25:1, 27:4-28:16, 30:20-31:5, 32:8-34:11, 34:25-
27		35:23, 36:5-7, 39:8-47:20, 48:22-54:22, 55:4-56:13, 57:15-62:22, 65:3-
27		72:6, 73:14-75:25, 76:24-78:15, 80:5-18, 81:10-25, 83:17-85:6, 87:9-
28		

Page 10 of 39

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 11 of 69

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP

6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 Phone: (702) 464-5000 | Fax: (702) 463-4440

	24, 89:15-25, 93:4-17, 96:9-96:14
Sonalolita Wilson	8:2-14, 11:8-22, 13:2-13:14, 15:3-16:15, 18:5-19:7, 19:20-21:11,
	21:18-22:13, 24:1-12, 27:7-29:18, 35:25-38:10, 38:24-54:1, 59:14-24,
	60:10-61:5, 65:5-66:20, 66:19-25, 67:10-12, 89:21-90:9, 90:20-91:8,
	97:2-109:10, 112:24-113:4, 113:5-113:13,119:8-119:13, 128:15-17,
	131:3-14, 136:14-137:2, 137:17-25,
Babuk Ghuman	9:8-17, 9:18-11:7, 11:13-24, 15:14-25, 16:1-7, 17:19-18:2, 21:9-22:24,
	24:13-23, 27:16 - 28:25, 30:8 - 33:11, 34:3-19, 35:1-41:9, 47:2-24,
	48:7-18, 49:6-50:8, 50:14-55:3, 60:1-23, 62:2-25, 63:8-14, 67:6-9,
	68:19-69:2, 80:5-12, 87:15-19, 91:14-23, 94:5-11, 100:9-18, 112:11-25,
	113:8-13
Duff Kaster	6:8-7:10, 7:11-22, 10:23-11:25, 15:23-16:10, 18:12-19:1, 21:12-15,
Dull Ruster	24:9-18, 28:4-7, 32:1-7
Robert Hinton	7:2-13, 9:6-16, 10:4 - 11:23, 12:17 - 13:1, 13:14-17:12, 18:21-19:22,
Robert Innton	21:10-24, 23:1-9, 26:1-7, 28:17-29:21, 31:1-9,
Mark Glyman	6:3-7:25, 8:13-15, 10:1-11:24, 13:7-10, 14:10-19, 16:11-17:9, 19:4-
IVIAIN OLYIIIAII	20:25, 21:8-22:4, 24:4-9, 30:1-31:16, 37:20-25
Thomas Dunn	6:12-7:23, 9:14-22, 10:8-23, 12:2-7, 18:3-19:5, 19:13-20:16, 23:5-24:2,
Thomas Dunn	
	37:10-17, 42:8-43:24, 45:17-47:5, 50:3-11,
D'-1-Cl	60:3-21, 60:23-61:6,
Rick Chavez	5:7-16, 21:1-3, 26:4-6, 28:3-10, 40:15-41:5, 44:3-45:8, 56:3-6,
	59:6-7, 61:10-62:6, 62:18-63:1, 64:5-20, 65:8-15, 67:4-68:25,
	69:1-5, 71:10-21, 72:2-14, 73:17-23, 74:15-22, 77:5-12, 84:13-21,
	85:1-17, 86:1-9, 88:16-17, 90:5-9, 96:4, 105:4-5, 111:3-19, 114:16-
	115:22, 119:22-120:1, 120:20-121:2
Kim Balogh	7:19-18:2, 12:4-13:8, 18:22-19:2, 24:9-25:9, 25:21-26:21, 28:7-13,
<u> </u>	28:22-29:2, 30:24-31:19, 32:14-33:23
David John Olivieri	7:25-9:25, 10:14-21, 11:12-24, 12:1-13:12, 14:9-15:6, 15:7-18, 15:23
	16:3, 16:4-24, 17:17-21, 18:4-19:3, 20:1-21, 21:2-22:16, 23:18-24:25,
	25:4-26:24, 27:3-28:10, 29:24-30:14, 31:3-32:14, 32:22-33:20, 34:4-
	36:1, 36:7-37:14, 39:1-21, 39:23-42:1, 42:15-43:2, 44:1-5, 44:7-45:7,
	45:19-46:5, 47:3-23, 51:1-16, 55:19-56:8, 57:21-58:4, 58:10-20, 58:21
	59:22, 60:1-9, 60:14-61:22, 64:4-22, 65:25-66:16, 66:17-67:2, 67:3
D 1 01	68:13, 68:14-22, 68:23-69:1, 69:18-70:13, 71:11-14, 77:22-79:23
Robert Simmons	7:15-19, 8:6-8, 11:7-13, 13:10-15, 14:9-13, 14:25-15:2,
	16:6-17:1, 17:9-16, 18:12-19:11, 20:4-20:22, 21:3-6, 24:1-25:2, 26:10
	27:8, 28:3-23, 29:20-30:18, 31:5-25, 32:4-17, 34:25-36:7, 36:8-25,
	37:1-8, 38:24-39:17, 41:10-25
Jaswinder Grover	8:19-21, 12:15-13:13, 20:5-8, 21:18-20, 23:1-24:11,
	26:22-27:18, 29:18-30:13, 33:2-3, 35:18-11, 36:22-37:1, 38:7-21, 39:2-
	41:20, 44:3-5, 45:10-19, 46:13-47:24, 48:12-25, 50:8-19, 56:2-7,
	56:16-22, 58:7-25, 63:13-23, 64:17-66:1, 67:3-68:6, 69:1-24, 71:11-
	72:23, 74:20-76:9, 80:8-19, 84:2-16, 88:2-19, 89:2-17, 90:16-91:22,
	94:14-95:18, 96:2-18, 97:2-22, 98:3-99:8, 99:9-100:18, 102:16-103:20,
	103:21-104:3, 104:10-105:9, 105:10-12, 106:4-107:9, 107:11-108:1,
	108:2-9,
Sonalolita Wilson pt.	148:16-25, 150:22-151:16, 152:1-7, 155:6-25, 157:1-164:11, 164:21-

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 12 of 69

II	170:13, 172:22-25, 174:1-8, 174:17-23, 175:13-25, 176:16-177:7, 177:11-21, 180:19-22, 182:14-183:8, 185:6-186:12, 189:7-190:19, 192:2-8, 192:25-193:6, 201:9-15, 205:1-22, 213:7-14, 213:18-22, 214:9-14, 217:5-25, 225:3-12, 238:19-239:11, 243:5-244:6, 248:11-24
Frank Perez	Plaintiff is in the process of obtaining his deposition transcript and will supplement at a later date.

Defendants anticipate reading depositions into the records and reserve the right to use all

depositions which have been conducted in this action due to witness unavailability, if allowed under

FRCP 32(a)(4)(B), to refresh recollection and/or to impeach a witness, as well as any other

permitted use under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Federal Rules of Evidence.

(f) Objections to Depositions:

(1) Plaintiff objects to Defendant USA's depositions as follows:

Plaintiff reserves the right to object to any particular portions of the deposition transcript(s), including, without limitation, if and/or when Defendant USA provides them.

(2) Plaintiff objects to Defendant DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's depositions as follows:

Deponent	Offered Testimony	Plaintiff's Objections
Liceth Demha	10:5-11:20, 15:7-8, 17:7-21, 20:9-13,	17:7 – 21 – Relevance
	20:20-25, 23:15-16, 24:11-16, 27:22-	20:20 – 25 – Relevance
	28:8, 28:24-31:7, 35:20-36:12, 40:14-16,	54:20 – 25 – Relevance
	47:14-19, 52:16-53:15, 54:20-25, 57:14-	
	23, 58:14-20, 59:23-60:5, 61:16-20	
Nakia McCloud	12:21-13:14, 24:14-25:1, 27:4-28:16,	24:14 – 18 – Relevance
	30:20-31:5, 32:8-34:11, 34:25-35:23,	30:20 – 31:5 – Speculation
	36:5-7, 39:8-47:20, 48:22-54:22, 55:4-	34:25 – 35:23 – Relevance
	56:13, 57:15-62:22, 65:3-72:6, 73:14-	
	75:25, 76:24-78:15, 80:5-18, 81:10-25,	
	83:17-85:6, 87:9-24, 89:15-25, 93:4-17,	
	96:9-96:14	
Sonalolita	8:2-14, 11:8-22, 13:2-13:14, 15:3-16:15,	27:7 – 28:23 – Relevance; mo
Wilson	18:5-19:7, 19:20-21:11, 21:18-22:13,	prejudicial than probative
	24:1-12, 27:7-29:18, 35:25-38:10, 38:24-	
	54:1, 59:14-24, 60:10-61:5, 65:5-66:20,	60:10 – 61:5 – Relevance;
	66:19-25, 67:10-12, 89:21-90:9, 90:20-	attorney client privilege; more
	91:8, 97:2-109:10, 112:24-113:4, 113:5-	prejudicial than probative
	113:13,119:8-119:13, 128:15-17, 131:3-	
	14, 136:14-137:2, 137:17-25,	
Babuk Ghuman	9:8-17, 9:18-11:7, 11:13-24, 15:14-25,	11:13 – 24 – Relevance
	16:1-7, 17:19-18:2, 21:9-22:24, 24:13-	

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP 6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 Phone: (702) 464-5000 | Fax: (702) 463-4440 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

	23, 27:16 - 28:25, 30:8 - 33:11, 34:3-19,	47:2 – 24 – Misrepresents fac
	35:1-41:9, 47:2-24, 48:7-18, 49:6-50:8,	evidence; speculation
	50:14-55:3, 60:1-23, 62:2-25, 63:8-14, 67:6-9, 68:19-69:2, 80:5-12, 87:15-19,	48:7 – 18 – Relevance; more
	91:14-23, 94:5-11, 100:9-18,112:11-25,	prejudicial than probative
	113:8-13	62:2 – 63:14 – Speculation;
		Relevance; Assumes facts no evidence
		112:11 – 25 – Misrepresents
		in evidence; speculation
		Plaintiff objects to any
		hypothetical questions not ba in evidence as to the causatio
		Plaintiff's injuries.
Duff Kaster	6:8-7:10, 7:11-22, 10:23-11:25, 15:23-	32:1 - 7 - Misrepresents the
	16:10, 18:12-19:1, 21:12-15,	witness' testimony; vague
	24:9-18, 28:4-7, 32:1-7	Plaintiff objects to any
		hypothetical questions not ba in evidence as to the causatio
		Plaintiff's injuries.
Robert Hinton	7:2-13, 9:6-16, 10:4 – 11:23, 12:17 –	
	13:1, 13:14-17:12, 18:21-19:22, 21:10-	
Mark Glyman	24, 23:1-9, 26:1-7, 28:17-29:21, 31:1-9, 6:3-7:25, 8:13-15, 10:1-11:24, 13:7-10,	13:7 – 10 – Relevance
	14:10-19, 16:11-17:9, 19:4-20:25, 21:8- 22:4, 24:4-9, 30:1-31:16, 37:20-25	14:10 – 19 – Relevance
	22.4, 24.4-9, 30.1-31.10, 37.20-23	
		Plaintiff objects to any hypothetical questions not ba
		in evidence as to the causatio
		Plaintiff's injuries.
Thomas Dunn	6:12-7:23, 9:14-22, 10:8-23, 12:2-7, 18:3-19:5, 19:13-20:16, 23:5-24:2,	18:3 – 19:5 – Relevance
	37:10-17, 42:8-43:24, 45:17-47:5, 50:3-	42:8 – 43:24 – Speculation;
	11, 60:3-21, 60:23-61:6,	improper hypothetical
		60:3 – 21 – Relevance
		Plaintiff objects to any
		hypothetical questions not bas

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP Anache Rd Ste 150 I as Vesas NV

case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 14 of 69

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP

6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 Phone: (702) 464-5000 | Fax: (702) 463-4440

1 2			in evidence as to the causation of Plaintiff's injuries.
3	Rick Chavez	5:7-16, 21:1-3, 26:4-6, 28:3-10, 40:15- 41:5, 44:3-45:8, 56:3-6,	
4		59:6-7, 61:10-62:6, 62:18-63:1, 64:5-20, 65:8-15, 67:4-68:25,	
5		69:1-5, 71:10-21, 72:2-14, 73:17-23,	
6		74:15-22, 77:5-12, 84:13-21, 85:1-17, 86:1-9, 88:16-17, 90:5-9, 96:4,	
7		105:4-5, 111:3-19, 114:16-115:22, 119:22-120:1, 120:20-121:2	
8	Kim Balogh	7:19-18:2, 12:4-13:8, 18:22-19:2, 24:9-25:9, 25:21-26:21, 28:7-13, 28:22-29:2,	
9		30:24-31:19, 32:14-33:23	10.14 0 1 D 1
10	David John Oliveri	7:25-9:25, 10:14-21, 11:12-24, 12:1- 13:12, 14:9-15:6, 15:7-18, 15:23 16:3,	10:14 – 21 – Relevance 18:4 – 19:3 – Relevance
11		16:4-24, 17:17-21, 18:4-19:3, 20:1-21, 21:2-22:16, 23:18-24:25, 25:4-26:24,	27:3 – 28:10 – Speculation 42:15 – 43:2 – Speculation
12		27:3-28:10, 29:24-30:14, 31:3-32:14,	
13		32:22-33:20, 34:4-36:1, 36:7-37:14, 39:1-21, 39:23-42:1, 42:15-43:2, 44:1-5,	67:3 – 68:13 – Relevance; violation of the collateral source
14		44:7-45:7, 45:19-46:5, 47:3-23, 51:1-16,	rule
15		55:19-56:8, 57:21-58:4, 58:10-20, 58:21 59:22, 60:1-9, 60:14-61:22, 64:4-22,	77:22 – 79:23 – Speculation
16		65:25-66:16, 66:17-67:2, 67:3 68:13, 68:14-22, 68:23-69:1, 69:18-70:13,	Plaintiff objects to any
17		71:11-14, 77:22-79:23	hypothetical questions not based in evidence as to the causation of
18			Plaintiff's injuries.
19	Robert Simmons	7:15-19, 8:6-8, 11:7-13, 13:10-15, 14:9- 13, 14:25-15:2, 16:6-17:1, 17:9-16,	24:1 – 25:2 – Speculation
20	Similions	18:12-19:11, 20:4-20:22, 21:3-6, 24:1-	29:20 – 32:17 – Speculation;
21		25:2, 26:10 27:8, 28:3-23, 29:20-30:18, 31:5-25, 32:4-17, 34:25-36:7, 36:8-25,	misstates facts in evidence; improper hypothetical
22		37:1-8, 38:24-39:17, 41:10-25	36:8 – 25 – Speculation
23			41:10 – 25 – Relevance
24	Iconvinder	9.10 21 12.15 12.12 20.5 9 21.19 20	62.12.02 and 64.17 66.1
25	Jaswinder Grover	8:19-21, 12:15-13:13, 20:5-8, 21:18-20, 23:1-24:11,	63:13-23 and 64:17 – 66:1 – Relevance; speculation
26		26:22-27:18, 29:18-30:13, 33:2-3, 35:18- 11, 36:22-37:1, 38:7-21, 39:2-41:20,	
27		44:3-5, 45:10-19, 46:13-47:24, 48:12-25, 50:8-19, 56:2-7, 56:16-22, 58:7-25,	
28	L	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1

¢	Case 2:18-cv-012	241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/	20/22 Page 15 of 69	
1 2		63:13-23, 64:17-66:1, 67:3-68:6, 69:1- 24, 71:11-72:23, 74:20-76:9, 80:8-19, 84:2-16, 88:2-19, 89:2-17, 90:16-91:22,		
3		94:14-95:18, 96:2-18, 97:2-22, 98:3-		
4		99:8, 99:9-100:18, 102:16-103:20, 103:21-104:3, 104:10-105:9, 105:10-12,		
5	Sonalolita	106:4-107:9, 107:11-108:1, 108:2-9, 148:16-25, 150:22-151:16, 152:1-7,	157:1 – 164:11 – Relevance	
6	Wilson pt. II	155:6-25, 157:1-164:11, 164:21-170:13,	164:21 – 170:13 – Relevance	
		172:22-25, 174:1-8, 174:17-23, 175:13-25, 176:16-177:7, 177:11-21, 180:19-22,	185:6 – 186:12 – Relevance 189:7 – 190:19 – Relevance	
7		182:14-183:8, 185:6-186:12, 189:7-		
8		190:19, 192:2-8, 192:25-193:6, 201:9- 15, 205:1-22, 213:7-14, 213:18-22,	192:25 – 193:6 – Relevance; hearsay	
9		214:9-14, 217:5-25, 225:3-12, 238:19-		
10		239:11, 243:5-244:6, 248:11-24	201:21 – 24 Relevance 205:1 – 22 – Relevance	
11				
12	(3) Defendant US	(3) Defendant USA objects to plaintiff's depositions as follows:		
13	a. Plaintiff WILSON's depositions: All testimony.			
14	b. David John Oliveri's deposition: All testimony; including, without limitation, to any			
15	testimony related to David John Oliveri's life care plan and future medical treatments as struck by			
16	the Court. See ECF No. 90.			
17	c. To the extent Plaintiff intends to call Defendant USA's expert witnesses and present their			
18	deposition testimony in her case-in-chief, Defendant USA objects to: All Plaintiff's proposed			
19	testimony of Defendant USA's expert witnesses; including, without limitation, to Rick Chavez and			
20	Kimberly Balough's testimony.			
21	Defendar	Defendant, USA reserves the right to object to any particular portions of the other deposition		
22	transcripts, inclu	transcripts, including, without limitation, those provided by Plaintiff and Defendants DEHMA-		
23	SANTIAGO and	SANTIAGO and DEMHA's inclusions in this order. Furthermore, USA joins as to co-defendant		
24	DEMHA-SANT	DEMHA-SANTIAGO's objections to Plaintiff's depositions as noted in subsection (4) below. USA		
25	further objects to the extent that either Plaintiff or co-defendants seek to introduce or use any			
26	deposition transcript at trial beyond that allowed under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and/or the			

Federal Rules of Evidence.

28

27

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP 6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 Phone: (702) 464-5000 | Fax: (702) 463-4440

Page 15 of 39

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 16 of 69

(4) The United States objects to Defendants DEMHA-SANTIAGO and DEMHA's deposition page,

2 line designations as follows:

1

Deponent	Offered Testimony	
Liceth Demha	10:5-11:20 (relevance; prejudicial; calls for speculation; incomplete	
	hypothetical; expert opinion)	
	20:20-25 (relevance; prejudicial; character evidence)	
Nakia McCloud	12:21-13:14 (relevance; prejudicial; calls for speculation	
	incomplete hypothetical; expert opinion) 27:4-28:16 (relevance)	
	30:20-31:5 (relevance)	
	34:25-35:23 (relevance; prejudicial; character evidence)	
	36:5-7 (relevance, confusion of issues)	
	39:8-47:20 (relevance; legal conclusion)	
	55:4-56:13 (relevance; prejudice; hearsay; best evidence rule)	
	57:15-62:22 (relevance; prejudice; hearsay; best evidence rule)	
	76:24-78:15 (relevance; hearsay; best evidence rule)	
	80:5-18 (relevance; prejudice; legal conclusion; best evidence rule)	
	81:10-25 (relevance; prejudice; legal conclusion; calls fo	
	speculation)	
	83:17-85:6 (relevance; prejudice; hypothetical to lay witness; lega	
	conclusion; calls for speculation)	
Sonalolita Wilson	89:15-25 (relevance; prejudice; testimony by counsel)24:1-12 (legal conclusion, expert opinion)	
Soliaiolita wiisoli	119:8-119:13 (hearsay)	
Babuk Ghuman	9:18-11:7 (relevance)	
Dabak Onuman	15:14-25 (relevance)	
	62:2-25 (relevance; best evidence rule)	
	67:6-9 (relevance; best evidence rule)	
	87:15-19 (relevance)	
	113:8-13 (relevance)	
Duff Kaster	6:8-7:10 (relevance)	
	10:23-11:25 (relevance)	
Robert Hinton	13:14-17:12 (object to 16:9-16 on grounds of relevance, prejudice	
	self-serving hearsay, legal conclusion)	
Mark Glyman	6:3-7:25 (relevance)	
	10:1-11:24 (relevance; best evidence rule);	
	13:7-10 (relevance; prejudicial)	
Thomas Dunn	24:4-9 (relevance; foundation)	
Thomas Dunn Rick Chavez	60:3-21 (relevance; hearsay; counsel testifying)	
KICK CHAVEZ	5:7-16 (relevance; foundation; best evidence rule) 28:3-10 (relevance)	
	40:15-41:5 (relevance)	
	44:3-45:8 (relevance; best evidence rule)	
	56:3-6 (relevance)	

case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 17 of 69

10

11

d., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 1-5000 | Fax: (702) 463-4440 MAINOR WIRTH, LLP

	59:6-7 (incomplete hypothetical; relevance)
	64:5-20 (testimony by counsel)
Kim Balogh	30:24-31:19 (relevance; incomplete hypothetical; foundation)
	32:14-33:23 (incomplete/improper hypothetical; foundation)
David John Olivieri	11:12-24 (relevance)
	15:23 16:3 (relevance; foundation; 702)
	34:4-36:1 (relevance; speculation)
	69:18-70:13 (relevance; foundation; 702)
	77:22-79:23 (relevance; foundation; 702)
Robert Simmons	7:15-19 (relevance)
	11:7-13 (relevance)
	17:9-16 (relevance)
	24:1-25:2 (hearsay)
Jaswinder Grover	21:18-20 (relevance)
	44:3-5 (relevance; foundation)
Sonalolita Wilson pt. II	243:5-244:6 (hearsay; legal conclusion)

(5) Defendant DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA object to plaintiff's depositions as follows:

Deponent	Offered Testimony
Liceth Demha	10:24-11:20, (calls for speculation; incomplete hypothetical; expert opinion
	21:1-19, (relevance; prejudicial)
	22:18-23:4, (relevance)
	27:22-28:8, (relevance)
	28:24-31:16, (relevance; assumption)
	35:20-49:24, (relevance; expert opinion)
	57:14-62:4 (relevance; expert opinion)
Nakia McCloud	39:8-47:20, (expert opinion)
	83:17-85:6, (incomplete hypothetical; calls for speculation; expert opinion)
	92:13-93:19, (calls for legal conclusion; expert opinion)
Sonalolita	13:2-13:22, (relevance, prejudicial, expert opinion)
Wilson	19:8-19:14, (relevance)
	23:9-26:10, (expert opinion)
	38:24-40:25, (expert opinion)
	42:5-54:1, (relevance, expert opinion)
	54:9-60:2, (relevance, expert opinion, best evidence rule)
	71:6-75:23, (expert opinion, best evidence rule)
	80:15-82:16, (relevance, prejudicial)
	86:8-88:3, (relevance, expert opinion, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	88:17-89:15, (relevance, expert opinion, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	89:25-90:13, (relevance, expert opinion, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	93:8-96:10, (relevance, expert opinion, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	102:14-103:1, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	105:18-106:18, (relevance, prejudicial)
	107:11-109:10, (relevance, prejudicial)
	109:25-111:12, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)

Page 17 of 39

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 18 of 69

	112:19-119:4, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	125:20-135:15, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	136:5-138:13 (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
Baduk Ghuman	18:14 – 20:6, (relevance, prejudicial)
	21:9 – 22:22, (relevance, prejudicial)
	27:16 – 28:25, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	35:1-41:9, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	44:9–49:5, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	50:14-55:3, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	55:5-56:1, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	56:25-58:7, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	59:2-60:23, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	60:24-64:15, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	64:16-67:9, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	68:6-71:9, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	75:11-76:25, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	82:7-84:5, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	84:11-88:18, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	89:3-91:16, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	94:19-96:12, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	100:6-103:25, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	108:7-110:22, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	111:16-112:25, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	113:21-115:25 (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
Duff Kaster	15:3-15:22, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	21:12-23:11, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	24:9-25:1, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	25:16-26:13, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	26:24-27:12, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	28:4-29:24, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	32:21-33:23, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	34:6-34:16, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	35:1-35:18(relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
Robert Hinton	21:10-23:19, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	24:12-25:12, (relevance, prejudicial, expert opinion, best evidence rule)
	26:1-30:14, (relevance, prejudicial, expert opinion, best evidence rule)
	31:1-32:2, (relevance, prejudicial, expert opinion, best evidence rule)
	33:9-40:23(relevance, prejudicial, expert opinion, best evidence rule)
Mark Glyman	11:25-12:21, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	14:10-15:1, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	19:1-22:4, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	22:18-23:16, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	24:4-31:16, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	33:3-33:20, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	34:13-37:13, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	37:20-41:16, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
1	41:22-43:9, (relevance, prejudicial, expert opinion, best evidence rule)

Page 18 of 39

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 19 of 69

	NV 89148	-4440
TRTH, LLP	150, Las Vegas,	Fax: (702) 463
MAINOR WIRTH, LLP	6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148	Phone: (702) 464-5000 Fax: (702) 463-4440
	6018	

Thomas Dunn	44:1-44:23(relevance, prejudicial, expert opinion, best evidence rule)
Thomas Dunn	25:4-25:22, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	26:18-31:19, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	33:20-35:10, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	35:17-39:10, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	39:21-44:20, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 48:25-50:11, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	52:20-55:5, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	56:7-57:7, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 57:20-60:2, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	60:23-61:6, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	61:21-62:20, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	63:19-66:3, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
D' 1 Cl	66:14-67:19(relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
Rick Chavez	10:16-11:6, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	20:6-20:18, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	22:21-24:22, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	25:3-25:14, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	29:16-31:21, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	41:3-42:19, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	45:9-46:1, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	47:23-50:5, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	51:1-53:9, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	59:13-60:21, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	63:14-63:25, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	64:24-70:10, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	71:10-72:24, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	73:9-74:14, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	75:25-76:17, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	77:17-78:12, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	79:1-81:14, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	82:8-83:2, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	84:13-86:9, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	87:6-87:24, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	94:19-96:9, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	102:21-103:19, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	106:7-107:10, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	108:17-109:18, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	110:1-112:2, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	114:9-118:17(relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
Kim Balogh	12:24-14:4, (relevance, prejudicial, speculative, best evidence rule)
	18:3-19:2, (relevance, prejudicial, speculative, best evidence rule)
	19:11-20:24, (relevance, prejudicial, speculative, best evidence rule)
	22:4-25:20, (relevance, prejudicial, speculative, best evidence rule)
	26:22-29:15, (relevance, prejudicial, speculative, best evidence rule)
	30:9-33:5, (relevance, prejudicial, speculative, best evidence rule)
	33:14-33:23 (relevance, prejudicial, speculative, best evidence rule)

Ca	ase 2:18-cv-01241	-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 20 of 69
1	David John	11.24 14.2 (malayan as much disial bast suiden as mula)
1	David John Olivieri	11:24-14:2, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 14:14-15:15, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
2	Onvien	16:25-17:16, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		20:1-20:16, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		24:4-24:25, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		26:2-26:24, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		28:3-28:10, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		30:3-30:17, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		31:14-32:4, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		32:17-36:1, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		36:7-37:14, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		37:22-42:1, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		42:15-43:15, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		44:2-45:7, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		49:7-50:7, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		51:8-51:16, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		52:19-53:5, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 53:18-54:14, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		55:19-57:12, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		57:21-58:20, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		61:3-62:3, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		64:14-64:22, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		65:11-66:21, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		71:8-73:5, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		77:6-77:13, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		77:19-78:5(relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	Robert Simmons	13:3-13:15, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		14:24-15:4, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		19:21-20:14, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		23:3-25:10, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		28:3-29:11, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		30:6-31:9, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 34:25-37:8, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		38:24-39:22, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		41:10-42:14(relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	Jaswinder	11:23-13:13, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
	Grover	17:6-17:22, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		20:5-21:8, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		21:21-22:13, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		23:1-24:11, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		25:2-27:18, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		29:18-31:3, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		32:3-33:1, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		35:18-38:21, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		39:2-41:20, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		43:2-43:6, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
		44:16-48:25, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule)
3		

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP Anache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV

0	Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 21 of 69	
$ \begin{array}{c} 1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\end{array} $	49:1-49:25, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 50:8-52:5, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 53:3-55:14, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 62:10-64:7, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 66:2-68:17, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 70:4-74:6, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 70:4-74:5, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 70:7-78:15, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 80:3-81:25, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 80:3-81:25, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 80:3-81:25, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 80:4:11-85:3, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 80:4:14-96:18, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 94:6-94:13, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 94:7-105:16, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 94:7-105:16, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 94:7-105:16, (relevance, prejudicial, best evidence rule) 106:6-111:21(relevance, prejudicial, expert opinion, best evidence rule) 106:6-111:21(relevance, prejudicial, expert opinion, best evidence rule) 11 184:2-185:5, (relevance, prejudicial, expert opinion, best evidence rule) 19:15-192:8, (relevance, prejudicial, expert opinion, best evidence rule) 19:15-192:8, (r	
20 21	VII.	
22	The following witnesses may be called by the parties at trial:	
23	(a) Plaintiff intends to call the following witnesses at trial:	
24	1. Plaintiff, SONALOLITA WILSON	
25	c/o /o Bradley S. Mainor, Esq. Joseph J. Wirth, Esq.	
26	Ash Marie Blackburn, Esq. Joseph W. Guindy, Esq.	
27	MAINOR WIRTH, LLP	
28	6018 S. Fort Apache Road, Ste. 150	
	Page 21 of 39	

0	Case 2:18-cv-(01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 22 of 89
1		Las Vegas, NV 89148 (702) 464-5000
2	2.	Nakia McCloud
3		c/o United States Attorney's Office 501 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 1100,
4		(702) 388-6336
5	3.	Bobby Warren
6		c/o United States Attorney's Office 501 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 1100
7		(702) 388-6336
8	4.	The FRCP 30(b)(6) Witness for the United States of America
9		c/o United States Attorney's Office 501 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 1100
10		(702) 388-6336
11	5.	Defendant, Liceth Demha-Santiago c/o the Law Offices of Denise McCurry
12		7251 West Lake Mead Blvd. #349
13		Las Vegas, NV 89128 (702) 408-3805
14	6.	Defendant, Juan Demha,
15		c/o the Law Offices of Denise McCurry 7251 West Lake Mead Blvd. #349, Las Vegas, NV 89128, (702) 408-3805
16	_	
17	7.	Calvin Hayes Address and phone number unknown
18	8.	Geraldine Gray
19		1232 Crafton Ave. #B Menton, CA 92359
20		(909) 562-625
21	9.	Latasha Wilson
22		3027 N. Orange Ave. Rialto, CA 92377
23		(909) 543-5163
24	10.	Tamika Williams
25 26		6666 W. Washington Ave. Bldg 4, Apt. 123
26 27		Las Vegas, NV 89107, (702) 472-4134
27		
28		
		Page 22 of 39

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV

(Case 2:18-cv-(01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 23 of 89
1 2 3	11.	Makita Cooper 2093. Guthrie, Apt. C Highland, CA 92404 (909) 684-1444
4 5 6	12.	Robert Lee Hinton 98 S. Martin Luther King, Apt. 234 Las Vegas, NV 89106 (810) 618-1344
7 8	13.	Michael Tucker 98 S. Martin Luther King, Apt. 234 Las Vegas, NV 89106 (503) 209-9954
9 10 11	14.	Candice Hinton 98 S. Martin Luther King, Apt. 234 Las Vegas, NV 89106 phone number unknown
12 13 14 15	15.	Officer Ireland, Badge # 6044 Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, 400 S. Martin Luther King Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 828-3111
16 17 18	16.	Officer Swan, Badge # 7303 Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department 400 S. Martin Luther King Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 828-3111
19 20 21 22	17.	Jaswinder Grover, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable able Nevada Spine Clinic 7401 Smoke Ranch Rd. #150 Las Vegas, NV 89128 (702) 320-8111
23242526	18.	Babuk Ghuman, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable able Nevada Spine Clinic 7140 Smoke Ranch Rd. #150 Las Vegas, NV 89128 (702) 320-8111
27 28	19.	Mark Glyman, M.D., DDS, FACS
		Page 23 of 39

(Case 2:18-cv-(01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 24 of 69
1 2		FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable able Mark Glyman, M.D., DDS, FACS
3		1775 Village Center Cir, #150 Las Vegas, NV, 89113 (702) 507-5555
4	20	
5	20.	Thomas Dunn, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable able
6		Desert Orthopedic Center 2800 E. Dessert Inn Rd., Ste 100
7		Las Vegas, NV 89121 (702) 731-1616
8	21.	Don Nobis, MSPT
9		FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable able Don Nobis Physical Therapy
10		1950 E. Desert inn Rd.,
11		Las Vegas, NV 89169 (702) 735-1501
12	22.	Louie Jan Singson, RN
13		Care Pro Home Health 5280 S. Eastern Ave, G2
14		Las Vegas, NV 89119 (702) 430-9517
15	22	
16	23.	Philip M. Paleracio, DDS Dental Center of NV, 5280 S. Eastern Ave, G2
17		Las Vegas, NV 89119 (702) 430-9517
18 19	24.	David Oliveri, M.D.
20		851 S. Rampart Dr., # 115, Las Vegas, NV 89145
20		(702) 778-9300
22	25.	Ira Spector, M.S., C.R.C.
23		3440 E. Russell Rd., #208 Las Vegas, NV 89120,
24		(702) 214-4294
25	26.	Samuel Terry Exhibit A
26		P.O. Box 530111 Henderson, NV 89053
27	27	
28	27.	Robert Simmons
		Page 24 of 39

¢	Case 2:18-cv-0	1241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 25 of 69
1		1911 E. Gary Way
2		Phoenix, AZ 85042
3	28.	Michael Freeman Med Dr. Ph.D., Forensic Research & Analysis
4		4256 NW 10th Ave. # 306
5		Portland, OR 97209
6	29.	Frank Perez, Ph.D., 4435 N. First St., #205
7		Livermore, CA
8	30.	Kimberly E. Balough, MSBE BiCoastal Forensics LLC
9		21143 Hawthrone Boulevard, Suite 415
10		Torrance, CA 90503 (480) 540-6213
11	31.	James G. Lowe, MD, FACS
12		Lowe-Greenwood-Zerbo Spinal Associates 1999 New Road, Suite B
13		Linwood, NJ, 08221 (609) 601-6363
14	22	
15	32.	Mark Remas, MA, CRC, ABVE The Remas Group
16		7710 Balboa Avenue, Suite 218-H San Diego, CA, 92111
17		(858) 560-6733
18	33.	Warren M. Torchinsky, DDS 223 East Main Street
19 20		Maple Shade, NJ, 08052
20 21		(856) 667-7900
21	34.	Thomas F. Cargill, PhD, LTD, 65 Bennington Court,
22		Reno NV, 89511 (702) 849-1588
23	a)	Plaintiff may call the following witnesses at trial if the need arises (the
25	<i>u</i>)	number of witnesses on this list that may be called heavily depends on Defendant's position as to the admissibility of Plaintiff's medical records):
26		-
27	1.	Erica Johnson, the FRCP 30(b)(6) Witness(es) and/or the Person Most Knowledgeable Records for Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
28		400 S. Martin Luther King Blvd.
		Page 25 of 39

(Case 2:18-cv-C	01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 26 of 89
1		Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 828-3111
2	2.	Kimberly E. Balough, MSBE
3		BiCoastal Forensics LLC 21143 Hawthrone Boulevard, Suite 415
4 5		Torrance, CA 90503 (480) 540-6213
6	3.	James G. Lowe, MD, FACS
7		Lowe-Greenwood-Zerbo Spinal Associates 1999 New Road, Suite B
8		Linwood, NJ, 08221 (609) 601-6363
9		
10	4.	Mark Remas, MA, CRC, ABVE The Remas Group
11		7710 Balboa Avenue, Suite 218-H San Diego, CA, 92111
12		(858) 560-6733
13	5.	Warren M. Torchinsky, DDS 223 East Main Street
14		Maple Shade, NJ, 08052
15		(856) 667-7900
16	6.	Thomas F. Cargill, PhD, LTD, 65 Bennington Court,
17		Reno NV, 89511 (702) 849-1588
18		
19	7.	Rick Chavez, MD Pain and Addiction Integrated Network, Inc.,
20		4733 Torrance Boulevard, Suite 625 Torrance, CA, 90506
21		(323) 833-8269
22	8.	Julie Shaked, Special Field Claims Representative
23		Farmers Insurance Company P.O. Box 268994
24		Oklahoma City, OK, 73126-8994 (800) 435-7764
25	9.	Jason Regester, Fleet Services Representative General Services Administration
26		Phoenix Fleet Management Center
27		GSA Fleet, Zone 4, 702-605-9892
28		
		Page 26 of 39

(Case 2:18-cv-(01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 27 of 69
_		
1	10.	David Holland
2 3		c/o United States Attorney's Office 501 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 1100
3 4		(702) 388-6336
5	11.	Jared Robbins c/o United States Attorney's Office
6		501 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 1100 (702) 388-6336
7	12.	Glen Banks, EMT
8		FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Las Vegas Fire Rescue
9		500 N. Casino Center Blvd., Lane Las Vegas, NV 89101
10	10	-
11	13.	Carlos Maltiz, Advanced EMT FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable
12		Las Vegas Fire Rescue 500 N. Casino Center Blvd., Lane
13		Las Vegas, NV 89101
14	14.	Jefferson D. Bracey, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable able
15 16		Rec EMP or Clark, (collectively Dr. Bracey), 901 Rancho Dr., #207, Las Vegas, NV 89106, (702) 385-0890
17	15.	Sandra Lee, MD
18		FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable able for Desert Radiologist
19		2020 Palomino Ln., Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 759-8600
20	16	
21	16.	Van Nguyen, MD, FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable
22		Desert Radiologist 2020 Palomino Ln.
23		Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 759-8600
24	17.	Brent Yamishita, P.T., D.P.T
25	17.	FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable
26		Better Back Physical Therapy 1740 Smoke Ranch Road
27		Las Vegas, Nevada 89128
28		
		Page 27 of 39

0	Case 2:18-cv-(01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 28 of 69
1 2 3	18.	Magdalen Marron, PTA FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Better Back Physical Therapy 1740 Smoke Ranch Road Las Vegas, Nevada 89128
4 5 6 7	19.	Nicole Hoffman, PT. MSPT, ART Practitioner FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Better Back Physical Therapy 1740 Smoke Ranch Road Las Vegas, Nevada 89128
8 9 10 11	20.	Monique A. Mogensen, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Records for American Radiology 6460 Medical Center Dr., #150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 (702) 868-278
12 13 14 15	21.	Michael B. Zlatkin, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Records for American Radiology 6460 Medical Center Dr., #150 Las Vegas, NV 89148 (702) 868-2781
16 16 17 18 19	22.	Matt Treinen, D.O. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable for Pueblo Medical Imaging 8551 W. Lake Mead Blvd., #150 Las Vegas, NV 89128 (702) 228-003
20 21 22 23	23.	Raj Agrawal, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Desert Radiology 2020 Palomino Lane Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 759-8600
24 25 26 27 28	24.	Janet Bauman, Ph.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable LF Mortillaro, Ph.D., LTD 501 S. Rancho Dr. #F37, Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 388-9403
20		Page 28 of 39

(Case 2:18-cv-(01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 29 of 69
1 2 3 4	25.	Duff Kaster, D.D.S. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Abbey Dental 4408 S. Eastern Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89119 (702) 731-5700
5 6 7 8	26.	John Lyons, PT FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Lyons Home Care 600 S. Tonapah Dr. #230 Las Vegas, NV 89106-8912 (702) 476-0222
9 10 11 12	27.	Damon Elliot, PTA FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Lyons Home Care 600 S. Tonapah Dr. #230 Las Vegas, NV 89106-8912 (702) 476-0222
13 14 15 16	28.	Apichai Haisupa, PT, FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Lyons Home Care 600 S. Tonapah Dr. #230 Las Vegas, NV 89106-8912 (702) 476-0222
17 18 19 20	29.	Danny Thai, RPh FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable LienRx 2600 W. Sahara Ave. Las Vegas NV 89102 (702) 257-2620
21222324	30.	James Peterson, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Records for Desert Radiology 2020 Palomino Lane, Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 759-8600
25 26 27 28	31.	Sukhjinder Singh, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Desert Radiology 2020 Palomino Lane, Las Vegas, NV 89106
		Page 29 of 39

		D1241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 30 of 69
1 2		(702) 759-8600
2 3	32.	David Plunkett, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable
4		Records for Desert Radiology 2020 Palomino Lane,
5		Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 759-8600
6	33.	The FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable
7		PayLater Pharmacy 552 E. Charleston Blvd.
8		Las Vegas, NV 89104
9	34.	Daniel Thai RPh FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable
10		LienRx 26000 W. Sahara Ave. # 120
11		Las Vegas, NV 89102
12	35.	Lori Ortale, RPh FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable
13		Las Vegas Pharmacy
14		2600 W. Sahara Ave. # 120 Las Vegas, NV 89102
15	36.	Michael Lundberg, D.O.
16		FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Mountain View Hospital
17		3100 N. Tenaya Way Las Vegas, NV 89128
18		(702) 962-5000
19 20	37.	Amit Valera, D.O.
20 21		FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Mountains Edge Hospital
21 22		8656 W. Patrick Ln. Las Vegas, NV 89148
22		(702) 777-7100
23	38.	FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or the Person Most Knowledgeable Valley Hospital
25		620 Shadow Lane Las Vegas, NV 89106
26		(702) 388-4000
27	39.	Huy N. Nguyen, M.D.
28		FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable
		Page 30 of 39

(Case 2:18-cv-(01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 31 of 69
1 2 3		Valley Hospital 620 Shadow Lane Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 853-3000
4 5	40.	Badreldin A. Ibrahim, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Smoke Ranch Specialists
6 7 8 9	41.	Magalen Page, PTA FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation 5850 S. Rainbow Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89118 (702) 470-1102
10 11 12	42.	Amir Aftab, M.D FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation 5850 S. Rainbow Blvd.
13 14 15	43.	Las Vegas, NV 89118 (702) 470-1102 Ali Badday, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable
16 17		American Radiology 7140 Smoke Ranch Rd. Ste. B Las Vegas, NV 89128 (702) 868-2781
18 19 20	44.	Dr. Badday FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Precision Diagnostic Imaging/Upright MRI 6460 Medical Center Drive, Suite 150 Las Vegas, Nevada 89148
21222324	45.	Michael Abiog, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable American Radiology/Precision Diagnostic Imaging 7140 Smoke Ranch Rd. Ste. B Las Vegas, NV 89128
25 26 27 28	46.	 (702) 868-2781 Ken Hughes, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Desert Anesthesiologists, Inc. 6655 W. Sahara Ave. #B200
20		Page 31 of 39

(Case 2:18-cv-(01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 32 of 69
1 2 3 4 5 6	47.	Las Vegas, NV 89146 (702) 933-3999 Christopher Milford, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Christopher M. Milford, M.D. 2585 Montessouri St., #100 Las Vegas, NV 89117 (702) 272-0694 Danny Thai
7 8 9		FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or the Person Most Knowledgeable Specialty Pharmacy 241 N. Buffalo Dr. # 150 Las Vegas, NV 89145
10 11 12 13	49.	Daniel T. Shiode Ph.D., ABPP FRCP 30(b)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Shiode Psychotherapy, Inc. 501 S. Rancho Dr. , Ste I-64 Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 384-4110
14 15 16 17	50.	Russell Shah, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or the Person Most Knowledgeable Radar Medical Group 2628 W. Charleston Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89102 (702) 644-0600
18 19 20 21	51.	Michael I. Rothman, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Records for Opensided MRI 600 Rancho Dr. # 101, Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 932-2740
22 23 24 25	52.	Keith Lewis, M.D. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or the Person Most Knowledgeable Opensided MRI 600 Rancho Dr. # 101 Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 932-2740
26 27 28	53.	Decorah Perkins, NP. FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or the Person Most Knowledgeable Grand Desert Psychiatric Services
		Page 32 of 39

¢	Case 2:18-cv-0	01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 33 of 69
1 2		2021 S. Jones Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89146 (702) 202-0099
3	54.	Anita Rich, M.D.
4		FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Precision Diagnostic Imaging
5		7140 Smoke Ranch Rd Ste. B Las Vegas,NV 89128
6		(702) 868-2781
7	55.	Simon Farrow, M.D.
8		FRCP 30(b0(6) witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Monitoring Associates
9 10		9811 W. Charleston Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89117
10		(833) 664-6342
12	56.	Craig Carroll, D.O. NRCP 30(b0(6) witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable
13		Monitoring Associates 9811 W. Charleston Blvd.,
14		Las Vegas, NV 89117 (833) 664-6342
15	57.	Zahld Hamid, M.D
16	57.	FRCP 30(b0(6) witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Dr. Hamid
17		9811 W. Charleston Blvd.
18		Las Vegas, NV 89117, (833) 664-6342
19	58.	Mike Phillips
20		FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Next Step Medical
21		8285 W. Arby Ave. Ste. 155 Las Vegas, NV 89113
22	59.	Demetrice Davis, M.D.
23 24		FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or the Person Most Knowledgeable Red Rock Radiology Associates
24 25		7130 Smoke Ranch Rd STE 101
26		Las Vegas, Nevada 89128
27	60.	Ronald F Sauer, Jr., DO FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or the Person Most Knowledgeable
28		Red Rock Radiology Associates
		Page 33 of 39
		1 ugo 55 01 57

(Case 2:18-cv-(01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 34 of 69
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 65. 66. 67.	 D1241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 34 of 69 7130 Smoke Ranch Rd STE 101 Las Vegas, Nevada 89128 Edward Sisson, CPO FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or the Person Most Knowledgeable Prove Partners, LLC, Prosthetic Center of Excellence 2047 West Charleston Blvd Suite 100 Las Vegas, NV 89102 Dawn Neilson, CFom FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Prove Partners, LLC, Prosthetic Center of Excellence 2047 West Charleston Blvd Suite 100 Las Vegas, NV 89102 Dawn Neilson, CFom FRCP 30(b)(6) Witness, and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Prove Partners, LLC, Prosthetic Center of Excellence 2047 West Charleston Blvd Suite 100 Las Vegas, NV 89102 FRCP 30(b)(6) witness, and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Dental/Southern Nevada General Dentistry Prada, PPLC, 2250 S. Rancho Dr., #205, Las Vegas, NV 89102 Mark Lawrence, RTP FRCP 30(B)(6) Witness and/or Person Most Knowledgeable Don Nobis Physical Therapy 1950 E. Desert inn Rd., Las Vegas, NV 89169 (702) 735-1501 Plaintiff reserves the right to call any witnesses identified in Defendants' witness list and named during the course of discovery; Plaintiff reserves the right to call rebuttal and/or impeachment witnesses at trial; Plaintiff reserves the right to call any of Defendants' experts as witnesses. dant, USA, objects to the vast number of witnesses and potential witnesses provided
21 22	Defen	idant, USA, objects to the vast number of witnesses and potential witnesses provided
 23 24 25 26 27 28 	30(b)(6) with Furthermore, USA reserves opinions that	above. In addition, Defendant, USA objects to the designation of a Fed. R. Civ. P. ness as that rule applies to deposition testimony and not testimony related to trial. Plaintiff fails to list specific topics to be covered by any 30(b)(6) witness. Defendant is all rights of objections to testimonies at trial including but not limited to any expert were not timely disclosed in discovery, lack foundation, and/or are not relevant and <i>e.g.</i> , Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2), 37(c)(1), <i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm.</i> , <i>Inc.</i> , 509 U.S.

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 12& Filed 05/20/22 Page 35 of 69

1	579 (1993) and its progeny. Defendant, USA, also objects to testimony by any witness that was not			
2	disclosed during the discovery period or whose testimony was already excluded by the Court,			
3	including Dr. Oliveri.			
4				
5	(a) Defendant USA's Witnesses			
6	 Nakia McCloud c/o United States Attorney's Office 			
7	501 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 1100, (702) 388-6336			
8	2. Plaintiff, SONALOLITA WILSON			
9	c/o /o Bradley S. Mainor, Esq.			
10	Joseph J. Wirth, Esq. Ash Marie Blackburn, Esq.			
11	Joseph W. Guindy, Esq. MAINOR WIRTH, LLP			
12	6018 S. Fort Apache Road, Ste. 150			
13	Las Vegas, NV 89148 (702) 464-5000			
14	3. Defendant, Liceth Demha-Santiago			
15	c/o the Law Offices of Denise McCurry 7251 West Lake Mead Blvd. #349			
16	Las Vegas, NV 89128			
17	(702) 408-3805			
18	 4. Defendant, Juan Demha, c/o the Law Offices of Denise McCurry 			
19	7251 West Lake Mead Blvd. #349, Las Vegas, NV 89128,			
20	(702) 408-3805			
21 5. Kimberly E. Balough, MSBE	5. Kimberly E. Balough, MSBE			
22	BiCoastal Forensics LLC 21143 Hawthrone Boulevard, Suite 415			
23	Torrance, CA 90503 (480) 540-6213			
24				
25	6. Rick Chavez, MD Pain and Addiction Integrated Network, Inc.,			
26	4733 Torrance Boulevard, Suite 625 Torrance, CA, 90506			
27	(323) 833-8269			
28				

	(ase 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 36 of 89
	1 2 3 4	 7. James G. Lowe, MD, FACS Lowe-Greenwood-Zerbo Spinal Associates 1999 New Road, Suite B Linwood, NJ, 08221 (609) 601-6363
	5	 8. Mark Remas, MA, CRC, ABVE The Remas Group 7710 Balboa Avenue, Suite 218-H
	6 7	San Diego, CA, 92111 (858) 560-6733
6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 Phone: (702) 464-5000 Fax: (702) 463-4440	8 9	9. Warren M. Torchinsky, DDS 223 East Main Street Maple Shade, NJ, 08052 (856) 667-7900
	 10 11 12 13 	10. Thomas F. Cargill, PhD, LTD, 65 Bennington Court, Reno NV, 89511 (702) 849-1588
0, Las V(ax: (702	13 14	Defendant, USA, reserves the right to call any witnesses identified in Plaintiff's witness list and named during the course of discovery;
the Rd., Ste. 15() 464-5000 F	15	11. Defendant reserves the right to call rebuttal and/or impeachment witnesses at trial;
	16 17	12. Defendant reserves the right to call any of Plaintiff's experts as witnesses.
tv17 t. Apac ne: (702	17	(b) Defendants' DEMHA-SANTIAGO, and DEMHA's Witnesses
6018 S. F Phon	19	 Plaintiff, SONALOLITA WILSON c/o /o Bradley S. Mainor, Esq. Joseph J. Wirth, Esq.
	20 21	Ash Marie Blackburn, Esq. Joseph W. Guindy, Esq. MAINOR WIRTH, LLP
	22 23	6018 S. Fort Apache Road, Ste. 150 Las Vegas, NV 89148 (702) 464-5000
	24	2. Nakia McCloud
	25	c/o United States Attorney's Office 501 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 1100,
	26 27	(702) 388-6336
	27 28	3. Defendant Liceth Demha-Santiago c/o Hall Jaffe and Clayton, LLP
		Page 36 of 39

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP

	¢	Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122 Filed 05/20/22 Page 37 of 69				
	1	7425 Peak Drive				
	2	Las Vegas, NV 89128				
	3	4. Defendant Juan Demha c/o Hall Jaffe and Clayton, LLP				
	4	7425 Peak Drive				
	5	Las Vegas, NV 89128				
	6	5. Officer Swan, Badge No. 7303 Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department				
	7	400 South Martin Luther King Boulevard Las Vegas, NV 89103				
	8					
	9	6. Hugh S. Selznick, MD Consultants Medical Group				
	10	2500 West Sahar Ave., Suite 207				
Þ	11	Las Vegas, NV 89102				
+++-C	12	7. Defendants reserve the right to call any and all witnesses identified in Plaintiff's				
04 (70	13	witness list and named during the course of discovery;				
dA. (/	14	8. Defendants reserve the right to call any and all witnesses identified in Defendant				
	15	USA's witness list and named during the course of discovery;				
) 404-2000 Fax. (102) 402-4440	16	9. Defendants reserve the right to call rebuttal and/or impeachment witnesses at				
	17	trial;				
	18	10. Defendants reserve the right to call any of Plaintiff's experts as witnesses.				
	19	11. Defendants reserve the right to call any of Defendant USA's experts as				
	20	witnesses.				
	21	VIII.				
	22	The attorneys or parties have met and jointly offer these trial dates:				
	23	November28, 2022 through December 2, 2022				
	24	January 17, 2023 through 2023				
	25	January 23, 2023 through January 27, 2023				
	26	February 13, 2023 through February 17, 2023				
	27	February 21, 2023 through February 24, 2023				
	28	It is expressly understood by the undersigned that the court will set the trial of this matter				

Page 37 of 39

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP 6018 S. Ft. Apache Rd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89148 Phome[•] (702) 464-5000 | Fax[•] (702) 463-4440 on one of the agreed-upon dates if possible; if not, the trial will be set at the convenience of the court's calendar.

IX.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

28

1

2

Plaintiff estimates that the trial will take a total of 17-21 days. Defendant USA will not stipulate to the authenticity of Plaintiff's medical records. As such, Plaintiff will be required to call a witness from each of her facilities to authenticate records from all forty-four (44) medical providers. Defendants Demha-Santiago and Demha had no objection to stipulating to the authenticity of Plaintiff's medical records.

Defendant USA believes the number of witnesses Plaintiff intends to call is excessive and less time is needed. Defendant USA believes it can present its case-in-chief in 2-3 days.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:

DATED this <u>11th</u> day of May, 2022.

MAINOR WIRTH, LLP

<u>/s/Ash Marie Blackburn</u> BRADLEY S. MAINOR, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 7434 ASH MARIE BLACKBURN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 14712 6018 S. Fort Apache Road, Ste. 150 Las Vegas, NV 89148-5652 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

DATED this <u>11th</u> day of May, 2022.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY

24 <u>/s/ Skyler Pearson</u>
25 SKYLER PEARSON, ESQ.
26 PATRICK ROSE, ESQ.
26 501 Las Vegas Blvd, South., Ste. 1100 Las Vegas, NV 89101
27 Attorney for Defendant United States of America

DATED this <u>11th</u> day of May, 2022.

HALL JAFFE & CLAYTON, LLP

/s/ Jan Tomasik

STEVEN T. JAFFE, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 7035 JAN K. TOMASIK, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 15104 7425 Peak Drive Las Vegas, NV 89128 Attorneys for Defendant/Cross-Claimant/Cross-Defendant Juan Demha And Cross-Claimant/Cross-Defendant Liceth Dehma-Santiago

Page 38 of 39

ACTION BY THE COURT

This case is set for jury trial on **January 23**, **2023**, **at 9:00 a.m**. Calendar call will be held on **January 18**, **2023**, **at 1:30 p.m**. This pretrial order has been approved by the parties to this action as evidenced by their signatures or the signatures of their attorneys hereon, and the order is hereby entered and will govern the trial of this case. This order may not be amended except by court order and based upon the parties' agreement or to prevent manifest injustice.

DATED: May 20, 2022.

Elle C. Mahan

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

		Case 2:1	8-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Docur	ment 122-1Filede0502012222Pagaeg4e0100165		
1			EXHI	BIT A		
2				DISTRICT COURT DF NEVADA		
3						
4	SO.	NALOLII	TA WILSON	CASE NO.: 2:18-CV-01241-JCM-NJK		
5	vs.		Plaintiff	Stipulated Exhibits		
6			TATES OF AMERICA ;			
7 8	DE	MHA; DO	EMHA-SANTIAGO; JUAN DES I THROUGH X; AND PRATIONS 1 THROUGH X,			
9			Defendants.			
10		Exhibit	Description			
11		1.	Manpower Employment File			
12	2. Plaintiff's Employment Records From Staffmark					
13	3. TrueBlue Records/ Peopleready Regarding Plaintiff's Earnings					
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23 24						
24						

	Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 124-2Filede0502012222Pagage11o6f65					
	EXHIBIT A-1					
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA						
SONALOLITA WILSON CASE NO.: 2:18-CV-01241-JCM-NJK						
Plaintiffvs.Stipulated Exhibits Available For Use At The Time of Trial But Are Not Currently						
	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ; LICETH DEMHA-SANTIAGO; JUAN DEMHA; DOES I THROUGH X; AND ROE CORPORATIONS 1 THROUGH X,					
_		Defendants.				
	Exhibit Description					
	1. Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint					
	2. Defendant United States' Answer to Plainitff's First Amended Complaint					
	3. Defendants' Liceth Demha-Santiago and Juan Demha's Answer to Plainitff's					
		First Amended Complaint				
	4.	Life Expectance Table				
	5.	Transcripts of Deposition of Ba	abuk Guman, M.D., With Exhibits			
	6.	Transcript of Deposition of Ric	k Chavez, M.D., With Exhibits			
	7.	Transcript of deposition of Lice	eth Demha			
	8. Transcript of deposition of Mark L. Glyman, M.D., D.D.S., F.A.C.S., with exhibits					
	9.	Transcript of deposition of Rob	pert L. Hinton			
	10.	Transcript of deposition of Duf				
	11.	Transcript of deposition of Nak				
	12.	Transcript of deposition of Son	alolita G. Wilson, with exhibits. Vol 1			
	13.	Transcript of deposition of Son	alolita G. Wilson, with exhibits Vol 2			

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-2FilEde0502012222Pagag4220665

14.	Transcript of deposition of Kimberly E. Balogh	
15.	Transcript of deposition of David J. Oliveri M.D	
16.	Transcript of deposition of Robert Simmons	
17. Transcript of deposition of Thomas Dunn, M.D		
18.	Transcript of deposition of Jaswinder Grover, M.D	
19.	Transcript of deposition of Frank A. Perez, Ph.D	
20.	David Oliveri, M.D. Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess Schedule	
21.	David Oliveri, M.D. Expert Report dated December 2, 2019	
22.	David Oliveri, M.D. Supplemental Expert Report dated August 4, 2020	
23.	Ira Spector M.S. C.R.C, M.D. Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess	
	Schedule	
24.	Ira Spector M.S. C.R.C, Expert Report dated December 12, 2019	
25.	Ira Spector M.S. C.R.C, Rebuttal Expert Report dated July 23, 2020	
26.	Samuel R. Terry Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess Schedule	
27.	Samuel R. Terry Expert Report dated June 3, 2020	
28.	Michael D. Freeman, MedDr, PhD, MPH, DLM, FAAFS Curriculum Vitae	
29.	Michael D. Freeman, MedDr, PhD, MPH, DLM, FAAFS Expert Report dated	
	July 8, 2020	
30.		
	Michael D. Freeman, MedDr, PhD, MPH, DLM, FAAFS Rebuttal Expert	
31.	Report dated August 5, 2020	
32.	Frank Perez, Ph.D Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess Schedule	
33.	Frank Perez, PhD, FAAFS Expert Report dated July 8, 2020	
34.	Frank Perez, PhD, FAAFS Expert Report dated July 8, 2020	
35.	Robert Simmons Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess Schedule	
36.	Robert Simmons Rebuttal Expert Report dated August 7, 2020	
50.	Terrence M. Clauretie, Ph.D. Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess	
	Schedule	

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-2FilEde0502012222Pagag4330665

37.	Terrence M. Clauretie, Ph.D. Expert Report dated February 4, 2020
38.	Thomas Dunn, MD Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess Schedule
39.	Thomas Dunn, MD Rebuttal Expert Report dated August 3, 2020
40.	Travis Snyder, D.O. Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess Schedule
41.	Travis Snyder, D.O. Rebuttal Expert Report dated August 7, 2020
42.	Travis Snyder, D.O. Presentation
43.	Kimberly Balogh's Expert Report (dated July 7, 2020)
44.	Kimberly Balogh's Rebuttal Expert Report (dated August 7, 2020)
45.	Kimberly Balogh's Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess Schedule
46.	Deposition of Kimberly Balogh (November 4, 2020)
47.	Dr. James Lowe's Expert Report (dated April 27, 2020)
48.	Dr. James Lowe's Rebuttal Expert Report (dated July 27, 2020)
49.	Dr. James Lowe's Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess Schedule
50.	Dr. Rick Chavez's Expert Report (dated July 7, 2020)
51.	Dr. Rick Chavez's Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess Schedule
52.	Deposition of Chavez (August 27, 2020)
53.	Dr. Warren Torchinsky's Expert Report (dated November 12, 2019)
54.	Dr. Warren Torchinsky's Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess
	Schedule
55.	Mark Remas's Expert Report (dated April 28, 2020)
56.	Mark Remas's Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess Schedule
57.	Dr. Thomas Cargill's Rebuttal Expert Report (dated August 3, 2020)
58. Dr. Thomas Cargill's Curriculum Vitae, Testimony List, and Fess	
59.	Curriculum Vitae, Fee schedule, Prior Testimony List and Reports authored by
	Mark Glyman, M.D., DDS, FACS
60.	Google Overhead Photo Depicting the Subject Intersection (1)
61.	Google Overhead Photo Depicting the Subject Intersection (1) Google Overhead Photo Depicting the Subject Intersection (2)
	Soogle Overhead I noto Depicting the Subject Intersection (2)

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-2FilEde0502012222Pagag4440665

62.	Color Photo Depicting the Scene of the Subject Incident (1)
63.	Color Photo Depicting the Scene of the Subject Incident (2)
64.	Color Photo Depicting the Scene of the Subject Incident (3)
65.	Color Photo Depicting the Scene of the Subject Incident (4)
66.	Color Photo Depicting the Scene of the Subject Incident (5)
67.	Color Photo Depicting the Scene of the Subject Incident (6)
68.	Black and White Photo Depicting Plaintiff's Property Damage (1)
69.	Black and White Photo Depicting Plaintiff's Property Damage (2)

TED ST ETH DE IHA; DO	UNITED STAT DISTRI A WILSON Plaintiff ATES OF AMERICA	CXHIBIT B FES DISTRICT COURT CT OF NEVADA CASE NO.: 2:18-CV Plaintiff's Exhibits	-01241-JCM-NJK
TED ST ETH DE IHA; DO	DISTRI A WILSON Plaintiff CATES OF AMERICA	CASE NO.: 2:18-CV	-01241-JCM-NJK
TED ST ETH DE IHA; DO	Plaintiff ATES OF AMERICA		-01241-JCM-NJK
ETH DE IHA; DO	ATES OF AMERICA	Plaintiff's Exhibits	
ETH DE IHA; DO			
	DES I THROUGH X; AN	AN ND	
Exhibit	Description	Defendants Demha- Santiago and Demha's Objections	Defendant USA's Objections
1.	Traffic Accident Report #LVM160901003306	Prejudicial, Relevance, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule	Relevance; prejudicial; foundation; best evidence
2.	Traffic Accident Report #LVM160901002946	Prejudicial, Relevance, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule	Relevance; prejudicial; foundation; best evidence
3.	Custodian of Records for 911 recordings and breakdown	Relevance, Prejudicial	Hearsay; prejudicial; authenticity
4.	911 Recordings	Relevance, Prejudicial	Hearsay; prejudicial; authenticity
	Transcribed Statement of Def. Demha-Santiago	Privileged, Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule	Prejudicial; foundation; best evidence
6.	IRS Incident Report	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule	Privileged; prejudicial; foundation; best evidence
7.	Color Photo Depicting Plaintiff's Property Damage		(No Bates Numbe Provided) Relevance; foundation; authenticity
	CORPOH Exhibit 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.	CORPORATIONS 1 THROUGH X Defendants. Exhibit Description 1. Traffic Accident Report #LVM160901003306 2. Traffic Accident Report #LVM160901002946 3. Custodian of Records for 911 recordings and breakdown 4. 911 Recordings 5. Transcribed Statement of Def. Demha-Santiago 6. IRS Incident Report 7. Color Photo Depicting Plaintiff's Property	CORPORATIONS 1 THROUGH X, Defendants. Exhibit Description Defendants Demha- Santiago and Demha's Objections 1. Traffic Accident Report #LVM160901003306 Prejudicial, Relevance, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule 2. Traffic Accident Report #LVM160901002946 Prejudicial, Relevance, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule 3. Custodian of Records for 911 recordings and breakdown Relevance, Prejudicial 4. 911 Recordings Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence 5. Transcribed Statement of Def. Demha-Santiago Privileged, Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule 6. IRS Incident Report Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule 7. Color Photo Depicting Plaintiff's Property Foundation, Best Evidence

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-3 Fifete 05/2/1/2/22 P & geg 4 2 of 65

8.	Farmers Insurance Exchange Property Damage Estimate of Plaintiff's Vehicle	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
9.	Black Box Data for Defendant's Vehicle - GMC Terrain 2014	Relevance, Prejudicial	Prejudicial; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
10.	Vehicle information regarding vehicle driven by Nikia McCloud's	Relevance, Prejudicial	Prejudicial; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
11.	Plaintiff's Employee Wage Sheet with Manpower	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	
12.	Plaintiff's Employment Records From Staffmark	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	
13.	TrueBlue Records/ Peopleready Regarding Plaintiff's Earnings	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	
14.	Life Expectance Table	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
15.	Color Photo of Plaintiff's Injury Taken by Plaintiff on September 13, 2016 (1)	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	(No Bates Numbers Provided) Relevance; prejudicial; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
16.	Color Photo of Plaintiff's Injury Taken by Plaintiff on September 13, 2016 (2)	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	(No Bates Numbers Provided) Relevance; prejudicial; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
17.	Video of Plaintiff Depicting Full Body Seizure Taken by Robert Hinton	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; foundation; best evidence; authenticity; hearsay
18.	Video of Plaintiff Depicting Right Leg Spasm Taken by Robert Hinton	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; foundation; best evidence; authenticity; hearsay
19.	Video of Plaintiff Depicting Leg Spasms	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; foundation; best

Casse 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-3 Filete 05/3/1/2/22 P & a of 65

Relevance, Prejudicial,

Rule, Authenticity

Foundation, Best Evidence

Rule, Authenticity

Foundation, Best Evidence

Rule, Authenticity

Foundation, Best Evidence

Rule, Authenticity

Rule, Authenticity

Rule, Authenticity

Rule, Authenticity

Rule, Authenticity

Foundation, Best Evidence

evidence:

Relevance;

prejudicial;

evidence;

Relevance:

prejudicial;

evidence;

Relevance;

prejudicial;

evidence;

Relevance;

prejudicial;

evidence; authenticity

Relevance;

evidence:

authenticity

Relevance;

evidence:

authenticity

Relevance:

evidence:

authenticity

Relevance;

evidence;

authenticity

foundation; best

foundation; best

foundation; best

foundation; best

authenticity; hearsay

authenticity; hearsay

authenticity; hearsay

authenticity; hearsay

prejudicial; hearsay;

prejudicial; hearsay;

prejudicial; hearsay;

prejudicial; hearsay;

foundation; best

foundation: best

foundation; best

foundation; best

When Walking Taken

by Robert Hinton

Video of Plaintiff

Video of Plaintiff

Video of Plaintiff

Plaintiff Medical

Medical Records and

Billing with Custodian

of Records for City of

Las Vegas Fire and

Rescue for Date of Service September 1,

Medical Records and

Billing with Custodian

of Records for City of

University Medical

Center for Date of Service September 1,

Specials Chart

Depicting Right Leg

Depicting Right Leg

Seizure

Spasm

Spasm

2016

2016

Depicting Full Body

20.

21.

22.

23.

24.

25.

	8
	9
1	С
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	(

23

26.	Medical Records and	
	Billing for McCourt	
	PLLC a/k/a EMP of	
	Clark UMC for Date of	
	Service September 1,	
	2016	
27.	Medical Records and	
	Billing with Custodian	
	of Records for Desert	
	Radiology Solutions	
	Dates of Service	

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-3 Fifete 05/2/1/2/22 P & geg 4 & of 65

	September 1, 206 Through December 6, 2017		
28.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Nevada Spine Clinic Dates of Service September 8, 2016 Through April 15, 2022	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
29.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Better Back Physical Therapy Dates of Service September 9, 2016 for Through December 2, 2016	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
30.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Mark Glyman, M.D. Dates of Service September 13, 2016 Through April 7., 2017	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
31.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for American Radiology Date of Service January 11, 2017	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
32.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Desert Orthopaedics Center Dates of Service September 30, 2016 Through March 15, 2018	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
33.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Pueblo Medical Imaging Dates	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-3 Fifete 05/2/1/2/22 P & geg 4 5 of 65

	of Service September 30, 2016		
	4. Medical Records and Billing for Absolute Dental Date of Service October 13, 2016	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
	5. Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Desert Anesthesiologist, Inc. Date of Service January 11, 2017	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
	6. Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Specialty Surgery Center Date of Service January 11, 2017	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
3	 7. Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Abby Dental Center, Inc. Dates of Service February 27, 2017 Through March 15, 2017 	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
	8. Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Smoke Ranch Surgery Center Dates of Service December 6, 2017 Through December 13, 2021	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
	 Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Don Nobis Progressive Physical Therapy Dates of Service December 26, 2017 Through February 8, 2022 	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-3 Fifete 05/2/1/2/22 P & e 6 of 65

1 2 3 4	40.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Silver State Neurology Dates of Service January 2, 2018 Through February 26, 2018	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
5	41.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Louis F.	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best
6 7		Mortillaro Dates of Service November 14,		evidence; authenticity
8		2018 Through December 5, 2018		
9	42.	Medical Records and Billing for Lien RX Dates of Service January	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best
10		4, 2017 Through January 23, 2019		evidence; authenticity
11 12	43.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Specialty	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence;
13 14		Pharmacy Dates of Service January 4, 2019 Through February 25, 2019		authenticity
15	44.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay;
16 17		of Records for Smoke Ranch Specialists Dates of Service January 10,	Rule, Authenticity	foundation; best evidence; authenticity
18		2019 Through May 2, 2019		
19	45.	Medical Records and Billing for CarePro	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay;
20 21		Home Health, Dates of Service January 11, 2019 Through February	Rule, Authenticity	foundation; best evidence; authenticity
22	16	11, 2019	Delevence Draindicial	Dalayanaay
23	46.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Lyons	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence;
24		Home Care Dates of Service January 12,		authenticity

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-3 Fifete 05/2/1/2/22 P & ge 5 7 of 65

1		2019 Through February 1, 2019		
2	47.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay;
3 4		of Records for PayLater Pharmacy Date of	Rule, Authenticity	foundation; best evidence; authenticity
4 5		Service January 23, 2019		authenticity
6	48.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay;
7		of Records for Comprehensive Medical	Rule, Authenticity	foundation; best evidence; authenticity
8		Dates of Service January 29, 2019 Through April 26, 2022		autientienty
9	49.		Relevance, Prejudicial,	Relevance;
10	49.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for American	Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best
11		Medical Response Date of Service May 2, 2019		evidence; authenticity
12		Through May 20, 2019		
13	50.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best
14		of Records for Las Vegas Pharmacy Dates of Service March 8,		evidence; authenticity
15		2019 Through July 1, 2020		
16	51.	Medical Records and	Relevance, Prejudicial,	Relevance;
17		Billing with Custodian of Records for Mountain	Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence;
18		View Hospital Dates of Service May 2, 2019		authenticity
19		Through May 3, 2019		
20	52.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best
21		of Records for Fremont Emergency Services Date of Service May 2,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	evidence; authenticity
22		2019		
23	53.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay;
24		of Records for	Rule, Authenticity	foundation; best

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-3 Fifete 05/2/1/2/22 P & ge 5 2 of 65

	Mountains Edge Hospital Dates of Service May 3, 2019 Through May 6, 2019		evidence; authenticity
54.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Valley Hospital Medical Center Dates of Service May 10, 2019 Through May 12, 2019	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
55.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Shadow Emergency Physicians Date of Service May 8, 2019 through May 14, 2019	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay foundation; best evidence; authenticity
56.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Monitoring Associates Date of Service May 15, 2019	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
57.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Summerlin Hospital Medical Center Dates of Service May 15, 2019 Through May 20, 2019	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
58.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Kindred Hospital Las Vegas- Sahara Campus Dates of Service May 21, 2019 Through July 4, 2019	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
59.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Next Step Medical Date of Service July 3, 2019	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-3 Fifete 05/2/1/2/22 P & ge 53 of 65

60.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Dental Centerof Nevada Date of Service September 16, 2019	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
61.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Zynex Medical, Inc. Date of Service November 21, 2019	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
62.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Shiode Psychotherapy, Inc. Dates of Service December 12, 2019 Through March 9, 2020	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
63.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Radar Medical Group Dates of Service January 16, 2020 Through August 7, 2020	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
64.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Open Sided MRI Dates of Service February 2, 2020 Through February 7, 2020	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
65.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Grand Desert Psychiatric Services Dates of Service March 16, 2020 Through May 14, 2020	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
66.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Las Vegas Health Services	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best

Caase22188exv012241JJJJMANJK Documeent12243 Filied095201222 Flagge54006650

	Dates of Service July 8, 2020 Through August 4, 2020		evidence; authenticity
67.	Medical Records and Billing for Silver State Adult Day care Dates of Service October 1, 2020 Through November 4, 2021	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hears; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
68.	Medical Records and Billing with Custodian of Records for Prove Partners Dates of Service May 12, 2021 Through February 8, 2022	Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity	Relevance; prejudicial; hears; foundation; best evidence; authenticity
69.	Defendant United State's Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories	Defendant objects to the improper use of USA's written discovery responses as trial exhibits. The responses mistake evidence. Relevance, Prejudicial, Hearsay, Best Evidence Rule, Foundation	Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsay; best evidence; foundation
70.	Defendant United State's Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production	Defendant objects to the improper use of USA's written discovery responses as trial exhibits. The responses mistake evidence. Relevance, Prejudicial, Hearsay, Best Evidence Rule, Foundation	Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsay; best evidence; foundation
71.	Defendant Liceth Demha Santiago's Responses to Plaintiff's Interrogatories		Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsay; best evidence; foundation
72.	Defendant Liceth Demha Santiago's Responses to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents		Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsay; best evidence; foundation

	EX	CHIBIT C				
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA						
SONALOLITA WILSON						
		CASE NO.: 2:18	-CV-01241-JCM-NJK			
vs.	Plaintiff	Defendant United	States of America's			
		Exhibits				
	STATES OF AMERICA ; LICE -SANTIAGO; JUAN DEME					
DOES	I THROUGH X; AND R	OE				
CORPOR	RATIONS 1 THROUGH X,					
	Defendants.					
De	fendant United States of America P Exhibit Description	hereby provide its list of tr Defendants Demha-	ial exhibits: Plaintiff's			
<u>Ex No.</u>		Santiago and Demha's Objections	Objections			
504	2018 W-4 Completed Form for Sonalolita Wilson		Relevance, Prejudicial, Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, Authenticity			
506	Plaintiff's Response to Defendant United States' First Set of Interrogatories (dated May 31, 2019)		Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsa best evidence; foundation			
507	Plaintiff's First Supplemental Response to Defendant United States' First Set of Interrogatories (dated November 8, 2019)		Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsa best evidence; foundation			
508	Plaintiff's Second Supplemental Response to Defendant United States' First Set of Interrogatories (dated January 28, 2021)		Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsa best evidence; foundation			
509	Plaintiff's Third Supplemental Response to		Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsa			

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-4FilEde0502012222Pagage62o668

1 2	Ex No.	Exhibit Description	Defendants Demha- Santiago and Demha's Objections	Plaintiff's Objections
3		Interrogatories (dated February 5, 2021)		best evidence; foundation
4 5 6	510	Plaintiff's Response to Defendant United States' Second Set of Interrogatories (dated November 22, 2019)		Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsay; best evidence; foundation
7 8 9	511	Plaintiff's Response to Defendant United States' Third Set of Interrogatories (dated March 20, 2020)		Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsay; best evidence; foundation
10 11 12	512	Plaintiff's Response to Defendant Demha's First Set of Interrogatories		Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsay; best evidence; foundation
13 14	513	Plaintiff's First Supplemental Response to Defendant Demha's First Set of Interrogatories		Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsay; best evidence; foundation
15 16 17 18	514	Plaintiff's Second Supplemental Response to Defendant Demha's First Set of Interrogatories (February 5, 2021)		Relevance; prejudicial; Hearsay; best evidence; foundation
19 20	515	Demha Defendants' Answers to Plaintiffs' Interrogatories (dated February 28, 2020)		
21		l	I	
22				
23				
24				
25 26				
27				
28				

Case 2::18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-5FilEde0502012222Pagage71o669					22P atgægte7100165
EXHIBIT D					
				DISTRICT COURT F NEVADA	
SC	ONALOLI	ΓA WILSON,			
		Plaintiff,		CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-012	241-JCM-NKJ
VS.		T familit,			
				Defendant Liceth Deml	na-Santiago and
		ATES OF AMERICA; LICETH		Juan Demha's Exhibits	ł
		NTIAGO; JUAN DEMHA; DO	DES		
	nrougn X; rough X, in	and ROE CORPORATIONS I			
um	lough A, h				
		Defendants.			
	Exhibit	Description	Def	endant USA's	Plaintiff's
		-		jections	Objections
	1.	Damage Estimate of 2005	Relevance; prejudicial;		
		Toyota Corolla		ndation; best evidence;	
	2.	Farmers Insurance Exchange		nenticity evance; prejudicial;	
	2.	Estimate of Record for 2005		ndation; best evidence;	
		Toyota Corolla		henticity	
	3.	CCC One Market Valuation		evance; prejudicial;	
		Report		ndation; best evidence;	
	1	Madical Decords and Dilling	-	nenticity	
	4.	Medical Records and Billing from Mark L. Glyman M.D.		evance; prejudicial; rsay; foundation; best	
		from Mark E. Oryman M.D.		lence; authenticity	
	5.	Medical Records, Billing	-	evance; prejudicial;	
		and Films from American		rsay; foundation; best	
		Radiology		lence; authenticity	
	6.	Medical Records and Billing		evance; prejudicial;	
		from Nevada Spine Clinic		rsay; foundation; best lence; authenticity	
	7.	Medical Records and Billing		evance; prejudicial;	
		from Smoke Ranch Surgery		rsay; foundation; best	
		Center		lence; authenticity	
	8.	Medical Records and Billing		evance; prejudicial;	
		from Don Nobis Progressive		rsay; foundation; best	
	1	Physical Therapy	-	lence; authenticity	
	9.	Billing from Abbey Dental	1م R	evance; prejudicial;	

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-5FilEde0508012222P 20action 69

evidence; authenticity

Relevance; prejudicial;

Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best

evidence; authenticity

Relevance: prejudicial;

evidence; authenticity

Relevance; prejudicial;

evidence; authenticity Relevance; prejudicial;

hearsay; foundation; best

hearsay; foundation; best

hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity

Relevance; prejudicial;

evidence; authenticity

Relevance; prejudicial;

evidence; authenticity Relevance: prejudicial:

evidence; authenticity

Relevance; prejudicial;

evidence; authenticity

Relevance; prejudicial;

evidence; authenticity

Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best

evidence; authenticity Relevance; prejudicial;

hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity

hearsay; foundation; best

hearsay; foundation; best

Relevance; prejudicial;

evidence; authenticity

Relevance: prejudicial;

evidence; authenticity

hearsay; foundation; best

hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

21.

22.

23.

24.

Medical Records and Billing

from Absolute Dental

Billing from Las Vegas

Medical records, films and

Billing from Smoke Ranch

Medical records and billing

from Daniel Shiode, Ph.D.

Grand Desert Psychiatric

Medical records and billing

Associates/Neuromonitoring

Medical records and billing

Medical records and films

from Precision Diagnostic

Records and billing from

from Las Vegas Health

Services, Inc.

Partners

Next Step Medical

Silver State Adult Day Care

Medical Records and Billing

Medical Records and Billing

from Silver State Neurology

Medical Billing from Prove

Medical billing and records

Absolute Dental/Southern

Nevada General Dentistry

billing from Kindred

Rehabilitation Hospital

Pharmacy

Specialists

Services

Associates

from Zynex

Imaging

from Monitoring

6

5

8 9

7

10 11

12 13

15 16

14

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

<u>1</u>

	-		
'		1	
		′	
4			

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-5FilEde0502012222Pagage930665

23	
^ 1	

	Prada, PPLC	
25.	Medical billing and records	Relevance; prejudicial;
	for Care Pro Home Health	hearsay; foundation; best
		evidence; authenticity
26.	Medical billing and records	Relevance; prejudicial;
	for Dental Center of NV	hearsay; foundation; best
		evidence; authenticity
27.	Las Vegas Fire and Rescue	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Receipts	hearsay; foundation; best
	-	evidence; authenticity
28.	University Medical Center of	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Southern Nevada Receipt	hearsay; foundation; best
		evidence; authenticity
29.	EMP of Clark UMC	Relevance; prejudicial;
	McCourt PLLC Medical	hearsay; foundation; best
	Group Receipt	evidence; authenticity
30.	University Medical Center of	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Southern Nevada,	hearsay; foundation; best
	Department of Radiology	evidence; authenticity
	Records	
31.	Better Back Physical	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Therapy under Nevada Spine	hearsay; foundation; best
	Clinic	evidence; authenticity
32.	Mark L. Glyman, M.D.,	Relevance; prejudicial;
	D.D.S.	hearsay; foundation; best
		evidence; authenticity
33.	Desert Orthopaedic Center	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Health Insurance Claim	hearsay; foundation; best
	Form	evidence; authenticity
34.	Pueblo Medical Imaging	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Records	hearsay; foundation; best
		evidence; authenticity
35.	Specialty Surgery Center	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Records	hearsay; foundation; best
		evidence; authenticity
36.	Better Back Physical	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Therapy Responsive Medical	hearsay; foundation; best
	Records	evidence; authenticity
37.	Desert Orthopaedic Center	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Responsive Medical Records	hearsay; foundation; best
		evidence; authenticity
38.	Dr. Mark Glyman	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Responsive Medical Records	hearsay; foundation; best
		evidence; authenticity
39.	Las Vegas Fire and Rescue	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Responsive Records	hearsay; foundation; best

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-5FilEde0508012222P 20206040669

evidence; authenticity

Relevance; prejudicial;

Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best

evidence; authenticity

Relevance; prejudicial;

Relevance; prejudicial;

evidence; authenticity

Relevance; prejudicial;

Relevance; prejudicial;

evidence; authenticity

Relevance; prejudicial;

hearsay: foundation; best

hearsay; foundation; best

hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity

hearsay; foundation; best

hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity

hearsay; foundation; best

hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity

40.

41.

42.

43.

44.

45.

46.

47.

48.

49.

50.

51.

52.

53.

54.

Pueblo Medical Imaging

Specialty Surgery Center

Responsive Medical Records

Responsive Medical Records

Responsive Medical Records

University Medical Center

Desert Orthopaedic Center

Responsive Radiology

Orthopedic Specialty

Orthopedic Specialty

Hospital of Nevada

Lyons Home Care Responsive Medical and

Billing Records Better Back Physical

Billing Records

Records

Records

Records

Hospital of Nevada

Specialty Surgery Center

Responsive Billing Records

Lien RX Billing Responsive

Responsive Medical Records

Responsive Billing Records

Responsive Medical Records

Therapy Responsive Medical

Specialty Surgery Center

Responsive Medical and

Kindred Transitional Care

and Rehabilitation-Spring

Valley Hospital Medical

Valley Responsive Medical

Center Responsive Medical

University Medical Center

Responsive Medical Records

Mountain View Hospital

Images

Records

'
8

9 10

11

12

14

13

16

17

15

18 19

20 21

> 22 23

า 4

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-5FilEde0502012222Pagage15o669

	and Billing Records	evidence; authenticity	
55.	University Medical Center	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Responsive Radiology	hearsay; foundation; best	
	Declaration and Records	evidence; authenticity	
	(disc)		
56.	Dr. Louis F. Mortillaro	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Responsive Medical and	hearsay; foundation; best	
	Billing Records	evidence; authenticity	
57.	Abbey Dental Responsive	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Records and X-Rays	hearsay; foundation; best	
		evidence; authenticity	
58.	Valley Hospital Responsive	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Radiology Discs (2)	hearsay; foundation; best	
		evidence; authenticity	
59.	Summerlin Hospital	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Responsive Medical and	hearsay; foundation; best	
	Billing Records	evidence; authenticity	
60.	Red Rock Diagnostics	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Responsive Medical and	hearsay; foundation; best	
	Billing Records	evidence; authenticity	
61.	986 Pharmacy Responsive	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Billing Records	hearsay; foundation; best	
		evidence; authenticity	
62.	Mountain View Hospital	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Responsive Radiology	hearsay; foundation; best	
	Records and Disc (1)	evidence; authenticity	
63.	Paylater Pharmacy	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Responsive Billing Records	hearsay; foundation; best	
<u> </u>		evidence; authenticity	
64.	Desert Orthopaedic Center	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Responsive Medical and	hearsay; foundation; best	
(7	Billing Records	evidence; authenticity	
65.	Desert Radiology	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Responsive Medical Records	hearsay; foundation; best	
	and Radiology Discs	evidence; authenticity	
66.	Pueblo Medical Imaging	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Responsive Medical Records	hearsay; foundation; best	
(7		evidence; authenticity	
67.	Pueblo Medical Imaging	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Response Radiology	hearsay; foundation; best	
60	Records	evidence; authenticity	
68.	Mountain View Responsive	Relevance; prejudicial;	
	Billing Records	hearsay; foundation; best	
69.	Summerlin Hospital	evidence; authenticity Relevance; prejudicial;	
60			

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-5FilEde0508012222P 2020069

Records evidence; authenticity 1 70. Pueblo Medical Imaging Relevance; prejudicial; 2 **Responsive Billing Records** hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity 3 71. **Better Back Physical** Relevance; prejudicial; hearsay; foundation; best Therapy Responsive Billing 4 evidence; authenticity Records **OpenSided MRI Responsive** Relevance; prejudicial; 72. 5 Medical Records hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity 6 Relevance; prejudicial; 73. Dr. David Oliveri hearsay; foundation; best Responsive Medical and 7 **Billing Records** evidence; authenticity Relevance; prejudicial; 74. Radar Medical Group 8 **Responsive Medical and** hearsay; foundation; best **Billing Records** evidence; authenticity 9 **OpenSided MRI Responsive** Relevance; prejudicial; 75. Medical and Radiology hearsay; foundation; best 10 Records (disc) evidence; authenticity **Red Rock Diagnostics** 76. Relevance; prejudicial; 11 **Responsive Billing Records** hearsay; foundation; best for OpenSided MRI evidence; authenticity 12 Relevance; prejudicial; Desert Anesthesiologist 77. **Responsive Billing and** hearsay; foundation; best 13 Medical Records evidence; authenticity Allegiant Spine Institute Relevance; prejudicial; 78. 14 hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity 15 79. Certified Vocational Relevance, Prejudicial, Services 16 Foundation, Best Evidence Rule, 17 Authenticity Las Vegas Fire and Rescue 80. Relevance; prejudicial; 18 hearsay; foundation; best evidence; authenticity 19 Specialty Pharmacy Relevance; prejudicial; 81. hearsay; foundation; best 20 evidence; authenticity Relevance; prejudicial; 82. Sonia Wilson's Summary 21 Slide of Imaging Findings hearsay; foundation; best Consistent with the History evidence; authenticity 22 of Trauma Dated 9/1/16 Life Expectancy Table Relevance; prejudicial; 83. 23 foundation; best evidence; authenticity <u>1</u>

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-5FilEde0502012222Pagage370669

84.	Defendant, Liceth Demha-	Defendant USA herein	
	Santiago's Responses to	reserve all objections	
	Plaintiff's Request for	pending notice of particular	
	Production of Documents	responses to be read	
85.	Defendants Liceth Demha-	Defendant USA herein	
	Santiago & Juan Demha's	reserve all objections	
	Answers to Plaintiffs'	pending notice of particular	
	Interrogatories	responses to be read	
86.	Plaintiff's Response to	Defendant USA herein	Relevance;
	Defendant United States'	reserve all objections	prejudicial;
	First Set of Interrogatories	pending notice of particular	Hearsay; best
		responses to be read	evidence;
			foundation
87.	Plaintiff's First	Defendant USA herein	Relevance;
	Supplemental Response to	reserve all objections	prejudicial;
	Defendant United States'	pending notice of particular	Hearsay; best
	First Set of	responses to be read	evidence;
	Interrogatories		foundation
88.	Plaintiff's Third	Defendant USA herein	Relevance;
	Supplemental Response to	reserve all objections	prejudicial;
	Defendant USA's First Set	pending notice of particular	Hearsay; best
	of Interrogatories	responses to be read	evidence;
			foundation
89.	Plaintiff's Response to	Defendant USA herein	Relevance;
	Defendant Demha's First Set	reserve all objections	prejudicial;
	of Interrogatories	pending notice of particular	Hearsay; best
		responses to be read	evidence;
90.	Plaintiff's First	Defendant USA herein	foundation
90.	Supplemental Response to	reserve all objections	Relevance; prejudicial;
	Defendant Demha's First Set	pending notice of particular	Hearsay; best
	of Interrogatories	responses to be read	evidence;
	or interrogatories	responses to be read	foundation
91.	Plaintiff's Second	Defendant USA herein	Relevance;
/ 1 0	Supplemental Response to	reserve all objections	prejudicial;
	Defendant Demha's First Set	pending notice of particular	Hearsay; best
	of Interrogatories	responses to be read	evidence;
	or more guerree		foundation
92.	Plaintiff's Response to	Defendant USA herein	Relevance;
	Defendant USA's First Set	reserve all objections	prejudicial;
	of Requests for Production	pending notice of particular	Hearsay; best
	of Documents	responses to be read	evidence;
			foundation
93.	Plaintiff's First	Defendant USA herein	Relevance;
	Supplemental Response to	reserve all objections	prejudicial;
	Defendant USA's First Set	pending notice of particular	Hearsay; best

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-5Filede0505012222P agarge4806695

responses to be read

Defendant USA herein

pending notice of particular

pending notice of particular

pending notice of particular

reserve all objections

responses to be read

Defendant USA herein

reserve all objections

responses to be read

Defendant USA herein

reserve all objections

responses to be read

foundation

foundation

authenticity

authenticity

best evidence;

authenticity

foundation

foundation

foundation

Relevance; prejudicial;

Hearsay; best evidence;

Relevance; prejudicial;

Hearsay; best evidence;

(No Bates Number

Provided) Relevance;

foundation; authenticity

foundation; best evidence;

foundation; best evidence;

Relevance; prejudicial;

Relevance; prejudicial;

Prejudicial; foundation;

Relevance; prejudicial;

Relevance; prejudicial;

Relevance; prejudicial;

evidence;

foundation

Relevance:

prejudicial;

evidence;

foundation

Relevance;

prejudicial;

evidence: foundation

Relevance;

prejudicial;

evidence;

foundation

Relevance:

prejudicial;

evidence;

authenticity

Relevance;

prejudicial;

foundation

Relevance:

prejudicial; foundation

Relevance;

prejudicial;

foundation; best

Hearsay; best

Hearsay; best

Hearsay; best

of Requests for Production

Supplemental Response to

Defendant USA's First Set

of Requests for Production

United States' Second Set of

Interrogatories to Plaintiff

Plaintiff's Response to

Plaintiff's Response to

Defendant United States'

United States' Responses

First Set of Requests for

Production of Documents United States' Responses

and Objections to Plaintiffs'

First Set of Interrogatories

Photographs of Plaintiff's

T-Mobile Phone Records

Google Overheads

Black Box Data for

IRS Claim Denial with

Receipt February 9, 2018

IRS Claim Denial without

Receipt September 5, 2019

Receipt September 5, 2019

IRS Claim Denial with

Terrain 2014

Defendant's Vehicle - GMC

and Objections to Plaintiffs'

Third Set of Interrogatories

of Documents

of Documents

94.

95.

96.

97.

98.

99.

100.

101.

102.

103.

104.

105.

vehicle

Plaintiff's Second

22

<u>1</u>

Case 2:18-cv-01241-JCM-NJK Document 122-5FilEde0502012222Pagage590669

^1