## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

ESTEBAN ALFARO-HUITRON, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v. Civ. No. 15-210 GJF/JHR

JAIME CAMPOS, et al.,

Defendants.

## ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE

THIS MATTER is before the Court upon Plaintiff's "Motion in Limine" [ECF No. 276] ("Motion"). As Defendant Campos neither objected nor responded to the Motion, the Court concludes under Rule 7.1(b) of the Local Rules of Civil Procedure that he has consented to the granting of the Motion. In addition, the Court has reviewed the Motion and finds it to be meritorious and well taken.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion is GRANTED as follows: Defendant Campos is hereby instructed to refrain from making *any* mention during interrogation, directly or indirectly, of *any* matter referenced below, without first approaching the bench and obtaining a ruling from the Court regarding its admissibility. Therefore, unless the Court is persuaded otherwise pursuant to a valid theory of admissibility put forth by Defendant Campos, the Court hereby **EXCLUDES** the following evidence from the trial:

- 1. References to the time or circumstances under which Plaintiffs employed their attorneys, or the motives of Plaintiffs or their counsel in prosecuting this matter.
- 2. Testimony by any witness not identified in discovery.
- 3. References to any documents or statements that Plaintiffs requested in discovery, or that should have been disclosed under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, but that Defendant either never produced or produced untimely.

- 4. Reference to any objections to interrogatories, requests for production, or other discovery that Plaintiffs made in response to any Defendant's discovery requests.
- 5. Any display of or attempt to introduce into evidence any photograph, videotape, audiotape, film, or motion picture without first presenting such items to the Court and Plaintiffs' counsel for inspection.
- 6. Any mention or display of or attempt to introduce before the Court any document or evidence that has not been given to Plaintiffs' counsel before trial.
- 7. Any reference to the fact that Plaintiffs or their attorneys have made a claim of any "privilege," whether in the present proceeding or upon a prior occasion, and any references drawn therefrom on the grounds that such matters are not relevant to the issues of this case and are prejudicial to Plaintiffs.
- 8. Any reference to any other claims that Plaintiffs had asserted against any Defendant in this litigation.
- 9. References that Plaintiffs or their counsel are motivated by money, greed, or some animus, along with references to any offers to compromise.
- 10. Reference to Plaintiffs' immigration status or place of birth.
- 11. Reference to the fact that a defaulting party, WKI Outsourcing Solutions, LLC, may also be liable for the damages at issue.
- 12. Reference to labor or weather conditions for Southern New Mexico farms at any time other than 2011 or 2012.
- 13. Reference to any payment by any other third party to Plaintiffs for settlement of claims in this lawsuit.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's first motion in limine [ECF No. 249] is **DENIED** as moot, as it has been superseded by the instant Motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

THE HONORABLE GREGORY J. FOURATT UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Presiding by Consent