UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----UTICA MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY, Plaintiff. 6:09-CV-853 -V-FIREMAN'S FUND INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendant. APPEARANCES: OF COUNSEL: SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP WILLIAM M. SNEED, ESQ. Attorneys for Plaintiff THOMAS D. CUNNINGHAM, ESQ. One South Dearborn Street Chicago, IL 60603 WILLIAMS LOPATTO PLLC JOHN B. WILLIAMS, ESQ. Attorneys for Defendant MARY A. LOPATTO, ESQ. 1707 L Street NW Suite 550 Washington, DC 20036 DAVID N. HURD United States District Judge **DECISION and ORDER** Plaintiff Utica Mutual Insurance Company and defendant Fireman's Fund Insurance Company have submitted the depositions of witnesses E. Barry Bradshaw and Gerald P. Konkel in advance of their use at trial in this matter. The parties have identified their

designations, counter-designations, supplemental designations, and corresponding

Dockets.Justia.com

objections to those depositions.¹ After reviewing the depositions and objections thereto, the following rulings are made with respect to all objections:

E. Barry Bradshaw

5/12/2014

Plaintiff's Designations	Defendant's Objections
99:9-100:7	Sustained
103:17-104:17	Overruled
105:19-24	Overruled
106:3-107:12	Overruled
107:16-109:19	Overruled
110:6-13	Overruled
110:21-113:11	Overruled
113:15-117:17	Overruled
Defendant's Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Objections
18:19-22	Sustained
24:22-25:21	Sustained
26:10-15	Sustained
40:19-25	Sustained
41:20-42:6	Sustained
85:20-86:10	Sustained
88:23-89:2	Sustained

¹ Those filings are docketed at ECF Nos. 377, 402, 410, and 417. To the extent any portion of the courtesy copies of the transcripts (with color coded designations, cross-designations, and objections) are inconsistent with the aforementioned court filings, the court filings have been treated as controlling for purposes of this decision.

91:14-15	Sustained
92:13-93:4	Overruled
121:7-13	Overruled

E. Barry Bradshaw

6/12/2008

Defendant's initial response (ECF No. 402) to plaintiff's designations of Bradshaw's 6/12/2008 deposition included no specific objections or counter-designations, but rather a general objection to the use of this deposition under Federal Rule of Evidence 804 and an objection based on irrelevance. However, in a courtesy copy submitted to the Court on 11/28/17 in advance of the Bradshaw testimony being read into the record, defendant has lodged the following two specific objections:

Plaintiff's Designations	Defendant's Objections
24:19-25:7	Overruled
26:2-5	Overruled

Gerald P. Konkel

3/31/2014

Plaintiff's Designations	Defendant's Objections
63:9-64:6	Sustained
71:14-16	Sustained
71:21-72:15	Sustained
72:20-73:2	Sustained

95:3-97:22	Sustained
147:18-148:5	Sustained
149:7-150:1	Sustained
156:2-157:1	Sustained
158:7-18	Sustained
160:22-162:8	Sustained
Defendant's Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Objections
20:13-18	Overruled
20:21-21:6	Overruled
73:2-5	Sustained
80:11-19	Overruled
83:13-16	Overruled
86:10-14, 18-22	Overruled
90:21-91:22	Overruled
93:20-94:6	Overruled
150:8-13	Sustained

The parties are directed to conform the deposition testimony in accordance with this decision. An updated courtesy copy for the Court is not needed.

Going forward, as the parties identify deposition testimony to be used the following day at trial, they are directed to confer and produce one courtesy copy for the Court which identifies (in the same color coded manner as was done with Bradshaw and Konkel) the parties' designations and all objections thereto.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

United States District Judge

Dated: November 28, 2017 Utica, New York.