

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT WINCHESTER

PEGGY E. MANN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:12-cv-84-SKL
)	
WAL-MART STORES EAST, LP,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant’s motion in limine [Doc. 35]. Defendant’s two-sentence motion seeks to exclude Plaintiff from presenting any evidence or making any arguments “about the fact that Wal-Mart is a corporation, as well as any reference to its size, revenue, and profitability.” [Doc. 35 at Page ID # 206]. As grounds for this exclusion, Defendant states that “[s]uch evidence and/or arguments would be irrelevant and unfairly prejudicial.” [*Id.*].

Defendant provides no citation to any authority, case, or rule in support of its motion in limine. Thus, the motion is not in compliance with the Local Rules, which require that a motion “include a concise statement of the factual and legal grounds which justify the ruling sought from the Court.” E.D. Tenn. L.R. 7.1(b); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 7. However, it appears from the parties proposed final pretrial order that the parties have stipulated: “The parties agree to exclude at trial any evidence or arguments about the fact that Wal-Mart is a corporation, as well as any reference to its size, revenue, and profitability.” Accordingly, Defendant’s motion in limine [Doc. 35] is **MOOT** and the Clerk is **DIRECTED** to term the motion.

SO ORDERED.

ENTER:

s/ Susan K. Lee

SUSAN K. LEE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE