

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

BRIGHT RESPONSE, LLC,  
Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE, INC., et al.,  
Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No. 2:07-cv-371-ce

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**ORDER**

On this day the Court considered Motion in Limine No. 2 of Plaintiff Bright Response, LLC (“Bright Response”). Bright Response requests an order excluding testimony from Mr. Chuck Williams in which Mr. Williams purports to offer information concerning a date on which the EZ Reader application was functioning or being used or operated in some iteration. Based on the testimony provided, the Court finds that Mr. Williams’s testimony is inadmissible as he is not a competent witness on this topic; he lacks personal knowledge and no foundation exists for the document. For any one and/or all of these reasons, Mr. Williams’s testimony on this issue concerning the EZ Reader is inadmissible for any purpose.