

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  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

BRITTANY EASTON,	)	CASE NO. C16-1694RSM
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
v.	)	DENYING IN PART DEFENDANT’S
	)	MOTIONS IN LIMINE
ASPLUNDH TREE EXPERTS, CO.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant’s Motions In Limine. Dkt. #54. Plaintiff does not oppose several of Defendant’s motions, but opposes others. Dkts. #54 and #60. For the reasons set forth herein, the Court now GRANTS IN PART AND DENIES IN PART Defendant’s Motions In Limine.

**II. LEGAL STANDARD**

Parties may file motions in limine before or during trial “to exclude anticipated prejudicial evidence before the evidence is actually offered.” *Luce v. United States*, 469 U.S. 38, 40 n.2, 105 S. Ct. 460, 83 L. Ed. 2d 443 (1984). To resolve such motions, the Court is guided by Fed. R. Evid. 401 and 403. Specifically, the Court considers whether evidence “has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence,” and whether “the fact is of consequence in determining the action.” Fed. R. Evid. 401. But the Court may exclude

1 relevant evidence if “its probative value is substantially outweighed by a danger of one or more  
2 of the following: unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, wasting  
3 time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.” Fed. R. Evid. 403.

### 4 **III. DISCUSSION**

#### 5 **A. Uncontested Motions In Limine 10-17**

6 Defendant has proposed a number of Motions In Limine which Plaintiff does not oppose.  
7 Dkts. #54 at 9-16 and #60 at 8-9. Accordingly, the following Motions In Limine will be  
8 GRANTED, which will result in excluding:  
9

10 10. Evidence or Argument Regarding Special Damages, Including Medical Damage  
11 and Wage Loss;

12 11. Argument, Testimony and Questions of Witnesses Regarding Current Issues;

13 12. Argument, Reference or Suggestion of (a) Teaching a Lesson, (b) Placing  
14 Themselves in the Positions of Plaintiffs, (c) Sending a Message, (d) the Golden  
15 Rule, or (e) Similar Situations;

16 13. Plaintiff’s Fact Witness Jaqui Bove;

17 14. Plaintiff’s Rebuttal Expert Witness Maureen Clark;

18 15. Expert Witness Randal Beaton, Ph.D. from Testifying Beyond the Scope of His  
19 Disclosure and Area of Expertise;

20 16. Non-Party Witnesses from the Courtroom; and

21 17. References to the Expense of Litigation.

#### 22 **B. Contested Motions In Limine 1-9**

23 Defendant has proposed a number of additional Motions In Limine, to which Plaintiff has  
24 objected. Dkts. #54 at 2-9 and #60 at 1-8. The Court addresses each of these motions, in turn,  
25 below.  
26

27 ///

1                   1. *Evidence or Argument of Retaliation*

2                   In its first Motion In Limine, Defendant requests that the Court exclude at trial any  
3 evidence or argument by Plaintiff that she was retaliated against by Asplundh, which would  
4 include Plaintiff from claiming that she was subject to an adverse employment action in response  
5 to engaging in a protected activity, including any allegation that she has been “blacklisted” from  
6 hiring for future work by Asplundh or other employers. Dkt. #54 at 2. Plaintiff responds that  
7 she does not intend to present argument or evidence regarding retaliation, but that she should not  
8 be restricted from testifying about the circumstances of her leaving employment. Dkt. #60 at 1-  
9 2. Plaintiff also argues that she should be free to testify about retaliation she suffered from Mr.  
10 Mell when her learned of her complaint to Mr. Fly, which is not contested by Defendant and was  
11 included in her original Complaint as an aspect of damages. *Id.* at 2.  
12

13                   The Court agrees with Plaintiff, and this Motion will be DENIED. This motion does not  
14 preclude Defendant from asking the Court for a limiting instruction should it feel such instruction  
15 is necessary at the time of trial.  
16

17                   2. *“Me Too” Evidence*

18                   Defendant next seeks an Order excluding witnesses from testifying about similar alleged  
19 experiences with Defendant. Dkt. #54 at 3-5. Plaintiff responds that the evidence should not be  
20 excluded because it is evidence that Defendant was on notice that its policies and procedures  
21 were ineffective and that female employees were at risk. Dkt. #60 at 2-4.  
22

23                   “Me too” evidence is “neither per se admissible nor per se inadmissible.” *Sprint/United*  
24 *Mgmt. Co. v. Mendelsohn*, 552 U.S. 379, 380, 128 S. Ct. 1140, 170 L. Ed. 2d 1 (2008). Rather,  
25 whether “me too” evidence can be admitted at trial is a case-by-case determination that “depends  
26 on many factors, including how closely related the evidence is to the plaintiff’s circumstances  
27  
28

1 and theory of the case.” *Sprint/United Mgmt.*, 552 U.S. at 388. The Ninth Circuit has had little  
2 occasion to apply *Sprint/United Management*. In *Moore v. Donahoe*, 460 F. App’x 661, 663 (9th  
3 Cir. 2011), an unpublished opinion, the Ninth Circuit found “[t]he district court did not abuse its  
4 discretion by excluding evidence of other . . . employees’ observations regarding race  
5 discrimination.” The panel explained that “the district court conducted a thorough, fact-intensive  
6 inquiry under Federal Rule of Evidence 401 before determining that the majority of the evidence  
7 was not relevant to [the plaintiff’s] claims,” in part because the other employees the plaintiff  
8 offered were not “similarly situated” to the plaintiff. *Id.* Other circuits, in published opinions,  
9 have interpreted *Sprint/United Management* as requiring a similar fact-intensive, case-by-case  
10 analysis. *See, e.g., Dindinger v. Allsteel, Inc.*, 853 F.3d 414, 424-25 (8th Cir. 2017). In this case,  
11 the Court does not have enough information to make a determination with respect to the proffered  
12 testimony of Mr. Chad Sweitzer and Mr. Shawn Shapiro.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff states that she is willing to  
13 make an offer of proof prior to such testimony. Dkt. #60 at 4. Accordingly, the Court DENIES  
14 this motion, subject to objection at the time the subject testimony is offered.  
15  
16

17  
18 *3. Evidence Regarding Aspludh’s Safety Policy and Joseph Mell’s Alleged Safety  
19 Violations*

20 Defendant next moves to exclude testimony about Defendant’s safety policies or any  
21 safety violations by Joseph Mell, on the basis that they are irrelevant to this employment case.  
22 Dkt. #54 at 5. Plaintiff responds that the evidence is relevant to Defendant’s tolerance of policy  
23 violations. Dkt. #60 at 4. The Court disagrees with Plaintiff and GRANTS this motion.  
24

25 ///

26 ///

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> The Court notes that Plaintiff is withdrawing Ms. Sarah Lee as a witness in this case. Dkt. #60  
at 4. Accordingly, the motion is moot with respect to Ms. Lee.

1                   4. *Plaintiff's Fact Witnesses Kathy Easton, Kirsti Muul and Sarah Lee*

2                   Defendant next moves to exclude fact witnesses Kathy Easton, Kirsti Muul and Sarah  
3 Lee, on the basis that they were only identified for the first time in Plaintiff's Pretrial Statement.  
4 Dkt. #54 at 5-6. Plaintiff stipulates to their exclusion. Dkt. #60 at 5. Accordingly, this motion  
5 is GRANTED.

6                   7                   5. *Plaintiff's Relatives and Friends As Fact Witnesses*

8                   Defendant next moves to exclude a number of Plaintiff's friends and family as fact  
9 witnesses, on the basis that they were not adequately disclosed prior to the discovery deadline.  
10 Dkt. #54 at 6-7. Plaintiff responds that the witnesses were adequately disclosed and that  
11 Defendant could have conducted discovery but chose not to do so. Dkt. #60 at 5-7.

12                   The Court agrees with Defendant that generally stating that Plaintiff's "boyfriend,  
13 mother, father, brother and uncle," without more, does not comply with the requirements for  
14 Initial Disclosures, and those witnesses will be excluded. With respect to Johnny Brown, Ricky  
15 Boyer, Rina Blackstrom, Tina Blackburn, Kelly Peterson-Lalka, Julie Guyton and Tim Doll, and  
16 to the extent that none of these witnesses are Plaintiff's boyfriend, mother, father, brother or  
17 uncle, these witnesses will not be excluded. Although they were disclosed late in the discovery  
18 process, they were disclosed with their contact phone numbers and a description of what they  
19 may testify to. *See* Dkt. #55-4. Defendant does not explain any efforts to reach these witnesses  
20 or to obtain discovery extensions from Plaintiff if they could not do so. Accordingly, this motion  
21 is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART.  
22  
23

24                   ///  
25

26                   ///  
27

28                   ///  
29

1                   6. *Videotaped Depositions*

2                   Defendant next moves to exclude the use of certain video depositions other than for  
3                   impeachment purposes. Dkt. #54 at 7-8. Plaintiff responds that the video depositions are for  
4                   impeachment purposes only. Accordingly, this motion is DENIED AS MOOT.

5                   7. *Expert Testimony on Legal Issues*

6                   Defendant next moves to exclude both fact and expert witnesses from testifying about  
7                   pure legal issues. Dkt. #54 at 8-9. Plaintiff responds that this motion is vague and does not cite  
8                   to specific concerns. Dkt. #60 at 7. The Court acknowledge that neither expert witnesses nor  
9                   lay witnesses are permitted to testify as to improper legal conclusions. However, the Court will  
10                  make such a determination at the time of trial with respect to specific testimony offered by the  
11                  parties. Accordingly, this motion is DENIED subject to objection at the time the subject  
12                  testimony is offered.

13                  8. *Photos Not Produced During Discovery*

14                  Defendant next moves to exclude photos of Plaintiff and her family and friends which  
15                  were never produced during discovery. Dkt. #54 at 9. Plaintiff responds that they are being  
16                  offered as demonstrative exhibits only. Dkt. #60 at 7. As limited to demonstrative exhibits only,  
17                  the Court DENIES Defendant's motion as MOOT.

18                  9. *Evidence of Other Lawsuits and Settlements*

19                  Finally, Defendant seeks an Order excluding evidence of settlements and other lawsuits.  
20                  Dkt. #54 at 9. Plaintiff responds that such evidence is admissible to show notice. As with  
21                  Defendant's "me too" motion, which appears to be related to this motion, the Court does not have  
22                  enough information to make a determination with respect to the proffered testimony. Plaintiff  
23                  has stated that she is willing to make an offer of proof prior to such testimony. Dkt. #60 at 4.  
24                  25  
26  
27  
28

1 Accordingly, the Court DENIES this motion, subject to objection at the time the subject  
2 testimony is offered.

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

4 Having reviewed Defendant's motions in limine, the opposition thereto, and the  
5 remainder of the record, the Court hereby ORDERS that Defendant's motions (Dkt. #54) are  
6 GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART as set forth above. Counsel shall inform the  
7 parties and their witnesses of the Courts rulings on these matters, and everyone shall abide by  
8 them when presenting evidence and testimony during trial.  
9

10 DATED this 13th day of March, 2018.

11  
12  
13 

14 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
15 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28