22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Jessica G. Heppenstall, Esq. (Bar No. 259489) Emily M. Straub, Esq. (Bar No. 259141) TYSON & MENDES 5661 La Jolla Boulevard La Jolla, CA 92037 Telephone: (858) 459-4400

F L E D

DEC - 6 2019

By: R. Cersosimo, Clerk

Attorneys for Defendant DAVID ARAMBULA

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO – HALL OF JUSTICE

CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

ν.

DAVID ARAMBULA; CITY OF LEMON GROVE; and DOES 1 through 1,000,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2018-00023369-CU-PO-CTL [Complaint Filed: May 11, 2018]

Judge: Hon. Richard S. Whitney Dept: C-68

DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE PLAINTIFF FROM PRESENTING ANY EXPERT OPINIONS DURING TRIAL; DECLARATION OF EMILY M. STRAUB

[MIL No. 16 of 22]

Trial Date: December 13, 2019

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendant David Arambula hereby moves the Court, on behalf of the defense, for an order precluding Plaintiff Christopher Williams and his counsel of record from presenting any expert opinions during trial.

This motion is based on the supporting memorandum of points and authorities, the Declaration of Emily M. Straub, the pleadings and papers on file in this action, and upon such argument and evidence as may be presented prior to or at the hearing of this matter.



I. INTRODUCTION

It is anticipated plaintiff and his counsel will attempt to present the jury with expert opinions. The problem? Plaintiff did not designate any experts. (Declaration of Emily M. Straub ("Straub Decl.") at ¶¶ 4-9.) The Court must therefore preclude plaintiff from presenting the jury with any expert opinions, whether they be from plaintiff's retained experts, non-retained medical providers, and/or defense experts.

II. AUTHORITY FOR MOTION

A motion *in limine* is the appropriate method "to preclude the presentation of evidence deemed inadmissible and prejudicial by the moving party." (*Blanks v. Seyfarth Shaw, LLP* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 336, 375.) The important purpose served by such motion is "to avoid the obviously futile attempt to "unring the bell" in the event a motion to strike is granted in the proceedings before the jury." (*Hyatt v. Sierra Boat Co.* (1978) 79 Cal.App.3d 325, 337.)

III. PLAINTIFF CANNOT OFFER ANY EXPERT OPINIONS BECAUSE HE DID NOT DESIGNATE ANY EXPERTS

A party who fails to timely designate any retained or non-retained experts waives his ability to offer expert opinions at trial. (Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2034.230, 2034.280 and 2034.30; Fairfax v. Lords (2006) 138 Cal.App.4th 1019, 1021, 1025; Kalaba v. Gray (2002) 95 Cal.App.4th 1416, 1422-1423.) Such opinions must be excluded from evidence as a matter of law. (Id.)

Here, it is anticipated plaintiff will attempt to offer expert opinions at trial concerning his claims of liability and damages, as well as his business plan model and forecasts. It is further anticipated plaintiff will seek to introduce expert opinion testimony of not only plaintiff's own retained experts, but also non-retained expert medical providers and defense experts. But plaintiff did not designate any expert witnesses. (Straub Decl. at ¶ 4-7.) He therefore waived his ability to offer expert opinions opinions at trial. Consequently, plaintiff should be precluded from presenting any expert opinions at trial.

A party may call as a witness at trial an expert not previously designated by that party if either of the following conditions is satisfied:

- (a) That expert has been designated by another party and has thereafter been deposed under Article 3 (commencing with <u>Section 2034.410</u>).
- (b) That expert is called as a witness to impeach the testimony of an expert witness offered by any other party at the trial. This impeachment may include testimony to the falsity or nonexistence of any fact used as the foundation for any opinion by any other party's expert witness, but may not include testimony that contradicts the opinion.

(Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.310 (emphasis added).)

In this case, plaintiff has not satisfied either of the above-noted conditions. Plaintiff has no legal basis to call the defendants' experts during trial under subdivision (a) of Code of Civil Procedure § 2034.310, because plaintiff never deposed defendants' experts, or even noticed their depositions. (C.f., Unzueta v. Akopyan (2019) WL 6113823 *11-12; Straub Decl. at ¶¶ 4-9.) Plaintiff has no legal basis to call the defendants' experts under subdivision (b) either. Why? There is no expert testimony plaintiff could possibly use to impeach the testimony of another expert—plaintiff did not retain any expert witnesses. (See generally, Tesoro del Valley Master Homeowners Assn. v. Griffin (2011) 200 Cal.App.4th 619, 641; Straub Decl. at ¶¶ 4-7.) Indeed, as discussed at length in the immediately preceding section of this brief, plaintiff has no ability to call any witnesses to provided expert opinion testimony during trial. (Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2034.230 and 2034.280; Fairfax v. Lords (2006) 138 Cal.App.4th 1019, 1021, 1025; Kalaba v. Gray (2002) 95 Cal.App.4th 1416, 1422-1423.) As such, plaintiff should be precluded from calling defendants' experts to testify at any time during trial.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

CONCLUSION V. For all of the foregoing reasons, Mr. Arambula respectfully requests the Court grant this motion and issue and order precluding plaintiff and his counsel from presenting any expert opinions during trial. Dated: December 5, 2019 **TYSON & MENDES** By: Jessica G. Heppenstall, Esq. Emily M. Straub, Esq. Attorneys for Defendant DAVID ARAMBULA

DECLARATION OF EMILY M. STRAUB

I, Emily M. Straub, Esq., declare as follows:

- I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice in all courts of the State of California.
- 2. I am a counsel of record for Defendant David Arambula, and offer this declaration in support of the corresponding motion *in limine*.
- 3. The following facts are based on my own personal knowledge, and if called upon I could and would testify competently thereto.
- 4. I drafted a demand for exchange of expert witness information and caused this document to be served on counsel for all parties on September 23, 2019.
- 5. In accordance with Code of Civil Procedure § 2034.220, the deadline for initial expert witness designations was October 24, 2019.
- 6. I drafted Mr. Arambula's initial exchange of expert witness designations and caused this document to be served on counsel for all parties on October 24, 2019.
- 7. I did not receive service of initial expert witness designations from counsel for Plaintiff Christopher Williams.
- 8. I did receive service of initial expert witness designations from counsel for Defendant City of Lemon Grove.
- 9. I did not receive service of any notices of deposition of defense experts from counsel for plaintiff prior or subsequent to the expert discovery cutoff of November 28, 2019.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed this 5th day of December, 2019, at La Jolla, California.

Emily M. Straub