

1 BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION [FILE: 1939.00]  
2 Cory J. Briggs (State Bar no. 176284)  
3 Nora Pasin (State Bar no. 315730)  
4 99 East "C" Street, Suite 111  
5 Upland, CA 91786  
6 Telephone: 909-949-7115

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff Christopher Williams

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**  
Superior Court of California,  
County of San Diego  
**08/03/2022** at 03:49:00 PM  
Clerk of the Superior Court  
By E-Filing, Deputy Clerk

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

10 CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS,

11 Plaintiff,

12 vs.

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

15 Defendants.

CASE NO. 37-2018-00023369-CU-PO-CTL

**PLAINTIFF CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS'S  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION *IN LIMINE*, 14 OF 23**

Action Filed: March 01, 2017  
Department: C-68 (Whitney)

Trial Date: August 5, 2022  
Trial Time: 8:30 a.m

16  
17 Plaintiff Christopher Williams ("Plaintiff") respectfully submits this brief in opposition to Defendant  
18 David Arambula ("Arambula") and City of Lemon Grove ("City") (collectively, Defendants)'s Motion *In*  
19 *Limine* No. 14 to preclude Plaintiff from using lay witnesses to provide expert opinions.

20 Defendants state they anticipate Plaintiff will attempt to use lay witnesses to present expert opinion  
21 testimony regarding the cause and nature of his injuries, future medical care needs, business plan projections,  
22 and loss of business profits and revenue and through this motion asks this Court to preclude him from doing  
23 so.

24 Defendants, however, fail to describe what witnesses would be providing "expert testimony". The  
25 motion is vague and lists an array of topics that he anticipates Plaintiff to wrongfully introduce expert testimony  
26 on. Defendants leave unclear if he is under the impression that each multiple witness will provide expert  
27 testimony as to the same topics or one or less than all of the topics he mentioned. He makes no showing which  
28

1 witnesses he is referring to and which witnesses have an expert opinion. The vague and sweeping attempt to  
2 silence Plaintiff's counsel in trying his client's case to the jury should be denied.

3 A motion *in limine* is used to preclude prejudicial or objectionable evidence before it is presented to  
4 the jury. See *Blanks v. Shaw*, 171 Cal. App. 4th 336, 375 (2009). "In limine motions are designed to  
5 facilitate the management of a case, generally by deciding difficult evidentiary issues in advance of trial. The  
6 usual purpose of motions in limine is to preclude the presentation of evidence deemed inadmissible and  
7 prejudicial by the moving party. A typical order in limine excludes the challenged evidence and directs counsel,  
8 parties, and witnesses not to refer to the excluded matters during trial." *Id.* (internal citation omitted). Matters  
9 that are lacking in factual support or argument are not properly the subject of motions *in limine*. See *Kelly*  
10 *v. New West Federal Savings*, 49 Cal. App. 4th 659, 670 (1996). When ruling on a motion *in limine*, the  
11 Court should not have to rule in a vacuum or guess at what evidence should be included within the scope of  
12 its ruling. *Id.* Motions *in limine* may be inappropriate where it is difficult to specify exactly what evidence is  
13 the subject of the motion. "[U]ntil the evidence is actually offered, and the court is aware of its relevance in  
14 context, its probative value, and its potential for prejudice, matters related to the state of the evidence at the  
15 time the objection is made, the court cannot intelligently rule on its admissibility." *People v. Jennings*, 46 Cal.  
16 3d 963, 975 (1988).

17 Because Defendants fail to show what testimony or evidence should be precluded, motion *in limine*  
18 no. 14 should be denied.

19  
20 Date: August 3, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION

21  
22  
23 By: Nora Pasin

24 Nora Pasin  
25 Cory J. Briggs  
26 Attorneys for Plaintiff Christopher Williams  
27  
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

1. My name is Keri Taylor. I am over the age of eighteen. I am employed in the State of California, County of San Bernardino.

2. My  business \_\_\_\_\_ residence address is Briggs Law Corporation, 99 East "C" Street, Suite 111 Upland, CA 91786

3. On August 3, 2022, I served \_\_\_\_\_ an original copy  a true and correct copy of the following documents: Plaintiff Christopher Williams's Opposition to Defendants' Motion in Limine 14

4. I served the documents on the person(s) identified on the attached mailing/service list as follows:  
 **by personal service.** I personally delivered the documents to the person(s) at the address(es) indicated on the list.

**by U.S. mail.** I sealed the documents in an envelope or package addressed to the person(s) at the address(es) indicated on the list, with first-class postage fully prepaid, and then I \_\_\_\_\_ deposited the envelope/package with the U.S. Postal Service  
\_\_\_\_\_ placed the envelope/package in a box for outgoing mail in accordance with my office's ordinary practices for collecting and processing outgoing mail, with which I am readily familiar. On the same day that mail is placed in the box for outgoing mail, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the U.S. Postal Service.

I am a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The mailing occurred in the city of Upland, California.


**by overnight delivery.** I sealed the documents in an envelope/package provided by an overnight-delivery service and addressed to the person(s) at the address(es) indicated on the list, and then I placed the envelope/package for collection and overnight delivery in the service's box regularly utilized for receiving items for overnight delivery or at the service's office where such items are accepted for overnight delivery.

**by facsimile transmission.** Based on an agreement of the parties or a court order, I sent the documents to the person(s) at the fax number(s) shown on the list. Afterward, the fax machine from which the documents were sent reported that they were sent successfully.

**by e-mail delivery.** Based on the parties' agreement or a court order or rule, I sent the documents to the person(s) at the e-mail address(es) shown on the list. I did not receive, within a reasonable period of time afterward, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws \_\_\_\_\_ of the United States  of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: August 3, 2022

Signature: 

## SERVICE LIST

*Christopher Williams vs. Lemon Grove*  
Superior Court of the State of California Case No. 37-2018-00023369-CU-PO-CTL

---

Kimberly S. Oberrecht  
Nathaniel J. Michels  
HORTON, OBERRECHT & KIRKPATRICK  
101 W. Broadway, Suite 600  
San Diego, California 92101  
Telephone: (619) 232-1183  
[koberrecht@hortonfirm.com](mailto:koberrecht@hortonfirm.com)  
[nmichels@hortonfirm.com](mailto:nmichels@hortonfirm.com)  
[pparish@hortonfirm.com](mailto:pparish@hortonfirm.com)

*Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF LEMON  
GROVE*

Kathryn Lee Colgan  
Emily M. Straub  
TYSON & MENDES LLP  
5661 La Jolla Boulevard  
La Jolla, CA 92037  
Telephone: (858) 459-4400  
[klee@tysonmendes.com](mailto:klee@tysonmendes.com)  
[estraub@tysonmendes.com](mailto:estraub@tysonmendes.com)  
Legal Assistant: Marlena Vaughn:  
[mvaughn@tysonmendes.com](mailto:mvaughn@tysonmendes.com)

*Attorneys for Defendant DAVID  
ARAMBULA*