	Case 2:08-cv-02051-FJM Document 298 Filed 05/07/10 Page 1 of 2
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
8	
9	American Traffic Solutions, Inc., ) No. CV 08-2051-PHX-FJM
10	Plaintiff, ORDER
11	vs.
12	Dadflay Traffia Systems Inc.
13	Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., ) Defendant. )
14	
15	
16	The court has before it defendant's "Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's April
17	30, 2010 Bench Decrees Denying Redflex's <i>Daubert</i> Motions". (Doc. 293). Defendant
18	contends that its motions were not motions in limine and therefore not subject to the page
19	limits in the Rule 16 Scheduling Order.
20	Under our Rule 16 order, the parties were required to disclose expert testimony back
21	in August 2009. Yet Redflex waited until April 20, 2010, ten days before the final pre-trial
22	conference, to file its Ingberman motion(doc. 249), and April 26, 2010, four days before the
23	final pre-trial conference, to file its Keeling motion (doc. 257). This was so late, plaintiff had
24	no opportunity to respond under LRCiv 7.2(c) before the conference. If a party is serious
25	about a <i>Daubert</i> issue, that is, above and beyond a garden variety objection under Rule 702,
26	Fed. R. Evid., its motion should be filed and heard long before the final pre-trial conference,
27	with an opportunity for the opposing party to respond, an opportunity for a reply and a
28	chance for the court to read, consider the matter, and hold an evidentiary hearing if

	Case 2:08-cv-02051-FJM Document 298 Filed 05/07/10 Page 2 of 2
1	nagassary Dadflay abasa a different noth. It abasa to tract its motion as one in liming under
1	necessary. Redflex chose a different path. It chose to treat its motion as one in limine under
2	the court's Rule 16 order, and thus was subject to the abbreviated procedures set forth in the order. Its motions were thus too long, too late, and not within the letter and spirit of the Rule
4	16 order. They were an ambush of the court and counsel. They were thus properly denied
5	as motions in limine. Counsel will simply have to make his objection at trial.
6	Accordingly, it is ORDERED DENYING Redflex's Motion for Reconsideration.
7	(Doc. 293).
8	DATED this 6 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2010.
9	
10	Frederick J. Martone
11	Frederick J. Martone United States District Judge
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	
26	
27	
28	
_ 5	