

# Cleveland State University EngagedScholarship@CSU

1995-2002 Court Filings

2000 Trial

12-6-1999

### **Defendant's Motion to Exclude Experts**

William D. Mason
Cuyahoga County Prosecutor

Marilyn B. Cassidy Cuyahoga County Assistant Prosecutor

Follow this and additional works at: https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/sheppard\_court\_filings\_2000

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

#### **Recommended Citation**

Mason, William D. and Cassidy, Marilyn B., "Defendant's Motion to Exclude Experts" (1999). *1995-2002 Court Filings*. 46.

https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/sheppard\_court\_filings\_2000/46

This Davis v. State of Ohio, Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Case No. CV96-312322 is brought to you for free and open access by the 2000 Trial at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in 1995-2002 Court Filings by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.

MALEC -5 P # 10

## IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO

ALAN DAVIS, EXECUTOR,

CASE NO. 312322

Plaintiff

:

V

JUDGE RONALD SUSTER

STATE OF OHIO,

**DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE** 

Defendant

**EXPERTS CHAPMAN, WILSON AND** 

**CHAKRABORTY** 

Defendant, by and through counsel, William D. Mason, Prosecuting Attorney for Cuyahoga County, and Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, Marilyn B. Cassidy, moves this honorable court to exclude both the reports and the testimony of experts Chapman, John Wilson, Rajit Chakraborty. The grounds for this motion are that the court, by way of case management order dated February 16, 1999, ordered plaintiff to submit expert reports to defendant on or before May 3, 1999. Plaintiff's expert reports were received by defendant approximately four weeks following that

date, in June of 1999. Plaintiff's submission of three additional expert reports seven months after the court's deadline, and only six weeks prior to trial, is impermissible under the rules and prejudices the defendant, all as is set forth fully in the memorandum attached hereto and expressly incorporated herein.

Respectfully Submitted,

WILLIAM D. MASON, PROSECUTING ATTORNEY, CUYAHOGA COUNTY

Marilyn B/Qassidy (0014647)

Assistant Prosecuting Attorney

1200 Ontario Street

Cleveland, Ohio 44113

(216) 443-7785

### MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

As has been previously briefed by the parties, Ohio Civil Rule 16(6) provides that the court may issue a case management order to establish, *inter alia*, the exchange of expert reports. Pretrial procedure relative to expert reports addressed by Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas, Loc. R. 21.1, which states specifically, "The parties shall submit expert reports in accord with the time schedule established at the case management conference. Upon good cause shown, the court may grant the parties additional time within which to submit their expert reports."

In this case, it is significant that plaintiff was already granted a lengthy extension of time in which to submit his expert reports. The court initially directed plaintiff to submit his expert reports by May 3, 1999. As plaintiff 's experts were unable to meet that time requirement, the court extended the date approximately four to six weeks, until June, 1999. Thereafter, the state moved for a continuance of trial, based in part upon the late arrival of plaintiff's expert reports and in part upon the state's plan to exhume the body of Marilyn Sheppard in October, 1999.

At the court's direction, the parties briefed the issue of production of expert reports under Civil Rule 16 and Local Rule 21.1. Despite the Cuyahoga County Local Rule's clear language providing that the party with the burden of proof first submit reports, and despite plaintiff's unequivocal representations that his reports must be supplemented, the court ordered the state to submit its list of expert witnesses by December 1, 1999. (See case management order dated Nov. 5, 1999).

The plaintiff has had defendant's list of expert witnesses since April, 1999. Plaintiff now seeks to add three experts, six months out of rule and only six weeks prior to trial. Defendant cannot reasonably expected to locate a rebuttal expert and secure a responsible report in that short period of time. Accordingly, defendant's case is unfairly prejudiced.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the State of Ohio respectfully requests that its motion to strike experts Chapman, Wilson, and Chakraborty, or in the alternative, motion to exclude testimony of excluded in the trial of this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

WILLIAM D. MASON, PROSECUTING ATTORNEY, CUYAHOGA COUNTY

Marilyn B. Cassidy (0014647)

Assistant Prosecuting Attorney

1200 Ontario Street

Cleveland, Ohio 44113

(216) 443-7785

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A copy of the foregoing Motion to Strike or in the Alternative Motion to Exclude Testimony has been served this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 1999, upon Terry Gilbert, 1370 Ontario Street, Suite 1700, Cleveland, Ohio 44113.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marilyn B. Cassidy Assistant Prosecutor