



CSU  
College of Law Library

Cleveland State University  
**EngagedScholarship@CSU**

---

1995-2002 Court Filings

2000 Trial

---

1-3-2000

## Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiff's Proposed Exhibits (#28, 29, 30...)

William D. Mason  
*Cuyahoga County Prosecutor*

Marilyn B. Cassidy  
*Cuyahoga County Assistant Prosecutor*

A. Steven Dever  
*Cuyahoga County Assistant Prosecutor*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/sheppard\\_court\\_filings\\_2000](https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/sheppard_court_filings_2000)

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Mason, William D.; Cassidy, Marilyn B.; and Dever, A. Steven, "Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiff's Proposed Exhibits (#28, 29, 30...)" (2000). *1995-2002 Court Filings*. 76.  
[https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/sheppard\\_court\\_filings\\_2000/76](https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/sheppard_court_filings_2000/76)

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](mailto:library.es@csuohio.edu).

## IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO

1000 JAN -3 1:27

ALAN J. DAVIS, Special Administrator  
of the Estate of  
SAMUEL H. SHEPPARD

Plaintiff

vs.

THE STATE OF OHIO

Defendant

Judge Ronald Suster


Case No. 312322

MOTION IN LIMINE TO  
EXCLUDE PLAINTIFF'S  
PROPOSED EXHIBITS  
(EVID. R. 401 & 402)

Defendant, State of Ohio, by and through counsel, William D. Mason,  
Prosecuting Attorney for Cuyahoga County, Assistant Prosecutor Marilyn Barkley  
Cassidy, and Assistant Prosecutor A. Steven Dever, moves this Honorable Court to  
exclude Plaintiff's proposed Exhibits numbered: 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 39  
for the reasons set forth fully in the following brief.

Respectfully Submitted,

WILLIAM D. MASON  
Prosecuting Attorney  
Cuyahoga County



Marilyn Barkley Cassidy (0014647)

A. Steven Dever (0024982)

Cuyahoga County Prosecutor's Office  
1200 Ontario St.

Cleveland, Ohio 44113

(216) 443-5870

Attorneys for Defendant

## BRIEF

### Facts and Introduction

The current Plaintiff's Exhibit List contains numerous items as proposed exhibits. Those exhibits are numbered on the current Plaintiff's Exhibit List as follows: 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 39. These exhibits include several items relating Vern Lund. Under Evid. R. 401 and 402, these exhibits are not admissible for the following reasons.

### Law and Argument

#### *Evid. R. 401 & Evid. R. 402*

Evid. R. 401 defines "relevant evidence" as being any "evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence." See also Brown v. City of Cleveland, (1981), 66 Ohio St.2d 93. The Plaintiff's proposed exhibits listed above do not meet this definition.

The proposed exhibits are being offered to impeach Richard Eberling and implicate him in the death of Marilyn Sheppard. These exhibits must be excluded because they do not make the existence of any fact of consequence more or less probable. Vern Lund's death certificate, passport, and military photographs simply do not make it more or less probable that Sam Sheppard murdered his wife, or that anyone else did for that matter.

The jury is facing substantial amounts of legal, factual, and scientific information, and the introduction of this evidence would only hinder the jury in its role. The presentation of this evidence would also lengthen what is anticipated to be a protracted trial. Judicial

resources will be strained enough in light of the complexity of the issues and the notoriety of this case and requires that this evidence be excluded.


These items pertaining to Vern Lund have absolutely no relevance to the determination of whether Samuel H. Sheppard is innocent of his wife's murder on July 4, 1954. Therefore, the proposed exhibits should not be admitted since they are not relevant under Evid. R. 402.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, the State of Ohio respectfully requests the court exclude Plaintiff's proposed exhibits 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 39 from this trial.


Respectfully Submitted,

WILLIAM D. MASON  
Prosecuting Attorney  
Cuyahoga County

  
Marilyn Barkley Cassidy (0014647)  
A. Steven Dever (0024982)  
Cuyahoga County Prosecutor's Office  
1200 Ontario St.  
Cleveland, Ohio 44113  
(216) 443-5870  
Attorneys for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The foregoing Motion to Exclude Plaintiff's Exhibits was served upon plaintiff's counsel Terry Gilbert at 1370 Ontario Street, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor, Cleveland, Ohio 44113 this 3 day of January, 2000, by regular U.S. Mail.

  
Marilyn Barkley Cassidy (0014647)