

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE: ASBESTOS PRODUCTS LIABILITY	)	Civil Action NO. MDL 875
LITIGATION (NO. VI)	)	
	)	
	)	
This document relates to all cases	)	
listed on the attached Exhibit A	)	
(CVLO-1&2, CVLO-3, CVLO-4	)	
CVLO-5, CVLO-6, and CVLO-7)	)	

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 17<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2012, following upon the filing of several motions *in limine*,<sup>1</sup> and our Order of February 1, 2012,<sup>2</sup> it is hereby **ORDERED** that no motions styled as motions *in limine* shall be filed in any of the Cascino Vaughan Law Offices

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Defendant General Electric Company’s Motion *in Limine* to Exclude Testimony of Plaintiff’s Expert Dr. Peter Orris (08-91884 Doc. No. 129), Defendant General Electric Company’s Motion *in Limine* to Exclude Testimony of Plaintiff’s Expert Stephen Kenoyer (08-90189 Doc. No. 130), and Defendant Ispat Inland Inc.’s Motion *in Limine* to Exclude Testimony of Plaintiff’s Expert Stephen Kenoyer (08-90287 Doc. No. 174). In that they have already been filed, they will be considered as motions for summary judgment, and Judge Robreno will handle them accordingly. If any motion of this kind is filed subsequent to the filing of this Order, however, it will be denied without prejudice, to be refiled as motions for summary judgment.

<sup>2</sup> In this Order, we advised all parties that the MDL Court no longer would consider motions *in limine*, and ordered the parties to refrain from filing any such motion in the MDL. We also reminded all counsel that nothing in that Order should be construed to limit or in any way affect the right of parties to file case dispositive motions, in accordance with the various scheduling orders applicable to any particular case, where the exclusion of the evidence would have a case dispositive effect, as a motion for summary judgment.

We understand that General Electric took note of our February 1, 2012 order and appears to have filed its motions *in limine* in an attempt to comply with it. (See, e.g. 08-90189 Doc. No. 130 n.1.) What General Electric has done, however, is not what we contemplated by the issuance of that Order. Accordingly, we issue this Order in an effort to provide a clarification.

As with our previous ruling on motions in limine, this Order shall have no effect upon the prospective testimony of Drs. Schonfeld, Anderson and Sadek, which is the subject of a separate order.

cases in MDL-875.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, any party who believes that any particular case presents a *limine* issue that would have a **case dispositive effect**, must present such issue to the Court as a motion for summary judgment.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ David R. Strawbridge  
DAVID R. STRAWBRIDGE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE