



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x  
IN RE:  
GENERAL MOTORS LLC IGNITION SWITCH  
LITIGATION

14-MD-2543 (JMF)  
14-MD-2543 (JMF)

*This Document Relates to:*  
*Cockram v. General Motors LLC, 14-CV-8176*  
-----x

**ORDER NO. 102**

JESSE M. FURMAN, United States District Judge:

**[Application of Certain Pretrial Orders in MDL Bellwether Trial Nos. 1 and 2  
to MDL Bellwether Trial No. 5 (Cockram)]**

1. **Application of Certain Pretrial Orders in Bellwether Trial Nos. 1 and 2 to Bellwether Trial No. 5:** Pursuant to Order No. 100 (Docket No. 2836), GM LLC and Plaintiff submitted a joint letter and proposal regarding the applicability of certain pretrial rulings from Bellwether Trial Nos. 1 and 2 to Bellwether Trial No. 5. Having reviewed the parties' submissions, and for good cause shown, the Court adopts the holdings contained in the chart attached as Exhibit 1 to this Order concerning the applicability of the listed pretrial rulings from Bellwether Trial Nos. 1 and 2 to Bellwether Trial No. 5. To the extent either party intends to file new briefing in accordance with this Order, the parties shall first meet and confer to avoid unnecessary motion practice and to narrow any disputes. Finally, for good cause shown (by way of letter motion seeking leave from the Court), any party may seek modification or reconsideration of the Court's evidentiary rulings that are deemed applicable to Bellwether Trial No. 5 pursuant to this Order if later rulings on motions *in limine*, dispositive motions, or *Daubert* motions change the scope of relevant and admissible evidence in Bellwether Trial No. 5. A party may only seek such leave to move for such modification or reconsideration, however, after meeting and conferring with the other side.

2. **Effect of This Order on Other Rules and Orders:** To the extent not explicitly modified herein, the Court's Individual Rules and Practices in Civil Cases and Rules and Procedures for Trials and all other applicable Orders of this Court remain in full force and effect. The Court may enter additional and/or modified orders regarding the pretrial schedule of Bellwether Trial No. 5 as circumstances require.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 10, 2016  
New York, New York

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JESSE M. FURMAN  
United States District Judge

<b>Issue Briefed in <i>Scheuer</i> or <i>Barthelemy</i> and Ruling</b>	<b>Application to <i>Cockram</i><sup>1</sup></b>
<b><i>Scheuer</i> Pl. Motion <i>In Limine</i> (“MIL”) No. 1 (Collateral Source Benefits) (Docket Nos. 1525, 1526)</b>  Ruling: 11/23/2015 Order (Docket No. 1727)	The parties agree that the Court’s ruling is specific to Oklahoma law and does not apply.  <b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding the <i>Scheuer</i> plaintiff’s MIL No. 1 does not apply to <i>Cockram</i> .
<b><i>Scheuer</i> Pl. MIL No. 2 (Prior Unrelated Injures and Family Medical History) (Docket Nos. 1565, 1566)</b>  Ruling: 11/23/2015 Order (Docket No. 1727)	The parties agree that the Court’s ruling is fact-specific to <i>Scheuer</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i> .  <b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding the <i>Scheuer</i> plaintiff’s MIL No. 2 does not apply to <i>Cockram</i> .
<b><i>Scheuer</i> Pl. MIL No. 3 (Use of Pain Medication) (Docket Nos. 1714, 1715)</b>  Ruling: 12/9/2015 Order (Docket No. 1837)	The parties agree that the Court’s ruling is fact-specific to <i>Scheuer</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i> .  <b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding the <i>Scheuer</i> plaintiff’s MIL No. 3 does not apply to <i>Cockram</i> .
<b><i>Scheuer</i> Pl. MIL No. 4 (Spoliation) (Docket Nos. 1711, 1712)</b>  Ruling: 12/29/2015 Order (Docket No. 1969)	The parties agree that the Court’s ruling is fact-specific to <i>Scheuer</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i> .  <b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding the <i>Scheuer</i> plaintiff’s MIL No. 4 does not apply to <i>Cockram</i> .

<sup>1</sup> Nothing in this proposed order should be construed to waive any of the parties’ preserved objections or rights to appeal the Court’s rulings. To the contrary, all arguments from prior briefing and/or oral arguments on such motions are expressly preserved.

<p><b><i>Scheuer Pl. MIL No. 5 (Deferred Prosecution Agreement)</i></b> (Docket Nos. 1731, 1732)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/16/2015 Order (Docket No. 1894); 1/6/2016 Order (Docket No. 2018) (redactions)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court’s ruling should apply to <i>Cockram</i>, subject to the parties’ rights to move for reconsideration should the Court’s subsequent rulings change the scope of relevant or admissible evidence in this case.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s ruling applies, subject to a party moving to reconsider pursuant to Paragraph 1 of this Order.</p>
<p><b><i>Scheuer Pl. MIL No. 6 (Live Trial Witnesses)</i></b> (Docket Nos. 1742, 1743)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/17/2015 Hr’g Tr. at 5:18-8:16</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court’s ruling is applicable to <i>Cockram</i>. The parties further agree to apply the process used in <i>Scheuer</i> for making GM LLC’s live witnesses available during plaintiff’s case in chief: specifically, 1) GM LLC will make any of its Will Call employee witnesses available to testify during her case in chief (subject to advance notice); and 2) by Monday, Sept 19, 2016, GM LLC will inform plaintiff as to whether it intends to call any of its May Call employee witnesses at trial, and any such GM LLC May Call witness will thereafter be made available to testify during plaintiff’s case in chief (subject to advance notice).</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding the <i>Scheuer</i> plaintiff’s MIL No. 6 applies to <i>Cockram</i> and the Court adopts the parties’ process set forth above regarding making GM LLC Will Call and May Call witnesses available to testify during plaintiff’s case in chief.</p>
<p><b><i>Scheuer Pl. MIL No. 7 (Plaintiff’s Feinberg Claim)</i></b> (Docket Nos. 1807, 1808)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/29/2015 Order (Docket No. 1969)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court’s ruling is fact-specific to <i>Scheuer</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding the <i>Scheuer</i> plaintiff’s MIL No. 7 does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b><i>Scheuer Pl. Daubert Motion</i></b> (Docket Nos. 1801, 1802)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/29/2015</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court’s rulings relating to Thomas Livernois and Jeya Padmanaban apply to <i>Cockram</i>. The Court’s ruling as to Harry Smith is not applicable to <i>Cockram</i> because Dr. Smith is not a designated expert in <i>Cockram</i>.</p>

<p>Order (Docket No. 1970)</p>	<p>Neither party anticipates the need to brief the issues resolved by this motion, but reserve the right to raise arguments to exclude experts and/or opinions not addressed in the <i>Scheuer</i> plaintiff's <i>Daubert</i> motion.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding the <i>Scheuer</i> plaintiff's <i>Daubert</i> motion applies in <i>Cockram</i>, but the parties are free to raise arguments to exclude experts and/or opinions not addressed in the <i>Scheuer</i> plaintiff's <i>Daubert</i> motion.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 1 (NHTSA Consent Order)</b> (Docket Nos. 1378, 1379)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/01/2015 Order (Docket No. 1770); 1/6/2016 Order (Docket No. 2017) (redactions)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling should apply to <i>Cockram</i>, subject to the parties' rights to move for reconsideration should the Court's subsequent rulings change the scope of relevant or admissible evidence in this case.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's ruling applies, subject to a party moving to reconsider pursuant to Paragraph 1 of this Order.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 2 (Spoliation)</b> (Docket Nos. 1411, 1415)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/29/2015 Order (Docket No. 1969)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling is fact-specific to <i>Scheuer</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding GM LLC's MIL No. 2 in <i>Scheuer</i> does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 3 (Paid vs. Incurred Medical Expenses)</b> (Docket Nos. 1573, 1574)</p> <p>Ruling: 11/23/2015 Order (Docket No. 1727)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling is specific to Oklahoma law and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding GM LLC's MIL No. 3 in <i>Scheuer</i> does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 4 (Plaintiff's Eviction)</b> (Docket Nos. 1580, 1581)</p> <p>Ruling: 11/30/2015</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling is fact-specific to <i>Scheuer</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding GM LLC's MIL No. 4 in <i>Scheuer</i> does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>

Order (Docket No. 1770)	
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 5 (Cases Filed and Prior Settlements)</b> (Docket Nos. 1582, 1583)</p> <p>Ruling: 11/30/2015 Order (Docket No. 1770)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court’s ruling should apply to <i>Cockram</i>, subject to the parties’ rights to move for reconsideration should the Court’s subsequent rulings change the scope of relevant or admissible evidence in this case.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order applies, subject to a party moving to reconsider pursuant to Paragraph 1 of this Order.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 6 (Anderson/Ward-Green Criminal Cases)</b> (Docket Nos. 1585, 1586)</p> <p>Ruling: 11/30/2015 Order (Docket No. 1770)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court’s ruling is applicable to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding GM LLC’s MIL No. 6 in <i>Scheuer</i> applies to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL Amended No. 7 (Punitive Damages)</b> (Docket Nos. 1800)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/30/2015 Order (Docket No. 1980)</p>	<p><b>Pl. Position:</b> The portion of the Court’s ruling indicating that there are three types of damages available to Plaintiffs, including that punitive damages are available against GM for “Independent Claims,” applies to <i>Cockram</i>. The part of the Court’s ruling addressing whether such punitive damages are available under Oklahoma law is specific to <i>Scheuer</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>GM LLC Position:</b> The Court’s ruling in <i>Scheuer</i> was dependent upon its summary judgment ruling in <i>Scheuer</i> and should not apply in <i>Cockram</i>, where the Court has not yet ruled on summary judgment. GM LLC anticipates moving for summary judgment on several issues, including punitive damages; therefore the Court’s ruling in <i>Scheuer</i> should not apply to <i>Cockram</i>. GM LLC reserves the right to brief the admissibility of evidence relating to punitive damages following the Court’s ruling on its motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff does not oppose this request.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s ruling applies, subject to a party moving to reconsider pursuant to Paragraph 1 of this Order.</p>

<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 8 (Misrepresentations to NHTSA)</b> (Docket Nos. 1614, 1615)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/3/2015 Order (Docket No. 1791)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling should apply to <i>Cockram</i>, subject to the parties' rights to move for reconsideration should the Court's subsequent rulings change the scope of relevant or admissible evidence in this case.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's ruling applies, subject to a party moving to reconsider pursuant to Paragraph 1 of this Order.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 9 (Privilege Issues at Trial)</b> (Docket Nos. 1616, 1617)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/3/2015 Order (Docket No. 1791)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling is applicable to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding GM LLC's MIL No. 9 in <i>Scheuer</i> applies to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 10 (Discovery and Other Litigation Conduct)</b> (Docket Nos. 1618, 1619)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/3/2015 Order (Docket No. 1791)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling is applicable to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding GM LLC's MIL No. 10 in <i>Scheuer</i> applies to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 11 (Other Similar Incidents)</b> (Docket Nos. 1629, 1630) (<i>see also</i> Docket Nos. 1834, 1910)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/3/2015 Order (Docket No. 1790); 12/28/2015 Order (Docket No. 1968)</p>	<p>The parties agree the Court's ruling on the admissibility of evidence regarding other similar incidents from <i>Scheuer</i> and <i>Barthelemy</i> is generally applicable, but reserve the right to raise new arguments based on the different evidence proffered by plaintiff and the different issues implicated in <i>Cockram</i>, including issues to be raised in the parties' dispositive motions and motions <i>in limine</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court reserves judgment on the applicability of its rulings on other similar incidents from <i>Scheuer</i> and <i>Barthelemy</i> to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 12 (Valukas Report)</b> (Docket Nos. 1631, 1632)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/9/2015</p>	<p><b>Pls. Position:</b> The Court's 12/9/15 and 1/6/16 rulings should apply to <i>Cockram</i>, but plaintiff would like the opportunity to select the excerpts from the Valukas Report that she would like to offer at trial. As such, pursuant to MDL Order No. 100, plaintiff must disclose by no later than <b>Friday, July 29, 2016</b>, the</p>

<p>Order (Docket No. 1837); 1/6/2016 Order (Docket No. 2019) (redactions)</p>	<p>excerpts from the Valukas Report that she intends to offer at trial and the parties will raise any disputes with respect thereto by no later than <b><u>Wednesday, August 10, 2016</u></b>.</p> <p><b>GM LLC Position:</b> To the extent subsequent rulings on GM LLC's motion for summary judgment, plaintiffs' OSI disclosure, or other rulings change the scope of relevant or admissible evidence in this case, GM LLC reserves the right to submit additional briefing on the scope of evidence admissible pursuant to this ruling following those rulings. Plaintiff does not oppose this request.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court reserves judgment on the applicability of the Order on GM LLC's MIL No. 12 in <i>Scheuer to Cockram</i> until after the Court rules on summary judgment or other rulings that may change the scope of relevant or admissible evidence in this case and until after review of any disputes raised with respect to plaintiff's Valukas Report excerpts.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 13 (Government Investigations)</b> (Docket Nos. 1633, 1634)</p> <p>Ruling: 11/25/2015 Order (Docket No. 1749)</p>	<p>GM LLC's motion remains unopposed. The parties agree that the Court's ruling in <i>Scheuer</i> granting the motion as unopposed is applicable to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> GM LLC's motion remains unopposed. The Court's order regarding GM LLC's MIL No. 13 in <i>Scheuer</i> granting the motion as unopposed applies to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 14 (Congressional Testimony)</b> (Docket Nos. 1635, 1636)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/9/2015 Order (Docket No. 1837)</p>	<p><b>Pls. Position:</b> The Court's ruling should apply to <i>Cockram</i>. Plaintiff agrees to disclose the specific page and line numbers of the Congressional testimony she intends to offer at trial along with her deposition designations on <b><u>Tuesday, July 26, 2016</u></b>, and the parties will raise any disputes with respect to this disclosure in connection with the parties' deposition designations.</p> <p><b>GM LLC Position:</b> To the extent subsequent rulings on GM LLC's motion for summary judgment, plaintiffs' OSI disclosure, or other rulings change the scope of relevant or admissible evidence in this case, GM LLC reserves the right to submit additional briefing on the scope of evidence admissible pursuant</p>



	<p>to this ruling following those rulings. Plaintiff does not oppose this request.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s ruling applies, subject to a party moving to reconsider pursuant to Paragraph 1 of this Order. The Court also adopts plaintiff’s proposal above regarding the disclosure of and resolution of disputes with respect to plaintiff’s proffered Congressional testimony in connection with the parties’ deposition designation disputes.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 15 (Government Reports)</b> (Docket Nos. 1637, 1638)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/9/2015 Order (Docket No. 1837)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court’s ruling in <i>Scheuer</i> should apply to <i>Cockram</i>. The parties agree to meet and confer with respect to proposed redactions to the <i>Path Forward</i> report. Any disagreements will be raised with the Court.</p> <p>In addition, to the extent subsequent rulings on GM LLC’s motion for summary judgment, plaintiffs’ OSI disclosure, or other rulings change the scope of relevant or admissible evidence in this case, GM LLC reserves the right to submit additional briefing on the scope of evidence admissible pursuant to this ruling following those rulings.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding GM LLC’s MIL No. 15 in <i>Scheuer</i> applies to <i>Cockram</i>. The parties shall meet and confer with respect to proposed redactions to the <i>Path Forward Report</i>. Any disagreements can be raised with the Court. GM LLC is also granted leave to submit additional briefing on this motion following the Court’s rulings on summary judgment or other rulings that change the scope of relevant or admissible evidence in this case.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 16 (Non-Delta Ignition Switches)</b> (Docket Nos. 1639, 1640)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/7/2015 Order (Docket No. 1825); 12/29/2015 Order (Docket No. 1971) (factual</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court’s ruling in <i>Scheuer</i> should apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding GM LLC’s MIL No. 16 in <i>Scheuer</i> applies to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>

correction)	
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 17 (Adequacy of Recall Remedies)</b> (Docket Nos. 1641, 1642)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/7/2015 Order (Docket No. 1825)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court’s ruling is fact-specific to <i>Scheuer</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding GM LLC’s MIL No. 17 in <i>Scheuer</i> does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 18 (Irrelevant, Pejorative, Unfairly Prejudicial Remarks)</b> (Docket Nos. 1643, 1644)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/7/2015 Order (Docket No. 1825)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the part of this motion that was granted is applicable to <i>Cockram</i>. The parties further believe they will be able to reach agreement on the rest of the issues raised in the motion.</p> <p>Neither party currently anticipates the need to brief the issue in <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding GM LLC’s MIL No. 18 in <i>Scheuer</i> applies to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 19 (Anonymous Letters)</b> (Docket Nos. 1805, 1806)</p> <p>Ruling: 12/29/2015 Order (Docket No. 1971)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court’s ruling should apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding GM LLC’s MIL No. 19 in <i>Scheuer</i> applies to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 20 (Evidence re Airbag Non-Deployment)</b> (Docket Nos. 2209, 2210)</p> <p>Order: 2/25/2016 (Docket No. 2362)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court’s ruling is fact-specific to <i>Barthelemy</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court’s order regarding GM LLC’s MIL No. 20 does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>GM LLC MIL No. 21 (FTC Consent Order)</b> (Docket Nos. 2213, 2214)</p> <p>Order: 2/16/2016</p>	<p>GM LLC and plaintiffs stipulate and agree that the parties will not introduce evidence relating to: (i) the proposed consent order between General Motors LLC and the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) (<i>In the Matter of General Motors LLC</i>, FTC File No. 152-3101), or (ii) any final version of such FTC consent</p>

(Memo Endorsement of Stipulation, Docket No. 2287)	order. <b>HOLDING:</b> SO ORDERED.
<b>GM LLC <i>Daubert</i> Motion</b> (Docket Nos. 1815, 1820)  Ruling: 12/29/2015 Order (Docket No. 1970)	The parties agree that the Court's rulings relating to the generic opinions of Steve Loudon, Glen Stevick, Michael Markushewski, and Chris Caruso apply to <i>Cockram</i> . The Court's case-specific rulings with respect to Michael Markushewski, and Chris Caruso, Robert Cox, and David Macpherson do not apply. The Court's rulings with respect to Michael McCort do not apply as he is not designated as an expert in <i>Cockram</i> .  The parties reserve the right to raise arguments to exclude experts and/or opinions not addressed in GM LLC's <i>Daubert</i> motion.  <b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding GM LLC's <i>Daubert</i> motion applies in <i>Cockram</i> to the extent described above, but the parties are free to raise arguments to exclude experts and/or opinions not addressed in GM LLC's <i>Daubert</i> motion in <i>Scheuer</i> .
<b>Redactions to the Valukas Report, the DPA Statement of Facts, and NHTSA Consent Order:</b>  Orders: 1/6/2016 (Docket Nos. 2017, 2018, 2019)	The parties agree that the applicability of the Court's rulings on the redactions to the Valukas Report, DPA Statement of Facts, and the NHTSA Consent Order should be deferred until the Court rules on GM LLC's motion for summary judgment and plaintiff's OSI disclosure.  <b>HOLDING:</b> The Court reserves judgment on the applicability of the rulings on redactions to the Valukas Report, DPA Statement of Facts, and NHTSA Consent Order in <i>Scheuer</i> to <i>Cockram</i> until after the Court rules on summary judgment or other rulings that change the scope of relevant or admissible evidence in this case.
<b>GM LLC Motion to Preclude Plaintiffs from Calling Michael Gruskin Live At Trial</b> (Docket Nos. 2404, 2442, 2455)	The parties agree that the Court's ruling precluding plaintiffs from calling Michael Gruskin to testify live at trial applies to <i>Cockram</i> .  <b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order precluding plaintiffs from calling Michael Gruskin to testify live at trial applies to <i>Cockram</i> .

<p>Ruling: 3/9/2016 Pretrial Conference Transcript (and Docket No. 2461)</p>	
<p><b>Barthelemy Pls. MIL No. 1 (Barthelemy's Criminal Record)</b> (Docket Nos. 2231, 2232)</p> <p>Order: 2/23/2015 (Text Order, Docket No. 2346)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling is fact-specific to <i>Barthelemy</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding the <i>Barthelemy</i> plaintiffs' MIL No. 1 does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>Barthelemy Pls. MIL No. 2 (Expert Testimony re Airbag Deployment)</b> (Docket Nos. 2215, 2216)</p> <p>Order: 2/23/2015 (Text Order, Docket No. 2346)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling is fact-specific to <i>Barthelemy</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding the <i>Barthelemy</i> plaintiffs' MIL No. 2 does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>Barthelemy Pls. MIL No. 4 (Prior Lawsuits by Plaintiffs)</b> (Docket Nos. 2223, 2224)</p> <p>Order: 2/23/2015 (Text Order, Docket No. 2346)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling is fact-specific to <i>Barthelemy</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding the <i>Barthelemy</i> plaintiffs' MIL No. 4 does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>Barthelemy Pls. MIL No. 6 (Officer David Kramer)</b> (Docket Nos. 2217, 2218)</p> <p>Order: 2/23/2015 (Text Order, Docket No. 2346)</p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling is fact-specific to <i>Barthelemy</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p> <p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding the <i>Barthelemy</i> plaintiffs' MIL No. 6 does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
<p><b>Barthelemy Pls. MIL No. 7 (Plaintiffs' Insurance Claims)</b></p>	<p>The parties agree that the Court's ruling is fact-specific to <i>Barthelemy</i> and does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>

<p>(Docket Nos. 2221, 2222)</p> <p>Order: 2/23/2015 (Text Order, Docket No. 2346)</p>	<p><b>HOLDING:</b> The Court's order regarding the <i>Barthelemy</i> plaintiffs' MIL No. 7 does not apply to <i>Cockram</i>.</p>
---	--