

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

-----  
JUAN M. PÉREZ,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

06-C-248-C

MATTHEW J. FRANK, RICHARD RAEMISCH,  
CATHERINE FARREY, LIZZIE A. TEGELS,  
SUE NAULT, MELANIE FAUST, MARK  
TESLIK, GREG GRAMS and TIMOTHY  
LUNDQUIST, in their individual and official capacities,

Defendants.  
-----

In this civil action, plaintiff Juan Pérez is proceeding to trial on his claims that defendants Mark Teslik, Catherine Farrey, Sue Nault, Melanie Faust, Lizzie Tegels, Richard Raemisch and Matthew Frank violated his rights under RLUIPA and the free exercise clause by promulgating and enforcing policies that deprived him of the ability to possess adequate quantities of prayer oil; defendants Teslik, Farrey, Tegels, Raemisch and Frank violated his rights under RLUIPA and the free exercise clause by preventing him from performing wudu during the hours the prison dayroom is closed; and defendants Teslik, Nault, Farrey, Faust, Tegels and Raemisch violated his rights under the establishment clause by refusing to provide

him with Halaal food for 'Eid al Fitr and 'Eid ul Adha, while providing special foods to non-Muslim inmates for their religious feast days. Trial is scheduled for May 21, 2007. This order will describe how the court generally conducts a trial and explain to the parties what written materials they are to submit before trial.

#### A. Preparing for Trial

In the magistrate judge's preliminary pretrial conference order entered on August 23, 2006, dkt. #18, the parties were given a deadline of April 23, 2007 for disclosing the names and addresses of their trial witnesses. In addition, the parties are reminded that the court's procedures require that any party who wishes to call an incarcerated witness to testify to serve and file a motion for the issuance of writs of habeas corpus ad testificandum at least four weeks before trial, together with supporting affidavits revealing the witness's willingness to appear voluntarily. The parties should make all efforts to submit any motion as soon as possible so that the court will be able to issue any writs in time to insure the witness's presence at trial. In addition, to avoid having to resubmit a motion, the parties should carefully describe the nature of the testimony the witnesses will give, being sure to explain how each potential witness has personal knowledge of information relevant to a claim or defense.

I presume that plaintiff will testify on his own behalf. Therefore, I will direct the

Clerk of Court to issue a writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum for his attendance at trial. Plaintiff should note that he cannot expect defendants to be present at trial. If he wishes to call defendants as witnesses at trial, he should promptly ask defendants' counsel whether defendants will agree to be called as witnesses by plaintiff, without requiring plaintiff to subpoena them. If defendants do not agree, plaintiff will have to follow the attached procedures for issuing subpoenas to defendants if he wishes to obtain testimony from them.

#### B. Other Documents Submitted Before Trial

The parties are reminded also that there is a May 14 deadline to file and serve any motions in limine, proposed voir dire questions, proposed jury instructions and proposed verdict forms. **In addition, the parties are requested to submit to the court and serve on each other no later than May 14, 2007, an exhibit list and a complete set of all of the exhibits they intend to introduce at trial.** Attached to the magistrate judge's preliminary pretrial conference order in this case is a copy of this court's "Procedures for Trial Exhibits in Cases Assigned to Judge Crabb." Another copy of the procedures is attached to this order. **Please note:** As they are presently drafted, the procedures do not require the parties to exchange copies of their trial exhibits in advance of trial. However, the court has determined that modification of the procedures to include this additional requirement is necessary for two reasons. First, it insures that the parties will consider

carefully what documentary evidence they will need to prove the elements of the claims for which they carry the burden of proof at trial and to obtain authentication of the documents before coming to trial, if necessary. Second, it promotes the efficient conduct of the trial by allowing each party to examine the opposing parties' exhibits in advance of trial so that objections to the admissibility of the documents may be taken up at the final pretrial conference outside the presence of the jury. The parties should be prepared to explain at the conference their grounds for objecting to a particular exhibit. Additional information about exhibits is discussed below in Section F.

Voir dire questions are discussed in Section D. A party might file a motion in limine to exclude improper evidence that the party believes the other side may try to submit. Motions in limine are not intended to resolve disputes regarding all pieces of evidence; most evidentiary objections about individual documents can be made during trial. However, in cases in which there are disputes regarding evidence having a potentially significant impact on the course of trial, it may be appropriate in some circumstances to seek a ruling in advance.

### C. Elements of Plaintiff's Claims

In order to survive a motion for judgment as a matter of law, plaintiff must present enough evidence to allow a reasonable jury to find that each legal element of each of his

claims has been proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

1. Free exercise claims

With respect to plaintiff's claims that defendant deprived him of his First Amendment right to exercise his religious beliefs, plaintiff must show that:

(1) he has a sincerely held belief in Islam;

(2) the use of prayer oil and the practice of wudu are of central importance to his practice of Islam; and

(3) defendants intentionally deprived plaintiff of the opportunity to perform wudu and have access to adequate quantities of prayer oil.

Plaintiff may establish the elements of his claim through his own testimony; however, if he intends to assert that the use of prayer oil and the practice of wudu are central expressions of Islamic spirituality, he will first need to establish the foundation of his knowledge of Islamic spiritual practices (for example, a longtime adherence to and participation in the Muslim faith may qualify plaintiff to testify regarding the practices central to his religious practice).

With respect to plaintiff's claim that defendant Teslik deprived plaintiff of his right to freely exercise his religious beliefs under RLUIPA, plaintiff must show that:

(1) he has a sincerely held belief in Islam;

(2) the use of prayer oil and the practice of wudu are expressions of his Muslim faith;  
and

(3) defendants substantially and intentionally burdened plaintiff's ability to perform wudu and possess adequate quantities of prayer oil.

Once plaintiff has met his burden with respect to his free exercise and RLUIPA claims, the burden shifts to defendants to show that they had a compelling reason for burdening plaintiff's right to free exercise. With respect to plaintiff's RLUIPA claims, defendants must show also that the burden they placed on plaintiff was a narrowly tailored response to their compelling interest.

## 2. Establishment clause claim

With respect to plaintiff's establishment clause claim, plaintiff must show that:

(1) Defendants Teslik, Nault, Farrey, Faust, Tegels and Raemisch provided special foods to non-Muslim inmates for their religious feast days; and

(2) Defendants refused to provide special foods to Muslim inmates for for the feasts of 'Eid al Fitr and 'Eid ul Adha.

If plaintiff meets his burden of coming forward with evidence on these elements, the burden shifts to defendants to show that they had a legitimate secular reason for the differential treatment of Muslim and non-Muslim inmates with respect to religious feasts.

#### D. Jury Selection - Voir Dire Questions

The trial will begin with jury selection. The judge will ask all the potential jurors standard “voir dire” questions, which they must answer under oath. (“Voir dire” means “to speak the truth.”) This is the parties’ chance to observe the potential jurors while they are being questioned so that they can decide which prospective jurors to strike from the panel when the time comes to exercise their strikes.

The standard questions appear in the attachment to the magistrate judge’s preliminary pretrial conference order. The parties may add to the standard questions by submitting their proposed questions to the court and the opposing party no later than seven days before trial.

A total of thirteen possible jurors will be called forward. When the court has finished questioning the thirteen, each side will be allowed to strike the names of three potential jurors. The plaintiff will strike one name, the defendants one name, the plaintiff one name, the defendants one name, etc., leaving seven persons who will make up the jury panel.

#### E. Opening Statements

After the parties select the jury, plaintiff will give an opening statement describing his claim. An opening statement should give the jury an idea of what the case is about and what the jurors will see and hear from the witnesses and from the exhibits that plaintiff will offer

into evidence. The opening statement is not a time for plaintiff to give testimony. What is said during opening statements is not evidence. Therefore, if plaintiff begins to make comments in the nature of testimony, and if defense counsel objects, the court will interrupt plaintiff and instruct the jury not to consider the testimony-like statements.

Following plaintiff's opening statement, defense counsel is allowed to make a statement about defendant's case. If counsel wishes, he or she may choose to delay the statement until the beginning of defendant's case.

#### F. Evidence

All factual evidence offered at trial must meet the requirements of the Federal Rules of Evidence, which plaintiff should study carefully before trial. Although it is impossible to predict which rules may be important in a given trial, the most commonly cited rules are those relating to hearsay (Rules 801-807), relevance (Rules 401 and 402), unfair prejudice (Rule 403), character evidence (Rules 404 and 608), use of criminal convictions to impeach (Rule 609) and prior statements of witnesses (Rule 613).

The Federal Rules of Evidence limit the testimony of witnesses. Witnesses may give testimony on any relevant matter about which they have personal knowledge. However, witnesses generally cannot give hearsay testimony, that is, a witness cannot testify about what someone else said out of court, since the accuracy of a hearsay statement cannot be

tested by the opposing party. There are a number of exceptions to this general rule that are set out in Rules 803 and 804.

Documentary evidence will not be admissible unless the document is authenticated or its authenticity has been stipulated to by the opposing party. If the parties cannot agree in advance of trial on the admissibility of a proposed document or other piece of evidence, the party wishing to introduce the evidence must produce a copy of the document and a witness who can testify from his or her own knowledge that the document is what it appears to be.

For example, if plaintiff wishes to introduce prison meal menus into evidence, he should obtain an authenticated copy of the relevant records from the prison staff member responsible for maintaining custody of the records and ask the custodian to certify that the records were made at or near the time the events recorded in them, and were recorded and kept in the course of regularly conducted business. Fed. R. Evid. 806(6). He may then testify that he obtained the records from the prison and that they reflect the meals he recalls being served.

Plaintiff should be aware that a party may not introduce affidavits into evidence or read from them at trial because they are hearsay statements, made outside the court. Similarly, statements that plaintiff made in a complaint or grievance is not evidence of the truth of that statement. However, a person who has completed an affidavit may appear in

person to testify as a witness if he or she can offer testimony that is relevant to the lawsuit. Also, if at trial a witness testifies to facts that are inconsistent with statements the witness made in an earlier affidavit, a party may use statements in the witness's affidavit to show that the witness's testimony is inconsistent with the witness's earlier sworn statements.

Finally, plaintiff should be aware that orders or opinions from this court, the court of appeals or the Supreme Court are not evidence that may be used to support his claim. Plaintiff may refer to this court's orders and other case law in deciding how to prove his case, but he may not submit them as exhibits,

#### G. Avoiding Dismissal of the Case

After opening statements, the evidentiary stage of the trial begins. Plaintiff must put in his evidence first, because he has the burden of proving his claims by a preponderance of the evidence. He must prove each element of his claim. If plaintiff does not put in enough evidence to prove his claim, defendant may move the court for judgment as a matter of law against plaintiff, and the judge may dismiss the case before defendant is called upon to produce any opposing evidence. In order to survive a motion for judgment as a matter of law, plaintiff must present enough evidence to allow a reasonable jury to find that each legal element of his claim has been proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

## H. Damages

If the jury finds that plaintiff is entitled to a verdict in his favor, it may award as compensatory damages an amount that reasonably compensates plaintiff for the injuries or damages he suffered as a result of defendant's acts. Because plaintiff did not suffer physical injury as a result of his alleged denial of religious accommodations, he may not recover compensatory damages. 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(e).

However, if plaintiff satisfies the legal standard for punitive damages set out in the court's standard instructions, the jury may, but is not required to, award these damages as a deterrence to defendant, in addition to nominal damages. I note that plaintiff will have an opportunity to present evidence regarding the whether punitive damages should be awarded with respect to the claims set forth above and those on which he was granted summary judgment; namely, his claims that defendants Teslik, Farrey, Nault, Faust, Tegels, Raemisch and Frank violated his rights under RLUIPA and the free exercise clause by promulgating and enforcing policies that deprived him of the ability to engage in Jumu'ah, Ta'alim and group prayer during 'Eid ul Fitr and 'Eid ul Adha; defendants Teslik, Farrey, Nault, Faust, Tegels, Raemisch and Frank violated his rights under the free exercise clause, RLUIPA and the establishment clause by preventing him from eating dates during Ramadan; defendants Teslik, Farrey, Nault, Faust, Tegels, Raemisch and Frank violated his rights under RLUIPA and the free exercise clause by preventing him from feasting on Halaal foods during

‘Eid ul Adha and ‘Eid ul Fitr; and defendants Teslik, Lundquist, Grams, Raemisch, Tegels and Faust violated his rights under the free exercise clause and RLUIPA by promulgating and enforcing policies that deprived him of the ability to possess a digital Qur’an player.

#### ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the Clerk of Court issue a writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum for the attendance of plaintiff Juan Pérez (New Lisbon Correctional Institution) at trial beginning on May 21, 2007.

FURTHER, IT IS ORDERED that

1. NOT LATER THAN May 7, 2007, the parties are to file and serve any motions for the issuance of subpoenas or writs of habeas corpus ad testificandum, together with supporting affidavits revealing the witness’s willingness to appear voluntarily.

2. NOT LATER THAN May 14, 2007, the parties are to file and serve (a) proposed questions for voir dire examination; (b) a proposed form of special verdict; and (c) proposed jury instructions; (d) a copy of all exhibits and an exhibit list; and (e) motions in limine. The parties should not submit the standard voir dire questions and jury instructions attached to the magistrate judge’s preliminary pretrial conference order. The court will consider any objections to the voir dire questions by either party in a conference to be held before jury selection begins.

3. The court retains the discretion to refuse to entertain special verdict forms or jury instructions not submitted on time, unless the subject of the request is one arising in the course of trial that could not reasonably have been anticipated prior to trial.

4. If any party wants to submit a trial brief in advance of trial, he must serve a copy of the brief on the opposing party. The party may file the brief with the court at any time before jury selection.

Entered this 19th day of April, 2007.

BY THE COURT:  
/s/  
BARBARA B. CRABB  
District Judge