

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

-----  
CAROLINE MORE,

Plaintiff,

FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE  
ORDER

12-cv-905-bbc

v.

WILLIAM MOORE,

Defendant.  
-----

A final pretrial conference was held in this case on April 6, 2015, before United States District Judge Barbara B. Crabb. Plaintiff appeared in person, without counsel; defendant appeared in person and by counsel, Keith Belzer and Jessica Kirchner.

Plaintiff and defendant's counsel predicted that the case would take no more than 3 days to try. They understand that trial on Monday will begin at 10:00 and will run until 5:30, with at least an hour for lunch, a short break in the morning and another in the afternoon. If the trial is not completed that day, trial on Tuesday will run from 9:30 until

1:00. The Wednesday schedule will be 9-5.

The parties agreed to the voir dire questions in the form distributed to them at the conference. The jury will consist of eight jurors to be selected from a qualified panel of fourteen. Each side will exercise three peremptory challenges against the panel. After the jury is selected, the court will read the introductory instructions to the jury.

Plaintiff and defendant's counsel should use the microphones at all times and address the bench with all objections. If they need to consult with one another, they should ask for permission to do so.

The parties discussed the form of the verdict and the instructions. Final decisions on the instructions and form of verdict will be made at the instruction conference at the close of evidence.

Plaintiff renewed her objection to the court's not sending her a subpoena form for Mary Amundsen. As I explained to her, although she brought up her desire to call Amundsen as a witness at the telephone status conference held on March 16, 2015, she did not list Amundsen as someone she wanted to subpoena in the list she submitted to the clerk of court. Therefore, the clerk did not send her a subpoena form for Amundsen.

The parties discussed defendant's motion to exclude evidence of his 1995 misdemeanor conviction for sexual assault. The motion was granted. Plaintiff did not show that the evidence would be admissible for any reason set out in Fed. R. Evid. 404(b), such

as intent, motive, preparation, knowledge, etc. Moreover, the conviction is 15 years old, it was for a misdemeanor and there is no documentation about the nature of the acts underlying the conviction.

Entered this 7th day of April, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

---

BARBARA B. CRABB  
District Judge