

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

ALEXANDER LUND,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL MATTHEWS, M.D.,
SIDNEY MEDICAL ASSOCIATES,
and CHEYENNE COUNTY
HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,

Defendants.

8:13CV144

ORDER

This matter is before the court on the defendants', Michael Matthews, M.D. (Dr. Matthews) and Cheyenne County Hospital Association, Inc. (CCHA), Motion to Compel and for Sanctions (Filing No. 30). The defendants filed a brief (Filing No. 31) and index of evidence (Filing No. 32) in support of the motion. The plaintiff, Alexander Lund (Lund), filed a brief (Filing No. 33) in opposition. The defendants filed a brief (Filing No. 34) and index of evidence (Filing No. 35) in reply.

BACKGROUND

This action relates to injuries Lund sustained while under Dr. Matthews' medical care at Memorial Health Center (MHC) in Sidney, Cheyenne County, Nebraska, on January 9 and 10, 1994. **See** Filing No. 1 - Complaint. Cathleen Lund, Lund's mother, was admitted to MHC on January 9, 1994, and gave birth to Lund on January 10, 1994. **Id.** ¶¶ 2, 13. Due to alleged mismanagement of Cathleen Lund's prenatal care and the labor and delivery of Lund by Dr. Matthews and MHC employees, Lund suffered a permanent brachial plexus injury, cervical and spinal injuries, and other birth trauma. **Id.** ¶¶ 15, 17-18.

On December 12, 2013, defendants' counsel, Mark A. Christensen (Mr. Christensen), scheduled Lund for a deposition. **See** Filing No. 32-1 - Mr. Christensen Aff. ¶ 2. Lund was present with his counsel, Patrick J. Cullan (Mr. Cullan). **Id.** After experiencing difficulties deposing Lund, Mr. Christensen terminated the deposition. **Id.**

¶ 3, Filing No. 32-1 - Lund Depo. p. 50-54. Subsequently, the defendants filed the instant motion to compel and for sanctions. **See** Filing No. 30 - Motion.

The defendants argue Mr. Cullan violated discovery rules during Lund's deposition by interrupting with an excessive number of baseless objections. **See** Filing No. 31 - Brief p. 3. The defendants contend after Mr. Christensen concluded background questions and began asking questions relevant to Lund's lawsuit, Mr. Cullan began offering suggestive speaking objections that shaped Lund's answers in a way to prevent meaningful discovery. *Id.* at 3-4. For example, the defendants cite the following exchange during Lund's deposition:

- Q. What made you decide to sue Dr. Matthews?
Mr. Cullan: Object to the form, foundation
- A. I don't know, I - -
Mr. Cullan: I guess I'll object to the form, foundation of that question, other than the fact that he's been injured by the wrongdoing of Dr. Matthews.
- Q. You still need to answer.
- A. Yeah. I would say that was pretty spot on.

See Filing No. 32-1 - Lund Depo. p. 28:17-15 to 29:1-4. The defendants assert such a speaking objection is highly inappropriate and merits sanctions. **See** Filing No. 31 - Brief p. 4. Thereafter, the defendants argue Mr. Christensen attempted to address three topics without avail due to Mr. Cullan's objections. *Id.* 4-5. The topics were: a statement Cathleen Lund made to Lund, individuals Lund spoke with about filing the lawsuit, and Lund's physical condition. *Id.*

The defendants contend after Lund "offered a sliver of potentially relevant testimony, stating that his mother told him the nurses 'had her legs pressed up' once problems appeared during his delivery, Mr. Cullan prevented Mr. Christensen from inquiring further into the statement with repeated speaking objections and suggestions to [Lund], which [Lund] eventually took." *Id.* at 4-5. The defendants argue the following objections with added commentary were improper and coached Lund: "That misstates his testimony, but go ahead if you know where the legs were pushed up" (Filing No. 32-1 - Lund Depo. p. 34:21-23); "That's asking for him to speculate" (*Id.* at 33:24-34:1); "He doesn't know what she meant by that" (*Id.* at 35:1-2); "If you recall specifically. If you don't --" (*Id.* at 35:7-8); "If that's what you recall, that's what you recall. You obviously

can't interpret what she's saying, but to the best of your recollection as you sit here today, or can you not recall with accuracy?" (*Id.* at 36:4-9). The defendants argue Mr. Cullan's improper objections foreclosed Mr. Christensen from learning what Lund knew about Cathleen Lund's statement because Lund took suggestions from Mr. Cullan and stated Lund could not remember the conversation with his mother. **See** Filing No. 31 - Brief p. 5.

The second topic the defendants assert Mr. Cullan prevented Mr. Christensen from addressing was who Lund spoke with about the lawsuit before filing the lawsuit. *Id.* at 5-12. The defendants argue Mr. Christensen sought to identify individuals with knowledge of Lund's lawsuit and did not seek to discover the substance of communications protected by the attorney-client privilege. *Id.* However, the defendants argue, Mr. Cullan's baseless objections effectively frustrated the questioning and guided Lund to answers that precluded a fair examination. *Id.* (**citing** Filing No. 32-1 - Lund Depo. p. 36-40). Additionally, the defendants contend during this line of questioning, Mr. Cullan improperly whispered in Lund's ear and instructed Lund not to answer a question based on an "asked and answered" objection. *Id.* (**citing** Filing No. 32-1 - Lund Depo. p. 38:19 - 42:10).

Lastly, the defendants argue Mr. Cullan's objections prevented Mr. Christensen's attempts to address the third topic: Lund's physical condition. *Id.* at 12-18. The defendants contend Lund took cues from Mr. Cullan's suggestive speaking objections and stated "I don't have a Ph.D." in response to whether or not Lund's neck hurt. *Id.* (**citing** Filing No. 32-1 - Lund Depo. p. 50:6).

The defendants argue the deposition transcript read as a whole shows Mr. Cullan's conduct impeded and frustrated the possibility of a fair deposition. *Id.* at 3. The defendants contend continuing the deposition under such circumstances would have only wasted time and money. *Id.* at 4. Therefore, the defendants seek an order compelling Lund to answer Mr. Christensen's questions at a second deposition and awarding the defendants the reasonable expenses and attorney's fees incurred during Lund's first deposition and making the instant motion. *Id.* at 2. The defendants also move for a protective order regarding Mr. Cullan's conduct. *Id.*

Lund asserts Mr. Cullan properly made objections during the three topics Mr. Christensen addressed. **See** Filing No. 33 - Response p. 2-8. Lund recognizes Mr. Cullan's comment during the colloquy why Lund sued Dr. Matthews had the unintentional effect of coaching Lund and apologizes for the comment. *Id.* at 1. However, Lund argues Mr. Cullan's subsequent objections were made to protect Lund's legitimate rights and interests and sanctions are unwarranted. *Id.* Lund contends telling a client to state what the client knows is not coaching because it does not suggest a particular answer. *Id.* at 2. Lund argues Mr. Cullan's objections related to the questioning about Cathleen Lund's legs being pressed up by the nurses during delivery were legitimate because Mr. Christensen misstated Lund's testimony and called for speculation. *Id.* at 2-8. Lund contends Mr. Cullan's objections during the questioning on the timing of the lawsuit were proper because Mr. Christensen sought irrelevant and inadmissible testimony. *Id.* Regarding Mr. Christensen's questions concerning Lund's neck, Lund argues Mr. Cullan properly asserted objections because Mr. Christensen berated Lund and Lund is not an expert qualified to testify on neck injuries. *Id.* Lastly, Lund argues Mr. Christensen engaged in similar conduct during Mr. Cullan's depositions of the defendants' witnesses. *Id.* at 8-9.

In reply, the defendants reiterate relevance is broadly construed during discovery and Mr. Cullan's objections are improper. **See** Filing No. 34 - Reply. Specifically, the defendants argue telling Lund to state what Lund knows is coaching as it instructs him to respond he does not know an answer. *Id.* at 2. Additionally, the defendants contend the purpose of Mr. Cullan's objection: "Objection, form, foundation. If you know, answer" is to disrupt the flow of the deposition. *Id.*

ANALYSIS

"Parties may obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party's claim or defense." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). "Broad discovery is an important tool for the litigant, and so '[r]elevant information need not be admissible at the trial if the discovery appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.'" *WWP, Inc. v. Wounded Warriors Family Support, Inc.*, 628 F.3d 1032, 1039 (8th Cir. 2011) (alteration in original) (**quoting** Fed. R. Civ. P.

26(b)(1)). Accordingly, relevant information includes “any matter that bears on, or that reasonably could lead to other matter that could bear on, any issue that is or may be in the case.” **Oppenheimer Fund, Inc. v. Sanders**, 437 U.S. 340, 351 (1978). The “broad scope of discovery applies to depositions[.]” **Pucket v. Hot Springs Sch. Dist. No. 23-2**, 239 F.R.D. 572, 579 (D.S.D. 2006); **see also Credit Lyonnais, S.A. v. SGC Int’l, Inc.**, 160 F.3d 428, 430 (8th Cir. 1998) (“The rules for depositions and discovery ‘are to be accorded a broad and liberal treatment.’”) (citing **Hickman v. Taylor**, 329 U.S. 495, 507 (1947)).

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 30(c) governs the conduct of examination by depositions. **See** Fed. R. Civ. P. 30. Specifically, Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(c)(2) provides objections must be made as follows:

An objection at the time of the examination--whether to evidence, to a party’s conduct, to the officer’s qualifications, to the manner of taking the deposition, or to any other aspect of the deposition--must be noted on the record, but the examination still proceeds; the testimony is taken subject to any objection. An objection must be stated concisely in a nonargumentative and nonsuggestive manner. A person may instruct a deponent not to answer only when necessary to preserve a privilege, to enforce a limitation ordered by the court, or to present a motion under Rule 30(d)(3).

See Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(c)(2). “A deposition is meant to be a question-and-answer conversation between the deposing lawyer and the witness. There is no proper need for the witness’s own lawyer to act as an intermediary, interpreting questions, deciding what questions the witness should answer.” **Plaisted v. Geisinger Med. Ctr.**, 210 F.R.D. 527, 534 (M.D. Pa. 2002) (citation omitted). “[I]f a witness is confused about a question, or if the question seems awkward or vague, the witness may ask deposing counsel to clarify the question; securing clarification is not the job of the witness’ counsel.” **Cordova v. United States**, CIV.05 563 JB/LFG, 2006 WL 4109659, at *2 (D.N.M. July 30, 2006).

Before addressing the propriety of Mr. Cullan’s objections, the court will address the parties’ relevance dispute. Lund argues the identity of individuals Lund spoke with about the lawsuit is irrelevant. **See** Filing No. 32-1 - Lund Depo p. 37; Filing No. 33 - Response p. 3-4. The court reminds the parties “relevance is a broader inquiry at the

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.