Larry E. Riley, Esq. GARLINGTON, LOHN & ROBINSON, PLLP 199 W. Pine, P.O. Box 7909
Missoula, MT 59807
Attorneys for Defendant
MONTANA ELEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, FLATHEAD COUNTY
ROB QUIST, and BONNI QUIST, wife, Cause No. DV-94-526A
Plaintiffs,
vs. ) Brief in Response to Plaintiffs'
ROCH R. BOYER, M.D.,  MOTION IN LIMINE
Defendant.
)
COMES NOW the Defendant and files the following response to Plaintiffs' Motion
in Limine.
Plaintiffs have asked to prohibit the mention of Plaintiff Rob Quist's marijuana use
the fact that Rob Quist has previously had genital herpes and TB test results.
The test for all evidence admitted during the trial of any case is whether that
evidence is relevant. Rule 401 of the Montana Rules of Evidence defines relevant
evidence as follows:
Rule 401. Definition of relevant evidence.
Relevant evidence means evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the
determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence. Relevant evidence may
include evidence bearing upon the credibility of a witness or hearsay declarant.
In this case, Rob Quist is claiming a variety of problems including lethargy,
depression and lack of energy. Dr. Boyer is not interested in introducing evidence that is

not relevant and that would only tend to reflect adversely on Rob Quist. On the other hand, if any of the conditions that Rob Quist is complaining about are caused or contributed to by the things which his counsel is trying to exclude, then they should not be excluded. That is a question of fact and law which the presiding judge can best answer as the medical information, and other information, is developed during trial. Based on the discovery that has been done to date, Defendant is not in a position to agree that the information sought to be excluded is irrelevant. Defendant is aware of the fact that it is sensitive information and could affect adversely Rob Quist. However, to exclude it at this stage of the case would be premature.

Therefore, we urge the Court to reserve its ruling on these issues until those matters have been developed at the time of trial and the Court can better ascertain the relevancy or lack thereof. As a part of that, I have no problem in agreeing that I will not inquire into the specific items addressed in Plaintiffs' motion without first alerting the Court and counsel of my intention to do so in order that we might go into chambers and address that issue at that time. This procedure will afford the Plaintiffs' the protection to which they're entitled without compromising any rights of the Defendant.

DATED this 15th day of March, 1996.

Attorneys for Defendant

GARLINGTON, LOHN & ROBINSON, PLLP 199 W. Pine, P. O. Box 7909 Missoula, MT 59807-7909 Telephone: (406) 523-2500

Larry E. Riley

BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN LIMINE