

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TALLAHASSEE DIVISION**

WILLIAM A. LINK, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No.: 4:21cv271-MW/MAF

MANNY DIAZ, JR., et al.,

Defendants,

_____ /

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN LIMINE

This Court has considered, without hearing, Defendants' motion in limine seeking to exclude certain categories of evidence pertaining to Legislative intent, ECF No. 193, and Plaintiffs' response in opposition, ECF No. 198. Defendants ask this Court to prohibit Plaintiffs from introducing evidence under four broad categories at the bench trial in this case—namely, (1) testimony from opposing legislators; (2) post-enactment statements; (3) news articles, periodicals, social media posts, websites, and interviews; and (4) extraneous remarks unrelated to HB 233. Defendants assert none of the evidence under these categories is admissible to prove legislative intent in this case. Plaintiffs, on the other hand, argue that Defendants' motion is premature and that it fails to cite any legal basis for exclusion or any specific evidence that Defendants wish to exclude. This Court agrees.

Much of Defendants' motion and case citations address the issue of what weight this Court should assign to Plaintiffs' evidence at trial. Defendants also paint with too broad of a brush in seeking to exclude broad categories of evidence. As this Court has already noted in the context of denying the parties' motions to exclude expert testimony, this Court is fully capable of sorting the wheat from the chaff during the parties' presentation of evidence. This Court can guarantee the parties that it will not permit either side to waste time and present cumulative or irrelevant evidence. The parties need only object with specificity and this Court will address their concerns on the record at the bench trial.

SO ORDERED on December 8, 2022.

s/Mark E. Walker

Chief United States District Judge