KING COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EXECUTIVE SERVICES INQUEST PROGRAM

In re INQUESTINTO THE DEATH OF CHARLEENA LYLES,

NO. 517IQ9301

THE FAMILY'S MOTIONS IN LIMINE

## A. MOTIONS IN LIMINE

The Family requests an order in limine by the Administrator prior to the inquest declaring that the irrelevant and prejudicial matters set forth below are inadmissible.

Motions *in limine* allow for more deliberate evidentiary rulings, a greater degree of fairness due to the exclusion of collateral, prejudicial evidence, and more expeditious use of judicial time by reducing the possibility of the need for new trials due to the introduction of prejudicial evidence.

Comment, Motions in Limine in Washington, 9 Gonz. L. Rev. 780, 790 (1974).

[T]he trial court should grant such a motion if it describes the evidence which is sought to be excluded with sufficient specificity to enable the trial court to determine that it is clearly inadmissible under the issues as drawn or which may develop during the trial, and if the evidence is so prejudicial in its nature that the moving party should be spared the necessity of calling attention to it by objecting when it is offered during the trial.

Motions in limine have been approved in Washington as an essential pretrial means of disposing of inadmissible evidence since 1937, the purpose being to eliminate the prejudice inherent in conducting an objectionable inquiry in the presence of the jury.

The irrelevant and prejudicial matters set forth below should be declared inadmissible.

## B. INADMISSIBLE MATTERS

1. Substance or alcohol use.

A toxicology report was performed immediately after Ms. Lyles' death that found no presence of acetone, ethanol, isopropanol, methanol, amphetamines, barbiturates, benzodiazepines, cannabinoids, cocaine metabolite, and opiates. Based upon the toxicology report results, the parties have stipulated that Ms. Lyles was not under the influence of alcohol or any drug substance at the time of the incident. The stipulation is not impacted by this motion in limine which instead applies to any potential claims or insinuations of prior substance abuse by Ms. Lyles or any other visitor to the household including but not limited to the collection or analysis of any samples obtained from the residence post incident. Any prior substance use, unless a clinical diagnosis or factor in psychological presentation, is irrelevant and prejudicial ER 403.

In *Kramer v. J.I. Case Mfg. Co.*, 62 Wn. App. 544, 815 P.2d 798 (1991), the Court of Appeals held that the trial court abused its discretion when it allowed the defendant to cross-examine the plaintiff about his substance abuse:

Absent evidence of long-term, irreversible, adverse effects from marijuana smoking, it is difficult to discern the probative value of [plaintiff's] preaccident marijuana smoking practices.

Kramer, 62 Wn. App. at 559. See, e.g., State v. Renneberg, 83 Wn.2d 735, 737, 522 P.2d 835 (1974) ("In view of society's deep concern today with drug usage and its consequent condemnation by many if not most, evidence of drug addiction is necessarily prejudicial in the minds of the average juror."); State v. Hettich, 70 Wn. App. 586, 591-592, 854 P.2d 1112 (1993) (affirming trial court's exclusion of evidence of a driver's blood sample testing positive for marijuana because the probative value was extremely limited). Any evidence of substance use or substances in the home has no causal connection to Ms. Lyles' death, is irrelevant and prejudicial, and should therefore be excluded from the inquest.

1	/s/ Karen Koeh	ler		
		ler, WSBA #15325		
2		ore, WSBA #41584		
	Melanie Nguye	n, WSBA #51724		
3		R KESSLER KOEHLER MOORE		
4				
5				
	CERTIFICATION			
6				
	ed a copy of the document to which this			
7				
	certification is attached for delivery to all parties of record as follows:			
8				
	Inquest Program Personnel	U.S. Mail (First Class and Certified)		
9	Hon. Michael Spearman	☐ Fax		
1.0	Claire Thornton	Process Server		
10	Claire.Thornton@kingcounty.gov	☐ Electronic Delivery		
	Dee Sylve			
11	Dee.Sylve@kingcounty.gov			
	Matt Anderson			
12	Matt.Anderson@kingcounty.gov			
	DES-Dept. of Executive Services			
13	401 5 <sup>th</sup> Ave., suite 131			
1.4	Seattle, WA 98104			
14	C1 1 C1 'C' WCD A 47750			
1.5	Ghazal Sharifi, WSBA 47750	U.S. Mail (First Class and Certified)		
15	Ghazal.Sharifi@seattle.gov	☐ Fax		
1.0	Rebecca Boatright	Process Server		
16	Rebecca.Boatright@Seattle.gov	⊠ Electronic Delivery		
17	Rebecca Widen			
17	Rebecca.widen@seattle.gov			
10	Seattle City Attorney's Office			
18	701 5 <sup>th</sup> Ave. Suite 2050			
10	Seattle, WA 98104-7097			
19	Counsel for City of Seattle re Inquest			
20	Ted Buck, WSBA #22029	U.S. Mail (First Class and Certified)		
20	tbuck@freybuck.com	☐ Fax		
21	Karen Cobb, WSBA #34958	Process Server		
21	kcobb@freybuck.com	⊠ Electronic Delivery		
22	Frey Buck, PS			
22	1200 5 <sup>th</sup> Ave, Suite 1900			
22	Seattle, WA 98101  Counsel for Officers Anderson and McNey			
23	Counsel for Officers Anderson and Michew			
23	Counsel for Officers Anderson and McNew			

24

1	
2	
2	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

/s/ Kristin Michaud
Kristin Michaud
Kristinm@stritmatter.com