VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FAIRFAX COUNTY

MARIA S. CANALES DE MALDONADO)		
)		
Plaintiff)		
)		
V.)	CL	2017-18241
)		
METROPOLITAN COMMUNICATIONS)		
GROUP, LLC, et al.)		
)		
Defendants)		

ORDER

THIS MATTER came before the court on Plaintiffs' motion in limine to "prohibit[] the introduction of any or all of her medical bills at trial for this matter . . . "

THE COURT, having considered Plaintiff's motion and the opposition thereto, hereby DENIES Plaintiff's motion because the medical bills are "directly related to the central issue before the jury, the extent of [Plaintiff's] damages." Barkley v. Wallace, 267 Va. 369, 374 (2004).

ENTERED this 19th day of June, 2019.

Richard E. Gardiner

Judge

ENDORSEMENT OF THIS ORDER BY COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR THE PARTIES IS WAIVED IN THE DISCRETION OF THE COURT PURSUANT TO RULE 1:13 OF THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

Copies to:

Meliha Perez Halpern Counsel for Plaintiff

Martin Schubert Counsel for Defendants

¹ That the motion in limine in Barkley v. Wallace was made by the defendant, whereas in the case at bar it is made by Plaintiff, does not affect this court's conclusion that it is governed by the principle of Barkley v. Wallace.