



1 Also before the Court is Plaintiff FDIC's Motion in Limine (#154) to which Defendant  
2 SAFECO filed a response (#159).

3 **ANALYSIS**

4 SAFECO's Motion in Limine No. 1

5 SAFECO seeks to limit the expert testimony of FDIC Experts Paul Palmer, Ronald Wohlust  
6 and Jerry Hudspeth from testifying on ultimate legal conclusions. FDIC states that it has no  
7 intention of eliciting such testimony and requests that the restriction should be mutual.

8 SAFECO's Motion in Limine No. 2

9 SAFECO seeks to prevent FDIC from offering evidence relating to SAFECO's handling of  
10 NETBANK'S claims on the grounds that FDIC's bad faith claims have been dismissed from the  
11 case. However, FDIC points out that the same claims-handling evidence may be relevant to the  
12 count for breach of fiduciary duty which remains.

13 Accordingly, the Court will allow limited evidence on the point to the extent it is relevant to  
14 the count for breach of fiduciary duty.

15 SAFECO'S Motion in Limine No. 3

16 SAFECO seeks to exclude evidence of the "obligee issue". FDIC asserts the motion is moot  
17 as FDIC has withdrawn any of its trial exhibits which would have related to the obligee issue.

18 SAFECO's Motion in Limine No. 4

19 SAFECO seeks to exclude cumulative expert testimony. FDIC's response summarizes the  
20 testimony it intends to illicit from Ronald Wohlust and Paul Palmer. As presented, the testimony  
21 would not be cumulative.

22 SAFECO Motion in Limine No. 5

23 SAFECO seeks to exclude evidence interpreting the lease bonds, Netbank's expectations  
24 regarding same or the structure of the CMC lease bond program. Evidence of the parties' intent  
25 concerning the lease bonds and the structure of the lease bond program is still relevant to FDIC's  
26

1 breach of contract and breach of fiduciary duty claims, as well as to SAFECO's limited fraudulent  
2 inducement defense. If FDIC can show that the information SAFECO is contending fraudulently  
3 induced it to enter into the transactions is information that SAFECO knew or should have known,  
4 SAFECO would not be able to establish fraudulent inducement. Netbank's understanding of how  
5 the bonds and the SSA's shifted risks away from it and onto the surety will be relevant and  
6 probative, especially in light of anticipated testimony from one of SAFECO's experts that the bank  
7 could be expected to have its own due diligence and not have relied solely on the underwriting  
8 performed by SAFECO.

9 SAFECO's Motion in Limine No. 6

10 SAFECO seeks to exclude evidence of SAFECO's actions after June 22, 1999. FDIC points  
11 out that SAFECO must demonstrate justifiable reliance in connection with their defense of fraud in  
12 the inducement. SAFECO's actions after June 1999 could show that SAFECO was either aware of  
13 material facts or that such facts were within the fair and reasonable reach of SAFECO, related to its  
14 fraudulent inducement claim. FDIC can argue that SAFECO's decision not to notify the banks upon  
15 discovery of the alleged fraud would tend to show SAFECO considered the information immaterial,  
16 or be evidence of conduct inconsistent with retaining the bond premiums.

17 FDIC's Motion in Limine (#154)

18 FDIC seeks to exclude evidence concerning representations made by CMC to sureties other  
19 than SAFECO, evidence concerning individual leases and lessees other than the 521 leases and  
20 lessees covered by the lease bonds issued by SAFECO for the lease pools that Netbank acquired, and  
21 communications that SAFECO or CMC may have had with investors other than Netbank.

22 SAFECO responds that CMC misrepresented the default rate in its lease bond program by  
23 telling SAFECO the program had a default rate of 4-6% percent when the actual default rate was  
24 much higher and that CMC failed to disclose that River Bank, one of the largest investor banks in  
25 CMC, to that point, had been ordered by bank regulators to rid itself of the CMC lease bond pools,  
26

1 failed to disclose bankruptcy filings and a criminal conviction of principals of CMC, a lawsuit  
2 against CMC for fraud in investor pools, a SEC injunction against the principal of CMC, and  
3 advances by CMC to cover up the true loss rate. Such evidence is relevant and probative of  
4 SAFECO's defense of fraudulent inducement. FDIC, in response to SAFECO's Motion in Limine  
5 Nos. 5 and 6, seeks to introduce evidence that the material facts upon which SAFECO relies for its  
6 defense of fraud in the inducement, were within the fair and reasonable reach of SAFECO. The  
7 Court has ruled above that such evidence is admissible and it is only fair that SAFECO not be unduly  
8 limited in presenting facts relevant to its defense. Accordingly, the Motion will be denied without  
9 prejudice to the right of Movant to object during the course of presentation of evidence on grounds  
10 of materiality and relevance.


11 CONCLUSION

12 SAFECO's Motion in Limine No.1 (No. 147) is **GRANTED**, mutual as to both parties.  
13 SAFECO's Motion in Limine No. 2 (#148) is **GRANTED** except to the extent claims-handling  
14 evidence may be relevant to the count for breach of fiduciary duty. SAFECO's Motion in Limine  
15 No. 3 (#149) is **DENIED** as moot. SAFECO's Motion in Limine No. 4 (#150) is **DENIED**.  
16 SAFECO's Motion in Limine No. 5 (#151) is **DENIED** to the extent the evidence is relevant to  
17 FDIC's breach of contract and breach of fiduciary claims as well as SAFECO's limited fraudulent  
18 inducement defense. SAFECO's Motion in Limine No. 6 (#152) is **DENIED** to the extent the  
19 proposed evidence is relevant to the issue of justifiable reliance and SAFECO's conduct after its  
20 discovery of the alleged fraud.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

1 FDIC's Motion in Limine (#154) is **DENIED** without prejudice to its right to object to  
2 evidence outside of those areas delineated in SAFECO's response (#159) or to other specific  
3 evidence based on grounds of materiality or relevance.

4 Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2011.

5  
6 

7 

---

KENT J. DAWSON  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26