Georgia State University ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Georgia Business Court Opinions

College of Law

8-17-2012

Order on Motion for Leave to Allow Disclosure and Designation of Expert Witness and Motion to Strike Affidavit (Khan_Shailendra)

Alice D. Bonner Fulton County Superior Court

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/col businesscourt



Part of the Law Commons

Recommended Citation

Bonner, Alice D., "Order on Motion for Leave to Allow Disclosure and Designation of Expert Witness and Motion to Strike Affidavit (Khan_Shailendra)" (2012). Georgia Business Court Opinions. Paper 255. http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/col businesscourt/255

This Court Order is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Law at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Georgia Business Court Opinions by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.



IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF FULTON COUNTY STATE OF GEORGIA

FILED IN OFFICE ISHTIAQ A. KHAN AND CHOICE CARE OCCUPATIONAL MEDICINE AND ORTHOPAEDICS, LLC, ISHTIAQ) AUG 1 7 2012 A. KHAN, as Trustee, MJ & KJ Khan 1990 Family Trust DEPUTY CLERK SUPERIOR COUR FULTON COUNTY, GA Plaintiffs, Civil Action File No. ٧. 2010CV194327 M. SHAILENDRA, KIRAN SHAILENDRA, SHAILENDRA GROUP, LLC, SHI HOLDINGS, LLC; SG CONTRACTING, INC., SG CONSULTING, INC., LEE'S MILL. INC., SG BROKERAGE, LLC, 966 INVESTMENTS, LLC, S&S **ENGINEERS. INC. and PINNACLE AT** EAGLE'S POINT. Defendants.

ORDER ON MOTION FOR LEAVE TO ALLOW DISCLOSURE AND DESIGNATION OF CARLENE KIKUGAWA AS AN EXPERT WITNESS AND MOTION TO STRIKE AFFIDAVIT OF CARLENE KIKUGAWA

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to Allow Disclosure and Designation of Carlene Kikugawa as an Expert Witness and Defendants' Motion to Strike Affidavit of Carlene Kikugawa. Upon consideration of the briefs submitted on the motion, the affidavit of Carlene Kikugawa, the arguments of counsel and the record of the case, the Court finds as follows:

Plaintiff Ishtiaq Khan ("Khan") retained Carlene Kikugawa, a CPA, to conduct an accounting of his investments with Defendant M. Shailendra ("Shailendra") at issue in this case, as well as investments at issue in other cases. Under the Court's case management orders, all parties were required to identify expert witnesses by January 16, 2012. Plaintiffs failed to designate Ms. Kikugawa as an expert by that deadline,

although she was identified as a fact witness. Additionally, Plaintiffs objected to the production of documents generated by Ms. Kikugawa or her accounting firm on the basis of the work product privilege. Plaintiffs now seek leave to designate Ms. Kikugawa as an expert witness at the upcoming trial of this matter. In addition, they submitted an affidavit of Ms. Kikugawa in opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. Defendants oppose Plaintiffs' motion and ask the Court to strike Ms. Kikugawa's affidavit.

Trial judges possess broad discretionary powers to control discovery, including the ability to impose sanctions, and an appellate court will not reverse a trial court's decision regarding discovery unless there has been a clear abuse of discretion. Collins v. Dickman, 295 Ga. App. 601 (2008). These sanctions can include excluding or striking testimony, including expert testimony. Gill v. Spivey, 264 Ga. App. 723 (2003).

Plaintiffs point the Court to <u>Hart v. Northside Hosp., Inc.</u>, 291 Ga. App. 208, 209-10 (2008), in which the Court of Appeals reversed the decision of the trial court to exclude the testimony of two expert witnesses belatedly identified by the plaintiffs in a malpractice action. In that case, the Court of Appeals found that the failure to meet a discovery deadline can only be cured by a postponement of trial or mistrial. <u>Id.</u>
However, the Court was careful to restrict this holding to those cases in which a party did not violate a court order specifically establishing deadlines by which a party must identify expert witnesses for trial:

We emphasize that this is not a case where a party violated a court order explicitly directing the party to identify an expert witness for trial, nor did the order at issue warn parties of potential sanctions for failure to meet deadlines, such as the exclusion of evidence or the dismissal of the action. Accordingly, we limit our holding to the specific issue before us, and we do not purport to limit a trial court's authority to issue such orders.

Id. at 578 n. 9.

Here, the Court ordered the parties to identify expert witnesses by January 16, 2012. Thus the Court is not inclined to exercise its discretion to permit Ms. Kikugawa to provide expert testimony, especially when that testimony, as described by Plaintiffs' counsel at the hearing, may amount to opinion testimony on ultimate issues in dispute (whether Shailendra's conduct amounts to a ponzi scheme or fraud) when such conclusions are capable of being drawn by a jury. See Raines v. Maughan, 312 Ga. App. 303, 307 (2011) ("where the path from evidence to conclusion is not shrouded in the mystery of professional skill or knowledge, and the conclusion determines the ultimate issues of fact in a case, the jury must make the journey from evidence to conclusion without the aid of expert testimony"). Moreover, the Court is not persuaded by Plaintiffs' explanation for the delay. Ms. Kikugawa has had deep involvement in the parties' disputes since at least 2010, and Defendants should not be penalized because Plaintiffs waited until the last minute to finalize their decision regarding expert testimony.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs' motion is **DENIED**. Ms. Kikugawa must restrict her testimony to matters appropriate for a fact witness. With regard to Defendants' motion to strike, the Court hereby **DENIES**, in part, to the extent Ms. Kikugawa provides factual information. Defendants are invited to submit by close of business on Monday, August 27, 2012, the specific paragraphs that they feel amount to expert opinion for the Court's consideration.

SO ORDERED this 17^{4} day of August, 2012.

Alle D Bonner

ALICE D. BONNER, SENIOR JUDGE Superior Court of Fulton County Atlanta Judicial Circuit

Copies sent electronically to:

Attorneys for Plaintiffs	Attorneys for Defendants
E. A. Seth Mills, Jr. Mills Paskert Divers 100 North Tampa Street, Ste. 3700 Tampa, Florida 33602 (813)229-3500 smills@mpdlegal.com	David B. Bell BELL & BELL P.O. Box 1011 Augusta, Georgia 30903 (706) 724-1882 davidbell@davidbelllawfirm.com
Richard J. Storrs Mills Paskert Divers 1355 Peachtree Street N.E., Ste. 1550 Atlanta, GA 30309 (404) 870-8200 rstorrs@mpdlegal.com Buddy Parker MALOY JENKINS PARKER Twenty-fifth Floor 75 Fourteenth Street NW Atlanta, GA 30309 parker@mjplawyers.com Howard P. Slomka The Slomka Law Firm 1069 Spring Street, NW 2nd Floor Atlanta, GA 30309 howie@slomkalawfirm.com Burton V. McCullough (pro hac vice) 4205 Encinas Drive La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011 818-952-5596 lexchexrex@sbcglobal.net	Mark C. de St. Aubin William V. Hearnburg, Jr. SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL LLP Promenade II, Suite 3100 1230 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30309-3592 (404) 815-3500 mdestaubin@sgrlaw.com wvhearnburg@sgrlaw.com William Q. Bird Jennifer Auer Jordan Amy L. Hadra BIRD LAW GROUP, PC 2170 Defoor Hills Road Atlanta, GA 30318 404-873-4696 billbird@birdlawgroup.com jaj@birdlawgroup.com amyhadra@birdlawgroup.com
Steven M. Kushner Hank Fellows FELLOWS LABRIOLA LLP Peachtree Center Suite 2300 South Tower 225 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, Georgia 30303 (404) 586-2041 direct skushner@fellab.com Hfellows@fellab.com	