


EXPERT CHALLENGE STUDY™

BRAD MICHAEL WONG, P.E., B.S.


ACCIDENT RECONSTRUCTION AND INVESTIGATION EXPERT WITNESS

REPORT PREPARED ON MAY 14, 2026

GROUNDS OF CHALLENGE



CHALLENGE DISPOSITION



EXPERT CHALLENGES

This section provides references to an expert who has been cited or mentioned in case opinions (reported and unreported), briefs (where available), jury verdicts, dockets, and expert challenges for both state and federal courts. It is again noted that not every jurisdiction and every court makes their case law available, and this profile is limited as such.

The following search string was run to ensure that all available cases and briefs are captured.

(((Brad or Bradley) w/2 Wong) w/100 (Expert or Mechanic! or Engineer! or Accident! or Reconstruct! or "Premis* Liab!" or Biomechanic! or "Human Factor!" or Product! or Design! or Defect! or Forensic! or Photograph! or Complianc! or Vehic! or Investigat!)) or ("Brad Michael Wong" or "Bradley Michael Wong" or "Brad M. Wong" or "Bradley M. Wong"))

The following legal databases were looked at during the preparation of this report:

1. Federal and State Cases Combined, Jury Verdicts and Settlements, Federal Agency Decisions, State Agency Decisions
2. Court Documents – Trial Filings, Appellate Briefs, Trial Orders, Dockets
3. PACER was searched to retrieve original documents, if available.

Document Access

We've sourced supporting documents (opinions, briefs, depositions, motions to exclude, expert reports, etc.) and organized them by availability:

1. **Free Download** - Opinions and public documents at no additional cost
2. **Order on Demand** - Request any other document. We'll confirm availability and cost. Upon payment, you'll receive a downloadable link immediately.

DIRECT CHALLENGES

This section includes reported, and numerous unreported cases from both state and federal jurisdictions where a "gatekeeping authority" has been cited or mentioned in a decision and the testifying expert's methodology or qualifications have been challenged. Gatekeeping authority is defined as a seminal decision or rule of evidence that defines or interprets the standards for admissibility or expert witness testimony for the corresponding jurisdiction. This section includes results from over 165 gatekeeping authorities, including but not limited to Daubert v. Merrell Dow, Frye v. United States, and their progeny. Sources for unreported decisions include docket sheets, litigation reports, jury verdicts, and other online resources. Although care has been followed to gather this information, not all cases involving expert challenges are reported.

Objection regarding testimony sustained.

Case Source:	Opinion, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Kess V. Daly City Serramonte Ctr.
Docket Number:	CGC-10-500592
Case Cite(s):	2011 Cal. Super. LEXIS 10047
Grounds of Challenge:	Qualification, Relevance, Methodology, Legal Conclusion
Area of Law:	Product Liability
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Anna Dubrovsky, Esq. SBN; 197116, Anna Dubrovsky Law Group, Inc., San Francisco, CA
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Nneth D. Simononi, Esq. (#145586), Kerri A. Johnson, Esq. (#138344), Sondra E. Kirwans Esq. (#157220), Simononi & Associates, Attorneys At Law, San Jose, CA
Judge(s):	Marla J. Miller
Date(s):	05/06/2011
Summary of Involvement:	The Court sustained Defendant's objection regarding Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Opinion dated May 06, 2011 2. ORDER ON DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO

3. ORDER RULING ON IPC'S OBJECTIONS

Motion to limit granted.

Case Source:	Opinion, Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Munguia v. Grelyn of Maui, LLC
Docket Number:	1:09cv58
Case Cite(s):	2010 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 561107; 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38735; 2010 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 561427; 2010 WL 6773370; 2010 WL 6773371; 2010 WL 7411590; 2010 WL 3688719
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Qualification
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	Hawaii
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - D. Hawaii
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Michael R. Cruise, Lead Attorney, The Law Office Of Michael Cruise, Honolulu, HI
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Ronald Shigekane, Lead Attorney, Ayabe Chong NishimotoSia& Nakamura LLLP, Honolulu, HI
Judge(s):	Helen Gillmor
Date(s):	04/08/2011
Summary of Involvement:	The Court granted Plaintiff's motion to limit Defendant's expert Wong's testimony.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Opinion dated April 08, 2011

2. TRANSCRIPT of Proceedings, Jury Trial, Day 1, held on September 28, 2010, before Senior Judge Helen Gillmor. Court Reporter Katherine Eismann, Telephone number (808)542-3406. Transcript may be viewed at the court public terminal or ordered through the Court Reporter before the deadline for Release of Transcript. Remote availability of electronic transcripts is regulated by FRCP 5.2(a), FRCrP 49.1(a) and FRBP 9037(a) Redaction Request due 11/29/2010. Redacted Transcript Deadline set for 12/7/2010.
3. TRANSCRIPT of Proceedings, Jury Trial, Day 3, held on September 30, 2010, - before Senior Judge Helen Gillmor. Court Reporter Katherine Eismann, Telephone number (808)542-3406. Transcript may be viewed at the court public terminal or ordered through the Court Reporter before the deadline for Release of Transcript. Remote availability of electronic transcripts is regulated by FRCP 5.2(a), FRCrP 49.1(a) and FRBP 9037(a) Redaction Request due 11/29/2010. Redacted Transcript Deadline set for 12/7/2010.
4. TRANSCRIPT of Proceedings, Jury Trial, Day 6, held on October 5, 2010, - before Senior Judge Helen Gillmor. Court Reporter Katherine Eismann, Telephone number (808)542-3406. Transcript may be viewed at the court public terminal or ordered through the Court Reporter before the deadline for Release of Transcript. Remote availability of electronic transcripts is regulated by FRCP 5.2(a), FRCrP 49.1(a) and FRBP 9037(a) Redaction Request due 11/29/2010. Redacted Transcript Deadline set for 12/7/2010.
5. EP: Jury Trial (6th Day)-Eight Jurors present. Also present- Plaintiffs Beverly Munguia and Ruben Mungia and Lea Rasos- General Manager of McDonald's of Maui. Robert Male - CST Video of Peter P.C. Chang played for the jury (witness), Ruben Munguia - CST. Plaintiff rests. 138 Defendant Grelyn of Maui, LLC dba McDonald's Dairy Road's Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law is DENIED. Brad M. Wong - CST, Eric Derige - CST. Defense rests. Jury is excused until October 6, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. Court's discu

6. EP:Motions and Final PreTrial conference Held. There are no objections by either party to any of the deposition designations. (Docs. 82-90, 100-107.) The parties have reached an agreement regarding the presentation of deposition testimony. The deposition videos of the following witnesses will be played at trial: Timothy Hopkins, M.D.; Peter Chang, M.D.; and Christopher Muniz. The deposition transcripts of the following witnesses will be read at trial: Camilo Lubera; and Mylene Calibuso. The part
7. MEMORANDUM in Opposition re 78 MOTION in Limine #1 Re: Exclusion of Expert Richard Gill filed by Beverly Munguia, Ruben Munguia. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration of Michael R. Cruise, # 2 Exhibit 1, # 3 Exhibit 2, # 4 Exhibit 3, # 5 Exhibit 4, # 6 Exhibit 5, # 7 Exhibit 6, # 8 Certificate of Service) (Cruise, Michael) (Entered: 09/10/2010)
8. Exhibit 4 ; Proceeding Number : 75-7
9. Exhibit 3 ; Proceeding Number : 74-6
10. STATEMENT re 66 MOTION to Limit Expert Testimony of Brad Wong, P.E. Statement of Position filed by Grelyn of Maui, LLC. (Shigekane, Ronald) (Entered: 09/07/2010)
11. Certificate of Service ; Proceeding Number : 66-5
12. MOTION to Limit Expert Testimony of Brad Wong, P.E. Michael R. Cruise appearing for Plaintiffs Beverly Munguia, Ruben Munguia (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum, # 2 Declaration, # 3 Exhibit 1, # 4 Exhibit 2, # 5 Certificate of Service)(Cruise, Michael) (Entered: 08/19/2010)
13. Memorandum ; Proceeding Number : 66-1
14. Case Docket Sheet

15. Ep: Jury Trial (6th Day)-Eight Jurors Present. Also Present- Plaintiffs Beverly Munguia And Ruben Mungia And Lea Rasos- General Manager Of Mcdonald's Of Maui. Robert Male - Cst Video Of Peter P.C. Chang Played For The Jury (Witness), Ruben Munguia - Cst. Plaintiff Rests. Defendant Grelyn Of Maui, LlcDbamcdonald's Dairy Road's Motion For Judgment As A Matter Of Law Is Denied. Brad M. Wong - Cst, Eric Derige - Cst. Defense Rests. Jury Is Excused Until October 6, 2010 At 9:00 A.M. Court's Discussion With Counsel Outside The Presence Of The Jury Regarding Jury Instructions. Counsel For Plaintiff Withdraws The Request For Punitive Damages. Court Shall Meet With Counsel Without The Jury On October 6, 2010 At 8:30 A.M. Further Jury Trial (7th Day) Set For October 6, 2010 At 9:00 A.M.(Court Reporter Katherine Eismann) (Senior Judge Helen Gillmor)(Mrf)No Cos Issued For This Docket Entry
16. Order Granting Plaintiffs' Motion To Limit Expert Testimony Of Brad Wong, P.E. Signed By Magistrate Judge Barry M. Kurren On October 5, 2010. (Bbb,)Certificate Of Serviceparticipants Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Received This Document Electronically At The E-Mail Address Listed On The Notice Of Electronic Filing (Nef). Participants Not Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Were Served By First Class Mail On The Date Of This Docket Entry
17. Ep:Motions And Final Pretrial Conference Held. There Are No Objections By Either Party To Any Of The Deposition Designations. (Docs. 82-90, 100-107.) The Parties Have Reached An Agreement Regarding The Presentation Of Deposition Testimony. The Deposition Videos Of The Following Witnesses Will Be Played At Trial: Timothy Hopkins, M.D.; Peter Chang, M.D.; And Christopher Muniz. The Deposition Transcripts Of The Following Witnesses Will Be Read At Trial: CamiloLubera; And MyleneCalibuso. The Parties Have Reached An Agreement Regarding The Availability Of Witnesses. Plaintiffs Will Present Themselves, As Well As Plaintiff Beverly Munguias Sister, Samia Rebecca Dawn Presley. Plaintiffs Will Subpoena Lubern Rosario. Defendant Will Present The Following Witnesses: Lea Rasos; Clifford Villahermosa; Layne Kushiya; AmabellegayDaludado; And Brad Wong. By Friday, 9/24/2010, Counsel Shall Submit To The Court A Joint

Submission Of Agreed Upon Proposed Jury Instructions. Each Party Shall Also Submit To The Court By Friday, September 24, 2010, A Supplemental Brief Indicating Disputed Jury Instructions And Including Concise Argument Supporting The Appropriateness Of The Partys Proposed Jury Instructions And Objecting To The Other Partys Proposed Instructions. Plaintiffs Objections To Defendants Proposed Exhibits 201-204 And 207, Filed September 14, 2010, (Doc. 121), Are Granted. Defendants Proposed Exhibits 201-204, Photographs Of Plaintiff Beverly Munguias Footwear, Will Not Be Admitted Into Evidence. Plaintiff Will Make The Actual Footwear Available As Evidence At Trial. Defendant May Use Its Proposed Exhibit 207, A Drawing By Plaintiff Beverly Munguias Sister, Only For The Purposes Of Impeachment. Counsel Shall Meet And Confer Regarding A Stipulation That The Remaining Exhibits Are Both Authentic And Admissible. Estimated Trial Days: Plaintiffs: 3-4 Days And Defendant: Day. Plaintiffs Motion In Limine No. 1 Barring Argument Or Statements On Facts Not In Evidence (Doc. 74). The Motion Is Denied. Plaintiffs Motion In Limine No. 2 Spoilation Of Evidence And Adverse Inference (Doc. 75). The Motion Is Denied. Defendants Motion In Limine No. 1 Exclusion Of Expert Richard Gill (Doc. 78). The Motion Is Denied. Defendants Motion In Limine No. 2 Admissibility Of Evidence Concerning The Lack Of Prior Accidents (Doc. 79). The Motion Is Denied. Defendants Motion In Limine No. 3 Exclusion Of Expert Richard Gills Photograph (Doc. 80). The Motion Is Granted. Defendants Motion In Limine No. 4 Exclusion Of Expert Richard Gills Slop Mopping Opinions (Doc. 81). The Motion Is Denied. (Court Reporter Katherine Eismann.) (Senior Judge Helen Gillmor)(Lls,)Certificate Of Service participants Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Received This Document Electronically At The E-Mail Address Listed On The Notice Of Electronic Filing (Nef). Participants Not Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Were Served By First Class Mail On The Date Of This Docket Entry

18. Ep: Hearing On 66 Plaintiffs' Rule 702 Motion To Limit Expert Testimony Of Brad Wong Held. This Motion Is Granted. Michael R. Cruise To Prepare Order. (C6f 2:56-3:00pm.) (Judge Barry M. Kurren)(Kur2)Certificate Of Serviceparticipants Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Received This Document Electronically At The E-Mail Address Listed On The Notice Of Electronic Filing (Nef). Participants Not Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Were Served By First Class Mail On The Date Of This Docket Entry
19. Statement Re Motion To Limit Expert Testimony Of Brad Wong, P.E. Statement Of Position Filed By Grelyn Of Maui, Llc
20. Eo: The Hearing On 66 Plaintiffs' Rule 702 Motion To Limit Expert Testimony Of Brad Wong Set For 9/17/2010 Is Continued To 9/20/2010 At 3:00 Pm Before Judge Barry M. Kurren. The Briefing Schedule Remains The Same. (Judge Barry M. Kurren)(Kur1)Certificate Of Serviceparticipants Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Received This Document Electronically At The E-Mail Address Listed On The Notice Of Electronic Filing (Nef). Participants Not Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Were Served By First Class Mail On The Date Of This Docket Entry
21. Notice Of Hearing On 66 Plaintiffs' Rule 702 Motion To Limit Expert Testimony Of Brad Wong. Motion Hearing Set For 9/17/2010 At 10:00am Before Judge Barry M. Kurren. Any Opposition Memorandum Is Due 9/8/2010. Any Reply Memorandum Is Due 9/13/2010.(Kur2)Certificate Of Serviceparticipants Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Received This Document Electronically At The E-Mail Address Listed On The Notice Of Electronic Filing (Nef). Participants Not Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Were Served By First Class Mail On The Date Of This Docket Entry
22. Certificate Of Service By Beverly Munguia, Ruben Munguia Re: Notice Of Taking Deposition Upon Oral Examination [Brad Wong]
23. Defendant Grelyn Of Maui, Llc. Dbamcdonald's Dairy Road's Pretrial Statement; Certificate Of Service

24. Defendant Grelyn Of Maui, Llc. Dbamcdonald's Dairy Road's Memorandum In Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion In Limine # 2 Re: Spoliation Of Evidence And Adverse Inference (Filed 9/7/10); Declaration Of Ronald Shigekane; Exhibits A - B; Certificate Of Service
 25. Plaintiffs' Memorandum In Opposition To Defendant's Motion In Limine #1 Re: Exclusion Of Expert Richard Gill; Declaration Of Counsel; Exhibits "1" - "6"; Certificate Of Service
 26. Certificate Of Service
 27. Declaration Of Counsel
 28. Declaration Of Michael R. Cruise
 29. Memorandum In Opposition Re 78 Motion In Limine #1 Re: Exclusion Of Expert Richard Gill Filed By Beverly Munguia, Ruben Munguia. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration Of Michael R. Cruise, # 2 Exhibit 1, # 3 Exhibit 2, # 4 Exhibit 3, # 5 Exhibit 4, # 6 Exhibit 5, # 7 Exhibit 6, # 8 Certificate Of Service)
 30. Memorandum
 31. Motion To Limit Expert Testimony Of Brad Wong, P.E. Michael R. Cruise Appearing For Plaintiffs Beverly Munguia, Ruben Munguia (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum, # 2 Declaration, # 3 Exhibit 1, # 4 Exhibit 2, # 5 Certificate Of Service)
-

Objection regarding declaration sustained.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	CHRISTINA MALDONADO VS CITY OF PASADENA
Docket Number:	24NNCV02871
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Others
Area of Law:	Constitutional and Civil Rights
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Los Angeles Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	GREEN NOAH
Defendant's Attorney(s):	DIAZ-HERRERA CHRISTINE
Judge(s):	Jared D. Moses
Date(s):	05/05/2026
Summary of Involvement:	According to "Minute Order (Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment (9858); Hearing on Mot...)" It was stated that "In opposition, Plaintiff does not dispute that the uplift's height was approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch but argues that triable issues of material fact exist because her "expert Brad M. Wong, P.E., confirms that a height differential of that size can present a tripping hazard under the totality of the circumstances, particularly in environments with reduced lighting and high pedestrian traffic. [Citation.] Mr. Wong further explains that pedestrians in commercial retail environments are often visually distracted, increasing the likelihood that such a condition will cause injury." (Opposition to City MSJ, p. 3:5-11; see Declaration of Brad M. Wong, P.E., filed April 17, 2026 ("Wong Decl."), ¶ 11 ["The portion of the pad that caused plaintiff to trip was

approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch at the time of the accident”]; ¶ 12 [“A height differential of even that size can pose a danger to pedestrians given the totality of the circumstances. In particular, a height of approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch can pose an increased risk of tripping to pedestrians when the sun goes down given decreased lighting and visibility. In addition, in retail commercial areas, such as this location where there can be heavy foot traffic, pedestrians’ attention can be drawn towards the surrounding features such as signs and store windows that are more at eye level rather than at the ground where they are walking”].) Other than Wong’s declaration, Plaintiff has not cited any other evidence (e.g., her deposition testimony) to show that triable issues of material fact exist with regard to the triviality of the defect.” It was further stated that “The Court finds the undisputed material facts do not support Plaintiff’s expert’s opinion that the lack of visibility caused the defect to present a substantial risk of injury to Plaintiff. It is undisputed that: “[a]t the time of Plaintiff’s fall, the sidewalk uplift was not covered by any shadows” (UMF No. 6); “Plaintiff did not see the sidewalk uplift before she fell because she was not looking at it (UMF No. 5); “[s]he did not fall due to any type of debris” (UMF No. 4); “[i]t was a warm and overcast day” (UMF No. 7); and “[i]t had not rained that day or the day prior to the incident” (UMF No. 7). Given those undisputed material facts, Wong’s opinion that decreased lighting and visibility increased the likelihood of Plaintiff falling amounts to speculation. (Howard v. Accor Management US, Inc. (2024) 101 Cal.App.5th 130, 137 [“expert speculation is not evidence that can defeat summary judgment”].)” It was also stated that “The Court has sustained MGP’s evidentiary objections to the evidence Plaintiff has cited from Wong’s declaration and the City’s discovery responses. (See Ruling on Objection No. 1 [sustaining lack of foundation

objection to Wong's testimony, which referred to the City's discovery responses] and No. 2 [sustaining lack of foundation and inadmissible hearsay objections to the City's evidentiary objections]; *People v. Arceo* (2011) 195 Cal.App.4th 556, 571 ["a codefendant's hearsay statement is admissible 'if it falls within a "firmly rooted" hearsay exception or is "supported by a showing of particularized guarantees of trustworthiness." [Citations.]' [Citation]"]; *Castaline v. City of Los Angeles* (1975) 47 Cal.App.3d 580, 588 [explaining that "when the response of a party to interrogatories is admitted against a third party who has never had an opportunity to cross-examine the person making the answers," that constitutes "elimination of the hearsay rule by a backdoor approach ...").] It was finally stated that "The Court finds that nothing in Wong's declaration supports Plaintiff's argument that MGP caused the uplift of the sidewalk. In addition, MGP has proved that it neither owned, controlled, or possessed the incident's location, and Plaintiff has failed to submit admissible evidence showing that triable issues of material fact exist as to that issue. Having found that no triable issues of material fact exist as to MGP's liability, the Court grants MGP's motion for summary judgment."

Supporting Document(s):

1. Minute Order (Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment (9858); Hearing on Mot...)
 2. Case Docket Sheet
-

Declaration and opinion found inadmissible.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	WESLEY OSAZE, SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST OF DECEDENT ANYA VALENCIA, et al vs. SKYLINE PET HOSPITAL, UNKNOWN ENTITY, et al
Docket Number:	21-CIV-04015
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Mateo Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	SAMI SEDGHANI
Defendant's Attorney(s):	ALICIA R KENNON, ILLISE SCHULMAN
Judge(s):	Jeffrey R. Finigan, Leland Davis, III, Michael L. Mau, Robert D Foiles, Timothy E. Elliott
Date(s):	08/22/2025

Summary of Involvement: According to "PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION TO STRIKE OR TAX COSTS; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT " it was stated that, "8(b)(1) \$8575 for Brad Wong whose opinion was struck as speculative and not necessary to the judgment on the MSJ ". It was further stated that, "Brad Wong (\$8,575.00): Mr. Wong's opinion was expressly excluded by the Court in granting summary judgment. His declaration was ruled speculative and inadmissible. As a result, his expert work was not considered or relied upon in any part of the ruling. Costs related to experts whose work was excluded as inadmissible are not "reasonably necessary to the conduct of the litigation" and must be taxed. (CCP § 1033.5(c)(2) ".

Supporting Document(s):

1. Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO STRIKE OR TAX COSTS
2. Appellant's Notice of Designation Appellants Notice of Designating Record on Appeal
3. Motion to Strike PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION TO STRIKE OR TAX COSTS; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHO
4. Notice of Entry of Judgment/Order
5. Order RULING ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
6. Case Docket Sheet

Objection regarding declaration sustained.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Emily Benson vs Board of Trustees of the California State University
Docket Number:	22CV405188
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Santa Clara Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Russell Alan Gold
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Jeffrey Noah Labovitch, Daniel Benjamin Alweiss, Stephen A. Acker
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	06/25/2025

Summary of Involvement: According to "ORDER RE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT " it was stated that, "Plaintiff objects to the Declaration of Brad M. Wong ("Wong Declaration"). Objection Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 to the Wong Declaration are not material to the resolution of this motion and the relevant paragraphs therein have not been relied on by this Court. Accordingly, the Court declines to rule on them. (See Code of Civil Procedure § 437c, subd. (q).) In Objection No. 3, Plaintiff objects to paragraph 12 of the Wong Declaration wherein he states, "[t]his would be obvious to anyone with their hand on the gate and indicate that the gate is unlatched and unsecured." Plaintiff maintains this statement is speculative. The Court agrees that it is speculative as to whether the gate was ajar at the time of the incident and whether it would be obvious to anyone in the vicinity of the gate. Therefore, Plaintiffs Objection No. 3 to the Wong Declaration is SUSTAINED pursuant to Evidence Code section 702."

Supporting Document(s):

1. Declaration: In Support
2. Index
3. Exhibit List (Party)
4. Notice: Entry of Order
5. No. 06-25-25-Notice_of_Entry_of_Order_CSU_MSJ-1-Notice_Entry_of_Order-4oq2XY8Q8F2WJdu0j.h5vCof4OvXgzFrBqILrGb.rcA
6. No. 06-25-25-Notice_of_Entry_of_Order_Lexington_Insurance_MSA-1-Notice_Entry_of_Order-TBzowvlpHVwOOAyTdF3X8WZyXpjCbl4PC6dRgKnWISA
7. No. 06-25-25-Notice_of_Entry_of_Order_CSU_MSJ-1-Notice_Entry_of_Order-4oq2XY8Q8F000AyTdF3X8WZyXpjCbl4PC6dRgKnWISA
8. No. 06-25-25-Notice_of_Entry_of_Order_CSU_MSJ-1-Notice_Entry_of_Order-4oq2XY8Q8F27u6jPVsv8JjCEAhBG.hkv4DLu7SLxNCQ

9. No. 06-25-25-
Notice_of_Entry_of_Order_Lexington_Insurance_MSA-1-
Notice_Entry_of_Order-
TBzowvlpHVy7u6jPVsv8JjCEAhBG.hkv4DLu7SLxNCQ
10. No. 06-25-25-
Notice_of_Entry_of_Order_Lexington_Insurance_MSA-1-
Notice_Entry_of_Order-
TBzowvlpHVyWJdu0j.h5vCof4OvXgzFrBqILrGb.rcA
11. No. 06-25-25-
Notice_of_Entry_of_Order_Lexington_Insurance_MSA-1-
Notice_Entry_of_Order-
TBzowvlpHVzsUwlQg1LW0mmhnwYSkbdXUyoVHphLydw
12. Order: Submitted Matter
13. No. 06-17-25-
HRG_6172025_Lexington_Insurance_Companys_MSJ-1-
Order_Submitted_Matter-
lrwpz9eU8SEOOAyTdF3X8WZyXpjCbl4PC6dRgKnWISA
14. No. 06-17-25-HRG_6172025_MSJ-1-
Order_Submitted_Matter-
zTTt9x3fqHUOOAyTdF3X8WZyXpjCbl4PC6dRgKnWISA
15. No. 06-17-25-HRG_6172025_MSJ-1-
Order_Submitted_Matter-
zTTt9x3fqHW7u6jPVsv8JjCEAhBG.hkv4DLu7SLxNCQ
16. No. 06-17-25-
HRG_6172025_Lexington_Insurance_Companys_MSJ-1-
Order_Submitted_Matter-
lrwpz9eU8SG7u6jPVsv8JjCEAhBG.hkv4DLu7SLxNCQ
17. No. 06-17-25-HRG_6172025_MSJ-1-
Order_Submitted_Matter-
zTTt9x3fqHWWJdu0j.h5vCof4OvXgzFrBqILrGb.rcA
18. No. 06-17-25-
HRG_6172025_Lexington_Insurance_Companys_MSJ-1-
Order_Submitted_Matter-
lrwpz9eU8SGWJdu0j.h5vCof4OvXgzFrBqILrGb.rcA
19. No. 06-17-25-
HRG_6172025_Lexington_Insurance_Companys_MSJ-1-
Order_Submitted_Matter-
lrwpz9eU8SHsUwlQg1LW0mmhnwYSkbdXUyoVHphLydw

20. No. 06-17-25-HRG_6172025_MSJ-1-
Order_Submitted_Matter-
zTTt9x3fqHXsUwlQg1LW0mmhnwYSkbdXUyoVHphLydw
21. Proposed Order
22. No. 06-12-25-
Hrg_61725_D18b_Proposed_Order_On_Defendant_CSUs_Reply
_To_Plaintiffs_Objections_To_Evidence-1-Proposed_Order-
mzUSsrxG68A00AyTdF3X8WZyXpjCbl4PC6dRgKnWISA
23. No. 06-12-25-
Hrg_61725_D18b_Proposed_Order_On_Defendant_CSUs_Reply
_To_Plaintiffs_Objections_To_Evidence-1-Proposed_Order-
mzUSsrxG68C7u6jPVsv8JjCEAhBG.hkv4DLu7SLxNCQ
24. No. 06-12-25-
Hrg_61725_D18b_Proposed_Order_On_Defendant_CSUs_Reply
_To_Plaintiffs_Objections_To_Evidence-1-Proposed_Order-
mzUSsrxG68DsUwlQg1LW0mmhnwYSkbdXUyoVHphLydw
25. DEFENDANT CSU???S REPLY TO PLAINTIFF???S
OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE
26. No. 06-06-25-
Hrg_61725_REPLY_TO_PLAINTIFFs_OBJECTIONS_TO_EVIDEN
CE-1-
DEFENDANT_CSUS_REPLY_TO_PLAINTIFFS_OBJECTIONS_TO
_EVIDENCE-
AXEeqPWtyBjsUwlQg1LW0mmhnwYSkbdXUyoVHphLydw
27. No. 06-06-25-
Hrg_61725_REPLY_TO_PLAINTIFFs_OBJECTIONS_TO_EVIDEN
CE-1-
DEFENDANT_CSUS_REPLY_TO_PLAINTIFFS_OBJECTIONS_TO
_EVIDENCE-
AXEeqPWtyBg00AyTdF3X8WZyXpjCbl4PC6dRgKnWISA
28. No. 06-06-25-
Hrg_61725_REPLY_TO_PLAINTIFFs_OBJECTIONS_TO_EVIDEN
CE-1-
DEFENDANT_CSUS_REPLY_TO_PLAINTIFFS_OBJECTIONS_TO
_EVIDENCE-
AXEeqPWtyBi7u6jPVsv8JjCEAhBG.hkv4DLu7SLxNCQ
29. P Ord Re Lex Obj re ev BOA CSU Opp To Lex MSA.pdf

30. No. 06-03-25-Pending_for_hearing_on_061025-1-
P_Ord_Re_Lex_Obj_re_ev_BOA_CSU_Opp_To_Lex_MSApdf-
EshfjDGHLUy7u6jPVsv8JjCEAhBG.hkv4DLu7SLxNCQ
31. No. 06-03-25-Pending_for_hearing_on_061025-1-
P_Ord_Re_Lex_Obj_re_ev_BOA_CSU_Opp_To_Lex_MSApdf-
EshfjDGHLUw00AyTdF3X8WZyXpjCbl4PC6dRgKnWISA
32. No. 06-03-25-Pending_for_hearing_on_061025-1-
P_Ord_Re_Lex_Obj_re_ev_BOA_CSU_Opp_To_Lex_MSApdf-
EshfjDGHLUzsUwlQg1LW0mmhnmwYSkbdXUyoVHphLydw
33. Reply iso MSA.pdf
34. Lex Objects to CSUs Evidence ISO Opp to Lex MSA.pdf
35. No. 05-30-25-
Hrg_61025_LEXINGTON_INSURANCE_COMPANYS_OBJECTION
NS_TO_EVIDENCE_OFFERED_IN_SUPPORT_OF_BOARD_OF_T
RUSTEES_OF_THE_CALIFORNIA_STATE_UNIVERSITYS_OPPO
SITION_TO_LEXINGTON_INSURANCE_COMPANYS_MOTION_F
OR_SUMMARY_ADJUDICATION-1-
Lex_Objects_to_CSUs_Evidence_ISO_Opp_to_Lex_MSApdf-
zXfMfY4Bo_400AyTdF3X8WZyXpjCbl4PC6dRgKnWISA
36. No. 05-30-25-
Hrg_61025_LEXINGTON_INSURANCE_COMPANYS_REPLY_BR
IEF_IN_SUPPORT_OF_ITS_MOTION_FOR_SUMMARY_ADJUDIC
ATION_RE_DUTY_TO_DEFEND-1-Reply_iso_MSApdf-
dnXNCTLvc5000AyTdF3X8WZyXpjCbl4PC6dRgKnWISA
37. No. 05-30-25-
Hrg_61025_LEXINGTON_INSURANCE_COMPANYS_OBJECTION
NS_TO_EVIDENCE_OFFERED_IN_SUPPORT_OF_BOARD_OF_T
RUSTEES_OF_THE_CALIFORNIA_STATE_UNIVERSITYS_OPPO
SITION_TO_LEXINGTON_INSURANCE_COMPANYS_MOTION_F
OR_SUMMARY_ADJUDICATION-1-
Lex_Objects_to_CSUs_Evidence_ISO_Opp_to_Lex_MSApdf-
zXfMfY4Bo_7sUwlQg1LW0mmhnmwYSkbdXUyoVHphLydw
38. No. 05-30-25-
Hrg_61025_LEXINGTON_INSURANCE_COMPANYS_REPLY_BR
IEF_IN_SUPPORT_OF_ITS_MOTION_FOR_SUMMARY_ADJUDIC
ATION_RE_DUTY_TO_DEFEND-1-Reply_iso_MSApdf-
dnXNCTLvc527u6jPVsv8JjCEAhBG.hkv4DLu7SLxNCQ

39. No. 05-30-25-

Hrg_61025_LEXINGTON_INSURANCE_COMPANYS_OBJECTION_TO_EVIDENCE_OFFERED_IN_SUPPORT_OF_BOARD_OF_TRUSTEES_OF_THE_CALIFORNIA_STATE_UNIVERSITYS_OPPPOSITION_TO_LEXINGTON_INSURANCE_COMPANYS_MOTION_FOR_SUMMARY_ADJUDICATION-1-

Lex_Objects_to_CSUs_Evidence_ISO_Opp_to_Lex_MSApdf-zXfMfY4Bo_67u6jPVsv8JjCEAhBG.hkv4DLu7SLxNCQ

40. No. 05-30-25-

Hrg_61025_LEXINGTON_INSURANCE_COMPANYS_REPLY_BRIEF_IN_SUPPORT_OF_ITS_MOTION_FOR_SUMMARY_ADJUDICATION_RE_DUTY_TO_DEFEND-1-Reply_iso_MSApdf-dnXNCTLvc53sUwlQg1LW0mmhwnwYSkbdXUyoVHphLydw

41. No. 05-28-25-

Hrg_61725_to_Evidence_in_Opposition_to_Defendants_Motion_for_Summary_Judgment-1-

20250528_Pltfs_Objections_to_Evidencepdf-

6dUqfSTebhU00AyTdF3X8WZyXpjCbl4PC6dRgKnWISA

42. No. 05-28-25-

Hrg_61725_to_Evidence_in_Opposition_to_Defendants_Motion_for_Summary_Judgment-1-

20250528_Pltfs_Objections_to_Evidencepdf-

6dUqfSTebhXsUwlQg1LW0mmhwnwYSkbdXUyoVHphLydw

43. 20250528 - Pltfs Objections to Evidence.pdf

Testimony admitted in part and excluded in part.

Case Source:	Opinion, Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Lovett V. Omni Hotels Mgmt. Corp.
Docket Number:	3:14-cv-02844, 14-cv-02844
Case Cite(s):	2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25480; 2016 LX 42378; 2015 WL 6452439
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology
Area of Law:	Product Liability
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	California
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - N.D. California
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Christopher Howard Mitchell, Lead Attorney, Stein, Mitchell Cipollone Beato & Missner LLP, Washington, DC, Jeffrey Lee Gordon, Doris Cheng, Michael Albert Kelly, Justin Chou, Walkup, Melodia, Kelly & Schoenberger, San Francisco, CA
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Justin M. Cuniff, Bonner Kiernan Trebach & Crociata, LLP, One Park Place, Annapolis, MD, Brian Christopher Lawrence, Thomas Ailbe Rector, Lead Attorney, Gregory Bing Chin, Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, San Francisco, CA
Judge(s):	Rudolph Contreras, Carlos E. Mendoza, Karla R. Spaulding, Richard Seeborg
Date(s):	02/29/2016
Summary of Involvement:	The Court noted that "Omni also challenges the reliability and admissibility of Wong's opinions regarding whether exercise bands should include instructions. Omni complains that Lovett's attorney omitted certain pages from an exhibit to Wong's declaration during the first round of summary judgment briefs before the request for leave to amend the complaint was granted. Why the fact or timing of this omission is prejudicial or

relevant to Omni's challenge to Wong's declaration remains unclear. Omni is capable of challenging the basis for Wong's opinion "in the crucible of cross-examination." *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36, 61, 124 S. Ct. 1354, 158 L. Ed. 2d 177 (2004)." The Court found that "In addition, Omni objects to the following statement: "According to various national standard and certifying organizations, instructions for safe use are required for consumer fitness products like the Xering resistance bands and Xertube resistance bands." Wong Decl. ¶ 10. Wong refers to two manuals, which arguably pertain to only mechanical stationary equipment. The first, "Standard Specification for Fitness Equipment," defines "fitness equipment" as a "mechanical device or hardware designed for use in exercising specific or multiple muscles of the body." Wong. Decl. Ex. 6, ASTM F2276-10, § 3.1.9. Specifically excluded from the definition of "fitness equipment" are "toys used for recreation, jump ropes, outdoor and indoor playground equipment or facilities, bicycles or other fitness soft goods such as gloves, belts, apparel, balls, and so forth." Id. § 3.1.9.1. The second standard Wong references is the ISO 20957-2 for "stationary training equipment—strength training equipment, additional specific safety requirements and test methods." Wong Decl. Ex. 7, ISO 20957-2. That standard applies to "strength training equipment with stack weight resistance or other means of resistance like weight discs, elastic cords, hydraulic, pneumatic and magnetic systems and springs" Id. at 1 (emphasis added)." The Court observed that "These standards are not so obviously inapplicable to elastic bands, like the Xering, such that Wong's testimony must be excluded. While Omni may be correct that these standards do not govern resistance bands, the exhibits and declaration in the record do not provide a basis to exclude Wong's opinions. Wong does not

fully explain whether he is using the manuals to extrapolate to elastic bands. Moreover, the ISO 20957-2 specifically mentions that the standard applies to elastic chords. This record simply does not provide a basis to exclude Wong's testimony. Omni is free, of course, to cross-examine Wong at trial about the applicability of these two standards." The Court further observed that "Finally, Omni challenges the reliability of Wong's opinion testimony about whether Lovett's injury could have been prevented had the kits included instructions. See Wong Decl. ¶¶ 14-16. An expert must be knowledgeable, which "connotes more than subjective belief or unsupported speculation." Daubert, 509 U.S. at 590. Wong's opinions about what might have been, however, are just that—unsupported speculation—and therefore improper expert opinion. Accordingly, Omni's objection to this aspect of Wong's testimony is sustained."

Supporting Document(s):

1. Opinion dated February 29, 2016
2. ORDER by Judge Richard Seeborg granting in part and denying in part 108 Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment.(cl, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 2/29/2016) (Entered: 02/29/2016)
3. Case Docket Sheet
4. No. 134 ORDER by Judge Richard Seeborg granting in part and denying in part 108 Defendant's Motion ...
5. No. 128-6 RESPONSE (re 108 MOTION for Summary Judgment) Declaration of Brang Wong, P.E. in Support of ...
6. No. 89 RESPONSE (re 59 MOTION for Summary Judgment) Plaintiff's Opposition Brief filed byJennifer ...
7. Plaintiff's Opposition To Defendant Omni Hotel Management Corporation's Motion For Summary Judgment Objections Regarding Testimony Improperly Sustained at Trial; Reversed on Appeal.

8. Response (Re Motion For Summary Judgment) Declaration Of Brang Wong, P.E. In Support Of Plaintiff's Opposition To Defendant Omni's Motion For Summary Judgment Filed Byjennifer K Lovett. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Exhibit 1 To Declaration Of Brad Wong, # 2 Exhibit Exhibit 2 To Declaration Of Brad Wong, # 3 Exhibit Exhibit 3 To Declaration Of Brad Wong, # 4 Exhibit Exhibit 4 To Declaration Of Brad Wong, # 5 Exhibit Exhibit 5 To Declaration Of Brad Wong, # 6 Exhibit Exhibit 6 To Declaration Of Brad Wong, # 7 Exhibit Exhibit 7 To Declaration Of Brad Wong) (Filed On 1/7/2016)
 9. Response (Re Motion For Summary Judgment) Plaintiff's Opposition Brief Filed Byjennifer K Lovett. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration Of Doris Cheng In Support Of Plaintiff's Opposition To Msj, # 2 Exhibit 1 - Malloy Deposition Excerpts, # 3 Exhibit 2 - Gittenmeier Deposition Excerpts, # 4 Exhibit 3 - Kesinger 30(B)(6) Deposition Excerpts, # 5 Exhibit 4 - Kesinger Deposition Excerpts, # 6 Exhibit 5 - Smith Deposition Excerpts, # 7 Exhibit 6 - DefSuppRog Responses, # 8 Exhibit 7 - Omni Produced Documents, # 9 Exhibit 8 - Lovett Deposition Excerpts, # 10 Exhibit 9 - Photograph, # 11 Declaration Of Justin Chou In Support Of Plaintiff's Opposition To Msj, # 12 Exhibit A, # 13 Exhibit B, # 14 Exhibit C, # 15 Exhibit D, # 16 Declaration Of Paul Laesecke In Support Of Plaintiff's Opposition To Msj, # 17 Exhibit 1 - Cv, # 18 Declaration Of Brad Wong In Support Of Plaintiff's Opposition To Msj, # 19 Exhibit 1 - Cv, # 20 Exhibit 2 - Photographs, # 21 Exhibit 3 - Xering Guide, # 22 Exhibit 4 - Omni 176, # 23 Exhibit 5 - Xertube Guide, # 24 Exhibit 6 - Astm, # 25 Exhibit 7 - Iso) (Filed On 9/11/2015)
-

Objection regarding testimony sustained at trial; reversed on appeal.

Case Source: Opinion, Docket, Court Filed Documents

Case Caption: [S. Sharufa, Et Al V. Raging Waters Of California, Ltd.](#)

Docket Number: 1-15-CV-275259, H044064, H044064

Case Cite(s): 49 Cal. App. 5th 493; 263 Cal. Rptr. 3d 112; 2020 Cal. App. LEXIS 457; CCH Prod. Liab. Rep. P20,903; 2018 CA App. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 7481; 2018 WL 5110990

Grounds of Challenge: Methodology

Area of Law: Personal Injury and Torts

Jurisdiction: State

State: California

Court Name: Court of Appeal of California Sixth Appellate District, California Superior Court - Santa Clara Cty.

Retained By: Plaintiff

Plaintiff's Attorney(s): John FitzpatrickVannucci

Defendant's Attorney(s): Michael L. Amaro, Esq. (Bar No. 109514), Rudie D. Baldwin, Esq. (Bar No. 245218), SanazCherazaie, Esq. (Bar No. 273944), Amaro, Baldwin LLP, 180 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 850, Long Beach, California 90802, (562) 912-4157, Facsimile: (562) 912-7919

Judge(s): William J. Elfving, Adrienne Grover, Mary Greenwood, Allison Marston Danner

Date(s): 05/27/2020

Summary of Involvement: According to the "Respondent, Festival Fun Parks, LLC dba Raging Waters San Jose's Brief On Appeal", it was stated that "Here, Appellant did not challenge the Trial Court's evidentiary rulings. When an appellant does not challenge the Trial Court's sustaining objections to evidence offered in support of summary judgment motion, "any issues concerning the correctness of the Trial Court's evidentiary rulings have been waived." (Lopez v.

Baca (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 1008, 1014-1015). Specifically, the Trial Court sustained all objections to the declaration of Appellant's expert, Brad Wong, P.E. Accordingly, based on Raging Waters' evidentiary objections, all testimony provided by Mr. Wong in support of Appellant's Opposition to Raging Waters' Motion for Summary Judgment, or in the alternative, Summary Adjudication was not considered by the Superior Court. On appeal, since Appellant has not challenged the Superior Court's evidentiary orders, the reviewing Court should consider all such evidence to have been properly excluded." It was also stated that "Interestingly, the only evidence Appellant offered was the declaration of his excluded expert, Brad Wong, P.E., wherein Mr. Wong speculated that tubing down a flume is unlike river rafting, based upon the unfounded assumption that a water slide is not analogous to recreational sporting activities like river rafting "because (the water slide) is controlled, in many aspects, by Defendants (sic) and not by the participants in the ride." It was further stated that "Even if such evidence were considered by the Court on review (despite Appellant's failure to challenge the Superior Court's evidentiary findings), Mr. Wong's analysis is based on the presumed fact that participants in other recreation sporting activities, particularly river rafting, exercise control in the circumstances of participating in an activity. To the contrary, a river rafter nor the river rafting company exercises any control over factors like those listed by Mr. Wong; indeed, neither controls the volume or flow of the river, the pitch or configuration of the river, the path of the river, or the depth of the river." The judgment was reversed on appeal.

Supporting Document(s):

1. Opinion dated May 27, 2020
2. RESPONDENT, FESTIVAL FUN PARKS, LLC dba RAGING WATERS SAN JOSE'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
3. Case Docket Sheet

4. Declaration Of Brad M. Wong, P.E. In Support Of Opposition
To Motion For Summary Judgment/Adjudication

Motion to exclude certain testimony denied.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	J.G. by and through his Guardian ad Litem VERONICA GUZMAN, Plaintiff, v. TODAY S HOTEL CORPORATION dba HOLIDAY INN GOLDEN GATEWAY and DOES 1 to 100, Defendants.
Docket Number:	CGC-13-530390
Case Cite(s):	2014 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 14531; 2014 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 13972; 2014 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 14529
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Steven August Fabbro
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Steven Douglas Werth
Judge(s):	Newton Lam, Cynthia M. Lee, Cynthia M. Lee
Date(s):	05/30/2014
Summary of Involvement:	The Court deied Defendant's motion to exclude certain testimony of Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony.
Supporting Document(s):	1. DEFENDANTS MOTION IN LIM/NE NO. 11 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OF THE CARPET AT THE HOLIDAY INN GOLDEN GATEWAY BEING WORN 2. MOTION IN LIMINE NO.11 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OF THE CARPET AT THE HOLIDAY INN GOLDEN GATEWAY BEING "WORN" FILED BY DEFENDANT TODAY'S HOTEL CORPORATION DBA HOLIDAY INN GOLDEN GATEWAY INTERSTATE HOTELS LLC AS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST TO INTERSTATE HOTELS CORPORATION

3. MOTION IN LIMINE NO.13 TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFF'S EXPERT BRAD WONG REGARDING THE MECHANICS OF THE BREAKAGE OF THE GLASS IN THE DECORATIVE ARTWORK FILED BY DEFENDANT TODAY'S HOTEL CORPORATION DBA HOLIDAY INN GOLDEN GATEWAY INTERSTATE HOTELS LLC AS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST TO INTERSTATE HOTELS CORPORATION
 4. MOTION IN LIMINE NO.9 TO RESTRICT PLAINTIFF'S EXPERTS' OPINIONS TO THOSE OPINIONS PROVIDED AT DEPOSITIONS FILED BY DEFENDANT TODAY'S HOTEL CORPORATION DBA HOLIDAY INN GOLDEN GATEWAY INTERSTATE HOTELS LLC AS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST TO INTERSTATE HOTELS CORPORATION
 5. DEFENDANTS MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 13 TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFF S EXPERT BRAD WONG REGARDING THE MECHANICS OF THE BREAKAGE OF THE GLASS IN THE DECORATIVE ARTWORK
 6. DEFENDANTS MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 9 TO RESTRICT PLAINTIFF S EXPERTS OPINIONS TO THOSE OPINIONS PROVIDED AT DEPOSITION
 7. Case Docket Sheet
 8. MINUTES FOR MAY-30-2014 9:30 AM
 9. MINUTES FOR MAY-21-2014 9:00 AM
 10. MOTION IN LIMINE NO.11 TO
 11. MOTION IN LIMINE NO.13 TO
 12. MOTION IN LIMINE NO.9 TO
 13. Opposition To Defts' Mtn In Limine No. 13 Re: Brad Wong's Demonstrations Of Glass Breakage Filed By Plaintiff J.G., By And Through His Guardian Ad Litem Veronica Guzman
-

Objection regarding testimony overruled.

Case Source: Docket, Court Filed Documents

Case Caption: **Cormier V. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.**

Docket Number: RG10501346

Case Cite(s): 2011 WL 11707946; 2011 WL 11711818

Grounds of Challenge: Methodology, Relevance

Area of Law: Personal Injury and Torts

Jurisdiction: State

State: California

Court Name: California Superior Court - Alameda Cty.

Retained By: Defendant

Plaintiff's Attorney(s): Michael M. Shea,Hinton, Alfert& Sumner, Attn: Alfert, Peter W.,
1646 N. California Blvd., Ste. 600, Walnut Creek, CA 94596-4113.
Law Offices Of Dawn Ceizler, Attn: Ceizler, Dawn, 1990 N.
California Blvd., Suite 305, CA 94596

Defendant's Attorney(s): Not Mentioned,Thomas J. Trachuk (SBN: 88194), Marna A.
Mitchell (SBN: 121365), Michael J. Greathouse (SBN: 100811),
Dang And Trachuk, 1939 Harrison Street, Suite 913, Oakland, CA
94612, Telephone: (510) 318-6340, Facsimile: (510) 318-6339.
Jonathan P. Lowell (SBN: 120842), City Attorney, City of
Pleasanton, 123 Main Street, PO Box 520, Pleasanton, CA 94566,
Telephone: (925) 931-5015, Fax: (925) 931-5482

Judge(s): Franklin Bondonno,RonniMacLaren

Date(s): 04/22/2011

Summary of Involvement: The Court held that "All objections to the declaration of Brad M. Wong are OVERRULED. The testimony is relevant and the opinions are supported by a sufficient foundation. The evidence on which the declarant relies is evidence that could be reasonably relied upon by an expert in formulating his opinion."

Supporting Document(s):

1. Case Docket Sheet
 2. City Of Pleasanton's Memorandum Of Points And Authorities
In Opposition To Pg&E's Motion For Summary
Judgment/Summary Adjudication
 3. Trail Order
-

Objection regarding testimony overruled.

Case Source:	Opinion, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Hardeman V. Amtrak/Caltrain Railroad
Docket Number:	3:04cv3360, 04-03360, C04-3360
Case Cite(s):	2006 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 175663; 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 57325; 2006 U.S. Dist. Ct. Motions LEXIS 41075; 2006 WL 2301526
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Relevance
Area of Law:	Labor and Employment Law
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	California
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - N.D. California
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Pamela Yvette Price
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Randy Scott Erlewine
Judge(s):	Susan Illston
Date(s):	07/31/2006
Summary of Involvement:	The Court in a footnote to its order dated July 31, 2006, held that "In connection with the summary judgment motion, both parties have filed a host of evidentiary objections. The Court OVERRULES Plaintiff's objection to the transcript of the May 22, 2003, disciplinary hearing, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to strike (Docket No. 115). The Court also OVERRULES Defendant's objections to the declarations of Hardeman, Breda, Fontaine, and Wong. Finally, the Court OVERRULES Defendant's objections to the declarations of Gallo and Campbell without prejudice to Defendant raising those objections again before trial."
Supporting Document(s):	1. Opinion dated July 31, 2006

2. Memorandum in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment filed by C. Faheem R. Hardeman. (Price, Pamela) (Filed on 7/8/2006) (Entered: 07/08/2006)
 3. PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
 4. Exhibit Exhibit A ; Proceeding Number : 86-1
 5. DECLARATION of BRAD WONG In Opposition to Defendant's Motion For Summary Judgment filed by C. Faheem R. Hardeman. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Exhibit A# 2) (Price, Pamela) (Filed on 7/7/2006) (Entered: 07/07/2006)
 6. Objections To Plaintiff's Evidence Submitted In Opposition Of Msj By Amtrak/Caltrain Railroad
 7. Exhibit Exhibit A
 8. Declaration Of Brad Wong In Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Summary Judgment Filed By C. Faheem R. Hardeman. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Exhibit A# 2)
-

Objection regarding declaration overruled.

Case Source:	Opinion, Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Morales V. Lowe's HIW, Inc.
Docket Number:	CIV509470, : CIV 509 470, : CIV 509 470 Civil Unlimited , 509470
Case Cite(s):	2012 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 30226; 2013 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 8350; 2012 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 26516; 2012 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 28166; 2012 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 28051; 2012 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 30878; 2013 Cal. Super. LEXIS 15706; 2013 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 8485; 2013 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 13242; 2013 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 8559; 2013 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 7995; 2012 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 27576; 2013 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 8401
Grounds of Challenge:	Unknown
Area of Law:	Product Liability
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Mateo Cty.
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Seth I. Rosenberg, Esq. [SBN 215135], Minami Tamaki LLP, San Francisco, CA
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Tharpe& Howell, LLP, Sherman Oaks, California, Charles D. May, Esq., State Bar No.: 129663, Gene B. Sharaga, State Bar No.: 131661, Diana M. Rivera, State Bar NO.: 222025
Judge(s):	V. Raymond Swope
Date(s):	05/10/2013
Summary of Involvement:	The Court held that "Plaintiffs' objection to Declaration of Brad M. Wong as to Item No. 1 is overruled."
Supporting Document(s):	1. Opinion dated May 10, 2013

2. DEFENDANT LOWE'S HIW, INC.'S REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
3. REPLY BRIEF OF DEFENDANT LOWE'S HIW, INC. TO PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
4. PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT LOWE'S HIW INC.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
5. PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION TO DEFENDANT'S EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
6. PLAINTIFFS' SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF DEFENDANT LOWE'S HIW INC.
7. PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT LOWE'S HIW, INC.'S SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
8. REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT LOWE'S HIW, INC.'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER
9. MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT LOWE'S HIW INC. MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER; REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS
10. MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT LOWE'S HIW, INC.'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER
11. DEFENDANT LOWE'S HIW, INC.'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
12. DEFENDANT LOWE'S HIW, INC.'S SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
13. MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT LOWE'S HIW, INC.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
14. Case Docket Sheet
15. Reply Brief In Support Of Defendant Lowe's Hiw, Inc's Motion For Protective Order Objection Regarding Testimony Sustained.

16. Plaintiffs' Opposition To Defendant Lowe's HiwInc.'S Motion
For Summary Judgment

17. Declaration Of Brad M. Wong In Support Of Defendants
Motion For Protective Order

18. Declaration Of Brad M. Wong In Support Of Defendant
Lowes Motion For Summary Judgment

Motion to exclude or limit denied.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Nancy Loughridge V. MEI-GSR Holdings (D10)
Docket Number:	CV17-02294
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Unknown
Area of Law:	Product Liability
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	Nevada
Court Name:	NV District - Washoe
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned
Judge(s):	Elliott A. Sattler
Date(s):	06/19/2019
Summary of Involvement:	The Court denied Plaintiff's motion to exclude or limit Defendant's expert Wong's testimony.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Case Docket Sheet 2. Request For Submission Plaintiff's Motion In Limine No. 2 To Exclude Or Limit The Testimony Of Defense Expert Brad Wong, P.E. Filed 5-6-19 3. Reply To Defendant's Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion In Limine No. 2 To Exclude Or Limit The Testimony Of Defense Expert Brad Wong, P.E. 4. Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion In Limine No. 2 To Exclude Or Limit The Testimony Of Defense Expert Brad Wong, P.E. 5. Delcaration Of Frank W. Thompson In Support Of Motion In Limine No. 2 To Exclude Or Limit The Testimony Of Defense Expert Brad Wong, P.E 6. Plaintiffs Motion In Limine No. 2 To Exclude Or Limit The Testimony Of Defense Expert Brad Wong, P.E.

7. Court Denied The Motion To Exclude Expert David Smith, And The Motion To Exclude Expert Brad Wong; Both Experts May Testify At Trial With The Limitations Set Forth By The Court. Court Further Ordered: The Motion Re: Inapplicable Standards Or Laws Was Addressed By The Court's Ruling On The Motion To Exclude Expert David Smith. Court Further Ordered That The Objections To Pretrial Disclosures Filed By Both Sides Will Be Addressed As They Come Up During Trial

Motion to exclude denied.

Case Source:	Opinion, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Hatch V. Union Pacific Railroad Company
Docket Number:	5:07cv298
Case Cite(s):	2008 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 205348; 2008 WL 11334029; 2008 WL 11334189; 2008 WL 2071314; 2008 WL 909555
Grounds of Challenge:	Qualification, Late Disclosure
Area of Law:	Constitutional and Civil Rights
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	California
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - C.D. California
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Jennifer Marie Misetich
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Brandie N. Charles
Judge(s):	John A. Kronstadt, Alicia G. Rosenberg
Date(s):	04/10/2008
Summary of Involvement:	The Court denied Plaintiff's motion to exclude Defendant's expert Wong's testimony.
Supporting Document(s):	1. NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION for Sanctions Exclude Expert Witnesses of Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company filed by Plaintiff Joshua Hatch.Motion set for hearing on 3/24/2008 at 10:00 AM before Judge Virginia A. Phillips. (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion of Plaintiff to Exclude, etc.# 2 Declaration of Mark P. Dupont in Support of Motion of Plaintiff to Exclude, etc.# 3 Proposed Order on Motion of Plaintiff to Exclude Expert Witness, etc.# 4 Proof of 2. Opinion filed on April 10, 2008 3. Opinion filed on April 04, 2008

4. Defendant's Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Exclude Expert Witnesses Designated By Defendant
 5. Notice Of Motion And Motion For Sanctions Exclude Expert Witnesses Of Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company Filed By Plaintiff Joshua Hatch. Motion Set For Hearing On 3/24/2008 At 10:00 Am Before Judge Virginia A. Phillips. (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum Of Points And Authorities In Support Of Motion Of Plaintiff To Exclude, Etc. # 2 Declaration Of Mark P. Dupont In Support Of Motion Of Plaintiff To Exclude, Etc. # 3 Proposed Order On Motion Of Plaintiff To Exclude Expert Witness, Etc. # 4 Proof Of Service)
 6. Memorandum Of Points And Authorities In Support Of Motion Of Plaintiff To Exclude Expert Witnesses Designated By Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company
-

Motion to limit denied without prejudice.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Campbell et al v. Logue et al
Docket Number:	3:10cv1821
Case Cite(s):	2010 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 203900; 2010 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 234142; 2010 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 255235
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Late Disclosure
Area of Law:	Admiralty and Maritime Law
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	California
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - S.D. California
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Jimmy Ray Ayers , Jr.,Jimmy Ray Ayers
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Chelsea Davenport Yuan
Judge(s):	Jeffrey T. Miller, David H. Bartick
Date(s):	05/20/2013
Summary of Involvement:	The Court denied Plaintiff's motion to limit Defendant's expert Wong's testimony without prejudice.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Declaration Maria Del Rocio Ashby ; Proceeding Number : 213-1 2. RESPONSE in Opposition re 188 In Limine MOTION Limit Expert Testimony of Experts Harvey Hunnicutt and Brad M. Wong filed by David Marquez. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration Maria Del Rocio Ashby, # 2 Exhibit A, # 3 Exhibit B, # 4 Proof of Service)(Klein, Neil) (Entered: 05/06/2013)

3. RESPONSE in Opposition re 188 In Limine MOTION Limit Expert Testimony Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 1 filed by William Logue, The Sears/Logue Revocable Trust. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit 1, # 2 Exhibit 2, # 3 Exhibit 3, # 4 Exhibit 4, # 5 Exhibit 5, # 6 Exhibit 6, # 7 Exhibit 7) (Castiov, Diana) (Entered: 05/06/2013)
4. Exhibit ; Proceeding Number : 188-1
5. In Limine MOTION Limit Expert Testimony by Steven Campbell, Carlota Franklin-Campbell. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit)(Ayers, Jimmy) (Entered: 04/29/2013)
6. MEMORANDUM OF FACTS AND CONTENTIONS OF LAW by David Marquez. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A & B, # 2 Proof of Service)(Klein, Neil) (jao). (Entered: 02/01/2013)
7. Exhibit A & B ; Proceeding Number : 144-1
8. Pretrial Disclosures by William Logue, The Sears/Logue Revocable Trust (Attachments: # 1 Proof of Service)(Castiov, Diana) (jao). (Entered: 01/22/2013)
9. Case Docket Sheet
10. No. 213 RESPONSE in Opposition re 188 In Limine MOTION Limit Expert Testimony of Experts Harvey Hunnicutt ...
11. No. 188 In Limine MOTION Limit Expert Testimony by Steven Campbell, Carlota Franklin-Campbell
12. Minute Order. For Proceedings Held Before Judge Jeffrey T. Miller: Pretrial Conference Held On 5/20/2013.Deferring Ruling On In Limine Motion To Preclude Plaintiffs From Introducing Or Referring To Testimony Of Michael Sampsel By Bluewater Yacht Builders, Ltd., Mikelson Yachts, Inc.; Denying Without Prejudice In Limine Motion To Preclude Plaintiffs From Introducing Or Referring To Testimony That Defendants Failed To Design Or Test The Vessel's Deck To Meet Coefficient Of Friction Standards By Bluewater Yacht Builders, Ltd., Mikelson Yachts, Inc.; Denying Without Prejudice In Limine Motion To Preclude Plaintiffs From Introducing Or Referring To Testimony Regarding The Consumer Expectations Test By Bluewater Yacht Builders, Ltd., Mikelson Yachts, Inc.; Denying In Limine Motion To Preclude Plaintiffs From Introducing Or Referring To Any Of Plaintiffs' Testimony Regarding The Medical Causation Of Plaintiff's Injuries By Bluewater Yacht Builders, Ltd.,

- Mikelson Yachts, Inc.; Denying 185 In Limine Motion To Preclude Plaintiffs From Introducing Or Referring To The Publication By Darren Melhuish And John Wegand Entitled "Coefficient Of Friction, The Development Of A Standard Portable Device For The Us Naval Fleet" By Bluewater Yacht Builders, Ltd., Mikelson Yachts, Inc.; Denying Without Prejudice In Limine Motion Limit Expert Testimony By Steven Campbell, Carlota Franklin-Campbell. Finding As Moot In Limine Motion To Exclude Evidence Of Collateral By Steven Campbell, Carlota Franklin-Campbell.; Finding As Moot In Limine Motion To Exclude Evidence And Argument By Steven Campbell, Carlota Franklin-Campbell.; Denying In Limine Motion Admit Testimony Of Expert Witness By Steven Campbell, Carlota Franklin-Campbell.; Denying, Granting, Finding As Moot, Finding As Moot In Limine Motion To Exclude Defendants' Witnesses By Steven Campbell, Carlota Franklin-Campbell.; Denying In Limine Motion To Exclude Evidence Of Industry Custom By Steven Campbell, Carlota Franklin-Campbell.; Denying In Limine Motion To Exclude Deposition Testimony By Steven Campbell, Carlota Franklin-Campbell.; Granting In Limine Motion To Preclude Testimony Of William Mastrodimos, Md By David Marquez.; Denying In Limine Motion To Exclude All Reference And Evidence Re Plaintiff Carlota Franklin-Campbell's Claim For Loss Of Consortium By David Marquez.; Denying Without Prejudice In Limine Motion To Limit Expert Testimony By Jeffrey Porter, Cpa By David Marquez. Trial Briefs Due 5/21/2013. Exhibit List Due By 5/28/2013. Pretrial Order Approved. (Court Reporter Debra Henson). (Plaintiff Attorney Jimmy Ray Ayers; Morgan JcScudi).(Defendant Attorney Frank Brucculeri; George Geoffrey Robb; Neil Klein; Rocio Ashby; Daniel Berberich).
13. Response In Opposition Re In Limine Motion Limit Expert Testimony Opposition To Plaintiffs' Motion In Limine No. 1 Filed By William Logue, The Sears/Logue Revocable Trust. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit 1, # 2 Exhibit 2, # 3 Exhibit 3, # 4 Exhibit 4, # 5 Exhibit 5, # 6 Exhibit 6, # 7 Exhibit 7)
14. Response In Opposition Re In Limine Motion Limit Expert Testimony Of Experts Harvey Hunnicutt And Brad M. Wong Filed By David Marquez. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration Maria Del Rocio Ashby, # 2 Exhibit A, # 3 Exhibit B, # 4 Proof Of Service)

15. Notice Of Lodgment By William Logue, The Sears/Logue
Revocable Trust Of Original Deposition Transcripts
(Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Exhibit B, # 3 Exhibit C, # 4
Exhibit D, # 5 Exhibit E, # 6 Exhibit F, # 7 Exhibit G)
 16. In Limine Motion Limit Expert Testimony By Steven
Campbell, Carlota Franklin-Campbell. (Attachments: # 1
Exhibit)
 17. Exhibit G
 18. Exhibit
 19. Declaration Maria Del Rocio Ashby
-

Objections regarding testimony improperly sustained at trial; reversed on appeal.

Case Source:	Opinion, Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Ponce v. Raymond Handling Sols, Inc.
Docket Number:	B246832, VC058495
Case Cite(s):	2013 CA App. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 3489; 2013 CA App. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 5668; 2014 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS 4797; 2013 CA App. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 4119
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Relevance
Area of Law:	Negligence and Malpractice
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Court of Appeal - 2d Dist., Court of Appeal of California Second Appellate District Division Three, California Superior Court - Los Angeles Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Young Wooldridge, Ned E. Dunphy
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, Anthony E. Sonnett And Trevor J. Ingold, Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith
Judge(s):	Aldrich, Klein, Kitching, Margaret Miller Bernal, William A. Patrick, Peter, Raul A. Sahagun, Master Calendar, Roger Ito
Date(s):	07/09/2014
Summary of Involvement:	The Appellate Court noted that "Defendants objected to vast portions of the Wong and Brault declarations on the grounds they were speculative, assumed facts not in evidence, lacked foundation, and were irrelevant. (Evid. Code, §§ 210, 350-351, 801 & 803.) Defendants posited multiple grounds for almost every objection." The Appellate Court found that "The Trial Court granted summary judgment. It noted that Plaintiff filed no written objections to the Rogers declaration. The Court found

that Rogers' terse declaration that "the forklift was not defective in any respect" was "sufficient to shift the burden to Plaintiffs." (Sic.) The Court ruled that Plaintiff failed to demonstrate a material dispute about whether there was a design defect. In so ruling, the Court sustained all of Defendants' objections to Wong's and Brault's declarations. The Court stated: "Plaintiff's experts' declarations are speculative and their opinions are based on facts not in evidence. The opinions lack foundation and do not meet the standards of *Vandermarck v. Ford Motor Co.* [sic] (1964) 61 Cal.2d 256, 37 Cal. Rptr. 896, 391 P.2d 168 or *Hinckley v. La Mesa R.V. Center, Inc.* (1984) 158 Cal.App.3d 630, 205 Cal. Rptr. 22." The Court then provided a list of each evidentiary objection posed, and indicated each was "sustained." Plaintiff's timely appeal followed." The Appellate Court further found that "The Trial Court granted summary judgment. It noted that Plaintiff filed no written objections to the Rogers declaration. The Court found that Rogers' terse declaration that "the forklift was not defective in any respect" was "sufficient to shift the burden to Plaintiffs." (Sic.) The Court ruled that Plaintiff failed to demonstrate a material dispute about whether there was a design defect. In so ruling, the Court sustained all of Defendants' objections to Wong's and Brault's declarations. The Court stated: "Plaintiff's experts' declarations are speculative and their opinions are based on facts not in evidence. The opinions lack foundation and do not meet the standards of *Vandermarck v. Ford Motor Co.* [sic] (1964) 61 Cal.2d 256, 37 Cal. Rptr. 896, 391 P.2d 168 or *Hinckley v. La Mesa R.V. Center, Inc.* (1984) 158 Cal.App.3d 630, 205 Cal. Rptr. 22." The Court then provided a list of each evidentiary objection posed, and indicated each was "sustained." Plaintiff's timely appeal followed." The Appellate Court observed that "With these rules in mind, we conclude both Wong's and Brault's declarations

provided sufficient foundation, were relevant, and were not speculative. Both experts inspected Raymond orderpickers and described the vehicle's operation in detail. Both described other materials on which they based their conclusions, including deposition transcripts, Raymond orderpickers photographs, drawing plans, and manuals. In 13 paragraphs with reference to supporting exhibits, Wong detailed how the panel cover is made of two separate pieces joined together which makes the cover weaker than if it were made of one piece. There are no washers at the point where the bolts' heads come in contact with the plastic cover to "distribute the load over a greater surface area" and "reduce pressure on the plastic panel cover." The plastic panel cover breaks and separates from the bolts which remained in the handlebar. He opined that the handlebar could have been mounted in a manner to prevent failure by increasing the mounting contact surface area with larger washers or bracing it to distribute the load at the point of contact with the panel cover. He described Raymond's 2007 single horizontal test of the grab handle and explained why it was foreseeable that an operator would also pull vertically on the handle. Wong then described the results of his inspection of damage to other Raymond forklifts at Slakey Brothers and concluded that the cost to repair the problem was \$500, whereas larger washers or bracing would prevent failure. For his part, Brault described, based on his expertise, the biomechanics of a backwards fall and that the most immediate, graspable component to prevent a fall was the horizontal grab handle, because the orderpicker's steering wheel was not large enough to grab onto to break a fall. These declarations are sufficient, Defendants' contention to the contrary notwithstanding, because they rely on matters that are the type on which experts may reasonably rely, and explain how the opinions are supported by the material on which the experts

relied, and are not speculative. As we observed in Garrett, these declarations are not speculative or lack a reasonable foundation merely because the experts omitted to describe the results of testing or the specifications considered. (Garrett, supra, 214 Cal.App.4th at p. 189.) The Trial Court abused its discretion in sustaining Defendants' evidentiary objections." The judgment of the Trial Court was reversed.

Supporting Document(s):

1. Opinion dated July 09, 2014
 2. Appellant's Reply Brief
 3. Respondents' Brief of The Raymond Corporation and Raymond Handling Solutions, Inc.
 4. Appellant's Opening Brief
 5. Opinion
 6. Case Docket Sheet
 7. Opposition (Declaration Of Brad M. Wong In Support Of Opposition To Msj/Msa) Filed By Attorney For Plaintiff Testimony Limited.
-

Objection regarding declaration overruled.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Tammy Faulkner vs Merced Cemetery District et al.
Docket Number:	19CV-03286
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Relevance
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Merced Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Mitchell, Timothy P
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Velasquez, Mark R
Judge(s):	McCabe, Brian
Date(s):	02/24/2021
Summary of Involvement:	According to "PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [Served Concurrently With Plaintiff's Opposition To The Defendants Motion For Summary Judgment; Declaration Of Timothy P. Mitchell; Declaration Of Zachary Moore, P.E., Separate Statement; Response to Separate Statement; [Proposed] Order On Objections]" it was stated that, "Plaintiff hereby submits the following evidentiary objections to the Declarations of Toni Hernandez, and Brad Wong, filed in support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment." It was further stated that, "Lacks Foundation/ No Personal Knowledge Evid. Code 702(a), 800 Inadmissible Speculations and Conclusions Evid. Code 400, 403, 410 Hearsay Evid. Code 1200 Not Likely to Lead to Admissible Evidence Evid. Code 210, 350,

352". Subsequently, according to "MINUTE ORDERS" dated 02/24/2021 it was stated that, " The Court orders: The tentative ruling is confirmed by the Court as follows:". The Court held that, "The Motion for Summary Judgment by Defendant Merced Cemetery District is based on a Separate Statement of Undisputed Fact containing Facts #1-24. Plaintiff has filed three objections to portions of the Declaration of Toni Hernandez, Manager of Merced Cemetery District, filed in support of the Motion for Summary Judgment. Those objections are OVERRULED. Plaintiff has filed eleven objection to the Declaration of Brad Wong, P.E. filed in support of the Motion for Summary Judgment. Those objections are OVERRULED. Accordingly, this court finds that there is admissible evidence supporting Undisputed Facts #1-24, and, therefore, that such facts establish a prima facie case that Defendant Merced Cemetery District is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. This shifts the burden of proof to Plaintiff to establish a triable issue of material fact."

Supporting Document(s):

1. Motion for Summary Judgment-MINUTE ORDERS
 2. PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
[Served Concurrently With Plaintiff's Opposition To The Defendants Motion For Summary Judgment; Declaration Of Timothy P. Mitchell; Declaration Of Zachary Moore, P.E., Separate Statement; Response to Separate Statement; [Proposed] Order On Objections]
-

Motion to exclude denied.

Case Source:	Opinion, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Esgana V. Union Pac. R.R. Co.
Docket Number:	5:07cv297
Case Cite(s):	2008 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 200379; 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129716; 2008 WL 873123
Grounds of Challenge:	Qualification, Late Disclosure
Area of Law:	Labor and Employment Law
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	California
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - C.D. California
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Mark P. Dupont, Lead Attorney, Mark P. Dupont Law Offices, Bigfork, MT; Robert George Kropp, Jr., Bush Gottlieb, Glendale, CA
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Adrian L Randolph, William H Pohle, Jr., Lead Attorney, Union Pacific Railroad Company Law Department, Roseville, CA; Robert George Kropp, Bush Gottlieb, Glendale, CA; Shannon Reno, Union Pacific Railroad Company, CA
Judge(s):	Virginia A. Phillips, John Charles Rayburn, Jr.
Date(s):	04/10/2008
Summary of Involvement:	The Court denied Plaintiff's motion to exclude Defendant's expert Wong's testimony.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Opinion dated April 10, 2008

2. NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION for Sanctions To Exclude Expert Witnesses of Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company filed by plaintiff Alphonso Esgana. Motion set for hearing on 3/24/2008 at 10:00 AM before Judge Virginia A. Phillips. (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion of Plaintiff to Exclude, etc. # 2 Declaration of Mark P. Dupont in Support of Motion of Plaintiff to Exclude Expert Witnesses, etc. # 3 Proposed Order Granting Motion of Plaintiff to Exclude Expe
 3. Memorandum Of Points And Authorities In Support Of Motion Of Plaintiff To Exclude Expert Witnesses Of Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company
 4. Notice Of Motion And Motion For Sanctions To Exclude Expert Witnesses Of Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company Filed By Plaintiff Alphonso Esgana. Motion Set For Hearing On 3/24/2008 At 10:00 Am Before Judge Virginia A. Phillips. (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum Of Points And Authorities In Support Of Motion Of Plaintiff To Exclude, Etc. # 2 Declaration Of Mark P. Dupont In Support Of Motion Of Plaintiff To Exclude Expert Witnesses, Etc. # 3 Proposed Order Granting Motion Of Plaintiff To Exclude Expert Witnesses Of Defendant, Etc. # 4 Proof Of Service)
-

Motion to exclude filed; not ruled upon due to dismissal of the suit.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Palacios V. Cosco Home And Office Products, Inc.
Docket Number:	4:14cv4066
Case Cite(s):	2016 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 504868; 2016 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 129708; 2016 WL 2859296; 2016 WL 2859294; 2016 WL 8650668; 2016 WL 3201563; 2016 WL 2859302; 2016 WL 8650698
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Relevance
Area of Law:	Product Liability
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	California
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - N.D. California
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	John Michael Brown
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Walter C. Greenough
Judge(s):	Kandis A. Westmore, Donna M. Ryu
Date(s):	07/20/2016
Summary of Involvement:	Defendant's motion to exclude Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony was not ruled upon due to dismissal of the suit.
Supporting Document(s):	1. SUR-REPLY (re 55 MOTION to Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong) filed byAmeriwood Industries, Inc. (Callahan, Matthew) (Filed on 3/25/2016) Modified on 3/28/2016 (kcS, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 03/25/2016) 2. Exhibit ; Proceeding Number : 60-1 3. Exhibit ; Proceeding Number : 59-1 4. Declaration of J. Michael Brown in Opposition to 55 MOTION to Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong filed by Victor Palacios. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit, # 2 Exhibit, # 3 Exhibit) (Brown, J.) (Filed on 3/7/2016) Modified on 3/8/2016 (kcS, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 03/07/2016)

5. Declaration of Brad M. Wong, P.E. in Opposition to 55 MOTION to Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong filed by Victor Palacios. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit, # 2 Exhibit) (Brown, J.) (Filed on 3/7/2016) Modified on 3/8/2016 (kcS, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 03/07/2016)
6. Declaration of Mishan R. Wroe in Support of 55 MOTION for Discovery (to Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong) filed by Ameriwood Industries, Inc.. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit 1, # 2 Exhibit 2, # 3 Exhibit 3, # 4 Exhibit 4 part 1, # 5 Exhibit 4 part 2, # 6 Exhibit 4 part 3, # 7 Exhibit 4 part 4, # 8 Exhibit 4 part 5, # 9 Exhibit 4 part 6, # 10 Exhibit 4 part 7)(Related document(s) 55) (Wroe, Mishan) (Filed on 2/22/2016) (Entered: 02/22/2016)
7. Exhibit 4 part 7 ; Proceeding Number : 56-10
8. Exhibit 4 part 3 ; Proceeding Number : 56-6
9. Exhibit 4 part 4 ; Proceeding Number : 56-7
10. Exhibit 4 part 5 ; Proceeding Number : 56-8
11. Exhibit 4 part 2 ; Proceeding Number : 56-5
12. Exhibit 4 part 6 ; Proceeding Number : 56-9
13. Exhibit 4 part 1 ; Proceeding Number : 56-4
14. MOTION to Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong filed by Ameriwood Industries, Inc. Motion Hearing set for 4/7/2016 11:00 AM in Courtroom 3, 3rd Floor, Oakland before Magistrate Judge Kandis A. Westmore. Responses due by 3/7/2016. Replies due by 3/14/2016. (Wroe, Mishan) (Filed on 2/22/2016) Modified on 2/23/2016 (cjlS, COURT STAFF). Modified on 3/8/2016 (kcS, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 02/22/2016)
15. Exhibit 3 ; Proceeding Number : 56-3
16. Case Docket Sheet

17. No. 64 ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO FILE SUR-REPLY BY 03/22/16 & PERMITTING DEFENDANT TO FILE RESPONSE ...
18. No. 63 RESPONSE (re 55 MOTION to Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong) (Reply in Support) filed by Ameriwood ...
19. No. 60 Declaration of Brad M. Wong, P.E. in Opposition to 55 MOTION to Exclude Plaintiff's Expert ...
20. No. 55 MOTION to Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong filed by Ameriwood Industries, Inc
21. Stipulation And Order Dismissing Case. Signed By Magistrate Judge Kandis A. Westmore On 7/20/16
22. Sur-Reply In Support Of Motion To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong
23. Sur-Reply (Re Motion To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong) Filed By ameriwood Industries, Inc. (Callahan, Matthew) (Filed On 3/25/2016) Modified On 3/28/2016
24. Response (Re Motion To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong) Filed By Victor Palacios
25. Response (Re Motion To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong) (Reply In Support) Filed By ameriwood Industries, Inc.
26. Reply In Support Of Motion To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong
27. Proposed Order Re Declaration In Support, 55 Motion For Discovery (To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong) By Ameriwood Industries, Inc.
28. Plaintiff's Sur Reply In Opposition To Motion Of Defendant To Exclude Expert Testimony
29. Plaintiff's Points And Authorities In Opposition To Motion Of Defendant To Exclude Expert Testimony
30. Order Requiring Plaintiff To File Sur-Reply By 03/22/16 & Permitting Defendant To File Response By 03/25/16 Re 55 Motion To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong Filed By Ameriwood Industries, Inc. Signed By Judge Kandis A. Westmore On 03/18/2016
31. Notice Of Motion And Motion To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong

32. Motion To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong Filed By Ameriwood Industries, Inc. Motion Hearing Set For 4/7/2016 11:00 Am In Courtroom 3, 3rd Floor, Oakland Before Magistrate Judge Kandis A. Westmore. Responses Due By 3/7/2016. Replies Due By 3/14/2016. (Wroe, Mishan) (Filed On 2/22/2016) Modified On 2/23/2016
 33. Joint Pretrial Statement
 34. Exhibit 4 Part 7
 35. Exhibit 4 Part 6
 36. Exhibit 4 Part 5
 37. Exhibit 4 Part 4
 38. Exhibit 4 Part 3
 39. Exhibit 4 Part 2
 40. Exhibit 4 Part 1
 41. Exhibit 3
 42. Declaration Of Mishan R. Wroe In Support Of Motion For Discovery (To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong) Filed By ameriwood Industries, Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit 1, # 2 Exhibit 2, # 3 Exhibit 3, # 4 Exhibit 4 Part 1, # 5 Exhibit 4 Part 2, # 6 Exhibit 4 Part 3, # 7 Exhibit 4 Part 4, # 8 Exhibit 4 Part 5, # 9 Exhibit 4 Part 6, # 10 Exhibit 4 Part 7)
 43. Declaration Of J. Michael Brown In Opposition To Motion To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong Filed By Victor Palacios. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit, # 2 Exhibit, # 3 Exhibit)
 44. Declaration Of Brad M. Wong, P.E. In Opposition To Motion To Exclude Plaintiff's Expert Brad Wong Filed By Victor Palacios. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit, # 2 Exhibit)
-

Objection regarding testimony filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	More V. Tenderloin Neighborhood Dev. Corp.
Docket Number:	CGC-15-547028, CGC-15-543418
Case Cite(s):	2017 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 10073; 2017 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 15746; 2017 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 14437
Grounds of Challenge:	Qualification, Methodology
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Susan Griffin, Esq., Griffin & Sullivan, San Francisco, CA
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Laurie E. Sherwood, State Bar No. 155312, Stephanie J. Rothberg, State Bar No. 245965, WFBM, LLP, San Francisco, California
Judge(s):	Harold Kahn
Date(s):	09/28/2017
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Plaintiff's objection regarding Defendant's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. DEFENDANT DATAM SF, LLC dba HOTEL NIKKO SAN FRANCISCO'S REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO ITS MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT 2. SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT DATAM SF, LLC dba HOTEL NIKKO SAN FRANCISCO'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT 3. Separate Statement Of Undisputed Material Facts In Support Of Defendant DatamSf, LlcDbA Hotel Nikko San Francisco's Motion For Summary Judgment

4. Defendant DatamSf, LlcDbA Hotel Nikko San Francisco's Reply
To Plaintiff's Opposition To Its Motion For Summary
Judgment

5. Plaintiff's Objections To Evidence In Support Of Defendants
Summary Judgment.

Motion to exclude filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	SPERO SARIDAKIS VS. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ET AL
Docket Number:	CGC-16-553818, : CGC-16-553818
Case Cite(s):	2018 CA Sup. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 428; 2018 CA Sup. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 309
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Relevance
Area of Law:	Product Liability
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Steven Richard Anthony, Steven R. Anthony, [Sbn 37778]; Thomas E. Fraysse, [Sbn 104436]; Jane L. Trigerro, [Sbn 103575], Knox RicksenLlp, Walnut Creek, CA
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Ann Marilynne Asiano, Jeremy Dwork, Esq.; Golnar Fozi, Esq., Ann M. Asiano, Esq.; Lane B. Webb, Esq.; Richard L. Hyde
Judge(s):	Charlene P. Kiesselbach, Teri L. Jackson, John K. Stewart
Date(s):	05/17/2018
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's motion to exclude Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. MOTION IN LIMINE: TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY FROM PLAINTIFFS BIO MECHANICAL EXPERT WITNESS BRAD WONG MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 8 (TRANSACTION ID # 62018211) FILED BY DEFENDANT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 2. TRIAL BRIEF 3. Case Docket Sheet 4. OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT CITY &

5. DECLARATION OF JEREMY M. DWORK

6. JOINDER TO CITY AND COUNTY

7. PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

8. MOTION IN LIMINE: TO EXCLUDE

9. TRIAL BRIEF (TRANSACTION ID #

10. JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT (TRANSACTION

11. Opposition To Defendant City & County Of San Franciscos
Motion In Limine No. 8 Re: Testimony Of Expert Brad Wong
(Transaction Id # 100037683) Filed By Plaintiff Saridakis,
Spero

12. Joinder To City And County Of San Franciscos Motion In
Limine No. 8 To Exclude Testimony From Plaintiffs
Biochemical Expert Witness Brad Wong (Transaction Id #
100037191) Filed By Defendant City College Of San Francisco

Motion to exclude filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Chavez V. Chowdhury
Docket Number:	MSC13-00422
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Unknown
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Contra Costa Cty.
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned
Judge(s):	Charles "Steve" Treat
Date(s):	01/17/2017
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Plaintiff's motion to exclude Defendant's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Case Docket Sheet 2. Action: Motion In Limine Filed By Douglas Chavez Re: #3 To Exclude Expert Brad Wong From Testifying

Motion to prohibit filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Caito V. Estenson Logistics
Docket Number:	MSC07-02430
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Unknown
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Contra Costa Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Joseph J. Appel
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned
Judge(s):	Benjamin Reyes, II
Date(s):	02/23/2009
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's motion to prohibit Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Case Docket Sheet 2. Motion In Limine Filed By EstensonLogisticsllc, DarshanBadesha Re: Mil#5-Prohibit Any And All Testimony&Evidence From Plntfs Expert Brad M. Wong Concerning 3. Declaration Of Kevin K. Cholakian Filed Re: In Suprt Of Mil #5-Prohibit Any And All Evidence F Rom Plntfs Expert Brad M.Wong

Motion to exclude certain testimony filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Jack Anthony Barron V. Thomas Mercure
Docket Number:	MSC94-04349
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Unknown
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Contra Costa Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Jeremya Archdeacon
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Kevin M. Smith
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	03/21/1996
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of the motion to exclude certain testimony of expert Wong is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Case Docket Sheet 2. Mtn In Limine To ExcldeExprt Witness Testimony O F Brad Wong Re Ubc Violations, Accident

Objection regarding declaration filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Opinion, Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Janet Tyer V. Mortons The Steakhouse
Docket Number:	2018-00228266, 34-2018-00228266
Case Cite(s):	2019 Cal. Super. LEXIS 68260; 2018 Cal. Super. LEXIS 42344
Grounds of Challenge:	Unknown
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Sacramento Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Geoffrey P. Wong
Defendant's Attorney(s):	John S. Williamson
Judge(s):	Ben Davidian , James P. Arguellas, Kevin R. Culhane, Raymond M. Cadei
Date(s):	09/13/2019
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's objection regarding Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Opinion dated September 13, 2019 2. Opinion dated September 20, 2018 3. Case Docket Sheet 4. Objection (To Declaration Of Brad M Wong In Opp To Msj) Filed. Filed By Mortons Of Chicago/Capitol Mall Llc(Defendant)

Motion to preclude certain testimony filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Snyder VS Quinn
Docket Number:	RG11605576
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Unknown
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Alameda Cty.
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Michael Scott Keck
Defendant's Attorney(s):	David James Samuelsen
Judge(s):	EvelioGrillo
Date(s):	05/03/2013
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Plaintiff's motion to preclude certain testimony of Defendant's expert Wong is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Case Docket Sheet 2. Motion In Limine Plaintiff's MIL #1 Preclude Defendants Expert Brad M. Wong From Offering Biomechani

Motion to exclude filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Ricardo Alva V. Nanda Avoy Et Al
Docket Number:	CGC-02-405981
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Unknown
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Anna Dubrovsky
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Ryan Owens Reimers
Judge(s):	Donald Sullivan
Date(s):	10/20/2003
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's motion to exclude Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Case Docket Sheet 2. Plaintiff's Opposition To Defendant's Motion In Limine To Exclude Testimony Of Brad Wong And Winthrop Smith Filed By Plaintiff Alva, Ricardo As To Defendant Nanda, Avoy

Objection regarding testimony filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Opinion, Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Alexander V. Wealth Props.
Docket Number:	CGC-11-515300, A139093
Case Cite(s):	2013 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 17080; 2016 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS 3022
Grounds of Challenge:	Legal Conclusion
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	Court Of Appeal Of California First Appellate District Division Three, California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty., California Court of Appeal - 1st Dist.
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Lawrence Dale Murray
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Frances H. Yoshimura, Esq. (SBN 124325), Law Offices Of John A. Biard, Walnut Creek, CA
Judge(s):	Martin J. Jenkins, Stuart R. Pollak, Peter J. Siggins
Date(s):	06/29/2016
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Plaintiff's objection regarding Defendant's expert Wong's testimony is unknown. Wong's testimony was discussed but was not at issue at the Appellate Court.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Opinion dated April 25, 2016 2. DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 5 RE: TESTIMONY OF EXPERT BRAD WONG 3. REMITTITUR AFFIRMED A139093 DIV 3 4. No. Opinion-Filed 5. NOTICE OF MOTION TO STRIKE 6. MINUTES FOR MAR-25-2013 9:00 AM

7. FURTHER BRIEF RE: EXCLUSION OF

8. OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN

9. MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 12

10. 7 MOTIONS IN LIMINE FILED

11. Case Docket Sheet

Motion to exclude certain testimony filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Clisura V. Wong
Docket Number:	RG-10-494572
Case Cite(s):	2012 WL 1517811
Grounds of Challenge:	Legal Conclusion
Area of Law:	Negligence and Malpractice
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Alameda Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned
Defendant's Attorney(s):	David J. Samuelsen (CBN #72504), Kristin K. Sato (CBN #219445), Bennett, Samuelsen, Reynolds & Allard, A Professional Corporation, 1301 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 300, Alameda, CA 94501, Telephone: (510)444-7688, Facsimile: (510) 444-5849
Judge(s):	Gail Brewster Bereola
Date(s):	01/13/2012
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's motion to exclude certain testimony of Plaintiff's expert Wong is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Mil No. 10: Defendant's Motion In Limine To Exclude Any Testimony From Plaintiff Or Her Retained Experts On The Subject Of Fault Or Negligence Attribution

Motion to exclude filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Hurtado V. Swiss Park Bar And Grille
Docket Number:	RG17848447
Case Cite(s):	2019 WL 1778584
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Alameda Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Philip R. Weltin, SBN 46141, Lindsay R. McKasson, SBN 293144, 1423 Martin Luther King Jr Way, Oakland, CA 94612, (510) 251- 6060, (510) 251-6040, lmnckasson@weltinlaw.com
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Paul V. Samoni (SBN 240184), Law Offices Of John A. Biard, P.O. Box 64093, St. Paul, Minnesota 55164-0093, Telephone: (925) 746-3957, Facsimile: (855) 668-5559, E-Mail: psamoni@travelers.com
Judge(s):	Stephen Kaus
Date(s):	01/11/2019
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's motion to exclude Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Case Docket Sheet 2. Miscellaneous Motion In Limine No.9 To Exclude Speculative Expert Opinion Of Brad M. Wong, P.E. Filed 3. Miscellaneous Plaintiff's Opposition To Mil No. 9 To Exclude Testimony Of Brad M. Wong P.E. Filed 4. Newark Swiss Park, Inc.'s Trial Brief

Objection regarding testimony filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source: Court Filed Documents

Case Caption: [Johnson-Loudermilk V. Playcore Wisconsin, Inc.](#)

Docket Number: 3:06cv44, 3:06-CV-00044

Case Cite(s): 2009 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 341572; 2007 U.S. Dist. Ct. Motions LEXIS 86912; 2007 U.S. Dist. Ct. Motions LEXIS 86913; 2007 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 236770; 2009 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 341569; 2010 WL 1992653; 2010 WL 1992649; 2007 WL 4648420; 2010 WL 1992652

Grounds of Challenge: Qualification, Methodology

Area of Law: Personal Injury and Torts

Jurisdiction: Federal

State: Nevada

Court Name: U.S. District Court - D. Nevada

Retained By: Plaintiff

Plaintiff's Attorney(s): Curtis B. Coulter

Defendant's Attorney(s): Evan K. McNamara

Judge(s): Robert A. McQuaid, Jr.

Date(s): 04/07/2010

Summary of Involvement: In a footnote to the "Reply In Support Of Joint Motion For Summary Judgment Of Defendant Playcore Wisconsin, Inc., And Third-Party Defendant Environmental Molding Concepts, LLC", it was stated that "Mr. Wong's affidavit should be completely disregarded. As conceded in his deposition, he is a mechanical engineer by training. (Ex. C at 12) He has no training in psychology or human factors. (Id.) The essence of his opinion is that although the playground covering is not unreasonably dangerous in design for its intended use in the field (id. at 102-103), it was somehow unreasonably dangerous when used

inside the Reno-Sparks Convention Center due to "environmental factors." (Id.) Mr. Wong - a mechanical engineer - is not qualified under FRE 702 to opine about such issues. He claims that he is able to do so because "based on my experience in looking at accidents and seeing why they occur, especially in premises liability accidents. . . ." (Id. at 74) With all due respect, many personal injury law firm paralegals have "looked at a lot of accidents." This fact does not qualify them to opine regarding the alleged "environmental factors" which transform a product which is apparently safe for small children into one which is treacherous when utilized by an adult woman." It was further stated that "Mr. Wong also agreed that he there is no statute, regulation, code, industry standard, or anything else that required Playcore to fence off or barricade the perimeter of the playground covering so that people would step off of it at 90 degree angles. (Ex. C at 65) He admitted that the playground covering "probably" complied with American Society for Testing and Materials ("ATSM") standard number 1951-99. (Id. at 65-69) He admitted that he is not aware of any regulation requiring that the perimeter of the playground covering be cast in a different color. (Id. at 103-104) And, he admitted that he has no information to suggest what Plaintiff was looking at immediately before she stepped off of the playground covering." The outcome of Defendant's objection regarding Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.

Supporting Document(s):

1. RESPONSE to 105 MOTION for Summary Judgment AGAINST THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT ENVIRONMENTAL MOLDING CONCEPTS, LLC, filed by ThirdParty Defendant Environmental Molding Concepts, LLC. Replies due by 4/13/2009. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Exhibit 1, # 2 Exhibit Exhibit 2, # 3 Exhibit Exhibit 3, # 4 Exhibit Exhibit 4, # 5 Exhibit Exhibit 5)(Hayward, Daniel) (Entered: 03/30/2009)

2. MOTION for Summary Judgment AGAINST THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT ENVIRONMENTAL MOLDING CONCEPTS, LLC by Defendant Playcore Wisconsin, Inc.. Responses due by 3/31/2009. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Exhibit B, # 3 Exhibit C, # 4 Exhibit D, # 5 Exhibit E, # 6 Exhibit F) (Matteoni, Paul) (Entered: 03/13/2009)
 3. Exhibit E ; Proceeding Number : 105-5
 4. REPLY to Response to 52 MOTION for Summary Judgment of Defendant Playcore Wisconsin, Inc., and Third-Party Defendant Environmental Molding Concepts, LLC ; filed by ThirdParty Plaintiff Playcore Wisconsin, Inc., ThirdParty Defendant Environmental Molding Concepts, LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit C)(Hayward, Daniel) (Entered: 10/25/2007)
 5. REPLY IN SUPPORT OF JOINT MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF DEFENDANT PLAYCORE WISCONSIN, INC., AND THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANT ENVIRONMENTAL MOLDING CONCEPTS, LLC
 6. Exhibit C ; Proceeding Number : 55-1
 7. PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM OF FACTS AND LAW IN OPPOSITION TO RULE 56 MOTION OF PLAYCORE AND ENVIRONMENTAL MOLDING CONCEPTS; ATTACHED DECLARATION OF BRAD M. WONG, P.E.
 8. Exhibit 2 ; Proceeding Number : 54-2
 9. Defendant/Third-Party Plaintiff Playcore Wisconsin, Inc.'S Opposition To Third-Party Defendant's Motion For Summary Judgment Re: Contribution
 10. Reply In Support Of Joint Motion For Summary Judgment Of Defendant Playcore Wisconsin, Inc., And Third-Party Defendant Gametime, Environmental Molding Concepts, LLC
 11. Third-Party Defendant Environmental Molding Concepts' Opposition To Playcore Wisconsin, Inc.'S Counter-Motion For Summary Judgment
 12. Cross-Claimant Environmental Molding Concepts' Reply In Support Of Motion Summary Judgment Re: Contribution
-

Objection regarding testimony filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	David Mizer V. City And County Of San Francisco Et Al
Docket Number:	CGC-15-548399
Case Cite(s):	2017 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 698; 2017 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 1064
Grounds of Challenge:	Unknown
Area of Law:	Real Property Law
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Brian L. Larsen
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Renee Louise Erickson
Judge(s):	Harold Kahn
Date(s):	02/02/2017
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's objection regarding Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. PLAINTIFF DAVID MIZER'S SEPARATE STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT 2. PLAINTIFF DAVID MIZER'S MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT 3. MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES 4. Case Docket Sheet 5. Objections To The Declaration Of David M. Wong, P.E. (Transaction Id # 60151553) Filed By Defendant Rayann, Llc

6. Declaration Of Brad M. Wong, P.E, In Support Of David Mizers
Opposition To Defendant Rayann, Llcs Motion For Summary
Judgment (Transaction Id # 100009737) Filed By Plaintiff
Mizer, David

Declaration filed in opposition to motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	MARIA BOWEN VS. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ET AL
Docket Number:	CGC-20-582001
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	GENEVIEVE K GUERTIN
Defendant's Attorney(s):	KAITLYN MURPHY
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	11/24/2021
Summary of Involvement:	Wong was retained by the Plaintiff as an expert in this case. Plaintiff filed the declaration of expert Wong in opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES 2. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO DEFENDANTS 3. DECLARATION OF BRAD M. WONG 4. Case Docket Sheet

Expert report criticized; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Manfredi Fiuzzi v. Paragon Sporting Goods Co. LLC et al
Docket Number:	2020-04474, 154392/2018
Case Cite(s):	2022 NY APP. DIV. BRIEFS LEXIS 3170; 2022 NY APP. DIV. BRIEFS LEXIS 3168; 2022 NY APP. DIV. BRIEFS LEXIS 3387
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Relevance
Area of Law:	Constitutional and Civil Rights
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	New York
Court Name:	Supreme Court Of New York Appellate Division First Department, New York Appellate Division - 1st Dept., New York State New York County Supreme Court
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	JAMES G MCCARNEY
Defendant's Attorney(s):	LESLEY C SISKIND, WILLIAM T. O'CONNELL, ADAM RICHARD DOLAN
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned, Arlene P. Bluth
Date(s):	08/19/2022

Summary of Involvement: According to "REPLY BRIEF FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT-RESPONDENT GAIAM AMERICAS, INC. " it was stated that, "However, apparently lacking confidence in his own arguments and pleadings, a month later Plaintiff desperately tried to supplement his opposition to GAIAM's CPLR 3211 motion to dismiss by untimely cross-moving to supplement the motion record to include an expert report of Brad M. Wong ("Wong Report"). (R. 258, 319-325). The Report makes conclusory allegations of defects in the handles of the Ultra Toner, which allegedly contributed to its slipping off Plaintiff's foot, notwithstanding the warnings inside the packaging (ignored by plaintiff) that the product must be secured under the foot. " It was further stated that, "Nevertheless, as the motion court found, the Wong Report was irrelevant to the instant motions because it was unsworn, and therefore, inadmissible. Although CPLR 3211 (c) allows either party to "submit any evidence that could properly be considered on a motion for summary judgment," unsworn hearsay expert reports are not the type of evidence that can be considered on summary judgment motions, and therefore, it is not admissible here. See *Solovey v. Dep 't of Education*, 136 A.D.3d 441, 442-443 (Pt Dep't 2016). In addition, the report, submitted one month after Plaintiffs original opposition was filed, was properly rejected as an improper sur-reply disguised as an untimely cross motion. See *Garced v. Clinton Arms Assoc.*, 58 A.D.3d 506, 509 (1 st Dep't 2009)." The outcome of the criticism is unknown.

Supporting Document(s):

1. REPLY BRIEF FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT - RESPONDENT GAIAM AMERICAS, INC.
2. REPLY BRIEF FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANTRESPONDENT PARAGON SPORTING GOODS CO. LLC
3. BRIEF FOR PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT-APPELLANT

4. REPLY BRIEF

5. REPLY BRIEF Reply Brief for Defendant-Appellant-
Respondent Paragon Sporting Goods Co. LLC

6. RESPONDENT-CROSS-APPELLANT'S BRIEF

7. JOINT RECORD ON APPEAL

8. MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO CROSS-MOTION
AND IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF MOTION

Objection regarding declaration filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	ELIZABETH NEUPAUER, Plaintiff, vs CITY OF FRESNO, Defendant.
Docket Number:	19CECG00882
Case Cite(s):	2020 CA SUP. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 7626
Grounds of Challenge:	Unknown
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Fresno Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Philip W Ganong
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Jesse Banuelos
Judge(s):	D Tyler Tharpe, Kimberly Gaab
Date(s):	03/12/2020
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of the evidentiary objections regarding Wong's declaration is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO THE CITY OF FRESNO'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, SUMMARY ADJUDICATION 2. Case Docket Sheet

Objection regarding declaration filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	THEA CHRISTINA THOMPSON VS. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ET AL
Docket Number:	CGC-21-596214
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Legal Conclusion, Qualification, Methodology, Relevance
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	MATTHEW N WHITE
Defendant's Attorney(s):	RYAN CHRISTOPHER STEVENS
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	05/25/2023
Summary of Involvement:	According to "DEFENDANT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO'S MOTIONS IN LIMINE " it was stated that, "Plaintiff has disclosed Brad Wong, an engineer, to testify about his inspection of the sidewalk where Plaintiff fell. The legal standard for a dangerous condition of public property is that the condition of the property creates a "substantial (as distinguished from a minor, trivial or insignificant) risk of injury when the property is used with due care. ..." (Gov. Code § 830.) In his declaration, Mr. Wong concludes "it is my opinion that the parallel offset upon which plaintiff fell is a significant (not trivial) walkway hazard, even when pedestrians are using due care for their own safety." (Stevens Declaration in Support of Defendant 's Motions in Limine ("Stevens Dec.") , Ex A,

Declaration of Brad Wong.) This opinion is a legal conclusion akin to an accident reconstruction expert expressing an opinion that a driver was negligent. Mr. Wong can testify about the measurement of the defect and how pedestrians may interact with the feature in the sidewalk. However, he should be precluded from offering the opinion that the defect satisfies the legal standard for a dangerous condition under Government Code Section 830." It was further stated that, "Based on the contents of Mr. Wong's file in this case, Defendant anticipates he may offer biomechanical, reconstruction and injury causation testimony. Mr. Wong is a mechanical engineer. He is not a medical doctor, and his CV reflects no education or training in the biomechanics of ankle injury. Mr. Wong conceded in deposition that his efforts at reconstructing the accident were only a "demonstration of principle," which does not rise to the level of an admissible expert opinion. (Stevens Dec., Ex B, Deposition of Brad Wong at 86:13-87:12.) He further conceded he was "not reconstructing anything." (Ibid.) In addition to lacking the adequate training and education in biomechanics, Mr. Wong admitted he does not have the required inputs to offer such an expert opinion. Specifically, he admitted he does not know Plaintiff's shoe size, he does not know how much she weighs, and he has not studied her gait. (Ibid.) " It was also stated that, "Therefore, Defendant requests that Mr. Wong be precluded from offering opinion testimony related to injury causation and/or the biomechanics of Plaintiff's ankle in her fall or any reconstruction of the fall. Defendant requests that Mr. Wong be precluded from admitting any reconstructions or demonstrations of the trip and fall. Alternatively, Defendant requests the opportunity to voir dire the witness on his qualifications to offer medical and/or biomechanical or accident reconstruction opinion testimony before Plaintiff is allowed to

elicit opinions from the witness on these topics." It was further stated that, "Plaintiff's engineering expert, Mr. Wong, intends to submit screenshots he took from the website Google Earth in an attempt to show the condition of the sidewalk on various dates. These images should be excluded entirely, but even if a proper foundation is laid for them, Mr. Wong should not be permitted to testify regarding these images. As a threshold matter, Plaintiff has not provided a declaration or other "evidence sufficient to sustain a finding that it is the writing that the proponent of the evidence claims it is." (Evid. Code §§ 1400, 1410.) There is no sponsoring witness to these documents. Without a proponent of the documents who purports that the documents are what they claim and has personal knowledge of such facts, the documents are inadmissible. Even if Plaintiff is able to have a witness authenticate and lay proper foundation for these documents, allowing Plaintiff's expert to present these images violates *People v. Sanchez* (2016) 63 Cal.4th 665, because they are case specific hearsay. (*Id.* at p. 684 ["If an expert testifies to case-specific out-of-court statements to explain the bases for his opinion, those statements are necessarily considered by the jury for their truth, thus rendering them hearsay. Like any other hearsay evidence, it must be properly admitted through an applicable hearsay exception."].) Finally, Mr. Wong does not rely on these images to reach his opinion that the lifted sidewalk was dangerous and these images have no admissible relevance to his opinion. He testified that he cannot use the Google street images to make measurements of the height of the alleged defect and he cannot recall ever "specifically using that Google image photograph to provide a photogrammetric analysis to determine the vertical height." (Stevens Dec., Ex B, Deposition of Brad Wong at 68:19- 69:14.) These images have no probative value. When asked if he relied upon them, Mr. Wong stated that "I

think the Google street view images show just the historical nature of the condition of the area as it existed over a period of time." (Stevens Dec, Ex B, Deposition of Brad Wong at 41:12-20). Mr. Wong explained that his opinion is based on his inspection, Plaintiff's testimony, and photographs of the sidewalk. (Ibid.) The "historical nature" of the sidewalk is not a proper subject of expert testimony and Mr. Wong is not an expert in the history of the sidewalk at that location. " The outcome of the objection is unknown.

Supporting Document(s):

1. RESPONSES TO DEFENDANTS MOTIONS IN
 2. [REVISED] RESPONSES TO DEFENDANTS MOTIONS
 3. MOTION IN LIMINE (TRANSACTION ID
 4. UPDATED TRIAL BRIEF (TRANSACTION ID
 5. DECLARATION OF JAMES F. HANNAWALT
 6. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
-

Opinion criticized; outcome unknown.

Case Source: Docket, Court Filed Documents

Case Caption: **PABLO ARREDONDO PADRON, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. HUGO OSOY, Defendant and Respondent.**

Docket Number: 20STCV19456, B333512

Case Cite(s): 2024 CA APP. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 5702

Grounds of Challenge: Methodology

Area of Law: Product Liability

Jurisdiction: State

State: California

Court Name: California Court of Appeal - 2d Dist., California Superior Court - Los Angeles Cty.

Retained By: Plaintiff

Plaintiff's Attorney(s): MABASA KIARA M.

Defendant's Attorney(s): Not Mentioned

Judge(s): Gary I. Micon, Serena R. Murillo, Stephen P. Pfahler

Date(s): 10/08/2024

Summary of Involvement: According to "RESPONDENT'S BRIEF" it was stated that, "Nor do the declarations from Padron's experts--Mark Burns and Brad Wong--generate any factual dispute. Burns inappropriately opined that the ladder was defective based on the same mischaracterization of Osoy's testimony described above. (5 AA 1616.) As described, Osoy testified that Padron caused the bend in the ladder, and it is pure conjecture to rely on that testimony to claim Padron had not "hit the ladder on the way down." (Ibid.) Burns conceded he did not inspect the ladder, and "[w]ithout an inspection, there is no way to determine if the ladder was in proper working condition." (5 AA 1616-1617.) His opinion was therefore speculative and lacking evidentiary value. (Howard v. Accor Management US, Inc. (2024) 101 Cal.App.5th 130, 137 [courts "must exclude speculative expert testimony" at summary judgment].) Wong similarly opined the ladder was defective because a ladder is generally stable on a flat surface, so any ladder movement causing Padron's fall was "more likely ... a result of some abnormal condition of the ladder as opposed to the surface on which it was placed." (5 AA 1659.) Wong's opinion merely "assume[s] the cause from the fact of the injury" and accordingly has "no evidentiary value." (Bushling v. Fremont Medical Center (2004) 117 Cal.App.4th 493, 510-511 [excluding expert's opinion that an injury was "'more probably than not' " caused by speculative events].) Indeed, like Burns, Wong had no basis to conclude the ladder's movement was not more likely caused by Padron, and he admitted as much. (5 AA 1659 ["I am not able to determine if the condition of the ladder was a factor in the incident."].) The outcome of the criticism is unknown.

Supporting Document(s):

1. RESPONDENT'S BRIEF
2. Case Docket Sheet

Objection regarding testimony filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Stefanie More, Plaintiff, vs. renderloin Neighborhood Development Corp., Nikko Hotel, and Does. Defendant.
Docket Number:	CGC-15-543418, CGC-15-547028
Case Cite(s):	2017 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 14437; 2017 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 10073; 2017 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 15746
Grounds of Challenge:	Qualification, Methodology
Area of Law:	Constitutional and Civil Rights
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Kevin M. Sullivan (SBN: 124523), Law Offices Of Kevin M. Sullivan, San Francisco, CA
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned
Judge(s):	Harold Kahn
Date(s):	09/28/2017
Summary of Involvement:	According to the "Defendant Datam SF, LLC DbA Hotel Nikko San Francisco's Reply To Plaintiff's Opposition To Its Motion For Summary Judgment", it was stated that "Plaintiff argues that the opinions of Hotel Nikko's engineering expert. Mr. Wong, should be excluded for a number of reasons, none of which have any merit, First, Plaintiff argues Mr. Wong's opinion should be excluded as "he did not perform any of the mathematical calculations necessary to accurately determine the difference in (sic) from the top of the eastern sidewalk slab and the top of the western sidewalk slab, (or the lower area where a longstanding gouge lowered the pavement even further). (Plaintiff's

Opposition at 3:26-4:4.) Specifically, Plaintiff appears to argue she tripped at the gouged area of the sidewalk which Mr. Wong did not take into consideration when performing his calculations regarding the change in elevation. However, during her deposition, Plaintiff admitted she did not trip on the crack depicted in the photographs, but on the unevenness of the sidewalk, which she measured. (Plaintiff's Deposition at 75:12-76:8.) Mr. Wong properly calculated this change in elevation based on Plaintiff's photographs as no more than three-quarters of an inch. Any other measurements are wholly irrelevant and immaterial." It was further stated that "Plaintiff also argues Mr, Wong's opinion should be excluded because it is based on photographs, and "[h]e is not qualified to perform measurements base (sic) on photographic analysis, a field known as "photogrammetry." Plaintiff fails to cite to any legal authority to support her position that Mr. Wong is not a qualified expert. In fact, Plaintiff's own expert, an engineer like Mr. Wong and not an expert in "photogrammetry," relied on the same evidence as Mr. Wong and reached the same conclusions. Plaintiff also objects to Mr. Wong's opinion throughout her Opposition on the grounds that he "estimates" rather than calculates the change in elevation. Yet, nowhere in Mr. Wong's declaration does he state he "estimated" the change in elevation. Instead, he clearly explains how he conducted his calculations and determined the change in elevation to be between one-half of an inch and three-quarters of an inch. Plaintiff also states that Mr, Wong "did not use the methods normally and properly used by experts In his field." (Opposition at 8:11-12.) Yet, this claim lacks merit as neither Plaintiff nor her expert specifically explain how Mr. Wong did not use methods normally used by experts in his field." The outcome of Plaintiff's objection regarding Defendant's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.

Supporting Document(s): 1. Plaintiff's Objections to Evidence In Support of Defendants
Summary Judgment.

Expert report criticized; outcome unknown.

Case Source: Docket, Court Filed Documents

Case Caption: [Valley v. Longs Drug Stores California, L.L.C.](#)

Docket Number: 1:23-cv-00102

Case Cite(s): 2024 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 353644; 2024 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 353641; 2024 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 353648; 2024 U.S. DIST. CT. MOTIONS LEXIS 353640

Grounds of Challenge: Methodology

Area of Law: Personal Injury and Torts

Jurisdiction: Federal

State: Hawaii

Court Name: U.S. District Court - D. Hawaii

Retained By: Defendant

Plaintiff's Attorney(s): Hannah Ehrig McKee, Robert P. Marx

Defendant's Attorney(s): Galen Kikaha Chee, John-Anderson L. Meyer

Judge(s): Susan OKI Mollway, JUDGE ROM TRADER

Date(s): 02/27/2024

Summary of Involvement: According to "CONCISE STATEMENT of Facts IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO SUMMARY JUDGMENT filed by Alicia Valley. (Attachments: # 1 Supplement CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT, # 2 Declaration DECLARATION OF ALICIA VALLEY, # 3 Declaration DECLARATION OF HANNAH E. MCKEE, # 4 Certificate of Service CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE, # 5 Exhibit EXHIBIT LIST, # 6 Exhibit EXHIBIT 1; CVS 001-011, # 7 Exhibit EXHIBIT 2; CVS 013-014, # 8 Exhibit EXHIBIT 3, AV INITIAL DISCLOSURES 374-376, # 9 Exhibit EXHIBIT 4; D" it was stated that, "Defense Expert Report of M. Wong, tested the sidewalk with water, not the substance Plaintiff slipped in; Mr. Wong admits that a different contaminant, such as vomit, may yield a different slip resistant result; due to the above, his report and/or statement is not admissible in court ".

Supporting Document(s):

1. CONCISE STATEMENT of Facts IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO SUMMARY JUDGMENT filed by Alicia Valley. (Attachments: # 1 Supplement CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT, # 2 Declaration DECLARATION OF ALICIA VALLEY, # 3 Declaration DECLARATION OF HANNAH E. MCKEE, # 4 Certificate of Service CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE, # 5 Exhibit EXHIBIT LIST, # 6 Exhibit EXHIBIT 1; CVS 001-011, # 7 Exhibit EXHIBIT 2; CVS 013-014, # 8 Exhibit EXHIBIT 3, AV INITIAL DISCLOSURES 374-376, # 9 Exhibit EXHIBIT 4; D
2. MEMORANDUM in Opposition TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT filed by Alicia Valley. (Attachments: # 1 Supplement CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT, # 2 Certificate of Service CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE) (McKee, Hannah) (Entered: 02/27/2024)

3. CONCISE STATEMENT of Facts re 61 MOTION for Summary Judgment Defendants Longs Drug Stores California, L.L.C.'s and CVS Pharmacy, Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment; Memorandum in Support of Motion; Certificate of Word Count; Certificate of Service Defendants Longs Drug Stores California, L.L.C.'s and CVS Pharmacy, Inc.'s Concise Statement of Facts in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment; Declaration of John-Anderson L. Meyer; Declaration of Brad M. Wong; Exhibits A-J; Certificate of Service fi
 4. ** Refiled at ECF 63 ** MOTION for Partial Summary Judgment Defendant Longs Drug Stores California, L.L.C.'s and CVS Pharmacy, Inc.'s concise Statement of Facts in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment; Declaration of John-Anderson L. Meyer; Declaration of Brad M. Wong; Exhibits A-J; Certificate of Service John-Anderson L. Meyer appearing for Defendants CVS Pharmacy, Inc., Longs Drug Stores California, L.L.C. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration of John-Anderson L. Meyer, # 2 Declaration of Brad M. Wo
 5. Memorandum in Support of Motion ; Proceeding Number : 61-1
 6. Declaration of Brad M. Wong ; Proceeding Number : 62-2
 7. Exhibit "H"-Longs & CVS Pharmacy's Disclosure of Expert Witnesses ; Proceeding Number : 62-10
 8. Exhibit "H"-Defs' Expert Disclosures ; Proceeding Number : 63-10
 9. Case Docket Sheet
-

Declaration criticized; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Castellanos vs PGS PARTNERS LLC [IMAGED]
Docket Number:	202200032056
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Diego Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Winter, Grant A
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Oberrecht, Kimberly S
Judge(s):	BEHAN, WENDY M.
Date(s):	05/10/2024
Summary of Involvement:	According to "DEFENDANTS/CROSSCOMPLAINANTS, PGS PARTNERS LLC DBA URBANA AND MOUNTAIN WEST REAL ESTATE, INC.'S REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO SEPARATE STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT" it was stated that, "P's Exhibit 6, Declaration of Brad M. Wong, ¶¶5-7. Disputed. The evidence offered does not support this fact. It is speculative and consists of improper expert opinion." The outcome of the criticism is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Reply to Opposition - Reply to Opposition - Other filed by MOUNTAIN WEST REAL ESTATE INC; PGS PARTNERS LLC.; Transaction Number: 22056286

Objection regarding declaration filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	MARY FELLER ET AL VS. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ET AL
Docket Number:	CGC-23-611339
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Relevance, Legal Conclusion
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	CHARLES OWEN GEERHART
Defendant's Attorney(s):	THOMAS J TARKOFF, ABIGAIL H. WALD, MELISSA GRANT ZAMORA
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	02/07/2025
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's objection regarding Wong's declaration is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS SEPARATE STATEMENT (TRANSACTION ID # 75604840) FILED BY DEFENDANT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 2. AMENDED REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (TRANSACTION ID # 75604840) FILED BY DEFENDANT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 3. OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE (TRANSACTION ID # 75604840) FILED BY DEFENDANT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

4. MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
OPPOSITION TO CCSF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
(TRANSACTION ID # 75565932) FILED BY PLAINTIFF
FELLER, MARY FELLER, GORDON

5. Case Docket Sheet

6. AMENDED REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS OPPOSITION

7. RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS SEPARATE STATEMENT

8. OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE (TRANSACTION ID

9. MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Motion to exclude filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Rosa Quiroa V. Michael John Doran II
Docket Number:	CGC-12-526855
Case Cite(s):	Not Mentioned
Grounds of Challenge:	Qualification
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	John V. Mejia
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Sabrina M. Berdux
Judge(s):	Newton Lam, Cynthia M. Lee, James J. McBride
Date(s):	07/28/2014
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's motion to exclude Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. MOTION IN LIMINE NOS. 1-12 FILED BY DEFENDANT DORAN II, MICHAEL JOHN 2. OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #12 TO EXCLUDE BIOMECHANICAL OPINIONS OF BRAD M. WONG, P.E. FILED BY PLAINTIFF QUIROA, ROSA 3. Case Docket Sheet 4. MOTION IN LIMINE NOS. 1-12 5. OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN

Motion to exclude filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket
Case Caption:	A. Frolov, et al vs C. Bentley, et al
Docket Number:	2006-1-CV-074858
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology
Area of Law:	Constitutional and Civil Rights
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Santa Clara Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, Michael Stanley Morse, Patrick Michael O'Shaughnessy, Anna Dubrovsky
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, Patrick Michael O'Shaughnessy, Anna Dubrovsky, Thomas S. Brazier
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	11/15/2006
Summary of Involvement:	Wong was retained by the Plaintiff as an expert in this case. Defendant filed a motion to exclude expert Wong's testimony. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. No.7 to exclude speculative testimony of plt's expert, Brad Wong, based on location of "white vehicle" in front of def's truck before collision & request for hearing per evidence code 402

Objection regarding declaration filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	JOAO PEDRO FOLHA ARAUJO VS. JANETTE BARROCA ET AL
Docket Number:	CGC-20-584640
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	MATTHEW J. QUINLAN
Defendant's Attorney(s):	TIM M. AGAJANIAN, JEFFREY BRAILLARD CEREGHINO, B. OTIS FELDER, PAUL J. BYRNE
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	08/04/2023
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's objection regarding Wong's declaration is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. DEFENDANTS JANETTE BARROCA AND BARROCA 2. REPLY TO THE OPPOSITION OF 3. RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS RESPONSE TO 4. PLAINTIFFS TABLE OF EVIDENCE AND

Objection regarding supplemental declaration filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	CAROL HASS VS. AIRBNB INC ET AL
Docket Number:	CGC-19-576012
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Relevance
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	CHRISTOPHER B. DOLAN
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, PAUL K SCHRIEFFER
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	08/14/2020
Summary of Involvement:	Defendant filed an objection regarding Wong's supplemental declarations. The outcome of the objection is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. OBJECTIONS TO DECLARATIONS OF BRAD 2. RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL SEPARATE 3. PLAINTIFFS SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM OF POINTS 4. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF MARI BANDOMA 5. Case Docket Sheet

Objection regarding declaration filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	MICHAEL S. LOZIER et al VS. CAHILL CONTRACTORS INC., A CORPORATION et al
Docket Number:	CGC-14-539420
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology, Relevance
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	MICHAEL JOHN APPEL
Defendant's Attorney(s):	BRIAN F. ZIMMERMAN
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	03/05/2015
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's objection regarding Wong's declaration is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS SEPARATE STATEMENT 2. EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS EVIDENCE 3. COMPLETE OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS SEPARATE 4. DECLARATION OF JOSEPH J. APPEL

Motion to preclude or limit filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket
Case Caption:	MENDA vs SANFORD-LEFFINGWELL, et al.
Docket Number:	23CV025532
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Unknown
Area of Law:	Constitutional and Civil Rights
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Alameda Cty.
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned
Judge(s):	Elizabeth Riles
Date(s):	03/25/2026
Summary of Involvement:	Wong was retained by the Defendant as an expert in this case. Plaintiff filed a motion to preclude or limit expert Wong's testimony. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Motion in Limine PLAINTIFFS MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 4 TO PRECLUDE OR LIMIT TESTIMONY BY DEFENSE EXPERTS BRAD WONG AND RICHARD NORMAN Filed by:Erol Menda

Objection regarding testimony filed; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Wah Lee V. SF Supermarket
Docket Number:	39-2014-00318448, STK-CV-UPI-2014-0011509
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Obvious Conclusion, Methodology
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	CA Superior - San Joaquin
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Clarence K. Chan
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Jeffery Clair Long
Judge(s):	Linda L. Lofthus
Date(s):	08/24/2016
Summary of Involvement:	The outcome of Defendant's objection regarding Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Defendant's Objection to Declaration of Brad M. Wong filed by Capitol City Amusement, Inc.. 2. Case Docket Sheet 3. Declaration Of Brad M. Wong, P.E. In Opposition To Motion For Summary Judgment Filed By Lee, Fong L

Objection regarding declaration filed; not ruled upon yet.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	CATHERINE ANGWIN GASCA vs. CITY OF BRENTWOOD
Docket Number:	C22-01563
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Methodology
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Contra Costa Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	SHANT N NASHALIAN, CATHERINE A WALSH
Defendant's Attorney(s):	KEITH R. SCHIRMER
Judge(s):	Benjamin T Reyes, II, Jill C Fannin, Terri Mockler
Date(s):	03/06/2026

Summary of Involvement: According to "PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT CITY OF BRENTWOOD'S SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, SUMMARY ADJUDICATION" it was stated that, "Disputed. Mr. Wong provided measurements for the right half of the sidewalk at three points, none of which correspond with where Plaintiff testified she fell: 12 inches from the far right edge of the side walk, 18 inches from the far right edge of the side walk, and 24 inches from the far right edge of the side walk. Despite Plaintiff's testimony during her deposition, Mr. Wong did not know where Plaintiff fell or what the measurement of the height differential was in the spot where Plaintiff fell. Mr. Wong failed to provide the measurement for the highest point of the height differential of the sidewalk, which well exceeded 1.5 inches." The objection has not been ruled upon yet.

Supporting Document(s):

1. City of Brentwood's reply brief ISO summary judgment or in the alt summary adjudication
2. Amended Filing Re: Reply brief ISO summary judgment
3. OBJECTION AND RESPONSES TO CITY OF BRENTWOODS SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS
4. Case Docket Sheet

INDIRECT CHALLENGES

This section includes reported, and numerous unreported cases from both state and federal jurisdictions where the expert's testimony has been cited or mentioned in a decision and the testifying expert's testimony has been offered in support of, in response to, or in opposition to motion for summary judgment, class certification, preliminary injunction, motion for a new trial or judgment notwithstanding the verdict. Sources for unreported decisions include docket sheets, litigation reports, jury verdicts, and other online resources. Although care has been followed to gather this information, not all cases involving such indirect expert challenges are reported.

Testimony insufficient to defeat grant of motion for partial summary judgment.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Steed V. Wal-Mart Stores East
Docket Number:	2:03-CV-00814
Case Cite(s):	2005 WL 2041200; 2005 WL 1989070
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	Utah
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - D. Utah
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Jeffrey R. Oritt,Jonathan Eric Halperin Lead Attorney;Attorney To Be Noticed Halperin Law Center 5225 Hickory Park Drive Suite B Glen Allen, VA 23059 USA 804-527-0100 Fax: 866-335- 1502 Email:Jonathan@halperinlegal.Com,Michael J. Valen,Michael A. Wasserman,Caleb Michael Hodge,Joe N. Tatum,Sarah Steinbaum, JOEY CHINDAMO
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Mitchel T. Rice,Terrence Lemarr Graves Lead Attorney;Attorney To Be Noticed Sands Anderson PC 1111 E Main Street 24th Floor P O Box 1998 Richmond, VA 23218-1998 USA (804) 648-1636 Email:Tgraves@sandsanderson.Com,Jerry Dean Hamilton,Marc M. Greenberg,Lee Ellen Bagley,Laura H. Katzenmeyer,Christine M. Manzo, MICHELE MORALES

Judge(s): Dee Benson, Henry E. Hudson, Virginia M. Hernandez Covington,
Julie S. Sneed, Gregory Keyser, Joseph Dawson, III, Daniel P.
Jordan, F. Keith Ball, Carlos Augusto Rodriguez, Luis F Calderon

Date(s): 05/19/2005

Summary of Involvement: Plaintiff filed its expert Wong's testimony in opposition to
Defendant's motion for partial summary judgment. The Court
granted the motion.

Supporting Document(s): 1. Plaintiffs' Memorandum In Opposition To Defendant's Motion
For Partial Summary Judgment Dismissing Plaintiffs' Third
Cause Of Action For Punitive Damages
2. Order Re Minutes - Granting Motion For Partial Summary
Judgment To DismPlas Third Cause Of Action For Punitive
Damages. Follows Oral Order Of 4/6/05. Signed By Judge Dee
Benson On 5/18/05

Testimony insufficient to win grant of motion for summary judgment without prejudice.

Case Source:	Opinion, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Estate Of Howard Edgar Boucher V. Lowe's Home Ctrs., LLC
Docket Number:	5:17cv930, EDCV-17-930-MWF (KKx)
Case Cite(s):	2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 221681; 2017 LX 80200
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	California
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - C.D. California
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Applicable
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Dimitry Chapovsky, Tharpe And Howell LLP, Sherman Oaks , CA USA
Judge(s):	Michael W. Fitzgerald
Date(s):	11/05/2018
Summary of Involvement:	Defendant filed its expert Wong's testimony in support of its motion for summary judgment. The Court denied Defendant's motion for summary judgment without prejudice.
Supporting Document(s):	1. MINUTES (In Chambers): ORDER DENYING Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment 18 by Judge Michael W. Fitzgerald: For the reasons discussed above, the Motion is DENIED without prejudice to renewal after Plaintiffs have had a reasonable opportunity to obtain the discovery they have identified. Plaintiffs shall serve Lowes with initial discovery requests by no later than 11/20/2017 and coordinate with Lowe's to schedule depositions without unnecessary delay. Plaintiffs are warned that the Court will 2. Opinion dated November 06, 2017

3. Declaration Of Brad Wong, Pe In Support Of Motion For Summary Judgment Notice Of Motion And Motion For Summary Judgment Filed By Defendant Lowe S Home Centers, Llc
 4. Notice Of Motion And Motion For Summary Judgment As To Motion For Summary Judgment Filed By Defendant Lowe S Home Centers, Llc. Motion Set For Hearing On 11/6/2017 At 10:00 Am Before Judge Michael W. Fitzgerald. (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum Memorandum Of Points And Authorities In Support Of Defendant Lowe's Home Centers, Llc's Motion For Summary Judgment, # 2 Separate Statement Of Undisputed Facts In Support Of Defendant Lowe's Home Centers, Llc Motion For Summary Judgment, # 3 Appendix Appendix Of Exhibits, # 4 Notice Of Lodging Non-Paper Exhibits, # 5 Declaration Declaration Of Winthrop Smith In Support Of Motion For Summary Judgment, # 6 Declaration Declaration Of Brad Wong In Support Of Motion For Summary Judgment, # 7 Declaration Declaration Of Kim Fowler-Pike In Support Of Motion For Summary Judgment, # 8 Declaration Declaration Of Kevin Mitchell, Esq. In Support Of Motion For Summary Judgment, # 9 Proposed Order Proposed Order)
-

Testimony insufficient to win grant of motion for summary judgment.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Myers V. Scandia Family Fun Centers
Docket Number:	A423304
Case Cite(s):	2001 WL 36115177; 2001 WL 36110783
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Negligence and Malpractice
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	Nevada
Court Name:	Nevada District Court - Clark County
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Bruce L. Woodbury, Esq., Nevada Bar No.: 799, Corey M. Eschweiler, Esq., Nevada Bar No.: 6635, Jolley, Urga, Wirth & Woodbury, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway/16th Floor Clerk, Las Vegas, Nevada 89109, (702) 699-7500
Defendant's Attorney(s):	0054, Leland Eugene Backus, Esq., Nevada State Bar No. 473, Mark Borghese, Esq., Nevada State Bar No. 6231, Backus & Associates, Ltd., 7670 W. Lake Mead Blvd., Suite 200, Las Vegas, Nevada 89128, (702) 872-5555 Clerk
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	09/12/2001
Summary of Involvement:	Defendant filed its expert Wong's testimony in support of its motion for summary judgment. The Court denied the motion for summary judgment.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Motion For Summary Judgment 2. Trial Order

Testimony insufficient to win grant of motion for partial summary judgment.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Blackwell V. City And County Of San Francisco
Docket Number:	4:07-CV-04629
Case Cite(s):	2010 WL 3591163; 2010 WL 3591161; 2010 WL 3591160; 2010 WL 2850552; 2010 WL 3591159
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Constitutional and Civil Rights
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	California
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - N.D. California
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Brian Gearing, Esq. (SBN 146125), Gearing Law Group, 825 Van Ness Ave., 4th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94109-7891, Telephone: 415/440-3175, Facsimile: 415/440-3103, brian@gearingerlaw.com
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Michael Kim Tcheng, Colombatto Sims LLP, San Francisco, CA, P. Richard Colombatto, Stratman, Patterson & Hunter, Oakland, CA
Judge(s):	Sandra Brown Armstrong
Date(s):	08/18/2010
Summary of Involvement:	Plaintiff filed its expert Wong's testimony in support of its motion for partial summary judgment. The Court denied the motion.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Plaintiff's Notice Of Motion And Motion For Partial Summary Judgment 2. Order By Judge Sandra Brown Armstrong Denying Plaintiff's Motion For Partial Summary Judgment; Granting Defendants 1268 Grant Ave Llc And Christoper P. Foley's Motion For Summary Judgment

3. Declaration Of Brad Wong In Support Of Motion For Partial Summary Judgment Filed By Charles Blackwell. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A)
 4. Plaintiff's Opposition To Defendant City And County Of San Francisco's Motion For Summary Judgment Or In The Alternative Partial Summary Judgment
 5. Plaintiff's Opposition To Defendants 1268 Grant LLC And Christopher Foley's Motion For Summary Judgment Or In The Alternative Partial Summary Judgment
 6. Plaintiff's Reply To Defendants' Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For Partial Summary Judgment
 7. Points And Authorities In Support Of Defendants' Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For Partial Summary Judgment
-

Testimony sufficient to win grant of motion for summary judgment in part.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Medeiros V. The City And County Of Honolulu
Docket Number:	1:11cv221
Case Cite(s):	2013 WL 8750085; 2013 WL 8937026
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	Hawaii
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - D. Hawaii
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Paul V. Smith, Schutter Dias Smith & Wong, Honolulu, HI
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Curtis E. Sherwood, Office Of Corporation Counsel, Honolulu, HI, Tracy S. Fukui
Judge(s):	Richard L. Puglisi
Date(s):	04/19/2013
Summary of Involvement:	Defendant filed its expert Wong's testimony in support of its motion for summary judgment. The Court granted in part and remanded in part the motion for summary judgment.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Case Docket Sheet

2. Memorandum Opinion And Order (1) Denying Plaintiff's Motion For Partial Summary Judgment And (2) Granting In Part And Remanding In Part Defendants' Motion For Summary Judgment. Signed By Judge Richard L. Puglisi On 4/19/2013. [Order Follows Motions Hearing Held On 3/28/2013. Minutes Of Hearing: Doc No. 99] (Afc)Certificate Of Serviceparticipants Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Received This Document Electronically At The E-Mail Address Listed On The Notice Of Electronic Filing (Nef). Participants Not Registered To Receive Electronic Notifications Were Served By First Class Mail On The Date Of This Docket Entry. Upon The Processing Of The Remand Of This Matter, A Certified Copy Of The Instant Order Will Be Served Upon The Clerk Of The Circuit Court Of The First Circuit, State Of Hawaii
 3. Concise Statement Of Facts Re: Filed By City And County Of Honolulu, N. Ah Yat. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration Brad Wong, # 2 Declaration Neal Ah Yat, # 3 Declaration John Ramos, # 4 Declaration Robyn Boxie, # 5 Exhibit A, # 6 Exhibit B, # 7 Exhibit C)
 4. Memorandum In Support Of Motion
 5. Defendants City And County Of Honolulu And Neal Ah Yat's Final Pretrial Statement; Certificate Of Service
-

Declaration cited in opposition to motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Elaine Pico vs. County of San Mateo, et al
Docket Number:	19-CIV-07360
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Mateo Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	REUBEN J. DONIG
Defendant's Attorney(s):	KAREN ROSENTHAL, MARK F HAZELWOOD, CHRISTINA MARIE FORST, JORDAN E. SCOTT
Judge(s):	Ernst A. Halperin, Robert D Foiles, Susan Greenberg
Date(s):	09/03/2021
Summary of Involvement:	Plaintiff cited the declaration of Wong in opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment or in alternative summary adjudication. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Reply PLAINTIFF ELAINE PICO'S CORRECTED RESPONSES TO DEFENDA 2. Separate Statement in Opposition to Motion PLAINTIFF ELAINE PICO'S RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT'S SEPARATE

Declaration filed in support of motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source: Court Filed Documents

Case Caption: **Casas V. Sutter Health & Mills Peninsula Health Servs.**

Docket Number: CIV538668, 4:07-CV-04629

Case Cite(s): 2017 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 20831; 2017 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 19425; 2017 CA Sup. Ct. Motions LEXIS 25944; 2010 WL 2850552; 2010 WL 3591159; 2010 WL 3591163; 2010 WL 3591161; 2010 WL 3591160

Grounds of Challenge: Others

Area of Law: Product Liability

Jurisdiction: Federal, State

State: California

Court Name: California Superior Court - San Mateo Cty.

Retained By: Defendant

Plaintiff's Attorney(s): William Campisi, Jr., Not Mentioned, RANDALL J. WITTE

Defendant's Attorney(s): Joseph E. Finkel, Robert T. Lynch, Esq. (Sb# 34716), Elisabeth A. Madden, Esq. (Sb# 131172), Frances Burns, Esq. (Sb# 270826), Lynch, Gilardi & Grummer, Apc, San Francisco, CA, David Sheuerman, Sb#78132, Marc G. Cowden, Sbn 169391, Kim H. Hara, Sb#258763, Sheuerman, Martini, Tabari, Zenere & Garvin, San Jose, California, DAVID SHEUERMAN

Judge(s): Joseph E. Bergeron, Joseph C. Scott, Steven L. Dylina, Not Mentioned, Jonathan E. Karesh, Richard H. DuBois, Robert D Foiles

Date(s): 03/15/2017

Summary of Involvement: Wong was retained by the Defendant in this case. Defendant filed the declaration of Wong in support of their motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.

Supporting Document(s):

1. SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, FILED ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT MILLS PENINSULA HEALTH SERVICES, individually and dba MILLS-PENINSULA MEDICAL CENTER
 2. NOTICE OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, FILED ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT MILLS PENINSULA HEALTH SERVICES, individually and dba MILLS-PENINSULA MEDICAL CENTER
 3. MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, FILED ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT MILLS PENINSULA HEALTH SERVICES, individually and dba MILLS-PENINSULA MEDICAL CENTER
 4. SOFIA CASAS VS SUTTER HEALTH ET AL, CIV538668, (Cal. St., San Mateo Co., Super. Ct. Mar. 15, 2017)
-

Testimony filed in support of motion for partial summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Gomes V. Hung Ma
Docket Number:	07-1-1292-07
Case Cite(s):	2008 WL 8968895
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Negligence and Malpractice
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	Hawaii
Court Name:	HI Circuit - Hawaii
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Keith K. Hiraoka, Shannon L. Wack
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	10/10/2008
Summary of Involvement:	Defendant filed expert Wong's testimony in support of its motion for partial summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Memorandum In Support Of Motion

Declaration cited in opposition to the motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket
Case Caption:	HALL VS CCSF
Docket Number:	CGC-99-308063
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, CRAIG KENNETH MARTIN
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, CITY ATTORNEY
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	11/22/1999
Summary of Involvement:	Wong's declaration was cited in opposition to the Defendant's motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. DECLARATION OF BRAD M WONG, P.E. IN OPPOSITION TO DEFT'S MTN FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Testimony filed in opposition to motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Mary Ender V. The Pam Companies Et Al
Docket Number:	CV023069
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	CA Superior - San Joaquin
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Brinton R. McCusker
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Carl E. Kadlic
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	08/23/2005
Summary of Involvement:	Plaintiff filed its expert Wong's testimony in opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Declaration Of Brad M Wong In Opposition To Deft's Motion For Summary Judgment

Testimony filed in opposition to motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	J. Boudreau V. Green Valley Corporation, Et Al
Docket Number:	2009-1-CV-159538
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Santa Clara Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Michael P. Purcell
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Paul C. Glaspy
Judge(s):	Kevin E. McKenney
Date(s):	02/21/2012
Summary of Involvement:	Plaintiff filed its expert Wong's testimony in opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Amended Brad M. Wong Re: Opposition To Def'sMtn For Summary Judgment Judge: Kevin E Mckenney

Testimony criticized; outcome unknown.

Case Source: Court Filed Documents

Case Caption: **Bombardier V. Winder**

Docket Number: 09A592401

Case Cite(s): 2014 WL 6756380; 2013 WL 9930911

Grounds of Challenge: Methodology

Area of Law: Personal Injury and Torts

Jurisdiction: State

State: Nevada

Court Name: Nevada District Court - Clark County

Retained By: Plaintiff

Plaintiff's Attorney(s): Not Mentioned

Defendant's Attorney(s): William W. McGaha, Esq., Nevada Bar #3234, Eva L. D. Johnson, Esq., Nevada Bar #10628, Schuetze&McGaha, P.C., 601 S. Rancho Drive, Suite C-20, Las Vegas, Nevada 89106, (702) 369-3225

Judge(s): Not Mentioned

Date(s): 04/15/2014

Summary of Involvement: According to the "Defendant Winder's Renewed Motion For Summary Judgment On Wrongful Death Claim Of Plaintiff The Estate Of Nicole Bombardier; Partial Summary Judgment On Wrongful Death Claim Of Plaintiffs Mario Bombardier, Brittany Rauseo, And Steven Bombardier And Summary Judgment Concerning The Negligence Of Daniel M. Winder, Or In The Alternative, Motion For Summary Judgment Concening The Comparative Negligence Of Decedent, Nicole Bombardier", it was stated that "Having failed to provide a speed calculation for Nicole's vehicle in his previous two reports, Mr. Wong chose to focus his December 5, 2013 report on Mr. Winder's alleged visibility as he exited the private driveway on the night of the

subject accident. In this report, Mr. Wong stated that he reviewed one of the video recordings and Mr. Winder's Answers to Interrogatories. Based on this review, Mr. Wong declared that it was clear Mr. Winder had not seen Nicole's vehicle prior to exiting the private driveway. Without rendering an official opinion, Mr. Wong stated that "[w]hen exiting the subject driveway, there are no physical objects on the sidewalk nor are there physical dimensions of the roadway which would impede [Mr. Winder's] ability to see oncoming vehicles traveling eastbound or westbound prior to entering the eastbound lanes." The unspoken implication in this statement was that Mr. Winder should have been able to see Nicole's vehicle prior to entering the roadway because there was no issue of visibility. In his supplemental report of March 17, 2014, Dr. Werner advised that Mr. Wong's December 5, 2013 report had overlooked the row of palm trees that affected the sight line to the west of the driveway and could have obscured from Mr. Winder's view a fast-approaching eastbound vehicle such as Nicole's. He also pointed out that Mr. Wong had failed to provide any information concerning the location of Mr. Winder's vehicle prior to exiting the driveway and thus Mr. Wong's opinion as to Mr. Winder's ability to see Nicole's oncoming vehicle was speculative." It was further stated that "In his March 17, 2014 supplemental report, Dr. Werner took exception with Mr. Wong's January 27, 2014 report, stating that Mr. Wong failed to address the exceptionally poor quality of the video recordings and highlighting the fact that Mr. Wong had failed to provide an analysis, despite claiming he could thanks to the videos. Dr. Werner also stated that Mr. Wing's report had not identified any information that had not already been available to him long before reviewing the videos and thus Mr. Wong' opinion that the videos were useful was unreliable. Dr. Werner further pointed out that, despite

producing four reports in this matter, Mr. Wong had still failed to indicate that he had performed a reconstruction of the subject accident. Though it would appear that Dr. Werner's March 17, 2014 report was written prior to the receipt of Mr. Wong's February 26, 2014 report, and thus Dr. Werner did not have the benefit, at the time of writing his most recent report, of reviewing the results of Mr. Wong's alleged computer simulation, as discussed above, Mr. Wong still failed to provide a calculation of the speed of Nicole's vehicle at the time it impacted Mr. Winder's vehicle, even after allegedly performing a computer simulation based on the video recordings. Thus, Mr. Wong remains the only person to have failed to provide a calculation of the speed of Nicole's vehicle at the time of its impact with Mr. Winder's vehicle and every calculation that has been provided Of the same puts Nicole's vehicle at an excessive rate of speed for the roadway in question." The outcome of Defendant's criticism regarding Plaintiff's expert Wong's testimony is unknown.

Supporting Document(s):

1. Defendant Winder's Renewed Motion For Summary Judgment On Wrongful Death Claim Of Plaintiff The Estate Of Nicole Bombardier; Partial Summary Judgment On Wrongful Death Claim Of Plaintiffs Mario Bombardier, Brittany Rauseo, And Steven Bombardier And Summary Judgment Concerning The Negligence Of Daniel M. Winder, Or In The Alternative, Motion For Summary Judgment Concening The Comparative Negligence Of Decedent, Nicole Bombardier
 2. Defendant Daniel M. Winder's Motion For Summary Judgment On Wrongful Death Claim Of Plaintiff The Estate Of Nicole Bombardier; Partial Summary Judgment On Wrongful Death Claim Of Plaintiffs Mario Bombardier, Brittany Rauseo, And Steven Bombardier And Summary Judgment Concerning The Negligence Of Daniel M. Winder, Or, In The Alternative, Motion For Summary Judgment Concerning The Comparative Negligence Of Decedent, Nicole Bombardier
-

Testimony filed in support of motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Williams v. Covington Engineering Corp. et al
Docket Number:	1:17cv481
Case Cite(s):	2018 WL 10758725; 2018 WL 10758733
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Product Liability
Jurisdiction:	Federal
State:	Hawaii
Court Name:	U.S. District Court - D. Hawaii
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	James Krueger
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Gary S. Miyamoto, Nicholas Petersen Ching, Wesley H.H. Ching, Barbara J. Kirschenbaum, Chad P. Love, Cathy S. Juhn, Erin Iliana Macdonald, J. Patrick Gallagher, Kamalolookalani K. Koanui-Kong, Leah M. Reyes
Judge(s):	Kenneth J. Mansfield
Date(s):	12/19/2018
Summary of Involvement:	Defendant filed its expert Wong's testimony in support of its motion for summary judgment dated December 19, 2018. The outcome of Defendant's motion for summary judgment is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Expert Witness Disclosure. filed by Dayton Electrical Mfg. Co.. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Certificate of Service)(Ching, Wesley) (Entered: 12/19/2018) 2. Exhibit A ; Proceeding Number : 66-1 3. Case Docket Sheet 4. Memorandum In Support Of Motion

5. Defendant Dayton Electric Manufacturing Co.'S Disclosure Of Expert Witnesses; Exhibit "A"; Certificate Of Service
 6. Concise Statement Of Facts Re Motion For Summary Judgment [Defendant Dayton Electric Manufacturing Co.S Motion For Summary Judgment] Filed By Dayton Electrical Mfg. Co. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration Wesley H.H. Ching, # 2 Exhibit A, # 3 Exhibit B, # 4 Exhibit C, # 5 Exhibit D, # 6 Exhibit E, # 7 Exhibit F, # 8 Declaration Brad M. Wong, # 9 Exhibit 1, # 10 Exhibit 2, # 11 Certificate Of Service)
-

Report insufficient to defeat the motion for partial summary judgment at Trial; remanded on Appeal.

Case Source: Opinion, Court Filed Documents

Case Caption: **DANA E. VINCENT, Plaintiff-Appellee, vs. JACQUELINE CLOUSE and JOHN DOES 1-20, Defendant-Appellant.**

Docket Number: CAAP-13-0005130

Case Cite(s): 2014 HI APP. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 978; 2014 HI APP. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 987; 134 Haw. 179; 339 P.3d 533; 2014 Haw. App. LEXIS 524; 2014 HI APP. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 996

Grounds of Challenge: Others

Area of Law: Negligence and Malpractice

Jurisdiction: State

State: Hawaii

Court Name: Hawaii Intermediate Court of Appeals

Retained By: Defendant

Plaintiff's Attorney(s): Randall L.K.M. Rosenberg

Defendant's Attorney(s): Jonathan L. Ortiz

Judge(s): Daniel R. Foley

Date(s): 11/19/2014

Summary of Involvement: According to the decision dated November 19, 2014, it was stated that, " Defendant-Appellant Jacqueline Clouse (Clouse) appeals from the September 18, 2013 "Order Granting Plaintiff Dana [E.] Vincent's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment as to Liability, Filed on January 11, 2013," (Summary Judgment Order) entered in the Circuit Court of the First Circuit(circuit court). This case arises from a motor vehicle accident in which both parties deny liability." It was further stated that, "Vincent said she was attempting to make a left hand turn from the workplace parking lot and two drivers in the southbound lanes halted their vehicles and waved her through. Clouse said that she had been driving her vehicle, a 2001 Honda Civic, down the turning lane at a speed of between five and ten miles per hour when she "got hit." Clouse's expert accident reconstruction witness, Brad M. Wong (Wong) stated that he believed Clouse was traveling between 10 and 15 miles per hour and Vincent was moving at between 7 to 10 miles per hour. Vincent's expert witness, John E. Muse (Muse) said he believed Clouse was moving at between 15 and 20 miles per hour. The speed limit for that part of Kamehameha Highway is 25 miles per hour." The Court held that, "For the foregoing reasons, we vacate the September 18, 2013 "Order Granting Plaintiff Dana E. Vincent's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment as to Liability, filed on January 11, 2013," entered in the Circuit Court of the First Circuit and remand this case for further proceedings consistent with this opinion."

Supporting Document(s):

1. Opinion dated November 19, 2014
2. DEFEND ANT-APPELLANT JACQUELINE CLOUSE'S; REPLY BRIEF
3. PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE DANA E. VINCENT'S; ANSWERING BRIEF

4. DEFEND ANT-APPELLANT JACQUELINE CLOUSE'S OPENING
BRIEF; STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES; CERTIFICATE OF
SERVICE; APPENDIX "1"; APPENDIX "2"

Affidavit filed in support of motion for final summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	Tri-County Diagnostic & Imaging Centers, LLC Plaintiff vs. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company Defendant
Docket Number:	COINX22050941, COINX23031207
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Constitutional and Civil Rights
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	Florida
Court Name:	Florida County Court - Broward County
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Phillips, Jonathan
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Ashton, Stephany Marie, Walsh, Michael Sundance
Judge(s):	Corey Amanda Cawthon, Steven 73 DeLuca
Date(s):	07/20/2023
Summary of Involvement:	Wong was retained by the Defendant in this case. Defendant filed the affidavit of Wong in support of their motion for final summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. No. 07-20-2023_Motion for Summary Final Judgment 2. No. 07-20-2023_Notice of Filing-2 3. No. 04-18-2023_Affidavit in Support of Motion

Declaration cited in opposition to the motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket
Case Caption:	Pomeroy v. The County of Sonoma
Docket Number:	SCV-269707
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California State Sonoma County Superior Court
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Michael Angelo Fiumara, Johann A Hall, MICHAEL C LI
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Michael Alcock King, Lydia D Goldman
Judge(s):	Christopher M. Honigsberg, Jennifer Dollard, V
Date(s):	04/12/2023
Summary of Involvement:	Wong's declaration was cited in opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Declaration in Opposition Declaration of Christian Engelmann in support of Opposition to MSJ

Declaration filed in opposition to the motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket
Case Caption:	OHAYON VS AMPCO SYSTEM PARKING
Docket Number:	CGC-99-305432
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, DAVID B GREEN
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, CLAPP MORONEY BELLAGAMBA & VUCINICH, STEVEN CVITANOVIC
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	03/23/2001
Summary of Involvement:	Plaintiff filed Wong's declaration in opposition to the Defendant's motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. DECLARATION OF BRAD M. WONG, P.E., IN SUPP OF OPPOSITION OFPLTF ELY OHAYON TO MO OF DEFTS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Declaration cited in support of the motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket
Case Caption:	SALTER VS J C F A RANCH
Docket Number:	BCV-20-102092
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Constitutional and Civil Rights
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Kern Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	FERNANDEZ NORMAN GREGORY
Defendant's Attorney(s):	YEN THOMAS
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	09/04/2020
Summary of Involvement:	Wong's declaration was cited in support of the motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. DECLARATION OF BRAD M. WONG, P.E. 2. Notice of Motion DEFENDANT MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Declaration cited in support of the motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	J. Youssef vs Westfield, LLC
Docket Number:	1-15-CV-280328
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Constitutional and Civil Rights
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Santa Clara Cty.
Retained By:	Not Mentioned
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Ram Fletcher, Fletcher, Ram
Defendant's Attorney(s):	John Rohan Brydon, Brydon, John R.
Judge(s):	Folan, Maureen A
Date(s):	02/05/2016
Summary of Involvement:	Wong was mentioned in this case. Wong's declaration was cited in support of the motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Case Docket Sheet 2. Declaration: In Support, Comment: Of Brad M Wong, P.E. 3. Motion: Summary Judgment

Declaration filed in support of the motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	DAIYING ZHANG VS. ALBERT SHUI-CHUN CHENG et al
Docket Number:	CGC-11-509328
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Defendant
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, GREGORY P. BROCK
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, DEBORAH TOMI BJONERUD, ALISON M. CRANE, ROBERT LEAR JACKSON, PHILIP HAROLD KELLY
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	03/11/2013
Summary of Involvement:	Defendant filed Wong's declaration in support of its motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. POS OF REPLY TO PLTF'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT/ADJUDICATION; REPLY OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT/ADJUDICATION; DECLARATION OF JACQUELINE MOREIRA AND BRAD WONG FILED BY DEFENDANT CHENG, ALBERT SHUI-CHUN CHENG, ANNE SHUI-CHUN DANIEL SULLIVAN, AS AN INDIVIDUAL AND AS TRUSTEE OF THE SULLIVAN FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST JUANITA SULLIVAN, AS AN INDIVIDUAL AND AS TRUSTEE OF THE SULLIVAN FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST FONG, MOLLY K DBA NEW PACIFIC REALTY

2. DECLARATION OF BRAD M WONG IN SUPPORT OF REPLY TO
PLTF'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT/ADJUDICATION FILED BY DEFENDANT CHENG,
ALBERT SHUI-CHUN CHENG, ANNE SHUI-CHUN DANIEL
SULLIVAN, AS AN INDIVIDUAL AND AS TRUSTEE OF THE
SULLIVAN FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST JUANITA SULLIVAN,
AS AN INDIVIDUAL AND AS TRUSTEE OF THE SULLIVAN
FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST FONG, MOLLY K DBA NEW
PACIFIC REALTY

Declaration filed in opposition to the motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket, Court Filed Documents
Case Caption:	KEVIN HEALY VS. JRD HOLDINGS INC., DBA RESTAURANT DEPOT LLC et al
Docket Number:	CGC-10-503083
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - San Francisco Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, LAWRENCE ALAN STRICK
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, JAMES DAVID BIERNAT, LAWRENCE E. HART, TRUMAN PHAN-QUANG, RENEE WELZE LIVINGSTON
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	09/09/2011
Summary of Involvement:	Plaintiff filed Wong's declaration in opposition to the Defendant's motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. Case Docket Sheet 2. DECLARATION OF BRAD M WONG, P.E., IN OPPOSITION TO DEFT NORTHWEST CONVERTING, CO., INC DBA PREMIER MOP AND BROOM MOTION FOR SUMM JUDGMENT FILED BY PLAINTIFF HEALY, KEVIN

Declaration filed in opposition to the motion for summary judgment; outcome unknown.

Case Source:	Docket
Case Caption:	WEINER -VS-CITY OF PALO ALTO
Docket Number:	2001-1-CV-796572
Case Cite(s):	No citations available for this case.
Grounds of Challenge:	Others
Area of Law:	Personal Injury and Torts
Jurisdiction:	State
State:	California
Court Name:	California Superior Court - Santa Clara Cty.
Retained By:	Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, Nicholas Alan Heiman
Defendant's Attorney(s):	Not Mentioned, Ariel Pierre Calonne, Jeffrey Frank Oneal
Judge(s):	Not Mentioned
Date(s):	03/12/2001
Summary of Involvement:	Plaintiff filed Wong's declaration in opposition to the Defendant's motion for summary judgment. The outcome of the motion is unknown.
Supporting Document(s):	1. SUPPLEMENTAL DECL OF BRAD M WONG P.E. IN SUPPT PLTFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFTS' MTN
