## 

Law Office of Joseph W. Geldhof 2 Marine Way. Suite 207 Juneau. Alaska 99801 Telephone: (907) 586-8193 E-mail: joeg@alaskan.com Counsel for Ray M. Collins and Carol J. Collins COPY
Original Received

MAY - 6 2016

Clerk of the Trial Courts

y \_\_\_\_ Deputy

## IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICTAT JUNEAU

RAY M. COLLINS and CAROL J. COLLINS, Plaintiffs, vs.	) ) ) )
DAVID W. HALL and MARGARET R. HALL Trustees, and their successors in trust, of the D & M Hall Community property trust, dated March 14, 2005, and also all other persons or parties unknown claiming a right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the real estate described in the complaint in this action,  Defendants.	) ) ) ) ) ) ) Case No.: 1JU-14-00771 Civil
	)

## PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO EXPERT WITNESS JOHN BENNETT

Ray M. and Carol J. Collins (Plaintiff), through counsel, reply to defendants' response related to the use of John Bennett as an expert witness.

Having exposed the various reports authored by John Bennett in their response, the issue of what to do about the information becomes as problematic as whether or not Bennett will testify at all. Having cleverly exposed much of what is likely to be the "evidence" Bennett will provide at trial, crafting an appropriate reply presents challenges.

The basic point made by the Collins' in their initial objection to allowing Bennett to testify was that they assumed his efforts and work product was to be prepared for the purpose of settlement and not for trial. At the time Bennett was seemingly engaged to prepare a report on the boundary issue in dispute in this case, the time for naming "expert witnesses" had expired. From the Collins' perspective, John Bennett was not going to participate in a trial if

settlement was not reached. [See generally, discussion in redacted e-mail between Dan Bruce (then counsel for Ray & Carol Collins), and Ray Collins dated January 25, 2016, attached to this reply as Attachment 1]. Tellingly, the contractual document counsel for the Halls provided as justification for allowing Bennett to testify as an expert lacks a signature by Dan Bruce. [See, Attachment 2 to Defendant's Response to Plaintiffs' Objections to John Bennett at page 6 of 7].

So what to do about the now exposed Bennett reports that were thought, at least by the Collins' to be used for settlement? Collins' continue to believe the use of Bennett as an expert witness in this dispute is more likely than not to generate confusion instead of evidence necessary to resolve this case. Much of Bennett's reports consist of superficial analysis and a surprising number of conclusions that are detached from standard surveying standards and in some instances deviate from applicable legal standards.

Under the circumstances, given that the Bennett reports have been exposed, Collins believe the only course of action that makes sense and is fair is to allow Bennett to testify. That way Bennett will be subject to cross-examination and his obvious encroachment on the court's legal prerogatives will likely be obvious and properly contained.

In conclusion, Collins' simply note now their generic objection to Bennett's testimony as being inconsistent with settlement purposes. Collins' will renew their generic objection at trial regarding Bennett's testimony and rely on cross-examination and the court's ability to winnow testimony and allocate the proper weight that should be given to this so-called "expert testimony.

**DATED** this 6<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2016 at Juneau, Alaska.

LAW OFFICE OF JOSEPH W<sub>3</sub>GELDHOF

Joseph W. Geldhof Alaska Bar # 8111097

## **CERTIFICATION**

I certify that on this date, a copy of this document, together with Attachment I was sent via USPS to:

Lael Harrison, Attorney for Defendants Faulkner Banfield, P.C. 8420 Airport Boulevard, Suite 101 Juneau, Alaska 99801

DATE: MAY 6, 3016

Joseph W. Geldhof

Reply to Response to Objection to John Bennett as Witness Collins vs. Hall 1 JU-14-771 Civil

. .