Terri Wood, OSB #88332 Law Office of Terri Wood, P.C. 730 Van Buren Street Eugene, Oregon 97402 541-484-4171

Attorney for Karla Finley

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON FOR LANE COUNTY

STATE OF OREGON,

Plaintiff,

CASE No. 20-07-18814

-VS-

KARLA MARIE FINLEY,

Defendant

MOTION IN LIMINE REGARDING "DUTIES"
OF DEFENDANT AND MISSTATEMENTS
OF THE LAW (Oral Argument Requested)

Defendant, Karla Finley, by and through her undersigned attorney, moves the Court for an Order prohibiting the State, its representatives, and witnesses from making any reference whatsoever through testimony, other evidence, or arguments of counsel, concerning the following:

- (1) That Karla Finley had a duty to contact the police immediately after the accident, or to remain at the scene until police arrived, or knew that she should remain at the scene and call the police, even if she did not have actual knowledge that the accident resulted in injury to any person or that the nature of the accident was such that injury was the probable result;
- (2) That Karla Finely had a duty to exit her vehicle and search the scene for any person who possibly may have been injured in the accident;

- (3) That Karla Finley had a duty to remain at the scene and fulfill the related duties required by ORS 811.705, even if she mistakenly but honestly believed that the other driver involved in the accident had fled the scene;
- (4) That Karla Finley had a duty to contact the police or to "turn herself in" days later after learning from her passenger that she had most likely been the driver involved in an accident resulting in the death of Randy Johnson;
- (5) That other individuals told Karla Finley that she should contact the police or turn herself in after they learned that she had most likely been the driver involved in an accident resulting in a fatality, but she declined or failed to do so;
- (6) That a guilty verdict could be returned against Karla Finley even if the State fails to prove that she knew the accident resulted in injury to a person; or
- (7) That a guilty verdict could be returned against Karla Finley even if the State fails to prove that she knew the driver of the other involved vehicle remained at the scene of the accident.

This motion is well-founded in law, and not made for the purpose of delay. It is supported by the points and authorities which follow, by the memorandum of law filed herewith, and by such other points and authorities as may be offered by way of supplemental memoranda or at hearing on this motion.

MOVED this 3rd day of January, 2008.

TERRI WOOD, OSB #88332 ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

1. Based upon discussions with the prosecutor, it appears the State intends to

argue or make comments to the jury about several matters of law on which the parties are in grave dispute. These particular legal issues involve the essential elements of the State's case and misstatement of these issues will strike at the heart of the defense case. Although not evidence, misleading arguments and misstating the law can easily mislead or confuse the jury and result in unfair prejudice to the defense. Cf., OEC 403. When the prosecutor misstates the law, a curative instruction or mistrial is required. See, e.g., *State v. Dyer*, 16 Or.App. 247, 254 (1974). Misleading arguments or misstatements of the law by the prosecutor may violate a defendant's constitutional rights to a fair trial, under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 11 of the Oregon Constitution.

In fairness to the prosecution, the legal issues in dispute are complex, and some of the finer points have not been addressed by the appellate courts. These are not issues upon which a court would likely be able to rule without first considering legal memoranda from the parties and reviewing the most pertinent cases first-hand. Preliminary discussions with the prosecutor have found agreement among the parties that it would be preferable for the Court to resolve this dispute pre-trial, rather than have the parties objecting to what they perceive as misstatements of law during voir dire or opening statements.

Additionally, the defense anticipates, based on statements in the discovery, that one or more State's witnesses may comment about Ms. Finley's "duty" to have called police immediately after the accident, or to have later gone to the police or turned herself in upon learning, days later, that she probably was the person police were seeking. Witness testimony regarding "duties" that they think are required by law, but which are not, is irrelevant, improper lay opinion testimony, and likely to

confuse the jury and unduly prejudice the defense. See OEC Rules 401-403 & 701. Similarly, witness testimony or arguments by the prosecutor concerning "duties" that may be civic or moral duties, but not required by law, are irrelevant, improper lay opinion testimony, likely to confuse the jury and unduly prejudice the defense in this case where the sole charge is "failure to perform the duties of a driver." See OEC Rules 401-403 & 701.

It is the Court's duty to determine what laws apply in any given case, and a pre-trial determination of the issues raised herein will prevent the jury from being confused or misled or unduly prejudiced by the presentation of irrelevant evidence or improper argument.

2. The defense further relies on the cases and statutes discussed in the memorandum of law filed herewith and incorporated by reference.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 3rd day of January, 2008.

TERRI WOOD, OSB #88332 ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have made service of the foregoing Motion In Limine, by hand-delivery of a true, full and exact copy thereof, except for the new case number, on July 3, 2007, to the Lane County District Attorney Office, 125 E. 8th Ave., Eugene, Oregon, 97401, attorney for plaintiff.

TERRI WOOD, OSB #88332