

attachment of at least \$300,000. Five days later, U.S. District Judge Jeffrey A. Meyer referred this motion to this Magistrate Judge. (Dkt. #44).

After a telephonic status conference was held on March 23, 2015 (Dkt. #61; see also Dkts. ##47, 57-58), an evidentiary hearing was scheduled for June 3-5, 2015. (Dkt. #62). On April 30, 2015, this Magistrate Judge filed an Order Regarding Evidentiary Hearing (Dkt. #77), requiring plaintiff and defendants Crouch and Williams to file a list of his or their witnesses (with a brief description of each witness' anticipated testimony), and a list of his or their exhibits (with a brief description of each exhibit) by May 15, 2015. On May 15, 2015, defendants Crouch and Williams filed their responses, listing six potential witnesses and twenty-one potential exhibits. (Dkt. #85). That same day, plaintiff filed his response (Dkt. #86), listing twenty-six potential witnesses – seven from the Connecticut State Police, four from the Town of East Haddam, two from the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection, two from the Connecticut State's Attorney's Office in Middletown, four from the "community," these two defendants, and seven from plaintiff's family, as well as twenty-seven exhibits.

On May 27, 2015, defendants Town of East Haddam, Walter and Creighton filed Motions to Quash Subpoenas directed to Donald Angersola, the Town Fire Marshal, Karl Karabeinikoff, a town police officer, and James Ventres, a Land Use Administrator/Zoning Enforcement Officer. (Dkts. ##87-89). On that same day, plaintiff filed his Motion for Permission to File Supplement[al] Witness List (Dkt. #90), seeking to add three more witnesses.

In her more than thirty years as a federal judicial officer, this Magistrate Judge has never had a PJR hearing with nearly thirty witnesses presented by one party. The PJR

Application is limited to a single event on a snowy day on March 9, 2013, when an automobile became "stuck in the snow" in plaintiffs' right of way, which led to plaintiff's arrest that day. (Dkt. #43, at 11-12). The witness testimony and exhibits at the PJR hearing **shall be limited to the events of March 9, 2013, and plaintiff's prosecution after his arrest that day.**

Accordingly, the pending Motions to Quash Subpoenas (Dkts. ##87, 89) are granted with respect to Angersola and Ventres, insofar as the proffered testimony is not relevant to the limited issues at the PJR hearing, and plaintiff's Motion for Permission to File Supplement[a] Witness List (Dkt. #90) is denied for the same reason. The pending Motion to Quash Subpoena (Dkt. #88) is denied without prejudice to renew, insofar as it is not clear, at least at this juncture, whether or not Karabeinikoff was involved in plaintiff's arrest on March 9, 2013.

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, this 29th day of May, 2015.

/s/ Joan G. Margolis, USMJ
Joan Glazer Margolis
United States Magistrate Judge