

Roger Williams University

DOCS@RWU

---

Life of the Law School (1993- )

Archives & Law School History

---

7-7-2016

## Newsroom: Kuckles on Discovery Ruling 7-7-2016

Sheri Qualters

*Rhode Island Lawyers Weekly*

Roger Williams University School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: [https://docs.rwu.edu/law\\_archives\\_life](https://docs.rwu.edu/law_archives_life)



Part of the [Civil Procedure Commons](#), [Courts Commons](#), [Evidence Commons](#), [Litigation Commons](#), and the [Rule of Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Qualters, Sheri and Roger Williams University School of Law, "Newsroom: Kuckles on Discovery Ruling 7-7-2016" (2016). *Life of the Law School (1993- )*. 555.

[https://docs.rwu.edu/law\\_archives\\_life/555](https://docs.rwu.edu/law_archives_life/555)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives & Law School History at DOCS@RWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Life of the Law School (1993- ) by an authorized administrator of DOCS@RWU. For more information, please contact [mwu@rwu.edu](mailto:mwu@rwu.edu).

# Newsroom

July 7, 2016

## Kuckes on Discovery Ruling

Professor Niki Kuckes explains how the RI Supreme Court's decision on the Superior Court's Rules of Civil Procedure regarding discovery reflects a growing trend.

**From Rhode Island Lawyers Weekly:** [“Access to opposing expert's background materials denied: R.I. Supreme Court rules in Sakonnet bridge case”](#) by Sheri Qualters



**June 23, 2016:** The Superior Court's Rules of Civil Procedure did not allow a litigant access to computer models and draft reports used by an opposing party's expert witness, the Rhode Island Supreme Court has found.

The case involved design problems concerning the Sakonnet River Bridge replacement project. The plaintiff, a bridge foundation subcontractor, claimed materials considered by a defense expert were fully discoverable, with the exception of core attorney work product. Citing federal precedent, plaintiff Cashman Equipment Corp. argued that allowing such discovery would enhance judicial economy and support effective cross-examination.

The Supreme Court disagreed.

Writing on behalf of the court, Justice William P. Robinson III said the trial judge was correct to rely on “the clear and unambiguous language of Rule 26(b)(4)(A).” [...]

The ruling is not only a correct interpretation of the language of the rule, it is part of a broader trend of reining in discovery, which has become extremely expensive and involved, said **Professor Niki Kuckes, who teaches civil procedure at Roger Williams University School of Law.**

"On the federal side, expert discovery has been cut back dramatically. This reflects that same point of view," Kuckes said.