

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

Eddie J. Logan, III v. New Orleans Public Belt Railroad Commission
for the Port of New Orleans, et al.

Logan v. New Orleans Public Belt Railroad Commission · No. 24-380 · Decided January 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana addressed a motion in limine to exclude the medical causation testimony of the plaintiff’s treating physicians in a Federal Employers’ Liability Act action. The court held that the physicians were not required to provide expert reports for opinions formed during treatment and that their causation opinions were sufficiently reliable under Federal Rule of Evidence 702 and Daubert. The court barred newly formed or materially expanded opinions based on litigation-generated materials, denied the motion in limine in part, and denied the contingent motion for summary judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Nannette Jolivette Brown
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
DECIDED	January 15, 2026
DOCKET	24-380
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant NOPB moved in limine to exclude the medical causation testimony of Plaintiff’s treating physicians and moved for summary judgment contingent on exclusion of that testimony.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For the motion in limine, the Court applied Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2)(B) and (C), Federal Rule of Evidence 702, and Daubert reliability principles. For summary judgment, the Court considered whether the record showed no genuine dispute of material fact and whether NOPB was entitled to judgment as a matter of law, viewing reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party and refraining from credibility determinations or weighing evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

PARTIES

Eddie J. Logan, III v. New Orleans Public Belt Railroad Commission for the Port of New Orleans, New Orleans Public Belt Railroad Corporation, Public Belt Railroad Commission for the City of New Orleans

TOPICS

summary judgment

motion in limine

expert testimony

daubert standard

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

evidence

Federal Employers' Liability Act

personal injury

negligence

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's treating physicians were required to provide expert reports under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2)(B) for their medical causation opinions.
2. Whether the treating physicians' causation testimony was inadmissible or unreliable under Federal Rule of Evidence 702 and Daubert.
3. Whether NOPB was entitled to summary judgment if the treating physicians' causation testimony was excluded.

HOLDINGS

1. Treating physicians are not required to provide Rule 26(a)(2)(B) expert reports for causation opinions formed during and based on their treatment of the patient. They may not offer opinions newly formed, materially expanded, or based on post-treatment review of deposition testimony, litigation photographs, or other materials outside the scope of medical care.
2. Treating physicians are not categorically barred from offering medical causation testimony when their opinions are based on personal knowledge and medical expertise. The physicians' opinions were sufficiently reliable because the record showed that they evaluated Plaintiff's symptoms, medical history, diagnostic studies, and reported work activities, and NOPB did not show that they ignored obvious alternative causes or used an unreliable methodology. Challenges concerning the bases, sources, and consideration of alternative causes went to weight rather than admissibility.
3. NOPB was not entitled to summary judgment because the Court did not exclude the treating physicians' causation testimony and material issues remained in dispute.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The key question remains whether the physicians' causation opinion existed independently of counsel's request." (III.A)

"There is no categorical bar preventing treating physicians from offering causation testimony, provided the opinions are based on the physician's personal knowledge and medical expertise." (III.B)

“The Court further finds that the physicians’ causation opinions are sufficiency reliable under Federal Rule 702 and Daubert.” (IV)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff worked as a switchman and conductor for Defendants and alleged that repeated walking on oversized and unstable railroad ballast, along with other railroad duties, caused cumulative trauma and repetitive-stress injuries to his feet. He underwent medical evaluation, plantar fasciotomy surgeries, medication treatment, and physical therapy, and alleged permanent sensitivity at the surgical sites. His treating physicians, Dr. Robert Treuting and Dr. Carmen Bruno, were designated to offer medical causation opinions regarding the relationship between his work activities and plantar fasciitis.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a Federal Employers' Liability Act action alleging occupational foot injuries caused by unsafe working conditions. The Court dismissed the claims against the New Orleans Public Belt Railroad Corporation and the Public Belt Railroad Commission for the City of New Orleans, leaving NOPB as the remaining defendant. NOPB then filed motions to exclude Plaintiff's treating-physician causation testimony and for summary judgment; the Court granted the motion in limine in part and denied it in part and denied summary judgment.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- McIntyre v. Hous. Auth. of New Orleans, 2015 WL 5083503, at *4 (E.D. La. Aug. 27, 2015)
- Lewis v. Illinois Central Railroad Company, 2023 WL 5312873, at *7 (C.D. Ill. Aug. 16, 2023)
- Tucker v. United States, 2019 WL 4198254, at *2 (E.D. La. Sept. 4, 2019)
- Causey v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 2018 WL 2234749, at *2 (E.D. La. May 16, 2018)
- Rea v. Wis. Coach Lines, Inc., 2014 WL 4981803, at *5 (E.D. La. Oct. 3, 2014)
- Goodman v. Staples The Office Superstore, LLC, 644 F.3d 817, 826 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Meyers v. National Railroad Passenger Corp. (Amtrak), 619 F.3d 729, 734-35 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Fielden v. CSX Transportation, Inc., 482 F.3d 866, 869 (6th Cir. 2007)
- Smith v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., 495 F.3d 224, 227 (5th Cir. 2007)
- Viterbo v. Dow Chemical Co., 826 F.2d 420, 422, 424 (5th Cir. 1987)
- McNabney v. Lab Corp. of Am., 153 F. App'x 293, 295 (5th Cir. 2005)
- Cross v. Forest Labs., No. 05-CV-00170, 2015 WL 728511, at *2 (S.D. Miss. Feb. 19, 2015)
- Westberry v. Gislaved Gummi AB, 178 F.3d 257, 265 (4th Cir. 1999)
- Barrios v. New Orleans & Gulf Coast Railway Co., 2019 WL 6464962, at *4 (E.D. La. Dec. 2, 2019)
- Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Prods., Inc., 530 U.S. 133, 150 (2000)

- Galindo v. Precision Am. Corp., 754 F.2d 1212, 1216 (5th Cir. 1985)
- Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986)
- First Nat'l Bank of Ariz. v. Cities Serv. Co., 391 U.S. 253, 289 (1968)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 325 (1986)
- Ragas v. Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., 136 F.3d 455, 458 (5th Cir. 1998)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-louisiana-united-states-district-court-for/2026/eddie-j-logan-iii-v-new-orleans-public-belt-railroad-xcoxqmgc>