

# ***First Circuit Opinion Summaries by Findlaw***

- [First Circuit Opinion Summaries by Findlaw](#) - with links to full-text opinions arranged by month.

## **Most Recent Summaries**

### **US v. Peake**

October 23, 2017

Criminal Law & Procedure

(United States First Circuit) - Affirming the district court's decision not to grant a new trial based on new evidence following the conviction of a man for an antitrust conspiracy in a case involving freight carrier rate fixing because although a qui tam whistleblower action relating to the conspiracy was unsealed in the interim the court reasoned that the massive amount of independently incriminating evidence already introduced against the defendant meant that there was no reason to believe that the outcome would change on retrial.

### **US v. Torres-Rivera**

October 23, 2017

Sentencing, Criminal Law & Procedure

(United States First Circuit) - Vacating the denial of a motion to reduce sentence because it appeared from the record that the district court may have been led to believe that the defendant's conduct in prison was materially more problematic than it actually was when the government used the word sanctions, implying that he had been sanctioned multiple times, when he had only been sanctioned once for a single incident.

### **Andrews v. Target Pharmacy**

October 23, 2017

Civil Procedure, Injury & Tort Law

(United States First Circuit) - Affirming the entry of an order of summary judgment against the defendant in a case where there were multiple deadline extensions granted to submit the documentation necessary to admit expert testimony that the defendant failed to meet because it was not an abuse of discretion to refuse to reopen discovery after the defense's repeated failure to comply with deadlines and submit the necessary documentation.

### **Insurance Brokers West, Inc. v. Liquid Outcome, LLC**

October 23, 2017

Civil Procedure, Contracts

(United States First Circuit) - Affirming the district court dismissal of a claim for breach of contract because the courts agreed that there was no chance that the plaintiff would recover more than \$75,000 if they prevailed in the action and, as such, the claim did not meet the amount-in-controversy requirement for diversity jurisdiction.