plaintiffs' perspective is that Dr. Paustenbach has testified that he's going to testify in this case and he's formulated opinions in this case regarding exposures to asbestos and what the levels of exposure to asbestos were of brake mechanics when performing this type of work. Dr. Paustenbach has acknowledged that there is a potential for exposure to asbestos when opening a box of brakes.

The issue of whether Dr. Paustenbach is relying upon the results of his study is not determinative of whether we are entitled to inquire into that subject, given that he is a testifying expert. And that's because the basis of Dr. Paustenbach's opinions in this case are now open for discovery. And the basis includes not only, Judge, things that Dr. Paustenbach chooses to rely upon, but also things that Dr. Paustenbach knows that he then chooses not to rely upon.

And here's why I think it's important. I'm entitled to know, and Mr. Mallia is entitled to know whether Dr. Paustenbach's experiments that measured or attempted to measure how much dust is released when you handle, when you open a box of brakes, if those numbers came out high, and he chooses not to rely upon them, that's obviously critically relevant to the veracity of his opinions in this case. If he's got a high number