

1 instruction, and the reason we would do so is because
2 of the facts of this case.

3 By its very nature friction products are an
4 expendable or renewable product, and I think just the
5 way the continuing duty to warn instruction is phrased
6 and as given, it leads to some kind of confusion
7 because -- especially with respect to the facts in the
8 Wood case where the vehicles were so much -- so old by
9 the time Mr. Wood started at the post office.

10 I think that the continuing duty to warn
11 instruction confuses the issue on that and it may lead
12 the jury to believe that there doesn't have to be
13 actually any Ford friction products on the truck in
14 order for them to judge liability.

15 I would just request that maybe there be a
16 one-sentence additional instruction to the jury
17 indicating that they should not consider the
18 continuing duty to warn instruction to prevent the
19 requirement that they actually have to find that the
20 plaintiffs were exposed to brake and clutch parts
21 supplied or manufactured by Ford.