

SECOND AMENDED ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 69:

See Objections and Answer to Interrogatory No. 68, which are incorporated by reference as though set forth herein in full.

INTERROGATORY NO. 70: Did Defendant, any predecessor, or any related company ever place any warning directly upon any of the products listed in response to Interrogatory Nos. 19 and 42?

SECOND AMENDED ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 70:

Abex objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, compound, vague and ambiguous and calls for speculation.

Abex also objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it purports to shift the burden of establishing causation from plaintiffs to Abex.

Abex further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it purports to seek information or materials regarding time periods and products that are not at issue in these cases, on the ground that such information or materials lack relevance and are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Abex objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that the information or materials it purports to seek otherwise lack relevance to the issues arising in these cases and are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Abex also objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it seeks to impose upon Abex a legal duty or obligation to which it was not subject.

Abex further objects to this interrogatory to the extent to which it purports to seek information or materials that have been gathered, received, or prepared in the course of litigation, or which are otherwise subject to the attorney-client privilege, protected by the attorney work-product doctrine, the rule protecting materials prepared in anticipation of and/or in connection