PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

BELL-6

CAUSE NO. DV00-03612-I

BARBARA J. DUNAGAN, Individually and as Personal Representative of the Heirs and Estate of MONTY JOE DUNAGAN, Deceased,	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT
	§	DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS
vs.	§	
GAF CORPORATION, ET AL.	§	162ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT

DEFENDANT BELL HELICOPTER SERVICES, INC.'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF BARBARA J. DUNAGAN'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES, FIRST REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION AND FIRST REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS

TO: PLAINTIFF BARBARA J. DUNAGAN, by and through her counsel of record, Holly J. W. Huart, Baron & Budd, The Centrum, 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Ste. 1100, Dallas, Texas 75219.

Pursuant to Rule 196, 197, and 198 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure (the "Rules"), Defendant Bell Helicopter Services, Inc. ("Defendant") responds and objects to *Plaintiff Barbara J. Dunagan's First Set of Interrogatories, First Request for Production and First Request for Admissions* as follows:

General Objections & Preliminary Statement

Defendant objects to the instructions provided by Plaintiff for use in answering these written questions to the extent they differ from the Rules. Defendant objects to the definitions provided by Plaintiff for use in answering these written questions to the extent they differ from the Rules or the commonly-used meaning of the term defined.

Defendant further states that in preparing and making these responses, it has not accepted or acquiesced in the purported directions, conditions or definitions imposed at the time these interrogatories or requests were propounded by the Plaintiffs. Further, Defendant incorporates herein by reference such other specific objections as may be contained hereinafter in its responses.

Subject to the objections herein, Decedent was never employed by Defendant Bell Helicopter Services as previously indicated and fully explained in its verified answer on file in this cause. As

such, Defendant is unable to answer any discovery propounded in that such answers would be nonsensical, meaningless and irrelevant to the subject matter of this cause.

INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1:
State the name, address, job title, length of time employed by Defendant, and a year-by-year list of all other positions, titles, or jobs held when working for Defendant of each person who has supplied any information used in answering these interrogatories.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1:
Admit that the Defendant ordered, purchased or otherwise acquired asbestos-containing products, asbestos-containing friction products, and/or machinery requiring the use of asbestos or asbestos-containing products.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad

and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2:
Admit that asbestos-containing products, asbestos-containing friction products, and/or machinery requiring the use of asbestos-containing products were utilized on Defendant's Premises between the years 1960 and 1994.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2:
If you admit the foregoing request, list all asbestos-containing products used at Defendant's Premises and for each product state the following:

a. What these products were used for
b. From whom these products were purchased
c. Where these products were installed
d. Specific persons or contractors who install these products
e. The first year each product was no longer purchased and installed on Defendants Premises.

ANSWER:
Defendant did not Admit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:
Produce all ordering and sales documents pertaining to the purchase or acquisition of such asbestos-containing products for use at Defendant's Premises, including but not limited to invoices, price quotations, purchase orders, requisitions, bills of lading, and other purchasing and/or shipping documents of the similar nature.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d

892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3:
Admit that during the time Plaintiff's Decedent was employed by Defendant, it was foreseeable that asbestos-containing products on Defendant's Premises would or could be removed, stripped, replaced or repaired at some time after installation.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4:
Admit that Plaintiff Decedent was exposed to asbestos-containing products and/or machinery requiring or calling for the use of asbestos and/or asbestos-containing products in his occupation at Defendant's Premises.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5:
Admit that Plaintiff's Decedent was employed by Defendant or by a predecessor-in-interest of Defendant.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents in supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the

Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:
If you admit the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce Plaintiff's Decedent's employment file.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin.* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

Do you contend that Plaintiff's Decedent was not exposed to asbestos while working at the Defendant's Premises? If the answer is anything other than "no", identify each and every fact which supports this contention.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein. Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6:
Admit that Plaintiff's Defendant worked at Defendant's Premises in areas where asbestos-containing products were installed, used, prepared for use, replaced or repaired, stored or loaded, unloaded or transported.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin*

v. Martin, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7:
Admit that while Plaintiff's Decedent was working on Defendant's Premises he was continuously exposed to asbestos and asbestos-containing dust without the provision of appropriate safeguards.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8:
Admit that Defendant was negligent in the installation, maintenance, removal and/or abatement of asbestos at Defendant's Premises.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:
Admit that Defendant consciously decided not to warn its employees of the dangers of asbestos.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4:
Do you contend that Defendant specifically warned Plaintiff's Decedent about the hazards of asbestos and asbestos-containing products? If the answer is anything other than "no", identify each and every fact which supports this contention.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5:
Describe all safety precautions taken by you or directed by you to be taken (such as containment areas, warning signs, ventilation systems, evacuating the premises, etc.) for the protection of bystanders (including but not limited to Plaintiff's Decedent) from the hazards resulting from the use of asbestos-containing products at Defendant's Premises.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:
Admit that you did not erect containment barriers to prevent emission of asbestos dust at the work sites where your employees were using asbestos-containing materials, including the work sites where Plaintiff's Decedent was present.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is

authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein. Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:
Admit that you did not utilize engineering controls such as isolation or enclosure at the work sites where your employees were using asbestos-containing materials, including the work sites where Plaintiff's Decedent was present.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request

for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:
Admit that you did not utilize ventilation or exhaust systems to divert dust at the work sites where your employees were using asbestos-containing materials, including the work sites where Plaintiff's Decedent was present.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.,* 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:

Admit that you did not utilize dust collection engineering controls to trap airborne asbestos dust at the work sites where your employees were using asbestos-containing materials, including the work sites where Plaintiff's Decedent was present.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:
Admit that you did not require your employees to handle, mix, apply, remove, cut or score asbestos-containing products in a wet state to prevent emission of airborne asbestos fibers at the work sites where your employees were using asbestos-containing materials, including the work sites where Plaintiff's Decedent was present.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:
Admit that you did not evacuate the premises prior to the utilization of asbestos-containing materials at the work sites where your employees were using asbestos-containing materials, including the work sites where Plaintiff's Decedent was present.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain

matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:
Admit that you did not protect Plaintiff's Decedent from exposure to asbestos fibers on Defendant's Premises.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex.

1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:
Admit that exposure to asbestos fibers on Defendant's Premises put Plaintiff's Decedent at an extreme risk of injury.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye,* 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.,* 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:
Admit that by failing to adequately protect Plaintiff's Decedent from exposure to asbestos fibers, Defendant placed Plaintiff's Decedent at an extreme degree of risk.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:
Admit that Defendant was aware of the presence of and/or use of asbestos-containing products on Defendant's Premises during the time period Plaintiff's Decedent was working on Defendant's Premises.

RESPONSE:

Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 20:
Admit that Defendant knew that asbestos fibers when inhaled could cause injury.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 21:
Admit that by knowing of the hazards of exposure to asbestos fibers and failing to protect Plaintiff's Decedent from exposure to asbestos fibers, Defendant exhibited conscious indifference to the rights, safety, and welfare of Plaintiff's Decedent.

RESPONSE:

Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing

expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 22:
Admit that Defendant demonstrated "such an entire want of care as to establish that its acts and omissions were the result of actual conscious indifference to the rights, safety and welfare to Plaintiff's Decedent, and that such acts and omissions were a proximate cause of Plaintiff's Decedent's death."

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex.

1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 23:
Admit that Defendant failed to provide safety equipment for Plaintiff's Decedent to use on Defendant's Premises.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye,* 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.,* 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco. Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 24:
Admit that Plaintiff's Decedent's exposure to asbestos at Defendant's Premises was a substantial contributing factor in causing his asbestos-related injury.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 25:
Admit that Defendant did not exercise reasonable care to reduce or eliminate the risk of harm posed by the use of asbestos-containing products at Defendant's Premises.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 28:
Admit that Defendant's failure to reduce or eliminate the risk of harm to Plaintiff's Decedent posed by exposure to asbestos was a substantial factor in bringing about Plaintiff's Decedent's asbestos-related injury.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain

matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:

If you contend that while at the premises on which you or your employees were working with asbestos-containing materials, Plaintiff's Decedent was not exposed to sufficient quantities of asbestos dust to produce the disease(s) complained of, produce all documents supporting your contention.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig.

proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27:
If you contend that Plaintiff's Decedent is suffering from an asbestos disease as a result of exposures other than asbestos dust at the premises on which you or your employees were working with asbestos-containing materials, produce all documents supporting your contention.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28:
If you contend that Plaintiff's Decedent does not suffer from the asbestos-related disease(s) complained of, produce all documents supporting your contention.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is

authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:
If you contend that Plaintiff's Decedent was not exposed to asbestos dust on Defendant's Premises, produce all documents supporting your contention.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

State whether Defendant has at any time provided safety equipment at any time for workers' protection against the inhalation of asbestos dust, including but not limited to masks, respirators, other breathing devices, protective clothing, protective gloves, etc. For each such item of equipment, indicate when such was first provided to your workers, under what circumstances such were provided; and the name, address and telephone number of the person most knowledgeable concerning such provision.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30:
Produce all documents which support your response to the foregoing interrogatory.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

If you have ever had a policy requiring employees to use respirators, state when this policy was implemented; describe this policy in detail; state to whom it applied (i.e. Defendant employees and contractor employees); and describe what types and brand names of respirators were required by you.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31:
Produce all documents which support your response to the foregoing interrogatory.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 29:
Admit that Defendant did not provide adequate safety measures and protection against asbestos dust to Plaintiff's Decedent.

RESPONSE:

Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 32:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 30:
Admit the Defendant did not adequately warn Plaintiff's Decedent of the extreme risk and dangers of asbestos exposure during the installation, maintenance, manufacturing and removal process.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 33:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8:
Identify any and all warnings ever given by Defendant, if any, to Plaintiff's Decedent regarding the hazards of asbestos and the dangers inherent in the inhalation of asbestos fibers.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9:
If Defendant or any of its predecessor or subsidiary companies have at any item published or distributed any printed material containing any warnings concerning the possibility of injury resulting from the use of asbestos-containing products or exposure to asbestos? If so, identify each person responsible for having drafted or issued the warning statements and/or written materials, and the dates when each warning was first issued or distributed.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson,* 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 31:
Admit that Defendant did not adhere to all industrial, governmental, regulatory and other established measures to protect workers from harm from exposure to asbestos during the relevant time of Plaintiff's Decedent's employment.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 34:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which supports your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 34:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10:
State in detail what tests, if any, Defendant, Defendant's employees, governmental inspectors or insurance company ever made with regard to the quantity, quality, or threshold limit values of asbestos dust or particles to which workers were exposed while suing, working with or around, or installing asbestos-containing products at any of Defendant's job sites. State where and when these tests were conducted, and the results of any such test.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 35:

Produce all documents identified in the foregoing interrogatory.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11:
State each time any regulatory agency or other governing body has inspected the Defendant's Premises to determine if health and safety regulations governing exposure to asbestos were being followed. Include in your response the date and results of each inspection, and state whether a written report was generated.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 36:
Produce all documents identified in the foregoing interrogatory.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 32:
Admit that Defendant attempted to install, maintain, manufacture and/or remove asbestos in its workplace without taking adequate precautions for the protection of workers in the vicinity and/or in the plant generally.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 37:
If you fail to unequivocally admit the foregoing request, produce all documents which support your response.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is

authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12:
State the years during which Defendant or its subsidiaries or predecessors operated a medical department and identify all persons who directed, headed or supervised said department and the years of their service in that capacity.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 13:
State the years during which Defendant or its predecessors or subsidiaries operated a safety department and identify all persons who directed, headed or supervised said department and the years of their service in that capacity.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 33:
Admit that asbestos containing materials are still in use on Defendant's Premises.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 33:
Admit that asbestos containing materials are no longer in use on Defendant's Premises.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause and states that it cannot admit or deny.

INTERROGATORY NO. 14:
State the date when Defendant ceased to use asbestos-containing products, indicating the first year each type of product was no longer purchased and/or installed.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15:
State whether written warnings were placed at any locations adjacent or near asbestos in place at Defendant's job sites. If so, describe with specificity such signs, including size, color, wording, etc. Additionally, state the number of such signs that were installed and indicate the specific location of each such sign and the dates and length of time such sing was placed at that location.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 16:
State whether any asbestos products in place or in use have been removed or abated from Defendant's Premises. If so, list each and every abatement company or other contractor involved with the removal of asbestos, including address and telephone number, dates and particular locations of such removal.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 17:
If you contend that you have not been negligent towards Plaintiff Decedent, as Plaintiff has alleged in Plaintiff's Original Petition and any amendments thereto, state in full the basis for this contention and describe all regulations, laws, statutes, or other authority including internal procedures relating to asbestos that you have relied upon in making this contention.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 18:
If Defendant has ever been a member of any trade organization that published or disseminated any documents or information relating to asbestos, state the names of such organizations and list the dates of membership.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson*, 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 19:
Identify every individual ever employed by Defendant who has made or presented a Worker's Compensation or other claim for personal injury or death resulting from inhalation of asbestos. Include in your response the date of any such claims and a description of the injury alleged.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson,* 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 20:
State whether a medical monitoring program, medical examination program or other medical surveillance was provided to your employees and specifically to Plaintiff's Decedent. If so, indicate what records of such program, examination or surveillance concerning Plaintiff's Decedent exist at this time, including but not limited to reports, x-rays, medical notes and/or descriptions of any kind.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson,* 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

INTERROGATORY NO. 21:
State the year you first learned that persons could suffer injury through inhalation of asbestos fibers and how Defendant became aware of the existence of asbestos hazards. Further, identify any documents that would indicate that asbestos fibers, when inhaled, can be hazardous to the health of human beings.

ANSWER:
Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that party may only discover a "matter that is not privileged and is *relevant* to the subject matter of the pending action . . . ." Rule 192.3(a). The information sought does not appear to be "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." See *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *Texaco, Inc. v. Sanderson,* 898 S.W.2d 813 (Tex. 1995). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 38:
Produce any and all documents, memoranda and/or other writings that reflect, indicate or in any way relate to communications between you and any manufacturer of asbestos-containing products concerning or related to the asbestos contained in such products.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 39:
Produce any and all documents, memoranda and/or other writings, including but not limited to books, pamphlets, or other written materials of any kind or character in your possession that would indicate that asbestos fibers, when inhaled, can be hazardous to the health of human beings.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time

period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 40:
Produce all publications in your possession that were disseminated or published by any trade association or organization and that contain information relating to the hazards of asbestos and all documents which refer to such publications.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 41:
Produce any and all documents, memoranda and/or other writings that indicate and/or reflect or refer to any inspections by an regulatory agency for the purpose of ascertaining whether health or safety regulations were being followed or adhered to at any of your job sites, including but not limited to written reports produced by such agency. This request specifically seeks any and all such documentation referring to dust hazards.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 42:
Produce all safety meeting minutes or other documents, memoranda and/or writings that refer to the dangers of asbestos and/or safety measures to be used in the vicinity of asbestos at Defendant's Premises.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request

for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 43:
Produce all contracts, memoranda, and/or other writings that in any way reflect arrangements made for the removal of asbestos and/or the installation of asbestos products at any of Defendant's facilities.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 44:
Produce all documents, memoranda, and/or other writings that in any way reflect a removal plan or organized written criteria or schedule for the removal of asbestos at any of Defendant's facilities.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to

produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 45:
Produce all safety manuals and/or safety handbooks provided to Defendant's employees at any time.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 46:
Produce any and all documents related to the medical condition of Plaintiff's Decedent at any time during his employment by Defendant and/or Defendant's subsidiary. This request specifically includes all x-rays, x-ray reports, medical notes and/or medical records of any kind, including annual physical forms.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 47:
Produce the entire personnel file for MONTY DUNAGAN.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad

and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 48:
Produce all documents that relate to an inquiry made by your to any contractor working at Defendant's Premises at the same time as Defendant's employees which refer, relate or mention the hazards of asbestos, the existence or location of asbestos-containing materials and/or procedures to follow in the event that work is to be performed by your employees, including Plaintiff's Decedent, in the vicinity of asbestos-containing materials.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.,* 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 49:

Produce all documents that relate to an inquiry made by any of your employees to your or to any other entity or individual which refer, relate or mention the hazards of asbestos, the existence or location of asbestos-containing materials and/or procedures to follow in the event that work is to be or has been performed by your employees, including Plaintiff's Decedent, in the vicinity of asbestos-containing materials.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 50:
Produce any and all safety guidelines, specifications and/or other documents provided to Defendant and/or its employees by any other contractors working at Defendant's job sites at the same time as Defendant's employees, including Plaintiff's Decedent, which refer, relate or mention the hazards of asbestos, the existence or location of asbestos-containing materials and/or procedures to follow in the event that work is to be performed in the vicinity of asbestos-containing materials.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing

expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 51:
Produce any and all safety guidelines, specifications and/or other documents from any source that were provided to Defendant's employees, including Plaintiff's Decedent, which refer or relate or mention the hazards of asbestos, the existence or location of asbestos-containing materials and/or procedures to follow in the event that work is to be performed by Defendant's employees in the vicinity of asbestos-containing materials.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig.

proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 52:
Produce any brochures, pamphlets, catalogs, packaging, or other written material of any kind or character containing any warnings concerning the possibility of injury resulting from the use of asbestos-containing products or exposure to asbestos that have been published, distributed, or disseminated by you.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 53:
Produce any photographs, videotape, film, slides or other tangible thing graphically depicting images of asbestos-containing products or exposure to asbestos that have been published, distributed, or disseminated by you.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a

general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 54:

Produce any photographs, videotape, film, slides or other tangible thing graphically depicting images of warning signs or other cautionary statements or statements restricting access to areas in the vicinity of asbestos-containing products or asbestos in place being mixed, applied, fabricated, installed, repaired, maintained, utilized, removed, replaced, or abated at any time at any of Defendant's facilities.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex.

1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 55:
Produce any photographs, videotape, film, slides, or other tangible thing graphically depicting images of containment areas or other restricted access areas in the vicinity of asbestos-containing products or asbestos in place being mixed, applied, fabricated, installed, repaired, maintained, utilized, removed, replaced, or abated at any time at any of Defendant's facilities.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 56:
Produce any documents, including but not limited to workers compensation claims, indicating that any individuals claimed injury as a result of exposure to asbestos products while employed by you.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a

general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 57:
Produce any memoranda, writings, or other documents, including but not limited to, corporate minutes, which in any way contain a discussion of the hazards or potential hazards of asbestos.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 58:
Produce any and all documents, including invoices, shipping receipts, bills of lading, purchase orders, or other documents of a similar nature related to the purchase of asbestos-containing products for use by Defendant's employees.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 59:
Produce any and all documents, including invoices, shipping receipts, bills of lading, purchase orders, or other documents of a similar nature related to the purchase of respirators, protective clothing, containment materials, or other protective devices for use by Defendant's employees who were to be working in the vicinity of asbestos-containing products during the course and scope of their employment duties.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is

authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 60:
Produce any and all records, documents, memoranda or other writings reflecting in any way any inspections by labor inspectors, insurance company inspectors or anyone from your company or hired by your company, that included the taking or measuring of "dust counts" at any of Defendant's facilities or at any of Defendant's job sites.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 61:
In the event that Defendant performed or had performed any dust level counts or measurements of any of its job sites with respect to asbestos dust, produce any documents, memoranda, or other writings that in any way reflect the results of such studies or counts and actions taken as a result of such counts or studies.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 62:
Produce any and all reports, writings (whether published or unpublished) and/or other documentation written, created and/or edited by any of your experts that in any way pertain to asbestos and the hazards and/or diseases that may result therefrom.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the

Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein. Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 63:
Produce any and all documents provided to any expert or fact witnesses as a result of the filing of this case.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 64:
Produce any and all curriculum vitae and/or resumes of any of the experts and/or persons with knowledge of relevant facts that you have listed in your Answers to Interrogatories.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 65:
Produce any and all documents which will be used at the time of trial, including all potential exhibits and those documents which may be used to cross-examine other witnesses or in rebuttal, and which you contend are relevant to any of Defendant's enumerated defenses in Defendant's most recently filed Answer.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812

S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 66:
Produce any books, pamphlets, memoranda, or written materials of any kind of character that would indicate that asbestos fibers, when inhaled, can be hazardous to the health of human beings.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 67:
Produce all documents which reflect an agreement between Defendant and any of Defendant's customers to indemnify and hold harmless any individual or entity for injuries sustained by Defendant's employees, including Plaintiff's Decedent, at any of Defendant's Premises between 1960 and 1994.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 68:
Produce all documents which reflect any discussion concerning the exercise of control over Defendant's employees, including Plaintiff's Decedent, over the work of Defendant's employees, or over the safety practices of Defendant's employees while such employees were performing their duties within the scope of their employment at Defendant's Premises between 1960 and 1994.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request

for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 69:
Produce all documents which reflect any discussion concerning the exercise of control over or monitoring of the use of respirators, protective clothing or other protective equipment by Defendant's employees, including Plaintiff's Decedent, while such employees were performing their duties within the course and scope of their employment at Defendant's Premises between 1960 and 1994.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 70:
Produce all documents used, referred to or relied upon in answering any Interrogatories or Requests for Disclosure.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein. Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 34:
Admit that Plaintiff filed suit against Defendant within two (2) years of the date of Plaintiff's Decedent's death.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 35:
Admit that the 3-hour time-weighted average airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers to which Plaintiff's Decedent was exposed exceeded five fibers, longer than 5 micrometers, per cubic centimeter of air.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 71:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 36:
Admit that you did not measure the 3-hour time-weighted average airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers to which Plaintiff's Decedent was exposed while in your employ.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 72:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.]

1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 37:
Admit that the 8-hour time-weighted average airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers to which Plaintiff's Decedent was exposed exceeded two fibers, longer than 5 micrometers, per cubic centimeter of air.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 73:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981. no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex.

1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 38:
Admit that you did not measure the 8-hour time-weighted airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers to which Plaintiff's Decedent was exposed while in your employ.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 74:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 39:
Admit that while in your employ, Plaintiff's Decedent was exposed to airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers in excess of 10 fibers, longer than 5 micrometers, per cubic centimeter of air.

RESPONSE:

Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 75:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 40:
Admit that you did not measure airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers in Plaintiff's Decedent's work area to determine whether Plaintiff's Decedent was exposed to airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers in excess of 10 fibers, longer than 5 micrometers, per cubic centimeter of air while in your employ.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 76:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 41:
Admit that you did not employ the following engineering control in Plaintiff's Decedent's place of employment: isolation.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 77:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.]

1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 42:
Admit that you did not employ the following engineering control in Plaintiff's Decedent's place of employment: enclosure.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 78:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig.

proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 43:
Admit that you did not employ the following engineering control in Plaintiff's Decedent's place of employment: exhaust ventilation.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 79:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 44:
Admit that you did not provide and require the use of the following special clothing by Plaintiff's Decedent: coveralls or similar whole body clothing.

RESPONSE:

Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 80:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 45:
Admit that you did not provide and require the use of the following special clothing by Plaintiff's Decedent: head coverings.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 81:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d

892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 46:
Admit that you did not provide and require the use of the following special clothing by Plaintiff's Decedent: gloves.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 82:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable

certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 47:
Admit that you did not provide and require the use of the following special clothing by Plaintiff's Decedent: foot coverings.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 83:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 48:
Admit that you did not undertake the laundering of Plaintiff's Decedent's work clothing worn during your employ.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 84:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 49:
Admit that you did not make determinations of airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers in Plaintiff's Decedent's place of employment by the membrane filter method at 400-450 X (magnification) (4 millimeter objective) with phase contract illumination.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 85:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 50:
Admit that you did not monitor every place of employment of Plaintiff's Decedent where asbestos fibers were released in such a way as to determine whether Plaintiff's Decedent's exposure to asbestos fibers was below two fibers, longer than 5 micrometers, per cubic centimeter of air.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 86:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain

matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 51:
Admit that you did not collect samples from within the breathing zone of the Plaintiff's Decedent on membrane filter of 0.8 micrometer porosity mounted in an open-face filter holder.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 87:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812

S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 52:
Admit that you did not collect samples (from within the breathing zone of the Plaintiff's Decedent on membrane filters of 0.8 micrometer porosity mounted in an open-face filter holder) of such frequency and pattern as to represent with reasonable accuracy the levels of exposure of employees, including Plaintiff's Decedent.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 88:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 53:
Admit that you did not collect samples (from within the breathing zone of the Plaintiff's Decedent on membrane filters of 0.8 micrometer porosity mounted in an open-face filter holder) at intervals of 6 months or less.

RESPONSE:

Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 89:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 54:
Admit that you did not collect samples from areas of a work environment which were representative of the airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers, which may have reached the breathing zone of Plaintiff's Decedent during his employ.

RESPONSE:

Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 90:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 55:

Admit that you did not collect samples (from areas of work environment which were representative of the airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers, which may have reached the breathing zone of Plaintiff during his employ) of such frequency and pattern as to represent with reasonable accuracy the levels of exposure of the Plaintiff's Decedent.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 91:
If you deny the foregoing request, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 56:
Admit that you did not collect samples (from areas of work environment which were representative of the airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers, which may have reached the breathing zone of Plaintiff's Decedent during his employ) at intervals equal to or less than 6 months.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 92:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing

expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 57:
Admit that you did not provide and display caution signs at each location where Plaintiff's Decedent worked and which airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers may have exceeded of two fibers, longer than 5 micrometers, per cubic centimeter of air.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 93:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request

for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 58:
Admit that you did not provide and display cautions signs at each location where Plaintiff's Decedent worked in which airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers may have exceeded two fibers, longer than 5 micrometers, per cubic centimeter of air.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 94:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 59:

Admit that you did not post caution signs at such a distance from such a location so that an employee may read the signs and take necessary steps before entering the area marked by the signs.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 95:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 60:
Admit that you did not post caution signs at all approaches to areas containing concentrations of airborne asbestos fibers in excess of two fibers, longer than 5 micrometers, per cubic centimeter of air.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 96:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 61:
Admit that you did not maintain records of any personal monitoring of the breathing zone of Plaintiff's Decedent.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 97:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial, including but not limited to the records pertaining to such monitoring.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to

produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 62:
Admit that you did not maintain records of any decision you made to forego personal monitoring of the breathing zone of Plaintiff's Decedent.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 98:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable

certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 63:
Admit that you did not maintain records of any monitoring of every place of employment of Plaintiff's Decedent where asbestos fibers are released in such a way as to determine whether every employee's exposure to asbestos is below two fibers, longer than 5 micrometers, per cubic centimeter of air.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 99:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial, including but not limited to the records pertaining to such monitoring.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.,* 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex.

1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 64:
Admit that you did not maintain records of any decision to forego monitoring of every place of employment of Plaintiff's Decedent where asbestos fibers are released in such a way as to determine whether every employee's exposure to asbestos fibers is below two fibers, longer than 5 micrometers, per cubic centimeter of air.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 100:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 65:

Admit that you did not notify Plaintiff's Decedent in writing that he had been exposed to airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers in excess of two fibers, longer than 5 micrometers, per cubic centimeter of air as soon as was practicable but not later than 5 days of the finding.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 101:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial, including but not limited to such written notifications.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 66:
Admit that you did not provide to Plaintiff's Decedent or make available to him at your cost, medical examinations relative to exposure to asbestos.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 102:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 67:
Admit that you did not provide or make available to Plaintiff's Decedent, within 30 calendar days following his first employment in an occupation exposed to airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers, a comprehensive medical examination, which included, as a minimum, a chest roentgenogram (posterior-anterior 14 x 17 inches), a history to elicit symptomatology of respiratory disease and pulmonary function tests to include forced vital capacity (FVC) and forced expiratory volume at 1 second.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 103:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 68:
Admit that you did not provide, or make available to Plaintiff's Decedent, comprehensive medical examinations on at least an annual basis that included, as a minimum, a chest roentgenogram (posterior-anterior 14 x 17 inches), a history to elicit etiology of respiratory disease and pulmonary function tests to include forced vital capacity (FVC) and forced expiratory volume at 1 second.

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 104:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing

expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 69:
Admit that you did not provide, or make available, within 30 calendar days before or after the termination of Plaintiff's Decedent's employment, a comprehensive medical examination which included, as a minimum, a chest roentgenogram (posterior-anterior 14 x 17 inches), a history to elicit symptomatology of respiratory disease, and pulmonary function tests to include forced vital capacity (FVC) and forced expiratory volume at 1 second ($FEV_{1.0}$).

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 105:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex.

1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 70:
Admit that you did not maintain and retain for at least 20 years complete and accurate records of all comprehensive medical examinations of Plaintiff's Decedent which included, as a minimum, a chest roentgenogram (posterior-anterior 14 x 17 inches), a history to elicit symptomatology of respiratory disease, and pulmonary function tests to include forced vital capacity (FVC) and forced expiratory volume at 1 second ($FEV_{1.0}$).

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 106:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial, including but not limited to the records of the examinations.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye,* 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.,* 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez,* 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin,* 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence,* 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex.

1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 71:
Admit that you did not maintain and retain for at least 20 years complete and accurate records of your decisions to forego providing or making available to Plaintiff's Decedent comprehensive medical examinations of Plaintiff which included, as a minimum, a chest roentgenogram (posterior-anterior 14 x 17 inches), a history to elicit symptomatology of respiratory disease, and pulmonary function tests to include forced vital capacity (FVC) and forced expiratory volume at 1 second ($FEV_{1.0}$)

RESPONSE:
Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause. Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 107:
If you deny the foregoing request, in whole or in part, produce all documents supporting your denial.

RESPONSE:
Defendant objects to this request for production in that it is so broad on its face that it clearly requires production of irrelevant documents. *Brad Caraway & Associates, Inc. v. Moye*, 724 S.W.2d 892 (Tex. App.--Texarkana 1987, no writ). Defendant objects to Plaintiff's wholesale request to produce written documents. The Rules permit discovery of documents "that constitute or contain matters relevant to the subject matter of the action." Rule 192.3(b). The Rule does not permit a general inspection of an adversary's records, as this constitutes nothing more than a fishing expedition. Plaintiff's request is too general and comprehensive. What the Plaintiff is seeking is authorization to conduct a general search of Defendant's files, and this is not permitted under the Rules. *Bryan v. General Elec. Credit Corp.*, 553 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1981, no writ). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad and is not sufficiently particular in its description to enable Defendant to determine with reasonable certainty what it is being called upon to produce. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominguez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Defendant objects to this request for production in that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and is not limited in time period designation as to be relevant or material to the subject matter of the pending action. *Loftin v. Martin*, 776 S.W.2d 145, 148 (Tex. 1989); *General Motors v. Lawrence*, 651 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. 1983); *Texaco, Inc. v. Dominquez*, 812 S.W.2d 451, 454 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 1991, orig. proceeding). Subject to the general and specific objections herein, Defendant references Plaintiff to the verified answer on file in this cause.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul E. Hanson
State Bar No. 08934410
Donald W. Shelton, II
State Bar No. 50511731
KIRKLEY SCHMIDT & COTTEN, L.L.P.
2700 City Center II
301 Commerce Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-4127
Telephone: (817) 338-4500
Facsimile: (817) 338-4599

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document, by and through her counsel of record, Holly J. W. Huart, Baron & Budd, The Centrum, 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Ste. 1100, Dallas, Texas 75219 was forwarded via Hand Delivery, to her counsel, and that all other counsel of record were notified of its mailing on the 6th day of April, 2001.

Paul E. Hanson