

September 3, 1941.

Bankers Indemnity Insurance Co.,
Newark,
New Jersey.

Attention: Mr. E. W. Kalbach,
Compensation Claim Department

Re: 4-C-4677 [REDACTED] vs. McLaren
Auto Supply - Accident 9/4/40

Dear Mr. Kalbach:

In accordance with your letter of August 23, I have gone over the file on the case indicated above and am returning it to you herewith.

As I interpret the present situation, there is some difficulty of arriving at the diagnosis in that the final diagnosis arrived at at the Hahnemann Hospital has been dis-
countenanced by Mr. [REDACTED] recovery. It still remains to be seen, however, whether this recovery is complete, or what nervous system damage will be revealed by Dr. Steinhilber's further examination. I shall be very much interested in knowing the outcome of Dr. Steinhilber's observation. I would not attempt to suggest a diagnosis in the absence of these necessary data.

Quite apart from arriving at a satisfactory diagnosis, it is quite apparent that no evidence has been adduced that would justify even suspicion that this man had lead poisoning. The clinical picture of the onset and course of the illness is typical, indeed, of lead intoxication, and the absence of any evidence of lead exposure is so complete as to make the diagnosis of lead poisoning in this case a very bizarre conclusion. Statements have been made in the documents which have been supplied to the effect that exposure to leaded gasoline is not sufficient to cause lead poisoning. No doubt, attempts could be made by counsel for the plaintiff to indicate that Mr. [REDACTED] is especially susceptible to lead. In this connection, it is worth while to know that no cases of lead poisoning have ever been reported among the tens of thousands of filling station attendants and other handlers of leaded gasoline. It is still

BAN

more pertinent and significant to realize that all attempts to find evidence of lead absorption among these men have been consistently unsuccessful. All of the available evidence tends to show that there is no occupational lead exposure associated with the handling of leaded gasoline. There is no evidence whatever of an opposed type. Consequently, it would seem that the entire basis for the suspicion of lead intoxication in this case was based on reasoning which has clearly been demonstrated to be fallacious.

The statements above are probably no news to you, but I have thought it well to make them in order that there may be nothing equivocal in my opinion concerning this case.

I should be glad to be of any assistance to you that is possible in connection with this case, but I have numerous engagements during the next several weeks and would appreciate having information from you as to what I can do further. Much will depend here, I believe, upon the opinion and the nature of the testimony of Dr. Steinhilber.

Very truly yours,

Robert A. Kehoe, M. D.

RAK ef

KE 0016351