

FILE NAME: Colgate (COL)

DATE: 2013 July 9

DOC#: COL025

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Legal - Deposition of Arthur M. Langer, PhD

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY

IN RE: BALTIMORE CITY *
ASBESTOS LITIGATION

* * * *

HAROLD GOLDSMITH, et al., * July 9, 2013

Plaintiffs * Trial Group

v. * Cons. Case No.

ACandS, INC., et al., * 24X11000783

Defendants *

* * * *

Cases Affected:

Joyce Barlow * 24X11000383

Kristi Lescalleet * 24X09000418

Clara Mosko * 24X11000514

Marguerite Wolf * 24X11000486

* * * *

THE DEPOSITION OF ARTHUR M. LANGER, PhD

FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 2013

NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK 10022

Reported By: Barbara J. Evans

EVANS REPORTING SERVICE
The Munsey Building, Suite 705
Seven North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
410.727.7100 800.256.8410

Arthur M. Langer, Ph.D. - 6/14/2013
Harold Goldsmith v. ACandS, Inc.

Page 2	Page 4
1 APPEARANCES 2 3 STEVEN SMITH, ESQUIRE 4 Law Offices of Peter Angelos, PC 5 100 North Charles Street, Suite 2200 6 Baltimore, Maryland 21201 7 410 649 2000 8 Ssmith@lawpga.com 9 On Behalf of the Plaintiffs 10 11 J.D. HORTON, ESQUIRE 12 MORGAN TOVEY, ESQUIRE 13 PAUL ROSENTHAL, ESQUIRE 14 KEITH FORST, ESQUIRE 15 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP 16 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor 17 New York, New York 10010 18 212 849.7000 19 Jdhorton@quinnemanuel.com 20 morgantovey@quinnemanuel.com 21 paulrosenthal@quinnemanuel.com 22 keithforst@quinnemanuel.com 23 On Behalf of the Defendant 24 Colgate-Palmolive Co. 25 26 JEANNIE KAUFFMAN, ESQUIRE 27 (Via Telephone) 28 Segal McCambridge Singer & Mahoney 29 One North Charles Street, Suite 2500 30 Baltimore, Maryland 21201 31 410.864.1210 32 jkauffman@smsm.com 33 On Behalf of the Defendant 34 Colgate-Palmolive Co 35	1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED 2 3 JAMES T. SMITH, ESQUIRE 4 (Via Telephone) 5 Bodie, Dohna, Hobbs, Friddell & 6 Grenzer, P.C. 7 21 Susquehanna Avenue 8 Towson, Maryland 21204 9 410 823 1250 10 jtsmith@bodie-law.com 11 On Behalf of Defendant E L 12 Stebbing & Co., Inc. (Third Party in 13 Wolf Case) 14 15 ANNE WILCOX LEWIS, ESQUIRE 16 (Via Telephone) 17 Kelley Jasons McGowan Spinelli 18 Hanna & Reber, LLP 19 Two Liberty Place, Suite 1900 20 50 South 16th Street 21 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102 22 215.854.0658 23 awlewis@kjmsh.com 24 On Behalf of the Defendant Walter E 25 Campbell Company, Inc. 26 27 Also Present: Peter McLaughlin, Quinn Emanuel 28 Summer Associate 29 30 31 32
Page 3	Page 5
1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED 2 3 MEGAN McCORMICK, ESQUIRE 4 (Via Telephone) 5 O'Connell Tivn Miller & Burns, LLC 6 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 2300 7 Chicago, Illinois 60603 8 312 256 8800 9 Mmccormick@otmblaw.com 10 On Behalf of the Defendant John 11 Crane, Inc 12 13 POLLEEN O'BRIEN, ESQUIRE 14 (Via Telephone) 15 Semmes, Bowen & Semmes 16 25 South Charles Street, Suite 1400 17 Baltimore, Maryland 21201 18 410 576.4756 19 Pobrien@semmes.com 20 On Behalf of the Defendants 21 Manitowac Cranes and Noland Company 22 23 MARIA JUAMBELTZ, ESQUIRE 24 (Via Telephone) 25 MacDonald Law Group, LLC 26 11720 Beltsville Drive 27 Suite 550 28 Beltsville, Maryland 20795 29 301 220 3481 30 lgaba@macdonaldlawgroup.com 31 On Behalf of Defendants, Craft Co., 32 Schneider Electric Company, and 33 Krafft-Murphy, a dissolved Delaware 34 Corporation 35	1 DEPOSITION OF ARTHUR M. LANGER, PhD 2 The Deposition of Arthur M. Langer, 3 PhD, Expert Witness, taken by the Plaintiffs 4 and reported by Barbara J. Evans, Court 5 Reporter and Notary Public, at the law offices 6 of Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, 7 511 Madison Avenue, 25th Floor, New York, New 8 York 10022, on June 14, 2013, commencing at 9 10:00 a.m. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 EVANS REPORTING SERVICE 20 The Munsey Building, Suite 705 21 Seven North Calvert Street 22 Baltimore, Maryland 21202 23 410.727.7100 800.256.8410 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32

Page 174	Page 176
1 A No. You wouldn't use that technique. 2 Q Would you also agree with me that in 3 none of the standard methodologies is SEM, 4 scanning electron microscopy, called for? 5 MR. HORTON: Object to form. 6 THE WITNESS: Well you could use 7 scanning electron microscopy with the proper 8 magnifications and resolution. 9 BY MR. SMITH: 10 Q But you would agree with me that it 11 is not referenced in NIOSH 7402, Yamate, AHERA? 12 Those are all TEM-based analyses, correct? 13 MR. HORTON: Object to form. 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. On the basis of 15 those regulatory agencies, the instrument of 16 choice is a transmission electron microscope. 17 Q So obviously you would agree then if 18 an investigator used SEM or XRD to identify 19 particles -- the presence or absence of 20 asbestos in those particles -- that that would 21 be a deviation from the standard methodologies	1 A Because Number 8 agreed with Number 8 2 in our assays. 3 MR. HORTON: Do you want to identify 4 it? 5 MR. SMITH: Yes. 6 MR. HORTON: Identify the document, 7 Dr. Langer, just the particular document. 8 THE WITNESS: This is Bob Nolan's 9 draft of the specimens that he recovered from 10 storage. 11 MR. SMITH: All right. Maybe we 12 should mark that one as a separate deposition 13 exhibit which will be the next number, 8. 14 (Langer Deposition Number 8 marked 15 for identification.) 16 THE WITNESS: This is marked as 17 Number 2. 18 BY MR. SMITH: 19 Q But since I'm going to question you 20 about the individual ones in there we will make 21 a separate copy for Number 8.
Page 175	Page 177
1 published by the government, in Yamate and 2 AHERA and NIOSH 7402? 3 MR. HORTON: Object to form, 4 incomplete hypothetical, assumes facts. 5 THE WITNESS: It would not conform 6 with the instrumental requirements. 7 MR. SMITH: All right. That's all 8 the questions I have now. 9 And when we come back from lunch I 10 will have a few more. 11 Thank you, Dr. Langer. 12 (Luncheon recess -- 1:15 p.m.) 13 (After recess -- 2:15 p.m.) 14 BY MR. SMITH: 15 Q I want to hand you, Dr. Langer, if I 16 could what has been marked as Exhibit 2 and 17 there is Post-its on two different pages. 18 (Document tendered to witness.) 19 A Yes. 20 Q Why did you highlight the talcum 21 products that you did on that page?	1 A No problem. 2 MR. HORTON: So part of Exhibit 2 and 3 then a separate one is Exhibit 8? 4 MR. SMITH: Correct. 5 BY MR. SMITH: 6 Q Is there any significance, 7 Dr. Langer, to the fact that you did not 8 highlight the two Cashmere Bouquet samples, 9 Number 23 and 24, on this Exhibit 8? 10 A Because 23 and 24 were not numbers 11 found in -- were not numbers of products noted 12 in the study. 13 Q Okay. 14 A In the study the products range from 15 Number 1 to Number 21. 16 Q Referring to the 1976 paper? 17 A Yes, yes. 18 MR. SMITH: Okay. We will get to 19 that in a minute. 20 Let's mark this next document I am 21 handing you as the next Exhibit Number 9.

Page 178	Page 180
1 (Langer Deposition Exhibit Number 9 2 marked for identification.) 3 (Document tendered to witness.) 4 BY MR. SMITH: 5 Q Will you please identify that 6 document for me. 7 (document tendered to witness.) 8 A This is a listing of the talcs which 9 were examined which were shown to contain 10 anthophyllite and/or tremolite. 11 Q During your analysis for the 1976 12 paper? 13 A Yes. 14 Q And what do those numbers represent? 15 MR. HORTON: Object to form. 16 THE WITNESS: The study numbers 17 correspond to the numbers in the study. It is 18 a strange redundancy but it is so. 19 BY MR. SMITH: 20 Q I am sorry. Is Cashmere Bouquet 21 listed Number One?	1 years ago. 2 Q Roughly during the analyses of the 3 talcum powder products you analyzed for the 4 1976 paper? 5 MR. HORTON: Object to form, 6 mischaracterizes testimony. 7 Q Is that fair? 8 A This represents the assays conducted 9 at that time on those samples, yes. 10 Q Okay. And the next document that you 11 have in front of you, I think we established 12 earlier the handwritten marginalia is yours? 13 A On the biology of talc, yes. 14 Q Okay. 15 A Consumer talcums. 16 Q Yes. Let's read this and we will 17 make that a separate exhibit as well please. 18 That will be the next number, 10. 19 A I have a better idea. This is the 20 document -- I guess you can do this, but the 21 document which is the reprint has my highlights
Page 179	Page 181
1 A Yes. 2 Q So if I go to the 1976 paper for 3 Sample Number One would that equate? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Okay. And similarly, weight by 6 percentage, what did you report at that time? 7 MR. HORTON: Object to form. 8 THE WITNESS: We reported 20 percent 9 fiber content by weight of anthophyllite and 10 tremolite. 11 Q And was that the highest of the 12 cosmetic talcum powder samples that you tested 13 at the time? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Was this document generated at the 16 time in the 1970s? 17 A I am not certain of the time that 18 that list was generated but it was in the past 19 and not a current document. 20 Q Okay. 21 A In the past meaning more than 20	1 and has marginalia. 2 Q I am sorry. I want that one. 3 A You want that one. That is fine. 4 Can we Xerox this before we leave because I 5 would like my comments just to have them. 6 MR. SMITH: Of course. 7 MR. HORTON: Yes. 8 THE WITNESS: Good. Done. 9 MR. SMITH: So that will be 10 Deposition Exhibit Number 10. 11 (Langer Deposition Exhibit Number 10 12 marked for identification.) 13 BY MR. SMITH: 14 Q All right. 15 A Please. 16 Q If I could ask you some general 17 questions, you can just put that aside. If we 18 get to it, we will get to it. 19 Prior to today did counsel for 20 Colgate provide to you any documents to review 21 that reflect at the time asbestos in Cashmere