

1 THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of significant
2 alternative exposure.

3 BY MR. RUCKDESCHEL:

4 Q And the adversarial process of these lawsuits
5 is such that in the Hicks case this previously
6 undisclosed exposure was revealed prior to trial?

7 MR. LANKFORD: Objection, -- what is the
8 question if I could have it read back?

9 JUDGE KLINE: You want to repeat the question?

10 BY MR. RUCKDESCHEL:

11 Q Sure. I'll repeat it. In the Hicks case, the
12 adversarial process and the discovery process of the
13 litigation revealed this previously unknown crocidolite
14 exposure before trial, correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And in fact the information that you receive
17 in cases like this case, and I've read your report, and
18 it lists all the information that you've gotten, is
19 more comprehensive than the information that, for
20 example, Ms. Teta had in her study from the 1980s
21 regarding the subjects of that study?

22 A It's an apples-and-oranges comparison. I can't
23 answer your question that way.

24 MR. RUCKDESCHEL: Okay. Let's take our lunch
25 break.