ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14: Abex objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous and lacks particularity in that the term "ever consider the resultant effect" is undefined. Abex further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it assumes facts not established. Because the asbestos in Abex's asbestos-containing automotive friction products was resin-bonded and encapsulated, it did not create or contribute to a health hazard.

15. Have you ever imposed or considered any restriction or limitation on the intended use, frequency of use and/or likely use of the asbestos products referred to in Answer No. 7, or sold to any other defendant? If so, state separately for each product:

a. the verbatim content of each limitation indicating which product is applied to;

b. the date it was first imposed;

c. the reason for imposing the restriction or limitations;

d. if the reason for the restriction is stated in any document, identify each document by date, author, title and state where it is presently located;

e. the person responsible for imposing the restriction or limitation;

f. if the limitation or restriction was communicated to purchases of the product, state how this was communicated, and if in writing, identify the communications and its location; and

g. if not imposed, state why not.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15: Abex objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous and lacks particularity as to what information is requested. Subjects to and without waiving this objection and to the extent Abex understands this interrogatory, no.