

[illegible]

BRAZORIA COUNTY, TEXAS

239th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Defendants.

COMES NOW DaimlerChrysler Corporation (formerly known as Chrysler Corporation), one of the Defendants in the above-styled and numbered cause (hereinafter “Chrysler” or “Defendant”), and submits its Second Supplemental Objections and Answers to Plaintiffs’ First [sic] Set of Interrogatories. This set of interrogatories is actually the second set served. In the event that any objections are overruled, Defendant Chrysler requests an extension of time within which to respond to each particular request.

INTERROGATORY NO. 19: Has your company, or its predecessors or subsidiaries, ever directly advised any contractor or customer to whom you sell your products containing asbestos of threshold limit values (TLV) for exposure to asbestos dust recommended by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienist?

If so, please state:

- (a) The date or dates that you so advised such contractor;
- (b) The manner in which you advised such contractor;
- (c) The name of each contractor; and
- (d) Identify all persons with knowledge of such communication.

ANSWER: Chrysler understands that Plaintiffs allege they were exposed to asbestos from automotive friction products and Chrysler's response to this interrogatory is limited to those products. Chrysler objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad, unduly burdensome and not reasonably limited in time or scope and seeks information outside the scope of permissible discovery. Chrysler objects to this interrogatory to the extent it argues that Chrysler had a duty to advise any contractor or customer of TLVs recommended by the ACGIH. Plaintiff's employer(s) were in the best position to regulate overall workplace health and safety concerns and advise regarding TLVs. Subject to said objections and without waiving same, Chrysler is not aware of any documents responsive to this Interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 20: Identify anyone (including, but not limited to, medical doctors, PhD's, industrial hygienists, risk managers, outside consultants, governmental employees and toxicologists) with whom the defendant consulted or who furnished any information to the defendant about respiratory protection, asbestos, asbestos containing products, asbestosis,

mesothelioma, cancer or any respiratory diseases associated with exposure to asbestos or silica dust or fibers and identify any such person who was employed by the defendant to render consultation or advice on these subjects.

ANSWER: Chrysler objects to Interrogatory No. 20 for the reason that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous and is unlimited in scope or in time and seeks information which is outside the scope of permissible discovery and the attorney-client and attorney work product privilege. It seeks irrelevant information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further objecting, this interrogatory seeks to review Chrysler's attorney work product and trial preparation, and information privileged from discovery under the consulting expert and party communications privileges. Subject to said objections, and without waiving same, Chrysler will identify those persons with knowledge of relevant facts pursuant to the Court's scheduling order.

INTERROGATORY NO. 21: Has defendant banned or stopped using asbestos containing products in its operations, work places, buildings, vessels, or areas where it employed people in the United States? If so, state the date when the defendant stopped using or banned asbestos containing products, the person or persons authorizing the stoppage or banning, and the reason why the use of such products was discontinued or banned.

ANSWER: Chrysler understands that Plaintiffs allege they were exposed to asbestos from automotive friction products and Chrysler's response to this interrogatory is limited to those products. Chrysler objects to this Interrogatory as it is overly broad, vague, ambiguous and overly burdensome. Objecting further, this Interrogatory seeks irrelevant information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to said objections and without waiving same, see response and objections to Interrogatory No. 2.