

File Room	Atty	MTV	Other
MTA	Para	7	T/S/AD
BRAYTON & ASSOCIATES			

APR 17, 1991

RECEIVED	
To File	
Class	3
B/D/S	1st
WC/DEF	

3570

SEDGWICK, DETERT, MORAN & ARNOLD
ROGER W. SLEIGHT
MICHAEL G. ORNSTIL
STEVEN X. SCHWENK
One Embarcadero Center, 16th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3765
Telephone: (415) 781-7900

Attorneys for Defendant
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

GALAN STEGEMAN,	)	NO. 924565
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	DEFENDANT GENERAL ELECTRIC
	)	COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO
v.	)	<u>PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES</u>
	)	
ABEX CORPORATION, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT
GE-41

PROPOUNDING PARTY : Plaintiff GALAN STEGEMAN
RESPONDING PARTY : Defendant GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
SET NUMBER : ONE

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY ("GE") responds to plaintiffs
first set of interrogatories as follows:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

The General Objections set forth below are applicable
to the interrogatories in their entirety as well as to each
individual interrogatory. By this reference, GE incorporates
each General Objection into its objections to the individual

1 interrogatories.

2 1. GE objects to the interrogatories on the ground
3 that they seeks information that is irrelevant and not reasonably
4 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The
5 information sought pursuant to the interrogatories principally
6 relates either to GE's asbestos-containing electrical cable or to
7 asbestos-containing products in general.

8 Although plaintiff, in both his complaint and
9 interrogatory answers, identifies numerous asbestos-containing
10 products to which he claims he was exposed, he has failed to
11 specifically identify a single GE-manufactured
12 asbestos-containing product. In fact, in his interrogatory
13 answers, plaintiff has not claimed exposure to
14 asbestos-containing electrical cable. He has only claimed
15 exposure to asbestos-containing electrical wire. Thus, any
16 information relating to asbestos-containing electrical cable,
17 circuit breakers, control boxes, switchboard and motors is
18 irrelevant.

19 2. GE objects to the interrogatories on the grounds
20 that they are overbroad and unduly burdensome and oppressive. As
21 noted above, plaintiff has failed to identify a single
22 asbestos-containing product manufactured by GE to which he was
23 exposed and to require GE to undertake an extensive and
24 exhaustive search for information under such circumstances is an
25 abuse of the discovery process.

26 3. GE is a large, decentralized corporation whose

1 product and service business undergo constant change and growth.
2 Due to its size and the fact that it has facilities in numerous
3 states and foreign countries, there is no central repository for
4 information of the type sought by way of the instant
5 interrogatories. Due to the nature of the interrogatories, the
6 only way to attempt to answer them is to review documents and
7 collate the information contained in said documents. As
8 previously explained to plaintiff's counsel, GE no longer has or
9 never had many of the documents required to answer these
10 interrogatories. Moreover, in light of the breadth of
11 plaintiff's inquiries and the fact that information is sought
12 dating back to 1950, it is essentially impossible for defendant
13 to conduct a complete search for the information sought.
14 Additionally, even a limited search will be extremely
15 time-consuming and costly.

16 4. GE no longer manufactures wire and cable and its
17 wire and cable operations ceased years ago. This fact, coupled
18 with the fact that old documents that may have been discarded,
19 lost or misplaced are needed to respond to these interrogatories,
20 makes it virtually impossible to locate and provide the
21 information requested.

22 5. GE objects to these interrogatories on the ground
23 that they assume the truth of matters not established and seek
24 information or materials which have been gathered or prepared in
25 anticipation of litigation or which are otherwise subject to the
26 attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product privilege.

1 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

2 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
3 is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "heat and flame
4 resistant cable." GE further objects to this interrogatory on
5 the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and
6 oppressive and seeks information that is irrelevant and not
7 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
8 evidence insofar as absolutely no geographic limitations are
9 placed on the scope of the inquiry and absolutely no evidence
10 exists that plaintiff's decedent worked with GE's
11 asbestos-containing cable. In fact, in plaintiff's interrogatory
12 answers, he lists numerous asbestos-containing products to which
13 he may have been exposed. Asbestos-containing cable is not on
14 plaintiff's list.

15 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving
16 said objections, GE is unable to determine how much
17 asbestos-containing cable it sold, if any, to be provided to the
18 shipyards in San Francisco at which plaintiff worked, or how much
19 asbestos-containing cable it sold to the U.S. Government during
20 the relevant time period.

21 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

22 See Response to Interrogatory No. 1, above.

23 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

24 See Response to Interrogatory No. 1, above.

25 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

26 See Response to Interrogatory No. 1, above.

1 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

2 See Response to Interrogatory No. 1, above.

3 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

4 See Response to Interrogatory No. 1, above.

5 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

6 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
7 is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase
8 "asbestos-containing cable other than heat and flame resistant
9 cable." All asbestos-containing cable is resistant to heat and
10 flame to a degree and thus, this interrogatory is
11 unintelligible. GE further objects to this interrogatory on the
12 grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive
13 and seeks information that is irrelevant and not reasonably
14 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence as
15 absolutely no geographic limitations are placed on the scope of
16 the inquiry and absolutely no evidence exists that plaintiff
17 worked with GE asbestos-containing cable. In fact, in
18 plaintiff's interrogatory answers, he lists numerous
19 asbestos-containing products to which he was allegedly exposed.
20 Asbestos-containing cable is not on plaintiff's list.

21 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving
22 said objections, GE is unable to determine the amount of
23 asbestos-containing cable, if any, it sold to be provided to the
24 shipyards in which plaintiff's decedent worked or sold to the
25 U.S. Government during the relevant time period.

26 ///

1 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

2 See Response to Interrogatory No. 7, above.

3 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9:

4 See Response to Interrogatory No. 7, above.

5 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:

6 GE objects to this interrogatory as vague and ambiguous
7 with respect to the term "promoted." GE further objects to this
8 interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is
9 irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery
10 of admissible evidence.

11 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving
12 said objections, GE has not been able to locate any records that
13 reflect the existence, if any, of a California sales office that
14 sold heat and flame resistant cable during the relevant time
15 period.

16 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11:

17 See Response to Interrogatory No. 10, above.

18 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12:

19 See Response to Interrogatory No. 10, above.

20 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13:

21 See Response to Interrogatory No. 10, above. GE
22 further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks
23 privileged and confidential information.

24 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14:

25 See Response to Interrogatory Nos. 10 and 13, above.

26 ///

1 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15:

2 See Response to Interrogatory Nos. 10 and 13, above.

3 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 16:

4 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
5 seeks information that is irrelevant and not reasonably
6 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. See
7 Response to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 10, above.

8 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving
9 said objections, GE has not been able to locate documents which
10 reflect the existence of California distributors of GE
11 asbestos-containing heat and flame resistant cable, if any,
12 during the period January 1, 1950 to December 31, 1959.

13 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17:

14 See Response to Interrogatory No. 16, above.

15 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving
16 said objections, Gibson Supply Co. may have been a distributor of
17 GE asbestos-containing heat and flame resistant cable during the
18 period January 1, 1960 to December 31, 1969.

19 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 18:

20 See Response to Interrogatory No. 16, above.

21 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving
22 said objections, Graybar Oakland, Graybar San Jose, Graybar San
23 Francisco and Phillips and Ober may have been distributors of GE
24 asbestos-containing wire and cable during the period January 1,
25 1970 to December 31, 1979.

26 ///

1 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 19:

2 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
3 seeks information that is confidential and privileged.

4 Notwithstanding said objections and without waiving said
5 objections, GE has been unable to locate any records indicating
6 who held the position of Vice President, Marketing, of the Wire
7 and Cable Division as of December 31, 1969.

8 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 20:

9 See Response to Interrogatory No. 19, above.

10 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving said
11 objections, GE has been unable to locate any records indicating
12 who held the position of Vice President, Marketing, of the Wire
13 and Cable Division as of December 31, 1979.

14 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 21:

15 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
16 is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive,
17 and seeks information that is irrelevant and not reasonably
18 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

19 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving said
20 objections, GE has not been able to locate any sales records
21 relating to the shipyards in which plaintiff worked during the
22 relevant time period.

23 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 22:

24 See Response to Interrogatory No. 21, above. GE has no
25 information as to whether any such records ever existed or if
26 they did exist at some point in time, whether they were

1 subsequently lost, misplaced or discarded.

2 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 23:

3 See Response to Interrogatory No. 21, above.

4 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 24:

5 See Response to Interrogatory No. 22, above.

6 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 25:

7 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
8 is vague and ambiguous, overbroad and seeks information that is
9 irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery
10 of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding said objections, and
11 without waiving said objections, GE has not been able to locate
12 any photographs and/or catalog representations depicting the type
13 of asbestos-containing cable suitable for shipboard use, if any,
14 that was used at the shipyards at which plaintiff worked during
15 the relevant time period. GE's investigation is continuing. It
16 should be noted that plaintiff has not identified any GE cable
17 that plaintiff worked with and excluded cable from the list of
18 asbestos-containing products to which he was allegedly exposed.

19 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 26:

20 See Response to Interrogatory No. 25, above.

21 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 27:

22 See Response to Interrogatory No. 25, above.

23 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 28:

24 See Response to Interrogatory No. 25, above.

25 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 29:

26 See Response to Interrogatory No. 25, above.

1 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 30:

2 See Response to Interrogatory No. 25, above.

3 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 31:

4 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
5 is overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive, and seeks
6 information that is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to
7 lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff has not
8 identified any GE cable that he was exposed to and failed to
9 include cable on his list of asbestos-containing products to
10 which he was allegedly exposed. Unless and until an
11 identification is made, GE is unable to respond to this
12 interrogatory.

13 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 32:

14 See Response to Interrogatory No. 31, above.

15 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 33:

16 See Response to Interrogatory No. 31, above.

17 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 34:

18 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
19 is vague, ambiguous and unintelligible. GE further objects to
20 this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad and seeks
21 information that is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to
22 lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. GE further objects
23 to this interrogatory insofar as it assumes facts not in
24 evidence. Unless and until plaintiff identifies what type of GE
25 cable, if any, he was exposed to, GE cannot respond to this
26 interrogatory. GE notes, however, that many of its cable

1 products were built to government specifications which are part
2 of the public record and equally available to plaintiff.

3 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 35:

4 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
5 is overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive, and seeks
6 information that is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to
7 lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. GE further objects
8 to this interrogatory insofar as it assumes facts not in
9 evidence. Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving
10 said objections, GE has not been able to locate any records
11 reflecting from whom it purchased asbestos from for use in GE's
12 asbestos-containing heat and flame resistant cable during the
13 relevant time period. GE's investigation is continuing.

14 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 36:

15 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
16 is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase
17 "asbestos-containing material" and is unintelligible. See
18 Response to Interrogatory No. 35, above.

19 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 37:

20 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
21 is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive,
22 harassing, seeks information that is irrelevant and not
23 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
24 evidence, and seeks information that is equally available to
25 plaintiff.

26 ///

1 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 38:

2 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
3 is overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive, and seeks
4 information that is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to
5 lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Unless and until
6 plaintiff specifies which GE asbestos-containing cable, if any,
7 he was exposed to, GE is unable to respond to this interrogatory.

8 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 39:

9 See Response to Interrogatory No. 38, above.

10 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 40:

11 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
12 seeks information that is irrelevant and not reasonably
13 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. GE
14 further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
15 assumes facts not in evidence. Plaintiff has not claimed that he
16 was exposed to asbestos contained in a GE circuit breaker and in
17 fact, has excluded circuit breakers from the list of
18 asbestos-containing products to which he was allegedly exposed.

19 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 41:

20 See Response to Interrogatory No. 40, above, which is
21 equally applicable to inquiries regarding switchboards.

22 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 42:

23 See Response to Interrogatory No. 40, above, which is
24 equally applicable to inquiries regarding control boxes.

25 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 43:

26 See Response to Interrogatory No. 40, above, which is

1 equally applicable to inquiries regarding motors.

2 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 44:

3 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
4 seeks information that is irrelevant and not reasonably
5 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
6 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving said
7 objections, GE believes it ceased the manufacture of
8 asbestos-containing heat and flame resistant Navy cable in 1962.
9 GE's investigation is continuing.

10 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 45:

11 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
12 is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "heat and flame
13 resistant cable" and seeks information that is irrelevant and not
14 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
15 evidence.

16 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 46:

17 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
18 is overbroad as to time and assumes facts not in evidence.
19 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving said
20 objections, GE has no reports or studies concluding that its
21 asbestos-containing cable posed any health dangers.

22 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 47:

23 See Response to Interrogatory No. 46, above.

24 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 48:

25 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
26 is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and seeks information that is

1 irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery
2 of admissible evidence. GE further objects to this interrogatory
3 on the ground that it assumes facts not in evidence and is
4 misleading in that it assumes that health hazards from exposure
5 to GE wire and cable products were known or should have been
6 known prior to 1979.

7 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving
8 said objections, GE has not been able to locate any documents
9 relating to health hazards caused by exposure to asbestos in GE
10 wire and cable products. Further, GE has not been able to locate
11 any documents reflecting when GE, as a corporate entity, first
12 learned that health hazards may result from the inhalation of
13 asbestos fibers.

14 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 49:

15 GE objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it
16 is misleading as it assumes facts not in evidence and is
17 misleading in that it assumes that health hazards from exposure
18 to GE wire and cable products were known or should have been
19 known prior to 1979.

20 GE refers plaintiff to its response to the "most
21 knowledgeable employee" deposition notices served by the Brayton
22 office in the Denison v. Abex case and subsequent correspondence
23 from GE's counsel to the Brayton office indicating the lack of
24 any such witness.

25 ///

26 ///

1 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 50:

2 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
3 seeks information that is irrelevant and not reasonably
4 calculated to the discovery of admissible evidence. GE further
5 objects to this interrogatory insofar as it assumes facts not in
6 evidence. Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving
7 said objections, GE has not been able to locate any studies
8 concerning the dangers posed to electricians using any type of GE
9 cable.

10 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 51:

11 See Response to Interrogatory Nos. 46 and 50, above.

12 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 52:

13 See Response to Interrogatory Nos. 46 and 50, above.

14 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 53:

15 See Response to Interrogatory Nos. 46 and 50, above.

16 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 54:

17 See Response to Interrogatory Nos. 46 and 50, above.

18 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 55:

19 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
20 is vague and ambiguous with respect to the term "varnished."
21 Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving said
22 objections, GE's Type AA wire was saturated and finished with a
23 flame resistant compound.

24 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 56:

25 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
26 is vague and ambiguous, assumes facts not in evidence and seeks

1 information that is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to
2 lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 57:

4 See Response to Interrogatory No. 56, above.

5 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 58:

6 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
7 is overbroad and seeks information that is irrelevant and not
8 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
9 evidence. GE further objects to this interrogatory on the
10 grounds that it seeks information equally available to
11 plaintiff. Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving
12 said objections, GE believes that it may have had cable products
13 of one specification or another on the Qualified Products List
14 during plaintiff's years of employment. See Response to
15 Interrogatory No. 44, however.

16 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 59:

17 See Response to Interrogatory No. 58, above.

18 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 60:

19 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
20 is vague and ambiguous, overbroad and seeks information that is
21 irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery
22 of admissible evidence. As phrased, GE is unable to respond to
23 this interrogatory.

24 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 61:

25 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
26 is overbroad and seeks information that is irrelevant and not

1 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
2 evidence. Notwithstanding said objections, and without waiving
3 said objections, GE believes all of its asbestos-containing wire
4 and cable products contained chrysotile fiber in which all
5 impurities were removed.

6 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 62:

7 See Response to Interrogatory Nos. 55 and 61, above.

8 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 63:

9 GE objects to this interrogatory as vague and
10 ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive, and seeks
11 information that is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to
12 lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding
13 said objections, and without waiving said objections, GE believes
14 all of its cable suitable for shipyard use was saturated.

15 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 64:

16 GE objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it
17 seeks information which is privileged and confidential.

18 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 65:

19 See Response to Interrogatory No. 64, above.

20 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 66:

21 See Response to Interrogatory No. 64, above.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

1 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 67:

2 See Response to Interrogatory No. 64, above.

3 Dated: April 15, 1991.

4 SEDGWICK, DETERT, MORAN & ARNOLD

5
6 By Michael G. Ornstil

7 Michael G. Ornstil
8 Attorneys for Defendant
9 GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

TITLE: GALAN STEGEMAN v. ABEX CORP., et al.

NO.: 924565 COURT: SUPERIOR COUNTY: SAN FRANCISCO

I am over 18 years of age and am not a party to the within entitled action. I am employed at and my business address is One Embarcadero Center, 16th Floor, San Francisco, California 94111-3765. On this date, I served the following document(s):

DEFENDANT GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S

INTERROGATORIES

by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid in the United States mail at San Francisco, California, addressed as shown below.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 16th day of April, 1991, at San Francisco, California.

Barbra Kearney
Barbra K. Kearney

Alan R. Brayton, Esq.
BRAYTON & ASSOCIATES
999 Grant Avenue
P.O. Box 2109
Novato, CA 94948

Charles S. Bishop, Esq.
JEDEIKIN, GREEN, SPRAGUE & BISHOP
300 Montgomery Street, Suite 450
San Francisco, CA 94104

Ray Wong, Esq.
HANCOCK, ROTHERT & BUNSHOFT
Four Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-4168