

SECOND AMENDED ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 79:

Abex objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, compound, vague and ambiguous and calls for speculation.

Abex also objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it purports to shift the burden of establishing causation from plaintiffs to Abex.

Abex further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it purports to seek information or materials regarding time periods and products that are not at issue in these cases, on the grounds that such information or materials lack relevance and are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. To the extent it purports to seek information or materials regarding the working conditions of Abex employees, this interrogatory is objected to on the grounds that such information or materials lack relevance to the issues arising in these cases and are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Abex also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that the information or materials it purports to seek lack relevance to the issues arising in these cases and are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Abex further objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it is speculative inasmuch as it fails to distinguish among raw asbestos, asbestos contained in building insulation products and/or asbestos-containing automotive and/or railroad friction products, and/or among the different types of asbestos fibers. Because the asbestos fiber contained in Abex's asbestos-containing automotive and/or railroad friction products was chrysotile, the only type of asbestos Abex ever used for product production, which was resin-bonded and encapsulated, proper use of such products did not create or contribute to any adverse health effects.