



IN RE: ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY
CASES

IN THE
CIRCUIT COURT
FOR BALTIMORE CITY

KEITH K. GREWE, SR.

Plaintiff

Case No. 93167501

April 1996 Trial Group

v.

ACandS, INC., et al.

Defendants

Judge Edward J. Angeletti
Trial Cluster No. 96112701

Chrysler Corporation's Answers to Plaintiff's Master Set of Interrogatories

Defendant Chrysler Corporation ("Chrysler") answers Plaintiff's Master Set of Interrogatories as follows.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Defendant, Chrysler Corporation (hereinafter, "Chrysler"), has provided responses to plaintiff's discovery requests pursuant to a reasonable and duly diligent investigation and search for information requested. The responses are given without prejudice to further discovery.

- These responses are based upon facts known or believed by Chrysler at the time of answering these discovery requests. Much of the information requested dates back many years and is difficult or impossible to reconstruct or retrieve.

Thousands of employees have worked at Chrysler Corporation over the years. In conducting business, Chrysler Corporation has created millions of documents kept in

numerous geographic locations that have been moved as required. Accordingly, Chrysler Corporation does not represent that the responses contained herein provide all information requested; rather these responses reflect information obtained before this date by Chrysler Corporation pursuant to a reasonable and duly diligent search and investigation in those areas where this information was expected to be found. To the extent that the request purports to require more, Chrysler objects on grounds that include that compliance with the request probably is not feasible and would impose an undue burden or expense.

If additional discovery requests are propounded upon Chrysler, it will not review the present discovery request to ascertain whether or subsequent to Chrysler's response to these interrogatories new information might be responsive to the present discovery request, except as governed by the Rules of Civil Procedures. To the extent that the present request purports to impose such an obligation, Chrysler objects on grounds that the request contravenes rules and, in addition, seeks to impose an undue burden and expense.

Chrysler objects to requests for information about subjects other than brake and clutch friction products as being outside the scope of activities which are the subject of this lawsuit and on the ground that the request seeks information that is neither relevant nor likely to lead to discovery of admissible evidence. Therefore, Chrysler objects to requests where the matter sought is neither relevant to the subject of this lawsuit nor reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence.

Although plaintiff has served Chrysler with a request, plaintiff may have some pertinent documents, perhaps even some Chrysler documents not received from Chrysler. Chrysler objects on the grounds that it would be less burdensome, more convenient, and less

expensive for plaintiff to identify what documents plaintiff already has that may fall within the scope of these requests. This would accomplish several purposes: (1) it would obviate Chrysler's having to search for and copy documents already in plaintiff's possession; (2) it would enable Chrysler to use the documents provided as guides in looking for related material; and (3) it would, if your purpose were to obtain authentication of particular documents, enable Chrysler to authenticate the copies provided by you without having to conduct an uninformed search for the documents.

Additionally, Chrysler objects to the definition of "asbestos", "asbestos products", "product containing asbestos fibers", "asbestos containing product" and "industrial insulation product" as applied to answering defendant, in that said term are overly broad, generic and encompass numerous different materials, each of which has a different chemical structure and composition. In that Chrysler has only used one specific type of asbestos material in certain components used in certain parts and in that this material is chrysotile asbestos, Chrysler hereby interprets the term "asbestos" as used in these interrogatories to be limited to chrysotile asbestos. Further, Chrysler states that it does not manufacture or sell "raw asbestos". In that many of the requests propounded by plaintiff, as drafted, are directed to manufacturers or suppliers of raw asbestos or insulation products, the requests are unintelligible, vague and confusing as to Chrysler.

Objection is also set forth as to the following undefined terms: safety, hazard, danger, harm, harmful, and risk. Said terms, not being defined by plaintiff are vague, ambiguous, technically imprecise, overbroad and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Chrysler also generally objects to the requests as overly broad, irrelevant, and unduly burdensome. In this regard, the requests seek information beyond plaintiff's alleged

working history and alleged exposure. Chrysler's corporate records do not indicate sales to any of plaintiff's employers. Further, plaintiff's work history encompasses years and it is burdensome and oppressive to provide information as to all products manufactured or sold by Chrysler during that period, as plaintiff has not provided specific information as to the dates, type of asbestos containing products manufactured or sold by Chrysler, and the makes and models of vehicles serviced. In the spirit of discovery, however, Chrysler provides information herein.

Finally, the responses in Chrysler's answers to plaintiff's discovery requests are made solely for the purpose of this lawsuit, and these responses incorporate the foregoing objections into each of the specific responses set forth below.

Answers

(1) State the name, address and official capacity of each person who has supplied information used in answering these interrogatories and indicate for which interrogatory each such person is responsible.

RESPONSE:

This defendant objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information within the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine. Without waiving said objection, these interrogatories were verified in accordance with the Maryland Rules of Civil Procedure by the person signing the Verification form. Furthermore, these answers were assembled by counsel for this defendant. Much of the information has been used in the past and it is no longer possible for this defendant to ascertain sources. Notwithstanding the above, aside from counsel for Chrysler, James Knoll has primarily been the persons consulted regarding information contained herein.

(2) Identify each document that was examined, reviewed and/or used in answering each interrogatory[.] specify the interrogatory and identify the present custodian of each document.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler refers to document(s) in certain responses to interrogatories. To the extent this Interrogatory asks for more information or documents Chrysler objects to this Interrogatory because it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(3) State whether you are a corporation. If so, state: your corporate name; state of incorporation; date of incorporation; address of principal place of business; address(es) of any other place of business, including sales offices; whether, if you are a "foreign corporation" as defined under the law of the State of Maryland, you are now or have ever been registered or qualified to do business in the State of Maryland; and the corporate name, state of incorporation and date of incorporation of any subsidiary, predecessor or affiliate corporation.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler Corporation has been in existence since 1925, and is authorized to do business in every State of the United States. It is incorporated in the State of Delaware, and its principal address and corporate headquarters is in Michigan. Chrysler Corporation has had many subsidiary corporations since 1925, none of which would have any bearing to this litigation.

(4) Identify all prior names by which you have existed.

RESPONSE:

Objection as to relevance. Notwithstanding said objection, defendant, Chrysler Corporation, has been named correctly in plaintiff's complaint. However, Chrysler Corporation denies that plaintiff has a valid claim against it. Further, see answer to interrogatory 3.

(5) If you have divisions which have ever mined, manufactured, produced, fabricated, imported, converted, compounded, processed sold, merchandised, supplied, distributed and/or otherwise placed in the stream of commerce asbestos products, identify each such division and state the names, addresses and job titles of each person who supervised each division, specifying the applicable time periods.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Without waiving said objection, Chrysler has never mined, milled, supplied, manufactured, imported for sale or distribution, processed for sale or distribution, distributed, marketed or sold raw asbestos fiber.

Further, Chrysler manufactured a portion of the brake linings utilized in Chrysler automobiles from 1959 to 1988 at the Trenton Chemical Plant. The Trenton Chemical plant was operated by Chrysler Corporation Chemical Division and was located in Trenton, Michigan.

(6) Have you controlled, purchased or in any way acquired any interest in any corporation or business entity which has mined, manufactured, produced, fabricated, imported, converted, compounded, processed, sold, merchandised, supplied, distributed and/or otherwise placed in the stream of commerce asbestos products?

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it is unduly burdensome and that the burden it imposes is grossly incommensurate with the results obtainable. Chrysler has not purchased, reorganized, or merged into any company involved in the manufacture of raw asbestos or insulation products. However, through the years, Chrysler obtained the AMC vehicle product lines. Chrysler also purchased Briggs Manufacturing Company in the 1950s. Furthermore, through stock transactions, Chrysler has had a controlling interest in Lamborghini and Maserati.

(7) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 6 is in the affirmative, identify and attach copies of all documents related thereto and state:

(A) The name(s), including prior name(s), and the business address(es) of any and all such corporation(s) or business entity(ies);

(B) The date(s) on which you first controlled, purchased or acquired said interest.

(C) The manner in which you acquired said interest, i.e., cash purchase,

merger, consolidation, exchange or sale of assets, etcetera:

(D) The percentage of assets, ownership and/or control acquired by you:

(E) Whether the corporation(s) or business entity(ies) acquired by you continued to exist following the acquisition and, if not, the date on which its existence ceased;

(F) The nature of and/or amount of consideration paid by you for said interest;

(G) The terms and conditions of any contracts or agreements by and between you and such corporation(s) or business entity(ies), including, but not limited to, the terms and conditions relating to the transfer of liabilities for obligations of such corporation(s) or business entity(ies);

(H) Whether you continued the manufacture, sale and/or distribution of such corporation's or business entity's asbestos products and, if so, whether you used the same product name(s) in so doing; and

(I) whether there was an identity of name, officers, directors, personnel, property, suppliers, distribution outlets and/or clients between you and such corporation(s) or business entity(ies);

RESPONSE:

Objection. This interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, see answer to interrogatory 6.

(8) If you have directly or indirectly mined, manufactured, produced, fabricated, imported, converted, compounded, processed, sold, merchandised, supplied, distributed, installed and/or otherwise placed in the stream of commerce asbestos or asbestos-containing products, state as to each such product, indicating separately those products dealt with by you, your predecessor(s) in interest, your subsidiary(ies), and your affiliate(s), if any, the following:

(A) Brand name, trade-name, and/or trade-mark;

(B) The generic name or identity;

(C) Description, including size, shape, color and composition, i.e. sold, powder or other form;

(D) Chemical and physical composition, including, but not limited to, the percentage of asbestos by weight and volume;

(E) Type of asbestos, i.e. chrysotile, amosite, crocidolite, actinolite, anthophyllite, or tremolite, indicating specifically the percentage of each such asbestos fiber by weight and volume;

(F) Intended marketable use;

(G) Dates during which each asbestos product was mined, manufactured, produced, fabricated, imported, converted, compounded, processed, sold, merchandised, supplied, distributed, installed and/or otherwise placed in the stream of commerce;

(H) The identity of each person and/or business entity in the State of Maryland to whom or to which you sold or distributed each such product;

(I) The identity of each contractor, subcontractor, installer or other business entity in the State of Maryland and which ultimately installed, applied or used each such product; and

(J) The custodian, identity and location of each document which refers to or contains information relevant to such sale, distribution or installation.

RESPONSE:

General Answer: Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, Chrysler did not mine, manufacture, produce, fabricate, import, convert, compound, process, sell, merchandise, supply, distribute, install or otherwise place in the stream of commerce, raw asbestos fibers. Without waiving these objections, and based on its understanding of plaintiffs' claims in this case, defendant will respond to this and all subsequent interrogatories with respect to brakes and standard transmissions clutches. Chrysler has sold automobiles since 1925 with brake and clutch parts already installed in the vehicles. Vehicles are generally not shipped in packages. With respect to after-market products, they are shipped in cardboard cartons of various sizes.

8 (a) Brake linings and clutches, some of which may have contained asbestos, have been installed on Chrysler Corporation vehicles. With respect to the after parts market, Chrysler parts have been sold under the trade names Mopar, Cycle-Weld, and Cycle-Bond. Historically, the Chrysler logo has been a pendant star.

8 (b) See general answer to interrogatory 8.

8 (c) A brake lining is solid tan or grey slate.

Chrysler placed indented identification marks on its brake linings. Color indentation appeared on the lining perpendicular to the friction surface. Each brake lining was marked on its edge with a two letter designation indicating the name of the manufacturer of the lining, a combination of letters or numbers indicating the chemical composition; two letters, "FE" or "EE", followed by numbers indicating the friction level of the lining when normal or hot, and followed by four digits indicating calendaring for date of manufacture. An emblem was also stamped on the brake shoes and brake support plate.

8 (d) Brake linings manufactured by Chrysler at the Trenton Chemical plant, contained 50 percent chrysotile by weight. The other 50 percent of the brake lining, manufactured by Chrysler, contained a 50 percent matrix. Chrysler objects to providing further information regarding the composition of its brakes products, because such information is a confidential proprietary trade secret. Additionally, Chrysler does not have specific information regarding the specific compositions of the asbestos containing friction products purchased from outside suppliers.

8 (e) See answer to interrogatory 8 (d).

8 (f) Brake linings are a component part of a vehicle braking system.

8 (g) Chrysler began the manufacture of brake linings in 1959. Chrysler began manufacture of vehicles in 1925.

8 (h) Chrysler would have supplied new vehicles to duly authorized Chrysler/Plymouth/Dodge dealerships.

Additionally, brake linings have been sold through authorized Chrysler dealers and service centers and through authorized distributors at certain points in time.

8 (i) Ultimate buyers do not purchase after market brake lining products directly from Chrysler. Chrysler does not have records of sales of parts by dealers or distributors. See also answer to interrogatory 20.

8 (j) See answer to interrogatory 8 (i).

(9) State whether you presently mine, manufacture, produce, fabricate, import, convert, compound, process, sell, merchandise, supply, distribute, install and/or otherwise place in the stream of commerce any asbestos product(s) listed in your Answer to the preceding interrogatory. If so, identify each product by brand name, trade name and/or trademark.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, see answer to interrogatory 8.

(10) Identify each individual who participated in the design and preparation of manufacturing specifications for each asbestos product identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 8.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, the design, manufacturing and testing of friction materials and other parts has been a continuing process at Chrysler throughout the years. It is, therefore, impossible to name each individual who has been involved in the design and preparation of manufacturing specifications for each product. Without waiving said objection, James Knoll is the most knowledgeable person with respect to brake product evaluation, research, and development at Chrysler during the relevant time frame of operation of the Trenton Chemical Plant.

(11) State whether any written memoranda, specifications blueprints or other written materials of any kind or character now exist relating to the design and preparation of the asbestos products identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 8. If so, identify:

- (A) Each such written material or document; and
- (B) The custodian, identity and location of each such written material or document.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Chrysler also objects to providing details of the formulations for friction products, which formulations are trade secrets. Without waiving said objection, although certain documents may exist concerning engineering drawings, specifications and possibly manufacturing documents for brake linings, there is no existing list of all of these documents, and it would be time consuming and expensive to compile such a list. Furthermore, plaintiff's interrogatory does not properly limit itself to a time period and/or model of a vehicle.

(12) Identify, by location and product, each mine, mill, plant or other facility of yours in which the asbestos products identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 8 have been manufactured and/or assembled and the dates said facilities have been in operation.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler manufactured a portion of the brake linings utilized in Chrysler automobiles, from 1959 to 1988, at Trenton Chemical plant in Michigan.

(13) If you have discontinued mining, manufacturing, producing, fabricating, importing, converting, compounding, processing, selling, merchandising, supplying, distributing and/or otherwise placing in the stream of commerce any asbestos products listed in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 81 identify the products discontinued, give the date of discontinuance and specify the reason(s) for such discontinuance.

RESPONSE:

Objection as to relevance and/or subsequent measures. Subject to this objection, clutches in Chrysler vehicles have not had asbestos since approximately 1984, and Chrysler discontinued manufacture of brake linings in 1988 for economic reasons in a shut down of a plant based upon a reduction of the work force and expenses.

(14) If you have done so, when did you first determine that any other material could be used in place of asbestos for high-temperature insulation or any other use to or for which asbestos has been applied. If you have, in fact, substituted other material(s) for asbestos in your product(s), then state:

(A) The identity of such substituted material(s);

(B) When the product(s) with such substituted material(s) was first developed and marketed; and

(C) The trade-name(s) and brand name(s) of the product(s) marketed with such substituted material(s).

RESPONSE:

- Defendant Chrysler objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably limited in time or scope. Further, it is vague, ambiguous and seeks irrelevant information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, Interrogatory potentially seeks confidential trade secret information, from which discovery Defendant seeks protection.

Without waiving the foregoing objection, Chrysler manufactures or sells non-asbestos containing brake linings and clutch facings for use as replacement parts where the original equipment part did not contain asbestos. For brake linings, the performance of asbestos-containing and non-asbestos-containing parts is different, so one cannot be substituted for the other without making other changes in the design of the brake

system to obtain similar performance. Because of the large number of different cars and trucks Chrysler has sold, identifying the dates of and reasons for the use of different kinds of parts would require extensive research and would be burdensome and harassing.

(15) With respect to each of the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 8, state whether there has been any change, alteration or modification (hereinafter collectively called "change") from the time when it was first developed or you began to manufacture or sell it, to the present. If so, state:

- (a) The identity, by brand name and trade name, of each such product;
- (b) The nature of each such change;
- (c) The reasons for each such change;
- (d) The details of how the changed product differed from the original product, including, but not limited to, any changes in the asbestos content or chemical composition of each such product;
- (e) The names of each person recommending and/or approving such change;
- (f) The date each change was accepted by you and made commercially available;
- (g) Whether there were any studies, evaluations or tests made in connection with such change, and if so, identify each such study by title, date, name of author and present location and custodian.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, not properly limited as to time and scope, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving said objection, formulations are developed for each brake design of each car or truck line. Engineers develop the formulation and no change is permitted after production is approved. Numerous formula specifications have been utilized by Chrysler throughout the years. It is therefore unduly burdensome and irrelevant as to the various specific formulations.

(16) Do you contend that any of the asbestos products listed in your Answer to

Interrogatory No. 8 require change or modification before they may be used? If so, specify what change or modification is required for each such product.

RESPONSE:

No. See also answer to interrogatory 15.

(17) Identify all patents issued, or any applications made therefor, for any asbestos product listed in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 8. Specify the number of each patent, the date(s) of application, issuance and renewal, if applicable, to whom each patent was issued and the product(s) for which each patent was issued.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler does not hold any patents for brake linings.

(18) Identify all trade-marks registered for any products listed in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 8. Specify the number and date of registration, the term thereof, the date(s) of renewal, if applicable, by whom each trade-mark was registered and the product(s) for which each trade-mark was registered.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, trademarks are public information. Since trademark registration is pursuant to a brand and not a particular product, there are no specific trademarks for brake shoes and lining or clutch facings at Chrysler.

(19) State whether you have distributed, sold or installed any asbestos or asbestos-containing products which was/were mined, manufactured, produced, fabricated, imported, converted, compounded, processed, sold, merchandised, supplied and/or otherwise placed in the stream of commerce by persons and/or business entities other than you or your predecessor(s) in interest or subsidiary(ies), if any. If so, state:

(A) The identity of each such person and/or business entity whose asbestos products you sold, distributed or installed on a product-by-product basis;

(B) The terms of all assignments, agreements, licenses and other arrangements which relate to same, including whether the relationship was exclusive. Identify and attach copies of all such documents;

(C) As to each product, the brand name, trade-name and/or trademark adopted and used by the source from which you obtained said product for distribution or sale;

(D) As to each product, the brand name, trade-name and/or trademark adopted and used by you for purposes of distribution or sale of said product;

(E) The generic name or identity of each such product;

(F) The dates during which you distributed, sold or installed each such asbestos product;

(G) As to each such product, a description, including size, shape, color, composition, i.e. solid, powder or other form;

(H) As to each such product, the type of asbestos and the percentage of asbestos, by weight and volume;

(I) As to each such product, its intended marketable use;

(J) The identity of each person and/or business entity in the State of Maryland to whom or to which you sold, distributed or shipped each such product;

(K) The identity of each contractor, subcontractor, installer or other business in the State of Maryland which ultimately installed, applied or used each such product; and

(L) The custodian, identity and location of each document which refers to or contains information relevant to such sale or distribution.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, not properly limited as to time and scope, and unduly burdensome.

Without waiving said objection, Chrysler is aware of the purchase of brake linings from the following entities from vehicle years 1958 to 1994.

1958	Abex Corporation (formerly known as American Brake Block); Johns-Manville Corporation
1959	Abex Corporation; Chrysler Corporation; Johns-Manville Corporation
1960	Same as 1968.
1961	Same as 1968.
1962	Bendix Corporation; Chrysler Corporation; Johns-Manville Corporation.
1963	Same as 1981.
1964	Same as 1981.
1965	Same as 1968.
1966	Same as 1968.
1967	Same as 1968.
1968	Abex Corporation; Bendix Corporation; Chrysler Corporation; Johns-Manville Corporation.
1969	Same as 1978.
1970	Same as 1981.
1971	Same as 1981.
1972	Same as 1981.
1973	Same as 1981.
1974	Bendix Corporation; Chrysler Corporation; Raybestos-Manhattan.
1975	Same as 1981.
1976	Same as 1981.
1977	Same as 1981.
1978	Abex Corporation; Bendix Corporation; Chrysler Corporation.
1979	Same as 1981.
1980	Same as 1981.
1981	Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Chrysler Corp. - Chemical Division.
1982	Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Chrysler Corp. - Chemical Division.
1983	Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Chrysler Corp. - Chemical Division.
1984	Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Chrysler Corp. - Chemical Division.
1985	Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Chrysler Corp. - Chemical Division.
1986	Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Chrysler Corp. - Chemical Division; Abex.
1987	Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Chrysler Corp. - Chemical Division; Abex; FDP (Friction Development Products).
1988	Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Chrysler Corp. - Chemical Division; Abex; FDP.
1989	Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Chrysler Corp. - Chemical Division; Abex; Valeo; Delco; Inland. *Last vehicle year for Chrysler.
1990	Abex; Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; FDP; Valeo; Delco.

1991	Abex; Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Jurid; Valeo; Nuturn.
1992	Abex; Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Galfer; Nuturn; Valeo.
1993	Abex; Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Delco; Galfer; Nuturn.
1994	Bendix Corp. - Friction Materials Division; Delco; Abex; Nuturn; Galfer.

Chrysler has also purchased brakes from Kelsey, Hayes and Wagner.

Standard transmission clutch facings were primarily supplied by Raybestos Manhattan.

(20) Identify the distributors or approved applicators of the asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 at any time during the period from 1930 to the present and identify and attach copies of all documents relating to said distributors and applicators. For each such entity, indicate:

(A) The terms of all assignments, agreements, licenses and other arrangements by and between you and said distributor or applicator;

(B) Whether the distribution or application relationship was exclusive;

(C) The year or years in which the distribution or application relationship was in effect;

(D) The identity of the asbestos products listed in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 which the distributor or applicator was authorized to and did distribute or apply; and

(E) The quantity of the asbestos products listed in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 distributed by the distributor or sold to the applicator on a year-by-year and product-by-product basis.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Without waiving said objection, prior to 1964, the parts distribution network originated from Chrysler national parts depots to independent wholesale distributors to vehicle dealers and parts jobbers. Between 1964 and 1981, the parts distribution network originated from Chrysler national parts depots to Chrysler field parts depots to vehicle dealers and the distribution originated from Chrysler Indianapolis after-market depot to independent

wholesale distributors to parts jobbers. Subsequent to 1981, the parts distribution network originates from Chrysler national parts depots to Chrysler field parts depots to vehicle dealers, wholesale dealers, and special product dealers. See also answer to interrogatory 8 (i).

(21) State whether you have ever sold, distributed or otherwise furnished any of the asbestos products listed in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 8 to any other person and/or business entity for resale or redistribution at any time from 1930 to the present. If so, state:

(A) The identity of each such person and/or business entity;

(B) The brand name, trade-name and/or trademark adopted and used by you for each such product;

(C) The brand name, trade-name and/or trademark adopted and used by each such person and/or business entity for each such product;

(D) The generic name or identity of each such product;

(E) The year(s) in which each such product was sold, distributed or otherwise furnished to each such person and/or business entity, and for each year, the quantity of each product sold, distributed or otherwise furnished;

(F) The intended marketable use for each such product;

(G) Whether each such product was intended to be used, resold, or distributed by such other person and/or business entity in the same or substantially the same condition as it was when shipped or delivered by you; and

(H) The custodian, identity and location of all documents pertaining to agreements for the resale, distribution, or furnishing of your asbestos products to each other person and/or business entity; and

(I) Whether the resale, rebranding or redistribution agreement was exclusive.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, not properly limited as to time and scope, and unduly burdensome. See also answer to interrogatory 20.

(22) State the following with respect to the packages and containers in which you sold, distributed or otherwise furnished each of the asbestos products described in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 on a year-by-year and product-by-product basis:

(A) A description of the package or container in which each product was sold, distributed or otherwise furnished, including composition, size, shape and color;

(B) A description of the markings or printed material that appeared on each package or container, indicating the size, color and location;

(C) A description of any logo or other design appearing, on the package or container, indicating the size, color and location;

(D) A verbatim description of all caution or warning notices appearing on the package or container, setting forth the exact dates, location, size and color in which each such notice appeared on each such product;

(E) A verbatim description of any instructions appearing on the package or container and include its location, size and color; and

(F) The identity of each person with knowledge of decisions made regarding the use and date of such caution, notice, warning or other statement or explanation.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, Chrysler answers as follows.

Chrysler has sold automobiles with brake and clutch parts already installed in the vehicles. Vehicles are generally not shipped in packages. With respect to after-market products, they are shipped in cardboard cartons of various sizes.

Owners' manuals and service manuals, containing information concerning brakes and clutches, have been available at Chrysler for decades.

Plaintiff alleges and this interrogatory assumes or implies that some unspecified warning was necessary with regard to answering defendants products, which Chrysler denies and no admission is made or intended by responding to this and other interrogatories as drafted. Nevertheless, this interrogatory is also objectionable, because it is

not confined to the time period at issue, that is, plaintiff's period of employment. Further, in response to these allegations, Chrysler states that no warning was necessary regarding the installation, replacement and/or repair; use of defendant's products will not expose a person to inhalable, intact, chrysotile fibers, of lengths considered to be pathogenic or in amounts which would cause disease. Without waiving said objection, brake linings and clutch facing products have contained warnings.

The first Chrysler service manual containing warnings concerning brake linings was printed in 1973.

The following warning appeared in Chrysler's 1973 service manual:

CAUTION: When resurfacing or refacing brake shoes follow manufacturing recommendations for proper use of their equipment. Whatever equipment is used, ensure that proper ventilation is provided to remove asbestos dust, which can be detrimental to health.

The following warning first appeared in Chrysler's 1984 service manuals regarding brake service:

CAUTION: When servicing brake assemblies or components, do not create dust by sanding, grinding or by cleaning brake parts with a dry brush or with compressed air. A water dampened cloth should be used. Many brake components contain asbestos fibers which can become airborne if dust is created during service operations. Breathing dust which contains asbestos fibers can cause serious bodily harm.

The following warning appeared in Chrysler's 1984 service manual regarding clutch:

CAUTION: When servicing clutch assemblies or components do NOT create dust by sanding or by cleaning clutch parts with a dry brush or with compressed air. (A water dampened cloth should be used.) The clutch disc contains "Asbestos Fibers" which can become airborne if dust is created during service operations. Breathing dust containing "Asbestos Fibers" may cause serious bodily harm.

Warnings have been incorporated in service manuals consistently since 1984.

In further response, subject to the foregoing objections, from 1983 to 1987, the cartons for Chrysler asbestos containing replacement parts contained the following warning:

CAUTION

THIS PRODUCT CONTAINS ASBESTOS. AVOID CREATING DUST. BREATHING ASBESTOS MAY RESULT IN SERIOUS BODILY HARM.

From 1988 to the present, the cartons for Chrysler asbestos containing replacement parts have contained the following warnings:

DANGER

**CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBERS AVOID CREATING DUST
CANCER AND LUNG DISEASE HAZARD.**

(D) - (F)

See response to (D) - (F) above.

(23) If any changes were made to the packages and containers in which you sold, distributed or otherwise furnished each of the asbestos products described in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, indicate as to each such package or container:

(A) The nature of each such change, e.g., changes in composition, size, shape and color, and/or changes regarding the placement, modification or removal of any color, logo, design, name, word, number, instruction, warning or other marking on the container;

(B) The date on which you decided to make the change;

(C) The date the container was in fact changed;

(D) The reason for the change;

— (E) The identity of each present or former employee, officer, representative or agent of yours at any time from 1930 to the present with knowledge or information regarding your decision to change any aspect of the package or container; and

(F) The custodian, location and identity of each document in your custody, control or possession which contains information relevant to your decision to change any aspect of the package or container.

RESPONSE:

See answer to interrogatory 22.

(24) Do you have custody, possession, or control of any packages that presently or formerly packaged asbestos-containing products? If so,

(A) Identify each such package;

(B) Identify the custodian of each such package;

(C) Identify the date on which each such package was sold and/or distributed by you and the date when each such package was retrieved from your facilities and/or from the stream of commerce;

(D) State whether or not each such package was retrieved from the stream of commerce or was retrieved from your warehouses or storage facilities;

(E) If it was retrieved from the stream of commerce, identify the person or company from whom it was retrieved;

(F) If it was retrieved from in-house sources, i.e., warehouses, storage facilities, or sales representatives, identify where and from whom it was received.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, Chrysler answers as follows.

Chrysler has not retained, as custom and practice, replacement parts in cardboard boxes; aside from what is in actual inventory for sale at the present time. However, counsel for Chrysler has in its possession brake lining and clutch packaging from 1985. To the best of Chrysler's knowledge, this is the oldest available packaging for this litigation.

(25) For each brochure, pamphlet, specification, instruction, manual, bulletin, advertisement or other written material describing or relating to each of the asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19:

(A) Describe its contents and the date thereof;

(B) State when and to whom it was distributed;

(C) State the manner in which it was placed in the product container or whether it was separate from the product container;

(D) State whether any written, printed or graphic matter was present to warn of any potential harmful ingredient it might contain. If so, state:

(i) Whether a signal word, e.g., "danger", "warning" or "caution" was present;

(ii) Whether the signal word was printed in bold face, capital letters or different colored inks;

(iii) The wording of the statements describing any hazard;

(iv) The wording, size, color and location of all directions and/or instructions pertaining to any method of use to avoid any hazard.

(E) Identify each individual who participated in the writing of the brochure or other written materials and describe in detail the extent of his participation;

(F) Identify and produce each document which reflects, refers or relates to the information contained in the brochures, or other written materials and/or the decision to include such information;

(G) As to any information received orally in answer to this interrogatory, identify each person who supplied such information and state the full substance of the information supplied.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, Chrysler answers as follows.

Advertisement was done pursuant to brand name not any particular product. Therefore, there is no specific advertisement for brake shoes and lining or clutch facings. See also answer to interrogatory 22.

(26) Identify each present or former employee, officer, agent or representative of yours who directed, handled, solicited, supervised, promoted or otherwise participated in the sale, supply, distribution, delivery, installation or removal in Maryland at any time from 1930 to the present, of any asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, defendant has not participated in any removal. Without waiving said objections, see responses to Interrogatory Nos. 8 (h)-(j), 10 and 20.

(27) For each person identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 26 who participated in the advertising in Maryland of any asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 at any time from 1930 to the present, state:

(A) His or her duties, responsibilities and inclusive years of employment;

(B) The identity of each product advertised, marketed or promoted;
and

(C) The method by which each product was advertised, marketed or promoted, and if by print, the name of the publication, the inclusive dates during which the advertisement or promotion appeared therein and the publisher.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 26.

(28) Describe your corporate structure and policy concerning the subject of employee safety in the design, development, manufacture, testing and use of asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 from 1930 to the present. In your Answer to this Interrogatory, identify each present or former corporate department, division, subdivision or other group responsible for the above-described activities and dates related thereto and, with respect to each, identify the name, title, duties, responsibilities, dates of employment and current or last

known business and residential address of the highest supervisory employee with knowledge of any of those activities during any time from 1930 to the present.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler has employed a medical director/physicians and industrial hygienists.

(29) Describe your corporate structure concerning the subject of research and development of asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 from 1930 to the present. In your Answer to this Interrogatory, identify each present or former corporate department, division, subdivision or other group responsible for any of these activities and dates related thereto and, with respect to each, identify the name, title, duties, responsibilities, dates of employment and current or last known business and residential address of the highest supervisory employee during any time from 1930 to the present.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, research and development of brake products was performed by brake engineers.

(30) Describe your corporate structure concerning medical directors, industrial hygienists, physicians, biological scientists or consultants in these fields from 1930 to the present. In your Answer to this Interrogatory, identify the name, title, duties, responsibilities, period of employment, to whom the individual reported, the current or last known business and residential address of each medical director, industrial hygienist, physician, biological scientist or consultant of yours, the location, identifying titles or codes, and custodians of all reports or memoranda written by each, the professional specialization of each, the reason for hiring each such person and the name and address of the person in your company responsible for hiring each such person.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 28.

(31) Identify any medical examination program offered or sponsored by you or your insurance carrier, from 1930 to the present, for employees handling or otherwise exposed to asbestos and/or asbestos products. With respect to each such program, indicating applicable time periods, state:

(A) The manner of communicating with employees about such program;

(B) Whether examination was optional or mandatory and, if the latter, how frequently such examination was required;

(C) What percentage of employees permitted to undergo such examination actually participated;

(D) What percentage of employees who underwent such medical examination were found to have pneumoconiosis, asbestosis, mesothelioma, lung cancer or other cancers; and

(E) With respect to the employees referred to in your Answer to Part (01 of this Interrogatory, what percentage of these employees were paid disability, and/or worker's compensation benefits and for what percentage of employees were medical expenses paid for purposes of treatment of such condition.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, this is an improper question. Since plaintiff does not contend that he worked at any Chrysler plant or facility, this interrogatory has absolutely no relevance to matters at issue, nor is it reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information.

(32) State whether you or anyone on your behalf ever conducted, engaged in or participated in any tests, studies and/or research concerning the human health consequences of persons coming in contact with and/or inhaling asbestos fibers or asbestos dust during the manufacture and/or use of asbestos products. If so, identify:

- (A) What tests, studies and/or research were done;
- (B) When said tests, studies and/or research were done;
- (C) The individuals who ordered and supervised the tests, studies and/or research;
- (D) The individuals or groups engaged in or participating in the tests, studies and/or research;
- (E) The substance of any recommendations and/or suggestions given as a result of the tests, studies or research. State when, by whom and to whom said recommendations were made, including the addresses of these individuals;
- (F) All written documents including, but not limited to, reports, memoranda, specifications and correspondence which refer, relate or pertain to said tests, studies and/or research; and
- (G) The present custodian of the written documents identified in your Answer to Part (F) of this Interrogatory.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, based on available corporate records, Mr. L. Gendernalik, a member of the Industrial Hygiene Department of Chrysler Corporation, sampled the air levels in 1972 and 1975. The 1972 sampling was done at Chrysler's brake plant test garage. Two samples of mechanics working on brake drums were taken with a cellulose ester filter. The results were 0.2 fibers per cubic centimeter when compressed air was used. In 1975, Mr. Gendernalik took air samples at Dodge Truck, Inc. in Chicago, Illinois. Counts were taken with the use of cellulose ester filter and the results were 0.0 fibers per cubic centimeter of air.

(33) State whether any of the medical directors, industrial hygienists, Physicians, biological scientists or consultants in these fields identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 30 ever made any recommendations and/or suggestions to you pertaining to the risks or hazards to persons involved in the manufacture or use of asbestos products. If so, identify:

- (A) The date when said recommendations and/or suggestions were made;
- (B) The individual to whom said recommendations and/or suggestions were made;
- (C) The individual who made said recommendations and/or suggestions;
- (D) The substance of the recommendations and/or suggestions;
- (E) What actions, if any, were taken by you as a result of said recommendations and/or suggestions; and
- (F) If no action was taken by you as a result of said recommendations and/or suggestions, state the reason(s) why and the person(s) responsible for making that decision.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, this is an improper question. Since plaintiff does not contend that he worked at any Chrysler plant or facility, this interrogatory has absolutely no relevance to matters at issue, nor is it reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information.

With respect to friction products, this interrogatory is objectionable, because it assumes that there are detrimental effects to users of friction products. Chrysler contends that its friction products are not detrimental.

(34) State whether you have ever conducted or directed any investigations or studies to determine the amount of airborne dust containing asbestos fibers in your facilities where asbestos products were mined, milled, manufactured, produced, fabricated, converted, processed, stored, used, handled, installed or removed. If so, identify:

- (A) The date of each such dust count or sampling;
- (B) The individual or group conducting each such dust count or sampling;
- (C) The result or conclusion of each such dust count or sampling;
- (D) All documents which refer, relate or pertain to each such dust

count or sampling;

(E) The technique used for each such dust count or sampling;

(F) The purpose for administering each such dust count or sampling;

(G) What action, if any, has been taken in response to the findings of each dust count or sampling;

(H) The living person who has the most knowledge of the matters herein;
and

(I) The identity of all documents identified in your Answer to this Interrogatory and custodian thereof.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Any information as to Chrysler's own employees is irrelevant. The brake linings undergoes a chemical transformation by reason of the braking process, converting more than 99 percent of the fibers into nonpathogenic minerals. Additionally, the asbestos fibers have attached to them flakes of resin. The mechanic is not exposed to inhalable, intact, chrysotile fibers of lengths considered to be pathogenic or in amounts which would cause disease.

(35) State whether any written memoranda, specification, blueprints or other written materials of any kind or character exist relating to any testing of the asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19. If so, identify:

(A) Each such written material or document by date and description; and

(B) The custodian, identity and location of each such written material or document.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad,

unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, see response to Interrogatory No. 32.

(36) State whether, after you released to the public any of the asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, you ever conducted or directed any tests thereon to determine potential health hazards involved in the use of the materials contained therein. If so, indicate the date of each test, the individual or group conducting each such test, the result or conclusion of each such test, all documents which refer, relate or pertain to each such test, and the present custodian of all documents identified in this Answer.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 32, 33, and 34.

(37) State whether, prior to 1982, you ever had any labor inspectors or persons from or financed by your company go to job sites or other areas where your asbestos products were being used or installed to make a dust level count. If so, indicate when and where such a practice or procedure occurred, the purpose of the practice or procedure, the results of such dust counts and what action, if any, was taken by you in response to the findings made as a result of said practice or procedure. If not, explain why such dust counts were not done.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler has no right to inspect work sites owned and operated by others.

(38) State whether you ever conducted or directed any studies designed to learn how to prevent, minimize or eliminate the inhalation and ingestion of asbestos dust and fibers by those who use your asbestos products or are exposed to asbestos dust or fibers therefrom. If so, indicate the date of each study, the individual or group conducting each such study, the result or conclusion of each such study, all documents which refer, relate or pertain to each such study, and the present custodian of all documents identified in this Answer.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, see responses to Interrogatory Nos. 32, 33 and 34.

(39) Identify all trade organizations, associations or other entities to which you belong or belonged. Said organizations, associations or other entities, include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) Deleted

(b) Industrial Hygiene Foundation and/or Industrial Health Foundation (IHF)

(c - g) Deleted.

(h) Asbestos Information Association of North America (AIA)

(i) Deleted.

(j) National Safety Council

(k - p) Deleted.

(q) Air Hygiene Foundation

(r) Deleted.

(s) Deleted.

(t) Institute of Occupational Environmental Health

(u) Friction Materials Standards Institute

(v) Friction Materials Safety Institute

(w - x) Deleted.

(y) Asbestosis Research Council of England

- (z) Asbestos International Association
- (aa) Deleted.
- (bb) American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH)
- (cc) American Association of Testing Materials (ASTM)
- (dd) Deleted.
- (ee) American National Standards Institute (ANSI)
- (ff - jj) Deleted.
- (kk) American Industrial Hygiene Association
- (ll - oo) Deleted.
- (pp) North American Industrial Hygiene Association (NAIHA)
- (qq - rr) Deleted.
- (ss) American Standards Association (ASI)
- (tt) American Society of Safety Engineers (ASSE)
- (uu) American Industrial Hygienists (AIHA)
- (vv - zz) Deleted.

or any other such trade association to which you had or have either corporate or individual association or to which you belong or belonged.

RESPONSE:

Objection to this interrogatory as vague, ambiguous and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. In addition, Chrysler has no information available upon which to base an answer identifying all organizations it belonged to since the 1920s. Without waiving its general and specific objections to this interrogatory, Chrysler answers as follows.

To answer this question would require making inquiry of every Chrysler employee, past or present, which would be impossible. Furthermore, there is an objection as to lack of relevance, unduly burdensome, overly broad, and lack of particularity. Without waiving these objections, Chrysler or Chrysler employees, or both, have had

memberships in the American Industrial Hygienists Association; the Friction Material Standard Institute; the Industrial Hygiene Foundation; the American Academy of Industrial Hygienists; National Safety Council; the Motor Vehicles Manufacturers Association; the Battery Council International; the Society of Automotive Engineers; and the Engineering Society of Detroit.

(40) For each trade organization, association or other entity identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 39 state:

- (A) Dates of membership;
- (B) Type of membership, i.e., regular or associate;
- (C) The dates and type of any meetings you attended and the identity of the individuals who attended such meetings on your behalf;
- (D) The identity, title, duties and responsibilities of any individual who held an elected, appointed or self-designated position within said organization(s);
- (E) The names of any publications or written materials distributed by or on behalf of said organization(s);
- (F) The identity of all documents received by you from said organization(s) and the dates of receipt of each;
- (G) The amount of money you contributed in each year;
- (H) Whether you served on the board or on any committees, and if so, identify the person(s) who was on said board or committee, the position of the person(s) on said board or committee and the dates thereof; and
- (I) The identity of all written studies, investigations, materials, notes, summaries, minutes or transcripts relating to publications, reports, transactions and proceedings of said organization(s), and the custodian thereof.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, see response to Interrogatory No. 39.

(41) For each trade organization, association or other entity identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 39 identify all studies, tests, research, recommendations, suggestions, seminars, symposia and/or speeches conducted or made which concerned, discussed, addressed or dealt with the actual, alleged or possible health hazards associated with exposure to asbestos.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, it is impossible to answer this interrogatory, as it would require ascertaining the subjective knowledge of every corporate employee, both past and present.

(42) With respect to each study, test, research project recommendation, suggestion, seminar, symposium or speech identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 41, identify:

- (A) The individuals or groups involved therein;
- (B) The date(s) thereof;
- (C) The complete results thereof;
- (D) The recommendations, if any, which were made as a result thereof; and
- (E) The custodian, identity and location of each document which represents, refers to or contains information relating thereto.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 41.

(43) Describe each action taken by you as a result of each study, test, research project, recommendation, suggestion, seminar, symposium and/or speech identified in your Answer

to Interrogatory No. 41. In your Answer to this Interrogatory, state the date of each action and the identity of the individual(s) who initiated said action.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 41.

(44) State whether you directed, sponsored, financed participated in or received any findings or results of any studies and/or tests performed by the Saranac Laboratory of the Trudeau Foundation or any correspondence or documents relating thereto concerning the human health consequences of exposure to asbestos.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, to Chrysler's knowledge it did not participate in nor does it have any corporate information regarding Saranac Lake Laboratories studies. However, documentation has recently come to counsel for Chrysler's attention indicating that a Dr. Alva Rush of Chrysler attended a Seventh Saranac Symposium. Chrysler has no corporate documentation to confirm this nor does Chrysler have any corporate information on this issue.

(45) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 44 is in the affirmative, identify:

— (A) All documents in your possession or control which summarize or explain the investigations or results of said studies or tests;

(B) The identity, substance and dates of all communications, oral or written, between you and Saranac Laboratory personnel, including but not limited to Gerrit W. Schepers, M.D., Arthur Vorwald, M.D. and/or Leroy Gardner, M.D.;

(C) All documents relating to Saranac Laboratory studies or tests which were received or submitted by you, either directly or indirectly through predecessor(s) in interest, subsidiary(ies) or affiliate(s), if any, through other companies, or through any trade associations, organizations or entities;

(D) All recommendations or findings of such studies in relation to:

- (i) adequacy or inadequacy of the threshold limit values;
- (ii) the substitution of materials for asbestos;

(E) Whether or not you entered into any agreements with the Saranac Laboratory. If so, state:

- (i) the date of the agreement;
- (ii) the signatories to the agreement;
- (iii) the purpose for entering into the agreement;
- (iv) what, if any, editing rights you retained regarding any reports or studies to be issued by the Saranac Laboratory; and
- (v) what, if any, materials you actually reviewed and/or edited as a result of the studies performed by Saranac Laboratory.

(F) The custodian and location of all documents and/or communications identified in your Answer to this Interrogatory.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory 44.

(46) State the amount of money spent or contributed by you annually from 1930 to the present for research of the relationship between exposure to asbestos dusts, fibers and/or products and any pulmonary pathology and identify each person or organization to whom the expenditure or contribution was made and the dates thereof.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler has not found any records of contributions for research of the nature

described.

(47) State whether you have ever maintained a library (or libraries) which contains books, articles, periodicals, journals and/or reference materials that relate to the subjects of asbestos, industrial hygiene, medicine, safety, health, occupational disease and/or engineering. If so, state:

(A) The date each such library was established;

(B) The location of each such library;

(C) The identity of each librarian or other person in charge of the operation and materials of each such library;

(D) For whose use each such library was established;

(E) The title, publisher and dates of subscription to or acquisition of each such periodical or journal for each such library; and

(F) The title, author, publisher, date and dates of acquisition of each such article and book for each such library.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The industrial hygiene department, the engineering department, and the medical department at Chrysler maintain reference libraries. Chrysler does not maintain a library solely related to asbestos, although certain literature maintained in these departments might relate to asbestos.

Identification of journals and books contained in the reference libraries is irrelevant information and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, Chrysler does not maintain a list that would enable it to identify journals, books, and articles.

(48) State whether any of the co-defendants in this litigation or the following companies have ever furnished you with any information as to the state of the medical knowledge at any time regarding the relationship between exposure to asbestos dusts, fibers and/or products and the contracting of diseases, including asbestosis, pneumoconiosis, mesothelioma, lung cancer and other cancers:

(a) Johns-Manville/Canadian Johns-Manville

(b) Raybestos-Manhattan/Raymark

(c) H.K. Porter/Southern Asbestos/Southern Textile

(d) Celotex/Philip Carey/Rapid-American Corporation/ Glen Alden Corporation

(e) Carey Canada

(f) National Gypsum/National Asbestos Mines

(g) Pittsburgh Corning

(h) Owens-Corning Fiberglas

(i) Owens-Illinois

(j) Keene/Ehret/Baldwin-Hill/Baldwin-Ehret-Hill/Mundet

(k) Fibreboard/Pabco

(l) GAF/Ruberoid/Eternit/Vermont Asbestos Mines

(m) Armstrong World Industries/Armstrong Cork

(n) Flintkote/Flintkote Mines

(o) Asbestospray/Smith & Kanzler/Spraycraft

(p) Georgia-Pacific

(q) U.S. Gypsum

(r) W.R. Grace/Zonolite/Multibestos

(s) Turner & Newall/Turner Bros. Asbestos/Turner Asbestos Corp./J.W. Roberts/Ferodo

(t) U.S. Minerals

(u) Asbestos Corporation Ltd.

(v) Asbestos Unlimited

(w) Union Carbide

(x) Cape Asbestos/Cape Industries/North American Asbestos Corp.

(y) Bell Asbestos Mines

(z) Lake Asbestos of Quebec

(aa) Nicolet Industries/Keasby & Mattison

(bb) Cassiar Asbestos Corp.

(cc) ACandS/Armstrong Contracting & Supply

(dd) General Motors Corp.

(ee) Westinghouse

(ff) Uniroyal/U.S. Rubber

(gg) Pfizer/Gibsonburg Lime Products Co.

(hh) McCormick Asbestos Co/MCIC

(ii) Porter Hayden/Reid Hayden

(jj) Hopeman Bros.

(kk) Krafft-Murphy

(ll) Hampshire Industries/John H. Hampshire

(mm) Dresser Industries/Harbison-Walker Refractories

(nn) Foster Wheeler

(oo) Ford Motor Co.

(pp) Unarco/Union Asbestos and Rubber Co.

(qq) Quigley Co.

(rr) Amatex

(ss) Eagle-Picher Industries

(tt) Metropolitan Life Insurance

(uu) Forty-Eight Insulation

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler does not have a central listing or catalog of information that may have been received from the parties listed in this interrogatory and Chrysler has no reasonable way of obtaining the information necessary to respond to this interrogatory.

(49) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 48 is in the affirmative, identify:

- (A) How the information was furnished;
- (B) Who furnished said information;
- (C) When said information was given to you; and
- (D) identity and substance of said information.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 48.

(50) State whether, at any time since 1930, you have interchanged, exchanged or communicated, the results of research, tests, studies or experiments regarding the relationship between asbestos dusts, fibers and/or products and the contracting of disease, including asbestosis, pneumoconiosis, mesothelioma, lung cancer and other cancers, with any other person, corporation or other business entity, including, but not limited to, co-defendants in this action and/or the companies listed in Interrogatory No. 48 above.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler does not have a central listing that records "exchanges of information" between its employees and employees of other companies. Therefore, it is impossible to answer this interrogatory, as it would require ascertaining the subjective knowledge of every corporate employee, both past and present.

(51) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 50 is in the affirmative, state:

(A) When said interchanges, exchanges or communications occurred;

(B) The identity of those persons, corporations or business entities who participated in said interchanges, exchanges, or communications;

(C) The content of said interchanges, exchanges or communications; and

(D) The identity of the custodian of any documents which relate to said interchanges, exchanges, or communications.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 50.

(52) Identify all persons who have testified on your behalf before the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, any United States Congressional or state legislative committee, subcommittee, administrative hearing or legislative proceeding on the subjects of the human health consequences of exposure to asbestos dusts, fibers and/or products and the setting, modification, feasibility and acceptance of allegedly safe or proper levels of exposure to said asbestos and asbestos products.

RESPONSE:

Objection. Lack of Relevance. Overly broad. Objection to employees who may have testified before any congressional committee or legislative proceeding concerning asbestos exposure, because as stated previously, Chrysler has many employees and it is unknown and impossible to contact each and every past and present employee with respect any testimony they may have made.

(53) Identify all documents presented to or utilized in the preparation of testimony before the organizations agencies or committees referred to in Interrogatory No. 52, specifying which documents were presented or utilized for each such body and the present custodian and location of each document.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 52.

(54) For all testimony or presentations identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 52, identify:

- (A) The dates and descriptions of the hearings and proceedings;
- (B) The relationship between the person who testified or responded and you; and

(C) All studies, test results, scientific and/or medical documents relied upon by each person as the basis for any recommendation made or testimony given;

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 52.

(55) State your knowledge relating to the meaning of "maximum allowable concentration" and/or "threshold limit value" as it pertains to asbestos exposure and disease.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, this interrogatory seeks expert opinion, which is improper. Without waiving this objection, in general, the maximum allowable concentration or threshold limit value is a number representing the maximum sustained rate of exposure to a material that will not produce adverse health effects. The publication containing a specific MAC or TLV should be consulted to determine exactly how it is defined.

(56) With reference to "maximum allowable concentration" and/or "threshold limit value", state:

(A) When and by what means you first obtained information related to a threshold limit value and/or maximum allowable concentration;

(B) The substance of any information imparted to you regarding the same;
and

(C) Whether and by what means you advised or warned anyone of details relating thereto.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, this interrogatory seeks information irrelevant to the subject matter. Plaintiff was not a Chrysler employee and, therefore, Chrysler's own employees are not at issue in this lawsuit and the information sought is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objections, Chrysler states that no records exist concerning when Chrysler knew that any governmental agency issued guidelines suggesting Threshold Limit Values for exposure to asbestos. Therefore, it is impossible to answer this interrogatory, as it would require ascertaining the subjective knowledge of every corporate employee, both past and present.

(57) State whether you ever knew that any governmental, private agency, and/or other entity issued guidelines suggesting a "maximum allowable concentration" and/or "threshold limit value" for exposure to asbestos dust and/or fibers. If so, state:

(A) The identity of the agency or other entity which issued said guidelines;

(B) The verbatim content of said guidelines;

(C) The date said guidelines were issued;

(D) The date you were first aware of the purpose of said guidelines; and

(E) The custodian, location and identity of all documents related thereto.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, this interrogatory seeks information irrelevant to the subject matter. Plaintiff was not a Chrysler employee and, therefore, Chrysler's own employees are not at issue in this lawsuit and the information sought is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objections, Chrysler states that no records exist concerning when Chrysler knew that any governmental agency issued guidelines suggesting Threshold Limit Values for exposure to asbestos. Therefore, it is impossible to answer this interrogatory, as it would require ascertaining the subjective knowledge of every corporate employee, both past and present.

(58) State whether you ever possessed any information or knowledge of documents indicating that existing or proposed "maximum allowable concentration" and/or "threshold limit values" were not safe or proper or that lower threshold limit values were necessary in order to prevent diseases caused by exposure to asbestos. If so, identify:

- (A) The source of such knowledge;
- (B) The persons who obtained such knowledge and when;
- (C) All documents relating thereto; and
- (D) The custodian and location of all documents identified in your Answer to Part (C) of this Interrogatory.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. See also response to Interrogatory No. 56.

(59) State whether you were ever made aware that the proper method for determining safe levels of asbestos dust was to test concentrations of asbestos fibers in the air rather than the total number of asbestos particles in the air. If so, state:

- (A) The source of such knowledge;
- (B) The persons who obtained such knowledge and when;
- (C) All documents relating thereto; and
- (D) The custodian and location of all documents identified in your Answer to Part (C) of this Interrogatory.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. See also response to Interrogatory No. 56.

(60) State in detail what tests or studies, if any, you ever conducted or directed with regard to the quantity, quality, or threshold limit values (as defined in Interrogatory No. 56) of asbestos dust, fibers or particles to which automobile brake/clutch mechanics or others who used the asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 and/or others working in the same vicinity were exposed.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 33 and 34.

(61) State in detail what research, tests or studies, if any, you ever conducted or directed to determine whether the exposure of automobile brake/clutch mechanics or others to asbestos dust exceeded the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists' (A.C.G.I.H.) recommended threshold limit values.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, see responses to Interrogatory Nos. 33 and 34.

(62) State in detail what steps, if any, you ever took to determine whether the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists' (A.C.G.I.H.) recommended threshold limit values for exposure to asbestos dust were accurate or reliable.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler relied on the wide acceptance of ACGIH threshold limit values by governments and other organizations regarding accuracy or reliability.

(63) State your knowledge relating to the meaning of "dose response relationship" as it pertains to exposure to asbestos dusts, fibers and/or products and the contracting of disease, including asbestosis, pneumoconiosis, mesothelioma, lung cancer and other cancers.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, this interrogatory seeks expert opinion, which is improper. Without waiving these objections, "dose response relationship" relates to asbestos-related diseases do not occur in the absence of excessive exposure.

(64) State whether you have ever placed any warranties, guarantees or other such representations on any asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 and/or on or in the containers or packages in which said products were sold, distributed or otherwise placed in the stream of commerce.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler made no warranties for brake linings or clutch facings that are relevant to this lawsuit or plaintiff's claims.

(65) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 64 is in the affirmative, for each such product and/or container or package, identify:

(A) The inclusive dates on which each such warranty, guarantee or other representation appeared on or with the product and/or on or in the container or package;

(B) A verbatim description of each such warranty, guarantee or other representation;

(C) A description of the location on the product and/or container where each such warranty, guarantee or other representation was placed;

(D) Each of your present or former highest supervisory employees with knowledge of the decision to place any such warranties, guarantees or other representations on or with the product and/or on or in the container or package; and

(E) The custodian of all documents in your custody, possession or control which relate to or describe any such warranties, guarantees or other representations or the decision to place any of these on or with the product and/or on or in the container or package.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 64.

(66) State whether the content and/or placement of any warranty, guarantee or other representation described in your Answer to Interrogatory Nos. 64 and 65 was ever changed. If so, for each such change, identify:

(A) The nature of the change, including a verbatim description, if applicable;

(B) The date when the change was made and the inclusive dates during which such change appeared on or with the product and/or on or in the container or package;

(C) The persons with personal knowledge of the reasons for making the change; and

(D) The custodian of documents in your custody, possession or control which relate to the decision and process of making the change.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 64.

(67) State when and by what means you became aware of the alleged hazards of exposure to asbestos dusts, fibers and/or products to the health of persons coming into contact with, handling or using asbestos products.

RESPONSE:

Objection. Lack of relevance, burdensome, and overly broad. This interrogatory improperly assumes that there is or might be adverse health effects associated with the use of chrysotile asbestos. Consequentially, answering defendant cannot respond to the interrogatory in its present form. Additionally, the interrogatory is designed to elicit a response that may be used in a misleading manner at the time of trial rather than the discovery of factual information. Chrysler does not acknowledge a causal relationship between exposure to brake dust or clutch facing dust and disease or illness. Chrysler was, however, aware in the 1930s that certain types of raw asbestos inhaled in large quantities could cause or contribute to pulmonary disease. Notably, chrysotile asbestos, used in friction products, is a different type of asbestos than insulation products. Therefore, Chrysler's understanding that insulation raw asbestos products have been connected to alleged asbestos related conditions is not applicable with respect to chrysotile asbestos used in friction production. Further, this interrogatory is objectionable, because it assumes that there are detrimental effects to users of friction products. Chrysler contends that its friction products are not detrimental.

(68) State when and by what means you became aware that exposure to asbestos dusts, fibers and/or products was acknowledged to be or alleged to be potentially hazardous to the health of persons coming in contact with, handling or using asbestos products.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 67 and 69.

(69) State whether you ever learned that there is or may be a causal connection between exposure to asbestos dust and:

- (A) Asbestosis;**
- (B) Pneumoconiosis;**
- (C) Lung Cancer;**
- (D) Mesothelioma; and**
- (E) Other cancers.**

RESPONSE:

Objection. Lack of relevance, burdensome, and overly broad. This interrogatory improperly assumes that there is or might be adverse health effects associated with the use of chrysotile asbestos. Consequentially, answering defendant cannot respond to the interrogatory in its present form. Additionally, the interrogatory is designed to elicit a response that may be used in a misleading manner at the time of trial rather than the discovery of factual information. Chrysler does not acknowledge a causal relationship between exposure to brake dust or clutch facing dust and disease or illness. Chrysler was, however, aware in the 1930s that certain types of raw asbestos inhaled in large quantities could cause or contribute to pulmonary disease. Notably, chrysotile asbestos, used in friction products, is a different type of asbestos than insulation products. Therefore, Chrysler's understanding that insulation raw asbestos products have been connected to alleged asbestos related conditions is not applicable with respect to chrysotile asbestos used in friction production. Further, this interrogatory is objectionable, because it assumes that there are detrimental effects to users of friction products. Chrysler contends that its friction products are not detrimental.

(70) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 69 is in the affirmative, identify the following as to each such disease listed therein:

- (A) When and by what means you first became aware of such causal**

connection;

(B) If your awareness of such causal connection was obtained at any conference, lecture, convention, symposium, or other such meeting, identify the event, its date, the person(s) who attended on your behalf and/or any documents obtained from such event; and

(C) If your awareness of such causal connection was obtained from a medical or scientific study, or from any other published works, identify the same and the date of your receipt thereof.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 69.

(71) State whether you ever specifically informed the purchasers and/or users of the asbestos products identified in your Answer to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 that exposure to asbestos dust could cause asbestosis, pneumoconiosis, lung cancer, mesothelioma and/or other cancers. If so, state:

(A) The date(s) of such notice to purchasers or users;

(B) The means used for transmittal of such notice;

(C) The custodian, identity and location of each document which refers to or contains information relevant to such notice; and

(D) The identity of each person who made decisions regarding the furnishing of such notice to purchasers and/or users.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 22 and 69.

(72) State whether you ever specifically informed the distributors or other entities identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 20 and/or those identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 21 who resold or redistributed the asbestos products identified in your answers to interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 that exposure to asbestos dust could cause asbestosis, pneumoconiosis, lung cancer, mesothelioma and/or other cancers. If so, state:

- (A) The date(s) of such notice;
- (B) The means used for transmittal of such notice;
- (C) The custodian, identity and location of each document which refers to or contains information relevant to such notice; and
- (D) The identity of each person who made decisions regarding the furnishing of such notice to distributors and/or those engaged in the resale or redistribution of the asbestos products.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 22 and 69.

(73) State whether you ever provided any caution, notice, warning or other statement or explanation of the potential health hazards of exposure to asbestos on or with the asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatories Nos. 8 and 19.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 22.

(74) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 73 is in the affirmative, state as to each product identified in your Answers to interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19:

- (A) The date(s) on which such caution, notice, warning or other statement or explanation first appeared;
- (B) The identity of each person with knowledge of decisions made regarding the use of such caution, notice, warning or other statement or explanation;
- (C) The verbatim content of each caution, notice, warning or other statement or explanation when it was first used;
- (D) Whether the caution, notice, warning or other statement or explanation

was ever altered, amended or changed. If so, how, when and why was it altered, amended or changed; and

(E) The size, color and location of the caution, notice, warning or other statement or explanation on each such product and/or its container or package.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 22.

(75) State when you first became aware that asbestos products were being labeled with a caution, warning, notice or other statement or explanation concerning the potential health hazards resulting from the use of asbestos products and/or exposure to asbestos dust or fibers and identify the product(s) and manufacturer(s) with which such label was connected.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler does not have a central listing or catalog of information about when hundreds of thousands past or present employees may have become aware of warnings on other manufacturers' products and there is no reasonable way for Chrysler to obtain the information necessary to answer this interrogatory.

(76) Identify the officer, agent, servant, employee or other representative of yours who first obtained an awareness that asbestos products were being labeled as described in Interrogatory No. 75.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 75.

(77) Identify the custodian, identity and location of all documents related to the

knowledge obtained by you regarding the labeling of asbestos products as described in Interrogatory No. 75.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 75.

(78) State when and by what means you first became aware that Johns-Manville Corporation or any of its affiliated companies placed on its asbestos products a caution, warning, notice, other statement or representation concerning the potential health hazards resulting from the use of asbestos products and/or exposure to asbestos dust or fibers.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, see response to Interrogatory No. 75.

(79) Identify the officer, agent, servant, employee or other representative of yours who first became aware that asbestos products of Johns-Manville Corporation or its affiliated companies were being labeled as described in Interrogatory No. 78.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 75 and 78.

(80) Identify the custodian, identity and location of all documents related to the knowledge obtained by you regarding the labeling of asbestos products by Johns-Manville Corporation or its affiliated companies as described in Interrogatory No. 78.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 75 and 78.

(81) If upon learning that Johns-Manville Corporation or its affiliated companies labeled its asbestos products as described in Interrogatory No. 78 you did not apply such labels to the products identified in your Answer to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, state:

(A) The reason(s) for such a decision;

(B) The identity of any agent, servant, employee, officer or representative of yours involved in discussions and decision . . . regarding the same; and

(C) The custodian, identity and location of all documents pertaining to such a decision.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 22, 33, 67, 75 and 78.

(82) State whether you specifically informed your employees, agents and/or servants that use of asbestos products and/or exposure to asbestos dust or fibers was either actually or alleged to be hazardous to their health.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, any information as to Chrysler's own employees is irrelevant. The brake linings undergoes a chemical transformation by reason of the braking process, converting more than 99 percent of the fibers into nonpathogenic minerals. Additionally, the asbestos fibers have attached to them flakes of resin. The mechanic is not exposed to inhalable, intact, chrysotile fibers of lengths considered to be pathogenic or in amounts which would cause disease. See also responses to Interrogatory Nos. 22, 33 and 67.

(83) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 82 is in the affirmative, state:

(A) When and in what manner you first provided such information to these persons;

(B) The identity of any agent, servant, employee, officer or representative of yours involved in discussions and decisions regarding providing information to these persons;

(C) The verbatim content of any written documents and/or communications containing such information; and

(D) The custodian, identity and location of all documents which relate or pertain to providing such information to these persons.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 82.

(84) Describe in detail any precautionary procedures which you urged or required your employees, agents and/or servants to follow so as to reduce and/or avoid the potential hazards or dangers associated with use of asbestos products and/or exposure to asbestos dust or fibers and state when and how each such procedure was introduced to these individuals.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 82.

(85) State whether you ever required your employees, agents and/or servants who worked with and around asbestos and/or asbestos products to wear respirators, gas masks, protective clothing and/or other protective devices. If so, state:

(A) Which employees, agents and/or servants, by type of employment and department, were required to use each such protective device;

(B) The date(s) on which the directive relative to each such protective device was issued for each type of employee and each department;

(C) Which type of protective device was required to be used or worn by each type of employee and each department;

(D) The identity of an agent, servant, employee, officer or representative of yours involved in discussions and decisions regarding the same; and

(E) The custodian, identity and location of all documents pertaining to protective devices.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, to answer this question would require making inquiry of every Chrysler Corporation employee, past or present, which would be impossible. See also response to Interrogatory No. 82.

(86) State whether at the commencement of an individual's employment with you, from 1930 to the present, you informed that person as to possible health ramifications of working with and around asbestos fibers, dust and/or products. If so, set forth:

(A) The nature of the warning;

(B) The manner in which said information is communicated and, if the communication is in writing, attach a copy hereto;

(C) When such practice was initiated; and

(D) By whom such information is communicated.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 82.

(87) State whether, based upon the material contents, the manufacturing

methods and the method of intended use of the asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, those asbestos products can generally be applied and/or removed by users or others without liberating asbestos fibers.

RESPONSE:

There is considerable data concerning the lack of toxicity of brake dust in that asbestos and friction products undergo tremendous heat and friction which transforms the asbestos into nontoxic substances. Moreover, the nature and exposure to brake dust normally is intermittent and involves only exposure to very minute quantities of dust, which contain no significant asbestos. Chrysler unequivocally denies that there exists today any medical or scientific knowledge that establishes risks associated with exposure to its friction products.

(88) State whether it was foreseeable to you that your asbestos-containing products would have to be removed, at any time after installation.

RESPONSE:

Brake linings and clutch facings wear with use and it is expected they will be replaced.

(89) State whether you ever provided users and others who would be applying or removing your asbestos products instructions concerning safety precautions to use during use of or exposure to such products.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory 22.

(90) State when you first became aware or received notice that any person was claiming injury as a result of use of and/or exposure to asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, to Chrysler's knowledge, the first asbestos lawsuit was filed in 1978.

(91) With regard to the first awareness or notice of claim of injury described in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 90 and regarding all claims filed up to the present for any injury allegedly resulting from the use of and/or exposure to asbestos products, state:

- (A) The identity of each claimant;
- (B) The date of notice of each claim;
- (C) A description of each claim;
- (D) The type of injury allegedly sustained by each claimant;
- (E) The job location and job function of each claimant;
- (F) The date of employment of each claimant;
- (G) The identity of each attorney representing the individuals making such claims;
- (H) The style, case number and court applicable to each claim;
- (I) The resolution of each claim; and
- (J) The custodian, identity and location of all documents which relate or pertain to each claim.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and because it seeks information protected by the attorney-client and work-product privileges. Without waiving these objections, see responses to Interrogatory Nos. 90, 22 and 67.

(92) State whether, at any time prior to the present, any person filed a claim against any worker's compensation insurance carrier which provided coverage for you alleging that he or she contracted a disease as a result of use of and/or exposure to asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19.

RESPONSE:

Objection. Lack of relevance, burdensome, and overly broad. Plaintiff was never an employee of Chrysler and, therefore, any workers compensation claims by Chrysler employees alleging asbestos induced disease is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(93) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 92 is in the affirmative, provide the following information:

(A) A list of each such claim by claimant's name, occupation, date of employment, job location, date claim filed and jurisdiction; and

(B) A brief summary of the disposition of each such claim.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 91 and 92.

(94) State whether you ever received any reports or communications from your worker's compensation insurance carrier or products liability insurance carrier with regard to potential health hazards incident to use of asbestos products and/or exposure to asbestos fibers or dust.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory 92.

(95) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 94 is in the affirmative, state:

- (A) The substance of the contents of such reports or communications;
- (B) The identity of the insurance carrier from which you received each report or communication;
- (C) The dates of each such report or communication; and
- (D) The custodian, identity and location of all documents which relate or pertain to such reports or communications.

RESPONSE:

Not applicable.

(96) State whether you ever maintained or operated a unit or units of your corporation, including, but not limited to divisions, subsidiaries or another entity, which was/were under contract to apply or install the asbestos products described in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, Chrysler states that there are no documents responsive to this request in its possession, custody or control.

(97) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 96 is in the affirmative, identify any and all claims filed by workers in such contract units or divisions alleging disease arising out of the use of asbestos products and/or exposure to asbestos fibers or dust and, as to each such claim, state:

- (A) The date on which you first received notice;
- (B) The identity of the claimant;
- (C) The nature and description of the claim;
- (D) The job location and job function of each claimant;
- (E) The date of employment of each claimant;
- (F) The style, case number and jurisdiction;
- (G) The resolution of the claim; and
- (H) The custodian, identity and location of all documents which relate or pertain to each claim.

RESPONSE:

Not applicable.

(98) Describe the method by which you have maintained records concerning the manufacture, sale, advertising, distribution, delivery and installation of each of the asbestos products identified in your Answer to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler customarily sells its cars, trucks, and replacement parts to authorized dealers and distributors who then resell them. The ultimate buyers do not purchase Chrysler products directly from Chrysler. Chrysler does not have records of sales of parts by dealers or distributors.

(99) With regard to the record-keeping method described in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 98 identify:

(A) Each present and former corporate department division or subdivision responsible for maintaining the records;

(B) How the records are kept, e.g., in boxes, files, on microfilm, microfiche or computer tape or disk;

(C) The inclusive dates of manufacture, sale, advertising, distribution, delivery and installation that the record keeping system covers;

(D) The location(s) where such records are maintained; and

(E) The identity of each person employed by you at any, time from 1930 to the present, in the highest supervisory capacity who is or was directly responsible for the collection and maintenance of such records.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(100) If the record keeping system described in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 99 includes use of microfilm, microfiche, computer tape or disk or any other system in which data is taken from other records, state whether you have retained the documents or other material from which the information entered into these modes of storage was obtained. If not, indicate:

(A) The date when and location where the original records were destroyed or discarded;

(B) The custodian and location of the records prior to their destruction; and -

(C) The identity of each employee, representative, official or agent of yours who ordered, authorized or supervised said destruction.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 99.

(101) State whether, at any time from 1930 to the present you made any representations that the presence of asbestos in the products identified in your Answer to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 made these products superior, in any way, to any asbestos-free product or material intended for the same or similar use.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, Chrysler states that there are no documents responsive to this request in its possession, custody or control.

(102) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 101 is in the affirmative, indicate with respect to each such representation:

(A) The date(s) on which the representation was made;

(B) Its exact content; and

(C) The manner in which it was communicated.

RESPONSE:

Not applicable.

(103) State whether, at any time from 1930 to the present you made any representations that the use of asbestos or the use of the asbestos products identified in your Answer to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 was safe, harmless or not dangerous.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, see answer to Interrogatory 22.

(104) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 103 is in the affirmative, indicate as to each such representation:

- (A) The date(s) on which the representation was made;
- (B) Its exact content; and
- (C) The manner in which it was communicated.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 103.

(105) State whether any of the asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 were ever stored or warehoused by you in Maryland at any time from 1930 to the present.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, there is no information in this matter that plaintiff worked at any such facility.

(106) If your Answer to Interrogatory No. 105 is in the affirmative, identify:

- (A) The address of each warehouse or storage facility;
- (B) The asbestos products stored or warehoused at each warehouse or storage facility identified in your Answer to part (A) of this Interrogatory;
- (C) The year(s) of such storage or warehousing; and
- (D) The custodian, identity and location of each document in your custody, possession or control which describes or relates to such storage or warehousing.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 105.

(107) Identify the means by which the asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 were transported to Maryland at any time from 1930 to the present and state:

(A) If the asbestos products were transported by rail, identify the name(s) of the railroad company(ies) providing that service and the year(s) during which such service was used;

(B) If the asbestos products were transported by truck, identify the name(s) of the carrier providing that service and the year(s) during which such service was used;

(C) If the asbestos products were transported by vessel identify the name(s) of the shipline providing that service and the year(s) during which such service was used;

(D) The identity of each employee of yours responsible for coordinating the transport or delivery of such products to Maryland and in the District of Columbia;

(E) The identity of each employee, officer, agent or representative of yours with personal knowledge of the transport or delivery of such products to Maryland and in the District of Columbia; and

(F) The custodian, identity and location of each document which describes or relates to the transport or delivery of such products to Maryland and in the District of Columbia;

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, the methods by which brake linings and clutch facings containing encapsulated asbestos were shipped for a period exceeding 65 years is not relevant to any issue in this lawsuit in which, as Chrysler understands it, plaintiff is claiming an exposure to asbestos during the performance of automotive repairs.

(108) Identify each person whom you expect to call as an expert witness at trial, state the subject matter on which each expert is expected to testify, state the substance of the findings and opinions to which each expert is expected to testify and a summary of the grounds for each opinion and produce any written report made by each expert concerning those findings and opinions.

RESPONSE:

To be supplied in accordance with the pre-trial scheduling order.

(109) With regard to expert witnesses identified in your Answer to Interrogatory No. 108, identify by case name, date, court and case number any deposition or testimony given by each such expert and state the custodian and location of transcripts thereof.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 108.

(110) Identify each person who has testified on your behalf, and each person who has testified who is or has been your employee, official or director, at trial or by deposition in a case alleging asbestos-related injury, state the custodian and location of transcripts thereof, and set forth the case name, number, court date, and court reporter with respect to each proceeding in which the witness testified.

RESPONSE:

Objection as to relevance and admissibility. Notwithstanding this objection, the answer is as follows:

<u>EMPLOYEE NAME</u>	<u>CASE NAME</u>	<u>ST</u>	<u>D O C K E T</u>	<u>COURT REPORTER</u>
			<u>NO./DATE</u> <u>OF DEPOSITION</u>	<u>NAME AND ADDRESS</u>
Peter Heckman	<u>Monohan v.</u> <u>Fibreboard</u>	CA	CV-086275 3/29/94	
James Knoll	<u>Vaughn v. Raymark</u>	MO	82-1655-C(A) 12/8/83	William J. Rittinger (CSR-2176)

James Knoll	<u>Horn v. Bendix Corp.</u>	WA	80-2-90935-3 6/15/84	Jo Anne Kippert
James Knoll	<u>Webb v. Celotex</u>	MI	85-514-889-NP 6/29/87	Rene Asbell Twedt CSR/RPR-2907
James Knoll	<u>Coates v. Raymark Ind.</u>	NJ	L-095651-85 9/14/88	Leslie Jean Geiser
James Knoll	<u>Marcinowski v. Abex</u>	PA	88-7410 4/26/91	Jeanne Hoyt-Christian
Gerald Sattelmeier	<u>Boatnar v. Chrysler</u>	MI	84-410-852-NP 7/15/86	Ramon Oliver Jonesan Geiser
Gerald Sattelmeier	<u>Coates v. Raymark Ind.</u>	NJ	L-095651-85 5/9/89	Lisa K. Traylor CSR-3428
Jack Koblin	<u>Coates v. Raymark</u>	NJ	1-095651-85 6/14/88	Marc Brody
Paul D. Kelly, Jr.	<u>Coates v. Raymark</u>	NJ	L-095651-85 6/14/88	Marc Brody
Paul D. Kelly, Jr.	<u>Becker v. Baron Bros.</u>	NJ	L-91267-85 6/15/88	Alena J. Lynch

(111) State whether you contend that asbestos products have been or can be manufactured or treated so as to eliminate all potential health hazards to workers who use asbestos products and/or are exposed to asbestos fibers or dust. If so, explain in detail the factual basis for this contention.

RESPONSE

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Additionally, this interrogatory improperly seeks expert opinion and fails to distinguish the different types of asbestos. Without waiving said objection, see response to interrogatory 87.

(112) State whether you contend that any person or business entity not presently a party to this action is responsible in whole or in part for any of the plaintiff's(s') damages. If so, identify each such person or business entity and state the facts which form the basis for each such contention.

RESPONSE:

Discovery is ongoing and this defendant reserves the right to amend this answer pending additional discovery.

(113) State whether you contend that asbestos products are not inherently dangerous. If so, state all facts and documents which form the basis for such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, see response to Interrogatory III.

(114) State whether you contend that you did not have any reason or duty to warn Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' employers or users of the asbestos products identified in your Answer to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 of the hazards and risks of use of and exposure thereto. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis for such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and because it is argumentative, misleading, and tries to require Chrysler to list facts to prove a negative and, as such, it tries to impose the burden of proof on Chrysler. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler denies that there are substantial risks or hazards associated with the use of these products. See response to Interrogatory No. 113.

(115) State whether you contend that you performed adequate tests of the safety of the asbestos products identified in your Answer to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis for such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Yes. See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 22, 34, 67 and 113.

(116) State whether you contend that you did not conspire with others to allow asbestos products to be used without adequate warnings, or without any warnings, regarding the hazards or risks of use of and/or exposure thereto. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis for such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and because it is argumentative, misleading, and an improper hypothetical that tries to force Chrysler to assume the false allegations that "Chrysler conspired with others" or that there are hazards and risks associated with its products. Without waiving this objection, see response to Interrogatory No. 114.

(117) State whether you contend that there are circumstances under which asbestos products can safely be handled and used. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis for such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Yes. See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 67, 113 and 114.

(118) State whether you contend that there is now or has ever been a distinction between one or more of the following with respect to use of and exposure to asbestos products and the health hazards or

risks relating thereto: miners, millers, textile workers, asbestos plant workers, insulators, shipyard workers, steel plant workers, building tradesmen, industrial workers and automobile brake/clutch mechanics. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis for such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, yes. See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 67, 113 and 114.

(119) State whether you contend that there are differences between asbestos fiber types (chrysotile, amosite, crocidolite, actinolite, anthophyllite or tremolite with regard to diseases they may be capable of causing. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis for such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, there are many published articles about the potential pathogenic effects of the various asbestos fiber types that are equally available to plaintiff. See also response to Interrogatory Nos. 67, 113 and 114.

(120) Identify all locations including but not limited to those at which Plaintiffs worked, to which you sold, supplied, distributed and/or installed asbestos products within the State of Maryland from the date of the inception of your company to the present and include as to each such location:

- (A) The identity of employees, including foremen and helpers;
- (B) Dates;
- (C) Location;
- (D) Identity and quantity of asbestos products;

- (E) Contracts;
- (F) Bids;
- (G) Specifications;
- (H) Work orders;
- (I) Estimates;
- (J) Reports; and
- (K) Job Books

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 98 and 99.

(121) Have you undertaken an investigation of the occurrence(s) alleged in plaintiffs' Complaints? If so, state:

(A) The identity of the person(s) participating in each such investigation;

(B) Whether you have obtained statements from any witness(es) and, if so, identify:

(i) The identity of each such witness; and

(ii) The identity of the person in possession of each such statement.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this Interrogatory because it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and because it seeks information protected by the attorney-client and work-product doctrines.

(122) State whether you contend that you gave adequate warnings to users of and to those exposed to your asbestos products, including the plaintiffs, of the hazards and risks of use of and exposure thereto. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, see responses to Interrogatory Nos. 22, 67, 113 and 114.

(123) State whether you contend that you recommended safety procedures regarding the use of and exposure to asbestos products to the plaintiff or the plaintiffs' employer. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 122.

(124) State whether you contend that the plaintiffs were exposed, if at all, to a safe amount of asbestos or to than the "threshold limit" of exposure to asbestos dust and fibers from the use of and exposure to asbestos products. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler does not know that plaintiff had any exposure to asbestos from Chrysler's products. See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 22, 67, 113, 114 and 123.

(125) State whether you contend that the plaintiffs' disabilities or injuries are unrelated to the use of and exposure to asbestos products. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis for such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Chrysler also objects to this Interrogatory because it is overly broad and it tries to require Chrysler to list facts to prove a negative (i.e., the non-causation of plaintiff's injuries) and, as such, it tries to impose on Chrysler the burden to prove the non-causation of plaintiff's injuries. The Interrogatory is also burdensome, harassing and oppressive. Discovery and investigation by Chrysler are continuing and it has not yet determined whether plaintiff's condition was caused by his alleged exposure to any asbestos-containing products. Even if it is determined that plaintiff's condition was caused by exposure to asbestos, Chrysler contends that plaintiff's condition was not caused by products manufactured by Chrysler. Chrysler is not aware of any admissible or credible evidence that indicates plaintiff had an exposure to asbestos from any of its products or that he suffered from any asbestos-related disease because of exposure to the products manufactured or sold by Chrysler. Chrysler relies on the absence of any evidence that would establish that a defect in any of its products caused or contributed to the injuries allegedly sustained by plaintiff. Chrysler also relies on the fact that plaintiffs and their lawyer cannot state with any specificity why they claim plaintiff was exposed to or injured by a Chrysler product nor can they adequately state the particular nature of any defect in a product or condition that they contend was responsible for plaintiff's alleged injuries. See also responses to Interrogatory Nos. 20, 67, 113, 114 and 123.

(126) State whether you contend that the plaintiffs' injuries are related in whole or in part to cigarette smoking. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis for such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, this defendant contends that plaintiff's alleged illness was caused by cigarette smoking and plaintiff may have failed to use due care for his own safety.

(127) State whether you contend that the plaintiffs' injuries are due to an act of the plaintiffs' employer. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 125.

(128) State whether you contend that the plaintiffs did not work with and were not exposed to any asbestos products mined, manufactured, sold, supplied, distributed and/or installed by you. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 125.

(129) State whether you contend that the asbestos products which the plaintiffs used and/or were exposed to were not under your exclusive control. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler is not aware of any allegation that plaintiff worked for or under the direction of Chrysler and, as such, Chrysler does not know of any facts to support an allegation against plaintiff's Employer. See also response to Interrogatory No. 125.

(130) State whether you contend that there were changes made to your asbestos products after they left your control. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(131) State whether you contend that the plaintiffs' claims are barred by the applicable statute of limitations. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

(132) State whether you contend that the plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrine of assumption of the risk. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, discovery and investigation are continuing and defendant has not yet determined whether plaintiff's claim is barred by his assumption of risk of injury while working with asbestos products.

(133) State whether you contend that the plaintiffs' claims are barred by his alleged contributory negligence. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, discovery and investigation are continuing and defendant has not yet determined

whether plaintiff's claim is barred by his contributory negligence while working with asbestos products.

(134) State whether you contend that the plaintiffs' claims are barred by his alleged misuse of the asbestos products with which he worked. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper. Because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, discovery and investigation are continuing and defendant has not yet determined whether plaintiff's claim is barred by his misuse of the asbestos products with which he worked.

(135) State whether you contend that the plaintiffs' injuries were caused by any intervening acts or superseding negligence. If so, state all facts and identify all documents which form the basis of such a contention.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler does not know what plaintiff means by "intervening acts or superseding negligence" in the context of this case.

(136) With regard to each type of asbestos or asbestos product identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, state:

(a) Where it was purchased, or if it was not purchased, where it was obtained;

(b) From whom it was purchased or obtained and when;

(c) The manner in which it was received, stored and used in the production of the product; and

(d) The amount of it received by you on a year to year basis.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, see response to interrogatory 19.

(137) Before marketing, selling, distributing and/or installing the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 did you or anyone on your behalf conduct any pre-marketing tests of such asbestos-containing products concerning their potential for causing injury to persons exposed thereto? If your answer is in the affirmative, please state:

(a) The particular products upon which such tests were performed;

- (b) When said tests were performed;
- (c) By whom said tests were performed;
- (d) Where said tests were performed;
- (e) What tests were performed;
- (f) The reason for performing said tests;
- (g) The results of said tests;
- (h) To whom said results were reported or communicated;
- (i) Where the results of said tests were memorialized

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 32, 33, 34 and 67.

(138) Before marketing, selling, distributing and/or installing the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, did you or anyone on your behalf conduct a search of the medical and scientific literature concerning asbestos or asbestos-containing products and potential health hazards associated therewith. If your answer is in the affirmative, please state:

- (a) The particular searches performed;
- (b) When said searches were performed;
- (c) The dates of such searches;
- (d) Where said searches were performed;
- (e) By whom said searches were performed;
- (f) The results of said searches;
- (g) To whom the results were reported or communicated;
- (h) Where the results of said searches were memorialized.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler has not found any information about searches like these, but would not expect to because of the passage of so much time. Further, plaintiff has not identified any medical or scientific literature from the 1930s or earlier proving that mechanics who worked with brake linings or clutches had an excess of any kind of asbestos-related disease.

(139) State when and under what circumstances you first learned that those engaged in the mining and milling of asbestos and/or the manufacturing of asbestos-containing products contracted asbestos-related lung diseases including but not limited to pleural asbestosis, parenchymal asbestosis, pulmonary asbestosis, lung cancer, colon cancer, other cancers, mesothelioma.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 69.

(140) Deleted.

(141) After marketing, selling, distributing and/or installing the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, did you or anyone on your behalf conduct a search of the medical and scientific literature concerning asbestos or asbestos-containing products and potential health hazards associated therewith. If your answer is in the affirmative, please state:

- (a) The particular searches performed;
- (b) The dates of such searches;
- (c) Where said searches were performed;

- (d) By whom said searches were performed;
- (e) The results of said searches;
- (f) To whom the results were reported or communicated;
- (g) Where the results of said searches were memorialized.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 22, 32, 33, 34 and 67.

(142) After learning that those involved in the mining and milling of asbestos and/or manufacturing of asbestos-containing products sustained asbestos-related injuries, did you or anyone on your behalf conduct any tests of the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 concerning their potential for causing injury to persons exposed thereto? If your answer is in the affirmative, please state:

- (a) The particular products upon which such tests were performed;
- (b) By whom said tests were performed;
- (c) Where said tests were performed;
- (d) What tests were performed;
- (e) The reason for performing said tests;
- (f) The results of said tests;
- (g) To whom said results were reported or communicated;
- (h) Where the results of said tests were memorialized.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(143) After learning that those involved in the mining and milling of asbestos and/or manufacturing of asbestos-containing products sustained asbestos-related injuries did you or anyone on your behalf conduct a search of the medical and scientific literature of asbestos or asbestos-containing products and potential health hazards associated therewith? If your answer is in the affirmative, please state:

- (a) The particular searches performed;
- (b) The dates of such searches;
- (c) Where said searches were performed;
- (d) By whom said searches were performed;
- (e) The results of said searches;
- (f) To whom the results were reported or communicated;
- (g) Where the results of said searches were memorialized.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(144) Have you or anyone on your behalf conducted or had conducted any investigation of the statistical and/or epidemiological relationship between your employees exposed to asbestos or any persons using the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 and the contraction by humans or animals of, cural asbestosis, parenchymal asbestosis, pulmonary asbestosis, lung cancer, colon cancer, other cancers and mesothelioma. If so:

- (a) Identify each person participating in such investigation and describe in detail the extent of this participation;
- (b) State when the investigation was conducted;
- (c) Identify the person or persons who authorized the investigation;

(d) Identify each document which refers or related to any information set forth in answer to this Interrogatory;

(e) As to any information received orally in answer to this Interrogatory, identify each person who supplied such information and state the full substance of the information supplied;

(f) Identify the person or persons to whom the results of the investigation were reported or communicated; and

(g) Where the results of said investigation were memorialized.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, this request is objectionable because it assumes that there are detrimental effects to users of friction products. Chrysler contends that its friction products are not detrimental. Further, this interrogatory improperly assumes that asbestos fibers or dust are inhaled by one using or exposed to defendant's products. Consequently, this interrogatory is objectionable as phrased.

Without waiving these objections, Chrysler has not engaged in any epidemiological studies of mechanics engaged in brake or clutch repair. Chrysler's expert witnesses will, however, testify about epidemiological studies of different types of workers exposed to asbestos if it is relevant to their opinions. See also responses to Interrogatory Nos. 32, 33, 34 and 69.

(145) Describe in detail all written and oral reports, including those reports originating from users of any of the asbestos-containing products identified in your answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 made by anyone, including doctors, and employees and agents of the Defendant, concerning any relationship between the use of these products and the development of pleural asbestosis, parenchymal asbestosis, pulmonary asbestosis, lung cancer, colon cancer, other cancer or mesothelioma in humans or animals;

(a) Identify all persons making said reports and to whom said reports were made;

(b) State whether any report or series of reports initiated changes and/or

spaces? If so, state:

(a) Who made the test or study;

(b) When was the test or study made;

(c) What was the result of the study or test;

(d) To whom the results were reported or communicated;

(e) If the result was written, identify the document by title, date, file designation and author of each such test or study, and the location and present custodian thereof.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, any information as to Chrysler's employees or manufacturing facilities is irrelevant since plaintiff is not and was not a Chrysler employee.

(152) Have you or has anyone on your behalf attended and/or participated in any conference, seminar, lecture or symposium not previously identified herein dealing with the potential health hazards of asbestos inhalation or use of asbestos-containing products and, if so, state:

(a) The date and place of such conference, seminar, lecture or symposium;

(b) The person or persons conducting such conference, seminar, lecture or symposium;

(c) The person or persons who attended on your behalf;

(d) The subject matter of such conference, seminar, lecture or symposium;

(e) The speakers and/or moderators at such conference, seminar, lecture or symposium;

(f) Whether any reports or memoranda were made concerning the matter of such conference, seminar, lecture or symposium; identifying each such report or memorandum.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Some of Chrysler's hundreds of thousands of employees have probably attended meetings where these topics were mentioned, but there is no practical way to identify these employees and meetings.

(153) State when, if at all, you received knowledge of the documents and/or publications listed on attached Exhibit A or matters discussed therein, who received such knowledge and identify all documents relating to such knowledge.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, it is impossible to answer this interrogatory, as it would require ascertaining the subjective knowledge of every corporate employee, both past and present.

(154) When was the first time that you became aware of the contents and existence of public Health Bulletin No. 241 entitled "A Study of Asbestosis in the Asbestos Textile Industry" by Dressen, Dallavale, Edwards, Miller and Sayers?

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, it is impossible to answer this interrogatory, as it would require ascertaining the subjective knowledge of every corporate employee, both past and present.

(155) With respect to the article referred to in the preceding Interrogatory, please state:

- (a) How you became aware of the existence of such article;
- (b) How you first became aware of the content of such article;
- (c) Which individuals, representatives, employees or agents of yours were the first to become aware of the content and existence of such article;
- (d) The job title or position held by such individual(s) of yours who first became aware of the contents and existence of such article.

RESPONSE:

Not applicable.

(156) State whether your knowledge of the contents of the article referred to in the preceding two interrogatories was relied upon by you at any time in deciding whether a caution or warning statement should be placed upon the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 concerning the potential health hazards of exposure to asbestos. If so, please state:

- (a) How such article influenced the decision concerning the placement of a caution or warning statement on such asbestos-containing products concerning the potential health hazards posed by exposure to asbestos.
- (b) Identify and attach hereto copies of all writings, including memos, letters, etc., concerning your reliance on such article in deciding whether to place a caution or warning statement on such asbestos-containing products.

RESPONSE:

Not applicable.

(157) When was the first time that you became aware of the contents and existence of the article entitled "A Health Survey of Pipe Covering Operations in Constructing Naval Vessels" by Fleischer, Viles, Gade, and Drinker.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler has no way of determining when one of its hundreds of thousands past and present employees may have received this article, if at all.

(158) With respect to the article referred to in the preceding interrogatory, please state:

- (a) How you became aware of the existence of such article;
- (b) How you first became aware of the content of such article;
- (c) Which individuals, representatives, employees or agents of yours were the first to become aware of the content and existence of such article;
- (d) The job title or position held by such individual(s) of yours who first became aware of the contents and existence of such article.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 157.

(159) State whether your knowledge of the contents of the article referred to in the preceding two interrogatories was relied upon by you at any time in deciding whether a caution or warning statement should be placed upon the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 concerning the potential health hazards of exposure to asbestos. If so, please state:

- (a) How such article influenced the decision concerning the placement of a caution or warning statement on such asbestos-containing products concerning the potential health hazards posed by exposure to asbestos.
- (b) Identify and attach hereto copies of all writings including memos, letters, etc., concerning your reliance on such article in deciding whether to place a caution or warning statement on such asbestos-containing products.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 158.

(160) Identify all patents issued, or any applications made there for by you, for any non-asbestos product which was developed to replace an asbestos containing product. Specify the number of each patent, the date(s) of application, issuance and renewal if applicable, to whom each patent was issued and the product(s) for which each patent was issued.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 14 and 17.

(161) Pursuant to your record destruction or retention policy have you destroyed any documents, records or writings pertaining to:

- (a) Health hazards of asbestos;
- (b) Workmen's Compensation claims arising out of asbestosis, lung cancer, mesothelioma, cor pulmonale, pneumoconiosis, or pulmonary fibrosis;
- (c) Placing caution statements or warning labels on your products;
- (d) Hazardous conditions in your mines, plants or factories;
- (e) Funding of studies about health hazards of asbestos;
- (f) Lawsuits arising out of injuries alleged to have been caused by asbestos.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this Interrogatory because it is argumentative, overly broad, unduly burdensome and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(162) State your understanding of what legal duties or obligations you have or had concerning testing, inspection, design, manufacturing and use of the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 before and after marketing them for sale.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and seeks a legal opinion. The existence or non-existence of a duty is a legal issue to be decided by the trial judge.

(163) State whether you have ever discussed or considered the effect giving caution statements or warnings would have on sales of products containing asbestos. If so, please state:

- (a) The form of the consideration or discussion;
- (b) The date of the discussion or consideration;
- (c) If the consideration or discussion occurred at a meeting, the names and present business and home addresses of those attending;
- (d) The location and identifying codes of any records of such considerations or discussions;
- (e) Whether you discussed or considered the effect such warning(s) would have on sales of the product;
- (f) Whether you considered or discussed the costs that would be incurred in preparing and using such label;
- (g) Whether consideration was given to the effect any particular language used in a warning might have on sales.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissable evidence. Without waiving this objection, see response to interrogatory 22.

(164) Did you ever consider the resultant effect on sales of the asbestos products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 of the public knowing of health hazards linked or allegedly linked to asbestos? If so, please state:

- (a) The form of consideration;
- (b) The date of the consideration;
- (c) The names of each person who considered the matter;
- (d) If the consideration occurred at a meeting, the names and present business and home addresses of those attending;
- (e) The location and identifying code of all records of such consideration.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 163.

(165) Have you ever imposed or considered any restriction or limitation on the use of the asbestos-containing products you sold, supplied, distributed and/or installed? If so, state separately for each product:

(a) The verbatim content of each limitation indicating which product it applied to;

(b) The date it was first imposed;

(c) The reason for imposing the restriction or limitation;

(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 purchasers of the product, state how this was communicated and if in writing, identify the communication and attach a copy to your answer;

(g) If not imposed, state why not.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(166) Did you, at any time since 1930, ever consider providing any warnings, using any caution label or imposing any restriction on the use of the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19? If so, state separately for each time the matter was considered:

(a) The form of the consideration:

- (b) The date of the consideration;
- (c) If the consideration occurred at a meeting, the names and present business and home addresses of those attending;
- (d) The substance of the consideration;
- (e) The location and identifying codes of any records of such consideration;
- (f) What language would be used in each label and whether you considered the effect such language would have in:
 - (i) providing an adequate warning;
 - (ii) depressing sales of the products;
- (g) What were the various sizes of labels that were considered and the substance of the discussion;
- (h) Where each label or warning was to be placed on the product and the substance of any pertinent discussions.

RESPONSE:

Objection to the undefined term "restriction on the use". Without waiving said objection, see responses to Interrogatory Nos. 22, 32, 34, 67, 113 and 114. Chrysler does not know what plaintiff means by "restriction on use."

(167) Did you receive any warning, instructions, or information as to the potential dangers of asbestos inhalation when you purchased, or accepted any asbestos or asbestos products? If so, for each:

- (a) describe in detail each such warning, instruction or information received;
- (b) State whether such warnings, instruction or information was oral or written;
- (c) If oral, identify the substance of the warning, instruction or information

received and the date and the name and company of the person from whom received;

(d) If written, attach a copy of each warning, instruction and information, identify it by date given, title and reference number and state the manner and location whereby it was transmitted to you.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(168) Have you ever included a health warning with respect to any product manufactured by you which does not contain asbestos, indicating that such non-asbestos containing product may in some way be harmful to human beings? If so, for each such product, please state:

- (a) The name of the product;
- (b) The chemical composition or ingredients of the product;
- (c) The use for which such product is intended;
- (d) The manner in which it is thought the product may cause harm to human beings;
- (e) The contents of the warning;
- (f) The size of the warning;
- (g) The color of the warning;
- (h) The date the warning was first given to the public;
- (i) The names of the people responsible for or participating in the decision to provide the warning and:
 - (1) Their present address;
 - (2) Their present position or status with your company;
 - (3) The position held at the time the decision was made.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler has provided many cautions in owner's manuals, service manuals and on products—that have absolutely no relevance to this lawsuit. It would be extremely expensive and potentially impossible to obtain copies of every owner's and service manual and caution label for every model vehicle or part that Chrysler manufactured or sold since 1925.

(169) Have you ever sent any advisory letter or memorandum to any of your customers (specifically including without limitation, to any co-defendant in this case) or to any of the Plaintiffs' employers, which attempts to advise them of any health hazard that may be associated with the use of asbestos-containing products? If so,

- (a) Identify the author of each such advisory letter or memorandum;
- (b) State the content of each such advisory letter or memorandum;
- (c) Identify the person(s) to whom each such letter or memorandum was sent;
- (d) State the date on which each such letter was sent; and
- (e) Identify the custodian of all such advisory letters or memoranda.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, this interrogatory is objectionable because it assumes there are health hazards associated with Chrysler products. Without waiving said objection, see responses to Interrogatory Nos. 67 and 113.

(170) Did you or do you claim that any respirators or other breathing devices prevent inhalation of 100% of the asbestos dust and fibers which may be given off or released from the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19? If so, state:

- (a) Identify the respirator by manufacturer of product name and number;
- (b) When the respirator was sold;
- (c) Give the detailed description of such respirator or other breathing device;
- (d) The basis of your claim that it will prevent the inhalation of such dust and fibers;
- (e) Identify any relevant tests performed by date, title, author and number.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Without waiving this objection, Chrysler denies that mechanics are exposed to excessive amounts of asbestos during brake or clutch repairs. Chrysler is not making any representation about the effectiveness of respirators in this case.

(171) Have you undertaken or financed any studies to determine what type of respirator and/or protective mask would either eliminate or afford maximum protection against the inhalation of asbestos fibers? If so, state:

- (a) Who made the study;
- (b) When was the study made;
- (c) What was the result of the study;
- (d) If the result was written, identify the document by title, date, file designation and author of each such study, and the location and present custodian thereof.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 67, 85, and 113.

(172) State whether you have entered into any agreement, either oral or written, with any other Defendant in this action or other personal injury asbestos cases regarding:

(a) Settlement or non-settlement and/or

(b) Allocation of damages, should the plaintiffs prevail on liability. if the answer is yes to either of the above, state the substance of each such agreement and such parties who have entered into this agreement:

(1) Identify those persons who participated in the preparation of each such agreement and describe in detail the nature and extent of his participation; and

(2) identify each document which contains, refers or relates to each such agreement.

RESPONSE:

No.

(173) Do you or your attorneys have any written statements which you have not previously produce from any persons having knowledge of facts relevant to the subject matter of this lawsuit, including witnesses to the exposure, injury, illnesses, etc. in question? If yes, please state the names, addresses, home telephone numbers, places of employment, relationship to you and the present whereabouts of all such persons.

RESPONSE:

(174) State whether any expert whom you expect to call as a witness at trial has performed any examination, test, modeling or other analysis of any product at issue in this action or of any product similar in nature to a product at issue in this trial, if you intend to call that witness to testify at trial and the witness will rely on the examination, testing, modeling, or other analysis of such similar products. If so:

(a) identify the product involved by trade name, brand name;

(b) Identify the defendant whom you claim manufactured or sold the product; and

(c) With respect to such examination, test, modeling or other analysis;

(i) identify the expert who performed it;

(ii) State the date it was performed;

(iii) State its purpose;

(iv) State its nature;

(v) State the results;

(vi) State the expert's conclusions;

(vii) State whether any notes of the examination, test, modeling or other analysis were made; and

(viii) State whether the expert has issued a report which mentions or is based in whole or in part upon any such examination, test, modeling or other analysis. If so, please attach a copy of the report to your answers to these Interrogatories.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 32. No tests, examinations, testing, modeling or product analysis has been performed specifically for this case up to this time. Investigation and discovery are continuing.

(175) State whether any expert whom you expect to call as a witness at trial has ever inspected, visited or otherwise viewed any work place where asbestos-containing products were used or removed. If so:

(a) identify the expert;

(b) identify each site inspected, visited or otherwise viewed;

(c) State the date of each such inspection, visit or viewing;

(d) State whether any notes were made by the expert with respect to such

inspection, visit or viewing;

(e) State the opinions of the expert band in whole or in part upon the inspection, visit or view; and

(f) State whether the expert issued any report concerning the inspection, visit or view. If so, please attach a copy to your Answers to these Interrogatories.

RESPONSE:

Discovery and investigation by Chrysler are continuing and Chrysler has not yet determined the expert witnesses who will be retained or called to testify at trial. When Chrysler makes that determination in accordance with the pre-trial schedule, it will supplement this response.

(176) For each person whom you expect to call as a non-expert witness on your behalf at trial who previously has testified in a trial or deposition in a Court or administrative proceeding involving asbestos-related injury, identify each such person, identify by case name, date, Court or administrative agency, and docket number, each such proceeding, and identify the custodian and location of each transcript of that person's testimony in such proceeding.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 175.

(177) State whether you have ever attended any meetings related to the setting of industry or governmental standards or regulations related to asbestos. If so, identify:

(a) when the meeting occurred;

(b) the participants;

(c) the standard or regulation which was involved;

(d) all other participants at the meeting; and

- (e) all documents which evidence, reference or relate to any such meeting.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, it is impossible to answer this interrogatory, as it would require ascertaining the subjective knowledge of every corporate employee, both past and present.

(178) State whether you have ever participated in any way in the development of governmental specifications for asbestos products. If so, state in detail:

- (a) the extent and substance of your participation;
- (b) the inclusive dates of your participation;
- (c) all persons who participated;
- (d) the governmental entity involved; and
- (e) the identity of all documents which evidence, reference or relate to your participation.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, it is impossible to answer this interrogatory, as it would require ascertaining the subjective knowledge of every corporate employee, both past and present.

(179) List all companies which have provided you Worker's Compensation insurance and accident and disability insurance since 1930 and the inclusive dates of coverage for each such company.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(180) Did you in any way assist or participate in, or receive information from or about:

(a) any Metropolitan Life Insurance Company investigations, studies or dust surveys of asbestos conducted from 1929 to 1960; and

(b) any Industrial Hygiene Foundation investigations, studies or dust surveys of asbestos from 1930 to 1982.

If so, for each:

(i) state what role or action you took;

(ii) identify all documents relevant to such activities by name, date, title, file number and present location.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, it is impossible to answer this interrogatory, as it would require ascertaining the subjective knowledge of every corporate employee, both past and present.

(181) State whether or not you were a member of any board, committee, organization or group involved in the review of [sic] formulation of Worker's Compensation laws concerning asbestos or asbestos-related disease in any of the United States. If so, for each:

(a) state what role or action you took and when;

(b) identify all documents relevant to such activities by name, date, title, file number and present location.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, it is impossible to answer this interrogatory, as it would require ascertaining the subjective knowledge of every corporate employee, both past and present.

(182) State whether or not you attended a symposium of dust problems held on January 15, 1935 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. If so, please state:

- (a) what, if any, matters were discussed at this symposium;
- (b) the substance of any discussions concerning asbestos or asbestos-related products;
- (c) the substance of any discussions concerning the problems of ventilation, dust collecting and elimination, respiratory devices, the establishment of standards for dust counting and particle size determination and for the taking of x-rays and diagnostic use and for interpretation of the markings on x-ray films.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, Chrysler states that there are no documents responsive to this request in its possession, custody or control.

(183) If your Answer to the preceding Interrogatory is affirmative, state whether or not you or any of your agents, representatives and/or employees were elected to any of the committees formed at the end of the January 15, 1935 symposium. If so, state:

- (a) what committees to which you/they were elected or named;
- (b) the purpose for the formulation of the committee;
- (c) the objectives of the committee; and
- (d) if any reports, notes, minutes and/or summaries were issued by said committee. If so, state:
 - (i) the identity of the notes, minutes and/or summaries and where

they are located.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 182.

(184) State whether you or any representatives, agents and/or employees were present at a meeting on November 11, 1948 held at the headquarters of the Johns Manville Corporation. If so, state:

- (a) the name of the individual who attended;
- (b) the matters discussed at the meeting;
- (c) whether any minutes, notes, reports and/or summaries of the meeting were made;
- (d) to whom said minutes, notes, reports and/or summaries of the meeting were delivered; and
- (e) by whom said minutes, notes, reports and/or summaries are maintained.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissable evidence. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, Chrysler states that there are no documents responsive to this request in its possession, custody or control.

(185) For every policy of liability insurance insuring you against losses as a result of claims for bodily injury or death as a result of use of your asbestos products from 1935 to the present list:

- (a) The name of each insurer;
- (b) Each policy number;
- (c) The term of each policy;
- (d) The amount of the coverage;
- (e) Whether each policy provides for primary or excess coverage and if excess, the limit;
- (f) The deductible, if any, for each policy;
- (g) The basis of coverage for each, e.g. claims made, occurrence;
- (h) The amount paid by the insurer to date or alternatively the amount of coverage still remaining;
- (i) The identity of the person having possession of each policy.

RESPONSE:

Answering defendant objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The defendant's assets are a matter of public record.

Notwithstanding the objections set forth, Chrysler Corporation is presently self-insured, and has been self-insured for years. There may, however, be certain concurrent coverage with the Hartford Insurance Company. Further, Chrysler has adequate insurance or self-insurance arrangements to satisfy any settlement or judgment in this case.

(186) If you contend that your financial condition in any of the past five (5) years is other than that which is stated in the documents produced pursuant to the Requests for Production filed in these cases, please state the particular facts upon which you base your contention that the financial condition of the company is different than that shown in those documents.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler does not make this contention.

(187) Deleted.

(188) For each of the last five (5) years, identify any off-balance sheet transaction, lease, asset, liability, or other factor that would have material effect on your financial condition as per trade on your balance sheets.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler will produce copies of the most recent annual report available.

(189) Please state for each of the last five (5) years the following financial ratios:

- (a) current ratio;
- (b) quick ratio;
- (c) income after taxes to sales;
- (d) income before interest and taxes to sales;
- (e) income after taxes to equity;

- (f) sales to assets;
- (g) sales to equity;
- (h) sales to equity;
- (i) sales to inventory;
- (j) equity to assets;
- (k) equity to debt;
- (l) cost of goods sold to sales; and
- (m) general and administrative expense to sales.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 188.

(190) Deleted.

(191) If you are part of a holding company structure, identify all payments of dividends, corporate allocations and charges for corporate expenses made by you to the parent corporation.

RESPONSE:

Not applicable.

(192) If you contend that you are unable to pay an award of punitive damages because of your financial condition or otherwise, state the facts upon which base such contention and identify all documents in support thereof.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler is not liable for punitive damages. Chrysler does not make an allegation it is unable to pay an award of damages. See response to Interrogatory No. 189.

(193) State whether you received any documents pertaining, relating or referring to the non-disclosure of potential health hazards associated with exposure to asbestos or asbestos-containing products. If so, for each such document state:

- (a) the date the document was received;
- (b) by whom the document was authored;
- (c) to whom the document was addressed;
- (d) the subject matter of the document;
- (e) where a copy of said document is maintained.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(194) Did you send any documents to any person or entity which relate, refer or pertain to the non-disclosure of potential health hazards associated with exposure to asbestos or asbestos-containing products? If so, for each document state:

- (a) the date the document was prepared;
- (b) by whom the document was prepared;
- (c) the date the document was sent;
- (d) to whom the document was addressed;
- (e) the subject matter of the document;
- (f) where a copy of said document is maintained.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(195) State whether you or anyone on your behalf ever made any changes, or approved any changes suggested by others, in any reports, studies or writings concerning potential health hazards associated with exposure to asbestos or asbestos-containing products. If your answer is in the affirmative, please state:

- (a) the date such suggestions were made;
- (b) by whom such suggestions were made;
- (c) the suggestions made;
- (d) the reasons for such suggestions;
- (e) if such suggestions were memorialized in writing;
- (f) if such suggestions were memorialized in the identity and location of a copy of said document reflecting such suggestions.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not

reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(196) State whether you ever received or are in possession of any documents, reports, writings, or studies which were done by you or someone on your behalf concerning the potential health hazards associated with exposure to asbestos or asbestos-containing products, which were not published or otherwise made available to members of the public. If your answer is in the affirmative, please state:

- (a) the title of the writing, report, document or study;**
- (b) the date;**
- (c) by whom prepared;**
- (d) to whom it was sent;**
- (e) where a copy of the document, writing, report or study is maintained.**

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(197) State whether you received any document, study, reports or other writings concerning the potential health hazards associated with exposure to asbestos or asbestos-containing products which document(s) were not made available through publication or otherwise to members of the public. If your answer is in the affirmative, please state:

- (a) the date of said document;**
- (b) the date received by you;**
- (c) by whom it was sent;**
- (d) to whom it was sent;**
- (e) the title of the document, if any;**
- (f) the subject matter of the document;**

(g) where a copy of said document is maintained.

RESPONSE:

This interrogatory is objectionable as phrased as it assumes there are detrimental affects to human health with regard to "users" of friction products. Chrysler contends its friction products are not detrimental. See also answer to interrogatory 22.

(198) State whether after you became aware of the potential health hazards associated with exposure to asbestos or asbestos-containing products you continued to sell, distribute or install the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 without any cautions or warnings and, if so, state:

- (a) the date you became aware of the potential hazards;
- (b) the period of time for each such product that you continued to sell, distribute or install said product without a caution or warning;
- (c) The reason(s) for continuing such sales, distributions or installations after you became so aware; and
- (d) The person is) responsible for such decision(s).

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler cannot answer this interrogatory because it attempts to force Chrysler to assume there is a health hazard associated with its products and it is argumentative, misleading, overly broad, and will not lead to admissible evidence. See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 32, 33, 34, 67, 113 and 114.

(199) If you contend that you are not responsible for the alleged acts, omissions and/or liabilities for any predecessor in interest, state the facts upon which you base such contention and identify all documents in support thereof.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, see response to interrogatory 6.

(200) State whether after learning of the potential health hazards associated with exposure to asbestos or asbestos-containing products you informed those selling, distributing and/or installing your product of those potential hazards. If so, state:

- (a) those informed;
- (b) the date(s) as to each;
- (c) who informed them;
- (d) what information was given;
- (e) if given in writing:
 - (i) the author;

- (ii) to whom sent;
- (iii) the date;
- (iv) where a copy of the writing is maintained.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 198.

(201) Identify all documents that you will use in support of your defense that you are not liable for punitive damages.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client and work-product doctrines and is an improper attempt by plaintiff to shift the burden of proof. Without waiving these objections, until plaintiff provides some evidence that allegedly supports a claim for punitive damages, Chrysler cannot determine what documents or other evidence it might use to rebut that claim.

(202) For each of the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, indicate the purpose of asbestos fibers in the product formulation and state whether such asbestos fibers were necessary for the proper performance of the product as intended by you.

RESPONSE:

In general, asbestos is utilized in friction products because it provides suitable friction, strength, binding, stability, heat resistance, and other characteristics required to obtain proper performance of a vehicle braking system or standard transmission clutch.

(203) If you had a sales or other office or manufacturing or storage facility located in Maryland, Pennsylvania Delaware, Washington, D.C. and/or Virginia state the following:

(a) The address and type (whether sales office, executive offices, manufacturing, packaging warehouse, shipping or other) of each office or facility;

(b) Dates each office or facility was open and in operation;

(c) The area or territory of responsibility for each such office or area or territory covered by the operations of each facility;

(d) The identity of any asbestos-containing products that were manufactured, packaged or stored in such facility and the dates applicable thereto;

(e) The identity of any asbestos-containing products that were sold, distributed or supplied from each such office or facility and the dates applicable thereto.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(204) If any product brochure, advertisement, bulletin or other document published by you identified job sites in Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Washington, D.C. and/or Virginia where any of the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 were supplied, delivered, installed or applied list each such product and job site, the dates or time period during which such asbestos-containing products were supplied, delivered, installed or applied and identify and attach copies of each brochure, advertisement, bulletin or document containing reference to each such job site.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(205) If you ever received notification or awareness of the failure of any of your asbestos containing products to perform as intended by you, state:

- (a) The name of the product;
- (b) The problem or failure discovered or of which you became aware;
- (c) The date you initially became aware of such problem or failure;
- (d) The time period during which you received notification of continued existence of such problem or failure;
- (e) Any actions taken by you as a result of such awareness;
- (f) Any labeling placed by you on packages of such products providing notification of such problem or failure;
- (g) The identity of any document prepared by you relating to the problem or failure;
- (h) Any decision by you to withdraw the defective product or to limit its production and/or availability.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(206) If you or any attorney or law firm representing you has in connection with any asbestos personal injury claim or asbestos property damage claim ever been fined or otherwise sanctioned by a court anywhere within the United States for improperly or inadequately responding to discovery requests or requests for production of documents, state:

(a) The identity of each judge and court which imposed any such fine or sanctions;

(b) The date of any such fine or sanctions;

(c) The amount of any fine;

(d) The details of any sanctions;

(e) The identity, title and business address of each person or persons fined or sanctioned;

(f) The date of any hearing or deposition conducted prior to the court's decision on any such fine or sanction;

(g) The identity of anyone testifying in any such hearing or deposition and the date thereof;

(h) If any such fine or sanctions were appealed;

(i) The decision on appeal;

(j) The case name and docket number of the proceeding in which any fine or sanctions were ordered.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissable evidence.

(207) For each of the asbestos products identified in your Answers to interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, state whether you engaged in any advertising program to promote the sale of that product and, if so, state:

(a) The name or description of each advertising media that you have used to promote the product during the period 1930 to 1982;

(b) The name of each national magazine or periodical in which you have advertised the product during the period 1930 to 1982;

(c) The date of each issue of such magazine or periodical in which such advertisement appeared;

(d) The name and address of each newspaper, in which it advertised the product during the period 1930 to 1982;

(e) The date of each publication of each newspaper in which the advertisement appeared;

(f) Identify and produce each document which refers, reflects or pertains to each such advertisement which was published in each such magazine, periodical and/or newspaper;

(g) State whether the advertising of the product was handled by an agency and; if so, state the name and address of each advertising agency that handled any portion of the advertising of the product during the period 1930 to 1982.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissable evidence. Without waiving this objection, see prior answers to interrogatories.

(208) State whether you have ever been the subject of any investigation or accusation by any Governmental Agency concerning asbestos and the provisions of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (PL. 93-596, 29 U.S.C. Section 653 et seq.). If so state:

(a) The date of such investigation, accusation, or other administrative or judicial procedure or action;

(b) The administrative agency or Court in which any proceedings arising from such investigation or accusation were heard or instituted;

(c) The determination and results of any such accusation or action;

(d) The identity of each document which refers or relates to information set forth in answer to this interrogatory;

(e) As to any information received orally in answer to this interrogatory, identify each person who supplied such information and state the full substance of information supplied.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, defendant objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it requests information regarding the working conditions of manufacturing and/or processing plants which is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the production of admissible evidence in this action. Without waiving these objections, Chrysler has not been the subject of any investigation pursuant to the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 in regard to any potential exposure to asbestos during the performance of brake or clutch repairs.

(209) Please state:

(a) Your knowledge as to any respirator or other breathing device which was on the market during the time period you produced, sold, distributed and/or installed asbestos-containing products which would prevent the inhalation of asbestos dust and fibers;

(b) A detailed description of such respirator or other breathing device, together with all information as to how such device prevents the inhalation of asbestos dust and fibers;

(c) What tests, if any, were conducted, by whom and where, with regard to the effectiveness of any such device;

(d) Identify each documents in your possession which refers or relates to the subject matter of this interrogatory;

(e) As to any information received orally in answer to this interrogatory identify each person who supplied such information and state the full substance of the information supplied.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, information about the effectiveness of respiratory protection devices is readily available from the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the suppliers of the devices, and other sources. See also response to 85.

(210) With respect to the period from 1930 to 1982, state the names, addresses and company title or position of each person who at any time during that period was in charge of the following activities with regard to each of the products identified in Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19:

(a) Production;

(b) Marketing;

(c) Labeling;

— (d) Advertising;

(e) Product evaluation;

(f) Research and development;

(g) Distribution.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, This defendant objects to this interrogatory in that the phrase "in charge of" is not defined. This request is also overly broad and vague. Without waiving said objection, Chrysler responds as follows:

With respect to production, Stan Enders, a former plant manager at Trenton Chemical is the person most knowledgeable during the period of the Trenton Chemical production.

With respect to after market sales, advertising, and distribution, Paul Kelley is the most knowledgeable present employee at Chrysler.

With respect to labeling, Paul Kelley and Jack Koblin, a former Chrysler attorney, are the most knowledgeable.

With respect to brake product evaluation, research, and development, James Knoll is the most knowledgeable.

(211) Deleted.

(212) As to any asbestos threshold limit values ever published by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists, state when, if ever, you brought such information to the attention of purchasers, users, sellers and/or suppliers of your asbestos products. If you did not do so, state the reasons why not.

RESPONSE:

See responses to Interrogatory Nos. 55, 56 and 122.

(213) Please identify all of your present or former employees, categorized by manufacturing plant, business division, date of claim, claimant occupation, employment date, and claim disposition who are now receiving or who have ever received benefits under any Occupational Disease or Workmen's Compensation Statute for each year from 1930 until the present time for each of the following:

(a) Asbestosis;

(b) Lung Cancer;

- (c) Mesothelioma;
- (d) Any other pulmonary disorder;
- (e) Gastrointestinal System Cancer; and
- (f) asbestos-related lung disease.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, see response to Interrogatory No. 179.

(214) Please state if any of the physicians, industrial hygienists, or other persons identified by you in these answers to interrogatories ever made at any time any recommendations and/or suggestions to you pertaining to the risks or hazards to persons involved in the manufacturing or use of any asbestos-containing product. If so, please state:

- (a) When was each such recommendation and/or suggestion made?
- (b) To whom was each such recommendation and/or suggestion made?
- (c) By whom was each such recommendation and/or suggestion made?
- (d) The substance of each recommendation and/or suggestion.
- (e) The identity of all writings addressed, directed or submitted to you pertaining to the subject matter of this interrogatory.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 33.

(215) Please state each private meeting or discussion held at any time before

December 31, 1982 between any of your directors, officers, or employees and any officer or employee of any other manufacturer or seller of asbestos or asbestos-containing products in which the safety of any asbestos-containing product was a subject of discussion. As to each such meeting or discussion, please state:

- (a) its date;
- (b) its location;
- (c) The participants in the meeting or discussion identified by name, title and business affiliation;
- (d) A description of all statements made by each participant concerning the safety of any asbestos-containing product;
- (e) The identity of all writings pertaining in any manner to the matters covered in this interrogatory.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler has no Board of Directors meeting minutes dealing with asbestos.

(216) please [sic] state whether you exported any asbestos-containing product to a country without attaching warnings or caution labels regarding the potential health hazards of asbestos exposure on the packaging of each such product after you had lied [sic] or distributed the same or similar teas [sic] of p [sic] United-States with such warnings or caution labels; if so, please state:

- (a) The generic and brand names of each such product exported;
- (b) The asbestos content, by type, weight and volume, of each such product exported;
- (c) The dates when you began and ceased exporting each such product;
- (d) The countries to which you exported each such product;
- (e) The dates, content and description, by size and color, of any warning or caution labels regarding the potential health hazards of asbestos exposure which were placed on

the packaging of each such product exported;

(f) The identity of each of your directors, officers and/or employees who participated in making the decision to export such products; and

(g) The identity of all documents pertaining to the export of each such product and the custodian thereof.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, this interrogatory is unintelligible.

(217) Please state whether you exported asbestos-containing products to a country after those same or similar types of products had been banned in the United States. If so, please state:

(a) The generic and brand names of each such product exported;

(b) The asbestos content, by type, weight and volume, of each such product exported;

(c) The dates when you began and ceased exporting each such product;

(d) The countries to which you exported each such product;

(e) The dates, content and description, by size and color, of any warning or caution labels regarding the potential health hazards of asbestos exposure which were placed on the packaging of each such product exported;

(f) The identity of each of your directors, officers and/or employees who participated in making the decision to export such products; and

(g) The identity of all documents pertaining to the export of each such product and the custodian thereof.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Asbestos-containing brake linings and clutches are not banned in the United States.

(218) State whether you ever received a publication known as the "Asbestos Magazine". If so, please state:

- (a) The dates you received such publication;
- (b) The terms, circumstances or requirements of receipt of publication, e.g., free, by subscription, distributed at meetings, etc.;
- (c) The identity and custodian of any copies of such magazine that you received.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, Chrysler states that there are no documents responsive to this request in its possession, custody or control.

(219) Please state whether you recalled any asbestos product or otherwise attempted to remove it from the stream of commerce after you became aware of the potential health hazards of asbestos exposure.

- (a) if so, please state when, why and how you performed such a recall for each such product.
- (b) If not, please state the reason for not doing so and the identity of all corporate officials responsible for not doing so.
- (c) Identify all documents pertaining to the subject matter of this interrogatory.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler has never recalled any of its vehicles for asbestos-related reasons.

(220) Please provide the approximate market share of each of your asbestos products, individually or by category, identified in Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19 which you sold, supplied, distributed and/or installed in Maryland, Washington, D.C., Pennsylvania, Delaware and/or the United States for each year from 1930 to 1982. Identify all documents pertaining to the subject matter of this Interrogatory.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objections, Chrysler does not have information available to it that would enable it to respond to this interrogatory. Historically, however, Chrysler's market share of sales of new vehicles has been less than 15 percent.

(221) Please state whether you used, installed, applied and/or removed asbestos-containing materials from any of your own facilities after learning of the potential health hazards of asbestos exposure. If so, please state:

- (a) the purpose for each such action;
- (b) the location where each such action occurred;
- (c) the dates for each such action;
- (d) the persons responsible for deciding to undertake such action;
- (e) how each such action was accomplished by the workers who were removing the asbestos-containing materials;

(f) what respiratory protection was recommended and/or required for the workers who were using or removing the asbestos-containing materials, and if so, the dates thereof, and

(g) the identity of any employees who alleged asbestos-lung disease or filed a Workers' Compensation claim alleging asbestos lung disease as a result of such work, and if so, all dates thereof.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objection, any information as to Chrysler facilities where plaintiff did not work is irrelevant.

(222) Please state whether you or any of your directors, officers, shareholders, or officials ever owned any financial interest or stock in any company other than yours which was involved in the mining, manufacturing, production, sale, supply or distribution of asbestos or any asbestos-containing product, including but not limited to, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., co-Defendants in this case and bankrupt asbestos companies, e.g., Johns-Manville Corporation and its subsidiaries and affiliated companies. If so, please state:

- (a) The identity of the entity or person(s) who owned such interest;
- (b) The job title and position of each person who owned such interest;
- (c) The value of such interest owned by each such entity or persons; and
- (d) The dates of such ownership by each such entity or persons.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler is not in the business of mining or milling asbestos and it has not owned any interests in such businesses. Chrysler has no way of determining whether its past or present directors, shareholders, officers or employees, numbering in the hundreds of thousands since 1925, ever owned any interests in such companies.

(223) State whether you ever produced, funded or in any way participated in the creation of any film, video, movie or tape (hereinafter "film") whose subjects included asbestos, asbestos-containing products, asbestos and health, methods of asbestos product application, or removal, recommended practices for asbestos product use or warnings concerning asbestos inhalation. If so, state:

- (a) The identity, contents and description of each film;
- (b) The author or producer of each film;
- (c) The date of each film;
- (d) The identity of all products discussed therein;
- (e) To whom each film was shown and when; and
- (f) The present location and custodian of each film.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(224) Have you or any of your representatives ever visited any of the locations or entities at which the Plaintiffs herein worked in the course of their employment for the purpose, among others, of promoting, selling or discussing asbestos-containing products or for the purpose of discussing, inspecting or reviewing the use of asbestos-containing products or the health and safety aspects concerning the use of such products? If so, state:

- (a) The name, address, and title of each individual, agent or employee who visited each location or entity;
- (b) The date of each visit;
- (c) The purpose of each visit;
- (d) Who at each location he or she saw and spoke to on each occasion;
- (e) Whether such party or parties discussed the possible long term effects on health and safety of exposure to asbestos with management personnel, and, if so state:

(i) The content of such discussions; and

(ii) The dates of such discussions.

(f) Whether such party or parties attempted to impart information respecting possible health and safety ramifications of long term asbestos exposure to employees and if so, state:

(i) The results of such efforts; and

(ii) The content of the information sought to be imparted; and

(iii) The date of such efforts.

(g) With respect to your answer to this interrogatory and each subpart thereof, identify and produce all documents relating to, concerning or referencing the information contained in your answer or to the subject matter of the interrogatory and each subpart thereof.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, not to Chrysler's present knowledge. Discovery and investigation are continuing.

(225) Please state the dates of your membership in the American Ceramic Society ("ACS"); identify by name, current address and title or position with you each of your officers, directors or employees who at any time were members of the ACS and the dates of their membership; identify each of your officers, directors or employees who ever served as an officer or director of the ACS and state the position held with the ACS and the dates thereof, and identify and produce all documents concerning the ACS and/or received by you or any of your officers, directors or employees from the ACS.

RESPONSE:

See interrogatory response 39.

(226) State if at any time from 1950 to 1980 you were self-insured for workers' compensation and if so provide the dates during which you were self-insured; identify, by name, current address and title or position the officer(s), director(s), employees(s) or agent(s) who had primary responsibility for overseeing the administration of your self-insurance and the dates thereof; identify each and every federal, state or local governmental agency or other entity with which you filed reports relating to your self-insurance and identify and produce any and all documents which refer, relate or pertain to your self-insurance.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(227) State if at any time from 1950 to 1980 your workers' compensation and/or general liability insurance coverage was canceled and/or not renewed; state the policy number or other identifier of each such policy, the identify of the insurer who provided the coverage, the date of any such cancellation and/or non-renewal, the date that any such policy was replaced, and identify and produce any documents relating to any such cancellation and/or non-renewal and replacement of insurance coverage.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information regarding Chrysler's workers compensation insurance carrier, as such information is totally irrelevant to the present action.

(228) State if you knew of the laws, including but not limited to occupational disease laws, of the states in which you operated and, identify by name, current address and title or position which of your officer(s), director(s), employee(s) or agent(s) had the primary responsibility of ensuring your compliance with applicable statutes and regulations in each state in which you operated.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, generally a plant manager has supervisory responsibility for the operations at his or her plant and for compliance with regulations. He or she would likely be assisted by and a medical director, safety director, industrial hygienist, or other employees.

(229) Name any person not heretofore mentioned having personal knowledge of the facts material to this case.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper,

because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

M. Bradley Hallwig
Anderson, Coe and King
201 North Charles Street
Suite 2000
Baltimore, Maryland 21201-3018
410-752-1630

Attorney for Chrysler Corporation

State of :

ss.

County of :

Nancy J. Fournier, being duly sworn under oath, deposes and says that she is the National Casualty Claims Coordinator for Gallagher Bassett Services, Inc., Chrysler Unit on behalf of Chrysler Corporation; that she has read the foregoing answers to interrogatories to defendant Chrysler Corporation, and subscribes to the same on behalf of Chrysler Corporation; and the foregoing answers to interrogatories are based upon books and records of Chrysler Corporation, and she believes the foregoing answers to be true and correct.

Nancy J. Fournier
National Casualty Claims Coordinator
GALLAGHER BASSETT SERVICES, INC.

Sworn and subscribed to before me
this day of , 199 .

IN RE: ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY
CASES

IN THE
CIRCUIT COURT
FOR BALTIMORE CITY

KEITH K. GREWE, SR.
Plaintiff

Case No. 93167501
April 1996 Trial Group

v.

ACandS, INC., et al.
Defendants

Judge Edward J. Angeletti
Trial Cluster No. 96112701

NOTICE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this day, February 29, 1996, a copy of the foregoing Defendant Chrysler Corporation's Answers to Interrogatories was mailed by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to:

Steven W. Smith, Esquire
Law Offices of Peter G. Angelos
300 East Lombard Street
18th Floor
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

and a copy of this Notice of Service was sent to all parties on the attached List of Parties.

M. Bradley Hallwig
Anderson, Coe and King
201 North Charles Street
Suite 2000
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
410-752-1630

Attorney for Chrysler Corporation

reevaluation of the production, sale or use, or recommendations for use, of any of those products;

(c) Identify each document which refers or relates to any information set forth in answer to this Interrogatory;

(d) As to any information received orally in answer to this Interrogatory, identify each person who supplied such information and state the full substance of the information supplied;

(e) the date of each of the reports.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, Chrysler states that there are no documents responsive to this request in its possession, custody or control.

(146) With respect to each of the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, state separately whether you gave any consideration to the possibility of inhalation of asbestos fibers by users of the product. If so:

(a) Describe, in detail, the factors considered;

(b) Give the date, location and names of participants at each meeting where the matter was discussed or considered;

(c) Identify each document recording such consideration by date, title, file designation, author and present location.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory Nos. 22, 32, 33, 34 and 67.

(147) At the time of the development of or at the time of the decision to manufacture, sell, distribute and/or install each of the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to

Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, did you attempt to determine whether the product complied with any then applicable safety standards, safety orders, regulations, laws, rules and design requirements of any city, county, state, or the Federal Government of the United States?

(a) If the answer is in the negative, please state the reasons for not conducting such an analysis and identify the name of the persons deciding not to conduct the analysis;

(b) If the answer is in the affirmative, identify those safety standards, safety orders, regulations, laws, rules, or other ordinances which you claim you considered.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Chrysler certifies that all motor vehicles it sells and their component parts comply with all federal motor vehicle safety standards which are a matter of public record.

(148) Did you ever recommend to purchasers or users of the asbestos-containing products identified in your Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 8 and 19, or to any other Defendant, with respect to asbestos products sold or made available to them, directly or indirectly, that respirators, protective masks and/or protective clothing be worn while working with, installing or removing the product? If so, state separately for each product:

(a) The date or dates when each such recommendation was made;

(b) The date or dates when each such recommendation was made to all users;

(c) Who made the recommendation;

(d) Who received the recommendation;

(e) If oral, the manner and substance of the recommendation;

(f) If written, identify the document by title, date, file designation and author of each such recommendation and the location and present custodian of each such recommendation.

RESPONSE:

See response to Interrogatory No. 85.

(149) Have you ever communicated with an agency or department of the United States, or state or local government, concerning the specifications and/or standard for any asbestos-containing product? If so, state separately for each product or set of specifications:

- (a) Identify each such product;
- (b) The number, if any, assigned to the military or federal specification or standard;
- (c) The intended purpose or use for the product so specified;
- (d) The date, time and place of each communication:
 - (1) The name of each of your agents or employees who participated in each communication;
 - (2) The name, titles, and agencies of each individual with whom such communication was had;
 - (3) The subject of the communication;
 - (4) Whether any notes, minutes or memoranda in any form were recorded of such communication or of any meetings between you and the agency;
 - (5) Whether any documents were submitted to the agency;
 - (6) If (4) or (5) is answered in the affirmative state the name, and location of the custodian of such records.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

(150) Have you ever been a member of or participated in a trade association which communicated

(

with any agency or a department of the United States, concerning specifications and/or standards for any asbestos product? If so, state separately for each product or set of specifications:

- (a) Identify each such product;
- (b) The number, if any, assigned to the military or federal specification or standard;
- (c) The name of the association;
- (d) The years during which you were a member of or participated in the association;
- (e) The intended purpose or use for the product so specified;
- (f) The date, time and place of each communication:
 - (1) The name of each of your agents or employees who participated in each communication;
 - (2) The name, titles, and agencies of each individual with whom such communication was had;
 - (3) The subject of the communication;
 - (4) Whether any notes, minutes or memoranda in any form were recorded of such communication or of any meetings between you and the agency;
 - (5) Whether any documents were submitted to the agency;
 - (6) If (4) or (5) is answered in the affirmative state the name, and location of the custodian of such records.

RESPONSE:

Chrysler objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope and improper, because it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, see response to interrogatory 39.

(151) Have you undertaken or financed any tests or studies to determine what type of ventilator or ventilation system would eliminate or decrease the number of airborne asbestos fibers in confined