

In The Matter Of:

*Patricia Lindamood-Tamler v.
State Farm Insurance Company*

*Robert C. Corn, M.D.
Vol. 1, May 14, 1996*

*Mehler & Hagestrom
Court Reporters
1750 Midland Building
Cleveland, OH 44115
(216) 621-4984 FAX: (216) 621-0050*

*Original File 960514rc.asc, 74 Pages
Min-U-Script® File ID: 4207577805*

Word Index included with this Min-U-Script®

Page 1

[1] IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
[2] CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO
[3] PATRICIA LINDAMOOD-)
[4] TAMLER,)
[5] Plaintiff,)
[6] -vs-) CASE NO. 287952
[7] STATE FARM INSURANCE)
[8] COMPANY,)
[9] Defendant.)
[10] Deposition of ROBERT C. CORN, M.D., taken as
[11] if upon direct examination before Susan M.
[12] Cebren, a Registered Professional Reporter and
[13] Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio,
[14] at the offices of Robert C. Corn, M.D., 850
[15] Brainard Road, Highland Heights, Ohio, at 9:38
[16] a.m. on Tuesday, May 14, 1996, pursuant to
[17] notice and/or stipulations of counsel, on behalf
[18] of the Defendant in this cause.
[19]
[20] MEHLER & HAGESTROM
[21] Court Reporters
[22] 1750 Midland Building
[23] Cleveland, Ohio 44115
[24] 216.621.4984
[25] FAX 621.0050
[26] 800.822.0650

Page 2

[1] APPEARANCES:
[2] Daniel M. Sucher, Esq.
[3] Sindell, Lowe & Guidubaldi
[4] 610 Skylight Office Tower
[5] Cleveland, Ohio 44115
[6] (216) 781-8880,
[7] On behalf of the Plaintiff;
[8] Joseph H. Wantz, Esq.
[9] Meyers, Hentemann, Schneider & Rea
[10] 2121 The Superior Building
[11] Cleveland, Ohio 44114
[12] (216) 241-3435,
[13] On behalf of the Defendant.
[14] ALSO PRESENT:
[15] Dan Williams, Multivideo Service
[16]
[17]
[18]
[19]
[20]
[21]
[22]
[23]
[24]
[25]

Page 3

[1] ROBERT C. CORN, M.D., of lawful age,
[2] called by the Defendant for the purpose of
[3] direct examination, as provided by the Rules of
[4] Civil Procedure, being by me first duly sworn,
[5] as hereinafter certified, deposed and said as
[6] follows:
[7] DIRECT EXAMINATION OF ROBERT C. CORN, M.D.
[8] BY MR. WANTZ:
[9] Q: Doctor, could you tell us your complete name for
[10] the record, please?
[11] A: My name is Robert Curtis Corn, C-o-r-n.
[12] Q: And I have referred to you as doctor. Are you a
[13] licensed physician in the State of Ohio?
[14] A: Yes, I am.
[15] Q: When did you obtain your license, doctor?
[16] A: In 1976.
[17] Q: And do you presently have an office in the Ohio
[18] or Cleveland area?
[19] A: I do.
[20] Q: And we are at that office right now, correct?
[21] A: Right. That's my primary office.
[22] Q: Could you tell the jury, please, the address
[23] here?
[24] A: We are at 850 Brainard Road in Highland Heights,
[25] Ohio.

Page 4

[1] Q: Now, you mentioned that you obtained your
[2] license in 1976. How long have you been
[3] actually practicing medicine?
[4] A: Well, I have been practicing orthopedic surgery
[5] since August of 1979. So I am in my seventeenth
[6] year.
[7] Q: Doctor, where did you obtain your medical
[8] education and training?
[9] A: I received my bachelor of science in biology
[10] from the Albrecht College in Redding,
[11] Pennsylvania. I moved back to my hometown,
[12] Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, where I attended the
[13] Hahnemann University School of Medicine from
[14] 1971 through 1975. I received my M.D. degree in
[15] June of 1975.
[16] Q: And did you receive any clinical training or
[17] practice or residency after that, doctor?
[18] A: Yes.
[19] Q: And where did you obtain that?
[20] A: Well, in June of 1975 I moved out here to
[21] Cleveland and I started the orthopedic residency
[22] program at the Cleveland Clinic. I was at the
[23] Clinic from 1975 through 1979, completing the
[24] orthopedic residency program at the Clinic.
[25] Q: And at that time you went into practice as an

<div>Page 5</div> <div><p>[1] orthopedic surgeon?</p><p>[2] A: Correct.As of August of that year, yes.</p><p>[3] Q: And have you been continuously practicing</p><p>[4] orthopedic surgery since that lime?</p><p>[5] A: Yes.</p><p>[6] Q: Doctor, could you tell us, please, what is</p><p>[7] orthopedic surgery?</p><p>[8] A: Orthopedic surgery is a subspecialty in the</p><p>[9] field of surgery.It involves the medical or</p><p>[10] nonsurgical as well as surgical treatment of</p><p>[11] diseases, disorders and injuries and tumors of</p><p>[12] the musculoskeletal system.</p><p>[13] That includes the bones, the muscles,</p><p>[14] tendons, joints, ligaments,their muscles,</p><p>[15] associated nerve problems as well as certain</p><p>[16] subspecialties, surgery of the spine, surgery of</p><p>[17] the hand, sports medicine and arthroscopic</p><p>[18] surgery,trauma and fracture surgery,surgery</p><p>[19] for musculoskeletal tumors as well as joint</p><p>[20] replacements and surgery for arthritis.</p><p>[21] Q: Doctor, you made reference to musculoskeletal</p><p>[22] problems. Could you explain for us a little bit</p><p>[23] more in detail what musculoskeletal problems</p><p>[24] are?</p><p>[25] A: Well,musculoskeletal problems, really, is sort</p></div>	<div>Page 7</div> <div><p>[1] due to anatomical pressures on the nerves.We</p><p>[2] don't deal with brain disorders or nerve</p><p>[3] disorders unless they affect the muscles, the</p><p>[4] joints or one of the other orthopedic areas.</p><p>[5] Q: Doctor, the jury will have heard from Dr.</p><p>[6] Jennifer Kriegler by the time they will be</p><p>[7] hearing your testimony.She has indicated she</p><p>[8] is a neurologist.</p><p>[9] What is your understanding of the</p><p>[10] difference between a neurologist and an</p><p>[11] orthopedic surgeon such as yourself?</p><p>[12] A: Well,we already defined orthopedic surgery.</p><p>[13] Neurology is a medical subspecialty which</p><p>[14] involves the care and treatment of diseases or</p><p>[15] problems of the central nervous system,which is</p><p>[16] the brain and spinal cord,and the peripheral</p><p>[17] nervous system, which is the nerves that go to</p><p>[18] all the other places in the body.</p><p>[19] They are not surgeons.They are</p><p>[20] diagnosticians and they offer treatment and help</p><p>[21] with a number of the surgical specialties to</p><p>[22] figure out where the problem is, where the nerve</p><p>[23] may be damaged and if there is any surgery that</p><p>[24] can correct that problem.</p><p>[25] Q: Thank you, doctor. Now, are you on staff at any</p></div>
<div>Page 6</div> <div><p>[1] of a wastebasket term to mean basically anything</p><p>[2] that is involved,the bones, the joints, their</p><p>[3] connecting soft tissue, which are the ligaments,</p><p>[4] their muscles,the nerves that supply those</p><p>[5] muscles,the developmental problems, that is</p><p>[6] congenital problems that babies are born with,</p><p>[7] developmental problems, stuff that the aging</p><p>[8] process adds, degenerative problems, as the</p><p>[9] population ages dealing with those problems, and</p><p>[10] any injuries that occur in any of those age</p><p>[11] groups are basically under the field of</p><p>[12] orthopedic surgery.</p><p>[13] So it is a fairly broad area of medical</p><p>[14] care.</p><p>[15] Q: Now, doctor, you mentioned you deal with nerve</p><p>[16] injuries to some degree in your field, is that</p><p>[17] correct?</p><p>[18] A: To some extent. Usually as it involves certain</p><p>[19] regions of the body, such as the wrists, the</p><p>[20] elbow, the shoulder, the spine, but we don't</p><p>[21] deal with the diseases of the nerves.</p><p>[22] In other words, if you have a problem of</p><p>[23] the nervous system,that's more in the field of</p><p>[24] neurology, whereas we deal with compression of</p><p>[25] the nerves, that is a pinching of the nerves or</p></div>	<div>Page 8</div> <div><p>[1] hospital or hospitals?</p><p>[2] A: Yes.</p><p>[3] Q: Anti could you tell us, please, which hospitals?</p><p>[4] A: I am an attending orthopedic surgeon at the</p><p>[5] Meridia Hillcrest Hospital, the Meridia Euclid</p><p>[6] Hospital, the Meridia Huron Hospital, the</p><p>[7] University Hospitals Bedford Medical Center, the</p><p>[8] Mount Sinai Medical Center and the Lake Hospital</p><p>[9] Systems.</p><p>[10] Q: And, doctor, do you or have you in the past held</p><p>[11] any positions other than as an attending</p><p>[12] physician at any of these facilities?</p><p>[13] A: Yes.</p><p>[14] Q: Could you tell us, please, about that?</p><p>[15] A: I was chief of orthopedic surgery at the Meridia</p><p>[16] Huron Hospital and I ran the orthopedic teaching</p><p>[17] service from January of 1984 to November of</p><p>[18] 1992.</p><p>[19] Q: Doctor, do you do any teaching?</p><p>[20] A: Yes, I do.</p><p>[21] Q: Where do you teach?</p><p>[22] A: Currently I am a clinical instructor in</p><p>[23] orthopedic surgeon at the Case Western Reserve</p><p>[24] University School of Medicine and I am an</p><p>[25] assistant professor of orthopedic surgery at the</p></div>

Page 9

[1] Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine.
[2] Q: Do you belong to any professional societies or
[3] groups in the field of orthopedic surgery or in
[4] medicine in general?
[5] A: Yes, I do.
[6] Q: And could you, again, please tell us a little
[7] bit about that?
[8] A: I am a fellow in the American Academy of
[9] Orthopedic Surgeons. I am a fellow in the
[10] American College of Surgeons. I am a fellow in
[11] The Orthopedic Research Society.
[12] I am a member of the American Medical
[13] Association, Ohio State Medical Association,
[14] Cleveland Academy of Medicine, Cleveland
[15] Orthopedic Society and a number of other
[16] organizations.
[17] Q: Now, doctor, the first societies which were
[18] basically orthopedic societies you mentioned you
[19] were a fellow as opposed to being a member. Is
[20] there a difference?
[21] A: Well, the second one I mentioned, the American
[22] College of Surgeons, is basically a surgical
[23] group. The other two are orthopedic, and there
[24] is a difference between fellowship and
[25] membership.

Page 10

[1] Membership, there are certain organizations
[2] where you basically if you fall into that
[3] category such as if you are a doctor you can
[4] join the medical society, and as long as you
[5] maintain their criteria for continuing medical
[6] education and you stay out of trouble you are a
[7] member forever.
[8] Whereas a fellow you have to be elected by
[9] that organization. You have to be board
[10] certified, you have to jump through certain
[11] hoops, so to speak, for the organization.
[12] For The Orthopedic Research Society you
[13] have to have had a major orthopedic presentation
[14] at the national meeting to even be considered
[15] for membership.
[16] The American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons
[17] you have to have been board certified in that
[18] and actually elected in by your peers, in other
[19] words, there is a constant peer review process.
[20] During the application process doctors come in
[21] to the operating rooms spontaneously, they come
[22] into your office, they appear on rounds when you
[23] are going to see your hospital patients and
[24] trying to observe what your level of quality
[25] is.

Page 11

[1] So that's the basic difference between the
[2] two, a fellowship and a membership.
[3] Q: Doctor, you mentioned several times that one has
[4] to be board certified. I take it then you are
[5] board certified?
[6] A: Yes.
[7] Q: And what is being board certified mean?
[8] A: Well, every medical and surgical specialty and
[9] subspecialty has a board or a committee which
[10] sets the educational requirements and testing
[11] requirements for that particular specialty.
[12] In other words, the American Board of
[13] Orthopedic Surgery, they approve every single
[14] residency or teaching program in North America.
[15] In other words, somebody goes out and makes sure
[16] everything is being followed just the way the
[17] board wants it to to standardize the education.
[18] They provide a written examination every year of
[19] your training. They also provide a so-called
[20] Anal exam, part of the board certification
[21] examination, which is two, three hour written
[22] exams.
[23] They also provide the oral exams and the
[24] criteria for which a young doctor can be a
[25] member or a fellow in that group, and there are

Page 12

[1] basically certain steps you had to follow.
[2] In 1980 I had to have completed a
[3] residency, approved residency and completed it
[4] in good standing, had passed the exams each
[5] year, had to have been in clinical practice for
[6] one calendar year in one location and that's the
[7] time the peer review takes place, and then you
[8] have to take a series of exams, and after
[9] passing that examine you were ultimately
[10] certified by the board and then qualified for
[11] the other organizations.
[12] Q: When did you become board certified, doctor?
[13] A: September of 1980.
[14] Q: Thank you. And, doctor, let me also ask you
[15] this. Have you done any writing or been
[16] published in your field as an orthopedic
[17] surgeon?
[18] A: Yes.
[19] Q: And could you please tell us some of the
[20] articles you have had published?
[21] A: Well, orthopedic research has been one of my
[22] interests ever since my college days. I worked
[23] at my medical school every summer with animal
[24] research.
[25] The first paper I actually had published

Page 13

[1] was in The International Journal of Surgery anti
[2] that was between my junior and senior year in
[3] college.

[4] During my medical school years I continued
[5] with my research work anti also in my residency
[6] where we **did** some of the preliminary work on
[7] biological fixation of joint replacements, that
[8] is the porous coating, how big the pores should
[9] be, what they should do, and that is now in
[10] clinical application.

[11] Since I finished my training most of my
[12] interest has been in basic diseases anti
[13] disorders that affect the general population,
[14] osteomyelitis, which is a bone infection. I
[15] have done some work and published papers on
[16] osteoporosis, including the surgical and
[17] orthopedic complications of osteoporosis, as
[18] well as a number of articles over the years.

[19] Q: Thank you, doctor. Now, during the course of
[20] your practice and just so we are all clear, do
[21] you have occasion personally to treat people who
[22] have injuries and problems with the back?

[23] A: Sure, on a fairly routine basis.

[24] Q: And, doctor, turning to Patricia
[25] Lindamood-Tamler, at my request **did** you have an

Page 14

[1] occasion to examine her?

[2] A: Yes.

[3] Q: And before we get into the specifics of that
[4] examination, doctor, generally speaking, do you
[5] **perform** what we call as lawyers independent
[6] medical examinations for others, for people on a
[7] general basis?

[8] A: I have a certain allotted time during the week
[9] that I will schedule independent exams. They
[10] aren't always defense exams. I have two slots a
[11] week that I reserve for nontreatment
[12] evaluations. This is basically scheduled on a
[13] first come first serve basis and it's for a
[14] nontreating exam, in other words, an evaluation
[15] and no treatment. In other words, just a letter
[16] to be written to someone. It can be an
[17] employee, it can be the State of Ohio, Bureau of
[18] Worker's Comp, it could be a plaintiff's lawyer,
[19] it could be a defense lawyer.

[20] In other words, these are certain time
[21] slots that I have that are for nontreatment and
[22] I do do that on a regular basis.

[23] Q: Doctor, you said you do that about two times a
[24] week?

[25] A: Correct. That's the typical schedule over the

Page 15

[1] years has been twice a week.

[2] Q: And do you have any knowledge as you sit here as
[3] to the breakdown of how many you might do for a
[4] defense lawyer as opposed to a plaintiff's
[5] lawyer or for the State of Ohio or an employer?

[6] A: Over the years I believe it's been, those
[7] particular exams have been about 55 or 60
[8] percent for defense, quote, unquote, and that
[9] could be for a personal injury such as this or
[10] an employer or Bureau of Workers' Compensation
[11] or the Attorney General's Office about a
[12] contested Workman's **Comp** claim, that would be
[13] that segment.

[14] The others would be one time evaluations
[15] for personal injury, product liability, medical
[16] malpractice, other things that I would do for
[17] either defense or plaintiffs, depending on the
[18] first come first serve basis. Obviously I have
[19] limited an amount of time so it doesn't
[20] interfere with my patient care time, and that's
[21] what I usually devote toward medico/legal aspect
[22] of orthopedics.

[23] My patients being in orthopedics, you can't
[24] avoid medical/legal issues, anti a lot of my
[25] patients have been injured with different claims

Page 16

[1] and, obviously, I would spend time working **up**
[2] their medical/legal problems as well from my
[3] standpoint and doing the same thing we are doing
[4] here, depositions and medical reports for them
[5] as well.

[6] So this is something you really can't avoid
[7] in an orthopedic surgeon's practice and I sort
[8] of enjoy the mental aspect of it.

[9] Q: Doctor, let me ask you this. You are
[10] compensated for doing these one time
[11] examinations, correct?

[12] A: Yes.

[13] Q: And your compensation for these examinations,
[14] does it change in terms of what your basic
[15] charges are regardless of who you do the
[16] examination for?

[17] A: Well, the charges are on the basis of the
[18] complexity and the amount of time it takes. It
[19] doesn't matter what the source of the reference
[20] is. It basically is not precisely a minute by
[21] minute type of charge, but it's based on the
[22] complexity and it would be the same for whoever
[23] is reserving that slot of my time.

[24] Q: And, doctor, when you do these examinations,
[25] these one time examinations, you have mentioned

Page 17

[1] that they are obviously iiontreating
[2] examinations.
[3] Apart from being nontreatiig examinations,
[4] is there any other difference between these one
[5] time examinations and your examination of a
[6] regular patient?
[7] **A:** The only difference is usually the complexity of
[8] the records and the complexity of the problem I
[9] am asked to try to sort out or give an opinion
[10] on, but the examination itself and the history
[11] that I, the questions I ask and the information
[12] I try to obtain is virtually the same as I would
[13] do for my own patients who are coming to me for
[14] treatment.
[15] The exception is that by agreement between
[16] the county and local Bar Association and the
[17] Academy of Medicine of Cleveland I am not
[18] allowed to talk about treatment, I can't offer
[19] these individuals any recommendations, I
[20] basically can evaluate them and that's it.
[21] So there are agreements and stipulations
[22] about these exams, and I have my limitations,
[23] even if I want to say listen, you should really
[24] do this or do that, I am not allowed to say that
[25] or not allowed to give those recommendations,

Page 18

[1] whether there are plaintiff attorneys present or
[2] defense attorneys present or not. These are
[3] just agreements that are strictly for an
[4] evaluation and I am limited in what I can do
[5] with them.
[6] So it is not something doctors feel real
[7] comfortable with. You like to help patients,
[8] you like to manage patients, you like to give
[9] them an idea what they could be doing
[10] differently, but that's not the purpose for this
[11] type of exam.
[12] **Q:** Thank you. Now, doctor, let's turn to Patricia
[13] Lindamood-Tamler. Can you tell us, please, when
[14] you saw her?
[15] **A:** The evaluation was on January 26th of 1996.
[16] **Q:** And at the time that you saw Miss Tamler could
[17] you tell us what the specific parts of your
[18] examination were, what you did as part of your
[19] examination and rendering of an opinion here?
[20] **A:** Well, she was present and she appeared with a
[21] lawyer from her plaintiff's law firm.
[22] I provided, I did a history and physical, a
[23] typical orthopedic history and physical, that is
[24] I tried to establish when she felt her problems
[25] began, some of the details about the accident,

Page 19

[1] although that is really out of the - the
[2] details are really anecdotal or just of interest
[3] and are not necessarily necessary for
[4] establishing what the injuries were, trying to
[5] chronologically put together what happened from
[6] the time the problem began to the present time,
[7] all the doctors they havr seen, all the tests
[8] that they can remember, what institutions they
[9] were seen at or evaluated at, what their current
[10] state is, what kind of medications they are on,
[11] was there any previous injuries or previous
[12] problems, and basically the history, the same as
[13] you would go to a doctor's office and the doctor
[14] would try to establish all the facts that he or
[15] she could.
[16] **Q:** Doctor, let me interrupt you for just a second.
[17] Just so we are clear, what is a history when you
[18] refer to that term?
[19] **A:** The history is the give **and take** conversation
[20] between a physician and a patient in which this
[21] chronology or this series of events is being put
[22] into order. It consists of the chief complaint,
[23] that is, what brings the patient to the office,
[24] the history of the present illness, any past
[25] medical history, current symptoms, employment

Page 20

[1] history, what medications they are on, those
[2] type of segments.
[3] **Q:** And did you go through all of those parts of a
[4] history with Miss Lindamood-Taniler?
[5] **A:** I did
[6] **Q:** And was there anything unusual or significant
[7] about the history that she gave you?
[8] **A:** The only thing that was a little bit challenging
[9] for me was to figure out what was really
[10] bothering her at the time that I saw her. I
[11] really had to ask a lot of questions trying to
[12] establish, you know, what her current condition
[13] is, you know, where does she hurt, what's going
[14] on now.
[15] Most people are very capable of doing that,
[16] whether they are here for treatment or they are
[17] here for evaluation, most people know what
[18] brings them into the doctor's office or know
[19] what their current situation is.
[20] It was difficult to assess when I evaluated
[21] her, it took a lot of questions and a lot of
[22] effort on my part. It usually doesn't take that
[23] long.
[24] **Q:** By the way, doctor, do you have an independent
[25] recollection as you sit here today of the

<div>Page 21</div> <div><p>[1] examination and the history that you obtained</p><p>[2] from Miss Lindamood-Tamler?</p><p>[3] A: No, I do not.</p><p>[4] Q: You have records in front of you that you are</p><p>[5] referring to to refresh your recollection, is</p><p>[6] that correct?</p><p>[7] A: Primarily the letter that I sent to you, yes.</p><p>[8] Q: Now, doctor, after you obtained her history,</p><p>[9] what is the next step of your examination?</p><p>[10] A: Well, the next step in the evaluation is to do a</p><p>[11] physical exam.</p><p>[12] Q: And could you tell us, please, the details of</p><p>[13] the physical examination that you performed?</p><p>[14] A: The physical examination revealed a 51-year old</p><p>[15] female who appeared older than her stated age.</p><p>[16] Her general body habitus, that is the shape of</p><p>[17] her body, showed that she was of somewhat short</p><p>[18] stature with the chest area or the trunk area of</p><p>[19] her body seeming a little shorter than it should</p><p>[20] have been as coniparison to her arms and legs,</p><p>[21] and noting subsequently the medical records with</p><p>[22] her history of severe osteoporosis this would</p><p>[23] certainly account for that general appearance.</p><p>[24] Some of the basic movements and motions</p><p>[25] observed that she was able to walk normally,</p></div>	<div>Page 23</div> <div><p>[1] known anatomical abnormality.</p><p>[2] In other words, you look for objective</p><p>[3] symptoms. Subjective complaints, that is</p><p>[4] something that only the individual can</p><p>[5] experience, and objective findings which someone</p><p>[6] who knows what to look for can find them. So</p><p>[7] there is really uncontested actual physical</p><p>[8] problems, and that's what a doctor looks for.</p><p>[9] Doctors like to treat physical problems or</p><p>[10] anatomical problems, and they don't like to</p><p>[11] treat syniptoms in general, unless you go to a</p><p>[12] pain center which all they do is treat syniptoms.</p><p>[13] The neck area revealed no signs of what we</p><p>[14] call spasm, which is an uncontrolled muscle</p><p>[15] contraction. It showed no evidence of</p><p>[16] dysmetria, abnormal muscle coordination and no</p><p>[17] guarding, which is the reflex tightening of a</p><p>[18] muscle. That's the feeling that a day after</p><p>[19] you, a day or two after you have done the</p><p>[20] gardening or the housekeeping you get that stiff</p><p>[21] muscle that sort of grabs you.</p><p>[22] That's called guarding. That is objective</p><p>[23] when it is present, but it wasn't present at the</p><p>[24] time of this exam.</p><p>[25] The range of motion of the neck was</p></div>
<div>Page 22</div> <div><p>[1] although she was somewhat hesitant when she</p><p>[2] first stood up. She was able to stand on her</p><p>[3] heels and toes showing in general a normal</p><p>[4] neurological function.</p><p>[5] She did claim to have some balance</p><p>[6] problems. She felt she had to hold onto the</p><p>[7] exam table as part of the, which is not terribly</p><p>[8] unusual, most people aren't used to walking</p><p>[9] around on their heels and toes.</p><p>[10] She was able to get up from a sitting</p><p>[11] position without any trouble. She was able to</p><p>[12] climb up and down from the exam table without</p><p>[13] any difficulty.</p><p>[14] In general the actual hands-on physical</p><p>[15] examination was divided into anatomical areas,</p><p>[16] the neck and tipper back, and that includes the</p><p>[17] shoulders and upper extremities, that is the</p><p>[18] arms, and then the lower back and then the lower</p><p>[19] extremities and the neurological evaluation of</p><p>[20] those areas. So it's sort of a regional</p><p>[21] evaluation.</p><p>[22] Going to the neck area, what a doctor tries</p><p>[23] to do in any evaluation is he tries to sort out</p><p>[24] what the patient is saying, that is take the</p><p>[25] patient's symptoms and try to match a treatable</p></div>	<div>Page 24</div> <div><p>[1] unrestricted. In other words, she had a full</p><p>[2] motion, being able to bend her chin on her</p><p>[3] chest, look up to the ceiling, look right, look</p><p>[4] left and tilt right, tilt left.</p><p>[5] The examination of her shoulder blades,</p><p>[6] upper back and neck area again failed to show</p><p>[7] any signs of this muscle irritation. It was</p><p>[8] full unrestricted motion of her shoulders, her</p><p>[9] shoulder blades, her elbows, wrists and small</p><p>[10] joints of the hand.</p><p>[11] She had a subjective weakness when I asked</p><p>[12] her to grip my fingers during the examination.</p><p>[13] However, there was no objective signs of muscle</p><p>[14] wasting, no physical observable atrophy or</p><p>[15] wasting of the muscles, and I physically took a</p><p>[16] tape measure and measured around the armpit, the</p><p>[17] upper arm, the forearm and wrist and, in fact,</p><p>[18] even around the hand, and both sides were</p><p>[19] equal.</p><p>[20] So there was a subjective weakness. In</p><p>[21] other words, she was claiming she was weak and</p><p>[22] she was not squeezing hard on that hand, but</p><p>[23] there was no objective finding that would give</p><p>[24] me a reason why she couldn't do that. In other</p><p>[25] words, there was no motor abnormality, no</p></div>

Page 25

[1] sensory or inability to detect sensation and
[2] there was no reflex abnormality and there was no
[3] muscle atrophy, but despite this she still had a
[4] weaker grip, and there is really no orthopedic
[5] explanation for that.

[6] Even the intrinsic muscles, which are the
[7] little muscles that move and wriggle the
[8] fingers, taking a tape measure and measuring
[9] around the hand and having them make a tight
[10] fist showed that there was really no significant
[11] difference. I mean, there was less than a
[12] millimeter of difference between the left and
[13] right hand, which showed essentially normal
[14] usage despite the subjective weakness that she
[15] demonstrated, and the only objective finding in
[16] the neck/upper back exam was this mildly
[17] positive Phalen's sign.

[18] The Phalen's sign was originally described
[19] by a doctor in the mid Fifties at the Cleveland
[20] Clinic, Dr. Phalen, who noted that if you force
[21] flex the wrists, that is, if the doctor does
[22] this and holds this for a period of time,
[23] usually 20 to 30 seconds, you may develop some
[24] numbness, tingling in the median nerve
[25] distribution, and this is commonly known as

Page 26

[1] carpal tunnel syndrome.

[2] There was mild response to that. In other
[3] words, with that hand bending down there was
[4] some tingling in her fingers.

[5] Q: Doctor, if I could interrupt you for just a
[6] second here. You have indicated that there may
[7] have been some evidence of carpal tunnel
[8] syndrome. Is that something that she complained
[9] of or that she related to this accident in any
[10] way?

[11] A: No. I mean, it was something that she didn't
[12] even know she had. Obviously by reading the
[13] records that was never any of the considerations
[14] by Dr. Krieger or the doctors at the Cleveland
[15] Clinic, that was not even a diagnosis that was
[16] entertained.

[17] Q: Thank you. I apologize for interrupting. Could
[18] you go on with your examination?

[19] A: Well, a similar type of exam was done of her
[20] lower back area. Again, the only area that she
[21] really truly complained of some discomfort was
[22] in the left sacroiliac joint area. That is
[23] where the pelvis meets the midportion of the
[24] backbone, and this was just tenderness. There
[25] was no objective finding associated with this.

Page 27

[1] There was unrestricted motion of her lumbar
[2] spine, that is, she had full range of motion,
[3] her hips examined normally, her knees, her
[4] ankles, her straight leg raising, that is
[5] looking for sciatic nerve irritation, there was
[6] no abnormal signs.

[7] There was no atrophy or muscle wasting in
[8] the upper or lower thigh or upper or lower calf
[9] area. Her deep tendon reflexes were intact and
[10] there was some discomfort in a Patrick Figure
[11] Four, that's when you cross the legs and roll
[12] them outward, she complained of some discomfort
[13] with that maneuver, but, again, no objective
[14] abnormality was associated with that, and her
[15] neurologic examination was normal.

[16] In other words, there was no evidence of
[17] any neurological disease or neurological injury,
[18] anti that essentially completed the actual hands-
[19] on physical exam.

[20] Q: Thank you, doctor. Now, doctor, during the
[21] course of the exam you mentioned the fact that
[22] you noted, I believe, that Mrs. Lindamood-Tamler
[23] suffers from osteoporosis?

[24] A: Well, that really was my clinical suspicion
[25] looking at her. I had not reviewed the records

Page 28

[1] or looked at the x-rays prior to the exam, but,
[2] yes, that was diagnosed by a number of, at least
[3] one other doctor prior to this evaluation.

[4] Q: Could you tell us, please, what is osteoporosis?

[5] A: Osteoporosis is a metabolic bone condition,
[6] which involves all people eventually, but
[7] primarily causation females in which when they
[8] either go through menopause, which can be
[9] anywhere from the 40's to 50's to early 60's, or
[10] if they have a surgical menopause, that is the
[11] ovaries are removed in one way, shape or form
[12] they start losing bone mass, they actually
[13] physically lose the calcium matrix.

[14] It is in some studies felt that women in
[15] their 30's start losing bone, and that's why a
[16] lot of Concentration from prophylaxis and
[17] appropriate diet, taking appropriate calcium and
[18] vitamins to help prevent this disease is so
[19] common and we hear about it on the news
[20] virtually everyday.

[21] But what happens is there is unrelenting
[22] loss of bone matrix, that is the actual stuff
[23] that makes the bone hard, and when you lose
[24] that, over a period of years the bones actually
[25] physically become weak to the point that women

<div>Page 29</div> <div><p>[1] can develop what we call atmumatic fractures,</p><p>[2] that is fractures that occur, collapses of the</p><p>[3] bone that occur that are not traumatic. In</p><p>[4] other words, you don't need a fall or car</p><p>[5] accident or someone pushing you down the steps</p><p>[6] or anything to cause the bone to break. It just</p><p>[7] breaks on its own through the normal stretches</p><p>[8] and pushes and pulls of the muscles.</p><p>[9] This is what the condition was that was in</p><p>[10] this particular patient. In other words, there</p><p>[11] had already been atraumatic spinal fmctures.</p><p>[12] If you can think of a Ping-Pong ball and you</p><p>[13] dent the Ping-Pong ball, there is no way of</p><p>[14] getting that dent out, and that is essentially</p><p>[15] what the fracture abnormalities were localized</p><p>[16] in her spine.</p><p>[17] The fractures themselves mean nothing other</p><p>[18] than the fact that it may be a source of pain,</p><p>[19] but what happens when you have more than one</p><p>[20] fracture is that the spine starts to collapse,</p><p>[21] and when the spine starts to collapse it throws</p><p>[22] the body off, and if you have one spinal</p><p>[23] fracture, the chance of getting the second one</p><p>[24] is about 30 percent; if you have two, the chance</p><p>[25] of a third is about 60 percent, anl when you</p></div>	<div>Pa90 31</div> <div><p>[1] injury as a result of this automobile accident</p><p>[2] based on your review of the records?</p><p>[3] A: I don't think that was anybody's opinion. I</p><p>[4] think that they assumed that it was part of the</p><p>[5] complications of osteoporosis, and the fractures</p><p>[6] were certainly by history not traumatic in that</p><p>[7] it would feel like you break your spine if it</p><p>[8] was from trauma.</p><p>[9] I don't think anybody's suggestion was that</p><p>[10] these were at all related to the accident anl</p><p>[11] were merely a preexisting condition.</p><p>[12] Q: Doctor, now you commented that a person with</p><p>[13] osteoporosis such as this is subject to</p><p>[14] atmumatic fractures of the bone, correct?</p><p>[15] A: Correct.</p><p>[16] Q: Does that also make such a person more subject</p><p>[17] to fractures even with simple trauma?</p><p>[18] A: Well, if the bone structure is weakened to the</p><p>[19] point that it doesn't take an injury to break</p><p>[20] it, then certainly an injury would have a</p><p>[21] tendency - it would certainly be more</p><p>[22] vulnerable to injury. It would take less of a</p><p>[23] trauma to continue the fracture process if it</p><p>[24] had already happened without trauma.</p><p>[25] Q: Doctor, osteoporosis, can that also cause pain</p></div>
<div>Page 30</div> <div><p>[1] have three the chance of a further fracture is a</p><p>[2] hundred percent.</p><p>[3] So once this thing starts it's unrelenting</p><p>[4] and there is no way of treating it. There is no</p><p>[5] way of physically operating on it to straighten</p><p>[6] out the spine, arid what this causes, it causes a</p><p>[7] mechanical abnormality and this is seen very</p><p>[8] commonly, not so much in the early 50's, but</p><p>[9] usually in the 60's and 70's when women's</p><p>[10] osteoporosis develops and worsens.</p><p>[11] In other words, that's when it becomes</p><p>[12] symptomatic. That's when people start</p><p>[13] presenting with symptoms, other than the fact</p><p>[14] that their clothes don't fit them right or they</p><p>[15] notice they are bent over a little bit more.</p><p>[16] Q: Doctor, now Mrs. Lintiamood-Tamler, as I</p><p>[17] understand it, suffered from severe osteoporosis</p><p>[18] at the time of this accident, is that correct?</p><p>[19] A: That was prior to the accident, yes.</p><p>[20] Q: And she had already suffered multiple</p><p>[21] compression fractures of the vertebral spine by</p><p>[22] the time of the accident?</p><p>[23] A: They were present on the initial evaluation.</p><p>[24] So, yes, they had probably occurred before that.</p><p>[25] Q: Did she suffer any types of fractures or bone</p></div>	<div>Page 32</div> <div><p>[1] and problems in the back? -----</p><p>[2] A: Well, osteoporosis, if you look at a hundred</p><p>[3] women with diagnosable osteoporosis, that is you</p><p>[4] know that they have it, 80 some percent will be</p><p>[5] totally pain free. They won't hurt at all and</p><p>[6] they won't even know they have it. They may</p><p>[7] notice their dresses fit a little funny or they</p><p>[8] may be rounded over a little bit or one of their</p><p>[9] grandchildren may say something to them, but</p><p>[10] they really don't hurt.</p><p>[11] The pain from osteoporosis comes from two</p><p>[12] primary reasons. The first is the fracture that</p><p>[13] can occur, and the second is mechanical. In</p><p>[14] other words, as the center of gravity is being</p><p>[15] forced forward, it takes more of an effort of</p><p>[16] the mid and upper back muscles to hold the body</p><p>[17] up. Otherwise, you would fall flat on your</p><p>[18] face, and this causes a diffuse muscle type of</p><p>[19] aching pain which is indistinguishable from a</p><p>[20] fibromyalgia type of picture in this age group.</p><p>[21] In other words, it's purely mechanical.</p><p>[22] They are much better when they are sitting, they</p><p>[23] are much better when they are lying, but the</p><p>[24] more they are on their feet or the more they are</p><p>[25] over a desk or the more they are bending and</p></div>

Page 33

[1] lifting and doing their regular daily chores,
[2] that's the other common pain associated with
[3] osteoporosis.
[4] The actual condition doesn't hurt. It's
[5] the complications of the condition that hurt.
[6] Q: Thank you, doctor. And I got a little bit away
[7] from your specific evaluation here.
[8] After you completed your examination of
[9] Miss Lindamood-Tamler did you have an
[10] opportunity to review medical records regarding
[11] her care and treatment?
[12] A: Yes, I did.
[13] Q: And could you tell us, please, what records you
[14] reviewed?
[15] A: The records were from the Parma Community
[16] Hospital, which was essentially the emergency
[17] room visit, Dr. Matthew Fronz, Dr. Daniel
[18] Mazanec and the Cleveland Clinic records, Dr.
[19] Jennifer Kriegler and the Mount Sinai Pain
[20] Management records, some records from
[21] Therapeutic Touch Massage or Massotherapy, Dr.
[22] Chad Deal, who was the rheumatologist that
[23] diagnosed the osteoporosis, as well as a series
[24] of x-rays from the Cleveland Clinic and the
[25] Mount Sinai Medical Center.

Page 34

[1] Q: And, doctor, after having - by the way, did
[2] that complete your evaluation and examination
[3] of, in connection with Miss Lindamood-Tamler?
[4] A: Yes.
[5] Q: And, doctor, having reviewed those records and
[6] examined Miss Tamler, did you come to an opinion
[7] to a reasonable degree of medical certainty as
[8] to whether or not she suffered any injury as a
[9] result of the automobile accident of October 11,
[10] 1993?
[11] A: I did develop a clinical impression, yes.
[12] Q: And, doctor, could you please tell us what that
[13] impression was?
[14] A: My impression was that she had a subjective pain
[15] syndrome without any substantial objective
[16] findings. Most of her ongoing pain subjectively
[17] seemed to be coming from the left sacroiliac
[18] joint, at least on the exam.
[19] There was no treatable orthopedic or
[20] neurosurgical or neurological process and that
[21] she probably had mechanical pain from the
[22] osteoporosis.
[23] Q: Doctor, you said that your opinion she had
[24] subjective symptoms as opposed to objective
[25] findings, is that correct?

Page 35

[1] A: Yes.
[2] Q: Could you explain, you may have done this
[3] already and I apologize, but could you explain
[4] the difference between subjective symptoms and
[5] objective findings?
[6] A: The way I simplistically look at that,
[7] subjective is something that only the individual
[8] can ascertain, and there is no way anybody else
[9] would know that is true or not. It's a pain.
[10] If you touch someplace, it can include
[11] tenderness, it can include trigger points, it
[12] can include headaches, how the pain bothers
[13] them, whether there is weather changes that
[14] affect their pain picture.
[15] These are all subjective complaints,
[16] whereas something that is an objective finding,
[17] it's something that someone other than the
[18] individual can determine is abnormal. It can be
[19] something on a physical finding, it can be the
[20] body habitus, it can be a finding on x-ray,
[21] those are irrefutable type of facts, and it's
[22] just separating which facts have to deal with
[23] the subjective symptoms, that's the challenge
[24] that the physicians have in prospectively
[25] managing a problem.

Page 36

[1] That is a patient coming into the office
[2] and what do you do next to try to make the
[3] person feel better or make the person better.
[4] Q: Doctor, you also mentioned that - strike that.
[5] Let me ask it a little different.
[6] Did you find anything based on your
[7] examination and your review of the medical
[8] records that would support an objective finding
[9] of injury as a result of this automobile
[10] accident?
[11] A: In my opinion, there was none. I know that some
[12] of the opinions registered and some of the
[13] doctors feel that when they do certain physical
[14] findings where they have tenderness in an area,
[15] that can constitute an objective finding, but in
[16] my opinion there was none that I found that was
[17] documented.
[18] Q: So, doctor, at least as I understand your
[19] opinion, you are basing any opinion that she was
[20] injured on what she told you?
[21] A: Well, I think that's what all of her doctors
[22] did. Certainly the doctors at the Clinic that
[23] saw her five months later, Dr. Kriegler who saw
[24] her 15 months later, they base their patient's
[25] symptoms on what the patient tells you.

<div>Page 37</div> <div><p>[1] Q: Doctor, Dr. Kriegler has rendered an opinion</p><p>[2] already that Miss Lindamood-Tamler suffers from</p><p>[3] fibromyalgia. Could you tell us, please, what</p><p>[4] is fibromyalgia or what is your understanding of</p><p>[5] the diagnosis of fibromyalgia?</p><p>[6] A: Fibromyalgia is a condition that is an exclusion</p><p>[7] diagnosis. In other words, after you have ruled</p><p>[8] out everything else and the patients still have</p><p>[9] pain that appears to be coming from their</p><p>[10] muscles or the lining of the muscles, it is</p><p>[11] given a diagnosis of fibromyalgia.</p><p>[12] There are certain characteristics that can</p><p>[13] be associated with fibromyalgia. You can have</p><p>[14] objective muscle spasm, muscle tightness. They</p><p>[15] are characterized by tenderness in certain</p><p>[16] muscle groups. They can be associated with so</p><p>[17] called trigger points. That is, if you push on</p><p>[18] an area and it gives them subjective pain, that,</p><p>[19] again, is a subjective finding. It rarely, it</p><p>[20] rarely has an objective abnormality associated</p><p>[21] with it.</p><p>[22] So it's basically muscle pain or pain</p><p>[23] stemming from the muscles or the lining of the</p><p>[24] muscles.</p><p>[25] Q: Doctor, Dr. Kriegler has mentioned or has</p></div>	<div>Page 39</div> <div><p>[1] So it triggers the symptom.</p><p>[2] Q: Doctor, if, in fact, Miss Lindamood-Tamler is</p><p>[3] suffering from the complaints of ongoing pain</p><p>[4] that she has told you about, do you have an</p><p>[5] opinion to a reasonable degree of medical</p><p>[6] certainty as to what is the cause of that</p><p>[7] ongoing pain?</p><p>[8] MR. SUCHER: Objection.</p><p>[9] A: I have an opinion, yes.</p><p>[10] Q: And what is that opinion, doctor?</p><p>[11] A: My opinion is that the pain as it is described,</p><p>[12] she subjectively relates it to the automobile</p><p>[13] accident, but the diffuse nature of her pain is</p><p>[14] commonly seen in individuals that have had</p><p>[15] spinal fixtures, spinal collapse, and the</p><p>[16] fibromyalgia symptoms, in my opinion, are</p><p>[17] probably coming from mechanical imbalance of her</p><p>[18] spine.</p><p>[19] MR. SUCHER: Objection. Move to</p><p>[20] strike. Not contained in the doctor's</p><p>[21] report.</p><p>[22] Q: Is that the osteoporosis that we've talked about</p><p>[23] earlier, doctor?</p><p>[24] MR. SUCHER: Same objection.</p><p>[25] A: In my opinion, it is related to the</p></div>
<div>Page 38</div> <div><p>[1] testified that she found various trigger points</p><p>[2] which she indicated supported her diagnosis of</p><p>[3] fibromyalgia.</p><p>[4] Do you have an understanding as to what she</p><p>[5] is referring to when she talks about trigger</p><p>[6] points?</p><p>[7] A: I know what a trigger point is. I assume that</p><p>[8] we are both using the same diagnosis.</p><p>[9] Q: Could you tell us, please?</p><p>[10] A: A trigger point, I guess the best way a regular</p><p>[11] person, non-doctor person understanding it is if</p><p>[12] on examination I touch a spot that reproduces</p><p>[13] the pain that an individual subjectively feels</p><p>[14] that, or it triggers the same symptom, that is</p><p>[15] called a trigger point.</p><p>[16] It is a subjective finding. It can be</p><p>[17] associated with an objective abnormality. There</p><p>[18] can be a tight muscle bundle, and I have seen</p><p>[19] this in patients, so it can be associated, but</p><p>[20] it doesn't have to be associated with a</p><p>[21] objective finding, and it is usually not</p><p>[22] associated with an objective finding, but it is</p><p>[23] simply a point at which when you apply pressure</p><p>[24] you can elicit the same symptoms that the</p><p>[25] patient complains of.</p></div>	<div>Page 40</div> <div><p>[1] osteoporosis, yes.</p><p>[2] MR. SUCHER: Objection. Move to</p><p>[3] strike. Not contained in the doctor's</p><p>[4] report.</p><p>[5] MR. WANTZ: Doctor, I have no</p><p>[6] other questions. Thank you very much.</p><p>[7]</p><p>[8] CROSS-EXAMINATION OF ROBERT C. CORN, M.D.</p><p>[9] BY MR. SUCHER:</p><p>[10] Q: Good afternoon, doctor. Doctor, my name is</p><p>[11] Daniel Sucher. I don't think we've ever met</p><p>[12] before.</p><p>[13] A: No.</p><p>[14] Q: I see you have your file in front of you. Can I</p><p>[15] take an opportunity to look at that?</p><p>[16] A: Sure.</p><p>[17] MR. SUCHER: Off the record,</p><p>[18] please.</p><p>[19] VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR: We're off the</p><p>[20] record</p><p>[21]</p><p>[22] (Off the record.)</p><p>[23]</p><p>[24] MR. SUCHER: Back on the record.</p><p>[25] VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR: Stand by.</p></div>

Page 41

[1] We're on the record.
[2] Q: Doctor, thank you for letting me have the
[3] opportunity to review your file.
[4] Now, doctor, you refer to your examination
[5] of my client as independent, don't you?
[6] A: Yes.
[7] Q: Now, doctor, you knew that this matter was in
[8] litigation prior to the examination, didn't you?
[9] A: I don't know. I knew there may have been
[10] issues. I don't know what the status of it
[11] was. I don't usually pay attention to that.
[12] Q: Well, doctor, if you look at your report, you
[13] have that in front of you, you refer to a case
[14] number there, don't you, doctor?
[15] A: I do, and I did when I wrote the report, but you
[16] asked me at the time of the examination and then
[17] I said I didn't know,
[18] Q: Okay. Doctor, do you know where you got that
[19] case number from?
[20] A: Probably from the medical records after I
[21] reviewed them.
[22] Q: The Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court case
[23] number would be on the medical records, doctor?
[24] A: It frequently is on the medical records, yes.
[25] Q: Okay. Mr. Wantz asked you to conduct this

Page 42

[1] examination, didn't he, doctor?
[2] A: Yes.
[3] Q: And he asked you to conduct it on behalf of his
[4] client, State Farm Insurance Company, didn't he,
[5] doctor?
[6] A: I am not sure who his client was.
[7] Q: Doctor, you understand that there is two sides
[8] to a case, there is a plaintiff and there is a
[9] defendant, don't you?
[10] A: Yes.
[11] Q: And you understand Mr. Wantz is representing the
[12] defendant in this case, don't you, doctor?
[13] A: Yes.
[14] Q: And, doctor, you did receive some of the medical
[15] records and don't they have a case caption on it
[16] that has Patricia Lindamood-Tamler versus State
[17] Farm?
[18] A: Well, I didn't really notice that. They may.
[19] Yes, as a matter of fact, it does.
[20] Q: Okay. So you understand that the defendant in
[21] this case is State Farm Insurance Company, don't
[22] you, doctor?
[23] A: I do now, yes.
[24] Q: And you rendered opinions for State Farm
[25] Insurance Company, doctor, didn't you?

Page 43

[1] A: I rendered my opinions.
[2] Q: For Mr. Wantz representing State Farm, is that
[3] correct?
[4] A: Correct.
[5] Q: Now, no one from my office asked you to perform
[6] this examination, did they, doctor?
[7] A: No.
[8] Q: And no one from the court asked you to perform
[9] this examination, did they, doctor?
[10] A: That is not my understanding, no.
[11] Q: That's correct, the judge didn't ask you to
[12] perform this, did he?
[13] A: No. I didn't understand what you meant. No.
[14] This was done for Mr. Wantz.
[15] Q: Solely for Mr. Wantz, is that correct, doctor?
[16] A: Yes.
[17] MR. WANTZ: I will stipulate to
[18] that.
[19] Q: Mr. Wantz is the one that has paid your fees in
[20] rendering your opinions and doing your report
[21] and your examination, isn't that correct,
[22] doctor?
[23] A: I have no idea if we have been paid yet for it.
[24] Q: Who would you have billed, doctor?
[25] A: Probably Mr. Wantz.

Page 44

[1] Q: And I assume you expect to be paid by Mr. Wantz,
[2] is that correct, doctor?
[3] A: I don't care who the check, who signs the check.
[4] Q: You prepared a report in this case, correct,
[5] doctor?
[6] A: Yes.
[7] Q: And the only person you sent that report to was
[8] Mr. Wantz, isn't that a fact, doctor?
[9] A: The letter was sent to him, yes.
[10] Q: You never sent it to me, did you, doctor?
[11] A: No. He usually sends it to the opposing
[12] attorneys.
[13] Q: Just answer my question. Did you send the
[14] report to me?
[15] A: No. I didn't even know who you were.
[16] Q: Did you send the report to the judge?
[17] A: No.
[18] Q: Did you send the report to Dr. Kriegler?
[19] A: No.
[20] Q: Have you ever talked to Dr. Kriegler about Miss
[21] Tamler?
[22] A: No.
[23] Q: Doctor, do you still feel that your examination
[24] was independent?
[25] A: Absolutely.

Page 45

[1] Q: Doctor, also, in fact, today's deposition is
[2] going to be shown during the defense of this
[3] case, isn't that a fact?
[4] A: Yes.
[5] Q: Doctor, you stated to Mr. Wantz that you are
[6] being compensated for your time today, that is
[7] correct?
[8] A: I am sorry?
[9] Q: You are being compensated for your time today,
[10] is that correct?
[11] A: Today, yes, I am.
[12] Q: And you are being compensated for your time for
[13] the report?
[14] A: Or I will be.
[15] Q: And the exam?
[16] A: Right.
[17] Q: And your review of the records, is that correct?
[18] A: Yes.
[19] Q: Doctor, my understanding - strike that.
[20] Doctor, my understanding is that you are
[21] compensated anywhere from 400 to \$1,200 per
[22] exam, report and review of medical records, is
[23] that correct?
[24] MR. WANTZ: Objection. *OK*
[25] A: That's approximately correct.

Page 46

[1] Q: Doctor, do you disagree with that number?
[2] A: Not in general, no.
[3] Q: And you perform two of these exams a week, is
[4] that correct?
[5] A: Well, I think I already testified that I do two
[6] nontreating exams a week. They are not
[7] necessarily defense exams.
[8] Q: Okay. But this was a defense exam, wasn't it,
[9] doctor?
[10] A: Yes.
[11] Q: Your two independent or your two legal, we'll
[12] call them legal exams, nontreating exams, would
[13] that be a better term to use?
[14] A: That's what I call them, yes.
[15] Q: You do two nontreating exams per week, is that
[16] correct, doctor?
[17] A: Yes.
[18] Q: And for those exams you charge between 400 and
[19] \$1,200, is that correct?
[20] MR. WANTZ: Objection. *OK*
[21] A: Usually.
[22] Q: Doctor, you are also being compensated for your
[23] time today for deposition, is that correct?
[24] A: Yes.
[25] Q: And my understanding is your normal fee for

Page 47

[1] deposition time is \$900.00, is that correct?
[2] MR. WANTZ: Objection. *OK*
[3] A: Yes.
[4] Q: Doctor, how many of these depositions do you do
[5] a week?
[6] A: I do depositions whenever I am asked to do
[7] depositions. I don't have a regular time. I
[8] can do zero or I can do three.
[9] Q: Doctor, would it be safe to say that you do one
[10] a week, maybe two a week?
[11] A: I would say on the average probably one a week
[12] for snre, over the 40 some weeks, probably 38 to
[13] 40 weeks a year, anti they are not obviously
[14] always for the defense. They are for whoever
[15] needs the deposition. They can be for Workman's
[16] Comp or plaintiff or defense, but I usually do
[17] them at the end of the day unless I am going to
[18] go on vacation, which is why we are here today
[19] on a Tuesday morning.
[20] MR. SUCHER: Move to strike the *3*
[21] answer as nonresponsive.
[22] Q: Doctor, the depositions that you do, they
[23] average what, with preparation time, actual
[24] testimony time about two hours?
[25] A: I don't know. I think I testified that

Page 48

[1] somewhere in the past, but it can be shorter or
[2] it can be longer.
[3] Q: But that would be a safe ballpark, doctor,
[4] approximately two hours?
[5] A: Yes.
[6] Q: Now, doctor, isn't it a fact that the majority
[7] of your testimony is for defendants in lawsuits?
[8] A: I am sorry?
[9] Q: The majority of your testimony is for defendants
[10] in lawsuits?
[11] A: The majority? Probably at this point in my
[12] life, yes.
[13] Q: And doctor, you have testified for Mr. Wantz in
[14] the past, haven't you?
[15] A: Yes.
[16] Q: And you have testified for other attorneys in
[17] Mr. Wanm's office?
[18] A: Yes.
[19] Q: And you are aware of, doctor, that their primary
[20] work is in defense of personal injury cases for
[21] insurance companies?
[22] MR. WANTZ: Objection. *OK*
[23] A: I would say most of the cases that I review for
[24] them are defense oriented, yes.
[25] Q: And, doctor, you are aware that their primary

Page 49

[1] client is the State Farm Insurance Company,
[2] aren't you?
[3] **MR. WANTZ:** Objection. *oh*
[4] **A:** I have no idea who they do all their business
[5] with. It is not any of my business and I have
[6] never asked.
[7] **Q:** Well, doctor, would it surprise you to know that
[8] their number one client is the State Farm
[9] Insurance Company?
[10] **MR. WANTZ:** Objection. *oh*
[11] **A:** I don't know.
[12] **Q:** Would it surprise you, doctor, that they list
[13] themselves in Martindale-Hubbell - are you
[14] familiar with Martindale-Hubbell, doctor?
[15] **A:** I never heard that name before.
[16] **Q:** It's a listing of attorneys and they list their
[17] primary client as State Farm Insurance Company,
[18] would that surprise you, doctor?
[19] **A:** I am not surprised by anything.
[20] **MR. WANTZ:** For the record, I am *oh*
[21] going to move to object and strike all of
[22] this testimony regarding who my clients are
[23] or my firm's clients are.
[24] **Q:** Doctor, do you know what percent of the cases
[25] that you look at on a legal standpoint end up

Page 50

[1] going to trial?
[2] **A:** I have no idea.
[3] **Q:** Doctor, would you agree with me that not all the
[4] cases go to trial?
[5] **A:** I have no idea what goes to trial. I don't
[6] usually know what settles or what goes to trial
[7] or what gets thrown out. I don't have time to
[8] keep track of that.
[9] **Q:** Okay. Doctor, would it surprise you if I have
[10] reviewed The Verdict Reporter for cases in Ohio
[11] since 1770 and it has you testifying in trials
[12] of actions 35 times?
[13] **MR. WANTZ:** Objection. *oh*
[14] **A:** Since 1990?
[15] **Q:** Since 1990.
[16] **A:** Would it surprise me? No, it wouldn't surprise
[17] me.
[18] **Q:** Doctor, would it surprise you if that
[19] publication revealed that 31 of those occasions
[20] you testified for the defendant?
[21] **MR. WANTZ:** Objection. *oh*
[22] **A:** I am not surprised by that figure, no.
[23] **Q:** And that would be four times that you testified
[24] for the plaintiff?
[25] **A:** In that particular listing, I guess. I have no

Page 51

[1] opinion of what that is or what counties that
[2] is, you know, I don't know what that means.
[3] **Q:** Do you want to take a look at it, doctor?
[4] **A:** I am not sure I will even understand it.
[5] **Q:** Okay. Doctor, it wouldn't surprise you that 13
[6] of those 31 cases that you testified for were on
[7] behalf of State Farm Insurance Company?
[8] **MR. WANTZ:** Objection. *oh*
[9] **Q:** Would that surprise you, doctor?
[10] **A:** I don't really have an opinion.
[11] **Q:** And would it also surprise, doctor, that you
[12] testified eight times for Mr. Wantz' law firm? *oh*
[13] **MR. WANTZ:** Objection.
[14] **A:** During that five year period of time?
[15] **Q:** Yes.
[16] **A:** That wouldn't surprise me.
[17] **Q:** And three of those times for Mr. Wantz
[18] particularly, would that surprise you, doctor?
[19] **A:** No. Not in five years, six years.
[20] **Q:** Doctor, do you remember testifying for Mr. Wantz
[21] in the past?
[22] **A:** Do I remember?
[23] **Q:** Yes.
[24] **A:** Sure.
[25] **Q:** Do you remember any of the particular cases that

Page 52

[1] you testified for Mr. Wantz?
[2] **A:** Not off the top of my head.
[3] **Q:** Do you remember a case by the name of Johnstone
[4] versus Lockgreen, doctor, where you testified
[5] for Mr. Wantz in Cuyahoga County in August of
[6] '93?
[7] **A:** I don't remember that at all.
[8] **MR. WANTZ:** Again, I am going to *oh*
[9] make a continuing objection.
[10] **Q:** Doctor, do you remember testifying for Mr. Wantz
[11] in a case entitled Reed versus Kiss in March of
[12] 1994?
[13] **A:** No.
[14] **Q:** Doctor, do you remember testifying for a case
[15] Barkensizk - I am mispronouncing that - versus
[16] Horner, Case Number 246004 in Cuyahoga County in
[17] January of 1994 for Mr. Wantz, do you remember
[18] that case, doctor?
[19] **A:** I have no independent recollection of it.
[20] **Q:** Doctor, do you remember testifying again on 13
[21] other times that went to trial for State Farm
[22] Insurance Company?
[23] **A:** You asked me that before and I said I don't
[24] recall the number nor does it matter to me.
[25] **Q:** You also testify for other defense firms in

<div>Page 53</div> <div><p>[1] town, don't you, doctor?</p><p>[2] A: Whoever, it is first come first serve. I don't</p><p>[3] have a particular law firm that I work with or</p><p>[4] like to work with more than another. It's</p><p>[5] basically luck of the draw.</p><p>[6] Q: Would it surprise you, doctor, that a review of</p><p>[7] The Verdict Reporter indicates that you testify</p><p>[8] primarily for Meyers, Hentemann, Williams &</p><p>[9] Sennet, Keller & Curtain and Nationwide</p><p>[10] Insurance Company attorneys, would that surprise</p><p>[11] you, doctor?</p><p>[12] A: It doesn't surprise me, no.</p><p>[13] Q: Doctor, in fact, recently you just testified in</p><p>[14] a matter for Mr. Roman of Mr. Wantz' office in a</p><p>[15] case that just went to trial, do you remember</p><p>[16] that?</p><p>[17] A: Not off the top of my head.</p><p>[18] Q: Do you remember testifying videotape on May 7th,</p><p>[19] doctor?</p><p>[20] A: Particularly on that date, I have no</p><p>[21] recollection of what I did on May 7, 1996.</p><p>[22] Q: Okay. Doctor, you don't remember testifying in</p><p>[23] the case of Mixon versus State Farm Insurance</p><p>[24] Company?</p><p>[25] A: I remember the Mixon case, yes, but I don't</p></div>	<div>Page 55</div> <div><p>[1] A: I have no idea.</p><p>[2] Q: Doctor, are you familiar with Dr. Kriegler?</p><p>[3] A: Yes.</p><p>[4] Q: Do you have an opinion of Dr. Kriegler?</p><p>[5] A: Specifically, yes.</p><p>[6] Q: What is that opinion, doctor?</p><p>[7] A: I have respect for what she does in the segment</p><p>[8] of the population that she tries to help.</p><p>[9] Q: Doctor, would you agree with me that she is a</p><p>[0] very competent physician?</p><p>[1] A: I don't really know her that well, but I just</p><p>[2] know her reputation and I do use her for</p><p>[3] referrals.</p><p>[4] Q: And you sent patients to her in the past,</p><p>[5] haven't you?</p><p>[6] A: Yes.</p><p>[7] Q: And you are associated with Mount Sinai and so</p><p>[8] is she?</p><p>[9] A: Well, I am very, very peripherally associated</p><p>[20] with Mount Sinai at this point in time and I</p><p>[21] know that that's her primary area. She was</p><p>[22] previously with University Hospitals and that's</p><p>[23] where most of my contacts with her were.</p><p>[24] Q: And you are associated with University Hospital,</p><p>[25] correct?</p></div>
<div>Page 54</div> <div><p>[1] remember what date it was or who was the</p><p>[2] attorneys involved.</p><p>[3] Q: Do you remember that would have been this month</p><p>[4] that you did a video deposition?</p><p>[5] A: You have to realize, this is a very small</p><p>[6] portion of my time, and I really don't keep that</p><p>[7] kind of log or keep or have an interest in</p><p>[8] maintaining the statistics like you are</p><p>[9] reciting.</p><p>[10] So, you know, I have no qualms and I have</p><p>[11] no opinions whether it's true or not true.</p><p>[12] MR. SUCHER: Objection. Move to</p><p>[13] strike as nonresponsive.</p><p>[14] Q: Now, doctor, you remember testifying in the</p><p>[15] Mixon matter, don't you?</p><p>[16] A: I vaguely remember it, yes.</p><p>[17] Q: So if I told you that the deposition was taken</p><p>[18] here on May 7, 1996, would you have any reason</p><p>[19] to disagree with that?</p><p>[20] A: No,</p><p>[21] Q: You testified for Mr. Roman in Mr. Wantz' office</p><p>[22] in that deposition?</p><p>[23] A: That's what you tell me, yes.</p><p>[24] Q: And his client was State Farm Insurance Company</p><p>[25] in that deposition?</p></div>	<div>Page 56</div> <div><p>[1] A: Yes.</p><p>[2] Q: Doctor, have you referred patients in the past</p><p>[3] to pain centers at Mount Sinai?</p><p>[4] A: I probably have.</p><p>[5] Q: And I'm sure -</p><p>[6] A: Although quite frankly she has joined their</p><p>[7] staff fairly recently and I am not sure when</p><p>[8] that was. I don't know how many people I have</p><p>[9] referred to her since she has left. That has</p><p>[0] probably been probably under five.</p><p>[1] Q: I take it, doctor, you refer people to the pain</p><p>[2] center at University Hospital?</p><p>[3] A: Very rarely. I don't really see that many</p><p>[4] people that would qualify for that, probably</p><p>[15] less than 10 patients a year that are not</p><p>[16] treatable from a standard standpoint and they</p><p>[17] need to have some sort of pain management. So</p><p>[18] it's not a large segment since I see about a</p><p>[19] hundred patients a week.</p><p>[20] Q: But you do send people to pain centers, doctor?</p><p>[21] A: I do use pain centers when I feel it is</p><p>[22] appropriate, sure.</p><p>[23] Q: And you have used University Hospital, is that</p><p>[24] correct, doctor?</p><p>[25] A: I have.</p></div>

Page 57

[1] Q: And you have also probably used the Cleveland
[2] Clinic, is that correct, doctor?
[3] A: I don't know if I specifically remember
[4] referring anybody to the Cleveland Clinic, but I
[5] am familiar with their program.
[6] Q: Doctor, you have had an opportunity to review
[7] the Cleveland Clinic records, is that correct?
[8] A: Yes.
[9] Q: And you reviewed the report from I believe it's
[10] doctor—
[11] A: Mazanec.
[12] Q: Mazanec. Are you familiar with Dr. Mazanec?
[13] A: I know of him. I don't know him personally.
[14] Q: Doctor, would you agree with me that he has a
[15] good reputation in the community?
[16] A: I have no idea.
[17] Q: Doctor, does the Cleveland Clinic have a good
[18] reputation in the community?
[19] A: Sure.
[20] Q: And, actually, you served your residency there,
[21] is that true?
[22] A: Yes, that's true.
[23] Q: Have you reviewed his report, doctor?
[24] A: I did.
[25] Q: And, doctor, what was his diagnosis and opinion

Page 58

[1] in this case?
[2] MR. WANTZ: Objection. *oh*
[3] A: I don't really remember at this point in time.
[4] Q: Doctor, would you like to take a moment and look
[5] at his report? I believe it's in front of you.
[6] A: Sure. If you want to go off the record I'll be
[7] glad to.
[8] VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR: Off the
[9] record.
[10]
[11] (Off the record.)
[12]
[13] MR. SUCHER: Back on the record.
[14] VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR: Stand by.
[15] We're on the record.
[16] Q: Doctor, you have had an opportunity to review
[17] Dr. Mazanec's findings, haven't you?
[18] A: Yes.
[19] Q: And what was his impression in this matter?
[20] MR. WANTZ: Objection. *oh*
[21] A: Mechanical back pain.
[22] Q: And what does that mean, doctor?
[23] A: Back pain due to abnormal spinal mechanics.
[24] Q: And, doctor, he related it to her accident of
[25] October 11, 1993, didn't he?

Page 59

[1] MR. WANTZ: Objection. *oh*
[2] A: He relates it by her history to the accident,
[3] correct.
[4] Q: Doctor, would you read the, I believe it's the
[5] fourth full paragraph, "it is my impression"?
[6] MR. WANTZ: I am going to object. *oh*
[7] A: Which — I am sorry?
[8] Q: Page one.
[9] A: Page one. You want me to read the whole
[10] paragraph?
[11] Q: Just the first sentence of the paragraph.
[12] A: "It was my impression that Miss Lindamood had a
[13] myofascial pain syndrome as a consequence of her
[14] injury and I recommended a trial of Trilisate
[15] twice a day and physical therapy".
[16] Q: And, doctor, do you agree with that opinion?
[17] A: What opinion?
[18] Q: Dr. Mazanec's opinion.
[19] A: No.
[20] Q: When did he see Miss Lindamood, doctor?
[21] A: He saw her about *t.*
[22] Q: Doctor, would you —
[23] Lindamood sustained some injury in her
[24] automobile accident?
[25] A: Probably.

Page 60

[1] Q: Doctor, now you are not a psychologist, are you?
[2] A: No.
[3] Q: You are not a psychiatrist?
[4] A: No.
[5] Q: You are not a neurologist?
[6] A: I am not a neurologist.
[7] Q: You are not a neurosurgeon?
[8] A: No. That's correct.
[9] Q: You are not a rheumatologist?
[10] A: No.
[11] Q: Doctor, you, also, when I review your report you
[12] state that there were no Cleveland Clinic
[13] records of epidural blocks, spinal blocks?
[14] A: I didn't say that. I said it was really
[15] difficult to establish when the exact dates
[16] were. That's what I said.
[17] Q: Doctor, can you refer to those records for me,
[18] please?
[19] A: Sure.
[20] Q: Would you go to Page 41? They are marked at the
[21] bottom, doctor.
[22] A: Okay.
[23] Q: Did you have trouble finding this when you were
[24] looking for your report?
[25] A: No. This was the history and physical done by

Page 61

Page 63

[1] actually one of the residents.
[2] Q: What does the procedure note say at the bottom,
[3] doctor?
[4] A: Well, I am not going to read the whole
[5] paragraph. Basically they stuck a needle in her
[6] back and they gave her a shot.
[7] Q: That is an epidural block, isn't it, doctor?
[8] A: It sounds like an epidural block, yes.
[9] Q: Okay. But you didn't notice that when you were
[10] preparing your report?
[11] A: No. I just said she had a number of blocks and
[12] I just couldn't find all of them.
[13] Q: Okay. Doctor, would you go to 43 and through
[14] 44. Do you see on Page 43, doctor, where there
[15] was a visit of 3/6/94?
[16] A: Yes.
[17] Q: And on the second page continuing on that visit
[18] do you see trigger point injections under
[19] impressions?
[20] A: No. It says, it's under plan.
[21] Q: Doctor, if you look at the bottom of Page 44.
[22] A: Yes. It says trigger point injection, it's
[23] under -
[24] Q: Impression.
[25] A: It is not under impression. It's a separate

Page 62

Page 64

[1] series of numbers. Impression, he has two
[2] impressions and then he has five things
[3] underneath that. So it's not under impression.
[4] Q: Okay. Thank you for correcting me, doctor. So
[5] trigger point was part of the plan on that date,
[6] is that correct?
[7] A: It was part of the plan on that date, that's the
[8] way it looks.
[9] Q: And then we look at procedure on Page 45, was a
[10] trigger point performed on that day, doctor?
[11] A: It's difficult for me to say what was given
[12] her. I have a hard time reading this, whether
[13] it was an attempted epidural block or what. I
[14] am not really sure what this says.
[15] Q: You can't read under number two, doctor, where
[16] it says patient sitting for lumbar epidural,
[17] sterile prep and drape?
[18] A: Right.
[19] Q: Would that indicate to you that an epidural was
[20] going to be performed?
[21] A: It looks like that's what their intention was.
[22] Q: And then, doctor, if we go to Page 46 at the
[23] 9/15 visit, that appears to be similar in
[24] nature, too, doesn't it, doctor, with the
[25] procedure that was performed, if you look at

[1] Page 47, procedure notes?
[2] A: Right.
[3] Q: And if we look also, doctor, on 10/4/94, pain
[4] management, Cleveland Clinic, Page 47, if we go
[5] on to Page 48, procedure, it also looks like a
[6] block was performed on that date, too, doesn't
[7] it, doctor?
[8] A: Certainly an injection, yes.
[9] Q: Doctor, what are epidural blocks?
[10] A: Epidural blocks are injections of chemicals into
[11] the epidural space.
[12] Q: And why would a patient have an epidural block?
[13] A: It is felt by some people that it tends to break
[14] the pain cycle and it's useful as part of pain
[15] management, and it's also the same location
[16] where anesthesia is given for surgery.
[17] Q: Doctor, is it painful for a person to get an
[18] epidural block?
[19] A: I have seen blocks that are very painful and
[20] blocks that - when my wife had her babies we
[21] had no problem with her epidural. So I think it
[22] varies on the technique and the ability of the
[23] individual physician.
[24] Q: And it would also, doctor, take into account the
[25] individual patient, is that correct?

[1] A: Whether they complain of pain or not? Sure.
[2] Obviously pain is subjective. So there is no
[3] way of verifying that.
[4] Q: Pain is always subjective, isn't it, doctor?
[5] A: Always.
[6] Q: Doctor, your opinions are subjective in a sense,
[7] aren't they?
[8] A: All opinions are subjective, but it's what they
[9] are based on that is not always subjective.
[10] Q: Now, doctor, you talked about Miss Lindamood's
[11] osteoporosis. Was that causing her any
[12] complaints prior to the accident?
[13] A: I don't remember. She obviously had it
[14] diagnosed. I don't remember what her complaints
[15] were at that time, though.
[16] Q: Doctor, would it be safe to say that it was
[17] asymptomatic prior to the accident?
[18] A: I don't remember.
[19] Q: Do you have anything to indicate otherwise,
[20] doctor?
[21] A: I don't remember.
[22] Q: The same thing with the fractures, doctor, were
[23] they asymptomatic before the accident?
[24]
[25]

Page 65

[1] problems, were they?
[2] **A:** Not that I saw in the records.
[3] **Q:** And she was under no treatment for those, was
[4] she, doctor?
[5] **A:** For the osteoporosis or - ,
[6] **Q:** For the osteoporosis and the fractures.
[7] **A:** I don't remember.
[8] **Q:** Doctor, you stated earlier during direct
[9] examination that 80 percent of women with
[10] osteoporosis are pain free, is that correct?
[11] **A:** Well, they are asymptomatic. They don't know
[12] they have it.
[13] **Q:** Meaning that they are pain free?
[14] **A:** Well, it could mean that they are pain free.
[15] **Q:** What else does it mean?
[16] **A:** It means they do not know they have
[17] osteoporosis. They could have pain and not know
[18] it's osteoporosis. What I am saying is that the
[19] diagnosis of osteoporosis was not correlated
[20] with their pain in those people.
[21] **Q:** Doctor, was there any evidence that Miss
[22] Lindamood was suffering any pain from her
[23] osteoporosis prior to the accident from the
[24] medical records you reviewed?
[25] **A:** I really don't recall. I don't remember.

Page 66

[1] **Q:** Now, doctor, you saw Miss Lindamood one time, is
[2] that correct?
[3] **A:** Yes.
[4] **Q:** And that was over *two* years after the accident,
[5] is that also true?
[6] **A:** Yes, that's also true.
[7] **Q:** And you didn't see her to treat you?
[8] **A:** Yes.
[9] **Q:** And you didn't see her at anyone's request other
[10] than Mr. Wantz?
[11] **A:** Again, yes, that's true.
[12] **Q:** And you saw her for about a half an hour for the
[13] history, is that correct, doctor?
[14] **A:** I don't know how long it took.
[15] **Q:** Would that be a safe estimate, doctor, that it
[16] took a half an hour?
[17] **A:** I have no idea. I usually leave 45 minutes for
[18] the examination. So it could be a half hour, it
[19] could have been 15 minutes.
[20] **Q:** And the exam itself would have taken 15 minutes,
[21] is that correct, doctor?
[22] **A:** Probably.
[23] **Q:** So some sort of combination between a half an
[24] hour to 15 minutes, 45 minutes total, is that
[25] correct, doctor?

Page 67

[1] **A:** That's what I usually leave. Now I am not sure
[2] how much of that time or if I used more time.
[3] **Q:** If Miss Lebit's notes from my office reflected a
[4] half hour history and 15 minute exam, you have
[5] no reason to disagree with that, would you,
[6] doctor?
[7] **A:** I really don't have an opinion.
[8] **Q:** Now, doctor, you haven't had the benefit of Dr.
[9] Kriegler of seeing my client everyday for a
[10] month during the pain management, did you?
[11] **A:** I am sorry?
[12] **Q:** You haven't -
[13] **A:** You talk very quickly and I am not sure I get
[14] all of your words.
[15] **Q:** I am sorry, doctor. You didn't have the
[16] benefit, let's say, that Dr. Kriegler had in
[17] examining Miss Lindamood, did you, doctor?
[18] **A:** I **did** not examine her frequently and I was not
[19] asked to comment on how she was on each of those
[20] individual time periods.
[21] **Q:** But, doctor, wouldn't you agree with me that Dr.
[22] Kriegler had the benefit of seeing Miss
[23] Lindamood on numerous occasions and, actually,
[24] she saw her for a continuous month during the
[25] pain management, wouldn't you agree with that,

Page 68

[1] doctor?
[2] **A:** I am not sure how many times she saw her during
[3] that month, but I think if that is what you are
[4] reflecting to me I have no problem with that.
[5] That would be actually very good medical care.
[6] **Q:** In reviewing the medical care that she received
[7] at the pain management, doctor, do you disagree
[8] with any of that medical care?
[9] **A:** I don't really have an opinion. I think that
[10] Dr. Kriegler's approach to chronic pain is
[11] better than most of the pain centers in the
[12] area. However, I have a problem, a subjective
[13] problem, that treating someone solely on the
[14] basis of their symptoms has some fraught with
[15] failure **and** inaccuracies, but I think if anybody
[16] does it, Dr. Kriegler probably does it the best.
[17] **MR. SUCHER:** Objection. Move to 7 *W.D.*
[18] strike as nonresponsive.
[19] **Q:** Doctor, and it is also a fact that you saw Miss
[20] Lindamood after she successfully completed her
[21] pain management with Dr. Kriegler, isn't that
[22] the fact?
[23] **A:** I am not sure successfully is an appropriate
[24] word, but I did see her a while after she
[25] completed her pain management.

Page 69

[1] **MR. SUCHER:** I have no further
[2] questions at this time.
[3]
[4] **REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF ROBERT C. CORN, M.D.**
[5] **BY MR. WANTZ:**
[6] **Q:** Doctor, just to follow-up. Mr. Sucher was
[7] asking you several questions about the epidural
[8] blocks. Do you dispute the fact that she had
[9] epidural blocks?
[10] **A:** No. Usually most medical records have the
[11] blocks as a procedure, as a separate operative
[12] procedure. I have never seen them and I had
[13] trouble with the Cleveland Clinic's records of
[14] trying to figure out exactly what is done.
[15] In other words, they don't have a set sheet
[16] like a procedure like other hospitals have that
[17] is easily attainable. I had no problem with the
[18] fact that she had the blocks. I just could not
[19] figure out what she had each individual time.
[20] **Q:** Doctor, the other question I have, Mr. Sucher
[21] asked you about Dr. Mazanec's report and he also
[22] asked you whether you agree with the opinion and
[23] you said no.
[24] Could you explain to us why you do not
[25] agree with Dr. Mazanec?

Page 70

[1] **A:** Dr. Mazanec really didn't address anything other
[2] - he called it mechanical back pain, but he
[3] really didn't go into why he called it
[4] mechanical. He felt it was related to the
[5] injury because the patient said it was related
[6] to the injury. There was really no explanation
[7] as to why it was mechanical, in other words, why
[8] the pain would be caused by a mechanical means.
[9] What he failed to address was why she was
[10] having mechanical pain. So I felt that his
[11] letter and evaluation was somewhat incomplete.
[12] But he is not an orthopedic surgeon, he a pain
[13] management physician similar to Dr. Kriegler.
[14] So I didn't really, he came out with a diagnosis
[15] of mechanical back pain, but he really didn't
[16] say how it was mechanical or what was
[17] mechanical, what was causing the mechanical
[18] quality.
[19] **Q:** What do you mean when you say mechanical back
[20] pain?
[21] **A:** When an orthopedic surgeon or spinal
[22] specialists, including neurosurgeons, talk about
[23] mechanical they mean that something was
[24] biomechanically off. In other words, there is
[25] an imbalance or there is some sort of mechanical

Page 71

[1] means or physical means of why the back is
[2] painful.
[3] It can mean a kyphotic deformity like the
[4] plaintiff has with her body forward flexed
[5] slightly off of midline or it could be related
[6] to other spinal abnormalities.
[7] **Q:** And you indicated Miss Lindamood-Tamler has a
[8] body flex forward, correct?
[9] **A:** Correct. She is a little out of balance.
[10] **Q:** And that's caused by the osteoporosis in your
[11] opinion, doctor?
[12] **A:** Solely due to the osteoporosis.
[13] **MR. WANTZ:** Thank you, doctor. I
[14] have no other questions.
[15] **MR. SUCHER:** I have no further
[16] questions.
[17] **VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR:** Doctor, you
[18] have the right to review this videotape or
[19] you can waive that right.
[20] **THE WITNESS:** I will waive my
[21] right.
[22] **VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR:** Will the
[23] attorneys from both sides waive the filing
[24] of this videotape?
[25] **MR. SUCHER:** Yes.

Page 72

[1] **THE WITNESS:** I waive signature.
[2] **MR. WANTZ:** I assume Dan will
[3] waive any filing of the transcript prior to
[4] trial?
[5] **MR. SUCHER:** Exactly. Same
[6] stipulations we had for Kriegler, Joe.
[7] **MR. WANTZ:** Thanks.
[8] (Signature waived.)
[9]
[10]
[11]
[12]
[13]
[14]
[15]
[16]
[17]
[18]
[19]
[20]
[21]
[22]
[23]
[24]
[25]

Page 73

[1]
[2]
[3]
CERTIFICATE
[4]
[5]
The State of Ohio,) SS:
[6] County of Cuyahoga.)
[7] I, Susan M. Cebon, a Notary Public within
and for the State of Ohio, authorized to
[8] administer oaths and to take and certify
depositions, do hereby certify that the
[9] above-named ROBERT C. CORN, M.D. Was by me,
before the giving of their deposition, first
[10] duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole
truth, and nothing but the truth; that the
[11] deposition as above-set forth was reduced to
writing by me by means of stenotypy, and was
[12] later transcribed into typewriting under my
direction; that this is a true record of the
[13] testimony given by the witness, and the reading
and signing of the deposition was expressly
[14] waived by the witness and by stipulation of
counsel; that said deposition was taken at the
[15] aforementioned time, date and place, pursuant to
notice or stipulation of counsel; and that I am
[16] not a relative or employee or attorney of any of
the parties, or a relative or employee of such
[17] attorney, or financially interested in this
action.
[18]
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
[19] hand and seal of office, at Cleveland, Ohio,
this ____ day of _____ A.D.
[20] 19 ____.
[21]
[22]
[23] Susan M. Cebon, Notary Public, State of Ohio
1750 Midland Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115
[24] My commission expires August 17, 1998
[25]

Page 74

[1]
WITNESS INDEX
[2]
PAGE
[3] DIRECT EXAMINATION
ROBERT C. CORN, M.D.
[4] BY MR. WANTZ..... 3
[5] CROSS-EXAMINATION
ROBERT C. CORN, M.D.
[6] BY MR. SUCHER..... 40
[7] REDIRECT EXAMINATION
ROBERT C. CORN, M.D.
[8] BY MR. WANTZ..... 69
OBJECTION INDEX
[9]
OBJECTION BY PAGE
0] MR. SUCHER: 39 ✓
1] MR. SUCHER: 39 ✓
MR. SUCHER: 39 ✓
2] MR. SUCHER: 40 ✓
MR. WANTZ: 45
3] MR. WANTZ: 46
MR. WANTZ: 47
4] MR. SUCHER: 47
MR. WANTZ: 48
5] MR. WANTZ: 49
MR. WANTZ: 49
6] MR. WANTZ: 49
MR. WANTZ: 50
7] MR. WANTZ: 50
MR. WANTZ: 51
[18] MR. WANTZ: 51
MR. WANTZ: 52
[19] MR. SUCHER: 54
MR. WANTZ: 58
[20] MR. WANTZ: 58
MR. WANTZ: 59
[21] MR. WANTZ: 59
MR. SUCHER: 68
[22]
[23]
[24]
[25]

\$	6	agree 50:3; 55:9; 57:14; 59:16, 22; 67:21, 25; 69:22, 25 agreement 17:15 agreements 17:21; 18:3 Albrecht 4:10 allotted 14:8 allowed 17:18, 24, 25 already 7:12; 29:11; 30:20; 31:24; 35:3; 37:2; 46:5 although 19:1; 22:1; 56:6 always 14:10; 47:14; 64:4, 5, 9 America 11:14 American 9:8, 10, 12, 21; 10:16; 11:12 amount 15:19; 16:18 anatomical 7:1; 22:15; 23:1, 10 sneccdot 19:2 anesthesia 63:16 animal 12:23 ankles 27:4 anybody 35:8; 57:4; 58:15 anybody's 31:3, 9 anyone's 66:9 anywhere 28:9; 45:21 apart 17:3 apologize 26:17; 35:3 appear 10:22 appearance 21:23 appeared 18:20; 21:15 appears 37:9; 62:23 application 10:20; 13:10 apply 38:23 approach 68:10 inappropriate 28:17, 17; 56:22; 68:23 approve 11:13 approved 12:3 approximately 45:25; 48:4 area 3:18; 6:13; 21:18, 18; 22:22; 23:13; 24:6; 26:20, 20, 22; 27:9; 36:14; 37:18; 55:21; 68:12 areas 7:4; 22:15, 20 arm 24:17 armipit 24:16 arms 21:20; 22:18 around 22:9; 24:16, 18; 35:9 arthritis 5:20 arthroscopic 5:17 articles 12:20; 13:18 ascertain 35:8 spect 15:21; 16:8 assess 20:20 assistant 8:25 associated 5:15; 26:25; 7:14; 33:2; 37:13, 16, 20;	38:17, 19, 20, 22; 55:17, 19, 24 Association 9:13, 13; 17:16 assume 38:7; 44:1; 72:2 assumed 31:4 asymptomatic 64:17, 23, 24; 65:11 atraumatic 29:1, 11; 31:14 atrophy 24:14; 25:3; 27:7 attainable 69:17 attempted 62:13 attended 4:12 attending 8:4, 11 attention 41:11 Attorney 15:11 attorneys 18:1, 2; 44:12; 48:16; 49:16; 53:10; 54:2; 71:23 August 4:5; 5:2; 52:5 automobile 31:1; 34:9; 36:9; 39:12; 59:24 average 47:11, 23 avoid 15:24; 16:6 aware 48:19, 25 away 33:6	bending 26:3; 32:25 benefit 67:8, 16, 22 bent 30:15 best 38:10; 68:16 better 32:22, 23; 36:3, 3; 46:13; 68:11 big 13:8 billed 43:24 biological 13:7 biology 4:9 biomechanically 70:24 bit 5:22; 9:7; 20:8; 30:15; 32:8; 33:6 blades 24:5, 9 block 61:7, 8; 62:13; 63:6, 12, 18 blocks 60:13, 13; 61:11; 63:9, 10, 19, 20; 69:8, 9, 11, 18 board 10:9, 17; 11:4, 5, 7, 9, 12, 17, 20; 12:10, 12 body 6:19; 7:18; 21:16, 17, 19; 29:22; 32:16; 35:20; 71:4, 8 bone 13:14; 28:5, 12, 15, 22, 23; 29:3, 6; 30:25; 31:14, 18 bones 5:13; 6:2; 28:24 born 6:6 both 24:18; 38:8; 71:23 bothering 20:10 bothers 35:12 bottom 60:21; 61:2, 21 brain 7:2, 16 Brainerd 3:24 weak 29:6; 31:7, 19; 33:13 breakdown 15:3 breaks 29:7 brings 19:23; 20:18 broad 6:13 bundle 38:18 Bureau 14:17; 15:10 business 49:4, 5
1	7			
10 56:15 10/4/94 63:3 11 34:9; 58:25 13 51:5; 52:20 15 36:24; 66:19, 20, 24; 67:4 1971 4:14 1975 4:14, 15, 20, 23 1976 3:16; 4:2 1979 4:5, 23 1980 12:2, 13 1984 8:17 1990 50:11, 14, 15 1992 8:18 1993 34:10; 58:25 1994 52:12, 17 1996 18:15; 53:21; 54:18	7 53:21; 54:18 70's 30:9 7th 53:18			
	8			
	80 32:4; 65:9 850 3:24			
	9			
	9/15 62:23 916194 61:15 93 52:6			
	A			
2	ability 63:22 able 21:25; 22:2, 10, 11; 24:2 abnormal 23:16; 27:6; 35:18; 58:23 abnormalities 29:15; 71:6 abnormality 23:1; 24:25; 25:2; 27:14; 30:7; 37:20; 38:17 Absolutely 44:25 Academy 9:8, 14; 10:16; 17:17 accident 18:25; 26:9; 29:5; 30:18, 19, 22; 31:1, 10; 34:9; 36:10; 39:13; 58:24; 59:2, 21, 24; 64:12, 17, 23; 65:23; 66:4 account 21:23; 63:24 aching 32:19 actions 50:12 actual 22:14; 23:7; 27:18; 28:22; 33:4; 47:23 actually 4:3; 10:18; 12:25; 28:12, 24; 57:20; 61:1; 67:23; 68:5 address 3:22; 70:1, 9 adds 6:8 affect 7:3; 13:13; 35:14 afternoon 40:10 again 9:6; 24:6; 26:20; 27:13; 37:19; 52:8, 20; 66:11 age 3:1; 6:10; 21:15; 32:20 ages 6:9 aging 6:7			
20 25:23 246004 52:16 26th 18:15				
3				
30 25:23; 29:24 30's 28:15 31 50:19; 51:6 35 50:12 38 47:12				
4				
40 47:12, 13 40's 28:9 400 45:21; 46:18 41 60:20 43 61:13, 14 44 61:14, 21 45 62:9; 66:17, 24 46 62:22 47 63:1, 4 48 63:5				
5				
50's 28:9; 30:8 51-year 21:14 55 15:7				
	B			
	rabies 6:6; 63:20 achelor 4:9 ack 4:11; 13:22; 22:16, 8; 24:6; 25:16; 26:20; 32:1, 16; 40:24; 58:13, 21, 3; 61:6; 70:2, 15, 19; 71:1 ackbone 26:24 alance 22:5; 71:9 all 29:12, 13 allpark 48:3 ar 17:16 arkensizk 52:15 ase 36:24 ased 16:21; 31:2; 36:6; 54:9 asic 11:1; 13:12; 16:14; 21:24 asically 6:1, 11; 9:18, 12; 10:2; 12:1; 14:12; 6:20; 17:20; 19:12; 37:22; 53:5; 61:5 asing 36:19 asis 13:23; 14:7, 13, 22; 5:18; 16:17; 68:14 become 12:12; 28:25 ecomes 30:11 edford 8:7 egan 18:25; 19:6 ehalf 42:3; 51:7 elieve 15:6; 27:22; 57:9; 8:5; 59:4 elong 9:2 end 24:2			
	C			
	3 3:1, 7; 40:8; 69:4 o-o-r-n 3:11 alcium 28:13, 17 alendar 12:6 alf 27:8 all 14:5; 23:14; 29:1; 36:12, 14 alled 3:2; 23:22; 37:17; 38:15; 70:2, 3 ame 70:14 an 7:24; 10:3; 11:24; 4:16, 17; 17:20; 18:4, 13; 9:8; 23:4, 6; 28:8; 29:1, 2; 31:25; 32:13; 35:8, 10, 1, 12, 18, 18, 19, 20; 6:15; 37:12, 13, 16;			

38:16, 18, 19, 24; 40:14; 47:8, 8, 15; 48:1, 2; 60:17; 71:3, 19 capable 20:15 caption 42:15 car 29:4 care 6:14; 7:14; 15:20; 33: 11; 44:3; 68:5, 6, 8 carpal 26:1, 7 Case 8:23; 41:13, 19, 22; 42:8, 12, 15, 21; 44:4; 45:3; 52:3, 11, 14, 16, 18; 53:15, 23, 25; 58:1 cases 48:20, 23; 49:24; 50:4, 10; 51:6, 25 category 10:3 causation 28:7 cause 29:6; 31:25; 39:6 caused 70:8; 71:10 causes 30:6, 6; 32:18 causing 64:11, 25; 70:17 ceiling 24:3 Center 8:7, 8; 23:12; 32:14; 33:25; 56:12 centers 56:3, 20, 21; 68:11 central 7:15 certain 5:15; 6:18; 10:1, 10; 12:1; 14:8, 20; 36:13; 37:12, 15 certainly 21:23; 31:6, 20, 21; 36:22; 63:8 certainty 34:7; 39:6 certification 11:20 certified 3:5; 10:10, 17; 11:4, 5, 7; 12:10, 12 Chad 33:22 challenge 35:23 challenging 20:8 chance 29:23, 24; 30:1 change 16:14 changes 35:13 characteristics 37:12 characterized 37:15 charge 16:21; 46:18 charges 16:15, 17 check 44:3, 3 chemicals 63:10 chest 21:18; 24:3 chief 8:15; 19:22 chin 24:2 chores 33:1 chronic 68:10 chronologically 19:5 chronology 19:21 Civil 3:4 claim 15:12; 22:5 claiming 24:21 claims 15:25 clear 13:20; 19:17 Cleveland 3:18; 4:21, 22; 14, 14; 17:17; 25:19; 26:14; 33:18, 24; 57:1, 4, 7, 17; 60:12; 63:4; 69:13 client 41:5; 42:4, 6; 49:1, 8, 17; 54:24; 67:9 clients 49:22, 23 climb 22:12 Clinic 4:22, 23, 24; 25:20 26:15; 33:18, 24; 36:22; 57:2, 4, 7, 17; 60:12; 63:4 Clinic's 69:13 clinical 416; 8:22; 12:5; 13:10; 27:24; 34:11 clothes 30:14 coating 13:8 collapse 29:20, 21; 39:15 collapses 29:2 College 4:10; 9:1, 10, 22; 12:22; 13:3 combination 66:23 comfortable 18:7 coming 17:13; 34:17; 36:1; 37:9; 39:17 comment 67:19 commented 31:12 committee 11:9 common 28:19; 33:2; 11:22 commonly 25:25; 30:8; 39:14 Community 33:15; 57:15, 18 Comp 14:18; 15:12; 17:16 companies 48:21 Company 42:4, 21, 25; 19:1, 9, 17; 51:7; 52:22; 13:10, 24; 54:24 comparison 21:20 compensated 16:10; 5:6, 9, 12, 21; 46:22 compensation 15:10; 16:13 competent 55:10 complain 64:1 complained 26:8, 21; 17:12 complains 38:25 complaint 19:22 complaints 23:3; 35:15; 19:3; 64:12, 14 complete 3:9; 34:2 completed 12:2, 3; 17:18; 33:8; 68:20, 25 completing 4:23 complexity 16:18, 22; 7:7, 8 complications 13:17; 1:5; 33:5 compression 6:24; 0:21 concentration 28:16 condition 20:12; 28:5; 29:9; 31:11; 33:4, 5; 37:6 conduct 41:25; 42:3 congenital 6:6 connecting 6:3 connection 34:3 consequence 59:13 considerations 26:1j considered 10:14 consists 19:22 constant 10:19 constitute 36:15 contacts 55:23 contained 39:20; 40:3 contested 15:12 continue 31:23 continued 13:4 continuing 10:5; 52:9; 61:17 continuous 67:24 continuously 5:3 contraction 23:15 conversation 19:19 coordination 23:16 cord 7:16 CORN 3:1, 7, 11; 40:8; 59:4 correcting 62:4 correlated 65:19 couldn't 24:24; 61:12 counties 51:1 county 17:16; 41:22; 12:5, 16 course 13:19; 27:21 Court 41:22; 43:8 criteria 10:5; 11:24 cross 27:11 ROSS-EXAMINATION 10:8 current 19:9, 25; 20:12, 9 currently 8:22 curtain 53:9 Curtis 3:11 Cuyahoga 41:22; 52:5, 16 cycle 63:14		defendants 48:7, 9 defense 14:10, 19; 15:4; 8, 17; 18:2; 45:2; 46:7, 8; 47:14, 16; 48:20, 24; 52:2; defined 7:12 deformity 71:3 degenerative 6:8 degree 4:14; 6:16; 34:7; 39:5 demonstrated 25:15 dent 29:13, 14 depending 15:17 deposed 3:5 deposition 45:1; 46:23; 47:1, 15; 54:4, 17, 22, 25 depositions 16:4; 47:4, 6, 7, 22 described 25: 18; 39:11 desk 32:25 despite 25:3, 14 detail 5:23 details 18:25; 19:2; 21:12 detect 25:1 determine 35:18 develop 25:23; 29:1; 34:11 developmental 6:5, 7 develops 30:10 devote 15:21 diagnosable 32:3 diagnosed 28:2; 33:23; 54:14 diagnosis 26:15; 37:5, 7, 11; 38:2, 8; 57:25; 65:19; 70:14 diagnosticians 7:20 diet 28: 17 difference 7:10; 9:20, 24; 11:1; 17:4, 7; 25:11, 12; 35:4 different 15:25; 36:5 differently 18:10 difficult 20:20; 60:15; 62:11 difficulty 22:13 diffuse 32:18; 39:13 direct 3:3, 7; 65:8 disagree 46:1; 54:19; 57:5; 68:7 discomfort 26:21; 27: 10, 12 disease 27: 17; 28: 18 diseases 5:11; 6:21; 7:14; 13:12 disorders 5:11; 7:2, 3; 13:13 dispute 69:8 distribution 25:25 divided 22:15 Doctor 3:9, 12, 15; 4:7, 7; 5:6, 21; 6:15; 7:5, 25; 10, 19; 9:17; 10:3; 11:3, 14; 12:12, 14; 13:19, 24; 14:4, 23; 16:9, 24; 18:12; 19:13, 16; 20:24; 21:8; 22:22; 23:8; 25:19, 21; 26:5; 27:20, 20; 28:3; 30:16; 31:12, 25; 33:6; 34:1, 5, 12, 23; 36:4, 18; 37:1, 25; 39:2, 10, 23; 40:5, 10, 10; 41:2, 4, 7, 12, 14, 18, 23; 42:1, 5, 7, 12, 14, 22, 25; 43:6, 9, 15, 22, 24; 44:2, 5, 8, 10, 23; 45:1, 5, 19, 20; 46:1, 9, 16, 22; 47:4, 9, 22; 48:3, 6, 13, 19, 25; 49:7, 12, 14, 18, 24; 50:3, 9, 18; 51:3, 5, 9, 11, 18, 20; 52:4, 10, 14, 18, 20; 53:1, 6, 11, 13, 19, 22; 54:14; 55:2, 6, 9; 56:2, 11, 20, 24; 57:2, 6, 10, 14, 17, 23, 25; 58:4, 16, 22, 24; 59:4, 16, 20, 22; 60:1, 11, 17, 21; 61:3, 7, 13, 14, 21; 62:4, 10, 15, 22, 24; 63:3, 7, 9, 17, 24; 64:4, 6, 10, 16, 20, 22; 65:4, 8, 21; 66:1, 13, 15, 21, 25; 67:6, 8, 15, 17, 21; 68:1, 7, 19; 69:6, 20; 71:11, 13, 17 doctor's 19:13; 20:18; 39:20; 40:3 doctors 10:20; 18:6; 19:7; 23:9; 26:14; 36:13, 11, 22 documented 36:17 done 12:15; 13:15; 23:19; 16:19; 35:2; 43:14; 60:25; 59:14 down 22:12; 26:3; 29:5 Dr 7:5; 25:20; 26:14; 13:17, 17, 18, 21; 36:23; 17:1, 25; 44:18, 20; 55:2, 57:12; 58:17; 59:18; 17:8, 16, 21; 68:10, 16, 21; 59:21, 25; 70:1, 13 drape 62:17 draw 53:5 dresses 32:7 due 7:1; 58:23; 71:12 duly 3:4 dying 10:20; 13:4, 19; 14:8; 24:12; 27:20; 45:2; 11:14; 65:8; 67:10, 24; 18:2 elymetria 23:16
capable - eight (2)	D	E

<p>either 15:17; 28:8 elbow 6:20 elbows 24:9 elected 10:8, 18 elicit 38:24 else 35:8; 37:8; 65:15 emergency 33:16 employee 14:17 employer 15:5, 10 employment 19:25 end 47:17; 49:25 enjoy 16:8 entertained 26:16 entitled 52:11 epidural 60:13; 61:7, 8; 62:13, 16, 19; 63:9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 21; 69:7, 9 equal 24:19 essentially 25:13; 27:18; 29:14; 33:16 establish 18:24; 19:14; 20:12; 60:15 establishing 19:4 estimate 66:15 Euclid 8:5 evaluate 17:20 evaluated 19:9; 20:20 evaluation 14:14; 18:4, 15; 20:17; 21:10; 22:19, 21, 23; 28:3; 30:23; 33:7; 34:2; 70:11 evaluations 14:12; 15:14 even 10:14; 17:23; 24:18; 25:6; 26:12, 15; 31:17; 32:6; 44:15; 51:4 events 19:21 eventually 28:6 every 11:8, 13, 18; 12:23 everyday 28:20; 67:9 everything 11:16; 37:8 evidence 23:15; 26:7; 27:16; 65:21 exact 60:15 exactly 69:14; 72:5 exam 11:20; 14:14; 18:11; 21:11; 22:7, 12; 23:24; 25:16; 26:19; 27:19, 21; 28:1; 34:18; 45:15, 22; 46:8; 66:20; 67:4 examination 3:3, 7; 11:18, 21; 14:4; 16:16; 17:5, 10; 18:18, 19; 21:1, 9, 13, 14; 22:15; 24:5, 12; 26:18; 27:15; 33:8; 34:2; 36:7; 38:12; 41:4, 8, 16; 42:1; 43:6, 9, 21; 44:23; 65:9; 66:18; 69:4 examinations 14:6; 16:11, 13, 24, 25; 17:2, 3, 5 examine 12:9; 14:1; 67:18 examined 27:3; 34:6</p>	<p>examining 67:17 exams 11:22, 23; 12:4, 8 14:9, 10; 15:7; 17:22; 46:3 6, 7, 12, 12, 15, 18 exception 17:15 exclusion 37:6 expect 44:1 experience 23:5 explain 5:22; 35:2, 3; 69:24 explanation 25:5; 70:6 extent 6:18 extremities 22:17, 19</p>	<p>35:5; 36:14; 58:17 fingers 24:12; 25:8; 26:4 finished 13:11 firm 18:21; 51:12; 53:3 firm's 49:23 firms 52:25 first 3:4; 9:17; 12:25; 14:13, 13; 15:18, 18; 22:2 32:12; 53:2, 2; 59:11 fist 25:10 fit 30:14; 32:7 five 36:23; 51:14, 19; 56:10; 59:21; 62:2 fixation 13:7 flat 32:17 flex 25:21; 71:8 flexed 71:4 follow 12:1 follow-up 69:6 followed 11:16 follows 3:6 force 25:20 forced 32:15 forearm 24:17 forever 10:7 form 28:11 forward 32:15; 71:4, 8 found 36:16; 38:1 four 27:11; 50:23 fourth 59:5 fracture 5:18; 29:15, 20, 23; 30:1; 31:23; 32:12 fractures 29:1, 2, 11, 17; 30:21, 25; 31:5, 14, 17; 39:15; 64:22; 65:6 frankly 56:6 frayed 68:14 free 32:5; 65:10, 13, 14 frequently 41:24; 67:18 front 21:4; 40:14; 41:13; 18:5 fronz 33:17 full 24:1, 8; 27:2; 59:5 unction 22:4 funny 32:7 further 30:1; 69:1; 71:15</p>	<p>good 12:4; 40:10; 57:15, 17; 68:5 grabs 23:21 grandchildren 32:9 gravity 32:14 grip 24:12; 25:4 group 9:23; 11:25; 32:20 groups 6:11; 9:3; 37:16 guarding 23:17, 22 guess 38:10; 50:25</p>	<p>Huron 8:6, 16 hurt 20:13; 32:5, 10; 33:4, 5</p>
	F		H	I
	<p>face 32:18 facilities 8:12 fact 24:17; 27:21; 29:18; 30:13; 39:2; 42:19; 44:8; 45:1, 3; 48:6; 53:13; 68:19 22; 69:8, 18 facts 19:14; 35:21, 22 failed 24:6; 70:9 failure 68:15 fairly 6:13; 13:23; 56:7 fall 10:2; 29:4; 32:17 familiar 49:14; 55:2; 57:5, 12 farm 42:4, 17, 21, 24; 13:2; 49:1, 8, 17; 51:7; 52:21; 53:23; 54:24 fee 46:25 feel 18:6; 31:7; 36:3, 13; 14:23; 56:21 feeling 23:18 feels 38:13 fees 43:19 feed 32:24 fellow 9:8, 9, 10, 19; 10:8; 1:25 fellowship 9:24; 11:2 felt 18:24; 22:6; 28:14; 3:13; 70:4, 10 female 21:15 females 28:7 fibromyalgia 32:20; 37:3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 13; 38:3; 39:16 field 5:9; 6:11, 16, 23; 9:3; 12:16 Fifties 25:19 figure 7:22; 20:9; 27:10; 50:22; 69:14, 19 file 40:14; 41:3 filling 71:23; 72:3 final 11:20 find 23:6; 36:6; 61:12 finding 24:23; 25:15; 26:25; 35:16, 19, 20; 36:8, 15; 37:19; 38:16, 21, 22; 60:23 findings 23:5; 34:16, 25;</p>		<p>habitus 21:16; 35:20 Hahnemann 4:13 half 66:12, 16, 18, 23; 57:4 hand 5:17; 24:10, 18, 22; 25:9, 13; 26:3 hands 27:18 lands-on 22:14 happened 19:5; 31:24 happens 28:21; 29:19 hard 24:22; 28:23; 62:12 haven't 48:14; 55:15; 18:17; 67:8, 12 head 52:2; 53:17 headaches 35:12 hear 28:19 heard 7:5; 49:15 hearing 7:7 heels 22:3, 9 heights 3:24 held 8:10 help 7:20; 18:7; 28:18; 5:8 Hentemann 53:8 hereinafter 3:5 hesitant 22:1 highland 3:24 hillscrest 8:5 hips 27:3 history 17:10; 18:22, 23; 9:12, 17, 19, 24, 25; 20:1, 7; 21:1, 8, 22; 31:6; 9:2; 60:25; 66:13; 67:4 old 22:6; 32:16 olds 25:22 ometown 4:11 oops 10:11 Horner 52:16 hospital 8:1, 5, 6, 6, 8, 16; 10:23; 33:16; 55:24; 56:12, 23 hospitals 8:1, 3, 7; 55:22; 59:16 hour 11:21; 66:12, 16, 18, 24; 67:4 hours 47:24; 48:4 housekeeping 23:20 hundred 30:2; 32:2; 56:19</p>	<p>idea 18:9; 43:23; 49:4; 50:2, 5; 55:1; 57:16; 66:17 illness 19:24 imbalance 39:17; 70:25 impression 34:11, 13, 14; 58:19; 59:5, 12; 61:24, 25; 62:1, 3 impressions 61:19; 62:2 inability 25:1 inaccuracies 68:15 include 35:10, 11, 12 includes 5:13; 22:16 including 13:16; 70:22 incomplete 70:11 independent 14:5, 9; 20:24; 41:5; 44:24; 46:11; 52:19 indicate 62:19; 64:19 indicated 7:7; 26:6; 38:2; 71:7 indicates 53:7 indistinguishable 32:19 individual 23:4; 35:7, 18; 18:13; 63:23, 25; 67:20; 59:19 individuals 17:19; 39:14 infection 13:14 information 17:11 initial 30:23 injection 61:22; 63:8 injections 61:18; 63:10 injured 15:25; 36:20 injuries 5:11; 6:10, 16; 3:22; 19:4, 11 injury 15:9, 15; 27:17; 1:1, 19, 20, 22; 34:8; 6:9; 48:20; 59:14, 23; 0:5, 6 institutions 19:s instructor 8:22 insurance 42:4, 21, 25; 8:21; 49:1, 9, 17; 51:7; 2:22; 53:10, 23; 54:24 intact 27:9 attention 62:21 interest 13:12; 19:2; 54:7 interests 12:22 interfere 15:20 international 13:1 interrupt 19:16; 26:5 interrupting 26:17 into 4:25; 10:2, 22; 14:3; 2:22; 20:18; 22:15; 36:1; 5:10, 24; 70:3 intrinsic 25:6 involved 6:2; 54:2 involves 5:9; 6:18; 7:14;</p>

28:6
irrefutable 35:21
irritation 24:7; 27:5
issues 15:24; 41:10
itself 17:10; 66:20

J

January 8:17; 18:15;
52:17
Jennifer 7:6; 33:19
Joe 72:6
Johnstone 52:3
join 10:4
joined 56:6
joint 5:19; 13:7; 26:22;
34:18
joints 5:14; 6:2; 7:4;
24:10
Journal 13:1
judge 43:11; 44:16
jump 10:10
June 4:15, 20
junior 13:2
jury 3:22; 7:5

K

keep 50:8; 54:6, 7
Keller 53:9
kind 19:10; 54:7
Kiss 52:11
knees 27:3
knew 41:7, 9
knowledge 15:2
known 23:1; 25:25
knows 23:6
Kriegler 7:6; 26:14;
33:19; 36:23; 37:1, 25;
44:18, 20; 55:2, 4; 67:9,
16, 22; 68:16, 21; 70:13;
72:6
Kriegler's 68:10
kyphotic 71:3

L

Lake 8:8
large 56:18
later 36:23, 24
law 18:21; 51:12; 53:3
lawful 3:1
lawsuits 48:7, 10
lawyer 14:18, 19; 15:4, 5;
18:21
lawyers 14:5
least 28:2; 34:18; 36:18
leave 66:17; 67:1
Lebit's 67:3
left 24:4, 4; 25:12; 26:22;
34:17; 56:9

leg 27:4
legal 46:11, 12; 49:25
legs 21:20; 27:11
less 25:11; 31:22; 56:15
letter 14:15; 21:7; 44:9;
70:11
letting 41:2
level 10:24
liability 15:15
license 3:15; 4:2
licensed 3:13
life 48:12
lifting 33:1
ligaments 5:14; 6:3
imitations 17:22
limited 15:19; 18:4
Lindamood 59:12, 20,
23; 65:22; 66:1; 67:17, 23;
68:20
Lindamood's 64:10
Lindamood-Tamler
13:25; 18:13; 20:4; 21:2;
27:22; 30:16; 33:9; 34:3;
37:2; 39:2; 42:16; 71:7
ining 37:10, 23
ist 49:12, 16

isten 17:23
isting 49:16; 50:25
itigation 41:8
ittle 5:22; 9:6; 20:8;
:1:19; 25:7; 30:15; 32:7, 8
3:6; 36:5; 71:9
ocal 17:16
ocalized 29:15
ocation 12:6; 63:15
ockgreen 52:4
og 54:7
ing 4:2; 10:4; 20:23;
6:14
inger 48:2
ok 23:2, 6; 24:3, 3, 3;
2:2; 35:6; 40:15; 41:12;
2:25; 51:3; 58:4; 61:21;
2:9, 25; 63:3
oked 28:1
oking 27:5, 25; 60:24
oks 23:8; 62:8, 21; 63:5
se 28:13, 23
sing 28:12, 15
ss 28:22
t 15:24; 20:11, 21, 21;
:16
wer 22:18, 18; 26:20;
:8, 8
ck 53:5
lumar 27:1; 6%t6
lying 32:23

M

M D 3:1, 7; 4:14; 40:8;
:4

maintain 10:5
maintaining 54:8
major 10:13
majority 48:6, 9, 11
makes 11:15; 28:23
malpractice 15:16
manage 18:8
Management 33:20;
56:17; 63:4, 15; 67:10, 25;
68:7, 21, 25; 70:13
managing 35:25
maneuver 27:13
many 15:3; 47:4; 56:8,
13; 68:2
March 52:11
marked 60:20
Martindale-Hubbell
49:13, 14
mass 28:12
Massage 33:21
Massotherapy 33:21
match 22:25
matrix 28:13, 22
natter 16:19; 41:7;
f2:19; 52:24; 53:14;
54:15; 58:19
Matthew 33:17
nay 7:23; 25:23; 26:6;
9:18; 32:6, 8, 9; 35:2;
1:9; 42:18; 53:18, 21;
4:18
maybe 47:10
azanec 33:18; 57:11,
2, 12; 69:25; 70:1
azanec's 58:17; 59:18;
9:21
ean 6:1; 11:7; 25:11;
6:11; 29:17; 58:22;
5:14, 15; 70:19, 23; 71:3
leaning 65:13
leans 51:2; 65:16; 70:8;
1:1, 1
leant 43:13
leasure 24:16; 25:8
leasured 24:16
leasuring 25:8
echanical 30:7; 32:13,
; 34:21; 39:17; 58:21;
f2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17,
, 19, 23, 25
echanics 58:23
edian 25:24
edical 4:7; 5:9; 6:13;
13:8; 7, 8; 9:12, 13; 10:4,
11:8; 12:23; 13:4; 14:6;
:15; 16:4; 19:25; 21:21;
:10, 25; 34:7; 36:7; 39:5;
:20, 23, 24; 42:14;
:22; 65:24; 68:5, 6, 8;
:10
edical/legal 15:24;
:2
msdications 19:10; 20:1
msdicine 4:3, 13; 5:17;

8:24; 9:1, 4, 14; 17:17
medico/legal 15:21
meeting 10:14
meets 26:23
member 9:12, 19; 10:7;
11:25
membership 9:25; 10:1,
15; 11:2
menopause 28:8, 10
mental 16:8
mentioned 4:1; 6:15;
9:18, 21; 11:3; 16:25;
27:21; 36:4; 37:25
merely 31:11
Meridia 8:5, 5, 6, 15
met 40:11
metabolic 28:5
Meyers 53:8
mid 25:19; 32:16
midline 71:5
midportion 26:23
might 15:3
nild 26:2
nildly 25:16
nillimeter 25:12
ninute 16:20, 21; 67:4
ninutes 66:17, 19, 20,
14, 24
nispronouncing 52:15
Miss 18:16; 20:4; 21:2;
3:9; 34:3, 6; 37:2; 39:2;
4:20; 59:12, 20, 22;
4:10; 65:21; 66:1; 67:3,
7, 22; 68:19; 71:7
fixon 53:23, 25; 54:15
oment 58:4
onth 54:3; 67:10, 24;
8:3
onths 36:23, 24; 59:21
ore 5:23; 6:23; 29:19;
3:15; 31:16, 21; 32:15,
124, 25; 53:4; 67:2
orning 47:19
ost 13:11; 20:15, 17;
2:8; 34:16; 48:23; 55:23;
8:11; 69:10
otion 23:25; 24:2, 8;
1, 2
otions 21:24
otor 24:25

Mount 8:8; 33:19, 25;
:17, 20; 56:3
ove 25:7; 39:19; 40:2;
:20; 49:21; 54:12; 68:17
oved 4:11, 20
ovements 21:24
Mrs 27:22; 30:16
uch 30:8; 32:22, 23;
:6; 67:2
ultiple 30:20
uscle 23:14, 16, 18, 21;
:7, 13; 25:3; 27:7; 32:18;
:14, 14, 16, 22; 38:18

muscles 5:13, 14; 6:4, 5;
7:3; 24:15; 25:6, 7; 29:8;
32:16; 37:10, 10, 23, 24
musculoskeletal 5:12,
19, 21, 23, 25
myofacial 59:13

N

name 3:9, 11; 40:10;
49:15; 52:3
national 10:14
Nationwide 53:9
nature 39:13; 62:24
necessarily 19:3; 46:7
necessary 19:3
neck 22:16, 22; 23:13, 25;
24:6
neck/upper 25:16
need 29:4; 56:17
needle 61:5
needs 47:15
nerve 5:15; 6:15; 7:2, 22;
25:24; 27:5
erves 6:4, 21, 25, 25;
7:1, 17
ervous 6:23; 7:15, 17
eurologic 27:15
eurological 22:4, 19;
7:17, 17; 34:20
eurologist 7:8, 10;
0:5, 6
eurology 6:24; 7:13
eurosurgeon 60:7
eurosurgeons 70:22
eurosurgical 34:20
ews 28:19
ext 21:9, 10; 36:2
ondocor 38:11
one 36:11, 16
onresponsive 47:21;
f13; 68:18
onsurgical 5:10
ontreating 14:14; 17:1,
46:6, 12, 15
ontreatment 14:11, 21
or 52:24
ormal 22:3; 25:13;
:15; 29:7; 46:25
ormally 21:25; 27:3

North 11:14
ite 61:2
ited 25:20; 27:22
ites 63:1; 67:3
othing 29:17
itice 30:15; 32:7; 42:18;
:9
oting 21:21
November 8:17
mber 7:21; 9:15;
:18; 28:2; 41:14, 19, 23;
:1; 49:8; 52:16, 24;
:11; 62:15

numbers 62:1
numbness 25:24
numerous 67:23

O

object 49:21; 59:6
Objection 39:8, 19, 24;
40:2; 45:24; 46:20; 47:2;
48:22; 49:3, 10; 50:13, 21;
51:8, 13; 52:9; 54:12; 58:2
20; 59:1; 68:17
objective 23:2, 5, 22;
24:13, 23; 25:15; 26:25;
27:13; 34:15, 24; 35:5, 16;
36:8, 15; 37:14, 20; 38:17,
21, 22
observable 24:14
observe 10:24
observed 21:25
obtain 3:15; 4:7, 19;
17:12
obtained 4:1; 21:1, 8
Obviously 15:18; 16:1;
17:1; 26:12; 47:13; 64:2,
13
occasion 13:21; 14:1
occasions 50:19; 67:23
occur 6:10; 29:2, 3; 32:13
occurred 30:24
October 34:9; 58:25
Off 29:22; 40:17, 19, 22;
52:2; 53:17; 58:6, 8, 11;
70:24; 71:5
offer 7:20; 17:18
office 3:17, 20, 21; 10:22;
15:11; 19:13, 23; 20:18;
36:1; 43:5; 48:17; 53:14;
54:21; 67:3
Ohio 3:13, 17, 25; 9:1, 13;
14:17; 15:5; 50:10
old 21:14
older 21:15
once 30:3
one 7:4; 9:21; 11:3; 12:6,
6, 21; 15:14; 16:10, 25;
17:4; 28:3, 11; 29:19, 22,
23; 32:8; 43:5, 8, 19; 47:9,
11; 49:8; 59:8, 9; 61:1;
66:1
ongoing 34:16; 39:3, 7
only 17:7; 20:8; 23:4;
25:15; 26:20; 35:7; 44:7
onto 22:6
operating 10:21; 30:5
operative 69:11
OPERATOR 40:19, 25;
58:8, 14; 71:17, 22
opinion 17:9; 18:19;
31:3; 34:6, 23; 36:11, 16,
19, 19; 37:1; 39:5, 9, 10,
11, 16, 25; 51:1, 10; 55:4,
6; 57:25; 59:16, 17, 18;
67:7; 68:9; 69:22; 71:11
opinions 36:12; 42:24;

43:1, 20; 54:11; 64:6, 8
opportunity 33:10;
40:15; 41:3; 57:6; 58:16
opposed 9:19; 15:4;
34:24
opposing 44:11
oral 11:23
order 19:22
organization 10:9, 11
organizations 9:16;
10:1; 12:11
oriented 48:24
originally 25:18
orthopedic 4:4, 21, 24;
5:1, 4, 7, 8; 6:12; 7:4, 11,
12; 8:4, 15, 16, 23, 25; 9:3,
9, 11, 15, 18, 23; 10:12,
13, 16; 11:13; 12:16, 21;
13:17; 16:7; 18:23; 25:4;
34:19; 70:12, 21
orthopedics 15:22, 23
osteomyelitis 13:14
osteoporosis 13:16, 17;
21:22; 27:23; 28:4, 5;
30:10, 17; 31:5, 13, 25;
32:2, 3, 11; 33:3, 23;
34:22; 39:22; 40:1; 64:11;
55:5, 6, 10, 17, 18, 19, 23;
71:10, 12
others 14:6; 15:14
Otherwise 32:17; 64:19
out 4:20; 7:22; 10:6;
11:15; 17:9; 19:1; 20:9;
22:23; 29:14; 30:6; 37:8;
30:7; 69:14, 19; 70:14;
71:9
outward 27:12
ovaries 28:11
Ovar 13:18; 14:25; 15:6;
28:24; 30:15; 32:8, 25;
47:12; 66:4
own 17:13; 29:7

P

Page 59:8, 9; 60:20;
51:14, 17, 21; 62:9, 22;
53:1, 4, 5
paid 43:19, 23; 44:1
pain 23:12; 29:18; 31:25;
32:5, 11, 19; 33:2, 19;
34:14, 16, 21; 35:9, 12, 14;
37:9, 18, 22, 22; 38:13;
39:3, 7, 11, 13; 56:3, 11,
7, 20, 21; 58:21, 23;
59:13; 63:3, 14, 14; 64:1,
4, 25; 65:10, 13, 14, 17,
20, 22; 67:10, 25; 68:7, 10,
1, 21, 25; 70:2, 8, 10, 12,
5, 20
painful 63:17, 19; 71:2
paper 12:25
papers 13:15
paragaph 59:5, 10, 11;
1:5

Parma 33:15
part 11:20; 18:18; 20:22;
22:7; 31:4; 62:5, 7; 63:14
particular 11:11; 15:7;
29:10; 50:25; 51:25; 53:3
particularly 51:18; 53:20
parts 18:17; 20:3
passed 12:4
passing 12:9
past 8:10; 19:24; 48:1, 14
51:21; 55:14; 56:2
patient 15:20; 17:6;
19:20, 23; 22:24; 29:10;
36:1, 25; 38:25; 62:16;
53:12, 25; 70:5
patient's 22:25; 36:24
patients 10:23; 15:23, 25;
17:13; 18:7, 8; 37:8; 38:19;
55:14; 56:2, 15, 19
Patricia 13:24; 18:12;
12:16
Patrick 27:10
pay 41:11
peer 10:19; 12:7
peers 10:18
Pelvis 26:23
Pennsylvania 4:11, 12
people 13:21; 14:6;
10:15, 17; 22:8; 28:6;
10:12; 56:8, 11, 14, 20;
3:13; 65:20
per 45:21; 46:15
percent 15:8; 29:24, 25;
0:2; 32:4; 49:24; 65:9
perform 14:5; 43:5, 8, 12;
6:3
performed 21:13; 62:10,
20, 25; 63:6
period 25:22; 28:24;
51:14
periods 67:20
peripheral 7:16
peripherally 55:19
person 31:12, 16; 36:3, 3;
38:11, 11; 44:7; 63:17
personal 15:9, 15; 48:20
personally 13:21; 57:13
Phalen 25:20
Phalen's 25:17, 18
Philadelphia 4:12
physical 18:22, 23;
21:11, 13, 14; 22:14; 23:7,
9; 24:14; 27:19; 35:19;
36:13; 59:15; 60:25; 71:1
physically 24:15; 28:13,
25; 30:5
physician 3:13; 8:12;
19:20; 55:10; 63:23; 70:13
physicians 35:24
picture 32:20; 35:14
pinching 6:25
Ping-Pong 29:12, 13
place 12:7
places 7:18

plaintiff 18:1; 42:8; 47:16
50:24; 71:4
plaintiff's 14:18; 15:4;
18:21
plaintiffs 15:17
plan 61:20; 62:5, 7
Pleas 41:22
please 3:10, 22; 5:6; 8:3,
14; 9:6; 12:19; 18:13;
21:12; 28:4; 33:13; 34:12;
37:3; 38:9; 40:18; 60:18
Podiatric 9:1
point 28:25; 31:19; 38:7,
10, 15, 23; 48:11; 55:20;
58:3; 61:18, 22; 62:5, 10
points 35:11; 37:17; 38:1,
5
population 6:9; 13:13;
55:8
porous 13:8
portion 54:6
position 22:11
positions 8:11
positive 25:17
pours 13:8
practice 4:17, 25; 12:5;
3:20; 16:7
practicing 4:3, 4; 5:3
precisely 16:20
preexisting 31:11
preliminary 13:6
prep 62:17
reparation 47:23
repared 44:4
reparing 61:10
resent 18:1, 2, 20; 19:6,
24; 23:23, 23; 30:23
resentation 10:13
resenting 30:13
resently 3:17
ressure 38:23
ressures 7:1
revent 28:18
revious 19:11, 11
reviously 55:22
Primarily 21:7; 28:7; 53:8
rimary 3:21; 32:12;
8:19, 25; 49:17; 55:21
rior 28:1, 3; 30:19; 41:8;
4:12, 17; 65:23; 72:3
robably 30:24; 34:21;
9:17; 41:20; 43:25;
7:11, 12; 48:11; 56:4, 10,
0, 14; 57:1; 59:25; 66:22;
8:16
roblem 6:22; 7:22, 24;
7:8; 19:6; 35:25; 63:21;
8:4, 12, 13; 69:17
roblems 5:15, 22, 23,
5:6; 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; 7:15;
3:22; 16:2; 18:24; 19:12;
2:6; 23:8, 9, 10; 32:1;
5:1
rocedure 3:4; 61:2;

62:9, 25; 63:1, 5; 69:11,
12, 16
process 6:8; 10:19, 20;
31:23; 34:20
product 15:15
professional 9:2
professor 8:25
program 4:22, 24; 11:14;
57:5
prophylaxis 28:16
prospectively 35:24
provide 11:18, 19, 23
provided 3:3; 18:22
psychiatrist 60:3
psychologist 60:1
publication 50:19
published 12:16, 20, 25;
13:15
pulls 29:8
purely 32:21
purpose 3:2; 18:10
push 37:17
pushes 29:8
pushing 29:5
put 19:5, 21

Q

qualified 12:10
qualify 56:14
quality 10:24; 70:18
qualms 54:10
quickly 67:13
quite 56:6
quote 15:8

R

raising 27:4
ran 8:16
range 23:25; 27:2
rarely 37:19, 20; 56:13
read 59:4, 9; 61:4; 62:15
reading 26:12; 62:12
real 18:6
realize 54:5
really 5:25; 16:6; 17:23;
19:1, 2; 20:9, 11; 23:7;
25:4, 10; 26:21; 27:24;
32:10; 42:18; 51:10; 54:6;
55:11; 56:13; 58:3; 60:14;
52:14; 65:25; 67:7; 68:9;
70:1, 3, 6, 14, 15
'reason 24:24; 54:18;
17:5
reasonable 34:7; 39:5
reasons 32:12
recall 52:24; 65:25
receive 4:16; 42:14
received 4:9, 14; 68:6
recently 53:13; 56:7

reciting 54:9
recollection 20:25; 21:
52:19; 53:21
recommendations
17:19, 25
recommended 59:14
record 3:10; 40:17, 20,
22, 24; 41:1; 49:20; 58:6,
9, 11, 13, 15
records 17:8; 21:4, 21;
26:13; 27:25; 31:2; 33:10
13, 15, 18, 20, 20; 34:5;
36:8; 41:20, 23, 24; 42:15
45:17, 22; 57:7; 60:13, 17
65:2, 24; 69:10, 13
Redding 4:10
REDIRECT 69:4
Reed 52:11
refer 19:18; 41:4, 13;
56:11; 60:17
reference 5:21; 16:19
referrals 55:13
referred 3:12; 56:2, 9
referring 21:5; 38:5; 57:
reflected 67:3
reflecting 68:4
reflex 23:17; 25:2
reflexes 27:9
refresh 21:5
regarding 33:10; 49:22
regardless 16:15
regional 22:20
regions 6:19
registered 36:12
regular 14:22; 17:6; 33:1;
38:10; 47:7
related 26:9; 31:10;
39:25; 58:24; 70:4, 5; 71:5
relates 39:12; 59:2
remember 19:8; 51:20,
22, 25; 52:3, 7, 10, 14, 17,
20; 53:15, 18, 22, 25; 54:1,
3, 14, 16; 57:3; 58:3;
64:13, 14, 18, 21; 65:7, 25
removed 28: 11
rendered 37:1; 42:24;
43:1
rendering 18:19; 43:20
replacements 5:20; 13:7
report 39:21; 40:4; 41:12,
15; 43:20; 44:4, 7, 14, 16,
18; 45:13, 22; 57:9, 23;
58:5; 60:11, 24; 61:10;
69:21
Reporter 50:10; 53:7
reports 16:4
representing 42:11; 43:2
reproduces 38:12
reputation 55:12; 57:15,
18
request 13:25; 66:9
requirements 11:10, 11
Research 9:11; 10:12;
12:21, 24; 13:5

Reserve 8:23; 14:11
reserving 16:23
residency 4:17, 21, 24;
11:14; 12:3, 3; 13:5; 57:2
residents 61:1
respect 55:7
response 26:2
result 31:1; 34:9; 36:9
revealed 21:14; 23:13;
50:19
review 10:19; 12:7; 31:2
33:10; 36:7; 41:3; 45:17,
22; 48:23; 53:6; 57:6;
58:16; 60:11; 71:18
reviewed 27:25; 33:14;
34:5; 41:21; 50:10; 57:9,
23; 65:24
reviewing 68:6
rheumatologist 33:22;
50:9
right 3:20, 21; 24:3, 4;
25:13; 30:14; 45:16;
52:18; 63:2; 71:18, 19, 21
Road 3:24
ROBERT 3:1, 7, 11; 40:8
59:4
roll 27:11
Roman 53:14; 54:21
room 33: 17
rooms 10:21
ounded 32:8
ounds 10:22
outline 13:23
uled 37:7
Rules 3:3

S

sacroiliac 26:22; 34:17
safe 47:9; 48:3; 64:16;
56:15
same 16:3, 22; 17:12;
19:12; 38:8, 14, 24; 39:24;
53:15; 64:22; 72:5
saw 18:14, 16; 20:10;
36:23, 23; 59:21; 65:2;
66:1, 12; 67:24; 68:2, 19
saying 22:24; 65:18
schedule 14:9, 25
scheduled 14:12
School 4:13; 8:24; 12:23;
3:4
sclatic 27:5
science 4:9
second 9:21; 19:16; 26:6;
9:23; 32:13; 61:17
seconds 25:23
seeing 67:9, 22
seemed 34:17
seeming 21:19
segment 15:13; 55:7;
6:18
segments 20:2

send 44:13, 16, 18; 56:
sends 44:11
senior 13:2
Sennet 53:9
sensation 25:1
sense 64:6
sensory 25:1
sent 21:7; 44:7, 9, 10;
55:14
sentence 59:11
separate 61:25; 69:11
separating 35:22
September 12:13
series 12:8; 19:21; 33:2;
52: 1
serve 14:13; 15:18; 53:2
served 57:20
service 8:17
set 69:15
sets 11:10
settles 50:6
seventeenth 4:5
several 11:3; 69:7
severe 21:22; 30:17
shape 21:16; 28:11
sheet 69:15
short 21:17
horter 21:19; 48:1
hot 61:6
houlder 6:20; 24:5, 9
houlders 22:17; 24:8
how 24:6
howed 21:17; 23:15;
5:10, 13
showing 22:3
shown 45:2
sides 24:18; 42:7; 71:23
sign 25:17, 18
signature 72:1, 8
significant 20:6; 25:10
signs 23:13; 24:7, 13;
27:6; 44:3
similar 26:19; 62:23;
70:13
simple 31:17
simplistically 35:6
simply 38:23
sinai 8:8; 33:19, 25;
5:17, 20; 56:3
single 11:13
sit 15:2; 20:25
sitting 22:10; 32:22;
2:16
ituation 20:19
ix 51:19
lightly 71:5
lot 16:23
lots 14:10, 21
mall 24:9; 54:5
o-called 11:19
ocieties 9:2, 17, 18

Society 9:11, 15; 10:4,
soft 6:3
Solely 43:15; 68:13;
71:12
somebody 11:15
someone 14:16; 23:5;
29:5; 35:17; 68:13
someplace 35:10
something 16:6; 18:6;
23:4; 26:8, 11; 32:9; 35:7
16, 17, 13; 70:23
somewhat 21:17; 22:1;
70:11
somewhere 48:1
sorry 45:8; 48:8; 59:7;
57:11, 15
sort 5:25; 16:7; 17:9;
22:20, 23; 23:21; 56:17;
56:23; 70:25
ounds 61:8
ource 16:19; 29:18
pace 63:11
pasm 23:14; 37:14
peak 10:11
peaking 14:4
pecialists 70:22
pecialties 7:21
pecialty 11:8, 11
pecific 18:17; 33:7
pecifically 55:5; 57:3
pecifics 14:3
pend 16:1
pinal 7:16; 29:11, 22;
9:15, 15; 58:23; 60:13;
0:21; 71:6
spine 5:16; 6:20; 27:2;
29:16, 20, 21; 30:6, 21;
31:7; 39:18
spontaneously 10:21
sports 5:17
spot 38:12
squeezing 24:22
staff 7:25; 56:7
stand 22:2; 40:25; 58:14
standard 56:16
standardize 11:17
standing 12:4
itandpoint 16:3; 49:25;
16:16
start 28:12, 15; 30:12
started 4:21
starts 29:20, 21; 30:3
state 3:13; 9:13; 14:17;
5:5; 19:10; 42:4, 16, 21,
4; 43:2; 49:1, 8, 17; 51:7;
2:21; 53:23; 54:24; 60:12
tated 21:15; 45:5; 65:8
tatistics 54:8
tature 21:18
tatus 41:10
tay 10:6
temming 37:23
step 21:9, 10

steps 12:1; 29:5
sterile 62:17
stiff 23:20
still 25:3; 37:8; 44:23
stipulate 43:17
stipulations 17:21; 72:6
stood 22:2
straight 27:4
straighten 30:5
stretches 29:7
strictly 18:3
strike 36:4; 39:20; 40:3;
45:19; 47:20; 49:21;
54:13; 68:18
structure 31:18
stuck 61:5
studies 28:14
stuff 6:7; 28:22
subject 31:13, 16
Subjective 23:3; 24:11,
10; 25:14; 34:14, 24; 35:4,
7, 15, 23; 37:18, 19; 38:16;
54:2, 4, 6, 8, 9; 68:12
subjectively 34:16;
38:13; 39:12
subsequently 21:21
subspecialties 5:16
subspecialty 5:8; 7:13;
1:9
substantial 34:15
successfully 68:20, 23
SUCHER 39:8, 19, 24;
0:2, 9, 11, 17, 24; 47:20;
4:12; 58:13; 68:17; 69:1,
20; 71:15, 25; 72:5
suffer 30:25
suffered 30:17, 20; 34:8
suffering 39:3; 65:22
suffers 27:23; 37:2
suggestion 31:9
summer 12:23
supply 6:4
support 36:8
supported 38:2
sure 11:15; 13:23; 40:16;
12:6; 47:12; 51:4, 24; 56:5,
7, 22; 57:19; 58:6; 60:19;
52:14; 64:1; 67:1, 13; 68:2,
13
surgeon 5:1; 7:11; 8:4,
13; 12:17; 70:12, 21
surgeon's 16:7
urgeons 7:19; 9:9, 10,
12; 10:16
urgery 4:4; 5:4, 7, 8, 9,
6, 16, 18, 18, 18, 20;
12; 7:12, 23; 8:15, 25;
13; 11:13; 13:1; 63:16
urgical 5:10; 7:21; 9:22;
1:8; 13:16; 28:10
urprise 49:7, 12, 18;
50:9, 16, 16, 18; 51:5, 9,
11, 16, 18; 53:6, 10, 12
surprised 49:19; 50:22

<p>suspicion 27:24 sustained 59:23 sworn 3:4 symptom 38:14; 39:1 symptomatic 30:12 symptoms 19:25; 22:25; 23:3, 11, 12; 30:13; 34:24; 35:4, 23; 36:25; 38:24; 39:16; 68:14 syndrome 26:1, 8; 34:15; 59:13 system 5:12; 6:23; 7:15, 17 Systems 8:9</p>	<p>tightness 37:14 tilt 24:4, 4 times 11:3; 14:23; 50:12, 23; 51:12, 17; 52:21; 68:2 tingling 25:24; 26:4 tissue 6:3 today 20:25; 45:6, 9, 11; 46:23; 47:18 today's 45:1 toes 22:3, 9 together 19:5 told 36:20; 39:4; 54:17 took 20:21; 24:15; 66:14, 16 top 52:2; 53:17 total 66:24 totally 32:5 Touch 33:21; 35:10; 38:12 toward 15:21 town 53:1 track 50:8 training 4:8, 16; 11:19; 13:11 transcript 72:3 trauma 5:18; 31:8, 17, 23, 24 traumatic 29:3; 31:6 treat 13:21; 23:9, 11, 12; 56:7 treatable 22:25; 34:19; 56:16 reating 30:4; 68:13 reatment 5:10; 7:14, 20; 14:15; 17:14, 18; 20:16; 33:11; 65:3 rial 50:1, 4, 5, 6; 52:21; 33:15; 59:14; 72:4 rials 50:11 tried 18:24 tries 22:22, 23; 55:8 trigger 35:11; 37:17; 38:1, 5, 7, 10, 15; 61:18, 22; 62:5, 10 triggers 38:14; 39:1 Trilisate 59:14 trouble 10:6; 22:11; 50:23; 69:13 true 35:9; 54:11, 11; 57:21, 22; 66:5, 6, 11 ruly 26:21 runk 21:18 ry 17:9, 12; 19:14; 22:25; 36:2 rying 10:24; 19:4; 20:11; 59:14 uesday 47:19 umors 5:11, 19 unnel 26:1, 7 urn 18:12 urning 13:24 wice 15:1; 59:15 wo 9:23; 11:2, 21; 14:10,</p>	<p>23; 23:19; 29:24; 32:11; 42:7; 46:3, 5, 11, 11, 15; 47:10, 24; 48:4; 62:1, 15; 66:4 type 16:21; 18:11; 20:2; 26:19; 32:18, 20; 35:21 types 30:25 typical 14:25; 18:23</p>	<p>W</p> <p>waive 71:19, 20, 23; 72:1, 3 waived 72:8 walk 21:25 walking 22:8 wants 11:17 WANTZ 3:8; 40:5; 41:25; 42:11; 43:2, 14, 15, 17, 19, 25; 44:1, 8; 45:5, 24; 46:20; 47:2; 48:13, 17, 22; 49:3, 10, 20; 50:13, 21; 51:8, 12, 13, 17, 20; 52:1, 5, 8, 10, 17; 53:14; 54:21; 58:2, 20; 59:1, 6; 66:10; 69:5; 71:13; 72:2, 7 wastebasket 6:1 wasting 24:14, 15; 27:7 way 11:16; 20:24; 26:10; 28:11; 29:13; 30:4, 5; 34:1; 35:6, 8; 38:10; 62:8; 64:3 weak 24:21; 28:25 weakened 31:18 weaker 25:4 weakness 24:11, 20; 25:14 weather 35:13 week 14:8, 11, 24; 15:1; 46:3, 6, 15; 47:5, 10, 10, 11; 56:19 weeks 47:12, 13 weren't 64:25 Western 8:23 what's 20:13 Whenever 47:6 whereas 6:24; 10:8; 35:16 whole 59:9; 61:4 wife 63:20 Williams 53:8 without 22:11, 12; 31:24; 34:15 WITNESS 71:20; 72:1 women 28:14, 25; 32:3; 65:9 women's 30:9 word 68:24 words 6:22; 10:19; 11:12, 15; 14:14, 15, 20; 23:2; 24:1, 21, 25; 26:3; 27:16; 29:4, 10; 30:11; 32:14, 21; 37:7; 67:14; 69:15; 70:7, 24 work 13:5, 6, 15; 48:20; 53:3, 4 Worked 12:22 Worker's 14:18 Workers 15:10 working 16:1 Norkman's 15:12; 47:15 vorsens 30:10 wiggle 25:7</p>	<p>wrist 24:17 wrists 6:19; 24:9; 25:21 writing 12:15 written 11:18, 21; 14:16 wrote 41:15</p>
<p>T</p>		<p>U</p>		<p>X</p>
<p>table 22:7, 12 talk 17:18; 67:13; 70:22 talked 39:22; 44:20; 64:10 talks 38:5 Tamler 18:16; 34:6; 44:21 tape 24:16; 25:8 teach 8:21 teaching 8:16, 19; 11:14 technique 63:22 tells 36:25 tendency 31:21 tenderness 26:24; 35:11; 36:14; 37:15 tendon 27:9 tendons 5:14 tends 63:13 term 6:1; 19:18; 46:13 terms 16:14 terribly 22:7 testified 38:1; 46:5; 47:25; 48:13, 16; 50:20, 23; 51:6, 12; 52:1, 4; 53:13; 54:21 testify 52:25; 53:7 testifying 50:11; 51:20; 52:10, 14, 20; 53:18, 22; 54:14 testimony 7:7; 47:24; 48:7, 9; 49:22 testing 11:10 tests 19:7 Thanks 72:7 themselves 29:17; 49:13 Therapeutic 33:21 therapy 59:15 thigh 27:8 third 29:25 though 64:15 three 11:21; 30:1; 47:8; 51:17 thrown 50:7 throws 29:21 tight 25:9; 38:18 tightening 23:17</p>		<p>ultimately 12:9 uncontested 23:7 uncontrolled 23:14 under 6:11; 56:10; 61:18, 20, 23, 25; 62:3, 15; 65:3 underneath 62:3 University 4:13; 8:7, 24; 55:22, 24; 56:12, 23 unless 7:3; 23:11; 47:17 unquote 15:8 unrelenting 28:21; 30:3 unrestricted 24:1, 8; 27:1 unusual 20:6; 22:8 up 16:1; 22:2, 10, 12; 24:3; 32:17; 49:25 upper 22:16, 17; 24:6, 17; 27:8, 8; 32:16 usage 25:14 use 46:13; 55:12; 56:21 used 22:8; 56:23; 57:1; 57:2 useful 63:14 using 38:8 Usually 6:18; 15:21; 17:7; 20:22; 25:23; 30:9; 38:21; 41:11; 44:11; 46:21; 47:16; 50:6; 66:17; 67:1; 69:10</p>		<p>Y</p>
		<p>V</p>		<p>Z</p>
		<p>vacation 47:18 vaguely 54:16 varies 63:22 various 38:1 Verdict 50:10; 53:7 verifying 64:3 versus 42:16; 52:4, 11, 15; 53:23 vertebral 30:21 video 54:4 VIDEOTAPE 40:19, 25; 53:18; 58:8, 14; 71:17, 18, 22, 24 virtually 17:12; 28:20 visit 33:17; 61:15, 17; 52:23 vitamins 28:18 vulnerable 31:22</p>		<p>year 4:6; 5:2; 11:18; 12:5, 6; 13:2; 47:13; 51:14; 56:15 years 13:4, 18; 15:1, 6; 28:24; 51:19, 19; 66:4 young 11:24</p>
				<p>zero 47:8</p>



Robert C. Corn, M.D., F.A.C.S.
Timothy L. Gordon, M.D.
Orthopaedic Surgeons

March 25, 1996

Joseph H. Wantz
Attorney at Law
The Superior r Building, 2 1st Floor
815 Superior Avenue, NE
Cleveland, OH 44115-2701

RE: Patricia Lindamood-Tamler
Case #287952
File #1700-12862

Dear Mr. Wantz:

I evaluated Patricia Lindamood-Tamler in my office on January 26, 1996, in reference to alleged residuals of injury sustained in a motor vehicular accident which occurred on October 11, 1993. Throughout the history and physical she was accompanied by her attorney, Linda Hardacre.

The history presented was that she was the driver and solo occupant, at approximately seven o'clock in the morning, of a 1989 Barretta heading in a southbound direction on Tidemann Road on the westside of Cleveland. She was on her way to work as a school teacher for the Brooklyn School District. She stated she was not stationary, but moving in traffic when she was suddenly rear-ended. At the moment of impact she was jolted forwards and backwards. She felt "stunned" but was able to make the appropriate reports and went on to work. She is employed as a reading specialist. She had slow development of upper back and lower back pain, reported it to her boss who recommended that she go to the hospital.

Initially she was evaluated at the Parma Community Hospital Emergency Room on the day of injury, primarily with left paracervical neck pain and chest pain from a contusion. She presented with a history at that time to the doctor that she was rear-ended by another car traveling perhaps 25 miles per hour. She stated that despite this impact there was "minimal damage to her car". Diagnostic studies were performed which were essentially normal. These were chest x-rays and neck x-rays. She was essentially treated and released.

She subsequently came under the care of Dr. Mathew Frantz, an osteopathic physician, with pains on both sides of her neck, headaches, blurred vision, and general soreness and weakness. This initial evaluation was on October 14, 1993, as a follow-up from the emergency room. Dr. Frantz saw her on three occasions in October of 1993, one occasion at the end of November 1993, and one on February 24, 1994. Osteopathic manipulations were tried on these occasions. It was felt that, at worst, she had a strain or sprain of the neck, upper back and left sacroiliac joint. Manipulations did not help.

She subsequently tried massotherapy at the Therapeutic Touch. These were done in early 1994, having four treatments. She stated that there was not much improvement with this type of approach. In fact, the massotherapy tended to make her worse.

Ultimately she was referred to the Cleveland Clinic where she was initially evaluated by Dr. Daniel Mazanec, approximately five months post-injury, on May 18, 1994. At this time her primary complaints were low back pain and left sided posterior chest **pain**. On examination there was full lumbar spinal motion, but some decreased extension. Essentially it was a normal neurological examination. It was felt at that time she had a "myofascial pain syndrome" and was started on a series of physical therapy treatments. The therapy was carried out through May, June, and early July of 1994.

Ultimately an MRI scan was performed of her lumbar spine. This was done on August 16, 1994, and revealed an old compression fracture with some wedging of T9 and T10.

Patricia Lindamood-Tamler, Page 3

Case #287952

File #1700-12862

Therefore, the T9-T10, and T11 were involved probably with osteoporosis. No disc herniations were noted, but there was arthritis noted bilaterally at the L3-4 and L4-5 level, as well as L5-S1 level. There was absolutely no signs of a herniated disc or any neurological abnormality to explain her arm and leg pain.

She stated she went through a series of spinal blocks and trigger injections. The exact dates could not be recalled nor were they readily ascertainable from review of the medical records provided. She stated that she may have had five injections total, as well as a variety of medications including anti-inflammatories, as well as pain medication.

She concluded her treatment at the Cleveland Clinic in December of 1994 and then transferred her medical care to the Mt. Sinai Medical Center. She was seeing an internist, Dr. Scott Feudo, and he referred her to Dr. Jennifer Kreigler for pain management..

On January 16, 1995, she was evaluated by Dr. Jennifer Kreigler, Director of the Center for Pain Management at Mt. Sinai. This was 15 months post-injury. She presented a history of pain since the time of the accident. She was evaluated at that point in time with their full pain management program, including a series of exercises and examinations. No further scans were done. She was treated for "fibromyalgia", that is, fibrous and muscular pain without any other anatomical abnormalities. She went through a physical therapy program for a month through the Wellness Center on South Woodland in Beachwood, including physical therapy, occupational therapy, exercises, low back school, as well as biofeedback. She was also tried on a number of medications and is currently still on Prozac and Xanax when she cannot sleep at night. She continues to be under the care of Dr. Kreigler, although according to the medical records the Pain Management Program went from February 20, 1995 to March 10 of 1995.

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY: She remains employed by the Brooklyn School District. She has some restrictions that were given by Dr. Kreigler which include the ability to change and move her position, limit the amount of time sitting or standing, and also the number of children she would teach at one time. This was not reviewed. It is her understanding that she has "fibromyalgia" which affects her from working.

PAST MEDICAL HISTORY was somewhat sketchy. The patient would not volunteer any tremendous details. She was, however, involved in previous trauma, three prior automobile accidents in which she had no long-term treatment. She also fell in 1990 breaking her ribs. Apparently she has also been under observation and diagnosed with osteoporosis which would account for her spinal compression abnormalities, and the somewhat short stature of her body.

CURRENT SYMPTOMS: Even with the careful questioning that I do to musculoskeletal complaining patients, I had difficulty eliciting her pain complaints. She was extremely evasive in trying to explain them, which I think is done on a routine basis with a fair degree of accuracy by the average individual. The bulk of her pain, to my understanding, is localized in the left low back sacroiliac joint area. The other area is about the left scapula. She is under the impression that her sacroiliac joint was "dislocated" at the time of the injury despite the fact that there was no inability to walk or move about initially. In fact, she was able to go on to work initially. This pain seems to radiate into the buttock and down to the lower extremity. After careful questioning, it appears that she has lost some sensation in her left leg which involves "part of the leg for part of the time". Some activities tend to relieve it such as swimming, stretching over a large rubber ball, as well as working on her flexibility exercises.

In reference to her upper back and shoulder, she has pain described as diffuse aching and burning pain about the left shoulder blade, but it's not as intense. Her left upper extremities "feel weak" although no precise neurological deficits ever were established. She never had any EMG and Nerve Conduction Studies to further delineate this. She is right handed. She feels that she has pins and needles along a

non-physiological pattern in her left upper extremity (a similar type of nondescript pattern was noted in her description of her left lower extremity). "Part of my arm is numb and part of it feels pins and needles".

PHYSICAL EXAMINATION revealed a 51 year old female who appeared much older than her stated age. Her body habitus appeared that she was of somewhat short stature, having the chest area of her spine somewhat disproportionally short. Retrospectively, this may have been due to the osteoporosis and the spinal compression.

Her gait pattern was normal, although she was somewhat hesitant. She was able to heel and toe stand, showing normal neurological function although there was some "balance problem". She was able to arise from a sitting position without difficulty. Ascending and descending the examining table was performed normally. There was, as will be noted below, a great deal of subjective symptoms without a great deal of objective findings.

Examination of her cervical spine revealed no spasm, dysmetria or muscular guarding. There was unrestricted range of motion in forward flexion being able to bend forward to put her chin on her chest. Hyperextension, side bending, and rotation, which showed no objective limitations of predicted normal. Examination of her shoulder blades, upper back, and neck area failed to show any no spasm, dysmetria or muscular guarding, or any objective signs of injury. There was a full range of motion of her elbows, wrists, and small joints of the hand. Despite the diffuse weakness that she demonstrated to me when asking her to grip, there was no difference in circumferential measurements at the axillary, midarm, forearm, or wrist level. There was no atrophy noted to gross observation of the intrinsic muscles of her left hand nor noted on circumferential measurements of her hand. The balance of the neurologic examination was normal, although there was a very slight positive Phalen sign which may indicate subclinical mild left carpal tunnel syndrome.

Examination of her lumbar spine again revealed no spasm, dysmetria, or muscular guarding. She seemed to be very tender in the area of the left sacroiliac joint.

Forward flexion was performed in an unrestricted fashion, bending forward to the ankle level. Hyperextension, side bending, and rotation were performed without any significant limitations of normal. Her straight leg raising both in the sitting and supine positions were performed to 90° bilaterally. No atrophy was noted on circumferential measurements of left upper thigh, lower thigh, mid-calf, or ankle levels. The deep tendon reflexes were intact. There seemed to be some irritation in the left sacroiliac joint on Patrick Figure-of-4 sign. Neurologic exam was normal.

IMPRESSION: Subjective pain syndrome without substantial objective findings. Chronic subjective pain stemming from the left sacroiliac joint. No objective ongoing treatable orthopaedic or neurological abnormalities.

DISCUSSION: I have had the opportunity to review a number of medical records associated with her care and treatment. These include records from the Parma Community Hospital, Drs. Mathew Frantz, Daniel Mazanec and the Cleveland Clinic, Jennifer Kreigler and the Mt. Sinai Pain Management Program, Therapeutic Touch Massotherapy, Dr. Chad Deal (doctor who evaluated her for osteoporosis), and a series of x-rays. These x-rays were reviewed from three sources, Cleveland Clinic Radiology (two envelopes), and the Mt. Sinai Medical Center.

After careful questioning of the patient's history and physical limitations, as well as after a careful physical examination and review of medical records, I have come to some conclusions concerning her ongoing level of physical impairment.

There was never any documented significant objective orthopaedic abnormality. She has had a substantial amount of treatment for subjective pain which has been diagnosed as "fibromyalgia". This is a term that poorly describes an organic pathology and is a descriptive term to explain an individual's subjective symptoms. Her symptoms did not improve with any of the invasive studies including the epidural blocks. It seems that the physical therapy and "pain management" with antidepressant medication seems to have relieved a fair amount of her symptoms and has made her

Patricia Lindamood-Tarnler, Page 7
Case #287952
File #1700-12862

much more functional. There is no indication that the epidural blocks had any benefit. There is no abnormalities noted on the MRI scan that would be related to trauma.

At the time of this evaluation, it was my conclusion that this is a woman who alleges a soft tissue strain or sprain of the upper and lower back, but never had any substantial objective findings. She has been treated by a number of physician sources, including Dr. Frantz, Dr. Mazanec and the Cleveland Clinic, as well as Dr. Kreigler solely on the basis of her ongoing subjective symptoms. Although I have seen individuals like this in my practice, there is clearly a functional non-physiological component to her claims of **pain**. There is no true way of verifying whether or not this pain exists. As stated above, there are no objective findings to support her ongoing complaints of pain and there does not appear to have been any substantial abnormalities ever noted by any of her treating physicians or health care providers.

The long-term prognosis is good. At the time of this evaluation, despite her symptoms, there are no objective findings. On the basis of this evaluation, no further orthopaedic care or treatment is necessary or appropriate for her alleged conditions. She has objectively recovered. The only symptoms noted were that of a subjective response to certain body positioning. These could not be verified or confirmed by abnormal physical findings. She has objectively recovered.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Corn', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Robert C. Corn, M.D., F.A.C.S

RCC/bn

cc: File