

In The Matter Of:

*BONNIE PIKKEL, ET AL v.
MARK ZANNETTI, D.C., ET AL*

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES - CHICAGO

<http://www.esquirecom.com>

155 NORTH WACKER DRIVE

10th FLOOR

CHICAGO, IL US 60606

(312) 782-8087 FAX: (312) 704-4950

*Original File ENGE0425.PIK, 185Pages
Min-U-Script® File ID: 0995141042*

Word Index included with this Min-U-Script®

Page 1

[1] IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO
[2] COMMON PLEAS COURT

[3]
[4] BONNIE PIKKEL, ET AL,)
[5] Plaintiffs,)
[6] vs.) No. 326207
[7] MARK ZANNETTI, D.C., ET AL,)
[8] Defendants.)
[9]

[10] The deposition of HERBERT H.
[11] ENGELHARD, M.D., called for examination, taken
[12] pursuant to the provisions of the Code of Civil
[13] Procedure and the Rules of the Supreme Court of
[14] the State of Illinois pertaining to the taking
[15] of depositions for the purpose of discovery,
[16] taken before LORIANNE McGUIRE, CSR No. 84-4269,
[17] a Notary Public within and for the County of
[18] Cook, State of Illinois, and a Certified
[19] Shorthand Reporter of said state, at Suite 1000,
[20] 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois, on
[21] the 25th day of April, A.D. 2001, at 1:45 p.m.
[22]
[23]
[24]

Page 2

[1] PRESENT: (continued)
[2]
[3] REMINGER & REMINGER,
[4] (113 Saint Clair Street, Suite 700,
[5] Cleveland, Ohio 44113), by:
[6] MS. LINDA GORCUNSKI,
[7] appeared on behalf of Defendants.
[8]
[9]
[10]
[11]
[12]
[13]
[14]
[15]
[16]
[17]
[18]
[19]
[20]
[21]
[22]
[23]
[24] REPORTED BY: LORIANNE McGUIRE, CSR NO. 84-4269.

Page 2

[1] PRESENT:
[2]
[3] LINTON & HIRSHMAN,
[4] (700 West Saint Clair Street, Suite 300,
[5] Cleveland, Ohio 44112), by:
[6] MR. ROBERT LINTON,
[7] appeared on behalf of Plaintiffs;
[8]
[9] LAW OFFICE OF MARK RUFF,
[10] (700 West Saint Clair Street, Suite 300,
[11] Cleveland, Ohio 44112), by:
[12] MR. MARK RUFF,
[13] appeared on behalf of Plaintiffs;
[14]
[15] WESTON HURD FALLON PAISLEY & HOWLEY,
[16] (2500 Terminal Tower, 50 Public Square,
[17] Cleveland, Ohio 44113), by:
[18] MR. KENNETH A. TORGERSON,
[19] appeared on behalf of Defendants;
[20]
[21]
[22]
[23]
[24]

Page 4

[1] (WHEREUPON, certain documents
[2] were marked Deposition
[3] Exhibit Nos. A-C, for
[4] identification, as of
[5] 4-25-01.)
[6] (WHEREUPON, the witness was duly
[7] sworn.)
[8] HERBERT H. ENGELHARD, M.D.,
[9] called as a witness herein, having been first
[10] duly sworn, was examined and testified as
[11] follows:
[12]
[13]

**EXAMINATION
BY MR. LINTON:**

[14] Q: Doctor, good afternoon. My name is
[15] Bob Linton. We met just a minute ago. Mark
[16] Ruff is on the line as well. The two of us
[17] represent Bonnie Pikkell and her husband in a
[18] lawsuit in which you've been retained by the
[19] emergency room doctor and his professional
[20] corporation as an expert in this case
[21] specifically in neurosurgery.
[22] I assume you've been deposed before?
[23] A: Yes, sir.
[24] Q: Have you produced for us and do we

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>[1] have in front of us your entire file in this [2] case? [3] A: Yes. [4] Q: Has there been anything removed at any [5] time from this file? [6] A: No. [7] Q: Aside from the literature that is [8] contained in Dr. Bell's deposition, have you [9] independently reviewed or researched the [10] literature in connection with this case? [11] A: A Little bit. To answer the question [12] more fully, I'd say that, you know, I've had [13] patients with this condition so I've been aware [14] of the literature. When I was first contacted [15] about this case, I looked at some of the [16] literature. [17] Over the past few weeks, especially [18] since literature was in one of the depositions, [19] I looked at some literature, various papers and [20] book chapters. As I sit here today, I couldn't [21] tell you all the authors of those. [22] Q: Did you keep a file either a hard file [23] or a computer file of the research that you've [24] done in connection with this case?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>[1] that are in your current cauda equina file? [2] A: No, although there was some overlap [3] with what was in the one deposition and article [4] by Dr. Shapiro, for instance, from 1993. [5] MR. RUFF: I'm still having problems [6] hearing. [7] (WHEREUPON, discussion was had [8] off the record.) [9] MR. LINTON: We'll have to do the best we [10] can because we can't be screaming and the phone [11] is close as it can get. [12] BY MR. LINTON: [13] Q: Just so we can get back on track, you [14] were identifying for us what articles are in [15] your cauda equina file. You mentioned some [16] overlap with Shapiro including an article from [17] 1993. [18] Any other articles or abstracts in [19] your file that you can recall? [20] A: There are other articles and abstracts [21] in the file. I know that there was an article [22] from surgical neurology now that I think about [23] it in 1998 from a Japanese group. But really as [24] far as the specific authors and so forth, I</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>[1] MR. RUFF: Excuse me, this is Mark Ruff. I [2] cannot hear the doctor at all. [3] THE WITNESS: I'll sit a little closer, [4] sorry about that. Is this better? [5] MS. GORCENSKI: That's much better. [6] MR. RUFF: Bob, if you could try and keep [7] your voice up, that would be helpful as well. [8] MR. TORGERSON: They're too polite at this [9] point and too soft spoken. [10] MR. RUFF: I completely missed the answer. [11] I didn't want to interrupt his answer. Go [12] ahead. [13] BY MR. LINTON: [14] Q: Just so we're clear the question is: [15] have you retained a file of the research that [16] you've done in connection with this case? [17] A: I don't have — I have a file in my [18] office that has a few articles on cauda equina [19] or lumbar disks and an abstract or two I might [20] have thrown in there. But as far as a file [21] specifically for this case with cauda equina [22] articles for instance or other relevant [23] articles, no. [24] Q: Can you identify any of the articles</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>[1] can't remember. [2] Q: Would you be willing to provide to us [3] at our expense a copy of your file as it now [4] exists? [5] A: If that's okay with Mr. Torgerson. [6] MR. LINTON: Do you have any objection to [7] that, Ken? [8] MR. TORGERSON: I don't know. I'll just [9] make an objection for the record, but I suspect [10] we'll be glad to do so. [11] BY MR. LINTON: [12] Q: Doctor, aside from what's in that [13] file, can you recall any articles you'd have [14] looked at in connection with this case? [15] A: Well, what I did on a couple of [16] occasions was just to scan through abstracts and [17] articles using an Internet search just to [18] refresh my memory and make sure I hadn't omitted [19] any critical articles. [20] I didn't really print all those out. [21] I just sort of read them because there's [22] hundreds of articles as you know, if not [23] thousands, on this and related subjects. So I [24] didn't want to print them all out, but I just</p>

Page 9

[1] did do a search through an Internet through med
[2] line.

[3] Q: What did you use as your search term?

[4] A: Oh, let's see, I did a search cauda
[5] equina, I looked through some articles on lumbar
[6] disk herniation.

[7] MR. RUFF: Hello.

[8] MS. GORCNSKI: It just got a lot worse.

[9] MR. RUFF: I can't hear at all.

[10] BY THE WITNESS:

[11] A: I looked through some articles on
[12] lumbar disk herniation. I looked through some
[13] articles on urinary problems. I can't think of
[14] anything else as a sit here right now.

[15] BY MR. LINTON:

[16] Q: Are you able to identify any other
[17] specific articles you looked at besides the ones
[18] we've just identified and those contained in
[19] Dr. Bell's deposition?

[20] A: No.

[21] Q: Would there be any way to reconstruct
[22] that at this point without —

[23] A: I could do more searches but that
[24] might not tell exactly which articles I was

Page 10

[1] looking at, but I could do some more searches.

[2] Q: Did you do a search of the literature
[3] before you prepared your report in this case
[4] specifically for this case?

[5] A: As I sit here today, I do not recall.
[6] It's more likely than not that I did, but these
[7] topics are something I deal with if not everyday
[8] every week. So you know, I may have just looked
[9] into it a month before. I really can't say.

[10] Q: You have no record that you can look
[11] to now that would show the jury for sure that
[12] you had done a literature search specifically
[13] for this case before preparing your report, can
[14] you?

[15] MR. TORGERSON: Note an objection. But you
[16] may answer.

[17] BY THE WITNESS:

[18] A: Correct.

[19] BY MR. LINTON:

[20] Q: Your report is identified as
[21] Exhibit A. That's dated September 17, 1999?

[22] A: Yes.

[23] Q: Is that the only report you prepared
[24] in this case?

Page 11

[1] A: Yes.

[2] Q: I note the handwritten word bladder on
[3] the second page. What's the significance of
[4] that?

[5] A: Well, the significance of this is, of
[6] course, I was contacted back in 1999 to review
[7] some records, and I agreed to do so. I
[8] generated this letter or report to
[9] Ms. Chrisafi. As the case developed and I was
[10] sent more information and more depositions, I
[11] made a couple little designations on this letter
[12] which is certainly sort of as you can see a
[13] preliminary short page and a half report or
[14] letter.

[15] I put the word bladder over nerve
[16] roots because at the beginning of Page 2 it
[17] says, "My opinion is that Ms. Pikkel's nerve
[18] roots were damage prior to her presentation,"
[19] and I wanted to clarify in my known mind what I
[20] meant by that. Nerve roots is a pretty general
[21] term, and what I meant by that is that the nerve
[22] roots going to her bladder and for the control
[23] of her bladder.

[24] Then I put C.E.S. at the bottom. As

Page 11

[1] you know, this has sort of developed into a big
[2] discussion about cauda equina syndrome, and
[3] that's what that stands for. Those are the two
[4] little notations I made on it.

[5] Q: What were the specific nerve roots in
[6] the bladder that were damaged?

[7] A: Well, we usually think of the sacral
[8] roots I guess through S5 going to the bladder,
[9] and we may not be able to tell exactly which one
[10] of those was damaged. Usually it's going to
[11] occur bilaterally in order to cause that sort of
[12] a problem. So I would say because we know that
[13] her bladder was having malfunction, those sacral
[14] nerve roots. That's what I meant.

[15] Q: Those sacral nerve roots being some or
[16] all of the nerve roots most likely bilaterally
[17] from S2 to S5?

[18] A: Correct.

[19] Q: Did you actually review the films
[20] themselves?

[21] A: Yes.

[22] Q: Do you have those with you or do you
[23] have those back in your office?

[24] A: I don't have a copy of those right

Page 13

[1] now. My recollection is that I mailed them to
[2] someone, but I did look at the actual films.

[3] Q: Was your interpretation
[4] consistent — strike that.

[5] Was your interpretation the same as
[6] Dr. Bell's and the radiologist that reviewed
[7] them?

[8] A: When I looked at the films, my
[9] recollection is that as far as what the
[10] radiology report said about them, I was pretty
[11] much in agreement with that.

[12] THE WITNESS: Are you hearing me better?

[13] MR. RUFF: I'm having a lot of trouble
[14] here. I'm wondering if when you guys picked the
[15] phone up you did something with the speaker
[16] volume.

[17] (WHEREUPON, discussion was had
[18] off the record.)

[19] BY MR. LINTON:

[20] Q: Does your report identify the items
[21] you would have reviewed before preparing the
[22] report?

[23] A: Yes.

[24] Q: What is your understanding of

Page 15

[1] A: I would say that that opinion comes
[2] from Dr. Bell's records and probably his
[3] deposition as well, and it might come from what
[4] Ms. Pikkel related in her deposition. Again, I
[5] don't know if that is true as far as what
[6] injuries she still has, if any, today.

[7] BY MR. LINTON:

[8] Q: Are all of her bowel, bladder, and
[9] perineal numbness problems a direct cause of the
[10] cauda equina syndrome?

[11] A: I would say, no. We would have to
[12] break those down if you wanted my opinion about
[13] each individual thing.

[14] Q: What is the cause of her bladder
[15] problem?

[16] A: The bladder problem according to my
[17] review of the records started with the
[18] manipulation by the chiropractor Dr. Zannetti.

[19] I would say the — just to finish up
[20] the answer of the question, the bowel problems
[21] and the numbness problems really became apparent
[22] and continued, of course, after her presentation
[23] to the emergency room on I believe it was the
[24] 5th; in other words, the second time she came

Page 14

[1] Ms. Pikkel's current condition?

[2] A: I don't have one.

[3] Q: Let me rephrase that. That was a bad
[4] question.

[5] What is your most recent account of
[6] her medical condition as it relates to the
[7] issues you'll be testifying to in this case?

[8] A: Well, the most recent account that I
[9] can recall, and I probably have to check through
[10] the records to be exactly sure, but she was
[11] continuing to have bladder problems, possibly
[12] some bowel problems and numbness in her perineal
[13] region. So that sometimes was a continuing
[14] chronic problem. Now whether she still has that
[15] today, I don't know.

[16] Q: Can you identify specifically what
[17] record you're referring to?

[18] A: Let's see.

[19] MR. RUFF: You guys have completely cut off.

[20] MR. LINTON: We're not talking. He's
[21] reviewing records.

[22] WHEREUPON, discussion was had
[23] off the record.)

[24] BY THE WITNESS:

Page 16

[1] back to the emergency room. So I think that
[2] answers your question. Despite the surgery,
[3] those three things continued.

[4] Q: Can we agree that all three of her
[5] problems, bladder, bowel, and numbness are due
[6] to the disk herniation?

[7] A: Yes.

[8] Q: Would you agree this is a case of
[9] acute cauda equina syndrome?

[10] A: Well, we'd have to define cauda equina
[11] syndrome. And really according to the
[12] definition of cauda equina syndrome, this was
[13] acute, yes, as far as if we think about her
[14] presentation to the emergency room on the 5th;
[15] in other words, the second time back. It was
[16] certainly an acute problem at that time.

[17] Really to characterize it better at
[18] its worst I'd say it was a partial cauda equina
[19] syndrome. It was not a full cauda equina
[20] syndrome.

[21] Q: How do you define partial as compared
[22] to full?

[23] A: Well, the full syndrome you could look
[24] at Dr. Shapiro's article for instance, there is

Page 17

[1] pain, there is numbness, there is weakness, and
[2] there is bowel, bladder involvement. Those
[3] things constitute the cauda equina syndrome.
[4] She never had much in the way of
[5] numbness going down her legs or weakness of her
[6] legs to make it the full syndrome. So I would
[7] say she had a partial cauda equina syndrome at
[8] best — or at most I should say.
[9] Q: From your perspective.
[10] A: Maybe worst. That's what she had
[11] immediately prior to the surgical intervention
[12] on the 5th.
[13] Q: Let me see if I'm understanding you
[14] correctly. You would define a full cauda equina
[15] syndrome to include pain, numbness, weakness,
[16] and bowel and bladder disfunction?
[17] A: Correct.
[18] Q: Because she did not have numbness into
[19] her legs or weakness in her legs, it would be an
[20] incomplete cauda equina syndrome?
[21] MR. TORGERSON: I'm just going to interpose
[22] an objection, I think it's vague. Go ahead.
[23] BY MR. LINTON:
[24] Q: Am I understanding you correctly?

Page 18

[1] A: It wasn't a complete cauda equina
[2] syndrome. It wasn't the cauda equina syndrome,
[3] for instance, that is dealt with in the Shapiro
[4] articles because it doesn't have all the
[5] features of the syndrome. Syndrome means
[6] symptoms or findings running together.
[7] Q: So I'm clear, the symptoms that were
[8] lacking from the full syndrome were numbness in
[9] the legs and weakness of the legs?
[10] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. You may answer.
[11] BY THE WITNESS:
[12] A: I think those are the main findings.
[13] The syndrome may also have positive straight leg
[14] raising, but yes.
[15] BY MR. LINTON:
[16] Q: Take as much time as you need. I
[17] don't need to try to trip you up or misconstrue
[18] what you're saying. I want to understand what
[19] your working definition of a full syndrome is.
[20] A full syndrome would include pain,
[21] numbness in the legs, weakness of the legs,
[22] bowel and bladder disfunction, and possibly
[23] straight leg raise?
[24] A: Yes, and the pain would be expected to

Page 19

[1] be severe and in the back and that may be
[2] radiating down the legs as well.
[3] Q: Now, from a mechanical standpoint the
[4] reason why you have a full syndrome is that more
[5] of the nerve roots in the cauda equina would be
[6] compressed as opposed to only some of those
[7] nerve roots being compressed?
[8] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[9] BY MR. LINTON:
[10] Q: Is that mechanically what happens?
[11] A: Yes.
[12] Q: In terms of whether it's acute or
[13] chronic or subacute, how do you define acute in
[14] terms of a time frame?
[15] A: Well, you kind of answered the
[16] question right. It's in terms of the time
[17] frame. You know, different articles have said
[18] 24 or 48 hours, maybe some people put it at 72
[19] as far as acute. Other authors have put a
[20] 72-hour time period or maybe a little bit longer
[21] in the subacute category. Chronic is definitely
[22] being there for several days, weeks, months.
[23] But I think for all practical intense
[24] and purposes we could say the acute would be in

Page 20

[1] that 24, 48 hour time range.
[2] Q: Now, the actual disk herniation in
[3] your opinion occurred at the time of the
[4] chiropractic manipulation?
[5] A: I think that's when it started, yes.
[6] Q: Can we agree that it is reported in
[7] the literature that chiropractic manipulation
[8] can, in fact, cause a cauda equina syndrome?
[9] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. But go ahead.
[10] BY THE WITNESS:
[11] A: Yes.
[12] BY MR. LINTON:
[13] Q: That was something that you were aware
[14] of as your experience and training as a
[15] neurosurgeon before you reviewed this case;
[16] isn't that right?
[17] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. But go ahead.
[18] BY THE WITNESS:
[19] A: Yes, if you look for them, you could
[20] find a couple of articles on that. Now, whether
[21] that's, I mean, everyone's general fund of
[22] knowledge, you know, I can't say that. But I
[23] was able to find in my literature searches a
[24] couple of articles relating cauda equina

Page 21

[1] syndrome to chiropractic manipulation, yes.
[2] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[3] **Q:** Can you explain exactly how that
[4] occurs, what mechanically actually happens?
[5] **A:** Well, I might not be able to explain
[6] it exactly. I think that, number one, someone
[7] is going to the chiropractor if they're having
[8] back pain because they may have a problem in the
[9] first place. The disk has two different
[10] components; there's an outer annulus and an
[11] inner nucleus. If the annulus has a crack in it
[12] for instance, that could be a cause of pain.
[13] Then if that area is moved thinking of
[14] it, that crack could widen or there could be
[15] more pressure on the disk that would cause some
[16] of that inner material to come out more. So it
[17] has been reported and it does make sense to me
[18] if the disk is being manipulated in some way.
[19] **Q:** Does the mere fact that someone like
[20] Bonnie Pikkel gets cauda equina syndrome from
[21] chiropractic manipulation meaning the
[22] chiropractor made a mistake or deviated from the
[23] standard of care in terms of how he did the
[24] manipulation?

Page 22

[1] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection. I think you're
[2] asking him a standard of care question on the
[3] chiropractor for which — is that what you're
[4] doing? He's not really testifying about that.
[5] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[6] **Q:** Let me ask it this way, whether it was
[7] a chiropractor or whether it was a physical
[8] therapist or whether it was an orthopedic surgeon
[9] or a neurosurgeon for that matter, simply
[10] because we have cauda equina syndrome resulting
[11] from manipulation does not mean that the
[12] manipulation was done improperly?
[13] **MR. RUFF:** Objection.
[14] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[15] **Q:** Is that true?
[16] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.
[17] **BY THE WITNESS:**
[18] **A:** I think that's true. I can agree with
[19] that. I'm not necessarily saying correct, that
[20] a manipulation was done improperly. People have
[21] back pain all the time, and they get
[22] manipulated, and I couldn't say that
[23] their — again, I'm not a chiropractor, but I
[24] can't say that the manipulation was done

Page 23

[1] improperly to cause it, that is true.
[2] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[3] **Q:** Now, is it your belief that there was
[4] partial herniation that then led to a more
[5] complete herniation between the time of the
[6] manipulation and the time of Bonnie Pikkel's
[7] second presentation to the ER?
[8] **A:** Could you read that back. I lost it.
[9] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[10] **Q:** Let me rephrase it, sure. Maybe I
[11] should ask it this way.
[12] **MR. RUFF:** Bob, I'm going to hang up. I
[13] can't hear. This is not useful to me to listen
[14] in.
[15] (WHEREUPON, discussion was had
[16] off the record.)
[17] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[18] **Q:** You believe, Doctor, that there was
[19] first interference with bladder function and
[20] then at a later point in time the numbness with
[21] interference with bowel function?
[22] **A:** Right.
[23] **Q:** Did I say that correctly?
[24] **A:** Yes, there was interference with

Page 24

[1] bladder function and at a later time there was
[2] inference with bowel function. There was some
[3] temporary numbness that cleared up and then
[4] numbness returned at or right before the time
[5] she went back into the emergency room the second
[6] time.
[7] **Q:** You're basing that conclusion on the
[8] medical records, specifically the ER records?
[9] **A:** Yes, but I also have read depositions
[10] so.
[11] **Q:** Let me ask it this way.
[12] **A:** But primarily I'm basing it on the
[13] medical records, that is correct.
[14] I'm just going to try to talk into
[15] phone.
[16] **Q:** Specifically the fact that the second
[17] ER record noted there was a problem with bowel
[18] function and the first ER record noted that
[19] there was numbness which has since resolved,
[20] correct?
[21] **A:** Yes, that's part of it; yes, sir.
[22] **Q:** What else can you point to in the
[23] materials that you've reviewed that support your
[24] view that those were new symptoms that arose

Page 25

[1] between the first ER and the second ER visit?
[2] A: In term of the bowel function?
[3] Q: Bowel and numbness, yes.
[4] A: Just the records that I reviewed, the
[5] medical records, and the account of the history
[6] and the findings in the two different ER visits.
[7] Q: Does it matter in terms of your
[8] opinions on causation whether those were
[9] problems that developed immediately after the
[10] manipulation or whether those were new problems
[11] that developed between the first visit and the
[12] second visit to the ER?
[13] A: To a certain extent, yes, it would
[14] matter.
[15] Q: How would it matter?
[16] A: If the problem started with the
[17] manipulation — and I'll try to get out my
[18] opinions here more than are on this little
[19] report. The problems starting with the
[20] manipulation, for instance the bladder.
[21] By the time she came into the
[22] emergency room and could have gotten into
[23] surgery, it was basically too late. The damage
[24] to the delicate nerves going to the bladder had

Page 26

[1] already occurred. Even if surgical
[2] decompression had been done earlier, it's my
[3] opinion that she would have had a very high
[4] chance of permanent or long-term damage.
[5] Numbness, take the issue of numbness,
[6] that actually is similar, I think that when you
[7] have a disk compressing nerve roots in the cauda
[8] equina region, once you get bladder difficulty
[9] and numbness as a surgeon you should certainly
[10] not guarantee your patient or even lead them to
[11] believe that you're probably going to be able to
[12] reverse that. They're very delicate nerves;
[13] permanent damage is very likely.
[14] But by the same token, the doctors
[15] really did not have a cauda equina syndrome.
[16] They never had a full cauda equina syndrome
[17] presenting to them. They had a partial cauda
[18] equina syndrome and reason to look at the cauda
[19] equina closely when she came into the emergenc
[20] room the second time, and she definitely had
[21] bowel findings at that time. So her picture was
[22] that of a progressive one.
[23] Q: Let me get back to the question I
[24] asked previously and that is, does it matter in

Page 27

[1] terms of causation; and that is, would there
[2] have been an increased likelihood of successful
[3] surgery if the symptoms all occurred immediately
[4] at the time of manipulation versus some of those
[5] symptoms occurring between, in your opinion, the
[6] first visit and the second visit?
[7] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. But go ahead.
[8] BY THE WITNESS:
[9] A: Now I think I understand your question
[10] a little better. I would say that right after
[11] the manipulation if Ms. Pikkel had developed a
[12] more characteristic cauda equina syndrome, if
[13] that had happened, it might have made a
[14] difference because — well, I won't say
[15] because. I'll wait for you to ask me.
[16] BY MR. LINTOM:
[17] Q: Why is that so?
[18] A: If she presented to the emergency room
[19] the first time with a full cauda equina
[20] syndrome, I have every reason to believe that
[21] would have been picked up like it was when she
[22] came back in the second time. It wouldn't have
[23] been as difficult to diagnose at that point. I
[24] think the surgeon would have been called in

Page 28

[1] earlier.
[2] Q: Assuming that the surgeon is called in
[3] during the first visit and further assuming that
[4] her symptoms existed at the time of the first
[5] visit, that is perineal numbness, interference
[6] with bowel function, interference with bladder
[7] function, there would have been a higher chance
[8] of a successful surgery than if it was done the
[9] second time — wait, let me back up.
[10] MR. TORGERSON: Let me interpose an
[11] objection. But go ahead.
[12] BY MR. LINTOM:
[13] Q: Let me back up to make sure we're not
[14] mixing apples and oranges here. I want to talk
[15] about two points in time for surgery; Number 1,
[16] after the first visit, and Number 2, after the
[17] second visit.
[18] A: Okay.
[19] Q: Now, under your scenario in which this
[20] was a partial syndrome because the bowel
[21] disfunction and the numbness did not begin until
[22] the second presentation, you're saying there was
[23] a high chance that there would be no difference
[24] with the surgery; is that in essence your

Page 29

[1] opinion?

[2] **MR. TORGERSON:** I'm going to object, and I'm
[3] going to ask that you read the question back so
[4] I can hear it again.

[5] **MR. LINTON:** Withdrawn.

[6] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[7] **Q:** Doctor, have you testified in other
[8] cauda equina syndrome cases?

[9] **A:** Yes.

[10] **Q:** How many other cases?

[11] **A:** One that I recall.

[12] **Q:** Did you do that for the patient or for
[13] the doctor or hospital?

[14] **A:** That was for a doctor.

[15] **Q:** What was the issue in that case?

[16] **A:** The issue — again, this was a few
[17] years ago so I have to apologize. I don't
[18] really have all the details of the case, but it
[19] was —

[20] **MR. TORGERSON:** Let me just interpose an
[21] objection. But go ahead.

[22] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[23] **A:** It was something to the effect that an
[24] epidural injection or epidural catheter had

Page 31

[1] it in my records.

[2] **Q:** What record would you look to?

[3] **A:** What I do is I look back through my
[4] tax records for the billing. I think it was in
[5] Wheaton County or in Wheaton, Illinois. You'd
[6] think I'd know the attorney's name or the
[7] patient's name, but I just don't. I'd have to
[8] go through my tax records and find a bill.

[9] **Q:** Would you go in and do that and
[10] provide a copy to Mr. Torgerson?

[11] **MR. TORGERSON:** Note an objection. But go
[12] ahead, Doctor.

[13] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[14] **Q:** I'll be happy to pay your professional
[15] time, you or your staff.

[16] **A:** I have a lot of tax records. If
[17] Mr. Torgerson says I should do that, I will do
[18] that.

[19] **Q:** When was that case approximately?

[20] **A:** Again, I think it was about — it was
[21] probably about three years ago, could have been
[22] as long as five years ago.

[23] **Q:** Did you give trial testimony in that
[24] case?

Page 30

[1] caused a cauda equina syndrome and that that
[2] should have been recognized earlier.

[3] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[4] **Q:** Was there likewise an issue in that
[5] case if it had been recognized earlier that
[6] there could have been surgical intervention that
[7] would or would not have made a difference?

[8] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection to the foundation
[9] of the question. Go ahead.

[10] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[11] **A:** Well, it was a complicated case but
[12] that was probably part of that. They thought
[13] that there should have been earlier surgical
[14] intervention, yes. That was the hypothesis that
[15] the plaintiff had.

[16] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[17] **Q:** In that case you had both an issue as
[18] to standard of care as well as causation?

[19] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.

[20] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[21] **A:** I would say so.

[22] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[23] **Q:** Would hired you in that case?

[24] **A:** I don't recall. I could probably find

Page 32

[1] **A:** Yes.

[2] **Q:** Did that result in a verdict?

[3] **A:** Yes.

[4] **Q:** Was the verdict in favor of the
[5] doctor?

[6] **A:** Yes.

[7] **Q:** What was the time involved in that
[8] case in term of the alleged delay?

[9] **A:** I don't recall.

[10] **Q:** Do you recall if it was 24 hours or 48
[11] hours?

[12] **A:** Don't recall.

[13] **Q:** When was the last time that you
[14] personally treated a patient surgically with
[15] cauda equina syndrome?

[16] **A:** I've treated two this year.

[17] **Q:** Surgically?

[18] **A:** Yes.

[19] **Q:** How long after onset of symptoms did
[20] you perform the surgery?

[21] **A:** One was several days so it would be in
[22] the subacute or chronic category, and one was
[23] after several months. You know what, I don't
[24] think I did a surgery on that one. I had a

Page 33

[1] patient with cauda equina syndrome that was so
[2] severe and so long-standing and she had such
[3] medical risks, I don't think I did a surgery.
[4] Q: The one with several months?
[5] A: Yes. But those are the two patients
[6] that come to mind this year.
[7] Q: Are you far enough out to see if
[8] there's been any improvement in bowel or bladder

[23] A: I tell them it's an individual matter,
[24] that we hope that there will be a recovery as a

Page 34

[1] matter of fact, but we can't guarantee
[2] recovery. In other words, recovery — and let
[3] me clarify, I'm sorry.
[4] Do we want me to focus on bowel and
[5] bladder? Focusing on bowel and bladder I tell
[6] them there may be some recovery. I hope there
[7] is some recovery. I would think it would be
[8] more likely that the recovery would take place
[9] within a year or less, but I think it **Would** be
[10] possible for a recovery to occur over a longer
[11] period.
[12] I also tell them that it may be
[13] possible that despite intervention and even
[14] rapid intervention they may continue to have
[15] that permanent problem with their bowel and
[16] their bladder. So I think that answers it.
[17] Q: If I understand you correctly then,
[18] you tell them that there would be probable
[19] improvement within one year and possible
[20] improvement thereafter, am I understanding you
[21] correctly?
[22] MR. TORGERSON: Note the objection. I think
[23] he testified to what he said, and I would let
[24] the record stand.

Page 31

BY THE WITNESS:

[1] A: You know for bowel and bladder, I
[2] don't use the word probable. If I used that in
[3] my answer, I shouldn't have. I hope that they
[4] would get better, but I'm very —

BY MR. LINTON:

[7] Q: Let me just stop you.

[8] A: It's not —

[9] Q: We're on two different wave lengths
[10] here. I understand that you're not talking
[11] about a probability of recovery from the
[12] surgery.

[13] What I'm actually talking about is
[14] there is improvement, you would expect that
[15] improvement to probably occur within one year,
[16] and there is still a chance of possible
[17] improvement thereafter?

[18] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. But go ahead.

BY THE WITNESS:

[20] A: I think that would be a fair
[21] characterization, yes.

BY MR. LINTON:

[23] Q: You would not tell the patient that if
[24] they had not recovered within one year that

Page 32

[1] there would be probable improvement thereafter?

[2] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

BY THE WITNESS:

[4] A: Correct.

BY MR. LINTON:

[6] Q: What is the longest from surgery that
[7] you have seen improvement of bowel or bladder
[8] function in a case of acute cauda equina
[9] syndrome?

[10] A: Well, I'd have to say that after a
[11] year or two I'm usually not following the
[12] patient because the patient is usually being
[13] followed in a rehabilitation facility as an
[14] outpatient or by a urologist or a neurologist.
[15] So me as the neurosurgeon several years out, I'm
[16] probably not continuing to see the patient.
[17] So I don't know if that plays into
[18] your question. You may want to ask it again.
[19] I'm not sure that I answered it. I'm usually
[20] not telling people at one year or later as a
[21] neurosurgeon. What I'm telling them in their
[22] more — in their period that is closer to the
[23] time of surgery what I'm telling them is based
[24] on the literature, based on what I've been told,

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>[1] you know, by urologists and so forth. But their [2] care at that time is usually not by me as the [3] neurosurgeon. [4] Q: Can you say how long after surgery [5] there can be bowel or bladder improvement based [6] on any specific literature? [7] A: I couldn't give a specific time frame, [8] no. [9] Q: Is it fair to say that at this point [10] in time with Bonnie Pikkell being this long after [11] surgery that she's probably as good as she's [12] going to get in terms of bowel and bladder [13] function? [14] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. [15] BY THE WITNESS: [16] A: Well, I couldn't say. That's why to [17] clarify in the letter I put in the last sentence [18] of the first paragraph, as you know a more [19] current report from a urologist as not been [20] received. [21] So to answer that question as [22] precisely as possible, I think that if we needed [23] or wanted or be desirable to assess her bowel [24] and bladder function by a urologist or someone</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>[1] A: It was so I didn't mean to say that [2] patient had acute cauda equina syndrome. He [3] was subacute to chronic area. [4] Q: Is there any difference in likelihood [5] of successful surgery if it is a subacute case [6] as opposed to an acute case of cauda equina [7] syndrome? [8] A: Well, that depends on what you mean by [9] successful. I think, for instance, in that [10] person or if someone has a subacute cauda equina [11] syndrome you weigh the risks and the benefits, [12] but in general it's worth doing the surgery. [13] But if you're talking about successful [14] meaning absolutely normal in terms of normal [15] strength, normal sensation, normal bowel [16] function, normal bladder function, I think that [17] would be very, very — I wouldn't say very, very [18] me; but I think it could happen, but it would [19] not usually be the case. [20] Q: Let me see if I could phrase it [21] differently. You've answered the question. [22] Do you keep records on the number of [23] procedures you do and the type of procedures [24] you've done?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>[1] who is trained to do that. I think as a general [2] principle the longer the time is without [3] recovery, the less likely it is to get it, but [4] I'm not ruling out the possibility. It could [5] happen. [6] BY MR. LINTON: [7] Q: You certainly can't say with [8] reasonable medical certainty that it will happen [9] in Bonnie Pikkell's case, can you? [10] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. [11] BY THE WITNESS: [12] A: Just let me see if I understand the [13] question, as far as where she's at today with [14] her bowel and bladder function, I would not say [15] that in a year from now, say the year 2002 or [16] something, that she would be better than the way [17] she is 2001, that is correct. I'm just not real [18] sure where she is at currently as I've answered [19] before. [20] BY MR. LINTON: [21] Q: I understand. The patient with acute [22] cauda equina syndrome you treated this year, you [23] used the word several days after onset. Do you [24] recall if it was beyond 48 hours?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>[1] A: No, the records go into the hospital [2] files. [3] Q: There would be no way now to go back [4] to your office and reconstruct how many acute [5] cauda equina syndrome cases you've handled, [6] would there? [7] A: Correct. [8] Q: When was the last cauda equina [9] syndrome case you handled before this year? [10] A: Well, I'd say in a general way either [11] myself or someone in our group or in past groups [12] sees one every year or two. It's fairly rare. [13] It's maybe one or two percent of lumbar disk [14] herniation, something in that range. [15] Q: You're speaking now of acute cauda [16] equina syndrome? [17] A: Yes. [18] Q: Can you recall as you sit here the [19] last case of acute cauda equina syndrome you [20] personally handled? [21] A: I think there was one due to an [22] infection a couple of years ago so it wasn't a [23] lumbar disk case; but otherwise, no. [24] Q: Would you be able to say with any</p>

Page 41

[1] degree of probability the number of cases that
[2] you personally have done surgery on for acute
[3] cauda equina syndrome?
[4] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[5] BY THE WITNESS:
[6] A: Certainly less than ten,
[7] maybe — probably closer to five. Again,
[8] they're pretty rare.
[9] BY MR. LINTON:
[10] Q: Can you recall as you sit here the
[11] circumstance of any specific acute cauda equina
[12] syndrome case you've handled?
[13] A: No.
[14] Q: If you were called in like Dr. Bell
[15] was, would you have recommended surgery on this
[16] patient?
[17] A: Yes.
[18] Q: Do you have any criticisms of Dr. Bell
[19] in terms of the procedure he performed or the
[20] way he performed it?
[21] A: In reviewing the operative report, I
[22] thought it was unusual that he used the laser.
[23] I think that was an option. I don't think most
[24] people are using the laser at this point. I

Page 42

[1] wouldn't call that a criticism. It was just
[2] something I noted reading his operative report.
[3] I also noted that he had the dural
[4] tear. Again, that is certainly something that
[5] could happen in this kind of a surgery. It
[6] could also have caused a nerve root injury. I'm
[7] not saying that it did. I'm saying it's
[8] possible.
[9] If the dural tear was made by the
[10] laser, it could have caused a nerve root
[11] injury. I just don't know. I'm not going to be
[12] critical of him in saying that that was
[13] negligent, but these are things I noted and I
[14] think you want to know in this discovery
[15] deposition.
[16] Q: I appreciate that. Let me just make
[17] sure that I'm hearing you correctly. You're not
[18] suggesting that Dr. Bell committed malpractice,
[19] was negligent, or failed in the standard of
[20] care, are you?
[21] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[22] BY MR. LINTON:
[23] Q: Is that correct?
[24] A: That is correct.

Page 43

[1] Q: You likewise can't say with a
[2] reasonable degree of medical probability that
[3] the dural tear, in fact, caused the bowel or
[4] bladder problems in this patient, can you?
[5] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[6] BY THE WITNESS:
[7] A: That is correct.
[8] BY MR. LINTON:
[9] Q: Can you say that if you had performed
[10] the surgery you would not have caused a dural
[11] tear as well?
[12] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[13] BY THE WITNESS:
[14] A: I'd say probably not, but 100 percent,
[15] I couldn't say that.
[16] BY MR. LINTON:
[17] Q: Do you understand in a case like this
[18] with a herniation that is that close to the dura
[19] that that is a normal risk and complication of
[20] the procedure?
[21] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[22] BY MR. LINTON:
[23] Q: Correct?
[24] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

Page 44

[1] BY THE WITNESS:
[2] A: Yes.
[3] BY MR. LINTON:
[4] Q: Aside from not using a laser, would
[5] you have performed the same type of surgery?
[6] A: Yes.
[7] Q: At what point — strike that.
[8] How long after onset would you
[9] say — strike that.
[10] At what point in time from the surgery
[11] would you no longer — at what point in time
[12] after the onset of cauda equina would you no
[13] longer recommend surgery because the chance of
[14] recovery or improvement would be too slight to
[15] justify the surgery?
[16] A: I can't give you an exact time frame,
[17] but the patient I had referred to had had it for
[18] years. So certainly after several years I think
[19] the chance of neurologic recovery from a cauda
[20] equina syndrome is low.
[21] But whether — I don't think you could
[22] say that there's a definite time frame such as
[23] three months, six months, one year, two weeks.
[24] I think you have to make that decision. This

<p>[1] whole area has been controversial in the [2] literature in terms of cauda equina syndrome. [3] So I wouldn't give you a specific time frame for [4] nonintervening. [5] Q: One could still recommend surgery even [6] weeks or months after the onset of cauda equina [7] syndrome? [8] A: It would depend on the patient but [9] that might happen, yes. [10] Q: Again, from your own knowledge base [11] you can't say how long after onset of cauda [12] equina you've performed surgery? [13] MR. TORGERSON: I'm going to object. [14] BY THE WITNESS: [15] A: I've certainly done it a few weeks [16] after the onset. Now whether it's — exactly [17] how many weeks, I just don't recall. [18] BY MR. LINTON: [19] Q: I assume you have not published [20] yourself on cauda equina syndrome? [21] A: I have not. [22] Q: Have you done any reliable research on [23] the subject? [24] MR. TORGERSON: What was that modifier, what</p>	<p>Page 45</p>	<p>Page 47</p> <p>[1] was in your file, your cauda equina syndrome [2] file? [3] A: Correct. [4] Q: That was the file that you kept not [5] solely for this case but for your general [6] medical knowledge? [7] A: Correct. [8] Q: Do you consider that article to be a [9] reliable authority in your field? [10] A: No, I think it's part of a literature [11] on a controversial topic. [12] Q: In your opinion is there any reliable [13] medical authority on this topic? [14] MR. TORGERSON: I'm going to object. I [15] think the question is a little flaccid by what [16] you mean by reliable. [17] But if you can answer, go ahead. [18] MR. LINTON: I haven't heard a flaccid [19] objection before. I'll add that to my [20] repertoire. [21] MR. TORGERSON: That's a thin objection to a [22] flaccid question, loose I meant. [23] BY THE WITNESS: [24] A: I don't think there is a reliable</p>
<p>[1] kind? [2] MR. LINTON: Reliable research. [3] MR. TORGERSON: Has he done any reliable [4] research? [5] MR. LINTON: On cauda equina syndrome. [6] MR. TORGERSON: Note an objection. [7] BY THE WITNESS: [8] A: Yes, I've researched it. I've [9] researched it for the my patients, and I've [10] researched it in conjunction with this case and [11] the previous case I mentioned. [12] BY MR. LINTON: [13] Q: Bad question. I don't mean did you [14] search the literature. Have you yourself done a [15] research project into outcomes as it relates to [16] cauda equina syndrome? [17] A No. [18] Q: Has anybody in your practice group? [19] A: No. [20] Q: Do you personally know Dr. Shapiro? [21] A: Not personally. [22] Q: Do you know of him? [23] A: Yes. [24] Q: In fact, one of his articles you say</p>	<p>Page 46</p>	<p>Page 48</p> <p>[1] literature or a paper or a collection of papers [2] that gives us the definitive answer for cauda [3] equina syndrome. I think that most of the [4] studies, if not all of them, are done [5] retrospectively. [6] I think that this is a controversial [7] area. I think different papers and different [8] people have come up with different conclusions. [9] I think that sometimes the conclusions are [10] trying to be forced. I think that time frames [11] such as 24 hours, 48 hours are basically [12] artificial. So it's a long answer to tell you [13] that I don't think there is an authoritative or [14] reliable paper on cauda equina syndrome. [15] And of course, as I pointed out many [16] times, this lady did not have the full blown [17] cauda equina syndrome that even — or that is [18] even covered in these kind of papers, so no. [19] BY MR. LINTON: [20] Q: If I can just summarize in a short [21] fashion here, you just told us in your judgment [22] there's no reliable or authoritative article or [23] publication in the area of cauda equina [24] syndrome, correct?</p>

Page 49

[1] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.

[2] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[3] **A:** Yes, I think what a neurosurgeon or

[4] orthopedic surgeon if they're doing this surgery

[5] what they have to do is be aware of — I'm

[6] speaking from the point of view of a

[7] neurosurgeon — has to be aware of this entity

[8] and be aware of how it presents, what the

[9] intervention could be, what the causes are, file

[10] that into one's memory bank, and then, you know,

[11] make individual decisions for patients based on

[12] that individual patient.

[13] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[14] **Q:** Are you relying on any specific

[15] medical literature or publication in giving your

[16] opinions?

[17] **A:** In giving my opinions about Ms. Pikkel

[18] and the whole situation, I'm relying on my 20

[19] years of work as a neurosurgeon and

[20] neurosurgical resident and my fund of knowledge

[21] from papers, talking to colleagues, patients,

[22] books, articles, abstracts, meetings, everything

[23] put together, the experience and things that

[24] I've learned over a long time frame.

Page 50

[1] **Q:** But there's not a specific article

[2] that you are relying on to give your opinions;

[3] is that correct?

[4] **A:** That is correct.

[5] **Q:** Is there a specific article that

[6] you've found in your literature search that you

[7] feel supports your opinion in this case?

[8] **A:** Yes, I think most of the articles

[9] support them. Now, if you're asking me to give

[10] a specific author's name, I mean, going back to

[11] the beginning of the deposition I can't do that

[12] as I sit here right now.

[13] **Q:** Again so I'm clear, you can't give us

[14] a specific article that supports your position

[15] as you sit here, correct?

[16] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.

[17] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[18] **A:** I could if I was required to do so.

[19] But as I sit here today, I wouldn't. I don't

[20] have any articles even with me so I couldn't

[21] give them to you. But there are articles out

[22] there if I wanted to find them, but it would

[23] depend on the specific question that you're

[24] asking me.

Page 51

[1] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[2] **Q:** Well, have you found any specific

[3] article that supports your opinions in this

[4] case?

[5] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection. That's the

[6] second, possibly third time you've asked that.

[7] But go ahead.

[8] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[9] **A:** I would say the literature in general

[10] taken together supports it.

[11] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[12] **Q:** Is there a specific article, though,

[13] that you can refer me to that supports your

[14] opinion in this case?

[15] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection; asked and

[16] answered.

[17] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[18] **A:** I could find articles, yes, to support

[19] my opinions if I needed to.

[20] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[21] **Q:** But you can't tell me as sit here what

[22] articles support that?

[23] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.

[24] **BY THE WITNESS:**

Page 52

[1] **A:** Not by specific author's name, no,

[2] sir.

[3] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[4] **Q:** Can you refer to a specific journal or

[5] specific year or a specific institution or any

[6] way in which you can identify as we sit here

[7] today an article or articles that support your

[8] opinions?

[9] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.

[10] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[11] **A:** I could if I needed to, but I don't

[12] have any article here with me today.

[13] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[14] **Q:** Not to beat a dead horse, right now

[15] I'm asking you can't refer me to a specific

[16] article or tell me there's a study out of this

[17] institution or check this particular journal as

[18] we sit here today, correct?

[19] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.

[20] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[21] **Q:** Is that correct?

[22] **MR. TORGERSON:** Asked and answered.

[23] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[24] **A:** What I would refer you to do is do a

April 25, 2001

Page 53

[1] search like I have done and look at all these
[2] articles and think about specific questions that
[3] need to be answered. So yes, I would refer you
[4] to do a search of the literature, absolutely.

BY MR. LINTON

[6] Q: I understand that a generic search.
[7] I'm talking about a specific article that you
[8] can say as you sit here that supports your
[9] position, and you don't have one, correct?

[10] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[11] answered.

BY THE WITNESS:

[13] A: I'm sorry, could you read that back,
[14] (WHEREUPON, the record was
[15] read by the reporter.)

BY THE WITNESS:

[17] A: I don't have any specific articles
[18] here in this room today other than the articles
[19] that are already attached to the depositions.

BY MR. LINTON:

[21] Q: You're not suggesting that one of
[22] those specific articles supports your position
[23] in this case, are you?

[24] A: It may.

Page 55

[1] that supported my opinions about this case. By
[2] answering it in this way, I in no way mean to
[3] imply that these would be the only articles
[4] supporting my position.

[5] For instance in Defendant's Exhibit G,
[6] the first article at the end of Dr. Bell's
[7] deposition, it's written by Dr. A-h-n of
[8] Baltimore. It says, quote, Timing of Surgical
[9] Decompression for Cauda Equina Syndrome
[10] Secondary to Lumbar Disk Herniation is
[11] Controversial. That supports my position.

[12] Let's just skim through these articles
[13] here. There's an article Defendant's Exhibit H,
[14] Cauda Equina Syndrome Due to Sequestered Disk
[15] Herniation After Chiropractic Manipulation by
[16] Markowitz and Dolshoy (phonetic) that supports
[17] what I said about the fact that it can occur
[18] after a chiropractic manipulation.

[19] We come to Dr. Shapiro's article which
[20] was written in 1993 and published in
[21] neurosurgery. Let me put on my glasses. He has
[22] a little table here. Again, I've given a lot of
[23] different opinions. I'm just picking out a
[24] couple of things. It's kind of a broad

Page 54

[1] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

BY THE WITNESS:

[3] A: It may. We'd have to go through the
[4] articles and see the specific question that we
[5] wanted to ask. But they may, sure.

BY MR. LINTON:

[7] Q: Have you done that?

[8] A: I've looked at the articles, yes.

[9] Q: Do any of those support your opinions
[10] in this case?

[11] A: Yes.

[12] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

BY MR. LINTON

[14] Q: Which articles?

[15] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. Go ahead.

BY MR. LINTON:

[17] Q: Which articles support your opinion?

[18] A: Well, let's find them. Is that okay?

[19] Q: Sure.

[20] (WHEREUPON, discussion was had
[21] off the record.)

BY THE WITNESS:

[23] A: So I'm trying to answer the question
[24] or I am answering the question about articles

Page 56

[1] question.

[2] These are people, again, that have
[3] cauda equina syndrome. These are not
[4] necessarily people like Ms. Pikkel, but you're
[5] asking me about this issue of cauda equina
[6] syndrome. So for instance Patient Number 2 in
[7] his Table 1 had five days. The surgery was done
[8] at five days after the appearance of the cauda
[9] equina syndrome and the outcome was normal.
[10] There was a Patient Number 11 that had surgery
[11] less than 24 hours after the onset of the
[12] syndrome but continued to have a problem, namely
[13] pain. This article will also talk about the
[14] controversy of cauda equina syndrome and the
[15] fact that even if surgery is done right away, a
[16] permanent problem can exist. The comments of
[17] the article are important.

[18] For instance, Dr. Miller on Page 747
[19] after that article says, quote, the study, of
[20] course, suffers from being retrospective and
[21] antidotal. So I agree with that, that supports
[22] my opinion.

[23] I'm looking at another exhibit here
[24] Exhibit J, an article by Demming and Shaffer

Page 57

[1] (phonetic). It's called, Discogenic
[2] Compression that Cause Cauda Equina, a Surgical
[3] Emergency. It's the type of article that would
[4] contribute to my understanding of cauda equina
[5] syndrome, the presenting symptoms, the surgical
[6] interventions, the operative technique. For
[7] instance, in the discussion of that article on
[8] Page 931 it says, quote, the surgical literature
[9] on this condition is somewhat scanty and for the
[10] most part consists of case reports or brief
[11] references.

[12] I can go on and on. Let's look at one
[13] more thing from the back of Dr. Bell's
[14] deposition. It's an article called, Cauda
[15] Equina Syndrome and Lumbar Disk Herniation. The
[16] first author is Dr. Kostuik. I don't know if I
[17] pronounced that correctly, K-o-s-t-u-i-k. At
[18] the end of the abstract it says, quote, there
[19] was no correlation of these times with return of
[20] function.

[21] So you know, definitely there are lots
[22] of articles in the literature that support the
[23] various positions and opinions I have in this
[24] case.

Page 58

BY MR. LINTON:

[2] Q: Are you through with your answer?
[3] A: Well, again, by answering with those,
[4] I don't mean to imply that those are the only
[5] articles that would support my position. But
[6] I'll stop there, yes.

[7] Q: Does the literature not generally
[8] suggest that the earlier the intervention the
[9] better?

[10] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. You may answer.

BY THE WITNESS:

[11] A: I would say so.

BY MR. LINTON:

[12] Q: And that the longer one waits to do
[13] surgery, in general the worse the outcome?

[14] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

BY THE WITNESS:

[15] A: I think it's an individual matter. It
[16] depends on the individual patient, what they've
[17] got, what's causing the cauda equina syndrome.
[18] So while the literature may generally have a
[19] suggestion of the timing, you could never use
[20] that as a neurosurgeon as far as what to tell an
[21] individual patient.

Page 59

[1] You should never tell a patient, for
[2] instance, if you're operating right away on a
[3] cauda equina syndrome that her bladder or his
[4] bladder will be normal. That would be a
[5] mistake. So there's what's in the literature
[6] and then there's what you use to relate to an
[7] individual patient.

BY MR. LINTON:

[8] Q: Well, Doctor, would you ever wait for,
[9] let's say, 12 hours or longer to do a surgery on
[10] a patient who presents with a acute cauda equina
[11] syndrome?

[12] A: As a neurosurgeon, no, I would not
[13] wait. That is correct.

[14] Q: Why is that?

[15] A: Because as soon as the diagnosis was
[16] made which usually means obtaining the lumbar
[17] MRI scan or sometimes the CT myelogram, if you
[18] have a cauda equina syndrome, as soon as the
[19] patient is medically ready I think it would be
[20] wise as Dr. Bell did in this case to go ahead
[21] and do the decompression.

[22] Q: Now, if you were the patient — strike
[23] that.

Page 60

[1] If a patient presented to you with a
[2] 26-hour history of being unable to void
[3] following chiropractic manipulation with
[4] perineal numbness that may or may not have
[5] resolved, would you not have made the diagnosis
[6] or at least included in your differential the
[7] diagnosis of cauda equina syndrome?

[8] MR. TORGERSON: I'm assuming that's a
[9] hypothetical. I'm going to object. Those are
[10] not the facts in this case.

BY THE WITNESS:

[11] A: I think I understand the question. Of
[12] course I'm a neurosurgeon. I'm going to look at
[13] it from the view of the neurosurgeon. Usually
[14] as neurosurgeon I'm already going to have the
[15] MRI scan done.

[16] I started my answer, but I lost the
[17] rest of your question. Could you either repeat
[18] it.

BY MR. LINTON: —

[19] Q: Let me rephrase it so we're clear.
[20] You're familiar with the emergency room record
[21] from the first visit?

[22] A: I am.

Page 61

[1] Q: You're familiar with the history that
[2] was presented by Bonnie to the emergency room?
[3] A: I am.
[4] Q: Based on that history would you have
[5] suspected cauda equina syndrome?
[6] A: I would not have.
[7] Q: You would not have suspected cauda
[8] equina syndrome or disk herniation with a
[9] 26-hour history of being unable to void with
[10] perineal numbness that may or may not have
[11] resolved following chiropractic manipulation?
[12] A: Let's clarify that. It's not a matter
[13] of suspecting cauda equina syndrome or not.
[14] When she came in that day to the emergency room
[15] the first time, she did not have cauda equina
[16] syndrome.
[17] Q: Would you —
[18] A: So it's not a matter of suspecting it
[19] or not.
[20] Q: The reason for that is because of how
[21] you define cauda equina syndrome?
[22] A: No, not the way that I've defined it.
[23] The way that it's been defined in the
[24] literature. When she came into the emergency

Page 62

[1] room the first time, she did not have cauda
[2] equina syndrome. She had urinary retention.
[3] So as a neurosurgeon with a patient
[4] having urinary retention, would I have done an
[5] MRI, probably not.
[6] Q: Would you have done a neurological
[7] examination?
[8] A: Well, that would be a decision that's
[9] made by the emergency room doctor.
[10] Q: I'm talking about you.
[11] A: As a neurosurgeon, that's what I do.
[12] If someone calls me to see a patient, of course
[13] I as a neurosurgeon have to do a neurologic
[14] examination. That's what I do.
[15] Q: You don't do a neurologic examination
[16] on every patient you see, do you?
[17] A: That's correct.
[18] Q: Regardless of the symptoms, the signs
[19] or symptoms?
[20] A: Right, you have to — well, the
[21] neurological examination is a big tool. It has
[22] many parts. There's a lot that could go into
[23] it. What you do is you selectively do an
[24] examination or you focus on the things that

Page 63

[1] could be a problem or that are appropriate. If
[2] someone has — well, I'll just stop there. The
[3] bottom line is that you do a neurological
[4] examination depending on the individual patient.
[5] Q: Assuming that the patient presented to
[6] you with a 26-hour history of not being able to
[7] void after chiropractic manipulation and had
[8] perineal numbness that may or may not have
[9] resolved, what would have been on your
[10] differential diagnosis?
[11] MR. TORGERSON: Interpose an objection.
[12] I'm assuming this is a hypothetical.
[13] BY THE WITNESS:
[14] A: So you're adding — I'm sorry to
[15] clarify this. You're adding numbness that may
[16] or may not have resolved with urinary
[17] retention?
[18] BY MR. LINTON:
[19] Q: Following chiropractic manipulation.
[20] A: And the question what would I have had
[21] in my differential. Well, I think you'd have a
[22] large differential. I think that the primary
[23] problem in that kind of a patient is going to be
[24] the urinary retention. You're going to want to

Page 64

[1] address that. I'm not a urologist, but there's
[2] dozens of things that could cause that.
[3] Now, adding onto that the numbness and
[4] manipulation. If the numbness had resolved, I
[5] might tell her to go either to the emergency
[6] room or to a urologist. It would depend on the
[7] patient. If the numbness was persistent, I
[8] don't know. Again, I'm a neurosurgeon. I know
[9] about lumbar disk herniations.
[10] So from the point of view of the
[11] neurosurgeon, I might have gotten on MRI. I
[12] don't know. But cauda equina syndrome does not
[13] describe that person. I would not have made
[14] that diagnosis.
[15] Q: Would you have —
[16] A: No one can because that's not the
[17] diagnosis at that time.
[18] Q: We can agree that you could have done
[19] an examination of the perineal area?
[20] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[21] BY MR. LINTON:
[22] Q: Including testing for sensation?
[23] MR. TORGERSON: I'm somewhat confused as to
[24] symptoms for which he would have done that.

Page 65

[1] Since I know in general that you started but
[2] it's changed as to resolved perineal hypesthesia
[3] or continued. I just want to — I would ask you
[4] to clarify what you're asking in that question.
[5] BY MR. LINTON:
[6] Q: I'm asking, Doctor, if this patient
[7] presented to you during her first visit to the
[8] ER, you would have done a neurological
[9] examination, correct?
[10] MR. TORGERSON: Which patient are we talking
[11] about?
[12] MR. LINTON: Bonnie Pikkel, the only patient
[13] that we're talking about in this case.
[14] MR. TORGERSON: As reflected in the 9-4-96
[15] ER review.
[16] MR. LINTON: That's correct,
[17] BY MR. LINTON:
[18] Q: You would have done a neurological
[19] examination, correct?
[20] A: I'm a neurosurgeon. I already
[21] answered that, what I do is a neurologic
[22] examination. If a patient just came in with
[23] urinary retention, I would say, look, I'm a
[24] neurosurgeon. Go to the emergency room doctor,

Page 66

[1] go to urologist. It wouldn't be appropriate for
[2] me to come in and start poking that woman's
[3] perineal, no.
[4] Q: Would you expect that an emergency
[5] room doctor was qualified to diagnosis cauda
[6] equina or a problem with a disk herniation to be
[7] able to do a proper examination, correct?
[8] MR. TORGERSON: I'll note an objection.
[9] BY MR. LINTON:
[10] Q: Don't you have to rely on emergency
[11] room doctors to do that?
[12] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[13] BY THE WITNESS:
[14] A: I'm going to try to answer now. In
[15] other words, in someone who has urinary
[16] retention would I rely on the emergency room
[17] doctor to do the appropriate examination, I
[18] would say, yes.
[19] BY MR. LINTON:
[20] Q: In fact, aren't doctors trained in
[21] medical school how to do physical examinations?
[22] A: Yes.
[23] Q: They're trained in medical school how
[24] to test, for example, for rectal tone?

Page 67

[1] A: Yes.
[2] Q: And how to test for sensation in the
[3] perineal area?
[4] A: Correct.
[5] Q: So an emergency room doctor would have
[6] received that training as any doctor when they
[7] went to medical school, correct?
[8] A: Yes.
[9] Q: That training to be further reinforced
[10] during their residency, correct?
[11] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[12] BY THE WITNESS:
[13] A: Yes.
[14] BY MR. LINTON:
[15] Q: Is there any way to reliably rule out
[16] perineal numbness without doing an examination
[17] of the perineal area?
[18] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[19] BY THE WITNESS:
[20] A: Well, practically speaking I think
[21] that the first thing to go on is what the
[22] patient tells you. If the patient says that,
[23] I'm having numbness, then you may need to
[24] examine that and pursue it. If they say, I'm

Page 68

[1] fine down there, I had some but now it's gone or
[2] resolved, then I probably would not have
[3] examined it because numbness in itself is
[4] subjective. You're relying on what the patient
[5] tells you.
[6] Actually, the patient can — and
[7] sometimes it's more advisable. The patient can
[8] feel that particular area and give you
[9] information as to whether or not it's numb. I
[10] don't think — this may be anticipating a
[11] question — in someone with urinary retention
[12] you should poke someone with a pin. I think
[13] it's an individual decision that is made. You
[14] may have nothing to gain by poking someone if
[15] they're telling you that I can feel there now.
[16] Q: Why would you ever do a pinprick
[17] sensation then? Why not just rely on what the
[18] patient tells you all the time?
[19] A: Well, one reason is because the
[20] patient may not know the distribution of the
[21] dermatomes. For instance, actually it's less
[22] important now when we get an MRI that will
[23] include that whole area. But in the past you
[24] wanted to identify which dermatomes were

April 25, 2001

Page 69

[1] involved with the numbness or in the pain or the
[2] weakness because that was what you used to
[3] localize the lesion that was causing the nerve
[4] root problem. So in this day of MRI, it's
[5] actually less important to do such a detailed
[6] exam.

[7] Q: Why is it important to check for
[8] rectal tone in a patient who has an inability to
[9] void 26 hours after chiropractic manipulation?

[10] A: Would be looking for cause. In other
[11] words, you're asking me a general question I
[12] think. In a person that has an inability to
[13] void if the rectal tone is being checked by a
[14] doctor, that doctor is trying to find out if the
[15] nerves going to the rectum are also being
[16] affected. That would help discriminate between,
[17] say, a mechanical bladder problem and something
[18] else.

[19] Q: You would you agree that a change in
[20] bowel or bladder function or incontinence
[21] suggests cauda equina syndrome?

[22] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[23] BY THE WITNESS:

[24] A: Urinary retention or fecal

Page 71

BY MR. LINTON:

[1] Q: Do you agree that it's crucial to do a
[2] rectal exam and test the perineal sensation if
[3] cauda equina syndrome is suspected?

[4] MR. TQWGERSON: I'll object.

[5] BY THE WITNESS:

[6] A: I think it would be advisable. I
[7] think practically what happens if it's suspected
[8] is that an MRI is done.

[9] BY MR. LINTON:

[10] Q: Even without a rectal exam or a test
[11] for perineal sensation?

[12] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[13] BY THE WITNESS:

[14] A: I'm sorry, that wasn't a complete
[15] question.

[16] BY MR. LINTON:

[17] Q: Let me just ask you the statement and
[18] tell me if you agree with it or disagree. Do
[19] you agree that it is crucial to do a rectal exam
[20] and test for perineal sensation if cauda equina
[21] syndrome is suspected?

[22] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[23] BY THE WITNESS:

Page 70

[1] incontinence are part of the cauda equina
[2] syndrome, yes.

[3] BY MR. LINTON:

[4] Q: So they would suggest a cauda equina
[5] syndrome?

[6] A: They're part of it; in other words,
[7] for the cauda equina syndrome as we've gone
[8] through, you have to think that plus other
[9] things.

[10] Q: So it's one factor or one sign that
[11] would suggest cauda equina syndrome?

[12] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[13] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Objection.

[14] BY THE WITNESS:

[15] A: The word suggestion or suggest I
[16] cannot accept because it's like the corner is
[17] part of this room. If you have a corner, it
[18] doesn't suggest a room. Those things that
[19] you're asking me about are part of the
[20] syndrome.

[21] Now, I don't know how I can make that
[22] clearer, just look at Dr. Shapiro's article, for
[23] instance, and what he says cauda equina syndrome
[24] is.

Page 72

[1] A: No, I think you can go by the
[2] information that the patient gives you. If
[3] you've made the decision to do the MRI, I
[4] wouldn't say that that absolutely is crucial to
[5] be done, no.

[6] BY MR. LINTON:

[7] Q: Let me ask it this way. Would you
[8] agree that it's crucial to do a rectal exam and
[9] test for perineal sensation or proceed with an
[10] MRI if cauda equina syndrome is suspected?

[11] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[12] BY THE WITNESS:

[13] A: It would depend on the individual
[14] case, how strong the suspicion was, what else
[15] was going on, if there was other reasonable
[16] explanations. I can't give you a blanket
[17] answer.

[18] BY MR. LINTON:

[19] Q: What other reasonable explanation
[20] could there have been in Bonnie Pikkell's case
[21] for urinary retention?

[22] A: Well, you have — again, I'm not a
[23] urologist, I'm not an emergency room doctor, but
[24] there are lot of things that could cause urinary

Page 73

[1] retention in a woman.
[2] Q: We know that she had cauda equina.
[3] She had a disk herniation at L5-S1, correct?
[4] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. I think there
[5] are two questions in there, and I'm not sure
[6] what we know.
[7] BY MR. LINTON:
[8] Q: Doctor, Bonnie Pikkel, in fact, had a
[9] disk herniation at L5-S1, did she not?
[10] A: She did.
[11] Q: In fact, you believe that was caused
[12] by chiropractic manipulation, correct?
[13] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[14] BY THE WITNESS:
[15] A: That's what started it.
[16] BY MR. LINTON:
[17] Q: That was what, in fact, was causing
[18] her inability to void for 26 hours when she
[19] presented to the ER for the first time, wasn't
[20] it?
[21] A: Yes.
[22] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[23] BY MR. LINTON:
[24] Q: That, in fact, was what was causing

Page 74

[1] her perineal numbness?
[2] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[3] BY MR. LINTON:
[4] Q: Correct?
[5] A: It did cause it later, yes. In other
[6] words, I don't want to imply by my answer that
[7] she had perineal numbness when she came in and
[8] saw Dr. Spanner because she didn't.
[9] Q: Even if you believe what Dr. Spanner
[10] put in his records, she had it at some point
[11] before her first visit and according to
[12] Dr. Spanner's record it was resolved?
[13] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[14] BY MR. LINTON:
[15] Q: Let me phrase it this way, Doctor.
[16] Regardless of whether the perineal numbness
[17] continued or stopped, the perineal numbness
[18] whenever it occurred was due to the disk
[19] herniation, correct?
[20] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[21] BY THE WITNESS:
[22] A: In my opinion I would say, yes.
[23] BY MR. LINTON:
[24] Q: Likewise the bowel incontinence was

Page 75

[1] due to the disk herniation, correct?
[2] A: At a later time, yes.
[3] Q: You said at a later time, doesn't the
[4] record state that she had been unable to have a
[5] BM for two days?
[6] MR. TORGERSON: Objection, point in time.
[7] BY MR. LINTON:
[8] Q: The second ER record.
[9] A: That's different than incontinence.
[10] Inability to have one is different than loss of
[11] control of holding it in.
[12] Q: Do you have the second ER record
[13] handy?
[14] A: Sure. Do you want me to just show you
[15] this?
[16] Q: Let me ask this, based on the record
[17] from the second ER visit, what was
[18] Bonnie's — the status of Bonnie's bowel control
[19] based on this record?
[20] A: So I'm reading from 9-5-96, it's the
[21] ER record on Bonnie Pikkel. The nurse says, in
[22] emergency department for urinary retention, et
[23] cetera. It says, urge to have BM. Is that what
[24] you're asking about?

Page 76

[1] Q: Correct. It also reports she was
[2] unable to have a BM for the past two days,
[3] doesn't it, in the physician's history?
[4] A: Yes, without bowel movement for two
[5] days. Yes, I see it.
[6] Q: Now, are you suggesting by that note
[7] that that meant her bowel problems only
[8] developed between the first and second visit to
[9] the ER?
[10] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[11] BY THE WITNESS:
[12] A: Well, what I'm suggesting actually is
[13] this, an urge to have a bowel movement and
[14] unable to have it for two days, that in itself
[15] does not mean that someone is incontinent of
[16] stool. It could be someone, for instance, who's
[17] very constipated. They need to go.
[18] BY MR. LINTON:
[19] Q: I'm not —
[20] MR. TORGERSON: Wait.
[21] BY MR. LINTON:
[22] Q: I want to just focus on the question.
[23] I'm not talking about what could have happened.
[24] I'm talking about this particular patient.

Page 77

[1] She was unable to have a BM for two
[2] days, that was reported during her second visit
[3] to the ER, right?
[4] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[5] BY THE WITNESS:
[6] A: That it true. That's what she
[7] reported.
[8] BY MR. LINTON:
[9] Q: Likewise on physical exam there was no
[10] rectal tone?
[11] A: Correct.
[12] Q: The first ER visit says nothing one
[13] way or the other about rectal tone, does it?
[14] A: Could I go back and look at that?
[15] Q: Sure.
[16] A: True.
[17] Q: Now, isn't it more likely based on the
[18] record that, in fact, the problem with the bowel
[19] goes back to before the first visit to the ER?
[20] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[21] BY MR. LINTON:
[22] Q: Let me rephrase it this way, bad
[23] question. Assuming that what is reported here
[24] is accurate, that is that there was a two-day

Page 78

[1] history of not being able to have bowel
[2] movements, there was no rectal tone, that would
[3] suggest that, in fact, the disk herniation was
[4] causing problems with the bowel correct?
[5] MR. TORGERSON: I'll object. But go head.
[6] BY THE WITNESS:
[7] A: I think the disk herniation was
[8] started with the chiropractor. It started to
[9] cause some symptoms first with her bladder and
[10] then I think her condition progressed. By the
[11] time she came into the ER the second time, she
[12] was having the bowel problems. You can't just
[13] say because she didn't have bowel a movement for
[14] two days that she was incontinent of bowel and
[15] had a flaccid rectal sphincter when she came in
[16] the first time to the emergency room, absolutely
[17] not.
[18] Q: We don't know because there is nothing
[19] in the record the first time that can show one
[20] way or the other whether she was
[21] having — whether she had rectal tone or not?
[22] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[23] BY MR. LINTON:
[24] Q: Right?

Page 79

[1] MR. TORGERSON: It sounds to me like you're
[2] arguing with the witness, but you did put a
[3] right in there. In any event, objection. Why
[4] don't you have the question read back so you can
[5] hear it again.
[6] BY MR. LINTON:
[7] Q: Let me rephrase. If you assume that
[8] what is in the second ER record is, in fact,
[9] accurate, doesn't that suggest that the disk
[10] herniation had caused problems with the bowel
[11] that existed at the time of the first ER visit?
[12] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[13] BY THE WITNESS:
[14] A: No, and let me explain. If someone
[15] loses rectal tone, they will usually defecate on
[16] themselves. If you have no rectal tone, you
[17] can't hold in your bowel movement. If that were
[18] in this case true, if she didn't have any rectal
[19] tone, I think she would have had the problem.
[20] She would have reported that she was losing
[21] control of her bowel. So exactly on the
[22] contrary I think that the bowel problem
[23] developed right before she came into the
[24] emergency room the second time.

Page 80

[1] Q: If she hadn't had a bowel movement in
[2] two days and presents the second time with no
[3] rectal tone, why isn't she defecating all over
[4] the ER?
[5] A: She might. It can happen with a full
[6] blown cauda equina syndrome. You could be in
[7] the cart in the emergency room and you could
[8] have — you could defecate in the ER.
[9] Q: If you get no rectal tone, you haven't
[10] had a bowel movement for two days, the movement
[11] has to go somewhere, doesn't it?
[12] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[13] BY THE WITNESS:
[14] A: That's exactly my point.
[15] BY MR. LINTON:
[16] Q: So where did it go? If she's got no
[17] rectal tone when she presented to the ER the
[18] second time, she would have had to have had a
[19] bowel movement that occurred in an uncontrolled
[20] fashion at some point either at the ER or before
[21] the ER, wouldn't she?
[22] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; argumentative.
[23] BY THE WITNESS:
[24] A: Well, it can depend on a lot of

Page 81

[1] things, how much you're eating. If you've eaten
[2] a lot in those intervening days, I think it
[3] would be more likely. If she hasn't eaten very
[4] much, she wouldn't necessarily have to have had
[5] one. Everyone's bowel habits honestly are a
[6] little different. Some people go everyday
[7] regularly, some people go every third day. It
[8] really depends.

[9] BY MR. LINTON:

[10] Q: Let's assume that she has regular
[11] bowel habits, that she has a BM regularly every
[12] morning, that she's eating a regular diet, that
[13] she's gone two days without a BM, and now she's
[14] shown to have no rectal tone when she presents
[15] the second time, wouldn't you expect that either
[16] at the time she presents or sometime before then
[17] she's going to defecate uncontrollably?

[18] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. If you can
[19] answer.

[20] BY THE WITNESS:

[21] A: Not necessarily, it could be after
[22] that: for instance, if she lost her rectal tone
[23] an hour before coming into the emergency room
[24] the second time, you know. As that tone becomes

Page a3

[1] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. Go ahead,
[2] BY THE WITNESS:

[3] A: No, practically speaking we can't
[4] record everything that we do on the chart. If I
[5] see a patient, I may do a lot of things, and
[6] I'll just kind of stick to the relevant or
[7] important things or sometimes you can't even put
[8] those on. So the medical record is incomplete.

[9] BY MR. LINTON:

[10] Q: Would you agree that cauda equina
[11] syndrome represents a true neurologic emergency?

[12] A: I don't think it's an emergency as
[13] much as, you know, a massive brain hemorrhage;
[14] but I think that it should be dealt with in an
[15] urgent matter, yes.

[16] MR. RUFF: I'm going to hang up. I can't
[17] hear.

[18] MR. LINTON: That's fine.

[19] MR. RUFF: Bye.

[20] (WHEREUPON, Mark Ruff

[21] telephonically left the

[22] deposition proceedings.)

[23] BY MR. LINTON:

[24] Q: From a timing standpoint should it be

Page 82

likely
's

that she probably did have
was in the emergency room

[7] BY MR. LINTON:

we don't know because it wasn't
recorded on the record, was it?

[10] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[11] answered, and the record is different from your

[13] BY MR. LINTON:

is there any reference
to the rectal tone being

[16] checked?

[17] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[18] BY THE WITNESS:

[19] A: I already answered that it wasn't
[20] recorded on the ER chart.

[21] BY MR. LINTON:

[22] Q: Doesn't the standard of care require a
[23] doctor to note on his chart the results of his
[24] examination?

Page 84

[1] handled any less urgently than a brain
[2] hemorrhage?

[3] A: Yes. For a brain hemorrhage you're
[4] immediately putting the person in the CT scan
[5] and immediately taking them up to the operating
[6] room after the diagnosis is made. Again, I
[7] don't mean to minimize a full blown cauda equina
[8] syndrome, but it's not as life threatening. The
[9] fact is that it's in a little different
[10] category.

[11] Q: Did Bonnie Pikkel ever have back pain
[12] from her disk herniation?

[13] A: Well, we know she had pain before
[14] going to the chiropractor, and I think it was
[15] about at that time that she was having the onset
[16] of this particular disk herniation progressing
[17] shall we say.

[18] Q: Do you feel with cauda equina
re's usually a weak Fishberg tone on
[20] rectal examine on associated urinary retention?

[21] A: Yes.

[22] Q: Do you agree that an MRI should be
[23] used on an urgent basis when cauda equina
[24] syndrome is suspected?

Page 85

[1] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[2] BY THE WITNESS:

[3] A: I think if you have a patient that you
[4] strongly suspect has cauda equina syndrome, you
[5] should get some sort of imaging of the spine,
[6] yes.

[7] BY MR. LINTON:

[8] Q: Would you expect that this massive of
[9] a herniation would likewise have to be disclosed
[10] on a CT scan?

[11] MR. TORGERSON: Objection to your
[12] characterization.

[13] BY THE WITNESS:

[14] A: It probably would have showed up on a
[15] CT scan. The MRI shows it better.

[16] BY MR. LINTON:

[17] Q: Is there any window of opportunity
[18] that you, yourself, recognized as a neurosurgeon
[19] based on your review of the literature, based on
[20] your own clinical experience, based on your
[21] general knowledge, is there a window of
[22] opportunity from which recovery of bowel and
[23] bladder function is more likely than not to
[24] occur?

Page 86

[1] A: I don't say that there's a window of
[2] opportunity, no. I think any such proposed time
[3] frame like 24 hours or 48 hours is really
[4] artificial. So I would not say to anyone, a
[5] patient or another doctor, that there's a window
[6] of opportunity, no, sir.

[7] Q: Is it your opinion that when you have
[8] acute disk herniation like Bonnie Pikkell has
[9] that leads to urinary retention that surgery
[10] will not ever to a reasonable degree of medical
[11] probability reverse the damage done to the nerve
[12] roots sufficient to regain bladder control?

[13] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[14] BY THE WITNESS:

[15] A: I have an opinion about that; that is
[16] that if you have a herniated disk that injures
[17] the nerve roots going to the bladder even if
[18] surgery is done immediately, there are certainly
[19] cases — and, again, it depends on exactly how
[20] much injury has been done. But even with
[21] immediate surgical decompression, it can be
[22] possible that the patient won't recover bladder
[23] function or they'll have at least some
[24] difficulty with their bladder as a residual

Page 87

[1] problem after the decompression.

[2] BY MR. LINTON:

[3] Q: I understand that it could possibly
[4] occur. But isn't it more probable that there
[5] will be recovery of some if not all bladder
[6] function if surgery is promptly done?

[7] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[8] BY THE WITNESS:

[9] A: I think it depends in all honesty on
[10] the degree of damage done to the nerve roots. I
[11] think if there's pressure on them and they are
[12] partially not working shall we say, that
[13] surgical decompression can help the situation.
[14] But if they've been severely damaged, then
[15] sometimes no surgery is going to be able to help
[16] that particular situation. You'd still want to
[17] do it to try.

[18] BY MR. LINTON:

[19] Q: How do you determine if they're
[20] partially damaged or if they're completely
[21] damaged?

[22] A: Well, I think that's in the realm of a
[23] neurologist — excuse me, a urologist. A
[24] urologist may be able to determine that in terms

Page 88

[1] of how much bladder function there is with a
[2] cystometrogram.

[3] Q: You can't say based on anything you've
[4] reviewed the extent to which there was complete,
[5] almost complete, or only partial damage to the
[6] nerve roots to Bonnie Pikkell's bladder, can you?

[7] MR. TORGERSON: I'm going to object. Are
[8] you asking him for an opinion or you are — is
[9] it a factual question. I'm not sure I
[10] understand.

[11] BY MR. LINTON:

[12] Q: Just that you can't — there's nothing
[13] you're talking about the way to look — there's
[14] nothing you can look to in the records that
[15] shows the extent of that damage to the nerve
[16] root?

[17] A: What I can look at is her course and
[18] the record and knowing that the disk herniation
[19] was large and in knowing that at least for many
[20] months, maybe a year she continued to have a
[21] problem. It's my belief that the damage to the
[22] nerve roots going to the bladder was severe.
[23] When this occurred was right after the time of
[24] the chiropractic manipulation because by the

Page 89

[1] time she came into the emergency room the first
[2] time, she had been unable to void for 26 hours.
[3] Q: Does that mean there was complete
[4] damage to all the nerve roots controlling the
[5] bladder at the time of the herniation?
[6] A: Most likely, either complete or shall
[7] we say severe.
[8] Q: Once there's complete or severe damage
[9] to the nerve roots, one cannot recover function
[10] with prompt surgery?
[11] A: Possible but unlikely. I've seen many
[12] cases where a person did not recover.
[13] Q: In an acute case?
[14] A: Yes.
[15] Q: How many of those cases?
[16] A: You know where are you, can I just
[17] take one second. This is beeping.
[18] (WHEREUPON, a recess was had.)
[19] BY MR. LINTON:
[20] Q: Doctor, can you tell just on — during
[21] surgery itself can you look at nerve roots and
[22] determine the extent of the damage?
[23] A: Well, usually in this kind of surgery
[24] you don't open up the dura so, no. Sometimes

Page 90

[1] you can see a nerve root and see if it's damaged
[2] and if there's a tumor in the cauda equina for
[3] instance or it's involved with tumor. But in
[4] this sort of situation, you're not going to be
[5] directly examining the nerve roots, that's
[6] correct.
[7] Q: Doesn't the literature, in fact,
[8] show — the overwhelming amount of literature
[9] show when you look at the patient population,
[10] you don't look at an individual patient; but you
[11] look at a patient population if you do this surgery
[12] promptly more likely than not, that is greater
[13] than 50 percent chance, are you going to get a
[14] recovery of function if not complete at least
[15] substantial recovery if you do prompt surgery?
[16] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[17] answered.
[18] BY THE WITNESS:
[19] A: Well, again, you're taking the
[20] individual patient out of the equation; but I've
[21] said this before, the interpretation of the
[22] literature is that you should do the surgery
[23] sooner as opposed to later. There's no doubt
[24] about that. I said that many times, but you

Page 91

[1] have to think of each individual patient.
[2] BY MR. LINTON:
[3] Q: Of course you can never decide what an
[4] individual patient is going to do, but if you
[5] look at the patient population as studied in
[6] most of the literature, doesn't it suggest that
[7] the majority of patients who receive prompt
[8] surgery will have a return of full or
[9] substantial bladder function?
[10] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[11] answered, indefinite and vague as to what you
[12] mean by prompt.
[13] BY THE WITNESS:
[14] A: Actually that's not my interpretation
[15] of the literature, no.
[16] BY MR. LINTON:
[17] Q: Likewise is that true with respect to
[18] bowel function?
[19] MR. TORGERSON: Same objection.
[20] BY THE WITNESS:
[21] A: I'm pausing because I'm trying to
[22] think of papers and so forth and my fund of
[23] knowledge about this, but I think regarding
[24] bowel function the literature would support

Page 92

[1] doing surgery earlier as opposed to later. But
[2] that's, again, looking at antitodal
[3] retrospective groups of patients.
[4] BY MR. LINTON:
[5] Q: When one looks at the literature, does
[6] not the majority of the literature support that
[7] if you have prompt surgery there will be in the
[8] majority of patients return of bowel function?
[9] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[10] answered.
[11] BY THE WITNESS:
[12] A: The literature looking at groups of
[13] patients would support doing prompt surgery,
[14] yes, I've said.
[15] BY MR. LINTON:
[16] Q: It would show that if prompt surgery
[17] is done the majority of those patients will have
[18] a return of bowel function, correct?
[19] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[20] answered.
[21] BY THE WITNESS:
[22] A: I think that depends on the individual
[23] patient as far as how bad their bowel was, the
[24] other things that were going on, other medical

Page 93

[1] conditions. So I just don't want to agree to
[2] that word majority, and it's really not fair to
[3] ask me about a majority because we have to total
[4] up all the numbers from all those patients. I
[5] don't have, you know, those figures all together
[6] to say whether it would be greater or less than
[7] 50 percent.

[8] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[9] **Q:** You haven't tried to do that as of
[10] this point?

[11] **A:** I haven't done that, and I don't know
[12] if it would be reasonable to do it because we're
[13] talking about an individual patient, not groups.

[14] **Q:** But don't we have to look at the
[15] literature in order to see as a patient
[16] population what most likely will occur?

[17] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection; asked and
[18] answered.

[19] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[20] **A:** We look at the literature to get as
[21] much information as we can as a neurosurgeon
[22] treating this kind of patient.

[23] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[24] **Q:** Isn't that the best predictor is

Page 95

[1] opinion that even by the time she got to the
[2] emergency room that first time that her — it is
[3] more probable than not that her nerve roots were
[4] irreversibly damaged going to her bladder, and
[5] she was going to have even with surgical
[6] decompression a continuing problem with her
[7] bladder.

[8] Furthermore, her clinical condition
[9] deteriorated. She represented to the emergency
[10] room the next day. She had more of the features
[11] of cauda equina syndrome. She still did not
[12] have all of the features of cauda equina
[13] syndrome, and then the MRI was appropriately
[14] done. The surgery was performed, you know, in a
[15] fairly quick manner; and she recovered to a
[16] certain extent, but she had some residual
[17] neurologic problems.

[18] Some of those went back to 26 hours
[19] before she presented to the emergency room the
[20] first time. Others of those may have been
[21] produced by when the cauda equina syndrome is
[22] worse. I'm saying that she presented to the
[23] emergency room with urinary retention.

[24] I think what they did to work up the

Page 94

[1] what's reported in terms of case studies and the
[2] literature?

[3] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.

[4] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[5] **A:** I think that's part of what you put
[6] together with your own personal experience and
[7] what you've learned. So the literature is part
[8] of the equation.

[9] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[10] **Q:** You're just essentially saying you'll
[11] never know with this patient because she never
[12] had a chance to have the surgery; so, therefore,
[13] one can't predict on a case by case basis how a
[14] particular patient will respond to surgery?

[15] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.

[16] **BY THE WITNESS:**

[17] **A:** No, that's not what I'm saying.

[18] **BY MR. LINTON:**

[19] **Q:** How am I misunderstanding you then?

[20] **A:** What I'm saying with Bonnie Pikkel is
[21] that she had a lumbar disk herniation which
[22] either started or was exacerbated by the
[23] chiropractic manipulation. This damaged the
[24] nerve roots going to her bladder. It's my

Page 96

[1] urinary retention was appropriate. If I had
[2] been in that spot at the same time and I think
[3] most reasonable physicians, of course that would
[4] have been an emergency physician, would have
[5] done the same thing. I don't think Dr. Spanner
[6] was negligent and that certainly it's
[7] unfortunate that she has some problem. If she
[8] does still have it today, I don't know.

[9] But this is the nature of damaging
[10] your nerve roots going to your bladder, your
[11] sexual area. They are sensitive. Even
[12] with — I don't think that catching it earlier
[13] would have made any difference.

[14] **Q:** Not a bit?

[15] **A:** Now, if it was possible to catch
[16] it — now, it's possible that within the first 6
[17] or 12 hours of that manipulation if somehow
[18] someone had been able to know that she had a
[19] large extruded disk, maybe an intervention could
[20] have been carried out at that time, but she did
[21] not have cauda equina syndrome —

[22] **Q:** Let me see what you're saying.

[23] **A:** — until later.

[24] **Q:** Are you saying now that with

Page 97

[1] reasonable medical probability if it had been
[2] operated on within 6 or 12 hours after onset
[3] that more likely than not there would have been
[4] return or at least improvement in bladder
[5] function?

[6] A: No, I'm just giving you the example
[7] that even if it had been diagnosed
[8] earlier — okay, I'll stop there.

[9] Q: So you're saying with reasonable
[10] medical probability if she had gone right from
[11] the chiropractor's office to the operating table
[12] and had surgery done at that time with
[13] reasonable medical probability there would not
[14] have been return or substantial improvement in
[15] bladder, is that your opinion?

[16] A: No, that's not what I'm saying.

[17] Q: So then there would have been with
[18] reasonable medical probability as of that point
[19] substantial improvement or return of bladder
[20] function?

[21] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[22] BY THE WITNESS:

[23] A: Where I was going with that to answer
[24] your question is that if immediately after the

Page 98

[1] chiropractic manipulation it had been
[2] possible — and I'm not saying that it would
[3] have been because she didn't have a cauda equina
[4] syndrome. She just had some urinary retention.
[5] But if had been possible to go back much, much
[6] earlier, the likelihood would have been greater
[7] to a point.

[8] BY MR. LINTON:

[9] Q: At least it would have been to a
[10] reasonable degree of probability 50
[11] percent — better than 50 percent likelihood?

[12] A: I still can't say 50 percent
[13] likelihood.

[14] Q: Again, getting back to the original
[15] hypothetical, she went from the chiropractor's
[16] office to the operating table, surgery was
[17] done. Even then in your judgment there was not
[18] a probability of return of bladder function?

[19] MR. TORGERSON: By probability you're using
[20] the legal term of probability, the greater or
[21] less than 50 percent.

[22] BY MR. LINTON:

[23] Q: Isn't that what you understand
[24] probability to mean, Doctor?

Page 99

[1] A Well, what I would say in answer to
[2] that is the chance would have been higher if the
[3] intervention would have been done earlier. But
[4] the problem is you can't make the diagnosis
[5] until the other things occur.

[6] In other words, it's not appropriate
[7] or the standard of care or necessary to get an
[8] MRI scan just with someone having urinary
[9] retention even if they have back pain
[10] chronically. It doesn't become appropriate
[11] until there are other neurological findings. By
[12] that time it was too late.

[13] BY MR. LINTON:

[14] Q: Let me ask it this way, just assume
[15] hypothetically that you could have had her on
[16] the operating table within two hours after
[17] leaving the chiropractor's office and had done
[18] the decompression at that point. Even then are
[19] you saying there is not a probability that is
[20] more likely than not that she would have had
[21] return of bladder function?

[22] A: I think her chance would have been
[23] better, but I still couldn't say that her
[24] bladder function would be normal because the

Page 100

[1] nerve roots would have been damaged.

[2] Q: So there would have been with
[3] reasonable medical probability improvement if
[4] the surgery had been done within two hours of
[5] the manipulation?

[6] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[7] BY MR. LINTON:

[8] Q: Is that what you're saying?

[9] A: I think the chance of improvement
[10] would have been higher.

[11] Q: Would it have been beyond — would it
[12] have been to a reasonable degree of medical
[13] probability; that is, a better 50 percent chance
[14] it would have improved?

[15] A: I don't know because we have no
[16] medical studies that have been published, and I
[17] personally don't have an experience in that area
[18] so it would be speculating.

[19] Q: What about your personal
[20] experience — do you have personal experience at
[21] six hours?

[22] A: Probably, but not just with an
[23] isolated urinary retention, no, because usually
[24] there are more symptoms and signs and findings

Page 101

[1] involved when this happens you see.
[2] Q: Help me out with this, Doctor. She
[3] has surgery after her second presentation?
[4] A: Correct.
[5] Q: Let's assume Dr. Bell or yourself had
[6] been called in after the first presentation.
[7] A: You mean to the emergency room when
[8] she came in the first time on the 4th?
[9] Q: Correct.
[10] A: Okay, I'm with you.
[11] Q: Assuming that the surgery was done
[12] following her first visit to the ER. Wouldn't
[13] there have been a better chance of some recovery
[14] than waiting until after the second
[15] presentation?
[16] MR. TORGERSON: I'm going to object. You
[17] should answer it, but you're implying that we're
[18] assuming something about a recovery better or
[19] worse than — I just don't know the status of
[20] her recovery. If you do, Doctor, answer the
[21] question.
[22] MS. GORCNSKI: Objection.
[23] BY THE WITNESS:
[24] A: Could you read that back.

Page 102

[1] (WHEREUPON, the record was
[2] read by the reporter.)
[3] BY THE WITNESS:
[4] A: Well, see, with her first presentation
[5] to the ER.
[6] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Did something happen to the
[7] phone?
[8] MR. TORGERSON: Can you hear us.
[9] (WHEREUPON, discussion was had
[10] off the record.)
[11] BY THE WITNESS:
[12] A: With her first presentation to the ER
[13] at that time she was just having the urinary
[14] retention. It wasn't appropriate to get an MRI
[15] scan so there would be no way to trigger the
[16] event that would have lead to the surgery.
[17] In your hypothetical are you asking me
[18] if just at, say, 30 hours with a disk pushing on
[19] the nerve roots going to the bladder that it
[20] would be more likely than not that the person
[21] would have recovered? Is that what you're
[22] asking me?
[23] Q: Yes.
[24] A: I can't say, but I think it's very

Page 103

[1] likely that the person would have had in — this
[2] particular person would have had continuing
[3] neurologic problems as I've already answered.
[4] Q: Exactly the same? An earlier surgery
[5] would not have effected in any way her residual
[6] problems from the disk herniation?
[7] MR. TORGERSON: Well, objection; asked and
[8] answered.
[9] BY THE WITNESS:
[10] A: I don't know. We don't have any
[11] studies specifically looking at that to tell
[12] us.
[13] BY MR. LINTON:
[14] Q: Would we have any studies at all that
[15] even address the issue in this case in terms of
[16] earlier surgery?
[17] A: I do not think there are any specific
[18] studies, no. I think what we have to use is our
[19] clinical experience and our opinion about that.
[20] Q: Your clinical experience, you can only
[21] remember probably five patients, and you can't
[22] even remember the details of more than one
[23] patient.
[24] A: This is a rare entity. This is going

Page 104

[1] to be true of everyone involved in this case.
[2] Q: Let's not speak — you haven't talked
[3] to Dr. Shapiro yet?
[4] A: Right.
[5] Q: In your experience you've got five
[6] cases. The only one you can remember any
[7] details about as you sit here is the one you
[8] operated on this year. We're not far enough out
[9] to determine involvement.
[10] So in terms of your clinical
[11] experience, you can't tell us any specifics that
[12] would apply to this case?
[13] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[14] answered. Don't answer the question. We've
[15] been over this before. It's in the record.
[16] Let's go on to a question that can be asked.
[17] BY MR. LINTON:
[18] Q: Please answer the question, Doctor.
[19] MR. TORGERSON: The question is complex,
[20] it's ambiguous, it needs definition.
[21] MR. LINTON: Just say the objection.
[22] MR. TORGERSON: I'm entitled to say the
[23] basis for the objection.
[24] MR. LINTON: You're not entitled to give a

Page 105

[1] speech to try to coach the doctor.
[2] **MR. TORGERSON:** I'm not coaching anybody,
[3] **MR. LINTON:** Let the doctor please answer
[4] the question as it's posed.
[5] **MR. TORGERSON:** The doctor has answered the
[6] question.
[7] **MR. LINTON:** Not that question.
[8] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.
[9] **MR. LINTON:** Please read back that question.
[10] (WHEREUPON, the record was
[11] read by the reporter.)
[12] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.
[13] **BY THE WITNESS:**
[14] **A:** Incorrect.
[15] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[16] **Q:** Okay, Doctor, let me try to go over
[17] that. I thought we did.
[18] Can you please tell us the details of
[19] any other acute cauda equina syndrome cases that
[20] you've treated other than the one you told us
[21] about this year.
[22] **MR. TORGERSON:** Note an objection.
[23] **BY THE WITNESS:**
[24] **A:** What happens when you have contact

Page 10

[1] cauda equina syndrome other than what you've
[2] told us?
[3] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.
[4] **BY THE WITNESS:**
[5] **A:** No, I've been focused on answering
[6] your questions, not thinking back about other
[7] patients. The best way for me to do that is for
[8] me to try to get some old records or something.
[9] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[10] **Q:** You have not attempted to do that as
[11] of this point, correct?
[12] **A:** No, I don't think that would be
[13] helpful for Ms. Pikkel anyway.
[14] **Q:** Would that be feasible at this point?
[15] **A:** No.
[16] **Q:** We don't want to call this — strike
[17] that.
[18] How would you define Bonnie Pikkel's
[19] condition?
[20] If you don't want to call it an acute
[21] cauda equina, how would you describe it?
[22] **A:** Thanks, that's a good question. When
[23] she came into the emergency room, her diagnosis
[24] and condition was that of urinary retention.

Page 106

[1] with these cases you talk to people, you learn
[2] about the situation at the meetings, you read
[3] papers, you read textbooks. What you use for
[4] your clinical experience or for making a
[5] clinical judgment isn't just based on the people
[6] that you've operated on. That's part of it, but
[7] there's more than that.
[8] So I don't have a photographic
[9] memory. I guess a few people do. If I learn
[10] about a person, a patient of mine or some other
[11] patient in the literature that has cauda equina
[12] syndrome, which is really not what this patient
[13] had any way, that goes into ones memory.
[14] So although I'm an expert on cauda
[15] syndrome, that doesn't mean necessarily I could
[16] tell you the exact age, time course,
[17] intervention that was done for specific people
[18] in the past, no.
[19] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[20] **Q:** I just want to make sure you haven't
[21] recalled more now than you did at the start of
[22] this deposition. Can you recall any more
[23] details about any other cases that were probably
[24] about five in number that presented with acute

Page 106

[1] That's on the first time, 9-4-96. When she came
[2] in the second time, her diagnosis was L5-S1 disk
[3] herniation.
[4] **Q:** Now, Doctor, what was the — strike
[5] that.
[6] Was anything done during her first
[7] visit to the ER to diagnosis the cause of the
[8] urinary retention?
[9] **A:** What was done was taking a history,
[10] performing a relevant exam, and placing the
[11] foley catheter which was more therapy than a
[12] diagnosis. So that's what was done.
[13] **Q:** First of all, the exam we don't know
[14] if rectal tone was checked and we don't know if
[15] perineal — if the perineal area was checked for
[16] sensation, correct?
[17] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection to form. Object
[18] to it's repetitive nature. The records speak
[19] for themselves as to what is known.
[20] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[21] **Q:** To lay my foundation for my next
[22] question, we can agree that there is nothing in
[23] the first visit — the record of the first visit
[24] that shows either rectal tone was checked or

Page 109

[1] that perineal area was checked for sensation,
[2] correct?
[3] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection; asked and
[4] answered. The continuing asking of the question
[5] which has been previously asked on several
[6] occasions is coming close to being harassment of
[7] this witness.
[8] **BY THE WITNESS:**
[9] **A:** My answer is that we've gone through
[10] that. I guess the best thing to rely upon is
[11] Dr. Spanner's deposition under oath and if he
[12] could recall what was done. Because as I've
[13] said many times, right, it was not recorded in
[14] the emergency room chart; but it is not possible
[15] to record everything that one does unless you
[16] have a court reporter sitting right here.
[17] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[18] **Q:** Would you expect that Dr. Spanner
[19] would have an independent memory of what he did
[20] on this patient this many years later or when
[21] his deposition was taken?
[22] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection. You may answer.
[23] **BY THE WITNESS:**
[24] **A:** I'm not going to answer for

Page 110

[1] Dr. Spanner, but there is something about having
[2] a lawsuit that does help to refresh one's memory
[3] sometimes. So you could ask him.
[4] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[5] **Q:** Would you then favor what Dr. Spanner
[6] has to say as opposed to what Bonnie Pikkel has
[7] to say about that point?
[8] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.
[9] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[10] **Q:** Or are you not picking sides?
[11] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.
[12] **BY THE WITNESS:**
[13] **A:** I'd rather not pick sides. I think
[14] the opinions I'm giving here today are — I
[15] mean, I am an expert for the defense, but I try
[16] to be objective and honest in my opinions. So I
[17] think that I'm not going to try to resolve a
[18] difference of opinions between Dr. Spanner and
[19] Ms. Pikkel. I think that's for the jury to do.
[20] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[21] **Q:** I appreciate that. But one of the
[22] purposes to do a proper examination of a patient
[23] like Bonnie Pikkel when she presents as she did
[24] during the first visit is to try to find a cause

Page 111

[1] for the urinary retention; is that correct?
[2] **A:** No, sometimes we treat something and
[3] then we find the cause later as a practical
[4] matter.
[5] **Q:** Isn't one of the reasons you do a
[6] clinical exam is to try to come to a diagnosis?
[7] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.
[8] **BY THE WITNESS:**
[9] **A:** Yes.
[10] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[11] **Q:** Isn't the purpose for a diagnosis to
[12] try to find out the cause of the problem. What's
[13] wrong with the patient?
[14] **A:** No, a diagnosis is really different
[15] than a cause, and this is a perfect example.
[16] The diagnosis was urinary retention, but since
[17] there are so many different causes, it wasn't
[18] feasible to really know what the cause was at
[19] that time.
[20] **Q:** You would agree knowing everything you
[21] know about Bonnie Pikkel that if an MRI was done
[22] that, in fact, would have showed the cause of
[23] the urinary retention being an L5-S1 disk
[24] herniation?

Page 112

[1] **MR. TORGERSON:** I'll object to everything we
[2] know about Bonnie Pikkel. But you may answer.
[3] **BY THE WITNESS:**
[4] **A:** I think that if an MRI would have been
[5] done at that time, and again I'm not saying it
[6] should have been, but it might have shown some
[7] of the disk herniation. But I think it is
[8] likely that it would have been smaller than the
[9] disk herniation later which was causing even
[10] more problems.
[11] I base my opinion on the fact that her
[12] clinical course deteriorated; in other words,
[13] she was worse the next time coming back into the
[14] ER than this time. This time she had urinary
[15] retention. I think if MRI had been done, it
[16] might have shown a small disk. Again, that's a
[17] totally different issue whether or not it would
[18] have been operated on at that time, but I'm
[19] speculating.
[20] **Q:** I understand. But based on what
[21] you're impression is of the medical records and
[22] what you believe her clinical course to have
[23] been, you believe if an MRI was taken during her
[24] first visit it would have most likely have shown

Page 113

[1] a smaller disk herniation than what was actually
[2] shown after her second presentation?

[3] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[4] answered. Go ahead.

[5] BY MR. LINTON:

[6] Q: Is that correct?

[7] A: Probably, yes.

[8] Q: Assuming that it showed a disk
[9] herniation although a smaller one, would it have
[10] been appropriate at that time to call in a
[11] specialist like Dr. Bell?

[12] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. You may answer.

[13] BY THE WITNESS:

[14] A: I think that would have — that might
[15] have been an option for the emergency room
[16] doctor.

[17] BY MR. LINTON:

[18] Q: Do you think it would have been
[19] equally appropriate for him to simply send her
[20] home with a catheter if the MRI showed a disk
[21] herniation even though it was smaller?

[22] A: I don't know.

[23] Q: Assuming it was a smaller disk
[24] herniation than was presented during the second

Page 115

MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

BY THE WITNESS:

[3] A: Well, I think that if somehow a
[4] neurosurgeon had been called in just based on
[5] urinary retention and a small disk herniation, I
[6] don't think neurosurgery would have been done.
[7] So I have to disagree with that. If I was
[8] called in on this day —

[9] BY MR. LINTON:

[10] Q: Day one?

[11] A: On day one as a neurosurgeon, I can't
[12] say that I would have recommended surgery
[13] because even in there was a disk
[14] herniation — that's a good other opinion to
[15] bring out because I wouldn't have thought with
[16] 36 hours of urinary retention, Number 1, that I
[17] was sure that the small disk herniation caused
[18] it or a smaller disk herniation.

[19] Number 3, by operating on it I
[20] wouldn't expect that her bladder problem would
[21] resolve. I would be worried about other things
[22] causing the bladder problem.

[23] Number 3, I'd be confused because
[24] there was no leg pain, there was no severe back

Page 114

[1] time and assuming if a neurosurgeon was called
[2] in to operate, more likely than not there would
[3] have been a better outcome in Bonnie Pikkel had
[4] the MRI been taken and had the surgery been done
[5] after the first visit, correct?

[6] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[7] answered.

[8] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Objection.

[9] BY THE WITNESS:

[10] A: The problem is there's so many parts
[11] to that question that I kind of lost track of
[12] it.

[13] BY MR. LINTON:

[14] Q: I'll break it down. I don't want you
[15] to be confused.

[16] Assuming the following facts, an MRI
[17] was taken after the first visit, that it showed
[18] a smaller disk herniation, that a neurosurgeon
[19] was called in after the first visit, that he did
[20] the surgery.

[21] When you compare that outcome as
[22] opposed to what happened in this case, more
[23] likely than not Bonnie would have had a better
[24] outcome, correct?

Page 116

[1] pain, the other symptoms were not there. So
[2] that's an important question that I think a
[3] neurosurgeon seeing her at that time probably
[4] would not have operated.

[5] Q: Doctor, please tell me whether the
[6] following in your opinion is appropriate or
[7] inappropriate.

[8] Would it be below the standard of care
[9] if a physician who is qualified to diagnosis
[10] cauda equina syndrome who sees a patient with a
[11] 26-hour urinary retention who has perineal
[12] numbness that may have resolved to simply place
[13] a catheter in that patient, diagnosis the
[14] patient as having urinary retention, and sent
[15] her home with no further diagnostic tests or
[16] studies?

[17] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[18] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Objection.

[19] BY THE WITNESS:

[20] A: No.

[21] BY MR. LINTON:

[22] Q: You believe that would have been
[23] entirely appropriate?

[24] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

Page 117

[1] **BY THE WITNESS:**
[2] **A:** I think it would depend on the
[3] circumstance. In looking at the Pikkel case, I
[4] think what Dr. Spanner did was appropriate
[5] considering what she told me and other factors.
[6] So I'm not critical of that, no. That's from
[7] the point of view of a neurosurgeon who's going
[8] to be more attune to the problem with the nerve
[9] roots than an emergency room physician would
[10] normally be.
[11] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[12] **Q:** If you were there during the first
[13] visit, you would not have ordered an MRI even if
[14] the MRI — strike that.
[15] You would not have ordered an MRI if
[16] you, yourself, were in Dr. Spanner's shoes,
[17] that's what you're saying, correct?
[18] **A:** I wouldn't be in his shoes. I'm not
[19] an emergency room physician.
[20] **Q:** If the patient had come into your
[21] office with this exact same presentation as
[22] presented on the first ER visit, would you have
[23] ordered an MRI scan?
[24] **A:** I might have, but I probably would not

Page 118

[1] ordered it emergent. In other words, I might
[2] have ordered it, but I can't imagine that I
[3] would have ordered it as an emergency, no,
[4] because I'm a neurosurgeon, that's what I do, I
[5] order MRIs.
[6] **Q:** Wouldn't there be at least some
[7] suspicion in your mind, however slight, that it
[8] could possibly be due to a problem with the disk
[9] compressing the nerve as a result of
[10] chiropractic manipulation?
[11] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.
[12] **MS. GORCZYNSKI:** Objection.
[13] **BY THE WITNESS:**
[14] **A:** Well, I think that was a suspicion in
[15] Dr. Spanner's mind.
[16] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[17] **Q:** If that's the case that it's a
[18] suspicion in Dr. Spanner's mind or in a
[19] neurosurgeon like yourself, doesn't the standard
[20] of care require that you first rule out any
[21] potential treatable causes?
[22] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.
[23] **MS. GORCZYNSKI:** Objection.
[24] **BY THE WITNESS:**

Page 119

[1] **A:** No, I think an emergency room doctor
[2] who deals with people with urinary retention
[3] from all kinds of reasons is going to behave
[4] exactly like he did. He put in a Foley and
[5] said, follow up with your doctor. There was
[6] nothing else about her neurologic exam that
[7] indicated that she was having a cauda equina
[8] syndrome.
[9] In fact, she did not have cauda equina
[10] syndrome. I can't stress that enough. That
[11] didn't happen until later when it was partial at
[12] best.
[13] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[14] **Q:** She at least had an L5-S1 disk
[15] herniation following chiropractic manipulation,
[16] correct?
[17] **A:** True.
[18] **Q:** She had a L5-S1 disk herniation at the
[19] time she presented to the ER the first time?
[20] **A:** She probably did.
[21] **Q:** That diagnosis was never made during
[22] her first presentation to the ER?
[23] **MR. TORGERSON:** Objection.
[24] **BY THE WITNESS:**

Page 120

[1] **A:** You say never, it was made when she
[2] got worse.
[3] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[4] **Q:** Let me repeat the question so I'm
[5] clear. Did Dr. Spanner diagnose an L5-S1 disk
[6] herniation you believe was present at the time
[7] Bonnie Pikkel went to the emergency room?
[8] **A:** Remember, I have the benefit of
[9] hindsight. So the answer is, no.
[10] (WHEREUPON, certain documents
[11] were marked Deposition
[12] Exhibit Nos. D, D1-D3, for
[13] identification, as of
[14] 4-25-01.)
[15] **BY MR. LINTON:**
[16] **Q:** Just for the record, Doctor, I'm going
[17] to mark as D your manila file. That contains
[18] all your correspondence in the case?
[19] **A:** Yes.
[20] **Q:** D 1 being the first note or your first
[21] contact in this case. I'm looking at a message
[22] slits to you dated 10-16-98 from Ms. Chrisafi who
[23] is the original attorney on this case?
[24] **A:** Yes.

Page 121

[1] Q: D 2 is a letter that followed on
[2] November 25, 1998, correct?
[3] A: Yes.
[4] Q: And D 3, are those your billing
[5] records in this case?
[6] A: These are recent ones from 2001.
[7] There were some previous bills generated at
[8] about the time that it was first sent to me as
[9] well, but those are, you know, previous tax
[10] years. I don't really keep those. They were
[11] paid.
[12] Q: Where can we get those bills?
[13] A: I would have to print them out from my
[14] computer or maybe Westin Hurt (phonetic) could
[15] give them to you.
[16] Q: Would you be so kind as to do that
[17] Mr. Torgerson in turn will give them to me. I'd
[18] just like to have a complete copy of your
[19] billing records if we could for this case.
[20] A: It's okay with me if it's okay with
[21] him.
[22] Q: You came over here, when was it, 1998
[23] to University of Illinois?
[24] A: Well, by over here, I came to

Page 122

[1] Chicago — I did my residency in Chicago.
[2] Q: Just to speed things up, at the time
[3] you got involved in this case, you originally
[4] were at Northwestern. You are now at University
[5] of Illinois; is that right?
[6] A: That is true.
[7] Q: When did you make that change?
[8] A: I started at the University of
[9] Illinois in February of '99.
[10] Q: I assume that was a better opportunity
[11] for you than at Northwestern?
[12] A: Sure was.
[13] Q: How was it better for your own career
[14] advancement?
[15] A: My salary was more. I was assigned to
[16] be the director of neuro-oncology as part of my
[17] responsibilities. I was an associate professor
[18] and got a promotion or academically I was an
[19] associate professor instead of an assistant
[20] professor. I was given research money, and I
[21] like the people that I worked with. So all in
[22] all it was a better opportunity for me.
[23] Q: Tell me the different academic
[24] positions that were in place at Northwestern as

Page 123

[1] well as the ones that are in place at the
[2] University of Illinois.
[3] A: Those are pretty much just on the CV.
[4] Q: You were an assistant professor at
[5] Northwestern?
[6] A: Yes.
[7] Q: The next step up from that, is that an
[8] associate professor?
[9] A: Yes, sir.
[10] Q: After that is a full professor?
[11] A: Yes.
[12] Q: Do you have tenure currently?
[13] A: I'm on what's called the tenure track,
[14] but tenure has not yet been awarded.
[15] Q: What is required for you to complete
[16] your track and get tenure?
[17] A: I don't think you can even be
[18] considered for it when you come in as an
[19] associate professor for two or three years or
[20] something like that. So I don't have tenure
[21] yet, that's correct.
[22] Q: I don't want to know the specific
[23] numbers, but what was the percentage increase in
[24] salary coming over here?

Page 124

[1] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[2] BY THE WITNESS:
[3] A: 50 percent.
[4] BY MR. LINTON:
[5] Q: In terms of research money, were you
[6] getting research money at Northwestern, you
[7] specifically?
[8] A: I had to get grants, some of which are
[9] listed in the CV. So I wasn't given research
[10] money just, say, on a month-to-month or a
[11] year-to-year basis. I had to apply for grants.
[12] In coming to the University of Illinois, they
[13] did give me start-up research money.
[14] Q: How much do they give you in start-up
[15] research money?
[16] A: \$315,000.
[17] Q: 315 or 350?
[18] A: 3, 1, 5. That was not to me but it's
[19] to my lab.
[20] Q: Not salary to you, it's money you use
[21] to fund your research projects?
[22] A: Exactly.
[23] Q: Is your research interest still brain
[24] tumor cell biology?

Page 125

[1] A: Yes.
[2] Q: Glioblastoma, is that still your baby?
[3] A: That and other things.
[4] Q: What other areas of brain tumor cell
[5] biology?
[6] A: Anything involving neuro-oncology
[7] which would be the way that tumors or cancer or
[8] benign tumors effect the nervous system. Any of
[9] that would be in my research area.
[10] Q: What percentage of your neuro-oncology
[11] responsibilities would relate to brain tumors
[12] versus other parts of the nervous system?
[13] A: Most of it is brain tumor, maybe 75 to
[14] sometimes 90 percent over the past two years.
[15] Q: Have the number of surgeries you
[16] performed changed since you came over here just
[17] in terms of numbers?
[18] A: They may have increased a little bit.
[19] You know, it's something that's going to vary
[20] from month to month, year to year; but it's been
[21] pretty consistent I'd say over the past ten
[22] years.
[23] Q: How many surgical procedures do you do
[24] on average per year?

Page 126

[1] A: I would say 200 to 300.
[2] Q: What percentage of those would be
[3] brain versus spine?
[4] A: Well, currently I'd say it's about
[5] 50/50. Earlier when I was at Northwestern I'd
[6] say it was 75 to 85 percent spine.
[7] Q: So even though you are a director of
[8] spine surgery where, you're still doing spine
[9] surgery yourself?
[10] A: Yes, sir, that is — really
[11] neurosurgeons do in general more spine surgery
[12] than brain surgery just because of the number of
[13] patients that have problems with the spine as
[14] opposed to brain problems. So I still do a lot
[15] of spine surgery, yes.
[16] Q: Could you just break out for me in
[17] term of percentage of your professional time
[18] what you do generically do in your current
[19] position?
[20] A: I'd say the vast majority of it is
[21] seeing and taking care of patients and
[22] performing their surgeries, probably 75, 85
[23] percent of it. Then there's the research which
[24] is the bulk of the rest of it. There's some

Page 127

[1] administrative work. There's some legal work
[2] like this which is maybe, you know, 2 percent of
[3] my time, something like that. Well, there's
[4] some other committee work and so forth, but I
[5] would lump that into administrative duties.
[6] So the vast majority is clinical and
[7] that overlaps with teaching. In other words, I
[8] give a few lectures a month, some of those are
[9] in the CV. But my teaching overlaps with the
[10] clinical work. So for instance, if I'm doing a
[11] surgery or seeing patients, a student or a
[12] resident is with me so I spend a good amount of
[13] time teaching as well, but that's kind of going
[14] along with my clinical work.
[15] Q: Do you teach formal classes at the
[16] medical school?
[17] A: Yes, I teach on neurosurgical topics.
[18] For instance, the medical students will have
[19] lectures on neurosurgery, and I and the other
[20] faculty members would give those. I'm also in
[21] the bioengineering department and give seminars
[22] according to that. So there are some formal
[23] teaching responsibilities, yes.
[24] Q: Have you specifically lectured on

Page 128

[1] cauda equina syndrome?
[2] A: I have mentioned it if I've been
[3] talking about disk surgery, specifically lumbar
[4] disk surgery. It's been something that has come
[5] up.
[6] Q: Do you have any course materials or
[7] written materials from any of those lectures?
[8] A: No.
[9] Q: Have you specifically lectured on the
[10] anticipated outcome of surgery or the timing of
[11] when surgery should occur with cauda equina
[12] syndrome either complete or partial?
[13] A: I probably have, and the opinion that
[14] I would give in that lecture would be similar to
[15] the one I've been giving today which is that
[16] this is something that — cauda equina syndrome
[17] is something that is better to be dealt with
[18] urgently, but even with immediate or very rapid
[19] surgical decompression, there can be continuing
[20] neurologic problems.
[21] You can't guarantee that operating
[22] within a certain time frame, for instances as
[23] we've gone over, is magical or that is the
[24] window of opportunity. I have not ever lead

Page 129

[1] students to believe that there is such a window
[2] of opportunity.

[3] Q: Of course there's no guarantee in your
[4] business, but isn't the whole reason for urgent
[5] surgery is because you expect that there will be
[6] some improvement after surgery?

[7] A: That's why you do surgery is you hope
[8] to make the patient better or prevent the
[9] patient from getting worse.

[10] Q: Again, I assume you don't have any
[11] written materials that would contain any
[12] information on that topic from your lectures?

[13] A: I don't, not the topic of cauda equina
[14] syndrome.

[15] Q: Is there a different policy in place
[16] at the University of Illinois compared to
[17] Northwestern in terms of your involvement as an
[18] expert in legal cases?

[19] A: I wouldn't say it's different. I
[20] think it's prudent to keep it to a very limited
[21] amount of time and not let it interfere with any
[22] of your responsibilities with your real job, and
[23] usually the amount of time that we spend doing
[24] this is reported. So there's no change I would

Page 131

[1] haven't made a determination as to how that will
[2] work,

[3] BY MR. LINTON:

[4] Q: Have you calculated a charge for doing
[5] that?

[6] A: No.

[7] Q: Have you ever had to travel out of
[8] town to testify at a trial?

[9] A: I've traveled out of town but never
[10] traveled out of state.

[11] Q: What do you charge — do you have a
[12] current fee schedule for testifying at trial?

[13] A: What I had charged in the past for
[14] testifying at trial is \$800 per hour plus travel
[15] expenses. Usually those have been very
[16] limited. So I'm going to have to think about
[17] that. I haven't really thought about it for
[18] coming to Cleveland if I need to do that.

[19] Q: What do you charge an hour to review
[20] records?

[21] A: \$400.

[22] Q: To give a deposition?

[23] A: \$600.

[24] Q: Have you ever worked before for

Page 130

[1] say that would be significant.

[2] Q: Is there any written policies or
[3] procedures or guidelines concerning that topic?

[4] A: No.

[5] Q: The fees that are paid for your work
[6] as an expert witness in legal cases, is that
[7] money that goes directly to you or does it go to
[8] the university?

[9] A: Well, it's discretionary. I think it
[10] could go to you. You could use it in that way,
[11] but you could also do it through the university
[12] billing system if that was your desire.

[13] Q: In this case it's gone through your
[14] own personal funds as opposed to billing through
[15] the university?

[16] A: To the state, it has, that's correct.

[17] Q: Do you anticipate changing that?

[18] MR. TORGERSON: Objection. Go ahead and
[19] answer.

[20] BY THE WITNESS:

[21] A: I don't know. I'll have to see what
[22] my academic and laboratory needs are. For
[23] instance — well, I haven't made — if I come to
[24] Cleveland to testify if and when, I really

Page 13:

[1] Ms. Chrisafi or the law firm of Jacobs, Manard
[2] Tushwin, and Caler (phonetic)? That was firm in
[3] Ohio that basically defended a company called
[4] PIE which is the largest malpractice insurer of
[5] physicians in Ohio. Did you do any work for
[6] that firm?

[7] A: I don't think so. I think this is my
[8] first contact with them, but I think I might
[9] have been sent one other PIE case a long time
[10] ago. I certainly never had to go to Ohio. I
[11] think it just sort of disappeared, and I don't
[12] remember the details of that. But I don't
[13] recall any previous work with Ms. Chrisafi or
[14] this law firm or the other one that you
[15] mentioned.

[16] Q: Or Mr. Torgerson I assume?

[17] A: No, this is definitely the first case
[18] I've worked on with Mr. Torgerson.

[19] Q: Are you doing less legal work now that
[20] than you did when you were at Northwestern?

[21] A: Yes.

[22] Q: You have less time?

[23] A: Yes.

[24] Q: Are you accepting new cases?

Page 133

[1] A: Yes, selectively.
[2] Q: Tell me in whatever way you can
[3] quantify how it's different now than it was at
[4] Northwestern.
[5] A: It's quantitatively less, maybe 50, 75
[6] percent less, something like that.
[7] Q: How many cases do you currently have?
[8] A: I don't know. I keep a little office
[9] that just holds records on cases, and most of
[10] those cases are from quite a long time ago,
[11] 1995, 1996.
[12] Q: Your previous life?
[13] A: My previous life. And I would
[14] say — as this one actually started in my
[15] previous life. I would say there's probably
[16] something like a dozen cases sitting there, and
[17] I don't know at the present time if those are
[18] just done or if they're going to go to trial or
[19] what. I think there may actively be one or two
[20] other cases that I'm working on. When I give a
[21] deposition, it's usually because I've been a
[22] treater.
[23] Q: Let me make sure I'm clear. The
[24] number of cases that you have you said is like a

Page 134

[1] dozen and then you said one to two other cases.
[2] I was confused.
[3] A: What I meant by that is I have on file
[4] maybe a dozen cases. Other than this one
[5] there's maybe one or two others —
[6] Q: Active?
[7] A: — that, you know, I have received
[8] communication about, say, this year.
[9] Q: I see. So the others are there if and
[10] when, but in terms of active cases, there would
[11] be just one or two?
[12] A I think that's an accurate
[13] characterization, yes.
[14] Q: Are you accepting new cases for review
[15] in term of case a month, a case every six
[16] months? Have you set any sort of goal or limit
[17] for yourself in that area?
[18] A: I haven't any sort of goal. I would
[19] limit it to only an occasional selective case,
[20] yes.
[21] Q: If we look at in term the course of a
[22] year, are we talking a couple a year?
[23] A: Right, a couple cases a year.
[24] Q: Separate from any work you've done as

Page 135

[1] a treating physician where you were asked to
[2] give deposition testimony in an auto accident
[3] case or Workers' Comp. case or something like
[4] that?
[5] A: This is correct.
[6] Q: The 2 percent or so of your practice
[7] that involves legal work, would that include
[8] those cases as well?
[9] A: I wouldn't say it's of my practice, I
[10] would say it's of —
[11] Q: Professional time?
[12] A: — my working time.
[13] Q: Which is how many hours a week
[14] approximately on a good week?
[15] A: Depending if I'm looking at it or if
[16] my wife is looking at it I would say probably I
[17] am working probably more than 80 hours a week.
[18] Q: When was the last time you gave a
[19] deposition in a case where a patient — excuse
[20] me, for a plaintiff in a medical malpractice
[21] case?
[22] A: Usually it becomes a little fuzzy to
[23] me because what's happened in the past is a
[24] lawyer has sent me a patient and then I become a

Page 136

[1] pi treater, but I also get involved as an expert.
[2] So that has probably happened this year, maybe
[3] last month where I was a treater, slash, expert.
[4] Q: Is that in a malpractice case?
[5] A: Oh, in a malpractice case. Yeah,
[6] within the last five or six months I was
[7] probably deposed as a treater and then they used
[8] me as the expert in a malpractice case which has
[9] subsequently settled.
[10] Q: For the patient?
[11] A: Yes.
[12] Q: What was the issue in that case,
[13] sentence or less?
[14] A: The issue was head trauma.
[15] Q: When before that did you last give a
[16] deposition for a plaintiff in a malpractice
[17] case?
[18] A: I don't recall.
[19] Q: Have you ever testified at trial for a
[20] plaintiff in a medical malpractice case?
[21] A: No.
[22] Q: How many times have you testified at
[23] trial in a medical malpractice case for a doctor
[24] or hospital?

Page 137

[1] A: I'd say about half a dozen times,
[2] probably less than ten, in that kind of range.
[3] Q: Have any of those aside from the one
[4] cauda equina case we talked about involve the
[5] issues in this case or relate to the issues in
[6] this case?
[7] A: No.
[8] Q: In terms of the number of cases, it's
[9] still the overwhelming majority that would be
[10] for the defense in a malpractice case as opposed
[11] to the plaintiff? If you look —
[12] A: If terms of testimony, yes. In my
[13] previous life I've been sent cases to analyze by
[14] plaintiff's attorneys, an occasional case. So
[15] in terms of case volume forgetting about
[16] depositions, at one time it was more like 50/50
[17] or maybe in terms of the plaintiffs; but a lot
[18] of those settled, and I never had to give a
[19] deposition and never testified at trial for
[20] them.
[21] Q: What do you expect — tax time is just
[22] completed. What did you make last year from
[23] your legal work approximately?
[24] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

Page 138

[1] BY THE WITNESS:
[2] A: In terms of total money or in terms of
[3] percentage or what?
[4] BY MR. LINTON:
[5] Q: Let's start with both.
[6] MR. TORGERSON: If can you segregate it,
[7] please do so.
[8] BY THE WITNESS:
[9] A: Well, I think total revenues from
[10] legal cases were about in the year 2000
[11] somewhere between \$60,000 and \$70,000.
[12] BY MR. LINTON:
[13] Q: In terms of percentage?
[14] A: It all depends on net income or gross
[15] income, things like that. It would be about 20,
[16] 25 percent.
[17] Q: Of net or gross?
[18] A: Gross. I should have my accountant in
[19] here.
[20] MR. TORGERSON: Don't suggest it.
[21] MR. LINTON: He'll be next.
[22] BY MR. LINTON:
[23] Q: Are you still doing any insurance
[24] examinations or examinations for any

Page 138

[1] governmental entity?
[2] A: No.
[3] Q: When was the last time you were
[4] involved in that sort of work?
[5] A: Unless, of course, you consider the
[6] University of Illinois a governmental entity.
[7] Q: Well, separate from that. I mean in
[8] terms of insurance exams or Workers' Comp,
[9] Social Security, anything of that sort?
[10] A: Anything that I do along those lines,
[11] anything that involves seeing a patient is
[12] clinical work, and it all goes through the
[13] University of Illinois. I don't do anything
[14] independently other than looking at some
[15] records.
[16] Q: In case reviews like this case?
[17] A: Right.
[18] Q: Has there been anything else you've
[19] been asked to do between now and trial in this
[20] case?
[21] A: No.
[22] Q: Kind of going backwards, as you may or
[23] may not know our local court rules require that
[24] you give notice of all of the opinions that you

Page 140

[1] hold in a case in your report and in
[2] deposition. I want to make sure I leave here
[3] today with all of your opinions.
[4] Do you have any other opinions in this
[5] case that we've not covered either in your
[6] report or in your deposition here today?
[7] A: Well, it's a little bit of a hard
[8] question to answer. I know you need to get the
[9] opinions, but for instance, look at all these
[10] flags on these depositions. I flagged them
[11] because either I had a little opinion or thought
[12] something about each little point.
[13] Q: Let's start.
[14] A: I'd have to say that I think most of
[15] the gist of things I've been able to get out
[16] here. I think I've made it very clear that the
[17] preliminary report that I gave did not express
[18] all of my opinion — I had a lot more opinions
[19] about, for instance, the definition of cauda
[20] equina syndrome and how Ms. Pikkel's condition
[21] related to that.
[22] So I think I've given most of my
[23] opinions, but for instance, if I'm asked, do
[24] agree with Dr. So-so about this particular

Page 141

[1] issue, it might trigger another opinion.
[2] Q: I want to make sure I know all those
[3] opinions. I'm happy to go through these
[4] depositions with the tabs and tell us what the
[5] significance of the tabs are and what additional
[6] opinions, if any, you have.

[7] A: Okay. Can I take a little break.
[8] (WHEREUPON, a recess was had.)

[9] BY MR. LINTON:

[10] Q: I don't want to be surprised at
[11] trial.

[12] A: We want to give all the opinions.

[13] Q: If there's anything else you have, I
[14] want to know about now because it's the last
[15] time we talk before trial. If it means going
[16] line by line every piece of record, I'll stay as
[17] long as you want to or come back. If it's just
[18] a matter of focus —

[19] MR. TORGERSON: It isn't a matter of staying
[20] as long as you want to. He's indicated that he
[21] has annotated his depositions which we've now
[22] been looking at, we've looking over for the last
[23] three hours.

[24] MR. LINTON: I haven't looked at any

Page 143

[1] you may want to know about.

[2] Q: Lee's start if we can with

[3] Dr. Spanner's deposition and just note the page
[4] you have tabbed, and tell us the significance,
[5] if any, of any of those pages in terms of your
[6] opinions.

[7] MS. GORCZYNSKI: What deposition are we
[8] starting with?

[9] MR. LINTON: Dr. Spanner.

[10] MR. TORGERSON: Every page or every page
[11] that —

[12] MR. LINTON: Every page that matters in
[13] terms of any of his opinions.

[14] BY THE WITNESS:

[15] A: Well, I would say — I'm going to move
[16] closer the speaker. Looking at Dr. Spanner's
[17] deposition, I mean, most of it if not all of
[18] it — I'm going to go through it kind of
[19] quickly — but I agree with him. So in most of
[20] these tags they were key points in which I was
[21] in agreement with him.

[22] BY MR. LINTON:

[23] Q: Could you just for the record identify
[24] the pages that you've tabbed.

Page 142

[1] depositions.

[2] MR. TORGERSON: You certainly had the
[3] opportunity.

[4] MR. LINTON: They're here.

[5] MR. TORGERSON: He had — and you chose to
[6] proceed the way you do. I'm not criticizing.

[7] (WHEREUPON, a recess was had.)

[8] BY MR. LINTON:

[9] Q: I'll try to speed this up, but I
[10] believe I've covered the opinions that you have
[11] given. I understand that obviously the opinions
[12] that you have today conflict to some extent with
[13] the deposition testimony of other witnesses in
[14] this case, in particular Dr. Bell and Dr. Yates,
[15] our emergency room expert.

[16] But if there are any new additional
[17] opinions that you have based on these tabs, I
[18] want to cover those. If it's simply that you
[19] disagree because you've given the opinion why
[20] already, we don't need to get into that.

[21] A: I think I understand the question is
[22] to get out my opinions, and I think that if I
[23] just kind of skim through these, it will refresh
[24] my memory about other opinions I may have that

Page 144

[1] A: Yeah. I tagged 31 and 32 and 33 and
[2] 35 and 38. A lot of these tags, though, are
[3] just for important points in the case such as it
[4] may be an L5-S1 herniated disk, something like
[5] that, and a witness or someone that was deposed
[6] might have said that so I may have tagged that.
[7] It doesn't really reflect on a major opinion of
[8] mine.

[9] But to continue 39, 43, 44, 47, 56,
[10] 57, 60, 63, 74, 77, 79, 83, 85, 87. I was
[11] noticing things like his knowledge of neurology
[12] and so forth which was good. I was agreeing
[13] with most of his opinions, for instance, about
[14] cauda equina. A particular thing was that I was
[15] aware that he was knowledgeable about the things
[16] that could possibly cause urinary retention
[17] which was the diagnosis obviously of Ms. Pikkel
[18] in this case when she presented to him.

[19] He confirmed in his deposition the
[20] 26-hour time frame of the urinary retention. He
[21] did appropriately on Page 56 include cauda
[22] equina syndrome is part of the differential
[23] diagnosis for Ms. Pikkel. I don't know if this
[24] is the kind of information you want.

Page 145

[1] Q: That's okay, yes.
[2] A: I thought that his knowledge of what
[3] the cauda equina was and his understanding of
[4] the time frame was good. I think his treatment
[5] of putting the Foley in obviously was
[6] appropriate. He said he did a neurologic
[7] examination.
[8] There was this issue of tweaking of
[9] the nerve roots. It's an op
[10] agree that can occur. As a
[11] might also be called to use a medical term
[12] instead of the more understandable laymen's term
[13] it might be called a neuropraxia.
[14] Q: Bruising of the nerve?
[15] A: No, praxia means a temporary nerve or
[16] nerve root injury.
[17] Q: How can one determine whether it's a
[18] neuropraxia versus external damage of the nerve?
[19] A: Neuropraxia is going to resolve more
[20] quickly.
[21] Q: But there is no way to know at the
[22] time she presents to the ER whether it is a
[23] condition that will resolve or a condition that
[24] will become permanent, correct, because as of

Page 146

[1] that point of time absent an MRI?
[2] A: As far as the bladder problem, true,
[3] but I think he could also use that in terms of
[4] the numbness. The numbness when he saw her in
[5] the emergency room, meaning Spanner which would
[6] be the first emergency room visit, the numbness
[7] had resolved.
[8] Q: If you believe Dr. Spanner?
[9] A: Correct. So my opinion that I'm
[10] conveying to you today is that the explanation
[11] of tweaking or a neuropraxia for a transient
[12] numbness I believe is valid.
[13] Q: But you know he's now wrong?
[14] A: I'm sorry?
[15] Q: You know he's wrong, it wasn't just a
[16] tweaking of the nerve?
[17] A: Well, you have to discriminate — no,
[18] I can't agree with that. To explain my answer
[19] you have to discriminate what nerve is being
[20] tweaked. Now, the nerve or the nerve root going
[21] to the bladder was permanently damaged, and
[22] that's what I said in my report.
[23] Q: So there was no tweaking of the nerve
[24] as it relates to the bladder?

Page 147

[1] A: I wouldn't say that was tweaked. I
[2] would say that was permanently damaged.
[3] Q: So Dr. Spanner was wrong to say that
[4] it was simply a tweaking of the nerve that lead
[5] to her urinary retention?
[6] A: Let me look at what he said.
[7] MR. TORGERSON: Let me interpose an
[8] objection.
[9] BY MR. LINTON:
[10] Q: You don't need to look at the exact
[11] time. Assume that if one was of the opinion
[12] during the first presentation that it was merely
[13] a tweaking of the nerve that caused the urinary
[14] tension, that would be incorrect?
[15] A: You have to put yourself back into
[16] 1996 in the emergency room.
[17] Q: No. We know that that was wrong,
[18] correct?
[19] MR. TORGERSON: I'm going to —
[20] BY MR. LINTON:
[21] Q: I'm not talking about what he knew —
[22] MR. TORGERSON: — interpose an a
[23] objection.
[24] BY MR. LINTON:

Page 148

[1] Q: — or should have known. I'm talking
[2] about the facts.
[3] The reality is it was not a tweaking
[4] of the nerve that caused the urinary retention,
[5] correct?
[6] A: I think it was valid as part of the
[7] differential diagnosis. I think it was — I
[8] think at this time it was a very real
[9] possibility. But now with hindsight and in my
[10] opinion, as you know I have said, I believe that
[11] the damage to the nerve roots going to the
[12] bladder was not a tweak but was permanent and
[13] that it had been going on for 26 hours.
[14] Q: Likewise, if the numbness had not
[15] resolved, then that, too, was not due to a
[16] tweaking of the nerve but due to the disk
[17] herniation?
[18] A: Now, it could be both. In other
[19] words, a disk herniation could cause a tweak or
[20] a neuropraxia. So I think for the numbness that
[21] was present and then resolved, tweaking or
[22] neuropraxia was correct.
[23] Q: Assume it does not resolve, assuming
[24] the time she presented to the ER visit number 1

Page 149

[1] she, in fact, had perineal knee numbness
[2] still. If that's the case, could that still be
[3] at that point simply a neuropraxia or is that
[4] due to more serious damage to the nerve roots
[5] caused by disk herniation following chiropractic
[6] manipulation?

[7] A: It still could be a neuropraxia at
[8] that time.

[9] Q: If it is neuropraxia at that time,
[10] isn't that all the more reason to get in there
[11] and do surgery to relieve the pressure off the
[12] nerve root?

[13] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

BY THE WITNESS:

[15] A: No, that doesn't really follow
[16] logically because a neuropraxia is a transient
[17] deficit. By definition the neuropraxia is going
[18] to resolve without surgery. Do you see what I
[19] mean? So no.

BY MR. LINTON:

[21] Q: Doctor, if the tweaking of the nerve
[22] was part of differential and the cauda equina
[23] syndrome was also part of their differential,
[24] isn't a doctor required first to rule out the

Page 151

[1] once again, go ahead and answer.

BY THE WITNESS:

[3] A: What he did was his history and
[4] neurologic exam, and the patient did not have
[5] the manifestations of cauda equina syndrome.

BY MR. LINTON:

[7] Q: You would agree that if he did not do
[8] a neurological exam, that that, in fact, would
[9] have been below the standard of care because he
[10] could then not have ruled out cauda equina?

[11] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[12] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Objection.

BY MR. LINTON:

[14] Q: Would it have been appropriate?

[15] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

BY THE WITNESS:

[17] A: He did a neurologic exam.

BY MR. LINTON:

[19] Q: How do you know that, Doctor?

[20] I'm not going to ask you to take
[21] sides. Assume that he did not.

[22] A: I'm waiting for a question.

[23] Q: Assume that he did not do a neurologic
[24] exam, what did he do to rule out cauda equina

Page 150

[1] more serious condition that can be treated
[2] surgically before he goes and makes the
[3] conclusion it's simply a tweaking of the nerve?

[4] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

BY THE WITNESS:

[6] A: It depends on the individual
[7] situation, and keeping it on this case, no, I
[8] don't think he was obligated to do an MRI. I
[9] already answered that.

BY MR. LINTON:

[11] Q: What did he do to rule out cauda
[12] equina syndrome from his differential? How did
[13] he rule that out?

[14] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[15] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Objection.

BY THE WITNESS:

[17] A: Cauda equina syndrome, I'll go through
[18] this again. I hate to beat a dead horse too.

BY MR. LINTON:

[20] Q: He used that term, Doctor. What did
[21] Dr. Spanner do to rule out the cauda equina
[22] syndrome that he had on his differential?

[23] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; this has been
[24] asked and answered. But since it's been asked

Page 152

[1] syndrome?

[2] MR. TORGERSON: Note an objection.

BY THE WITNESS:

[4] A: I've asked this many times, cauda
[5] equina syndrome is a clinical presentation. She
[6] did not have cauda equina syndrome.

BY MR. LINTON:

[8] Q: So he was wrong to put that on his
[9] differential, which one is it, Doctor?

[10] You said you agree it should have been
[11] on his differential. Now you're saying it
[12] shouldn't be on his differential.

[13] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

BY THE WITNESS:

[15] A: I think the differential you could
[16] make very broad. I mean, in your differential
[17] you could include infection, leprosy. The
[18] differential is big.

BY MR. LINTON:

[20] Q: Would you include leprosy here,
[21] Doctor?

[22] A: Well, I think leprosy might be a
[23] possible cause of cauda equina syndrome.

[24] Q: Would that be on your differential?

Page 153

[1] A: I was trying to answer a question by
[2] making a point. In a differential diagnosis,
[3] you keep it — you keep it broad and you think
[4] about all these different things, but what you
[5] treat is the patient. The treatment that was
[6] given putting in the catheter I think was the
[7] appropriate treatment.

[8] BY MR. LINTON:

[9] Q: How did putting in a
[10] catheter — assuming he did not do a neuro exam,
[11] how did putting in a catheter rule out cauda
[12] equina syndrome from his differential diagnosis?

[13] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[14] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Objection.

[15] BY THE WITNESS:

[16] A: You're asking me a question that
[17] doesn't make any sense.

[18] BY MR. LINTON:

[19] Q: Because what he did doesn't make any
[20] sense, Doctor.

[21] MR. RUFF: Objection.

[22] BY MR. LINTON:

[23] Q: If it's on his differential and he
[24] doesn't do a neurologic examination, he hasn't

Page 154

[1] That doesn't say anything about the
[2] lumbar disk, but it says — it speaks to the
[3] fact of someone having cauda equina syndrome or
[4] not.

[5] BY MR. LINTON:

[6] Q: Well, I think we're arguing over
[7] semantics I understand they are very important
[8] to you. Hear me out, I understand that you're
[9] using a medical, technical definition of cauda
[10] equina syndrome. Let's call it lumbar disk
[11] herniation.

[12] What did Dr. Spanner do to rule out a
[13] lumbar disk herniation during the first visit to
[14] the ER?

[15] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[16] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Objection.

[17] BY THE WITNESS:

[18] A: Same answer, he took the history of
[19] the patient and did the examination focused on
[20] the problem that the patient came in with.

[21] BY MR. LINTON:

[22] Q: Now, assuming he did not do a
[23] neurologic examination, did not check with
[24] pinprick sensation, did not do a rectal

Page 154

[1] ruled it out. If he doesn't do an MRI, he
[2] hasn't ruled it out; isn't that right?

[3] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[4] BY THE WITNESS:

[5] A: No —

[6] BY MR. LINTON:

[7] Q: Let me ask it this way.

[8] A: — he can rule out cauda equina —

[9] MR. TORGERSON: Wait a minute, the doctor is
[10] trying to answer one of your last several
[11] questions.

[12] BY THE WITNESS:

[13] A: He can rule out cauda equina syndrome
[14] simply with a question. Let me illustrate this,
[15] cauda equina syndrome as we've gone through the
[16] very beginning is a collection of different
[17] findings, okay. If those findings are absent,
[18] if a person does not have pain — really if you
[19] come right down to it if you're talking about
[20] cauda equina syndrome in the strictest sense, if
[21] you ask the patient, are you in pain, and they
[22] say, no, you could make an argument for the fact
[23] that the person doesn't have cauda equina
[24] syndrome.

Page 155

[1] examination, what then did he do to rule out a
[2] lumbar disk herniation?

[3] MR. TORGERSON: Object to the hypothetical
[4] assumptions.

[5] BY THE WITNESS:

[6] A: Same answer, he took the history and
[7] examined the patients extremities and did an
[8] examination that he thought was appropriate.

[9] BY MR. LINTON:

[10] Q: But the appropriate examination for a
[11] patient in whom you suspect a lumbar disk
[12] herniation as a possible cause of urinary
[13] retention is to do a rectal exam and to check
[14] for perineal numbness, right? Isn't that what's
[15] required to do a proper exam?

[16] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[17] BY THE WITNESS:

[18] A: No, this patient was not even having
[19] back pain, was not having leg pain. He would
[20] have had to have been psychic to —

[21] Q: To do a simple examination?

[22] A: — think she had a lumbar
[23] radiculopathy or a lumbar disk herniation. This
[24] was an unusual presentation for you want to call

Page 157

[1] it a cauda equina syndrome. He did what was
[2] appropriate. With hindsight we know that she
[3] had to have disk surgery the next day.
[4] Q: Would it have been unreasonable for
[5] him to do a rectal exam and for him to do a
[6] pinprick examination for sensation of the
[7] perineal area?
[8] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[9] BY THE WITNESS:
[10] A: Would it have been unreasonable? I
[11] don't think the patient necessarily would have
[12] liked it, but —
[13] BY MR. LINTON:
[14] Q: I think she would have liked it very
[15] much, Doctor, if it had led to the diagnosis of
[16] her disk herniation and led her to have an
[17] earlier surgery that Dr. Bell, her treating
[18] surgeon, said would have made a difference in
[19] her outcome. I think she would have appreciated
[20] that very much.
[21] A That's a statement. I need a
[22] question.
[23] MR. TORGERSON: I don't think you can
[24] respond to that.

Page 158

[1] BY MR. LINTON:
[2] Q: Would it have been unreasonable for
[3] him to do an MRI?
[4] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[5] answered.
[6] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Objection.
[7] BY THE WITNESS:
[8] A: I don't think an MRI was indicated
[9] based on the presentation that day with
[10] Dr. Spanner.
[11] BY MR. LINTON:
[12] Q: Would it have been unreasonable?
[13] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[14] BY THE WITNESS:
[15] A: I think in most — I don't know if it
[16] would have even been approved because there was
[17] not an indication to do an MRI.
[18] BY MR. LINTON:
[19] Q: Approved by whom, by an insurance
[20] company?
[21] A: Yeah.
[22] Q: Assume that the patient would pay for
[23] it anyway, would it be unreasonable for a doctor
[24] to order it?

Page 159

[1] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[2] BY THE WITNESS:
[3] A: I don't think it was indicated to
[4] order it,
[5] BY MR. LINTON:
[6] Q: Assuming a doctor suspected a disk
[7] herniation in a patient that has a 26-hour
[8] history of being unable to void, what should be
[9] done to rule that out from the differential
[10] diagnosis?
[11] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[12] BY MR. LINTON:
[13] Q: Full history, a full examination, and
[14] assuming the examination shows persistent
[15] perineal numbness and a lack of rectal tone, at
[16] that point would an MRI be appropriate?
[17] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[18] BY THE WITNESS:
[19] A: Yes.
[20] BY MR. LINTON:
[21] Q: If at that point the MRI showed a disk
[22] herniation even if it was smaller than what was
[23] shown on the second ER visit, would a
[24] neurosurgical consultation be appropriate?

Page 160

[1] MR. TORGERSON: Objection,
[2] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Objection.
[3] MR. TORGERSON: Asked and answered.
[4] THE WITNESS: Could you read that question
[5] again.
[6] BY MR. LINTON:
[7] Q: I'll withdraw the question. Assume
[8] that the MRI was performed during the first ER
[9] visit and showed the same size disk herniation,
[10] we can agree then a neurosurgical consultation
[11] should have been done?
[12] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[13] BY THE WITNESS:
[14] A: Let me make sure I understand the
[15] question. So what you're saying is that if a
[16] patient comes into the ER with all these
[17] problems including the urinary retention,
[18] including the history of back pain, including
[19] the chiropractic manipulation.
[20] BY MR. LINTON:
[21] Q: Let me just be clear so I can lay it
[22] out for you.
[23] A: Thanks.
[24] Q: Presents in the ER with a 26 — strike

Page 161

[1] that.

[2] Presents in the ER with a 26-hour
[3] history of being unable to void following
[4] chiropractic manipulation, the physical
[5] examination is performed and shows no rectal
[6] tone, shows perineal numbness, and MRI is then
[7] order which shows the same disk herniation that
[8] was shown when the MRI in this case was taken.

[9] Assuming all of that occurred during
[10] the first ER visit, then a neurosurgical
[11] consultation should have been obtained —

[12] MR. TORGERSON: Objection

[13] BY MR. LINTON:

[14] Q: — correct?

[15] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[16] BY THE WITNESS:

[17] A: If we see all those things, I would
[18] say, yes.

[19] BY MR. LINTON:

[20] Q: I interrupted you when you were going
[21] through Dr. Spanner's deposition. Could you
[22] pick up when where you left off.

[23] A: I think I was done with it.

[24] Q: How about Dr. Bell's deposition?

Page 162

[1] A: Well, I've marked about probably 100
[2] pages on this. In prefacing going through these
[3] depositions, you said that you assumes opinions
[4] different than —

[5] Q: That's all I want to know about.

[6] A: — Dr. Bell. So I would agree —

[7] Q: I just want to make sure that there's
[8] nothing in these tabs that is going to trigger
[9] in you a new opinion that we haven't covered
[10] during the deposition today.

[11] A: Give me a few minutes to scan through
[12] this. Let me just see if there's going to be
[13] any new opinions.

[14] MR. LINTON: Linda, I'm assuming you don't
[15] have any questions or do you?

[16] MS. GORCZYNSKI: I do not.

[17] BY THE WITNESS:

[18] A: For instance, this could be an
[19] important point. This opinion that if she had
[20] been operated on 9-4-96 her chances of having
[21] recovered without residual bowel and bladder
[22] problems with have improved to approximately 80
[23] percent. In my opinion and I don't think the
[24] medical literature and our knowledge as

Page 16

[1] neurosurgeons would support coming up with a
[2] figure such as 80 percent, 55 percent.

[3] BY MR. LINTON:

[4] Q: Would support any figure?

[5] A: It would not support a specific
[6] figure, that is correct. So that's an important
[7] opinion to come out.

[8] Q: You've made a distinction in your
[9] report and in your testimony today between the
[10] return of function or full function versus the
[11] return of any function. With reasonable medical
[12] probability wouldn't you expect there to be with
[13] prompt surgery and, let's say, 35 hours versus
[14] 48 hours there to be the return of some
[15] function?

[16] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[17] BY THE WITNESS:

[18] A: Well, with the bladder it's pretty
[19] much either working or it's not. You'd have to
[20] ask a urologist exactly about trying to
[21] quantitate it and if some medicines may be able
[22] to help. For instance, you know, if Ms. Pikkel
[23] is still having some bladder problems today, I
[24] don't know if she's on medicine for that. I

Page 16

[1] don't know if she's been evaluated for that. I
[2] recommend she be evaluated for that to see if
[3] there are some medicines that could help her
[4] situation. That's another opinion, that's
[5] true.

[6] BY MR. LINTON:

[7] Q: You didn't know that she was still
[8] self-catheterizing 10 to 15 times a day in order
[9] to urinate? Do you recall seeing that in her
[10] deposition?

[11] MR. TORGERSON: That deposition goes back to
[12] 1999 or 2000. We'd like to take her deposition
[13] again, but I think you've resisted that.

[14] MR. LINTON: I think the doctor also said
[15] that after 1999 he would not have expected any
[16] further improvement.

[17] MR. TORGERSON: I'm not sure he did.

[18] MR. LINTON: With reasonable medical
[19] certainty.

[20] BY THE WITNESS:

[21] A: If that, in fact, is happening that
[22] she is having to catheterize herself, you know,
[23] I would really hope that she is under the care
[24] of a urologist so that if there is anything that

Page 165

[1] can be done to help that that would be done.
[2] That's my opinion about that.
[3] Dr. Bell on Page 75 answered that he
[4] had no problem with Dr. Spanner, I agree with
[5] that.

[6] BY MR. LINTON:

[7] Q: I believe that's a mischaracterization
[8] of his testimony.

[9] A: Well, you guys can figure that out.
[10] I'm just giving my opinions.

[11] Q: Did you continue reading on
[12] page — strike that.

[13] Go ahead, Doctor.

[14] A: Well, I want to draw attention to this
[15] time frame on Page 111 of Dr. Bell's deposition,
[16] and this is something we haven't covered. When
[17] she showed up in the emergency room on September
[18] 5, 1996, that would be the second time, it was
[19] about a seven-hour time period between when she
[20] came in and when the surgery was started.

[21] So I'm not being critical of that
[22] seven hour delay because as, you know, it's my
[23] opinion that if this surgery had been done at
[24] three hours, four hours it wouldn't have made

Page 167

[1] of their availability to come and do the surgery
[2] had they been called after her first visit?

[3] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[4] BY THE WITNESS:

[5] A: Well, I wouldn't give a blanket answer
[6] that I would defer to Dr. Bell. I'm just only
[7] pointing out an opinion that additional time
[8] which you've recognized would have to be added
[9] to any possible intervention. Would I defer to
[10] Dr. Bell, that would depend. You would have to
[11] ask me specifically what I would defer to him
[12] about. I've already admitted in this deposition
[13] the way he did the procedure, I'm not critical
[14] that.

[15] BY MR. LINTON:

[16] Q: He says he could be there within five
[17] hours or certainly within seven hours, the same
[18] time period as after the first surgery. You
[19] would not disagree with that?

[20] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[21] BY MR. LINTON:

[22] Q: You don't have any factual basis,
[23] would you?

[24] A: Well, in Illinois you should really be

Page 166

[1] any difference in her long-term outcome.
[2] But we have to realize that if it took
[3] seven hours in the middle of the day on the 5th,
[4] I think it is very likely if you're coming up
[5] with a theory in terms of any alleged injury,
[6] that you would have to add that time period or
[7] even more because it was late at night if you're
[8] going to be thinking about when the surgical
[9] intervention was done if it was done the day
[10] earlier.

[11] BY MR. LINTON:

[12] Q: It's not going to be done when she
[13] walks in the ER. You would, of course, defer to
[14] Dr. Bell who was a 40-year — had a 40-year
[15] history of being a neurosurgeon in Cleveland and
[16] was the former head of the department there, you
[17] would defer to Dr. Bell in terms of when he
[18] thought he could come in and do the surgery had
[19] he been called after the ER visit, would you
[20] not?

[21] MR. TORGERSON: Let me object.

[22] BY MR. LINTON:

[23] Q: You don't profess the workings of
[24] Meridia Hospital and Dr. Bell's group in terms

Page 168

[1] available to the ER in about an hour as a
[2] neurosurgeon if you're on call. So if he was
[3] saying I would get there in five hours, I don't
[4] know if I could defer to that. That might not
[5] be appropriate. It might depend on the patient.

[6] Q: If you were the one covering this ER
[7] on the night of the first ER, you would have
[8] been there in an hour if it was at one of your
[9] local hospitals or at your university?

[10] A: No, I said that that's the time frame
[11] in which we need to be available.

[12] Q: To respond to a call?

[13] A: Right. So if someone had urinary
[14] retention, I probably wouldn't have been called
[15] at all.

[16] Q: Let me ask this way, just based on
[17] your own clinical experience, best case scenario
[18] you're called in covering for neurosurgery that
[19] night, what would be the quickest you could get
[20] in and do surgery assuming it was indicated?

[21] MR. TORGERSON: Note an objection. But go
[22] ahead and answer.

[23] BY THE WITNESS:

[24] A: If the MRI had already been done, less

Page 169

[1] than an hour.

[2] BY MR. LINTON:

[3] Q: Less than hour you could actually be
[4] in the hospital or in the OR?

[5] A: In the hospital and in OR.

[6] Looking at Dr. Zannetti,

[7] Q: Actually, I don't care about

[8] Dr. Zannetti. You're not offering opinions on

[9] Dr. Zannetti.

[10] A: We'll leave him out. I did review
[11] Pikkel's deposition, and I found just a few
[12] things. Really the fact that the pain was
[13] different over any particular time, my opinion
[14] is that clinically that didn't really have a lot
[15] of significance.

[16] Q: The pain being the severity of the
[17] backpain?

[18] A: Yes.

[19] Q: Why would that not have clinical
[20] significance in a case of disk herniation?

[21] A: Well, I think if back pain was present
[22] enough to be a complaint, that could have
[23] significance. But if back pain is a little
[24] better, a little worse, different in character

Page 17

[1] But on the other hand, if someone says, I'm
[2] defecating on myself or my whole region is numb,
[3] I think that would have made it into the record
[4] so I'm giving that opinion.

[5] Q: The standard of care required that if
[6] there was complaint of numbness made by a
[7] patient that should have been recorded in the
[8] record and you would expect that that would have
[9] been recorded in the record, correct?

[10] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[11] BY THE WITNESS:

[12] A: If it was clinically significant. In
[13] other words —

[14] BY MR. LINTON:

[15] Q: You're saying it would have been
[16] clinically significant in this case. I'm saying
[17] if, in fact, it was made —

[18] A: There's a difference between a little
[19] numbness and, for instance, spinal anesthesia.
[20] I think you can appreciate that.

[21] If someone says, I'm a little numb
[22] back here, that might not be clinically
[23] significant. If one says, my entire genital
[24] area has no feeling and I can poke it with a pin

Page 170

[1] provided that that difference isn't radiating
[2] down the leg for instance or may be associated
[3] with another neurologic deficit, that didn't
[4] have a lot of meaning to me.

[5] Q: Assume that she actually has
[6] excruciating pain and also numbness through her
[7] mid section even before she goes to the
[8] chiropractic, would that suggest that she's
[9] starting the disk herniation or starting the
[10] compression of the nerve roots even before the
[11] manipulation occurs?

[12] A: That would be more suggestive of that,
[13] yes.

[14] Another thing is if she had — I don't
[15] remember exactly where this is in her
[16] deposition, but if she did have a very
[17] significant complaint of numbness, if that were
[18] true, I think it would have been recorded by the
[19] nurses and doctors seeing her in the emergency
[20] room.

[21] Q: You hope it would be recorded?

[22] A: I gave you an opinion saying that a
[23] doctor can't put everything that he does into
[24] the opinion — or into the record, excuse me.

Page 17:

[1] and there's nothing there, that's different.
[2] That would have made it into the medical record
[3] and that should have been in the medical record.

[4] Q: Standard of care would require that?

[5] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[6] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Objection.

[7] BY THE WITNESS:

[8] A: I'm not an emergency doctor, but as a
[9] neurosurgeon, I would have been interested in
[10] that, yes.

[11] I note in her deposition, and this is
[12] important, that she has not had as of the time
[13] that this was done a repeat cystoscopy or
[14] urodynamic study. I think if she's going to say
[15] she's permanently injured or to what extent
[16] she's injured, I think that should be done.
[17] That's an opinion. Now whether it will get
[18] done, I don't know.

[19] The only two things I've got left is
[20] Villarosa who really I had no criticism of what
[21] he did, and I don't think anyone else did
[22] either. The plaintiff's ER doctor, I'm not an
[23] ER doctor. I'm looking at these opinions
[24] through the eyes of a neurosurgeon obviously. I

Page 173

[1] disagree with some things.
[2] Q: In all fairness then you're not in a
[3] position to say whether or not Dr. Spanner met
[4] or deviated from the standard of care, are you?
[5] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[6] MS. GORCZYNSKI: Objection.
[7] BY MR. LINTON:
[8] Q: You're talking about this as a
[9] neurosurgeon?
[10] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.
[11] BY THE WITNESS:
[12] A: There's no doubt that I'm talking
[13] about it as a neurosurgeon, and the clinical
[14] issue in this case is neurosurgical or
[15] causation, that's another medical term — I mean
[16] a legal term, excuse me.
[17] BY MR. LINTON:
[18] Q: Let me ask it this way.
[19] MR. TORGERSON: You're interrupting him.
[20] MR. LINTON: I will interrupt him.
[21] MR. TORGERSON: You will interrupt him.
[22] MR. LINTON: I will.
[23] BY MR. LINTON:
[24] Q: I want very simply do you or do you

Page 175

[1] school. In my internship I spent I think it was
[2] two months in the emergency room just working in
[3] the emergency room. I actually moonlit or
[4] moonlighted in the emergency room during my
[5] mining working in the emergency room.
[6] Then as I mentioned as a neurosurgeon
[7] myself or my residents get called about
[8] emergency problems frequently. Saturday night
[9] is a primary example.
[10] Q: So you are able to testify then about
[11] all issues as it relates to the standards of
[12] care provided by Dr. Spanner to Bonnie Pikkel;
[13] is that your testimony?
[14] MR. TORGERSON: Note an objection.
[15] BY MR. LINTON:
[16] Q: You've gone back and forth, Doctor, in
[17] all fairness. You said, I can't defer to the
[18] doctor because I'm not an ER doctor; but when
[19] you want to give an opinion favorable to
[20] Dr. Spanner, then you say you are qualified.
[21] I want to know, are you qualified —
[22] MR. TORGERSON: Argumentative.
[23] BY MR. LINTON:
[24] Q: — across the board unequivocally to

Page 174

[1] not know the standard of care that applies to an
[2] emergency room doctor like Dr. Spanner under
[3] those circumstances when he saw Bonnie Pikkel?
[4] MR. TORGERSON: Note an objection.
[5] BY THE WITNESS:
[6] A: I do for this problem because as a
[7] neurosurgeon I'm called into the emergency room
[8] all the time. If a patient has a neurologic
[9] problem, in my career I have to go in there and
[10] interact with the emergency room physicians,
[11] absolutely. So in a situation like this, I can
[12] give an opinion
[13] BY MR. LINTON:
[14] Q: I see.
[15] A: But there's no doubt that I'm not an
[16] emergency room doctor, and there's other experts
[17] that are talking about that.
[18] So I do have some criticisms of the
[19] plaintiff's emergency room expert.
[20] Q: Tell me what experience and training
[21] you have with respect to the standards of the
[22] care of an emergency room doctor.
[23] A: Sure, I mean, emergency room medicine
[24] and emergency situations are covered in medical

Page 176

[1] the standard of care by Dr. Spanner or are you
[2] not?
[3] MR. TORGERSON: Argumentative, asked and
[4] answer, mis leading.
[5] BY THE WITNESS:
[6] A: I think as it relates to this case I
[7] can give an opinion.
[8] BY MR. LINTON:
[9] Q: On all issues as it relates to
[10] Dr. Spanner's treatment to Bonnie Pikkel during
[11] the ER during her first visit?
[12] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[13] answered.
[14] BY THE WITNESS:
[15] A: Can I ask a point of clarification,
[16] what do you mean by all issues? Do you mean the
[17] emergency room physician call schedule for that
[18] day?
[19] BY MR. LINTON:
[20] Q: I'm talking about anything that he did
[21] in his history, examination, diagnosis or
[22] misdiagnosis, and treatment of Bonnie Bikkel
[23] during this first visit.
[24] A: I'm qualified.

Page 177

[1] Q: You're **qualified** and you're confident
[2] that you know the standard of care that applied
[3] to an ER doctor like Dr. Spanner under those
[4] circumstances?

[5] MR. TORGERSON: Objection; asked and
[6] answered.

[7] BY THE WITNESS:

[8] A: I can be an expert about that, of
[9] course.

[10] BY MR. LINTON:

[11] Q: Have you ever been **qualified in any**
[12] court to give expert testimony on the standard
[13] of care as that applies to an emergency room
[14] physician?

[15] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[16] BY THE WITNESS:

[17] A: What does that mean being **qualified in**
[18] a court?

[19] BY MR. LINTON:

[20] Q: Has the court allowed you to testify
[21] on that **issue on the standard of care that**
[22] applies to an emergency room doctor?

[23] MR. TORGERSON: Objection.

[24] BY THE WITNESS:

Page 178

[1] A: I have given testimony, yes, in court
[2] about emergency room issues as they relate to
[3] neurological surgery, yes.

[4] BY MR. LINTON:

[5] Q: Specifically whether an ER doctor met
[6] or violated the standard of care of an ER doctor
[7] under those circumstances?

[8] A: Yes.

[9] Q: I'm sorry I interrupted you when you
[10] were going through the deposition.

[11] MR. LINTON: You forgot your flaccid
[12] objection by the way.

[13] MR. TORGERSON: Once is enough.

[14] BY THE WITNESS:

[15] A: You know, do you want me to read the
[16] pages where I tagged Yate's deposition?

[17] BY MR. LINTON:

[18] Q: Yes?

[19] A: 7.

[20] Q: And if those represent any new
[21] opinions, please let us know.

[22] A: 7, 10, 15, 34, 49, 56, 73, 76. Let's
[23] look at 76 because I disagree with this, and we
[24] might as well just get it out here. Dr. Yates

Page 178

[1] alleges that perhaps Dr. Spanner had fallen into
[2] the trap of finding a possible explanation that
[3] was benign and talked himself out of ruling out
[4] a more dangerous cause of the symptoms. He
[5] continues. I want to point out that I disagree
[6] with that.

[7] Q: Why do you disagree?

[8] A: Because from my looking at the record
[9] and understanding what was going on with

[10] Ms. Pikkel at that time even separate from the
[11] issue of what Dr. Spanner said in his
[12] deposition, I don't think it was a matter of him
[13] talking himself, for instance, out of the
[14] possibility of cauda equina syndrome. She
[15] didn't have cauda equina syndrome.

[16] Q: I think Dr. Yates —

[17] A: No talking out was necessary.

[18] Q: I think Dr. Yates was saying there
[19] that on the differential was a temporary
[20] condition versus a permanent condition that
[21] could have been or would have been corrected by
[22] surgery and that it was a mistake for the doctor
[23] to go with the temporary condition as opposed to
[24] the ruling out the more serious correctable

Page 180

[1] condition; i.e., the lumbar disk herniation as
[2] opposed to a merely tweaking of the nerve.

[3] A: And in general if you're just try to
[4] get my opinion, I disagree with his line of
[5] thinking.

[6] Q: Why is that?

[7] A: Mostly because she just had the
[8] urinary retention without the other things that
[9] would make — but you've gotten this opinion out
[10] of me already, that part of it.

[11] The emergency room doctor here
[12] mentions on Page 91 — you know, I may have
[13] skipped a couple of flagged pages. Let me see,
[14] let me put those into the record, 86, 77. I
[15] think that covers it.

[16] It's talking about the neurosurgeon.

[17] This is an emergency room doctor expert talking
[18] about the issue of the neurosurgeon dealing with
[19] causation. So I want to point that out, that's
[20] why I can be involved here.

[21] Q: So you can criticize him but he can't
[22] criticize you?

[23] A: He can criticize me. That's for the
[24] jury to decide I guess and the court system.

Page 181

[1] Really that's all I have.
[2] MR. LINTON: Thank you. That's all the
[3] questions I have at this time.
[4] MR. TORGERSON: Is that it?
[5] MR. RUFF: Linda, nothing at your end?
[6] MS. GORCZYNSKI: No questions.
[7] THE WITNESS: I better read.
[8] MR. TORGERSON: We'll order it and read it.
[9] MR. LINTON: A is the reports. B was your
[10] old CV. October '98 CV. C your current CV. D
[11] is your file. I marked D 1, D 2 and D 3
[12] individual records from that file. I think that
[13] covers it.
[14] FURTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT.

Page 183

[1] STATE OF ILLINOIS)
[2]) SS:
[3] COUNTY OF COOK)
[4] I, LORIANNE McGUIRE, a Notary Public
[5] within and for the County of Cook, State of
[6] Illinois, and a Certified Shorthand Reporter of
[7] the State of Illinois, do hereby certify:
[8] That previous to the commencement of
[9] the examination of the witness herein, the
[10] witness was duly sworn to testify the whole
[11] truth concerning the matters herein;
[12] That the foregoing deposition
[13] transcript was reported stenographically by me,
[14] was thereafter transcribed under my personal
[15] direction and constitutes a true, complete and
[16] correct record of the testimony given and the
[17] proceedings had;
[18] That the said deposition was taken
[19] before me at the time and place specified;
[20] That I am not a relative or employee
[21] or attorney or counsel, nor a relative or
[22] employee of such attorney or counsel for any of
[23] the parties hereto, nor interested directly or
[24] indirectly in the outcome of this action.

Page 182

[1] IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO
[2] COMMON PLEAS COURT
[3] BONNIE PIKKEL, ET AL,)
[4] Plaintiffs)
[5] vs.) No. 326207
[6] MARK ZANNETTI, D.C., ET AL,))
[7] Defendants.)
[8] I hereby certify that I have read the
[9] foregoing transcript of my deposition given at
[10] the time and place aforesaid, consisting of
[11] Pages 1 to 181 inclusive, and I do again
[12] subscribe and make oath that the same is a true,
[13] correct and complete transcript of my deposition
[14] so given as aforesaid, and includes changes, if
[15] any, so made by me.
[16]
[17] HERBERT H. ENGELHARD, M.D.
[18] SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO
[19] before me this day
[20] of , A.D. 200 .
[21] Notary Public

Page 184

[1] IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto set
[2] my hand and affix my seal of office at Chicago,
[3] Illinois, this 30th day of April, 2001.
[4]
[5]
[6] Notary Public, Cook County,
[7] Illinois.
[8] My commission expires 2-16-05.
[9]
[10]
[11]
[12] C.S.R. Certificate No. 84-4269.
[13]
[14]
[15]
[16]
[17]
[18]
[19]
[20]
[21]
[22]
[23]
[24]

Page 18

[1] INDEX
[2] WITNESS EXAMINATION
[3] HERBERT H. ENGELHARD
[4] By Mr. Linton 4
[5]
[6] EXHIBITS
[7] NUMBER PAGE/LINE
[8] Nos. A-C 4
[9] Nos. D, D1-D3 120
[10]
[11]
[12]
[13]
[14]
[15]
[16]
[17]
[18]
[19]
[20]
[21]
[22]
[23]
[24]

Lawyer's Notes

8

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem.

2. The second step is to gather the facts and information relevant to the problem.

3. The third step is to analyze the facts and information to determine the cause of the problem.

4.

5. The fourth step is to develop a plan of action to solve the problem.

6.

7. The fifth step is to implement the plan of action and monitor the results.

8. The sixth step is to evaluate the results and make adjustments as needed.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13. The final step is to document the results of the process.

14.

15. The final step is to document the results of the process.

<p>\$</p> <p>\$315,000 124:16 \$400 131:21 \$60,000 138:11 \$600 131:23 \$70,000 138:11 \$800 131:14</p>	<p>35 144:2; 163:13 350 124:17 36 115:16 38 144:2 39 144:9</p>	<p>9</p> <p>9-4-96 65:14; 108:1; 162:20 9-5-96 75:20 90 125:14 91 180:12 931 57:8 98 181:10 99 122:9</p>	<p>advancement 122:14 advisable 68:7; 71:7 affected 69:16 afternoon 4:14 Again 15:4; 22:23; 29:4; 16; 31:20; 36:18; 41:7; 42:4; 45:10; 50:13; 55:22; 56:2; 58:3; 64:8; 72:22; 79:5; 82:14; 84:6; 86:19; 90:19; 92:2; 98:14; 112:5; 16; 129:10; 150:18; 151:1; 160:5; 164:13 age 106:16 ago 4:15; 29:17; 31:21; 22; 40:22; 132:10; 133:10 agree 16:4, 8; 20:6; 22:18; 56:21; 64:18; 69:19; 71:2; 19; 20; 72:8; 83:10; 84:22; 93:1; 108:22; 111:20; 140:24; 143:19; 145:10; 146:18; 151:7; 152:10; 160:10; 162:6; 165:4 agreed 11:7 agreeing 144:12 agreement 13:11; 143:21 ahead 6:12; 17:22; 20:9; 17; 27:7; 28:11; 29:21; 30:9; 31:12; 35:18; 47:17; 51:7; 54:15; 59:21; 83:1; 113:4; 130:18; 151:1; 165:13; 168:22 alleged 32:8; 166:5 alleges 179:1 allowed 177:20 almost 88:5 along 33:18; 127:14; 139:10 although 7:2; 106:14; 113:9 ambiguous 104:20 amount 90:8; 127:12; 129:21, 23 analyze 137:13 anesthesia 171:19 annotated 141:21 annulus 21:10, 11 answered 19:15; 36:19; 38:18; 39:21; 51:16; 52:22; 53:3, 11; 65:21; 82:11, 19; 90:17; 91:11; 92:10, 20; 93:18; 103:3, 8; 104:14; 105:5; 109:4; 113:4; 114:7; 150:9, 24; 158:5; 160:3; 165:3; 176:13; 177:6 anticipate 130:17 anticipated 128:10 anticipating 68:10 antidotal 56:21; 92:2 apologize 29:17 apparent 15:21 appearance 56:8 apples 28:14</p>	<p>applied 177:2 applies 174:1; 177:13, 22 apply 104:12; 124:11 appreciate 42:16; 110:21; 171:20 appreciated 157:19 appropriate 63:1; 66:1; 17:96:1; 99:6, 10; 102:14; 113:10, 19; 116:6, 23; 117:4; 145:6; 151:14; 153:7; 156:8, 10; 157:2; 159:16, 24; 168:5 appropriately 95:13; 144:21 approved 158:16, 19 approximately 31:19; 135:14; 137:23; 162:22 area 21:13; 39:3; 45:1; 48:7, 23; 64:19; 67:3, 17; 68:8, 23; 96:11; 100:17; 108:15; 109:1; 125:9; 134:17; 157:7; 171:24 areas 125:4 arguing 79:2; 155:6 argument 154:22 argumentative 80:22; 175:22; 176:3 arose 24:24 article 7:3, 16, 21; 16:24; 47:8; 48:22; 50:1, 5, 14; 51:3, 12; 52:7, 12, 16; 53:7; 55:6, 13, 19; 56:13; 17, 19, 24; 57:3, 7, 14; 70:22 articles 6:18, 22, 23, 24; 7:14, 18, 20; 8:13, 17, 19; 22; 9:5, 11, 13, 17, 24; 18:4; 19:17; 20:20, 24; 46:24; 49:22; 50:8, 20, 21; 51:18, 22; 52:7; 53:2, 17; 18, 22; 54:4, 8, 14, 17, 24; 55:3, 12; 57:22; 58:5 artificial 48:12; 86:4 Aside 5:7; 8:12; 44:4; 137:3 assess 37:23 assigned 122:15 assistant 122:19; 123:4 associate 122:17, 19; 123:8, 19 associated 84:20; 170:2 assume 4:22; 45:19; 79:7; 81:10; 99:14; 101:5; 122:10; 129:10; 132:16; 147:11; 148:23; 151:21; 23; 158:22; 160:7; 170:5 assumes 162:3 Assuming 28:2, 3; 60:8; 63:5, 12; 77:23; 101:11; 18; 113:8, 23; 114:1, 16; 148:23; 153:10; 155:22; 159:6, 14; 161:9; 162:14, 168:20 assumptions 156:4 attached 53:19 attempted 107:10</p>
<p>1</p> <p>1 28:15; 56:7; 115:16; 120:20; 124:18; 148:24; 181:11 10 164:8; 178:22 10-16-98 120:22 100 43:14; 162:1 11 56:10 111 165:15 12 59:10; 96:17; 97:2 15 164:8; 178:22 17 10:21 1993 7:4, 17; 55:20 1995 133:11 1996 133:11; 147:16; 165:18 1998 7:23; 121:2, 22 1999 10:21; 11:6; 164:12, 15</p>	<p>4</p> <p>4-25-01 4:5; 120:14 40-year 166:14, 14 43 144:9 44 144:9 47 144:9 48 19:18; 20:1; 32:10; 38:24; 48:11; 86:3; 163:14 49 178:22 4th 101:8</p> <p>5</p> <p>5 124:18; 165:18 50 90:13; 93:7; 98:10, 11, 12, 21; 100:13; 124:3; 133:5 50/50 126:5; 137:16 55 163:2 56 144:9, 21; 178:22 57 144:10 5th 15:24; 16:14; 17:12; 166:3</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A-C 4:3 A-h-n 55:7 able 9:16; 12:9; 20:23; 21:5; 26:11; 40:24; 63:6; 66:7; 78:1; 87:15, 24; 96:18; 140:15; 163:21; 175:10 absent 146:1; 154:17 absolutely 39:14; 53:4; 72:4; 78:16; 174:11 abstract (519; 57:18 abstracts 7:18, 20; 8:16; 49:22 academic 122:23; 130:22 academically 122:18 accept 70:16 accepting 132:24; 134:14 accident 135:2 according 15:16; 16:11; 74:11; 127:22 account 14:5, 8; 25:5 accountant 138:18 accurate 77:24; 79:9; 134:12 accurately 33:17 across 175:24 Active 134:6, 10 actively 133:19 actual 13:2; 20:2 actually 12:19; 21:4; 26:6; 35:13; 68:6, 21; 69:5; 76:12; 82:2; 91:14; 113:1; 133:14; 169:3, 7; 170:5; 175:3 acute 16:9, 13, 16; 19:12; 13, 19, 24; 36:8; 38:21; 39:2, 6; 40:4, 15, 19; 41:2, 11; 59:11; 86:8; 89:13; 105:19; 106:24; 107:20 add 47:19; 166:6 added 167:8 adding 63:14, 15; 64:3 additional 141:5; 142:16; 167:7 address 64:1; 103:15 administrative 127:1, 5 admitted 167:12</p>		
<p>2</p> <p>2 11:16; 28:16; 56:6; 121:1; 127:2; 135:6; 181:11 20 49:18; 138:15 200 126:1 2000 138:10; 164:12 2001 38:17; 121:6 2002 38:15 24 19:18; 20:1; 32:10; 48:11; 56:11; 86:3 25 121:2; 138:16 26 69:9; 73:18; 89:2; 95:18; 148:13; 160:24 26-hour 60:2; 61:9; 63:6; 116:11; 144:20; 159:7; 161:2</p>	<p>6</p> <p>6 96:16; 97:2 60 144:10 63 144:10</p> <p>7</p> <p>7 178:19, 22 72 19:18 72-hour 19:20 73 178:22 74 144:10 747 56:18 75 125:13; 126:6, 22; 133:5; 165:3 76 178:22, 23 77 144:10; 180:14 79 144:10</p>			
<p>3</p> <p>3 115:19, 23; 121:4; 124:18; 181:11 30 102:18 300 126:1 31 144:1 315 124:17 32 144:1 33 144:1 34 178:22</p>	<p>8</p> <p>80 135:17; 162:22; 163:2 83 144:10 85 126:6, 22; 144:10 86 180:14 87 144:10</p>			

attention 165:14
attorney 120:23
attorney's 31:6
attorneys 137:14
attune 117:8
author 57:16
author's 50:10; 52:1
authoritative 48:13, 22
authority 47:9, 13
authors 5:21; 7:24; 19:19
auto 135:2
availability 167:1
available 168:1, 11
average 125:24
awarded 123:14
aware 5:13; 20:13; 49:5,
7, 8; 144:15
away 56:15; 59:2

B

B 181:9
baby 125:2
back 7:13; 11:6; 12:23;
16:1, 15; 19:1; 21:8; 22:21;
23:8; 24:5; 26:23; 27:22;
28:9, 13; 29:3; 31:3; 40:3;
50:10; 53:13; 57:13;
77:14, 19; 79:4; 84:11;
95:18; 98:5, 14; 99:9;
101:24; 105:9; 107:6;
112:13; 115:24; 141:17;
147:15; 156:19; 160:18;
164:11; 169:17, 21, 23;
171:22; 175:16
backwards 139:22
bad 14:3; 46:13; 77:22;
92:23
Baltimore 55:8
bank 49:10
base 45:10; 112:11
based 36:23, 24; 37:5;
49:11; 61:4; 75:16, 19;
77:17; 82:9; 85:19, 19, 20;
88:3; 106:5; 112:20;
115:4; 142:17; 158:9;
168:16
basically 25:23; 48:11;
132:3
basing 24:7, 12
basis 84:23; 94:13;
104:23; 124:11; 167:22
beat 52:14; 150:18
became 15:21
become 99:10; 135:24;
145:24
becomes 81:24; 82:1;
135:22
beeping 89:17
begin 28:21
beginning 11:16; 50:11;
154:16
behave 119:3
belief 23:3; 88:21

Bell 41:14, 18; 42:18;
59:21; 101:5; 113:11;
142:14; 157:17; 162:6;
165:3; 166:14, 17; 167:6,
10
Bell's 5:8; 9:19; 13:6;
15:2; 55:6; 57:13; 161:24;
165:15; 166:24
below 116:8; 151:9
benefit 120:8
benefits 39:11
benign 125:8; 179:3
besides 9:17
best 7:9; 17:8; 93:24;
107:7; 109:10; 119:12;
168:17
better 6:4, 5; 13:12;
16:17; 27:10; 35:5; 38:16;
58:9; 85:15; 98:11; 99:23;
100:13; 101:13, 18; 114:3,
23; 122:10, 13, 22; 128:17;
129:8; 169:24; 181:7
beyond 38:24; 100:11
big 12:1; 62:21; 152:18
bilaterally 12:11, 16
bill 31:8
billing 31:4; 121:4, 19;
130:12, 14
bills 121:7, 12
bioengineering 127:21
biology 124:24; 125:5
bit 5:11; 19:20; 96:14;
125:18; 140:7
bladder 11:2, 15, 22, 23;
12:6, 8, 13; 14:11; 15:8,
14, 16; 16:5; 17:2, 16;
18:22; 23:19; 24:1; 25:20,
24; 26:8; 28:6; 33:8, 13,
16; 34:5, 5, 16; 35:2; 36:7;
37:5, 12, 24; 38:14; 39:16;
43:4; 59:3, 4; 69:17, 20;
78:9; 85:23; 86:12, 17, 22,
24; 87:5; 88:1, 6, 22; 89:5;
91:9; 94:24; 95:4, 7; 96:10;
97:4, 15, 19; 98:18; 99:21,
24; 102:19; 115:20, 22;
146:2, 21, 24; 148:12;
162:21; 163:18, 23
blanket 72:16; 167:5
blown 48:16; 80:6; 84:7
BM 75:5, 23; 76:2; 77:1;
81:11, 13
board 175:24
Bob 4:15; 6:6; 23:12
Bonnie 4:17; 21:20; 23:6;
37:10; 38:9; 61:2; 65:12;
72:20; 73:8; 75:21; 84:11;
86:8; 88:6; 94:20; 107:18;
110:6, 23; 111:21; 112:2;
114:3, 23; 120:7; 174:3;
175:12; 176:10, 22
Bonnie's 75:18, 18
book 5:20
books 49:22
both 30:17; 138:5; 148:18
bottom 11:24; 63:3

bowel 14:12; 15:8, 20;
16:5; 17:2, 16; 18:22;
23:21; 24:2, 17; 25:2, 3;
26:21; 28:6, 20; 33:8, 13,
16; 34:4, 5, 15; 35:2; 36:7;
37:5, 12, 23; 38:14; 39:15;
43:3; 69:20; 74:24; 75:18;
76:4, 7, 13; 77:18; 78:1, 4,
12, 13, 14; 79:10, 17, 21,
22; 80:1, 10; 19; 81:5, 11;
85:22; 91:18, 24; 92:8, 18,
23; 162:21
brain 83:13; 84:1, 3;
124:23; 125:4, 11, 13;
126:3, 12, 14
break 15:12; 114:14;
126:16; 141:7
brief 57:10
bring 115:15
broad 55:24; 152:16;
153:3
Bruising 145:14
bulk 126:24
business 129:4
Bye 83:19

C

C 181:10
C.E.S 11:24
calculated 131:4
Caler 132:2
call 42:1; 107:16, 20;
113:10; 155:10; 156:24;
168:2, 12; 176:17
called 4:9; 27:24; 28:2;
41:14; 57:1, 14; 101:6;
114:1, 19; 115:4, 8;
123:13; 132:3; 145:11, 13;
166:19; 167:2; 168:14, 18;
174:7; 175:7
calls 62:12
came 15:24; 25:21;
26:19; 27:22; 61:14, 24;
65:22; 74:7; 78:11, 15;
79:23; 89:1; 101:8;
107:23; 108:1; 121:22, 24;
125:16; 155:20; 165:20
Can 6:24; 7:10, 11, 13, 19;
8:13; 10:10, 13; 11:12;
14:9, 16; 164:20; 6, 8;
21:3; 22:18; 24:22; 29:4;
33:21; 37:4, 5; 38:9; 40:18;
41:10; 43:4, 9; 47:17;
48:20; 51:13; 52:4, 6; 53:8;
55:17; 56:16; 57:12;
64:16, 18; 68:6, 7, 15;
70:21; 72:1; 78:19; 79:4;
80:5, 24; 81:18; 86:21;
87:13; 88:6, 14, 17; 89:16,
20, 21; 90:1; 91:3; 93:21;
102:8; 103:20; 104:6, 16;
105:18; 106:22; 108:22;
121:12; 123:17; 128:19;
133:2; 138:6; 141:7;
143:2; 145:10, 17; 150:1;
154:8, 13; 157:23; 160:10,

21; 165:1, 9; 171:20, 24;
174:11; 176:7, 15; 177:8;
180:20, 21, 23
cancer 125:7
care 21:23; 22:2; 30:18;
37:2; 42:20; 82:22; 99:7;
116:8; 118:20; 126:21;
151:9; 164:23; 169:7;
171:5; 172:4; 173:4;
174:1, 22; 175:12; 176:1;
177:2, 13, 21; 178:6
career 122:13; 174:9
carried 96:20
cart 80:7
case 4:20; 5:2, 10, 15, 24;
6:16, 21; 8:14; 10:3, 4, 13,
24; 11:9; 14:7; 16:8; 20:15;
29:15, 18; 30:5, 11, 17, 23;
31:19, 24; 32:8; 36:8; 38:9;
39:5, 6, 19; 40:9, 19, 23;
41:12; 43:17; 46:10, 11;
47:5; 50:7; 51:4, 14; 53:23;
54:10; 55:1; 57:10, 24;
59:21; 60:10; 65:13;
72:14, 20; 79:18; 89:13;
94:1, 13, 13; 103:15;
104:1, 12; 114:22; 117:3;
118:17; 120:18, 21, 23;
121:5, 19; 122:3; 130:13;
132:9, 17; 134:15, 15, 19;
135:3, 3, 19, 21; 136:4, 5,
8, 12, 17, 20, 23; 137:4, 5,
6, 10, 14, 15; 139:16, 16,
20; 140:1, 5; 142:14;
144:3, 18; 149:2; 150:7;
161:8; 168:17; 169:20;
171:16; 173:14; 176:6
cases 29:8, 10; 40:5;
41:1; 86:19; 89:12, 15;
104:6; 105:19; 106:1, 23;
129:18; 130:6; 132:24;
133:7, 9, 10, 16, 20, 24;
134:1, 4, 10, 14, 23; 135:8;
137:8, 13; 138:10
catch 96:15
catching 96:12
category 19:21; 32:22;
84:10
catheter 29:24; 108:11;
113:20; 116:13; 153:6, 10,
11
catheterize 164:22
cauda 6:18, 21; 7:1, 15;
9:4; 12:2; 15:10; 16:9, 10,
12, 18, 19; 17:3, 7, 14, 20;
18:1, 2; 19:5; 20:8, 24;
21:20; 22:10; 26:7, 15, 16,
17, 18; 27:12, 19; 29:8;
30:1; 32:15; 33:1; 36:8;
38:22; 39:2, 6, 10; 40:5, 8,
15, 19; 41:3, 11; 44:12, 19;
45:2, 6, 11, 20; 46:5, 16;
47:1; 48:2, 14, 17, 23;
55:9, 14; 56:3, 5, 8, 14;
57:2, 4, 14; 58:20; 59:3,
11, 19; 60:7; 61:5, 7, 13,
15, 21; 62:1; 64:12; 66:5;
69:21; 70:1, 4, 7, 11, 23;
71:4, 21; 72:10; 73:2; 80:6;

83:10; 84:7, 18; 23; 85:4;
90:2; 95:11, 12, 21; 96:21;
98:3; 105:19; 106:11, 14;
107:1, 21; 116:10; 119:7;
9; 128:1, 11, 16; 129:13;
137:4; 140:19; 144:14, 21;
145:3; 149:22; 150:11, 17,
21; 151:5, 10, 24; 152:4, 6,
23; 153:11; 154:8, 13; 15,
20, 23; 155:3, 9; 157:1;
179:14, 15
causation 25:8; 27:1;
30:18; 173:15; 180:19
cause 121:1; 15:9, 14;
20:8; 21:12, 15; 23:1; 57:2;
64:2; 69:10; 72:24; 74:5;
78:9; 108:7; 110:24;
111:3, 12, 15, 18, 22;
144:16; 148:19; 152:23;
156:12; 179:4
caused 30:1; 42:6, 10;
43:3, 10; 73:11; 79:10;
115:17; 147:13; 148:4;
149:5
causes 49:9; 111:17;
118:21
causing 58:20; 69:3;
73:17, 24; 78:4; 112:9;
115:22
cell 124:24; 125:4
certain 4:1; 25:13; 95:16;
120:10; 128:22
certainly 11:12; 16:16;
26:9; 38:7; 41:6; 42:4;
44:18; 45:15; 86:18; 96:6;
132:10; 142:2; 167:17
certainty 38:8; 164:19
cetera 75:23
chance 26:4; 28:7, 23;
35:16; 44:13, 19; 90:13;
94:12; 99:2, 22; 100:9, 13;
101:13
chances 162:20
change 69:19; 122:7;
129:24
changed 65:2; 125:16
changing 130:17
chapters 5:20
character 169:24
characteristic 27:12
characterization 35:21;
85:12; 134:13
characterize 16:17
charge 131:4, 11, 19
charged 131:13
chart 82:20, 23; 83:4;
109:14
check 14:9; 52:17; 69:7;
155:23; 156:13
checked 69:13; 82:9, 16;
108:14, 15, 24; 109:1
Chicago 122:1, 1
chiropractic 20:4, 7;
21:1, 21; 55:15, 18; 60:3;
61:11; 63:7, 19; 69:9;
73:12; 88:24; 94:23; 98:1;

118:10; 119:15; 149:5;
160:19; 161:4; 170:8
chiropractor 15:18;
21:7, 22; 22:3, 7, 23; 78:8;
84:14
chiropractor's 97:11;
98:15; 99:17
chose 142:5
Chrisafi 11:9; 120:22;
132:1, 13
chronic 14:14; 19:13, 21;
32:22; 39:3
chronically 99:10
circumstance 41:11;
117:3
circumstances 174:3;
177:4; 178:7
clarification 176:15
clarify 11:19; 34:3; 37:17;
61:12; 63:15; 65:4
classes 127:15
clear 6:14; 18:7; 50:13;
60:21; 120:5; 133:23;
140:16; 160:21
cleared 24:3
clearer 70:22
Cleveland 130:24;
131:18; 166:15
clinical 85:20; 95:8;
103:19, 20; 104:10; 106:4;
5; 111:6; 112:12, 22;
127:6, 10, 14; 139:12;
152:5; 168:17; 169:19;
173:13
clinically 169:14; 171:12,
16, 22
close 7:11; 43:18; 109:6
closely 26:19
closer 6:3; 36:22; 41:7;
143:16
coach 105:1
coaching 105:2
colleagues 49:21
collection 48:1; 154:16
coming 81:23; 109:6;
112:13; 123:24; 124:12;
131:18; 163:1; 166:4
comments 56:16
committed 42:18
committee 127:4
communication 134:8
Comp 135:3; 139:8
company 132:3; 158:20
compare 114:21
compared 16:21; 129:16
complaint 169:22;
170:17; 171:6
complete 18:1; 23:5;
71:15; 88:4, 5; 89:3, 6, 8;
90:14; 121:18; 123:15;
128:12
completed 137:22
completely 6:10; 14:19;
87:20

complex 104:19
complicated 30:11
complication 43:19
components 21:10
compressed 19:6, 7
compressing 26:7;
118:9
Compression 57:2;
170:10
computer 5:23; 121:14
concerning 130:3
conclusion 24:7; 150:3
conclusions 48:8, 9
condition 5:13; 14:1, 6;
57:9; 78:10; 95:8; 107:19,
24; 140:20; 145:23, 23;
150:1; 179:20, 20, 23;
180:1
conditions 93:1
confident 177:1
confirmed 144:19
conflict 142:12
confused 64:23; 114:15;
115:23; 134:2
conjunction 46:10
connection 5:10, 24;
6:16; 8:14
consider 47:8; 139:5
considered 123:18
considering 117:5
consistent 13:4; 125:21
consists 57:10
constipated 76:17
constitute 17:3
consultation 159:24;
160:10; 161:11
contact 105:24; 120:21;
132:8
contacted 5:14; 11:6
contain 129:11
contained 5:8; 9:18
contains 120:17
continue 34:14; 144:9;
165:11
continued 15:22; 16:3;
56:12; 65:3; 74:17; 88:20
continues 179:5
continuing 14:11, 13;
36:16; 95:6; 103:2; 109:4;
128:19
contrary 79:22
contribute 57:4
control 11:22; 75:11, 18;
79:21; 86:12
controlling 89:4
controversial 45:1;
47:11; 48:6; 55:11
controversy 56:14
conveying 146:10
copy 8:3; 12:24; 31:10;
121:18
corner 70:16, 17
corporation 4:20

correctable 179:24
corrected 179:21
correctly 17:14, 24;
23:23; 34:17, 21; 42:17;
57:17
correlation 57:19
correspondence 120:18
County 31:5
couple 8:15; 11:11;
20:20, 24; 40:22; 55:24;
134:22, 23; 180:13
course 11:6; 15:22;
48:15; 56:20; 60:13;
62:12; 88:17; 91:3; 96:3;
106:16; 112:12, 22; 128:6;
129:3; 134:21; 139:5;
166:13; 177:9
court 109:16; 139:23;
177:12, 18, 20; 178:1;
180:24
cover 142:18
covered 48:18; 140:5;
142:10; 162:9; 165:16;
174:24
covering 168:6, 18
covers 180:15; 181:13
crack 21:11, 14
critical 8:19; 42:12;
117:6; 165:21; 167:13
criticism 42:1; 172:20
criticisms 41:18; 174:18
criticize 180:21, 22, 23
criticizing 142:6
crucial 71:2, 20; 72:4, 8
CT 59:18; 84:4; 85:10, 15
current 7:1; 14:1; 37:19;
126:18; 131:12; 181:10
currently 38:18; 123:12;
126:4; 133:7
cut 14:19
CV 123:3; 124:9; 127:9;
181:10, 10, 10
cystometrogram 88:2
cystoscopy 172:13

D

D 120:12, 17, 20; 121:1, 4;
181:10, 11, 11, 11
D1-D3 120:12
damage 11:18; 25:23;
26:4, 13; 86:11; 87:10;
88:5, 15, 21; 89:4, 8, 22;
145:18; 148:11; 149:4
damaged 12:6, 10;
87:14, 20, 21; 90:1; 94:23;
95:4; 100:1; 146:21; 147:2
damaging 96:9
dangerous 179:4
dated 10:21; 120:22
day 61:14; 69:4; 81:7;
95:10; 115:8, 10, 11;
157:3; 158:9; 164:8;
166:3, 9; 176:18

days 19:22; 322:1; 38:23;
56:7, 8; 75:5; 76:2, 5, 14;
77:2; 78:14; 80:2, 10; 81:2,
13
dead 52:14; 150:18
deal 10:7
dealing 180:18
deals 119:2
dealt 18:3; 83:14; 128:17
decide 91:3; 180:24
decision 44:24; 62:8;
68:13; 72:3
decisions 49:11
decompression 26:2;
55:9; 59:22; 86:21; 87:1,
13; 95:6; 99:18; 128:19
defecate 79:15; 80:8;
81:17
defecating 80:3; 171:2
Defendant's 55:5, 13
defended 132:3
defense 110:15; 137:10
defer 166:13, 17; 167:6,
9, 11; 168:4; 175:17
deficit 149:17; 170:3
define 16:10, 21; 17:14;
19:13; 61:21; 107:18
defined 61:22, 23
definite 44:22
definitely 19:21; 26:20;
57:21; 132:17
definition 16:12; 18:19;
104:20; 140:19; 149:17;
155:9
definitive 48:2
degree 33:12; 41:1; 43:2;
86:10; 87:10; 98:10;
100:12
delay 32:8; 165:22
delicate 25:24; 26:12
Demming 56:24
department 75:22;
127:21; 166:16
depend 45:8; 50:23;
64:6; 72:13; 80:24; 117:2;
167:10; 168:5
depending 63:4; 135:15
depends 39:8; 58:19;
81:8; 86:19; 87:9; 92:22;
138:14; 150:6
DEPONENT 181:14
deposed 4:22; 136:7;
144:5
Deposition 4:2; 5:8; 7:3;
9:19; 15:3, 4; 42:15; 50:11;
55:7; 57:14; 83:22;
106:22; 109:11, 21;
120:11; 131:22; 133:21;
135:2, 19; 136:16; 137:19;
140:2, 6; 142:13; 143:3, 7,
17; 144:19; 161:21, 24;
162:10; 164:10, 11, 12;
165:15; 167:12; 169:11;
170:16; 172:11; 178:10,
16; 179:12

depositions 5:18; 11:10;
24:9; 53:19; 137:16;
140:10; 141:4, 21; 142:1;
162:3
dermatomes 68:21, 24
describe 64:13; 407:21
designations 11:11
desirable 37:23
desire 130:12
Despite 16:2; 34:13
detailed 69:5
details 29:18; 103:22;
104:7; 105:18; 106:23;
132:12
deteriorated 95:9;
112:12
determination 131:1
determine 87:19, 24;
89:22; 104:9; 145:17
developed 11:9; 12:1;
25:9, 11; 27:11; 76:8;
79:23
deviated 21:22; 173:4
diagnose 27:23; 120:5
diagnosed 97:7
diagnosis 59:16; 60:5, 7;
63:10; 64:14, 17; 66:5;
84:6; 99:4; 107:23; 108:2,
7, 12; 111:6, 11, 14, 16;
116:9, 13; 119:21; 144:17,
23; 148:7; 153:2, 12;
157:15; 159:10; 176:21
diagnostic 116:15
diet 81:12
difference 27:14; 28:23;
30:7; 39:4; 96:13; 110:18;
157:18; 166:1; 170:1;
171:18
different 19:17; 21:9;
25:6; 35:9; 48:7, 7, 8;
55:23; 75:9, 10; 81:6;
82:11; 84:9; 111:14, 17;
112:17; 122:23; 129:15;
19; 133:3; 153:4; 154:16;
162:4; 169:13, 24; 172:1
differential 60:6; 63:10,
21, 22; 144:22; 148:7;
149:22, 23; 150:12, 22;
152:9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18,
24; 153:2, 12, 23; 159:9;
179:19
differently 39:21
difficult 27:23
difficulty 26:8; 86:24
direct 15:9
directly 90:5; 130:7
director 122:16; 126:7
disagree 71:19; 115:7;
142:19; 167:19; 173:1;
178:23; 179:5, 7; 180:4
disappeared 132:11
disclosed 85:9
Discogenic 57:1
discovery 42:14
discretionary 130:9

April 25, 2001

discriminate 69:16;
146:17, 19
discussion 7:7; 12:2;
13:17; 14:22; 23:15;
54:20; 57:7; 102:9
disfunction 17:16;
18:22; 28:21
disk 9:6, 12; 16:6; 20:2;
21:9, 15, 18; 26:7; 40:13;
23:55:10, 14; 57:15; 61:8;
64:9; 66:6; 73:3, 9; 74:18;
75:1; 78:3, 7; 79:9; 84:12;
16; 86:8, 16; 88:18; 94:21;
96:19; 102:18; 103:6;
108:2; 111:23; 112:7, 9,
16; 113:1, 8, 20, 23;
114:18; 115:5, 13, 17, 18;
118:8; 119:14, 18; 120:5;
128:3, 4; 144:4; 148:16;
19; 149:5; 155:2, 10, 13;
156:2, 11, 23; 157:3, 16;
159:6, 21; 160:9; 161:7;
169:20; 170:9; 180:1
disks 6:19
distinction 163:8
distribution 68:20
Doctor 4:14, 19; 6:2;
8:12; 23:18; 29:7, 13, 14;
31:12; 32:5; 59:9; 62:9;
65:6, 24; 66:5, 17; 67:5, 6;
69:14, 14; 72:23; 73:8;
74:15; 82:14, 23; 86:5;
89:20; 98:24; 101:2, 20;
104:18; 105:1, 3, 5, 16;
108:4; 113:16; 116:5;
119:1, 5; 120:16; 136:23;
149:21, 24; 150:20;
151:19; 152:9, 21; 153:20;
154:9; 157:15; 158:23;
159:6; 164:14; 165:13;
170:23; 172:8, 22, 23;
174:2, 16, 22; 175:16, 18;
18; 177:3, 22; 178:5, 6;
179:22; 180:11, 17
doctors 26:14; 66:11, 20;
170:19
documents 4:1; 120:10
Dolshoy 55:16
done 5:24; 6:16; 10:12;
22:12, 20, 24; 26:2; 28:8;
39:24; 41:2; 45:15, 22;
46:3, 14; 48:4; 53:1; 54:7;
56:7, 15; 60:16; 62:4, 6;
64:18, 24; 65:8, 18; 71:9;
72:5; 86:11, 18, 20; 87:6;
10:92:17; 93:11; 95:14;
96:5; 97:12; 98:17; 99:3;
17:100:4; 101:11; 106:17;
108:6, 9, 12; 109:12;
111:21; 112:5, 15; 114:4;
115:6; 133:18; 134:24;
159:9; 160:11; 161:23;
165:1, 1, 23; 166:9, 9, 12;
168:24; 172:13, 16, 18
doubt 90:23; 173:12;
174:15
down 15:12; 17:5; 19:2;
68:1; 114:14; 154:19;
1702

dozen 133:16; 134:1, 4;
137:1
dozens 64:2
Dr 5:8; 7:4, 9; 19:13; 6;
15:2, 18; 16:24; 41:14, 18;
42:18; 46:20; 55:6, 7, 19;
56:18; 57:13, 16; 59:21;
70:22; 74:8, 9, 12; 96:5;
101:5; 104:3; 109:11, 18;
110:1, 5, 18; 113:11;
117:4, 16; 118:15, 18;
120:5; 140:24; 142:14, 14;
143:3, 9, 16; 146:8; 147:3;
15021; 155:12; 157:17;
158:10; 161:21, 24; 162:6;
165:3, 4, 15; 166:14, 17,
24; 167:6, 10; 169:6, 8, 9;
173:3; 174:2; 175:12, 20;
176:1, 10; 177:3; 178:24;
179:1, 11, 16, 18
draw 165:14
due 16:5; 40:21; 55:14;
74:18; 75:1; 118:8;
148:15, 16; 149:4
duly 4:6, 10
dura 43:18; 89:24
dural 42:3, 9; 43:3, 10
during 28:3; 65:7; 67:10;
77:2; 89:20; 108:6;
110:24; 112:23; 113:24;
117:12; 119:21; 147:12;
155:13; 160:8; 161:9;
162:10; 175:4; 176:10, 11,
23
duties 127:5

E

earlier 26:2; 28:1; 30:2, 5,
13; 58:8; 92:1; 96:12; 97:8;
98:6; 99:3; 103:4, 16;
126:5; 157:17; 166:10
eaten 81:1, 3
eating 81:1, 12
effect 29:23; 125:8
effected 103:5
either 5:22; 40:10; 60:18;
64:5; 80:20; 81:15; 89:6;
94:22; 108:24; 128:12;
140:5, 11; 163:19; 172:22
else 9:14; 24:22; 69:18;
72:14; 119:6; 139:18;
141:13; 172:21
emergency 4:19; 15:23;
16:1, 14; 24:5; 25:22;
26:19; 27:18; 57:3; 60:22;
61:2, 14, 24; 62:9; 64:5;
65:24; 66:4, 10, 16; 67:5;
72:23; 75:22; 78:16;
79:24; 80:7; 81:23; 82:5;
83:11, 12; 89:1; 95:2, 9,
19, 23; 96:4; 101:7;
107:23; 109:14; 113:15;
117:9, 19; 118:3; 119:1;
120:7; 142:15; 146:5, 6;
147:16; 165:17; 170:19;
172:8; 174:2, 7, 10, 16, 19,

22, 23, 24; 175:2; 3, 4, 5, 8;
176:17; 177:13, 22; 178:2;
180:11, 17
emergent 118:1
end 55:6; 57:18; 181:5
ENGELHARD 4:8
enough 33:7; 104:8;
119:10; 169:22; 178:13
entire 5:1; 171:23
entirely 116:23
entitled 104:22, 24
entity 49:7; 103:24;
139:1, 6
epidural 29:24, 24
equally 113:19
equation 90:20; 94:8
equina 6:18, 21; 7:1, 15;
9:5; 12:2; 15:10; 16:9, 10,
12, 18, 19; 17:3, 7, 14, 20;
18:1, 2; 19:5; 20:8, 24;
21:20; 22:10; 26:8, 15, 16,
18, 19; 27:12, 19; 29:8;
30:1; 32:15; 33:1, 36:8;
3822; 39:2, 6, 10; 40:5, 8,
16, 19; 41:3, 11; 44:12, 20;
45:2, 6, 12, 20; 46:5, 16;
47:1; 48:3, 14, 17, 23;
55:9, 14; 56:3, 5, 9, 14;
57:2, 4, 15; 58:20; 59:3,
11, 19; 60:7; 61:5, 8, 13,
15, 21; 62:2; 64:12; 66:6;
69:21; 70:1, 4, 7, 11, 23;
71:4, 21; 72:10; 73:2; 80:6;
83:10; 84:7, 18, 23; 85:4;
90:2; 95:11, 12, 21; 96:21;
98:3; 105:19; 106:11;
107:1, 21; 116:10; 119:7,
9; 128:1, 11, 16; 129:13;
1374; 140:20; 144:14, 22;
145:3; 149:22; 150:12, 17,
21; 151:5, 80, 24; 152:5, 6,
23; 153:12; 154:8, 13, 15,
20, 23; 155:3, 10; 157:1;
179:14, 15
ER 23:7; 24:8, 17, 18;
25:1, 1, 6, 12; 65:8, 15;
73:19; 75:8, 12, 17, 21;
76:9; 77:3, 12, 19; 78:11;
79:8, 11; 80:4, 8, 17, 20,
21; 82:15, 20; 101:12;
102:5, 12; 108:7; 112:14;
117:22; 119:19, 22;
145:22; 148:24; 155:14;
159:23; 160:8, 16, 24;
161:2, 10; 166:13, 19;
168:1, 6, 7; 172:22, 23;
175:18; 176:11; 177:3;
178:5, 6
especially 5:17
essence 28:24
essentially 94:10
et 75:22
evaluated 164:1, 2
Even 26:1, 10; 34:13;
45:5; 48:17, 18; 50:20;
56:15; 71:11; 74:9; 83:7;
86:17, 20; 95:1, 5; 96:11;
97:7; 98:17; 99:9, 18;

103:15, 22; 112:9; 113:21;
115:13; 117:13; 123:17;
126:7; 128:18; 156:18;
158:16; 159:22; 166:7;
170:7, 10; 179:10
event 79:3; 102:16
everyday 10:7; 81:6
everyone 104:1
everyones 20:21; 81:5
exacerbated 94:22
exact 44:16; 81:15;
106:16; 117:21; 147:10
exactly 9:24; 12:9; 14:10;
21:3, 6; 45:16; 79:21;
80:14; 82:3; 86:19; 103:4;
119:4; 124:22; 163:20;
170:15
exam 69:6; 71:3, 11, 20;
728; 77:9; 108:10, 13;
111:6; 119:6; 151:4, 8, 17,
24; 153:10; 156:13, 15;
157:5
EXAMINATION 4:12;
62:7, 14, 15, 21, 24; 63:4;
64:19; 65:9, 19, 22; 66:7,
17; 67:16; 82:24; 110:22;
145:7; 153:24; 155:19, 23;
156:1, 8, 10, 21; 157:6;
159:13, 14; 161:5; 176:21
examinations 66:21;
138:24, 24
examine 67:24; 84:20
examined 4:10; 68:3;
1567
examining 90:5
example 66:24; 97:6;
111:15; 175:9
exams 139:8
excruciating 170:6
Excuse 6:1; 87:23;
135:19; 170:24; 173:16
Exhibit 4:3; 10:21; 55:5,
13; 56:23, 24; 120:12
exist 56:16
existed 28:4; 79:11
exists 8:4
expect 33:21; 35:14;
66:4; 85:8; 109:18;
115:20; 129:5; 137:21;
163:12; 171:8
expected 18:24; 164:15
expense 8:3
expenses 131:15
experience 20:14; 49:23
85:20; 94:6; 100:17, 20,
20; 103:19, 20; 104:5, 11;
106:4; 168:17; 174:20
expert 4:20; 106:14;
110:15; 129:18; 130:6;
136:1, 3, 8; 142:15;
174:19; 177:8, 12; 180:17
experts 174:16
explain 21:3, 5; 79:14;
146:18
explanation 72:19;
146:10; 179:2

explanations 72:16
express 140:17
extent 25:13; 88:4, 15;
89:22; 95:16; 142:12;
172:15
external 145:18
extremities 156:7
extruded 96:19
eyes 172:24

F

facility 36:13
fact 20:8; 21:19; 24:16;
34:1; 43:3; 46:24; 55:17;
56:15; 66:20; 73:8; 11, 17,
24; 77:18; 78:3; 79:8; 82:4;
84:9; 90:7; 111:22;
112:11; 119:9; 145:10;
149:1; 151:8; 154:22;
155:3; 164:21; 169:12;
171:17
factor 70:10
factors 117:5
facts 60:10; 114:16;
148:2
factual 88:9; 167:22
faculty 127:20
failed 42:19
fair 35:20; 37:9; 93:2
fairly 40:12; 95:15
fairness 173:2; 175:17
fallen 179:1
familiar 60:22; 61:1
far 6:20; 7:24; 13:9; 15:5;
16:13; 19:19; 33:7; 38:13;
58:23; 92:23; 104:8; 146:2
fashion 48:21; 80:20
favor 32:4; 110:5
favorable 175:19
feasible 107:14; 111:18
features 18:5; 95:10, 12
February 122:9
fecal 69:24
fee 131:12
feel 50:7; 68:8, 15; 84:18
feeling 171:24
fees 130:5
few 5:17; 6:18; 29:16;
45:15; 106:9; 127:8;
162:11; 169:11
field 47:9
figure 163:2, 4, 6; 166:9
figures 93:5
file 5:1, 5, 22, 22, 23; 6:15
17, 20; 7:1, 15, 19, 21; 8:3,
13; 47:1, 2, 4; 49:9;
120:17; 134:3; 181:11, 12
files 40:2
films 12:19; 13:2, 8
find 20:20, 23; 30:24;
31:8; 50:22; 51:18; 54:18;
69:14; 110:24; 111:3, 12

finding 179:2
findings 18:6, 12; 25:6;
26:21; 99:11; 100:24;
154:17, 17
fine 68:1; 83:18
finish 15:19
firm 132:1, 2, 6, 14
first 4:9; 5:14; 21:9;
23:19; 24:18; 25:1, 11;
27:6, 19; 28:3, 4, 16;
37:18; 55:6; 57:16; 60:23;
61:15; 62:1; 65:7; 67:21;
73:19; 74:11; 76:8; 77:12,
19; 78:9, 16, 19; 79:11;
82:6, 15; 89:1; 95:2, 20;
96:16; 101:6, 8, 12; 102:4,
12; 108:1, 6, 13, 23, 23;
110:24; 112:24; 114:5, 17,
19; 117:12, 22; 118:20;
119:19, 22; 120:20, 20;
121:8; 132:8, 17; 146:6;
147:12; 149:24; 155:13;
160:8; 161:10; 167:2, 18,
168:7; 176:11, 23
Fishberg 84:19
five 31:22; 41:7; 56:7, 8;
103:21; 104:5; 106:24;
136:6; 167:16; 168:3
flaccid 47:15, 18, 22;
78:15; 178:11
flagged 140:10; 180:13
flags 140:10
focus 34:4; 62:24; 76:22;
141:18
focused 107:5; 155:19
Focusing 34:5
foley 108:11; 119:4;
145:5
follow 33:18; 119:5;
149:15
followed 36:13; 121:1
following 36:11; 60:3;
61:11; 63:19; 101:12;
114:16; 116:6; 119:15;
149:5; 161:3
follows 4:11
forced 48:10
forgetting 137:15
forgot 178:11
form 108:17
formal 127:15, 22
former 166:16
forth 7:24; 37:1; 91:22;
127:4; 144:12; 175:16
found 50:6; 51:2; 169:11
foundation 30:8; 108:21
four 165:24
frame 19:14, 17; 37:7;
44:16, 22; 45:3; 49:24;
86:3; 128:22; 144:20;
145:4; 165:15; 168:10
frames 48:10
frequently 175:8
front 5:1
full 16:19, 22, 23; 17:6.

14; 18:8, 19, 20; 19:4;
26:16; 27:19; 48:16; 80:5;
84:7; 91:8; 123:10;
159:13, 13; 163:10
fully 5:12
function 23:19, 21; 24:1,
2, 18; 25:2; 28:6, 7; 33:9,
14; 368:37:13, 24; 38:14;
39:16, 16; 57:20; 69:20;
85:23; 86:23; 87:6; 88:1;
89:9; 90:14; 91:9, 18, 24;
92:8, 18; 97:5, 20; 98:18;
99:21, 24; 163:10, 10, 11,
15
fund 20:21; 49:20; 91:22;
124:21
funds 130:14
further 28:3; 67:9;
116:15; 164:16; 181:14
Furthermore 95:8
fuzzy 135:22

G

G 55:5
gain 68:14
gave 135:18; 140:17;
170:22
general 11:20; 20:21;
38:1; 39:12; 40:10; 47:5;
51:9; 58:15; 65:1; 69:11;
85:21; 126:11; 180:3
generally 58:7, 21
generated 11:8; 121:7
generic 53:6
generically 126:18
genital 171:23
gets 21:20
gist 140:15
given 55:22; 122:20;
124:9; 140:22; 142:11, 19;
153:6; 178:1
gives 48:2; 72:2
giving 49:15, 17; 97:6;
110:14; 128:15; 165:10;
171:4
glad 8:10
glasses 55:21
Glioblastoma 125:2
goal 134:16, 18
goes 77:19; 106:13;
130:7; 139:12; 150:2;
164:11; 170:7
gong 72:15
good 4:14; 37:11; 107:22;
115:14; 127:12; 135:14;
144:12; 145:4
GORCZYNSKI 6:5; 9:8;
70:13; 101:22; 102:6;
114:8; 116:18; 118:12, 23;
143:7; 150:15; 151:12;
153:14; 155:16; 158:6;
160:2; 162:16; 172:6;
173:6; 181:6
governmental 139:1, 6

grants 124:8, 11
greater 90:12; 93:6; 98:6,
20
Gross 138:14, 17, 18
group 7:23; 40:11; 46:18;
166:24
groups 40:11; 92:3, 12;
93:13
guarantee 2610:34:1;
128:21; 129:3
guess 12:8; 106:9;
109:10; 180:24
guidelines 130:3
guys 13:14; 14:19; 165:9

H

H 4:8; 55:13
habits 81:5, 11
half 11:13; 137:1
hand 171:1
handled 40:5, 9, 20;
41:12; 84:1
handwritten 11:2
handy 75:13
hang 23:12; 83:16
happen 38:5, 8; 39:18;
42:5; 45:9; 80:5; 102:6;
119:11
happened 27:13; 76:23;
114:22; 135:23; 136:2
happening 164:21
happens 19:10; 21:4;
71:8; 101:1; 105:24
happy 31:14; 141:3
harassment 109:6
hard 5:22; 140:7
hate 150:18
head 78:5; 136:14;
166:16
hear 6:2; 9:9; 23:13; 29:4;
79:5; 83:17; 102:8; 155:8
heard 47:18
hearing 7:6; 13:12; 42:17
Hello 9:7
help 69:16; 87:13, 15;
101:2; 110:2; 163:22;
164:3; 165:1
helpful 6:7; 107:13
hemorrhage 83:13; 84:2,
3
HERBERT 4:8
herein 4:9
herniated 86:16; 144:4
herniation 9:6, 12; 16:6;
20:2; 23:4, 5; 40:14; 43:18;
55:10, 15; 57:15; 61:8;
56:6; 73:3, 9; 74:19; 75:1;
78:3, 7; 79:10; 84:12, 16;
35:9; 86:8; 88:18; 89:5;
4:21; 103:6; 108:3;
11:24; 112:7, 9; 113:1, 9,
11, 24; 114:18; 115:5, 14,
17, 18; 119:15, 18; 120:6;

148:17, 19; 149:5; 155:11,
13; 156:2, 12, 23; 157:16;
159:7, 22; 160:9; 161:7;
169:20; 170:9; 180:1
herniations 64:9
herself 164:22
high 26:3; 28:23
higher 28:7; 99:2; 100:10
himself 179:3, 13
hindsight 120:9; 148:9;
157:2
hired 30:23
history 25:5; 60:2; 61:1,
4, 9; 63:6; 763:78:1;
108:9; 151:3; 155:18;
156:6; 159:8, 13; 160:18;
161:3; 166:15; 176:21
hold 79:17; 140:1
holding 75:11
holds 133:9
home 113:20; 116:15
honest 110:16
honestly 81:5
honesty 87:9
hope 33:24; 34:6; 35:4;
129:7; 164:23; 170:21
horse 52:14; 150:18
hospital 29:13; 40:1;
136:24; 166:24; 169:4, 5
hospitals 168:9
hour 20:1; 81:23; 131:14,
19; 165:22; 168:1, 8;
169:1, 3
hours 19:18; 32:10, 11;
38:24; 48:11, 11; 56:11;
59:10; 69:9; 73:18; 86:3, 3;
89:2; 95:18; 96:17; 97:2;
99:16; 100:4, 21; 102:18;
115:16; 135:13, 17;
141:23; 148:13; 163:13,
14; 165:24, 24; 166:3;
167:17, 17; 168:3
hundreds 8:22
Hurt 121:14
husband 4:17
hypesthesia 65:2
hypothesis 30:14
hypothetical 60:9;
63:12; 98:15; 102:17;
156:3
hypothetically 99:15

I

i.e 180:1
identification 4:4;
120:13
identified 9:18; 10:20
identify 6:24; 9:16; 13:20;
14:16; 52:6; 68:24; 143:23
identifying 7:14
Illinois 31:5; 121:23;
122:5, 9; 123:2; 124:12;
129:16; 139:6, 13; 167:24

illustrate 154:14
imagine 118:2
Imagining 85:5
immediate 86:21; 128:1
immediately 17:11; 25:9;
27:3; 84:4, 5; 86:18; 97:2
imply 55:3; 58:4; 74:6
implying 101:17
important 5617:68:22;
69:5, 7; 83:7; 116:2; 144:2
155:7; 162:19; 163:6;
172:12
impression 112:21
improperly 22:12, 20;
23:1
improve 33:11
Improved 33:15, 15;
100:14; 162:22
improvement 33:8, 12;
34:19, 20; 35:14, 15, 17;
36:1, 7; 37:5; 44:14; 97:4,
14, 19; 100:3, 9; 129:6;
164:16
inability 69:8, 12; 73:18;
75:10
inappropriate 116:7
include 17:15; 18:20;
68:23; 135:7; 144:21;
152:17, 20
included 60:6
including 7:16; 64:22;
160:17, 18, 18
income 138:14, 15
incomplete 17:20; 83:8
incontinence 69:20;
70:1, 74:24; 75:9
incontinent 76:15;
78:14; 82:2
Incorrect 105:14; 147:14
increase 123:23
increased 27:2; 125:18
indefinite 91:11
independent 109:19
independently 5:9;
139:14
indicated 119:7; 141:20;
158:8; 159:3; 168:20
indication 158:17
individual 15:13; 33:23;
49:11, 12; 58:18, 19, 24;
59:7; 63:4; 68:13; 72:13;
90:10, 20; 91:1, 4; 92:22;
93:13; 150:6; 181:12
infection 40:22; 152:17
inference 24:2
information 11:10; 68:9;
72:2; 93:21; 129:12;
144:24
injection 29:24
injured 172:15, 16
injures 86:16
injuries 15:6
injury 42:6, 11; 86:20;
145:16; 166:5

April 25, 2001

inner 21:11, 16 instance 6:22; 7:4; 16:24; 18:3; 21:12; 25:20; 39:9; 55:5; 56:6, 18; 57:7; 59:2; 68:21; 70:23; 76:16; 81:22; 90:3; 127:10, 18; 130:23; 140:9, 19, 23; 144:13; 162:18; 163:22; 1702; 171:19; 179:13 instances 128:22 instead 122:19; 145:12 institution 52:5, 17 insurance 138:23; 139:8; 158:19 insurer 132:4 intense 19:23 interact 174:10 interest 124:23 interested 172:9 interfere 129:21 interference 23:19, 21, 24; 28:5, 6 Internet 8:17; 9:1 internship 175:1 interpose 17:21; 28:10; 29:20; 63:11; 147:7, 22 interpretation 13:3, 5; 90:21; 91:14 interrupt 6:11; 173:20, 21 interrupted 161:20; 178:9 interrupting 173:19 intervening 81:2 intervention 17:11; 30:6; 14; 34:13, 14; 49:9; 58:8; 96:19; 99:3; 106:17; 166:9; 167:9 interventions 576 into 10:9; 12:1; 17:18; 24:5, 14; 25:21, 22; 26:19; 36:17; 40:1; 46:15; 49:10; 61:24; 62:22; 78:11; 79:23; 81:23; 89:1; 106:13; 107:23; 112:13; 117:20; 127:5; 142:20; 147:15; 160:16; 170:23, 24; 171:3; 172:2; 174:7; 179:1; 180:14 involve 137:4 involved 32:7; 69:1; 90:3; 101:1; 104:1; 122:3; 136:1; 139:4; 180:20 involvement 17:2; 104:9; 129:17 involves 135:7; 139:11 involving 125:6 irreversibly 95:4 isolated 100:23 issue 26:5; 29:15, 16; 30:4, 17; 56:5; 103:15; 112:17; 136:12, 14; 141:1; 145:8; 173:14; 177:21; 179:11; 180:18 issues 14:7; 137:5, 5;	175:11; 176:9, 16; 178:2 items 13:20 J J 56:24 Jacobs 132:1 Japanese 7:23 job 129:22 journal 52:4, 17 judgment 48:21; 98:17; 106:5 jury 10:11; 110:19; 180:24 justify 44:15 K K-o-s-t-u-i-k 57:17 keep 5:22; 6:6; 39:22; 121:10; 129:20; 133:8; 153:3, 3 keeping 150:7 Ken 8:7 kept 47:4 key 143:20 kind 19:15; 42:5; 46:1; 48:18; 55:24; 63:23; 83:6; 89:23; 93:22; 114:11; 121:16; 127:13; 137:2; 139:22; 142:23; 143:18; 144:24 kinds 119:3 kneel 149:1 knew 147:21 knowing 88:18, 19; 111:20 knowledge 20:22; 45:10; 47:6; 49:20; 85:21; 91:23; 144:11; 145:2; 162:24 knowledgeable 144:15 known 11:19; 108:19; 148:1 Kostuik 57:16 L L5-S1 73:3, 9; 108:2; 111:23; 119:14; 18; 120:5; 144:4 lab 124:19 laboratory 130:22 lack 159:15 lacking 18:8 lady 48:16 large 63:22; 88:19; 96:19 largest 132:4 laser 41:22, 24; 42:10; 44:4 last 32:13; 37:17; 40:8; 19:135:18; 136:3, 6, 15; 137:22; 139:3; 141:14, 22;	154:10 late 25:23; 99:12; 166:7 later 23:20; 24:1; 36:20; 74:5; 75:2, 3; 90:23; 92:1; 96:23; 109:20; 111:3; 112:9; 119:11 law 132:1, 14 lawsuit 4:18; 110:2 lawyer 135:24 lay 108:21; 160:21 laymen's 145:12 lead 26:10; 102:16; 128:24; 147:4 leading 176:4 leads 86:9 learn 106:1, 9 learned 49:24; 94:7 least 33:15; 60:6; 86:23; 88:19; 90:14; 97:4; 98:9; 118:6; 119:14 leave 140:2; 169:10 leaving 99:17 lecture 128:14 lectured 127:24; 128:9 lectures 127:8, 19; 128:7; 129:12 led 23:4; 157:15, 16 left 83:21; 161:22; 172:19 leg 18:13, 23; 33:16; 115:24; 156:19; 170:2 legal 98:20; 127:1; 129:18; 130:6; 132:19; 135:7; 137:23; 138:10; 173:16 legs 17:5, 6, 19, 19; 18:9, 9, 21, 21; 19:2; 33:14 lengths 35:9 leprosy 152:17, 20, 22 lesion 69:3 less 349:383; 41:6; 561:1; 68:21; 69:5; 82:1, 1; 84:1; 93:6; 98:21; 132:19, 22; 133:5, 6; 136:13; 137:2; 168:24; 169:3 letter 11:8, 11, 14; 37:17; 121:1 life 84:8; 133:12, 13, 15; 137:13 liked 157:12, 14 likelihood 27:2; 39:4; 98:6, 11, 13 likely 10:6; 12:16; 26:13; 34:8; 38:3; 77:17; 81:3; 82:1; 85:23; 89:6; 90:12; 93:16; 97:3; 99:20; 102:20; 103:1; 112:8, 24; 114:2, 23; 166:4 likewise 304:43:1; 74:24; 77:9; 85:9; 91:17; 148:14 limit 134:16, 19 limited 129:20; 131:16 Linda 162:14; 181:5 line 4:16; 9:2; 63:3; 141:16, 16; 180:4	lines 139:10 LINTON 4:13; 15; 6:13; 7:9, 12; 8:6, 11; 9:15; 10:19; 13:19; 14:20; 15:7; 17:23; 18:15; 19:9; 20:12; 21:2; 22:5, 14; 23:2, 9, 17; 27:16; 28:12; 29:5, 6; 30:3, 16, 22; 31:13; 35:6, 22; 36:5; 38:6, 20; 41:9; 42:22; 43:8, 16, 22; 44:3; 45:18; 46:2, 5, 12; 47:18; 48:19; 49:13; 51:1, 11, 20; 52:3, 13, 20; 53:5, 20; 54:6, 13, 16; 58:1, 13; 59:8; 60:20; 63:18; 64:21; 65:5, 12, 16, 17; 66:9, 19; 67:14; 70:3; 71:1, 10, 17; 72:6, 18; 73:7, 16, 23; 74:3, 14, 23; 75:7; 76:18, 21; 77:8, 21; 78:23; 79:6; 80:15; 81:9; 82:7, 13, 21; 83:9, 18, 23; 85:7, 16; 87:2, 18; 88:11; 89:19; 91:2, 16; 92:4, 15; 93:8, 23; 94:9, 18; 98:8; 22; 99:13; 100:7; 103:13; 104:17, 21, 24; 105:3, 7, 9, 15; 106:19; 107:9; 108:20; 109:17; 110:4, 9, 20; 111:10; 113:5, 17; 114:13; 115:9; 116:21; 117:11; 118:16; 119:13; 120:3, 15; 124:4; 131:3; 138:4, 12, 21, 22; 141:9, 24; 142:4, 8; 143:9, 12, 22; 147:9, 20, 24; 149:20; 150:10, 19; 151:6, 13, 18; 152:7, 19; 153:8, 18, 22; 154:6; 155:5, 21; 156:9; 157:13; 158:1, 11, 18; 159:5, 12, 20; 160:6, 20; 161:13, 19; 162:14; 163:3; 164:6, 14, 18; 165:6; 166:11, 22; 167:15, 21; 169:2; 171:14; 173:7, 17, 20, 22, 23; 174:13; 175:15, 23; 176:8, 19; 177:10, 19; 178:4, 11, 17; 181:2, 9 listed 124:9 listen 23:13 literature 5:7, 10, 14, 16, 18, 19; 10:2, 12; 20:7, 23; 36:24; 37:6; 45:2; 46:14; 47:10; 48:1; 49:15; 50:6; 51:9; 53:4; 57:8, 22; 58:7, 21; 59:5; 61:24; 85:19; 90:7, 8, 22; 91:6, 15, 24; 92:5, 6, 12; 93:15, 20; 94:2, 7; 106:11; 162:24 little 5:11; 6:3; 11:11; 12:4; 19:20; 25:18; 27:10; 47:15; 55:22; 81:6; 84:9; 125:18; 133:8; 135:22; 140:7, 11, 12; 141:7; 169:23, 24; 171:18, 21 local 139:23; 168:9 localize 69:3 logically 149:16 long 31:22; 32:19; 33:21; 37:4, 10; 44:8; 45:11; 48:12; 49:24; 132:9;	133:10; 141:17, 20 long-standing 33:2 long-term 264; 166:1 longer 19:20; 34:10; 38:2; 44:11, 13; 58:14; 59:10 longest 366 look 10:10; 13:2; 16:23; 20:19; 26:18; 31:2, 3; 53:1; 57:12; 60:13; 65:23; 70:22; 77:14; 88:13, 14, 17; 89:21; 90:9, 10, 11; 91:5; 93:14, 20; 134:21; 137:11; 140:9; 147:6, 10; 178:23 looked 5:15, 19; 8:14; 9:5, 11, 12, 17; 10:8; 13:8; 548; 141:24 looking 10:1; 5623; 69:10; 92:2, 12; 103:11; 117:3; 120:21; 135:15, 16; 139:14; 141:22, 22; 143:16; 169:6; 172:23; 179:8 looks 92:5 loose 47:22 loses 79:15 losing 79:20 loss 75:10 lost 23:8; 60:17; 81:22; 114:11 lot 9:8; 13:13; 31:16; 55:22; 62:22; 72:24; 80:24; 81:2; 83:5; 126:14; 137:17; 140:18; 144:2; 169:14; 170:4 lots 57:21 low 44:20 lumbar 6:19; 9:5, 12; 40:13, 23; 55:10; 57:15; 59:17; 64:9; 94:21; 128:3; 155:2, 10, 13; 156:2, 11, 22, 23; 180:1 lump 127:5 M M.D 4:8 magical 128:23 mailed 13:1 main 18:12 major 144:7 majority 91:7; 92:6, 8, 17; 93:2, 3; 126:20; 127:6; 137:9 makes 150:2 making 106:4; 153:2 malfunction 12:13 malpractice 42:18; 132:4; 135:20; 136:4, 5, 8, 16, 20, 23; 137:10 Manard 132:1 manifestations 151:5 manila 120:17 manipulated 21:18;
--	---	---	--	--

22:22
manipulation 15:18;
20:4, 7; 21:1, 21, 24;
22:11, 12, 20, 24; 23:6;
25:10, 17, 20; 27:4, 11;
55:15, 18; 60:3; 61:11;
63:7, 19; 64:4; 69:9; 73:12;
88:24; 94:23; 96:17; 98:1;
100:5; 118:10; 119:15;
149:6; 160:19; 161:4;
170:11
manner 95:15
many 29:10; 40:4; 45:17;
48:15; 62:22; 88:19;
89:11, 15; 90:24; 109:13,
20; 111:17; 114:10;
125:23; 133:7; 135:13;
136:22; 152:4
Mark 4:15; 6:1; 83:20;
120:17
marked 4:2; 120:11;
162:1; 181:11
Markowitz 55:16
massive 83:13; 85:8
material 21:16
materials 24:23; 128:6,
7; 129:11
matter 22:9; 25:7, 14, 15;
26:24; 33:23; 34:1; 58:18;
61:12, 18; 83:15; 111:4;
141:18, 19; 145:10;
179:12
matters 143:12
may 10:8, 16; 12:9; 18:10,
13; 19:1; 21:8; 34:6, 12,
14; 36:18; 53:24; 54:3, 5;
58:10, 21; 60:4, 4; 61:10,
10; 63:8, 8, 15, 16; 67:23;
68:10, 14, 20; 83:5; 87:24;
95:20; 109:22; 112:2;
113:12; 116:12; 125:18;
133:19; 139:22, 23;
142:24; 143:1; 144:4, 6;
163:21; 170:2; 180:12
Maybe 17:10; 19:18, 20;
23:10; 40:13; 41:7; 88:20;
96:19; 121:14; 125:13;
127:2; 133:5; 134:4, 5;
136:2; 137:17
mean 20:21; 22:11; 39:1,
8; 46:13; 47:16; 50:10;
55:2; 58:4; 76:15; 84:7;
89:3; 91:12; 98:24; 101:7;
106:15; 110:15; 139:7;
143:17; 149:19; 152:16;
173:15; 174:23; 176:16,
16; 177:17
meaning 21:21; 39:14;
146:5; 170:4
means 18:5; 59:17;
141:15; 145:15
meant 11:20, 21; 12:14;
47:22; 76:7; 134:3
mechanical 19:3; 69:17
mechanically 19:10;
21:4
med 9:1

medical 14:6; 24:8, 13;
25:5; 33:3; 38:8; 43:2;
47:6, 13; 49:15; 66:21, 23;
67:7; 83:8; 86:10; 92:24;
97:1, 10, 13, 18; 100:3, 12,
16; 112:21; 127:16, 18;
135:20; 136:20, 23;
145:11; 155:9; 162:24;
163:11; 164:18; 172:2, 3;
173:15; 174:24
medically 59:20
medicine 163:24; 174:23
medicines 163:21; 164:3
meetings 49:22; 106:2
members 127:20
memory 8:18; 49:10;
106:9, 13; 109:19; 110:2;
142:24
mentioned 7:15; 46:11;
128:2; 132:15; 175:6
mentions 180:12
mere 21:19
merely 147:12; 180:2
Meridia 166:24
message 120:21
met 4:15; 160:14; 173:3;
178:5
mid 170:7
middle 166:3
might 6:19; 9:24; 15:3;
21:5; 27:13; 45:9; 64:5, 11;
80:5; 112:6, 16; 113:14;
117:24; 118:1; 132:8;
141:1; 144:6; 145:11, 13;
152:22; 168:4, 5; 171:22;
178:24
Miller 56:18
mind 11:19; 33:6; 118:7,
15, 18
mine 106:10; 144:8;
145:9
minimize 84:7
minute 4:15; 154:9
minutes 162:11
mis 176:4
mischaracterization
165:7
misconstrue 18:17
misdiagnosis 176:22
missed 6:10
mistake 21:22; 59:5;
179:22
misunderstanding
94:19
mixing 28:14
modifier 45:24
money 122:20; 124:5, 6,
10, 13, 15, 20; 130:7;
138:2
month 10:9; 125:20, 20;
127:8; 134:15; 136:3
month-to-month 124:10
months 19:22; 32:23;
33:4; 44:23, 23; 45:6;
88:20; 134:16; 136:6;

175:2
moonlighted 175:4
moonlit 175:3
more 5:12; 9:23; 10:1, 6;
11:10, 10; 19:4; 21:15, 16;
23:4; 25:18; 27:12; 33:17;
34:8; 36:22; 37:18; 57:13;
68:7; 77:17; 81:3; 82:1, 1;
85:23; 87:4; 90:12; 95:3,
10; 97:3; 99:20; 100:24;
102:20; 103:22; 106:7, 21;
22; 108:11; 112:10; 114:2,
22; 117:8; 122:15; 126:11;
135:17; 137:16; 140:18;
145:12, 19; 149:4, 10;
150:1; 166:7; 170:12;
179:4, 24
morning 81:12
most 12:16; 14:5, 8; 17:8;
41:23; 48:3; 50:8; 57:10;
89:6; 91:6; 93:16; 96:3;
112:24; 125:13; 133:9;
140:14, 22; 143:17, 19;
144:13; 158:15
Mostly 180:7
move 143:15
moved 21:13
movement 76:4, 13;
78:13; 79:17; 80:1, 10, 10,
19
movements 78:2
MRI 59:18; 60:16; 62:5;
64:11; 68:22; 69:4; 71:9;
72:3, 10; 84:22; 85:15;
95:13; 99:8; 102:14;
111:21; 112:4, 15, 23;
113:20; 114:4, 16; 117:13,
14, 15, 23; 146:1; 150:8;
154:1; 158:3, 8, 17;
159:16, 21; 160:8; 161:6,
8; 168:24
MRIs 118:5
much 6:5; 13:11; 17:4;
18:16; 81:1, 4; 83:13;
86:20; 88:1; 93:21; 98:5, 5;
123:3; 124:14; 157:15, 20;
163:19
myelogram 59:18
myself 40:11; 171:2;
175:7

N

name 4:14; 31:6, 7;
50:10; 52:1
namely 56:12
nature 96:9; 108:18
necessarily 22:19; 56:4;
81:4, 21; 106:15; 157:11
necessary 99:7; 179:17
need 18:16, 17; 53:3;
67:23; 76:17; 131:18;
140:8; 142:20; 147:10;
157:21; 168:11
needed 37:22; 51:19;
52:11

needs 104:20; 130:22
negligent 42:13, 19; 96:6
nerve 11:15, 17, 20, 21;
12:5, 14, 15, 16; 19:5, 7;
26:7; 42:6, 10; 69:3; 86:11,
17; 87:10; 88:6, 15, 22;
89:4, 9, 21; 90:1, 5; 94:24;
95:3; 96:10; 100:1;
102:19; 117:8; 118:9;
145:9, 14, 15, 16, 18;
146:16, 19, 20, 20, 23;
147:4, 13; 148:4, 11, 16;
149:4, 12, 21; 150:3;
170:10; 180:2
nerves 25:24; 26:12;
69:15
nervous 125:8, 12
net 138:14, 17
neuro 153:10
neuro-oncology 122:16;
125:6, 10
neurologic 44:19; 62:13,
15; 65:21; 83:11; 95:17;
103:3; 119:6; 128:20;
145:6; 151:4, 17, 23;
153:24; 155:23; 170:3;
174:8
neurological 62:6, 21;
63:3; 65:8, 18; 99:11;
151:8; 178:3
neurologist 36:14; 87:23
neurology 7:22; 144:11
neuropraxia 145:13, 18,
19; 146:11; 148:20, 22;
149:3, 7, 9, 16, 17
neurosurgeon 20:15;
22:9; 36:15, 21; 37:3; 49:3,
7, 19; 58:23; 59:13; 60:13,
14, 15; 62:3, 11, 13; 64:8,
11; 65:20, 24; 85:18;
93:21; 114:1, 18; 115:4,
11; 116:3; 117:7; 118:4,
19; 166:15; 168:2; 172:9,
24; 173:9, 13; 174:7;
175:6; 180:16, 18
neurosurgeons 126:11;
163:1
neurosurgery 4:21;
55:21; 115:6; 127:19;
168:18
neurosurgical 49:20;
127:17; 159:24; 160:10;
161:10; 173:14
new 24:24; 25:10; 132:24;
134:14; 142:16; 162:9, 13;
178:20
next 95:10; 108:21;
112:13; 123:7; 138:21;
157:3
night 166:7; 168:7, 19;
175:8
nonintervening 45:4
normal 33:12; 39:14, 14,
15, 15, 16; 43:19; 56:9;
59:4; 99:24
normally 117:10
Northwestern 122:4, 11,

24; 123:5; 124:6; 126:5;
129:17; 132:20; 133:4
Nos 4:3; 120:12
notations 12:4
Note 10:15; 11:2; 31:11;
34:22; 46:6; 66:8; 76:6;
82:23; 105:22; 120:20;
143:3; 152:2; 168:21;
172:11; 174:4; 175:14
noted 24:17, 18; 42:2, 3,
13
notice 139:24
noticing 144:11
November 121:2
nucleus 21:11
numb 68:9; 171:2, 21
number 21:6; 28:15, 16;
39:22; 41:1; 56:6, 10;
106:24; 115:16, 19, 23;
125:15; 126:12; 133:24;
137:8; 148:24
numbers 93:4; 123:23;
125:17
numbness 14:12; 15:9,
21; 16:5; 17:1, 5, 15, 18;
18:8, 21; 23:20; 24:3, 4,
19; 25:3; 26:5, 5, 9; 28:5,
21; 60:4; 61:10; 63:8, 15;
64:3, 4, 7; 67:16, 23; 68:3;
69:1; 74:1, 7, 16, 17;
116:12; 146:4, 4, 6, 12;
148:14, 20; 149:1; 156:14
159:15; 161:6; 170:6, 17;
171:6, 19
nurse 75:21
nurses 170:19

O

oath 109:11
object 29:2; 45:13; 47:14
60:9; 71:5; 78:5; 88:7;
101:16; 108:17; 112:1;
156:3; 166:21
objection 8:6, 9; 10:15;
17:22; 18:10; 19:8; 20:9,
17; 22:1, 13, 16; 27:7;
28:11; 29:21; 30:8, 19;
31:11; 34:22; 35:18; 36:2;
37:14; 38:10; 41:4; 42:21;
43:5, 12, 21, 24; 46:6;
47:19, 21; 49:1; 50:16;
51:5, 15, 23; 52:9, 19;
53:10; 54:1, 12, 15; 58:10,
16; 63:11; 64:20; 66:8, 12;
67:11, 18; 69:22; 70:12,
13; 71:13, 23; 72:11; 73:4,
13, 22; 74:2, 13, 20; 75:6;
76:10; 77:4, 20; 78:22;
79:3, 12; 80:12, 22; 81:18;
82:10, 17; 83:1; 85:1, 11;
86:13; 87:7; 90:16; 91:10,
19; 92:9, 19; 93:17; 94:3,
15; 97:21; 100:6; 101:22;
103:7; 104:13, 21, 23;
105:8, 12, 22; 107:3;
108:17; 109:3, 22; 110:8,

April 25, 2001

11:111:7; 113:3, 12;
114:6, 8; 115:1; 116:17.
18, 24; 118:11, 12, 22, 23;
119:23; 124:1; 130:18;
137:24; 147:8, 23; 149:13;
150:4, 14, 15, 23; 151:11,
12, 15; 152:2; 13; 153:13,
14, 21; 154:3; 155:15, 16;
156:16; 157:8; 158:4, 6,
13; 159:1, 11, 17; 160:1, 2,
12; 161:12, 15; 163:16;
167:3, 20; 168:21; 171:10;
172:5, 6; 173:5, 6, 10;
174:4; 175:14; 176:12;
177:5, 15, 23; 178:12
objective 110:16
obligated 150:8
obtained 161:11
obtaining 59:17
obviously 142:11;
144:17; 145:5; 172:24
occasional 134:19;
137:14
occasions 8:16; 109:6
occur 12:11; 34:10;
35:15; 55:17; 85:24; 87:4;
93:16; 99:5; 128:11;
145:10
occurred 20:3; 26:1;
27:3; 74:18; 80:19; 88:23;
161:9
occurring 27:5
occurs 21:4; 170:11
October 181:10
off 7:8; 13:18; 14:19, 23;
23:16; 54:21; 102:10;
149:11; 161:22
offering 169:8
office 6:18; 12:23; 40:4;
97:11; 98:16; 99:17;
117:21; 133:8
Ohio 132:3, 5, 10
old 107:8; 181:10
omitted 8:18
once 26:8; 89:8; 151:1;
178:13
one 5:18; 7:3; 12:9; 14:2;
21:6; 26:22; 29:11; 32:21,
22, 24; 33:4, 16; 34:19;
35:15, 24; 36:20; 40:12,
13, 21; 44:23; 45:5; 46:24;
53:9, 21; 57:12; 58:14;
64:16; 68:19; 70:10, 10;
75:10; 77:12; 78:19; 81:5;
89:9, 17; 92:5; 94:13;
103:22; 104:6, 7; 105:20;
109:15; 110:21; 111:5;
113:9; 115:10, 11; 128:15;
132:9, 14; 133:14, 19;
134:1, 4, 5, 11; 137:3, 16;
145:17; 147:11; 152:9;
154:10; 168:6, 8; 171:23
one's 49:10
ones 9:17; 106:13; 110:2;
121:6; 123:1
only 10:23; 19:6; 55:3;
58:4; 65:12; 76:7; 88:5;

103:20; 104:6; 134:19;
167:6; 172:19
onset 32:19; 38:23; 44:8,
12; 45:6, 11, 16; 56:11;
84:15; 97:2
onto 64:3
open 89:24
operate 114:2
operated 97:2; 104:8;
106:6; 112:18; 116:4;
162:20
operating 59:2; 84:5;
97:11; 98:16; 99:16;
115:19; 128:21
operative 41:21; 42:2;
57:6
opinion 11:17; 15:1, 12;
20:3; 26:3; 27:5; 29:1;
47:12; 50:7; 51:14; 54:17;
56:22; 74:22; 86:7, 15;
88:8; 95:1; 97:15; 103:19;
112:11; 115:14; 116:6;
128:13; 140:11, 18; 141:1;
142:19; 144:7; 145:9;
146:9; 147:11; 148:10;
162:9, 19, 23; 163:7;
164:4; 165:2, 23; 167:7;
169:13; 170:22, 24; 171:4;
172:17; 174:12; 175:19;
176:7; 180:4, 9
opinions 25:8, 18; 49:16;
17:50:2, 51:3, 19; 52:8;
54:9; 55:1, 23; 57:23;
110:14, 16, 18; 139:24;
140:3, 4, 9, 18, 23; 141:3,
6, 12; 142:10, 11, 17, 22,
24; 143:6, 13; 144:13;
162:3, 13; 165:10; 169:8;
172:23; 178:21
opportunity 85:17, 22;
86:2, 6; 122:10, 22;
128:24; 129:2; 142:3
opposed 19:6; 39:6;
90:23; 92:1; 110:6;
114:22; 126:14; 130:14;
137:10; 179:23; 180:2
option 41:23; 113:15
oranges 28:14
order 12:11; 93:15;
118:5; 158:24; 159:4;
161:7; 164:8; 181:8
ordered 117:13, 15, 23;
118:1, 2, 3
original 98:14; 120:23
originally 122:3
orthopedic 22:8; 49:4
Others 95:20; 134:5, 9
otherwise 40:23
out 8:20, 24; 21:16;
25:17; 33:7; 36:15; 38:4;
48:15; 50:21; 52:16;
55:23; 67:15; 69:14;
90:20; 96:20; 101:2;
104:8; 111:12; 115:15;
118:20; 121:13; 126:16;
131:7, 9, 10; 140:15;
142:22; 149:24; 150:11,

13, 21; 151:10, 24; 153:11;
154:1, 2, 8, 13; 155:8, 12;
156:1; 159:9; 160:22;
163:7; 165:9; 167:7;
169:10; 178:24; 179:3, 3,
5, 13, 17, 24; 180:9, 19
outcome 56:9; 58:15;
114:3, 21, 24; 128:10;
157:19; 166:1
outcomes 46:15
outer 21:10
outpatient 36:14
Over 5:17; 11:15; 34:10;
49:24; 80:3; 104:15;
105:16; 121:22, 24;
123:24; 125:14, 16, 21;
128:23; 141:22; 155:6;
169:13
overlap 7:2, 16
overlaps 127:7, 9
overwhelming 90:8;
137:9
own 45:10; 85:20; 94:6;
122:13; 130:14; 168:17

P

page 11:3, 13, 16; 56:18;
57:8; 143:3, 10, 10, 12;
144:21; 165:3, 12, 15;
180:12
pages 143:5, 24; 162:2;
178:16; 180:13
paid 121:11; 130:5
pain 17:1, 15; 18:20, 24;
21:8, 12; 222:1; 561:3;
69:1; 84:11, 13; 99:9;
115:24; 116:1; 154:18, 21;
156:19, 19; 160:18;
169:12, 16, 17, 21, 23;
170:6
paper 48:1, 14
papers 5:19; 48:1, 7, 18;
49:21; 91:22; 106:3
paragraph 37:18
part 24:21; 30:12; 47:10;
57:10; 70:1, 6, 17, 19;
94:5, 7; 106:6; 122:16;
144:22; 148:6; 149:22, 23;
180:10
partial 16:18; 21; 17:7;
23:4; 26:17; 2820; 88:5;
119:11; 128:12
partially 87:12, 20
particular 52:17; 68:8;
7624; 84:16; 87:16;
94:14; 103:2; 140:24;
142:14; 144:14; 169:13
parts 62:22; 114:10;
125:12
past 5:17; 40:11; 68:23;
76:2; 106:18; 125:14, 21;
131:13; 135:23
patient 26:10; 29:12;
32:14; 33:1, 9; 35:23;
36:12, 12, 16; 38:21; 39:2;

41:16; 43:4; 44:17; 45:8;
49:12; 56:6, 10; 58:19, 24;
59:1, 7, 11, 20, 23; 60:1;
62:3, 12, 16; 63:4, 5, 23;
64:7; 65:6, 10, 12, 22;
67:22, 22; 68:4, 6, 7, 18,
20; 69:8; 72:2; 76:24; 83:5;
85:3; 86:5, 22; 90:9, 10,
11, 20; 91:1, 4, 5; 92:23;
93:13, 15, 22; 94:11, 14;
103:23; 106:10, 11, 12;
109:20; 110:22; 111:13;
116:10, 13, 14; 117:20;
129:8, 9; 135:19, 24;
136:10; 139:11; 151:4;
153:5; 154:21; 155:19, 20;
156:11, 18; 157:11;
158:22; 159:7; 160:16;
168:5; 171:7; 174:8
patient's 31:7
patients 5:13; 33:5, 20;
46:9; 49:11, 21; 91:7; 92:3,
8, 13, 17; 93:4; 103:21;
107:7; 126:13, 21; 127:11;
156:7
pausing 91:21
pay 31:14; 158:22
people 19:18; 22:20;
36:20; 41:24; 48:8; 56:2, 4;
81:6, 7; 106:1, 5, 9, 17;
119:2; 122:21
per 125:24; 131:14
percent 40:13; 43:14;
90:13; 93:7; 98:11, 11, 12,
21; 100:13; 124:3; 125:14;
126:6, 23; 127:2; 133:6;
135:6; 138:16; 162:23;
163:2, 2
percentage 1:3; 23;
125:10; 126:2, 17; 138:3,
13
perfect 111:15
perform 32:20
performed 33:9; 41:19,
20; 43:9; 44:5; 45:12;
95:14; 125:16; 160:8;
161:5
performing 108:10;
126:22
perhaps 179:1
perineal 14:12; 15:9;
28:5; 60:4; 61:10; 63:8;
54:19; 65:2; 66:3; 673, 16
17:71:3, 12, 21; 72:9;
74:1, 7, 16, 17; 108:15, 15;
109:1; 116:11; 149:1;
156:14; 157:7; 159:15;
161:6
period 19:20; 34:11;
36:22; 165:19; 166:6;
167:18
permanent 26:4, 13;
34:15; 56:16; 145:24;
148:12; 179:20
permanently 146:21;
147:2; 172:15
persistent 64:7; 159:14
person 39:10; 64:13;

69:12; 84:4; 89:12;
102:20; 103:1, 2; 106:10;
154:18, 23
personal 94:6; 100:19,
20; 130:14
personally 32:14; 40:20;
41:2; 46:20, 21; 100:17
perspective 17:9
phone 7:10; 13:15; 24:15;
102:7
phonetic 55:16; 57:1;
121:14; 132:2
photographic 106:8
phrase 39:20; 74:15
physical 22:7; 66:21;
77:9; 161:4
physician 96:4; 116:9;
117:9, 19; 135:1; 176:17;
177:14
physician's 76:3
physicians 96:3; 132:5;
174:10
pick 110:13; 161:22
picked 13:14; 27:21
picking 55:23; 110:10
picture 26:21
PIE 132:4, 9
piece 141:16
Pikkel 4:17; 15:4; 21:20;
27:11; 37:10; 49:17; 56:4;
65:12; 73:8; 75:21; 84:11;
86:8; 94:20; 107:13;
110:6, 19, 23; 111:21;
112:2; 114:3; 117:3;
120:7; 144:17, 23; 163:22;
174:3; 175:12; 176:10, 22;
179:10
Pikkel's 11:17; 14:1;
23:6; 38:9; 72:20; 88:6;
107:18; 140:20; 169:11
pin 68:12; 171:24
pinprick 68:16; 155:24;
157:6
place 21:9; 34:8; 116:12;
122:24; 123:1; 129:15
placing 108:10
plaintiff 30:15; 135:20;
136:16, 20; 137:11
plaintiff's 137:14;
172:22; 174:19
plaintiffs 137:17
plays 36:17
Please 104:18; 105:3, 9;
8; 116:5; 138:7; 178:21
plus 70:8; 131:14
point 6:9; 9:22; 23:20;
24:22; 27:23; 37:9; 41:24;
44:7, 10, 11; 49:6; 64:10;
74:10; 75:6; 80:14, 20;
93:10; 97:18; 98:7; 99:18;
107:11, 14; 110:7; 117:7;
140:12; 146:1; 149:3;
153:2; 159:16, 21; 162:19;
176:15; 179:5; 180:19
jointed 48:15

pointing 167:7
points 28:15; 143:20;
144:3
poke 68:12; 171:24
poking 662; 68:14
policies 130:2
policy 129:15
polite 6:8
population 90:9, 11;
91:5; 93:16
posed 105:4
position 50:14; 53:9, 22;
55:4, 11, 58:5; 126:19;
173:3
positions 57:23; 122:24
positive 18:13
possibility 38:4; 148:9;
179:14
possible 34:10, 13, 19;
35:16; 37:22; 42:8; 86:22;
89:11; 96:15, 16; 98:2, 5;
109:14; 152:23; 156:12;
167:9; 179:2
possibly 14:11, 18:22;
51:6; 87:3; 118:8; 144:16
potential 118:21
practical 19:23; 111:3
practically 67:20; 71:8;
83:3
practice 46:18; 135:6, 9
praxia 145:15
precisely 37:22
predict 94:13
predictor 93:24
prefacing 162:2
preliminary 11:13;
140:17
prepared 10:3, 23
preparing 10:13; 13:21
present 120:6; 133:17;
148:21; 169:21
presentation 11:18;
15:22; 16:14; 23:7; 28:22;
101:3, 6, 15; 102:4, 12;
113:2; 117:21; 119:22;
147:12; 152:5; 156:24;
158:9
presented 27:18; 60:1;
61:2; 63:5; 65:7; 73:19;
80:17; 95:19, 22; 106:24;
113:24; 117:22; 119:19;
144:18; 148:24
presenting 26:17; 57:
presents 49:8; 59:11;
80:2; 81:14, 16; 110:23;
145:22; 160:24; 161:2
pressure 21:15; 87:11;
149:11
pretty 11:20; 13:10; 41:8;
123:3; 125:21; 163:18
prevent 129:8
previous 46:11; 121:7, 9;
132:13; 133:12, 13, 15;
137:13
previously 26:24; 109:5

primarily 24:12
primary 63:22; 175:9
principle 38:2
print 8:20, 24; 121:13
prior 11:18; 17:11
probability 35:11; 41:1;
43:2; 86:11; 97:1, 10, 13,
18; 98:10, 18, 19, 20, 24;
99:19; 100:3, 13; 163:12
probable 34:18; 35:3;
36:1; 87:4; 95:3
probably 14:9; 15:2;
26:11; 30:12, 24; 31:21;
35:15; 36:16; 37:11; 41:7;
43:14; 62:5; 68:2; 82:4;
85:14; 100:22; 103:21;
106:23; 113:7; 116:3;
117:24; 119:20; 126:22;
128:13; 133:15; 135:16;
17; 136:2, 7; 137:2; 162:1;
168:14
problem 12:12; 14:14;
15:15, 16; 16:16; 21:8;
24:17; 34:15; 56:12, 16
63:1, 23; 66:6; 69:4, 17;
77:18; 79:19, 22; 87:1;
88:21; 95:6; 96:7; 99:4;
111:12; 114:10; 115:20,
22; 117:8; 118:8; 146:2;
155:20; 165:4; 174:6, 9
problems 7:5; 9:13;
14:11, 12; 15:9, 20, 21;
16:5; 25:9, 10, 16, 19;
43:4; 76:7; 78:4, 12; 79:10;
95:17; 103:3, 6; 112:10;
126:13, 14; 128:20;
160:17; 162:22; 163:23;
175:8
procedure 41:19; 43:20;
167:13
procedures 39:23, 23;
125:23; 130:3
proceed 72:9; 142:6
proceedings 83:22
produced 4:24; 95:21
profess 166:23
professional 4:19;
31:14; 126:17; 135:11
professor 122:17, 19,
20; 123:4, 8, 10, 19
progressed 78:10
progressing 84:16
progressive 26:22
project 46:15
projects 124:21
promotion 122:18
prompt 89:10; 90:15;
91:7, 12; 92:7, 13, 16;
163:13
promptly 87:6; 90:12
pronounced 57:17
proper 66:7; 110:22;
156:15
proposed 86:2
provide 8:2; 31:10
provided 170:1; 175:12

prudent 129:20
psychic 156:20
publication 48:23; 49:15
published 45:19; 55:20;
100:16
purpose 111:11
purposes 19:24; 110:22
pursue 67:24
pushing 102:18
put 11:15, 24; 19:18, 19;
37:17; 49:23; 55:21;
74:10; 79:2; 83:7; 94:5;
119:4; 147:15; 152:8;
170:23; 180:14
putting 84:4; 145:5;
153:6, 9, 11

Q

qualified 66:5; 116:9;
175:20, 21; 176:24; 177:1,
11, 17
quantify 133:3
quantitate 163:21
quantitatively 133:5
quick 95:15
quickest 168:19
quickly 143:19; 145:20
quite 133:10
quote 55:8; 56:19; 57:8,
18

R

radiating 19:2; 170:1
radiculopathy 156:23
radiologist 13:6
radiology 13:10
raise 18:23
raising 18:14
range 20:1; 40:14; 137:2
rapid 34:14; 128:18
rare 39:18; 40:12; 41:8;
103:24
rather 110:13
read 8:21; 23:8; 24:9;
29:3; 53:13, 15; 79:4;
101:24; 102:3; 105:9, 11;
106:2, 3; 160:4; 178:15;
181:7, 8
reading 42:2; 75:20;
165:11
ready 59:20
real 38:17; 129:22; 148:8
reality 148:3
realize 166:2
really 7:23; 8:20; 10:9;
15:21; 16:11, 17; 22:4;
26:15; 29:18; 33:17; 81:8;
86:3; 93:2; 106:12;
111:14, 18; 121:10;
126:10; 130:24; 131:17;
144:7; 149:15; 154:18;

164:23; 167:24; 169:12,
14; 172:20; 181:1
realm 87:22
reason 19:4; 26:18;
27:20; 61:20; 68:19;
129:4; 149:10
reasonable 38:8; 43:2;
72:15, 19; 86:10; 93:12;
96:3; 97:1, 9, 13, 18;
98:10; 100:3, 12; 163:11;
164:18
reasonably 33:21
reasons 111:5; 119:3
recall 7:19; 8:13; 10:5;
14:9; 29:11; 30:24; 32:9,
10, 12; 38:24; 40:18;
41:10; 45:17; 106:22;
109:12; 132:13; 136:18;
164:9
recalled 106:21
receive 91:7
received 37:20, 67:6;
134:7
recent 14:5, 8; 121:6
recess 89:18; 141:8;
142:7
recognized 30:2, 5;
85:18; 167:8
recollection 13:1, 9
recommend 44:13; 45:5;
164:2
recommended 41:15;
115:12
reconstruct 9:21; 40:4
record 7:8; 8:9; 10:10;
13:18; 14:17, 23; 23:16;
24:17, 18; 31:2; 34:24;
53:14; 54:21; 60:22;
74:12; 75:4, 8, 12, 16, 19,
21; 77:18; 78:19; 79:8;
82:9, 11, 15; 83:4, 8;
88:18; 102:1, 10; 104:15;
105:10; 108:23; 109:15;
120:16; 141:16; 143:23;
170:24; 171:3, 8, 9; 172:2,
3; 179:8; 180:14
recorded 82:20; 109:13;
170:18, 21; 171:7, 9
records 11:7; 14:10, 21;
15:2, 17; 24:8, 8, 13; 25:4,
5; 31:1, 4, 8, 16; 39:22;
40:1; 74:10; 88:14; 107:8;
108:18; 112:21; 121:5, 19;
131:20; 133:9; 139:15;
181:12
recover 33:11; 86:22;
89:9, 12
recovered 35:24; 95:15;
102:21; 162:21
recovery 33:22, 24; 34:2,
2, 6, 7, 8, 10; 35:11; 38:2;
44:14, 19; 85:22; 87:5;
90:14, 15; 101:13, 18, 20
rectal 66:24; 69:8, 13;
71:3, 11, 20; 72:8; 77:10,
13; 78:2, 15, 21; 79:15, 16,
18; 80:3, 9, 17; 81:14, 22;

82:5, 15; 84:20; 108:14,
24; 155:24; 156:13; 157:5
159:15; 161:5
rectum 69:15
refer 51:13; 52:4, 15, 24;
53:3
reference 82:14
references 57:11
referred 44:17
referring 14:17
reflect 144:7
reflected 65:14
refresh 8:18; 110:2;
142:23
regain 86:12
regarding 91:23
Regardless 62:18; 74:16
region 14:13; 26:8; 171:2
regular 81:10, 12
regularly 81:7, 11
rehabilitation 36:13
reinforced 67:9
relate 59:6; 125:11;
137:5; 178:2
related 8:23; 15:4; 140:21
relates 14:6; 46:15;
146:24; 175:11; 176:6, 9
relating 20:24
relevant 6:22; 83:6;
108:10
reliable 45:22; 46:2, 3;
47:9, 12, 16, 24; 48:14, 22
reliably 67:15
relieve 149:11
rely 66:10, 16; 68:17;
109:10
relying 49:14, 18; 50:2;
68:4
remember 8:1; 103:21,
22; 104:6; 120:8; 132:12;
170:15
removed 5:4
repeat 60:18; 120:4;
172:13
repertoire 47:20
repetitive 108:18
rephrase 14:3; 23:10;
60:21; 77:22; 79:7
report 10:3, 13, 20, 23;
11:8, 13; 13:10, 20, 22;
25:19; 37:19; 41:21; 42:2;
140:1, 6, 17; 146:22; 163:9
reported 20:6; 21:17;
77:2, 7, 23; 79:20; 94:1;
129:24
reporter 53:15; 102:2;
105:11; 109:16
reports 57:10; 76:1;
181:9
represent 4:17; 178:20
representation 82:12
represented 95:9
represents 83:11
require 82:22; 118:20;

April 25, 2001

139:23;172:4
required 50:18; 123:15;
 149:24;156:15;171:5
research 5:23; 6:15;
 45:22; 46:2, 4, 15; 122:20;
 124:5, 6, 9, 13, 15, 21, 23;
 125:9; 126:23
researched 5:9; 46:8, 9,
 10
residency 67:10; 122:1
resident 49:20; 127:12
residents 175:7
residual 86:24; 95:16;
 103:5; 162:21
resisted 164:13
resolve 110:17; 115:21;
 145:19, 23; 148:23;
 149:18
resolved 24:19; 60:5;
 61:11; 63:9, 16; 64:4; 65:2;
 68:2; 74:12; 116:12;
 146:7; 148:15, 21
respect 91:17; 174:21
respond 94:14; 157:24;
 168:12
responsibilities 122:17;
 125:11; 127:23; 129:22
rest 60:18; 126:24
result 32:2; 118:9
resulting 22:10
results 82:23
retained 4:18; 6:15
retention 62:2, 4; 63:17,
 24; 65:23; 66:16; 68:11;
 69:24; 72:21; 73:1; 75:22;
 84:20; 86:9; 95:23; 96:1;
 98:4; 99:9; 100:23;
 102:14; 107:24; 108:8;
 111:1, 16, 23; 112:15;
 115:5, 16; 116:11, 14;
 119:2; 144:16, 20; 147:5;
 148:4; 156:13; 160:17;
 168:14; 180:8
retrospective 56:20;
 92:3
retrospectively 48:5
return 57:19; 91:8; 92:8,
 18; 97:4, 14, 19; 98:18;
 99:21; 163:10, 11, 14
returned 24:4
revenues 138:9
reverse 26: 12; 86:11
review 11:6; 12:19;
 15:17; 65:15; 85:19;
 131:19; 134:14; 169:10
reviewed 5:9; 13:6, 21;
 20:15; 24:23; 25:4; 88:4
reviewing 14:21; 41:21
reviews 139:16
right 9:14; 12:24; 19:16;
 20:16; 23:22; 24:4; 27:10;
 50:12; 52:14; 56:15; 59:2;
 62:20; 77:3; 78:24; 79:3,
 23; 88:23; 97:10; 104:4;
 109:13, 16; 122:5; 134:23;
 139:17; 154:2, 19; 156:14;

168:13
risk 43:19
risks 33:3; 39:11
room 4:19; 15:23; 16:1,
 14; 24:5; 25:22; 26:20;
 27:18; 53:18; 60:22; 61:2,
 14; 62:1, 9; 64:6; 65:24;
 66:5, 11, 16; 67:5; 70:17,
 18; 72:23; 78:16; 79:24;
 80:7; 81:23; 82:5; 84:6;
 89:1; 95:2, 10, 19, 23;
 101:7; 107:23; 109:14;
 113:15; 117:9, 19; 119:1;
 120:7; 142:15; 146:5, 6;
 147:16; 165:17; 170:20;
 174:2, 7, 10, 16, 19, 22,
 23; 175:2, 3, 4, 5; 176:17;
 177:13, 22; 178:2; 180:11,
 17
root 42:6, 10; 69:4; 88:16;
 90:1; 145:16; 146:20;
 149:12
roots 11:16, 18, 20, 22;
 12:5, 8, 14, 15, 16; 19:5, 7;
 26:7; 86:12, 17; 87:10;
 88:6, 22; 89:4, 9, 21; 90:5;
 94:24; 95:3; 96:10; 100:1;
 102:19; 117:9; 145:9;
 148:11; 149:4; 170:10
Ruff 4:16; 6:1, 1, 6, 10;
 7:5; 9:7, 9; 13:13; 14:19;
 22:13; 23:12; 83:16, 19,
 20; 153:21; 181:5
rule 67:15; 118:20;
 149:24; 150:11, 13, 21;
 151:24; 153:11; 154:8, 13;
 155:12; 156:1; 159:9
ruled 151:10; 154:1, 2
rules 139:23
ruling 38:4; 179:3, 24
running 18:6

S

S2 12:17
S5 12:8, 17
sacral 12:7, 13, 15
SAITH 181:14
salary 122:15; 123:24;
 124:20
same 13:5; 26:14; 44:s;
 91:19; 96:2, 5; 103:4;
 117:21; 155:18; 156:6;
 160:9; 161:7; 167:17
Saturday 175:8
saw 74:8; 146:4; 174:3
saying 18:18; 22:19;
 28:22; 33:17; 42:7, 7, 12,
 94:10, 17, 20; 95:22;
 96:22, 24; 97:9, 16; 98:2;
 99:19; 100:8; 112:5;
 117:17; 152:11; 160:15;
 168:3; 170:22; 171:15, 16;
 179:18
scan 8:16; 59:18; 60:16;
 84:4; 85:10, 15; 99:8;
 102:15; 117:23; 162:11

scanty 57:9
scenario 28:19; 168:17
schedule 131:12; 176:17
school 66:21, 23; 67:7;
 127:16; 175:1
screaming 7:10
search 8:17; 9:1, 3, 4;
 10:2, 12; 46:14; 50:6; 53:1,
 4, 6
searches 9:23; 10:1;
 20:23
second 11:3; 15:24;
 16:15; 23:7; 24:5, 16; 25:1,
 12; 26:20; 27:6, 22; 28:9,
 17, 22; 51:6; 75:8, 12, 17;
 76:8; 77:2; 78:11; 79:8, 24;
 80:2, 18; 81:15, 24; 89:17;
 101:3, 14; 108:2; 113:2,
 24; 159:23; 165:18
Secondary 55:10
section 170:7
Security 139:9
seeing 116:3; 126:21;
 127:11; 139:11; 164:9;
 170:19
sees 40:12; 116:10
segregate 138:6
selective 134:19
selectively 62:23; 133:1
self-catheterizing 164:s
semantics 155:7
seminars 127:21
send 113:19
sensation 33:15; 39:15;
 64:22; 67:2; 68:17; 71:3,
 12, 21; 72:9; 108:16;
 109:1; 155:24; 157:6
sense 21:17; 153:17, 20;
 154:20
sensitive 96:11
sent 11:10; 116:14;
 121:8; 132:9; 135:24;
 137:13
sentence 37:17; 136:13
Separate 134:24; 139:7;
 179:10
September 10:21;
 165:17
Sequestered 55:14
serious 149:4; 150:1;
 179:24
set 134:16
settled 136:9; 137:18
seven 165:22; 166:3;
 167:17
seven-hour 165:19
several 19:22; 32:21, 23;
 33:4; 36:15; 38:23; 44:18;
 109:5; 154:10
severe 19:1; 33:2; 88:22;
 89:7, 8; 115:24
severely 87:14
severity 169:16
sexual 96:11

Shaffer 56:24
shall 84:17; 87:12; 89:6
Shapiro 7:4, 16; 18:3;
 46:20; 104:3
Shapiro's 16:24; 55:19;
 70:22
shoes 117:16, 18
short 11:13; 48:20
show 10:11; 75:14;
 78:19; 90:8, 9; 92:16
showed 85:14; 111:22;
 113:8, 20; 114:17; 159:21;
 160:9; 165:17
shown 81:14; 112:6, 16,
 24; 113:2; 159:23; 161:8
shows 85:15; 88:15;
 108:24; 159:14; 161:5, 6, 7
sides 110:10, 13; 151:21
sign 70:10
significance 11:3, 5;
 141:5; 143:4; 169:15, 20,
 23
significant 130:1;
 170:17; 171:12, 16, 23
signs 62:18; 100:24
similar 26:6; 128:14
simple 156:21
simply 22:9; 113:19;
 116:12; 142:18; 147:4;
 149:3; 150:3; 154:14;
 173:24
sit 5:20; 6:3; 9:14; 10:5;
 40:18; 41:10; 50:12, 15,
 19; 51:21; 52:6, 18; 53:8;
 104:7
sitting 109:16; 133:16
situation 49:18; 87:13;
 16; 90:4; 106:2; 150:7;
 164:4; 174:11
situations 174:24
six 44:23; 100:21; 134:15;
 136:6
size 160:9
skim 55:12; 142:23
skipped 180:13
slash 136:3
slight 44:14; 118:7
slip 120:22
small 112:16; 115:5, 17
smaller 112:8; 113:1, 9,
 21, 23; 114:18; 115:18;
 159:22
So-so 140:24
Social 139:9
soft 69
solely 47:5
somehow 96:17; 115:3
someone 13:2; 21:6, 19;
 37:24; 39:10; 40:11;
 62:12; 63:2; 66:15; 68:11,
 12, 14; 76:15, 16; 79:14;
 96:18; 99:8; 144:5; 155:3;
 168:13; 171:1, 21
sometime 81:16

sometimes 14:13; 48:9;
 59:18; 68:7; 83:7; 87:15;
 89:24; 110:3; 111:2;
 125:14
somewhat 579:64; 23
somewhere 80:11;
 138:11
soon 59:16, 19
sooner 90:23
sorry 6:4; 34:3; 53:13;
 63:14; 71:15; 146:14;
 178:9
sort 8:21; 11:12; 12:1, 11;
 33:20; 85:5; 90:4; 132:11;
 134:16, 18; 139:4, 9
sounds 79:1
Spanner 74:8, 9; 96:5;
 109:18; 110:1, 5, 18;
 117:4; 120:5; 143:9;
 146:5, 8; 147:3; 150:21;
 155:12; 158:10; 165:4;
 173:3; 174:2; 175:12, 20;
 176:1; 177:3; 179:1, 11
Spanner's 74:12;
 109:11; 117:16; 118:15,
 18; 143:3, 16; 161:21;
 176:10
speak 104:2; 108:18
speaker 13:15; 143:16
speaking 40:15; 49:6;
 67:20; 83:3
speaks 155:2
specialist 113:11
specific 7:24; 9:17; 12:5;
 37:6, 7; 41:11; 45:3; 49:14;
 50:1, 5, 10, 14, 23; 51:2,
 12; 52:1, 4, 5, 5, 15; 53:2,
 7, 17, 22; 54:4; 103:17;
 106:17; 123:22; 163:5
specifically 4:21; 6:21;
 10:4, 12; 14:16; 24:8, 16;
 103:11; 124:7; 127:24;
 128:3, 9; 167:11; 178:5
specifics 104:11
speculating 100:18;
 112:19
speech 105:1
speed 122:2; 142:9
spend 127:12; 129:23
spent 175:1
sphincter 78:15
spinal 171:19
spine 85:5; 126:3, 6, 8, 8,
 11, 13, 15
spoken 6:9
spot 96:2
staff 31:15
stand 34:24
standard 21:23; 22:2;
 30:18; 42:19; 82:22; 99:7;
 116:8; 118:19; 151:9;
 171:5; 172:4; 173:4;
 174:1; 176:1; 177:2, 12,
 21; 178:6
standards 174:21;
 175:11

standpoint 19:3; 83:24
stands 12:3
start 66:2; 106:21; 138:5;
140:13; 143:2
start-up 124:13, 14
started 15:17; 20:5;
25:16; 60:17; 65:1; 73:15;
78:8, 8; 94:22; 122:8;
133:14; 165:20
starting 25:19; 143:8;
170:9, 9
state 75:4; 130:16;
131:10
statement 71:18; 157:21
status 75:18; 101:19
stay 141:16
staying 141:19
step 123:7
stick 83:6
still 7:5; 14:14; 15:6;
33:18; 35:16; 45:5; 87:16;
95:11; 96:8; 98:12; 99:23;
124:23; 125:2; 126:8, 14;
137:9; 138:23; 149:2, 2, 7;
163:23; 164:7
stool 76:16
stop 35:7; 58:6; 63:2;
97:8
stopped 74:17
straight 18:13, 23
strength 33:14; 39:15
stress 119:10
strictest 154:20
strike 13:4; 44:7, 9;
59:23; 107:16; 108:4;
117:14; 160:24; 165:12
strong 72:14
strongly 85:4
student 127:11
students 127:18; 129:1
studied 91:5
studies 48:4; 94:1;
100:16; 103:11, 14, 18;
116:16
study 52:16; 56:19;
172:14
subacute 19:13, 21;
32:22; 39:3, 5, 10
subject 45:23
subjective 68:4
subjects 8:23
subsequently 136:9
substantial 90:15; 91:9;
97:14, 19
successful 27:2; 28:8;
39:5, 9, 13
suffers 56:20
sufficient 86:12
suggest 58:8; 70:4, 11,
15, 18; 78:3; 79:9; 91:6;
138:20; 170:8
suggesting 42:18;
53:21; 76:6, 12
suggestion 58:22; 70:15

suggestive 170:12
suggests 69:21
summarize 48:20
support 24:23; 50:9;
51:18, 22; 52:7; 54:9, 17;
5722:58:5; 82:4; 91:24;
92:6, 13; 163:1, 4, 5
supported 55:1
supporting 55:4
supports 50:7, 14; 51:3,
10, 13; 53:8, 22; 55:11, 16;
56:21
sure 8:18; 10:11; 14:10;
23:10; 28:13; 33:18;
36:19; 38:18; 42:17; 54:5,
19; 73:5; 75:14; 77:15;
88:9; 106:20; 115:17;
122:12; 133:23; 140:2;
141:2; 160:14; 162:7;
164:17; 174:23
surgeon 22:8; 26:9;
27:24; 28:2; 49:4; 157:18
surgeries 125:15;
126:22
surgery 162:25:23;
27:3; 28:8, 15, 24; 32:20,
24; 33:3, 9, 20; 35:12;
36:6, 23; 37:4, 11; 39:5,
12; 41:2, 15; 42:5; 43:10;
44:5, 10, 13, 15; 45:5, 12;
49:4; 56:7, 10, 15; 58:15;
59:10; 86:9, 18; 87:6, 15;
89:10, 21, 23; 90:11, 15,
22; 91:8; 92:1, 7, 13, 16;
94:12, 14; 95:14; 97:12;
98:16; 100:4; 101:3, 11;
102:16; 103:4, 16; 114:4,
20; 115:12; 126:8, 9, 11,
12, 15; 127:11; 128:3, 4,
10, 11; 129:5, 6, 7; 149:11,
18; 157:3, 17; 163:13;
165:20, 23; 166:18; 167:1,
18; 168:20; 178:3; 179:22
surgical 7:22; 17:11;
26:1; 30:6, 13; 55:8; 57:2,
5, 8; 8621:87:13; 95:5;
125:23; 128:19; 166:8
surgically 32:14, 17;
150:2
surprised 141:10
suspect 8:9; 85:4; 156:11
suspected 61:5, 7; 71:4,
8, 22; 72:10; 84:24; 159:6
suspecting 61:13, 18
suspicion 72:14; 118:7,
14, 18
sworn 4:7, 10
symptoms 18:6, 7;
24:24; 27:3, 5; 28:4; 32:19;
57:5; 62:18, 19; 64:24;
78:9; 100:24; 116:1; 179:4
syndrome 12:2; 15:10;
16:9, 11, 12, 19, 20, 23;
17:3, 6, 7, 15, 20; 182, 2,
5, 5, 8, 13, 19, 20; 194;
20:8; 21:1, 20; 22:10;
26:15, 16, 18; 27:12, 20;
38:20; 29:8; 30:1; 32:15;

33:1; 36:9; 38:22; 39:2, 7,
11; 40:5, 9, 16, 19; 41:3,
12; 44:20; 45:2, 7, 20;
46:5, 16; 47:1; 48:3, 14,
17, 24; 55:9, 14; 56:3, 6, 9,
12, 14; 57:5, 15; 58:20;
59:3, 12, 19; 60:7; 61:5, 8,
13, 16, 21; 62:2; 64:12;
69:21; 70:2, 5, 7, 11, 20,
23; 71:4, 22; 72:10; 80:6;
83:11; 84:8, 19, 24; 85:4;
95:11, 13, 21; 96:21; 98:4;
105:19; 106:12, 15; 107:1;
116:10; 119:8, 10; 128:1,
12, 16; 129:14; 140:20;
144:22; 149:23; 150:12,
17, 22; 151:5; 152:1, 5, 6,
23; 153:12; 154:13, 15, 20,
24; 155:3, 10; 157:1;
179:14, 15
system 125:8, 12;
130:12; 180:24

T

tabbed 143:4, 24
table 55:22; 56:7; 97:11;
98:16; 99:16
tabs 141:4, 5; 142:17;
162:8
tagged 144:1, 6; 178:16
tags 143:20; 144:2
talk 24:14; 28:14; 56:13;
106:1; 141:15
talked 104:2; 137:4;
179:3
talking 14:20; 35:10, 13;
39:13; 49:21; 53:7; 62:10;
65:10, 13; 76:23, 24;
88:13; 93:13; 128:3;
134:22; 147:21; 148:1;
154:19; 173:8, 12; 174:17;
176:20; 179:13, 17;
180:16, 17
tax 31:4, 8, 16; 121:9;
137:21
teach 127:15, 17
teaching 127:7, 9, 13, 23
tear 42:4, 9; 43:3, 11
technical 155:9
technique 57:6
telephonically 83:21
telling 36:20, 21, 23;
58:15
tells 67:22; 68:5, 18
temporary 24:3; 145:15;
179:19, 23
ten 41:6; 125:21; 137:2
tension 147:14
enure 123:12, 13, 14, 16,
20
term 9:3; 11:21; 98:20;
45:11, 12; 150:20;
73:15, 16
terms 19:12, 14, 16;
21:23; 25:2, 7; 27:1; 32:8;

37:12; 39:14; 41:19; 45:2;
87:24; 94:1; 103:15;
104:10; 124:5; 125:17;
126:17; 129:17; 134:10,
15, 21; 137:8, 12, 15, 17;
138:2, 2, 13; 139:8; 143:5,
13; 146:3; 166:5, 17, 24
test 66:24; 67:2; 71:3, 11,
21; 72:9
testified 4:10; 29:7;
34:23; 136:19, 22; 137:19;
177:20
testify 130:24; 131:8;
175:10
testifying 14:7; 22:4;
131:12, 14
testimony 31:23; 135:2;
137:12; 142:13; 163:9;
165:8; 175:13; 177:12;
178:1
testing 64:22
tests 116:15
textbooks 106:3
Thanks 107:22; 160:23
theory 166:5
therapist 22:8
therapy 108:11
thereafter 34:20; 35:17;
36:1
therefore 94:12
thin 47:21
thinking 21:13; 107:6;
166:8; 180:5
third 51:6; 81:7
though 51:12; 113:21;
126:7; 144:2
thought 30:12; 41:22;
105:17; 115:15; 131:17;
140:11; 145:2; 156:8;
166:18
thousands 8:23
threatening 84:8
three 16:3, 4; 31:21;
44:23; 123:19; 141:23;
165:24
thrown 6:20
times 48:16; 57:19;
90:24; 109:13; 136:22;
137:1; 152:4; 164:8
Timing 55:8; 58:22;
83:24; 128:10
today 5:20; 10:5; 14:15;
15:6; 38:13; 50:19; 52:7,
12, 18; 53:18; 96:8;
110:14; 128:15; 140:3, 6;
142:12; 146:10; 162:10;
163:9, 23
together 18:6; 49:23;
51:10; 93:5; 94:6
token 26:14
told 36:24; 48:21; 105:20;
107:2; 117:5
tone 66:24; 69:8, 13;
77:10, 13; 78:2, 21; 79:15,
16, 19; 80:3, 9, 17; 81:14,
22, 24; 82:5, 15; 84:19;

108:14, 24; 159:15; 161:6;
took 155:18; 156:6; 166:6
tool 62:21
topic 47:11, 13; 129:12,
13; 130:3
topics 10:7; 127:17
TORGERSON 6:8; 8:5, 8;
10:15; 17:21; 18:10; 19:8;
20:9, 17; 22:1, 16; 27:7;
28:10; 29:2, 20; 30:8, 19;
31:10, 11, 17; 34:22;
35:18; 36:2; 37:14; 38:10;
41:4; 42:21; 43:5, 12, 21,
24; 45:13, 24; 46:3, 6;
47:14, 21; 49:1; 50:16;
51:5, 15, 23; 52:9, 19, 22;
53:10; 54:1, 12, 15; 58:10;
16; 60:8; 63:11; 64:20, 23;
65:10, 14; 66:8, 12; 67:11;
18; 69:22; 70:12; 71:5, 13;
72:11; 73:4, 13, 22;
74:2, 13, 20; 75:6; 76:10,
20; 77:4, 20; 78:5, 22;
79:1, 12; 80:12, 22; 81:18;
82:10, 17; 83:1; 85:1, 11;
86:13; 87:7; 88:7; 90:16;
91:10, 19; 92:9, 19; 93:17;
94:3, 15; 97:21; 98:19;
100:6; 101:16; 102:8;
103:7; 104:13, 19, 22;
105:2, 5, 8, 12, 22; 107:3;
108:17; 109:3, 22; 110:8,
11; 111:7; 112:1; 113:3,
12; 114:6; 115:1; 116:17,
24; 118:11, 22; 119:23;
121:17; 124:1; 130:18;
132:16, 18; 137:24; 138:6;
20; 141:19; 142:2, 5;
143:10; 147:7, 19, 22;
149:13; 150:4, 14, 23;
151:11, 15; 152:2, 13;
153:13; 154:3, 9; 155:15;
156:3, 16; 157:8, 23;
158:4, 13; 159:1, 11, 17;
160:1, 3, 12; 161:12, 15;
163:16; 164:11, 17;
166:21; 167:3, 20; 168:21;
171:10; 172:5; 173:5, 10;
19, 21; 174:4; 175:14, 22;
176:3, 12; 177:5, 15, 23;
178:13; 181:4, 8
total 93:3; 138:2, 9
totally 112:17
town 131:8, 9
track 7:13; 114:11;
123:13, 16
trained 38:1; 66:20, 23
training 20:14; 67:6, 9;
174:20; 175:5
transient 146:11; 149:16
trap 179:2
trauma 136:14
travel 131:7, 14
traveled 131:9, 10
treat 111:2; 153:5
treatable 118:21
treated 32:14, 16; 38:22;
105:20; 150:1

April 25, 2001

treater 133:22; 136:1, 3, 7
treating 93:22; 135:1;
157:17
treatment 145:4; 153:5,
7; 176:10, 22
trial 31:23; 131:8, 12, 14;
133:18; 136:19, 23;
137:19; 139:19; 141:11,
15
tried 93:9
trigger 102:15; 141:1;
162:8
trip 18:17
trouble 13:13
true 15:5; 22:15, 18; 23:1;
77:6, 16; 79:18; 83:11;
91:17; 104:1; 119:17;
122:6; 146:2; 164:5;
170:18
try 6:6; 18:17; 24:14;
25:17; 66:14; 87:17;
105:1, 16; 107:8; 110:15,
17, 24; 111:6, 12; 142:9;
180:3
trying 48:10; 54:23;
69:14; 91:21; 153:1;
154:10; 163:20
tumor 90:2, 3; 124:24;
125:4, 13
tumors 125:7, 8, 11
turn 121:17
Tushwin 132:2
tweak 148:12, 19
tweaked 146:20; 147:1
tweaking 145:8; 146:11,
16, 23; 147:4, 13; 148:3,
16, 21; 149:21; 150:3;
180:2
two 4:16; 6:19; 12:3; 21:9;
25:6; 28:15; 32:16; 33:5;
35:9; 36:11; 40:12, 13;
44:23; 73:5; 75:5; 76:2, 4,
14; 77:1; 78:14; 80:2, 10;
81:13; 99:16; 100:4;
123:19; 125:14; 133:19;
134:1, 5, 11; 172:19; 175:2
two-day 77:24
type 20:22; 44:5; 57:3
typically 33:19

U

unable 60:2; 61:9; 75:4;
76:2, 14; 77:1; 89:2; 159:8;
161:3
uncontrollably 81:17
uncontrolled 80:19
under 28:19; 109:11;
164:23; 174:2; 177:3;
178:7
understandable 145:12
unequivocally 175:24
unfortunate 96:7
University 121:23;
122:4, 8; 123:2; 124:12;

129:16; 130:8, 11, 15;
139:6, 13; 168:9
unless 109:15; 139:5
unlikely 89:11
unreasonable 157:4, 10;
158:2, 12, 23
unusual 41:22; 156:24
up 6:7; 13:15; 15:19;
18:17; 23:12; 24:3; 27:21;
28:9, 13; 48:8; 83:16; 84:5;
85:14; 89:24; 93:4; 95:24;
119:5; 122:2; 123:7;
128:5; 142:9; 161:22;
163:1; 165:17; 166:4
upon 109:10
urge 75:23; 76:13
urgent 83:15; 84:23;
129:4
urgently 84:1; 128:18
urinary 9:13; 62:2, 4;
63:16, 24; 65:23; 66:15;
68:11; 69:24; 72:21, 24;
75:22; 84:20; 86:9; 95:23;
96:1; 98:4; 99:8; 100:23;
102:13; 107:24; 108:8;
111:1, 16, 23; 112:14;
115:5, 16; 116:11, 14;
119:2; 144:16, 20; 147:5,
13; 148:4; 156:12; 160:17;
168:13; 180:8
urinate 164:9
urodynamic 172:14
urologist 36:14; 37:19,
24; 64:1, 6; 66:1; 72:23;
87:23, 24; 163:20; 164:24
urologists 37:1
use 9:3; 35:3; 58:22; 59:6;
103:18; 106:3; 124:20;
130:10; 145:11; 146:3
used 35:3; 38:23; 41:22;
69:2; 84:23; 136:7; 150:20
useful 23:13
using 8:17; 41:24; 44:4;
98:19; 155:9
usually 12:7, 10; 36:11,
12, 19; 37:2; 39:19; 59:17;
60:14; 79:15; 84:19;
89:22; 100:22; 120:22;
131:15; 133:21; 135:22

V

vague 17:22; 91:11
valid 146:12; 148:6
various 5:19; 57:23
vary 125:19
vast 126:20; 127:6
verdict 32:2, 4
versus 274; 125:12;
1263; 145:18; 163:10, 13;
179:20
view 24:24; 49:6; 60:14;
64:10; 117:7
Villarosa 172:20
violated 178:6

visit 25:1, 11, 12; 27:6, 6;
28:3, 5, 16, 17; 60:23;
65:7; 74:11; 75:17; 76:8;
77:2, 12, 19; 79:11;
101:12; 108:7, 23, 23;
110:24; 112:24; 114:5, 17;
19:117:13, 22; 1466;
148:24; 155:13; 159:23;
160:9; 161:10; 166:19;
167:2; 176:11, 23
visits 25:6
voice 6:7
void 60:2; 61:9; 63:7;
69:9, 13; 73:18; 89:2;
159:8; 161:3
volume 13:16; 137:15

W

wait 27:15; 28:9; 59:9, 14;
76:20; 154:9
waiting 101:14; 151:22
waits 58:14
waive 35:9
walks 166:13
way 9:21; 17:4; 21:18
22:6; 23:11; 24:11; 38:16;
40:3, 10; 41:20; 52:6; 55:2;
2; 61:22, 23; 67:15; 72:7;
74:15; 77:13, 22; 78:20;
88:13; 99:14; 102:15;
103:5; 106:13; 107:7;
125:7; 130:10; 133:2;
142:6; 145:21; 154:7;
167:13; 168:16; 173:18;
178:12
weak 84:19
weakness 17:1, 5, 15,
19; 18:9, 21; 69:2
weather 20:20
week 10:8; 135:13, 14, 17
weeks 5:17; 19:22; 44:23;
45:6, 15, 17
weigh 39:11
Westin 121:14
what's 8:12; 11:3; 58:20;
59:5; 94:1; 111:312;
123:13; 135:23; 156:14
Wheaton 31:5, 5
whenever 74:18
WHEREUPON 4:1, 6;
7:7; 13:17; 14:22; 23:15;
53:14; 54:20; 83:20;
89:18; 102:1, 9; 105:10;
120:10; 141:8; 142:7
who's 76:16; 117:7
whole 45:1; 49:18; 68:23;
129:4; 171:2
widen 21:14
wife 135:16
winning 8:2
window 85:17, 21; 86:1
5; 128:24; 129:1
wise 59:21
withdraw 160:7

Withdrawn 29:5
within 34:9, 19; 35:15, 24;
96:16; 97:2; 99:16; 100:4;
128:22; 1366; 167:16, 17
without 9:22; 38:2; 67:16;
71:11; 76:4; 81:13;
149:18; 162:21; 180:8
witness 4:6, 9; 6:3; 9:10;
10:17; 13:12; 14:24;
18:11; 20:10, 18; 22:17;
27:8; 29:22; 30:10, 20;
35:1, 19; 36:3; 37:15;
38:11; 41:5; 43:6, 13; 44:1;
45:14; 46:7; 47:23; 49:2;
5017; 51:8, 17, 24; 52:10,
23; 53:12; 16; 54:2, 22;
58:11, 17; 60:11; 63:13;
6613; 67:12, 19; 69:23;
70:14; 71:6, 14, 24; 72:12;
73:14; 74:21; 76:11; 77:5;
78:6; 79:2, 13; 80:13, 23;
81:20; 82:18; 83:2; 85:2;
13; 86:14; 87:8; 90:18;
91:13, 20; 92:11, 21;
93:19; 94:4, 16; 97:22;
101:23; 102:3, 11; 103:9;
105:13, 23; 107:4; 109:7,
8, 23; 110:12; 111:8;
112:3; 113:13; 114:9;
115:2; 116:19; 117:1;
118:13, 24; 119:24; 124:2;
130:6, 20; 138:1, 8;
143:14; 144:5; 149:14;
150:5, 16; 151:2, 16;
152:3, 14; 153:15; 154:4,
12; 155:17; 156:5, 17;
157:9; 158:7, 14; 159:2,
18; 160:4, 13; 161:16;
162:17; 163:17; 164:20;
167:4; 168:23; 171:11;
172:7; 173:11; 174:5;
176:5, 14; 177:7, 16, 24;
178:14; 181:7
witnesses 142:13
woman 73:1
woman's 662
wondering 13:14
word 11:2, 15; 35:3;
38:23; 70:15; 93:2
words 15:24; 16:15; 34:2;
66:15; 69:11; 70:6; 74:6;
99:6; 112:12; 118:1;
127:7; 148:19; 171:13
work 49:19; 95:24; 127:1,
1, 4, 10, 14; 130:5; 131:2;
132:5, 13, 19; 134:24;
135:7; 137:23; 139:4, 12
worked 122:21; 131:24
132:18
Workers 135:3; 139:8
working 18:19; 87:12;
133:20; 135:12, 17;
163:19; 175:2, 5
workings 16623
worried 115:21
worse 9:8; 58:15; 95:22
101:19; 112:13; 120:2;
129:9; 169:24

worst 16:18; 17:10
worth 39:12
written 55:7, 20; 128:7;
129:11; 130:2
wrong 111:13; 146:13,
15; 147:3, 17; 152:8

Y

Yate's 178:16
Yates 142:14; 178:24;
179:16, 18
year 32:16; 33:6; 34:9,
19; 35:15, 24; 36:11, 20;
38:15, 15, 22; 40:9, 12;
44:23; 52:5; 88:20; 104:8;
105:21; 125:20, 20, 24;
134:8, 22, 23; 136:2;
137:22; 138:10
year-to-year 124:11
years 29:17; 31:21, 22;
36:15; 40:22; 44:18, 18;
49:19; 109:20; 121:10;
123:19; 125:14, 24

Z

Zannetti 15:18; 169:6, 8,
9