Page 1 1 IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS 2 OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO 3 4 GERALDINE MEDLEN, 5 Plaintiff, 6 vs. Case No. 425998 7 KAISER PERMANENTE 8 MEDICAL CENTER, et al., 9 Defendants. 10 11 DEPOSITION OF DARSHAN MISTRY, M.D. 12 Thursday, November 15, 2001 13 14 Deposition of DARSHAN MISTRY, M.D., a 15 Defendant herein, called by the Plaintiff for 16 examination under the statute, taken before me, 17 Karen M. Patterson, a Registered Merit Reporter 18 and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio, 19 pursuant to notice of counsel, at the offices of 20 Kaiser Permanente Medical Center, 17406 Royalton 21 Road, Strongsville, Ohio, on the day and date 22 set forth above, at 9:38 o'clock a.m. 23	 Page 3 1 DARSHAN MISTRY, M.D., of lawful age, 2 called for examination, as provided by the Ohio 3 Rules of Civil Procedure, being by me first duly 4 sworn, as hereinafter certified, deposed and 5 said as follows: 6 EXAMINATION OF DARSHAN MISTRY, M.D. 7 BY MR. MISHKIND: 8 Q. Would you please state your name for 9 the record. 10 A. Darshan Mistry. 11 Q. Have you ever had your deposition 12 taken before, sir? 13 A. Yes, one time. 14 Q. To try to save some time, I'm going 15 to show you what was provided to me by the 16 attorneys " 17 A. Okay. 18 Q. "from Ohio Permanente. It's a 19 two-page document. We will mark it as 20 Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. What we will do is go 21 off the record, the court reporter will mark it, 23 and I will hand it to you. 23 and
Page 2 1 APPEARANCES: 2 On behalf of the Plaintiff: 3 Becker & Mishkind Co., L.P.A., by 4 HOWARD D. MISHKIND, ESQ. 5 660 Skylight Office Tower 6 1660 W. 2nd Street 7 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 8 (216) 241-2600 9 On behalf of the Defendants: 10 Reminger & Reminger Co., L.P.A., by 11 MARILENA DISILVIO, ESQ. 12 Suite 700 13 The 113 St. Clair Building 14 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 15 (216) 687-1311 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 Page 4 of identification.) Q. Doctor, we are back on the record. Is Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 a copy of your professional resume, otherwise known as a curriculum vitae? A. That's what it looks like to me. Q. Is it current? A. It may not be current, actually. This is an old one. It may not be current. Q. Do you have a current one? A. No, I don't have any current one. Since I joined this organization, I never made any other resume, and I don't believe there are anymore changes in there since that were made. Q. Can you tell me, approximately, when this would have been prepared? A. Probably when I joined this OPMG somewhere in 1993. At that time, I submitted this resume to the group. Some things are handwritten here. These are my writings. Q. Since 1993, there wouldn't be any additional ~ A. There wouldn't be any additions to this resume.

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

NOVEMBER 15, 2001

 Page 5 1 Q. Where are you licensed to practice medicine? 3 A. Ohio. 4 Q. Any other states? 5 A. No other states currently. I used to 6 be, but not currently. 7 Q. Are you board certified? 8 A. Yes, I am. 9 Q. In what specialty? 10 A. Internal medicine. 11 Q. Were you successful in your first 12 attempt at becoming board certified? 13 A. Yes, I was. 14 MS. DISILVIO: Doctor, you're doing a 15 great job, but if you would let Mr. Mishkind 16 finish his question first, it will make it 17 easier for Karen. 18 Q. How many times have you had your 19 deposition taken? 20 A. How many times? Just one time. 21 Q. This is the second? 22 A. This is the second time. 23 Q. What I'm going to do is, whenever 24 you're answering a question, I'm going to remain 25 silent until I'm absolutely certain that you're 	 Page 7 1 Q. When you have seen Mrs. Medlen as a 2 patient, has it always been here in 3 Strongsville? 4 A. Yes, I believe so. Well, I don't 5 recall exactly, because I saw her first time 6 long time ago, and I think that would have been 7 in another facility because I came to this 8 facility nearly three years ago. 9 Q. Which facility were you at before? 10 A. North Olmsted. 11 Q. Is it fair to say that, before coming 12 to this facility, you probably saw Mrs. Medlen 13 at the other facility? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 Q. A moment ago when I asked you whether 16 you've had your deposition taken before, you 17 told me one other time; true? 18 A. That is true. 19 Q. How long ago was that? 20 A. That I don't remember. 21 Approximately, I would say, four or five years 22 ago. 23 Q. Were you a defendant, someone that 24 had been sued in the case? 25 A. That is true.
 Page 6 1 done with the answer. Is that fair? A. That's fair. Q. Also, when I'm asking you something, 4 even though you may know what the answer is and 5 you're just dying for me to stop talking, as a 6 lot of people are, wait until I'm done before 7 you start answering. Fair? 8 A. That's fair. 9 Q. If at the end of my question you have 10 no idea what I was asking you, tell me, Mr. 11 Mishkind, please rephrase the question. 12 A. I will. 13 Q. If I don't understand one of your 14 answers, or if for some reason the court 15 reporter doesn't get it down clearly, we may 16 both stop you and ask you to repeat what you 17 just said. 18 A. Sure. 19 Q. Now, we are in Strongsville at the 20 Kaiser facility today; correct? 21 A. That is true. 22 Q. Your office is located here? 23 A. My office is located here. 24 Q. Do you have any other offices? 25 A. No, I don't have any other office. 	 Page 8 Q. Besides your deposition being taken, did you also have to appear at trial in that case? A. Yes, I had to. Q. What was the name of the patient that had filed the claim against you? A. Difficult for me to remember at this time. Probably, if I don't forget, it was Mr. Pittock, P-I-T-T-O-C-K; something like that. Q. Did it involve care that had taken place at Kaiser? A. It did. Q. Were there other people besides yourself named in the case? A. There were other people besides my name. Q. Without giving me a long explanation, can you just tell me very briefly what the subject matter or the issue with this patient pertained to? M. S. DISILVIO: Objection. You may answer. A. Say that again. MS. DISILVIO: I objected, but you can go ahead and answer.

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

NOVEMBER 15, 2001

Page 9	Page 11
1 A. It was about a stroke. 2 Q. Did the patient die? 3 A. No. 4 Q. The patient had some neurological 5 complications secondary to a stroke? 6 A. That is true. 7 Q. Was the issue whether or not you 8 should have done something to have prevented or 9 minimized the likelihood of a stroke occurring? 10 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. 11 answer. 12 12 A. That is true. 13 Q. Do you know what the outcome of that 14 case was when it came to court? 15 15 A. Well, it came in favor of us. 16 Q. Congratulations. 17 So besides the case that you've just 18 told me about that your deposition was taken and 19 it went to trial, today is now the second time? 20 A. That is true. 21 Q. Have you ever had your privileges 22 Suspended or revoked?	 A. I can't tell for sure. I can't tell. Q. At least once? A. At least once. Q. Do you have a recollection as to whether that would have been, say, from summer up to now, or earlier in the year of 2001? A. Maybe summer up to now. Q. Do you have any recollection as to what the medical condition was that you saw her 10 for? A. No, not at this time. Q. Was it an emergency, or to your recollection, was it a regularly-scheduled A. It was not an emergency. I'm sorry, I jumped in between, but it was not an emergency. Q. To your recollection, was it a regularly-scheduled appointment? A. It was a regularly-scheduled appointment. Q. Do you maintain a chart here in Strongsville on Mrs. Medlen? A. Yes, we do maintain charts in the
25 at any hospital and been denied?	25 computer.
Page 10 1 A. No. 2 Q. When is the last time that you had	Page 12 1 Q. If you went to your office right now 2 and wanted to access information on Mrs. Medlen,
3 occasion to see Mrs. Medlen as a patient? 4 A. I don't recall. I have to look into	3 what would you have to do?4 A. I just have to open that window.
5 this file when was the last time I saw her.	5 Q. The window?
6 Q. In a moment, what we're going to do	6 A. Window. There is a window I can
7 is I'm going to have you literally open up the 8 record and refer to it as necessary, because	7 access my notes.8 Q. A window on the computer?
9 this is not a memory contest.	9 A. Yes.
10 MS. DISILVIO: In fairness, Howard, 11 to both you and the doctor, I have brought	10 Q. I'm envisioning you opening up a
12 progress notes until December 26th, 2000. I	11 window on the building and accessing it. That's12 not the case?
13 don't have anything subsequent to that time with	
	13 A. No.
14 me, so he can comment from April 18, '78 through	 A. No. Q. You would go onto the computer under
 14 me, so he can comment from April 18, '78 through 15 December 26, 2000. 16 Q. Let me ask him this. Since the end 	 A. No. Q. You would go onto the computer under her name and access your notes? A. That is true.
 14 me, so he can comment from April 18, '78 through 15 December 26, 2000. 16 Q. Let me ask him this. Since the end 17 of 2000, roughly over the last ten plus months, 	 13 A. No. 14 Q. You would go onto the computer under 15 her name and access your notes? 16 A. That is true. 17 Q. When you saw the patient let's
 14 me, so he can comment from April 18, '78 through 15 December 26, 2000. 16 Q. Let me ask him this. Since the end 17 of 2000, roughly over the last ten plus months, 18 without holding you to an absolute, is it your 19 recollection, do you believe, that you have seen 	 A. No. Q. You would go onto the computer under her name and access your notes? A. That is true.
 14 me, so he can comment from April 18, '78 through 15 December 26, 2000. 16 Q. Let me ask him this. Since the end 17 of 2000, roughly over the last ten plus months, 18 without holding you to an absolute, is it your 19 recollection, do you believe, that you have seen 20 Mrs. Medlen sometime in the year 2001? 	 A. No. Q. You would go onto the computer under her name and access your notes? A. That is true. Q. When you saw the patient let's talk about in 2001 when you saw her for the regularly-scheduled appointment, you would have written down some notes; correct?
 14 me, so he can comment from April 18, '78 through 15 December 26, 2000. 16 Q. Let me ask him this. Since the end 17 of 2000, roughly over the last ten plus months, 18 without holding you to an absolute, is it your 19 recollection, do you believe, that you have seen 20 Mrs. Medlen sometime in the year 2001? 21 A. Yes, I did. 	 A. No. Q. You would go onto the computer under her name and access your notes? A. That is true. Q. When you saw the patient let's talk about in 2001 when you saw her for the regularly-scheduled appointment, you would have written down some notes; correct? A. Yes, I do.
 14 me, so he can comment from April 18, '78 through 15 December 26, 2000. 16 Q. Let me ask him this. Since the end 17 of 2000, roughly over the last ten plus months, 18 without holding you to an absolute, is it your 19 recollection, do you believe, that you have seen 20 Mrs. Medlen sometime in the year 2001? 21 A. Yes, I did. 22 Q. Can you tell me, again, without 23 holding you to an absolute number, can you tell 	 A. No. Q. You would go onto the computer under her name and access your notes? A. That is true. Q. When you saw the patient let's talk about in 2001 when you saw her for the regularly-scheduled appointment, you would have written down some notes; correct? A. Yes, l do. Q. When you finish seeing the patient, what would you have done with your progress
 14 me, so he can comment from April 18, '78 through 15 December 26, 2000. 16 Q. Let me ask him this. Since the end 17 of 2000, roughly over the last ten plus months, 18 without holding you to an absolute, is it your 19 recollection, do you believe, that you have seen 20 Mrs. Medlen sometime in the year 2001? 21 A. Yes, I did. 22 Q. Can you tell me, again, without 23 holding you to an absolute number, can you tell 24 me approximately how many times you would have 	 A. No. Q. You would go onto the computer under her name and access your notes? A. That is true. Q. When you saw the patient let's talk about in 2001 when you saw her for the regularly-scheduled appointment, you would have written down some notes; correct? A. Yes, I do. Q. When you finish seeing the patient, what would you have done with your progress notes?
 14 me, so he can comment from April 18, '78 through 15 December 26, 2000. 16 Q. Let me ask him this. Since the end 17 of 2000, roughly over the last ten plus months, 18 without holding you to an absolute, is it your 19 recollection, do you believe, that you have seen 20 Mrs. Medlen sometime in the year 2001? 21 A. Yes, I did. 22 Q. Can you tell me, again, without 23 holding you to an absolute number, can you tell 	 A. No. Q. You would go onto the computer under her name and access your notes? A. That is true. Q. When you saw the patient let's talk about in 2001 when you saw her for the regularly-scheduled appointment, you would have written down some notes; correct? A. Yes, l do. Q. When you finish seeing the patient, what would you have done with your progress

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

Page 13	Page 15
 nurse. Q. Where does it go then from that point? A. That nurse scans that note in the computer. Q. What happens then with the physical note that you prepared? A. Physical notes go to some other facility for recordkeeping. Q. You do not retain a hard copy of the note A. No, I don't. Q in your office? So you don't have a file, per se, with written pages of records that you maintain on patients that you're seeing on a day-to-day basis; is that true? A. That is true. Q. The facility that the hard copy of the notes goes to, is that the facility where all records for Kaiser patients are maintained? A. That's what I believe. Q. Do you know where that facility is? A. No, I don't. Q. Do you have to enter some type of a password or an access number to get to Mrs. 	 diabetics that you see in your practice; correct? A. Yes, I do. Q. In internal medicine, that is probably a fairly significant portion of the adult internal medicine practice; correct? A. There are a number of patients with diabetes. Q. At any time since Mrs. Medlen has had her amputation of her leg, have you and her talked at all about the lawsuit? A. Not at all. Q. I take it you've not brought it up either? A. No, I did not. Q. At on talk to me. Q. And did you express any opinions to her as to why it is that she lost her leg? A. No, I did not. S. Q. She is still your patient; correct?
 Page 14 Medlen's record when you look on the window of your computer? A. Yes. I have to enter her medical record number. Q. Doctor, I want to back up for one second, and then we're going to talk about the period of time which is really the subject matter of this lawsuit, okay? A. Okay. Q. You indicated to me that you're board certified in internal medicine. A. Correct. Q. You've not written anything in any journals or textbooks in the area of internal medicine, have you? A. No, I do not. Q. Have you any specialty or subspecialty within the area of internal medicine? A. No, I do not. Q. Do you have an area of interest that you find, from the standpoint of research or practice, that you like or concentrate in? A. Not really. Q. You certainly have patients that are 	 Page 16 A. She is still my patient. Q. When she comes to see you sometime in 2001, and perhaps before that, normally, is her husband with her? A. Normally, her husband accompanies Mrs. Medlen. Q. Is he also a patient of yours? A. I think so. Q. Do you have a recollection of when you last saw him? A. No, I don't. Q. Can you tell me, like we talked about with Mrs. Medlen, in the year 2001, whether you saw Mr. Medlen also? A. That I don't remember. Q. Fair enough. This is a general question. How would you describe your relationship with the patient, with Mrs. Medlen? Do you understand what I mean by that? Q. Yes. A. As usual, the relations with any of the patients, it is a doctor-patient relationship. It's a normal doctor-patient

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

r	
Page 17	Page 19
1Q.Now, to me that may mean one thing;2to you it may mean something else, and let me be3a little bit more specific, okay?4A.5Q.6As an attorney, I have clients that7I'm able to communicate well with, that I say7things to, they listen to me, I give them8recommendations, they request information;9there's a good line of communication between my10client and myself. There are other clients that11I know are going to be essentially noncompliant,12that I will tell them to do something and they13won't do it, and I am always concerned about14what they're doing, or they may even be arrogant15at times with me. Do you follow the difference?16A.17Q.Q.And you probably have patients that18listen to what you're saying and understand what19you're saying and follow your advice?20A.21patients like that, too.22Q.23in our professions.24Tell me about Mrs. Medlen in that25context. What type of patient has she been,	 part; true? A. I cannot recollect, yes, any compliance or noncompliance issue at this moment. Q. I'm talking about noncompliance issues. In other words, can you tell me, from what you recall about your patient, that there were situations where she was not complying with what you told her to do? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot say for sure. MS. DISILVIO: I think the answer was he can't recall compliant or noncompliant, and I want his answer to be his honest answer to you, and I think you want that, too. MR. MISHKIND: Well, and I would like, since we now have a local rule dealing with objections, I would like to have compliance with the Local Rule 1213 with regard to depositions and not having you testify, Marilena, with all due respect. I asked him a question concerning noncompliance, and I want to have that question answered. I don't want to have you providing your spin on the testimony.
Page 18	Page 20
 from your personal experience? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. If you can answer it in that context. A. I can't specify anything in particular, but so far, it was a usual, normal patient that I have a usual, normal relationship as I have relationships with any other patient. Compliant or noncompliant, very difficult to recollect it at this point to me. Q. Nothing that stands out in your mind that would cause you to say that she was noncompliant; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You may answer. A. I cannot comment on that. At this moment, I cannot comment on that because occasions vary. Somebody could be noncompliant; the same patient can be compliant tomorrow. Q. Sure, I understand that. A. Because I have to deal with a number of patients, it's very difficult to recollect specifically one patient. Q. That's why I say, with regard to Mrs. Medlen, you're not able to specifically recollect any examples of noncompliance on her 	1 MS. DISILVIO: It will, and we can have it read back, because just as there's a local rule, there's no local rule that says we are allowed to mischaracterize testimony. And the local rule doesn't prevent me from protecting this witness from having his testimony mischaracterized. MR. MISHKIND: You can certainly object. What you've stated before is very clear on the record. My question to him and my subsequent question is very clear on the record. If we need to motion the Court with regard to that, I'm going to do so. I'm going to move on to the next question because I'm not going to have further speeches with regard to testimony. Q. I'm talking about noncompliance, failure on the part of the patient to follow any advice or instructions that you personally can recall. Are there any examples that you can recall that Mrs. Medlen failed to comply with, instructions or recommendations, that you gave to her during the course of your relationship? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. Very difficult for me to recall any

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

Page 21	Page 23
1 such event today.	1 Q. Do you know Nancy Holmes?
2 Q. Fair enough. What have you reviewed,	2 A. I heard her name.
3 doctor, in order to be in a position to talk to	3 Q. Where did you hear the name from?
4 me about Mrs. Medlen?	4 A. Well, we hear the name from other
5 A. Mostly I reviewed my notes.	5 colleagues because she is one of the colleagues
6 Q. What notes are you referring to?	6 and she does not work in this facility, so I
7 A. There are a few notes, four or five	7 happen to hear her name.
8 notes, I happened to review.	8 Q. Did you hear it in the context of
9 Q. How did you obtain those notes?	9 other patients?
10 A. I got the record, I got the medical 11 record.	10 A. May have in the past.11 Q. What about in the context of Mrs.
	11 Q. What about in the context of Mrs. 12 Medlen?
12 Q. Did you go into a window on your 13 computer to access that?	13 A. I just recently heard.
14 A. Well, I got the hard copy. From that	14 Q. You know that back in August, on
15 I reviewed.	15 August 4, 1999, Nancy Holmes saw Mrs. Medlen?
16 Q. So counsel provided you with the hard	16 A. I know about that.
17 copy of the record; is that correct?	17 Q. Have you had occasion to talk to
18 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You don't	18 Nancy Holmes?
19 need to answer anything about communications	19 A. No, I did not talk to her at all.
20 between you and me, Dr. Mistry.	20 Q. What about Kathryn Dillon, do you
21 Q. Did you have a copy, hard copy, of	21 know Kathryn Dillon?
22 the records in your possession?	A. I know Kathryn Dillon.
23 A. Yes, I did.	23 Q. Who is Kathryn Dillon?
2.4 Q. How long have you had a copy of the	24 A. A physician assistant.
25 records?	25 Q. Where does she work?
 Page 22 1 A. How long? 2 Q. Yes. 3 A. Probably a week. 4 Q. And that hard copy included not only 5 your record, your entries, but also other 6 entries; correct? 7 A. That is true. 8 Q. Did you look at all of the records on 9 Mrs. Medlen that you've had for a week? 10 A. Not specifically. I might have 11 glanced at a few notes, but not specifically 12 detailed I reviewed the records. 13 Q. Now, there's a volume of records to 14 your right. Are those the records that you 15 reviewed? 16 MS. DISILVIO: That's my copy. 17 Q. Do you have a similar copy to that 	 Page 24 A. Right in this facility. Q. Does she still work here? A. She still works here. Q. Doctor, I'm going to show you what was marked in Nancy Holmes' deposition as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2. I believe that counsel has a copy of that opened. Do you recall receiving this? A. No, I don't, sir. I don't recall receiving this note. Q. Do you have any reason to believe that you didn't receive this note? A. Do I have any reason to believe? Q. Right. A. No. What kind of reason? Q. Well, let me rephrase it. First, have you seen Nancy Holmes'
18 copy?	18 deposition?
19 A. I have the copy, though I don't have 20 it with me now.	19 A. No, I did not.20 Q. Were you aware that her deposition
20 It with the now. 21 MS. DISILVIO: I'll represent to you	20 Q. Were you aware that her deposition 21 was taken?
22 this is what he has.	21 was taken? 22 A. Yes, I am aware.
23 A. This looks about the same.	23 Q. Have you been provided with any type
24 Q. It looked about the same thickness?	24 of a summary at all of her testimony?
25 A. Yes.	25 A. I was just told.
	-

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

NOVEMBER 15,2001

	Page 25	Page 27
1 Q. You don't have to talk		1 that it would have been communicated with the
2 your discussions. You were just 3 deposition was taken?		 patient. Q. Would it need to be communicated to
4 A. Was taken. That's all I		4 the physician that was working with the
5 MS. DISILVIO: I'm goi		5 physician's assistant?
6 not to answer any questions that	call for 6	6 A. I cannot say that.
7 conversations between you and 1		7 Q. Well ···
8 THE WITNESS: Okay.		8 A. Whom she was working with at that
9 Q. If Nancy Holmes sent t 10 you received it, what would you		 <i>g</i> time, I cannot say that. <i>Q</i>. Well, let me ask you this, doctor.
11 procedure have been in terms of		
12 have done with it?	1	
13 A. Very difficult to say an		3 heel ulcers, that's known in the Kaiser
14 difficult to recall, and if I had rec		4 system this is not a patient that was new to
15 that time, and looking at the circ16 that time, very difficult for me to		5 the Kaiser system with the urine glucose and 6 with the CBC results that were obtained on that
17 would have responded to this no		
18 Q. Tell me why you say th		8 regard to those results?
19 A. Because I don't know w		J
20 circumstances at that time with N		1 /
21 she wrote the note. When did I22 note, what was the problem on t		· 1 ·
23 is the thing I cannot recall at this		
24 And how I would have acted on		
25 know. If I see the note, all these	e things are 2:	
	Page 26	Page 28
1 mentioned I don't know how I	-	Page 28
1 mentioned, I don't know how I 2 responded to each factor.	-	see the patient. I'm asking you, where a
 mentioned, I don't know how I with the second second	would have 1	see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose,
 responded to each factor. Q. Well, if you take, in tot statement of the urine glucose gr 	would have 1 al, the 3 reater than 4	see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other lab 	would have 1 al, the 3 reater than 4 values that are 5	see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other lab 6 referenced on here in the contex 	would have 1 al, the 2 reater than 4 values that are 5 t of this 6	see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other lab 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history that 	would have1al, the3reater than4values that are5tt of this6tt is recorded7	see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other lab 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history that 	would have1al, the3reater than4values that are5tt of this6tt is recorded7	see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other laby 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,5yhether she did1	see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection.
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other lab 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,5whether she did1here it's1	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other lab v 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 12 mentioned that I had seen Mrs. I 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,8vhether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there.
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other lab v 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 12 mentioned that I had seen Mrs. I 13 means she had seen. And when 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,8whether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1this note was1	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there. Q. I understand that.
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other lab of 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signified 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be well 11 run into some problem, because 12 mentioned that I had seen Mrs. If 13 means she had seen. And when 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,8whether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1this note was1eceived this1	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there. Q. I understand that. A. Had I been there, what would have
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other laby 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 12 mentioned that I had seen Mrs. I 13 means she had seen. And when 14 written and when I would have re 15 note, I won't have any recollection 16 assuming that I would have received 	would have1al, the3reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,8whether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1this note was1eceived this1on. We are1ved it. I don't1	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there. Q. I understand that. A. Had I been there, what would have been my judgment? Q. Yes, sir.
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other laby 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 12 mentioned that I had seen Mrs. I 13 means she had seen. And when 14 written and when I would have re 15 note, I won't have any recollection 16 assuming that I would have received 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,8whether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1this note was1eceived this1on. We are1ved it. I don't1this note or1	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there. Q. I understand that. A. Had I been there, what would have been my judgment? Q. Yes, sir. A. It depends. Only after I see the
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other laby 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 12 mentioned that I had seen Mrs. I 13 means she had seen. And when 14 written and when I would have re 15 note, I won't have any recollecting 16 assuming that I would have received 17 recollect whether I ever received 18 not. My response to my thinking 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,8whether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1this note was1eceived this1on. We are1would be this1	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there. Q. I understand that. A. Had I been there, what would have been my judgment? Q. Yes, sir. A. It depends. Only after I see the patient, because I cannot judge just by one
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other laby 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 12 means she had seen. And when 14 written and when I would have re 15 note, I won't have any recollecting 16 assuming that I would have received 17 recollect whether I ever received 18 not. My response to my thinking 19 would have been communicated 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,8whether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1this note was1eceived this1on. We are1who dit. I don't1this note or1g would be this15by her to the14	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there. Q. I understand that. A. Had I been there, what would have been my judgment? Q. Yes, sir. A. It depends. Only after I see the patient, because I cannot judge just by one piece of information what would have been done
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other laby 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 12 mentioned that I had seen Mrs. I 13 means she had seen. And when 14 written and when I would have re 15 note, I won't have any recollecting 16 assuming that I would have received 17 recollect whether I ever received 18 not. My response to my thinking 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,8whether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1this note was1eceived this1on. We are1who dit. I don't1this note or1g would be this15by her to the14	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there. Q. I understand that. A. Had I been there, what would have been my judgment? Q. Yes, sir. A. It depends. Only after I see the patient, because I cannot judge just by one piece of information what would have been done.
 2 responded to each factor. Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other laby 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 12 mentioned that I had seen Mrs. I 13 means she had seen. And when 14 written and when I would have re 15 note, I won't have any recollecting 16 assuming that I would have received 17 recollect whether I ever received 18 not. My response to my thinking 19 would have been communicated 20 patient and to the physician who 21 would you expect that 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,8whether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1this note was1eceived this1on. We are1what i. I don't1this note or1g would be this13by her to the19was working20this type of22	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there. Q. I understand that. A. Had I been there, what would have been my judgment? Q. Yes, sir. A. It depends. Only after I see the patient, because I cannot judge just by one piece of information what would have been done. Q. What would have been within your differential with the CBC and do you have the
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other laby 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 12 mentioned that I had seen Mrs. I 13 means she had seen. And when 14 written and when I would have received 16 assuming that I would have received 17 recollect whether I ever received 18 not. My response to my thinking 19 would have been communicated 20 patient and to the physician who 21 with her at that time. 22 Q. Would you expect that 23 information would be communicated 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,8whether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1this note was1eceived this1on. We are1would be this1this note or1g would be this1by her to the19was working20this type of22ated to the23	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there. Q. I understand that. A. Had I been there, what would have been my judgment? Q. Yes, sir. A. It depends. Only after I see the patient, because I cannot judge just by one piece of information what would have been done. Q. What would have been within your differential with the CBC and do you have the results? You should have them. I can hand them
 2 responded to each factor. 3 Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other laby 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 12 mentioned that I had seen Mrs. I 13 means she had seen. And when 14 written and when I would have received 16 assuming that I would have received 17 recollect whether I ever received 18 not. My response to my thinking 19 would have been communicated 20 patient and to the physician who 21 with her at that time. 22 Q. Would you expect that 23 information would be communicated 24 patient? 	would have1al, the3reater than4values that are5t of this6t of this7ficance, if any,8whether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1this note was1eceived this1on. We are1wed it. I don't1this note or1g would be this13by her to the19was working20this type of22ated to the23	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there. Q. I understand that. A. Had I been there, what would have been my judgment? Q. Yes, sir. A. It depends. Only after I see the patient, because I cannot judge just by one piece of information what would have been done. Q. What would have been within your differential with the CBC and do you have the results? You should have them. I can hand them to you if it will make it easier for you.
 2 responded to each factor. Q. Well, if you take, in tot 4 statement of the urine glucose gr 5 1000, if you take the other laby 6 referenced on here in the contex 7 patient, as well as the history tha 8 by Nancy Holmes, of what signif 9 is all of this information? 10 A. Significance would be w 11 run into some problem, because 12 mentioned that I had seen Mrs. I 13 means she had seen. And when 14 written and when I would have received 16 assuming that I would have received 17 recollect whether I ever received 18 not. My response to my thinking 19 would have been communicated 20 patient and to the physician who 21 with her at that time. 22 Q. Would you expect that 23 information would be communicated 	would have1al, the2reater than4values that are5t of this6t is recorded7ficance, if any,8whether she did1here it's1Medlen. That1this note was1eceived this1on. We are1ved it. I don't1this note or1g would be this1by her to the19was working20this type of22ated to the22	 see the patient. I'm asking you, where a physician's assistant obtains a urine glucose, has a CBC, has the history that the patient gave, and also has available to her the history of the patient being a diabetic, being a high risk amputation, having been treated for foot ulcers, coupled with these lab results, had you been there to see the lab results, what steps or action would you have taken? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. If I had been there, but I was not there. Q. I understand that. A. Had I been there, what would have been my judgment? Q. Yes, sir. A. It depends. Only after I see the patient, because I cannot judge just by one piece of information what would have been done. Q. What would have been within your differential with the CBC and do you have the results? You should have them. I can hand them to you if it will make it easier for you.

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

	Page 29	Page 31
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 it looks like 7 and 8. MS. DISILVIO: What was the question? I'm sorry. A. Can you please rephrase. Q. I'm asking you, had you seen this patient on August 4th with the history that is provided to you by Nancy Holmes, 56-year-old female with fever, chills times three days, has a temperature of 101 on Sunday, Monday was achy, Tuesday evening was 101. This a.m. was normal temperature. Body aching. Patient presents complaining of running fever since Sunday night, body aches, and then you have the CBC, the urine showing the glucose. What would have been within your differential diagnosis? A. Unfortunately, I did not see the patient. Q. I understand that. A. I cannot make any comment on that. Just looking at the numbers, I cannot make out anything. Q. Would you agree that this was a new 	 A. Absolutely not. I don't have any recollection. Q. Certainly this is a patient, with a description of the history and with the lab results, that needed to be evaluated by a physician on that date; correct? A. According to what you said, yes, because of the new complaints. Q. Well, I don't want it to be according to what I say. I'm saying honest and factual information, am I not? A. That is true. Q. Now, the diagnosis on that date was fever of unknown etiology. Do you know, first, whether that diagnosis was arrived at before or after the lab results came back? A. According to the notes, what you are showing, the diagnosis was very difficult to say whether that was put down before or after these lab results. Q. Is it fair to say you don't know whether it was before or after?
22 23 24 25	finding for this patient, a new clinical finding? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. What was a	 A. I don't know exactly. Q. Now, if you had seen this patient, whether it was with Nancy Holmes or with Kathryn
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 30 new clinical finding? A. I do not know, sir, what are the new clinical findings. The CBC, the WBC counts are the new finding, or the body ache was the new finding? I don't know. Q. Whenever a new clinical issue presents with a patient, the patient needs to be evaluated by the supervising physician; correct? A. That is true.	Page 32 1 Dillon, and you had the history on this patient 2 and you came in and you saw the patient and had 3 the benefit of the labs, the urine, and all of 4 the tests that were done on that date, what 5 would you have been required to do in order to 6 meet reasonable and accepted standards of care? 7 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. 8 A. Im supposed to examine the patient
10 11 12 13 14	Q. If the supervising physician does not evaluate the patient, that's not in keeping with the appropriate protocols here at Kaiser, is it?A. That is true. New patients, new	 9 and determine the patient by myself. I have to 10 look at all the circumstances. I don't know 11 exactly today what I would have done at that 12 tinie with that patient with all these complaints 13 and symptoms. 14 Q. Good.

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

Page 33	Page 35
 1 talking about varied infections. Q. So it would have at least been within 3 your thought process to rule out or confirm? A. Fever, possible infection, may or may not be. Fever does not always mean it's 6 infection. Q. What about the elevated white blood 8 count and the shifts that we have in the CBC? 9 A. Does not always point to infection. 10 It could happen in a noninfectious problem, too. 11 Q. But in a patient that is a diabetic 12 that has bilateral heel ulcers that is a high 13 risk for amputation, would you agree that a 14 reasonable and prudent physician would at least 15 consider, with these acute findings and with the 16 lab results, the possibility of infection? 17 A. May or may not be. Depends on still 18 the circumstances, still the symptoms, and I 19 actually have to interview the patient. 20 Q. And examine the patient? 21 A. And examine the patient? 22 Q. In a patient that comes in with the 23 history that she has, the exam would not just be 24 limited to upper body; it would also be to look 25 at the patient's lower extremities? 	 Q. And I'm not suggesting in all cases. There are other things that can cause an elevation of the white blood count; correct? A. That is true. Q. What else can cause an elevation? A. Certain medications. Was the patient taking certain medication like steroid medications. That can give elevation. If the patient has some hematologic disorder, cancer, leukemia, they may have elevated white blood cell counts and fever at the same time. Q. Was this patient taking any medications that would cause an elevation in her white blood cell count? A. I have no idea. I have no recollection. That is the reason I answer I have to look at all the circumstances, including examining the patient and interviewing the patient. Q. Fair enough. These are the kind of things that need to be done on a hands-on basis by a physician? A. Not necessarily a physician. Physician assistant, supported with the physician.
Page 34 1 A. Still it depends. Still it depends 2 what are the symptoms, what are the 3 circumstances, what are the yes, other 4 presenting symptoms. 5 Q. Would you agree that the lab results 6 are consistent with, but not necessarily 7 diagnostic of, an infection? 8 A. No, I won't.	Page 36 Q. Well, doctor, there's no question, just so that we can save some time, that the physician assistant utilization plan clearly requires that the patient be seen by a physician when the patient has a new let me give you the exact word when the patient has a new condition, the patient needs to be seen and personally evaluated by the supervising
 9 Q. Why? 10 A. Because if you have can you be 11 specific? What lab result? Are you talking 12 about the white cell count? 13 Q. Take a look. 14 A. Consistent with infection? 15 Q. Consistent with, but not necessarily 16 diagnostic of, 17 A. Still it may not point to the 18 infection etiology. White cell count elevation 19 may not always point to the infectious etiology. 20 Q. Is that elevation in the white blood 21 cell count a finding that you see in patients 22 that have a diagnosis of infection? 23 A. Not necessarily. 24 Q. But in some cases, yes? 25 A. In some cases. Not in all cases. 	 9 physician prior to initiating any treatment? 10 A. Correct. 11 Q. If the patient presents with a new 12 condition and they're not seen and personally 13 evaluated by the supervising physician, that is 14 considered to be below accepted practice; true? 15 A. I may not say that, but, yes, your 16 first part of the question, I agree with that. 17 Q. What was the first part of my 18 question? 19 A. The physician needs to be seen for a 20 new problem, a new complaint. 21 Q. If the physician doesn't see the 22 patient that presents with a new condition, 23 that's not good practice, is it? 24 A. May not be a good practice, yes. 25 Q. If you were there as opposed to some

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

NOVEMBER 15, 2001

Page 37	Page 39
 other physician, you would have expected of yourself to have seen and evaluated the patient for her symptoms; correct? A. I would have expected to see the patient, yes, for this new problem. Q. When you say see the patient, that's actually doing a physical examination as opposed to just standing out in the hallway and not coming in and examining the patient; true? A. Not always, necessarily. Seeing the patient, attending the patient, and what my physician assistant is doing depends whether I would agree with that or not. Sometimes it may be enough. Q. I just want to understand your sworn testimony. What you're suggesting is that your understanding of how you can utilize physician assistants in the State of Ohio and here at Kaiser is that when a patient presents with a new condition I want you to listen to my question entirely before you answer it because this is real important if a patient presents with a new condition, what you're telling me is 	 is when it was, according to any information that you have available to you as an Ohio Permanente Medical Group employee, when you first became aware of these results from the lab tests, the UA, the CBC, from Mrs. Medlen's August 4, '99 visit. When did it first come to your attention? A. I don't recall whether it ever came to my attention or whether anybody ever talked to me or called me about that. Q. In fairness to you, because we have a note that Nancy Holmes says she sent to you at some time, what you're saying to me is she may have sent that to me, but I just can't say one way or another whether I ever received it; true? A. I may have received it. Q. Do you have a recollection of having received it? A. I may or may not have received that. Q. In her note, it says she couldn't
 Page 38 1 actually need to be physically examined by a 2 physician? 3 A. No, I did not say that. 4 Q. Just so I'm clear, what you're 5 telling me is, if a patient does present with a 6 new condition, in order to comply with the law 7 and the physician assistant utilization plan at 8 Kaiser, the physician does need to physically 9 examine the patient? 10 A. That is true. 11 Q. Failure to do that is not complying 12 with the utilization plan at Kaiser; correct? 13 A. Maybe, yes. 14 Q. And it's not complying with what you 15 understand the law to be for physician assistant 16 supervision; true? 17 A. Sure. 18 Q. Now, I take it, just so I'm clear and 19 I don't spend a lot of time on something that 20 you have no knowledge of, you have no basis to 21 tell me, from looking at the record, that Dr. 22 Yang actually physically examined Mrs. Medlen on 23 August 4, 1999? 24 A. I don't know that. 25 Q. Now, what I would like to understand 	 Page 40 1 find anything wrong with her, thought you might 2 want to see the blood work, and then it says 3 chest x-ray negative. So that if you received 4 Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, is it fair to say that 5 what she is saying in this exhibit is that she 6 was also providing you with the blood work from 7 that visit on August 4, '99? 8 A. According to this note, yes. 9 Q. k it fair to say, doctor, that you 10 may or may not have received the blood work that 11 she is referencing in this letter that was 12 performed on August 4, 99? 13 A. That is true. 14 Q. Do you have any basis to tell me, 15 because, again, I don't work here; I'm trying to 16 understand the system as I'm going along and I'm 17 just a lawyer, but can you tell me from looking 18 at the records that a physician's assistant or a 19 physician was notified of the blood work and the 20 results of the urinalysis at any time on August 21 4, '99 when the patient was present? 23 A. I don't know, Your question was why 24 it, or what should have happened over there? 25 Q. Well, those are all very good

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

	D 12
Page 41 1 questions. I have a very strong reason to 2 believe that Mrs. Medlen was sent honie on August 3 4 and was not told the results of these tests, 4 even though the tests were performed on a 5 Wednesday when she was present. I have, 6 further, very strong reason to believe that on 7 August 5, Thursday, when her husband called, 8 they still did not provide her with the results 9 even though the results were available, and it 10 wasn't until August 6th when she wound up going 11 to the emergency room and seeing Dr. Gajdowski 12 that someone took a look and saw what the 13 results were. 14 If my statement is accurate, do you 15 consider that to be the kind of care that 16 patients at Kaiser should receive? 17 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. 18 A. I cannot comment on that, what kind 19 of judgment if they received a phone call, if 20 they received a lab result, what kind of 21 judgment they took in their mind, what kind of 22 discussion they had, what was their best 23 judgment when they saw the patient, and 24 examination was normal, not normal, what kind of 25 instruction was given to the patient. So I	 Page 43 patients can be comfortably taken care of as an outpatient if the problem is not that serious. So it depends on all the circumstances. Still, the bottom line is, how is the patient, how did the patient present, how sick was the patient. Q. Let's move past August 4 for a moment. The patient calls Kaiser and the patient is calling to get the results of the tests on a Thursday. The patient certainly is entitled to be advised of the results; correct? A. Yes, patient is usually communicated with the results. Q. If the patient was seen the day before with these test results and now has dry heaves and shakes, what, as a reasonable physician, would you consider with all of the history that you have, the test results, the patient's history, the patient has a fever now at the time of the telephone call of 101, has dry heaves and shakes, what reasonably needs to be done with regard to that patient? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. Q. You cananswer. A. Physician who saw the patient needs
 Page 42 cannot make any comment on that. Q. If you have a patient where you have a fever of unknown origin and you do tests to determine what the cause of the fever is, would you as a physician want to know the results of those tests? A. Yes. Q. Depending on what? A. What I do with the patient, how I examine the patient, what is my judgment. Judgment from physician-to-physician, they differ. Whether I want to get the blood test result right away to check something or just to follow a few things or just to what you call ** let me go slightly back. I'm trying to ** I don't want to confuse anybody. Still it depends on my own judgment. Is the patient acutely ill, acutely sick, does she need care immediately or ** Q. Go ahead. A. ** or the patient can be followed work is immediately necessary. That means somebody that belongs to ** what you call ** 	 Page 44 to reassess the situation. That's what I will say. Q. How do you go about reassessing the patient? A. Either the patient is sick enough they should be seen again, or the care should be directed to some appropriate specialty or facility, depending on the initial judgment, how the patient was instructed and what are the follow-up symptoms, how sick the patient became. Q. Would you agree that the patient needs to be given some communication either to come in or to go someplace? A. Depends on the initial evaluation by the initial physician. Q. Doctor, you're not sitting here today treatment that Mrs. Medlen received on August 4, 1999 met the standards of care, are you? A. I can't comment on that. Q. Okay. A. It may have niet the standard of care, may not have been. Very difficult for me to comment because I did not give her care. Q. But you've had a chance to look at

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

Page 45	Page 47
1 the records and you've had a chance to look at	1 know.
2 the lab results.	2 Q. You're aware the patient was seen by
3 A. Still, I cannot make my own judgment	3 Dr. Gajdowski in the emergency room at Kaiser on
4 based on other people's notes because the	4 August 6, 1999; true?
5 patient was not in front of me.	5 A. Yes, patient was seen by Dr.
6 Q. Got it. And if the patient wasn't in	6 Gajdowski in the emergency room.
7 front of Dr. Yang and wasn't physically	7 Q. Are you familiar with the clinical
8 evaluated by Dr. Yang, would you agree that you	8 findings at that time?
9 would have more of a problem with the care?	9 A. Not exactly.
10 MS. DISILVIO: Objection.	10 Q. Are you aware of the fact that, based
11 A. I don't know whether Dr. Yang saw the	1 1 upon the progression of her symptoms, that she
12 patient or not.	12 was very promptly transferred to the Cleveland
13 Q. If Dr. Yang didn't see the patient.	13 Clinic for further evaluation and treatment?
14 A. I don't know.	14 A. That's true.
15 Q. If Dr. Yang didn't see the patient	15 Q. And ultimately underwent debridement,
16 MS. DISILVIO: What's the question?	16 antibiotic treatment and amputations?
17 If Dr. Yang didn't see the patient?	17 A. That's what I heard.
18 MR. MISHKIND: I'm trying to finish	18 Q. Is it fair to say, however, that with
19 it.	19 regard to the specifics of what transpired,
20 Q. If Dr. Yang didn't see the patient,	20 you're not intimately familiar with that?
21 would you agree with me that that would be below	21 A. No, I am not.
22 the standards of care?	22 Q. Do you hold an opinion, doctor, in
23 MS. DISILVIO: Objection.	23 this case whether the patient's amputation would
A. Yes, with a new complaint, not seeing	24 have been avoided had she been diagnosed with an
25 the patient.	25 infection on August 4, 1999?
Page 46	Page 48
Page 46	Page 48
1 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that	1 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I
1 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that 2 would be below the standards of care; true?	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that,
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected.
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or A. I have no opinion, because I was not
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there.
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it that way. 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it that way. Q. I'll accept that as an answer to my 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have no opinion? A. I cannot form any opinion looking at
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it that way. Q. I'll accept that as an answer to my question. 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have no opinion? A. I cannot form any opinion looking at the record either.
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it that way. Q. I'll accept that as an answer to my question. Do you show in your records, either 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have no opinion? A. I cannot form any opinion looking at the record either. Q. Let's talk about Mrs. Medlen now.
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it that way. Q. I'll accept that as an answer to my question. Do you show in your records, either 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have no opinion? A. I cannot form any opinion looking at the record either. Q. Let's talk about Mrs. Medlen now. Recognizing that you saw Mrs. Medlen once, but
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it that way. Q. I'll accept that as an answer to my question. Do you show in your records, either on the window of your computer or anything else that you generated, any follow-up in response to 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have no opinion? A. I cannot form any opinion looking at the record either. Q. Let's talk about Mrs. Medlen now. Recognizing that you saw Mrs. Medlen once, but maybe more than once in 2001, this question may
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it that way. Q. I'll accept that as an answer to my question. Do you show in your records, either on the window of your computer or anything else that you generated, any follow-up in response to this comniunication by Nancy Holmes to you? 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have no opinion? A. I cannot form any opinion looking at the record either. Q. Let's talk about Mrs. Medlen now. Recognizing that you saw Mrs. Medlen once, but maybe more than once in 2001, this question may or may not be difficult for you to answer, okay.
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it that way. Q. I'll accept that as an answer to my question. Do you show in your records, either on the window of your computer or anything else that you generated, any follow-up in response to this comniunication by Nancy Holmes to you? A. I don't recall. I don't recall 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have no opinion? A. I cannot form any opinion looking at the record either. Q. Let's talk about Mrs. Medlen now. Recognizing that you saw Mrs. Medlen once, but maybe more than once in 2001, this question may or may not be difficult for you to answer, okay.
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it that way. Q. I'll accept that as an answer to my question. Do you show in your records, either on the window of your computer or anything else that you generated, any follow-up in response to this comniunication by Nancy Holmes to you? A. I don't recall. I don't recall 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have no opinion? A. I cannot form any opinion looking at the record either. Q. Let's talk about Mrs. Medlen now. Recognizing that you saw Mrs. Medlen once, but maybe more than once in 2001, this question may or may not be difficult for you to answer, okay. How do you recall Mrs. Medlen's spirits to be? The reason I ask you that is, given that she has
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it that way. Q. I'll accept that as an answer to my question. Do you show in your records, either on the window of your computer or anything else that you generated, any follow-up in response to this comniunication by Nancy Holmes to you? A. I don't recall. I don't recall 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have no opinion? A. I cannot form any opinion looking at the record either. Q. Let's talk about Mrs. Medlen now. Recognizing that you saw Mrs. Medlen once, but maybe more than once in 2001, this question may or may not be difficult for you to answer, okay.
 Q. And absent seeing the patient, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. I cannot answer for him. Q. I'm not asking you to answer for him, but as a reasonable and prudent doctor, if Dr. Yang, or if you happened to have been in Dr. Yang's position, if you didn't see the patient on that day, that would be below the standards of care; true? MS. DISILVIO: Objection. You niay answer. A. It would have been more consistent to see the patient. It was the responsibility of the physician to see the patient. Let me put it that way. Q. I'll accept that as an answer to my question. Do you show in your records, either on the window of your computer or anything else that you generated, any follow-up in response to this comniunication by Nancy Holmes to you? A. I don't recall. I don't recall 	 A. I cannot give any opinion, because I don't know whether it was really infected or not before that. We know on August 6. Before that, I don't know whether it was infected. Q. Fair enough. What I want to understand is, you're not going to take the stand and say that, had everything been done the way that the Medlens and Mr. Mishkind as their attorney is suggesting should have been done on August 4, that it wouldn't have made a difference. You have no opinion one way or another? A. I have no opinion, because I was not present there. Q. Even looking at the records, you have no opinion? A. I cannot form any opinion looking at the record either. Q. Let's talk about Mrs. Medlen now. Recognizing that you saw Mrs. Medlen once, but maybe more than once in 2001, this question may or may not be difficult for you to answer, okay. How do you recall Mrs. Medlen's spirits to be? The reason I ask you that is, given that she has

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

Page 49	Page 51
 when you have seen her most recently, is she despondent, or does she seem to be upbeat in terms of your communication? Do you follow me? A. I'm following you, but I don't recall exactly any emotional aspects or psychological aspects of the patient at that time. Looking at my note, I saw her for some kind of problem, or symptom, what I addressed. No, I really don't recall how was she emotionally or how was she accepting the whole situation before or after that, Q. All right. Let's talk about what you have seen her for. A. I have to go to my note. Q. Go right ahead. Tell me, before August of '99, what conditions were you treating her for? A. August of '99. This is a visit that shows in December 1996. Q. Was '96 the first time that you would have seen her as a patient? A. I would have contacted the patient on 	 patient. Q. It's very helpful, isn't it? A. It is helpful. Q. In fact, I think it's sort of unique to the Kaiser system, or A. That is true. Q. Right. And it really gives you sort of a cheat sheet, if you will, in terms of the medical history on the patient right there and then; correct? A. That's true. Q. So this encounter in '96 was a telephone encounter, you believe? A. I believe it was a telephone encounter. Q. It looks like you prescribed some antibiotics. Q. You did not see her on that date, though, did you? A. No, it doesn't look like I saw her on that day. Q. You made a point of determining whether or not she had fever, shortness of breath or chest pain; correct?
 Page 50 1 that day, it looks like to me. I just said 2 spoke to the patient. That means I may not have 3 physically seen the patient, but I may have 4 talked to her on the phone. 5 Q. And what was the problem that caused 6 you to talk to her on the phone? 7 A, It looks like she was having cough, 8 productive cough, and congestion. 9 Q. You knew back in '96, according to 10 the progress notes, that she had been treated 11 for foot ulcers; correct? 12 A. That is there from the sheet, yes. 13 Q. And that she also had, obviously, the 14 diagnosis of diabetes? 15 A, That is true. 16 Q. And, in fact, one of the diagnoses 17 showed DM ulcer, which is diabetes mellitus 18 ulcer; correct? 19 A. That's correct. 20 Q. Tell me the reason that the Ohio 21 Pernianente Medical Group or Kaiser has this 20 ongoing diagnosis on patients. 23 A. So if the patient has been seen by 24 any new doctor or physician, someone can get an 25 idea about a past medical history about the 	 Page 52 A. That is true. Q. Had she had any of those symptoms, what would you have done? A. I would have called to see the patient by myself. Q. When next did you see the patient, or have any encounter with the patient, I should say? A. April 17th, '97. Q. Was this an appointment? A. Yes, it was an appointment. Q. You were treating her as her primary medical physician at this time; correct? A. Correct, Q. In fact, the previous note had Dr. Kaleupu, K-A-L-E-U-P-U A. Correct. Q as the primary. And then come April of '97, Dr. Mistry is there? A. That is true. Q. Can you explain to me why his name was gone and your name was on? A. Patient might have preferred to can say from this.

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

NOVEMBER 15,2001

Page 53	Page 55
 Q. Was the other doctor still around? A. No, she is not around. She is not here. She used to work at the company a long time ago. Q. Mrs. Medlen may have requested you because she liked you, or you may have been A. Because she might be leaving the company. Q. And you may have been the only person that was next in line or something? A. Yes, because there were only two physicians at the North Olmsted facility, me and her. Q. By process of elimination, she may have wound up with you whether she wanted you or not? A. That is true. Q. I'm not suggesting that is good or bad. I just want to understand the process of her going from her to you. This was a follow-up visit and she was being seen for insulin treatment for her diabetes? A. Yes. She was on insulin treatment. Q. Can you tell me what you noted on 	 slowly so that we don't make the court reporter's life more miserable than it is sometimes. A. Okay. I just mention continue with the current medications. Laboratory, fasting blood sugar, BUN, creatinine, glycated hemoglobin, lipids, LEPs and urinalysis. Q. Along the right-hand side you have today? A. Today. Q. What does that mean? A. Today on the date of visit. Q. In the North Olmsted Medical Center where she was being seen, you had a lab right there that could do all of that? A. We had a lab right there. Q. And how soon would the results be processed by the lab? A. Low back exercises, instructions. Dietary referral for weight reduction purpose, and follow-up after six months. Q. Now, ASPR, what does that stand for? A. Well, I did not write that. I don't
 Page 54 1 that date? I'm having a difficult time. A. Follow-up visit. She was complaining 3 of chronic low back pain without radiation. 4 Patient compliant with medication. 5 Q. I'm sorry, what? 6 A. Patient compliant with the 7 medication. 8 Q. That goes to one of those issues that 9 we talked about before? 10 A. That's true. 11 Q. She was taking what she was told to 12 take? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Go ahead. 15 A. Concerned about increasing weight. 16 Q. Aren't we all? 17 A. Yes. Vital signs stable and physical 18 examination unremarkable. 19 Q. No new diagnoses added to the list? 20 A. No new diagnoses added. 21 Q. There are some additional notes on 22 the next sheet that you made for that visit. 23 A. Yes, sir. It has all the laboratory 24 workup, all the blood tests. 25 Q. Before you start to read it, read it 	 Page 56 know exactly what is ASPR. That's the nurse who mentioned some kind of abbreviation, but I don't understand what exactly it stands for. Q. Is that the nurse's signature, E A, It looks like there is a nurse's signature who discharged the patient from the office. Q. To the right of the nurse's signature there is M. There is my signature. Q. And then it looks like we have the A. Prescription written down at the bottom, Q. There are two prescriptions there, doctor; is that correct? A. There is only one yes, there are two prescriptions. Q. It looks like on April 17th she also had an eye exam. I don't know if you're A. That I'm not familiar. I'm not aware about that. Q. Let's go to the next encounter that you had with her. What would that date, please, be? A. August 25th.

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

Page 57	Page 59
1 Q. 1997?	1 was noncompliant; true?
2 A. 1997.	2 A. On this visit so far, yes.
3 Q. What were your findings on that date?	3 Q. My statement is accurate?
4 A. My findings, patient presented for	4 A. Yes.
5 the left pedal edema, and findings were for	5 Q. When did you next have any contact
6 pitting edema, one to two plus. That is a	6 with her after August 1997?
7 grading of the edema.	7 A. My next visit, September 7, 1999.
8 Q. You said? 9 A, Edema, E-D-E-M-A, that's the swelling	8 Q. I'm sorry, what was the date? 9 A. September 7, 1999. August '97 to
10 of the soft tissues; left lower leg, ankle, with	10 September '99.
11 increased warmth, without tenderness.	11 Q. What were her symptoms in September
12 Q. It looks like you added venous	12 of '99?
13 stasis ••	13 A. Diarrhea. Follow-up, diarrhea since
14 A. Venous stasis.	14 came home from nursing home.
15 Q as a new diagnosis.	15 Q. Had you seen her when she was in the
16 A. As a new diagnosis.	16 nursing home?
17 Q. Did you order any tests to be	17 A. No, I did not. We do not go to
18 performined to determine the cause of the venous	18 nursing home.
19 stasis?20 A. Doesn't look like I ordered any test.	19 Q. Do you know why she had been in the 20 nursing home?
20 A. Doesn't look like l'oldered any test. 21 Q. You were also considering cellulitis	20 hursing nome? 21 A. Probably after the surgery, for
22 at that time; correct?	22 rehabilitation purpose, she was placed in
23 A. Yes. That was part of that because I	23 nursing home.
24 question marked the venous stasis because it	24 Q. What was she being rehabilitated for?
25 could have been cellulitis.	A. Well, this is September, so I'm
Page 58	Page 60
1 Q. How did you go about differentiating	1 assuming after her amputation.
2 between it being venous stasis versus	2 Q. Which date are you referring to?
3 cellulitis?	3 A. September 7, 1999.
4 A. Most likely, most commonly, clinical	4 Q . I'm sorry, which year?
5 examination.	5 A. '99. 6 O. '99. okay. Did she have a Kaiser
6 Q. Do your records reflect that you 7 arrived at that time at a final diagnosis as to	6 Q. '99, okay. Did she have a Kaiser 7 doctor that was her primary doctor while she was
8 the likely	8 in the nursing home after her amputation?
9 A. No, it does not reflect that I	9 A. I don't know.
10 arrived at one particular diagnosis. I'm	10 Q. No indication on September 7, '99
11 putting down two differential diagnoses and	11 when you saw her for the diarrhea that patient
12 trying to work on both diagnoses with the hope	12 was noncompliant; correct?
13 of reassessment at a later date.	13 A. Correct.
14 Q. When does it say on your note for	14 Q. When did you see her after September
15 that visit in August that you were planning to 16 see her next?	15 7? 16 A December 26 2000
16 see her next? 17 A. It does not say that. Usually we try	A. December 26, 2000.Q. What were her symptoms when you saw
18 to instruct the patients, any kind of	18 her in December of 2000?
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	19 A. That says cough and cold for four
19 worsening I did not write it over here, but	
19 worsening I did not write it over here, but20 many times it happens, we instruct the patient	20 days,
20 many times it happens, we instruct the patient 21 verbally.	20 days,21 Q. Between when you had seen her in
 20 many times it happens, we instruct the patient 21 verbally. 22 Q. It would have been more on a p.r.n. 	 20 days, 21 Q. Between when you had seen her in 22 September of '99 and when you saw her in
 20 many times it happens, we instruct the patient 21 verbally. 22 Q. It would have been more on a p.r.n. 23 basis? 	 20 days, 21 Q. Between when you had seen her in 22 September of '99 and when you saw her in 23 December of 2000, were there any appointments
 20 many times it happens, we instruct the patient 21 verbally. 22 Q. It would have been more on a p.r.n. 23 basis? 24 A. More on a p.r.n. basis. 	 20 days, 21 Q. Between when you had seen her in 22 September of '99 and when you saw her in 23 December of 2000, were there any appointments 24 that she failed to keep with you or failed to
 20 many times it happens, we instruct the patient 21 verbally. 22 Q. It would have been more on a p.r.n. 23 basis? 	 20 days, 21 Q. Between when you had seen her in 22 September of '99 and when you saw her in 23 December of 2000, were there any appointments

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

NOVEMBER 15,2001

Page 61	Page 63
 Page 61 A. I cannot say with me, actually, because we did not offer anybody appointments at that time. But she looks like she was under care of other subspecialties and they were following her problem in different ways. Q. b it fair to say that Mrs. Medlen was not only seen by you, but by a number of other doctors? A. A number of other doctors too. Q. But speaking from your personal experience, as of December of 2000 when you last saw her, according to the note, you see no evidence of any noncompliance on the patient's part; correct? A. That is true. That is correct. Q. Can you tell me, doctor, from that December 2000 note, or from anything that you can recollect, how she seemed to be adapting to having her leg amputated? A. Difficult to say. Very difficult to recollect. Q. Nothing that stands out in your mind? A. Exactly. Not out of the ordinary 	 A. This record? This just reflects the progress note. It does not reflect the laboratory values. This is the day when the laboratories were ordered, but the results go in some different in different folders. Q. So how would you know what the results of the labs were? A. The results will come back to me the next day. Q. All right. And if the labs were abnormal? A. I will act on that Q. And do what? A appropriately. Q. Okay. A. Adjust the medications, if needed. Q. Do you see any indication in your record on or after December 26, 2000 that you took any action relative to those labs? A. I can't recall at this moment. I would have to go back to my records after this date.
	C
24 that stands out, that she behaved in some25 different way, or she was depressed or either	24 December 26, 2000 other than your note sometime 25 in 2001, which you told me you at least remember
Page 62	Page 64
 extremes. I don't recall. Q. Fair enough. When you saw her in December of 2000, as her internist, would you have examined the area where the amputation A. I may or may not have examined the area. Q. Her presenting symptoms in December of 2000 were what? A. Cough and cold. Q. What was determined to be the cause? A. Well, what I wrote down, I have to go back to my note. Nasopharyngeal inflammation. Bilateral facial and frontal tenderness, and there is indication of sinusitis. Q. Were any labs ordered? A. Chemistry, sugar, cholesterol, liver functions. Q. What were the results? A. I have no idea. I don't know now. I don't remember. Q. Well, you have got the records in front of you, so I'm asking you to tell me what 	 1 summer to fall time period, if there was no 2 immediate action taken after December 2000, 3 would it be fair to assume that, when you 4 received the lab results, that they were within 5 normal limits for this patient? 6 A. I don't recall. If they would not 7 have been within normal limits, I would have 8 done something for that. I would have ordered 9 medications for that. 10 Q. Fair enough. If they were within 11 normal limits, it would be reasonable for you to 12 have no notes by you after that, because no 13 action was taken? 14 A. That is true. 15 Q. And no action would be required? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Fair enough. We are almost done, 18 doctor. 19 Did you ever have occasion to talk to 20 Dr. Matalavage about his management of Mrs. 21 Medlen's heel ulcers? 22 A. Not at all. I don't recall. 23 Q. Doctor, as a physician, when a 24 patient that has a history of diabetes that is 25 at a high risk of amputation presents with a

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

		T	
	Dogo 65		Dogo 67
	Page 65		Page 67
1	recent history of fever and complains of body	1	Q other than low grade, if you have
2	aching and chills, prior to doing any testing,	2	an elevation in temperature, does that cause you
3	what is within your differential as a potential	3	to think away from infection?
4	cause?	4	MS. DISILVIO: Objection.
5	MS. DISILVIO: Objection.	5	A. No, you cannot say that. We cannot
6	A. Just assuming I need to see the	6	say that. You have to collect other data.
7	patient.	7	Q. But certainly, in a symptom complex,
8	Q. I know. But presented to you as	8	a patient that's diagnosed with infection, it's
9	you're taking your boards for internal medicine	9	
		10	not uncommon to see elevation in temperature as
10	and you're given the history on this patient ••		well; true?
11	A. Okay.	11	A. They may have elevated temperature
12	Q. she's a diabetic, she's a high	12	with infection.
13	risk amputation, she has been treated for	13	Q. They don't necessarily have to have
14	bilateral foot ulcers, she presents with a		elevated temperature?
15	recent history, three days of fever, she has	15	A. That is true.
16	body aches and chills, before ordering any labs,	16	Q. But to say the patient has an
17	what, Dr. Mistry, is within your preliminary	17	elevation in temperature, therefore, it can't be
18	differential diagnosis?	18	an infection, that would be a silly statement;
19	MS. DISILVIO: Objection.	19	true?
20	A. Only after physical examination.	20	A. That is true, but usually with
21	Q. What would the physical examination	21	ongoing infection, some people will have some
22	consist of?	22	continuous fever. That's true, too.
23	A. Well, I have to check symptoms, other	23	Q. Patients that have peripheral
24	circumstances, too, symptoms, her medications.	24	neuropathy, that are diabetics, that have foot
25	I have to put many things together before making	25	ulcers, are they more prone to infections?
	i have to put many unings together before making		aleels, are aley more prone to intections.
	Page 66		Page 68
1		1	
$\frac{1}{2}$	any list of differential diagnosis.	1	A. Mayor may not be.
2	any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be	2	A. Mayor may not be.Q. Doctor, have some documents which
2 3	any list of differential diagnosis.Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild	2 3	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio
2 3 4	any list of differential diagnosis.Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body	2 3 4	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently
2 3 4 5	any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination?	2 3 4 5	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at
2 3 4 5 6	any list of differential diagnosis.Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination?A. Not necessarily. Depends on the	2 3 4 5 6	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking
2 3 4 5 6 7	any list of differential diagnosis.Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination?A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	any list of differential diagnosis.Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination?A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, l cannot say that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, l cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, l cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, I cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, l cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Can you have an elevation in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it? A. Message. There is the appropriate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, I cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Can you have an elevation in temperature in a patient that also has 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it? A. Message. There is the appropriate message for the patients to be conveyed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, I cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Can you have an elevation in temperature in a patient that also has laboratory findings consistent with an 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it? A. Message. There is the appropriate message for the patients to be conveyed to appropriate providers. That's the whole
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, I cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Can you have an elevation in temperature in a patient that also has 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it? A. Message. There is the appropriate message for the patients to be conveyed to appropriate providers. That's the whole intention.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, I cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Can you have an elevation in temperature in a patient that also has laboratory findings consistent with an 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it? A. Message. There is the appropriate message for the patients to be conveyed to appropriate providers. That's the whole
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, I cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Can you have an elevation in temperature in a patient that also has laboratory findings consistent with an infection? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it? A. Message. There is the appropriate message for the patients to be conveyed to appropriate providers. That's the whole intention.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, I cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Can you have an elevation in temperature in a patient that also has laboratory findings consistent with an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Are you saying that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it? A. Message. There is the appropriate message for the patients to be conveyed to appropriate providers. That's the whole intention. Q. With what purpose in mind?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, I cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Can you have an elevation in temperature in a patient that also has laboratory findings consistent with an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Are you saying that A. If you can be specific. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it? A. Message. There is the appropriate message for the patients to be conveyed to appropriate providers. That's the whole intention. Q. With what purpose in mind? A. Communication. Q. Communication?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, I cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Can you have an elevation in temperature in a patient that also has laboratory findings consistent with an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Are you saying that A. If you can be specific. Q. If you have an elevation in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it? A. Message. There is the appropriate message for the patients to be conveyed to appropriate providers. That's the whole intention. Q. With what purpose in mind? A. Communication. Q. Communication about the patient.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, I cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Can you have an elevation in temperature in a patient that also has laboratory findings consistent with an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Are you saying that A. If you can be specific. Q. If you have an elevation in temperature 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it? A. Message. There is the appropriate message for the patients to be conveyed to appropriate providers. That's the whole intention. Q. With what purpose in mind? A. Communication. Q. Communication about the patient. Q. So that communication can take place
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 any list of differential diagnosis. Q. Would your physical examination be limited to upper body if the patient has mild throat pain, or would you do a full body examination? A. Not necessarily. Depends on the symptoms and priorty of the areas to be examined according to the symptoms. Q. Can you tell from this record on August 4th whether or not the physical exam was adequate or inadequate? A, I cannot say that. Q. Is elevation in temperature a finding that is seen in patients that have an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Can you have an elevation in temperature in a patient that also has laboratory findings consistent with an infection? A. Not necessarily. Q. Are you saying that A. If you can be specific. Q. If you have an elevation in temperature 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Mayor may not be. Q. Doctor, I have some documents which are referred to as Kaiser Permanente of Ohio encounter system documents. They're apparently an e-mail type of system that's used here at Kaiser. As I'm talking, you're sort of looking over. Do you know what I'm referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to? A. I think I know what you're referring to. Q. This encounter system where messages are sent back and forth by some type of an e-mail system, is that used frequently in the Kaiser system? A. Yes, it is. Q. What's the purpose of it? A. Message. There is the appropriate message for the patients to be conveyed to appropriate providers. That's the whole intention. Q. With what purpose in mind? A. Communication. Q. Communication about the patient.

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

Page 69	Page 71
 physicians? A. That is true. Q. I want to ask you just a couple questions, There's an encounter system document that I have that's dated August 7, '99. It has you as the sender. A. Yes. Q. Then it says, patient needs to be 9 seen by podiatry ASAP for follow-up in office, 10 and it's got a DM after that. A. Yes. Q. Do you see that document? A. I do. Q. Is the DM most likely your initials? A. That is me. Q. Is it fair to say that this encounter 17 form that I'm referring to was likely generated 18 by you? A. Yes. Q. You somewhat hesitated when you said yes. Q. And there aren't too many A. Sender is me. This was generated by 	 somewhere. I need to see that part, why I responded in this way, why patient needs to be seen by podiatry, is she having some active foot problem at that time, or I wanted to see the patient in the office. Q. And you're generating this on August 9? A. August 9. Q. That would be Monday. A. Probably, yes. Q. From that communication by you, is it fair to say that you did not know that this patient was in the Cleveland Clinic Foundation undergoing A. Very difficult for me to recall at this moment, and how much information did I have about this patient on this date. Q. Is it fair to say that you did not know that the patient was in the Cleveland Clinic undergoing major treatment in an effort to salvage her leg, otherwise, you would not have made that note that she needed to be seen by podiatry ASAP for follow-up in the office? A. That's why I told you, I need to see
A. Sender is me. This was generated by	A. That's why I told you, I need to see
25 me.	25 the actual message, what kind of message came to
Page 70	
Fage 70	Page 72
 Q. Explain this document to me. A. In what way? Q. In whatever way you can. A. Because I don't know the previous message, in what context I responded in this way. I need to see that. Q. Tell me what the date was that you were sending this message. A. That was August 9th. Q. And who is it that, according to this document, had been the sender? A. Sender is me. It is sent to my nurse. Q. Who had provided the original comniunication to you that caused you A. That's what I'm trying to find out. I must have got some input from somewhere. In that context, I must have responded in this way. So I should have some kind of message from the patient or from some of the staff members. Q. You see on the top portion of that 	 Page 72 me. Somebody messaged me, patient is in Clinic, I responded that way; patient is being discharged from the Clinic, I responded in that way; or patient was in nursing home, I responded in that way. So the top portion, some part is missing. Q. So the top portion of this document, which was provided to me by counsel for Kaiser, does not relate to your response? A. No, because there is no text over here. Q. I agree with you. I'm just trying to understand. MR. MISHKIND: Marilena, do you have the message that Dr. Mistry would be responding to? MS. DISILVIO: I have everything that I sent to you. MR. MISHKIND: Again, I'm assuming you understand the hieroglyphics of the system better than I do, so I'm wondering whether you
 Q. Explain this document to me. A. In what way? Q. In whatever way you can. A. Because I don't know the previous message, in what context I responded in this way. I need to see that. Q. Tell me what the date was that you were sending this message. A. That was August 9th. Q. And who is it that, according to this document, had been the sender? A. Sender is me. It is sent to my nurse. Q. Who had provided the original comniunication to you that caused you A. That's what I'm trying to find out. I must have got some input from somewhere. In that context, I must have responded in this way. So I should have some kind of message from the patient or from some of the staff members. Q. You see on the top portion of that there's a reference to Parma emergency department. 	 me. Somebody messaged me, patient is in Clinic, l responded that way; patient is being discharged from the Clinic, I responded in that way; or patient was in nursing home, I responded in that way. So the top portion, some part is missing. Q. So the top portion of this document, which was provided to me by counsel for Kaiser, does not relate to your response? A. No, because there is no text over here. Q. I agree with you. I'm just trying to understand. MR. MISHKIND: Marilena, do you have the message that Dr. Mistry would be responding to? MS. DISILVIO: I have everything that I sent to you. MR. MISHKIND: Again, I'm assuming you understand the hieroglyphics of the system better than I do, so I'm wondering whether you have ** MS. DISILVIO: I have it in exactly
 Q. Explain this document to me. A. In what way? Q. In whatever way you can. A. Because I don't know the previous message, in what context I responded in this way. I need to see that. Q. Tell me what the date was that you were sending this message. A. That was August 9th. Q. And who is it that, according to this document, had been the sender? A. Sender is me. It is sent to my nurse. Q. Who had provided the original commiunication to you that caused you A. That's what I'm trying to find out. I must have got some input from somewhere. In that context, I must have responded in this way. So I should have some kind of message from the patient or from some of the staff members. Q. You see on the top portion of that there's a reference to Parma emergency 	 me. Somebody messaged me, patient is in Clinic, l responded that way; patient is being discharged from the Clinic, I responded in that way; or patient was in nursing home, I responded in that way. So the top portion, some part is missing. Q. So the top portion of this document, which was provided to me by counsel for Kaiser, does not relate to your response? A. No, because there is no text over here. Q. I agree with you. I'm just trying to understand. MR. MISHKIND: Marilena, do you have the message that Dr. Mistry would be responding to? MS. DISILVIO: I have everything that I sent to you. MR. MISHKIND: Again, I'm assuming you understand the hieroglyphics of the system better than I do, so I'm wondering whether you

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

NOVEMBER 15,2001

Page 73	Page 75
 response time, and I will certainly check to see for you if there is anything else. Q. Do you know who Lisa Smith is? A. No. MS. DISILVIO: This may be your answer here. There's a note that begins two pages earlier from the record that you showed the doctor that is from the Parma emergency department the same date, 8-7-99. MR. MISHKIND: I'm on that right now. I'm asking whether he knows who Lisa Smith is. MS. DISILVIO: So the question is, do you know who Lisa Smith is? MR. MISHKIND: Yes. MS. DISILVIO: That's the question; do you know who Lisa Smith is. A. No, I don't know. It's just ER. Must be some person in the emergency room sending a message to me. Q. Now, that message that you're referring to now, this is one that's dated on August 7, '99 jit looks like the origin time is 5:05 p.m.? A. Yes. Q. Does that look to be accurate? 	1Q.So if you were responding solely to2this message, you would have had no way to know?3A.4No clue where the patient is at that4time.5Q.6All right. Certainly, if the6emergency department knew that the patient had7been admitted to the hospital, that's something8that could have been included in this9communication to you as her primary medical10physician; correct?11MS. DISILVIO: Objection.12A.13responded in that way.14Q.15message, then you would not have said in your16response that the patient needs to be seen in17podiatry ASAP or follow-up in office?18A.19are 48 hours in between. I won't know in two20days where the patient is, whether the patient21is still in the hospital or the patient is being22discharged or sent to another place.23Q.2448 hours, uncomplicated
 A. Yes. Q. This is not something that you were generating; this is something that was routed to you; correct? A. Correct, and August 7th was what day? Was it Saturday? Q. August 7th would have been Saturday. A. Saturday. This would have been Monday. So it looks like the weekend. The message was sitting there, and I retrieved the message on Monday, and I responded. Q. Is it fair to say that the communication that you received from the Parma emergency department on August 7th at 5:05 p.m. didn't tell you that your patient had already been transferred and admitted to the Cleveland Clinic Foundation? A. No. This message doesn't tell anything about that. Q. The communication that you had from the emergency department that was generated at 5:05 p.m. on August 7th did not contain any information that the patient was at the Cleveland Clinic Foundation; true? A. That is true. 	 Page 76 recovery. Maximum 72 hours. That's what I see by working here. Q. Did you have any occasion to see or treat Mrs. Medlen for any complications that she has had since her amputation as a result of the amputation? A. Not that I recall. Q. Do you recall any incidents where she had any physical complications by virtue of her prosthesis or ambuiation? A. Not that I recall. Most likely those kinds of problems and complications post-surgery are communicated to the surgeons. Q. When you go on to your computer and look in the window under Mrs. Medlen's name, are you able to pull up all of the encounter system communications as well as her progress notes? A. Most of the time. MS. DISILVIO: Can we go off the record for a minute? (Discussion off the record.) Q. Doctor, did you ever have occasion to talk to Dr. Gajdowski concerning his examination of your patient in the emergency room? A. This patient?

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

Page 77	Page 79
I Q. Yes.	1 Q. Do you know what type of intravenous
2 A. No. I don't recall. 3 O. Doctor, I have another encounter	2 antibiotics are used?3 A. There are various different kinds of
3 Q. Doctor, I have another encounter 4 system document that is sent to you on August	3 A. There are various different kinds of4 antibiotics people use. It all depends on the
5 9th, it looks like within about an hour, almost	5 infectious disease specialist or the primary
6 two hours, after the last encounter document you	6 care physician taking care of the patient is
7 referred to that you said patient needs to be	7 using the best judgment.
8 seen by podiatry, and this one seems to have	8 Q. Does gas gangrene always lead to
9 been routed to you by Angela Woodard. First, do	9 amputation?
10 you know who Angela Woodard is? 11 A. No. I don't.	10 A. It does not always lead to
11 A. No, I don't. 12 Q. This was routed to you on August 9 at	 amputation. It may lead to some complication like that.
13 about 9:50 a.m.; true?	13 O. Is it important to diagnose gas
14 A. That's true.	14 gangrene as early as possible?
15 Q. And you have no reason to believe	15 A. It is important to diagnose gas
16 that this wasn't received by you, do you?	16 gangrene, yes, sir.
17 A. No. I don't have any reason to	17 Q. The earlier you diagnose it, the
18 believe I did not receive that. 19 O. When the encounter documentation	18 earlier you can start appropriate antibiotic
19 Q. When the encounter documentation 20 comes to you, does it pop up on your computer	19 therapy?20 A. That is true, and, as necessary,
20 comes to you, does it pop up on your computer 21 screen?	21 surgical debridement.
22 A. Yes. It comes on my computer screen.	22 Q. The earlier you treat it with
23 Q. Like an e-mail that I would get?	23 antibiotics and, as necessary, surgical
A. No, not like an e-mail. We have to	24 debridement, that increases the likelihood of
25 keep refreshing. It's a window that contains	25 saving the leg; true?
Page 78	Page 80
Page 78	Page 80
1 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing.	1 MS. DISILVIO: Objection.
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may,
1 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing.	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may,
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not.
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. O. This would have been sent to you at 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene?
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir.
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir.
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have seen it on your computer screen 11 A. Not at that time, not usually at that 12 time. I may open it another time. 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have seen it on your computer screen 11 A. Not at that time, not usually at that 12 time. I may open it another time. Q. Unless you happen to have been 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have seen it on your computer screen 11 A. Not at that time, not usually at that 12 time. I may open it another time. 13 Q. Unless you happen to have been 14 looking at your computer at that time? 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that we haven't talked about today?
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have seen it on your computer screen 11 A. Not at that time, not usually at that 12 time. I may open it another time. 13 Q. Unless you happen to have been 14 looking at your computer at that time? 15 A. Yes. 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that we haven't talked about today? A. No. I don't recall
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have seen it on your computer screen A. Not at that time, not usually at that time. I may open it another time. Q. Unless you happen to have been looking at your computer at that time? A. Yes. Q. But this told you that the patient 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that we haven't talked about today? A. No. I don't recall Q. Okay.
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have seen it on your computer screen 11 A. Not at that time, not usually at that time. I may open it another time. Q. Unless you happen to have been looking at your computer at that time? A. Yes. Q. But this told you that the patient had been admitted on August 7 with the diagnosis 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that we haven't talked about today? A. No. I don't recall
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have seen it on your computer screen 11 A. Not at that time, not usually at that time. I may open it another time. Q. Unless you happen to have been looking at your computer at that time? A. Yes. Q. But this told you that the patient had been admitted on August 7 with the diagnosis of gas gangrene? A. Yes. 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that we haven't talked about today? A. No. I don't recall Q. Okay. A any such encounters. Q. All right. There was one item that I think you were trying to remember early in the
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have seen it on your computer screen A. Not at that time, not usually at that time. I may open it another time. Q. But this told you that the patient had been admitted on August 7 with the diagnosis of gas gangrene? A. Yes. Q. What is that? 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that we haven't talked about today? A. No. I don't recall Q. Okay. A any such encounters. Q. All right. There was one item that I think you were trying to remember early in the
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have 10 seen it on your computer screen •• 11 A. Not at that time, not usually at that 12 time. I may open it another time. 13 Q. Unless you happen to have been 14 looking at your computer at that time? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. But this told you that the patient 17 had been admitted on August 7 with the diagnosis 18 of gas gangrene? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. What is that? 21 A. It's a necrosis of the soft tissues 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that we haven't talked about today? A. No. I don't recall Q. All right. There was one item that I think you were trying to remember early in the deposition, and I can't remember what it was and I was going to ask you whether you remember it
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have seen it on your computer screen 11 A. Not at that time, not usually at that time. I may open it another time. Q. But this told you that the patient 17 had been admitted on August 7 with the diagnosis of gas gangrene? A. Yes. Q. What is that? A. It's a necrosis of the soft tissues that usually happens as a result of infection. 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that we haven't talked about today? A. No. I don't recall •• Q. All right. There was one item that I think you were trying to remember early in the deposition, and I can't remember you remember it now, but I can't even tell you what it was. It
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have 10 seen it on your computer screen - 11 A. Not at that time, not usually at that 12 time. I may open it another time. 13 Q. Unless you happen to have been 14 looking at your computer at that time? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. But this told you that the patient 17 had been admitted on August 7 with the diagnosis 18 of gas gangrene? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. What is that? 21 A. It's a necrosis of the soft tissues 22 that usually happens as a result of infection. 23 Q. How is it treated? 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that we haven't talked about today? A. No. I don't recall Q. All right. There was one item that I think you were trying to remember early in the deposition, and I can't remember what it was and I was going to ask you whether you remember it now, but I can't even tell you what it was. It was a question I had asked you earlier, but I'll
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have seen it on your computer screen 11 A. Not at that time, not usually at that time. I may open it another time. Q. But this told you that the patient 17 had been admitted on August 7 with the diagnosis of gas gangrene? A. Yes. Q. What is that? A. It's a necrosis of the soft tissues that usually happens as a result of infection. 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that we haven't talked about today? A. No. I don't recall Q. All right. There was one item that I think you were trying to remember early in the deposition, and I can't remember what it was and I was going to ask you whether you remember it now, but I can't even tell you what it was. It was a question I had asked you earlier, but I'll just leave it at that. When I look at my notes,
 all the messages. We have to keep refreshing. Q. This would have been sent to you, but as to when you would have seen it, is that difficult to answer? A. Say that again. Yes. Q. This would have been sent to you at 9:50 a.m.? A. 9:50 a.m. Q. As to when you personally would have 10 seen it on your computer screen 11 A. Not at that time, not usually at that 12 time. I may open it another time. 13 Q. Unless you happen to have been 14 looking at your computer at that time? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. But this told you that the patient 17 had been admitted on August 7 with the diagnosis 18 of gas gangrene? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. What is that? 21 A. It's a necrosis of the soft tissues 22 that usually happens as a result of infection. 23 Q. How is it treated? 24 A. Many ways. Debridement, foot care, 	 MS. DISILVIO: Objection. A. It may. Not necessarily. It may, because you don't know at the time when the gas gangrene happened if the limb can be saved at that time or not. Q. You certainly recognize that earlier is much better than later in terms of diagnosing gas gangrene? A. That is standard, yes. Yes, sir. Q. Doctor, are there any encounters that you specifically remember, either by way of seeing Mrs. Medlen, talking with her, or communicating through the encounter system, that we haven't talked about today? A. No. I don't recall Q. All right. There was one item that I think you were trying to remember early in the deposition, and I can't remember what it was and I was going to ask you whether you remember it now, but I can't even tell you what it was. It was a question I had asked you earlier, but I'll just leave it at that. When I look at my notes,

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

Page 81 1 Marilena. 2 Other than that, doctor, I have no 3 further questions for you. Thank you very much 4 for your time. 5 MS. DISILVIO: We'll read it, please. 6 If you would send one directly to the doctor and 7 a mlnl and big transcript for myself. 8 (Deposition concluded at 11:25 o'clock a.m.) 9 (Signature not waived.) 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Page 83 CERTIFICATE State of Ohio,) SS: County of Cuyahoga.) I, Karen M. Patterson, a Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that the within named DARSHAN MISTRY, M.D. was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the course aforesaid; that the testimony as above set forth was by me reduced to stenotypy, afterwards transcribed, and that the foregoing Is a true and correct transcription of the testimony. I do further certify that this deposition wes completed without adjournment; that I am not a relative or attorney for either party or otherwise interested in the event of this action. I am not, nor is the court reporting firm with which I am affiliated, under a contract as denned in Civil Rule 28(D). NNWITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office at Cleveland, Ohio, on this 21st day of November 2001. Macren M. Patterson, Notary Public Within and for the State of Ohio My commission expires October 7, 2004.
Page 82 1 AFFIDAVIT 2 I have read the foregoing transcript from 3 page 1 through 81 and note the following 4 corrections: 5 PAGE 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 DARSHAN MISTRY, M.D. 19 Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21 day of, 2001. 23	

21 (Pages 81 to 83)

NOVEMBER 15,2001

Page

A	acutely 42:17,18	64:25 65:1375:24	58:10	68:11
abbreviation 56:2	adapting 61:18	76:5,6 79:9,11	arrogant 17:14	bad 53:19
able 17:6 18:24	added 54:19,20	amputations 47:16	ASAP 69:9 71:23	based 45:4 47:10
76:16	57:12	48:25	75:17	
abnormal 63:11	additional 4:23	Angela 77:9,10	asked 7:15 19:21	basis 13:16 35:21
1	54:21	ankle 57:10		38:20 40:14 58:23
abnormalities	additions 4:24	another 7:7 39:15	80:23	58:24
32:20	addressed 49:8		asking 6:3,10 28:1	became 39:4 44:10
about 9:1,18 12:18		48:12 75:22 77:3	29:5 46:5 62:24	Becker 2:3
14:6 15:11,18	adequate 66:11	78:12	73:11	becoming 5:12
16:12 17:13,24	adjournment 83:14		aspects 49:5,6	before 1:16 3:12
19:5,7 20:16 21:4	Adjust 63:16	8:25 9:11 18:3,14	ASPR 55:24 56:1	6:6 7:9,11,16 16:3
21:19 22:23,24	admitted 74:16	19:12,14,14 21:19	assistant 23:24 27:5	20:9 31:15,19,22
23:11,16,20 25:1	75:7 78:17	25:6,1635:16	28:2 35:24 36:3	37:22 43:15 48:3
33:1,7 34:12	adult 15:6	37:22 43:24 46:4	37:12 38:7,15	48:3 49:10,15,18
39:1044:348:19	advice 17:19 20:18	46:5,12,17 48:22	40:18	54:9,25 65:16,25
49:1250:25,25	advised 43:11	73:6 78:4	assistants 37:19	82:20
54:9,15 56:21	AFFIDAVIT 82:1	answered 19:23	assume 26:25 32:16	begins 73:6
58:164:2068:23	affiliated 83:16	answering 5:24 6:7	64:3	behalf 2:2,9
71:17 74:19 77:5	affixed 83:18	answers 6:14	assuming 26:16	behaved 61:24
77:13 80:14	aforesaid 83:11	antibiotic 47:16	60:1 63:23 65:6	being 3:3 8:1 28:5,5
above 1:22 72:25	after 28:17 31:16	79:18	72:19	53:22 55:14 58:2
83:11	31:19,22 46:25	antibiotics 51:17,18	attempt 5:12	59:24 72:2 75:21
absent 46:1	49:10 55:23 59:6	78:25 79:2,4,23	attending 37:11	believe 4:14 7:4
absolute 10:18,23	59:21 60:1,8,14	anybody 39:9 42:16	attention 39:7,9	10:19 13:21 24:6
absolutely 5:25	63:18,21,23 64:2	61:2	attorney 17:5 48:9	
31:1	64:1265:20 69:10	anymore 4:15	83:15	24:11,13 41:2,6
accept 46:17	77:6	anything 10:13	attorneys 3:16	44:17 51:13,14
	afterwards 83:11	14:13 18:4 21:19		77:15,18
accepted 32:6 36:14	again 8:23 10:22	29:21 40:1 46:20	August 23:14,15	belongs 42:24
accepting 49:10	40:15 44:6 69:22		28:25 29:6 30:25	below 36:14 45:21
access 12:2,7,15	72:1978:5	61:17 73:2 74:19	38:23 39:6 40:7	46:2,9
13:25 21:13		apparently68:4	40:12,20 41:2,7	benefit 32:3
accessing 12:11	against 8:6	appear 8:2	41:10 43:7 44:18	besides 8:1,13,15
accompanies 16:5	age 3:1	APPEARANCES	47:4,25 48:3,10	9:17
according 31:7,9,17	ago 7:6,8,15,19,22	2:1	49:15,19,21 56:25	best 41:2279:7
39:1 40:8 50:9	53:4	applied 9:24	58:15 59:6,9	better 72:21 80:7
61:1266:870:10	agree 29:22 33:13	appointment 11:18	66:10 69:5 70:9	between 11:15 17:9
accurate 41:14 59:3	34:5 36:16 37:13	11:20 12:19 52:10	71:6,8 73:22 74:5	21:20 25:7 58:2
73:25	44:1145:8,21	52:11	74:7,14,22 77:4	60:21 75:19
ache 30:4	72:12	appointments	77:12 78:17	big 81:7
aches 29:13 65:16	ahead 8:25 42:20	60:23 61:2	available 28:4 39:2	bilateral 33:12
aching 29: 1165:2	49:18 54:14	stppropriate 30:12	41:9	62:13 65:14
achy 29:9	al 1:8	44:7 68:16,18	ivoided 47:24	bit 17:3
act 63:12	allowed 20:4	79:18	aware 24:20,22	blood 32:18 33:7
acted 25:24	ilmost 64:1777:5	ippropriately	39:4 47:2,10	34:20 35:3,10,14
action 27: 17 28:9	along 40:16 55:8	63:14	56:20	40:2,6,10,19
46:25 63:19 64:2	ilready 74:15	sipproximately 4:16	≈iway 42:1367:3	42:12,22 54:24
64:13,15 68:25	ilways 7:2 17:13	7:21 10:24	i.m 1:22 29:10	
83:16	33:5,9 34:19	April 10:14 52:9,19	77:13 78:7,8 81:8	55:6 heard 5:7 12 14:10
active 71:3	37:10 79:8,10	56:18	11.15 10.1,0 01:0	board 5:7,12 14:10
	ambulation 76:10	irea 14:14,18,21	R	boards 65:9
actual 71:25	amputated 61:19	· · · ·		body 29:11,13 30:4
actually 4:9 30:25	simputation 15:10	62:4,6	back 4:3 14:5 20:2	33:24 65:1,16
33:19 37:7 38:1	27:12 28:6 33:13	areas 66:7	23:14 31:16 42:15	66:3,4
38:22 61:1		around 53:1,2	50:9 54:3 55:21	both 6:16 10:11
acute 33:15	47:23 60:1.8 62:4	arrived 31:15 58:7	62:12 63:8,21	17:22 58:12

Page 2

l				[
bottom 43:4 56:13	change 52:24 82:5	26:19,23 27:1,3	32:22 36:14	cuyahoga 1:283:5
breath 51:25	changes 4:15	40:23 43:12 75:14	considering 57:21	
briefly 8:18	chart 11:21	76:13	consist 65:22	D
brought 10:11	charts 11:23	communicating	consistent 34:6,14	D 2:4
15:13,15	cheat 51:8	80:13	34:15 46:13 66:18	darshan 1:11,14
building 2:13 12:11	check 42: 1365:23	communication	contact 59:5	3:1,6,10 82:18
BUN 55:6	73:1	17:9 44:12 46:22	contacted 49:25	83:9
	Chemistry 62:18	49:3 68:21,22,23	contain 74:22	data 67:6
<u> </u>	chest 40:3 51:25	68:24 70:15 71:11	contains 77:25	date 1:21 27:17
call 25:6 41:19	chills 29:8 65:2,16	74:13,20 75:9	contest 10:9	31:6,13 32:4
42:14,24 43:20	cholesterol 62:18	communications	context 17:25 18:3	51:19 54:1 55:12
called 1:15 3:2	chronic 54:3	21:19 76:17	23:8,11 26:6 70:5	56:23 57:3 58:13
39:10 41:7 52:4	circumstances	company 53:3,8	70:18	59:8 60:2 63:22
calling 43:9	15:19 25:15,20	complaining 29:12	continue 55:4	70:7 71:17 73:9
calls 43:8	32:10 33:18 34:3	54:2	continuous 67:22	dated 69:5 73:21
came 7:7 9:14,15	35:17 43:4 65:24	complains 65:1	contract 83:17	day 1:21 25:22
31:16 32:2 39:8	Civil 3:3 83:17	complaint 36:20	conversations 25:7	43:14 46:9 50:1
59:14 71:25	claim 8:6	45:24	conveyed 68:17	51:22 63:3,9 74:5
cancer 35:9	Clair 2:13	complaints 30:14	copy 4:4 13:10,18	82:21 83:19
care 8:1032:6	clear 20:9,11 38:4	31:8 32:12	21:14,17,21,21,24	days 29:8 60:20
41:15 42:18,25	38:18	completed 83:14	22:4,16,17,18,19	65:15 75:20
43:1 44:6,17,19	clearly 6:15 36:3	complex 67:7	24:7	day-to-day 13:16
44:22,24 45:9,22	Cleveland 2:7,14	compliance 19:3,18	correct 6:20 12:20	deal 18:20
46:2,10 61:4	47:12 71:13,19	compliant 18:8, 18	14:12 15:2,6,25	dealing 19:17
78:24 79:6,6	74:16,24 83:18	19:13 54:4,6	21:17 22:6 30:8	debridement 47:15
case 1:67:24 8:3,14	client 17:10	complication 79:11	31:6 35:3 36:10	78:24 79:21,24
9:14,17 12:12	clients 17:5,10	complications 9:5	37:3 38:12 43:11	December 10:12,15
47:23	Clinic 47:13 71:13	76:4,9,12	50:11,18,19 51:10	49:22 60:16,18,23
cases 34:24,25,25	71:20 72:1,3	comply 20:21 38:6	51:25 52:13,14,17	61:11,17 62:3,7
35:1	74:17,24	complying 19:8	56:15 57:22 60:12	63:18,24 64:2
cause 18:11 35:2,5	clinical 29:23 30:1	38:11,14	60:13 61:14,15	defendant 1:15
35:13 42:4 57:18	30:3,6 47:7 58:4	computer 11:25	74:4,5 75:10	7:23
62:1065:467:2	clue 75:3	12:8,14 13:5 14:2	83:12	Defendants 1:92:9
83:11	Co 2:3,10	21:13 46:20 76:14	corrections 82:4	defined 83:17
caused 50:5 70:15	cold 60: 1962:9	77:20,22 78:10,14	cough 50:7,8 60:19	denied 9:25
CBC 27:1628:3,22	colleagues 23:5,5	concentrate 14:23	62:9	department 70:23
28:25 29:13 30:3	collect 67:6	concerned 17:13	counsel 1:19 21:16	72:25 73:9 74:14
33:8 39:5	come 39:6 44:13	54:15	24:6 72:8	74:21 75:6
cell 34:12,18,21	52:18 63:8	concerning 19:22	count 32:18 33:8	depending 42:8
35:11,14	comes 16:2 33:22	76:23	34:12,18,21 35:3	44:8
cellulitis 57:21,25	77:20,22	concluded 81:8	35:14	depends 28:17
58:3	comfortably 43:1	condition 11:9 36:7	counts 30:3 35:11	32:25,25 33:17
center 1:8,20 55:13	coming 7:1137:9	36:12,22 37:21,24	county 1:283:5	34:1,1 37:12
certain 5:25 35:6,7	comment 10:14	37:25 38:6	couple 69:3	42:16 43:3 44:14
certainly 14:25	18:15,16 29:19	conditions 49:16,19	coupled 28:7	66:6 79:4
20:8 31:3 43:10	41:18 42:1 44:20	confinement 75:23	course 20:23	deposed 3:4
67:7 73:1 75:5	44:24	confirm 33:3	court 1:13:21 6:14	deposition 1:11,14
80:6	commission 82:25	confuse 42:16	9:14 20:12 55:1	3:11,24 5:19 7:16
CERTIFICATE	83:22	congestion 50:8	83:16	8:1 9:18 24:5,18
83:1	commissioned 83:9	Congratulations	creatinine 55:6	24:20 25:3 80:20
certified 3:4 5:7,12	COMMON 1:1	9:16	current 4:8,9,10,11	81:8 83:13
14:11	commonly 58:4	consider 33:15	4:1255:5	depositions 19:20
certify 83:9,13	communicate 17:6	41:15 43:17	currently 5:5,6	depressed 61:25
chance 44:25 45:1	communicated	considered 32:17	curriculum 4:6	describe 16:17

I	1		1	1
description 31:4	disease 79:5	during 20:23 60:25	etiology 31:14	eye 56:19
despondent 49:2	DISILVIO 2:11	dying 6:5	34:18,19	E-D-E-M-A 57:9
detailed 22:12	5:14 8:21,24 9:10		evaluate 30:11	e-mail 68:5,12
determine 32:9	10:10 18:2,13	E	evaluated 30:8 31:5	77:23,24
42:4 57:18	19:10,12 20:1,24	E 56:4	36:8,13 37:2 45:8	
determined 62:10	21:18 22:16,21	each 26:2	evaluation 44:14	F
determining 51:23	25:5 27:19 28:10	earlier 11:6 73:7	47:13	facial 62:13
diabetes 15:8 50:14	29:2,25 32:7	79:17,18,22 80:6	even 6:4 17:14	facility 6:20 7:7,8,9
50:17 53:23 64:24	41:17 43:23 45:10	80:23	30:16 41:4,9	7:12,13 13:9,18
diabetic 27:1128:5	45:16,23 46:3,11	early 79:14 80:19	48:1580:22	13:19,22 23:6
33:11 65:12	65:5,1967:4	easier 5:1728:24	evening 29:10	24:1 30:23 44:8
diabetics 15:I	72:17,23 73:5,12	edema 57:5,6,7,9	event 21:1 83:15	53:12
67:24	73:15 75:11 76:19	effort 71:20	ever 3:11 9:21,24	fact 47:10 50:16
diagnose 79:13,15	80:1 81:5	either 15:16 44:5	15:13,18 26:17	51:4 52:15
79:17	disorder 35:9	44:12 46:19 48:18	39:8,9,15 64:19	factor 26:2
diagnosed 47:24	DM 50:17 69:10,14	61:25 80:11 83:15	76:22	factual 31:10
67:8	doctor 4:3 5:14	elevated 32:18 33:7	everything 48:7	failed 20:21 60:24
diagnoses 50:16	10:11 14:5 21:3	35:10 67:11,14	72:17	60:24
54:19,20 58:11,12	24:4 27:10,24	elevation 34:18,20	evidence 61:13	failure 20:17 38:11
diagnosing 80:7	36:140:944:16	35:3,5,8,13 66:13	exact 36:6	fair 6:1,2,7,8 7:11
diagnosis 29:15	46:6 47:22 50:24	66:16,23 67:2,9	exactly 7:5 31:23	16:16 21:2 31:21
31:13,15,18 34:22	53:156:1560:7,7	67:17	32:11,24 47:9	35:20 39:22 40:4
50:14,22 57:15,16	61:16 64:18,23	elimination 53:14	49:5 56:1,3 61:23	40:9 47:18 48:5
58:7,10 65:18	68:2 73:8 76:22	emergency 11:12	72:23	61:6 62:2 64:3,10
66:1 78:17	77:3 80:10 81:2,6	11:14,16 41:11	exam 33:23 56:19	64:17 69:16 71:12
diagnostic 34:7,16	doctors 61:8,9	42:25 47:3,6	66:10	71:18 74:12
diarrhea 59:13,13	doctor-patient	70:22,24 72:25	examination 1:16	fairly 15:5
60:11	16:23,24	73:8,18 74:14,21	3:2,6 37:7 41:24	fairness 10:10
die 9:2,3	document 3:19 69:4	75:676:24	54:18 58:5 65:20	27:25 39:11
Dietary 55:22	69:12 70:1,11	emotional 49:5	65:21 66:2,5	fall 64:1
differ 42:12	72:7 77:4,6	emotionally 49:9	76:23	familiar 47:7,20
difference 17:15 48:11	documentation 77:19	employee 39:3	examine 32:8 33:20	56:20
different 61:5,25		encounter 51:12,13 51:15 52:7 56:22	33:21 38:9 42:10	far 18:5 59:2
63:5,5 79:3	documents 68:2,4 doing 5:14 17:14		examined 38:1,22	fasting 55:5
differential 28:22	37:7,12 65:2	68:4,10 69:4,16 76:16 77:3 6 10	62:4,5 66:7	favor 9:15 female 29:8
29:1532:23 58:11	done 6:1,6 9:8	76:16 77:3,6,19 80:13	examining 35:18 37:9	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
65:3,18 66:1	12:23 25:12 28:19	encounters 80:10	examples 18:25	fever 29:8,12 31:14 33:4,5 35:11 42:3
differentiating 58:1	28:20 32:4,11	80:17	20:20	42:4 43:19 51:24
difficult 8:7 18:8,21	35:21 43:22 48:7	end 6:9 10:16	exercises 55:21	65:1,15 67:22
20:25 25:13,14,16	48:9 52:3 64:8,17	enough 16:162I:2	exhibit 3:20,25 4:4	Few 21:7 22:11
26:25 31:18 32:15	down 6:15 12:20	35:20 37:1439:22	24:6 40:4,5	42:14
44:23 48:22 54:1	31:19 56:12 58:11	44:5 48:5 62:2	Exhibits 28:25	file 10:5 13:14
61:20,20 71:15	62:11	64:10,17	existing 30:16	filed 8:6
75:18 78:4	Dr 21:20 30:20,22	enter 13:24 14:3	expect 26:22	final 58:7
Dillon 23:20,21,22	30:24 38:21 41:11	entirely 37:22	expected 37:1,4	find 14:22 40:1
23:23 32:1	45:7,8,11,13,15	entitled 43:11	experience 18:1	70:16
directed 44:7	45:17,20 46:6,7	entries 22:5,6	61:11	finding 29:23,24
directly 81:6	47:3,5 52:15,19	entry 72:25	expires 82:25 83:22	30:1,4,5 34:21
discharged 56:6	64:20 65:17 72:15	snvisioning 12:10	explain 52:21 70:1	66:13
72:3 75:22	72:25 76:23	ER 73:17	explanation 8:17	Endings 30:3 33:15
discussion 41:22	dry 43:15,21	I ESQ 2:4,11	express 15:22	47:8 57:3,4,5
76:21	due 19:21	essentially 17:11	extremes 62:1	66:18
discussions 25:2	duly 3:3 83:8,10	et 1:8	extremities 33:25	finish 5:16 12:22
		·····		

Γ	1	T	T	
45:18	Gajdowski 41:11	78:13	hold 47:22	71:16 74:23
firm 83:16	47:3,6 76:23	happened 21:8	holding 10:18,23	initial 44:8,14,15
first 3:3 5:11,16 7:5	gangrene 78:18	40:24 46:7 80:4	Holmes 23:1,15,18	initials 69:14
24:17 31:14 36:16	79:8,14,16 80:4,8	happens 13:6 58:20	24:5,17 25:9 26:8	initiating 36:9
36:1739:4,6	gas 78:18 79:8,13	78:22	29:7 31:25 39:12	input 70:17
49:23 77:9 83:10	79:15 80:3,8	hard 13:10,18	46:22	instruct 58:18,20
five 7:21 21:7	gave 20:22 28:4	21:14,16,21 22:4	home 41:2 59:14,14	instructed 44:9
folders 63:5	general 16:16 17:20	having 19:20 20:6	59:16,18,20,23	instruction 41:25
follow 17:15,19	generated 46:21	28:6 39:18 50:7	60:8 72:4	42:22
20:17 42:14 49:3	69:17,24 74:21	54:1 61:19 71:3	honest 19:14 31:10	instructions 20:18
followed 42:21	generating 71:6	hear 23:3,4,7,8	hope 58:12	20:22 55:21
following 49:4 61:5	74:3	heard 23:2,13	hospital 9:25 75:7	insulin 53:22,24
82:3	GERALDINE 1:4	47:17	75:21	intention 68:19
follows 3:5	give 17:7 35:8 36:5	heaves 43:16,21	hour 77:5	interest 14:21
follow-up 44:10	44:24 48:1	heel 27:13 33:12	hours 55:19 75:19	interested 83:15
46:21 53:21 54:2	given 41:25 44:12	64:21	75:25 76:1 77:6	internal 5:10 14:11
55:23 59:13 69:9	48:24 65:10	helpful 5 1:2,3	howard 2:4 10:10	14:14,18 15:4,6
71:23 75:17	gives 51:7	hematologic 35:9	husband 16:4,5	65:9
foot 28:6 50:11	giving 8:17	hemoglobin 55:7	41:7	internist 62:3
65:14 67:24 71:3	glanced 22:11	her 7:5 10:5,25 11:9	11./	interview 33:19
78:24	glucose 26:4 27:15	12:15,18 14:3	Ι	interviewing 35:18
foregoing 82:2	28:2 29: 14 32: 19	15:10,10,10,18,20	idea 6:10 35:15	intimately 47:20
83:12	glycated 55:6	15:23,23 16:3,4,5	50:25 62:21	intravenous 78:25
forget 8:8	go 3:20 8:25 12:14	18:25 19:9 20:23	identification 4:1	79:1
form 11:24 48:17	13:2,8 21:12	23:2,7,19 24:20	ill 42: 17	involve 8:10
69:17	32:21 42:15,20,25	24:24 25:2 26:19	immediate 64:2	issue 8:19 9:7 17:22
forth 1:22 68:11	44:3,13 49:17,18	26:21 28:4 35:13	immediately 42:18	19:3 30:6
83:11	54:1456:22 58:1	37:3 39:25 40:1	42:23	issues 19:6 54:8
Foundation 71:13	59:17 62:11 63:4	41:7,8 44:24		item 80:18
74:17,24	63:21 76:14,19	47:11 49:1,7,13	important 37:23 79:13,15	Relli 60.10
four 7:21 21:7	goes 13:19 54:8	49:16,20,24 50:4		J
60:19	going 3:145:23,24	50:6 51:19,21	inadequate 66:11 incidents 76:8	job 5:15
frequently 68:12	10:6,7 14:6 17:11	52:12,12 53:13,20	included 22:4 75:8	joined 4:13,18
from 3:18 10:14	20:13,13,14 24:4	53:20,22 56:23		journals 14:14
11:5 13:2 14:22	25:5 40:16 41:10	58:16 59:6,11,15	including 35:17	
	48:6 53:20 80:21	, , ,	increased 57:11 increases 79:24	judge 28:18
18:1 19:6 20:5,6	gone 52:22	60:1,7,8,11,14,17		judged 27:22
21:14 23:3,4		60:18,21,22 61:5	increasing 54:15	judgment 28:15
28:25 38:21 39:4	good 17:9 32:14	61:12,19 62:2,3,7	indicated 14:10	41:19,21,23 42:10
39:5 40:6,17	36:23,24 40:25	65:24 71:21 75:9	indication 58:25	42:11,17 44:8
42: 1I 50: 1252:25	53:18	76:5,9,17 80:12	60:10 62:14 63:17	45:3 79:7
53:20 56:6 59:14	grade 67:1	hereinafter 3:4	infected 48:2,4	jumped 11:15
61:10,16,17 66:9	grading 57:7	hereunto 83:18	infection 32:23,25	just 5:20 6:5,17
67:3 70:17,19,20	great 5:15	hesitated 69:20	33:4,6,9,16 34:7	8:18 9:17 12:4
71:11 72:3 73:7,8	greater 26:4 32:18	hieroglyphics 72:20	34:14,18,22 47:25	20:2 23:13 24:25
74:13,20 82:2	group 4:20 39:3	high 27:1128:5	66:14,19 67:3,8	25:2 28:18 29:20
front 45:5,7 62:24	50:21	33:12 64:25 65:12	67:12,18,21 78:22	33:23 36:2 37:8
frontal 62:13	H	him 10:16 16:10	iinfections 33:1	37:15 38:4,18
full 66:4		19:21 20:10 30:21	67:25	39:14 40:17 42:13
functions 62:19	hallway 37:8	46:4,5	infectious 34:19	42:14 50:1 53:19
further 20:15 41:6	hand 3:22 12:25	history 26:7 27:12	79:5	55:4 63:1 65:6
46:25 47:13 81:3	28:23 83:18	28:3,4 29:6 31:4	inflammation 62:12	69:3,2272:12
83:13	hands-on 35:21	32:1 33:23 43:18	information 12:2	73:1780:24
G	handwritten 4:21	43:19 50:25 51:9	17:8 26:9,23	
- G	happen 23:7 33:10	64:24 65:1,10,15	28:19 31:11 39:1	K

[<u> </u>	1	T
kaiser 1:7,20 6:20	labs 32:3,20 62:15	20:3,5	33:17 34:17,19	75:2,15
8:11 13:20 27:13	62:16,17 63:7,10	located 6:22,23	35:10 36:15,24	messaged 72:1
27:15 30:1237:20	63:19 65:16	long 7:6,19 8:17	37:1339:13,16,17	messages 68:10
38:8,12 41:16	last 10:2,5,17 16:10	21:24 22:1 53:3	39:22,22,24,24	78:1
43:8 47:3 50:21	61:11 77:6	75:23	40:10,10 44:22,23	met 44:19,22
51:5 60:6 68:3,6	later 58:1380:7	look 10:4 14:1 22:8	46:11 48:21,22	might 22:1040:1
68:13 72:8	law 38:6,15	32:10 33:24 34:13	50:2,3 53:5,6,9,14	52:23 53:7
Kaleupu 52:16	lawful 3:1	35:17 41:12 44:25	62:5,5 67:11 68:1	mild 66:3
Karen 1:17 5:17	lawsuit 14:8 15:11	45:1 51:21 57:20	68:1 73:5 75:12	mind 18:10 41:21
83:8,20	lawyer 40:17	73:25 76:1580:24	78:1279:1180:2	61:22 68:20
Kathryn 23:20,21	lead 79:8,10,11	looked 22:24	80:2	mini 81:7
23:22,23 31:25	least 11:2,3 33:2,14	looking 25:1529:20	maybe 11:7 38:13	minimized 9:9
keep 60:24 77:25	63:25	38:21 40:17 48:15	48:21 75:12,12	minute 76:20
78:1	leave 80:24	48:17 49:6 68:6	mean 16:19 17:1,2	mischaracterize
keeping 30:11	leaving 53:7	69:22 78:14	33:5 55:11	20:4
kind 17:22 24:15	left 57:5,10	looks 4:7 22:23 29:1	means 26: 13 42:23	mischaracterized
35:20 41:15,18,20	leg 15:10,20,23	50:1,7 51:16 56:5	50:2	20:7
41:21,24 49:7	57:10 61:19 71:21	56:11,18 57:12	medical 1:8,20 11:9	miserable 55:2
56:2 58:18 70:19	79:25	61:3 73:22 74:9	14:3 21:10 39:3	mishkind 2:3,4 3:7
71:25	LEPs 55:7	77:5	50:21,25 51:9	5:15 6:11 19:16
kinds 17:20 76:12	let 5:15 10:16 17:2	lost 15:20,23	52:13 55:13 75:9	20:8 45:18 48:8
79:3	24:16 27:10 36:5	lot 6:6 38:19	medication 35:7	72:14,19 73:10,14
knew 50:9 75:6	42:15 46:15	low 54:3 55:21 67:1	54:4,7	missing 70:25,25
know 6:4 9:13	letter 40:11	lower 33:25 57:10	medications 35:6,8	72:6
13:22 17:11 23:1	let's 12:17 43:7	L.P.A 2:3,10	35:13 55:5 63:16	mistry 1:11,14 3:1
23:14,16,21,22	48:19 49:12 56:22		64:9 65:24	3:6,10 21:20
25:4,19,25 26:1	leukemia 35:10	M	medicine 5:2,10	52:19 65:17 72:15
30:2,5,20,21	licensed 5:1	M 1:17 83:8,20	14:11,15,19 15:4	82:18 83:9
31:14,21,23 32:10	life 55:2	made 4:13,15 48:10	15:6 65:9	Mistry's 72:25
38:24 40:22 42:5	like 4:7 8:9 14:23	51:23 54:22 71:22	medlen 1:4 7:1,12	moment 7:15 10:6
45:11,14 47:1	16:12 17:21 19:17	maintain 11:21,23	10:3,20 11:22	18:16 19:4 25:23
48:2,3,4 56:1,19	19:18 29:1 35:7	13:15	12:2 15:9 16:6,13	43:8 63:20 71:16
59:19 60:9 62:21	38:25 50:1,7	maintained 13:20	16:14,18 17:24	Monday 29:9 71:9
63:6 65:8 68:7,8	51:16,21 56:5,11	major 71:20	18:24 20:21 21:4	74:9,11
70:4 71:12,19	56:18 57:12,20	make 5:16 28:24	22:9 23:12,15	months 10:17 55:23
73:3,13,16,17	61:3 73:22 74:9	29:19,20 42:1	25:20 26:12 38:22	more 17:3 45:9
75:2,19 77:10	77:5,23,24 79:12	45:3 55:1	41:2 44:18 48:19	46:13 48:21 55:2
79:1 80:3	liked 53:6	making 65:25	48:20 53:5 61:6	58:22,24 67:25
knowledge 30:24	likelihood 9:9 79:24	management 64:20	76:4 80:12	most 49:1 58:4,4
38:20	likely 58:4,8 69:14	many 5:18,20 10:24	Medlens 48:8	69:14 76:11,18
known 4:5 27:13	69:17 76:11	58:20 65:25 69:23	Medlen's 14:1 39:5	Mostly 21:5
knows 73:11	limb 80:4	78:24	48:23 64:21 76:15	motion 20:12
K-A-L-E-U-P-U	limited 33:24 66:3	marilena 2:11	meet 32:6	move 20:1343:7
52:16	limits 64:5,7,11	19:21 72:14 81:1	mellitus 50:17	much 71:16 80:7
·····	line 17:9 43:4 53:10	mark 3:19,21	members 70:20	81:3
	82:5	marked 3:25 24:5	memory 10:9	must 70:17,18
lab 26:5 27:21 28:7	lipids 55:7	57:24	mention 55:4	73:18
28:8 31:4,16,20	Lisa 73:3,11,13,16	Matalavage 64:20	mentioned 26:1,12	myself 17:10 32:9
33:16 34:5,11	list 54:19 66:1	matter 8:19 14:8	56:2	52:5 81:7
39:4 41:20 45:2	listen 17:7,18 37:21	Maximum 76:1	Merit 1:17	M.D 1:11,14 3:1,6
55:14,16,18 64:4	literally 10:7	may 4:9,10 6:4,15	message 68:16,17	82:18 83:9
laboratories 63:4	little 17:3	8:21 17:1,2,14	70:5,8,19 71:25	N
laboratory 54:23	liver 62:18	18:13 23:10 32:24	71:25 72:15 73:19	-
55:5 63:3 66:18	llocal 19:17,19 20:3	32:24 33:4,4,17	73:20 74:10,11,18	mame 3:8 8:5,16

r				1
12:15 23:2,3,4,7	normally 16:3,5	obtains 28:2	38:6 57:17 72:24	18:6,7,18,22 19:7
52:21,22 69:22	75:24,25	obviously 50:13	ordered 57:20	20:1726:7,20,24
76:15	North 7:10 53:12	occasion 10:3 23:17	62:15,16 63:4	27:2,11,11,12,14
named 8:14 83:9	55:13	64:19 76:3,22	64:8	27:20,21,23 28:1
Nancy 23:1,15,18	Notary 1:18 82:24	occasions 18:17	ordering 65:16	28:3,5,18 29:6,11
24:5,17 25:9 26:8	83:8,20	occurring 9:9	ordinary 61:23	29:17,23 30:7,7
29:7 31:25 39:12	note 12:25 13:4,7	October 83:22	organization 4:13	30:11,16,25 31:3
46:22	13:11 24:10,12	off 3:21 76:19,21	origin 42:3 73:22	31:24 32:1,2,8,9
Nasopharyngeal	25:17,21,22,25	offer 61:2	original 70:14	32:12 33:11,19,20
62:12	26:13,15,17 39:12	office 2:5 6:22,23	other 4:14 5:4,5	33:21,22 35:6,9
nearly 7:8	39:25 40:8 46:24	6:25 12:1 13:13	6:24,25 7:13,17	35:12,18,19 36:4
necessarily 34:6,15	49:7,17 52:15	56:7 69:9 71:5,23	8:13,15 13:8	36:5,6,7,11,22
34:23 35:23 37:10	58:14 61:12,17	75:17 83:18	17:10 18:7 19:6	37:2,5,6,9,11,11
66:6,15,20 67:13	62:12 63:2,24	offices 1:19 6:24	22:5 23:4,9 26:5	37:20,23,25 38:5
80:2	71:22 73:6 82:3	ohio 1:2,18,21 2:7	32:20,20 34:3	38:9 40:21 41:23
necessary 10:8	noted 53:25 55:20	2:14 3:2,18 5:3	35:2 37:1 45:4	41:25 42:2,9,10
42:23 79:20,23	notes 10:12 11:24	37:1939:250:20	53:1 61:4,8,9	42:17,21 43:5,5,6
necrosis 78:21	12:7,15,20,24	68:3 83:3,8,19,21	63:24 65:23 67:1	43:8,9,10,12,14
need 20:12 21:19	13:8,19 21:5,6,7,8	okay 3:17 14:8,9	67:6 81:2	43:19,22,25 44:4
27:3,17 35:21	21:9 22:11 31:17	17:3 25:7,8 44:21	otherwise 4:5 71:21	44:5,9,10,11 45:5
38:1,8 42:18 65:6	45:4 50:10 54:21	48:22 49:1455:4	83:15	45:6,12,13,15,17
70:6 71:1,24	63:23 64:12 76:17	60:6 63:15 65:11	out 18:10 29:20	45:20,25 46:1,8
needed 27:23 31:5	80:24	80:16	33:3 37:8 61:22	46:14,15 47:2,5
63:16 71:22	nothing 18:10	old 4:10	61:23,24 70:16	49:6,24,25 50:2,3
needs 30:7 36:7,19	61:22 83:10	Olmsted 7:10 53:12	outcome 9:13	50:23 5 1:1,9 52:5
42:25 43:21,25	notice 1:19	55:13	outpatient 42:22	52:6,7,23 54:4,6
44:12 69:8 71:2	notified 40:19	once 11:2,3 48:20	43:2	56:6 57:4 58:20
75:1677:7	November 1:12	48:21	over 10:1740:24	60:11 64:5,24
negative 40:3	83:19	one 3:13 4:10,11,12	58:19 68:7 72:10	65:7,10 66:3,17
neurological 9:4	number 10:23	5:20 6:13 7:17	own 42:17 45:3	67:8,16 68:23
neuropathy 67:24	13:25 14:4 15:7	14:5 17:1 18:22	o'clock 1:22 81:8	69:8 70:20 71:2,5
never 4:13	18:20 61:7,9	23:5 28:18 39:14	D	71:13,17,19 72:1
new 27: 1429:22,23	numbers 29:20	48:11 50:1654:8	<u>P</u>	72:2,4 74:15,23
30:1,2,4,4,6,13,13	nurse 13:1,4 56:1	56:16 57:6 58:10	page 82:3,5	75:3,6,16,20,20
30:16 31:8 36:5,6	70:13	73:21 77:8 80:18	pages 13:14 73:7	75:21 76:24,25
36:11,20,20,22	nurse's 56:4,5,8	81:6	pain 51:25 54:3	77:7 78:16 79:6
37:5,21,24,25	nursing 59:14,16	ongoing 50:22	66:4	patients 13:15,20
38:6 45:24 50:24	59:18,20,23 60:8	67:21	Parma 30:23 70:22	14:25 15:7 16:23
54:19,20 57:15,16	72:4	only 22:4 27:22	70:24 72:24 73:8	17:17,21 18:21
next 20: 14 52:6	0	28:17 52:24 53:9	74:13	23:9 30:13 34:21
53:10 54:22 56:22		53:11 56:16 61:7	part 19:120:17	41:16 43:1 50:22
58:16 59:5,7 63:9	object 20:9	65:20	36:16,17 57:23	58:18 66:14 67:23
night 29:12	objected 8:24	onto 12:14	61:14 70:25 71:1	68:17
noncompliance	Objection 8:21 9:10	open 10:7 12:4	72:5	patient's 33:25
18:25 19:3,5,22	18:2,13 19:10	78:12	particular 18:5	43:19 47:23 61:13
20:16 61:13	20:24 21:18 27:19	opened 24:7	58:10	Patterson 1:17 83:8
noncompliant	28:1029:25 32:7	opening 12:10	party 83:15	83:20
17:11 18:8,12,17	41:17 43:23 45:10	operations 48:25	password 13:25	pedal 57:5
19:13 59:1 60:12	45:23 46:3,11	opinion 47:22 48:1	past 23:10 43:7	people 6:6 8:13,15
moninfectious 33:10	65:5,19 67:4	48:11,13,16,17	50:25	67:21 79:4
normal 16:24 18:5	75:11 80:1	opinions $15:22$	patient 7:2 8:5,19	people's 45:4
18:6 25:10 29:10	objections 19:18	OPMG 4:18	9:2,3,4 10:3 12:17	per 13:14
41:24,24 64:5,7	obtain 21:9	opposed 36:25 37:7	12:22 15:25 16:1	performed 40:12
64:11	obtained 27:16	order 21:3 32:5	16:7,18,20 17:25	41:4 57:18

A state of the second

Page 7

I		1	1	1
perhaps 16:3	34:17,19 39:16	professional 4:5	reason 6: 14 24: 11	58:6 62:23,25
period 14:7 60:25	51:23	professions 17:23	24:13,15 35:16	63:21
64:1	pop 77:20	progress 10:12	41:1,6 48:24	recovery 76:1
peripheral 67:23	portion 15:5 70:21	12:23,25 50:10	50:20 77:15,17	reduced 83:11
permanente 1:7,20	72:5,7	63:2 76:17	reasonable 32:6	reduction 55:22
3:18 39:3 50:21	position 21:3 46:8	progression 47:11	33:14 43:16 46:6	refer 10:8
68:3	possession 21:22	promptly 47:12	64:11	reference 70:22
person 53:9 73:18	possibility 32:23	prone 67:25	reasonably 43:21	referenced 26:6
personal 18:1 61:10	33:16	prosthesis 76:10	reassess 44:1	referencing 40:11
personally 20:18	possible 33:4 79:14	protecting 20:6	reassessing 44:3	referral 55:22
36:8,12 78:9	post-surgery 76:12	protocols 30:12	reassessment 58:13	referred 68:3 77:7
pertained 8:20	potential 65:3	provide 41:8	recall 7:5 10:4 19:7	referring 21:6 60:2
phone 41:19 50:4,6	68:25	provided 3:2,15	19:13 20:19,21,25	68:7,8 69:17
physical 13:6,8	practice 5:114:23	21:16 24:23 29:7	24:7,9 25:14,23	73:21
37:7 54:17 65:20	15:1,6 36:14,23	70:14 72:8	39:8 46:23,23	reflect 19:25 58:6,9
65:21 66:2,10	36:24	providers 68:18	48:23 49:4,9 62:1	62:25 63:2
76:9	preferred 52:23	providing 19:24	63:20 64:6,22	reflects 63:1
physically 38:1,8	preliminary 65:17	40:6	71:15 76:7,8,11	refreshing 77:25
38:22 45:7 50:3	prepared 4:17 13:7	prudent 33: 14 46:6	77:2 80:15	78:1
physician 23:24	prescribed 51:16	prudent 35.1440.0 psychological 49:5	receive 24:12 25:21	regard 18:23 19:19
26:20 27:4 30:8	Prescription 56:12	Public 1:1882:24	41:16 77:18	20:12,15 27:18
30:10,15,18 31:6	prescription 56:12	83:8,20	received 25:10,14	43:22 47:19
33:14 35:22,23,24	56:17	pull 76:16	26:14,16,17 39:15	Registered 1:17
35:25 36:3,4,9,13	present 38:5 40:21	purpose 55:22	39:16,17,19,23,24	regularly-schedul
36:19,21 37:1,12	41:5 43:5 48:14	59:22 68:15,20	40:3,10 41:19,20	11:13,18,19 12:19
37:18 38:2,7,8,15	presented 57:4 65:8	purposes 3:25	44: 1846:24 64:4	rehabilitated 59:24
40:19 42:5 43:17	presenting 34:4	pursuant 1:19	74:13 77:16	rehabilitation
43:25 44:15 46:15	62:7	put 31:19 46:15	receiving 24:8,10	59:22
50:24 52:13,24	presents 29:1130:7	65:25	recent 65:1,15	relate 72:9
64:23 75:10 79:6	36:11,22 37:20,23	putting 58:11	recently 23: 13 49: 1	relation 16:20
physicians 53:12	64:25 65:14	P-I-T-T-O-C-K 8:9	recognize 80:6	relations 16:22
69:1	prevent 20:5	p.m 73:23 74:14,22	Recognizing 48:20	relationship 16:18
physician's 27:5	prevented 9:8	p.r.n 58:22,24	recollect 18:9,21,25	16:24,25 18:6
28:2 40:18	previous 52:15 70:4	p.1.11 50.22,24	19:2 26:17 61:18	20:23
physician-to-phy	primary 52:12,18	Q	61:21	relationships 18:7
42:11	60:7 75:9 79:5	qualified 83:9	recollection 10:19	relative 63:19 83:15
piece 28:19	prior 36:9 65:2	question 5:16,24	11:4,8,13,17 16:9	remain 5:24
pitting 57:6	prior ty 66:7	6:9,11 16:17	26:15 31:2 35:16	remember 7:20 8:7
Pittock 8:9	privileges 9:21,24	19:22,23 20:10,11	39:18,21	16:15 62:22 63:25
place 8:1168:24,25	probably 4:187:12	20: 14 29:2 36: 1	recommendations	80:11,19,20,21,25
75:22 83:14	8:815:517:17	36:16,18 37:22	17:8 20:22	Reminger 2:10,10
placed 59:22	22:3 59:21 71:10	40:22 45:16 46:18	record 3:9,21 4:3	repeat 6:16
Plaintiff 1:5,15 2:2	problem 25:22	48:21 57:24 73:12	10:8 14:1,4 19:25	rephrase 6:11
plaintiff's 3:20,24	26:11 30:17 33:10	73: 15 80:23	20:10,11 21:10,11	24:1629:4
4:4 24:6 40:4	36:20 37:5 39:20		21:17 22:5 38:21	reporter 1:17 3:21
plan 36:3 38:7,12	43:2 45:9 49:7	questions 25:6 41:1 69:4 81:3	48:18 63:1,18	6:15
planning 58:15	50:5 61:5 71:4	09.4 01.3	48:18 63:1,18 66:9 73:7 76:20	reporter's 55:2
PLEAS 1:1	problems 76:12	R	76:21	-
please 3:8 6:11 29:4	procedure 3:3	radiation 54:3	recorded 26:7	reporting 83:16 represent 22:21
56:23 81:5	25:11	read 20:2 54:25,25	recorded 20:7 recordkeeping 13:9	request 17:8
plus 10:17 57:6	process 33:3 53:14	81:5 82:2	records 13:14,20	request of 53:5 82:5
podiatry 69:9 71:3	53:19		21:22,25 22:8,12	required 32:5 64:15
71:23 75:17 77:8	processed 55:18	real 37:23 really 14:7,24 48:2	21:22,23 22:8,12 22:13,14 40:18	requires 36:4
point 13:3 18:9 33:9	productive 50:8		45:1 46:19 48:15	requires 36:4 research 14:22
Pomr 12.2 10:3 22:3	Productive 30:8	49:8 5 1:7	43.140.1946.13	n cocai (11 14.22

Page 8

respect 19:2173:959:15 60:21 61:773:16stable 54:17responded 25:17Saturday 74:6,7,866:14 69:9 71:3soft 57:10 78:21staff 70:2026:2 70:5,18 71:2save 3:14 36:271:22 75:16 77:8solely 75:1stand 48:7 5572:2,3,4 74:11saved 80:478:3,10some 3:144:20 6:14stand 44:275:13saving 79:25send 81:69:4 12:20 13:8,2480:9responding 72:15saw 7:5,12 10:5sender 69:6,2426:11 34:24,25standards 32:75:111:9 12:17,1870:11,1235:9 36:2,2544: 19 45:2246:21 72:9 73:130:25 32:2 41:12sending 70:8 73:1939:13,16 42:2246:946:21 72:9 73:130:25 32:2 41:12sent 25:9 39:12,1444:7,12 49:7standing 37:875:1641:23 43:25 45:1141:2 68:11 70:1251:16 54:21 56:2standpoint 14responsibility 46:1448:20 49:7 51:2172:18 75:22 77:461:24 63:5 67:21stands 18:10 5result 34:1141:2060:11,17,22 61:1278:2,667:21 68:2,1161:22,2442:13 76:5 78:2262:2September 59:7,970:17,19,20,25start 6:7 54:2.results 27:16,18saying 17:18,1959:10,11,25 60:371:3 72:5 73:1879:1828:7,8,23 31:5,1631:10 39:13 40:560:10,14,2279:11stasis 57:13,1-31:20 33:16 34:566:21serious 43:2 48:25somebody 18:1757:24 58:239:4 40:20 41:3,8says 20:3 39:12,25set 1:22 83:11,1842:24 72:1state 1:18 3:8 <th></th>	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	
75:13saving 79:25send 81:69:4 12:20 13:8,2480:9responding 72:15saw 7:5,12 10:5sender 69:6,2426:11 34:24,25standards 32:75:111:9 12:17,1870:11,1235:9 36:2,2544: 19 45:22response 26:1816:10,14 23:15sending 70:8 73:1939:13,16 42:2246:946:21 72:9 73:130:25 32:2 41:12sent 25:9 39:12,1444:7,12 49:7standing 37:875:1641:23 43:25 45:1141:2 68:11 70:1251:16 54:21 56:2standpoint 14responsibility 46:1448:20 49:7 51:2172:18 75:22 77:461:24 63:5 67:21stands 18:10 542:1376:5 78:2262:2September 59:7,970:17,19,20,25start 6:7 54:22results 27:16,18saying 17:18,1959:10,11,25 60:371:3 72:5 73:1879:1828:7,8,23 31:5,1631:10 39:13 40:560:10,14,2279:11stasis 57:13,1431:20 33:16 34:566:21serious 43:2 48:25somebody 18:1757:24 58:2	
responding 72:15saw 7:5,12 10:5sender 69:6,2426:1134:24,25standards 32:75:111:9 12:17,1870:11,1235:9 36:2,2544:1945:22response 26:1816:10,14 23:15sending 70:8 73:1939:13,16 42:2246:946:21 72:9 73:130:25 32:2 41:12sent 25:9 39:12,1444:7,12 49:7standing 37:875:1641:23 43:25 45:1141:2 68:11 70:1251:16 54:21 56:2standpoint 14responsibility 46:1448:20 49:7 51:2172:18 75:22 77:461:24 63:5 67:21stands 18:10 5result 34:1141:2060:11,17,22 61:1278:2,667:21 68:2,1161:22,2442:13 76:5 78:2262:2September 59:7,970:17,19,20,25start 6:7 54:2results 27:16,18saying 17:18,1959:10,11,25 60:371:3 72:5 73:1879:1828:7,8,23 31:5,1631:10 39:13 40:560:10,14,2279:11stasis 57:13,1431:20 33:16 34:566:21serious 43:2 48:25somebody 18:1757:24 58:2	22
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	
response 26:1816:10,14 23:15sending 70:8 73:1939:13,16 42:2246:946:21 72:9 73:130:25 32:2 41:12sent 25:9 39:12,1444:7,12 49:7standing 37:875:1641:23 43:25 45:1141:2 68:11 70:1251:16 54:21 56:2standpoint 14responsibility 46:1448:20 49:7 51:2172:18 75:22 77:461:24 63:5 67:21stands 18:10 5result 34:11 41:2060:11,17,22 61:1278:2,667:21 68:2,1161:22,2442:13 76:5 78:2262:2September 59:7,970:17,19,20,25start 6:7 54:2.results 27:16,18saying 17:18,1959:10,11,25 60:371:3 72:5 73:1879:1828:7,8,23 31:5,1631:10 39:13 40:560:10,14,2279:11stasis 57:13,1431:20 33:16 34:566:21serious 43:2 48:25somebody 18:1757:24 58:2	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2 46:2
75:1641:23 43:25 45:1141:2 68:11 70:1251:16 54:21 56:2standpoint 14responsibility 46:1448:20 49:7 51:2172:1875:22 77:461:24 63:5 67:21stands 18:10 5result 34:11 41:2060:11,17,22 61:1278:2,667:21 68:2,1161:22,2442:1376:5 78:2262:2September 59:7,970:17,19,20,25start 6:7 54:2results 27:16,18saying 17:18,1959:10,11,25 60:371:3 72:5 73:1879:1828:7,8,23 31:5,1631:10 39:13 40:560:10,14,2279:11stasis 57:13,1431:20 33:16 34:566:21serious 43:2 48:25somebody 18:1757:24 58:2	
responsibility 46:1448:20 49:7 51:2172:1875:22 77:461:24 63:5 67:21stands 18:10 3result 34:1141:2060:11,17,22 61:1278:2,667:21 68:2,1161:22,2442:1376:5 78:2262:2September 59:7,970:17,19,20,25start 6:7 54:2results 27:16,18saying 17:18,1959:10,11,25 60:371:3 72:5 73:1879:1828:7,8,23 31:5,1631:10 39:13 40:560:10,14,2279:11stasis 57:13,1431:20 33:16 34:566:21serious 43:2 48:25somebody 18:1757:24 58:2	
result 34:11 41:2060:11,17,22 61:1278:2,667:21 68:2,1161:22,2442:13 76:5 78:2262:2September 59:7,970:17,19,20,25start 6:7 54:2.results 27:16,18saying 17:18,1959:10,11,25 60:371:3 72:5 73:1879:1828:7,8,23 31:5,1631:10 39:13 40:560:10,14,2279:11stasis 57:13,1431:20 33:16 34:566:21serious 43:2 48:25somebody 18:1757:24 58:2	
42:1376:578:2262:2September 59:7,970:17,19,20,25start 6:7 54:2.results 27:16,18saying 17:18,1959:10,11,25 60:371:3 72:5 73:1879:1828:7,8,23 31:5,1631:10 39:13 40:560:10,14,2279:11stasis 57:13,1431:20 33:16 34:566:21serious 43:2 48:25somebody 18:1757:24 58:2	56:3
results 27:16,18 28:7,8,23 31:5,16 31:20 33:16 34:5saying 17:18,19 31:10 39:13 40:559:10,11,25 60:3 60:10,14,22 serious 43:2 48:2571:3 72:5 73:18 79:11 somebody 18:1779:18 57:24 58:2	-
28:7,8,23 315,1631:10 39:13 40:560:10,14,2279:11stasis 57:13,1431:20 33:16 34:566:21serious 43:2 48:25somebody 18:1757:24 58:2	3
31:20 33:16 34:5 66:21 serious 43:2 48:25 somebody 18:17 57:24 58:2	4.10
	4,19
	37.10
39.4 40.20 41.3,8 says 20.3 59.12,25 set 1.22 83.11,18 42.24 72.1 state 1.18 5.8 41:9,13 42:5 43:9 40:2 60:19 69:8 shakes 43:16,21 someone 7:23 41:12 83:3,8,21	57.17
41.3,13 +2.3 +3.3 40.2 00.19 09.8 snakes 43.10,21 someone 7.23 +1.12 so.3,8,21 43:11,13,15,18 scanned 11:24 sheet 50:12 51:8 50:24 stated 20:9	
45:2 55:1762:20 scans 13:4 54:22 someplace 44:13 statement 26:	4
45.2 55.17 54.22 somephace 44.15 statement 26. 63:4,7,8 64:4 schedule 60:25 shifts 33:8 something 6:3 8:9 41:14 59:3 6	
resume 4:5,14,20 screen 77:21,22 shortness 51:24 9:817:2,12 38:19 states 5:4,5	0,.10
4:25 78:10 show 3:15 24:4 42:13 53:10 64:8 statute 1:16	
retain 13:10 se 13:14 46:19 62:17 70:24 74:2,3 75:7 stenotypy 83:	:11
retrieved 74:10 seal 83:18 showed 50:1773:7 sometime 10:20 steps 28:8	
review 21:8 second 5:21,22 9:19 showing 29:14 16:2 63:24 steroid 35:7	
reviewed 21:2,5,15 14:6 31:18 sometimes 37:13 still 15:25 16:	:124:2
22:12,15 secondary 9:5 shows 49:22 55:3 24:3 33:17,1	
revoked 9:22 see 10:3 15:1 16:2 sick 42:18 43:6 44:5 somewhat 69:20 34:1,1,17 41	1:8
right 12:1 22:14 17:20 25:25 27:23 44:10 somewhere 4:19 42:16 43:44	45:3
24:1,14 30:18 28:1,8,17 29:16 side 55:8 70:17 71:1 53:1 75:21	
42:13 49:12,18 34:21 36:21 37:4 signature 56:4,6,8 soon 55:17 stop 6:5,16	
51:7,9 55:14,16 37:6 40:2 45:13 56:10 81:9 sorry 11:14 29:3 Street 2:6	
56:8 63: 10 66:25 45:15,17,20 46:8 significance 26:8,10 54:5 59:8 60:4 stroke 9:1,5,9	
73:10 75:5 80:18 46:14,15 51:19 significant 15:5 sort 51:4,7 68:6 strong 41:1,6	
right-hand 55:8 52:4,6 58:16 signs 54:17 speaking 61:10 Strongsville 1	
risk 27:1228:6 60:14 61:12 63:17 silent 5:25 specialist 79:5 6:19 7:3 11:	
33:13 64:25 65:13 65:6 67:9 69:12 silly 67:18 specialty 5:9 14:17 subject 8:19 1 Boad 1:21 70:6 21 71:1 4 24 similar 22:17 44/7 subject 8:19 1	
Road 1:21 70:6,21 71:1,4,24 similar 22:17 44:7 submitted 4:1 room 41:11 47:3,6 73:1 76:1,3 since 4:13,15,22 specific 17:3 34:11 Subscribed 82	1
room 41:11 47:3,6 73:1 76:1,3 since 4:13,15,22 specific 17:3 34:11 Subscribed 82 70:24 73:18 76:24 seeing 12:22 13:15 10:16 15:9 19:17 66:22 subsequent 10	
roughly 10:17 37:10 41:11 45:24 29:12 59:13 60:22 subsequent subsequent 37:10 41:11 45:24 29:12 59:13 76:5 specifically 18:22 20:11	0.13
routed 74:3 77:9,12 46:1 80:12 sinusitis 62:14 18:24 22:10,11 subspecialties	61.4
Royalton 1:20 seem 49:2 sin 3:12 7:1424:9 80:11 subspeciality	
rule 19:17,19 20:3,3 seemed 61:18 28:16 30:2 33:21 specifics 47:19 successful 5:1	
20:5 33:3 83:17 seems 77:8 54:23 79:1680:9 specified 83:14 sued 7:24	
Rules 3:3 seen 7:1 10:19,25 sitting 44:16 74:10 specify 18:4 sugar 55:6 62	:18
run 26:11 24:17 26:12,13 situation 44:149:10 speeches 20:15 suggesting 35	
running 29:12 27:20,21 29:5 situations 19:8 spend 38:19 37:17 48:95	
30:14.17 31:24 six 55:23 spin 19:24 Suite 2:12	
S 36:4,7,12,19 37:2 Skylight 2:5 spirits 48:23 summary 24:2	24
salvage 7 1:2 1 43:14 44:6 47:2,5 slightly 42:15 spoke 50:2 summer 11:5,	
same 18:18 22:23 49:1,13,24 50:3 slowly 55:1 SS 83:4 64:1	
22:24 35:1172:24 50:23 53:22 55:14 Smith 73:3,11,13 St 2:13 Sunday 29:9,1	12

Page 9

F	1	T	m	T
supervising 30:8,10	19:6 25:5,18	8:89:19 10:2,5,13	5 1:6,11 52:1,20	until 5:25 6:6 10:12
30:15,17 36:8,13	38:21 40:14,17	11:11 14:7 15:9	53:17 54:10 59:1	41:10
supervision 38:16	49:15,18 50:20	25:15,16,20 26:21	61:15 64:14 67:10	upbeat 49:2
supported 35:24	53:25 61:16 62:24	27:9,22 32:12	67:15,19,20,22	upper 33:24 66:3
supposed 32:8	66:9 70:7 74:15	35:11 36:2 38:19	69:2 74:24,25	urinalysis 40:20
sure 6:18 11:1	74:18 80:22	39:1340:20 43:20	77:13,14 79:20,25	55:7
18:19 19:11 38:17	telling 37:24 38:5	46:24 47:8 49:6	83:12	urine 26:4 27:15
surgeons 76:13	44:17	49:23 52:13 53:4	truth 83:10,10,10	28:2 29:13 32:3
surgery 59:21	temperature 29:9	54:157:22 58:7	try 3:14 58:17	32:19
			trying 40: 15 42: 15	use 79:4
surgical 79:21,23	29:11 66:13,17,24	60:25 61:3 64:1		
surrounding 15:19	67:2,9,11,14,17	71:4 73:1,22 75:4	45:18 58:12 70:16	used 5:5 53:3 68:5
suspended 9:22	ten 10:17	76:1878:11,12,12	72:12 80:19	68:1279:2
swelling 57:9	tenderness 57:11	78:14 80:3,5 81:4	Tuesday 29:10	using 79:7
sworn 3:4 37:15	62:13	83:14	two 53:11 56:14,17	usual 16:22 18:5,6
82:20 83:10	terms 25:11 49:3	times 5:18,20 10:24	57:6 58:11 73:6	usually 43:12 58:17
symptom 49:8 67:7	51:8 80:7	17:15 29:8 58:20	75:19 77:6	67:20 78:11,22
symptoms 32:13	test 42:12 43:15,18	tissues 57:10 78:21	two-page 3:19	utilization 36:3
33:1834:2,437:3	57:20	today 6:20 9:19	type 13:24 17:25	38:7,12
44:1047:1152:2	testify 19:20 83:10	21:1 32:11 44:16	24:23 26:22 68:5	utilize 37:18
59:11 60:17 62:7	testimony 19:24	55:9,10,12 80:14	68:1179:1	
65:23,24 66:7,8	20:4,7,15 24:24	together 65:25		V
system 27:14,15	37:16 83:11,12	told 7:17 9:18 19:9	<u> </u>	values 26:5 27:22
40:16 51:5 68:4,5	testing 65:2	24:25 25:2 41:3	UA 39:5	63:3
68:10,12,13 69:4	tests 32:4 39:5 41:3	54:11 63:25 71:24	ulcer 50:17,18	varied 33:1
72:20 76:1677:4	41:4 42:3,6 43:10	78:16	ulcers 27:1328:7	various 79:3
80:13	54:24 57:17	tomorrow 18:18	33:12 50:11 64:21	vary 18:17
	text 72:10	top 70:21 72:5,7	65:1467:25	venous 57:12,14,18
T	textbooks 14:14	total 26:3	ultimately 47:15	57:24 58:2
take 15:15 26:3,5	Thank 81:3	Tower 2:5	uncommon 67:9	verbally 58:21
34:13 38:18 48:6	their 41:21,22 48:8	transcribed 83:12	uncomplicated	versus 58:2
54:1268:24,25	therapy 79:19	transcript 81:7	75:25	very 8:18 18:8,21
taken 1:16 3:12	thickness 22:24	82:2	under 1:16 12:14	20:9,11,25 25:13
5:19 7:16 8:1,10	thing 17:1 25:23	transcription 83:12	61:3 76:15 83:16	25:13,16 26:25
9:1824:21 25:3,4	52:24	transferred 47:12	undergoing 71:14	31:18 32:15 40:25
27:1728:943:1	things 4:20 17:7	74:16	71:20	41:1,6 44:23
64:2,13 83:14	25:25 35:2,21	transpired 47:19	undergone 48:25	47:12 51:2 61:20
taking 35:7,12	42:14 65:25	treat 76:4 79:22	understand 6:13	71:15 75:18 81:3
54:1165:979:6	think 7:6 16:8	treated 28:6 49:16	16:19 17:18 18:19	virtue 76:9
talk 12:18 14:6	19:12,15 51:4	50: 10 65: 13 78:23	27:24,25 28:13	visit 39:6 40:7
15:21 21:3 23:17	67:3 68:8 80:19	treating 49:19	29:18 37:15 38:15	49:21 53:21 54:2
23:19 25:1 48:19	thinking 26:18	52:12	38:25 40:16 48:6	54:22 55:12 58:15
49:12 50:6 64:19	though 6:4 22:19	treatment 36:9	53:19 56:3 72:13	58:25 59:2,7
76:23	41:4,9 51:20	44:18 47:13,16	72:20	vitae 4:6
talked 15:11,18	thought 33:3 40:1	53:22,24 71:20	understanding	Vital 54:17
16:12 39:9 50:4	thousand 32:19	trial 8:2 9:19	37:18	volume 22:13
54:9 80:14	three 7:8 29:8	true 6:217:17,18	underwent 47:15	volume 22:15 vs 1:6
talking 6:5 19:5	65:15	7:25 9:6,12,20	Unfortunately	və 1.0
20:1633:134:11	05:15 throat 66:4		29:16	W
	through 10:14	12:16 13:16,17 18:12 19:1 22:7		W 2:6
68:6 80:12			unique 5 1:4	
telephone 43:20	32:21 80:13 82:3	30:9,13,19 31:12	unknown 31:14	wait 6:6
51:13,14	Thursday 1:12 41:7	35:4 36:14 37:9	42:3	waived 81:9
tell 4:16 6:10 8:18	43:10	38:10,16 39:15	Unless 78:13	want 14:5 19:14,15
10:22,23 11:1,1	time 3:13,14 4:19	40:13 46:2,10	unremarkable	19:22,23 31:9
16:12 17:12,24	5:20,22 7:5,6,17	47:4,14 50:15	54:18	37:15,21 40:2
	1 1			· 1

Page 10

P		T	T	····
42:5,12,16 48:5	Woodard 77:9,10	49: 16 59:7,9 60:3	78 10:14	
53:19 69:3	word 36:6			
wanted 12:2 53:15	words 19:6	2	8_	
71:4	work 23:6,25 24:2	2 24:6 40:4	829:1	
warmth 57:11	30:22 40:2,6,10	2nd 2:6	8-7-99 73:9	
wasn't 41:10 45:6,7	40:15,19 42:23	2000 10:12,15,17	81 82:3	
77:16	53:3 58:12	60:16,18,23 61:11		
way 39:15 46:16	working 26:20 27:4	61:17 62:3,8	9	
48:8,11 61:25	27:8 76:2	63:18,24 64:2	971:7,877:12	
70:2,3,6,18 71:2	works 24:3 30:23	2001 1:12 10:20,25	9th 70:9 77:5	
72:2,4,5 75:2,13	workup 54:24	11:6 12:18 16:3	9:38 1:22	
80:11	worsening 58:19	16:13 48:21 63:25	9:50 77:1378:7,8	
ways 61:5 78:24	wouldn't 4:22,24	82:21 83:19	96 49:23 50:9 51:12	
WBC 30:3	48:10	2004 83:22	97 52:9,19 59:9	
Wednesday 41:5	wound 41:10 53:15	21st 83:19	99 39:6 40:7,12,21	
week 22:3,9	write 55:25 58:19	216 2:8,15	49:19,21 59:10,12	
weekend 74:9	80:25	24 55:19 75:25	60:5,6,10,22 69:5	
weight 54:15 55:22	writings 4:21	24 55 19 75 25 241-2600 2 :8	73:22	
well 7:4 9:15 17:6	written 12:20 13:14	25th 56:25	, 1 J	
19:16 21:14 23:4	14:13 26:14 56:12	25th 50.25 26 10:15 60:16		
24:16 26:3,7 27:7	wrong 40:1	63:18,24		
27:10 31:9 36:1	wrote 25:21 62:11	26th 10:12		
40:25 55:25 59:25	WICE 23.21 02.11	28(D) 83:17		
62:11,23 65:23	X	20(1) 05.17		
67:10 76:17	x-ray 40:3	4		
went 9:19 12:1	A Tuy 10.5	4 23:15 28:25 30:25		
were 4:15 5:11 7:9	Y	38:23 39:6 40:7		
7:23 8:13,15 19:8	Yang 30:20,22,25	40:12,21 41:3		
24:20 25:2 27:16	38:22 45:7,8,11	43:7 44:18 47:25		
32:4 36:25 41:4,9	45:13,15,17,20	48:10		
41:13 49:19 52:12	46:7	4th 28:25 29:6		
53:11 57:3,5,21	Yang's 46:8	66:10		
58:15 59:11 60:17	year 10:20,25 11:6	425998 1:6		
60:23 61:4 62:8	16:13 60:4	44113 2:7,14		
62:15,16,20 63:4	years 7:8,21	48 75:19,25		
63:7,10,23 64:4	Jears	10 / 5.1 5 , 200		
64:10 70:8 74:2	1	5		
75:1 80:19	1 3:20,25 4:4 82:3	5 28:25 41:7		
We'll 81:5	1000 26:5	5:05 73:23 74:14,22		
we're 10:6 14:6	101 29:9,10 43:20	56-year-old 29:7		
WHEREOF 83:18	11:25 81:8	· · · ·		
while 60:7	113 2:13	6		
white 32:1833:7	1213 19:19	628:25 47:4 48:3		
34:12,18,20 35:3	15 1:12	6th 41:10		
35:10,14	1660 2:6	6602:5		
whole 39:20 49:10	17th 52:9 56:18	687-1311 2:15		
68:18 83:10	17406 1:20			
window 12:4,5,6,6	18 10:14	7		
12:8,11 14:1	19 30:25	7 29:159:7,9 60:3		
21:12 46:20 76:15	1993 4:19,22	60:10,15 69:5		
77:25	1996 49:22	73:22 78:17 83:22		
witness 20:6 25:8	1997 57: 1,2 59:6	'7th 74:5,7,14,22		
83:18	1999 23:15 38:23	700 2:12		
wondering 72:21	44:1947:4,25	° 72 76:1		
L			1	L