

**In The Matter Of:**

*RIDOLFI v.  
NEAL CHADWICK, M.D.*

---

*Norman Silverman, M.D  
Vol. I, September 19, 2000*

---

*Esquire Deposition Services  
2560 Crooks Rd.  
Troy, MI 48084  
(248) 2449700 FAX: (248) 244-8804*

*Original File DKSILVER.VI, 58 Pages  
Min-U-Script® File ID: 4018461114*

**Word Index included with this Min-U-Script®**

Page 1	Page 3
<p>[1] IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR [2] CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO [3] [4] RICHARD RIDOLFI, et al., [5] [6] Plaintiffs. [7] m [8] vs Case No. 322843 [9] [10] NEAL CHADWICK, M.D., et al., [11] [12] Defendants. [13] [14] [15] DEPONENT: NORMAN A. SILVERMAN, M.D. [16] DATE: Tuesday, September 19, 2000 [17] TIME: 1:10 p.m. [18] LOCATION: Henry Ford Hospital [19] 2799 West Grand Boulevard, 14th Floor [20] Detroit, Michigan [21] REPORTER: Denise M. Kizy, RPWCSR-2466 [22] [23] [24] [25]</p>	<p>[1] TABLE OF CONTENTS [2] WITNESS PAGE [3] NORMAN A. SILVERMAN, M.D. [4] Examination by Mr. Coticchia 4 [5] [6] m [7] [8] [9] [10] EXHIBITS [11] NUMBER IDENTIFICATION PAGE [12] Ex. 1 Curriculum Viae 5 [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] [21] [22] [23] [24] [25]</p>
Page 2	Page 4
<p>[1] APPEARANCES: [2] [3] JOSEPH L. COTICCHIACO, L.P.A. [4] By: Mr. Joseph L. Coticchia [5] 1370 Ontario Street, Suite 1640 [6] Cleveland, Ohio 44113 [7] (216) 861-6622 [8] Appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff [9] [10] REMINGER &amp; REMINGER CO., L.P.A. [11] By: Mr. William Meadows [12] 113 St. Clair Avenue, N.E., 7th floor [13] Cleveland, Ohio 44114 [14] (216) 687-1311 [15] Appearing on behalf of the Defendant, [16] Robert Paul Van Bergen, M.D. [17] [18] [19] [20] [21] [22] [23] [24] [25]</p>	<p>[1] Detroit, Michigan [2] Tuesday, September 19, 2000 [3] At about 1:10 p.m. [4] [5] [6] NORMAN A. SILVERMAN, M.D. [7] was thereupon called as a witness herein, and after [8] having first been duly sworn to tell the truth, the [9] whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined [10] and testified as follows: [11] MR. COTICCHIA: This is the [12] deposition of Doctor Norman Silverman. The [13] deposition is being taken pursuant to agreement. [14] Is that correct? [15] MR. MEADOWS: Correct. [16] EXAMINATION [17] BY MR. COTICCHIA: [18] Q: Doctor, please state your full name and [19] spell your last name. [20] A: Norman A. Silverman, S I L V E R M A N. [21] Q: What is your address here at the office? [22] A: Henry Ford Hospital, 2799 West Grand [23] Boulevard, Detroit, 48202. [24] Q: What is your residential address? [25] A: 11 Sycamore Lane, S Y C A M O R E, Grosse</p>

<div>Page 5</div> <div><p>[1] Pointe, Michigan, 48230.</p><p>[2] Q: And what is your occupation?</p><p>[3] A: I'm a cardiac surgeon.</p><p>[4] Q: Are you board certified?</p><p>[5] A: Yes.</p><p>[6] Q: In what area are you board certified?</p><p>[7] A: In general surgery and thoracic surgery.</p><p>[8] Q: You have a board certification in each one</p><p>[9] of those <i>two</i>?</p><p>[10] A: Yes.</p><p>[11] Q: Do you have your curriculum vitae?</p><p>[12] A: Rightthere.</p><p>[13] Q: Okay. Let's mark this Deposition Exhibit</p><p>[14] 1.</p><p>[15] (Marked for identification Deposition</p><p>[16] Exhibit No. 1.)</p><p>[17] Q: Doctor, I'm going to hand you what's been</p><p>[18] marked Exhibit 1.</p><p>[19] Do you recognize that?</p><p>[20] A: Yes.</p><p>[21] Q: Is that your curriculum vitae?</p><p>[22] A: Yes.</p><p>[23] Q: When did you get licensed to practice</p><p>[24] medicine in Michigan?</p><p>[25] A: 1989.</p></div>	<div>Page 7</div> <div><p>[1] transcript of Doctor Richard Mayers?</p><p>[2] A: Not that I can remember.</p><p>[3] Q: Did you review a deposition transcript of</p><p>[4] a Doctor Edward Levy?</p><p>[5] A: No.</p><p>[6] Q: Did you review a deposition transcript of</p><p>[7] Doctor Ralph Lach, LA C H?</p><p>[8] A: Not that I remember.</p><p>[9] Q: Did you review a deposition transcript of</p><p>[0] Doctor Pamcia Mohoney?</p><p>[1] A: Not that I remember.</p><p>[2] Q: Did you review a deposition transcript of</p><p>[3] Doctor Bonita Shah, S H A H?</p><p>[4] A: Not that I remember.</p><p>[5] Q: Did you review a deposition transcript of</p><p>[6] John Bennett, M.T.?</p><p>[7] A: Not that I remember.</p><p>[8] Q: Did you review a deposition transcript of</p><p>[9] Doctor Phillip I. Lerner?</p><p>[0] A: Not that I remember.</p><p>[1] Q: Doctor, there's no issue here in regard to</p><p>[2] the success of Richard Ridolfi's coronary artery</p><p>[3] bypass graft; is there?</p><p>[4] MR. MEADOWS: Objection because the</p><p>[5] way you worded that suggests that the issue is a</p></div>
<div>Page 6</div> <div><p>[1] Q: Are you licensed <i>to</i> practice medicine</p><p>[2] anywhere else?</p><p>[3] A: No.</p><p>[4] Q: So if I add correctly you'll be 54 on</p><p>[5] December 19th, this year?</p><p>[6] A: Yes.</p><p>[7] Q: Did you review records regarding the</p><p>[8] treatment of the plaintiff, Richard Ridolfi, in this</p><p>[9] case?</p><p>[10] A: Yes.</p><p>[11] Q: Tell me what records you reviewed.</p><p>[12] A: I reviewed the hospitalizations at — the</p><p>[13] initial hospitalization, Southwest General Hospital,</p><p>[14] and subsequent hospital admissions to Fairview</p><p>[15] General Hospital, and I reviewed numerous</p><p>[16] depositions of Mrs. Ridolfi, Doctor Van Bergen,</p><p>[17] Arnold Markowitz, Gary Noskin, and Doctor Gopal as</p><p>[18] well as an ER report — record of the 4th of</p><p>[19] September.</p><p>[20] Q: September 4, '95?</p><p>[21] A: Yes.</p><p>[22] Q: That's an ER record for Richard Ridolfi?</p><p>[23] A: At Fairview Hospital.</p><p>[24] Q: Yes. All right.</p><p>[25] Did you review a deposition</p></div>	<div>Page 8</div> <div><p>[1] legal matter as to what's in issue for the jury.</p><p>[2] I object to form. The question is</p><p>[3] vague.</p><p>[4] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) You may answer.</p><p>[5] A: Could you say the question again?</p><p>[6] Q: Do you agree there's no issue here</p><p>[7] regarding Richard Ridolfi's coronary artery bypass</p><p>[8] graft?</p><p>[9] A: I don't know how to answer that question.</p><p>[10] It doesn't make any sense to me, sir.</p><p>[11] Q: Was there anything inappropriate in the</p><p>[12] way Doctor Van Bergen performed the <i>graft</i> based on</p><p>[13] your review of the records of Fairview Hospital when</p><p>[14] he underwent the CABG as you referred to it?</p><p>[15] A: I didn't refer to it as CABG.</p><p>[16] Q: Or as is referred to, as I referred to it.</p><p>[17] A: It seems that the operation was done in an</p><p>[18] appropriate manner.</p><p>[19] Q: I have a copy of your May 21, 1999 letter.</p><p>[20] I'm going to show it to you, make sure we got the</p><p>[21] same copy.</p><p>[22] That's it?</p><p>[23] A: Yes.</p><p>[24] Q: Before we go through your letter, I want</p><p>[25] to ask you a few questions in general.</p></div>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>[1] As a surgeon in your experience how [2] many coronary artery bypass grafts have you [3] performed? [4] <b>A:</b> Four or 5,000. [5] <b>Q:</b> And is that as the attending or primary [6] physician? [7] <b>A:</b> Yes. [8] <b>Q:</b> Since your board certification? [9] <b>A:</b> A few of them were done before then [10] because you don't get certified the first year that [11] you're out, so since I finished the residency and — [12] since I finished the residency, that's about four or [13] 5,000. [14] <b>Q:</b> So that would be, tell me, because I don't [15] have it right now, when were you board certified as [16] a thoracic surgeon? [17] <b>A:</b> Maybe '92. No, no, '82. '81 or '82. I [18] finished the residency in 1980 and then I got my [19] boards in general surgery before you can get your [20] boards in thoracic surgery and then I got my boards [21] in thoracic surgery. By the time you went through [22] the four stages to get to my boards was probably '92 [23] by the time I was certified. [24] <b>MR. MEADOWS:</b> '82 or '92? [25] <b>THE WITNESS:</b> '82, sorry, '82, but I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>an infection? <b>A:</b> It's such a nondescript symptom that very little credulity could be placed on the diagnostic veracity of a low grade fever. <b>Q:</b> Let's say fourth day postoperatively which is Richard Ridolfi's situation, can that be a sign of a fever? <b>A:</b> That's a very very very weak discriminator of infection in that circumstance. <b>Q:</b> Is it something we take into consideration with all the other elements if you're trying to determine the presence of an infection? <b>A:</b> It's not very helpful. Low grade fever, no. No, I don't put much credence on that. <b>Q:</b> Is a high white cell count a sign of infection, can it be? <b>A:</b> It has to be again taken with all the other clinical circumstances. In isolation, it's meaningless. <b>Q:</b> Let's take it collectively, Assuming that there's existence of incision drainage and a low grade temperature. Is a high white cell count a sign of infection? <b>MR. MEADOWS:</b> Objection to form.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>[1] was an attending on the faculty of the University of [2] Illinois, so for two years I did cardiac surgery and [3] I don't know how many of those were. [4] <b>Q:</b> (BY MR. COTICCHIA) So approximately 4,000 [5] to 5,000 since about generally speaking the time you [6] were board certified in '82? [7] <b>A:</b> Yes. [8] <b>Q:</b> Is that fair? [9] <b>A:</b> Yeah. We won't quibble over the other [10] part of it. [11] Okay. Yes. [12] <b>Q:</b> Does coronary artery bypass surgery [13] involve the risk of infection? [14] <b>A:</b> Yes. [15] <b>Q:</b> And is that risk in the area of the [16] sternal incision? [17] <b>A:</b> That is one of the risks. [18] <b>Q:</b> Okay. As a sign of infection is drainage [19] from the incision, I'm talking about the sternal [20] area, is drainage from the incision, can that be a [21] sign of infection? [22] <b>A:</b> There are — in association with many [23] other presenting syndromes, symptomatology, it can [24] be but not necessarily always associated. [25] <b>Q:</b> Can a low grade temperature be a sign of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p><b>THE WITNESS:</b> Well, again it has to be — taken in isolation those three things are not — they can suggest that there may be an infection, but they're not very diagnostic. <b>Q:</b> (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Is dehiscence of the sternal wound a sign of infection? <b>A:</b> Again, taken in isolation, a sternal wound, if it is dehiscd, can be infected but it may well not be infected just as often. <b>Q:</b> Is an unstable sternum following discharge after a CABG? <b>A:</b> I just answered this question. <b>Q:</b> I'm not talking about a dehiscence now. I'm talking about an unstable sternum. <b>A:</b> Well, if it's unstable that means the sternal closure is dehiscd. <b>Q:</b> Is incisional pain fourth day postoperative surgery? <b>A:</b> That's an absolutely worthless indicator of the degree of healing of a sternal wound on the fourth postoperative day. [22] <b>Q:</b> Is agitation a sign of infection? <b>A:</b> No, not necessarily. <b>Q:</b> Have you had occasion when you have treated patients that you've performed coronary</p>

<p>Page 13</p> <p>[1] artery surgery, to have a patient contract a sternal [2] wound infection? [3] <b>A:</b> Yes. [4] <b>Q:</b> Have you had occasion where in the [5] treatment of that infection you will call in an [6] infectious disease doctor? [7] <b>A:</b> Yes. [8] <b>Q:</b> Do you have occasion before you discharge [9] a patient following coronary artery surgery to take [10] a sternal wound culture? [11] <b>A:</b> No. [12] <b>Q:</b> Why not? [13] <b>A:</b> You have to culture something. The [14] concept of culturing a sternal wound implies that [15] the wound is all separated and open, so you didn't [16] mention that. So we wouldn't discharge a patient [17] whose wound is separated and open. [18] <b>Q:</b> I said prior. Well, let me repeat it. [19] Prior to discharge. [20] When you perform a coronary artery [21] bypass graft, before you close, do you do a wound [22] culture. [23] <b>A:</b> No. [24] <b>Q:</b> When have you done, if at all, a wound [25] culture of a patient following or during coronary</p>	<p>Page 15</p> <p>1] <b>A:</b> Mostly it's a disrupted dehiscence wound 2] that is draining purulent material associated with 3] redness usually in a patient who has a high fever 4] and a marked elevation of their white count. 5] <b>Q:</b> What percentage of your patients following 6] coronary artery surgery contract a sternal wound 7] infection? 8] <b>A:</b> Probably somewhere between — somewhat 9] less than one and a half percent probably would be, 0] one year maybe two percent, another year maybe half 1] a percent, but less than one and a half percent I 2] would say would be an average. 3] <b>Q:</b> Doctor, let's talk a little bit about your 4] report. 5] Do you have copy of it in front of 6] you? 7] <b>A:</b> Yes. 8] <b>Q:</b> Do you have the home-going records in 9] front of you now? 0] <b>A:</b> I don't know what you mean — I don't know 1] what a home-going record is here. 2] <b>Q:</b> Well, you said Fairview home care records. 3] Where are those? 4] <b>A:</b> I don't know where those are. I don't 5] have all — some records may be at home. I do not</p>
<p>Page 14</p> <p>[1] artery bypass surgery? [2] <b>A:</b> Those are two questions. You want to [3] separate them? [4] <b>MR. COTICCHIA:</b> Would you read the [5] question back, please. [6] (Record repeated by Court Reporter.) [7] <b>THE WITNESS:</b> That's two questions. [8] The during is never, the answer to during is never. [9] The answer to following if the [10] clinical circumstances warrant it. [11] <b>Q:</b> (BY MR. COTICCHIA) What clinical [12] circumstances warrant a culture? [13] <b>A:</b> If you suspect clinically that the patient [14] has an infection and you take him to the operating [15] room, we usually — we do intraoperatively on [16] exploring wounds culture various levels of the [17] wound. [18] <b>Q:</b> And what are the aspects or the bases upon [19] which you would suspect an infection? [20] <b>A:</b> There are numerous factors with an [21] infection and you'd have to see the patient's [22] clinical symptomatology and his physical examination [23] and his laboratory evaluation. [24] <b>Q:</b> Tell me what you look for in the clinical [25] symptomatology.</p>	<p>Page 16</p> <p>[1] have here in front of me the home care record. [2] <b>Q:</b> Was there anything in the home care [3] records that you used as a basis of your opinion in [4] this letter? [5] <b>A:</b> I don't have an independent recollection [6] right now of what the home care records were, so I [7] can't answer that question. [8] I would suspect since I wrote that I [9] reviewed them that I made my judgments on what I [10] reviewed. [11] <b>Q:</b> Did you make any notes in regard to the [12] home care records? [13] <b>A:</b> No, sir. [14] <b>Q:</b> Do you have your notes here today [15] regarding — first of all, did you prepare notes [16] before you wrote this letter? [17] <b>A:</b> No. [18] <b>Q:</b> Did you underline anything before you [19] wrote the letter? [20] <b>A:</b> No. [21] <b>Q:</b> Is it your testimony that you prepared [22] this letter simply by reading the records and not [23] making a note? [24] <b>A:</b> I guarantee it. [25] <b>Q:</b> Did you make an outline?</p>

Page 17

[1] A: No, I dictated this off the top of my  
[2] head.  
[3] Q: Did you put any tabs, sticky tabs on any  
[4] pages?  
[5] A: There was no pages. It was dictated with  
[6] a Dictaphone.  
[7] Q: I'm talking about pages in the records you  
[8] reviewed.  
[9] A: The only sticky tabs on the pages are what  
[10] came with the pages.  
[11] Q: Okay. Did you fold the comers over on  
[12] any records that you thought —  
[13] A: I made no marks in these, sir, either by  
[14] physically distorting the pages or inserting markers  
[15] or putting in cardboard or underlining things in  
[16] yellow or writing in pencil or any other way. There  
[17] is no physical notation in the records that were  
[18] sent to me.  
[19] Q: Why do you not make notes or mark pages?  
[20] A: Because then I have to just go find them  
[21] again. I just don't do that.  
[22] Q: When you're reading a record do you have  
[23] your portable dictator with you?  
[24] A: No. I do not make verbal notes either,  
[25] but no — it is with me because it's on the desk.

Page 18

[1] If I read them here it's on the desk. If I read  
[2] them at home then it's not near me.  
[3] I want to be sure I tell the truth.  
[4] Q: So it's my understanding you get the  
[5] records and you read them?  
[6] A: Correct.  
[7] Q: You don't take a note?  
[8] A: Correct.  
[9] Q: You don't mark anything either by pencil,  
[10] pen or sticky tab of anything that you think is  
[11] significant?  
[12] A: Correct.  
[13] Q: And after you've read all the records —  
[14] how many times would you read the records? How many  
[15] times did you read these records?  
[16] A: In toto probably once. Probably scanning  
[17] some parts, two or three times.  
[18] Q: All right. And independent of all the  
[19] things we just talked about, you do not make oral  
[20] records on your portable dictator when you're  
[21] reviewing the records?  
[22] A: No, sir.  
[23] Q: All right. What records do you recall  
[24] reading more than once?  
[25] A: Those would be the operative notes that

Page 19

were done, and I believe I've looked at this ER  
sheet a couple of times, and the depositions of  
Markowitz, Noskin, and Van Bergen I believe I've  
read twice.  
Q: In the first paragraph you state that  
there are notes in the chart stating the wound is  
dry, no drainage. The patient was afebrile and the  
last white count taken two days prior to his  
discharge was not inappropriately elevated.  
I want to talk to you about the words  
"was not inappropriately elevated."  
Are you saying there that the white  
count was elevated?  
A: No. No, elevated is a relative word. His  
white count upon discharge was somewhere around  
12,000.  
I take that back. His white count  
was about 12,000 a few days prior to his discharge.  
That is not elevated for someone who has had recent  
cardiac surgery, so I do not believe that it was  
elevated at all.  
Q: But you're saying that this is —  
A: It depends upon —  
Q: — fourth day postoperatively: right?  
A: I believe he was discharged on the fourth

Page 20

postoperative day. He was in the hospital.  
Q: What was the white count?  
A: 12,000 something; wasn't it —  
MR. MEADOWS: When?  
MR. COTICCHIA: I'm talking about the  
statement here that he's saying —  
THE WITNESS: Can I clarify it in the  
answer?  
Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Yeah, please.  
A: The white count that I'm talking about was  
the last white count taken during his  
hospitalization when he was discharged on the 25th  
of August in 1995, and the last notarization on the  
routine hematology report shows that the white count  
was 12.6 thousand and that was on the 23rd.  
Q: Can I see that, please?  
That was the 23rd, correct, 12.6;  
correct?  
A: Yeah, that's what I just said.  
Q: And it says H after it; doesn't it?  
A: Yes.  
Q: That means high; doesn't it?  
A: No.  
Q: So you're disagreeing with the symbol used  
at the Fairview Hospital hematology lab when they

Page 21	Page 23
<p>[1] put an H after it?</p> <p>[2] <b>A:</b> That's not the purpose of that. The</p> <p>[3] purpose of that — that is a meaningless H in my</p> <p>[4] opinion because that would group all patients at all</p> <p>[5] times in all circumstances, and they have a range of</p> <p>[6] values.</p> <p>[7] The appropriate grouping of patients</p> <p>[8] would be someone who had recent major or cardiac</p> <p>[9] surgery. So I do not feel that that white count</p> <p>[10] deserves an <b>H</b> and I would disregard it as being</p> <p>[11] abnormal. That is my opinion.</p> <p>[12] <b>Q:</b> Would you disregard the notations of the</p> <p>[13] letters L as well for the same reason?</p> <p>[14] <b>A:</b> I don't know what circumstance you're</p> <p>[15] talking about.</p> <p>[16] <b>MR. MEADOWS:</b> L for what?</p> <p>[17] <b>Q:</b> (BY MR. COTICCHIA) On the same hematology</p> <p>[18] report we're <b>talking</b> about here.</p> <p>[19] <b>A:</b> Where is L?</p> <p>[20] <b>Q:</b> There are Ls following hemoglobin.</p> <p>[21] <b>A:</b> That's individually the L following</p> <p>[22] hemoglobin and hematocrit and platelet count, those</p> <p>[23] Ls are not abnormal for a patient being discharged</p> <p>[24] postoperatively, and I would consider that a routine</p> <p>[25] assessment or quantitation of the blood count, the</p>	<p>[1] <b>MR. COTICCHIA:</b> I apologize.</p> <p>[2] <b>Q:</b> (BY MR. COTICCHIA) August.</p> <p>[3] <b>A:</b> Yes.</p> <p>[4] <b>Q:</b> Now would you refer to those records,</p> <p>[5] please. I'll give it back to you.</p> <p>[6] <b>A:</b> Okay.</p> <p>[7] <b>Q:</b> Will you turn to the graphic — well, do</p> <p>[8] you have a copy of the graphic flow sheet for August</p> <p>[9] 29th — I'm sorry, August 26th through 29th?</p> <p>[10] <b>A:</b> Graphic of what?</p> <p>[11] <b>Q:</b> Temperature.</p> <p>[12] <b>A:</b> Yes.</p> <p>[13] <b>Q:</b> Doctor, do you agree that indicated on</p> <p>[14] this chart is a line, next to the line is 98.6 for</p> <p>[15] Fahrenheit and 37 for Centigrade; do you see that?</p> <p>[16] <b>A:</b> Yes.</p> <p>[17] <b>Q:</b> Do you agree that that represents a normal</p> <p>[18] level?</p> <p>[19] <b>A:</b> No.</p> <p>[20] <b>Q:</b> What was Richard Ridolfi's temperature on</p> <p>[21] the morning of August 29th?</p> <p>[22] <b>A:</b> It looks like about 37.6.</p> <p>[23] <b>Q:</b> And what does that represent in</p> <p>[24] Fahrenheit?</p> <p>[25] <b>A:</b> 99.</p>
Page 22	Page 24
<p>[1] white count and the platelet count in someone being</p> <p>[2] discharged after cardiac surgery.</p> <p>[3] <b>Q:</b> So it's your testimony in regard to the</p> <p>[4] hematology of August 23rd that the indications H</p> <p>[5] which we can assume mean high and the indications L</p> <p>[6] which you can assume mean low, in your opinion as a</p> <p>[7] cardiothoracic surgeon are not relevant?</p> <p>[8] <b>A:</b> Your question is not completely stated.</p> <p>[9] In a patient who is being discharged</p> <p>[10] after cardiac <b>surgery</b>, I do not think they're</p> <p>[11] inappropriate. If you add the last little caveat to</p> <p>[12] that then I would say yes.</p> <p>[13] <b>Q:</b> As a matter of fact, as I recall before</p> <p>[14] you closed the file there were no hematology reports</p> <p>[15] for the 24th or the 25th; were there?</p> <p>[16] <b>A:</b> I think that's appropriate.</p> <p>[17] <b>Q:</b> I'm not asking you if it's appropriate.</p> <p>[18] I'm just asking did you see any in</p> <p>[19] there?</p> <p>[20] <b>A:</b> No.</p> <p>[21] <b>Q:</b> Did you review the admission of Richard</p> <p>[22] Ridolfi on the 26th of September?</p> <p>[23] <b>A:</b> Yes.</p> <p>[24] <b>MR. MEADOWS:</b> You said September. Do</p> <p>[25] you mean to say September?</p>	<p>[1] <b>Q:</b> Is that a low grade fever?</p> <p>[2] <b>A:</b> Not necessarily, no.</p> <p>[3] <b>Q:</b> Will you please turn back to the graphic</p> <p>[4] flow records for his previous admission when he</p> <p>[5] underwent the bypass surgery which would be August</p> <p>[6] 20 to August 25.</p> <p>[7] <b>MR. MEADOWS:</b> You want him to look at</p> <p>[8] the graphics for that?</p> <p>[9] <b>MR. COTICCHIA:</b> Yeah, I want to look</p> <p>[10] at the temperature graphics.</p> <p>[11] <b>THE WITNESS:</b> I have it, sir.</p> <p>[12] <b>Q:</b> (BY MR. COTICCHIA) You have it here?</p> <p>[13] <b>A:</b> Yes.</p> <p>[14] <b>Q:</b> Will you tell me what his temperature was</p> <p>[15] on the last temperature taken on August 24, '95?</p> <p>[16] <b>MR. MEADOWS:</b> August 24th or 25th?</p> <p>[17] <b>THE WITNESS:</b> You said the 24th. Is</p> <p>[18] that what you want?</p> <p>[19] <b>MR. COTICCHIA:</b> I said the 24th.</p> <p>[20] <b>MR. MEADOWS:</b> Okay.</p> <p>[21] <b>THE WITNESS:</b> That looks to me like</p> <p>[22] 37.6 or something. There's a little flag on it. I</p> <p>[23] can't tell whether that's one or two readings.</p> <p>[24] <b>Q:</b> (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Well, it looks like</p> <p>[25] two readings because one is above the other.</p>

Page 25	Page 27
<p>[1] A: Well, one is a circle and one is a heart.</p> <p>[2] Q: One is a dot and one is a circle; right?</p> <p>[3] A: Right.</p> <p>[4] Q: Let's refer to the dot. It's a slightly</p> <p>[5] higher elevation.</p> <p>[6] What's the temperature in Fahrenheit?</p> <p>[7] A: 99 something. 99.3 or something, 5. I</p> <p>[8] can't tell,</p> <p>[9] Q: <del>All</del> right. Doesn't that indicate to</p> <p>[10] you —</p> <p>[11] A: No, actually it would be difficult to</p> <p>[12] ascertain. The spacing is not quite right.</p> <p>[13] Q: Well, we can agree it's somewhere between</p> <p>[14] 99 and 100; would you agree with that?</p> <p>[15] A: Most likely.</p> <p>[16] Q: All right. Now my question is as a</p> <p>[17] cardiothoracic surgeon, isn't it a concern if you</p> <p>[18] want to diagnose or rule out an infection in this</p> <p>[19] patient, he's basically got the same temperature</p> <p>[20] levels on his discharge — he's discharged on the</p> <p>[21] 25th, by the way. There's no temperature at all; is</p> <p>[22] there?</p> <p>[23] MR. MEADOWS: That's not true.</p> <p>[24] Objection.</p> <p>[25] THE WITNESS: If you looked at the</p>	<p>but if you can, go ahead.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: I don't know what</p> <p>you're talking about, sir. I really don't. Are you</p> <p>saying that —</p> <p>Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) You don't understand</p> <p>my question; is that what you're saying?</p> <p>A: Yes, yes, sir.</p> <p>Q: Well, I can't form it any better because</p> <p>I'm not a doctor.</p> <p>A: It has nothing to do with a physician. It</p> <p>has to do with — his name was the same too. He</p> <p>doesn't have a temperature spike. That is a normal</p> <p>temperature curve for someone following surgery.</p> <p>Since he seemed to have an uneventful</p> <p>convalescence from his first surgery, an uneventful</p> <p>convalescence from his second surgery, I suspect</p> <p>that his vital signs would be similar, his weight</p> <p>would be similar, his name would be similar, his BUN</p> <p>and creatinine would be similar.</p> <p>So I think that since there was no</p> <p>evidence that he was infected when he left the first</p> <p>time and there was no evidence he was infected when</p> <p>he left the second time, that his charts would look</p> <p>similar.</p> <p>Q: So you're saying his discharge with this</p>
Page 26	Page 28
<p>[1] chart, I guess maybe you did or didn't, he's got a</p> <p>[2] temperature of 37.1 on the morning of the 25th.</p> <p>[3] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) All right. My</p> <p>[4] question is as a cardiothoracic surgeon if you're</p> <p>[5] going to rule out infection in this patient, isn't</p> <p>[6] it something you want to take in consideration when</p> <p>[7] he's got a temperature on the 24th or the 25th for</p> <p>[8] that matter —</p> <p>[9] A: He doesn't have a temperature on the 25th,</p> <p>[10] sir. He doesn't have a fever. Everyone has a</p> <p>[11] temperature. He doesn't have a fever on the 25th.</p> <p>[12] Q: Even though the finding is above 37 or</p> <p>[13] above 98.6, you don't consider that a fever or low</p> <p>[14] grade fever?</p> <p>[15] A: No.</p> <p>[16] Q: And he's got similar readings, does he</p> <p>[17] not, the last two days that he's discharged</p> <p>[18] following the surgery for the dehiscence on the 28th</p> <p>[19] and the 29th?</p> <p>[20] MR. MEADOWS: Objection to form.</p> <p>[21] What do you mean by similar, similar to what?</p> <p>[22] MR. COTICCHIA: On the 28th and 29th,</p> <p>[23] similar to the 24th and 25th.</p> <p>[24] MR. MEADOWS: Objection to form.</p> <p>[25] I don't know how you can answer that,</p>	<p>temperature elevation on the 25th —</p> <p>A: I didn't say it was a temperature</p> <p>elevation, sir.</p> <p>Q: Well, I'm referring to it. I'm using that</p> <p>word, okay.</p> <p>A: Well, then don't —</p> <p>MR. MEADOWS: He just told you it's</p> <p>not.</p> <p>MR. COTICCHIA: Well, I'm going to</p> <p>ask him again since he didn't understand my</p> <p>question.</p> <p>Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Is it your testimony</p> <p>that the temperature on the 24th and the 25th which</p> <p>are approximately 99.3 and 99, as well as Richard</p> <p>Ridolfi's discharge on the 28th and the 29th which</p> <p>vary in range from 98.8 to 99, are not significant</p> <p>and of no indication of an infection?</p> <p>MR. MEADOWS: Objection to form.</p> <p>Go ahead and answer if you can.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: Well, there's more than</p> <p>objection to form. You didn't present all the — if</p> <p>you want to enumerate what all the data points are,</p> <p>then you could have said what all the data points</p> <p>are.</p> <p>You specifically or purposely, I</p>



<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>[1] don't know what, excluded two of the temperatures [2] which were below what are perceived normal of 37, [3] 98.6 on the 28th, one of which showed that his [4] temperature was actually 36, and the last discharge [5] temperature was 37.2 or 1 or something like that or [6] 37, those you ignored to mention. [7] Do you want me to answer the [8] question? [9] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Sure. [10] A: Well, I can't answer the question because [11] all you did was give me two points on either side. [12] Do you want me to answer the question [13] that all the data points that you wanted to have, [14] the 24th and the 25th, there are six temperatures on [15] this patient on August 24th and 25th, and the last [16] two days, August 28th and 29th, there's one, two, [17] three, four, five, six, seven, there are eight data [18] points there and I think those data points are [19] comparable and normal. [20] That is my testimony. [21] Q: You earlier testified regarding [22] temperatures of a patient referring to a spike; [23] correct? Did you use that word? [24] A: I don't remember. If you want to read [25] back the question. I don't know the context where I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>severe coughing spell and he return to the hospital and had prompt operative intervention. At this time he underwent a weave to reconstruct the sternal fragments and then these were wired back together. This is an alternative and acceptable form of therapy for what was felt to be a sternal dehiscence. What do you mean by an alternative and acceptable form of therapy? A: It is one acceptable way of dealing with a surgical problem. Q: What are the other alternative ways to deal with this dehiscence? A: To do a flap reconstruction of his sternum. Q: Flap reconstruction of the sternum, what do you mean? A: The sternal wound. To use — to not wire him back together, but to move some muscle flaps or omental flaps to reconstruct his chest wall rather than reclosing it primarily. Q: Which method do you use? MR. MEADOWS: Under what circumstance? Objection to form. I don't think</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>[1] used it. [2] MR. COTICCHIA: Do you want to go [3] back and see if you can find it? It's several [4] questions back. [5] (Brief delay.) [6] (Record repeated by Court Reporter.) [7] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Doctor, are you [8] satisfied that you used the word spike? [9] A: Yes. [10] Q: Ail right. My question to you is what is [11] a spike when we talk about a patient's temperature? [12] A: It would be a graphic representation — [13] usually it comes from the graphic representation of [14] his vital signs and if he has an abnormally high [15] temperature and that it subsequently comes down. [16] Q: Calling your attention to the graphic flow [17] records for August 26 through 29, is the spike — or [18] is the increase in temperature from 36 it looks like [19] .1 or .2 to a little over 37.5, is that a spike? [20] A: No. [21] Q: Is that an indication of a fever? [22] A: No. [23] Q: Now let's go on with your report, Doctor. [24] Your next paragraph states, I quote: [25] The drainage noted on the following day was after a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>it's complete. Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Which method do you use, Doctor? MR. MEADOWS: Under what circumstance? MR. COTICCHIA: I'm talking about this situation right here. Don't interrupt. He did not have a question about my question. You don't have to coach the witness. We're three days from trial, Bill, and I accommodated you to postpone this twice, so I appreciate your not interfering with this deposition. MR. MEADOWS: Are you done? MR. COTICCHIA: I'm done and I hope you're done. MR. MEADOWS: Are you done? Under the rules I'm obligated to tell you the basis for my objection when it is to the form of the question. MR. COTICCHIA: Then object. MR. MEADOWS: I'm obligated to tell you the basis of my objection when it is to the form of the question. Frankly, many of your questions, the</p>

Page 33

[1] way you have formed them, lead to valid objections.  
[2] I apologize that that's necessary,  
[3] but it's your fault.  
[4] Go ahead, try it again.  
[5] **THE WITNESS:** Do you want to ask the  
[6] question again?  
[7] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Under these  
[8] circumstances of a dehiscence.  
[9] A: Which circumstances, the circumstances —  
[10] Q: The one you're writing about here.  
[11] A: Okay.  
[12] Q: Have you wired a sternal dehiscence in  
[13] this manner in your experience?  
[14] A: Yes.  
[15] Q: Have you used as you said sternal flaps?  
[16] A: No, I didn't say sternal flaps. I said  
[17] reconstruct the chest wall with various kinds of  
[18] flaps, and we have done it that way too, yes.  
[19] Q: Do you do that or do you call in a plastic  
[20] surgeon to do that?  
[21] A: We have the plastic surgeons do it, but  
[22] it's usually an intraoperative decision.  
[23] Q: Is there an incidence of infection that's  
[24] tracked just for statistical purpose of whether the  
[25] wiring of a sternal dehiscence in this manner is

Page 35

patient has, then we'll do a chest wall  
reconstruction, but they're not all alternatives.  
They're applied in different  
circumstances depending upon the character of the  
wound and the character of the patient, so they're  
noncomparable.  
Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) When you said chest  
wall reconstruction, is that what Doctor Van Bergen  
did here?  
A: Doctor Van Bergen generically  
reconstructed his chest wall by closing it primarily  
as opposed to using flaps to reconstruct his chest  
wall.  
Q: All right. Now earlier you said you used  
the — let's see if we're on the same page here.  
When you say chest wall  
reconstruction, you're talking about wiring the  
sternum?  
A: Okay. No.  
You have a wound, you have to close  
it. You can close it primarily, so I won't use the  
term chest wall reconstruction anymore, you can  
close the wound primarily or you can close the wound  
using various flaps.  
Q: Okay. And I think you said if the chest

Page 34

[1] greater or less than the muscle flap you're talking  
[2] about to repair a sternal dehiscence?  
[3] A: Is your question is the incidence — if  
[4] it's not infected and you have a sterile sternal  
[5] dehiscence, if it's reconstructed by primary  
[6] rewiring versus flap reconstruction, is the  
[7] infection — is infection secondary to  
[8] reconstruction of the initial sterile dehiscence  
[9] higher with one or the other, is that the question  
[10] you're asking?  
[11] Q: Yes.  
[12] A: Then I have no idea. I have no data to  
[13] support or refute that.  
[14] Q: Which method do you use more frequently?  
[15] MR. MEADOWS: Objection.  
[16] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Which of these two  
[17] methods?  
[18] MR. MEADOWS: Vague and ambiguous.  
[19] THE WITNESS: That actually is not —  
[20] that's not an answerable question either. It's not  
[21] prolonged. If there's sufficient bone that we feel  
[22] is good bone to put the chest wall back together  
[23] then we will do that. If we do not think that the  
[24] sternum is good, and depending upon the clinical  
[25] circumstances of other associated diseases that the

Page 36

wasn't good you would use chest wall reconstruction?  
A: I probably used that and I will redefine  
that term so that there's no more confusion with it.  
Q: Well, I want to ask you a question first.  
A: Well, you asked me a question.  
MR. MEADOWS: Let him answer your  
question.  
THE WITNESS: You already asked me a  
question. You want me to not answer that question?  
Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) No, I don't want you  
answer that question.  
MR. MEADOWS: Are you withdrawing the  
question?  
MR. COTICCHIA: I'm withdrawing the  
question, yeah.  
Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) My question is when  
you say depending on if the chest wall is not  
good —  
A: That's not what I said.  
Q: What is a good and not good chest wall in  
your opinion?  
MR. MEADOWS: Objection. That's not  
what he said.  
THE WITNESS: That's not what I said,  
sir. What I said was it was the character of the

<div>Page 37</div> <div><p>[1] sternum that needed — the character of the sternal</p><p>[2] bone that needed to be reapproximated is what I</p><p>[3] said.I think I’m right on that.</p><p>[4] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA)And I still have the</p><p>[5] same question.</p><p>[6] When you said good or not good —</p><p>[7] A: So your question is what determines</p><p>[8] whether a sternum is sufficient that it could be</p><p>[9] reclosed primarily versus closed using an</p><p>[10] alternative flap technique; is that the question you</p><p>[11] want to ask me?</p><p>[12] Q: Yeah, but you used the word good, and I’ll</p><p>[13] be happy to have this capable court reporter go</p><p>[14] back. You said it’s not good and I want to know</p><p>[15] what you mean when you say it’s not good.</p><p>[16] What are the factors that you take</p><p>[17] into consideration when you determine it’s not good?</p><p>[18] A: The thickness of the sternal remnant,</p><p>[19] whether there is good marrow there, whether the</p><p>[20] wound was opened initially in the middle, whether a</p><p>[21] mammary artery was used to dissect it, whether it</p><p>[22] bleeds satisfactorily upon debridement, whether the</p><p>[23] patient has other associated diseases that would</p><p>[24] impair wound healing such as diabetes or chronic</p><p>[25] obstructive pulmonary disease, how sick the patient</p></div>	<div>Page 39</div> <div><p>[1] way, does it state that he contacted the lab; does</p><p>[2] it?</p><p>[3] A: There is testimony in Doctor Van Bergen’s</p><p>[4] deposition about his communication with the resident</p><p>[5] and calling the laboratory.</p><p>[6] Q: Who called the lab, Doctor Van Bergen or</p><p>[7] the resident?</p><p>[8] A: I would have to find it in the deposition</p><p>[9] transcript.</p><p>[10] Q: Doctor, I’m going to quote for you page 22</p><p>[11] of Doctor Mayers’ deposition, line 18.</p><p>[12] A: I haven’t got it.</p><p>[13] Q: As I recall you did not read that</p><p>[14] deposition; did you?</p><p>[15] A: Not that I remember.</p><p>[16] Q: Question: Let me rephrase the question.</p><p>[17] As a resident at Fairview Hospital, was it the</p><p>[18] practice for the lab to call either you or Doctor</p><p>[19] Van Bergen when the culture came back of this</p><p>[20] nature?</p><p>[21] Answer: I cannot answer that exactly</p><p>[22] because I do not recall how they did things back in</p><p>[23] Fairview.</p><p>[24] Then up above, line 13: My question</p><p>[25] is independent of what you saw in the culture did</p></div>
<div>Page 38</div> <div><p>[1] is, and the need for multiple operations versus one</p><p>[2] single operation.</p><p>[3] There’s a lot of things that go into</p><p>[4] it.</p><p>[5] Q: All right. Now I have another question.</p><p>[6] You talk about he recovered promptly</p><p>[7] from this surgery and it is noted in the chart that</p><p>[8] there was contact with the pathology lab in regards</p><p>[9] to the intraoperative cultures.</p><p>[10] Where in the record is there contact</p><p>[11] with the pathology lab that you made that</p><p>[12] statement — upon which you made that statement?</p><p>[13] A: It was in the progress notes that the</p><p>[14] residents wrote.</p><p>[15] Q: I think I have what you’re referring to.</p><p>[16] Hold on a second.</p><p>[17] A: It says cultures negative so far. The</p><p>[18] progress note on 8-29, 6:45 post update No. 3, it</p><p>[19] says doing well, <i>chest</i> tube dislodged yesterday,</p><p>[20] accidentally chest <del>x-ray</del> obtained without pneumo. CAT</p><p>[21] something. Something without seepage that is post</p><p>[22] doing well, will get — actually that’s arterial</p><p>[23] blood gas, cultures negative so far.</p><p>[24] Q: All right. Nowhere in that statement by</p><p>[25] the resident, whose name is Doctor Mayers by the</p></div>	<div>Page 40</div> <div><p>[1] you call the lab before you signed the discharge to</p><p>[2] get an update?</p><p>[3] Answer: That I can’t recall. I’d</p><p>[4] like to think I would have, but I don’t remember.</p><p>[5] So my question to you, Doctor, is</p><p>[6] where in the records do you base that statement?</p><p>[7] A: I base it —</p><p>[8] MR. MEADOWS: Objection; asked and</p><p>[9] answered.</p><p>[10] You can answer it again.</p><p>[11] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Independent of Doctor</p><p>[12] Van Bergen’s deposition or independent of Doctor</p><p>[13] Mayers’ deposition, where in the records does it</p><p>[14] show that there was contact with the lab, the</p><p>[15] pathology lab, in regard to the intraoperative</p><p>[16] cultures?</p><p>[17] A: If the cultures were — if he states the</p><p>[18] cultures were negative he had to get that</p><p>[19] information from the pathology laboratory. The</p><p>[20] pathology laboratory issues those statements that</p><p>[21] they’re negative. There’s no other place he can get</p><p>[22] them from. It’s not a revelation.</p><p>[23] Q: It doesn’t say where he got that</p><p>[24] information; does it?</p><p>[25] A: That’s where the information is generated,</p></div>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>[1] in the pathology laboratory. It has to be [2] communicated from the pathology laboratory. [3] Q: Right. [4] A: So if the cultures are negative from now [5] and he's checked the cultures, they're negative from [6] now, he says the cultures are negative, okay, then [7] that communication has to come through the pathology [8] laboratory. They're the ones who determine that [9] they're negative. He doesn't make it up. [10] Q: No, I'm not saying he made it up. [11] My point is that entry does not state [12] where he got that information; does it? [13] A: It doesn't matter where he got the [14] information from. The information came from the [15] pathology laboratory. Whether it was put on a [16] computer or whether he called them or whether it was [17] printed out in the chart, the information came from [18] the pathology laboratory. They do the examination. [19] Q: Right. [20] Because it comes from the pathology [21] lab doesn't mean it came directly from the lab to [22] Doctor Mayers; does it? [23] MR. MEADOWS: Objection. [24] THE WITNESS: What difference does [25] that make? That's ridiculous.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>[1] 30th. [2] THE WITNESS: I know, but that [3] particular report is — [4] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Well, that's an easy [5] question. Here, let me show you the culture. All [6] right. That's an easy question. Here. [7] In the middle of the page it says [8] August 26th, culture. Tell me what the culture [9] reading was on the date for the Serratia. [10] MR. MEADOWS: You want him to explain [11] the whole context in which that was taken. [12] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) I'm handing you what [13] was marked Exhibit 1. [14] A: I wouldn't pay any attention to that. [15] Q: I'm not asking you whether you paid [16] attention. [17] A: It's the wrong culture, sir. [18] Q: I'm asking you what the record says. [19] A: The record is uninterpretable. [20] Q: You cannot interpret it? [21] A: No. [22] Q: Okay. Thank you. [23] I went you to assume that Richard [24] Ridolfi was not discharged on August 29th, and based [25] on the culture of August 30th that says rare</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>[1] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Well, the difference [2] is this: [3] It says culture negative so far; [4] doesn't it? [5] A: Correct. [6] Q: It doesn't say final; does it? [7] A: It doesn't make any difference. The [8] cultures were three days out by then. By the time [9] he was discharged the cultures were three days out. [10] That is — anything after that would either be [11] spurious or have to be explained some other way. [12] Q: What happened the next day, what was the [13] culture the next day? [14] A: I have no idea what the culture was the [15] next day. [16] No, no, I'll answer that question [17] even better than you think I believe. [18] An inappropriate culture came back, [19] something that would be almost impossible to [20] interpret. [21] Q: He had a positive culture for rare [22] Serratia; didn't he? [23] MR. MEADOWS: The next day you're [24] asking? [25] MR. COTICCHIA: The next day, August</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>[1] Serratia, and since you can't interpret it, you [2] called in an infectious disease specialist and that [3] specialist suggests that you prescribe — I don't [4] know how to pronounce this — Piperacillin because [5] of the presence, even though it's rare, of Serratia. [6] All right. Can you assume that for [7] me for a moment? [8] A: No, sir. That is an untenable position. [9] Q: Do you agree that if that Serratia had [10] been treated with an antibiotic to which Serratia is [11] sensitive on the 30th of August, the infection would [12] not have grown and the debridement would not have [13] been necessary? [14] MR. MEADOWS: Objection to form. [15] THE WITNESS: No, I strongly disagree [16] with that. [17] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) What's your reason for [18] disagreeing? [19] A: His subsequent infection, wound infection, [20] was not due to Serratia. [21] His Serratia that was reported [22] couldn't possibly have been of clinical significance [23] from that operative culture that was taken when he [24] was rewired. It's of no significance and is [25] uninterpretable.</p>

Page 45	Page 47
<p>[1] Q: Why is it insignificant or of no [2] significance?</p> <p>[3] A: First, it was reported on the fourth [4] postoperative day <del>so</del> there must have been a [5] minuscule inoculum.</p> <p>[6] Secondly, the subsequent wound [7] infection was due to a strep that was cultured from [8] the wound. Truly a strep infection. Never had [9] Serratia cultured from the medius on the wound [10] before. Serratia, that's a laboratory growth of [11] what doesn't represent an infection. It is not the [12] clinical circumstance in which you'd find Serratia [13] grown, and, lastly, Serratia can't grow <del>in</del> an [14] anaerobic culture report because it's not an [15] anaerobe.</p> <p>[16] Q: Doctor, do you agree that the culture [17] taken by Doctor Van Bergen was a wound culture on [18] the admission of August 26th?</p> <p>[19] A: Yes.</p> <p>[20] Q: All right. You don't have any problem [21] with that?</p> <p>[22] A: It was a culture taken in the operating [23] room of the wound, yes.</p> <p>[24] Q: And do you know where it came from?</p> <p>[25] A: Yes.</p>	<p>1] contaminant; correct?</p> <p>2] A: Yes.</p> <p>3] Q: And then you go on to say: Serratia is an 4] opportunistic nosocomial infection.</p> <p>5] What do you mean by opportunistic?</p> <p>6] A: Usually occurs not as a primary invader. 7] It has to have a compromised host or the person who 8] is having the infection has to be compromised in 9] some way, and Serratia overgrows — there's an 0] overgrowth of Serratia usually <del>in</del> the absence of the 1] other microbes that are commonly present in the 2] body, normally present. You alter the microbial 3] environment, in that way Serratia would be able to 4] become an infection. In the normal microbial 5] environment of the body it can't become invasive and 6] infectious.</p> <p>7] Q: What do you mean by nosocomial?</p> <p>8] A: Hospital acquired.</p> <p>9] Q: And you say: The infection usually 0] occurring in patients having had prolonged 1] antibiotic therapy or an intensive care unit 2] setting; correct?</p> <p>al A: Yes.</p> <p>4] Q: All right. When Richard Ridolfi was 5] discharged on the 25th he was discharged following</p>
Page 46	Page 48
<p>[1] Q: You read his deposition; right?</p> <p>[2] A: Yes.</p> <p>[3] Q: He described he went below the sternum and [4] he took a swab somewhere around the pericardium; do [5] you remember that?</p> <p>[6] A: Yes.</p> <p>[7] Q: <del>So</del> he's gone deep enough to go below the [8] bone; correct?</p> <p>[9] A: Yes.</p> <p>[10] Q: All right. That culture grew rare [11] Serratia; didn't it?</p> <p>[12] A: I have no idea, sir. I don't know whether [13] that culture grew Serratia.</p> <p>[14] Q: Okay. <del>So</del> this culture which we marked [15] Exhibit 1, organism No. 1, you don't understand or [16] you can't interpret; is that it?</p> <p>[17] A: Yes.</p> <p>[18] Q: Okay. Your last sentence in the second [19] <del>last</del> paragraph, or I should <del>just</del> say second [20] paragraph: The <del>fact</del> that later on Serratia was [21] grown from that, when you say "that," I assume [22] you're saying that culture. What do you mean by [23] "that?"</p> <p>[24] A: Yes.</p> <p>[25] Q: Okay. You say: I feel reflects a</p>	<p>[1] bypass surgery; correct?</p> <p>[2] A: Yes.</p> <p>[3] Q: He was in the intensive care unit, I [4] believe it was cardiac intensive care; correct?</p> <p>[5] MR. MEADOWS: At what point?</p> <p>[6] MR. COTICCHIA: His initial surgery.</p> <p>[7] MR. MEADOWS: Up until his discharge [8] you're asking?</p> <p>[9] MR. COTICCHIA: Yeah.</p> <p>[10] THE WITNESS: I don't think he was [11] discharged from the ward, not from the intensive [12] care unit.</p> <p>[13] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) When he left the [14] surgery room where did they place him?</p> <p>[15] A: That's not the question you asked. Are [16] you asking when he went home or —</p> <p>[17] Q: No, I said — you said intensive care.</p> <p>[18] A: Okay. Time out. ?</p> <p>[19] He was in the intensive care unit [20] during the hospitalization for his coronary [21] revascularization, okay. He wasn't discharged from [22] there. He was in it before he went home, yes, in [23] some bizarre <del>link</del> of nature, but he was only in it [24] for a short period of time. He was only in the [25] hospital for a short period of time. His intensive</p>

Page 49

[1] care unit —  
[2] Q: Wait a minute.  
[3] A: That's the question you asked me.  
[4] Q: I have a separate question. You just  
[5] answered my question.  
[6] I want to know following his coronary  
[7] artery bypass graft surgery was he in intensive  
[8] care?  
[9] MR. MEADOWS: Ever?  
[10] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) Do you understand the  
[11] question, on that admission?  
[12] A: Was he ever in the intensive care unit?  
[13] Q: Yes.  
[14] A: Yes.  
[15] Q: Okay. So he fits that category?  
[16] A: No, he does not in any way, shape or form.  
[17] Q: Okay. I got another question.  
[18] MR. MEADOWS: You can try to trick  
[19] witnesses and play your word games. It's not going  
[20] to work.  
[21] MR. COTICCHIA: He's too smart. I  
[22] can't trick him. He knows more about medicine than  
[23] me.  
[24] MR. MEADOWS: I'd appreciate it if  
[25] you didn't try.

Page 51

MR. MEADOWS: I move to strike.  
THE WITNESS: He was given  
prophylactic antibiotics appropriate for the  
coronary revascularization which is the antithesis  
of prolonged antibiotic therapy.  
Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) And I assume at some  
point you agree that Mr. Ridolfi in fact had a  
Serratia infection?  
A: No.  
Q: He never had a Serratia infection?  
A: Not of his sternal wound, no.  
Q: No?  
A: No.  
Q: Did he have a Serratia infection?  
A: He had Serratia cultured. The primary  
source of the Serratia, I do not know where that was  
from, on a subsequent admission, not these two, but  
his wound was never infected, the surgical wound,  
the sternal wound was never infected with Serratia.  
Q: Did you review x-rays of Richard Ridolfi  
in regard to any of these admissions?  
A: No, sir.  
Q: Do you know any of the doctors who treated  
Richard Ridolfi in this case?  
A: No, sir.

Page 50

[1] MR. COTICCHIA: I'm not even trying.  
[2] I'm trying to find out what he means by intensive  
[3] care unit setting.  
[4] MR. MEADOWS: No, you're not.  
[5] THE WITNESS: The word is prolonged.  
[6] The adjective goes with both of them, okay.  
[7] Q: (BY MR. COTICCHIA) What's the purpose  
[8] of —  
[9] A: Well, that's the purpose of it; otherwise,  
[10] we're going to sit here screwing around for hours  
[11] doing diddly squat.  
[12] You want to get discovery, you want  
[13] to get information, or do you want to play games?  
[14] Q: Was he given antibiotic therapy?  
[15] A: Not prolonged antibiotic therapy. My  
[16] statement holds. This patient did not receive  
[17] either prolonged —  
[18] Q: Wait. My question is — let me put it  
[19] this way.  
[20] Just like you have disagreements  
[21] about high and low, some people who are experts may  
[22] have disagreements about what's prolonged and what's  
[23] not or whether even prolonged is necessary.  
[24] My question is real simple. Was he  
[25] given antibiotics in his first admission?

Page 52

Q: Do you know Robert Van Bergen?  
A: He was one of the doctors. No, sir, I  
just said that.  
Q: Do you know of him?  
A: No, I never heard of him before this.  
Q: How were you contacted to review this  
case?  
A: Mr. Meadows called me.  
Q: When he called you did he describe the  
case to you?  
A: I have no independent recollection of what  
the initial conversation was.  
Q: How were the records transported to you;  
mail, FedEx, UPS?  
A: I don't know, sir.  
Q: Was there a cover letter?  
A: I suspect there was. I don't remember it.  
Q: Did you remove any letters or  
correspondence before today's deposition?  
A: No.  
Q: I don't see any cover letter there.  
A: I did not remove any before today's  
deposition.  
Q: Where is the cover letter, sir?  
A: I have no idea. I wouldn't keep the cover

<div>Page 53</div> <div><p>[1] letter. The cover letter generically usually states</p><p>[2] that, you know, enclosed is such.</p><p>[3] Q: So you would have not kept it?</p><p>[4] A: Yes.</p><p>[5] Q: That means you would throw it away?</p><p>[6] A: Yes.</p><p>[7] Q: Is there any other correspondence that is</p><p>[8] not with these records that you're aware of?</p><p>[9] A: No, sir.</p><p>[10] I probably sent him a bill. I don't</p><p>[11] keep a record of those, but I probably sent him a</p><p>[12] bill.</p><p>[13] Q: Did Mr. Meadows or anybody from Reminger</p><p>[14] and Reminger send you any kind of correspondence;</p><p>[15] enclosed is a deposition transcript, there are</p><p>[16] questions here we'd like you to review, anything</p><p>[17] like that?</p><p>[18] A: It wasn't led that way. The first part of</p><p>[19] the letters, we usually like that: Enclosed, please</p><p>[20] find deposition transcripts.</p><p>[21] Q: Where are those letters?</p><p>[22] A: That's the same as the letters of these.</p><p>[23] I threw them out.</p><p>[24] Q: Why did you throw them out?</p><p>[25] A: I have no reason to keep them.</p></div>	<div>Page 55</div> <div><p>A. No, sir, I do not remember.</p><p>Q: How did Mr. Meadows get your name?</p><p>A: I have no idea. You'd have to ask Mr.</p><p>Meadows.</p><p>Q: What percentage of your time do you spend</p><p>in the clinical practice of medicine?</p><p>A: About 98.</p><p>Q: How many cases in the last five years,</p><p>medical malpractice cases, have you reviewed?</p><p>A: 50 to 75.</p><p>Q: So that would be approximately 10 to 15</p><p>cases per year?</p><p>A: Yes, sir.</p><p>Q: On the basis of a hundred percent, have</p><p>you reviewed cases — on the basis of a hundred</p><p>percent, what percentage have you reviewed cases for</p><p>the patient/plaintiff?</p><p>A: Probably less than 10 percent.</p><p>Q: How much are you charging for your time</p><p>today in this deposition?</p><p>A: \$500 an hour.</p><p>Q: When you reviewed the records for this</p><p>case that were sent to you by Mr. Meadows did you</p><p>charge \$500 per hour?</p><p>A: No, I charged 5350 an hour because I</p></div>
<div>Page 54</div> <div><p>[1] Q: Were you instructed by Mr. Meadows to</p><p>[2] throw them out?</p><p>[3] A: No, sir.</p><p>[4] Q: Have you reviewed cases for any other</p><p>[5] attorneys in the office of Reminger and Reminger?</p><p>[6] A: I believe I have.</p><p>[7] Q: Who are the other attorneys?</p><p>[8] A: I don't remember their names, sir.</p><p>[9] Q: Are you related to any lawyers at Reminger</p><p>[10] and Reminger either by marriage or by blood?</p><p>[11] A: No, sir.</p><p>[12] Q: Is your wife related to any attorneys at</p><p>[13] Reminger and Reminger, either by marriage or by</p><p>[14] blood?</p><p>[15] A: No, sir.</p><p>[16] Q: When you say you don't remember who the</p><p>[17] other lawyers were, are you currently reviewing any</p><p>[18] other cases for attorneys at Reminger and Reminger?</p><p>[19] A: I believe there's another case that I'm</p><p>[20] reviewing for them</p><p>[21] Q: For who, for Mr. Meadows?</p><p>[22] A: No, not for Mr. Meadows.</p><p>[23] Q: Do you remember who the other lawyer is?</p><p>[24] A: No, sir.</p><p>[25] Q: You don't remember the name of the lawyer?</p></div>	<div>Page 56</div> <div><p>changed in January of this year. I had the same</p><p>amount for 10 years.</p><p>Q: When Mr. Meadows was sitting here with you</p><p>before we started the deposition, and I'm not going</p><p>to ask you what was talked about, but I'm assuming</p><p>you discussed this case; correct?</p><p>A: Yes.</p><p>Q: Do you charge Mr. Meadows \$500 an hour?</p><p>A: Yes.</p><p>MR. COTICCHIA: Okay. This can be</p><p>off the record.</p><p>(Discussion held off the record.)</p><p>MR. COTICCHIA: I don't have any more</p><p>questions.</p><p>Ms. Kizy, I would like a copy of this</p><p>quickly, rush, whatever you want to call it, and I</p><p>don't care whether you waive signature or not.</p><p>MR. MEADOWS: We'll have him read it.</p><p>(Deposition concluded at about</p><p>2:20 p.m.)</p></div>

Page 57

[1]  
[2]  
[3] SIGNATURE PAGE  
[4]  
[5]  
[6]  
[7]  
[8]  
[9] NORMAN A. SILVERMAN, M.D.  
[10]  
[11]  
[12] DATE  
[13]  
[14]  
[15]  
[16]  
[17]  
[18]  
[19]  
[20]  
[21]  
[22]  
[23]  
[24]  
[25]

Page 58

[1] State of Michigan)  
[2] County of Oakland)  
[3] Certificate of Notary Public  
[4] I do hereby certify that the witness, whose  
[5] attached testimony was taken in the above-entitled  
[6] matter, was first duly sworn to tell the truth; the  
[7] testimony contained herein was reduced to writing in  
[8] the presence of the witness by means of stenography;  
[9] afterwards transcribed; and is a true and complete  
[10] transcript of the testimony given by the witness.  
[11] I further certify that I am not connected  
[12] by blood or marriage with any of the parties; their  
[13] attorneys or agents; and that I am not interested,  
[14] directly or indirectly, in the matter of  
[15] controversy.  
[16] In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my  
[17] hand at Beverly Hills, Michigan, County of Oakland,  
[18] State of Michigan.  
[19]  
[20]  
[21] Denise M. Kizy, RPWCSR-2466  
[22] Registered Professional Reporter  
[23] Certified Shorthand Reporter  
[24] Notary Public, Oakland, Michigan  
[25] My Commission Expires: 7-28-03



<b>\$</b>	37.6 23:22; 24:22	address 4:21, 24	29:15, 16; 30:17; 42:25; 43:8, 24, 25; 44:11; 45:18	49:18; 56:10
	<b>4</b>	adjective 50:6	43:8, 24, 25; 44:11; 45:18	capable 37:13
\$350 55:25 \$500 55:21, 24; 56:8	4 6:20 4,000 10:4 48202 4:23 48230 5:1 4th 6:18	admission 22:21; 24:4; 45:18; 49:11; 50:25; 51:17	average 15:12	cardboard 17:15
<b>1</b>		admissions 6:14; 51:21	aware 53:8	cardiac 5:3; 10:2; 19:20; 21:8; 22:2, 10; 48:4
1 5:14, 16, 18; 29:5; 30:19; 43:13; 46:15, 15 10 55:11, 18; 56:2 100 25:14 114:25 12,000 19:16, 18; 20:3 12.6 20:15, 17 1339:24 15 55:11 1839:11 194:2 1980 9:18 1989 5:25 1995 20:13 1999 8:19 19th 6:5 1:10 4:3		afebrile 19:7	away 53:5	cardiothoracic 22:7; 25:17; 26:4
	<b>5</b>	again 8:5; 11:17; 12:1, 7; 17:21; 28:10; 33:4, 6; 40:10	<b>B</b>	care 15:22; 16:1, 2, 6, 12; 47:21; 48:3, 4, 12, 17, 19; 49:1, 8, 12; 50:3; 56:17
		agitation 12:22	back 14:5; 19:17; 23:5; 24:3; 29:25; 30:3, 4; 31:4, 19:34:22; 37:14; 39:19, 22; 42:18	case 6:9; 51:24; 52:7, 10; 54:19; 55:23; 56:6
		agree 8:6; 23:13, 17; 25:13, 14; 44:9; 45:16; 51:7	base 40:6, 7	cases 54:4, 18; 55:8, 9, 12, 15, 16
		agreement 4:13	based 8:12; 43:24	CAT 38:20
		ahead 27:1; 28:19; 33:4	bases 14:18	category 49:15
		almost 42:19	basically 25:19	caveat 22:11
		alter 47:12	basis 16:3; 32:19, 23; 55:14, 15	cell 11:15, 23
		alternative 31:5, 8, 12; 37:10	become 47:14, 15	Centigrade 23:15
		alternatives 35:2	below 29:2; 46:3, 7	certification 5:8; 9:8
		always 10:24	Bennett 7:16	certified 5:4, 6; 9:10, 15, 23; 10:6
		ambiguous 34:18	Bergen 6:16; 8:12; 19:3; 35:8, 10; 39:6, 19; 45:17; 52:1	changed 56:1
		amount 56:2	Bergen's 39:3; 40:12	character 35:4, 5; 36:25; 37:1
		anaerobe 45:15	better 27:8; 42:17	charge 55:24; 56:8
		anaerobic 45:14	Bill 32:10; 53:10, 12	charged 55:25
		answerable 34:20	bit 15:13	charging 55:19
		answered 12:12; 40:9; 49:5	bizarre 48:23	chart 19:6; 23:14; 26:1; 38:7; 41:17
		antibiotic 44:10; 47:21; 50:14, 15; 51:5	bleeds 37:22	charts 27:23
		antibiotics 50:25; 51:3	blood 21:25; 38:23; 54:10, 14	checked 41:5
		antithesis 51:4	board 5:4, 6, 8; 9:8, 15; 10:6	chest 31:20; 33:17; 34:22; 35:1, 7, 11, 12, 16, 22, 25; 36:1, 17, 20; 38:19, 20
		anymore 35:22	boards 9:19, 20, 20, 22	chronic 37:24
		apologize 23:1; 33:2	body 47:12, 15	circle 25:1, 2
		applied 35:3	bone 34:21, 22; 37:2; 46:8	circumstance 11:9; 21:14; 31:24; 32:5; 45:12
		appreciate 32:12; 49:24	Bonita 7:13	circumstances 11:18; 14:10, 12; 21:5; 33:8, 9, 9; 34:25; 35:4
		appropriate 8:18; 21:7; 22:16, 17; 51:3	Boulevard 4:23	clarify 20:7
		approximately 10:4; 28:14; 55:11	Brief 30:5	clinical 11:18; 14:10, 11, 22, 24; 34:24; 44:22; 45:12; 55:6
		area 5:6; 10:15, 20	BUN 27:18	clinically 14:13
		Arnold 6:17	bypass 7:23; 8:7; 9:2; 10:12; 13:21; 14:1; 24:5; 48:1; 49:7	close 13:21; 35:20, 21, 23, 23
		around 19:15; 46:4; 50:10	<b>C</b>	closed 22:14; 37:9
		arterial 38:22	C 4:25; 7:7	closing 35:11
		artery 7:22; 8:7; 9:2; 10:12; 13:1, 9, 20; 14:1; 15:6; 37:21; 49:7	CABG 8:14, 15; 12:11	closure 12:16
		ascertain 25:12	call 13:5; 33:19; 39:18; 40:1; 56:16	coach 32:9
		aspects 14:18	called 4:7; 39:6; 41:16; 44:2; 52:8, 9	collectively 11:20
		assessment 21:25	Calling 30:16; 39:5	commonly 47:11
		associated 10:24; 15:2; 34:25; 37:23	came 17:10; 39:19; 41:14, 17, 21; 42:18; 45:24	communicated 41:2
		association 10:22	can 7:2; 9:19; 10:20, 23, 25; 11:6, 16; 12:3, 8; 20:7, 16; 22:5, 6; 25:13; 26:25; 27:1; 28:19; 30:3; 35:21, 22, 21; 40:10, 21; 44:6;	communication 39:4; 41:7
		assume 22:5, 6; 43:23; 44:6; 46:21; 51:6		comparable 29:19
		Assuming 11:21; 56:5		complete 32:1
		attending 9:5; 10:1		completely 22:8
		attention 30:16; 43:14, 16		compromised 47:7, 8
		attorneys 54:5, 7, 12, 18		
		August 20:13; 22:4; 23:2, 8, 9, 21; 24:5, 6, 15, 16;		
	<b>A</b>			
	able 47:13			
	abnormal 21:11, 23			
	abnormally 30:14			
	above 24:25; 26:12, 13; 39:24			
	absence 47:10			
	absolutely 12:19			
	acceptable 31:5, 9, 10			
	accidentally 38:20			
	accommodated 32:11			
	acquired 47:18			
	actually 25:11; 29:4; 34:19; 38:22			
	add 6:4; 22:11			
<b>2</b>				
2 30:19 20 24:6 2000 4:2 21 8:19 22 39:10 23rd 20:15, 17; 22:4 24 24:15 24th 22:15; 24:16, 17, 19; 26:7, 23; 28:13; 29:14, 15 25 24:6 25th 20:12; 22:15; 24:16; 25:21; 26:2, 7, 9, 11, 23; 28:1, 13; 29:14, 15; 47:25 26 30:17 26th 22:22; 23:9; 43:8; 45:18 2799 4:22 28th 26:18, 22; 28:15; 29:3, 16 29 30:17 29th 23:9, 9, 21; 26:19, 22; 28:15; 29:16; 43:24 2:20 56:20				
<b>3</b>				
3 38:18 30th 43:1, 25; 44:11 36 29:4; 30:18 37 23:15; 26:12; 29:2, 6 37.1 26:2 37.2 29:5 37.5 30:19				

<p>computer 41:16  concept 13:14  concern 25:17  concluded 56:19  confusion 36:3  consider 21:24; 26:13  consideration 11:10; 26:6; 37:17  contact 38:8, 10; 40:14  contacted 39:1; 52:6  contaminant 47:1  context 29:25; 43:11  contract 13:1; 15:6  convalescence 27:15, 16  conversation 52:12  copy 8:19, 21; 15:15; 23:8; 56:15  corners 17:11  coronary 7:22; 8:7; 9:2; 10:12; 12:25; 13:9, 20, 25; 15:6; 48:20; 49:6; 51:4  correctly 6:4  correspondence 52:19; 53:7, 14  COTICCHIA 4:11, 17; 8:4; 10:4; 12:5; 14:4, 11; 20:5, 9; 21:17; 23:1, 2; 24:9, 12, 19, 24; 26:3, 22; 27:5; 28:9, 12; 29:9; 302, 7; 32:2, 6, 15, 21; 33:7; 34:16; 35:7; 36:10, 14, 16; 37:4; 40:11; 42:1, 25; 43:4, 12; 44:17; 48:6, 9, 13; 49:10, 21; 50:1, 7; 51:6; 56:10, 13  coughing 31:1  count 11:15, 23; 15:4; 19:8, 13, 15, 17; 20:2, 10, 11, 14; 21:9, 22, 25; 22:1, 1  couple 19:2  Court 14:6; 30:6; 37:13  cover 52:16, 21, 24, 25; 53:1  creatinine 27:19  credence 11:14  credulity 11:3  culture 13:10, 13, 22, 25; 14:12, 16; 39:19, 25; 42:3, 13, 14, 18, 21; 43:5, 8, 8, 17, 25; 44:23; 45:14, 16, 17, 22; 46:10, 13, 14, 22  cultured 45:7, 9; 51:15  cultures 38:9, 17, 23; 40:16, 17, 18; 41:4, 5, 6; 42:8, 9  culturing 13:14  currently 54:17  curriculum 5:11, 21  curve 27:13</p>	<p><b>D</b></p> <p>data 28:22, 23; 29:13, 17, 18; 34:12  date 43:9  day 11:5; 12:17, 21; 19:24; 20:1; 30:25; 42:12, 13, 15, 23, 25; 45:4  days 19:8, 18; 26:17; 29:16; 32:10; 42:8, 9  deal 31:13  dealing 31:10  debridement 37:22; 44:12  December 6 5  decision 33:22  deep 46:7  degree 12:20  dehisced 12:8, 16; 15:1  dehiscence 12:5, 13; 26:18; 31:7, 13; 33:8, 12, 25; 34:2, 5, 8  delay 30:5  depending 34:12; 35:4; 36:17  depends 19:23  deposition 4:12, 13; 5:13, 15; 6:25; 7:3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18; 32:13; 39:4, 8, 11, 14; 40:12, 13; 46:1; 52:19, 23; 53:15, 20; 55:20; 56:4, 19  depositions 6:16; 19:2  describe 52:9  described 46:3  deserves 21:10  desk 17:25; 18:1  determine 11:12; 37:17; 41:8  determines 37:7  Detroit 4:1, 23  diabetes 37:24  diagnose 25:18  diagnostic 11:3; 12:4  discriminator 11:8  Dictaphone 17:6  dictated 17:1, 5  dictator 17:23; 18:20  diddysquat 50:11  difference 41:24; 42:1, 7  different 35:3  difficult 25:11  directly 41:21  disagree 44:15  disagreeing 20:24; 44:18  disagreements 50:20, 22  discharge 12:10; 13:8, 16, 19; 19:9, 15, 18; 25:20; 27:25; 28:15; 29:4; 40:1; 48:7</p>	<p>discharged 19:25; 20:12; 21:23; 22:2, 9; 25:20; 26:17; 42:9; 43:24; 47:25, 25; 48:11, 21  discovery 50:12  discussed 56:6  Discussion 56:12  disease 13:6; 37:25; 44:2  diseases 34:25; 37:23  dislodged 38:19  disregard 21:10, 12  disrupted 15:1  dissect 37:21  distorting 17:14  Doctor 4:12, 18; 5:17; 6:16, 17; 7:1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 19, 21; 8:12; 13:6; 15:13; 23:13; 27:9; 30:7, 23; 32:3; 35:8, 10; 38:25; 39:3, 6, 10, 11, 18; 40:5, 11, 12; 41:22; 45:16, 17  doctors 51:23; 52:2  done 8:17; 9:9; 13:24; 19:1; 32:14, 15, 16, 17; 33:18  dot 25:2, 4  down 30:15  drainage 10:18, 20; 11:22; 19:7; 30:25  draining 15:2  dry 19:7  due 44:20; 45:7  duly 4:8  during 13:25; 14:8, 8; 20:11; 48:20</p>	<p>exactly 39:21  <b>EXAMINATION</b> 4:16; 14:22; 41:18  examined 4:9  excluded 29:1  Exhibit 5:13, 16, 18; 43:13; 46:15  existence 11:21  experience 9:1; 33:13  experts 50:21  explain 43:10  explained 42:11  exploring 14:16</p> <p><b>F</b></p> <p>fact 22:13; 46:20; 51:7  factors 14:20; 37:16  faculty 10:1  Fahrenheit 23:15, 24; 25:6  fair 10:8  Fairview 6:14, 23; 8:13; 15:22; 20:25; 39:17, 23  far 38:17, 23; 42:3  fault 33:3  FedEx 52:14  feel 21:9; 34:21; 46:25  felt 31:6  fever 11:4, 7, 13; 15:3; 24:1; 26:10, 11, 13, 14; 30:21  few 8:25; 9:9; 19:18  file 22:14  final 42:6  find 17:20; 30:3; 39:8; 45:12; 50:2; 53:20  finding 26:12  finished 9:11, 12, 18  first 4:8; 9:10; 16:15; 19:5; 27:15, 21; 36:4; 45:3; 50:25; 53:18  <b>fits</b> 49:15  five 29:17; 55:8  flag 24:22  flap 31:14, 16; 34:1, 6; 37:110  flaps 31:19, 20; 33:15, 16, 18; 35:12, 24  <b>flow</b> 23:8; 24:4; 30:16  fold 17:11  following 12:10; 13:9, 25; 14:9; 15:5; 21:20, 21; 26:18; 27:13; 30:25; 47:25; 49:6  <b>follows</b> 4:10  Ford 4:22  form 8:2; 11:25; 26:20, 24; 27:8; 28:18, 21; 31:5, 9, 25; 32:20, 23; 44:14; 49:16  formed 33:1  Four 9:4, 12, 22; 29:17</p>	<p>fourth 11:5; 12:17, 21; 19:24, 25; 45:3  fragments 31:4  Frankly 32:25  frequently 34:14  front 15:15, 19; 16:1  <b>full</b> 4:18</p> <p><b>G</b></p> <p>games 49:19; 50:13  Gary 6:17  gas 38:23  general 5:7; 6:13, 15; 8:25; 9:19  generally 10:5  generated 40:25  generically 35:10; 53:1  given 50:14, 25; 51:2  goes 50:6  good 34:22, 24; 36:1, 18, 20, 20; 37:6, 6, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19  Gopal 6:17  grade 10:25; 11:4, 13, 22; 24:1; 26:14  graft 7:23; 8:8, 12; 13:21; 49:7  grafts 9:2  Grand 4:22  graphic 23:7, 8, 10; 24:3; 30:12, 13, 16  graphics 24:8, 10  greater 34:1  grew 46:10, 13  Grosse 4:25  group 21:4  grouping 21:7  grow 45:13  grown 44:12; 45:13; 46:21  growth 45:10  guarantee 16:24  guess 26:1</p> <p><b>H</b></p> <p><b>H</b> 7:7, 13, 13; 20:20; 21:1, 3, 10; 22:4  half 15:9, 10, 11  hand 5:17  hanging 43:12  happened 42:12  happy 37:13  head 17:2  healing 12:20; 37:24  heard 52:5  heart 25:1  held 56:12  helpful 11:13  hematocrit 21:22</p>

<p>hematology 20:14, 25; 21:17; 22:4, 14 hemoglobin 21:20, 22 Henry 4:22 herein 4:7 high 11:15, 23; 15:3; 20:22; 22:5; 30:14; 50:21 higher 25:5; 34:9 Hold 38:16 holds 50:16 home 15:22, 25; 16:1, 2, 6, 12; 18:2; 48:16, 22 home-going 15:18, 21 hope 32:15 Hospital 4:22; 6:13, 14, 15, 23; 8:13; 20:1, 25; 31:1; 39:17; 47:18; 48:25 hospitalization 6:13; 20:12; 48:20 hospitalizations 6:12 host 47:7 hour 55:21, 24, 25; 56:8 hours 50:10 hundred 55:14, 15</p>	<p>information 40:19, 24, 25; 41:12, 14, 14, 17; 50:13 initial 6:13; 34:8; 48:6; 52:12 initially 37:20 inoculum 45:5 inserting 17:14 insignificant 45:1 instructed 54:1 intensive 47:21; 48:3, 4, 11, 17, 19, 25; 49:7, 12; 50:2 interfering 32:12 interpret 42:20; 43:20; 44:1; 46:16 interrupt 32:8 intervention 31:2 into 11:10; 37:17; 38:3 intraoperative 33:22; 38:9; 40:15 intraoperatively 14:15 invader 47:6 invasive 47:15 involve 10:13 isolation 11:18; 12:2, 7 issue 7:21, 25; 8:1, 6 issues 40:20</p>	<p>lawyer 54:23, 25 lawyers 54:9, 17 lead 33:1 led 53:18 left 27:21, 23; 48:13 legal 8:1 Lerner 7:19 less 15:9, 11; 34:1; 55:18 letter 8:19, 24; 16:4, 16, 19, 22; 52:16, 21, 24; 53:1, 1 letters 21:13; 52:18; 53:19, 21, 22 level 23:18 levels 14:16; 25:20 Levy 7:4 licensed 5:23; 6:1 likely 25:15 line 23:14, 14; 39:11, 24 link 48:23 little 11:3; 15:13; 22:11; 24:22; 30:19 look 14:24; 24:7, 9; 27:23 looked 19:1; 25:25 looks 23:22; 24:21, 24; 30:18 lot 38:3 low 10:25; 11:4, 13, 22; 22:6; 24:1; 26:13; 50:21 Ls 21:20, 23</p>	<p>9:24; 11:25; 20:4; 21:16; 22:24; 24:7, 16, 20; 25:23; 26:20, 24; 28:7, 18; 31:23; 32:4, 14, 17, 22; 34:15, 18; 36:6, 12, 22; 40:8; 41:23; 42:23; 43:10; 44:14; 48:5, 7; 49:9, 18, 24; 50:4; 51:1; 52:8; 53:13; 54:1, 21, 22; 55:2, 4, 23; 56:3, 8, 18 mean 15:20; 22:5, 6, 25; 26:21; 31:8, 17; 37:15; 41:21; 46:22; 47:5, 17 meaningless 11:19; 21:3 means 12:15; 20:22; 50:2; 53:5 medical 55:9 medicine 5:24; 6:1; 49:22; 55:6 medius 45:9 mention 13:16; 29:6 method 31:22; 32:2; 34:14 methods 34:17 Michigan 4:1; 5:1, 24 microbes 47:11 microbial 47:12, 14 middle 37:20; 43:7 minuscule 45:5 minute 49:2 Mohoney 7:10 moment 44:7 more 18:24; 28:20; 34:14; 36:3; 49:22; 56:13 morning 23:21; 26:2 Most 25:15 Mostly 15:1 move 31:19; 51:1 Mrs 6:16 much 11:14; 55:19 multiple 38:1 muscle 31:19; 34:1 must 45:4</p>	<p>nondescript 11:2 normal 23:17; 27:12; 29:2, 19; 47:14 normally 47:12 NORMAN 4:6, 12, 20 Noskin 6:17; 19:3 nosocomial 47:4, 17 notarization 20:13 notation 17:17 notations 21:12 note 16:23; 18:7; 38:18 noted 30:25; 38:7 notes 16:11, 14, 15; 17:19, 24; 18:25; 19:6; 38:13 Nowhere 38:24 numerous 6:15; 14:20</p>
<p><b>I</b></p> <p>idea 34:12; 42:14; 46:12; 52:25; 55:3 identification 5:15 ignored 29:6 Illinois 10:2 impair 37:24 implies 13:14 impossible 42:19 inappropriate 8:11; 22:11; 42:18 inappropriately 19:9, 11 incidence 33:23; 34:3 incision 10:16, 19, 20; 11:22 incisional 12:17 increase 30:18 independent 16:17; 18:18; 39:25; 40:11, 12; 52:11 indicate 25:9 indicated 23:13 indication 28:17; 30:21 indications 22:4, 5 indicator 12:19 individually 21:21 infected 12:8, 9; 27:21, 22; 34:4; 51:18, 19 infection 10:13, 18, 21; 11:1, 9, 12, 16, 24; 12:4, 6, 22; 13:2, 5; 14:14, 19, 21; 15:7; 25:18; 26:5; 28:17; 33:23; 34:7, 7; 44:11, 19, 19; 45:7, 8, 11; 47:4, 8, 14, 19; 51:8, 10, 14 infectious 13:6; 44:2; 47:16</p>	<p><b>J</b></p> <p>January 56:1 John 7:16 judgments 16:9 jury 8:1</p>	<p><b>M</b></p> <p>M 4:20, 25 M.D 4:6 M.T 7:16 mail 52:14 major 21:8 making 16:23 malpractice 55:9 mammary 37:21 manner 8:18; 33:13, 25 many 9:2; 10:3, 22; 18:14, 14; 32:25; 55:8 mark 5:13; 17:19; 18:9 Marked 5:15, 18; 15:4; 43:13; 46:14 markers 17:14 Markowitz 6:17; 19:3 marks 17:13 marriage 54:10, 13 marrow 37:19 material 15:2 matter 8:1; 22:13; 26:8; 41:13 may 8:4, 19; 12:3, 8; 15:25; 50:21 Maybe 9:17; 15:10, 10; 26:1 Mayers 7:1; 38:25; 39:11; 40:13; 41:22 MEADOWS 4:15; 7:24;</p>	<p><b>N</b></p> <p>N 4:20 name 4:18, 19; 27:11, 18; 38:25; 54:25; 55:2 names 54:8 nature 39:20; 48:23 near 18:2 necessarily 10:24; 12:23; 24:2 necessary 33:2; 44:13; 50:23 need 38:1 needed 37:1, 2 negative 38:17, 23; 40:18, 21; 41:4, 5, 6, 9; 42:3 next 23:14; 30:24; 42:12, 13, 15, 23, 25 noncomparable 35:6</p>	<p><b>O</b></p> <p>O 4:25 object 8:2; 32:21 Objection 7:24; 11:25; 25:24; 26:20, 24; 28:18, 21; 31:25; 32:19, 23; 34:15; 36:22; 40:8; 41:23; 44:14 objections 33:1 obligated 32:18, 22 obstructive 37:25 obtained 38:20 occasion 12:24; 13:4, 8 occupation 5:2 occurring 47:20 occurs 47:6 off 17:1; 56:11, 12 office 4:21; 54:5 often 12:9 omental 31:20 once 18:16, 24 one 5:8; 10:17; 15:9, 10, 11; 24:23, 25; 25:1, 1, 2, 2; 29:3, 16; 31:10; 33:10; 34:9; 38:1; 52:2 ones 41:8 only 17:9; 48:23, 24 open 13:15, 17 opened 37:20 operating 14:14; 45:22 operation 8:17; 38:2 operations 38:1 operative 18:25; 31:2; 44:23 opinion 16:3; 21:4, 11; 22:6; 36:21 opportunistic 47:4, 5 opposed 35:12 oral 18:19 organism 46:15 otherwise 50:9 out 9:11; 25:18; 26:5; 41:17; 42:8, 9; 48:18; 50:2;</p>

53:23, 24; 54:2 outline 16:25 over 10:9; 17:11; 30:19 overgrows 47:9 overgrowth 47:10	point 41:11; 48:5; 51:7 Pointe 5:1 points 28:22, 23; 29:11, 13, 18, 18 portable 17:23; 18:20 position 44:8 positive 42:21 possibly 44:22 post 38:18, 21 postoperative 12:18, 21; 20:1; 45:4 postoperatively 11:5; 19:24; 21:24 postpone 32:11 practice 5:23; 6:1; 39:18; 55:6 prepare 16:1j prepared 16:21 prescribe 44:3 presence 11:12; 44:5 present 28:21; 47:11, 12 presenting 10:23 previous 24:4 primarily 31:21; 35:11, 21, 23; 37:9 primary 9:5; 34:5; 47:6; 51:15 printed 41:17 prior 13:18, 19; 19:8, 18 probably 9:22; 15:8, 9; 18:16, 16; 36:2; 53:10, 11; 55:18 problem 31:11; 45:20 progress 38:13, 18 prolonged 34:21; 47:20; 50:5, 15, 17, 22, 23; 51:5 prompt 31:2 promptly 38:6 pronounce 44:4 prophylactic 51:3 pulmonary 37:25 purpose 21:2, 3; 33:24; 50:7, 9 purposely 28:25 pursuant 4:13 purulent 15:2 put 11:14; 17:3; 21:1; 34:22; 41:15; 50:18 putting 17:15	Ralph 7:7 range 21:5; 28:16 rare 42:21; 43:25; 44:5; 46:10 rather 31:20 read 14:4; 18:1, 1, 5, 13, 14, 15; 19:4; 29:24; 39:13; 46:1; 56:18 reading 16:22; 17:22; 18:24; 43:9 readings 24:23, 25; 26:16 real 50:24 really 27:3 reapproximated 37:2 reason 21:13; 44:17; 53:25 recall 18:23; 22:13; 39:13, 22; 40:3 receive 50:16 recent 19:19; 21:8 reclosed 37:9 reclosing 31:21 recognize 5:19 recollection 16:5; 52:11 reconstruct 31:3, 20; 33:17; 35:12 reconstructed 34:5; 35:11 reconstruction 31:14, 16; 34:6, 8; 35:2, 8, 17, 22; 36:1 record 6:18, 22; 14:6; 15:21; 16:1; 17:22; 30:6; 38:10; 43:18, 19; 53:11; 56:11, 12 records 6:7, 11; 8:13; 15:18, 22, 25; 16:3, 6, 12, 22; 17:7, 12, 17; 18:5, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 23; 23:4; 24:4; 30:17; 40:6, 13; 52:13; 53:8; 55:22 recovered 38:6 redefine 36:2 redness 15:3 refer 8:15; 23:4; 25:4 referred 8:14, 16, 16 referring 28:4; 29:22; 38:15 reflects 46:25 refute 34:13 regard 7:21; 16:11; 22:3; 40:15; 51:21 regarding 6:7; 8:7; 16:15; 29:21 regards 38:8 related 54:9, 12 relative 19:14 relevant 22:7 remember 7:2, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20; 29:24; 39:15; 40:4; 46:5; 52:17; 54:8, 16, 23, 25; 55:1 Reminger 53:13, 14;	54:5, 5, 9, 10, 13, 13, 18, 18 remnant 37:18 remove 52:18, 22 repair 34:2 repeat 13:18 repeated 14:6; 30:6 rephrase 39:16 report 6:18; 15:14; 20:14; 21:18; 30:23; 43:3; 45:14 reported 44:21; 45:3 Reporter 14:6; 30:6; 37:13 reports 22:14 represent 23:23; 45:11 representation 30:12, 13 represents 23:17 residency 9:11, 12, 18 resident 38:25; 39:4, 7, 17 residential 4:24 residents 38:14 return 31:1 revascularization 48:21; 51:4 revelation 40:22 review 6:7, 25; 7:3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18; 8:13; 22:21; 51:20; 52:6; 53:16 reviewed 6:11, 12, 15; 16:9, 10; 17:8; 54:4; 55:9, 15, 16, 22 reviewing 18:21; 54:17, 20 rewired 44:24 rewiring 34:6 Richard 6:8, 22; 7:1, 22; 8:7; 11:6; 22:21; 23:20; 28:14; 43:23; 47:24; 51:20, 24 ridiculous 41:25 Ridolfi 6:8, 16, 22; 22:22; 43:24; 47:24; 51:7, 20, 24 Ridolfi's 7:22; 8:7; 11:6; 23:20; 28:15 Right 5:12; 6:24; 9:15; 16:6; 18:18, 23; 19:24; 25:2, 3, 9, 12, 16; 26:3; 30:10; 32:7; 35:14; 37:3; 38:5, 24; 41:3, 19; 43:6; 44:6; 45:20; 46:1, 10; 47:24 risk 10:13, 15 risks 10:17 Robert 52:1 room 14:15; 45:23; 48:14 routine 20:14; 21:24 rule 25:18; 26:5 rules 32:18 rush 56:16	<b>S</b>  S 4:20, 25; 7:13 same 8:21; 21:13, 17; 25:19; 27:11; 35:15; 37:5; 53:22; 56:1 satisfactorily 37:22 satisfied 30:8 saw 39:25 saying 19:12, 22; 20:6; 27:4, 6, 25; 41:10; 46:22 scanning 18:16 screwing 50:10 second 27:16, 23; 38:16; 46:18, 19 secondary 34:7 Secondly 45:6 seemed 27:14 seems 8:17 seepage 38:21 send 53:14 sense 8:10 sensitive 44:11 sent 17:18; 53:10, 11; 55:23 sentence 46:18 separate 14:3; 49:4 separated 13:15, 17 September 4:2; 6:19, 20; 22:22, 24, 25 Serratia 42:22; 43:9; 44:1, 5, 9, 10, 20, 21; 45:9, 10, 12, 13; 46:11, 13, 20; 47:3, 9, 10, 13; 51:8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 19 setting 47:22; 50:3 seven 29:17 several 30:3 severe 31:1 Shah 7:13 shape 49:16 sheet 19:2; 23:8 short 48:24, 25 show 8:20; 40:14; 43:5 showed 29:3 shows 20:14 sick 37:25 side 29:11 sign 10:18, 21, 25; 11:6, 15, 23; 12:6, 22 signature 56:17 signed 40:1 significance 44:22, 24; 45:2 significant 18:11; 28:16 signs 27:17; 30:14 SILVERMAN 4:6, 12, 20 similar 26:16, 21, 21, 23; 27:17, 18, 18, 19, 24 simple 50:24 simply 16:22
p.m 4:3; 56:20 page 35:15; 39:10; 43:7 pages 17:4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 19 paid 43:15 pain 12:17 paragraph 19:5; 30:24; 46:19, 20 part 10:10; 53:18 particular 43:3 parts 18:17 pathology 38:8, 11; 40:15, 19, 20; 41:1, 2, 7, 15, 18, 20 patient 13:1, 9, 16, 25; 14:13; 15:3; 19:7; 21:23; 22:9; 25:19; 26:5; 29:15, 22; 35:1, 5; 37:23, 25; 50:16 patient's 14:21; 30:11 patient/plaintiff 55:17 patients 12:25; 15:5; 21:4, 7; 47:20 Patricia 7:10 pay 43:14 pen 18:10 pencil 17:16; 18:9 people 50:21 per 55:12, 24 perceived 29:2 percent 15:9, 10, 11, 11; 55:14, 16, 18 percentage 15:5; 55:5, 16 perform 13:20 performed 8:12; 9:3; 12:25 pericardium 46:4 period 48:24, 25 person 47:7 Phillip 7:19 physical 14:22; 17:17 physically 17:14 physician 9:6; 27:10 Piperacillin 44:4 place 40:21; 48:14 placed 11:3 plaintiff 6:8 plastic 33:19, 21 platelet 21:22; 22:1 play 49:19; 50:13 please 4:18; 14:5; 20:9, 16; 23:5; 24:3; 53:19 pneumo 38:20	<b>Q</b>  quantitation 21:25 quibble 10:9 quickly 56:16 quite 25:12 quote 30:24; 39:10	<b>R</b>  R 4:20, 25		

single 38:2 sit 50:10 sitting 56:3 situation 11:6;32:7 six 29:14, 17 slightly 25:4 smart 49:21 someone 19:19; 21:8; 22:1; 27:13 somewhat 15:8 somewhere 15:8; 19:15; 25:13; 46:4 sorry 9:25; 23:9 source 51:16 Southwest 6: 13 spacing 25:12 speaking 10:5 specialist 44:2, 3 specifically 28:25 spell 4:19; 31:1 spend 55:5 spike 27:12; 29:22; 30:8, 11, 17, 19 spurious 42:11 stages 9:22 started 56:4 state 4:18; 19:5; 39:1; 41:11 stated 22:8 statement 20:6; 38:12, 12, 24; 40:6; 50:16 statements 40:20 states 30:24; 40:17; 53:1 stating 19:6 statistical 33:24 sterile 34:4, 8 sternal 10:16, 19; 12:6, 7, 16, 20; 13:1, 10, 14; 15:6; 31:3, 6, 18; 33:12, 15, 16, 25; 34:2, 4; 37:1, 18; 51:11, 19 sternum 12:10, 14; 31:15, 16; 34:24; 35:18; 37:1, 8; 46:3 sticky 17:3, 9; 18:10 still 37:4 strep 45:7, 8 strike 51:1 strongly 44:15 subsequent 6: 14; 44: 19; 45:6; 51:17 subsequently 30:15 success 7:22 sufficient 34:21; 37:8 suggest 12:3 suggests 7:25; 44:3 support 34:13 sure 8:20; 18:3; 29:9 surgeon 5:3; 9:1, 16; 22:7; 25:17; 26:4; 33:20 surgeons 33:21 surgery 5:7, 7; 9:19, 20, 21: 10:2, 12:12:18:13:1.	9; 14:1; 15:6; 19:20; 21:9; 22:2, 10; 24:5; 26:18; 27:13, 15, 16; 38:7; 48:1, 5, 14; 49:7 surgical 31:11; 51:18 suspect 14:13, 19; 16:8; 27:16; 52:17 swab 46:4 sworn 4:8 Sycamore 4:25 symbol 20:24 symptom 11:2 symptomatology 10:23; 14:22, 25 syndromes 10:23	transported 52:13 reated 12:25; 44:10; 51:23 reatment 6:8; 13:5 trial 32:10 lrick 49:18, 22 true 25:23 Truly 45:8 truth 4:8, 9, 9; 18:3 try 33:4; 49:18, 25 trying 11:11; 50:1, 2 tube 38:19 Tuesday 4:2 turn 23:7: 24:3 twice 19:4; 32:11 two 5:9; 10:2; 14:2, 7; 15:10; 18:17; 19:8; 24:23, 25; 26:17; 29:1, 11, 16, 16; 34:16; 51:17	ary 28:16 eracity 11:4 erbal 17:24 ersus 34:6; 37:9; 38:1 itae 5:11, 21 ital 27:17; 30:14	<b>X</b>  x-ray 38:20 x-rays 51:20
	<b>T</b>  tab 18:10 tabs 17:3, 3, 9 talk 15:13; 19:10; 30:11; 38:6 talked 18:19; 56:5 talking 10:19; 12:13, 14; 17:7; 20:5, 10; 21:15, 18; 27:3; 32:6; 34:1; 35:17 technique 37:10 temperature 10:25; 11:22; 23:11, 20; 24:10, 14, 15; 25:6, 19, 21; 26:2, 7, 9, 11; 27:12, 13; 28:1, 2, 13; 29:4, 5; 30:11, 15, 18 temperatures 29:1, 14, 22 term 35:22; 36:3 testified 4:10; 29:21 testimony 16:21; 22:3; 28: 12; 29:20; 39:3 therapy 31:6, 9; 47:21; 50:14, 15; 51:5 thereupon 4:7 thickness 37:18 thoracic 5:7; 9:16, 20, 21 though 26:12; 44:5 thought 17:12 thousand 20:15 three 12:2; 18:17; 29:17; 32:10; 42:8, 9 threw 53:23 throw 53:5, 24; 54:2 times 18:14, 15, 17; 19:2; 21:5 today 16:14; 55:20 today's 52:19, 22 together 31:4, 19; 34:22 told 28:7 took 46:4 top 17:1 toto 18:16 tracked 33:24 transcript 7:1, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18; 39:9; 53:15 transcripts 53:20	<b>U</b>  Under 31:23; 32:4, 18; 33:7 underline 16:18 underlining 17:15 underwent 8:14; 24:5; 31:3 uneventful 27:14, 15 uninterpretable 43:19; 44:25 unit 47:21; 48:3, 12, 19; 49:1, 12; 50:3 University 10:1 unstable 12:10, 14, 15 untenable 44:8 up 39:24; 41:9, 10; 48:7 update 38:18; 40:2 upon 14:18; 19:15, 23; 34:24; 35:4; 37:22; 38:12 UPS 52:14 use 29:23; 31:18, 22; 32:3; 34:14; 35:21; 36:1 used 16:3; 20:24; 30:1, 8; 33:15; 35:14; 36:2; 37:12, 21 using 28:4; 35:12, 24; 37:9 usually 14:15; 15:3; 30:13; 33:22; 47:6, 10, 19; 53:1, 19	<b>W</b>  Vait 49:2; 50:18 vaive 56:17 vall 31:20; 33:17; 34:22; 5:1, 8, 11, 13, 16, 22; 6:1, 17, 20 vard 48:11 varrant 14:10, 12 vay 7:25; 8:12; 17:16; 5:21; 31:10; 33:1, 18; 9:1; 42:11; 47:9, 13; 9:16; 50:19; 53:18 vays 31:12 veak 11:8 veave 31:3 veight 27: 17 Nest 4:22 vhat's 5:17; 8:1; 25:6; 4:17; 50:7, 22, 22 vhte 11:15, 23; 15:4; 9:8, 12, 15, 17; 20:2, 10, 1, 14; 21:9; 22:1 vhole 4:9; 43:11 vhose 13:17; 38:25 vife 54:12 vire 31:18 vired 31:4; 33:12 viring 33:25; 35:17 withdrawing 36:12, 14 without 38:20, 21 Nitness 4:7; 9:25; 12:1; 4:7; 20:7; 24:11, 17, 21; 25:25; 27:2; 28:20; 32:10; 33:5; 34:19; 36:8, 24; 11:24; 43:2; 44:15; 48:10; 50:5; 51:2 witnesses 49:19 word 19:14; 28:5; 29:23; 30:8; 37:12; 49:19; 50:5 worded 7:25 words 19:10 work 49:20 worthless 12:19 wound 12:6, 8, 20; 13:2, 10, 14, 15, 17, 21, 24; 14:17; 15:1, 6; 19:6; 31:18 35:5, 20, 23, 23; 37:20, 24 44: 19; 45:6, 8, 9, 17, 23; 51:11, 18, 18, 19 wounds 14:16 writing 17:16; 33:10 wrong 43:17 wrote 16:8, 16, 19; 38:14	<b>Y</b>  Y 4:25 year 6:5; 9:10; 15:10, 10; 55:12; 56:1 years 10:2; 55:8; 56:2 yellow 17:16 yesterday 38:19
	<b>V</b>  V 4:20 vague 8:3; 34:18 valid 33:1 values 21:6 Van 6:16; 8:12; 19:3; 35:8, 10; 39:3, 6, 19; 40:12; 45: 17; 52:1 various 14:16; 33:17; 35:24			

FAIRVIEW GENERAL HOSPITAL  
DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY  
LABORATORY SUMMARY REPORT

RIDOLFI, RICHARD  
AGE: 54Y  
SS#: 284-34-5392  
HOSP: 1691895

SOON: 225-1  
VANBERGEN ROBERT D  
ADN DATE: 08/26/95  
OSC DATE: 08/29/95

===== WOUND MICROBIOLOGY =====  
08/26/95 WOUND CULTURE  
\* 1230 ACC. NO.: S78527  
FNL 08/29/95

SPECIMEN DESCRIPTION: WOUND CHEST  
SPECIAL REQUESTS: NONE

GRAM STAIN: OBS #1 MANY RBC'S SEEN  
OBS #2 RARE WBC'S SEEN  
OBS #3 NO ORGANISMS SEEN

CULTURE: ORG #1 NO GROWTH 3 DAYS

08/26/95 WOUND CULTURE  
\* 1350 ACC. NO.: S78578  
FNL 13/29/95

SPECIMEN DESCRIPTION: WOUND CHEST CAVITY  
SPECIAL REQUESTS: SURGICAL SPECIMEN

GRAM STAIN: OBS #1 FEW RBC'S SEEN  
OBS #2 NO ORGANISMS SEEN

CULTURE: ORG #1 NO GROWTH 3 DAYS

08/26/95 ANAEROBIC CULTURE  
\* 1350 ACC. NO.: S78579  
FNL 18/30/95

SPECIMEN DESCRIPTION: WOUND CHEST CAVITY  
SPECIAL REQUESTS: SURGICAL SPECIMEN

GRAM STAIN: OBS #1 MODERATE RBC'S SEEN  
OBS #2 NO ORGANISMS SEEN

CULTURE: ORG #1 RARE SERRATIA MARCESCENS  
ORG #2 NO ANAEROBES CULTURED

<< CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE >>

0021