

JS WURN 6 ASSOCIATES (402) 475-3376

SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. PAGE 11 PAGE 9 SHEET 2 9 11 All right. Did gou revieu the pathology report ۵. 1 à. Yes fror I think It was the Yankton Clinic ulth respect to the And the hospital record from Mrs. Wiebelhaus' 2 p. 2 other patholong that they developed? 3 3 pregnancg? A. The.... 4 A. 4 Yes. 5 The cost. 5 And portions of the record from the John Wagne p. p. MR. DOHIHA: The initial one? It was from Sloux Cancer Institute? 6 6 7 Falls, if that helps. 7 A. Yes. And as far as neglical records, that would - and Ε 8 ٥. MR. BATALLOW: No, I's talking about the one that 9 the UNIC record? 9 was done later in 1993. 18 MR. DOHIWA: Okag. 18 à. Yes. 11 (By Mr. Batallion) You're not aware of that 11 ٥. And that would be It as far as p. 12 That uonld be about It.  $\mathbf{E}$ el ther? Δ I dldn't knov It. Vere you aware that she did have a second relances 13 A. 13 D. 14 lesion on her back while she was at John Vague? 14 D. All right. Let's just start over. Magbe It's 15 easter to do It this way: Uhat records have you reviewed? 15 Α I have revleued all of the information that All right. And good uere not auare that she had a 16 Α. 16 Q. cystic lesion in her chest area In 1993. :17 doctor - that it. Dorina gave re probably three sonths or so 17 ago ulth respect to the Initial events af the hospitalization 'la 18 A. No. MR. DOHHA: In '93. 19 and her pregnancy and sore of the material fror UNMC as well 19 20 as sore data frnr California; and then there was other 20 MR. EATALLOW: Right. 21 materials. I think it was primarily depositions that care 21 MR. DOMINA: Okag. :12 subsequent to that. I have not revleued that because I was (By Mr. Batallion) And gou uere not aware that 22 ٥. 23 under the impression that it uasn't uolna to be that big of a she had a brain tumor that was diagnosed in '937 23 24 deal, so In essence I have tossed all of that. Yell, I thint It was word of mouth, but I 24 A. 25 25 dldn't - never got ang docurentatioo. ۵. Are gou going to testing with respect to the JS WURN & RSSOCIATES (402)475-3376 JS WURN b ASSOCIATES (402)475-3376 PAGE 18 - PAGE 12 . la 12 standard of medical care rendered by Dr. Magengast? Didn't see records, all right. Rod vere gou aware 1 1 Q. 2 **MR. DOHIWA:** Ask him uhat he leans If you don't 2 that she had developed bone cancer - bone retastasts also? I knew that there was more extensive involvement 3 tnow. 3 A. 4 Yhat do gou - I guess .... than Just localized within the lymph nodes. I knew that there A. 4 5 (By Mr. Batallion) Are you going to offer any 5 vas liver Involverent and got the impression from the records ۵. criticisus about the care #at D: Magengast rendered to this that Indeed it was rore extensive. Whether or not there was 6 6 7 patient? 7 defiaite boog Involvement I can't address. 8 Veil, I thint certainly In sore respects the delag Е Q. You dldn't see ---A. 9 In performing a biopsy Is an issue. 9 A. But that doesn't surprise re. 18 ۵. All right. Any other criticisus that god're going 10 ٥. Okag. Do gou have - Is there ang wag to tell 11 to have as far as his care Is concerned? uhether or not Mrs. Ylebelhaus was retastatic the dag that Dr. 11 12 A. Hot that I's aware of based on the information Е Magengast first examined her in January of 1991 - or '927 13 Presented to re. Strike that. I got the dates wrong. 13 14 You've not had an opportunity to review his ۵. 14 Is there any wag that gou can sag one wag or 15 deposition, is that correct? 15 another whether Mrs. Wiebelhaus was netastatic in July of 1992 I believe It was In that first raterial. 16 A. 16 uhen Dr. Kagengast was first apprised of her role on her upper 17 M. DOHIWR: No. 17 right shoulder? 18 ME VITNESS: It uasn't? Okag. 18 R. DOHIHA: ObJection, fora and foundatioo. 19 Then I don't - no, I have oot reviewed his A. 19 Not based on the documentation provided. 'Α. 28 deposi*t*ion. 28 (Bg Mr. Bata() [on) Yhat would gou need? ۵. 21 ME WITNESS: Was that In the second packet? 21 - A. Yell. obviousig a staging workup would have 22 M. DOHAY Yes 22 / Included a chest X-rag and sore blood uort and a nore detailed 23 A. So I haven't reviewed his depositloo. history and physical exasination. Perhaps other scans. 23 (89 hr. Batalllon) You've bad an opportunity, 24 Q., radiographic studies, et cetera, that kind of stuff. 24 25 though, to review his office record? All of this was done in October at the Med Center? ۵. JS WURN & ASSOCIATES (402)475-3376 JS WURN & ASSOCIATES (402)475-3376

JS WURN A ASSOCIATES (402) 475-3376

SCOT SORENSEN, H.D. PAGE 19 PAGE 17 SHEET 3 17 19 A There is no way to solve that problem. adverse prognostic indicator of outcore, okag? Further 1 1 Okag. Is it true that Clark's Level 1 relanora analysis of lymph mode negative patients, roughly 588 or so, 2 ۵. 2 can be metastatic? 3 recognized that that Is probably too thin, that Indeed the 3 prognosis doesn't start to, quote, drop off, end quote, until 4 A Yes 4 5 Q. Clark's Level 27 5 the tuior Is greater than 1.70 millimeters. And uhen I sag 6 Yes 6 'drop off, ' I'm talking about anything less than that, a 90 A Clark's Level 3? 7 percent survival rate at five gears, greater than 1.7 It drops 7 ٥. down to about 65 percent, and then obviously angthlou greater 8 8 Yes A. Clark's Level 47 9 than 3.7 or thereabouts It drops off even further then, so 9 Ο. ء ۱ A. Ves 16 It's a step-ulse regression. 11 0 And Clark's Level 5 by definition is ietastatle. 11 ٥. And the speed at uhlch. ulth uhlch these tunors 12 Yell, I -- well, not in the true sense of uhat 12 grow is tremendousig variable, isn't it? A Clark's Is because Clark's Is Just purely looking at the 13 13 A Yes prirarg tuior; bot, yes, all five levels can eventually lead **Q**. You can have tuxors that are greater - strike 14 14 15 to the patlent's death. 15 that. You can have tuxors that grow at a verg slow rate and 16 ۵. To ietastatlc dlsease. 16 turors that grow at a very quick rate. Is that correct7 17 And the patlent's death, right. Correct. A. 17 А It's ig understanding that at those various 18 18 **Q**. And If It's a lifelong tuior, It's really Ø. 19 staging levels, the percentages are more, become more and more impossible to tell how deep It really Is. 19 in favor of the plaintiff -- or in favor of the patlent. Define "lifelong," 28 20 A. The lover the level --Yell, if It's a noise that has had — that has been 21 21 Ο. 22 Exactly. There's a direction relationship between 22 present on the patlent for their entire life. A. the depth of the turor and subsequent development of 23 23 Yell, gean, I guess that per se doesn't have A. 24 ietastatlc dlsease and thelr survival. bearing ulth respect to the proanosls. Again, once the 24 25 Yhat's your understanding for Clark's 1, the ٥. ielanoia has occurred and the depth of the tuior 15, again, 25 JS YURn b ASSOCIATES (482) 475-3375 JS WURN & ASSOCIATES (402) 475-3376 PAGE 18 PAGE 20 -18 25 I survival? the **most** (moortant prognostic variable. 1 I uould sag In excess of 98 percent. 95 percent; 2 A. 2 ٥. And as far as Brestow's Is concerned, the studies 3 but, again, going down -- I don't, personally I don't follow would limit - strike that. The studies as far as thinness 3 4 the Clark's level. I think the accounter from the 4 are limited to patients that do not have ignob node 5 pathologist Is the biggest determinant, and that's basically Involveient, I think gou sald. 5 measuring the depth of the initial tumor as opposed to Clark's 6 Α Correct. 6 level, and that's the so-called Breslov's classification. 7 7 0. Once the patlent has I grown node Involveient, It a О. And so you would prefer the Breslow's doesn't latter how thin -8 9 classification. 9 A. Correct. 10 A. Sloht. - the tumor is, right? đ. 16 11 α. And uhat are the Breslow classifications? Is that Correct. 11 A. 12 one through something, too? 12 Ρ You can have lymph node involvement ulth a tumor 13 A. It's basically Just neasuring the invasion or the that Is less than 8.76 millingters. Is that correct7 13 14 depth of the tunor, so It's typically measured in illilreters. 14 Α You can, ges. 15 ٥. And do you recall ubat the depth of Mrs. 15 Ρ. And the depth of the tunor really Isn't going to 16 Viebelbaus' tuior vas? 16 tell you whether or not you have lymph node involvement, Is 17 A. Not right offband, no. 17 that correct? 18 ۵. What's the cutoff between -- or can gou give he a 18 True, true, at the tire of Initial diagnosis. A. 19 general Idea -19 10. Rloht 28 А I understand uhat gog're --20 А Correct. 21 ۵. - of uhat prognosis verice talking about at 21 ۵. You can have a suge tuior and still have no lgrph various sizes? 22 22 oode lavolvement. 23 A. I understand uhat gou're saging. At this point 10 23 A. Correct. 24 tlie -- okag, historically, le to 15 gears ago, it uas felt 24 ۵. Do got knou uhether they dld a brain scan on ars. :25 that anything over .76 illlieters. 8.76 illlieters was an 25 Viebelhaus uhen she was at the fled Center? IS YURn b ASSOCIATES (402)475-3375 JS YURn b ASSOCIATES (402) 475-3376

JS WURM & ASSOCIATES (482) 415-3376

and the second se	SCOT SORENSEN.H.D. PAGE 25 SHEET 4 PAGE 27				
	25	ſ	27		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 6 7 8 9 1 6 7 8 9 1 6 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 ;20 ;21 ;22 ;23 ;24	<ul> <li>(Indicating)</li> <li>Q. All right. It's on page 1507 of DeVita's third edition, Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The sentence Sags, The timing of the blopsg prior to the first definitive treatment was found to have simulficant influence on survival in one series, 'which means in one of several series this variable was felt to be simulficant. Is that correct? <ul> <li>MR. DOMINA: Objection, arnurentative. It mag have been one of one.</li> <li>Q. (Bg Mr. Batailion) So we don't know uhether the series is reproducible.</li> <li>A. True: It's only been published in that one report by that gentiemen that I spelled for you.</li> <li>Q. And from a scientific standpoint, one series Is not — does not a standard of care rake.</li> <li>A. I think, again, that's arnurentative.</li> <li>MR. DOMINA: Sustained.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. (Bg Mr. Batailion) You don't know the ansuer to that.</li> <li>A. For ges, for good clinical medicine, ges, one series doesn't necessarily rake the standard of practice, that the dimensional series is reproduced.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 6 7 8 9 1 6 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 22	the blood work, the chest X-rag, and the examination is, quote, negative, then I say, "Bave the surgeon see the patient for vide exclsion." And so, in essence, there's no sense to delaging, having the patient see the and then see the surgeon, because it realing doesn't accomplish anything in the scheme of things. Q. So how long do gnu usually see ther after the surgeon completes the vide exclsion? A. Oh. within a few weeks or so. It depends on healing and uhat their location Is. Q. And then 900 would start the chemotherapy if there was shown to be retastatic disease? A. Well, okag, I would consider them a candidate for an investigational study. Chemotherapy Is not just routinely adrinistered after having found that there Is retastatic disease because, keep to mind, there sometimes rag be two different procedures perforred: One, the uide excision; and then, depending on the prognostic information available at that time, specifically the depth of the tumor, then there rag be the next procedure right be a tymph node dissection. Do you see what I rean? Q. Yes A. So patients aren't necessarily routinely started on cherotherapy just because they have a relance a removed and wide of the other some the some a selance a removed and		
:25	that's the way It should be.	25	vide exclsion, okay? I uanted to clarifg what I rean.		
JS WURI <i>b</i> ASSOCIATES (402)475-3376			JS MM 6 ASSOCIATES (482)475-3376		
-	PAGE 2626		PAGE 2828		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. I understand. Wou, how lonn do gnu think It is on average betueen the tire a physician, a family practitioner or prirary care physician, from the tire of blopsy to the tire they get to you for treatrent? How long does that usually take, if you have an estimate?</li> <li>A. Oh. typically within a usek or so.</li> <li>Q. All rinht. Let's back up, let's work this out.</li> <li>One usek, prirarg blopsy by the primary care physician, right?</li> <li>How long does It take to get the report back from patholong?</li> <li>A. Two days.</li> <li>Q. Then you bave to do a ulde excision, right? And who usually does that?</li> <li>A. The surgeon.</li> <li>Q. How long does It take the prirary care physician to net him referred to a surgeon for a wide excision?</li> <li>A. Oh. I would sag a usek.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 8 9 1 8 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. When do gou usually start the chemotherapy, on uhat type of relanora patients?</li> <li>A. Well, okag.</li> <li>Q. If any at all.</li> <li>A. Yell, see, again, that's an issue. Chemotherapy certaining is not very effective in this disease. I think chemotherapy has a role in patients who have documented retastatic involverent, for example, in the liver, the bones, the lungs, whatever. Its benefit is open to question and is arguable with respect to it realig trulg has an impact. It is not routinely administered for patients who are found to have igmph node involverent and are free of disease elsewhere, okay? There are clinical studies evaluating uhether or not sore form of adfuvant therapy is of any benefit like it is in breast cancer after a mastectomy, for example; but those trials at this point in tire don't suggest that treatrent beyond igmph node removal, as long as</li> </ul>		

JS WURN & ASSOCIATES (402) 475-3376

	SCOT SORENSEN, M. D.				
	33	ıГ	35		
1	percentage basis uhat the Increase In her prognosis uould have	1	Q. All right.		
2	been, 15 that correct?	2	A. I thlnk —		
3	A, Correct.	3	Q. How lona -		
4	$\mathbf{Q}$ . And gnu can't sag that gou're even sure that It	4	MR. DONINA: I don't think he's finished.		
5	uould have made a difference.	5	Q. (Bg dr. Batailion) Ame gou rinished?		
6	A. I think the evidence is clear that It would rake a	6	A. I'm trying to collect my thoughts here because		
7 8	difference. Q. In uhat respect?	7	understand uhat gog're trging to sag. and I All I am, all I am saging to gog is that ∎think the tyo-month issue did		
° 9	A. From the standpoint of the things that we talked	9	have a significant lepact on her outcome, but to quantify that		
10	about, earlier diagnosis/better survival. In addition to the	18	Is impossible.		
11	staterent that's published in that textbook.	11	Q. All rlaht. Yhat uould be a reasonable delag? A		
12	Q. All right. Is there and wag of knowing whether	12	wonth?		
13	she had  gm9h node lnvolverent In julg of '92?	13	A. Yell, you knou, on the part of vho? The patlent		
14	nr. DOMINA: ObJectlon, asked and ansuered.	14	or the medical system or, you know, the physician? I rean,		
15	A Again, not to ag knowledge was that ever	15	that's because, understandably, if there's other things		
16	addressed.	16	going on on the part of the patient, they rag sag, 'Gee. I		
17	Q. (By Ar. Bata(  on) Yell, It was subclinical even In October, was It not? By that ∎ rean from a clinical	17 18	don't want to do that now because I'm having a wedding, or, gou knou, those types of thinas.		
:18 :19	analysis.	10	a. Is that okag?		
28	A. Correct.	28	A. Yell, I think certainly it jeopardizes the		
21	P. If It was subclinical in October and It was	21	outcore. It's not to sag that just because there is a		
22	present In Julg, it would have still been subclinical, is that	22	suspicious abnormality that that is imminently		
23	correct?	23	life-threatening, that's not to equate that; but I think that		
24	A. Yes.	24	suspicious abnormality becomes more of a life-threatening		
25	P. All rlaht. And so unless an excision of the lymph	25	potential If Indeed the clinical findings are worrisone.		
1	JS WURN & ASSOCIATES (482)475-3376				
		L.,	JS WURI 6 ASSOCIATES (402)475-3376		
Г	PAGE 34	, ŕ	PAGE 36		
Γ-	PAGE 34 34		PAGE 36 36		
	34		36		
1 2		1 2	36 A very small role that's been there forever that		
1	34 nodes uould have been done In Juig, there's really nu way of	1	36		
1 2	34 nodes usual have been done In Juig, there's really nu way of knowlag whether there was retastatic disease In that Igaph	1 2	36 A very small role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going		
1 2 3	34 nodes usual have been done In Juig, there's realig nu wag of knowing whether there was retastatic disease In that ignob node In Juig, is that correct?	1 2 3	36 A very small role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is		
1 2 3 4 5 <b>5</b>	34 nodes would have been done In Juig, there's really nu way of knowing whether there was retastatic disease In that ignob node In Juig, is that correct? A True. Q. And there's really no way to know how long before Juig. If it existed in Juig, that it existed.	1 2 3 4 5 6	36 A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed ulthin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It woold be incumbent upon the physician to be more		
1 2 3 4 5 <b>6</b> 7	34 nodes would have been done In Juig, there's realig nu way of knowing whether there was retastatic disease In that ignob node In Juig, is that correct? A True. Q. And there's realig no way to know how long before Juig. If it existed in Juig, that it existed. A. True. '	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	36 A very small role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed ulthin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be more metications and expeditions in pursuing a workup of that latter		
1 2 3 4 5 <b>5</b> <b>6</b> 7 <b>8</b>	34 nodes would have been done In July, there's really nu way of knowing whether there was retastatic disease In that lyaph node In July, is that correct? A True. Q. And there's really no way to know how long before July, If it existed in July, that it existed. A. True. Q. And lyrph node Involverent is the prirarg	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A very small role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed ulthin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be more neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former.		
1 2 3 4 5 5 5 7 8 9	34 nodes would have been done In July, there's really nu way of knowlog whether there was retastatic disease In that lyaph node In July, is that correct? A True. Q. And there's really no way to know how long before July. If it existed in July, that it existed. A. True.' Q. And lymph node Involverent is the prirarg indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the twor, as to the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A very small role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed ulthin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be more neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient?		
1 2 3 4 5 5 5 7 8 9 1 1	34 nodes would have been done In July, there's really nu way of knowing whether there was retastatic disease In that lyaph node In July, is that correct? A True. Q. And there's really no way to know how long before July, If it existed in July, that it existed. A. True. Q. And lyrph node Involverent is the prirarg	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 19	A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed ulthin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be more neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A. I would personally sag. I think I's more		
1 2 3 4 5 5 5 7 8 9	34 nodes would have been done In Juig, there's really nu way of knowlag whether there was retastatic disease In that Igaph node In Julg, is that correct? A True. Q. And there's really no way to know how long before Julg. If it existed in July, that it existed. A. True. Q. And Igrph node Involverent is the prirarg indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the tunor, as to the survivability of the patient.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A very small role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed ulthin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be more neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient?		
1 2 3 4 5 5 5 7 8 9 1 1 1	34 nodes usual have been done In Juig, there's really nu way of knowlag whether there was retastatic disease In that Igaph node In Julg, Is that correct? A True. Q. And there's really no way to know how long before Julg. If it existed in July, that it existed. A. True. Q. And Igrph node Involverent is the prirarg Indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the tunor, as to the survivability of the patient. A. Correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 19 11	A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed ulthin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be more neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A I would personally sag. I think I'm more concerned about this, that this is something that should be		
1 2 3 4 5 5 6 7 8 9 1 1 11 12 13 14	<pre>34 nodes would have been done In Juig, there's realig nu wag of thowing whether there was retastatic disease In that ignob node In Juig, is that correct?</pre>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 8 9 1 8 11 12	A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed uithin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be more neticalous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A mould personally sag. I think I'm more concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next week, depending on what your schedule		
1 2 3 4 5 5 5 7 8 9 1 1 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>34 nodes would have been done In Juig, there's realig nu wag of thowing whether there was retastatic disease In that ignob node In Juig, is that correct?</pre>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 1 1 1 2 13 14 15	A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed ulthin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incurbent upon the physician to be more neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A fucual personally sag. I think I'm more concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next week, depending on what your schedule is." Q. Or two weeks. A. Tuo, that's, Frean, yeah, one or two weeks; I		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 1 1 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>34</li> <li>nodes uould have been done In Juig, there's really nu way of knowlag uhether there was retastatic disease In that 1900 node In Julg, 1s that correct?</li> <li>A True.</li> <li>Q. And there's really no way to know how long before July. If it existed in July, that it existed.</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. And Igrph node Involverent is the prirarg indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the tunor, as to the survivability of the patient.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>P. So how can you sag that It rakes an9 difference in her outcome?</li> <li>A. Yhat you sag is true, but the devil's advocate could cow back to you and say. If there was even less retastatic disease in the 1900 nodes at the tire of July, for</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed ulthin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be more neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A fucual personally sag. I think I'm more concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next ueek, depending on uhat your schedule is. <sup>o</sup> Q. Or two weeks. A. Tuo, that's, frean, yeah, one of two weeks; I rean, that's arbitrary. I think the Issue Is how important do		
1 2 3 4 5 5 5 7 8 9 1 1 1 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>34 nodes uould have been done In Juig, there's really nu way of knowlag uhether there was retastatic disease In that Igaph node In Julg, Is that correct?</pre>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1	36 A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed uithin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incurbent upon the physician to be nore neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A I would personally sag. 'I think I'm nore concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next week, depending on what your schedule is.' Q. Or two weeks. A. Tuo, that's, I rean, yeah, one of two weeks; I rean, that's arbitrary. I think the Issue Is how important do you stress to the patient that this is a worrisone abournality.		
1 2 3 4 5 5 5 7 8 9 1 1 1 12 13 14 15 16 17 16	<ul> <li>34</li> <li>nodes uould have been done In Juig, there's realig nu wag of knowing uhether there was retastatic disease In that ignob node In Julg, is that correct?</li> <li>A True.</li> <li>Q. And there's realig no wag to know how long before Julg. If it existed in Julg, that it existed.</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. And lgrph node involvement is the prirarg indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the tunor, as to the survivability of the patient.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>P. So how can you sag that It rakes an9 difference in her outcome?</li> <li>A. Yhat you sag is true, but the devil's advocate could cow back to you and sag. If there was even less retastatic disease in the ignob nodes at the tire of Julg, for example, and a node dissection had been performed, that rag have prevented ber fror seeding to other areas of the body.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 8 9 1 8 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	36 A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is nov ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed uithin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be nore neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a vorkup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A fucual personally sag. I think I'm nore concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next week, depending on what your schedule is. Q. Or two weeks. A. Tuo, that's, Frean, yeah, one or two weeks; I rean, that's arbitrary. I think the Issue Is how important do you stress to the patient that this is a vorrisone abnormality that needs to be addressed despite other things that rag be		
1 2 3 4 5 5 5 7 8 9 1 1 1 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>34</li> <li>nodes uould have been done In July, there's really nu way of thowing uhether there was retastatic disease In that 1900 node In July, 1s that correct?</li> <li>A True.</li> <li>Q. And there's really no way to thow how long before July. If it existed in July, that it existed.</li> <li>A. True.'</li> <li>Q. And lgrph node Involverent is the prirarg indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the tunor, as to the survivability of the patient.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>P. So how can you sag that It rakes an9 difference in her outcome?</li> <li>A. Yhat you sag is true, but the devil's advocate could cow back to you and say. If there was even less retastatic disease in the 1900 nodes at the tire of July, for example, and a node dissection had been performed, that rag have prevented her fror seeding to other areas of the body.</li> <li>#a4, okay? And I think certaining the Issue of the tuno-Moth</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 1 1 1 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed uithin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be more neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A mould personally sag. I think I'm nore concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next week, depending on what your schedule is.* Q. Or two weeks. A. Tuo, that's, Trean, yeah, one or two weeks; I frean, that's arbitrary. I think the Issue Is how important do you stress to the patient that this is a worrisone abnormality that needs to be addressed despite other things that rag be going on to your life, or reassurance and say, 'Yell, sou		
1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 16 19	<ul> <li>34</li> <li>nodes uould have been done In Juig, there's realig nu wag of knowing uhether there was retastatic disease In that ignob node In Julg, is that correct?</li> <li>A True.</li> <li>Q. And there's realig no wag to know how long before Julg. If it existed in Julg, that it existed.</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. And lgrph node involvement is the prirarg indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the tunor, as to the survivability of the patient.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>P. So how can you sag that It rakes an9 difference in her outcome?</li> <li>A. Yhat you sag is true, but the devil's advocate could cow back to you and sag. If there was even less retastatic disease in the ignob nodes at the tire of Julg, for example, and a node dissection had been performed, that rag have prevented ber fror seeding to other areas of the body.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 8 9 1 8 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A very small role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed ulthin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be more neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A mould personally sag. I think I'm nore concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next week, depending on what your schedule is." Q. Or two weeks. A. Two, that's, Trean, yeah, one of two weeks; I rean, that's arbitrary. I think the Issue Is how important do you stress to the patient that this is a worrisome abnormality that needs to be addressed despite other things that rag be going on to your life, or reassurance and say, 'Yell, sou know, I'm not too concerned about it. We can do it whenever		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 16 17 16 19 25	<ul> <li>nodes uould have been done In Juig, there's realig nu wag of knowing uhether there was retastatic disease In that ignob node In Julg, is that correct?</li> <li>A True.</li> <li>Q. And there's realig no wag to know how long before July. If it existed in Juig, that it existed.</li> <li>A. True.'</li> <li>Q. And ignph node involvement is the prirarg indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the tunor, as to the survivability of the patient.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>P. So how can you sag that It rakes an9 difference in ber outcome?</li> <li>A. Yhat you sag is true, but the devil's advocate could cow back to you and sag. If there was even less retastatic disease in the ignob nodes at the tire of Juig, for example, and a node dissection had been performed, that rag have prevented ber fror seeding to other areas of the body.</li> <li>Res, otag? And I think certaining the Issue of the tuo-Moth or two-and-a-balf wonth delag personaling, in my own view, I</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 1 1 2 1 3 14 15 16 17 7 18 19 2 8	A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed uithin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incumbent upon the physician to be more neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A mould personally sag. I think I'm nore concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next week, depending on what your schedule is.* Q. Or two weeks. A. Tuo, that's, Trean, yeah, one or two weeks; I frean, that's arbitrary. I think the Issue Is how important do you stress to the patient that this is a worrisone abnormality that needs to be addressed despite other things that rag be going on to your life, or reassurance and say, 'Yell, sou		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 J 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 16 19 29 21	<ul> <li>nodes uould have been done In Juig, there's realig nu wag of knowing uhether there was retastatic disease In that ignob node In Juig, is that correct?</li> <li>A True.</li> <li>Q. And there's realig no wag to know how long before Julg. If it existed in Juig, that it existed.</li> <li>A. True.'</li> <li>Q. And lgrph node Involverent is the prirarg indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the tunor, as to the survivability of the patient.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>P. So how can you sag that It rakes an9 difference in ber outcome?</li> <li>A. Yhat you sag is true, but the devil's advocate could cow back to you and sag. If there was even less retastatic disease in the ignob nodes at the tire of Juig, for example, and a node dissection had been performed, that rag have prevented ber fror seeding to other areas of the body.</li> <li>Mag, otag? And I think certaining the Issue of the tuo-Moth or two-and-a-half wonth delag personaling. In my own view, I thint is too long for accepted medical practice io a situation</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 28 21	A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed ulthin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incurbent upon the physician to be nore neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A fucual personally sag. I think I'm nore concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next ueek, depending on what your schedule is.* Q. Or two weeks. A. Two, that's, frean, yeah, one of two weeks; I frean, that's arbitrary. I think the Issue Is how important do you stress to the patient that this is a vorrisone abnormality that needs to be addressed despite other things that rag be going on to your life, of reassurance and sag, 'Yell, sou know, I'm not too concerned about it. We can do it whenever you want to. you decide what gour schedule's like.* I think		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 16 19 29 21 22 23 34	<ul> <li>nodes uould have been done In July, there's really nu way of knowlag uhether there was retastatic disease In that Igaph node In July, Is that correct?</li> <li>A True.</li> <li>Q. And there's really no way to know how long before July. If it existed in July, that it existed.</li> <li>A. True.'</li> <li>Q. And lgrph node Involverent is the prirarg indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the tunor, as to the survivability of the patient.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>P. so how can you sag that It rakes an9 difference in her outcome?</li> <li>A. Yhat you sag is true, but the devil's advocate could cow back to you and say. If there was even less retastatic disease in the Igaph nodes at the tire of July, for example, and a node dissection had been performed, that rag have prevented her fror seeding to other areas of the body.</li> <li>Ray, okay? And I think certainly the Issue of the tuo-Moth or two-and-a-half month delag personally, in my own view, I thint is too long for accepted medical practice io a situation dealing uith a ver! suspicious primary abnormality based on</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 19 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 28 21 22	A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is nov ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed uithin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incurbent upon the physician to be nore neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a vorkup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A fucual personally sag. I think I's more concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next ueek, depending on what your schedule is. Q. Of two weeks. A. Two, that's, frean, yeah, one of two weeks; I rean, that's arbitrary. I think the Issue Is how important do you stress to the patient that this is a vorrisone abnormality that needs to be addressed despite other things that rag be going on to your life, or reassurance and sag. Yell, sou know, I'm not too concerned about it. We can do it whenever you want to. you decide what gour schedule's like.* I think that's where It's a rotoal decision between the patient and		
1 2 3 4 5 5 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 16 19 29 21 22 23	<ul> <li>nodes uould have been done In Juig, there's really nu way of knowing uhether there was retastatic disease In that ignob node In Julg, is that correct?</li> <li>A True.</li> <li>Q. And there's really no way to know how long before July. If it existed in July, that it existed.</li> <li>A. True.'</li> <li>Q. And lgrph node involvement is the prirarg indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the tunor, as to the survivability of the patient.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>P. so how can you sag that It rakes an9 difference in ber outcome?</li> <li>A. Yhat you sag is true, but the devil's advocate could cow back to you and sag. If there was even less retastatic disease in the ignob nodes at the tire of July, for exaple, and a node dissection had been performed, that rag have prevented har fror seeding to other areas of the body.</li> <li>Ray, okay? And I think certainig the Issue of the tuo-Moth or two-and-a-half wonth delay personally, in my own view, I thint is too long for accepted medical practice io a situation dealing uth a ver! suspicious primary abnormality based on the evidence that the plaintiff had presented to the</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1	A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is now ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed uithin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It woold be incumbent upon the physician to be nore neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A Twould personally sag. I think I'm nore concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next usek, depending on what your schedule is. Q. Of two weeks. A. Two, that's, Trean, yeah, one of two weeks; I rean, that's arbitrary. I think the Issue Is how important do you stress to the patient that this is a vorrisone abnormality that needs to be addressed despite other things that rag be young on to your life, or reassurance and say. Yell, sou know, I'm not too concerned about it. We can do it whenever you want to. you decide what your schedule's like.' I think that's where It's a rotoal decision between the patient and the physician, but I think It has to be directed by the		
1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9	<ul> <li>nodes uould have been done In Juig, there's realig nu wag of thousag uhether there was retastatic disease In that ignob node In Julg, is that correct?</li> <li>A True.</li> <li>Q. And there's realig no wag to thow how long before Julg. If it existed in Juig, that it existed.</li> <li>A. True.'</li> <li>Q. And lgrph node involvement is the prirarg indicator, notwithstanding the depth of the tunor, as to the survivability of the patient.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>P. So how can you sag that It rakes an9 difference in ber outcome?</li> <li>A. Yhat you sag is true, but the devil's advocate could cow back to you and sag. If there was even less retastatic disease in the ignob nodes at the tire of Juig, for example, and a node dissection had been performed, that rag have prevented her fror seeding to other areas of the body.</li> <li>Raf, okag? And I think certaining the Issue of the tuo-Moth or two-and-a-half nonth delag personality. In my own view, I thint is too long for accepted medical practice io a situation dealing uith a ver! susplicious primarg abnormality based on the evidence that the plaintiff had presented to the physician, specificaling an olcerated area, those types of</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 8 9 1 8 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 28 21 22 23 24	A very stall role that's been there forever that has not changed Is not something that the physician is going to be too concerned about as opposed to a larger area that Is nov ulcerated and the patient has said that It's changed uithin a short period of tire. That I think Is two different issues. It would be incurbent upon the physician to be more neticulous and expeditious in pursuing a workup of that latter as opposed to the former. Q. And how much do you tell the patient? A mould personally sag. I think I'm more concerned about this, that this is something that should be done within the next week, depending on what your schedule is. <sup>9</sup> Q. Or two weeks. A. Two, that's, Trean, yeah, one or two weeks; I frean, that's arbitrary. I think the Issue Is how important do you stress to the patient that this is a worrisone abnormality that needs to be addressed despite other things that rag be soing on to your life, or reassurance and say. 'Yell, sou know, I'm not too concerned about it. We can do it whenever you want to. you decide what your schedule's like. <sup>6</sup> I think that's where It's a rotoal decision between the patient and the physician, but I think It has to be directed by the collical appearance and aood redical practice on the part of		

PAGE 41 SHEET 6

SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. PAGE 43

43 41 uanted to do it. Oh, back mole." 1 1 A. And other factors. Obviousig she's pregnant and. ٥. -- "back iole, advise exclsion." 2 Δ 2 3 you know, I rean, obviously the pregnancy and her firstborn 3 A. Ökag. 4 and all that kind of stuff Is sore of an issue for her than Ρ. And then we have Aunust 31st, 'sole ulcerated,' 4 5 angthing else. 5 right? Well, If she sags to the physician, "I'm going to 6 ٥. 6 A. Rlght. deliver in a week or two. I'd like to wait until after I 7 Ρ. And then the iole Is exclosed, I belleve, on ? 9-14-92 я deliver,' Is the physician supposed to sag, 'Don't do that." 8 9 I uonld. If there is a clinical, if there is a g Right. A. A. clinical recommendation that this thing needs to be rejoved 18 All right, Do you find that his charting 1Ø Ρ. because I'm concerned that It's malignant, especially In view generally nests the standard, if gou will, of uhat gou see In 11 11 12 of the ulceration that was documented, at least documented on family practitioners In outlying areas7  $\mathbf{E}$ 13 August 31, that that takes precedence over and above the 13 A. Yes. pregnancy. That's g oplnion. 14 Q. I uant gou to assume that the first the he felt 14 that the tole should be reioved was on August 22nd. 15 0. Do you --15 And that should be done because that Isn't that Correct. 16 A. 16 A. big of a procedure. Now, If you told se that she - that this And then there was a delag until September 14th 17 17 Q. was a gall bladder attack and, 900 knou, that kind of stuff, before the patlent --18 18 Actually had -then obviously that's another Issue; but, I sean, doing a 19 19 A. -- actually had the procedure done. 28 blopsg Is an out-patlent Issue. 28 Ο. 21 But you can't do It unless the patient lets you do 21 Okag. ۵. A. 22 And that obviously he sau It on August 13th and It 22 It. ۵. 23 Correct. 23 ¥as --A 24 Q, And If you tell the patient that It's possibly 24 A. 31. - or 31 and It was ulcerated. salignant, shouldn't that kind of tell then that saybe you 25 ۵. 25 JS WURL & ASSOCIATES (402)475-3376 JS WURN & ASSOCIATES (402) 475-3376 PAGE 42 - PAGE 44 -44 42 I A. Correct. would like then to have It done? 1 2 ٥. Is that too iuch of a delag between August 22nd 2 A. That's correct. 3 and September 14th? ٥. If the note had not ulcerated on August 22nd and 3 4 A. Too nucl of a delag In her outcoie, that mag 4 the patient -- If It was not ulcerated on examination on 5 have --5 August 220d and the patient said she uanted to valt until her Ρ. 6 Affected her outcoie. delivery which was expected in a usek or tuo, would It be okag . 6 7 -- affected her outcoie? I would sag possibly If In sour opinion for the paysician to say, "All rinht, let's A. 7 Indeed this iole had not olcerated or vas not-ulcerated on wait until after you deliver the child.\* 8 8 August 22. Now, there's no documentation that It was, hut we 9 9 A. I uonld imagine so. Again, what I'm trying to (let 16 all know that that may or may not have been the case. 10 at is, I think It depends on the clinical suspicion of the Ο. 11 All right. 11 lesion to make that judgment ubether or not excision Is So, I guess If It Indeed bad ulcerated In the span recommended. Now, he's recommended excision on August 22. E! A. 12 of eight dags or give dags from August 22 to August 31, that That I think right there Is enough to sag he's concerned 13 13 obviousig Is a significant Issue, okag? So I guess what the 14 14 enough about it that it should be done. 15 clinical appearance on August 22 trulg is or was bas some 15 ٥. Right. 16 bearing to ansuer that question. 16 A. Or should have been done at some point In time In 17 Ρ. If the clinical appearance was that there was no 17 the past if there has trulg not been any change In this: but, 18 ulceration on August 22. uhat difference does It rake in your again, there's no docnientation one way or another to ansuer 18 19 oplaiaa? 19 that. I think If a physician is willing to document that 28 A. I woold sag that the three ueek or, geah, 28 excision Is advised based on bis clinical judgment, then that 21 three-ueek Interval from the time of recommending excision to Is something that should be followed through in a relatively 21 22 the tlie of that procedure being done might have had an expeditious fashion over and above any other things that may 22 23 outcoie In her - **might** have had a different - It right have 23 be going on In the patient's life. Now, again, that bas to be 24 affected her outcoie. 24 a nutual decision between the patient and the physician. B ۵. But that again depends on uhether the patient 25 Ulceration aside, is what I'm trying to net at. JS WURN & ASSOCIATES (402) 475-3376 JS WURN b ASSOCIATES (482)475-3376

JS YURn b ASSOCIATES (402) 475-3376

SCOT SORENSEN, M.D. PAGE 51

Protocology (	PAGE 49 SBEET 7				
		49		51	
1	A.	I'd sag three or four.	1	was one had to do ulth a failure to diagnose lung cancer	
		Can yon tell <b>me</b> In the spilt whether You've ever	2	and, hog, the third one I can't I don't even remember.	
2	Q.	•	3		
3		n behalf of the suing part as opposed to the	3	-	
4	physician?		4	remember what the nature of that case was?	
5	Α.	Probablg 50/50.	5	A. That was a failure to diagnose a kidney cancer.	
6	Q.	All right. All cancer cases?	6	Q. And both of the cases, the one gou did in Lincoin	
7	Α.	Yes.	7	and the one yon remembered from the Lincoln attornegs, did	
8	Q.	All in Lincoln?	8	part of that defense revolve around the fact that It wouldn't	
9	Α.	no.	9	have iade ang dlffereoce as far as outcoie 15 concerned ultb	
10	٥.	can you give le an Idea of the geographic	10	an earlier diagnosis?	
11	breakdown?		11	A. Some of them did, some of ther, geah. I don't	
12	A.	Three of then uere out of state - out of Lincoln,	12	Q. Yhat Is your rate because I've got to pay It.	
			13	A. A hundred fifty dollars an hour.	
13		in Lincoln.			
14	Q.	And the one Io Lincoln, was that for the defendant	14	-	
15	or the plain		15	testimong?	
16	Α.	I think that was for the defendant.	16	A. No, just for the testimong.	
17	Q.	Do you rererber angthing about that case?	17	Q. Do gon charge for revieu?	
18	Α.	Bog, that was, that was shortly after I caie to	18	A. No.	
19	town and so	I	19	Q. In this case to date have you made any billing or	
20	Q.	About 10 '83 Magba?	28	intend to <b>rake</b> ang <b>billing</b> ?	
21	Α.	Yeah no, It was actually '85 or thereabouts.	21	A. 10.	
22	Q.	Uhat attoroeg retained gou, if gou remember?	22	Q. I asked two questions. Have you iade any billing?	
23	Ă.	Boy, I don't even recall.	23	A. No, and I don't Intend to make billing for	
24	0.	Snovden, Kauffman?	24	angthing else prior to this.	
25	4. A.	It right have been Jin Snowden, but I don't	25	Q. All right. Let <b>ne</b> ask you this: If there was a	
1	n•			the stright. Let we tak juy this. If there was a	
		TO VIDE & ASSOCIATES (462) 425-2225		JS YURN & ASSOCIATES (402)475-3376	
L		JS YURN A ASSOCIATES (402)475-3376			
	PAGE 58				
<b>r</b>	PAGE 58			PAGE 52	
Γ	PAGE 58	50		PAGE 52 52	
[	PAGE 58	50			
			1	52	
	aaalo, don'	t quote <b>me</b> on that.		52 lesion no her back that was found after the leslon that we see	
1	aaalo, don' Q.	t quote <b>me</b> on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth מר. Snowden before?	1 2	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion Is metanoma, It's a	
1	aaalo, don' Q. A.	t quote <b>me</b> on that. Have yon ever <b>vorked ulth Mr. Snowden</b> before? I belleve <b>so.</b>	1	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion Is relanona, It's a ralignant relanona and It's of the same variety as the one	
1 2 3 4	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q.	t quote <b>me</b> on that. Have yon ever <b>vorked ulth Mr. Snowden</b> before? I belleve <b>so.</b> Bow about Mr. Kauffman?	1 2 3 4	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relanoua, it's a ralignant relanous and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way	
1 2 3 4 5	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A.	t quote <b>me</b> on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall.	1 2 3 4 5	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relanora, it's a raiignant relanora and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that gou can say which is the primary and which is the	
1 2 3 4 5 6	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth מר. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about מר. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire	1 2 3 4 5 6	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion Is relanona, It's a ratignant relanona and It's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which Is the secondary?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are	t quote <b>me</b> on that. Have yon ever <b>vorked ulth Mr. Snowden</b> before? I belleve <b>so.</b> Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And <b>the cases</b> out-state, uhat <b>tire</b> <b>ve</b> talking about?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relanoua. It's a malignant relanoua and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that gou can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably atmost a gear ago,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relance, it's a rationant relance and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. Io other words, if it appeared after the lymph	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at	t quote <b>me</b> on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And <b>the cases</b> out-state, uhat <b>tire</b> we talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relanoua. It's a rationant relanous and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A and both at Q.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember who theg were?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relanoua, it's a ralignant relanoua and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that gou can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A and both at Q. A.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked uith Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember uho theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relanoua. It's a rationant relanous and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A and both at Q. A.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember who theg were?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relance, it's a ratignant relance and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. Io other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying? Q. Yell, how can goo say that?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 18 11	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A and both at Q. A.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked uith Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember uho theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relangua. It's a ratignant relangua and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. Io other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 18 11 11 12	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at Q. A. the page I	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do you remember who theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relance, it's a ratignant relance and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. Io other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying? Q. Yell, how can goo say that?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. Period are A and both at Q. A. the pare I Q.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do you remember who theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou. Christensen?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relanged. It's a matigment relanged and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that 900 can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lynch nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what I'm saying? Q. Yell, how can goo say that? A. Yell, okay, I guess also it woold also binge on	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. Period are A. and both at: Q. A. the name I Q. A.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember uho theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou. Christensen? No.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relance, it's a rationant relance and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying? Q. Yell, how can goo say that? A. Yell, okay, I guess also it woold also binge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at: Q. A. the page I Q. A. Q.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember who theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou. Christensen? No. That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams? Yes, he was the defendant's attorneg.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relance, it's a raignant relance and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying? Q. Yell, how can goo say that? A. Yell, okay, I guess also it woold also hinge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean. that's not going to be the primary site of	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 11	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at Q. A. the page I Q. A. Q. A. P.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probablý almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember uho theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou. Christensen? No. That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams? Yes, he was the defendant's attorneg. And gou were testifging for?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relance, it's a matigment relance and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying? Q. Yell, how can goo say that? A. Yell, okay, I guess also it woold also hinge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean. that's not going to be the primary site of her lymph node involvement; but, again, I think whether or not	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 18	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at Q. A. the page I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do you remember who theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell you. Christensen? No. That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams? Yes, he was the defendant's attorneg. And you were testifying for? On the part of the defendant.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relanged. It's a matigment relanged and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying? Q. Yell, how can goo say that? A. Yell, okag, I guess also it woold also hinge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean. that's not going to be the primary site of her lymph node involvement; but, again, I think whether or not It's the primary site responsible for the subsequent hepatic	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 18 19	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at Q. A. the pare I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do you remember uho theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou. Christensen? No. That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams? Yes, he was the defendant's attorneg. And gou were testifging for? On the part of the defendant. And what klod of case was It?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relance. It's a matigment relance and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying? Q. Yell, how can goo say that? A. Yell, okay, I guess also It woold also binge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean. that's not going to be the primary site of her lymph node involvement; but, again, I think whether or not it's the primary site responsible for the subsequent hepatic involvement and bone and all the things that she died of I	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 2 3 14 15 16 11 18 19 28	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at Q. A. the pare I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do you remember who theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell you. Christensen? No. That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams? Yes, he was the defendant's attorneg. And you were testifying for? On the part of the defendant.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 26	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is relanged. It's a matigment relanged and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do you see what i'm saying? Q. Yell, how can goo say that? A. Yell, okag, I guess also It woold also hinge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean. that's not going to be the primary site of her lymph node involvement; but, again, I think whether or not it's the primary site responsible for the subsequent hepatic involvement and bone and all the things that she died of I think is an argumentative Issue.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 18 19 28 21	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. Period are A. and both at: Q. A. the name I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Cancer.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probablý almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember uho theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou. Christensen? No. That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams? Yes, he was the defendant's attorneg. And gou were testifging for? On the part of the defendant. And what klod of case was It? That was a, quote. failure to diagnose colon	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 26 21	<ul> <li>52</li> <li>lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is metanoma. It's a maignant metanoma and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the second ary?</li> <li>A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do you see what i'm saying?</li> <li>Q. Yell, how can goo say that?</li> <li>A. Yell, okag, I guess also It woold also hinge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean. that's not going to be the primary site of her lymph node involvement; but, again, I think whether or not it's the primary site responsible for the subsequent hepatic involvement and bone and all the things that she died of I think is an argumentative Issue.</li> <li>Q. Yon can't tell, can you?</li> </ul>	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 18 19 22 21 22	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at: Q. A. the pare I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Cancer. Q.	<ul> <li>t quote me on that.</li> <li>Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before?</li> <li>I belleve so.</li> <li>Bow about Mr. Kauffman?</li> <li>No, I don't recall.</li> <li>That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire we talking about?</li> <li>There was one I think probably almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln.</li> <li>Do gou remember who they were?</li> <li>One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told recould tell gou.</li> <li>Christensen?</li> <li>No.</li> <li>That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams?</li> <li>Yes, he was the defendant's attorneg.</li> <li>And gou were testifging for?</li> <li>On the part of the defendant.</li> <li>And what klod of case was It?</li> <li>That was a, quote. failure to diagnose colon</li> <li>All right. And then gou have had two others, If</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 26 21 22	52 lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is melanoma. It's a maignant melanoma and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the secondary? A. Depends on when the timing of that second lesion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying? Q. Yell, how can goo say that? A. Yell, okay, I guess also it woold also hinge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean. that's not going to be the primary site of her lymph node involvement; but, again, I think whether or not it's the primary site responsible for the subsequent hepatic involvement and bone and all the things that she died of I think is an argumentative Issue. Q. Yon can't tell, can gou? A. You can't tell. I lean, that's going to hinge on	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 18 19 28 21 22 23	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at Q. A. the page I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Cancer. Q. You can hal	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probablý almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember uho theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou. Christensen? No. That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams? Yes, he was the defendant's attorneg. And gou were testifging for? On the part of the defendant. And what klod of case was It? That was a, quote. failure to diagnose colon All right. And then gou have had two others, If fyag give me an Idea, if you can remember.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 26 21	<ul> <li>52</li> <li>lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is melanoma. It's a maignant melanoma and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the second resion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying?</li> <li>Q. Yell, how can goo say that?</li> <li>A. Yell, okag, I guess also It woold also hinge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean, that's not going to be the primary site of her lymph node involvement; but, again, I think whether or not it's the primary site responsible for the subsequent bepatic involvement and bone and all the things that she died of I think is an argumentative Issue.</li> <li>Q. Yon can't tell, can gou?</li> <li>A. You can't tell. I lean, that's going to hinge on depth and a guess.</li> </ul>	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 18 19 22 23 24	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at Q. A. the page I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Sourcer. Q. M. Q. A. Cancer. Q. A.	<ul> <li>t quote me on that.</li> <li>Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before?</li> <li>I belleve so.</li> <li>Bow about Mr. Kauffman?</li> <li>No, I don't recall.</li> <li>That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about?</li> <li>There was one I think probablý almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln.</li> <li>Do gou remember uho theg were?</li> <li>One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou.</li> <li>Christensen?</li> <li>No.</li> <li>That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams?</li> <li>Yes, he was the defendant's attorney.</li> <li>And gou were testifging for?</li> <li>On the part of the defendant.</li> <li>And what klod of case was It?</li> <li>That was a, quote. failure to diagnose colon</li> <li>All right. And then gou have had two others, If fivag give me an Idea, if you can remember.</li> <li>I don't remember the attorneys and I don't even</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 26 21 22	<ul> <li>52</li> <li>lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is metanoma. It's a matigmant metanoma and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that gou can say which is the primary and which is the second resion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying?</li> <li>Q. Yell, how can goo say that?</li> <li>A. Yell, okay, I guess also it woold also hinge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean. that's not going to be the primary site of her lymph node involvement; but, again, I think whether or not it's the primary site responsible for the subsequent hepatic involvement and bone and all the things that she died of I think is an argumentative Issue.</li> <li>Q. Yon can't tell, can gou?</li> <li>A. You can't tell. I lean, that's going to hinge on the primary site.</li> </ul>	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 18 19 28 21 22 23	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at Q. A. the page I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Sourcer. Q. M. Q. A. Cancer. Q. A.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probablý almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember uho theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou. Christensen? No. That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams? Yes, he was the defendant's attorneg. And gou were testifging for? On the part of the defendant. And what klod of case was It? That was a, quote. failure to diagnose colon All right. And then gou have had two others, If fyag give me an Idea, if you can remember.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 26 21 22	<ul> <li>52</li> <li>lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is melanoma. It's a maignant melanoma and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that you can say which is the primary and which is the second resion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying?</li> <li>Q. Yell, how can goo say that?</li> <li>A. Yell, okag, I guess also It woold also hinge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean, that's not going to be the primary site of her lymph node involvement; but, again, I think whether or not it's the primary site responsible for the subsequent bepatic involvement and bone and all the things that she died of I think is an argumentative Issue.</li> <li>Q. Yon can't tell, can gou?</li> <li>A. You can't tell. I lean, that's going to hinge on depth and a guess.</li> </ul>	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 18 19 22 23 24	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at Q. A. the page I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Sourcer. Q. M. Q. A. Cancer. Q. A.	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probablý almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember uho theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou. Christensen? No. That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams? Yes, he was the defendant's attorney. And gou were testifging for? On the part of the defendant. And what klod of case was It? That was a, quote. failure to diagnose colon All right. And then gou have had two others, If fvag give me an Idea, if you can remember. I don't remember the attorneys and I don't even	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 26 21 22 23	<ul> <li>52</li> <li>lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is metanoma. It's a matigmant metanoma and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that gou can say which is the primary and which is the second resion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying?</li> <li>Q. Yell, how can goo say that?</li> <li>A. Yell, okay, I guess also it woold also hinge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean. that's not going to be the primary site of her lymph node involvement; but, again, I think whether or not it's the primary site responsible for the subsequent hepatic involvement and bone and all the things that she died of I think is an argumentative Issue.</li> <li>Q. Yon can't tell, can gou?</li> <li>A. You can't tell. I lean, that's going to hinge on the primary site.</li> </ul>	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 18 19 22 23 24	aaalo, don' Q. A. Q. period are A. and both at Q. A. the page I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Cancer. Q. You can hall A. recall iuch	t quote me on that. Have yon ever vorked ulth Mr. Snowden before? I belleve so. Bow about Mr. Kauffman? No, I don't recall. That's fine. And the cases out-state, uhat tire ve talking about? There was one I think probablý almost a gear ago, tornegs were from Lincoln. Do gou remember uho theg were? One was with Cline, Williams, and if goo told re could tell gou. Christensen? No. That's okag. But one was from Cline, Williams? Yes, he was the defendant's attorney. And gou were testifging for? On the part of the defendant. And what klod of case was It? That was a, quote. failure to diagnose colon All right. And then gou have had two others, If fvag give me an Idea, if you can remember. I don't remember the attorneys and I don't even	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 26 21 22 23	<ul> <li>52</li> <li>lesion no her back that was found after the lesion that we see an her right shoulder and that lesion is metanoma. It's a matigmant metanoma and it's of the same variety as the one that was found on her right shoulder. Is there really any way that gou can say which is the primary and which is the second resion appeared. To other words, if it appeared after the lymph nodes were documented to be proven, then obviously it's Probably an incidental malignancy and not the primary site. Do You see what i'm saying?</li> <li>Q. Yell, how can goo say that?</li> <li>A. Yell, okay, I guess also it woold also hinge on the anatomic location of the, quote, lesion to her back. I lean, if it was on the other shoulder or the other flank, then that's not, I lean. that's not going to be the primary site of her lymph node involvement; but, again, I think whether or not it's the primary site responsible for the subsequent hepatic involvement and bone and all the things that she died of I think is an argumentative Issue.</li> <li>Q. Yon can't tell, can gou?</li> <li>A. You can't tell. I lean, that's going to hinge on the primary site.</li> </ul>	

JS WURM & ASSOCIATES (402) 475-3376

SCOT SORENSEN.N.D.					
	PAGE 57 SHEET 8 57		FAGE 3759		
1	prognosis is worse for ulcerated lesions. Q. How much worse?	1	she has ietastatle dlsease at that time? A. Yes.		
2	A. I'd have to I don't know right offhand. I'd	3	A. Tes. MR. BATAILLOH: All right. That's all the		
4	have to review that, but there is no question that diceration	4	questions I have.		
5	is an adverse prognostic Indicator, just like turor depth,	5	(At this time, a short break		
6	just like a variety of other prognostic indicators. So I	6	⊌2S had.)		
7	think the tire frare of nine days of, quote, assuming there's	7	CROSS-EYAHIHATIOH		
E	no ulceration to the time that there was ulceration documented	E	BY MR. DOHIHA:		
9	I think certaining Is an Issue.	9	Q. D: Sorensen, I want to return to the last subject		
10	Q. Bot ag question is, at the time of ulceration, is	10	that Mr. Batallion addressed vita 300 because I think there		
11	It more likely than not that there's already retastatic	11	rag have been sore confusion about his question even after It was restated. Does the ulceration of a noise suggest the		
13	disease? MR. DOHIHA: Objection, asked and answered.	13	presence of retastaslzed relanora?		
14	Q. (By Mr. Bata([]on) You can answer that.	14	A. Xo.		
15	A. It increases the likelihood that there is	15	Q. Does the fact of ulceration make metastasis more		
16	retastatic disease at that tire.	16	probable?		
17	Q. The question is, is It lore likely than not that	17	A. Yes.		
18	there's retastatic disease when It Is ulcerated?	18	MR. DOHIHA: That's all.		
19	MR. DOHIHA: ObJectlon, asked and ansuered. The	19	REDIRECT EXAMINATION		
20	Vitness has answered the question.	20	BY MR. EATAILLOH:		
21	MR. EATAILLON: No, he hasn't.	i21 i22	Q. I'l not sure that there is any confusion about		
22 23	MR. DOMINA: Yes, he has. He said It's more	23	this question, but I'm going to ask gou a little bit. Uhen I sag rore probably than not, I rean more likely than not there		
24	M. BATAILLOH: No, no, he dldn't sa! that.	24	Is retastasls. Would got accept that definition when I sag		
25	He said It's Increased, but I want to know whether It's more	:25	rore probable than not?		
1			-		
L	JS YURn 6 ASSOCIATES (462)475-3376		JS WURN & ASSOCIATES (482)475-3376		
PAGE 58		PAGE 68			
	PAGE 58		PAGE 68		
Γ	PAGE 58 58		PAGE 6868		
	58		60		
		1 2			
1	58	1	6 <b>6</b> MR. DOMINA: Well, now let's —		
1	58 Ilkelg than not uhen It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease.	1	6 <b>5</b> MR. DOMINA: Well, now let's — MR. BATAILLOH: Let re <b>change</b> the question, I'll		
1 2 3	58 Treastatic disease. MR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by	1 2 3	65 ng. DOMINA: Well, now let's — ng. BATAILLOH: Let re change the question, I'll change the whole question. Q. (By dr. Batailloni If a patient comes In and we know that the mole has changed enough to advise an excision		
1 2 3 4 5 6	58 Likelg than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. MR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer.	1 2 3 4 5 6	65 MR. DOMINA: Well, now let's — MR. BATAILLOH: Let re change the question, I'll change the whole question. Q. (By Mr. Batallioni If a patient comes In and we know that the mole has changed enough to advise an excision and now we have ulceration of the mole, all right, based on		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	58 Likelg than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. MR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with bim now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. tR. DOMINA: I'd like gog to refrain from	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>68</li> <li>MR. DOMINA: Well, now let's —</li> <li>MR. BATAILLOH: Let re change the question, I'll change the whole question.</li> <li>Q. (B9 Mr. Batallioni If a patient comes In and we know that the mole has changed enough to advise an excision and now we have ulceration of the mole, all right, based on gour opinion, Is it rore probable than not that there has been</li> </ul>		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E	58 Likely than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. MR. DOHIHA: He's interred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. MR. DOMINA: I'd like you to refrain from argument.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E	68 NR. DOMINA: Well, now let's — NR. BATAILLOH: Let re change the question, I'll change the whole question. Q. (Bg Mr. Batallioni If a patient comes in and we know that the mole has changed enough to advise an excision and now we have ulceration of the mole, all right, based on gour opinion, Is it rore probable than not that there has been retastasls on the date that we see the ulceration?		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3	58 Likely than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. MR. DOHIHA: He's interred that's a guess case by case. That's the best you're going to get. You're arguing with bim now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. MR. DOMINA: I'd like his answer. M. EATAILLON: I'd like gou to refrain from argument. M. EATAILLOH: I'd like his answer.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9	68 NR. DOMINA: Well, now let's — NR. BATAILLOH: Let re change the question, I'll change the whole question. Q. (Bg Mr. Batailloni If a patient comes In and we know that the mole has changed enough to advise an excision and now we have ulceration of the mole, all right, based on gour opinion, Is it rore probable than not that there has been retastasts on the date that we see the ulceration? A. Not to ansuer the question with a question, but		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E	58 Itkelg than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. MR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. MR. DOMINA: I'd like bis answer. M. EATAILLOH: I'd like bis answer. A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E	68 NR. DONINA: Well, now let's — NR. BATAILLOH: Let re change the question, I'll change the whole question. Q. (Bg Mr. Batallioni If a patient comes In and we know that the mole has changed enough to advise an excision and now we have ulceration of the mole, all right, based on gour opinion, Is it rore probable than not that there has been retastasts on the date that we see the ulceration? A. Not to ansuer the question with a question. but are gout saging greater than 50 percent?		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 19	58 likelg than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. MR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. MR. DOMINA: I'd like his answer. M. EATAILLOH: I'd like his answer. A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 18	68 NR. DOMINA: Well, now let's — NR. BATAILLOH: Let re change the question, I'll change the whole question. Q. (Bg Mr. Batailloni If a patient comes In and we know that the mole has changed enough to advise an excision and now we have ulceration of the mole, all right, based on gour opinion, Is it rore probable than not that there has been retastasts on the date that we see the ulceration? A. Not to ansuer the question with a question, but		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 18 11	58 Likely than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. MR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. MR. DOMINA: I'd like his answer. M. EATAILLOH: I'd like his answer. A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please? Q. (By thr. Satailion) The question is, at the tire	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 <b>1</b> <i>B</i> 11	58 NR. DONINA: Well, now let's — NR. BATAILLOH: Let re change the question, I'll change the whole question. Q. (By Mr. Batallioni If a patient comes in and we know that the mole has changed enough to advise an excision and now we have ulceration of the mole, all right, based on your opinion, Is it rore probable than not that there has been retastasts on the date that we see the ulceration? A. Not to ansuer the question with a question. but are you saying greater than 58 percent? Q. Right.		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 18 11 12	58 Likely than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. MR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with bin nov. M. EATAILLON: I'd like bis answer. MR. DOMINA: I'd like bis answer. M. EATAILLOH: I'd like bis answer. A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please? Q. (By thr. Batailion) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viebelbaus, Is It nore { (keig than not	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 16 11 11 12	68 NR. DONINA: Well, now let's — NR. BATAILLOH: Let re change the question, I'll change the whole question. Q. (By Mr. Batallioni If a patient comes in and we know that the mole has changed enough to advise an excision and now we have ulceration of the mole, all right, based on your opinion, Is it rore probable than not that there has been retastasts on the date that we see the ulceration? A. Not to ansuer the question with a question. but are you saying greater than 58 percent? Q. Right. A. The odds are?		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 1 8 11 12 13 14 15	58 Likely than not uhen It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. IR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. IR. DOMINA: I'd like his answer. M. EATAILLOH: I'd like his ansuer. A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please? Q. (By thr. Satailion) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viebelbaus, Is It more likely than not that she has retastatic disease at that tire? A. Yes. Q. All right.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 16 11 12 13 14 15	68 NR. DONINA: Well, now let's — NR. BATAILLOH: Let re change the question, I'll change the whole question. Q. (Bg Mr. Batailloni If a patient comes in and we know that the mole has changed enough to advise an excision and now we have ulceration of the mole, all right, based on gour opinion, is it rore probable than not that there has been retastasts on the date that we see the ulceration? A. Not to ansuer the question with a question, but are gou saging greater than 58 percent? Q. Right. A. The odds are? Q. The odds are. A. Okag, now I understand completely ubat gou're getting at. No, I would sag no to that question.		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>58</li> <li>Ittels than not uhen It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease.</li> <li>MR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with bin nov.</li> <li>M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>MR. DOMINA: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>M. EATAILLOH: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>M. EATAILLOH: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please?</li> <li>Q. (By thr. Sataillon) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viedelbaus, Is It nore likels than not that she has retastatic disease at that tire?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>IR. EATAILOH: I don't have ang further</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 18 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Not to ansuer the question with a question. but are gou saging greater than 50 percent?</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are.</li> <li>Q. Wey now I understand completely ubat gog're setting at. No. I would you sag no to that question?</li> </ul>		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 1 8 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	58 It kaig than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. IR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. RR. DOMINA: I'd like his answer. R. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please? Q. (By thr. Batailion) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viebelbaus, Is It more {{tels than not that she has retastatic disease at that tire? A. Yes. Q. All right. RR. EATAILOH: I don't have ang further questions, doctor. Thank you very much. If I can just inok	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 1 5 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Not to ansuer the question with a question. but are gou saging greater than 58 percent?</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are.</li> <li>A. Okag, now I understand completely ubat gou're setting at. No. I would sag no to that question?</li> <li>A. Not are gou saging that assuming that</li> </ul>		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 1 8 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	58 Ittels than not uhen It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. IR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. IR. DOMINA: I'd like bis answer. M. EATAILLOH: I'd like bis answer. A. Could you rephrase the question for re, please? Q. (By thr. Batailion) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viebelbaus, Is It more   (kels than not that she has retastatic disease at that tire? A. Yes. Q. All right. IR. EATAILUOH: I don't have any further questions, doctor. Thank you very much. If I can just look at gour book for a minute.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 1 6 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 1e	<ul> <li>A. Not to ansuer the question with a question. but are gout saging greater than 58 percent?</li> <li>Q. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are say no to that question.</li> </ul>		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	58 It kaig than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. IR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. RR. DOMINA: I'd like his answer. R. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please? Q. (By thr. Batailion) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viebelbaus, Is It more {{tels than not that she has retastatic disease at that tire? A. Yes. Q. All right. RR. EATAILOH: I don't have ang further questions, doctor. Thank you very much. If I can just inok	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 1 5 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Not to ansuer the question with a question, but are gout saying greater than 58 percent?</li> <li>Q. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are.</li> <li>A. Oray, now I understand completely ubat gou're setting at. No, I would gou say no to that question?</li> </ul>		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 18 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	58 Iterig than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. IR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with bin now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. IR. DOMINA: I'd like his answer. IR. DOMINA: I'd like bis answer. A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please? Q. (By thr. Batailion) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viebelbaus, Is It nore likely than not that she has retastatic disease at that tire? A. Yes. Q. All right. IR. EATAIUOH: I don't have ang further questions, doctor. Thank gou very much. If I can just look at gour book for a minute. IR. DOMINA: Hore likely than not or rore likely	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 1 6 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 1e 19	<ul> <li>A. Not to ansuer the question with a question. but are gout saging greater than 58 percent?</li> <li>Q. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are say to that question.</li> </ul>		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 25	58 Itials than not when It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease. IR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now. M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer. IR. DOMINA: I'd like his answer. IR. DOMINA: I'd like bis answer. M. EATAILLOH: I'd like his ansuer. A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please? Q. (By thr. Batailion) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viedelbaus, Is It more likels than not that she has retastatic disease at that tire? A. Yes. Q. All right. IR. EATAILOH: I don't have ang further questions, doctor. Thank you very much. If I can just look at your book for a minute. MR. DOMINA: fore likely than not or rore likely than othervise? dore likely than vithout giceration?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 16 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 1e 19 26	<ul> <li>A. Not to ansuer the question with a question, but are gou saging greater than 58 percent?</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The add set.</li> <li>A. Primarily because god're saging that assuming that the vole sag no to that question?</li> </ul>		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 25 21 22 3	<ul> <li>58</li> <li>Iterig than not uhen It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease.</li> <li>MR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best you're going to get. You're arguing with him now.</li> <li>M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>MR. DOMINA: I'd like gou to refrain from argument.</li> <li>M. EATAILLOH: I'd like his ansuer.</li> <li>A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please?</li> <li>Q. (By thr. Batailion) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viebelbaus, is It more (keig than not that she has retastatic disease at that tire?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. EATAILUOH: I don't have ang further</li> <li>questions, doctor. Thank you verg much. If I can just look at your book for a minute.</li> <li>MR. DOMINA: fore likely than not or rore likely than othervise? More (ikely than vithout diceration?</li> <li>ME WITNESS: Yell. I assure that's uhat he meant, nore likely than without ulceration. I guess I'm.</li> <li>Q. (By fir. Batailion) Oh, no, no. The question Is</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 16 17 16 19 25 21	<ul> <li>A. Not to ansuer the question with a question. but are gout saging greater than 58 percent?</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are.</li> <li>A. Not is gout or build gout sag no to that question?</li> <li>A. Primaring because goutre saging that assuming that there's ulceration, that rore than half of those patients will have metastatic disease at the tire of the clinical diagnosis. There is no proof to that only assumes half of the question.</li> </ul>		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 25 21 22 ;3 24	<ul> <li>58</li> <li>11keig than not uhen It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease.</li> <li>IR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now.</li> <li>M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>IR. DOHINA: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>IR. DOHINA: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>M. EATAILLOH: I'd like his ansuer.</li> <li>A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please?</li> <li>Q. (By thr. Batailion) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viebelbaus, Is It more { (kel y than not that she has retastatic disease at that tire?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>IR. EATAIUOH: I don't have any further</li> <li>questions, doctor. Thank you very much. If I can just look at gour book for a minute.</li> <li>IR. DOMINA: fore likely than not or rore [ kel y than otherwise? More [ kel y than without ulceration?</li> <li>M E WITNESS: Yell. I assure that's uhat he meant, nore likely than without ulceration. I guess I'm —</li> <li>Q. (By thr. Batailion) Oh, no, no. The question Is yory simple. The question is, if she presents vith an</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 1 8 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 1e 19 28 21 22 3 24	<ul> <li>A. Not to ansuer the question with a question, but are got saging greater than 58 percent?</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. Built and for the form of the form of the got saging state that the rest of the saging state that the rest of the saging state that the rest of the saging state that the saging state stat</li></ul>		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 25 21 22 3	<ul> <li>58</li> <li>Iterig than not uhen It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease.</li> <li>MR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best you're going to get. You're arguing with him now.</li> <li>M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>MR. DOMINA: I'd like gou to refrain from argument.</li> <li>M. EATAILLOH: I'd like his ansuer.</li> <li>A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please?</li> <li>Q. (By thr. Batailion) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viebelbaus, is It more (keig than not that she has retastatic disease at that tire?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. EATAILUOH: I don't have ang further</li> <li>questions, doctor. Thank you verg much. If I can just look at your book for a minute.</li> <li>MR. DOMINA: fore likely than not or rore likely than othervise? More (ikely than vithout diceration?</li> <li>ME WITNESS: Yell. I assure that's uhat he meant, nore likely than without ulceration. I guess I'm.</li> <li>Q. (By fir. Batailion) Oh, no, no. The question Is</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 <b>15</b> 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 12 19 2 <b>6</b> 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Not to ansuer the question with a question. but are got saging greater than 58 percent?</li> <li>Q. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. The odds are.</li> <li>A. Otag, now I understand completely ubat got're setting at. No, I would sag no to that question?</li> <li>A. Primarily because got're saging that assuming that there's ulceration, that rore than half of those patients will have metastatic disease at the tire of the clinical diagnosis. There is no proof to that only assumes half of the qoestion.</li> <li>A. All right.</li> </ul>		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 3 15 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 25 21 22 ;3 24	<ul> <li>58</li> <li>11keig than not uhen It's ulcerated that there's already retastatic disease.</li> <li>IR. DOHIHA: He's inferred that's a guess case by case. That's the best gou're going to get. You're arguing with him now.</li> <li>M. EATAILLON: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>IR. DOHINA: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>IR. DOHINA: I'd like his answer.</li> <li>M. EATAILLOH: I'd like his ansuer.</li> <li>A. Could gou rephrase the question for re, please?</li> <li>Q. (By thr. Batailion) The question is, at the tire of ulceration In Mrs. Viebelbaus, Is It more { (kel y than not that she has retastatic disease at that tire?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>IR. EATAIUOH: I don't have any further</li> <li>questions, doctor. Thank you very much. If I can just look at gour book for a minute.</li> <li>IR. DOMINA: fore likely than not or rore [ kel y than otherwise? More [ kel y than without ulceration?</li> <li>M E WITNESS: Yell. I assure that's uhat he meant, nore likely than without ulceration. I guess I'm —</li> <li>Q. (By thr. Batailion) Oh, no, no. The question Is yory simple. The question is, if she presents vith an</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 E 9 1 8 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 1e 19 28 21 22 3 24	<ul> <li>A. Not to ansuer the question with a question, but are got saging greater than 58 percent?</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. The odds are?</li> <li>Q. Built and for the form of the form of the got saging state that the rest of the saging state that the rest of the saging state that the rest of the saging state that the saging state stat</li></ul>		

.

JS WURN & ASSOCIATES (482) 475-3376

## SCOT SORENSEN, M.D.

	PAGE 65 SEEET 9
	65
1	Q. My question Is, if you blopsy the tissue dag one,
2	can you look at that tissue In your opinion and sag It's been
3	here for X augher of
4	A. No. I ansuered that question before. No, goo
5	can't.
6	Q. That's uhat I thouaht.
7	MR. BATAILLON: All rlaht, I don't have angthing
8	further.
9	MR. DOMINA: You have a rlaht to read and sign the
10	depositloo Or gou can vaive that rlaht
11	ME YITNESS: I'll waive It. That's fine.
12	(Deposition concluded at 9:45 a.m.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	JS WURD & ASSOCIATES (402)475-3376
	JJ CONI D ASSOCIATES (400)415 JJ10
	PAGE 66
	PAGE 6666
	66
1	66 CERTIFICATE
	66
1	66 CERTIFICATE
1 2	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and
1 2 3 4	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly commissioned, qualified, and acting under a general dotorial commission uithin and
1 2 3 4 5	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly compissioned, qualified, and acting under a general dotorial compission uithin and for the State of Nebraska, do herebg certify that:
1 2 3 4 5 6	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly consistioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial consistion ulthin and for the State of Mebraska, do herebg certify that: SCOT SOREXSEX, N.D.
1 2 3 4 5 6 <b>7</b>	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, dulg commissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial commission within and for the State of Mebraska, do herebg certifg that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.D. Was bg me first dulg sworn to tell the truth, the whole
1 2 3 4 5 6	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly commissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial commission within and for the State of Mebraska, do hereby certify that: SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. Was by me first duly sworm to tell the truth, the Whole truth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing
1 2 3 4 5 6 <b>7</b>	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, dulg commissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial commission within and for the State of Mebraska, do herebg certifg that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.D. Was bg me first dulg sworn to tell the truth, the whole
1 2 3 4 5 6 <b>7</b> 8	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly commissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial commission within and for the State of Mebraska, do hereby certify that: SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. Was by me first duly sworm to tell the truth, the Whole truth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 19	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly commissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial commission uithin and for the State of Nebraska, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. was by is first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition uas taken by le at the time and place berein specified and In accordance uith the within stipulations;
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 19 11	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly consistioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial consistion uithin and for the State of Mebraska, do hereby certify that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.D. Was by is first duly sworn to tell the truth, the Whole truth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition was taken by le at the time and place berein specified and In accordance uith the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of either
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 1 9 11 12	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general dotorial confission uithin and for the State of Mebraska, do hereby certify that: SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. Was bg is first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition uas taken bg le at the tiff and place berein specified and in accordance uith the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of either party or otherwise Interested In the event of this suit.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 1 9 1 1 1 1 2 13	CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, dulg commissioned, qualified, and acting under a general dotorial commission uithin and for the State of Mebraska, do herebg certifg that: SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. Was bg me first dulg sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and dothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition uas taken bg le at the time and place herein specified and in accordance uith the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorneg, or relative of either party or otherwise Interested In the event of this suit. N TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set My hand
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 1 9 11 12	66 CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general dotorial confission uithin and for the State of Mebraska, do hereby certify that: SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. Was bg is first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition uas taken bg le at the tiff and place berein specified and in accordance uith the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of either party or otherwise Interested In the event of this suit.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 1 9 1 1 1 1 2 13	CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, dulg commissioned, qualified, and acting under a general dotorial commission uithin and for the State of Mebraska, do herebg certifg that: SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. Was bg me first dulg sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and dothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition uas taken bg le at the time and place herein specified and in accordance uith the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorneg, or relative of either party or otherwise Interested In the event of this suit. N TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set My hand
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 9 1 9 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 3 1 4	CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly commissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial commission uithin and for the State of Mebraska, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. Was by he first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition uas taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance with the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of either party or otherwise Interested In the event of this sult. N TESTINOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set My hand officially and attached My notarial seal at Lincoln,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 9 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly commissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial commission uithin and for the State of Mebraska, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. Was by he first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition uas taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance with the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of either party or otherwise Interested In the event of this sult. N TESTINOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set My hand officially and attached My notarial seal at Lincoln,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 9 1 9 1 1 1 1 2 13 14 15 16 17	EXERTIFICATE Is a series of Meterson, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duig confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial confission ulthin and for the State of Metrasta, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.O. Not by the first duig sworn to tell the truth, the whole furth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition has taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance ulth the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of elither juty or otherwise interested in the event of this suit. N first HNOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set 15 hand officialis and attached 15 notorial seal at Lincoln, heraska, this 11th dag of DECEMBER 1993.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 5 1 1 1 2 1 3 14 15 16 17 18	CERTIFICATE I, Raelene Petersen, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duly commissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial commission uithin and for the State of Mebraska, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEN, N.D. Was by he first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition uas taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance with the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of either party or otherwise Interested In the event of this sult. N TESTINOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set My hand officially and attached My notarial seal at Lincoln,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 5 1 1 2 1 3 1 4 15 16 17 18 19	EXERTIFICATE Is a series of Meterson, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duig confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial confission ulthin and for the State of Metrasta, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.O. Not by the first duig sworn to tell the truth, the whole furth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition has taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance ulth the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of elither juty or otherwise interested in the event of this suit. N first HNOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set 15 hand officialis and attached 15 notorial seal at Lincoln, heraska, this 11th dag of DECEMBER 1993.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 5 1 1 1 2 1 3 14 15 16 17 18	EXERTIFICATE Is a series of Meterson, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duig confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial confission ulthin and for the State of Metrasta, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.O. Not by the first duig sworn to tell the truth, the whole furth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition has taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance ulth the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of elither juty or otherwise interested in the event of this suit. N first HNOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set 15 hand officialis and attached 15 notorial seal at Lincoln, heraska, this 11th dag of DECEMBER 1993.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 5 1 1 2 1 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	EXERTIFICATE Is a series of Meterson, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duig confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial confission ulthin and for the State of Metrasta, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.O. Not by the first duig sworn to tell the truth, the whole furth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition has taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance ulth the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of elither juty or otherwise interested in the event of this suit. N first HNOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set 15 hand officialis and attached 15 notorial seal at Lincoln, heraska, this 11th dag of DECEMBER 1993.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 1 1 2 1 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 2 9 2 9 2 1	EXERTIFICATE Is a series of Meterson, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duig confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial confission ulthin and for the State of Metrasta, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.O. Not by the first duig sworn to tell the truth, the whole furth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition has taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance ulth the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of elither juty or otherwise interested in the event of this suit. N first HNOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set 15 hand officialis and attached 15 notorial seal at Lincoln, heraska, this 11th dag of DECEMBER 1993.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	EXERTIFICATE Is a series of Meterson, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duig confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial confission ulthin and for the State of Metrasta, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.O. Not by the first duig sworn to tell the truth, the whole furth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition has taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance ulth the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of elither juty or otherwise interested in the event of this suit. N first HNOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set 15 hand officialis and attached 15 notorial seal at Lincoln, heraska, this 11th dag of DECEMBER 1993.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 73	EXERTIFICATE Is a series of Meterson, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duig confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial confission ulthin and for the State of Metrasta, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.O. Not by the first duig sworn to tell the truth, the whole furth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition has taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance ulth the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of elither juty or otherwise interested in the event of this suit. N first HNOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set 15 hand officialis and attached 15 notorial seal at Lincoln, heraska, this 11th dag of DECEMBER 1993.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 5 1 1 1 2 3 14 15 16 7 18 19 2 5 2 1 2 2 5 2 1 2 2 3 2 4	EXERTIFICATE Is a series of Meterson, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duig confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial confission ulthin and for the State of Metrasta, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.O. Not by the first duig sworn to tell the truth, the whole furth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition has taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance ulth the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of elither juty or otherwise interested in the event of this suit. N first HNOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set 15 hand officialis and attached 15 notorial seal at Lincoln, heraska, this 11th dag of DECEMBER 1993.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 73	EXERTIFICATE Is a series of Meterson, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duig confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial confission ulthin and for the State of Metrasta, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.O. Not by the first duig sworn to tell the truth, the whole furth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition has taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance ulth the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of elither juty or otherwise interested in the event of this suit. N first HNOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set 15 hand officialis and attached 15 notorial seal at Lincoln, heraska, this 11th dag of DECEMBER 1993.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 5 1 1 1 2 3 14 15 16 7 18 19 2 5 2 1 2 2 5 2 1 2 2 3 2 4	EXERTIFICATE Is a series of Meterson, Stenographic Reporter and General Notarg Public, duig confissioned, qualified, and acting under a general notorial confission ulthin and for the State of Metrasta, do herebg certify that: SCOT SORENSEX, N.O. Not by the first duig sworn to tell the truth, the whole furth, and nothing but the troth; that the foregoing deposition has taken by le at the time and place berein specified and in accordance ulth the within stipulations; that I am not counsel, attorney, or relative of elither juty or otherwise interested in the event of this suit. N first HNOMY WEREOF, I have hereunto set 15 hand officialis and attached 15 notorial seal at Lincoln, heraska, this 11th dag of DECEMBER 1993.

.

3	accommodate 29:12	attorney 3:11 49:22 50:16 66:11	
	accomplish 27:5	attorneys 50:9.24 51:7	C
<b>'83</b> 49:20	accordance 66:10	August 38:19,25 40:10,13,16,19,	Calder 4:9
'85 49:21	acting 66:4	25 41:4, 15, 22 42:2, 9, 13, 13, 15, 18	California 8:20 9:20
<b>'92</b> 7:10 12:12 33:13	action 48:6 active 31:16,21	43:13 44:3,5,12 45:1,2,3,15 53:17 55:1,7,16,19,20	calling 45:8
<b>'93</b> 11:19,23	Actually 41:19	authoritative 24:21	came 9:21 23:24 49:18
0	actually 41:20 49:21	available 27:18 29:25	Can 4:16 5:3 22:15 23:19 49:2,10 62:16 63:21,23 64:1
	addition 33:10	Avenue 1:14	can 4:18 12:14 13:15 15:10 17:3
0.76 18:25 20:13	address 12:7 47:12 55:4	average 26:2	14 18:18 19:14,15 20:12,14,21 21:
1	addressed 33:16 36:18 45:3,18	aware 9:11 10:12 11:13,16,22 12: 1 16:24 30:10 46:19	110 22:2.9.22 23:7.12 19 32:16.25
	55:22 59:10 adjuvant 28:14	away 24:14	34:12 36:20 38:17,22 45:10,10 48:
1.70 19:5,7 52:25	administered 27:15 28:11	Axillary 14:12	
10 15:12,13 17:2,25 18:24 11th 66:15	admittedly 29:7	axillary 15:3	
	adverse 19:1 57:5	D	
	12 60:5.25	<u> </u>	00.20 40.21 40.11,10 41.12 01.2
15 15:12,13 18:24	advocate 34:14	baby 56:4	52:21,22 55:4 61:9 64:7 65:5
1507 25:2	Affected 42:6	back 8:10 11:14 26:7,9,18 32:10,	Cancer 11:6 23:21 24:7 31:8
<b>15th 4</b> 0:16   1982 24:8	affected 42:7,24	11 34:15 39:2,20 40:10,13,16 41:1, 2 52:1 14 24 53:3 60:22 53:16 64:	49:6 50:21 51:1,5 61:25
1983 4:23	Affects 62:14 Affects 52:163:19	2 52:1,14,24 53:3 60:22 63:16 64: 1   <b>bad 37:1</b>	candidate 27, 13, 28, 22
1991 12:12 45:3	Atter 15:21:03:19		care 5:12 6:12 10:1,6,11 25:18 26:
1992 12:15 39:17 40:6 45:15	after 15:25 27:7, 15 28:1529:1,2 31:21,33:643:744:8,46.10 52:1,854:259:11,61:14 52:1,854:259:11,61:14	based 6:23 8:13 10:12 12:19 22:	care 5:12 6:12 10:1,6,11 25:18 26: 3,8,14,22 29: 1931:1737: 1953:12 case 8:12 37:13 42:10 47:5 49:17 50:19 51:3,4,19 54:13 58:3,4
1993 1:9 2:3 3:4 9:9 11:17 66:15	52:1854:2 59:11 61:14 49:	15,19 23:7 32:9 34:22 44:20 55:4	case 8:12 37:13 42:10 47:5 49:17
1st 40:11	again 7:5 13:15 18:3 19:25 24:3	60:6 62:3 63:1 64:1 Based 8:18 13:24 14:6 22:19 56:	cases 49:6 50:6,25 51:6
2	25:19 28:5 30:24 32:11 39:4 40:10	10,13	Center 12:25 20:25
	42:25 44:18,23 45:3 50:1 52:17		centimeter 14:25 21:4
22nd 40:25 41:15 42:2,9,13,15,18 44:3,5,12 53:17 55:1,7,16	60:22 63:9 Ada	basis22,7;18,18;5,13, 37:23 56:9	centimeters21:2,5,10
2414 24:8	Again 16:4,5 19:24 33:15 38:20	62:25 BATAILLON 1:16 2:10,12 3:11 4:6	Certainly 4: 17
2425 1:14 3:8 17:5	age 4:2	9:8,11 10:5,24 11:20,22 12:20 14:	certainly 7:20,22 10:8 28:6 34:19 35:20 55:25 57:9
3	addressive.5618-04 Ford	3 15:6 25:13 21 30:7 32:3 33:17 35:5 39:11 45:10,13 46:14,17 48:	
	ager 3:25/18/18:24 47:14 50:8 agreed 3:2 8:7 45:1 47:9 55:2	35:5 39:11 45:10,13 46:14,17 48:	certainty 22: 1623:8 Certificate 2:5 66:1
324 3:10 17:7 3.7 19:9	allow 54:3	12,15 53:6,23 56:22 57:14,21,24	certification 3:12
31 40:19 41:24,25 42:13 43:13 55:	allow 54:3 almost 50:8	58:6,9,11,16,23 59:3,10,20 60:2,4	certified 4:3,24 5:25 certify 66:5
19,20	aiready 54:1 56:24 57:11 58:1	61:5,7,11 64:24 65:7 bearing 6:11 19:24 23:16 42:16	cetera 12:24 56:15
31d41:445:3,15	American 31:8 amount 46:9 53:16	because 6:7,9 9:22 15:9,24 17:13 27:5,16,24 29:12 32:18 35:6,15,17,	chances 30:15
4		27:5,16,24,29:12,32:18,35:6,15,17,	changed 36:2,4 38:16 39:6 44:17
	analysis 19:2 33:19 63:14 64:10	21 38:2,2,15 43:11,16 45:11 51:12 54:13,16 55:9 59:10 60:17 61:20	46:6,8 55:3 60:2,3,5,24 61:12 <b>62:</b> 17
4 2:10 3:15 17:9 49 24:8	analysis 2429 analomic 52 14	62:6	
	another 6:7 12:15 16:22 22:11 28: 22 43:19 44:18 45:14 55:14	Because 7:18 23:14 37:8	charge 51:17 charted 40:1545:2
5		become 6:2 17:19	charting 41:10
50/50 49:5 55:2 60:10 61:16 62:9.	answer 22:24 25:21 42:16 44:18 45:10,11 57:14 58:6 9 60:9 answered 33:14 53:21 56:11 57:	becomes 35:24 before 3:5 16:6 24:12 29:6,15,19,	check <b>39:20</b> 40:4 checked 40:7
<b>1500</b> 19:2	answered 33:14 53:21 56:11 57:	22 34:5 41:18 45:22 46:25 47:4	chemistry 26:25
	13,19,20 65:4	50:2 54: 10 55:22 64:20 65:4	chemotherapy 27: 11,24 28:1,7,20
59 2:11,12 3:17 17:11	anxiety 29:4 10 10:0 0 00:0 07:5 40:22 43:5 45:8,18 49:17 51:24	behalt 49:3	31:18
6		believe 7:10 10:16 13:1,15 14:20	Chemother <b>199 27:14</b> 28:5 chest 11:17 12:22 27:1
65 19:8	165:7	131, 1, 4 32, 19 41, 7 43, 24 40, 7 50, 3	child 44:8
66 2:5 3:19	anyway 29:13 Janywhere 29:3	53:16,19,63;9,22,64:13	Christensen50:13
7		benefit 28:9,15	<b>clarify</b> 8:21 <b>27:25 32:8</b> <b>Clark's</b> 17:2,5,7,9,11,13,13,25 18:
	apparently 40:7	benign 5:9,12 38:3 best 13:15 30:24 38:20 58:4	4,6 52:25 64;4
7000 1:17	appearance 30:18 36:24 42:15,17 55:9 62:3	better 22:21,23,24 31:1,6	classification 18:7,9 64:5
76 18:25	Appearances 2:3		classifications 18:11
8	appeared 52:8,8 55:19	1822:25 26:2 36:22 42:2 44:24	classify 6:15
8:00 1:9	appears 62:17	45: 19 <b>55:23</b> 64:3 beyond <b>14:8</b> 28:17	clear 31:8 33:6 Clerk 3:12
8th 40:13	apprised 12:16	big 9:23 29:8 43: 17 54: 16	Cline 50:11,15
-	appropriate 54: 12 approximately 21:9	biggest 18:5	Clinic 4:21 5:19 9:2
9	arbitrary 36:16	biologic 56:1	clinical 6:9 <b>25:23</b> 28:13 30:19 33: 1835:25 36:24 38:7 42:15,17 43:
9 1:9 39:17 40:6	area 11:17 14:8 34:24 <b>36:3</b> 53:4		9,10 44:10,20 55:9 60:19 61:22
9-14-92 41:8	areas 15:3 34:18 41:12	biopsy 8:13 10:9 14:9 22:10 23:25	9,10 44:10,20 55:9 60:19 61:22 62:2
<b>99</b> 18:2 19:6	Biguabie 28: 28		clinicaliy 46:20 56:17
99 6:12	arguing 58:4		clinics 5:16 collect 35:6
<b>9:45</b> 65:12	argumentative25:10,19 45:5 52:	bladder 43:18	colon <b>50:20</b>
A	around 51:8 56:4		come 29:6 34:15
	4	DUALU 4.24 5.25	comes32:14 40:10,13,16 60:4 63:
am 1:965:12 ability 8:556:20	article 24:5, 11,24 31:5 32:22	body 34:18 37:21,47:8	r comfortable 29: 19
able 24:4 30:16 63:16	Ask 10:2 asked 33:14 45:24 51:22,25 53:21		coming <b>30:23</b> 38:16
abnormalities 31:10	56:11 57:13 19 59:22 60:22 61:24	bony 12:7	comment 7:13 45:6,13
abnormality 34:22 35:22,24 36:17	asking 30 6	book 58:18	commissioned 66:3,4
about 5:1 7:9 9:8 10:6 11:12 18: 21 19:6,8 21:6 22:2 29:5 30:25 32:	<b>ASKS</b> 45.5		compared 61:4,5,10 comparison61:7
22 33:10 36:3,11,20 40:11 44:14	associate 5:20 association 64:3	bottom 30:8 55:13	completely60:14
45:7,14 47:4 48:1 49:17 50:4,7.25	assume 7:5 21:14 37:12 39:18 41:	Boy 49:18,23	completes 27:8
45:7,14 47:4 48:1 49:17 50:4,7,25 53:13,15 54:17 55:11 56:13 59:11, 21 63:15 64:17,22	14 45:1 56:16 58:21 61:12.13.14	boy 51:2	concerned 10:11 16:14 20:2 29:5,
About 49:20	14 45:1 56:16 58:21 61:12,13,14 assumes 60:21	<b>22:6 38:4</b>	18 32:21 36:3,11,20 37:17 43:11 44:13 51:9 54:21 55:11 56:7
	<b>assuming</b> 26:25 57:7 60:17		concernin <b>g 3</b> 0:1
above 6:5 <b>43:13 44:22</b> 62:9 absence 32:9	assumption 24:16,17		concerns <b>29</b> : 14
academic 610	attack 43:18		concluded65;12 condition 6:15 61:16
acceptable 54:3 59:24	attempt 1624		conducted <b>22:20</b>
accepted 34:21	attention 38:15	bulk 6:9	confined 15:11

COURT REPORTER In DEX v1.06

**lesion 11:14,17 16:10 30:19,20** 37:3,4 44:11 46:12 52:1,1,2,7,14, 24 53: 18 55:1 58:25 62:3,6 **lesions 14:**24 37:25 57:1 means 10:2 25:7 55:23 meant 58:21 62:11 63:20 measured 18:14 nodule 16:1 impossible 19:19 35:10 nocule 16:1 normalignant 30:11 normal 15:11 26:21 Notary 3:6 66:3,18 notes 47: 19 nothing 14:7 40:11,15 61:8 66:8 Nothing 40:14 notice 3:8 impression 9:23 12:5 Incidental 52:10 measured 10.14 measuring 18:6,13 Medical 1:8 4: 11,25 12:25 20:25 medical 5:25 6:3,6 10:1 11:8 22: 1623:8 34:21 **35:14** 36:24 39:9, 12,15,15 47:25 48:21 54:20 medicine 05:02 included 12:22 incomplete 61:6 less 19:6 20:13 34:15 55:2 62:23 increase 33:1 62:12 let 8:21 Increased 57:25 increases 57:15 62:8 Let's 8:10 9:14 26:7 37:12 45:24 51:25 60:2,22 let's 26:7 44:7 60:1 incumbent36:6 54:11 indeed 12:6 19:3 22:12 23:4,15 35:25 39:6 42:8,12 47:5,6 55:20 56:2,3 medicine 25:23 notorial 66:4-14 notwithstanding 34:9 Now 26:1 39:21 42:9 43:17 44:12, meets 41:11 lets 43:21 101 18 8:11 11:13 1 19:25 26:22 24 28:2 29:21 20,22,23,24 32:7 52:2 59:13 62: 19:25 23 61:14 now 31:17 35:17 36:4 58:5 60:1.6. indicated54:1 14,25 61:14 62:2 63:19 64:15,22 number 15:21 46:19 65:3 nurse 39:22 18 Indicating 25:1 indicator 19:1 34:9 57:5 indicators 57:6 life-threatening 35:23,24 lifelong 19:18,20 like 6:1 7:18 16:5 28:15 30:21 36: Melanoma 24:9 memory 54:5 inferred 58:3 mentioned 23:15 39:17 21 38:25 43:7 44:1 57:5,6 58:6,7,9 61:13 metastases 6:18 48:13 metastasis 8:5 12:2 55:23 56:7,19 0 influence24:125:7 Information 9: 16 10:12 13:7 22: 19 27:18 29:25 45:22 25 46:2,6 53:16:19 56:13 63:1,8 Initial 8:13,18 9:6,18 14:8 18:6 20 18 22:13 23:16 63:7 64:18,21 oath 4:4 Uke 63:19 Objection 12:18 15:4 25:10 33:14 46:15 53:5,21 56:11 57:13,19 objections 3:15 45:5 obviously 6:10 7:22 12:21 19:8 22:6 29:8 31:8,14 37:7 41:22 42: 14 43:3,19 47:3 52:9 54:19 55:7 59:15.24 60:8 metastasized 56:24 59:13 likelihood 15:2 16:16 56:20 57:15 metastasized 50:24 59:13 metastatic 8:1,9 12:11,15 14:21 15:2,10 17:3,11,16,24 22:5 27:12, 15 28:8,21 32:13,18 34:2,16 46:10, 12 47:2 53:1 56:20 57:11,16,18 62:8.12 likely 16:20 45:3 46:6 57:11,17,23 58:1,12,19,19,20,22,25 59:23 61:2, 1822:13/23:16/03:7/64:16, initially 56:14 Institute 11:6 intend 45:21/51:20,23 interested 6:7/37:2/66:12 interleukin 28:24 9,16 62:5 limit 20:3 58:2,13 59:1 60:19 61:3,17,22 62: 56:18 60:24 limited20:4 4,6,8,18 Obviously 43:2 Lincoln 5:15 49:8,12,13,14 50:9 51:3,6,7 66:14 line 30:8 39:19 55:13 62:10 listen 60:22 Obviously 43:2 occurred 19:25 October 12:25 14:19,21,24 15:2 16:17 21:21 33:18,21 odds 30:17,18 60:12,13 61:2 Mer 10:5 19:4,6,9 Mhand 18:17 57:3 meticulous36.7 internists 5:12 interval 42:21 micrometer 18:4 microscopically16:11 46:21 might 21:8 27:20 39:22 42:22,23, Invasion 18:13 64:4 investigational 27:1428:23 23 49:25 literature 48:2 Involved 46:19,21 involvement6:25 7:2,3,7,9,12,20 21,25 12:3,5,7 15:8,10,14 16:1,5,7 13,17,18,20:5,7,12,16,22 21:15,28 little 7:198:8,10 16:6 59:22 liver 7:2,7,9,11,19,24 12:5 28:8 millimeters 18:14,25,25 19:5 20: Office 1:8 Mice 5:14 10:25 54:22 13 mind 27:16 55:18 minus 21:4 localized 12:4 location 27:10 52:14 long 4:22 16:9 21:5, 11 26:1,4,9,14 27:7 28:17 34:5,21 35:3 46:11,25 47:24 officially 66:14 8,12 32:18 33:13 34:8 47:7,10 52: minute 58:1862:2 Oh 26:6, 16 27:9 31:16 41:1 48:1 17.19 Miss 6:15 58:23 misspoke 21:8 Okay 4:24 9:10 10:18 11:21 12:10 17:2 21:19 22:3 32:5,8 39:24 41:3, 21 60:14,21 62:13 okay 18:24 19:1 27:13,25 28:3,13, 19 34:19 35:19 42:14 44:6 50:15 52:13 56:21 Involvement 15:15 **mole** 12:16 19:21 30:14 36:1 38: 13.1839:17,20,25 40:4,7,11,15,20 41:1,2,4,7,15 **42:8** 44:3 45:2,14 46:10 54:24 **56:22** 59:12 60:5,6,24 61:12 62:17,17 longstanding 8:1 looked 30:21 38:24,25 58:17 63: Irritated 38:5,6 isn't 16:20 19:12 20:15 29:8 40:22 43:16 45:8 11 65:2 looking 17:13 38:23 40:20 46:7 looks 61:13 issued 3:9 7:20 10:9 16:7 28:5 34 19 35:8 36:16 42:14 43:4,19,20 61:12 62:17,17 Mole 40:1 moles 29:21 30:10 38:3 months 9:17 22:25 32:20 34:20 35:12 47:1,11,14 more 12:3,6,22 15:21 16:7,20 17: 19,19 29:5,20 30:5 35:24 36:6, 10 43:4 45:3,21,25 56:1,23 57:11, 17,22,25 58:12,19,22,25 59:15,23, 23,25 60:7,18 61:2,9,16 More 58:19,20 morping 4:14 45:4 47:4,16 52:20 53:15 57:9 lower 17:21 52:24 53:3 older 29:7 63:12 issues 36:6 lungs 28:9 51:1 once 19:24 Once 20:7 lymphatic 6:19,24,25 12:4 13:3 itself 8:23 13:10 14:7, 10 15:8,8,12,13,18 16:5,10, 16,17 19:2 20:4,7,12,16,21 21:15, 21 22:1,4 27:20 28:12,17 32:10 oncologist 5:21,24 6:3 21:18 26: 19 oncology 4: 11,20,25 5:25 6:6 one 4:16 6:2,22 9:6,8 12:14 14:16, 25 16:1,13,22 18:12 21:4 22:11 24:6,13,14 25:7,8,11,11,12,12,15, 17,23 29:22 30:5 36:15 44:18 45: January 12:12 33:13,25 34:2,8,16 46:19 47:8,9 jaundice 7:21 52:8,17 eopardizes 35:20 lymphatics 53:4 Jim 48:17 49:25 John 11:5,14 lýmphoma 5:11 More 58:19,20 morning 4:14 most 5:11 20:1 23:22 29:22 30:10 37:1 38:2 63:3 Most 5:14 6:6 mouth 11:24 Mrs 8:12 11:2 12:11,15 18:15 20: 24 21:9 37:12 58:12 much 22:21,24 23:10,12 24:2 31: 15 20:38:9 42:2 4 50:25 53:18 57 13 49:13,14 50:8,15 51:1,2,6,7 52: 3 55:13 58:25 64:6,6 65:1 One 26:8 27:17 50:11 JOSEPH 1:16 3:11 Μ judgment 38:10 44:11,20 July 12:15 16:18 23:1 33:13,22 M.D 1:4 2:9 3:4 4:1 66:6 only 14:24 15:13 25:15 32:6,12 60:21 made 13:4 22:16 31:8 32:20 33:5 38:10,11 51:9,19,22 55:14 majority 15:7,24 29:18 32:17 61: 34:1,3,6,6,16 38:14 39:17 40:6 K oozing 56:22 open 28:9 opinion 7:25 8:11 13:24 31:5 42: 19 43:14 44:7 45:8 46:8,9 56:23 60:7 65:2 21 K-u-b-e 48:18 **make** 4:18 16:10 23:1 25:18,24 26:18 33:6 42:18 44:11 47:19 51: 20,23 56:6 59:15 Kauffman 49:24 50:4 15.2036:9 42:2,4 50:25 53:18 57: 2 58:17 keep 27:16 55:18 keeping 54:23 kidney 51:5 kind 5:11 7:22 12:24 24:14 31:11 mutual 36:22 44:24 makes 22:10 34:12 opinions 45:22 46:2 myself 5:19 13:13 opportunity 8:19 10:14,24 13:6 opposed 6:2 18:6 32:2 36:3,8 48: malignancies 6:14 malignancy 6:16 8:6 52:10 56:1 malignant 5:6,10,10 30:16 37:2,3, Ν 38:6 43:4,18,25 50:19 54:14.18 16 49:3 61:16 63:14 order 46:1.2 14,18,25 38:2 43:11,25 52:3,25 55 Nagengast 10:1,6 12:12,16 53:16 knew 7:6 12:3.4 knew 7:6 12:3,4 knowing 6:18 9:13 10:3 14:21 16: 2,3,19,21 20:24 22:2 23:7 24:4 25: 13,21 30:7,8,15 32:16 33:12 34:2,5 35:13,14,18 36:20 37:24 38:1 40:6 42:10 43:3,18 46:25 54:15,19 55: 11 57:3,25 60:5 62:21,22 63:5 knowing 2:15 54:**1**1 organs 8:6 original 3:10 original 3:10 other 6:22 9:3,20 10:10 **12:23** 15: 331:4 32:19 34:18 **35:15** 36:18 **37:23** 43:2 **44:22** 46:6 48:2,5 50: 25 52:8,15 15 53:11 57:6 Nagengast's 22: 10 39:15 53:12 name 4:7 48:16 50:12 natural 29:16 46:22 Malignant 24:8 malpractice 48:6 managing 29:19 many 5:17 29:21 48:24 MARKED 2:15 nature 51-4 NEBRASKA 1:1 3:13 5:16 66:5.15 necessarily 25:24 27:23 need 12:20 26:24 37:8 45:25 needed 53:17,19 marked 2:16 62:10 others 50:22 knowledge 33:15 knows 53:9 otherwise 21:13 54:16 58:20 66: mass 8:9 mastectomy 28:15 material 9:19 10:16 12 KNOX 1:1 3:13 needs 36:18 43:10 56:5 61:13 out-patient43:20 49:12,12 55:8 out-state 5:166:1323:24 26:7 38. Kube 48:17,19 materials 9:21 negative19:22 matter 20:8 47:11 54:13 may 3:4,17 13:25 22:13 23:4 25: 10 27:18,19 28:25 34:17,19 35:16 36:18 40:4 42:4,10,10 44:22 55:2 59:11 62:9 negligence 48:22 54:22,25 16 39:11 50:6 outcome 7:16,23 19:1 22:14 23:4, 5,17 28:19 32:21 34:13 35:9,21 42:4,6,7,23,24 51:9 55:15 62:14 outlying 41:12 outpide 2:17 never 11:25 53:8 next 27:20 36:12 nine 42:13 55:21 56:2 57:7 Nine 55:23 larger 36:3 last 24:25 53:15 59:9 later 9:9 latter 36:7 Maybe 9:14 24:24 39:9,10 nobody 53:8 outside 3:17 over 6:5 9:14 18:25 31:21 43:13 **nobody** 53:8 **node6**:24 13:3 15:3,8,9,13 16:5, 10,13,17,17 19:2 20:4,7,12,16,22 21:15,21 22:1,4 27:20 28:12,17 33:13 34:3,8,17 47:9 52:17 **nodes** 12:4 14:7,10,16 15:12,18 20:10 34:1 16 46:19 47:8 52:9 lawful 4:2 maybe 43:25 49:20 lawyer 48:19 Mayo 4:21 44:22 lead 17.14 Mayo's 31:22 own 34:20 37:21 mean 8:21 21:7 24:13 27:21,25 31:13 32:2,8 33:18 **35:14** 36:15,16 38:1,7 39:2,5 43:3,19 46:23 47:3 52:15,16,22 54:14,19 56:15 59:23 learn 30:4 least 43:12 47:10 leave 54:22 P packet 10:21 led 55:11 32:10 34:1,16 46:19 47:8 52:9

stuff 5:11 6:12 7:22 12:24 31:11 Nords 52:8 63:11 64:15 thinness 20:3 third 23:23 25:2 51:2 those 8:6 14:16 15:18 17.1823:18 24:14 28:16,24 29:17 30:17 32:10 norked 50:2 unquote 54:3 38:6 43:4,18 54:14 subclinical 33:17,21,22 47:4 until 3:16 19:4 29:1 37:3 41:17 43 7 44:5,8 54:2,23 workup 12:21,22 21:18 26:7 27:1 subject 59:9 16.7 vorried 54:17 vorrisome 35:25 36:1755:20 submit 39:16 40:2 upon 3:9 8:10 26:7 29:13 36:6 subsequent 9:22 17:23 29:1 52: upper 12:16 upsets 37:8 34:24 35:18 48:9 60:18 62:16 Those 30:18 though 10:25 30:1048:24 18 vorse 7:23 57:1,2 vouldn't 30:15 51:8 55:14 62:20 upside 40:18 subspecialists 6:8 thoughts 35:6 62:11 65:6 three 5:15 9:17 21:2,4,9 29:2 42: 20 47:14 49:1 vriting 39:18,19 40:2,4 vritten 47:18 usually 5:7 6:13 7:25 16:14 26:4, 1227:7 28:1 29:21 56:1 succumb 32:17 such 56:17 vrong 12:13 vrote 24:5 39:20 sufficient 48:11 suggest 22:12 28:17 56:25 59:12 suing 49:3 Three 49:12 three-week 42:21 value 24:22 variable 19:12 20:1 25:8 suit 66:12 thrown 55 support 31:5 61:20 supposed 30:21 43:8 48:1 53:10 till 55:1656:3 Till 55:17 variables 29:16 (-ray 12:22 27:1 (-rays 13:16 varies 26:20 time 3:6,16 6:4 7:9 8:5 13:3 14:1,4 **Strife** 7:6 33:4 **39:23** 59:21 Sure 22:7 variety 5:15 6:7 52 57:6 verbally 47:18 15:8,18:24 20:18 21:14,21 22:1,4 16 **36:5 39:16** 40:18 41:14 42:21, surgeon 26:13,15,17 27:2,4,8 surgery 22:13 23:15 ankton 9:2 verbatim 23:24 rears 6:5,5,7 15:19,21,25 18:24 9:7 47:1 50:8 22 44:16 48:13 50:6 53:20.25 55: 16.16:17:21 56:3,19 57:7,8,10,16 Very 15:23 19:15,16 28:6 34:22 surgical 14:6 15:17 46:20 36:1 37:1<sup>7</sup> 58:17,24 ounger 29:5 58:11,13 59:1,5 60:19 61:3,22,24 surprise 12:9 ourself 47:22 62:19 63:6 66:9 surprised 30:4 view 34:20 43:11 survey 30:2 survivability 34:10 survival 17:24 18:1 19:7 24:1 25:7 32:15 33:10 time-wise 47:12 vitae 4:12 Volume 24:7 times 48:24 56:12 timing 16:14 22:13 23:15,24 25:5 30:25 52:7 56:14 W Survival 24:8 tissue 8:23,23,24 64:22 65:1,2 wait 37:14 43:7 44:5,8 54:2 62:2 survive 15:16 title 3:7 waiting 37:18 waived 3:20 65:10,11 want 23:6 28:22 29:5,15 35:17 36: 21 37:22 38:24 41:14 53:15 57:25 today 53:13 told 43:17 50:11 suspect 6:23 8:1325:12 39:22 suspicion 44:10 suspicious 31:9 34:22 35:22,24 Sustained 25:20 tossed 9:24 town 49:19 59:9 61:12,12,13,15 wanted 27:25 30:14 **43:1** 44:5 54: training 4;20 6:5 transcribed 3:17,19 sworn 66:7 system 5:6 7:1 35:14 transgressed 8:6 2,12 wants 37:13 transmission 6:19,20 wasn't 9:23 10:18 transpired 55:10 16:19,219,22:17:52:15012:10,14.14 treating 29:13 31:15,25 Taken31588,14,5;12,6:12,21:24,24: treatment 7:15 23:25 25:6 26:4 24:3 25:25 32:25 33:12 34:1,5 38: 1 44:18 45:13,24 46:18,21 52:4 54:20 55:1362:22 takes 16:9 43:13 tremendously 19:12 taking 31:17 talked 30:25 32:21 33:9 45:14 47: 4 53:13,15 58:13 trial 3:16 45:22 48:25 trials 28:16 Wayne 11:5,14 ways 46:24 we're 18:21 56:4 true 15:10 17:2,12 20:18 34:14 talking 9:8-18:21 19:6 21:6 50:7 47:3 53:9.10 True 20:18 25:15 34:4,7 53:2,7 weak 6413 Taylor 1:14 truly 16:7,21 28:10,18 42:15 44:11 wedding 35:17 week 26:6,8,16 36:12 42:20 43:7 tell 12:10 19:19 20:16 36:9 37:12, 64:5 21,22,54:20,61:15,63:12,16,64:7 14:6 try11.6917 8985:6,7 37:11 44:9,25 weeks 27:9 29:2 36:14,15 54:7,8,5 45:7 64:11,12 55:13 fêling 37:2 55:25 tuck 24:14 well 5:15 6:9 9:19 17:12 26:25 31; ten 3 Well 6:16:0.99.1917.1220.2531; 9 38:251:14 54:15 63;7 Well 6:48:22 10:8 11:24 12:21 15 23 17:12 19:21,23 21:25 22:9 23; 12 23 24:3,12 26:20 27:13 28:35 29:3 30:7 32:333:17 35:13 20 36; 19 39:2,4 43:6 48; 18 47;3 52:12, 13 54:7 55:18 58:21 60:1 62:2 64; tumor 5:6,6 6:10,13,16,19 8:9 11: 23 14:8 15:11 17:14,23 18:6,14,16 19:5,18,25 20:10,12,15 21 21:2,3,9 27:19 34:9 46:23 47:7 56:17 57:5 63:4.5.12,12,17 64:1,12 testified 48:5,21,24 49:3 testify 9:25 testimony 3.17 22:25 46:5 51:15. tumors 19:11,14,15,16 two6:4,5,722:2527:1632:5,14, 16,2036:5,14,1543:744:650:22 **TESTIMONY** 66:13 textbook 33:11 3,11 Thank 58:17 What's 17:25 18:18 what's 32:1564:9 51:22 54:7,8 55:13 That's 4:19 32:14 39:13 43:14 44: Two 26:10 36:15 54:9 two-month/34:19435:8 **1141 S 4**, 1922, 1932, whatever 28:9 40:7 whenever 36:20 type 28:2 WHEREOF 66: 13 whether 6:18 12:11,15 20:16,24 21:23 23:7 25:13 28:14 33:12 34:2 42:25 44:11 45:14,18 46:20 47:1 49:2 52:17 56:23 57:25 61:25 63:3 Whether 12:6 types 28:24 29:17 34:14 35:18 typically 18:14 26:6,20 21 62:10 Uh-huh 14:5 24:18 40:17 46:24 ulcerated 34:24 36:4 37:25 38:3 40:20 41:4, 25 42:8,8 12 44:3,4 45: 2,15 55:1,21 56:3 57:1,18 58:1,25 60:25 61:1,14 62:6 ulcerates 56:23 themselves 50:25 whole 6:3 66:7 whom 48:9 wider 13:4 26:11,15 27:3,8,17,25 29:1,2,6,15 63:8 Wiebelhaus' 6:15 8:12 11:2 12: 11,15 18:16 20:25 21:9 37:13 53: theory 32:22 therapy 28:14,23,23 29:1 there \$ 5:9 24:3 27:3 29:25 31:16 32:25 34:1,5 35:15 38:1 40:11 42: 9 44:18 45:11 46:18,18 47:4 54:19 ulceration 30:23 42:18 43:12 55: 57:7,11,18 58:1 60:18 61:7,20 There's 8:4 16:19 17:22 62:22 1957;4,8,8,1058;12,20,2259;12, 1550;6,8,1861;2163;2 WII 3: 10, 12 5: 12 15:9, 17 32: 17 39: thereabouts 19:9 49:21 thereafter 7:1 thereof 3:14 Ulceration 44:25 Will 15:17 ulcerization 30:23 62:18 ultimately 32:17 62:14 understand 6:24 9:23 18:20,23 Williams 50: 11, 15 things 24:14 27:6 28:24 29:17 33: 0 34:25 35:15,18 **36:18** 39:6 43:10 **44:22** 52:19 willing 29:12 44:19 willing 29:12 44:19 willing 24:13 within 7:2:415:24.26:6.27:9 36:5, 3:6 24:10 26:1 **35:7** 40:5 60:14 2:11 64:24 66:4 **44:22** 52:19 **think** 8:17 9:221 **10:8** 11:24 15:23 16:3 18:4 **19:3 20:5,8 22:22** 23:3,3 25:19 26:1,20 28:6 29:3,10,25 30: 1733:6 34:19,21 35:2,4,8,20,23 36:5,10,16,21,23 37:5,15,19 39:4,7 44:10,13,19 46:1,5 47:24 48:17,24 49:16 50:8 52:17,20 54:10,13 55: **20,25** 56:6,25 57:7,9 **59:10** 62:4,23 Understandably7:20 29:4 Without 38:22 54:23 58:20,22 understandably 35:15 understanding 7:8 17:18,25 38: WITNESS 2:8 10:18,21 48:23 58: 21 64:17 65:11 13.18 Witness 3:18 57:20 Witness' 4:4 Unless 21:13 38:4 unless 33:25 38:6 43:21 UNMC 6:25 9:19 11:9 13:23 14:3, word 11:24