

In The Matter Of:

*Wagner v.
Litvak*

*Raoul Wientzen, Jr., M.D.
August 7, 1995*

*Sherry Roe & Associates, Inc.
1825 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1212
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 429-0034*

*Original File rw080795.a, 147 Pages
Min-U-Script® File ID: 3774718585*

Word Index included with this Min-U-Script®

1. *Pharmaceutical Innovation and the Role of the State*
 2. *The Impact of Patent Law on Drug Development*
 3. *The Role of Government in Regulating Pharmaceuticals*
 4. *The Impact of Health Insurance on Drug Access*
 5. *The Role of the Pharmaceutical Industry in Public Health*
 6. *The Impact of Globalization on Drug Markets*
 7. *The Role of the Pharmaceutical Industry in Developing Countries*
 8. *The Impact of Biotechnology on Drug Development*
 9. *The Role of the Pharmaceutical Industry in the Future of Healthcare*
 10. *The Impact of the Pharmaceutical Industry on the Environment*

Page 1

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

ROBBIN M. WAGNER and DOROTHY:
S. WAGNER, as Personal :
Representatives of the Estate :
of RUSSELL WAGNER, DECEASED, :
Plaintiffs,

v. : CA No.:
: 92-6493(13)

BARIS LITVAK, M.D., OSCAR BETANCOURT, :
M.D., LAURENCE PEARSON, M.D. and :
CHILDREN'S MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, :
Defendants.

X

Monday, August 7, 1995
District of Columbia

Videotaped Deposition of
RAOUL WIENTZEN, JR., M.D.,
the witness, called for examination by counsel for
the Plaintiffs, pursuant to notice of counsel, held
at Georgetown University Hospital, 3800 Reservoir
Road, Northwest, Washington, D.C., beginning at 2:55
o'clock, p.m., before Justina M. Consoazio, RPR, a
Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia,
when were present on behalf of the respective
parties:

Page 2

For the Plaintiffs:
STUART N. RATZAN, ESQUIRE
Stewart Tilghman Fox & Bianchi, P.A.
Suite 1900
44 West Flagler Street
Miami, FL 33130-1808
(305) 358-6644
For the Defendant
Oscar Betancourt, MD.:
STEVEN M. LURY, ESQUIRE
Santone, Eyler & Lury, P.A.
2300 Glades Road, Suite 280 West
Boca Raton, FL 33431-7334
(407) 395-4220
For the Defendant
Baris Litvak, M.D.:
STEVEN Y. LEINICKE, ESQUIRE
Wicker, Smith, Tutan, O'Hara,
McCoy, Graham & Lane, P.A.
5th Floor, Barnett Bank Plaza
One East Broward Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
(305) 467-6405
For the Defendant
Laurence Pearson, M.D.:
DAVID V. KING, ESQUIRE
George, Hartz & Lundeen, P.A.
3rd Floor, Justice Building East
524 South Andrews Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
(305) 462-1620

Page 3

CONTENTS
EXAMINATION OF DR. WIENTZEN BY: PAGE:
MR. RATZAN: 5-145
PLAINTIFFS' DEPOSITION EXHIBITS: PAGE:
1 - Three-Page Letter Dated September 13, 1994
to Raoul Wientzen, M.D. From Steven M. Lury 10
2 - One Page of Handwritten Notes 13
3 - Three Pages of Handwritten Notes 13
4 - Cover of Deposition of Oscar
Betancourt, M.D. with Handwritten Notations 13
5 - One-Page 1024/Wagner v. Betancourt, M.D.
Depo of Robbin M. Wagner 11/23/92 13
6 - One-Page 1024/Wagner v. Betancourt, M.D.
Depo of Baris Litvak, M.D. 12/15/92
with Handwritten Notations 13
7 - One-Page 1024/Wagner v. Betancourt, M.D.
Depo of Laurence D. Pearson, M.D. 7/1/92
with Handwritten Notations 13
8 - One-Page 1024/Wagner v. Betancourt, M.D.
Continuation of Depo of Dorothy Wagner
11/23/92 with Handwritten Notations 13
9 - One-Page 1024/Wagner v. Betancourt, M.D.
Depo of Dorothy Wagner 7/6/92 13

Page 4

[1] PROCEEDINGS
[2] THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the [3]
videotaped deposition of Raoul Wien-

tzen in the [4] matter of Wagner versus
Litvak. Today's date is [5] August 7th,
1995. The time is 2:55. The recording [6]
is taking place at 3800 Reservoir Road,
Washington, [7] D.C. This deposition is
being videotaped on behalf [8] of attor-
ney, Stuart Ratzan, Esquire.

[9] I am neither counsel for, employed by
or [10] related to any parties in this action,
nor am I [11] interested in the outcome
thereof. Counsel, please [12] introduce
yourself and state your appearance.

[13] MR. RATZAN: Stuart Ratzan for the
[14] Plaintiffs, Dorothy and Robbin Wag-
ner and the Estate [15] of Russell Wagner.

[16] MR. LURY: Steven Lury for Dr. [17]
Oscar Betancourt.

[18] MR. KING: David King for Dr. [19]
Pearson.

[20] MR. LEINICKE: And Steven Leinicke
[21] for Dr. Litvak.

[22] THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay, we're
now

Page 5

[1] on the record. Would the reporter
please swear in [2] the witness.

[3] Thereupon,

[4] RAOUL WIENTZEN, JR., M.D., [5] the
witness, called for examination by coun-
sel for [6] the Plaintiffs, and, after having
been sworn by the [7] notary, was ex-
amined and testified as follows:

[8] EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR
THE PLAINTIFFS

[9] BY MR. RATZAN:

[10] Q: Good afternoon, Doctor. I in-
troduced [11] myself earlier. My name is
Stuart Ratzan. I [12] represent the Plain-
tiffs in this case. Could you [13] state your
full name for us, for the record.

[14] A: My name is Raoul L. Wientzen, Jr.,
M.D.

[15] Q: Dr. Wientzen, you're aware, are
you not, [16] that this deposition is being
videotaped for the [17] purpose of play-
ing it to a jury in Broward County, [18]
Florida?

[19] A: Yes, I do.

[20] Q: I assume you've been deposed
before?

[21] A: Yes.

[22] Q: If you will do me a favor, then, if I
ask

Page 6

if you a question that you don't un-
derstand or you [2] didn't like the way it
was phrased, let me know, and [3] I'll try
to rephrase it in a way that you do [4]
understand it.

[5] A: Fair enough.

[6] Q: If you don't do that, I'm going to
assume [7] that you've understood the
questions as I've asked [8] them.

[9] A: Understood.

[10] Q: Is that fair?

[11] A: Yes.

[12] Q: Do you have a copy of your CV
with you [13] today?

[14] A: No, I don't.

[15] Q: Can you obtain one for us by the
end of [16] this deposition?

[17] A: Sure.

[18] Q: Okay, and where are you employ-
ed, sir?

[19] A: Georgetown University Hospital
Department [20] of Pediatrics.

[21] Q: How long have you been here?

[22] A: This is my 19th year.

Page 7

[1] Q: And that's where we are today?

[2] A: Yes.

[3] Q: Do you have any particular titles or
[4] positions in this hospital?

[5] A: Yes, I'm an associate professor of [6]
pediatrics, and I'm chief of the division
of [7] pediatric infectious diseases.

[8] Q: The CV that you will provide us,
will you [9] make sure that it's a current
and up-to-date copy?

[10] A: It will be my most recent CV, but it
needs [11] to be updated.

[12] Q: You have before you a packet of
materials, [13] it looks like. Are those the
materials that you've [14] reviewed for
this case?

[15] A: Yes, they are.

[16] Q: Is there anything that is not there
that [17] you have been sent or that you
have reviewed?

[18] A: Yes, there is one item.

[19] Q: What is that?

[20] A: It was a letter, summary of the
recent [21] deposition of one of your
experts in California,

[22] Q: Is there any particular reason why
you

Page 8

[1] don't have that letter here today?

[2] A: Yes, Mr. Lury took it from the
packet.

[3] Q: Did you read that letter?

[4] A: Yes, I did.

[5] Q: Did it make any - have any sig-
nificance [6] to you?

[7] MR. LURY: Did it have any [8] signif-
cance to him? What do you mean by
'any [9] significance to him?' Did he rely
upon it, is that [10] your question?

[11] BY MR. RATZAN:

[12] Q: No, did it have any significance to
you in [13] formulating your opinions
here today?

[14] A: I have formulated my opinions well before [15] I read that letter, which was just I guess this [16] weekend,

[17] Q: Yes, sir.

[18] A: So, no, it had no significance with [19] respect to my opinions.

[20] Q: Did it confirm at all any of your [21] opinions?

[22] A: As I sit here, I read the letter once and

Page 9

[11] I can't even honestly recall all of the physician's [2] opinions in that letter. I can't even recall his [3] name, so I would be hesitant to answer that [4] question.

[5] Q: That's fine. The materials you have [6] before you, there is a letter or two. Are those [7] from Mr. Lury?

[8] A: Yes.

[9] Q: May I see those, please?

[10] A: Sure, and I have some handwritten notes on [11] the back of the original cover letter.

[12] Q: The first earliest dated letter is [13] September 13, 1994. Had you had any contact with [14] Mr. Lury prior to that time?

[15] A: I would expect he had called me about this [16] case prior to that time, yes, but I don't know that [17] for sure.

[18] Q: When do you think the first time was that [19] you and Mr. Lury spoke about this case?

[20] A: I really don't know.

[21] Q: I'll take a minute to read this letter, if [22] you don't mind. I'd like to have this letter marked

Page 10

[1] as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1 for identification for your [2] deposition.

[3] (Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 1 marked for [4] identification by the reporter and [5] attached to the transcript.)

[6] BY MR. RATZAN:

[7] Q: Are you aware of which materials you [8] received together with this letter of September 13, [9] 1994?

[10] A: Pretty much so, yes.

[11] Q: Okay. Would you tell us what they are?

[12] A: I received the office records of the [13] pediatric group, Dr. Betancourt's group. I received [14] the death certificate of Russell Wagner. I received [15] a stapled package of records that represents the [16] resuscitation at the Humana Hospital Bennett on the [17] night of Russell's admission and then death in that [18] place. It also contains, I believe, a short version [19] of the autopsy that was done but not all of the [20] autopsy information.

[21] Q: May I see the office chart?

[22] A: Sure. The office chart is falling apart,

Page 11

[1] so they were at one time stapled together, and just [2] to continue so that I don't lose my -

[3] Q: Yes, please do.

[4] A: - my train of thought, I also received [5] Dr. Betancourt's deposition and the exhibit that [6] came with it which was his phone log of the phone [7] calls of the night of his interaction with the [8] parents. I think that's, let me just make sure, I [9] believe that's what came originally.

[10] Q: What was the last item?

[11] MR. LURY: The phone log that was [12] attached as an exhibit to Dr. Betancourt's [13] deposition.

[14] BY MR. RATZAN:

[15] Q: Is this your underlining here in red?

[16] A: Yes, it is.

[17] Q: Then you have another packet of materials [18] before you. I know you've put them all together [19] again, but you had other materials that you did not [20] receive -

[21] A: No, they're still separate as I told you [22] originally.

Page 12

[1] Q: Okay, forgive me. You have another packet [2] there in front of you. Did you receive those on [3] July 20th, 1995?

[4] A: Or thereabouts, I think they were mailed [5] on that date.

[6] Q: Okay. What have you got there?

[7] A: I received the complete packet that's [8] labeled The Complete Autopsy File. I received the [9] depositions of Robbin, Mr. Robbin Wagner, two-part [10] deposition of Mrs. Dorothy Wagner, deposition of Dr. [11] Pearson and deposition of Dr. Litvak.

[12] Q: Have you had a chance to review all those [13] materials?

[14] A: Yes, I have.

[15] Q: Have you received any other letters from [16] Mr. Lury besides the two that are here and the one [17] that you spoke of regarding the other doctor in [18] California's testimony?

[19] A: No, I have not.

[20] Q: Have you received any medical records of [21] any other kind besides the ones you've talked to me [22] about?

Page 13

[1] A: No, I have not. I need to take a quick [2] break, I'm sorry. I just got paged.

[3] THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay, we're [4] off the record. The time is 3:02.

[5] (Thereupon, a brief recess was taken,

after which [6] the deposition continued as follows: [7] (Plaintiffs' Exhibit Nos. 2-9 marked for [8] identification by the reporter and [9] attached to the transcript.)

[10] THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay, we're now [11] back on the record. The time is 3:12.

[12] BY MR. RATZAN:

[13] Q: Doctor, while we were off the record, I [14] marked for identification the next appropriate [15] numbers other materials on which you've written [16] notes and things.

[17] A: Okay.

[18] Q: Also this fell off the deposition of Dr. [19] Betancourt. I'd like to make that the next number [20] exhibit, whatever number we're on. That looks like [21] the phone log.

[22] (Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 10 marked for

Page 14

[1] identification by the reporter and [2] attached to the transcript.)

[3] BY MR. RATZAN:

[4] Q: Dr. Wientzen, have you ever reviewed any [5] autopsy slides or photographs in this case?

[6] A: No, I have not.

[7] Q: Besides Mr. Lury, have you had any [8] conversations with any of the other lawyers in this [9] case?

[10] A: Yes, I have.

[11] Q: Who have you had conversations with?

[12] A: Very briefly this afternoon waiting for [13] this to start, Mr. Leinicke and Mr. -

[14] MR. KING: King, King.

[15] THE WITNESS: King.

[16] BY MR. RATZAN:

[17] Q: Did they speak to you about anything [18] regarding this case?

[19] A: Yes.

[20] Q: What did they talk about?

[21] A: We had a brief conversation about the [22] pathology of the adrenal.

Page 15

[1] Q: Did you talk about their clients and the [2] care rendered by either of them?

[3] A: No, it was pathology of the adrenal.

[4] Q: What did they ask you about the pathology [5] of the adrenal?

[6] A: Basically what Waterhouse-Friderichsen's [7] syndrome is and what it would look like, whether or [8] not the absence of hemorrhage would disallow that [9] diagnosis. That was basically the conversation.

[10] Q: And what did you tell them?

[11] A: Well, I told them that basically the [12] diagnosis of Waterhouse-Friderichsen's

richsen's syndrome is a [13] diagnosis that has adrenal hemorrhage associated [14] with it but that it sort of begs the point, and the [15] point is that in this case this baby had fulminant [16] sepsis and died of a very aggressive bacterial [17] disease. Whether there was adrenal hemorrhage or [18] not doesn't change the fact that this was a [19] fulminant variety of bacterial sepsis.

[20] **Q:** In other words, the issue of whether [21] **Waterhouse-Friderichsen's** syndrome exists at all in [22] this case, as far as you see it, is not relevant?

Page 16

[1] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[2] **THE WITNESS:** In the sense that [3] should the pathology show hemorrhagic adrenal, one [4] could say this is Waterhouse-Friderichsen's [5] syndrome.

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

[7] **Q:** Yes, sir.

[8] **A:** But that doesn't add more to knowing that [9] this child died of an overwhelming variety of very [10] fulminant sepsis.

[11] **Q:** If you take the question the other way, [12] Doctor, if there is no Waterhouse-Friderichsen's [13] syndrome apparent on autopsy in this case -

[14] **A:** Right.

[15] **Q:** - does that have any bearing on your [16] opinion as you sit here today?

[17] **A:** No.

[18] **Q:** So, what I suggested was the diagnosis or [19] not of Waterhouse-Friderichsen in this case is not [20] relevant to your opinions?

[21] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[22] **THE WITNESS:** Well, I think all

Page 17

[1] facts are relevant to some degree. I don't think [2] it's crucially relevant to saying whether this child [3] had overwhelming sepsis or not. His clinical course [4] speaks to that better than any pathology report [5] would ever.

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

[7] **Q:** I understand, to be fair, because the [8] diagnosis of Waterhouse-Friderichsen or not would [9] not change your opinions?

[10] **A:** Right.

[11] **Q:** Is it fair that it's not relevant to your [12] opinions whether the diagnosis is there or not [13] there?

[14] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form, [15] asked and answered. Tell him once again, Doctor.

[16] **THE WITNESS:** I think again to [17] answer the question, I think the more information [18] one could have about a

case, the more complete you [19] can be about your evaluation of the case, and [20] certainly to have Waterhouse-Friderichsen's syndrome [21] pathologically defined in this case would allow a [22] physician to say that's for sure the compartment we

Page 18

[1] can put this case into. Nonetheless, absent [2] **Waterhouse-Friderichsen's** syndrome, this child had [3] overwhelming fulminant sepsis. So it's relevant, [4] but not importantly so.

[5] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[6] **Q:** In your words, though, the issue of [7] whether there is Waterhouse-Friderichsen at all begs [8] the point?

[9] **A:** Uh-huh, correct.

[10] **Q:** And I'm sure we'll talk about that later. [11] Have you had any conversation with any of the [12] Defendants in this case?

[13] **A:** No.

[14] **Q:** Have you had any conversation with any [15] other lawyer at all pertaining to Russell Wagner?

[16] **A:** Just you.

[17] **Q:** When Mr. Lury first contacted you, was [18] that the first time any lawyer has ever contacted [19] you about this case?

[20] **A:** As far as I know, yes.

[21] **Q:** And do you keep these records, as long as [22] the case is ongoing, do you keep the records here in

Page 19

[1] your office or wherever your office is?

[2] **A:** I try to, yes.

[3] **Q:** What did Mr. Lury ask you to do?

[4] **A:** He basically asked me to review the case [5] and determine whether or not Dr. Betancourt [6] practiced within the standard of care; and number [7] two, whether or not there was a likelihood of [8] survivability or not during the course of the [9] evolution of the various interactions that this baby [10] had with Dr. Betancourt.

[11] **Q:** What did you tell him?

[12] **A:** Well, I -

[13] **MR. LURY:** At what point in time?

[14] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[15] **Q:** After he asked you to do that.

[16] **MR. LURY:** Wait, wait, before he [17] reviewed the records or after he reviewed the [18] records, Stuart? Put this in some time context.

[19] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[20] **Q:** You can answer.

[21] **MR. LURY:** No, don't answer it, [22] put it in a time context for the Doctor, please.

Page 20

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

[2] **Q:** Look, I'm going to try my best to ask you [3] questions. If you understand them, I want you to as [4] best you can answer them. If you don't, let me [5] know; okay?

[6] **A:** Okay.

[7] **Q:** What did you tell Mr. Lury when he asked [8] you those questions?

[9] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form. [10] At what point in time, before he reviewed the [11] records or after, counsel? Doctor, do you [12] understand the question?

[13] **THE WITNESS:** I understand the [14] question. I think there may be some confusion about [15] the use of the term when he told you of this or [16] whatever. I think I answered your question with [17] respect to the request in the letter that Mr. Lury [18] mailed to me, and I've reviewed the records and then [19] made up my mind as to what was the issues.

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

[21] **Q:** Right, I don't want to make this a more [22] complicated question than it is. He sent you the

Page 21

[1] records and he asked you the things you just told me [2] he asked you?

[3] **A:** Right.

[4] **Q:** When you completed your analysis, what did [5] you tell him that you thought about the case?

[6] **A:** Okay, after I read through the records, it [7] was my opinion that Dr. Betancourt practiced within [8] the standard of care based on what he said in his [9] deposition and what was in the records; and number [10] two, that at the 6:00 o'clock juncture on the [11] evening of the 1st of December, 1989, it was my view [12] that Russell Wagner was not salvageable at that [13] point regardless of the therapy he might have [14] received.

[15] **Q:** Now, you didn't prepare the written [16] report?

[17] **A:** No.

[18] **Q:** You took notes, though, and I've tried to [19] mark the documents on which you've taken notes.

[20] **A:** Right.

[21] **Q:** Did you take notes anywhere else on any [22] other kind of legal pad or paper or any other kind

Page 22

[1] of document?

[2] **A:** Just what's written on tops of the [3] deposition covers and the front pages you've already [4] marked, no other notes.

[5] **Q:** There would be no other notes in your [6] possession regarding this case?

[7] **A:** That is correct. I hate to do this, but I [8] just got paged again.
[9] **MR. LURY:** Okay.
[10] **THE VIDEOGRAPHER:** Okay, the time [11] is 3:19. We're off the record.
[12] (Thereupon, a discussion was held off the record.)
[13] **THE VIDEOGRAPHER:** We're now back [14] on the record. The time is 3:21.
[15] **BY MR. RATZAN:**
[16] **Q:** Has Mr. Lury or his firm paid you for any [17] of the time you've spent reviewing this case?
[18] **A:** I'm sure I sent him a bill after I read [19] the records the first time.
[20] **Q:** How many hours do you think you've worked [21] on this case so far?
[22] **A:** With the first review, I would judge three

Page 23

[1] or four hours.
[2] **Q:** So far I mean.
[3] **A:** In the last week or ten days, reading [4] through the additional depositions that were sent, [5] as well as the original records and meeting with [6] Mr. Lury today, probably another six or eight hours.
[7] **Q:** Did you reach your initial conclusions [8] about this case before you received that second [9] batch of documents?
[10] **A:** Yes.
[11] **Q:** And in the last ten days is when you [12] received - I mean not received, but is when you [13] reviewed that second batch of documents?
[14] **A:** Correct.
[15] **Q:** Have you billed Mr. Lury for that second [16] group of work yet?
[17] **A:** I missed the question.
[18] **Q:** Have you billed Mr. Lury for that second [19] group of work?
[20] **A:** No.
[21] **Q:** What do you charge per hour for review of [22] records?

Page 24

[1] **A:** I charge \$300 an hour for record review, [2] \$400 an hour for deposition.
[3] **Q:** And trial?
[4] **A:** Well, probably for a day, \$3,000.
[5] **Q:** Have you been contacted as someone [6] Mr. Lury would like to testify at trial?
[7] **A:** In this case?
[8] **Q:** Yes, sir.
[9] **A:** I think he has asked me if I would come [10] and testify.
[11] **Q:** Do you know when the trial date is?

[12] **A:** I heard just as the proceedings began [13] sometime in early September.
[14] **Q:** You didn't know about it before then?
[15] **A:** I probably did, I just didn't remember it [16] before we sat down.
[17] **Q:** Are you available to testify at trial at [18] that time?
[19] **A:** Assuming the trial doesn't interfere with [20] my planned trip to the infectious disease meetings, [21] yes, I will be there.
[22] **Q:** Do you need to get that page?

Page 25

[1] **A:** You know, may I suggest that I ask my [2] partner to take calls for me this afternoon if she's [3] still here,
[4] **Q:** That would be good.
[5] **A:** It's usually not like this on a Monday [6] afternoon. I know this is annoying to everyone, as [7] well as to me. So, let me get this page and I'll [8] see if I can reach my partner and we'll get this [9] done. I'll buy an hour. I still need to do the [10] consult at 4:30, though.
[11] **THE VIDEOGRAPHER:** We're now off [12] the record. The time is 3:23.
[13] (Thereupon, a discussion was held off the record.)
[14] **THE VIDEOGRAPHER:** Okay, we're now [15] back on the record. The time is 3:27.
[16] **BY MR. RATZAN:**
[17] **Q:** Dr. Wientzen, have you testified before in [18] a medical malpractice case?
[19] **A:** Yes, I have.
[20] **Q:** About how many times do you think you [21] testified in deposition in a medical malpractice [22] case?

Page 26

[1] **A:** Probably three or four times a year for [2] the last eight or nine years.
[3] **Q:** And before the last eight or nine years [4] you've testified?
[5] **A:** Fewer times than that.
[6] **Q:** How many times a year do you think you did [7] before?
[8] **A:** Couple times, one or two times a year.
[9] **Q:** How many years have you been doing it all [10] together?
[11] **A:** Since about 1980 or '79.
[12] **Q:** And of those one to two times a year until [13] the last eight years, and then did you say two to [14] three times a year?
[15] **A:** Three or four times.
[16] **Q:** Three or four times a year, after that in [17] the aggregate what would you say your frequency is [18] testifying for the Plaintiff's side versus the [19] Defendant's side?

[20] **A:** Probably in the early years it was more [21] Plaintiff than Defendants, and now it's more [22] Defendant than Plaintiff.

Page 27

[1] **Q:** In the last two years, what do you think [2] the ratio is between Defendant and Plaintiff?
[3] **A:** Probably 60/40.
[4] **Q:** Do you have any idea why that ratio has [5] changed?
[6] **A:** I probably get more cases from Defendant's [7] attorneys than Plaintiff's attorneys.
[8] **Q:** How many cases do you review in a year in [9] which you don't testify in a deposition?
[10] **A:** I probably review, where I don't testify, [11] probably 10 or 12 cases a year.
[12] **Q:** In addition to the ones you testify in?
[13] **A:** Right.
[14] **Q:** And of those, would you say the ratio is [15] the same, 60/40?
[16] **A:** I don't really know.
[17] **Q:** Okay. How many times have you testified [18] at trial?
[19] **A:** Probably eight or - now probably about [20] ten times.
[21] **Q:** And have you testified in that same ratio, [22] 60/40, Defendant/Plaintiff?

Page 28

[1] **A:** Probably.
[2] **Q:** Which Plaintiff's lawyer did you testify [3] at trial for?
[4] **A:** Here in this area, there is a Mr. Heller, [5] there is a Mr. - you said trial?
[6] **Q:** Yes, sir.
[7] **A:** All right, in Florida there is a Mr. Allen [8] Friedman and Mr. Marvin Weinstein. I think they're [9] in Miami, and I don't think I've been to Florida for [10] a Plaintiff trial except for that firm.
[11] **Q:** How about other states besides Florida?
[12] **A:** Kansas, I did a - there was a trial [13] appearance for Mr. Jim Bartimus, James Bartimus, and [14] then in this area, I was a Plaintiff expert for a [15] Mr. Ropollo, R-O-P-O-L-L-O, I think.
[16] **MR. RATZAN:** Can we go off the [17] record for one second? He's back. You know, I was [18] just about to ask some questions that I think you'd [19] be interested in. So, I didn't want to do that [20] while you were out of the room.
[21] **MR. KING:** Thanks. Sorry for [22] holding you up.

Page 29

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

[2] **Q:** Dr. Wientzen, do you have an understanding [3] as to Russell Wagner's presentation to Dr. Pearson?

[4] **A:** Yes, I think I do.

[5] **Q:** And before we go into that, are you aware [6] that there is a difference in perception between the VI events, both the signs and symptoms that Russell [8] presented, and what was actually described to Dr. [9] Pearson?

[10] **MR. KING:** Objection to form.

[11] **MR. LEINICKE:** Join.

[12] **MR. LURY:** Join. At what time and [13] what presentation are you talking about, counsel?

[14] **THE WITNESS:** I don't understand [15] the question.

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

[17] **Q:** Okay. Are you familiar at any time in the [18] three phone calls that Dorothy Wagner had with Dr. [19] Pearson that you, looking back on it, there has been [20] a difference of perception between Dorothy Wagner [21] and Dr. Pearson as to what Russell's signs and [22] symptoms were, as well as what was reported to Dr.

Page 30

[1] Pearson?

[2] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection to the [3] form of the question. By the way, I just want to [4] state my objection so you can change it. I don't [5] know what you mean by the word "perception," and I [6] think that's vague and ambiguous, and I don't know [7] whether or not you are asking him whether or not [8] they just have a different statement between them or [9] description of what had occurred or whether or not [10] their observations of the clinical condition of the [11] child were different. I object to that as being [12] vague and ambiguous.

[13] **MR. KING:** I join in the [14] objection. I also think looking back is somewhat [15] vague and confusing.

[16] **MR. LURY:** Join.

[17] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[18] **Q:** You can answer the question.

[19] **A:** The only information that I'm privy to is [20] the description the parents give as to their [21] recollection of how the child appeared to them and [22] what they think they said to Dr. Pearson over the

Page 31

[1] phone and Dr. Pearson's recollection of what he [2] recall having talked to the parents about over the [3] phone on the evening of the 30th when those three [4] phone calls were made.

[5] **Q:** Which account of the events do you think [6] is more close to reality?

[7] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[8] **MR. KING:** I object to the form.

[9] **THE WITNESS:** I can't choose [10] between the parents' recollections and the doctor's [11] recollections as to which was more close to reality [12] at that time.

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

[14] **Q:** In these kinds of cases involving [15] bacterial meningitis, this has happened before; [16] you're aware of that?

[17] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form. [18] What has happened before?

[19] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[20] **Q:** In your experience this difference in [21] perception.

[22] **MR. KING:** I object to the form.

Page 32

[1] **MR. LURY:** Join.

[2] **MR. LEINICKE:** Same.

[3] **THE WITNESS:** To answer your [4] question, I think parents frequently have a [5] different perception or appreciation of the level of [6] illness of a patient, their child, because they're [7] emotionally vested into the child's welfare, and [8] they see a change versus how a pediatrician or [9] another physician would interpret that knowing how [10] sick children really do appear. So, yes, I think as [11] a practicing doctor, I'm exposed to that change in [12] perception all the time, the difference of [13] perception all the time.

[14] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[15] **Q:** Based on your experience and training, do [16] you feel you have an understanding or a perception [17] of your own as to which account, the mother's or the [18] pediatrician's, is most reliable?

[19] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[20] **MR. LEINICKE:** I object to the [21] form of the question.

[22] **MR. KING:** Objection.

Page 33

[1] **MR. LEINICKE:** In this case or in [2] general terms?

[3] **MR. RATZAN:** In general terms.

[4] **MR. LEINICKE:** I object to the [5] form.

[6] **MR. KING:** Join.

[7] **MR. LURY:** Join.

[8] **THE WITNESS:** I don't know how to [9] answer your question with the terminology that you [10] used, namely more reliable. I think a physician has [11] to weigh everything a parent says, has to take into [12] account every statement a parent makes to him or her [13] over the phone about a child's signs and symptoms, [14] and then a physician has to ask appropriate [15] questions to try to get beyond the lay concept of [16] what's being stated to the medical understanding of [17] what's being stated.

[18] To give you a very concrete example of [19] that, I think the issue of possible convulsions in [20] this case is such a consideration. When a parent [21] says, "The child is making these strange motions, is [22] shivering or shaking and I'm worried it's a seizure,

Page 34

[1] what should I do, "I think a physician has a [2] responsibility if that information is offered to [3] try [4] to come to some understanding over the phone whether [5] it is a convulsion or not, and there are questions, [6] behavioral observations that the parent can make [7] over the phone which can dispel the possibility of [8] there being seizures, and a physician would need to [9] do that.

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

[10] **Q:** That's a great example. In this case, [11] Dorothy Wagner in her deposition, which I know you [12] read, discusses that and that she used the word [13] convulsions and/or shaking.

[14] **A:** Right.

[15] **Q:** Yet Dr. Pearson, whose deposition you also [16] read, doesn't acknowledge that she ever used either [17] of those words.

[18] **A:** Correct.

[19] **Q:** That's a difference in at least perception [20] as to what happened?

[21] **MR. KING:** Excuse me, I object to [22] the form of the question because I don't think that

Page 35

[1] accurately reflects the testimony of Mrs. Wagner.

[2] **MR. LURY:** Join.

[3] **MR. LEINICKE:** Same.

[4] **THE WITNESS:** Again, I'm not in [5] any position to disagree with your reconstruction of [6] Mrs. Wagner's deposition testimony. Maybe she said [7] that and maybe not. I do - in reading both the [8] mother and father's depositions, I spent some time [9] trying to answer in my own way whether or not [10] Russell was having seizures that night, and I found [11] two statements that the parents made that would to [12] me dispel the concern that this was seizures, and if [13] Dr. Pearson had a similar understanding of the [14] events, then it would have dispelled that for him [15] also.

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

[17] **Q:** What were those statements?

[18] **A:** The mother in her deposition states that [19] she was talking to Dr. Pearson and describing the [20] motor activity that she was observing and was [21] concerned, and she said somewhere in her deposition [22] "I saw Russell standing there shaking, shivering."

Page 36

[1] Now, if you're having a seizure, you can't stand [2] there. You would collapse. You would have no motor [3] tone. You cannot have a standing up seizure.

[4] Second feature, and this is the father's [5] deposition, was when he was being - the question [6] about the motor activity, he may have mentioned the [7] fact that the motor activity continued until he put [8] the child in a cool bath and a cool bath made the [9] shaking stop. Cool baths do not stop seizures.

[10] So, hearing that, I mean, I don't know [11] what else Dr. Pearson could have heard, but to me if [12] I had heard that as a description of the child, he's [13] standing here, he's shaking, you say to yourself as [14] a doctor that's not a seizure, your child is having [15] a chill.

[16] Q: Do you recall Dorothy Wagner testifying [17] that she picked Russell up and he was trembling in [18] her arms as she was holding him?

[19] A: I believe that's in her deposition, yes.

[20] Q: In any event, the question I was asking [21] was that Dr. Pearson has no recollection in his [22] deposition of this discussion?

Page 37

[1] A: Correct.

[2] Q: Of convulsion or seizure or shaking or any [3] of it?

[4] MR. KING: I object to the form.

[5] BY MR. RATZAN:

[6] Q: Is that consistent with your recollection [7] of Dr. Pearson's deposition?

[8] A: Let me just look at the cover of his [9] deposition because I think I made some notes as to [10] what he recalls. He recalls that the first call was [11] about the fever but the mother didn't know the [12] temperature, and so she took the temperature, called [13] him back, and it was at that juncture that he asked [14] questions about the use of Tylenol, how well he was [15] drinking, breathing, whether there was any pain, his [16] eye contact, vomiting, diarrhea, prior medicines, [17] his temperature and gave some instruction to do a [18] tepid bath and to call back. Then on page 24 he [19] says there was no conversation concerning [20] convulsions or shivering, possibly being a [21] convulsion that he can recall. So, you're right, he [22] does not recall.

Page 38

[1] Q: Now, for purposes of this deposition, if [2] we call that a difference in perception or at least [3] a different account of what happened, what I want to [4] know is whether you have any experience or training [5] that would enable you to have your own perception

as [6] to which account, Dorothy Wagner's or Dr. Pearson's, [7] is more reliable regarding that issue?

[8] MR. KING: I object to the form of [9] the question, number one, asked and answered, also [10] it might not be their perception, it might be [11] recollection.

[12] MR. LEINICKE: Same.

[13] MR. LURY: Join.

[14] BY MR. RATZAN:

[15] Q: You can answer the question.

[16] A: You're referring I think to whether or not [17] the conversation existed between the two of them, [18] not whether or not these motor activities were [19] seizures or not?

[20] Q: That's right.

[21] A: Because I've already told you my opinion [22] on that.

Page 39

[1] Q: I understand.

[2] A: I wouldn't be able to pick which one I [3] would find more reliable. On the one hand, you're [4] asking what would be indelible in the memory of a [5] physician whose patient dies 24 hours later, and on [6] the other, you're asking what's indelible on the [7] memory of a parent whose child dies, and they're [8] both very difficult events for both parties, and I [9] don't know who, and I'm not going to pick one or the [10] other.

[11] Q: Is that something you would ever do?

[12] A: I think it would depend on other [13] circumstances, but in this case, I just don't see [14] how I could choose one side or the other.

[15] Q: When the mother called Dr. Pearson and [16] reported that the baby was hot, she also recollects [17] that she called back and gave the doctor a [18] temperature of 105 degrees?

[19] A: Right.

[20] Q: That temperature of 105 degrees made its [21] way into the history note of Dr. Litvak the next [22] day?

Page 40

[1] A: Correct.

[2] Q: Dr. Pearson doesn't recall the [3] temperature.

[4] A: Okay.

[5] Q: Whose perception do you think is more [6] accurate?

[7] MR. KING: I object to the form of [8] the question. This Doctor is not the fact finder [9] here. If you have a question of the Doctor based [10] upon the facts as you see them or hypothetically, I [11] think that's a proper way to ask the Doctor [12] questions. This way is im proper, and I object to [13] it.

[14] MR. LURY: I join in the [15] objection.

[16] MR. LEINICKE: Same objection.

[17] BY MR. RATZAN:

[18] Q: You can answer the question.

[19] A: I think to me the fact that this [20] temperature of 105 is entered the next day in the [21] medical record suggests that a temperature of 105 [22] definitely was recorded prior to this child coming

Page 41

[1] into the emergency room, and based on all the other [2] information, that probably would have been the [3] evening of the prior night. Whether or not that was [4] given to Dr. Pearson is a separate question, and I [5] would just from having dealt with parents probably [6] say yes, she probably did tell Dr. Pearson of that [7] degree of temperature.

[8] Q: Are you aware that the mother testified [9] that signs and symptoms of Russell Wagner on the [10] night of November 30, the night that she made those [11] three or she had those three telephone contacts with [12] Dr. Pearson, were that her baby was screaming, he [13] was hot and trembling, breathing rapidly, vomiting, [14] that he had never had any signs or symptoms before, [15] that he had had his head in his hands at dinner and [16] was acting fussy and that she had given him Tylenol [17] before dinner and before bed?

[18] A: I certainly recall all those pieces of [19] information in her deposition.

[20] MR. KING: I object to the form, [21] sorry.

[22] BY MR. RATZAN:

Page 42

[1] Q: When Dr. Pearson learned of the [2] temperature of 105 degrees, did Dr. Pearson have a [3] responsibility to ask the mother questions to elicit [4] that information?

[5] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[6] THE WITNESS: Yes.

[7] BY MR. RATZAN:

[8] Q: Do you believe Dr. Pearson did that?

[9] A: Based on his deposition, it sounds like he [10] went over many of the features that you're supposed [11] to go over when you have a child with a high fever.

[12] Q: What are the things you're supposed to go [13] over?

[14] A: How the child is interacting with the [15] parent. In other words, what we're trying to get to [16] as physicians is whether this is an acutely ill [17] child who is toxic or sick appearing and needs to be [18] seen that night or whether this is something that is [19] more standard and can wait until the next morning to

[20] be evaluated.
[12] In general what physicians attempt is to [22] bring the temperature down through medicines and

Page 43

[1] through cool baths and then to have the parents [12] judge the level of irritability, listlessness, lack [3] thereof, the interactivity of the child with the [4] environment, how well the child will be comforted by [5] the family or by the parent.

[6] They are the key features in the initial [7] evaluation of such a fever, as well as trying as [8] best as one can to over the phone localize the [9] fever. Does the child have an ear ache? Could this [10] be an ear infection? Is there a sore throat? Is [11] there a lot of diarrhea? Is there vomiting, which [12] could be a gas trointestinal infection, those sorts [13] of things.

[14] Q: Well, let me ask you this: At 10:00 p.m., [15] after the third phone call and after Dr. Pearson had [16] gained whatever information existed to him at the [17] time, what should his differential diagnosis have [18] been?

[19] MR. KING: I object to the form.

[20] THE WITNESS: At the end of the [21] third phone call, I think the differential diagnosis [22] should be a brewing viral infection. and I think one

Page 44

[1] always has in the back of his mind the possibility [2] that this is the opening of what could be a [3] bacterial process.

[4] BY MR. RATZAN:

[5] Q: At any time during that evening, should [6] Dr. Pearson have considered or suspected bacterial [7] meningitis as one of the possibilities for Russell [8] Wagner?

[9] A: It's my personal belief that every time a [10] physician interacts with a parent of a young baby [11] with fever, that automatically gets put on the list [12] of considerations, not to the point where you say [13] oh, I'm going to do a lumbar puncture on this child [14] obviously, but to the point where you're getting [15] information back from the parent to help you judge [16] should I do the lumbar puncture at this point, [17] should I refer this child to the emergency room.

[18] So, from that standpoint, yes, although [19] that's not often a consciously stated thing in the [20] minds of physicians. The mind of the physician is [21] let's talk some more to this mother to determine how [22] sick this child is. Meningitis can be one of the

Page 45

[1] things to make a child sick, and if so, we'll do the [2] right thing for the child.

[3] Q: Aside from the fever, why else

should Dr. [4] Pearson have considered bacterial meningitis on the [5] evening of November 30th?

[6] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[7] MR. KING: Join.

[8] THE WITNESS: I think the signs [9] and symptoms of meningitis are very non-specific in [10] the initial phases especially, and so when a patient [11] presents with fever and non-specific signs and [12] symptoms such as vomiting, poor appetite, crying, [13] irritability, they would be some of the other [14] non-specific features that are found with many, many [15] illnesses, hundreds of illnesses, but meningitis [16] being one of them. So, a physician takes [17] information about those features in an effort to [18] make a determination whether or not a lumbar [19] puncture should be done.

[20] BY MR. RATZAN:

[21] Q: Okay, Dr. Wientzen, what I want to know [22] is what symptoms or signs did Russell Wagner present

Page 46

[1] that should have given Dr. Pearson the impetus to [2] consider bacterial meningitis?

[3] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[4] MR. KING: Join.

[5] MR. LEINICKE: Same.

[6] THE WITNESS: I think I just told [7] you that.

[8] BY MR. RATZAN:

[9] Q: Respectfully, I think, Doctor, what I [10] heard was a summary of the general guidelines for [11] considering meningitis, but what I need to know is [12] because, Doctor, you already stated that Dr. Pearson [13] should have considered bacterial meningitis in light [14] of the high fever, you said any doctor should do [15] that, what I want to know is what other signs or [16] symptoms, even though they may be non-specific in [17] your words, besides the 105 fever would give cause [18] to Dr. Pearson to consider bacterial meningitis on [19] November 30th?

[20] MR. LURY: I object to the form. [21] It characterizes his prior testimony.

[22] MR. KING: I object to the form of

Page 47

[1] the question, if any.

[2] MR. LEINICKE: Okay, same. By the [3] way, could we just have perhaps an agreement to [4] speed this up that if one of us objects, that's an [5] objection for all of us? Would you agree to that so [6] we don't all have to -

[7] MR. RATZAN: I'll agree to that. [8] That's fine, unless one of you doesn't want that [9] objection for you, you can't have it.

[10] MR. LEINICKE: Is that acceptable, [11] guys?

[12] MR. KING: Yes.

[13] MR. LURY: Yes.

[14] MR. LEINICKE: Okay, then we don't [15] all have to keep chiming in on this, thank you.

[16] BY MR. RATZAN:

[17] Q: Okay, you can answer the question.

[18] A: In looking over the list of things that [19] Mrs. Wagner states in her deposition were features [20] of Russell's initial illness, there is fever, there [21] is crying and there is vomiting, and those three [22] things can be seen with meningitis. They're

Page 48

[1] non-specific features of many, many things, but [2] those three things are non-specific features that [3] can be associated with meningitis.

[4] Q: When Dr. Pearson or any doctor hears a [5] mother talk about trembling, maybe it's convulsions [6] over the telephone, would it be appropriate for the [7] doctor to do a physical exam of that baby to rule [8] out convulsions or seizures as opposed to a mere [9] shake?

[10] MR. KING: I object to the form, [11] incomplete hypothetical.

[12] MR. LURY: Join.

[13] THE WITNESS: I think the answer [14] to your question is that it would not really be a [15] typical scenario where a physician could get that [16] information over the phone, have the child come in [17] and that motor activity would still be present an [18] hour later. Seizures would either have stopped [19] spontaneously or when the temperature is controlled, [20] the shivering would stop. So, no, I don't think one [21] could ever practice medicine that way.

[22] BY MR. RATZAN:

Page 49

[1] Q: Bacterial meningitis is a life-threatening [2] condition?

[3] A: Yes, it is.

[4] Q: If a baby is showing signs and symptoms of [5] bacterial meningitis, enough that the doctor - [6] strike that. If the shaking and the convulsions are [7] indeed a sign or symptom of bacterial meningitis, [8] does the doctor, hearing that sign or symptom [9] reported over the phone by the mother, should he [10] include that as well as the other things [11] mentioned in the constellation of signs and symptoms [12] to cause him to suspect bacterial meningitis?

[13] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[14] THE WITNESS: I think you can't [15] put both shaking and convulsions in

your question. [16] It's either one or the other, and I think a [17] physician makes a determination which of the two it [18] is. If he determines it's convulsions, then the [19] answer to your question would be yes, it needs to be [20] put into the list of things that could possibly be [21] meningitic symptoms in this patient. If he [22] concludes no, this is shaking, based on the

Page 50

[11] information he gets from the mother, then that is [2] not put into the list of things that raises the [3] issue of meningitis again,

[4] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[5] **Q:** Do you fairly believe that a pediatrician [6] can determine whether it's shaking or a convulsion [7] on a telephone?

[8] **A:** Yes, I think oftentimes a physician can.

[9] **Q:** Have you done that?

[10] **A:** Yes, I have.

[11] **Q:** At any time, should Dr. Pearson have [12] considered or suspected bacteremia?

[13] **A:** Yes.

[14] **Q:** Why should he have done that?

[15] **A:** The symptoms that this baby presented [16] with, mainly high fever, is the way bacteremia is [17] presented.

[18] **Q:** What did Dr. Pearson do to rule out [19] bacterial meningitis?

[20] **A:** I think he ruled out bacterial meningitis [21] over the course of several phone calls with this [22] mother based on his deposition and determining how

Page 51

[1] sick the child appeared during the course of the two [2] hours that he had conversations with her.

[3] **Q:** I understand that. I would like you to [4] describe for me the specific things that Dr. Pearson [5] did to rule out bacterial meningitis in this baby.

[6] **A:** Again, it's based on the list of things [7] that he says he discussed with Mrs. Wagner. At the [8] time of the second phone call, it's listed in his [9] deposition, and that was a discussion of a list of [10] questions, a sort of review of systems list of [11] questions that he says he remembers having asked [12] Mrs. Wagner over the phone, and that included things [13] like the drinking history of the child, his [14] breathing ability, whether or not he was having any [15] pain, what his eye contact was with Mrs. Wagner, [16] probably Mr. Wagner, the vomiting, diarrhea, the [17] medicines he was on and the height of his [18] temperature.

[19] **Q:** What did Dr. Pearson do to rule out [20] bacteremia?

[21] **A:** Same.

[22] **Q:** You teach residents and interns, fellows?

Page 52

[1] **A:** Yes.

[2] **Q:** Here at Georgetown?

[3] **A:** Correct.

[4] **Q:** You teach them pediatric infectious [5] disease?

[6] **A:** Right.

[7] **Q:** When you're teaching your residents, [8] interns or fellows, what do you teach them to do in [9] order to rule out bacterial meningitis when they [10] suspect it in a patient?

[11] **MR. LEINICKE:** I object to the [12] form.

[13] **THE WITNESS:** I teach them to take [14] a good history and do a very good physical exam. I [15] teach them to have a concern for bacterial [16] meningitis when the child looks sick or toxic. I [17] teach them if they are unconvinced of the absence of [18] meningitis at the time of their first examination [19] with the child that it's prudent to keep the child [20] under evaluation for an hour or two and reevaluate [21] the child even cursorily to see whether or not [22] there's been progression of the neurologic findings

Page 53

[1] that are commensurate with bacterial meningitis, and [2] I teach them that follow-up in the short term is [3] very helpful in determining whether or not a patient [4] has bacterial meningitis.

[5] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[6] **Q:** What do they do to reevaluate and follow [7] up? Do they perform a second exam?

[8] **A:** Not so much a second exam necessarily as a [9] brief observational evaluation of the patient to see [10] whether or not the child continues to be alert and [11] interactive, to see whether the level of [12] irritability if it was present initially has gotten [13] worse, the level of lethargy if it was present [14] initially has gotten worse. The presumption is that [15] patients with bacterial meningitis will progress [16] with their signs and symptoms over the short term.

[17] **Q:** Do you teach them to perform a hands-on [18] exam?

[19] **A:** Yes, I do.

[20] **Q:** Do you teach them to, in re-evaluating [21] them, to view the patient themselves?

[22] **A:** Yes.

Page 54

[1] **Q:** Can you tell me or describe for me, if you [2] would, the importance of a

physical exam -

[3] **MR. KING:** I object to the form.

[4] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[5] **Q:** - when a physician considers or suspects [6] bacterial meningitis in a baby?

[7] **MR. KING:** I object to the form of [8] the question, incomplete hypothetical.

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

[10] **Q:** You can answer.

[11] **A:** I think the physical exam is helpful. I [12] think unfortunately neurologic meningeal signs, as [13] they're recalled, are not always present during the [14] course of bacterial meningitis. One can find some [15] pertinent positive features of an examination that [16] could guide the decision to do a lumbar puncture.

[17] More important in my judgment in the [18] effort to make a decision to do a lumbar puncture [19] are the observational variables that you really [20] don't need a physical exam to do but which can be [21] done by basically observing the patient in a period [22] of time.

Page 55

[1] **Q:** If Dr. Pearson considered or suspected [2] bacterial meningitis in Russell Wagner at 10:00 p.m. [3] on November 30th, 1989, what should he have done?

[4] **MR. KING:** I object to the form.

[5] **THE WITNESS:** If after discussing [6] the various list of things that we've already talked [7] about that he said he discussed he still has the [8] concern for bacterial meningitis at that juncture, [9] he should have referred this patient to a facility [10] where a lumbar puncture could have been done.

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

[12] **Q:** And what should have followed from there?

[13] **A:** Depends on what the lumbar puncture [14] showed.

[15] **Q:** Did you agree with Dr. Pearson's diagnosis [16] of November 30th, 1989?

[17] **A:** As I sit here, I don't remember him being [18] asked the specific diagnosis that he had in mind. [19] You can refresh my memory. You probably know his [20] deposition better than I.

[21] **Q:** I don't. I don't know what his diagnosis [22] was.

Page 56

[1] **A:** I can't recall what he said his diagnosis [2] was.

[3] **Q:** Did you read any notes that Dr. Pearson [4] made of his telephone calls of that night?

[5] **A:** No.

[6] **Q:** I noticed Dr. Betancourt provided a log to [7] his deposition which you

reviewed?

[8] A: Yes.

[9] Q: Did you see any kind of log that Dr. Pearson had written of his phone calls of that [11] night?

[12] A: I did not see such a thing, no.

[13] Q: Do you teach your residents to make notes [14] of phone calls that they receive from others [15] reporting signs and symptoms, all be it [16] non-specific, for meningitis?

[17] MR. LEINICKE: I object to the [18] form.

[19] MR. KING: I object to the form, [20] incomplete hypothetical.

[21] THE WITNESS: No, no, I generally [22] don't teach my residents to make phone call notes.

Page 57

[1] BY MR. RATZAN:

[2] Q: Do they know to do that anyway?

[3] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[4] THE WITNESS: I think they know to [5] do that for certain reasons, oh, if a medicine is [6] going to be prescribed, for instance, to note that [7] so it goes into the medical record, but not [8] necessarily each and every febrile baby to have a [9] phone message written as to the signs and symptoms [10] and the interaction between the parents and the [11] doctor.

[12] BY MR. RATZAN:

[13] Q: In the clinical practice that Dr. Pearson [14] had with Dr. Litvak and Dr. Betancourt, should Dr. [15] Pearson have written some notes to transfer the [16] information he was receiving from Dorothy Wagner for [17] Russell's appointment the next day with one of his [18] partners?

[19] MR. KING: I object to the form.

[20] THE WITNESS: I don't think [21] there's any rule that requires a physician to do [22] that. I think there needs to be a way of

Page 58

[1] communicating important information from one person [2] in the department or division or practice to [3] another, but it need not be written.

[4] BY MR. RATZAN:

[5] Q: Okay. It might be oral?

[6] A: Yes.

[7] Q: And if Dr. Pearson was making an [8] appointment for 8:30 - I'm sorry, if Dr. Pearson [9] was making an appointment the next morning for [10] Russell to see one of his partners, do you think Dr. [11] Pearson should have discussed all the signs and [12] symptoms and history that existed in Russell the [13] night before with Dr. Litvak, the next physician to [14] see the baby?

[15] MR. KING: I object to the form.

[16] THE WITNESS: I think, again, if [17] Dr. Pearson felt there was something particularly [18] unusual about the presentation of a [19] 17 month old [20] baby with high fever, he would have to tell Dr. [21] Litvak what that unusual feature was, but this is [22] such a common thing for a physician to be called [23] about in the off hours, high fever, that I know when

Page 59

[1] I was doing general pediatrics we never had that [2] need, I never had that need to tell my partners the [3] story of each and every child whose parents had [4] called me the night before because of a fever, and [5] if the child was to come in, the history would be [6] obtainable again from the parent.

[7] BY MR. RATZAN:

[8] Q: Now, to be fair, there was more than a [9] fever with Russell Wagner on the evening of November [10] 30th, 1989?

[11] A: True.

[12] Q: And depending on whose account you [13] believe, there was in addition to fever vomiting?

[14] A: Right.

[15] Q: Shaking?

[16] A: Right.

[17] Q: Screaming?

[18] MR. KING: I object to the form.

[19] THE WITNESS: Sure.

[20] BY MR. RATZAN:

[21] Q: And some irritability?

[22] A: Screaming and irritability I would say is

Page 60

[1] the same.

[2] Q: Does Dr. Pearson, after knowing all of [3] those signs and symptoms at 10:00 p.m. on November [4] 30th, 1989, assuming for the moment that he did, [5] what should his differential diagnosis have been at [6] 10:00 p.m. on November 30th, 1989?

[7] MR. KING: Excuse me, I object to [8] the form of the question. I think the question is [9] unclear because it makes it sound like these items [10] are continuing in nature, and I don't think that's [11] the case. Anyway, I object to the form.

[12] BY MR. RATZAN:

[13] Q: You can answer the question.

[14] A: Well, I'm not sure a physician truly [15] develops a differential diagnosis necessarily when [16] he's discussing something over the phone with a [17] parent. He draws up a preliminary list of things [18] that might be present but not truly a formalized [19] differential diagnosis.

[20] So, to substitute that as, you know, as a

[21] preliminary list of things, I think in the [22] physician's mind would be a viral syndrome brewing.

Page 61

[1] with fever and maybe vomiting in a child who's very [2] unhappy because of the fever and therefore crying. [3] That would be I think the most likely differential [4] diagnosis or preliminary, number one on the [5] preliminary list, and number two would be the onset [6] of a bacterial superinfection of something such as a [7] middle ear infection, strep throat, a bacterial [8] enteritis.

[9] Number three would be the possibility of [10] some more deep seeded tissue infection such as the [11] beginning of a pneumonia, the beginning of what [12] might be bacteremia, and then I think one would [13] continue in the face of any febrile baby as I said [14] before to think we still need meningitis in the back [15] of our minds as this child's illness progresses with [16] time.

[17] Q: Do you think Dr. Pearson should have made [18] arrangements to visit that baby at that point in [19] time?

[20] A: Are you talking about 10:00 o'clock at [21] night?

[22] Q: Yes, sir.

Page 62

[1] A: No, I think based on the information that [2] he received, that he says he received during the [3] course of his conversation with Mrs. Wagner, the [4] child was not apparently sick enough to require that [5] sort of intervention.

[6] Q: If you assume that he received the [7] information that Mrs. Wagner reported, does your [8] opinion change?

[9] A: No, I think Mrs. Wagner doesn't talk in [10] her deposition about the salient feature of what Dr. [11] Pearson got to in his conversation with the mother, [12] that is to say the level of toxicity of the child [13] based on his ability to interact, as Dr. Pearson [14] uses his eye contact with the mother, and that is [15] something that physicians get skilled in in [16] eliciting, even over the phone, from parents who are [17] very concerned about their children.

[18] Q: Does eye contact in the face of all those [19] other non-specific signs and symptoms that existed [20] with Russell Wagner on November 30th, 1989, does eye [21] contact rule out bacterial meningitis?

[22] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

Page 63

[1] MR. KING: Join.

[2] THE WITNESS: No, nothing rules [3] out bacterial meningitis. There is always a chance [4] for bacterial meningitis to be present, even in a [5] baby who looks

spectacularly well, but it does rule [6] out the need of a physician to act any further.

[7] BY MR. RATZAN:

[8] Q: Why is that?

[9] A: Because it would be an extremely rare [10] circumstance for a child with bacterial meningitis [11] to be very interactive with the environment, to be [12] comforted by the mother, to be comfortable, to have [13] the irritability and the crying and the screaming [14] dissipate when the fever comes down.

[15] Q: If a baby presented to you with 105 fever, [16] irritability, vomiting, shaking but had good eye [17] contact, would that rule out bacterial meningitis?

[18] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[19] MR. KING: Join.

[20] THE WITNESS: Again, as I said [21] before, that single feature would not rule out [22] bacterial meningitis. It would be strong evidence

Page 64

[1] against bacterial meningitis, and if one could then [2] be comfortable that the level of irritability that's [3] being proffered by the parent was not that level of [4] irritability which is consistent with meningitis, [5] then you would be very certain that this is not [6] bacterial meningitis.

[7] BY MR. RATZAN:

[8] Q: How do you do that on a telephone?

[9] A: This is a skill physicians have honed over [10] many years of practice, and one gets a sense of what [11] apparent means when she says the child is fussy or [12] crying or irritable, and that takes years I think of [13] experience to get.

[14] Q: Do you think Dr. Pearson - I'll strike [15] that. Do you have any criticisms of the care [16] rendered by Dr. Pearson?

[17] MR. KING: I object to the form.

[18] THE WITNESS: Assuming that Dr. [19] Pearson's rendition of his list of questions to the [20] mother is about right, no, I don't.

[21] BY MR. RATZAN:

[22] Q: If you assume what the mother says she

Page 65

[1] told Dr. Pearson is accurate and that the baby had [2] all the signs and symptoms that the mother reported, [3] do you have any criticisms of the care rendered by [4] Dr. Pearson?

[5] MR. KING: I object to the form of [6] the question.

[7] THE WITNESS: Again, I'm not [8] dis-counting that the mother or I'm not saying that [9] the mother's list of complaints weren't told to Dr. [10] Pearson.

I'm merely saying that Dr. Pearson had a [11] duty to discuss, for instance, the irritability with [12] the mother to get a sense of that irritability, to [13] make a determination that that level of irritability [14] was not consistent with bacterial meningitis, rather [15] it was consistent with a child who was unhappy [16] because he had a fever.

[17] So, even if the mother complained of [18] irritability and vomiting and so on, as long as Dr. [19] Pearson got through those complaints to the point [20] where he was comfortable that it wasn't bacterial [21] meningitis, then I would have no criticism of Dr. [22] Pearson.

Page 66

[1] BY MR. RATZAN:

[2] Q: As you understand it, Russell Wagner [3] appeared at the office the next morning with his [4] mother?

[5] A: Right.

[6] Q: Do you think it was appropriate for Dr. [7] Pearson to arrange for that appointment or recommend [8] that appointment for the next day?

[9] A: Yes, I think it was.

[10] Q: Why do you think so?

[11] A: I think a young baby at 17 months of age [12] with a high fever probably needs to be evaluated for [13] that fever within a reasonably short period of time.

[14] Q: Why is that?

[15] A: For all the reasons we just discussed [16] right now.

[17] Q: I'm not clear. What needed to be done in [18] the office the next day in the face of the symptoms [19] and the fever for Russell Wagner?

[20] A: Well, if one presumes that the physical [21] examination based on the review of systems that a [22] physician gets is going to be negative, then a blood

Page 67

[1] count is often done in a febrile baby this age with [2] no focus of infection. So, what would be done, [3] typically a blood count, and depending on other [4] features of the exam, maybe a throat culture, maybe [5] antibiotics for a trivial ear infection, maybe a [6] chest x-ray.

[7] Q: I guess I didn't make my question clear. [8] What is the physician or physicians looking for in [9] evaluating the baby the next day in the face of [10] those signs and symptoms?

[11] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to the [12] form, vague and ambiguous.

[13] THE WITNESS: I think the [14] physician is looking for further confirmation that [15] the child does not have a life-threatening illness, [16] number one. The physician is looking for further [17] progression of the initial presentation to

a defined [18] diagnosis, whether it be a viral diagnosis, an ear [19] infection diagnosis, a throat infection diagnosis on [20] the other hand. So, they would be the two reasons [21] for the examination.

[22] BY MR. RATZAN:

Page 68

[1] Q: Now, again, you're aware there is a [2] difference in either perception or reporting as to [3] what Russell's signs and symptoms were at 10:00 a.m. [4] in Dr. Litvak's office between the mom and the [5] doctor?

[6] MR. LEINICKE: I object to the [7] form.

[8] THE WITNESS: As I sit here, I [9] don't independently recall what the mother in her [10] deposition says about Russell's signs and symptoms [11] while he was in the office with Dr. Litvak. I do [12] know what Dr. Litvak writes about his exam, but I [13] don't recall independently what the mother says was [14] going on.

[15] BY MR. RATZAN:

[16] Q: Okay. Well, I want you to assume for the [17] purpose of this question that the mother testified [18] that Russell was pale, that he was quiet, that he [19] didn't want to do anything, that he wanted to be [20] held, that he didn't want to eat, that he had been [21] drinking a little Gatorade, that he hadn't slept [22] well and that he had been taking Tylenol. If you

Page 69

[1] assume those things to be true, do you agree with [2] Dr. Litvak's diagnosis of viremia?

[3] A: Do I agree that it's a proper diagnosis to [4] make?

[5] Q: Do you agree that his diagnosis of viremia [6] was correct?

[7] A: Well, I wouldn't need the parents' list of [8] things knowing the subsequent course of events with [9] the retrospective scope to know or not know whether [10] Dr. Litvak's diagnosis is correct. It is my opinion [11] that this baby probably was bacteremic at the time [12] of his evaluation by Dr. Litvak at 10:00 or 11:00 in [13] the morning.

[14] Whether it was prudent or reasonable or [15] proper for Dr. Litvak to have made a diagnosis of [16] bacteremia when the white count comes back 5,000 is [17] a different question, and I would say yes, it was [18] reasonable based on his evaluation of the child, but [19] in retrospect he would have been wrong.

[20] Q: All right, we'll get to the white count. [21] This is your copy of the notes from December 1st, [22] 1989?

Page 70

[1] A: Yes.

[2] Q: From Dr. Litvak?

[3] **A:** Right.
[4] **Q:** You've written something there in red ink?
[5] **A:** Yes.
[6] **Q:** Can you read what this says?
[7] **A:** This is actually a translation of the [8] handwriting in the bracketed area to the left of the [9] note. It says, "acted same," referring to the sib, [10] "permom for one to two days."

[11] **Q:** What's in that bracket? What does that [12] say?

[13] **A:** It says, "Sib questionable viral illness [14] one week ago," and then - I'm sorry, my [15] handwriting, my red handwriting doesn't explicate [16] what's in the bracket, it explicates what's next to [17] the bracket.

[18] **Q:** Okay. The bracket says, "Sib [19] questionable" -

[20] **A:** "Viral illness one week ago," and then [21] there's next to that, "acted the same per mom times [22] one to two days," meaning the sibling had a viral

Page 71

[1] illness a week ago and acted the way this baby is [2] acting now.

[3] **Q:** Is that significant at all?

[4] **A:** Yes, I think it is.

[5] **Q:** Why is that?

[6] **A:** Viral diseases are certainly transmissible [7] in a family. It's very common for an older child to [8] acquire a viral illness and then infect or bring the [9] infection into the family, and other family members [10] can get it. So, when one sees this sort of [11] epidemiologic transmission of the illness, it lends [12] some weight, epidemiologic weight that it's the same [13] disease.

[14] **Q:** I'm glad you used that word. Epidemiology [15] is the study of, is it not, the transfer of the [16] origin of a virus or a bacterial infection?

[17] **A:** In part.

[18] **Q:** So, in this case, it was important for Dr. [19] Litvak to know about that viral history from the [20] sister in reaching his diagnosis of viremia?

[21] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection to form.

[22] **THE WITNESS:** Again, the word

Page 72

[1] important isn't what I would use. I think that -

[2] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[3] **Q:** I'm sorry, what word would you use?

[4] **A:** I think it is another piece of information [5] that helps Dr. Litvak in coming up with the [6] diagnosis of a possible or probable viral disease. [7] In and of itself it's not crucial to that diagnosis, [8] but it helps.

[9] **Q:** Sometimes do babies also get bacterial [10] infections from their siblings?

[11] **A:** Yes, certainly they can.

[12] **Q:** And if you're treating a baby, is it [13] important to you to know if any siblings have had a [14] recent illness?

[15] **A:** I think again it's helpful sometimes to [16] know that. One would certainly not expect a [17] self-limiting illness in an older child to have been [18] bacterial, and I think that's the issue that comes [19] up with the sibling's case in this regard, that is [20] if the child had it, the older child had it and got [21] better spontaneously, it is evidence against Russell [22] Wagner's illness being anything but a viral disease.

Page 73

[1] **Q:** Because the sibling had a viral disease?

[2] **A:** Because the sibling got better [3] spontaneously, and children with Hemophilus [4] meningitis or bacterial sepsis don't get better [5] spontaneously.

[6] **Q:** The bacteria that causes Hemophilus [7] meningitis is called Hemophilus influenzae B?

[8] **A:** Type B, yes.

[9] **Q:** And that bacteria can cause other [10] infections besides meningitis in children?

[11] **A:** True.

[12] **Q:** That bacteria, in fact, is one of the [13] leading causes of an ear infection?

[14] **A:** Untrue.

[15] **Q:** Would you agree that - strike that. The [16] Hemophilus influenzae virus -

[17] **A:** It's not a virus.

[18] **Q:** I'm sorry, you're right, Hemophilus [19] influenzae bacteria can cause ear infections?

[20] **A:** Are you talking about type B [21] specifically?

[22] **Q:** In general, the bacteria Hemophilus

Page 74

[1] influenzae, not type B.

[2] **A:** Not type B, yes, it can cause it.

[3] **Q:** Can the Hemophilus influenzae B cause ear [4] infection?

[5] **A:** Yes, it's a rare cause of middle ear [6] disease.

[7] **Q:** The - strike that. Should Dr. Litvak [8] have considered or suspected bacterial meningitis in [9] Russell Wagner as one of the possibilities?

[10] **A:** I think the duty that Dr. Litvak would [11] have for Russell would be the same duty that I laid [12] to Dr. Pearson, that is to say history of a high [13] fever in a baby with the other complaints that are [14] listed here, the vomiting, the mo-

ther's complaint of [15] listlessness would raise that as an issue, a general [16] issue but nonetheless an issue, yes.

[17] **Q:** Should Dr. Litvak have considered or [18] suspected bacteremia in Russell Wagner as one of the [19] possibilities?

[20] **A:** Yes.

[21] **Q:** By the way, do you recall that Mrs. Wagner [22] actually suggested to Dr. Litvak that her baby might

Page 75

[1] have bacterial meningitis?

[2] **A:** I'm sorry, I missed your question.

[3] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection to form.

[4] **THE WITNESS:** Did I remember -

[5] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[6] **Q:** Do you recall that Mrs. Wagner, the mom, [7] while she was in Mr. Litvak's (sic) office actually [8] suggested the possibility of bacterial meningitis to [9] the doctor?

[10] **MR. LEINICKE:** I object to the [11] form.

[12] **THE WITNESS:** As I stated, I don't [13] recall that's in her deposition, but I certainly [14] take your word for it if you say it is.

[15] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[16] **Q:** Do you recall it being in Dr. Litvak's [17] deposition?

[18] **A:** No.

[19] **Q:** Did Dr. Litvak do anything to rule out [20] bacterial meningitis?

[21] **A:** Yes, he did.

[22] **Q:** And before I get to that, if you take my

Page 76

[1] word that Mrs. Wagner did suggest to Dr. Litvak or [2] at least raise the suspicion of bacterial [3] meningitis, would that be significant to you?

[4] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection to form.

[5] **THE WITNESS:** It would be [6] significant in one regard, and that is the parent [7] obviously has a concern that needs to be discussed [8] with the physician. It may not be a legitimate [9] medical concern, but it's certainly a concern that a [10] physician would spend a little time trying to [11] diffuse.

[12] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[13] **Q:** On December 1st when Dr. Litvak was [14] getting a blood count done and doing a neurological [15] exam, testing for what's called nuchal rigidity, I [16] guess a stiff neck, some doubt existed at that point [17] before he was done -

[18] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection.

[19] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[20] **Q:** - as to whether Russell had bacterial [21] meningitis?

[22] MR. LEINICKE: Objection.

Page 77

[1] MR. LURY: Object to the form.

[2] MR. LEINICKE: I object to the [3] form as vague and ambiguous. The concept of some [4] doubt existed has absolutely no meaning in this case [5] and is so vague as to possibly be answered yes or [6] no. Are you talking about a doubt in the doctor's [7] mind, a doubt in the mother's mind or a doubt [8] retrospectively? I object to the form.

[9] BY MR. RATZAN:

[10] Q: Doctor, you can answer the question.

[11] A: You know, doubt is again a difficult word [12] to deal with. Physicians have what's known as [13] clinical certainty that there is or isn't something [14] present but that doesn't remove all doubt. Even [15] after a full evaluation, even after a lumbar [16] puncture, it doesn't remove all doubt that there's [17] no meningitis.

[18] So, I would have to answer your question [19] with that as my concept of doubt, as saying [20] certainly, there's always doubt every time a patient [21] leaves a doctor's office, certainly before the [22] examination is done there is some doubt that the

Page 78

[1] diagnosis is correct. All we can offer is a [2] reasonable medical clinical certainty that we have [3] discharged our duty and ruled out what is apparent [4] at the present time.

[5] Q: Well, let me put it this way, before Dr. [6] Litvak commenced all of the tests that he commenced, [7] some doubt existed which probably motivated him to [8] do those tests?

[9] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

[10] THE WITNESS: Yes, I would agree [11] with you that using the word doubt in the sense that [12] a laboratory determination can shed some light on [13] the clinical exam and diminish that doubt, yes.

[14] BY MR. RATZAN:

[15] Q: Now, you said that Dr. Litvak did some [16] things to rule out bacterial meningitis?

[17] A: Yes.

[18] Q: Would you describe for me the specifics of [19] what he did to rule out bacterial meningitis on [20] December 1st, 1989.

[21] A: All right, he did a series of physical [22] examinations.

Page 79

[1] Q: By the way, I'd like to take them one by [2] one, okay, so identify the first series of physical [3] examinations.

[4] A: Well, there are here in his record a few [5] things that are called observational variables that [6] enable a physician to separate children who are ill [7] and who need evaluation in a hospital versus those [8] children who are ill but have a viral syndrome or a [9] trivial bacterial process.

[10] The first would be the determination that [11] this child was alert. That is an evidence that the [12] child's neurologic functioning is high level and not [13] compromised, and it's a sign of intact nervous [14] system functioning.

[15] Q: Okay. What was the next thing?

[16] A: Second thing is his statement that the [17] child is active. The level of activity is a helpful [18] determinant as to how sick the child is. A child [19] who is active, moving around is a child who has a [20] less chance of having a serious bacterial infection [21] certainly than a child who is lethargic, laying [22] there, not moving and so on.

Page 80

[1] Q: Babies can be alert and active yet still [2] have bacterial meningitis?

[3] A: Again, as I said before, even alert, [4] active children with a negative lumbar puncture can [5] have bacterial meningitis.

[6] Q: And a baby that's alert and active [7] obviously can be bacteremic?

[8] A: True.

[9] Q: What else did he do after alert and [10] active?

[11] A: He determined the level of irritability in [12] the child and notes the child to be mildly [13] irritable, which is evidence for a non-serious [14] ongoing process. Next he determines that the child [15] is responding appropriately. These are listed [16] observational variables. You can find them in [17] something called the Yale observation score, which [18] are ways of looking at children to determine who is [19] sick or who is not sick.

[20] Q: What was the next thing he did?

[21] A: The next thing he did was to perform a [22] physical examination, searching for a particular

Page 81

[1] site of infection. None was found.

[2] Q: What did he do?

[3] A: He did a general examination looking in [4] the - he basically has written here that the [5] physical exam all was negative, and I'm sure that [6] means he looked in the child's throat and his ears, [7] listened to the chest and listened to the heart, he [8] checked the skin and the joints, he felt the [9] abdomen, and then he writes more specific features [10] about the child's neurologic exam in-

cluding the fact [11] that the neck is supple, including the fact that the [12] neurologic exam was normal.

[13] Q: What does that mean, the neck is supple? [14] What is he looking for?

[15] A: He's looking for the nuchal signs of [16] bacterial meningitis.

[17] Q: What does that mean?

[18] A: That means when one flexes the neck in a [19] child with bacterial meningitis, one can sometimes [20] find resistance to that passive flexion of the [21] neck. It hurts when you stretch the nerves of a [22] child who has bacterial meningitis and he'll refuse

Page 82

[1] to let you flex his neck.

[2] Q: Does the absence of any symptoms in his [3] neck, the absence of nuchal rigidity rule out [4] bacterial meningitis?

[5] A: No, it does not.

[6] Q: Would you have expected that a baby [7] Russell Wagner's age would have presented with [8] nuchal rigidity, Doctor?

[9] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[10] THE WITNESS: The majority of [11] children after 15 months of age with bacterial [12] meningitis have nuchal rigidity, but still a large [13] fraction, a third, 40 percent do not. So, the [14] answer to the question is more likely than not, but [15] it's still, to go back to your prior question, does [16] not rule out bacterial meningitis.

[17] BY MR. RATZAN:

[18] Q: 40 percent is a large enough number to [19] continue with the examination?

[20] A: That's right.

[21] MR. LURY: Is that a question?

[22] MR. LEINICKE: I object to the

Page 83

[1] form.

[2] MR. RATZAN: He understood me.

[3] THE WITNESS: The physical [4] examination is what I understood you meant to say.

[5] BY MR. RATZAN:

[6] Q: Right. When you teach your residents, [7] interns and fellows, in fact, you would teach them [8] the test for nuchal rigidity in a baby of Russell [9] Wagner's age does not rule out bacterial meningitis?

[10] A: Yes, that's what I would teach.

[11] Q: Did he do anything else besides the things [12] you've mentioned so far that would rule out [13] bacterial meningitis?

[14] A: No, I think this is the standard approach [15] to make a determination as

to whether or not a baby [16] needs a lumbar puncture.

[17] Q: Well, what of those things ruled out [18] bacterial meningitis?

[19] A: The fact that the child was alert and [20] active and responding appropriately, had negative [21] nuchal signs and a normal neurologic exam is about [22] as close as you can do in determining whether or not

Page 84

[1] a child has bacterial meningitis, and clinically [2] speaking, it's reasonable evidence against there [3] being bacterial meningitis.

[4] Q: If Russell Wagner had bacterial meningitis [5] at 10:00 a.m. on December 1st, is it possible that [6] he could have been alert and active?

[7] MR. LURY: Just alert and active?

[8] THE WITNESS: Yes.

[9] BY MR. RATZAN:

[10] Q: Is it possible he could have been alert [11] and active and had the physical and neurological [12] exam that Dr. Litvak noted in his office chart?

[13] A: Yes.

[14] MR. LEINICKE: I object to the [15] form.

[16] BY MR. RATZAN:

[17] Q: On December 1st, 1989 after Dr. Litvak had [18] concluded his physical and neurological exam and [19] written down that the baby was alert and active, the [20] possibility existed that Russell Wagner was still [21] bacteremic?

[22] A: True.

Page 85

[1] Q: Dr. Litvak had not yet ruled out that [2] Russell Wagner was bacteremic?

[3] A: Well, again, I'm not sure what time the [4] CBC was done, so you may be right, but I don't [5] recall reading his deposition whether that was done [6] in the middle of his exam or the end.

[7] Q: Well, putting aside the CBC for a second, [8] okay, just put that aside, on the basis of that [9] information alone, the diagnosis of bacteremia was [10] not ruled out?

[11] A: I see your question. True, I don't think [12] the physical exam is necessarily ever capable of [13] ruling out the possibility of bacteremia, which is [14] why we proceed to laboratory tests.

[15] Q: In fact, with the retrospective scope, [16] Russell Wagner was indeed bacteremic at 10:00 a.m. [17] on December 1st, 1989?

[18] A: I believe he probably was, yes.

[19] Q: Even the white blood count, whatever it [20] was, in the face of it, Russell Wagner was [21] bacteremic on

December 1st, 1989?

[22] MR. LURY: It was 5,400, that's

Page 86

[1] what it was.

[2] THE WITNESS: The white blood cell [3] count was 5,400, and it had a normal differential, [4] and unfortunately Russell did not have an elevated [5] white count to give the physicians the laboratory [6] tip off that this child could be bacteremic.

[7] BY MR. RATZAN:

[8] Q: Does a white blood count of 5,400 rule out [9] bacterial meningitis?

[10] A: No.

[11] Q: You talked about the differential. There [12] were 65 percent neutrophils and 35 percent [13] leukocytes - I'm sorry, lymphocytes or monocytes?

[14] A: Right.

[15] Q: Do you know the mean percentages of [16] neutrophils versus lymphocytes in a child Russell's [17] age?

[18] A: Yes, I do.

[19] Q: What are they?

[20] A: In a baby who is about 18 months of age, [21] it's usually about 50/50.

[22] Q: The other thing about the differential is

Page 87

[1] that in what I saw there doesn't appear to be any [2] study of band cells.

[3] A: Well, there may or may not be bands. [4] There are 65 segs. That would typically mean mature [5] cells.

[6] Q: But there's no breakdown that I could see, [7] if you saw one, let me know, identifying the number [8] of band cells?

[9] A: Again, I don't know whether this blood [10] count can assess for bands. I just see segs here.

[11] Q: Well, they're called neutrophils?

[12] A: Right.

[13] Q: A band cell, in fact, is a variety of [14] neutrophil that's not yet segmented?

[15] A: Actually that's not true. It is segmented [16] but it is not polymorphonuclear. It's using two [17] lobes.

[18] Q: Okay, I appreciate that. The band cell [19] then is segmented and it's a type of neutrophil?

[20] A: It's immature or early form of [21] neutrophils, yes.

[22] Q: What is a shift to the left. Doctor?

Page 88

[1] A: A shift to the left is when there are an [2] excessive number of neutrophils in the peripheral [3] smear.

[4] Q: When using a white blood count - strike [5] that. Explain to me how it could be that a white [6] count in Russell

Wagner was reported as 5,400 and [7] yet he was at least bacteremic.

[8] A: Well, you've put your finger on the [9] limitation of the laboratory. Right now it's [10] estimated that about 85 or 90 percent of children [11] who are bacteremic will have an elevated white [12] count, more than 15,000, and that is assessed to be [13] about as sensitive as we can have for [14] bacteremia.

[15] As you asked me a little while ago, and [16] the truth of the matter is there is nothing on the [17] physical examination that will rule out bacteremia [18] in a febrile baby. Physicians then turn, if there's [19] no focus of infection in the right age with the [20] right fever which there was here, to the white count [21] as a further guide to the possible presence of [22] bacteremia, and when they turn, they know that

Page 89

[1] they're dealing with an 85 to 90 or 92 percent [2] certainty that the white count will be elevated if [3] the baby is bacteremic.

[4] Putting that together with the physical [5] exam is what physicians have to rely on to make a [6] decision to do a blood culture or not do a blood [7] culture for bacteremia. So, the answer to your [8] question is it's intrinsically a test that has a 90 [9] percent sensitivity, and that's as good as it gets.

[10] Q: That, in all fairness and with respect to [11] your answer, I don't feel was the answer to my [12] question. What I asked -

[13] A: Give me your question again.

[14] Q: Okay, what I asked was, and I'll rephrase [15] it, could you describe for me the process of what is [16] going on in the baby so that he's bacteremic and yet [17] at that moment in time his white count reads 5,400, [18] an otherwise normal amount of overall white blood [19] cells?

[20] MR. LURY: Well, before you [21] answer, in all fairness, I think it was responsive [22] to his question, but go ahead and answer this

Page 90

[1] different question.

[2] MR. KING: I object to the form of [3] the question.

[4] THE WITNESS: I think if you're [5] asking the molecular reason, the bone marrow [6] molecular reason for a normal white count in the [7] face of an ongoing bacterial bloodstream infection, [8] the answer is that there are toxins that are [9] produced by bacteria that can actually suppress the [10] bone marrow response, and it can be evidence for the [11] beginning of an overwhelming process. Can we take a [12] two-minute break? I got

paged a minute ago.
[13] MR. LURY: Yes.
[14] MR. RATZAN: Sure.
[15] THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay, the time [16] is 4:28, and we are now off the record.
[17] (Thereupon, a discussion was held off the record.)
[18] THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay, we're now [19] back on the record. The time is 5:15.
[20] BY MR. RATZAN:
[21] Q: Okay, Doctor, I think we were talking [22] about the white blood count before our break, and I

Page 91

[1] asked you how it could be that Russell Wagner could [2] have a white count of 5,400 and yet be bacteremic, [3] and I think you had described or you were going to [4] describe the mechanism by which that could occur. [5] Would you do that for me, describe the mechanism [6] that exists allowing him to have a normal white [7] count -
[8] A: Right.
[9] Q: - and yet be bacteremic.
[10] A: I think I gave a short view of that before [11] the break, and the answer is that there are [12] chemicals or toxins that are produced by various [13] bacteria, Hemophilus being one, that can actually [14] repress or suppress bone marrow, release of cells. [15] It can actually kill white blood cells. They're [16] called leukocidin, and some bacteria have the [17] ability to produce them.
[18] Q: Also we talked about a shift to the left. [19] In looking at a normal white blood count, what does [20] seeing a shift to the left indicate as far as a [21] bacterial infection?
[22] A: It's consistent with a bacterial

Page 92

[1] infection. It's consistent with an acute viral [2] process, too, in the earliest stages.
[3] Q: And can you explain the mechanism in [4] common terms so that the jury can understand what is [5] happening when there is a shift to the left?
[6] A: When there is a shift to the left, the [7] bone marrow has released into the circulation and [8] the non-circulating pool of white blood cells has [9] been recruited into the circulation in an effort to [10] fight an infection, in effort to send white blood [11] cells, which are sort of the soldiers of the immune [12] response, to an area of infection.
[13] Q: Here at this institution when you order a [14] differential, do you usually have the ability to [15] determine whether there is a shift to the left?
[16] A: Yes. if we use the main lab. If we

use - [17] what we used to use in our pediatric clinic did not [18] give anything but segs and bands - segs and lymphs [19] rather, which could tell us whether there is a shift [20] to the left, but it couldn't give us bands; but if [21] we use the main lab, we can get bands.
[22] Q: What does - how can you tell if there is

Page 93

[1] a shift to the left if you are not able to identify [2] the percentage of band cells?
[3] A: Well, again, a shift to the left can mean [4] and often does mean a predominance of [5] polymorphonuclear leukocytes, a predominance of [6] segmented neutrophils. So, to have more segmented [7] neutrophils than should be present by age would be a [8] shift to the left. To have some of them to be bands [9] would also be a shift to the left.
[10] Q: If the neutrophil count is elevated and [11] you don't know how many band cells there are, the [12] elevated neutrophil count can indicate a shift to [13] the left?
[14] A: Yes.
[15] Q: Now, we talked about what Dr. Pearson did [16] to rule out meningitis. We also talked about what [17] Dr. Litvak did to rule out meningitis. Did Dr. [18] Pearson indeed rule out meningitis?
[19] A: Again, I don't know how you're using the [20] term "rule out." He had a clinical diagnosis or [21] judgment made that the likelihood of meningitis was [22] not high enough to warrant a further evaluation at

Page 94

[1] that time.
[2] Q: Fair enough. We need to define the term [3] "rule out." When you use the word "rule out," [4] whether it's in medical literature or here at the [5] hospital, what generally does that term really mean?
[6] MR. LURY: I object to the form.
[7] THE WITNESS: In general, the term [8] means that the process to be ruled out is a [9] consideration that is raised based on the [10] presentation of the patient. That's about all it [11] means. It doesn't necessarily mean one needs to do [12] a laboratory study to further eliminate the thought [13] of that.
[14] It just means that the original [15] presentation calls that diagnosis to mind, and one [16] is going to proceed according to clinical practice [17] along a path that will allow you to say this process [18] needs further evaluation or we can say no, we don't [19] need further evaluation of this process.
[20] BY MR. RATZAN:
[21] Q: Is there a difference between

reaching a [22] level of suspicion, if you would, that would maybe

Page 95

[1] warrant you or not to go to a next diagnostic level [2] and ruling out a disease?
[3] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form, [4] vague and ambiguous.
[5] MR. KING: Objection.
[6] THE WITNESS: I don't think I [7] understand the distinction you're trying to make.
[8] BY MR. RATZAN:
[9] Q: Fair enough. You did the right thing. Is [10] there a difference between ruling out a disease and [11] not having the necessary level of suspicion to do [12] additional tests to rule out a disease?
[13] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form, [14] vague and ambiguous.
[15] THE WITNESS: If I understand your [16] question, I think we're really sort of wrapped up in [17] a semantic argument or discussion about what the [18] word rule out would mean or require a physician to [19] do. I myself use the word rule out very frequently [20] even at the very first writing up of a patient and, [21] for instance, if I were to see a child where I [22] think, I don't know, strep throat might be present

Page 96

[1] based on my initial history or my initial physical [2] exam, it wouldn't require me, for instance, to do a [3] rapid strep test or a throat culture. There would [4] be other features that would play into that, but it [5] would require me to continue to keep that in a list [6] of things that possibly will be raised again pending [7] the evolution of the patient's clinical [8] presentation.
[9] BY MR. RATZAN:
[10] Q: Well, so that we don't get too wrapped up [11] in semantics, what is the best single test to rule [12] in bacterial meningitis?
[13] MR. KING: I object to the form of [14] the question.
[15] THE WITNESS: The best laboratory [16] test to rule in bacterial meningitis would be a [17] lumbar puncture.
[18] BY MR. RATZAN:
[19] Q: If Dr. Litvak did consider or suspect [20] bacterial meningitis before Russell Wagner left his [21] office on December 1st, 1989, what tests should he [22] have performed to rule out bacterial meningitis?

Page 97

[1] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to the [2] form of the question. It's a multiple question. [3] You've got to assume there's a difference between [4] consider and suspect. Certainly a physician can [5]

consider something without suspecting that it is [6] indeed present, but I object to the form of the [17] question as being multiple and vague.

[8] THE WITNESS: I think the answer [9] to your question is that the physical examination [10] and history is what determines in a physician's mind [11] whether the level of suspicion about any diagnosis [12] including meningitis raises to a or rises to a level [13] that requires another level of diagnostic testing, [14] and so what tests did he do or what did he do, it [15] was his history and his physical exam, his [16] observation of the child.

[17] BY MR. RATZAN:

[18] Q: I didn't ask what he did do. What I'm [19] trying to find out is if Dr. Litvak suspected [20] bacterial meningitis on December 1st, 1989, what [21] single laboratory test should he have done to rule [22] out bacterial meningitis?

Page 98

[1] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[2] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

[3] THE WITNESS: Again, I will use [4] your word suspected meningitis being that his [5] examination rose to a level or his concern after his [6] examination rose to a level that he really felt the [7] need to be much more certain about the possibility [8] of meningitis, if that were the case then he needed [9] to have done a lumbar puncture.

[10] BY MR. RATZAN:

[11] Q: And if the lumbar puncture were - tell us [12] what a lumbar puncture is.

[13] A: Lumbar puncture is an examination of the [14] or is a test whereby one obtains spinal fluid from [15] the sac around the spinal cord of a child and sends [16] it to the laboratory to test it for the presence of [17] pus cells, the presence of sugar, protein and the [18] bacteria.

[19] Q: If the results of the lumbar puncture were [20] indicative of bacterial meningitis, what would have [21] happened next?

[22] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

Page 99

[1] THE WITNESS: The child would have [2] been admitted to the hospital, and he would have [3] been treated with antibiotic therapy.

[4] BY MR. RATZAN:

[5] Q: If Dr. Litvak had diagnosed Russell Wagner [6] with bacteremia on December 1st, 1989, what would he [7] have been required to do to treat that disease?

[8] A: If he had diagnosed him with bacteremia, [9] there would be no way to diagnose somebody with [10] bacteremia

without a positive blood culture. So, I [11] don't think he could have made a definitive or a [12] firm proven diagnosis of bacteremia at the time of [13] that visit

[14] Q: Fair enough. He did diagnose him with [15] viremia. Had he written bacteremia as his [16] presumptive diagnosis on December 1st, 1989, what [17] would he have been required to do for Russell [18] Wagner?

[19] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

[20] THE WITNESS: The typical standard [21] in 1989 would be to obtain a blood culture and to [22] start the child on an antibiotic regimen. It could

Page 100

[1] be done as an outpatient. It could be done as an [2] inpatient. If the child didn't appear very sick, [3] most physicians would have used oral Amoxicillin.

[4] BY MR. RATZAN:

[5] Q: How would you characterize - strike [6] that. Would you characterize the care that Russell [7] received at 10:00 a.m. in that office visit by Dr. [8] Litvak, would you characterize that care as [9] excellent?

[10] A: I don't know how you mean by excellent. I [11] think the care that he received was within the [12] standard of care based on how I read the record. He [13] had a competent examination, which included the [14] important things for a physician to note. He had a [15] blood count done, which was required I believe based [16] on his absence of physical finding to find where his [17] illness was.

[18] He had a history, one that included a [19] salient epidemiologic variable mainly with his [20] sister, and he had very good follow-up instructions [21] to have a phone call back. So, I don't know, I [22] don't grade outpatient visits A, B or C, but he had

Page 101

[1] a very standard visit that was within the standard.

[2] Q: Okay. As you would use the word [3] "excellent," would you characterize Dr. Litvak's [4] care as excellent?

[5] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[6] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

[7] THE WITNESS: I don't know how I, [8] without having been in the room watching the [9] interaction, how I could even proceed to go beyond [10] what I feel my role is here, namely to say this was [11] Standard, appropriate, within the standard or not. [12] So, I couldn't answer your question more precisely [13] than that.

[14] BY MR. RATZAN:

[15] Q: And on the issue of the viremia and the [16] sister's - the epidemiologic inquiry that he made [17] regarding the sister's virus. YOU mentioned that it [18]

went away by itself, meaning the sister's problem?

[19] A: Right.

[20] Q: What did you mean by that?

[21] A: Meaning that from what I can gather from [22] the parents' deposition, the mother and father's

Page 102

[1] depositions, there was no need for the sibling to [2] receive antibiotic therapy to be treated to get [3] better from that illness.

[4] Q: It's your understanding she didn't receive [5] antibiotic therapy and she got better by herself?

[6] A: Yes.

[7] Q: At the 3:20 p.m. phone call to Dr. Litvak

[8] A: Right.

[9] Q: - again, would you agree that there is a [10] difference in perception or accounts of what [11] happened between the mom's account and Dr. Litvak's [12] account?

[13] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

[14] THE WITNESS: Let me just read my [15] notes as to what the mom's account was and Dr. [16] Litvak's account, and I'll answer your question.

[17] BY MR. RATZAN:

[18] Q: And you don't have to describe all -

[19] A: No, I won't. No, I won't.

[20] Q: Just answer it yes or no.

[21] A: Yes, I would say there is a discrepancy

Page 103

[1] between the mother's deposition testimony about how [2] the baby looked at that period and Dr. Litvak's [3] recollection of what the phone call contained.

[4] Q: If you assume that the mother's account, [5] that Russell was not drinking, that he hadn't gone [6] to the bathroom, that he hadn't changed much, that [7] he was still lethargic, listless or quiet, [8] starry-eyed, gazing about and had thrown up his [9] Tylenol and that the mother asked Dr. Litvak about [10] antibiotics at that point in time, should Dr. Litvak [11] at that point in time have suspected bacterial [12] meningitis?

[13] A: Yes.

[14] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to the [15] form of the question.

[16] THE WITNESS: If those features [17] are present in a baby and, in fact, this goes [18] exactly to what we discussed a couple of hours ago [19] about Dr. Pearson's interaction with the mother, if [20] the mother now is coming forth with the answers to [21] those sorts of questions

that say the child has no 121 eye-to-eye contact, is starry-eyed, is extremely

Page 104

[1] lethargic, isn't drinking, isn't moving about at [2] all, absolutely any physician I think needs to [3] consider not only meningitis but a large group of [4] very serious or potentially serious and [5] life-threatening processes.

[6] BY MR. RATZAN:

[7] Q: If they're life-threatening processes, [8] these various diseases that the doctor needs to [9] consider, I assume it's an emergent situation?

[10] A: Given the description of a child like Mrs. [11] Litvak's - I'm **sorry**, Mrs. Wagner's description of [12] the 3:00 o'clock view that she thinks she remembers [13] talking to Dr. Litvak about, yes, it would be 114 something that would have to be acted on in the [15] short term.

[16] Q: And what should be done?

[17] A: The child needs to be re-evaluated either [18] in the office or in the emergency room. I need to [19] take a break, I'm very **sorry**.

[20] THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay, we're now [21] off the record. The time is 5:29. [22] (Thereupon, a discussion was held off the record.)

Page 105

[1] THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is now [2] tape two, and the deposition is beginning at 5:36.

[3] BY MR. RATZAN:

[4] Q: Now again, Doctor, taking or assuming the [5] mother's account to be true and given that [6] requirement of Dr. Litvak, had he not responded the [7] way you just described, would that have been a [8] deviation from the standard of care?

[9] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

[10] THE WITNESS: Had he not [11] responded, you mean Dr. Litvak had not sent this [12] child to the emergency room?

[13] BY MR. RATZAN:

[14] Q: Yes, sir.

[15] A: Yes, if that was the information [16] communicated to him and he didn't either send the [17] child to the ER or have the child come back to the [18] office for another evaluation, it would not be [19] within the standard.

[20] Q: And what would his differential diagnosis [21] have been at that point in time?

121 A: I think his differential diagnosis at that

Page 106

111 point in time would have been extremely long and [2] very broad and

included infectious disorders and [3] metabolic disorders and traumatic disorders, many, [4] many things.

[5] Q: Would the differential diagnosis include [6] bacterial meningitis?

[7] A: Yes, it would.

PI Q: Would it include bacteremia?

[9] A: Yes.

[10] Q: When does bacteremia require [11] hospitalization?

[12] A: When it is associated with a [13] septic-appearing child.

[14] Q: And what is a septic-appearing child?

[15] A: It's a child who looks very sick, who [16] looks toxic, has poor eye-to-eye contact, is [17] listless, nonresponsive, non-interactive, a baby who [18] looked different than Dr. Litvak's description of [19] this child at 10:00 o'clock.

[20] Q: Let's talk about that for a second. If [21] you replace the words "alert" and "active" with the [22] words "lethargic" and "listless," what did the

Page 107

[1] standard of care require of Dr. Litvak?

[2] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[3] MR. LEINICKE: Same objection.

[4] THE WITNESS: If Dr. Litvak's [5] description of the child had been lethargic and [6] listless?

[7] BY MR. RATZAN:

[8] Q: Yes, Doctor.

[9] A: What about the next statement, responding [10] appropriately, would that be the same or would that [11] change?

[12] Q: Everything is the same. **All** I'm changing [13] is "lethargic" and "listless" in place of "alert" [14] and "active."

[15] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[16] THE WITNESS: That would in [17] general put a lot of burden on Dr. Litvak to do a [18] more thorough and in-depth evaluation of why the [19] child would be lethargic and listless, and I say [20] that with the idea in mind that some children are [21] initially lethargic and listless with viral [22] diseases, with fevers, with a whole bunch of things,

Page 108

[1] but over a period of an hour in an office can wake [2] up and be very interactive and no longer be [3] lethargic and listless. So, assuming the degree of [4] those two conditions was significant and persistent, [5] there would be a responsibility on Dr. Litvak's part [6] to go ahead and evaluate that.

[7] BY MR. RATZAN:

[8] Q: In addition to the things that he did in [9] fact do, would, in the face of lethargic and [10] listless as an ob-

servation of Dr. Litvak's, would he [11] need to get a lumbar puncture done?

[12] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

[13] THE WITNESS: If assuming the rest [14] of the physical exam did not disclose the reason for [15] the lethargy and the listlessness, and again with [16] the caveat that we're talking about significant [17] degrees of lethargy and listlessness as annotated by [18] a, you know, a physician who knows what those words [19] mean, then yes, I think that would ordinarily be [20] part of the evaluation, lumbar puncture.

[21] BY MR. RATZAN:

[22] Q: That's what the standard of care would

Page 109

[1] require; is it not?

[2] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

[3] THE WITNESS: Yes.

[4] BY MR. RATZAN:

[5] Q: Did you notice that Dr. Litvak charted his [6] phone call with the mom at 3:20 p.m.?

[7] A: That's what I have written on my - yes.

[8] Q: It's right there in the bottom right-hand [9] corner of the page?

[10] A: Yes.

[11] Q: Was that appropriate for him to chart the [12] phone call that he had with the mother at 3:20 [13] p.m.?

[14] A: Yes, it was reasonable to do that.

[15] Q: He knew he was going to be off call later [16] on that day?

[17] A: I don't know the answer to that question. [18] I imagine he did.

[19] Q: Well, we know Dr. Betancourt came on call [20] to handle any calls from Russell Wagner's mother?

121 A: Yes.

122 MR. LURY: Is that a question?

Page 110

[1] BY MR. RATZAN:

[2] Q: Are you aware of that?

[3] A: Yes, I am.

[4] Q: And Dr. Betancourt received a phone call [5] sometime between 5:00 and 6:00 p.m.; are you aware [6] of that?

[7] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[8] THE WITNESS: My understanding is [9] about 6:00 p.m., yes.

[10] BY MR. RATZAN:

[11] Q: And again, there is another difference - [12] and I'm using the word perception or account, and if [13] you don't like those words, let me know. I mean, [14] there is a difference in someone's perception as to [15] what happened, and that someone is the mom and

Dr. [16] Betancourt in this case at 6:00 p.m.?

[17] **MR. LURY:** Is that another [18] question or is that a statement?

[19] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[20] **Q:** Do you agree with that?

121 A: Can you repeat it again?

121 Q: Sure. The phone call at 6:00 p.m., again

Page 111

[1] we have a difference in perception or at least a [2] different account of what was going on with Russell [3] and what was reported between Dr. Betancourt and the [4] mother?

[5] **A:** Well, actually, I'm not sure -

[6] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[7] **THE WITNESS:** I don't think the [8] record really is supportive of that statement. I [9] think the mother's deposition doesn't really add [10] very much more to Dr. Betancourt's own recollection [11] of that interaction.

[12] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[13] **Q:** Are you aware of the difference in [14] perception as to Dr. Betancourt's statement that he [15] had been fully apprised of Russell's condition by [16] Dr. Litvak or something to that effect and the [17] mother's statement that Dr. Litvak was not aware or [18] hadn't been fully informed about Russell?

[19] **A:** Yes, I recall -

[20] **MR. LEINICKE:** Excuse me, I think [21] that might have been a misstatement by you, sir. I [22] think you said Dr. Litvak had not been aware. I

Page 112

111 think you meant to say Dr. Betancourt.

[2] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[3] **Q:** You're right, I'll clear up the question. [4] Dr. Betancourt said he had spoken to Dr. Litvak?

[5] **A:** Yes, Dr. Litvak said he had spoken to Dr. [6] Betancourt.

[7] **Q:** And the mother's recollection is that Dr. [8] Betancourt was not aware of Russell's condition [9] whether it be from Dr. Litvak or anybody?

[10] **A:** That is true, as far as I recollect.

[11] **Q:** Had Dr. Betancourt been aware of all the [12] history starting with Dr. Pearson's phone call at [13] 8:00 p.m. the night before and up until the point of [14] 3:20 p.m., the last phone call to Dr. Litvak, and [15] given these additional signs and symptoms of [16] cramping and pulling the right leg up, should Dr. [17] Betancourt have suspected bacterial meningitis?

[18] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[19] **THE WITNESS:** No, I don't think [20]

that the presentation of abdominal pain and [21] abdominal cramping **is** something that typically calls [22] to mind bacterial meningitis, and that wouldn't be

Page 113

111 - it wouldn't follow that one would jump to that [2] diagnosis based on knowing the prior history and [3] knowing **this** new complaint.

[4] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[5] **Q:** Knowing the prior history - what about [6] pulling the right leg up, what significance does [7] that have to you?

[8] **A:** Again, it well often is a sign of [9] abdominal discomfort.

[10] **Q:** What else can it be a **sign** of?

[11] **MR. LURY:** Object to the form.

[12] **THE WITNESS:** It would be a very [13] unusual presentation for a seizure, but I imagine it [14] could possibly be a focal seizure.

[15] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[16] **Q:** Given the history of this baby that we've [17] talked about at length and the possibility that [18] pulling the right leg **up** could indicate a focal [19] seizure, with that in mind, should Dr. Betancourt [20] have suspected bacterial meningitis?

[21] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[22] **THE WITNESS:** Again, to answer

Page 114

[1] your question, no, I don't think so because I don't [2] believe it would be a requirement on Dr. Litvak's [3] part to go over with Dr. Betancourt the entire story [4] of the shivering, was it convulsions, the physical [5] exam and **so** on. I think what the requirement would [6] be for Dr. Litvak to tell Dr. Betancourt, we saw [7] this child. The child had a fever. We did an [8] exam. The child looked okay. There was no focus. [9] The white count was normal. I think it's a viral [10] syndrome.

[11] The rest of the history is I think not [12] needed in a communication between physicians who are [13] signing off on to the other. So, I don't think [14] there would be any requirement for Dr. Betancourt to [15] know anything about the shivering to put into [16] perspective this next feature.

[17] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[18] **Q:** Let's assume for - strike that. Assume [19] for a moment that Dr. Pearson had taken notes the **121** night before and recorded his history and Dr. [21] Betancourt had the opportunity to see those notes, **121** as well as discuss the **case** with Dr. Litvak, under

Page 115

[1] those circumstances. should Dr. Betancourt have [2] suspected bacterial

meningitis?

[3] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[4] **THE WITNESS:** Again, I think what [5] you're really trying to get to is to leave open this [6] question of shivering being convulsions, and I think [7] a physician who would make a note about a patient [8] from an evening conversation, should that be done [9] wouldn't leave that open-ended.

[10] He would say the child was having chills, [11] not there was motor activity and the mother thought [12] it might be convulsions and we **still** have an [13] open-ended question, but rather that this child was [14] having chills and then was seen because of fever, [15] and **again**, that being the case, the activity of the [16] leg raising and the abdominal discomfort would not [17] raise the **issue** of that being a seizure.

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

[19] **Q:** Well, let me ask the question a different **121** way. Putting aside for a second whether Dr. Litvak [21] had an obligation to tell about the entire history **121** to Dr. Betancourt, assuming Dr. Betancourt did have

Page 116

[1] the benefit of all that information and the [2] information regarding pulling the right leg up, [3] under those circumstances, did Dr. Betancourt - [4] ~~strike that~~ - should Dr. Betancourt have considered [5] or suspected bacterial meningitis as one of the [6] possibilities?

[7] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[8] **MR. LEINICKE:** I object to the [9] form of the question.

[10] **THE WITNESS:** You're going to have [11] to read back the first part of the question. It was **121** kind of a convoluted question.

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

[14] **Q:** I'm going to rephrase it, Doctor.

[15] **A:** All right.

116 Q: Had Dr. Betancourt had the benefit of all [17] of the history, putting aside whether Dr. Litvak had [18] an obligation to tell him, had Dr. Betancourt had [19] the benefit of all of that information and received [20] this phone call regarding pulling of the right leg, [21] should Dr. Betancourt have suspected bacterial **121** meningitis?

Page 117

[1] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[2] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection to form.

[3] **THE WITNESS:** No, the answer to [4] the question would be there would **still** be no way to [5] go from this abdominal leg complaint to bacterial [6] meningitis even with the history that Dr. Betancourt [7] could have had had every single

element of the [5] history been recorded and given to him on a piece of [9] paper.

[10] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[11] **Q:** Is the fact that this is I think the fifth [12] contact that the mother has had with this pediatric [13] practice group over I guess a 15 to 20 hour period [14] significant?

[15] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection to form.

[16] **MR. LURY:** Join,

[17] **THE WITNESS:** It's significant in [18] the sense that it represents the mother is very [19] concerned about her baby.

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

[21] **Q:** If you add to that the fact that this [22] mother has never been known by this pediatric

Page 118

[1] practice group to call this many times and report [2] symptoms like this for Russell or any of her [3] children, is that also significant?

[4] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[5] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection to form.

[6] **THE WITNESS:** Again, it's as [7] significant as if a mother had called frequently. I [8] think a physician always listens to what mothers [9] have to say and does their best to get through the [10] history to see whether the anxiety is something that [11] is really focused on an observation that needs to be [12] acted on or not.

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

[14] **Q:** Is it something that would raise or lower [15] a physician's suspicion?

[16] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form. [17] Is what something?

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

[19] **Q:** Do you understand what I'm asking?

[20] **A:** I don't know what "it" is.

[21] **Q:** The number of phone calls the mother has [22] made and the history regarding this mother.

Page 119

[1] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[2] **MR. LEINICKE:** Same objection.

[3] **THE WITNESS:** I think absent a [4] physical examination during the course of the day [5] had this just been repetitive phone calls, that [6] would raise the need for the patient to be seen [7] because it would raise a physician's concern that [8] this unknown patient still has a problem that's very [9] worrisome to the parent.

[10] In the face of an examination that had [11] been done eight hours earlier, seven hours earlier, [12] and in the face of a planned follow-up phone call, a [13] planned one, this was executed based on the [14] follow-up plan that Dr. Litvak put

into operation, [15] then the next phone call I don't think rises to the [16] level of concern that, for instance, a mother who [17] had called six times during a day about a problem [18] that no one had seen and no one had followed up on. [19] I hope that answers your question.

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

[21] **Q:** Is it your understanding that the mother's [22] plan according to Dr. Litvak was to call again

Page 120

[1] around 6:00 o'clock to Dr. Betancourt?

[2] **A:** No, I was talking about -

[3] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection to form, [4] mischaracterization of testimony.

[5] **THE WITNESS:** No, my reference was [6] to the 3:00 o'clock phone call that Dr. Litvak had [7] planned to have with the mother to get more feedback [8] about how Russell was doing in the afternoon hours.

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

[10] **Q:** Okay. Should Dr. Betancourt have [11] considered bacteremia at 6:00 p.m.?

[12] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[13] **THE WITNESS:** Again, based on the [14] deposition that's written or that's taken from the [15] mother and the father, I don't think bacteremia [16] would have been a likely diagnosis for Dr. [17] Betancourt to consider because the baby's [18] temperature was markedly lower than the 105 fever [19] that was the presentation fever and because as the [20] mother states in her deposition, she basically went [21] right to the issue of the raising of the leg and the [22] abdominal discomfort, and actually Mr. Wagner

Page 121

[1] corroborates that by saying he recollects the phone [2] conversation between Dr. Betancourt and his wife, [3] and in that conversation what was discussed was the [4] abdominal complaints and the leg moving but not the [5] baby's color, not the baby's irritability, not the [6] baby's cry. It was basically for the abdominal [7] complaint and the leg. So, that wouldn't raise an [8] issue of bacteremia to me.

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

[10] **Q:** Did Dr. Betancourt ask any of those [11] questions to elicit any of that information?

[12] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[13] **THE WITNESS:** His recollection of [14] the deposition - his recollection in his deposition [15] of that conversation is he only remembers talking [16] about the abdominal complaints and doesn't have [17] any more recollection, so I don't know.

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

[19] **Q:** Should he have asked questions to elicit [20] information like that regarding the color, lethargy, [21] fever, vomiting, listlessness, starry-eyed look, [22] laying around, any of those kinds of observations?

Page 122

[1] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[2] **THE WITNESS:** No, I don't think he [3] has at that point another independent duty to go [4] back over all the history. He basically I think can [5] rely on a parent to say here's where we are with [6] this baby, been seen by Dr. Litvak, phone call at [7] 3:00 in the afternoon, viral syndrome, and now the [8] baby has what I think to be abdominal discomfort, [9] he's raising the legs up and crying with that.

[10] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[11] **Q:** Do you agree with Dr. Betancourt's [12] diagnosis of the flu?

[13] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[14] **THE WITNESS:** I don't remember [15] where he made that diagnosis or if he made the [16] diagnosis in his deposition, but I think what I [17] would think had I been called by a mother like this [18] that this could be the persistent ongoing evolution [19] of an intestinal viral process.

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

[21] **Q:** Looking back on it now knowing what you [22] know now, do you agree, assuming he made the

Page 123

[1] diagnosis of the flu and prescribed Donnatal Elixir [2] for abdominal cramping as part of that flu -

[3] **A:** Right.

[4] **Q:** - do you agree with that diagnosis and [5] form of treatment?

[6] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[7] **MR. LEINICKE:** I object to the [8] form.

[9] **THE WITNESS:** Oh, in retrospect -

[10] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[11] **Q:** Yes, sir.

[12] **A:** - this baby had certainly more than [13] abdominal complaints. This baby did have I'm sure [14] esophagitis and duodenitis, GI bleeding, probably [15] had an ulcer based on the autopsy and based on the [16] presence of blood later on in the baby's stool and [17] blood in the gastric acid, coffee-ground vomitus. [18] This baby was having the beginning of GI bleeding [19] and probably was having abdominal pain.

[20] So, I think Dr. Betancourt and I think he [21] mother, if this was her observation to Dr. [22] Betancourt, I think they were both right. There was

Page 124

[1] an abdominal process going on at that juncture that [2] she was picking up correctly on, but I'm also sure [3] that the baby had more than that at that juncture. [4] The baby had meningitis and sepsis at that point.

[5] BY MR. RATZAN:

[6] Q: How do you account for Dr. Betancourt's [7] missing the diagnosis of meningitis and sepsis?

[8] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[9] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

[10] THE WITNESS: I think unless a [11] physician is given the appropriate history and [12] enough history, he can't come to a diagnosis of [13] meningitis or sepsis.

[14] BY MR. RATZAN:

[15] Q: Do you fault the mother for not giving Dr. [16] Betancourt enough history or information at that [17] point in time?

[18] A: No, I don't fault either party.

[19] Q: How do you account for it in this case?

[20] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[21] THE WITNESS: In this case, I [22] account for it based on the mother's deposition and

Page 125

[1] the father's deposition that they both were focused [2] now on this child's abdominal complaints and wanted [3] to discuss specifically that with the doctor who was [4] on call, and again, according to the father, the [5] mother didn't offer as a complaint anything else to [6] Dr. Betancourt, and when that's the case, a [7] physician who already begins with the idea that this [8] is a viral syndrome seen by his partner, the white [9] count is normal, the exam is normal, a phone call [10] was satisfying enough to his partner to say we're [11] not going to do anymore, the next step is abdominal [12] pain, hey, the baby is going to have diarrhea in [13] three hours. I don't think you need to go beyond [14] that as a practicing pediatrician.

[15] BY MR. RATZAN:

[16] Q: Do you fault the mother at all for not [17] telling Dr. Betancourt about the entire history of [18] the night before and her visit to the doctor and her [19] impressions of what happened and how each doctor [20] responded to her?

[21] A: No.

[22] Q: Meningitis, we talked about non-specific

Page 126

[1] symptoms. So, meningitis often presents like many [2] other illnesses?

[3] A: Correct.

[4] Q: What do you see as the first line approach [5] with respect to meningitis?

[6] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[7] MR. LEINICKE: Same objection, [8] vague and ambiguous.

[9] THE WITNESS: The first line [10] approach meaning the antibiotic therapy that we [11] would offer?

[12] BY MR. RATZAN:

[13] Q: Do you understand what I mean when I use [14] the word "first line approach?"

[15] A: That's why I tried to clarify your [16] question. No, I don't.

[17] Q: Have you ever heard of that type of [18] phraseology before?

[19] A: Probably, but I don't know how it applies [20] to this case and what you mean by this case, first [21] line approach.

[22] Q: When you're confronted with this

Page 127

[1] presentation, non-specific signs is the term you [2] used earlier -

[3] A: Right.

[4] Q: - what is the first line approach with [5] respect to reaching or excluding a diagnosis of [6] meningitis in the face of those non-specific signs?

[7] MR. LURY: I object to the form.

[8] THE WITNESS: The first line [9] approach is to do an examination of the patient [10] after you've taken the adequate history and make a [11] judgment whether the patient looks sick or not. The [12] trouble with meningitis, traditionally looks sick. [13] As we talked before, there are occasionally children [14] with meningitis who don't look sick enough yet to [15] warrant the lumbar puncture, but they have [16] meningitis and we can't know it. So, the first line [17] approach is an examination of the patient if the [18] presentation speaks loudly enough about the [19] possibility of meningitis to warrant the [20] examination.

[21] BY MR. RATZAN:

[22] Q: Well, what do you teach residents

Page 128

[1] interns or fellows here at Georgetown regarding the [2] appropriate circumstances for a lumbar puncture?

[3] A: The appropriate circumstances for a lumbar [4] puncture are many. One such circumstance is a baby [5] who looks sick or toxic or septic. Those babies [6] need lumbar punctures. A second approach would be [7] babies who have physical findings on examination [8] that speak to nuchal irritation, to meningeal [9] irritation, stiff neck, positive Kernig's sign, [10] positive Babinski's sign, focal neurologic signs.

[11] A third indication would be in the newborn [12] period basically fever at any time, and there are [13] many others. I don't know that I could sit here and [14] list for you each and every indication for a lumbar [15] puncture, but the basic one is a sick-looking child [16] in the eyes of the physician who spends time [17] evaluating that child for toxicity.

[18] Q: Have you ever ordered or performed a [19] lumbar puncture on an infant or child Russell [20] Wagner's age, plus or minus a few months, who was [21] not lethargic or listless?

[22] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

Page 129

[1] THE WITNESS: Who was not [2] lethargic or listless, yes, I think the opposite of [3] lethargy and listlessness would be irritability, and [4] a baby who was irritable but not lethargic or [5] listless would be an indication for, in some [6] instances, for a lumbar puncture.

[7] BY MR. RATZAN:

[8] Q: Have you ever performed a lumbar puncture [9] on a child, same general age, whose symptoms were a [10] fever of 105 degrees and irritable but who did not [11] have nuchal rigidity, upon whom the white blood [12] count was either normal or hadn't even been ordered [13] and was pale?

[14] MR. LURY: Object to the form.

[15] MR. LEINICKE: Objection to form.

[16] MR. KING: I object to the form, [17] incomplete hypothetical.

[18] THE WITNESS: I think it would [19] depend on the level of irritability. The answer to [20] your question would be sure, I'm sure there are [21] patients that I have seen who are pale and are [22] irritable and have a temperature of 105 in whom the

Page 130

[1] rest of the examination shows enough global change [2] in their level of interactivity that I would do a [3] lumbar puncture.

[4] BY MR. RATZAN:

[5] Q: Do you have the opportunity to view their [6] level of activity over a certain amount of time when [7] you do that?

[8] A: Usually, yes.

[9] Q: And again, that goes back to the [10] importance of either a physical exam or on-site [11] evaluation by the doctor of the patient?

[12] MR. KING: I object to the form, [13] incomplete hypothetical.

[14] THE WITNESS: Well, if you could [15] co-join it with the original need to see the patient [16] in the first place, yes.

[17] BY MR. RATZAN:
 [18] **Q:** How many lumbar punctures do you think you [19] perform a year or order a year?
 [20] **A:** Or order, I'm glad you said or ordered.
 [21] **Q:** Perform or order.
 [22] **A:** I don't perform any anymore. I'm probably

Page 131

[1] involved with, I don't know, more than 50, more than [2] 100 children a year who get lumbar punctures.

[3] **Q:** Over the last how many years?

[4] **A:** 20 years.

[5] **Q:** And of the lumbar punctures ordered, based [6] on your training and experience, of the lumbar [7] punctures ordered in accordance with the standard of [8] care, what do you estimate the ratio is between the [9] lumbar puncture that reveals or indicates meningitis [10] and those that are negative for such disease?

[11] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[12] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection to form.

[13] **THE WITNESS:** I mean, there is [14] some guessing to this because I've never done a [15] study of that, but I would probably say it's on the [16] order of 10 or 15 percent that are positive for [17] meningitis. The majority are negative for [18] meningitis.

[19] BY MR. RATZAN:

[20] **Q:** So, it would be about 10 to 1?

[21] **A:** 7 to 1, 8 to 1, 9 to 1, yes.

[22] **Q:** What do you attribute that ratio to?

Page 132

[1] **A:** I attribute that ratio to the fact that [2] the majority of children who look sick or toxic do [3] not have meningitis. They have viral diseases. [4] They have gastroenteritis. They have viremia, which [5] is enough to make them look sick enough that we [6] don't know whether it's bacterial or viral.

[7] **Q:** So, why do the lumbar puncture?

[8] **A:** We do the lumbar puncture because when you [9] get to a certain level of illness, the risk for [10] meningitis has risen to a high enough level that the [11] yield is reasonable and the importance of making an [12] early diagnosis is well-known.

[13] **Q:** Well, I guess what I'm masking you is if [14] there is - do you think it's appropriate that [15] there's such a high ratio?

[16] **A:** Yes.

[17] **Q:** Why do you think so?

[18] **A:** I think because there's no way to know [19] bacterial meningitis from a serious viral illness [20] that can mimic

bacterial meningitis, and when you [21] get to a certain level of disease, the risk for [22] bacteremia and meningitis goes up to 10 or 15

Page 133

[1] percent, and that's a high enough risk to act on.

[2] **Q:** Is that because it's a life-threatening [3] illness?

[4] **A:** To some degree, yes.

[5] **Q:** If you don't do the lumbar puncture and [6] you leave it to chance, the baby could die?

[7] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[8] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection to form.

[9] **THE WITNESS:** If you would take [10] out "leave it to chance," I would answer your [11] question affirmatively. I think this issue of [12] leaving it to chance, the jury needs to know that [13] physicians when they practice medicine always leave [14] something to chance. There is no 100 percent [15] certain way of ruling out meningitis.

[16] BY MR. RATZAN:

[17] **Q:** I understand, but to do the lumbar [18] puncture, the risk of doing the lumbar puncture [19] versus the benefit of doing a lumbar puncture in the [20] face of bacterial meningitis, a life-threatening [21] disease, makes it appropriate to have a ratio of 9 [22] negatives for every 1 positive?

Page 134

[1] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[2] **MR. LEINICKE:** Same.

[3] **THE WITNESS:** When the risk of [4] meningitis being present is in that neighborhood, [5] 10, 15 percent likelihood, then you're right, the [6] risk factor ratio favors doing extra lumbar [7] punctures to find that 15 percent that have [8] meningitis.

[9] BY MR. RATZAN:

[10] **Q:** Do you have, as you sit here now, any [11] reason to believe that any of the doctors, Dr. [12] Litvak, Dr. Betancourt, Dr. Pearson deviated from [13] the standard of care in this case in any way?

[14] **A:** Again, taking each one by name, Dr. [15] Betancourt I really don't see any concern for him [16] deviating from the standard of care based on the [17] mother's deposition, the father's deposition, his [18] deposition and so on.

[19] Dr. Litvak, assuming his record is the [20] proper record and a real description of the child, [21] he practiced well within the standard of care in his [22] determination to do a blood count, to watch the

Page 135

[1] child, to have a phone call back. No, I don't think [2] he deviated from the

standard of care.

[3] Dr. Pearson, again, depending on a belief [4] that he did involve the parents in a conversation or [5] the mother in a conversation about the things he [6] says he did and determined in his mind that the [7] level of irritability was not so high that [8] meningitis or sepsis or some other life-threatening [9] illness was pressing enough to be acted upon right [10] then, again, I think he was within the standard of [11] care. Now, you give me a different hypothetical, [12] and I'll give you a different answer as we've [13] already gone through.

[14] **Q:** I understand, I meant as you sat here now [15] given what you understand to be the facts of the [16] case.

[17] **A:** Yes.

[18] **Q:** Going back to the white blood count for [19] one moment, the neutrophils, we talked about a shift [20] to the left, and neutrophils, without knowing more [21] like about band cells or other types of [22] polymorphonuclear leukocytes, when neutrophils are

Page 136

[1] elevated that could suggest a shift to the left?

[2] **A:** Yes.

[3] **Q:** Looking back on it now with the [4] retrospective scope, do you have reason to believe [5] that the neutrophils in this case actually were [6] elevated?

[7] **MR. LEINICKE:** I object to the [8] form.

[9] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[10] **THE WITNESS:** Well, the [11] neutrophils were 65 percent. I would have to look [12] at Oski's book to see what the, you know, the two [13] standard deviations around the mean is for a child [14] this age with respect to the percent polys. That [15] could be a slight increase in the number of polys, [16] but if it is, it's very trivial and not something [17] that strikes you as a physician that this is a [18] raging bacterial process. If anything, this is [19] commensurate with a viral disease that has just [20] begun.

[21] BY MR. RATZAN:

[22] **Q:** What I meant, and I want to make sure you

Page 137

[1] understand the question, is looking back on it now, [2] not at the time that Dr. Litvak looked at it, but [3] looking back on it now and knowing what we know now [4] and in your opinion that the baby had bacteremia at [5] presentation, is it likely that the neutrophils at [6] 65 percent was elevated?

[7] **A:** Again -

[8] **MR. LEINICKE:** I object to the [9] form.

[10] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[11] **THE WITNESS:** Again, I think I [12] answered your question that way. My answer would be [13] I would first check Oski's Textbook of Pediatric [14] Hematology to **make** sure that the range of normal [15] does not extend to 60 percent or 65 percent in a [16] baby this age, because this may in fact be normal, [17] in which case one could not say this is a shift to [18] the left in response to a bacterial sepsis picture.

[19] **BY MR. RATZAN:**

[20] **Q:** How do you spell Oski?

[21] **A:** O-S-K-I. If it turns out these numbers [22] are elevated above the range of normal, two standard

Page 138

[1] deviations from the norm, from the mean, then I [2] would answer your question affirmatively. This in [3] retrospect was the bone marrow's response to a [4] bacterial infection.

[5] **Q:** And under those circumstances, if there [6] were a study of the band cells done, do you have [7] reason to believe that that would have indicated an [8] elevated count of band cells?

[9] **MR. LURY:** I object to the form.

[10] **MR. LEINICKE:** Objection to form.

[11] **THE WITNESS:** I don't think [12] there's any way to make that judgment. It may [13] have. It may not have. There's no scientific way [14] to say yes or no on that. Just to go beyond this, I [15] think maybe we're not communicating on a level that [16] we want to be. The risk for bacteremia anyway has [17] nothing to do with the number of bands, at least as [18] physicians practice general pediatrics.

[19] The total white count is what determines [20] the risk for bacteremia. The band count, the shift [21] to the left, other things that might be done with a [22] white count is not commonly used in the algorithm

Page 139

[1] for determining who might be bacteremic and who [2] might not be.

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

[4] **Q:** Is it ever used in the algorithm for [5] determining who might be suffering for bacterial [6] meningitis?

[7] **A:** No, the white count, no, no correlation [8] between the white count and directly with bacterial [9] meningitis. There is a correlation -

[10] **Q:** Have you ever heard of -

[11] **MR. LURY:** Let him finish his [12] answer.

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

[14] **Q:** I agree, I apologize.

[15] **A:** There is a correlation obviously between a [16] high white count and bacteremia, and bacteremia does [17]

lead to meningitis. So, indirectly there is that [18] correlation, but directly there is no correlation.

[19] **Q:** Is there any correlation to the percentage [20] of immature versus mature neutrophils in peripheral [21] white blood at all and bacterial meningitis?

[22] **A:** Well, there is what's known as the I/T

Page 140

[1] ratio, which is I think what you **just** described, the [2] ratio of immature to total white count - the total [3] poly count, rather, and that ratio has been most [4] commonly used in the newborn period to determine [5] which babies might be at risk for group B strep, [6] sepsis and disease.

[7] I'm not aware of there being an [8] application of the I/T ratio in children with [9] bacterial meningitis outside the newborn period, but [10] certainly in the newborn period there is. You know, [11] I got paged about ten minutes ago, and I've been [12] putting it off.

[13] **MR. LURY:** Before you go, Stuart, [14] how much more do you have?

[15] **MR. RATZAN:** A bunch,

[16] **MR. LURY:** Then we're definitely [17] not going to finish tonight because we've got three [18] attorneys that are going to catch a flight out.

[19] **MR. RATZAN:** Are we still on the [20] record?

[21] **MR. LURY:** Yes, we're still on the [22] record. I told you earlier that we would make

Page 141

[1] arrangements for you to complete this deposition by [2] telephone. You were unwilling to accept that. You [3] have been going I'm not sure, you know, with the [4] breaks, I apologize for the breaks. I think it's [5] unfair that you expect three attorneys -

[6] **MR. KING:** Why don't you let the [7] Doctor go while we're talking.

[8] **MR. LURY:** - okay, who need to [9] get back to Florida for depositions and hearings [10] scheduled for tomorrow morning to continue with this [11] deposition until all hours. You're telling me [12] you've got a bunch more which doesn't mean we're [13] going to get out of here at 7:00 or 8:00 or 9:00 [14] o'clock tonight, and we all have flights.

[15] We understand that you don't have a flight [16] tonight. Therefore, I'm making the offer that the [17] Doctor will make himself available by telephone to [18] complete the deposition, but for all intents and [19] purposes, this deposition is now over.

[20] **MR. RATZAN:** Well, if that's your [21] position, that's your position, but I can

tell you [22] that this deposition has been interrupted numerous

Page 142

[1] times by the Doctor. It was scheduled to start at [2] 2:30. He wasn't here. It started at 5 to 3:00.

[3] He's been out for several, I don't know [4] how many pages. He spent a half an hour downstairs, [5] and for the early part of this deposition, there [6] were countless speaking objections which interrupted [7] me and interrupted the procedure here, and we're [8] going to move to strike this witness and to prevent [9] him from testifying at trial unless I can go forward [10] right now and complete this deposition. I'm here. [11] He's there. We're all ready to complete it, and [12] that's just the way it is.

[13] **MR. LURY:** Okay.

[14] **MR. KING:** Let me put this on the [15] record. I don't have a dog in the fight with [16] respect to the Doctor's availability or with respect [17] to the circumstances that called him away today from [18] time to time. However, the last flight out that we [19] can catch back to Fort Lauderdale is at 7:00 [20] o'clock. It's now 5 minutes after 6:00. I suppose [21] we could go for another 10, 15 minutes tops, but [22] then we're going to still have to leave

Page 143

[1] The point being that we're not going to [2] complete this deposition today anyway. I think in [3] all fairness it's going to have to be reset. Again, [4] I don't have a dog in that fight, but it cannot go [5] forward today.

[6] **MR. RATZAN:** Well, let's go [7] 10 more minutes and you guys gotta go. I mean, I don't [8] have brains. I can't keep you from getting on an [9] airplane. I'm just telling you my position. Can we [10] go 10 more minutes and get 10 more minutes done?

[11] **MR. LEINICKE:** Why go 10 more [12] minutes if you're not going to get done? That's the [13] only question I have.

[14] **MR. RATZAN:** Because it's 10 more [15] minutes now, get 10 more minutes done now, and then [16] you can go.

[17] **MR. LURY:** No, because we're [18] talking Washington, we're talking traffic, and we're [19] still talking 20 or 25 minutes to the airport, plus [20] we all have to change tickets. I'm not going to [21] miss and these gentlemen aren't going to mistake [22] their flights back to Florida. It would be one

Page 144

[1] thing if we could just jump on a plane, but we can't [2] do it.

[3] **MR. RATZAN:** I mean, that's our [4] position.

[5] MR. KING: We're going to have to [6] redo it anyway.

[7] MR. RATZAN: I don't know, I think [8] that we'll see what Judge Moe (phonetic) says about [9] it. I mean, I don't know if this witness is going [10] to be available to testify at trial after what [11] happened today.

[12] MR. KING: It's not your fault I [13] don't think that the depo necessarily can't be [14] completed, but I do think you could have maybe [15] gotten to the point a little quicker, but it's not [16] our fault either that the deposition couldn't be [17] completed, and the Doctor has been trying to deal [18] with certain emergencies that he has here. I don't [19] think it's anybody's fault, and it's just something [20] we all have to deal with. I don't think he should [21] be stricken because of that. Anyway -

[22] MR. RATZAN: I have nothing to

financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

Notary Public in and for
the District of Columbia

My commission expires:
August 31, 1997

Page 145

[1] say. That's sit. We're going to move to strike the [2] guy.

[3] THE WITNESS: One thing I want to [4] say is I think your clock is a lot different than my [5] clock. I'm sorry, I was here at 25 of, and I was [6] here waiting for you before that after my conference [7] with Mr. Lury. So, I don't think it was 5 to 3:00 [8] when we really started.

[9] MR. RATZAN: It was. She's got it [10] on her machine.

[11] THE WITNESS: I was here at 25 of, [12] and I'm not sure why we didn't get going.

[13] MR. LURY: I don't know why we [14] didn't get started.

[15] THE WITNESS: We were waiting for [16] one attorney on the phone and so on, but I was here [17] very close to the time we were supposed to start. I [18] definitely apologize for all the interruptions. I'm [19] very sorry for that.

[20] MR. RATZAN: I understand. I [21] mean, no one is going to be in the court blaming [22] you, at least not here.

Page 146

[2] (Thereupon, with the consent of the witness, reading [3] and signature waived.)

[5] Whereupon, the deposition was adjourned at [6] 6:12 p.m.)

Page 147

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Justina M. Consoiazio, the officer before whom the foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me in stenotype and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that said deposition is a true record of the testimony given by said witness; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor

(

(

(

\$	3:02 13:4 3:12 13:11 3:19 22:11 3:20 102:7; 109:6, 12; 112:14 3:21 22:14 3:23 25:12 3:27 25:15	A	13, 17; 16:3 affirmatively 133:11; 138:2 afternoon 5:10; 14:12; 25:2, 6; 120:8; 122:7 again 11:19; 17:15, 16; 22:8; 35:4; 50:3; 51:6; 58:16; 59:6; 63:20; 65:7; 68:1; 71:22; 72:15; 77:11; 80:3; 85:3; 87:9; 89:13; 93:3, 19; 96:6; 98:3; 102:10; 105:4; 108:15; 110:11, 21, 22; 113:8, 22; 115:4, 15; 118:6; 119:22; 120:13; 125:4; 130:9; 134:14; 135:3, 10; 137:7, 11; 143:3 against 64:1; 72:21; 84:2 age 66:11; 67:1; 82:7, 11; 83:9; 86:17, 20; 88:19; 93:7; 128:20; 129:9; 136:14; 137:16 aggregate 26:17 aggressive 15:16 ago 70:14, 20; 71:1; 88:15; 90:12; 103:18; 140:11 agree 47:5, 7; 55:15; 69:1, 3, 5; 73:15; 78:10; 102:10; 110:20; 122:11, 22; 123:4; 139:14 agreement 47:3 ahead 89:22; 108:6 airplane 143:9 airport 143:19 alert 53:10; 79:11; 80:1, 3, 6, 9; 83:19; 84:6, 7, 10, 19; 106:21; 107:13 algorithm 138:22; 139:4 Allen 28:7 allow 17:21; 94:17 allowing 91:6 alone 85:9 along 94:17 already 22:3; 38:21; 16:12; 55:6; 125:7; 135:13 although 44:18 always 44:1; 54:13; 63:3; 77:20; 118:8; 133:13 ambiguous 30:6, 12; 57:12; 77:3; 95:4, 14; 26:8 amount 89:18; 130:6 amoxicillin 100:3 analysis 21:4 and/or 34:13 annotated 108:17 annoying 25:6 answered 17:15; 20:16; 8:9; 77:5; 137:12 antibiotic 99:3, 22; 02:2, 5; 126:10 antibiotics 67:5; 103:10 anxiety 118:10 anybody's 144:19 anymore 130:22 anyway 57:2; 60:11; 138:16; 143:2; 144:6, 21 anywhere 21:21 apart 10:22 apologize 139:14; 141:4; 145:18 apparent 16:13; 78:3 apparently 62:4 appear 32:10; 87:1; 100:2 appearance 4:12; 28:13 appeared 30:21; 51:1; 66:3 appearing 42:17 appetite 45:12 application 140:8 applies 126:19 appointment 57:17; 58:8, 9; 66:7, 8 appreciates 87:18 appreciation 32:5 apprised 111:15 approach 83:14; 126:4, 10, 14, 21; 127:4, 9, 17; 128:6 appropriate 13:14; 33:14; 48:6; 66:6; 101:11; 109:11; 124:11; 128:2, 3; 132:14; 133:21 appropriately 80:15; 33:20; 107:10 area 28:4, 14; 70:8; 92:12 argument 95:17 arms 36:18 around 79:19; 98:15; 120:1; 121:22; 136:13 arrange 66:7 arrangements 61:18; 141:1 Aside 45:3; 85:7, 8; 115:20; 116:17 assess 87:10 assessed 88:12 associate 7:5 associated 15:13; 48:3; 06:12 assume 5:20; 6:6; 62:6; 14:22; 68:16; 69:1; 97:3; 03:4; 104:9; 114:18, 18 Assuming 24:19; 60:4; 14:18; 105:4; 108:3, 13; 15:22; 122:22; 134:19 attached 10:5; 11:12; 3:9; 14:2 attempt 42:21 attorney 4:8; 145:16 attorneys 27:7, 7; 40:18; 141:5 tribute 131:22; 132:1 August 4:5 automatically 44:11 utopsv 10:19, 20; 12:8;
1	4	5	6
2	7	8	9
3			

14:5; 16:13; 123:15
availability 142:16
available 24:17; 141:17;
 144:10
aware 5:15; 10:7; 29:5;
 31:16; 41:8; 68:1; 110:2, 5
 111:13, 17, 22; 112:8, 11;
 140:7
away 101:18; 142:17

B

B 73:7, 8, 20; 74:1, 2, 3;
 100:22; 140:5
babies 72:9; 80:1; 128:5,
 7; 140:5
Babinski's 128:10
baby 15:15; 19:9; 39:16;
 41:12; 44:10; 48:7; 49:4;
 50:15; 51:5; 54:6; 57:8;
 58:14, 19; 61:13, 18; 63:5,
 15; 65:1; 66:11; 67:1, 9;
 69:11; 71:1; 72:12; 74:13,
 22; 80:6; 82:6; 83:8, 15;
 84:19; 86:20; 88:18; 89:3,
 16; 103:2, 17; 106:17;
 113:16; 117:19; 122:6, 8;
 123:12, 13, 18; 124:3, 4;
 125:12; 128:4; 129:4;
 133:6; 137:4, 16
baby's 120:17; 121:5, 5,
 6; 123:16
back 9:11; 13:11; 22:13;
 25:15; 28:17; 29:19;
 30:14; 37:13, 18; 39:17;
 44:1, 15; 61:14; 69:16;
 82:15; 90:19; 100:21;
 105:17; 116:11; 122:4, 21;
 130:9; 135:1, 18; 136:3;
 137:1, 3; 141:9; 142:19;
 143:22
bacteremia 50:12, 16;
 51:20; 61:12; 69:16;
 74:18; 85:9, 13; 88:14, 17,
 22; 89:7; 99:6, 8, 10, 12,
 15; 106:8, 10; 120:11, 15;
 121:8; 132:22; 137:4;
 138:16, 20; 139:16, 16
bacteremic 69:11; 80:7;
 84:21; 85:2, 16, 21; 86:6;
 88:7, 11; 89:3, 16; 91:2, 9;
 139:1
bacteria 73:6, 9, 12, 19,
 22; 90:9; 91:13, 16; 98:18
bacterial 15:16, 19;
 31:15; 44:3, 6; 45:4; 46:2,
 13, 18; 49:1, 5, 7, 12;
 50:19, 20; 51:5; 52:9, 15;
 53:1, 4, 15; 54:6, 14; 55:2,
 8; 61:6, 7; 62:21; 63:3, 4,
 10, 17, 22; 64:1, 6; 65:14,
 20; 71:16; 72:9, 18; 73:4;
 74:8; 75:1, 8, 20; 76:2, 20;
 78:16, 19; 79:9, 20; 80:2,
 5; 81:16, 19, 22; 82:4, 11,
 16; 83:9, 13, 18; 84:1, 3, 4;
 86:9; 90:7; 91:21, 22;
 96:12, 16, 20, 22; 97:20,

22; 98:20; 103:11; 106:6;
 112:17, 22; 113:20; 115:2
 116:5, 21; 117:5; 132:6,
 19, 20; 133:20; 136:18;
 137:18; 138:4; 139:5, 8,
 21; 140:9
band 87:2, 8, 13, 18; 93:2
 11; 135:21; 138:6, 8, 20
bands 87:3, 10; 92:18,
 20, 21; 93:8; 138:17
Bartimus 28:13, 13
based 21:8; 32:15; 40:9;
 41:1; 42:9; 49:22; 50:22;
 51:6; 62:1, 13; 66:21;
 69:18; 94:9; 96:1; 100:12,
 15; 113:2; 119:13; 120:13;
 123:15, 15; 124:22; 131:5;
 134:16
basic 128:15
Basically 15:6, 9, 11;
 19:4; 54:21; 81:4; 120:20;
 121:6; 122:4; 128:12
basis 85:8
batch 23:9, 13
bath 36:8, 8; 37:18
bathroom 103:6
baths 36:9; 43:1
bearing 16:15
bed 41:17
egan 24:12
eginning 61:11, 11;
 90:11; 105:2; 123:18
egins 125:7
egs 15:14; 18:7
egun 136:20
ehalf 4:7
ehavioral 34:5
elief 44:9; 135:3
elieve 10:18; 11:9;
 36:19; 42:8; 50:5; 59:13;
 85:18; 100:15; 114:2;
 34:11; 136:4; 138:7
enefit 116:1, 16, 19;
 33:19
Bennett 10:16
besides 12:16, 21; 14:7;
 38:11; 46:17; 73:10; 83:11
rest 20:2, 4; 43:8; 96:11,
 5; 118:9
etancourt 4:17; 13:19;
 9:5, 10; 21:7; 56:6; 57:14;
 09:19; 110:4, 16; 111:3;
 12:1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 17;
 13:19; 114:3, 6, 14, 21;
 15:1, 22, 22; 116:3, 4, 16,
 8, 21; 117:6; 120:1, 10,
 7; 121:2, 10; 123:20, 22;
 24:16; 125:6, 17; 134:12,
 5
etancourt's 10:13;
 1:5, 12; 111:10, 14;
 22:11; 124:6
tetter 17:4; 55:20; 72:21;
 3:2, 4; 102:3, 5
eyond 33:15; 101:9;
 25:13; 138:14

bill 22:18
billed 23:15, 18
blaming 145:21
bleeding 123:14, 18
blood 66:22; 67:3; 76:14;
 85:19; 86:2, 8; 87:9; 88:4;
 89:6, 6, 18; 90:22; 91:15,
 19; 92:8, 10; 99:10, 21;
 100:15; 123:16, 17;
 129:11; 134:22; 135:18;
 139:21
bloodstream 90:7
bone 90:5, 10; 91:14;
 92:7; 138:3
book 136:12
both 29:7; 35:7; 39:8, 8;
 49:15; 123:22; 125:1
bottom 109:8
bracket 70:11, 16, 17, 18
bracketed 70:8
Drains 143:8
reak 13:2; 90:12, 22;
 91:11; 104:19
reakdown 87:6
reaks 141:4, 4
reathing 37:15; 41:13;
 51:14
rewing 43:22; 60:22
rief 13:5; 14:21; 53:9
riefly 14:12
iring 42:22; 71:8
iroad 106:2
roward 5:17
unch 107:22; 140:15;
 41:12
urden 107:17
uy 25:9

C

> 100:22
California 7:21
California's 12:18
all 37:10, 18; 38:2;
 3:15, 21; 51:8; 56:22;
 00:21; 102:7; 103:3;
 09:6, 12, 15, 19; 110:4,
 2; 112:12, 14; 116:20;
 18:1; 119:12, 15, 22;
 20:6; 122:6; 125:4, 9;
 35:1
alled 5:5; 9:15; 37:12;
 9:15, 17; 54:13; 58:21;
 9:4; 73:7; 76:15; 79:5;
 0:17; 87:11; 91:16;
 18:7; 119:17; 122:17;
 42:17
alls 11:7; 25:2; 29:18;
 1:4; 50:21; 56:4, 10, 14;
 4:15; 109:20; 112:21;
 18:21; 119:5
ame 11:6, 9; 109:19
an 6:15; 17:19; 18:1;
 9:20; 20:4; 25:8; 28:16;

30:4, 18; 34:5, 6; 37:21;
 38:15; 40:18; 42:19; 43:8;
 44:22; 47:9, 17, 22; 48:3;
 50:6, 8; 54:1, 10, 14, 20;
 55:19; 60:13; 70:6; 71:10;
 72:11; 73:9, 19; 74:2, 3;
 77:10; 78:1, 12; 80:1, 4, 7,
 16; 81:19; 83:22; 87:10;
 88:13; 90:9, 10, 11; 91:13,
 15; 92:3, 4, 21, 22; 93:3,
 12; 94:18; 97:4; 101:21;
 108:1; 110:21; 113:10;
 122:4; 132:20; 141:21;
 142:9, 19; 143:9, 16
capable 85:12
care 15:2; 19:6; 21:8;
 64:15; 65:3; 100:6, 8, 11,
 12; 101:4; 105:8; 107:1;
 108:22; 131:8; 134:13, 16,
 21; 135:2, 11
case 5:12; 7:14; 9:16, 19;
 14:5, 9, 18; 15:15, 22;
 16:13, 19; 17:18, 19, 21;
 18:1, 12, 19, 22; 19:4;
 21:5; 22:6, 17, 21; 23:8;
 24:7; 25:18, 22; 33:1, 20;
 34:10; 39:13; 60:11;
 71:18; 72:19; 77:4; 98:8;
 110:16; 114:22; 115:15;
 124:19, 21; 125:6; 126:20,
 20; 134:13; 135:16; 136:5;
 137:17
cases 27:6, 8, 11; 31:14
catch 140:18; 142:19
ause 46:17; 49:12; 73:9,
 19; 74:2, 3, 5
auses 73:6, 13
aveat 108:16
CBC 85:4, 7
cell 86:2; 87:13, 18
cells 87:2, 5, 8; 89:19;
 91:14, 15; 92:8, 11; 93:2,
 11; 98:17; 135:21; 138:6, 8
certain 57:5; 64:5; 98:7;
 130:6; 132:9, 21; 133:15;
 144:18
certainly 17:20; 41:18;
 71:6; 72:11, 16; 75:13;
 76:9; 77:20, 21; 79:21;
 77:4; 123:12; 140:10
certainty 77:13; 78:2;
 9:2
ertificate 10:14
chance 12:12; 63:3;
 9:20; 133:6, 10, 12, 14
change 15:18; 17:9; 30:4;
 2:8, 11; 62:8; 107:11;
 30:1; 143:20
hanged 27:5; 103:6
hanging 107:12
haracterize 100:5, 6, 8;
 01:3
harge 23:21; 24:1
hart 10:21, 22; 84:12;
 09:11
harted 109:5
heck 137:13

checked 81:8
chemicals 91:12
chest 67:6; 81:7
chief 7:6
child 16:9; 17:2; 18:2;
 30:11, 21; 32:6; 33:21;
 36:8, 12, 14; 39:7; 40:22;
 42:11, 14, 17; 43:3, 4, 9;
 44:13, 17, 22; 45:1, 2;
 48:16; 51:1, 13; 52:16, 19,
 19, 21; 53:10; 59:3, 5;
 61:1; 62:4, 12; 63:10;
 64:11; 65:15; 67:15;
 69:18; 71:7; 72:17, 20, 20;
 79:11, 17, 18, 18, 19, 21;
 80:12, 12, 14; 81:19, 22;
 83:19; 84:1; 86:6, 16;
 95:21; 97:16; 98:15; 99:1,
 22; 100:2; 103:21; 104:10,
 17; 105:12, 17, 17; 106:13,
 14, 15, 19; 107:5, 19;
 114:7, 7, 8; 115:10, 13;
 128:15, 17, 19; 129:9;
 134:20; 135:1; 136:13
child's 32:7; 33:13;
 61:15; 79:12; 81:6, 10;
 125:2
children 32:10; 62:17;
 73:3, 10; 79:6, 8; 80:4, 18;
 82:11; 88:10; 107:20;
 118:3; 127:13; 131:2;
 132:2; 140:8
chill 36:15
chills 115:10, 14
 chiming 47:15
choose 31:9; 39:14
circulation 92:7, 9
circumstance 63:10;
 128:4
circumstances 39:13;
 115:1; 116:3; 128:2, 3;
 138:5; 142:17
clarify 126:15
clear 66:17; 67:7; 112:3
lients 15:1
clinic 92:17
clinical 17:3; 30:10;
 57:13; 77:13; 78:2, 13;
 93:20; 94:16; 96:7
clinically 84:1
lock 145:4, 5
lose 31:6, 11; 83:22;
 145:17
o-join 130:15
offee-ground 123:17
ollapse 36:2
olor 121:5, 20
omfortable 63:12; 64:2;
 5:20
omforted 43:4; 63:12
oming 40:22; 72:5;
 03:20
ommenced 78:6, 6
ommensurate 53:1;
 36:19
ommon 58:21; 71:7;

92:4
commonly 138:22; 140:4
communicated 105:16
communicating 58:1;
 138:15
communication 114:12
compartment 17:22
competent 100:13
complained 65:17
complaint 74:14; 113:3;
 117:5; 121:7; 125:5
complaints 65:9, 19;
 74:13; 121:4, 16; 123:13;
 125:2
complete 12:7, 8; 17:18;
 141:1, 18; 142:10, 11;
 143:2
completed 21:4; 144:14,
 17
complicated 20:22
compromised 79:13
concept 33:15; 77:3, 19
concern 35:12; 52:15;
 55:8; 76:7, 9, 9; 98:5;
 119:7, 16; 134:15
concerned 35:21; 62:17;
 117:19
concerning 37:19
concluded 84:18
concludes 49:22
conclusions 23:7
concrete 33:18
condition 30:10; 49:2;
 111:15; 112:8
conditions 108:4
conference 145:6
confirm 8:20
confirmation 67:14
confronted 126:22
confusing 30:15
confusion 20:14
consciously 44:19
consent 146:2
consider 46:2, 18; 96:19;
 97:4, 5; 104:3, 9; 120:17
consideration 33:20;
 94:9
considerations 44:12
considered 44:6; 45:4;
 46:13; 50:12; 55:1; 74:8,
 17; 116:4; 120:11
considering 46:11
considers 54:5
consistent 37:6; 64:4;
 65:14, 15; 91:22; 92:1
constellation 49:11
consult 25:10
contact 9:13; 37:16;
 51:15; 62:14, 18, 21;
 63:17; 103:22; 106:16;
 117:12
contacted 18:17, 18;
 24:5

contacts 41:11
contained 103:3
contains 10:18
context 19:18, 22
continue 11:2; 61:13;
 82:19; 96:5; 141:10
continued 13:6; 36:7
continues 53:10
continuing 60:10
controlled 48:19
conversation 14:21;
 15:9; 18:11, 14; 37:19;
 38:17; 62:3, 11; 115:8;
 121:2, 3, 15; 135:4, 5
conversations 14:8, 11;
 51:2
convoluted 116:12
convulsion 34:4; 37:2,
 21; 50:6
convulsions 33:19;
 34:13; 37:20; 48:5, 8; 49:6
 15, 18; 114:4; 115:6, 12
cool 36:8, 8, 9; 43:1
copy 6:12; 7:9; 69:21
cord 98:15
corner 109:9
correctly 124:2
correlation 139:7, 9, 15,
 18, 18, 19
corroborates 121:1
couldn't 92:20; 101:12;
 144:16
counsel 4:9, 11; 5:5, 8;
 20:11; 29:13
count 67:1, 3; 69:16, 20;
 76:14; 85:19; 86:3, 5, 8;
 87:10; 88:4, 6, 12, 20;
 92:2, 17; 90:6, 22; 91:2, 7,
 9; 93:10, 12; 100:15;
 14:9; 125:9; 129:12;
 34:22; 135:18; 138:8, 19,
 20, 22; 139:7, 8, 16; 140:2,
 3
countless 142:6
county 5:17
couple 26:8; 103:18
course 17:3; 19:8; 50:21;
 1:1; 54:14; 62:3; 69:8;
 19:4
court 145:21
over 9:11; 37:8
overs 22:3
ramping 112:16, 21;
 23:2
criticism 65:21
criticisms 64:15; 65:3
racial 72:7
racially 17:2
ry 121:6
rying 45:12; 47:21; 61:2;
 3:13; 64:12; 122:9
ulture 67:4; 89:6, 7;
 96:3; 99:10, 21
current 7:9

cursorily 52:21
CV 612; 7:8, 10

D

D.C. 4:7
date 4:4; 12:5; 24:11
dated 9:12
David 4:18
day 24:4; 39:22; 40:20;
 57:17; 66:8, 18; 67:9;
 109:16; 119:4, 17
days 23:3, 11; 70:10, 22
deal 77:12; 144:17, 20
dealing 89:1
dealt 41:5
death 10:14, 17
December 21:11; 69:21;
 76:13; 78:20; 84:5, 17;
 85:17, 21; 96:21; 97:20;
 99:6, 16
decision 54:16, 18; 89:6
deep-seeded 61:10
Defendant 26:22; 27:2
Defendant's 26:19; 27:6
Defendant/Plaintiff
 27:22
Defendants 18:12; 26:21
define 94:2
defined 17:21; 67:17
definitely 40:22; 140:16;
 145:18
definitive 99:11
degree 17:1; 41:7; 108:3;
 133:4
degrees 39:18, 20; 42:2;
 108:17; 129:10
Department 61:9; 58:2
depend 39:12; 129:19
depending 59:12; 67:3;
 135:3
Depends 55:13
depo 144:13
deposed 5:20
deposition 4:3, 7; 5:16;
 5:16; 7:21; 10:2; 11:5, 13;
 2:10, 10, 11; 13:6, 18;
 11:9; 22:3; 24:2; 25:21;
 17:9; 34:11, 15; 35:6, 18,
 11; 36:5, 19, 22; 37:7, 9;
 38:1; 41:19; 42:9; 47:19;
 40:22; 51:9; 55:20; 56:7;
 52:10; 68:10; 75:13, 17;
 5:5; 101:22; 103:1;
 05:2; 111:9; 120:14, 20;
 21:14, 14; 122:16;
 24:22; 125:1; 134:17, 17,
 8; 141:1, 11, 18, 19, 22;
 42:5, 10; 143:2; 144:16;
 146:5
depositions 12:9; 23:4;
 35:8; 102:1; 141:9
describe 51:4; 54:1;
 78:18; 89:15; 91:4, 5;

102:19
described 29:8; 91:3;
 105:7; 140:1
describing 35:19
description 30:9, 20;
 36:12; 104:10, 11; 106:18
 107:5; 134:20
determinant 79:18
determination 45:18;
 49:17; 65:13; 78:12;
 79:10; 83:15; 134:22
determine 19:5; 44:21;
 50:6; 80:18; 92:15; 140:4
determined 80:11; 135:6
determines 49:18;
 80:14; 97:10; 138:19
determining 50:22; 53:3;
 83:22; 139:1, 5
develops 60:15
deviated 134:12; 135:2
deviating 134:16
deviation 105:8
deviations 136:13; 138:1
diagnose 99:9, 14
diagnosed 99:5, 8
diagnosis 15:9, 12, 13;
 16:18; 17:8, 12; 43:17, 21;
 55:15, 18, 21; 56:1; 60:5;
 15, 19; 61:4; 67:18, 18, 19,
 19; 69:2, 3, 5, 10, 15;
 71:20; 72:6, 7; 78:1; 85:9;
 93:20; 94:15; 97:11;
 99:12, 16; 105:20, 22;
 106:5; 113:2; 120:16;
 122:12, 15, 16; 123:1, 4;
 124:7, 12; 127:5; 132:12
diagnostic 95:1; 97:13
diarrhea 37:16; 43:11;
 51:16; 125:12
die 133:6
lied 15:16; 16:9
lies 39:5, 7
difference 29:6, 20;
 31:20; 32:12; 34:19; 38:2;
 38:2; 94:21; 95:10; 97:3;
 02:11; 110:11, 14; 111:1,
 3
different 30:8, 11; 32:5;
 38:3; 69:17; 90:1; 106:18;
 11:2; 115:19; 135:11, 12;
 45:4
differential 43:17, 21;
 0:5, 15, 19; 61:3; 86:3,
 1, 22; 92:14; 105:20, 22;
 06:5
difficult 39:8; 77:11
diffuse 7:6, 11
diminish 78:13
dinner 41:15, 17
directly 139:8, 18
disagree 35:5
isallow 15:8
ischarged 78:3
isclose 108:14
iscomfort 113:9;

115:16; 120:22; 122:8
discounting 65:8
discrepancy 102:22
discuss 65:11; 114:22;
 125:3
discussed 51:7; 55:7;
 58:11; 66:15; 76:7;
 103:18; 121:3
discusses 34:12
discussing 55:5; 60:16
discussion 22:12; 25:13;
 36:22; 51:9; 90:17; 95:17;
 104:22
disease 15:17; 24:20;
 52:5; 71:13; 72:6, 22; 73:1;
 74:6; 95:2, 10, 12; 99:7;
 131:10; 132:21; 133:21;
 136:19; 140:6
diseases 7:7; 71:6;
 104:8; 107:22; 132:3
disorders 106:2, 3, 3
dispel 34:6; 35:12
dispelled 35:14
dissipate 63:14
distinction 95:7
division 7:6; 58:2
Doctor 5:10; 12:17;
 13:13; 16:12; 17:15;
 19:22; 20:11; 32:11;
 36:14; 39:17; 40:8, 9, 11;
 46:9, 12, 14; 48:4, 7; 49:5,
 3, 57:11; 68:5; 75:9; 77:10;
 32:8; 87:22; 90:21; 104:8;
 105:4; 107:8; 116:14;
 125:3, 18, 19; 130:11;
 141:7, 17; 142:1; 144:17
doctor's 31:10; 77:6, 21;
 142:16
doctors 134:11
document 22:1
documents 21:19; 23:9,
 3
log 142:15; 143:4
fone 10:19; 25:9; 45:19;
 40:9, 14; 54:21; 55:3, 10;
 66:17; 67:1, 2; 76:14, 17;
 77:22; 85:4, 5; 97:21; 98:9;
 00:1, 1, 15; 104:16;
 08:11; 115:8; 119:11;
 31:14; 138:6, 21; 143:10,
 2, 15
Donnatal 123:1
Dorothy 4:14; 12:10;
 9:18, 20; 34:11; 36:16;
 8:6; 57:16
doubt 76:16; 77:4, 6, 7, 7,
 1, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22;
 8:7, 11, 13
'own 24:16; 42:22;
 3:14; 84:19
ownstairs 142:4
or 4:16, 18, 21; 5:15;
 0:13; 11:5, 12; 12:10, 11;
 3:18; 14:4; 19:5, 10; 21:7;
 5:17; 29:2, 3, 8, 18, 21,
 2, 30:22; 31:1; 34:15;

35:13, 19; 36:11, 21; 37:7;
38:6; 39:15, 21; 40:2; 41:4
6, 12; 42:1, 2, 8; 43:15;
44:6; 45:3, 21; 46:1, 12,
18; 48:4; 50:11, 18; 51:4,
19; 55:1, 15; 56:3, 6, 9;
57:13, 14, 14, 14; 58:7, 8,
10, 13, 17, 19; 60:2; 61:17;
62:10, 13; 64:14, 16, 18;
65:1, 4, 9, 10, 18, 21; 66:6;
68:4, 11, 12; 69:2, 10, 12,
15; 70:2; 71:18; 72:5; 74:7
10, 12, 17, 22; 75:16, 19;
76:1, 13; 78:5, 15; 84:12,
17; 85:1; 93:15, 17, 17;
96:19; 97:19; 99:5; 100:7;
101:3; 102:7, 12, 16;
103:2, 9, 10, 19; 104:13;
105:6, 11; 106:18; 107:1,
4, 17; 108:5, 10; 109:5, 19;
110:4, 15; 111:3, 10, 14,
16, 17, 22; 112:1, 4, 4, 5, 5,
7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16;
113:19; 114:2, 3, 6, 6, 14,
19, 20, 22; 115:1, 20, 22,
22; 116:3, 4, 16, 17, 18,
21; 117:6; 119:14, 22;
120:1, 6, 10, 16; 121:2, 10;
122:6, 11; 123:20, 21;
124:6, 15; 125:6, 17;
134:11, 12, 12, 14, 19;
135:3; 137:2
draws 60:17
drinking 37:15; 51:13;
68:21; 103:5; 104:1
duodenitis 123:14
during 19:8; 44:5; 51:1;
54:13; 62:2; 119:4, 17
duty 65:11; 74:10, 11;
78:3; 122:3

E

each 57:8; 59:3; 125:19;
128:14; 134:14
ear 43:9, 10; 61:7; 67:5,
18; 73:13, 19; 74:3, 5
earlier 5:11; 119:11, 11;
127:2; 140:22
earliest 9:12; 92:2
early 24:13; 26:20; 87:20;
132:12; 142:5
ears 81:6
eat 68:20
effect 111:16
effort 45:17; 54:18; 92:9,
10
eight 23:6; 26:2, 3, 13;
27:19; 119:11
either 15:2; 34:16; 48:18;
49:16; 68:2; 104:17;
105:16; 124:18; 129:12;
130:10; 144:16
element 117:7
elevated 86:4; 88:11;
89:2; 93:10, 12; 136:1, 6;
137:6, 22; 138:8

elicit 42:3; 121:11, 19
eliciting 62:16
eliminate 94:12
Elixir 123:1
else 21:21; 36:11; 45:3;
80:9; 83:11; 113:10; 125:5
emergencies 144:18
emergency 41:1; 44:17;
104:18; 105:12
emergent 104:9
emotionally 32:7
employed 4:9; 6:18
enable 38:5; 79:6
end 6:15; 43:20; 85:6
enough 6:5; 49:5; 62:4;
82:18; 93:22; 94:2; 95:9;
99:14; 124:12, 16; 125:10;
127:14, 18; 130:1; 132:5,
5, 10; 133:1; 135:9
entered 40:20
enteritis 61:8
entire 114:3; 115:21;
125:17
environment 43:4; 63:11
epidemiologic 71:11,
12; 100:19; 101:16
Epidemiology 71:14
ER 105:17
esophagitis 123:14
especially 45:10
Esquire 4:8
Estate 4:14
estimate 131:8
estimated 88:10
evaluate 108:6
evaluated 42:20; 66:12
?valuating 67:9; 128:17
?valuation 17:19; 43:7;
52:20; 53:9; 69:12, 18;
77:15; 79:7; 93:22; 94:18,
19; 105:18; 107:18;
108:20; 130:11
even 9:1, 2; 46:16; 52:21;
52:16; 63:4; 65:17; 77:14,
15; 80:3; 85:19; 95:20;
101:9; 117:6; 129:12
evening 21:11; 31:3;
11:3; 44:5; 45:5; 59:9;
115:8
?vent 6:20
events 29:7; 31:5; 35:14;
39:8; 69:8
?very 33:12; 44:9; 57:8;
39:3; 77:20; 117:7;
28:14; 133:22
everyone 25:6
everything 33:11;
07:12
evidence 63:22; 72:21;
9:11; 80:13; 84:2; 90:10
evolution 19:9; 96:7;
22:18
exactly 103:18
exam 48:7; 52:14; 53:7, 8,

18; 54:2, 11, 20; 67:4;
68:12; 76:15; 78:13; 81:5,
10, 12; 83:21; 84:12, 18;
85:6, 12; 89:5; 96:2; 97:15
108:14; 114:5, 8; 125:9;
130:10
examination 5:5, 8;
52:18; 54:15; 66:21;
67:21; 77:22; 80:22; 81:3;
82:19; 83:4; 88:17; 97:9;
98:5, 6, 13; 100:13; 119:4,
10; 127:9, 17, 20; 128:7;
130:1
examinations 78:22;
79:3
examined 5:7
example 33:18; 34:10
excellent 100:9, 10;
101:3, 4
except 28:10
excessive 88:2
excluding 127:5
Excuse 34:21; 60:7;
111:20
executed 119:13
Exhibit 10:1, 3; 11:5, 12;
13:7, 20, 22
existed 38:17; 43:16;
58:12; 62:19; 76:16; 77:4;
78:7; 84:20
exists 15:21; 91:6
expect 9:15; 72:16; 141:5
expected 82:6
experience 31:20; 32:15;
38:4; 64:13; 131:6
expert 28:14
experts 7:21
Explain 88:5; 92:3
explicate 70:15
explicates 70:16
exposed 32:11
extend 137:15
extra 134:6
extremely 63:9; 103:22;
106:1
?yes 7:16; 51:15; 62:14,
8, 20; 63:16
?ye-to-eye 103:22;
06:16
?yes 128:16

F

ace 61:13; 62:18; 66:18;
7:9; 85:20; 90:7; 108:9;
19:10, 12; 127:6; 133:20
acility 55:9
act 15:18; 36:7; 40:8, 19;
3:12; 81:10, 11; 83:7, 19;
5:15; 87:13; 103:17;
08:9; 117:11, 21; 132:1;
37:16
actor 134:6
acts 17:1; 40:10; 135:15

Fair 6:5, 10; 17:7, 11;
59:8; 94:2; 95:9; 99:14
fairly 50:5
fairness 89:10, 21; 143:3
falling 10:22
familiar 29:17
family 43:5; 71:7, 9, 9
far 15:22; 18:20; 22:21;
23:2; 83:12; 91:20; 112:10
father 120:15; 125:4
father's 35:8; 36:4;
101:22; 125:1; 134:17
fault 124:15, 18; 125:16;
144:12, 16, 19
favor 5:22
favours 134:6
feature 364; 58:20;
62:10; 63:21; 114:16
features 42:10; 43:6;
45:14, 17; 47:19; 48:1, 2;
54:15; 67:4; 81:9; 96:4;
103:16
febrile 57:8; 61:13; 67:1;
88:18
feedback 120:7
feel 32:16; 89:11; 101:10
fell 13:18
fellows 51:22; 52:8; 83:7;
128:1
felt 58:17; 81:8; 98:6
fever 37:11; 42:11; 43:7,
9; 44:11; 45:3, 11; 46:14,
17; 47:20; 50:16; 58:19,
22; 59:4, 9, 13; 61:1, 2;
63:14, 15; 65:16; 66:12,
13, 19; 74:13; 88:20;
114:7; 115:14; 120:18, 19;
121:21; 128:12; 129:10
fevers 107:22
few 79:4; 128:20
Fewer 26:5
fifth 117:11
fight 92:10; 142:15; 143:4
File 12:8
find 39:3; 54:14; 80:16;
31:20; 97:19; 100:16;
134:7
finder 40:8
inding 100:16
indings 52:22; 128:7
ine 9:5; 47:8
inger 88:8
inish 139:11; 140:17
irm 22:16; 28:10; 99:12
irst 9:12, 18; 18:17, 18;
22:19, 22; 37:10; 52:18;
9:2, 10; 95:20; 116:11;
26:4, 9, 14, 20; 127:4, 8,
6; 130:16; 137:13
lex 82:1
lexes 81:18
lexion 81:20
light 140:18; 141:15;
42:18

flights 141:14; 143:22
Florida 5:18; 28:7, 9, 11;
141:9; 143:22
flu 122:12; 123:1, 2
fluid 98:14
focal 113:14, 18; 128:10
focus 67:2; 88:19; 114:8
focused 118:11; 125:1
follow 53:6; 113:1
follow-up 53:2; 100:20;
119:12, 14
followed 55:12; 119:18
follows 5:7; 13:6
forgive 12:1
form 16:1, 21; 17:14;
20:9; 29:10; 30:3; 31:7, 8,
17, 22; 32:19, 21; 33:5;
34:22; 37:4; 38:8; 40:7;
41:20; 42:5; 43:19; 45:6;
46:3, 20, 22; 48:10; 49:13;
52:12; 54:3, 7; 55:4; 56:18,
19; 57:3, 19; 58:15; 59:18;
50:8, 11; 62:22; 63:18;
54:17; 65:5; 67:12; 68:7;
71:21; 75:3, 11; 76:4; 77:1,
3, 8; 78:9; 82:9; 83:1;
34:15; 87:20; 90:2; 94:6;
95:3, 13; 96:13; 97:2, 6;
98:1, 2, 22; 99:19; 101:5,
5; 102:14; 103:15; 105:9;
107:2, 15; 108:12; 109:2;
110:7; 111:6; 112:18;
113:11, 21; 115:3; 116:7,
3; 117:1, 2, 15; 118:4, 5,
16; 119:1; 120:3, 12;
121:12; 122:1, 13; 123:5,
5, 8; 124:8, 9, 20; 126:6;
127:7; 128:22; 129:14, 15,
16; 130:12; 131:11, 12;
133:7, 8; 134:1; 136:8, 9;
137:9, 10; 138:9, 10
ormalized 60:18
ormulated 8:14
ormulating 8:13
Fort 142:19
orth 103:20
orward 142:9; 143:5
ound 35:10; 45:14; 81:1
our 23:1; 26:1, 15, 16
raction 82:13
requency 26:17
requeently 32:4; 95:19;
18:7
riedman 28:8
ront 12:2; 22:3
ull 5:13; 77:15
ully 111:15, 18
ulminant 15:15, 19;
6:10; 18:3
unctioning 79:12, 14
urther 63:6; 67:14, 16;
8:21; 93:22; 94:12, 18, 19
ussv 41:16; 64:11

<p>G</p> <p>gained 43:16 gastric 123:17 gastroenteritis 132:4 gastrointestinal 43:12 gather 101:21 Gatorade 68:21 gave 37:17; 39:17; 91:10 gazing 103:8 general 33:2, 3; 42:21; 46:10; 59:1; 73:22; 74:15; 81:3; 94:7; 107:17; 129:9; 138:18 generally 56:21; 94:5 gentlemen 143:21 Georgetown 6:19; 52:2; 128:1 gets 44:11; 50:1; 64:10; 66:22; 89:9 GI 123:14, 18 given 41:4, 16; 46:1; 104:10; 105:5; 112:15; 113:16; 117:8; 124:11; 135:15 giving 124:15 glad 71:14; 130:20 global 130:1 goes 57:7; 103:17; 130:9; 132:22 Good 5:10; 25:4; 52:14, 14; 63:16; 89:9; 100:20 gotta 143:7 grade 100:22 great 34:10 group 10:13, 13; 23:16, 19; 104:3; 117:13; 118:1; 140:5 guess 8:15; 67:7; 76:16; 117:13; 132:13 guessing 131:14 guide 54:16; 88:21 guidelines 46:10 guy 145:2 guys 47:11; 143:7</p>	<p>hate 22:7 head 41:15 heard 24:12; 36:11, 12; 46:10; 126:17; 139:10 hearing 36:10; 49:8 hearings 141:9 hears 48:4 heart 81:7 height 51:17 held 22:12; 25:13; 68:20; 90:17; 104:22 Heller 28:4 help 44:15 helpful 53:3; 54:11; 72:15; 79:17 helps 72:5, 8 Hematology 137:14 Hemophilus 73:3, 6, 7, 16, 18, 22; 74:3; 91:13 hemorrhage 15:8, 13, 17 hemorrhagic 16:3 here's 122:5 herself 102:5 hesitant 9:3 hey 125:12 high 42:11; 46:14; 50:16; 58:19, 22; 66:12; 74:12; 79:12; 93:22; 132:10, 15; 133:1; 135:7; 139:16 himself 141:17 history 39:21; 51:13; 52:14; 58:12; 59:5; 71:19; 74:12; 96:1; 97:10, 15; 100:18; 112:12; 113:2, 5, 16; 114:11, 20; 115:21; 116:17; 117:6, 8; 118:10, 22; 122:4; 124:11, 12, 16; 125:17; 127:10 holding 28:22; 36:18 honed 64:9 honestly 9:1 hope 119:19 Hospital 6:19; 7:4; 10:16; 79:7; 94:5; 99:2 hospitalization 106:11 hot 39:16; 41:13 hour 23:21; 24:1, 2; 25:9; 18:18; 52:20; 108:1; 117:13; 142:4 hours 22:20; 23:1, 6; 19:5; 51:2; 58:22; 103:18; 19:11, 11; 120:8; 125:13; 41:11 humana 10:16 hundreds 45:15 hurts 81:21 hypothetical 48:11; 14:8; 56:20; 129:17; 30:13; 135:11 hypothetically 40:10</p>	<p>I</p> <p>IT 139:22; 140:8 idea 27:4; 107:20; 125:7 identification 10:1, 4; 13:8, 14; 14:1 identify 79:2; 93:1 identifying 87:7 ill 42:16; 79:6, 8 illness 32:6; 47:20; 61:15; 67:15; 70:13, 20; 71:1, 8, 11; 72:14, 17, 22; 100:17; 102:3; 132:9, 19; 133:3; 135:9 illnesses 45:15, 15; 126:2 imagine 109:18; 113:13 immature 87:20; 139:20; 140:2 immune 92:11 impetus 46:1 importance 54:2; 130:10; 132:11 important 54:17; 58:1; 71:18; 72:1, 13; 100:14 importantly 18:4 impressions 125:19 improper 40:12 in-depth 107:18 include 49:10; 106:5, 8 included 51:12; 100:13, 18; 106:2 including 81:10, 11; 97:12 incomplete 48:11; 54:8; 56:20; 129:17; 130:13 increase 136:15 indeed 49:7; 85:16; 13:18; 97:6 indelible 39:4, 6 independent 122:3 independently 68:9, 13 indicate 91:20; 93:12; 113:18 indicated 138:7 indicates 131:9 indication 128:11, 14; 129:5 indicative 98:20 indirectly 139:17 infant 128:19 infect 71:8 infection 43:10, 12, 22; 11:7, 10; 67:2, 5, 19, 19; 1:9, 16; 73:13; 74:4; 19:20; 81:1; 88:19; 90:7; 11:21; 92:1, 10, 12; 138:4 infections 72:10; 73:10, 9 infectious 7:7; 24:20; 2:4; 106:2 influenzae 73:7, 16, 19; 4:1, 3</p>	<p>information 10:20; 17:17; 30:19; 34:2; 41:2, 19; 42:4; 43:16; 44:15; 45:17; 48:16; 50:1; 57:16; 58:1; 62:1, 7; 72:4; 85:9; 105:15; 116:1, 2, 19; 121:11, 20; 124:16 informed 111:18 initial 23:7; 43:6; 45:10; 47:20; 67:17; 96:1, 1 initially 53:12, 14; 107:21 ink 70:4 inpatient 100:2 inquiry 101:16 instance 57:6; 65:11; 95:21; 96:2; 119:16 instances 129:6 institution 92:13 instruction 37:17 instructions 100:20 intact 79:13 intents 141:18 interact 62:13 interacting 42:14 interaction 11:7; 57:10; 101:9; 103:19; 111:11 interactions 19:9 interactive 53:11; 63:11; 108:2 interactivity 43:3; 130:2 interacts 44:10 interested 4:11; 28:19 interfere 24:19 interns 51:22; 52:8; 83:7; 128:1 interpret 32:9 interrupted 141:22; 142:6, 7 interruptions 145:18 intervention 62:5 intestinal 122:19 into 18:1; 29:5; 32:7; 13:11; 39:21; 41:1; 49:20; 10:2; 57:7; 71:9; 92:7, 9; 16:4; 114:15; 119:14 intrinsically 89:8 introduce 4:12 introduced 5:10 involve 135:4 involved 131:1 involving 31:14 irritability 43:2; 45:13; 13:12; 59:21, 22; 63:13, 6; 64:2, 4; 65:11, 12, 13, 18; 80:11; 121:5; 129:3, 9; 135:7 irritable 64:12; 80:13; 29:4, 10, 22 irritation 128:8, 9 issue 15:20; 18:6; 33:19; 8:7; 50:3; 72:18; 74:15, 6, 16; 101:15; 115:17; 20:21; 121:8; 133:11 issues 20:19</p>	<p>item 7:18; 11:10 items 60:9 itself 72:7; 101:18</p> <p>J</p> <p>James 28:13 Jim 28:13 Join 29:11, 12; 30:13, 16; 32:1; 33:6, 7; 35:2; 38:13; 40:14; 45:7; 46:4; 48:12; 63:1, 19; 117:16 joints 81:8 JR 5:4, 14 judge 22:22; 43:2; 44:15; 144:8 judgment 54:17; 93:21; 127:11; 138:12 July 12:3 jump 113:1; 144:1 juncture 21:10; 37:13; 55:8; 124:1, 3 jury 5:17; 92:4; 133:12</p> <p>K</p> <p>Kansas 28:12 keep 18:21, 22; 47:15; 52:19; 96:5; 143:8 Kernig's 128:9 key 43:6 kill 91:15 kind 12:21; 21:22, 22; 56:9; 116:12 kinds 31:14; 121:22 KING 4:18, 18; 14:14, 14, 14, 15; 28:21; 29:10; 30:13; 31:8, 22; 32:22; 33:6; 34:21; 37:4; 38:8; 40:7; 41:20; 43:19; 45:7; 46:4, 22; 47:12; 48:10; 54:3, 7; 55:4; 56:19; 57:19; 58:15; 59:18; 60:7; 63:1, 19; 64:17; 65:5; 90:2; 95:5; 96:13; 129:16; 130:12; 141:6; 142:14; 144:5, 12 knew 109:15 knowing 16:8; 32:9; 60:2; 59:8; 113:2, 3, 5; 122:21; 135:20; 137:3 known 77:12; 117:22; 139:22 knows 108:18</p> <p>L</p> <p>5:14 ab 92:16, 21 abeled 12:8 aboratory 78:12; 85:14; 136:5; 88:9; 94:12; 96:15; 17:21; 98:16 ack 43:2</p>
---	---	--	--	--

<p>laid 74:11</p> <p>large 82:12, 18; 104:3</p> <p>last 11:10; 23:3, 11; 26:2, 3, 13; 27:1; 112:14; 131:3; 142:18</p> <p>later 18:10; 39:5; 48:18; 109:15; 123:16</p> <p>Lauderdale 142:19</p> <p>lawyer 18:15, 18; 28:2</p> <p>lawyers 14:8</p> <p>lay 33:15</p> <p>laying 79:21; 121:22</p> <p>lead 139:17</p> <p>leading 73:13</p> <p>learned 42:1</p> <p>least 34:19; 38:2; 76:2; 88:7; 111:1; 138:17; 145:22</p> <p>leave 115:5, 9; 133:6, 10, 13; 142:22</p> <p>leaves 77:21</p> <p>leaving 133:12</p> <p>left 70:8; 87:22; 88:1; 91:18, 20; 92:5, 6, 15, 20; 93:1, 3, 8, 9, 13; 96:20; 135:20; 136:1; 137:18; 138:21</p> <p>leg 112:16; 113:6, 18; 115:16; 116:2, 20; 117:5; 120:21; 121:4, 7</p> <p>legal 21:22</p> <p>legitimate 76:8</p> <p>legs 122:9</p> <p>LEINICKE 4:20, 20; 14:13; 29:11; 30:2; 32:2, 20; 33:1, 4; 35:3; 38:12; 40:16; 46:5; 47:2, 10, 14; 52:11; 56:17; 67:11; 68:6; 71:21; 75:3, 10; 76:4, 18, 22; 77:2; 78:9; 82:22; 84:14; 95:3, 13; 97:1; 98:2, 22; 99:19; 101:6; 102:14; 103:14; 105:9; 107:3; 108:12; 109:2; 111:20; 116:8; 117:2, 15; 118:5; 119:2; 120:3; 123:7; 124:9; 126:7; 128:22; 129:15; 131:12; 133:8; 134:2; 136:7; 137:8; 138:10; 143:11</p> <p>lends 71:11</p> <p>length 113:17</p> <p>less 79:20</p> <p>lethargic 79:21; 103:7; 104:1; 106:22; 107:5, 13, 19, 21; 108:3, 9; 128:21; 129:2, 4</p> <p>lethargy 53:13; 108:15, 17; 121:20; 129:3</p> <p>letter 7:20; 8:1, 3, 15, 22; 9:2, 6, 11, 12, 21, 22; 10:8; 20:17</p> <p>letters 12:15</p> <p>leukocidin 91:16</p> <p>leukocytes 86:13; 93:5; 135:22</p>	<p>level 32:5; 43:2; 53:11, 13; 62:12; 64:2, 3; 65:13; 79:12, 17; 80:11; 94:22; 95:1, 11; 97:11, 12, 13; 98:5, 6; 119:16; 129:19; 130:2, 6; 132:9, 10, 21; 135:7; 138:15</p> <p>life-threatening 49:1; 67:15; 104:5, 7; 133:2, 20; 135:8</p> <p>light 46:13; 78:12</p> <p>likelihood 19:7; 93:21; 134:5</p> <p>likely 61:3; 82:14; 120:16; 137:5</p> <p>limitation 88:9</p> <p>line 126:4, 9, 14, 21; 127:4, 8, 16</p> <p>list 44:11; 47:18; 49:20; 50:2; 51:6, 9, 10; 55:6; 60:17, 21; 61:5; 64:19; 65:9; 69:7; 96:5; 128:14</p> <p>listed 51:8; 74:14; 80:15</p> <p>listened 81:7, 7</p> <p>listens 118:8</p> <p>listless 103:7; 106:17, 22; 107:6, 13, 19, 21; 108:3, 10; 128:21; 129:2, 5</p> <p>listlessness 43:2; 74:15; 108:15, 17; 121:21; 129:3</p> <p>literature 94:4</p> <p>little 68:21; 76:10; 88:15; 144:15</p> <p>litvak 4:4, 21; 12:11; 39:21; 57:14; 58:13, 20; 58:11, 12; 69:12, 15; 70:2; 71:19; 72:5; 74:7, 10, 17, 12; 75:19; 76:1, 13; 78:6, 15; 84:12, 17; 85:1; 93:17; 96:19; 97:19; 99:5; 100:8; 102:7; 103:9, 10; 104:13; 105:6, 11; 107:1, 17; 109:5; 111:16, 17, 22; 124:5, 9, 14; 114:6, 22; 15:20; 116:17; 119:14, 12; 120:6; 122:6; 134:12, 9; 137:2</p> <p>litvak's 68:4; 69:2, 10; 75:7, 16; 101:3; 102:12, 7; 103:2; 104:11; 106:18; 107:4; 108:5, 10; 114:2</p> <p>obes 87:17</p> <p>ocalize 43:8</p> <p>og 11:6, 11; 13:21; 56:6, 11</p> <p>ong 6:21; 18:21; 65:18; 106:1</p> <p>onger 108:2</p> <p>ook 15:7; 20:2; 37:8; 21:21; 127:14; 132:2, 5; 36:11</p> <p>oked 81:6; 103:2; 106:18; 114:8; 137:2</p> <p>oking 29:19; 30:14; 7:18; 67:8, 14, 16; 80:18; 1:3, 14, 15; 91:19; 22:21; 136:3; 137:1, 3</p>	<p>looks 7:13; 13:20; 52:16; 63:5; 106:15, 16; 127:11, 12; 128:5</p> <p>lose 11:2</p> <p>lot 43:11; 107:17; 145:4</p> <p>loudly 127:18</p> <p>lower 118:14; 120:18</p> <p>lumbar 44:13, 16; 45:18; 54:16, 18; 55:10, 13; 77:15; 80:4; 83:16; 96:17; 98:9, 11, 12, 13, 19; 108:11, 20; 127:15; 128:2, 3, 6, 14, 19; 129:6, 8; 130:3, 18; 131:2, 5, 6, 9; 132:7, 8; 133:5, 17, 18, 19; 134:6</p> <p>LURY 4:16, 16; 8:2, 7; 9:7, 14, 19; 11:11; 12:16; 14:7; 16:1, 21; 17:14; 18:17; 19:3, 13, 16, 21; 20:7, 9, 17; 22:9, 16; 23:6, 15, 18; 24:6; 29:12; 30:16; 31:7, 17; 32:1, 19; 33:7; 35:2; 38:13; 40:14; 42:5; 45:6; 46:3, 20; 47:13; 48:12; 49:13; 57:3; 62:22; 63:18; 77:1; 82:9, 21; 84:7; 85:22; 89:20; 90:13; 94:6; 98:1; 101:5; 107:2, 15; 109:22; 110:7, 17; 111:6; 112:18; 113:11, 21; 115:3; 116:7; 117:1, 16; 118:4, 16; 119:1; 120:12; 121:12; 122:1, 13; 123:6; 124:8, 20; 126:6; 127:7; 129:14; 131:11; 133:7; 134:1; 136:9; 137:10; 138:9; 139:11; 140:13, 16, 21; 141:8; 142:13; 143:17; 145:7, 13</p> <p>lymphocytes 86:13, 16</p> <p>lymphs 92:18</p>	<p>marrow 90:5, 10; 91:14; 92:7</p> <p>marrow's 138:3</p> <p>Marvin 28:8</p> <p>materials 7:12, 13; 9:5; 10:7; 11:17, 19; 12:13; 13:15</p> <p>matter 4:4; 88:16</p> <p>mature 87:4; 139:20</p> <p>May 9:9; 10:21; 20:14; 25:1; 36:6; 46:16; 76:8; 85:4; 87:3, 3; 137:16; 138:12, 13</p> <p>Maybe 35:6, 7; 48:5; 61:1; 67:4, 4, 5; 94:22; 138:15; 144:14</p> <p>mean 8:8; 23:2, 12; 30:5; 36:10; 81:13, 17; 86:15; 87:4; 93:3, 4; 94:5, 11; 95:18; 100:10; 101:20; 105:11; 108:19; 110:13; 126:13, 20; 131:13; 136:13; 138:1; 141:12; 143:7; 144:3, 9; 145:21</p> <p>meaning 70:22; 77:4; 101:18, 21; 126:10</p> <p>means 64:11; 81:6, 18; 94:8, 11, 14</p> <p>neant 83:4; 112:1; 135:14; 136:22</p> <p>nechanism 91:4, 5; 92:3</p> <p>nedical 12:20; 25:18, 21; 33:16; 40:21; 57:7; 76:9; 78:2; 94:4</p> <p>nedicine 48:21; 57:5; 133:13</p> <p>nedicines 37:16; 42:22; 51:17</p> <p>neeting 23:5</p> <p>neetings 24:20</p> <p>members 71:9</p> <p>memory 39:4, 7; 55:19</p> <p>neningeal 54:12; 128:8</p> <p>neningitic 49:21</p> <p>neningitis 31:15; 44:7, 12; 45:4, 9, 15; 46:2, 11, 3, 18; 47:22; 48:3; 49:1, 1, 7, 12; 50:3, 19, 20; 51:5; 52:9, 16, 18; 53:1, 4, 15; 54:6, 14; 55:2, 8; 56:16; 57:14; 62:21; 63:3, 4, 10, 7, 22; 64:1, 4, 6; 65:14, 1; 73:4, 7, 10; 74:8; 75:1, 1; 20; 76:3, 21; 77:17; 8:16, 19; 80:2, 5; 81:16, 9, 22; 82:4, 12, 16; 83:9, 3, 18; 84:1, 3, 4; 86:9; 3:16, 17, 18, 21; 96:12, 6, 20, 22; 97:12, 20, 22; 8:4, 8, 20; 103:12; 104:3; 106:6; 112:17, 22; 113:20; 15:2; 116:5, 22; 117:6; 24:4, 7, 13; 125:22; 26:1, 5; 127:6, 12, 14, 16, 9; 131:9, 17, 18; 132:3, 0, 19, 20, 22; 133:15, 20; 34:4, 8; 135:8; 139:6, 9,</p>	<p>17, 21; 140:9</p> <p>mentioned 36:6; 49:11; 83:12; 101:17</p> <p>mere 48:8</p> <p>merely 65:10</p> <p>message 57:9</p> <p>metabolic 106:3</p> <p>Miami 28:9</p> <p>middle 61:7; 74:5; 85:6</p> <p>might 21:13; 38:10, 10; 58:5; 60:18; 61:12; 74:22; 95:22; 111:21; 115:12; 138:21; 139:1, 2, 5; 140:5</p> <p>mildly 80:12</p> <p>mimic 132:20</p> <p>mind 9:22; 20:19; 44:1, 20; 55:18; 60:22; 77:7, 7; 94:15; 97:10; 107:20; 112:22; 113:19; 135:6</p> <p>minds 44:20; 61:15</p> <p>minus 128:20</p> <p>minute 9:21; 90:12</p> <p>minutes 140:11; 142:20, 21; 143:7, 10, 10, 12, 15, 15, 19</p> <p>mischaracterization 120:4</p> <p>mischaracterizes 46:21</p> <p>miss 143:21, 21</p> <p>missed 23:17; 75:2</p> <p>missing 124:7</p> <p>misstatement 111:21</p> <p>Moe 144:8</p> <p>nolecular 90:5, 6</p> <p>nom 68:4; 70:10, 21; 75:6; 109:6; 110:15</p> <p>nom's 102:12, 16</p> <p>noment 60:4; 89:17; 114:19; 135:19</p> <p>Monday 25:5</p> <p>nonocytes 86:13</p> <p>nonth 58:18</p> <p>nonths 66:11; 82:11; 36:20; 128:20</p> <p>nore 16:8; 17:17, 18; 20:21; 26:20, 21; 27:6; 31:6, 11; 33:10; 38:7; 39:3; 40:5; 42:19; 44:21; 54:17; 59:8; 61:10; 81:9; 82:14; 88:12; 93:6; 98:7; 101:12; 107:18; 111:10; 120:7; 21:17; 123:12; 124:3; 25:11; 131:1, 1; 135:20; 40:14; 141:12; 143:7, 10, 0, 11, 14, 15</p> <p>norning 42:19; 58:9; 63:3; 69:13; 141:10</p> <p>nost 7:10; 32:18; 61:3; 100:3; 140:3</p> <p>nother 35:8, 18; 37:11; 9:15; 41:8; 42:3; 44:21; 8:5; 49:9; 50:1, 22; 62:11, 4; 63:12; 64:20, 22; 65:2, 12, 17; 66:4; 68:9, 13, 7; 101:22; 103:9, 19, 20;</p>
M				
<p>M.D 5:4, 14</p> <p>nachine 145:10</p> <p>nailed 12:4; 20:18</p> <p>nain 92:16, 21</p> <p>nainly 50:16; 100:19</p> <p>najority 82:10; 131:17; 132:2</p> <p>nakes 33:12; 49:17; 50:9; 133:21</p> <p>naking 33:21; 58:7, 9; 32:11; 141:16</p> <p>nalpractice 25:18, 21</p> <p>nany 22:20; 25:20; 26:6, 1; 27:8, 17; 42:10; 45:14, 4; 48:1, 1; 64:10; 93:11; 106:3, 4; 118:1; 126:1; 28:4, 13; 130:18; 131:3; 42:4</p> <p>nark 21:19</p> <p>narked 9:22; 10:3; 13:7, 4, 22; 22:4</p> <p>narkedly 120:18</p>				

109:12, 20; 111:4; 115:11;
117:12, 18, 22; 118:7, 21,
22; 119:16; 120:7, 15, 20;
122:17; 123:21; 124:15;
125:5, 16; 135:5
mother's 32:17; 65:9;
74:14; 77:7; 103:1, 4;
105:5; 111:9, 17; 112:7;
119:21; 124:22; 134:17
mothers 118:8
motions 33:21
motivated 78:7
motor 35:20; 36:2, 6, 7;
38:18; 48:17; 115:11
move 142:8; 145:1
moving 79:19, 22; 104:1;
121:4
Mrs 12:10; 35:1, 6; 47:19;
51:7, 12, 15; 62:3, 7, 9;
74:21; 75:6; 76:1; 104:10,
11
much 10:10; 53:8; 98:7;
103:6; 111:10; 140:14
multiple 97:2, 7
myself 5:11; 95:19

N

name 5:11, 13, 14; 9:3;
134:14
namely 33:10; 101:10
nature 60:10
necessarily 53:8; 57:8;
60:15; 85:12; 94:11;
144:13
necessary 95:11
neck 76:16; 81:11, 13, 18,
21; 82:1, 3; 128:9
need 13:1; 24:22; 25:9;
34:7; 46:11; 54:20; 58:3;
59:2, 2; 61:14; 63:6; 69:7;
79:7; 94:2, 19; 98:7; 102:1;
104:18; 108:11; 119:6;
125:13; 128:6; 130:15;
141:8
needed 66:17; 98:8;
114:12
needs 7:10; 42:17; 49:19;
57:22; 66:12; 76:7; 83:16;
94:11, 18; 104:2, 8, 17;
118:11; 133:12
negative 66:22; 80:4;
81:5; 83:20; 131:10, 17
negatives 133:22
neighborhood 134:4
neither 4:9
nerves 81:21
nervous 79:13
neurologic 52:22; 54:12;
79:12; 81:10, 12; 83:21;
128:10
neurological 76:14;
84:11, 18
neutrophil 87:14, 19;
93:10, 12

neutrophils 86:12, 16;
87:11, 21; 88:2; 93:6, 7;
135:19, 20, 22; 136:5, 11;
137:5; 139:20
new 113:3
newborn 128:11; 140:4,
9, 10
next 13:14, 19; 39:21;
40:20; 42:19; 57:17; 58:9,
13; 66:3, 8, 18; 67:9;
70:16, 21; 79:15; 80:14,
20, 21; 95:1; 98:21; 107:9;
114:16; 119:15; 125:11
night 10:17; 11:7; 35:10;
41:3, 10, 10; 42:18; 56:4,
11; 58:13; 59:4; 61:21;
112:13; 114:20; 125:18
nine 26:2, 3
non-circulating 92:8
non-interactive 106:17
non-serious 80:13
non-specific 45:9, 11,
14; 46:16; 48:1, 2; 56:16;
62:19; 125:22; 127:1, 6
None 81:1
Nonetheless 18:1; 74:16
nonresponsive 106:17
nor 4:10
norm 138:1
normal 81:12; 83:21;
36:3; 89:18; 90:6; 91:6, 19;
114:9; 125:9, 9; 129:12;
137:14, 16, 22
Nos 13:7
notary 5:7
note 39:21; 57:6; 70:9;
100:14; 115:7
noted 84:12
notes 9:10; 13:16; 21:18,
19, 21; 22:4, 5; 37:9; 56:3,
13, 22; 57:15; 69:21;
80:12; 102:16; 114:19, 21
nothing 63:2; 88:16;
38:17; 144:22
notice 109:5
noticed 56:6
November 41:10; 45:5;
6:19; 55:3, 16; 59:9; 60:3,
5; 62:20
nuchal 76:15; 81:15;
12:3, 8, 12; 83:8, 21;
28:8; 129:11
number 13:19, 20; 19:6;
1:9; 38:9; 61:4, 5, 9;
7:16; 82:18; 87:7; 88:2;
18:21; 136:15; 138:17
numbers 13:15; 137:21
numerous 141:22

O

'clock 21:10; 61:20;
04:12; 106:19; 120:1, 6;
41:14; 142:20
O-S-K-I 137:21

object 16:1, 21; 17:14;
20:9; 30:11; 31:7, 8, 17,
22; 32:19, 20; 33:4; 34:21
37:4; 38:8; 40:7, 12; 41:20
42:5; 43:19; 45:6; 46:3, 20
22; 48:10; 49:13; 52:11;
54:3, 7; 55:4; 56:17, 19;
57:3, 19; 58:15; 59:18;
60:7, 11; 62:22; 63:18;
64:17; 65:5; 68:6; 75:10;
77:1, 2, 8; 82:9, 22; 84:14;
90:2; 94:6; 96:13; 97:6;
98:1; 101:5; 107:2, 15;
110:7; 111:6; 112:18;
113:11, 21; 115:3; 116:7,
8; 117:1; 118:4, 16; 119:1;
120:12; 121:12; 122:1, 13
123:6, 7; 124:8, 20; 126:6;
127:7; 129:14, 16; 130:12
131:11; 133:7; 134:1;
136:7, 9; 137:8, 10; 138:9
Objection 29:10; 30:2, 4,
14; 32:22; 40:15, 16; 47:5,
3; 67:11; 71:21; 75:3; 76:4
18, 22; 78:9; 95:3, 5, 13;
97:1; 98:2, 22; 99:19;
101:6; 102:14; 103:14;
105:9; 107:3; 108:12;
109:2; 117:2, 15; 118:5;
119:2; 120:3; 124:9;
126:7; 128:22; 129:15;
131:12; 133:8; 138:10
objections 142:6
objects 47:4
obligation 115:21;
116:18
observation 80:17;
97:16; 108:10; 118:11;
123:21
observational 53:9;
14:19; 79:5; 80:16
observations 30:10;
14:5; 121:22
observing 35:20; 54:21
obtain 6:15; 99:21
obtainable 59:6
obtains 98:14
obviously 44:14; 76:7;
10:7; 139:15
occasionally 127:13
occur 91:4
occurred 30:9
off 13:4, 13, 18; 22:11, 12;
5:11, 13; 28:16; 58:22;
6:6; 90:16, 17; 104:21,
2; 109:15; 114:13;
40:12
offer 78:1; 125:5; 126:11;
41:16
ffered 34:2
ffice 10:12, 21, 22; 19:1,
6; 66:3, 18; 68:4, 11; 75:7;
7:21; 84:12; 96:21;
00:7; 104:18; 105:18;
08:1
ften 44:19; 67:1; 93:4;
13:8; 126:1

oftentimes 50:8
old 58:18
older 71:7; 72:17, 20
on-site 130:10
once 8:22; 17:15
one 6:15; 7:18, 21; 11:1;
12:16; 16:3; 17:18; 26:8,
12; 28:17; 38:9; 39:2, 3, 9,
14; 43:8, 22; 44:7, 22;
45:16; 47:4, 8; 48:20;
49:16; 54:14; 57:17; 58:1,
10; 61:4, 12; 64:1, 10;
66:20; 67:16; 70:10, 14,
20, 22; 71:10; 72:16;
73:12; 74:9, 18; 76:6; 79:1,
2; 81:18, 19; 87:7; 91:13;
94:11, 15; 98:14; 100:18;
113:1; 116:5; 119:13, 18,
18; 128:4, 15; 134:14;
135:19; 137:17; 143:22;
145:3, 16, 21
ones 12:21; 27:12
ongoing 18:22; 80:14;
90:7; 122:18
only 30:19; 104:3;
121:15; 143:13
onset 61:5
open 115:5
open-ended 115:9, 13
opening 44:2
operation 119:14
operation 16:16; 21:7;
38:21; 62:8; 69:10; 137:4
opinions 8:13, 14, 19, 21;
9:2; 16:20; 17:9, 12
opportunity 114:21;
130:5
opposed 48:8
opposite 129:2
oral 58:5; 100:3
order 52:9; 92:13;
130:19, 20, 21; 131:16
ordered 128:18; 129:12;
130:20; 131:5, 7
ordinarily 108:19
origin 71:16
original 9:11; 23:5;
14:14; 130:15
originally 11:9, 22
Oscar 4:17
Oski 137:20
Oski's 136:12; 137:13
others 56:14; 128:13
otherwise 89:18
out 28:20; 48:8; 50:18,
10; 51:5, 19; 52:9; 62:21;
13:3, 6, 17, 21; 75:19;
18:3, 16, 19; 82:3, 16;
13:9, 12, 17; 85:1, 10, 13;
16:8; 88:17; 93:16, 17, 18,
10; 94:3, 3, 8; 95:2, 10, 12,
8, 19; 96:22; 97:19, 22;
33:10, 15; 137:21;
40:18; 141:13; 142:3, 18
outcome 4:11

outpatient 100:1, 22
outside 140:9
over 30:22; 31:2; 33:13;
34:3, 6; 42:10, 11, 13;
43:8; 47:18; 48:6, 16; 49:9;
50:21; 51:12; 53:16;
60:16; 62:16; 64:9; 108:1;
114:3; 117:13; 122:4;
130:6; 131:3; 141:19
overall 89:18
overwhelming 16:9;
17:3; 18:3; 90:11
own 32:17; 35:9; 38:5;
111:10

P

p.m 43:14; 55:2; 60:3, 6;
102:7; 109:6, 13; 110:5, 9,
16, 22; 112:13, 14; 120:11;
146:6
package 10:15
packet 7:12; 8:2; 11:17;
12:1, 7
pad 21:22
page 24:22; 25:7; 37:18;
109:9
paged 13:2; 22:8; 90:12;
140:11
pages 22:3; 142:4
paid 22:16
pain 37:15; 51:15;
112:20; 123:19; 125:12
pale 68:18; 129:13, 21
paper 21:22; 117:9
parent 33:11, 12, 20;
34:5; 39:7; 42:15; 43:5;
44:10, 15; 59:6; 60:17;
54:3, 11; 76:6; 119:9;
122:5
parents 11:8; 30:20;
31:2, 10; 32:4; 35:11; 41:5;
13:1; 57:10; 59:3; 62:16;
59:7; 101:22; 135:4
part 71:17; 108:5, 20;
114:3; 116:11; 123:2;
142:5
particular 7:3, 22; 80:22
particularly 58:17
parties 4:10; 39:8
partner 25:2, 8; 125:8, 10
partners 57:18; 58:10;
19:2
party 124:18
passive 81:20
path 94:17
pathologically 17:21
pathology 14:22; 15:3, 4;
6:3; 17:4
patient 32:6; 39:5; 45:10;
9:21; 52:10; 53:3, 9, 21;
4:21; 55:9; 77:20; 94:10;
5:20; 115:7; 119:6, 8;
27:9, 11, 17; 130:11, 15
patient's 96:7

<p>patients 53:15; 129:21 Pearson 4:19; 12:11; 29:3, 9, 19, 21; 30:1, 22; 34:15; 35:13, 19; 36:11, 21; 39:15; 40:2; 41:4, 6, 12; 42:1, 2, 8; 43:15; 44:6; 45:4; 46:1, 12, 18; 48:4; 50:11, 18; 51:4, 19; 55:1; 56:3, 10; 57:13, 15; 58:7, 8, 11, 17; 60:2; 61:17; 62:11, 13; 64:14, 16; 65:1, 4, 10, 10, 19, 22; 66:7; 74:12; 93:15, 18; 114:19; 134:12; 135:3 Pearson's 31:1; 37:7; 38:6; 55:15; 64:19; 103:19; 112:12 pediatric 7:7; 10:13; 52:4; 92:17; 117:12, 22; 137:13 pediatrician 32:8; 50:5; 125:14 pediatrician's 32:18 Pediatrics 6:20; 7:6; 59:1; 138:18 pending 96:6 per 23:21; 70:10, 21 percent 82:13, 18; 86:12, 12; 88:10; 89:1, 9; 131:16; 133:1, 14; 134:5, 7; 136:11, 14; 137:6, 15, 15 percentage 93:2; 139:19 percentages 86:15 perception 29:6, 20; 30:5; 31:21; 32:5, 12, 13, 16; 34:19; 38:2, 5, 10; 40:5; 68:2; 102:11; 110:12, 14; 111:1, 14 perform 53:7, 17; 80:21; 130:19, 21, 22 performed 96:22; 128:18; 129:8 perhaps 47:3 period 54:21; 66:13; 103:2; 108:1; 117:13; 128:12; 140:4, 9, 10 peripheral 88:2; 139:20 persistent 108:4; 122:18 person 58:1 personal 44:9 perspective 114:16 pertaining 18:15 pertinent 54:15 phases 45:10 phone 11:6, 6, 11; 13:21; 29:18; 31:1, 3, 4; 33:13; 34:3, 6; 43:8, 15, 21; 48:16; 49:9; 50:21; 51:8, 12; 56:10, 14, 22; 57:9; 60:16; 62:16; 100:21; 102:7; 103:3; 109:6, 12; 110:4, 22; 112:12, 14; 116:20; 118:21; 119:5, 12, 15; 120:6; 121:1; 122:6; 125:9; 135:1; 145:16 Dhonic 144:8</p>	<p>photographs 14:5 phrased 6:2 phraseology 126:18 physical 48:7; 52:14; 54:2, 11, 20; 66:20; 78:21; 79:2; 80:22; 81:5; 83:3; 84:11, 18; 85:12; 88:17; 89:4; 96:1; 97:9, 15; 100:16; 108:14; 114:4; 119:4; 128:7; 130:10 physician 17:22; 32:9; 33:10, 14; 34:1, 7; 39:5; 44:10, 20; 45:16; 48:15; 49:17; 50:8; 54:5; 57:21; 58:13, 21; 60:14; 63:6; 66:22; 67:8, 14, 16; 76:8, 10; 79:6; 95:18; 97:4; 100:14; 104:2; 108:18; 115:7; 118:8; 124:11; 125:7; 128:16; 136:17 physician's 9:1; 60:22; 97:10; 118:15; 119:7 physicians 42:16, 21; 44:20; 62:15; 64:9; 67:8; 77:12; 86:5; 88:18; 89:5; 100:3; 114:12; 133:13; 138:18 pick 39:2, 9 picked 36:17 picking 124:2 picture 137:18 piece 72:4; 117:8 pieces 41:18 place 4:6; 10:18; 107:13; 130:16 Plaintiff 26:21, 22; 27:2; 28:10, 14 Plaintiff's 26:18; 27:7; 28:2 Plaintiffs 4:14; 5:6, 8, 12; 10:1, 3; 13:7, 22 plan 119:14, 22 plane 144:1 planned 24:20; 119:12, 13; 120:7 play 96:4 playing 5:17 please 4:11; 5:1, 9; 9; 11:3; 19:22 plus 128:20; 143:19 pneumonia 61:11 point 15:14, 15; 18:8; 19:13; 20:10; 21:13; 44:12, 14, 16; 61:18; 65:19; 76:16; 103:10, 11; 105:21; 106:1; 112:13; 122:3; 124:4, 17; 143:1; 144:15 poly 140:3 polymorphonuclear 87:16; 93:5; 135:22 polys 136:14, 15 pool 92:8 poor 45:12; 106:16 position 35:5; 141:21, 21; 143:9; 144:4</p>	<p>positions 7:4 positive 54:15; 99:10; 128:9, 10; 131:16; 133:22 possession 22:6 possibilities 44:7; 74:9, 19; 116:6 possibility 34:6; 44:1; 61:9; 75:8; 84:20; 85:13; 98:7; 113:17; 127:19 possible 33:19; 72:6; 84:5, 10; 88:21 possibly 37:20; 49:20; 77:5; 96:6; 113:14 potentially 104:4 practice 48:21; 57:13; 58:2; 64:10; 94:16; 117:13; 118:1; 133:13; 138:18 practiced 19:6; 21:7; 134:21 practicing 32:11; 125:14 precisely 101:12 predominance 93:4, 5 preliminary 60:17, 21; 61:4, 5 prepare 21:15 prescribed 57:6; 123:1 presence 88:21; 98:16, 17; 123:16 present 45:22; 48:17; 53:12, 13; 54:13; 60:18; 63:4; 77:14; 78:4; 93:7; 95:22; 97:6; 103:17; 134:4 presentation 29:3, 13; 58:18; 67:17; 94:10, 15; 96:8; 112:20; 113:13; 120:19; 127:1, 18; 137:5 presented 29:8; 50:15, 17; 63:15; 82:7 presents 45:11; 126:1 pressing 135:9 presumes 66:20 presumption 53:14 presumptive 99:16 Pretty 10:10 prevent 142:8 prior 9:14, 16; 37:16; 40:22; 41:3; 46:21; 82:15; 113:2, 5 privy 30:19 probable 72:6 probably 23:6; 24:4, 15; 26:1, 20; 27:3, 6, 10, 11, 19, 19; 28:1; 41:2, 5, 6; 51:16; 55:19; 66:12; 69:11; 78:7; 85:18; 123:14, 19; 126:19; 130:22; 131:15 problem 101:18; 119:8, 17 procedure 142:7 proceed 85:14; 94:16; 101:9 PROCEEDINGS 4:1; 24:12</p>	<p>process 44:3; 79:9; 80:14; 89:15; 90:11; 92:2; 94:8, 17, 19; 122:19; 124:1; 136:18 processes 104:5, 7 produce 91:17 produced 90:9; 91:12 professor 7:5 proffered 64:3 progress 53:15 progresses 61:15 progression 52:22; 67:17 proper 40:11; 69:3, 15; 134:20 protein 98:17 proven 99:12 provide 7:8 provided 56:6 prudent 52:19; 69:14 pulling 112:16; 113:6, 18; 116:2, 20 puncture 44:13, 16; 45:19; 54:16, 18; 55:10, 13; 77:16; 80:4; 83:16; 96:17; 98:9, 11, 12, 13, 19; 108:11, 20; 127:15; 128:2, 4, 15, 19; 129:6, 8; 130:3; 131:9; 132:7, 8; 133:5, 18, 18, 19 punctures 128:6; 130:18; 131:2, 5, 7; 134:7 purpose 5:17; 68:17 purposes 38:1; 141:19 pus 98:17 put 11:18; 18:1; 19:18, 22; 36:7; 44:11; 49:15, 20; 50:2; 78:5; 85:8; 88:8; 107:17; 114:15; 119:14; 142:14 putting 85:7; 89:4; 115:20; 116:17; 140:12</p>	<p>rapidly 41:13 rare 63:9; 74:5 rather 65:14; 92:19; 115:13; 140:3 ratio 27:2, 4, 14, 21; 131:8, 22; 132:1, 15; 133:21; 134:6; 140:1, 2, 3, 8 Ratzan 4:8, 13, 13; 5:9, 11; 8:11; 10:6; 11:14; 13:12; 14:3, 16; 16:6; 17:6; 18:5; 19:14, 19; 20:1, 20; 22:15; 25:16; 28:16; 29:1, 16; 30:17; 31:13, 19; 32:14; 33:3; 34:9; 35:16; 37:5; 38:14; 40:17; 41:22; 42:7; 44:4; 45:20; 46:8; 47:7, 16; 48:22; 50:4; 53:5; 54:4, 9; 55:11; 57:1, 12; 58:4; 59:7, 20; 60:12; 63:7; 64:7, 21; 66:1; 67:22; 68:15; 72:2; 75:5, 15; 76:12, 19; 77:9; 78:14; 82:17; 83:2, 5; 84:9, 16; 86:7; 90:14, 20; 94:20; 95:8; 96:9, 18; 97:17; 98:10; 99:4; 100:4; 101:14; 102:18; 104:6; 105:3, 13; 107:7; 108:7, 21; 109:4; 110:1, 10, 19; 111:12; 112:2; 113:4, 15; 114:17; 115:18; 116:13; 117:10, 20; 118:13, 18; 119:20; 120:9; 121:9, 18; 122:10, 20; 123:10; 124:5, 14; 125:15; 126:12; 127:21; 129:7; 130:4, 17; 131:19; 133:16; 134:9; 136:21; 137:19; 139:3, 13; 140:15, 19; 141:20; 143:6, 14; 144:3, 7, 22; 145:9, 20 re-evaluated 104:17 reach 23:7; 25:8 reaching 71:20; 94:21; 127:5 read 8:3, 15, 22; 9:21; 21:6; 22:18; 34:12, 16; 56:3; 70:6; 100:12; 102:15; 116:11 reading 23:3; 35:7; 85:5; 146:2 reads 89:17 ready 142:11 real 134:20 reality 31:6, 11 really 9:20; 27:16; 32:10; 48:14; 54:19; 94:5; 95:16; 98:6; 111:8, 9; 115:5; 118:11; 134:15; 145:8 reason 7:22; 90:5, 6; 108:14; 134:11; 136:4; 138:7 reasonable 69:14, 18; 78:2; 84:2; 109:14; 132:11 reasonably 66:13 reasons 57:5; 66:15; 67:20 recall 9:1, 2; 36:16;</p>
---	--	--	--	---

37:21, 22; 40:2; 41:18; 56:1; 68:9, 13; 74:21; 75:6 13, 16; 85:5; 111:19 recalls 31:2; 37:10, 10 receive 11:20; 12:2; 56:14; 102:2, 4 received 10:8, 12, 13, 14 11:4; 12:7, 8, 15, 20; 21:14; 23:8, 12, 12; 62:2, 2, 6; 100:7, 11; 110:4; 116:19 receiving 57:16 recent 7:10, 20; 72:14 recess 13:5 recollect 112:10 recollection 30:21; 31:1; 36:21; 37:6; 38:11; 103:3; 111:10; 112:7; 121:13, 14, 17 recollections 31:10, 11 recollects 39:16; 121:1 recommend 66:7 reconstruction 35:5 record 5:1, 13; 13:4, 11, 13; 22:11, 12, 14; 24:1; 25:12, 13, 15; 28:17; 40:21; 57:7; 79:4; 90:16, 17, 19; 100:12; 104:21, 22; 111:8; 134:19, 20; 140:20, 22; 142:15 recorded 40:22; 114:20; 117:8 recording 4:5 records 10:12, 15; 12:20; 18:21, 22; 19:17, 18; 20:11, 18; 21:1, 6, 9; 22:19; 23:5, 22 recruited 92:9 red 11:15; 70:4, 15 redo 144:6 reevaluate 52:20; 53:6 reevaluating 53:20 refer 44:17 reference 120:5 referred 55:9 referring 38:16; 70:9 reflects 35:1 refresh 55:19 refuse 81:22 regard 72:19; 76:6 regarding 12:17; 14:18; 22:6; 38:7; 101:17; 116:2, 20; 118:22; 121:20; 128:1 regardless 21:13 regimen 99:22 related 4:10 release 91:14 released 92:7 relevant 15:22; 16:20; 17:1, 2, 11; 18:3 reliable 32:18; 33:10; 38:7; 39:3 rely 8:9; 89:5; 122:5 remember 24:15; 55:17;	75:4; 122:14 remembers 51:11; 104:12; 121:15 remove 77:14, 16 rendered 15:2; 64:16; 65:3 rendition 64:19 repeat 110:21 repetitive 119:5 rephrase 6:3; 89:14; 116:14 replace 106:21 report 17:4; 21:16; 118:1 reported 29:22; 39:16; 49:9; 62:7; 65:2; 88:6; 111:3 reporter 5:1; 10:4; 13:8; 14:1 reporting 56:15; 68:2 represent 5:12 represents 10:15; 117:18 repress 91:14 request 20:17 require 62:4; 95:18; 96:2, 5; 106:10; 107:1; 109:1 required 99:7, 17; 100:15 requirement 105:6; 114:2, 5, 14 requires 57:21; 97:13 Reservoir 4:6 reset 143:3 residents 51:22; 52:7; 56:13, 22; 83:6; 127:22 resistance 81:20 respect 8:19; 20:17; 9:10; 126:5; 127:5; 36:14; 142:16, 16 respectfully 46:9 responded 105:6, 11; 25:20 responding 80:15; 3:20; 107:9 response 90:10; 92:12; 37:18; 138:3 responsibility 34:2; 42:3; 108:5 responsive 89:21 rest 108:13; 114:11; 30:1 results 98:19 esuscitation 10:16 ztrospect 69:19; 123:9; 38:3 ztrospective 69:9; 5:15; 136:4 ztrospectively 77:8 weals 131:9 view 12:12; 19:4; 2:22; 23:21; 24:1; 27:8, 3; 51:10; 66:21 viewed 7:14, 17; 14:4; 19:17, 17; 20:10, 18; 23:13; 56:7	reviewing 22:17 Right 16:14; 17:10; 20:21; 21:3, 20; 27:13; 28:7; 34:14; 37:21; 38:20; 39:19; 45:2; 52:6; 59:14, 16; 64:20; 66:5, 16; 69:20; 70:3; 73:18; 78:21; 82:20; 83:6; 85:4; 86:14; 87:12; 88:9, 19, 20; 91:8; 95:9; 101:19; 102:9; 109:8; 112:3, 16; 113:6, 18; 116:2, 15, 20; 120:21; 123:3, 22; 127:3; 134:5; 135:9; 142:10 right-hand 109:8 rigidity 76:15; 82:3, 8, 12 83:8; 129:11 risen 132:10 rises 97:12; 119:15 risk 132:9, 21; 133:1, 18; 134:3, 6; 138:16, 20; 140:5 Road 4:6 Robbin 4:14; 12:9, 9 role 101:10 room 28:20; 41:1; 44:17; 101:8; 104:18; 105:12 Ropollo 28:15 rose 98:5, 6 rule 48:7; 50:18; 51:5, 19; 52:9; 57:21; 62:21; 63:5, 17, 21; 75:19; 78:16, 19; 82:3, 16; 83:9, 12; 86:8; 88:17; 93:16, 17, 18, 20; 94:3, 3; 95:12, 18, 19; 96:11, 16, 22; 97:21 ruled 50:20; 78:3; 83:17; 85:1, 10; 94:8 rules 63:2 ruling 85:13; 95:2, 10; 133:15 Russell 4:15; 10:14; 18:15; 21:12; 29:3, 7; 35:10, 22; 36:17; 41:9; 44:7; 45:22; 55:2; 58:10, 12; 59:9; 62:20; 66:2, 19; 58:18; 72:21; 74:9, 11, 18; 76:20; 82:7; 83:8; 84:4, 20; 85:2, 16, 20; 86:4; 88:6; 91:1; 96:20; 99:5, 17; 100:6; 103:5; 109:20; 11:2, 18; 118:2; 120:8; 28:19 Russell's 10:17; 29:21; 17:20; 57:17; 68:3, 10; 66:16; 111:15; 112:8	134:2 sat 24:16; 135:14 satisfying 125:10 saw 35:22; 87:1, 7; 114:6 saying 17:2; 65:8, 10; 77:19; 121:1 scenario 48:15 scheduled 141:10; 142:1 scientific 138:13 scope 69:9; 85:15; 136:4 score 80:17 screaming 41:12; 59:17, 22; 63:13 searching 80:22 second 23:8, 13, 15, 18; 28:17; 36:4; 51:8; 53:7, 8; 79:16; 85:7; 106:20; 115:20; 128:6 seeing 91:20 sees 71:10 segmented 87:14, 15, 19; 93:6, 6 segs 87:4, 10; 92:18, 18 seizure 33:22; 36:1, 3, 14; 37:2; 113:13, 14, 19; 115:17 seizures 34:7; 35:10, 12; 36:9; 38:19; 48:8, 18 self-limiting 72:17 semantic 95:17 semantics 96:11 send 92:10; 105:16 sends 98:15 sense 16:2; 64:10; 65:12; 78:11; 117:18 sensitive 88:13 sensitivity 89:9 sent 7:17; 20:22; 22:18; 23:4; 105:11 separate 11:21; 41:4; 79:6 sepsis 15:16, 19; 16:10; 17:3; 18:3; 73:4; 124:4, 7, 13; 135:8; 137:18; 140:6 September 9:13; 10:8; 24:13 septic 128:5 septic-appearing 06:13, 14 series 78:21; 79:2 serious 79:20; 104:4, 4; 32:19 seven 119:11 several 50:21; 142:3 shake 48:9 shaking 33:22; 34:13; 5:22; 36:9, 13; 37:2; 49:6, 5, 22; 50:6; 59:15; 63:16 shed 78:12 shift 87:22; 88:1; 91:18, 0; 92:5, 6, 15, 19; 93:1, 3, 9, 12; 135:19; 136:1; 37:17; 138:20 hivering 33:22; 35:22;	37:20; 48:20; 114:4, 15; 115:6 short 10:18; 53:2, 16; 66:13; 91:10; 104:15 show 16:3 showed 55:14 showing 49:4 shows 130:1 sib 70:9, 13, 18 sibling 70:22; 73:1, 2; 102:1 sibling's 72:19 siblings 72:10, 13 sic 75:7 sick 32:10; 42:17; 44:22; 45:1; 51:1; 52:16; 62:4; 79:18; 80:19, 19; 100:2; 106:15; 127:11, 12, 14; 128:5; 132:2, 5 sick-looking 128:15 side 26:18, 19; 39:14 sign 49:7, 8; 79:13; 113:8, 10; 128:9, 10 signature 146:3 significance 8:5, 8, 9, 12, 18; 113:6 significant 71:3; 76:3, 6; 108:4, 16; 117:14, 17; 118:3, 7 signing 114:13 signs 29:7, 21; 33:13; 41:9, 14; 45:8, 11, 22; 46:15; 49:4, 11; 53:16; 54:12; 56:15; 57:9; 58:11; 50:3; 62:19; 65:2; 67:10; 58:3, 10; 81:15; 83:21; 112:15; 127:1, 6; 128:10 similar 35:13 single 63:21; 96:11; 97:21; 117:7 sister 71:20; 100:20 sister's 101:16, 17, 18 sit 8:22; 16:16; 55:17; 58:8; 128:13; 134:10 site 81:1 situation 104:9 six 23:6; 119:17 kill 64:9 killed 62:15 kin 81:8 lept 68:21 lides 14:5 light 136:15 mear 88:3 oldiers 92:11 omebody 99:9 omeone 24:5; 110:15 omeone's 110:14 omething 39:11; 42:18; 8:17; 60:16; 61:6; 62:15; 0:4; 77:13; 80:17; 97:5; 04:14; 111:16; 112:21; 18:10, 14, 17; 133:14; 36:16; 144:19
---	---	--	--	---

S

sac 98:15

salient 62:10; 100:19

salvageable 21:12

same 27:15, 21; 32:2;

5:3; 38:12; 40:16; 46:5;

47:2; 51:21; 60:1; 70:9, 21;

71:12; 74:11; 107:3, 10,

12; 119:2; 126:7; 129:9;

sometime 24:13; 110:5
Sometimes 72:9, 15;
 81:19
somewhat 30:14
somewhere 35:21
sore 43:10
sorry 13:2; 28:21; 41:21;
 58:8; 70:14; 72:3; 73:18;
 75:2; 86:13; 104:11, 19;
 145:5, 19
sort 15:14; 51:10; 62:5;
 71:10; 92:11; 95:16
sorts 43:12; 103:21
sound 60:9
sounds 42:9
speak 14:17; 128:8
speaking 84:2; 142:6
speaks 17:4; 127:18
specific 51:4; 55:18; 81:9
specifically 73:21; 125:3
specifics 78:18
spectacularly 63:5
speed 47:4
spell 137:20
spend 76:10
spends 128:16
spent 22:17; 35:8; 142:4
spinal 98:14, 15
spoke 9:19; 12:17
spoken 112:4, 5
spontaneously 48:19;
 72:21; 73:3, 5
stages 92:2
stand 36:1
standard 19:6; 21:8;
 42:19; 83:14; 99:20;
 100:12; 101:1, 11, 11;
 105:8, 19; 107:1; 108:22;
 131:7; 134:13, 16, 21;
 135:2, 10; 136:13; 137:22
standing 35:22; 36:3, 13
standpoint 44:18
stapled 10:15; 11:1
starry-eyed 103:8, 22;
 121:21
start 14:13; 99:22; 142:1;
 145:17
started 142:2; 145:8, 14
starting 112:12
state 4:12; 5:13; 30:4
stated 33:16, 17; 44:19;
 46:12; 75:12
statement 30:8; 33:12;
 79:16; 107:9; 110:18;
 111:8, 14, 17
statements 35:11, 17
states 28:11; 35:18;
 47:19; 120:20
step 125:11
Steven 4:16, 20
stiff 76:16; 128:9
still 11:21; 25:3, 9; 48:17;
 55:7; 61:14; 80:1; 82:12,

15; 84:20; 103:7; 115:12;
 117:4; 119:8; 140:19, 21;
 142:22; 143:19
stool 123:16
stop 36:9, 9; 48:20
stopped 48:18
story 59:3; 114:3
strange 33:21
strep 61:7; 95:22; 96:3;
 140:5
stretch 81:21
stricken 144:21
strike 49:6; 64:14; 73:15;
 74:7; 88:4; 100:5; 114:18;
 116:4; 142:8; 145:1
strikes 136:17
strong 63:22
Stuart 4:8, 13; 5:11;
 19:18; 140:13
study 71:15; 87:2; 94:12;
 131:15; 138:6
subsequent 69:8
substitute 60:20
suffering 139:5
sugar 98:17
suggest 25:1; 76:1;
 136:1
suggested 16:18; 74:22;
 75:8
suggests 40:21
summary 7:20; 46:10
superinfection 61:6
supple 81:11, 13
supportive 111:8
suppose 142:20
supposed 42:10, 12;
 145:17
suppress 90:9; 91:14
Sure 6:17; 7:9; 9:10, 17;
 10:22; 11:8; 17:22; 18:10;
 22:18; 59:19; 60:14; 81:5;
 85:3; 90:14; 110:22;
 111:5; 123:13; 124:2;
 129:20, 20; 136:22;
 137:14; 141:3; 145:12
survivability 19:8
suspect 49:12; 52:10;
 96:19; 97:4
suspected 44:6; 50:12;
 55:1; 74:8, 18; 97:19; 98:4;
 103:11; 112:17; 113:20;
 115:2; 116:5, 21
suspecting 97:5
suspects 54:5
suspicion 76:2; 94:22;
 95:11; 97:11; 118:15
swear 5:1
sworn 5:6
symptom 49:7, 8
symptoms 29:7, 22;
 33:13; 41:9, 14; 45:9, 12,
 22; 46:16; 49:4, 11, 21;
 50:15; 53:16; 56:15; 57:9;
 58:12; 60:3; 62:19; 65:2;

66:18; 67:10; 68:3, 10;
 82:2; 112:15; 1182;
 1261; 129:9
syndrome 15:7, 12, 21;
 16:5, 13; 17:20; 18:2;
 60:22; 79:8; 114:10;
 122:7; 125:8
system 79:14
systems 51:10; 66:21

T

talk 14:20; 15:1; 18:10;
 44:21; 48:5; 62:9; 106:20
talked 12:21; 31:2; 55:6;
 86:11; 91:18; 93:15, 16;
 113:17; 125:22; 127:13;
 135:19
talking 29:13; 35:19;
 61:20; 73:20; 77:6; 90:21;
 104:13; 108:16; 120:2;
 121:15; 141:7; 143:18, 18,
 19
tape 105:2
teach 51:22; 52:4, 8, 13,
 15, 17; 53:2, 17, 20; 56:13,
 22; 83:6, 7, 10; 127:22
teaching 52:7
telephone 41:11; 48:6;
 50:7; 56:4; 64:8; 141:2, 17
telling 125:17; 141:11;
 143:9
temperature 37:12, 12,
 17; 39:18, 20; 40:3, 20, 21;
 41:7; 42:2, 22; 48:19;
 51:18; 120:18; 129:22
ten 23:3, 11; 27:20;
 140:11
tepid 37:18
term 20:15; 53:2, 16;
 93:20; 94:2, 5, 7; 104:15;
 127:1
terminology 33:9
terms 33:2, 3; 92:4
test 83:8; 88:13; 89:8;
 96:3, 11, 16; 97:21; 98:14,
 16
testified 5:7; 25:17, 21;
 26:4; 27:17, 21; 41:8;
 58:17
testify 24:6, 10, 17; 27:9,
 10, 12; 28:2; 144:10
estifying 26:18; 36:16;
 142:9
estimony 12:18; 35:1, 6;
 16:21; 103:1; 120:4
esting 76:15; 97:13
ests 78:6, 8; 85:14;
 95:12; 96:21; 97:14
textbook 137:13
thanks 28:21
hemselves 53:21
herapy 21:13; 99:3;
 02:2, 5; 126:10
hereabouts 12:4

therefore 61:2; 141:16
thereof 4:11; 43:3
Thereupon 5:3; 13:5;
 22:12; 25:13; 90:17;
 104:22; 146:2
they're 11:21; 28:8; 32:6;
 39:7; 47:22; 54:13; 87:11;
 89:1; 91:15; 104:7
third 43:15, 21; 82:13;
 128:11
thorough 107:18
though 18:6; 21:18;
 25:10; 46:16
thought 11:4; 21:5;
 94:12; 115:11
three 22:22; 26:1, 14, 15,
 16; 29:18; 31:3; 41:11, 11;
 47:21; 48:2; 61:9; 125:13;
 140:17; 141:5
throat 43:10; 61:7; 67:4,
 19; 81:6; 95:22; 96:3
thrown 103:8
tickets 143:20
times 25:20; 26:1, 5, 6, 8,
 8, 12, 14, 15, 16; 27:17,
 20; 70:21; 118:1; 119:17;
 142:1
tip 86:6
tissue 61:10
titles 7:3
today 6:13; 7:1; 8:1, 13;
 16:16; 23:6; 142:17;
 143:2, 5; 144:11
Today's 4:4
together 10:8; 11:1, 18;
 26:10; 89:4
told 11:21; 15:11; 20:15;
 21:1; 38:21; 46:6; 65:1, 9;
 140:22
tomorrow 141:10
tone 36:3
tonight 140:17; 141:14,
 16
took 8:2; 21:18; 37:12
tops 22:2; 142:21
total 138:19; 140:2, 2
toxic 42:17; 52:16;
 106:16; 128:5; 132:2
toxicity 62:12; 128:17
toxins 90:8; 91:12
traditionally 127:12
traffic 143:18
train 11:4
training 32:15; 38:4;
 131:6
transcript 10:5; 13:9;
 14:2
transfer 57:15; 71:15
translation 70:7
transmissible 71:6
transmission 71:11
traumatic 106:3
reat 99:7
reated 99:3; 102:2

treating 72:12
treatment 123:5
trembling 36:17; 41:13;
 48:5
trial 24:3, 6, 11, 17, 19;
 27:18; 28:3, 5, 10, 12;
 142:9; 144:10
tried 21:18; 126:15
trip 24:20
trivial 67:5; 79:9; 136:16
trouble 127:12
True 59:11; 69:1; 73:11;
 80:8; 84:22; 85:11; 87:15;
 105:5; 112:10
truly 60:14, 18
truth 88:16
try 6:3; 19:2; 20:2; 33:15;
 34:2
trying 35:9; 42:15; 43:7;
 76:10; 95:7; 97:19; 115:5;
 144:17
turn 88:18, 22
turns 137:21
two 9:6; 12:16; 19:7;
 21:10; 26:8, 12, 13; 27:1;
 35:11; 38:17; 49:17; 51:1;
 52:20; 61:5; 67:20; 70:10,
 22; 87:16; 105:2; 108:4;
 136:12; 137:22
two-minute 90:12
two-part 12:9
Tylenol 37:14; 41:16;
 58:22; 103:9
Type 73:8, 20; 74:1, 2;
 87:19; 126:17
types 135:21
typical 48:15; 99:20
typically 67:3; 87:4;
 112:21

U

ulcer 123:15
unclear 60:9
unconvinced 52:17
under 52:20; 114:22;
 116:3; 138:5
underlining 11:15
understood 6:7, 9; 83:2,
 4
unfair 141:5
unfortunately 54:12;
 36:4
unhappy 61:2; 65:15
University 6:19
unknown 119:8
unless 47:8; 124:10;
 142:9
untrue 73:14
unusual 58:18, 20;
 13:13
unwilling 141:2
up 20:19; 28:22; 36:3, 17;

47:4; 53:7; 60:17; 72:5, 19;
95:16, 20; 96:10; 103:8;
108:2; 112:3, 13, 16;
113:6, 18; 116:2; 119:18;
122:9; 124:2; 132:22
up-to-date 7:9
updated 7:11
upon 8:9; 40:10; 129:11;
135:9
use 20:15; 37:14; 72:1, 3;
92:16, 16, 17, 21; 94:3;
95:19; 98:3; 101:2; 126:13
used 33:10; 34:12, 16;
71:14; 92:17; 100:3;
127:2; 138:22; 139:4;
140:4
uses 62:14
using 78:11; 87:16; 88:4;
93:19; 110:12
usually 25:5; 86:21;
92:14; 130:8

V

vague 30:6, 12, 15;
67:12; 77:3, 5; 95:4, 14;
97:7; 126:8
variable 100:19
variables 54:19; 79:5;
80:16
variety 15:19; 16:9; 87:13
various 19:9; 55:6;
91:12; 104:8
version 10:18
versus 4:4; 26:18; 32:8;
79:7; 86:16; 133:19;
139:20
vested 32:7
VIDEOGRAPHER 4:2,
22; 13:3, 10; 22:10, 13;
25:11, 14; 90:15, 18;
104:20; 105:1
videotaped 4:3, 7; 5:16
view 21:11; 53:21; 91:10;
104:12; 130:5
viral 43:22; 60:22; 67:18;
70:13, 20, 22; 71:6, 8, 19;
72:6, 22; 73:1; 79:8; 92:1;
107:21; 114:9; 122:7, 19;
125:8; 132:3, 6, 19; 136:19
viremia 69:2, 5; 71:20;
99:15; 101:15; 132:4
virus 71:16; 73:16, 17;
101:17
visit 61:18; 99:13; 100:7;
101:1; 125:18
visits 100:22
vomiting 37:16; 41:13;
43:11; 45:12; 47:21;
51:16; 59:13; 61:1; 63:16;
65:18; 74:14; 121:21
vomitus 123:17

W

Wagner 4:4, 14, 15;
10:14; 12:9, 10; 18:15;
21:12; 29:18, 20; 34:11;
35:1; 36:16; 41:9; 44:8;
45:22; 47:19; 51:7, 12, 15,
16; 55:2; 57:16; 59:9; 62:3
7, 9, 20; 66:2, 19; 74:9, 18,
21; 75:6; 76:1; 84:4, 20;
85:2, 16, 20; 88:6; 91:1;
96:20; 99:5, 18; 120:22
Wagner's 29:3; 35:6;
38:6; 72:22; 82:7; 83:9;
104:11; 109:20; 128:20
Wait 19:16, 16; 42:19
waiting 14:12; 145:6, 15
waived 146:3
wake 108:1
warrant 93:22; 95:1;
127:15, 19
Washington 4:6; 143:18
watch 134:22
watching 101:8
Waterhouse-
Friderichsen 16:19;
17:8; 18:7
Waterhouse-
Friderichsen's 15:6, 12,
21; 16:4, 12; 17:20; 18:2
way 6:2, 3; 16:11; 30:3;
35:9; 39:21; 40:11, 12;
47:3; 48:21; 50:16; 57:22;
71:1; 74:21; 78:5; 79:1;
99:9; 105:7; 115:20;
117:4; 132:18; 133:15;
134:13; 137:12; 138:12,
13; 142:12
Nays 80:18
Neek 23:3; 70:14, 20;
71:1
weekend 8:16
weigh 33:11
weight 71:12, 12
Neinstein 28:8
velfare 32:7
vell-known 132:12
veren't 65:9
vhat's 22:2; 33:16, 17;
49:6; 70:11, 16, 16; 76:15;
77:12; 139:22
whereby 98:14
Yhereupon 146:5
wherever 19:1
white 69:16, 20; 85:19;
6:2, 5, 8; 88:4, 5, 11, 20;
9:2, 17, 18; 90:6, 22;
1:2, 6, 15, 19; 92:8, 10;
14:9; 125:8; 129:11;
35:18; 138:19, 22; 139:7,
16, 21; 140:2
rho's 61:1
hrole 107:22
ihose 34:15; 39:5, 7;
0:5; 59:3, 12; 129:9

Wientzen 4:3; 5:4, 14, 15
14:4; 25:17; 29:2; 45:21
wife 121:2
within 19:6; 21:7; 66:13;
100:11; 101:1, 11; 105:19;
134:21; 135:10
without 97:5; 99:10;
101:8; 135:20
witness 5:2, 5; 14:15;
16:2, 22; 17:16; 20:13;
29:14; 31:9; 32:3; 33:8;
35:4; 42:6; 43:20; 45:8;
46:6; 48:13; 49:14; 52:13;
55:5; 56:21; 57:4, 20;
58:16; 59:19; 63:2, 20;
64:18; 65:7; 67:13; 68:8;
71:22; 75:4, 12; 76:5;
78:10; 82:10; 83:3; 84:8;
86:2; 90:4; 94:7; 95:6, 15;
96:15; 97:8; 98:3; 99:1, 20;
101:7; 102:15; 103:16;
105:10; 107:4, 16; 108:13;
109:3; 110:8; 111:7;
112:19; 113:12, 22; 115:4;
116:10; 117:3, 17; 118:6;
119:3; 120:5, 13; 121:13;
122:2, 14; 123:9; 124:10,
21; 126:9; 127:8; 129:1,
18; 130:14; 131:13; 133:9;
134:3; 136:10; 137:11;
138:11; 142:8; 144:9;
145:3, 11, 15; 146:2
word 30:5; 34:12; 71:14,
22; 72:3; 75:14; 76:1;
77:11; 78:11; 94:3; 95:18,
19; 98:4; 101:2; 110:12;
126:14
words 15:20; 18:6; 34:17;
42:15; 46:17; 106:21, 22;
108:18; 110:13
work 23:16, 19
worked 22:20
worried 33:22
worrisome 119:9
vorse 53:13, 14
vrapped 95:16; 96:10
vrites 68:12; 81:9
vriting 95:20
written 13:15; 21:15;
42:2; 56:10; 57:9, 15; 58:3;
70:4; 81:4; 84:19; 99:15;
09:7; 120:14
wrong 69:19

X

:-ray 67:6

Y

'ale 80:17
ear 6:22; 26:1, 6, 8, 12,
4, 16; 27:8, 11; 130:19,
9; 131:2
ears 26:2, 3, 9, 13, 20;
7:1; 64:10, 12; 131:3, 4

yield 132:11
young 44:10; 66:11

Lawyer's Notes

1