

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
GENERAL JURISDICTION DIVISION
CASE NO. 94-08273 CA (22)

HOWARD A. ENGLE, M D. ,
et al. ,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

R. J. REYNOLDS TOBACCO
COMPANY, et al. ,

Defendants.

_____ /

Miami-Dade County Courthouse
Miami, Florida
1:40 p.m
December 21, 1998

TRIAL - VOLUME 166

The above-styled cause came on for trial
before the Honorable Robert Paul Kaye, Circuit Judge,
pursuant to notice.

APPEARANCES:

STANLEY M ROSENBLATT, ESQ.

SUSAN ROSENBLATT, ESQ.

On behalf of Plaintiffs

DECHERT PRICE & RHOADS

ROBERT C. HEIM, ESQ.

SEAN P. WAJERT, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendant Philip Morris

COLL DAVIDSON CARTER SMITH SALTER & BARKETT

NORMAN A. COLL, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendant Philip Morris

ZACK KOSNITZKY

STEPHEN N. ZACK, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendant Philip Morris

CARLTON FIELDS WARD EMMANUEL SMITH & CUTLER

R. BENJAMINE REID, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendant R. J. Reynolds

JONES, DAY, REAVIS & POGUE

RICHARD M KIRBY, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendant R. J. Reynolds

KING & SPALDING

MICHAEL RUSS, ESQ.

RICHARD A. SCHNEIDER, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendant Brown & Williamson

CLARKE SILVERGLATE WILLIAMS & MONTGOMERY

KELLY ANNE LUTHER, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendants Liggett Group

and Brooke Group

SHOOK HARDY & BACON

EDWARD A. MOSS, ESQ.

WILLIAM P. GERAGHTY, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendant Brown & Williamson

JAMES T. NEWSOM, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendant Lorillard

DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON

ANNE COHEN, ESQ.

JOSEPH R. MOODHE, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendant The Council for Tobacco Research

(APPEARANCES - Continued)

GREENBERG TRAUIG HOFFMAN LIPOFF ROSEN & QUENTEL

DAVID L. ROSS, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendant Lorillard

MARTINEZ & GUTIERREZ

JOSE MARTINEZ, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendant Dosal Tobacco Corp.

and Tobacco Institute

KASOWITZ BENSON TORRES & FRIEDMAN

AARON MARKS, ESQ.

NANCY STRAUB, ESQ.

On behalf of Defendants Liggett Group

and Brooke Group

I N D E X

WITNESS	PAGE
PAUL C. MELE, Ph. D.	
Cross by Mr. Heim	18279
Redirect by Mr. Rosenblatt	18336

E X H I B I T S

PLAINTIFFS'	OFFERED	ADMITTED	FOR ID
EXHIBITS	PAGE	PAGE	PAGE
410			18275

E X H I B I T S

DEFENDANTS'	OFFERED	ADMITTED	FOR ID
EXHIBITS	PAGE	PAGE	PAGE
36684			18294

1 (Whereupon, the following proceedings were had:)

2 THE COURT: Okay. Ready?

3 MR. HEIM Just a couple of things, Your
4 Honor, before we start, one of which has no real
5 relevance to Dr. Mele, and the other, we probably ought
6 to ask him to step outside for a minute.

7 THE COURT: If you would, Doctor, just one
8 second or a couple of seconds.

9 MR. HEIM The first thing, Your Honor, as I
10 mentioned to Mr. Rosenblatt, that I inadvertently -- I
11 didn't recognize one of the documents that got used
12 just ever so quickly this morning as a privilege
13 document.

14 I had correspondence with Mr. Rosenblatt that
15 we weren't going to use privileged documents, so I'm
16 sure he didn't do it on purpose, and I didn't miss it
17 on purpose.

18 THE COURT: Which one was it?

19 MR. HEIM It was 410. So I would just ask
20 that we put off admissibility as to that document until
21 we do the other privileged documents. It was 410. I
22 don't think it was actually offered into evidence yet,
23 but I may have said at some point along the line I
24 didn't have an objection to it.

25 THE COURT: Yes, you did.

1 MR. HEIM But I didn't have it in front of
2 me was my problem. And it is on our privilege log, and
3 we have a privilege objection to it.

4 I don't think there's a problem on the
5 plaintiffs' side with just holding that one off.

6 MR. ROSENBLATT: No, there isn't.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 Miss Clerk?

9 THE CLERK: Yes, sir.

10 THE COURT: 410 has been admitted, but leave
11 it over for I. D.

12 THE CLERK: It will be for I. D.

13 THE COURT: For I. D.

14 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 410 was marked for
15 identification.)

16 MR. HEIM Then, Your Honor, the other
17 subject is, over the lunch hour, I went back to the --
18 I went back to the transcript from last Tuesday to try
19 to figure out what had been said and what hadn't been
20 said on the subject of the Shook Hardy lawyers and
21 legal liability, because -- and what I found was that
22 there had actually been a fair amount of testimony
23 about this, both to the jury and on voir dire. I
24 didn't remember that there was so much discussion about
25 it in the testimony on Tuesday.

1 But there was testimony -- there was one line
2 of testimony where Dr. Mele said that -- that legal
3 considerations were the reason that the lab was being
4 closed, and that was followed immediately after by a
5 line of questions about the Shook Hardy lawyers'
6 presence. And it was at that point that we went into
7 voir dire about the Shook Hardy lawyers.

8 THE COURT: Do you have the reference there?

9 MR. HEIM Yes, sir. Pages 17754 and Pages
10 17755.

11 THE COURT: What is the text of that so I can
12 see it? Just read it into the record.

13 MR. HEIM Sure. On 17754, the question is:
14 Okay. When Charles answered your question and told you
15 that the laboratory was being closed, that this was a
16 business decision, did you understand what he meant?

17 The witness said: No. Well, I got no
18 further explanation, although it had been clear in
19 discussions with Jim Charles directly and Dr. Osdene
20 and Dr. DeNoble for several months before that, that
21 there was great concern that the work we were doing was
22 causing -- then I said objection, and then he
23 answered -- a legal liability.

24 And then Your Honor said: Just leave it at
25 that.

1 And then the next question was: Now, you
2 referred to this six or nine-month period before April
3 of '84 when you got some indication the lab might be
4 closed. In terms of specific events or anyone coming
5 to the lab during that time frame, the next -- the six
6 or nine months before, what happened?

7 And the answer was: We had several visitors.
8 In and around '83, we had a series of outside attorneys
9 come from the firm of Shook, Hardy and Bacon in Kansas
10 City. We were told that those are attorneys.

11 Then there's an objection.

12 Then we go into a sidebar, and then we go
13 into a voir dire examination on the whole Shook Hardy.

14 THE COURT: That's where the Cipollone issue
15 came up.

16 MR. HEIM Yes. Yes, Your Honor.

17 So my position is, based on those two
18 questions being asked back to back, I need to be able
19 to at least ask this witness whether or not they
20 weren't there for the defense of lawsuits in terms of
21 looking at documents, without mentioning Cipollone or
22 any particular --

23 THE COURT: How would he know?

24 MR. HEIM Pardon?

25 THE COURT: How would he know?

1 MR. HEIM Well, he says on voir dire that
2 he -- that there was --

3 THE COURT: They were there because of the
4 pending litigation?

5 MR. HEIM Right.

6 THE COURT: Specifically the Cipollone case.

7 MR. HEIM Well, he doesn't say -- in the
8 first voir dire answer, he doesn't say Cipollone. He
9 just says: To defend litigation.

10 And what I'm saying is, I need to be able to
11 ask him, because if I don't, the jury will be left with
12 an impression that they were there to close it down
13 when --

14 THE COURT: Yes. That's why I --

15 MR. HEIM -- that's not the case.

16 THE COURT: -- I asked you, do you really
17 want the objection sustained.

18 MR. HEIM No, I don't. I didn't remember
19 what the examination had been last week, and that's why
20 I went back to look at it.

21 THE COURT: I said it four times. You really
22 want that? You said, yeah. I said okay.

23 MR. HEIM If I did, I misspoke.

24 Whether it's cumulative or not, I think I
25 should be entitled to ask him those questions.

1 THE COURT: He already said they were there
2 for pending litigation of some sort.

3 MR. HEIM Right. Without asking him any
4 question about the pending litigation --

5 THE COURT: Right.

6 MR. HEIM -- I'm just going to ask him one
7 or two questions.

8 THE COURT: You can ask him, you know, why
9 they were there, in the sense of whether they were
10 there to gather documents or whatever. He may or may
11 not know.

12 MR. HEIM Right.

13 THE COURT: Okay. As long as it's already
14 done and in the record. Okay.

15 Let's bring them out.

16 THE BAILIFF: Bringing in the jury.

17 (The jury entered the courtroom)

18 THE COURT: Okay. Do we need the witness?

19 (The witness entered the courtroom)

20 THE COURT: All right. I believe we were
21 going to start with cross examination.

22 MR. HEIM Yes, sir.

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. HEIM

25 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Mele.

1 Doctor, my name is Bob Heim I represent
2 Philip Morris, and I'm going to try to bring us back a
3 little bit to some of your testimony, I think it was
4 last Tuesday, and I'm going to be asking you questions
5 principally about what you did while you were at Philip
6 Morris and the results of your research while you were
7 there. Okay?

8 A. Okay.

9 Q. Now, you worked in the -- I think we all
10 remember, you worked in the behavioral pharmacology
11 laboratory at the R&D center in Richmond; right?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. And R&D is research and development center?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Okay. And as I recall what you said, you
16 worked for -- with and for Dr. DeNoble, who was your
17 project leader?

18 A. That's correct. Right.

19 Q. Okay. And he, Dr. DeNoble, reported to
20 Dr. Charles?

21 A. Uh-huh.

22 Q. And Dr. Charles reported on up to Dr. Osdene;
23 is that right?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. Okay. And then, I guess, Dr. Osdene reported

1 to Dr. Hausermann?

2 A. Right. The vice president.

3 Q. Right. So there were a whole bunch of
4 different levels at the R&D center, and that
5 essentially was the reporting structure up the line?

6 A. Presumably, right.

7 Q. Okay. As far as you knew?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. All right. And the research and development
10 department in Richmond is one of a number of
11 departments in the whole company; right?

12 A. That is correct.

13 Q. Okay. Now, your degree was in experimental
14 psychology, and your specialty was in behavioral
15 pharmacology?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. And your job working with Dr. DeNoble was to
18 look at the effects of certain drugs and compounds in
19 rats and the brains of rats?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. Okay. And those rat -- those studies with
22 rats, the centerpiece of those studies with rats were
23 what you've described as the self-administration
24 studies; were they not?

25 A. They were, yes. A majority of our time was

1 spent on those.

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. Or much of our time.

4 Q. And the basic idea was to understand how
5 nicotine or other -- some other compounds,
6 acetaldehyde, for example, how it affected the brains
7 and the behavior of rats?

8 A. Correct. Nicotine and acetaldehyde and some
9 of the other drugs we looked at.

10 Q. And some others, right.

11 And you would do these studies and do the
12 research, like scientist -- like a good scientist
13 would, and you would report the results, and the
14 results would get reported up the chain somewhere;
15 right?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. Okay. Now, I want to start, and what I'll
18 try to do, Doctor, is -- so that we're talking about
19 the same thing, if I'm shifting to a different subject,
20 I'll let you know.

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. So you can kind of readjust as we do this.

23 But I want to start with nicotine and
24 self-administration of nicotine. And am I correct that
25 determining whether or not nicotine was addictive was

1 not the purpose of the behavioral pharmacology lab?

2 That is correct. Nobody -- our goal was not
3 to prove or disprove addiction. Our goal was to find
4 compounds that would substitute for nicotine, because
5 the question of addiction or dependence was never in
6 doubt --

7 Q. Okay. And --

8 A. -- to my understanding.

9 Q. So your job -- you weren't looking at whether
10 nicotine was addictive in connection with the analog
11 program. You were looking at issues with regard to,
12 for example, whether it would meet the goals -- the two
13 goals that you testified before of the analog program,
14 maintaining the physiological effect and reducing any
15 cardiovascular concerns; right?

16 A. Those were the primary goals. Though, to
17 fully characterize an analog, which was part of our
18 job, we were trying to fully characterize the effects
19 of nicotine. There were studies we ran other than the
20 self-administration to get a broad view of what any
21 single particular drug would look like.

22 Q. Right. I'm already violating my own rule,
23 because I already jumped to analog. I didn't mean to
24 do that yet.

25 I wanted to just stay on the subject of

1 nicotine and what you were really looking at and what
2 you found and what you didn't find, okay, with regard
3 to nicotine.

4 Now, one of the important things you were
5 looking at was to see whether nicotine was a positive
6 reinforcer; correct?

7 A. That is correct.

8 Q. Okay. And the way you did that would be to
9 look to see whether rats would self-administer the
10 nicotine, whether they would work to get the nicotine;
11 correct?

12 A. That is correct.

13 Q. Now, there had been some studies done before
14 yours by researchers outside the tobacco companies on
15 self-administration of nicotine by rats, or in rats,
16 but I think you said that they weren't as complete or
17 as thorough as yours; would that be a fair
18 characterization?

19 A. That is correct. There were certain
20 characteristics of those studies and certain controls
21 that we felt needed to be done to unequivocally show in
22 rats.

23 Q. Okay. Those studies did conclude that there
24 was positive reinforcement; didn't they?

25 A. I'd have to see those papers. They might

1 have.

2 Q. Okay. Do you remember some work that was
3 done by some Australian scientists?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Okay. And those scientists had concluded
6 that nicotine was a positive reinforcer in rats?

7 A. Right. That's correct.

8 Q. Okay. Now, was one of the -- was one of your
9 concerns about those other studies, even though they
10 showed that nicotine was a positive reinforcer, that
11 they -- that they didn't deal with food administration
12 in the way that you dealt with it?

13 A. In order for those studies to get their rats
14 to self-administer nicotine, they had to concurrently
15 provide food reinforcement to the animals over -- when
16 the animal was working, he was really working for two
17 things. And the only way you can tell what he's
18 actually working for is to pull one or the other out.
19 And when the food was eliminated, the rats stopped
20 working for the nicotine.

21 So they may have concluded nicotine was a
22 positive reinforcer in those studies. That would have
23 met the usual criteria of the community.

24 Q. Now, were you aware of any studies by outside
25 researchers, such as the Australian researchers, before

1 yours, that rats will self-administer nicotine, even
2 without a food administration schedule?

3 A. There were attempts to show that. One study
4 by a researcher, I believe his name was Hanson, had
5 some self-administration of nicotine, but it didn't
6 seem to -- the self-administration didn't vary when he
7 substituted saline for nicotine, which is another very
8 critical point. A rat is going to press a lever at
9 some low level for both a drug and a vehicle. That
10 certainly doesn't confirm that he's responding to the
11 drug.

12 Q. Were you aware of any other studies that
13 showed, again by people who are looking at this subject
14 outside the tobacco companies, and I mean before you
15 did your work, that showed that nicotine was a positive
16 reinforcer even without regard to food administration?

17 A. There were -- there were other studies.
18 Again, none of those studies, in our view,
19 unequivocally showed it was a positive reinforcer
20 because they didn't run through the number of adequate
21 and necessary control procedures to demonstrate you
22 could manipulate nicotine self-administration in the
23 rat. You could increase it or decrease it by your
24 experimental control.

25 Q. Okay. So what you're saying is that, while

1 there were outside researchers who were looking at this
2 issue of nicotine being self-administered by rats, and
3 concluding that they -- that nicotine was a positive
4 reinforcer, the studies weren't done sufficiently
5 carefully or didn't have sufficient controls, or at
6 least -- they weren't as good as yours in that regard?

7 A. I can't even say they concluded. I'd have to
8 see those. And in cases where you can't show that type
9 of manipulation and demonstration, the conservative
10 reasonable response would be, we're not manipulating
11 this treatment as we should and further studies are
12 warranted, there's clearly not a good understanding
13 that there are variables that control nicotine
14 self-administration in a rat. Up until that point,
15 there was not a good understanding in the literature.

16 Q. Okay. Now, the fact this drug or a compound
17 is a positive reinforcer doesn't necessarily mean it's
18 addictive; does it?

19 A. No, it does not. I don't know if you can
20 ever demonstrate addiction in a rat. A rat is a rat.
21 Addiction is a particularly human quality.

22 But if a rat will self-administer a drug, a
23 human will self-administer a drug. There's no drug
24 that I am aware of that a rat self-administers and
25 humans don't.

1 Once you have self-administration, especially
2 if it's a nonmedical use for the drug, by definition,
3 that's drug abuse. And then, as the frequency and
4 compulsiveness of that use expands, you get into drug
5 dependence and addiction in people.

6 Q. Right.

7 A. But it's certainly a prediction that the
8 compound is likely to be abused.

9 Q. All right. So what you've said is that, when
10 you work with rats, rats -- you can look to see
11 whether, when you take a drug like nicotine, okay, you
12 can look to see whether or not, through scientific
13 experiments, it has certain characteristics. And if
14 one defines a term like addiction, in terms of those
15 characteristics, then you can -- you can draw at least
16 a conclusion about it.

17 You can say, well -- let me start over.
18 That's a bad question already.

19 What I'm getting at is, rats aren't people;
20 we all know that; right? But if you say positive
21 reinforcement is a feature, a characteristic of
22 addiction, if you set that in humans, then you can see
23 whether positive reinforcement takes place in rats, and
24 then you can say that's predictive of humans; right?

25 A. Correct.

1 Q. And you can do that with other things, as
2 well. For example, if you set up as your hypothesis
3 that physical dependence is a criteria for addiction,
4 then you can look to see whether there is physiological
5 dependence for nicotine in rats, and there either is or
6 there isn't; right?

7 A. When you say there is or there isn't, with
8 adequate testing and evaluation, yes.

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. I mean, at some point, you would, with enough
11 studies and enough manipulations, you would reach a
12 conclusion one way or the other.

13 Q. You would conclude that there either is
14 physical dependence or there's not in rats; right?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. Okay.

17 A. You would do that.

18 Q. You concluded in your research that nicotine
19 was a relatively weak positive reinforcer; correct?

20 A. That statement was made very early on in an
21 attempt -- yes, we did make that statement, very early
22 on, in an attempt to qualify our results.

23 Again, this was the first -- early on at
24 Philip Morris, when I was there, this was the first
25 real demonstration of nicotine as a positive reinforcer

1 with rats. We weren't sure what to expect.

2 The self-administration we got out of the
3 rats was very reliable, but the numbers were somewhat
4 low, at least comparing to other studies published in
5 the literature.

6 What we really needed to do -- so in one
7 sense we were being conservative because it was the
8 very first study. And with any study you want to see
9 replication and expansion.

10 Q. Doctor, were you comparing --

11 A. And --

12 Q. I'm sorry.

13 A. I just wanted to say --

14 Q. Finish your answer.

15 A. -- what we really needed to do for that
16 qualifier is to compare nicotine directly to other
17 drugs of abuse, which we were not allowed to do.

18 So, without any direct comparison, it's hard
19 to say whether it's weaker or stronger. You could make
20 the same claim for heroin being weaker than cocaine,
21 for example, comparing a cross-study.

22 Q. Well, didn't you in your studies actually
23 make a comparison between the reinforcing effect of
24 nicotine and the reinforcing effect of four classes of
25 abused substances?

1 A. Not in our actual experiments, no. We were
2 never able to bring in controlled substances commonly
3 known as drugs of abuse into the lab.

4 Q. Well, do you recall whether or not you
5 contrasted and compared, for example, the reinforcing
6 effect of nicotine, which, as you've said, you
7 described in your early-on work as being weak, with the
8 reinforcing effect of things like opiates,
9 amphetamines, barbiturates and alcohol?

10 A. Yes. Again, those were discussed comparing
11 our results and published studies in the literature.

12 Again, to really make an adequate comparison
13 to control for all of the variables that come into play
14 when you compare studies from different laboratories,
15 you really need to do a direct comparison in your
16 laboratory, preferably in the same rats, to get a real
17 understanding of that.

18 And without that type of additional data, the
19 conclusion that it was weak was very conservative and
20 probably was very unwarranted in one sense.

21 Q. Well, did you conclude, based on the work you
22 did with your rats and the reinforcing effect of
23 nicotine there, the positive reinforcing effect of
24 nicotine in the literature, and such things as alcohol,
25 barbiturates, amphetamines and opiates, which would

1 include morphine and heroin --

2 A. Opiates, yes.

3 Q. -- that nicotine, compared to what the
4 literature was saying about these other things, was a
5 weak reinforcer, that these other things were strong --
6 much stronger reinforcing than nicotine?

7 A. Well, again, our procedure is -- we're not
8 exactly the same as those used in the literature. We
9 did make that conclusion very early on. And, in fact,
10 while we were collecting some of that data, there was a
11 study that came out in monkeys that directly compared
12 nicotine and cocaine self-administration, which was one
13 of the few studies that directly compared those two
14 drugs.

15 And, indeed, they found that in many
16 instances, nicotine and cocaine were similarly
17 reinforcing. So that's the kind of study that needs to
18 be done. That's the kind of study we were not allowed
19 to do. And without that data, even though we made that
20 statement, it's got to be qualified because we didn't
21 have as much data as we needed to make a very firm,
22 very committed statement.

23 Q. Doctor, what I'm going to do is, just to see
24 if I can refresh your recollection on some of this, I'm
25 going to -- assuming I can find it here in a minute --

1 I'm going to give you a copy of a draft report of your
2 research for 1984 and ask you some questions about.
3 First of all, whether you remember it or not.

4 So, let me see if I can find it. It is
5 marked as a plaintiffs' exhibit, Judge. It's
6 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 5458. But we'll have to give it a
7 defense number.

8 THE COURT: 5458?

9 MR. HEIM Yes. It is marked as Defendants'
10 Exhibit 5458. But for identification purposes, I'll
11 refer to it as -- oh, it's premarked.

12 Thanks, Chris.

13 It's premarked as Defendants' Exhibit 36684.

14 And if I may --

15 THE COURT: Let me see it.

16 MR. HEIM I have one for you.

17 THE COURT: I just want to see this for the
18 numbers.

19 Okay. I don't see it on my list here. It
20 hasn't been marked for identification or as an exhibit
21 yet.

22 MR. HEIM It is on the -- it is on the
23 plaintiffs' exhibit list as 5458.

24 THE COURT: I don't see that designation.

25 MR. HEIM Let me see if I can find it.

1 THE COURT: I have 5448. Maybe that's the
2 one you're talking about.

3 Do you have it?

4 MR. HEIM I think the different -- I think
5 what we're saying, Judge, is that it was on their list
6 of exhibits. I don't think it's one that they offered
7 this morning.

8 THE COURT: It hasn't surfaced yet.

9 MR. HEIM Right. It hasn't surfaced.

10 THE COURT: Let's mark it, then, if that's
11 the number, 5458, let's mark it for identification for
12 that purpose.

13 MR. HEIM Okay.

14 THE COURT: As a defense, 5458?

15 MR. HEIM It would be defense.

16 THE COURT: Defense 366 --

17 MR. HEIM 84.

18 THE COURT: -- 84.

19 MR. HEIM Right.

20 THE COURT: That's what we'll do.

21 (Defendants' Exhibit 36684 was marked for
22 identification.)

23 THE COURT: This is Defense I.D. 36684.

24 MR. HEIM Okay. Now, I need to give
25 Dr. Mele one.

1 (Document handed to witness.)

2 BY MR. HEIM

3 Q. Doctor, can you just take a quick look at
4 this document and tell me if you recognize it?

5 A. It looks like a draft of an annual report.

6 Q. And is this -- as you look at it, it begins
7 at the top: We've continued to use the
8 self-administration technique.

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. Does this look like a draft of the annual
11 report for the behavioral pharmacology lab?

12 A. Sure.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And as you look at some of the data in there,
16 for example, Page 6, it's far too complicated for me to
17 try to ask you questions about it, but does that look
18 like to you -- does that look like the kind of the
19 studies that you would do?

20 A. This looks like one of our annual reports,
21 yes.

22 Q. Okay. Now, in here, you make reference -- if
23 you look at the very first page, right under experiment
24 one where you say: The weak reinforcing effect of
25 nicotine is notably different from the four classes of

1 abused substances.

2 A. Uh-huh.

3 Q. Do you see that?

4 A. Yes. Right here.

5 Q. And then it says: However, the lack of a
6 physiological dependence following chronic access sets
7 nicotine apart from only three classes.

8 Now, actually, what you were talking about
9 there is that amphetamines and cocaine are the one
10 class that doesn't create -- that is a powerful
11 reinforcer as opposed to the others; right?

12 A. Would you repeat that, please?

13 Q. Sure. What I'm saying is, just so we're
14 seeing what you said in your annual report, your draft
15 annual report here, is you're basically saying that
16 three of the four of those classes that we talked about
17 of abused substances are more powerful, positive
18 reinforcers than nicotine?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. Okay. And the one -- the one that is
21 different is amphetamines and cocaine?

22 A. I don't -- I'm not -- I'm sorry. I'm not
23 following that.

24 Q. Okay. If you just read the first paragraph
25 there -- let me see if I can straighten it out this

1 way. Why don't I give you a minute to read that first
2 paragraph, and then you can probably help us all with
3 this.

4 The subject matter is physiological
5 dependence and reinforcement.

6 A. Okay.

7 Q. Okay. So, you had established, through your
8 preliminary research, that nicotine did not create a
9 physical dependence; correct?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. And I think in this report, you were saying
12 that, except for amphetamines and cocaine, the other
13 three categories, alcohol, heroin, morphine, do create
14 a physical dependence; right?

15 A. Yes. Alcohol or barbiturates and
16 opiates are well-known in their strong physical
17 dependence-producing properties.

18 Q. You were distinguishing -- on the one hand
19 you were saying nicotine doesn't create a physical
20 dependence. Alcohol does, barbiturates do, heroin
21 does. But cocaine is more like nicotine in that
22 regard, it does not?

23 A. Amphetamines and cocaines and those classes
24 of drugs certainly are different, yes. In the one
25 study we conducted with nicotine, the initial study, we

1 were unable to demonstrate a physical dependence.

2 Q. Okay. So, then, as I understood your report
3 when I read it, you then went on to see whether cocaine
4 and amphetamines were different from nicotine in some
5 other way. That is, you did some actual research
6 studies to see whether cocaine -- self-administration
7 of cocaine or amphetamines had been found to disrupt
8 ongoing behavior that were maintained by other
9 reinforcers; isn't that what you were saying at the
10 bottom of that page?

11 A. I'll have to take a few minutes to read this.

12 Q. Sure. Take a minute and look at it.

13 You can see where it says the purpose of the
14 present experiment.

15 A. Yes. Right. Okay. Yes. I see where you
16 are.

17 Q. Okay. And your conclusion was that nicotine
18 does not interfere with self-administration of another
19 reinforcer like food, but cocaine does; right?

20 A. Depending upon your dose and your conditions
21 of delivery, yes, and that sort of thing, yes. I
22 mean --

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. In this one -- again, in this one first
25 study, it looks like we were unable to demonstrate

1 that.

2 Q. Okay. And to the extent that -- to the
3 extent that physical dependence, physiological
4 dependence is viewed by the scientific community as a
5 criteria for addiction, your research was actually
6 helpful to the company; was it not?

7 A. Well, actually, physiological dependence at
8 that time was not viewed as a criterion for addiction.
9 It was a possible criteria for some, but that --
10 although that was an older view by the early '80s, most
11 of the textbooks that were out did not insist on having
12 physiological dependence as a criterion for addiction.
13 It could be there, but it wasn't essential.

14 Q. My question, Doctor, was that --

15 A. But the answer is, I guess, no.

16 Q. My question -- let me go back to the
17 question.

18 My question was, to the extent -- to the
19 extent that there were views that physiological
20 dependence was required in order for a substance to be
21 addictive, there had to be a physical dependence on the
22 subject. To that extent, to accept that, your research
23 would have been helpful to Philip Morris; correct?

24 A. If one accepts that view, right.

25 Q. It would have been helpful?

1 A. Presumably.

2 Q. All right. And, again, to the extent
3 that your research showed that cocaine --
4 self-administration of cocaine will interfere with the
5 administration of other reinforcers, like food, and
6 nicotine does not, nicotine does not disrupt ongoing
7 behavior, that would be helpful to the company as well
8 in distinguishing nicotine from cocaine; right?

9 A. Well, one -- let's make it clear. We never
10 did look at cocaine. Okay. We never looked at cocaine
11 directly.

12 And it's important to make a distinction
13 between studies that show something definitively and
14 studies that fail to show something. When you do
15 scientific studies and you fail to get a result, the
16 question is always there, what else do we need to do to
17 demonstrate the phenomena we're looking at?

18 And in our case, we had a series of studies,
19 such as the failure to disrupt the ongoing behavior and
20 the failure to demonstrate a physiological dependence,
21 but we had very few opportunities to pursue those lines
22 of research to see what else we could generate in
23 further studies.

24 Q. Doctor, would you -- the pages aren't
25 numbered, but if you'll turn to table one, which is

1 actually your fifth page in --

2 A. Okay.

3 Q. -- the last two sentences reads as follows:

4 The major finding is that self-administration of
5 nicotine does not interfere with self-administration of
6 another reinforcer, food, in parenthesis. This is in
7 direct contrast to data obtained with morphine,
8 ethanol, phencyclidine, amphetamine or pentobarbital.
9 This would suggest that nicotine can be differentiated
10 for classically abused drugs, using several behavioral
11 tests.

12 Now, after you concluded that in this report,
13 did you make any qualifications that you can find about
14 needing further research or that this --

15 A. Well --

16 Q. Did you qualify that in any way the way you
17 just did here today?

18 A. No. There was certainly no question that we
19 would never be allowed to have drugs like cocaine or
20 amphetamine in the laboratory. When we actually
21 requested to bring amphetamine in, that was declined
22 outright by Jim Charles. They did not want any type of
23 scheduled controlled substances in there that would
24 relate us in any way to drugs.

25 And so we were unable to do those studies.

1 And we were unable to follow up on these studies.

2 Q. And do you in any way -- well, never mind.

3 Skip it.

4 Doctor --

5 A. I think it was common scientific
6 understanding: You do a study. This is what we did.
7 This is what we found.

8 There are many more studies to do. We didn't
9 routinely list every study we wanted to do in these
10 types of reports. We were trying to keep those as
11 short and concise as possible.

12 Q. But you wouldn't -- excuse me. I'm sorry. I
13 didn't mean to interrupt you.

14 Doctor, you didn't write anything in this
15 report that you didn't think was correct; did you?

16 A. No. No. I think at this time, after this
17 first study, that was a conclusion comparing a
18 cross-study in the literature. And we clearly did not
19 find the disruptions that the other studies had been --
20 had reported.

21 So, at this point there was a distinction
22 between nicotine and these other -- other studies that
23 had already been published.

24 Q. You mentioned --

25 A. I might add, though, that each of these

1 classes of drugs that are mentioned here also can be
2 distinguished amongst each other in various ways, so
3 this happened to be one grouping. You could scramble
4 this grouping if you were looking at other factors or
5 other variables, to try and distinguish, again, one
6 class of abused compound from another.

7 Q. And this was the grouping that you selected
8 for purposes of this report?

9 A. Correct. Well, yes.

10 Q. All right. Now, when you took rats off
11 nicotine in your studies of self-administration of
12 nicotine, when you took the rats off the nicotine, they
13 did not experience or you did not observe physical
14 withdrawal symptoms in the rats; did you?

15 A. That is correct.

16 Q. It's correct that you did not observe
17 withdrawal symptoms?

18 A. We did not in our studies, although within
19 five to eight years, there were a number of reports in
20 the literature using more sensitive techniques,
21 apparently, than we did, and they were able to
22 demonstrate, in three or four different laboratories,
23 physiological withdrawal in rats following chronic
24 nicotine administration.

25 Q. But as far as what you were saying to your

1 superiors and what you were saying in your reports to
2 Philip Morris, you didn't find any?

3 A. We could not find any. We could not
4 demonstrate it.

5 Q. All right. Now, you believe that rat models
6 can be predictive of human behavior; don't you?

7 A. I think that's a fair statement.

8 Q. And while it can be difficult to make a
9 direct comparison, you know how reinforcing something
10 is in a human when it's reinforcing a rat, it's a
11 value; correct?

12 A. I'm not sure what you mean by value.

13 Q. Well, it's predictive in the way that you
14 suggested --

15 A. Well, if a rat will self-administer it --

16 Q. Right.

17 A. -- a human will self-administer it.

18 Q. Right. What I'm saying is you would agree
19 that you can't, for example, establish the degree of
20 self-administration, the quality of self-administration
21 in a human based on a rat, but you can observe that if
22 a rat will self-administer, a human will
23 self-administer?

24 A. Well, certainly not on the basis of one rat
25 study. You might want a series of rat studies that

1 look at a number of factors and variables.

2 You want to manipulate dose and access. You
3 want to look at self-administration in other species.
4 But any time you're investigating a new drug in
5 animals, the chain is that you look at a series of
6 animal species, what you get in animals, and
7 establishing models is predictive of what you find in
8 humans.

9 Q. So if a witness were to have come here and
10 testified to this jury that rat work -- rat studies
11 were not very valid for humans, for determining the
12 effect in humans, that's something you'd strongly
13 disagree with; correct?

14 A. In general -- I mean, you're saying that
15 animal studies don't predict what you find in humans.
16 Yes.

17 Q. I mean specifically rat studies. If a
18 witness were to have come here and said to the jury,
19 well, rat studies aren't very valid in terms of trying
20 to figure out what will happen with a human, you'd
21 disagree with that?

22 A. Well, I think rat studies are valid under the
23 appropriate conditions in the right context.

24 Q. Now, I want to ask you a question or two
25 about the conversation that you said you had with

1 Mr. Remington, okay, on the subject of whether --
2 whether nicotine is addictive.

3 Remington was not a research and development
4 person; right?

5 A. At the time I had interactions with him, he
6 was at the operations center, which was one of the
7 three main facilities down there. But he was not at
8 the R&D center at that time.

9 Q. All right. And to your knowledge, had he
10 ever been at the R&D center?

11 A. I don't recall. These guys would float
12 around in the company and get moved up and sideways, so
13 he most likely held a lot of positions. But I'm not
14 aware of him being at the R&D center when I was there.

15 Q. And did you ever see his name on any of the
16 reports that were -- that you were -- that behavioral
17 pharmacology laboratory was sending out?

18 A. On the distribution list?

19 Q. Right. On the distribution list.

20 A. I never put together the distribution list,
21 so I -- I mean, I never would have seen that. My stuff
22 went either to DeNoble or Charles directly. But he
23 wasn't in the R&D center, so --

24 Q. Do you still have up there, Doctor, the
25 reports that were shown to you this morning?

1 A. I do not.

2 Q. Well, let me just -- let me just show you the
3 one in my hand while I take a second.

4 This is 5087, which was the behavioral
5 pharmacology report.

6 A. Excuse me. Just in answer to your last
7 question, again, most of the time I was there, the
8 restriction was very, very narrow for our annual
9 reports, so somebody like Remington would be unlikely
10 to see it until possibly later on.

11 Q. And actually, you have no idea whether he
12 ever got to see any of these reports; right?

13 A. I do not know.

14 Q. All right. And the one I was going to hand
15 you which was marked this morning as Plaintiffs'
16 Exhibit 5087, if you would take a look at that, I
17 see -- I just counted quickly about 24 people whose
18 names are on that report. And you don't find
19 Dr. Remington there anywhere; do you? Or
20 Mr. Remington. I don't know what he was.

21 A. No. His name is not on this list. That is
22 correct.

23 Q. Dr. Mele, is he a Mr. Remington or a
24 Dr. Remington; do you know?

25 I'll take that.

1 A. I'm not aware of him having a higher degree.

2 Q. Okay. So, as far as you know, Mr. Remington
3 who made this remark that you've quoted this morning,
4 he didn't have access to information that your
5 laboratory was producing on whether nicotine created a
6 physiological dependence, or he didn't have access, for
7 example, to your draft report there; correct?

8 A. I can't answer that.

9 Q. All right. And you don't know, for example,
10 whether back in 1984, 1983, Mr. Remington had access
11 to the views of someone like Dr. DeNoble on whether at
12 that time Dr. DeNoble thought nicotine was addictive?

13 A. You're asking me did Remington talk to
14 DeNoble?

15 Q. Right.

16 A. I do not know if Remington talked to
17 DeNoble.

18 Q. And when you -- and when you --

19 A. If you're --

20 Q. When you were asked the question by Shep
21 Pollack, who was then the president of the company, as
22 to whether you thought nicotine was addictive, as I
23 recall your testimony from Tuesday, you said that the
24 laboratory wasn't set up to answer that question, and
25 in order to answer that question, a fair amount of more

1 work would have to be done?

2 A. The purpose of the laboratory, the stated
3 goals were not to address addiction as confirming or
4 denying.

5 The work we were doing certainly did address
6 addiction, just because of the nature of the work and
7 because of the analogs. But, as you pointed out,
8 because we could not generate physiological dependence,
9 we had some questions, we had some initial studies with
10 our nicotine self-administration, we felt we needed to
11 do additional studies to pursue that. But clearly this
12 was the line of work to pursue if you wanted to get an
13 answer to that question.

14 Q. All right. And when you gave them that
15 answer, that you couldn't answer his question, that
16 was -- that was an honest answer that you gave him,
17 wasn't it, at the time?

18 A. Well, when the president of the company asks
19 you a question like that out of the blue and it's using
20 a word that one is then instructed not to use, it was
21 an honest answer, and it was a rather intimidating
22 question.

23 Q. Someone must have forgotten to instruct him
24 not to use it.

25 A. That's probably true. He was the boss.

1 Q. But you wouldn't have given him a dishonest
2 answer; right? Whether he's the president or not, you
3 answered the question the way you thought the question
4 ought to be answered?

5 A. Well, when he asked specifically, yes,
6 whether those results showed -- proved it was addicting
7 or not, again, addiction, I don't believe, is an animal
8 quality, but we felt that's what our results had
9 indicated.

10 Q. As I told you before, I was going to shift --
11 when I would shift, I would tell you.

12 Now I want to talk to you about analogs.
13 Okay?

14 A. About?

15 Q. Analogous.

16 Now, as I recall, what you said on Tuesday,
17 you were saying that these nicotine analogs, one of the
18 ideas or part of the idea behind the development of a
19 nicotine analog -- and an analog is a -- an analog is
20 something you make in the laboratory, and it's a
21 substitute for the natural compound; right?

22 Just so -- I wanted to make sure the jury --
23 kind of get us back to where we were last Tuesday.

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. So one of the reasons for looking at these

1 analogs was the company was kind of protecting itself
2 against the possibility that nicotine would be banned.
3 If nicotine were banned for use in cigarettes, they
4 wanted to have something else that they could use.

5 A. Well, that was one of the possibilities. It
6 wasn't -- I can't say I was ever -- I was never told
7 that was the driving force behind the analogs. It was
8 one of the considerations that they might have to deal
9 with.

10 They may want a compound that was, again,
11 better in some ways and maintained the desired
12 qualities without losing those -- you know, without
13 losing those qualities, so --

14 Q. Okay. And I remember you testifying -- and
15 you said that you heard that, that you heard that that
16 was one of the possibilities, but --

17 A. That was discussed at the meetings.

18 Q. That was discussed. Okay.

19 And it was discussed that the company wanted
20 to be prepared for that possibility; right?

21 A. I won't speak for the company, but for the
22 scientific group, yes, in case that they needed to put
23 in a substitute for nicotine, they would have one on
24 the shelf ready to go.

25 Q. And I think that's an interesting observation

1 you just made, when you said you won't speak for the
2 company. Your discussions, largely, except for when
3 you had a visitor, which you said wasn't often, but
4 your discussions largely were with the research
5 scientists at the R&D center; correct?

6 A. The research scientists at the R&D center and
7 selected consultants, yes.

8 Q. Right. Like, Doctor -- well, we'll talk
9 about some of them. But that's right.

10 You weren't actively involved in talking to
11 the management people in New York; for example?

12 A. We would have conversations with Fred Newman
13 on our papers, the meanings of the papers, that sort of
14 thing, explaining those to him. But in -- other than
15 for one trip where DeNoble went up to New York to do a
16 presentation at corporate headquarters on our work,
17 most of our work was reported up through the chain.

18 Q. Okay. Up through the chain at the R&D
19 center?

20 A. To New York. Jim Charles would often have, I
21 was told by him, conversations with Fred Newman on the
22 work.

23 Q. Well, what I meant, Doctor, you weren't
24 involved in decisions about what products to use, how
25 to commercialize products --

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. -- those kinds of decisions. That was not
3 anywhere near your field of -- your responsibility?

4 A. We weren't involved in product decisions.

5 Q. Okay.

6 A. In terms of marketing and that sort of thing
7 or alter or manipulating a product.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. A specific product.

10 Q. Or doing the engineering work to try to
11 commercialize a product, you weren't involved with the
12 production facility, the manufacturing process. That's
13 something you weren't involved with; right?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Okay. Now, I think -- I made a note last
16 week when you were testifying, that you said that what
17 the company was trying to do with the analogs was two
18 things; one was to have the same properties as nicotine
19 in terms of the physiological effect that it has on a
20 smoker's brain, you know, the same kind of effect that
21 nicotine has, but to reduce or eliminate any
22 cardiovascular effect, because you said that at that
23 time, there was a concern about the cardiovascular
24 effect of nicotine.

25 Now, do you know whether, after your time at

1 the company, the scientific community expressed the
2 view that nicotine is not a serious cardiovascular
3 risk?

4 A. There are really two aspects of
5 cardiovascular toxicity. That got factored out. It
6 was realized later on that much of the stuff in
7 non-nicotine, the stuff in tar, has certain effects,
8 such as cholesterol effects, that would lead to
9 clogging, causing blood cells to stick together and
10 that sort of thing.

11 But clearly, the heart rate and blood
12 pressure effects of nicotine were well-known and
13 maintained and were of concern just as they are of
14 concern now.

15 Q. Okay. So, if a witness who was testifying
16 for the plaintiffs in this case came here and testified
17 and told the jury that nicotine in cigarettes is not a
18 major cause of injury, that it's not a clinically
19 significant health risk, nicotine itself, is that
20 something that you'd disagree with, that you have a
21 basis to disagree with?

22 A. I -- I would not comment -- I don't know at
23 this point in terms of the latest views on that.

24 Q. Okay. People can get nicotine without a
25 prescription; can't they?

1 A. That is -- well, you can now. I guess you
2 can buy -- you can buy gum without a prescription.

3 Q. You can buy patches?

4 A. I don't know about patches, but you can buy
5 gum

6 Q. Are you aware of any -- any abuse of nicotine
7 patches or nicotine gum?

8 A. Yes. I know -- abuse. I know people that
9 are addicted to the gum They've given up smoking.
10 They've been chewing gum for years. They cannot give
11 up the gum So I would call that an addiction.

12 Q. Okay. Other than --

13 A. Unable to function without it.

14 Q. Other than your own experience with somebody
15 you know or some people you know, do you know whether
16 there are any scientific studies that say that nicotine
17 in patches or gums that are available over the counter
18 at the corner drugstore is a subject of abuse?

19 A. The patch was specifically designed to try
20 and prevent abuse potential because of the way it
21 delivers nicotine. It delivers it very slowly and in a
22 very gradual fashion.

23 What's known about smoking and with the gum,
24 if you chew it the right way or the wrong way, is that
25 you can deliver a bolus of nicotine very quickly. You

1 can get a big punch into your blood and into your
2 brain. That's what's believed to be important in
3 maintaining the nicotine abuse. And you can do that
4 with the gum if chewed in a certain way.

5 Q. All right. Forgive me, Doctor, but my
6 question was, do you know of any reports in any
7 scientific literature --

8 A. Are there reports? These issues are
9 discussed in the literature. I can't tell you whether
10 someone has actually gone out and definitively decided
11 that gum-chewing or patch use is considered an
12 addiction.

13 Q. Just so I can finish my question --

14 A. These are warnings -- I'm sorry.

15 Q. You were jumping to the answer before I got
16 to the question, so let me go back and try the question
17 again. Okay.

18 We've established that you can get nicotine
19 gum over the -- over the counter and without a
20 prescription; right? And you can get nicotine --
21 you're not sure about nicotine patches.

22 A. I don't know about patches. I can only speak
23 for Maryland, in my local drugstore, that you can buy
24 the gum

25 Q. Now, my question was, are you aware of any

1 studies that have been done, scientific studies
2 reported in the scientific literature, that conclude
3 that there is any abuse, any significant abuse of those
4 products that are now available to anybody who wants to
5 walk into a drugstore and buy them?

6 A. I have not, no.

7 Q. You said over the two and a half years that
8 you worked in the lab, you tested over close to 100
9 analogs; right?

10 A. We test -- there are over 100 analogs
11 generated. We tested many of those.

12 Q. You were doing the testing for the brain
13 affect. You weren't doing the cardiovascular testing;
14 correct?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. In fact, one of the people that was doing the
17 cardiovascular testing was Dr. Leo Abood --

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. -- from the University of Rochester, and he
20 was one of the outside consultants that the company was
21 using?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. Correct? Okay.

24 And how about Jack Eagle from the Medical
25 College of Virginia; was he also doing cardiovascular

1 testing?

2 A. He had had a contract with Philip Morris to
3 do some of that also. It terminated by the time I was
4 there or through most of my time there.

5 Q. Do you know whether subsequent to that he
6 also did further cardiovascular testing on nicotine
7 analogs?

8 A. I do not know.

9 Q. Now, developing a successful nicotine analog,
10 one that worked -- fulfilled all of the objectives and
11 didn't have a downside, would have been a significant
12 competitive advantage for Philip Morris if the other
13 companies didn't have one; right?

14 A. Competitive -- now you're asking me about
15 business and commercialization aspects or about --

16 Q. Well, let me ask you this: Did the R&D --

17 A. Marketing --

18 Q. Did the R&D scientists, those of you who were
19 there, because all I want to ask about is what you knew
20 at the time, did the R&D scientists think that
21 development of a successful analog would be a
22 competitive breakthrough for Philip Morris?

23 A. Development of an analog would have been --
24 would have met one of the criteria that -- would have
25 met an objective of the research center for Philip

1 Morris. Whether they considered that competitive
2 versus RJ Reynolds or some other company or only
3 concerned about their own aspects, I can't comment on
4 that.

5 It certainly was something they wanted done
6 to ensure the continued use of their own product.

7 Q. Sure. Because if nicotine had been banned,
8 they would be able to -- sorry.

9 If nicotine had been banned, they would have
10 been able to continue selling the product, using the
11 analog, and if the other companies hadn't been
12 successful, that would have been an enormous
13 competitive advantage; right?

14 A. I suppose. I mean, again, that gets beyond
15 anything I worked on.

16 Q. Now, you said you saw some of the
17 cardiovascular -- well, before I get there, I think you
18 said there were two candidates that you thought met the
19 goals of the program, two prime methyl nicotine and four
20 prime methyl nicotine; correct?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And the goals of the program, as you
23 understood it, were maintaining the same -- the
24 physiological effects of nicotine and decreasing the
25 cardiovascular concern.

1 A. Right. Keep the rats responding and
2 eliminate the cardiovascular toxicity.

3 Q. Right. Now, you didn't see, yourself,
4 personally, all of the data on the cardiovascular side;
5 did you?

6 A. All of the data? Probably not, because if
7 you're not doing the studies yourselves, rarely does
8 anybody see all of the data. We saw the data that was
9 summarized and provided by Dr. Abood, who was primarily
10 responsible for generating those for the company.

11 Q. And did you see Dr. Eagle's data?

12 A. I don't -- I don't recall seeing his data.
13 His data was not -- and he was not a regular attendee
14 at the analog meetings.

15 Q. Now, if you wanted to use an analog in place
16 of nicotine, you'd have to take the nicotine out first?

17 A. If you wanted to use an analog in place of
18 nicotine?

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. Presumably you would have to take it out, if
21 you were going to be replacing it.

22 Q. Sure. That's just common sense, right.

23 And I think you said, in response to
24 questions that were asked by plaintiffs' counsel, that
25 you were aware that experimentally, in 1984, Philip

1 Morris was able to take nicotine out of -- out of its
2 experimental cigarettes in the laboratory; right?

3 A. Philip Morris could produce cigarettes with
4 varying amounts of nicotine, including no nicotine, so
5 they had the technology to totally remove nicotine from
6 cigarettes.

7 Q. And that was technology that you referred to
8 as having been available in the experimental
9 laboratory; isn't that right?

10 A. No. The laboratory would request these
11 cigarettes, and those cigarettes were produced outside,
12 and then sent back in. I mean, outside of the
13 behavioral research unit.

14 We didn't make our own cigarettes, or Frank
15 Ryan didn't make those cigarettes. They were made
16 somewhere else in the company.

17 Q. Do you know where they were made in the
18 company?

19 A. I do not.

20 Q. Do you know if they were made somewhere other
21 than the research and development center?

22 A. You mean physically in the R&D building or
23 next-door in manufacturing?

24 Q. Yes.

25 A. Or next-door in -- no, I have no idea.

1 Q. And you're not aware, are you, in those
2 cigarettes, in those experimental cigarettes where all
3 of the nicotine was removed, other things came out
4 along with the nicotine?

5 A. Was I aware? Just from my discussions with
6 Frank Ryan and Bill Dunn that they had denicotinized
7 cigarettes, and they were testing for the affect of
8 nicotine manipulations with the understanding that it
9 was simply or strictly nicotine that was being
10 manipulated.

11 Q. And the question, Doctor, was, do you know,
12 when those experimental cigarettes were produced
13 without nicotine, whether nicotine and nicotine alone
14 was taken out or whether other things, the experimental
15 process that was used to take nicotine out, also
16 extracted other things with it?

17 A. I only know what I was told by the
18 researchers, and they -- they claimed that it was
19 nicotine only that was removed.

20 Q. Did you ever ask that question? Did you say
21 -- did you ever ask the question: Are you only taking
22 out nicotine, or are there other things in the tobacco
23 that's coming out along with it?

24 Do you remember that?

25 A. Well, no, because there are so many studies

1 being done that they would selectively also alter other
2 aspects of the cigarette, so I had faith in the
3 researchers, that when they were -- say they were
4 manipulating a particular aspect, that's what they were
5 doing.

6 Those might have been nicotine studies.
7 Others would have altered flavor. Others would alter
8 the feel and heft of the cigarette.

9 Q. Doctor, do you know whether in 1984 there was
10 any commercial process that was available to Philip
11 Morris to extract nicotine and nicotine alone from
12 cigarettes?

13 A. Commercial process. You mean large-scale
14 manufacturing?

15 Q. Right. That's how cigarettes are made, large
16 scale in manufacturing, right?

17 A. No. I don't know that.

18 Q. So you -- in terms --

19 A. I don't know if there's a difference between
20 commercial processing and the experimental cigarette
21 production, if that's what you're asking.

22 Q. So whether or not Philip Morris had any
23 capability in a commercial production, large scale,
24 large volume production, to extract nicotine from
25 cigarettes as opposed to work in the laboratory is

1 something you just don't know; correct?

2 A. That is correct.

3 Q. Now, are you aware of whether or not the use
4 of 2-prime methyl nicotine or 4-prime methyl nicotine
5 would increase or not increase the level of
6 tobacco-specific nitrosamines in a cigarette?

7 A. I don't know.

8 Q. Okay. Questions like that would have needed
9 to be answered before an analog could be used in a
10 cigarette; was it not?

11 A. Not necessarily. I don't know what questions
12 were asked or answered by the company. It certainly
13 didn't come up at our analog meetings.

14 In fact, in all of the meetings I discussed
15 within our research division that discussed
16 nitrosamines and other compounds, I never once heard
17 any concern about those compounds being in smoke and
18 that the company should try and get those out.

19 Q. Well, if the company was going to proceed
20 with an analog, you would expect that it would be
21 interested in determining whether or not the use of the
22 analog had any kind of synergistic effect with other
23 aspects of the cigarette; would you not, when it was --
24 when it was burnt, when pyrolysis took place?

25 A. Again, you're getting beyond things I dealt

1 with. But it depends what you're interested in. If
2 your goal is to keep people smoking that cigarette with
3 nicotine in there, that was the goal we were working on
4 within the analog group.

5 Never once was there a concern there would
6 ever be or were these other harmful aspects of
7 cigarette smoke that needed to come out or we had to
8 make sure two prime methyl wasn't ten times more
9 cancer-producing than nicotine in tobacco smoke. I
10 never heard concern expressed that way.

11 Q. Doctor, you just said at the beginning of
12 that answer that I was getting into areas that you
13 weren't concerned about.

14 So, it was not within your area of
15 responsibility, as a behavioral pharmacologist, working
16 in the rat laboratory doing the experiments you were
17 doing, to be concerned with the level of
18 tobacco-specific nitrosamines in smoke?

19 A. Correct. It was not an area I worked in, but
20 I think your question said was it ever discussed, and I
21 never heard it discussed.

22 Q. But you weren't everywhere within the
23 research and development center; were you?

24 A. No. Most of it was in the behavioral
25 pharmacology or in the general division meetings where

1 these nitrosamines and other compounds were discussed.

2 Q. Now, you said there were also questions about
3 FDA approval for analogs; true?

4 A. Yes. Correct.

5 Q. Okay. And among the research scientists,
6 questions were discussed about, for example, whether
7 the Federal Drug Administration -- Food and Drug
8 Administration would have to approve an analog before
9 it could be used in a cigarette; right?

10 A. That was a question that did come up at the
11 analog meetings.

12 Q. And you and your fellow --

13 A. Nobody seemed to know the answer to that.

14 Q. Pardon?

15 A. Nobody seemed to know the answer to that.

16 Q. Right. And you and your fellow scientists
17 talked about the fact that nobody knew the answer to
18 that. Nobody knew whether the company wanted to get
19 FDA approval or they didn't want to get FDA approval;
20 right?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And you never heard how, if at all, those
23 kind of questions were resolved?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. And you were not involved in any decisions by

1 the company to use or not to use analogs in a
2 commercial cigarette; correct?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. Okay. And you're not aware of any firsthand
5 knowledge that any analog was actually used in a
6 commercial cigarette?

7 A. No. I never found out whether they were
8 used, although the clear intent of that group to
9 discuss these was to find the compounds that we could
10 recommend as being the best analogs, and then hand it
11 off to the next group.

12 MR. HEIM Your Honor, if you want to -- if
13 you and/or the jury would like to take a short break
14 here, we could do that.

15 THE COURT: Do you want to take a vote for a
16 break?

17 Okay. Break.

18 All right. We'll take a short break.

19 (The jury exited the courtroom)

20 (Brief recess.)

21 THE COURT: Okay. Bring the jury out, I
22 guess.

23 Are you going to be basically the rest of the
24 afternoon?

25 MR. HEIM No, sir. I'm not going to be very

1 long at all.

2 THE COURT: Anybody else going to have
3 cross --

4 MR. HEIM No, sir.

5 THE COURT: -- for this witness.

6 Okay. I'm trying to figure out how to --
7 what to do with the balance of the time.

8 We'll find something.

9 MR. ROSENBLATT: The video man is here.

10 THE COURT: On which one?

11 MR. ROSENBLATT: Goldstone.

12 THE COURT: That's going to be a problem

13 MR. MOSS: We have to go over those.

14 THE COURT: We're going to have to argue
15 Goldstone. I know Mr. Reid wants to talk about it.

16 All right. Let's finish up with this witness
17 anyway.

18 All right. Let's bring the jury out.

19 (The jury entered the courtroom)

20 THE COURT: All right. Be seated, please.

21 All right. Let's resume.

22 MR. HEIM Yes, sir.

23 BY MR. HEIM

24 Q. Dr. Mele, I'm switching gears. I'm switching
25 to a different topic here for a few minutes.

1 And the other research effort that you
2 testified about, I think I covered nicotine and the
3 analogs. I want to talk about acetaldehyde for a
4 couple of minutes. Okay.

5 Now, I think you testified that acetaldehyde
6 is a compound that is found in cigarette smoke, but
7 it's also exists in nature. You can find it in foods,
8 like yogurt; right?

9 A. Correct. That's my understanding.

10 Q. Okay. And your research was that -- your
11 research was that you found that rats would
12 self-administer acetaldehyde when you put it in
13 solution just as they would nicotine; correct?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. And you found that when you combine the two,
16 nicotine and acetaldehyde, you got more
17 self-administration than when using either one
18 separately; correct?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. So, in effect, you got more -- you got more
21 reinforcement than you did if you used each one of them
22 by themselves?

23 A. You could characterize it that way. That
24 would be fair.

25 Q. Now, your work showing that there was more

1 self-administration when nicotine and acetaldehyde was
2 used in combination, that was, I think, a study that
3 you did with four rats; is that correct?

4 A. Yes. If you're referring to the -- this came
5 up clearly at the deposition in some detail, and if
6 you're referring to that, the eight and the four --

7 Q. Whichever.

8 A. -- whatever you want to say.

9 Q. I don't care whether you want to make it
10 eight or four.

11 A. Right. We started with eight and ended with
12 four, and Mr. Otero had a big problem with it.

13 Q. Right. I didn't --

14 A. Neither did I.

15 Q. You started with eight and ended up with
16 four. It was somewhere in the neighborhood of four to
17 eight rats; right?

18 A. Right. It definitely demonstrated proof of
19 the concept that the two compounds together had this
20 synergistic effect.

21 Q. You already said, I think, earlier this
22 afternoon that your work with nicotine did not show in
23 those studies that you did that nicotine caused
24 physiological dependence in rats. And my question is,
25 your work with acetaldehyde also showed that that was

1 true, that acetaldehyde did not cause physiological
2 dependence in rats; correct?

3 A. We certainly looked at the
4 nicotine/acetaldehyde combinations. I don't recall
5 whether we looked at acetaldehyde alone, but we
6 probably did. And the combinations did not produce a
7 physiological dependence. Again, using the same tests
8 and procedures that were ineffective in showing
9 nicotine physiological withdrawal were also ineffective
10 in showing physiological withdrawal with the
11 combinations, again, I think, indicating our procedures
12 were not as sensitive as they should -- they could have
13 been.

14 Q. But at least as far as the data that you were
15 reporting on in your reports to the company, you were
16 showing nicotine by itself didn't create physiological
17 dependence. Acetaldehyde by itself didn't create a
18 physiological dependence --

19 A. That's probably true, but I'd have to check
20 the documents on that, or you probably have those.

21 Q. And you -- and the combination --

22 A. The combination.

23 Q. -- of those two did not create a
24 physiological dependence; right?

25 A. Correct. Again, in those initial studies

1 that we ran.

2 Q. And am I right, Doctor, that you -- you, in
3 your days that you were at Philip Morris, you never
4 heard anyone at Philip Morris say that the company
5 planned to use acetaldehyde in the commercial
6 production of cigarettes?

7 A. Anyone?

8 Q. Well --

9 A. I mean, this was a topic that was discussed
10 at the analog meetings. Victor DeNoble and I talked
11 about it frequently.

12 The research people talked about it, but not
13 the -- the guys who actually made the cigarettes
14 themselves for sale.

15 Q. Okay. So it would be fair to say that you
16 didn't know of any decisions that were being made by
17 the company or that ever were made by the company to
18 use acetaldehyde in the commercial production of
19 cigarettes while you were at the company?

20 A. That -- that is correct. I do not know how
21 they handled that data.

22 Q. Okay. And you have no firsthand knowledge
23 that your research on acetaldehyde and nicotine was
24 ever used to modify any commercially sold cigarette?

25 A. My only knowledge was reports in the press

1 showing --

2 Q. Doctor, I want you to answer my question
3 about your knowledge while you were at the company.

4 That's the way I asked the question.

5 A. Well, right. At the company, when I was
6 there, no, other than reports I read in the press, that
7 acetaldehyde levels were increasing --

8 THE COURT: You can't talk about what the
9 media might have shown.

10 BY MR. HEIM

11 Q. So the answer to my question is no, correct?

12 A. No. No one at the company ever -- I never
13 heard anybody at the company say they were -- they had
14 manipulated acetaldehyde levels in a commercial
15 cigarette.

16 Q. All right. Now, Doctor, you testified that
17 you were told by Jim Charles that the company had made
18 a decision to close the behavioral pharmacology lab for
19 business reasons; right?

20 A. Right. Right.

21 Q. Okay. And you also testified that in the
22 beginning -- I'm sorry. I may be wrong about that --
23 that in about mid 1993, a number of lawyers from the
24 law firm of Shook, Hardy and Bacon had come to visit
25 the laboratory?

1 A. '83, yes.

2 Q. '83, yes. Did I say '83?

3 A. You said '93.

4 Q. I said '93. Four rats, eight rats. '93.

5 A. I'll give you the decade.

6 Q. I'm sorry. I meant '83.

7 A. That's all right.

8 Q. And I think you said they spent time looking
9 over your documents and your files, and that there was
10 a presence of lawyers from the law firm of Shook, Hardy
11 and Bacon there over a period of a number of months?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. All right. And you said that there had been
14 some litigation against the company back in and around
15 that time?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. Okay. Now, Doctor, am I right that you don't
18 know -- you don't know, Dr. Mele, whether the reason
19 the lawyers were present during that period of time was
20 to look through --

21 MR. ROSENBLATT: Well, excuse me. If we
22 start off with the premise he doesn't know, the
23 question must contain speculation.

24 THE COURT: Yes. I agree.

25 So the question is do you know why they were

1 there.

2 MR. HEIM Okay.

3 THE COURT: And what purpose. And if he
4 doesn't know, he doesn't know. If he does know, then
5 he can tell us.

6 BY MR. HEIM

7 Q. Do you know whether the purpose that those
8 lawyers were there had to do with the defense of that
9 litigation that was being brought against the company?
10 Just yes or no.

11 A. I was told that.

12 Q. And do you know whether --

13 A. By Jim Charles.

14 Q. Okay. That's fair enough.

15 And do you know that, since they were
16 defending that litigation, that what they were doing
17 was responding to requests for documents that
18 plaintiffs had made in the litigation?

19 MR. ROSENBLATT: Objection.

20 THE COURT: That would be speculation unless
21 he knows. If there was no knowledge --

22 BY MR. HEIM

23 Q. Do you know, Doctor?

24 A. I don't know. I don't know if that's what
25 they were doing.

1 THE COURT: Enough said.

2 MR. HEIM All right. He doesn't know.

3 BY MR. HEIM

4 Q. You don't have any -- you didn't have any
5 conversation with Mr. Charles about that subject?

6 A. The specific --

7 THE COURT: I really don't want to explore
8 that any further, based on conversations we've had.

9 MR. HEIM All right.

10 BY MR. HEIM

11 Q. You left the company in November or December,
12 was it?

13 A. My last day of employment at Philip Morris
14 was December 31st, 1984.

15 Q. And you were paid up until the day you left?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. And you had an office at the company there?

18 A. I had an office.

19 Q. Did you have secretarial support?

20 A. Yes. We were able to use the personnel group
21 to job search.

22 MR. HEIM That's all. Thank you.

23 THE COURT: Okay. Any redirect?

24 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

25 BY MR. ROSENBLATT:

1 Q. You had an office at Philip Morris in
2 December of 1984, but did you have any job function?

3 A. Look for a job and eat lunch.

4 Q. Look for a job and eat lunch?

5 A. Basically it. Keep a low profile.

6 Q. Who told you to keep a low profile?

7 A. We were working with the personnel manager,
8 Mr. Jim Harding -- Harden or Harding -- that was
9 overseen by Jim Charles. We touched base with him on a
10 weekly or so basis to see how we were doing. We were
11 basically told, go over here, we were -- a warehouse
12 that had been converted to some offices, given desk and
13 phones, and said, find a job.

14 Q. Find a job within Philip Morris or --

15 A. No, no.

16 Q. -- out --

17 A. Outside.

18 Q. Outside of Philip Morris.

19 From the time the laboratory was closed, from
20 the time you were advised of that in April of 1984,
21 until your last day at the company at the end of
22 December of '84, were you ever given anything
23 meaningful to do or any real job position at Philip
24 Morris?

25 A. We had no duties. We had -- again, our

1 badges were removed. We were told where we could and
2 could not go and what we should be doing.

3 Q. Now, this concept of reinforcement, which
4 we've been over, where the rats press the levers, this
5 is a conscious, voluntary act on the part of the rat;
6 correct?

7 A. He presses the lever, yes.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Okay.

11 A. I have a problem with the conscious act of
12 rat.

13 Q. I don't want to get into metaphysical.

14 A. I don't want to get into what the rat thinks.
15 They move around.

16 Q. Nobody knows what the rat thinks, not even
17 Philip Morris.

18 MR. HEIM Not even the plaintiffs.

19 THE COURT: That's known as tit for tat, but
20 I don't know if you're talking about rats or what.

21 MR. ROSENBLATT: Well, I'll restrain
22 myself --

23 THE COURT: Go ahead.

24 MR. ROSENBLATT: -- from the next obvious
25 line.

1 THE COURT: Let's move on.

2 BY MR. ROSENBLATT:

3 Q. Within a 24-hour period, what is the number
4 of times that these rats would be hitting the lever for
5 nicotine?

6 A. Roughly 100, 80 to 120, somewhere around
7 there. About a hundred times.

8 Q. Do rats like cocaine?

9 A. Rats like cocaine.

10 Q. They'll hit a lever for cocaine?

11 A. Uh-huh.

12 Q. Will they do it for LSD?

13 A. No. Rats are smart. Again, there are some
14 things rats will not self-administer that humans will.
15 Hallucinogens, such as LSD, are things that rats will
16 not abuse. Whatever it does to them, they don't like.
17 Humans, as you know, will. So that's part of that
18 conservative aspect, again, of a rat model where a drug
19 is self-administered.

20 Q. The concept of nicotine being a positive
21 reinforcer means exactly what?

22 A. In the strictest definition, a positive
23 reinforcer is something that maintains behavior that
24 produced it. If you do something and you get it, this
25 reinforcer, you're more likely to do it again in the

1 future.

2 We like to say the rats work for it, or the
3 people work for it. But in the scientific definition,
4 it's just as I just said, it leads to the behavior
5 being repeated that created it.

6 Q. Dr. Mele, you said in response to Mr. Heim
7 that you were not allowed to do studies comparing
8 nicotine and cocaine. What reason were you given as to
9 why you could not make those comparison studies?

10 A. We weren't allowed to bring in any controlled
11 substance. A controlled substance involves all your
12 drugs of abuse. Drugs that have abuse potential are
13 controlled by the Drug Enforcement Agency and are
14 categorized in certain ways.

15 We were not allowed to have controlled
16 substances in the lab, because, again, because of the
17 associative nature of a controlled drug and nicotine.
18 We were just told we cannot have those two things in
19 the same room. It was a bad association.

20 Q. Mr. Heim asked you about a question that the
21 president of Philip Morris, Shep Pollack, had asked you
22 on the subject of addiction, on -- during the time of
23 the VIP tour of Mr. Remington, when he made the
24 comment that everyone at Philip Morris knows that
25 nicotine is addictive. Did you agree with that --

1 MR. HEIM Objection, Your Honor.

2 Q. -- or disagree with it?

3 MR. HEIM Mischaracterizes the testimony.

4 THE COURT: I'll sustain that objection as to
5 dealing now with everybody.

6 BY MR. ROSENBLATT:

7 Q. Did you agree with Mr. Remington's comment
8 to the effect that people know -- or at least some
9 people at Philip Morris accept the premise that
10 nicotine is addictive?

11 A. Certainly within the science group we worked
12 under, I believe there was no question that that was
13 the case. That was the whole aspect of the analog
14 program

15 There may have been issues that we didn't
16 have all of the data in place that we would have liked
17 to have had. But, again, we weren't -- we weren't
18 trying to prove this point or disprove it. We were
19 trying to come up with an analog that would keep people
20 smoking the cigarettes. That was our -- this question
21 of addiction or dependence was assumed. Otherwise, the
22 analog program makes no sense.

23 Q. Now, you were asked some questions about this
24 draft of the 1984 annual report. And in the very first
25 paragraph, the statement is made: We have continued to

1 use the self-administration technique to further
2 characterize nicotine's reinforcing effects, to
3 identify nicotine analogs that may have positive
4 reinforcing value, and to examine the relationship
5 between the reinforcing effects of nicotine and
6 acetaldehyde.

7 What did you learn about the relationship
8 between the reinforcing effects of nicotine, together
9 with acetaldehyde?

10 A. Well, when you put the two compounds
11 together, we had this synergistic effect. Again, the
12 combination produced more self-administration than
13 either of the compounds alone. And if you just tried
14 to add the two effects together of the individual
15 compounds, the effect was much greater.

16 I mean, that is by definition what they call
17 synergism or potentiation in pharmacology.

18 The whole was greater than the sum of the
19 parts was one way to look at it.

20 Q. The sum of nicotine and acetaldehyde together
21 were greater than either one individually?

22 A. The whole was greater than the sum. If you
23 add nicotine at this level and acetaldehyde at this
24 level, if you just added them together, I mean, they
25 would be at this level, but what the rat actually did

1 was at this level. So the two drugs together had this
2 super-additive or synergistic effect.

3 Q. Now, you were asked some questions about this
4 concept of Philip Morris being worried about whether
5 nicotine might be banned. Banned by who?

6 A. Well, the question that came up was the FDA.

7 Q. Well, did the FDA back in the '80s, or for
8 that matter, today, have jurisdiction over cigarettes,
9 over nicotine?

10 MR. MOSS: Your Honor, we're getting into an
11 area that we talked about before, this --

12 (The following proceedings were had at
13 sidebar:)

14 MR. MOSS: Two things. One, the man is here
15 as a fact witness. He's not an expert on the FDA.

16 Number two, the FDA's position is a matter of
17 law, whether they have jurisdiction or not.

18 THE COURT: Yes.

19 MR. HEIM It's irrelevant, actually,
20 whether --

21 MR. MOSS: Well, that's the -- it has nothing
22 do with any issue we're trying here.

23 THE COURT: Well, the whole issue with the
24 FDA came up in the sense of what happened if it was
25 shot down by the FDA.

1 MR. MDSS: He's already talked about that.

2 MR. ROSENBLATT: Counsel opened the door,
3 asked about -- he asked specifically was Philip Morris
4 worried about nicotine being banned by the FDA. And
5 then there was also questions about the concern of
6 Philip Morris about whether some of these analogs might
7 be banned --

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 MR. ROSENBLATT: -- by the FDA.

10 THE COURT: I don't know if he's in a
11 position to answer the question you posed, however.

12 MR. MDSS: Of course not.

13 THE COURT: Which is whether the FDA had a
14 jurisdiction, because that was the subject matter of a
15 lawsuit --

16 MR. MDSS: Yes, sir.

17 THE COURT: -- that grew out of this thing.

18 MR. MDSS: We gave you a copy of the opinion.

19 THE COURT: Maybe at that time everybody
20 assumed that they did. And if they were working under
21 the assumption that we assumed the FDA had
22 jurisdiction, therefore, they had authority, that's one
23 thing. But whether they actually do or not is another
24 story.

25 So, where are you going with this? Just the

1 issue that if the FDA could ban nicotine, they could
2 also ban an analog?

3 MR. ROSENBLATT: No. No. Just --

4 MR. MDSS: Just once again --

5 THE COURT: It came up, so --

6 MR. ROSENBLATT: Yes. It came up, and I
7 wanted to show that no one was worried about that. The
8 FDA had no jurisdiction to ban --

9 MR. HEIM He testified they were worried.
10 He said that they were -- that it was a concern and
11 that it was a possibility.

12 THE COURT: You would have to ask him, does
13 he know whether the FDA had jurisdiction. And his
14 answer is going to be yes, I know, or no, I don't. And
15 if he doesn't know, that would be supposition.

16 MR. MDSS: But even if he --

17 THE COURT: Now, this --

18 MR. MDSS: There's really no foundation.

19 THE COURT: This is really a policy
20 decision-making process which is outside of his
21 expertise.

22 MR. MDSS: The man is here as a fact witness,
23 Judge. We're getting so far outside his field. We've
24 spent, with a fact witness, almost two days now, and
25 clearly most of his testimony has not been as a fact

1 witness.

2 THE COURT: That's what I'm -- I don't know
3 exactly where you're going with this thing. If the
4 FDA -- if he thought the FDA might be in a position to
5 have some restriction on analogs, you could ask him
6 that. If he thought they did, that's what he thought.

7 MR. MOSS: What would be the relevance of
8 that?

9 THE COURT: I don't know. No. The relevance
10 is you brought it up. The fact that that's why they
11 were looking for an analog.

12 MR. ROSENBLATT: I simply -- I simply --

13 THE COURT: That would be relevant material
14 at this point. Now, if you're going to say, well, even
15 if you developed an analog --

16 MR. ROSENBLATT: No. In all honesty, I'm not
17 interested in pursuing that point. I'm interested in
18 establishing that, during the whole period while he was
19 there, they never had any involvement with the FDA.

20 THE COURT: Involve --

21 MR. ROSENBLATT: He knows. He knows. His
22 research lab had zero involvement.

23 THE COURT: Well, ask him that question.

24 MR. ROSENBLATT: I will.

25 MR. HEIM Whether his research --

1 THE COURT: I'll sustain it for this purpose.

2 MR. MOSS: We object to the question that you
3 just said he could ask.

4 THE COURT: So what else is new?

5 Overruled.

6 MR. HEIM All right.

7 THE COURT: They objected to the question
8 you're going to ask, and I overruled it.

9 MR. ROSENBLATT: It pays to hang around.

10 (The sidebar conference was concluded, and
11 the following proceedings were held in open court:)

12 BY MR. ROSENBLATT:

13 Q. Dr. Mele, during the period of time that you
14 were employed as a research scientist at Philip Morris
15 in the laboratory, from November of '81 until the time
16 it was summarily closed in April of 1984, did you ever
17 have any involvement with anyone from the FDA, the Food
18 and Drug Administration?

19 A. Myself directly?

20 Q. Yes.

21 A. No. No.

22 Q. Did anyone, to your knowledge, did anyone
23 from the Food and Drug Administration ever come to the
24 laboratory and get a VIP tour --

25 A. No.

1 Q. -- or inspect the laboratory?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Now, with respect to the lawyers from the law
4 firm of Shook, Hardy and Bacon that were on the
5 premises of the laboratory for several months, prior to
6 the time that it was closed, do you know one way or the
7 other whether those lawyers, who were in Richmond at
8 the laboratory, had any active role whatsoever in
9 defending litigation?

10 A. I do not know.

11 Q. You just know they were lawyers and they
12 were --

13 MR. MDSS: Your Honor --

14 Q. -- in the lab, correct, for months?

15 MR. MDSS: That's been asked and answered,
16 Your Honor.

17 MR. HEIM It's also leading.

18 THE COURT: The answer is either yes or no.

19 A. Yes.

20 THE COURT: All right.

21 BY MR. ROSENBLATT:

22 Q. How many people would generally attend the
23 analog meetings?

24 A. Five to ten, a dozen.

25 Q. Scientists?

1 A. Yes. All scientists.

2 Q. Organic chemists?

3 A. Organic chemists.

4 Q. And the analog meetings were held how
5 frequently, during the period of time you worked in the
6 lab?

7 A. Oh, roughly monthly.

8 Q. Dr. Mele, at any analog meeting that you ever
9 attended, and during any discussion that was ever held,
10 did any of these Philip Morris scientists ever at any
11 time during any meeting in that two-and-a-half year
12 period express any interest whatsoever in the health of
13 Philip Morris smokers?

14 MR. MDSS: Objection, Your Honor.

15 BY MR. ROSENBLATT:

16 Q. Did that come up?

17 THE COURT: I'll overrule the objection.

18 BY MR. ROSENBLATT:

19 Q. You can answer it.

20 A. Never once in my whole time at the company
21 did I hear any concern for the customer, other than one
22 scientist who was complaining that he was repeatedly --
23 repeatedly having his research changed in direction any
24 time he came upon some hot research.

25 MR. HEIM Your Honor, I move to strike that

1 answer.

2 MR. ROSENBLATT: Thank you, Doctor.

3 THE COURT: Overruled.

4 All right. You may step down, sir.

5 Thank you very much.

6 Okay. I guess I'm going to have to talk to
7 the lawyers for a second.

8 (Discussion off the record.)

9 THE COURT: All right, folks. We've been
10 discussing the scheduling, and we still have some stuff
11 that we have to do, and you'll get a break today. So
12 I'll let you go home a little early.

13 Anybody protests?

14 All right, folks. We'll be reconvening
15 tomorrow at the usual time, 9:15.

16 Same rules apply.

17 (The jury exited the courtroom)

18 THE COURT: Okay. You can all be seated.

19 MR. ROSENBLATT: Apparently some of the
20 videographer's equipment was stolen.

21 THE COURT: Stolen?

22 MR. ROSENBLATT: The VCR.

23 THE COURT: From where?

24 MR. ROSENBLATT: Out of the courtroom Out
25 of the other room

1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: My VCR.

2 THE CLERK: In the media room?

3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Yes. Leaving it there for
4 convenience of getting it back here.

5 THE COURT: When did you first bring it in?

6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: It's been there for weeks.

7 (Discussion off the record.)

8 MR. SCHNEIDER: Judge, I did bring Thomas
9 Sandifur's deposition. Plaintiffs added about double
10 the designations on Friday night. We went through it,
11 got it done and color-coded.

12 MR. MOSS: Isn't that nice?

13 THE COURT: Sandifur.

14 MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. It's all color-coded
15 for you.

16 THE COURT: Now, which one do you want to
17 talk about first, Goldstone or Bible?

18 MR. HEIM: Goldstone.

19 MR. REID: Goldstone.

20 MR. ROSENBLATT: I would think Bible
21 because -- but it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter.
22 Bible was on the tip of my tongue.

23 THE COURT: Are you doing both?

24 MR. REID: I'm just doing Goldstone.

25 MR. ROSENBLATT: Fine.

1 THE COURT: Now --

2 MR. REID: I thought I would like to make
3 some introductory comments about our motion before I
4 get in --

5 THE COURT: You might as well, because your
6 motion is to just disregard the whole thing.

7 MR. REID: Exactly. Exactly.

8 And I don't want to belabor the point. It's
9 laid out thoroughly in the paper that we filed.

10 But as the Court is aware, Mr. Goldstone is
11 the executive of Nabisco. He is not an executive of RJ
12 Reynolds Tobacco Company.

13 We've cited a number of cases in Florida
14 that --

15 THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Let me just see
16 here. Okay. He is the chairman and executive officer
17 at the time of the deposition of RJR Nabisco.

18 MR. REID: The parent, a different
19 corporation.

20 THE COURT: The question, did he ever work at
21 RJR or --

22 MR. REID: No, sir. In fact, he -- as you'll
23 see, he had only worked in our -- in Page 2 of our
24 memo, we have some of these facts laid out with cites.
25 It's called Motion in Limine of defendant.

1 This deposition, just to give you background,
2 Your Honor, was taken in the Attorney General's
3 lawsuit.

4 THE COURT: Yes.

5 MR. REID: And he became the head of Nabisco
6 in 1995. Before that, he was a corporate lawyer with a
7 big law firm in New York. He wasn't involved with any
8 of the companies before 1995, which, of course, is
9 after this case was filed.

10 He was not a scientist. He's a mergers and
11 acquisitions lawyers.

12 In the deposition, they asked him a lot of
13 questions about the history and corporate activity
14 before he was ever associated with the parent. And the
15 important thing to remember is that he is not connected
16 with the party who is in this litigation.

17 He is not connected with RJ Reynolds Tobacco
18 Company. He is the chairman of the parent.

19 And in our memo, we cited a number of Florida
20 cases that talk about the corporate division, Florida
21 cases. We also cite cases from around the country
22 where this specific division has been made. And in
23 fact, I think one lawyer was sanctioned because he
24 added the parent. They said they shouldn't have been
25 in the tobacco cases. We've attached those to our

1 memo.

2 Not only does Florida follow the division
3 between the two companies, but there is case law around
4 the country where this very question has come up. That
5 is just a general overriding concept I think we ought
6 to keep in mind as we go through this.

7 THE COURT: Just to let you know, because of
8 testimony taken this morning, I haven't had time to
9 read this. It was placed on my desk today.

10 MR. REID: Yes. The reason -- let me tell
11 you why. The motion or our objections --

12 THE COURT: The motion.

13 MR. REID: One of the problems was, of
14 course, as with the other situations, we got these new
15 designations late Friday.

16 THE COURT: I understand that, but now
17 you're -- it's not as if I had time to read it and
18 digest it.

19 MR. REID: Would you rather put this one off
20 until --

21 THE COURT: Well --

22 MR. REID: Maybe I should just give you a few
23 other general concepts.

24 THE COURT: Go ahead and give your argument,
25 and we'll see where we go. If I feel I can't make a

1 decision on that basis, I'll let you know.

2 MR. REID: Apparently Mr. Heim tells me this
3 is going to be a lot of the same argument with
4 Mr. Bible, as well. He's going to have a lot of the
5 same corporate objections.

6 THE COURT: We might as well air it out today
7 and see where we go.

8 MR. REID: In his deposition, Your Honor,
9 generically they ask him questions about causation of
10 cancer. They ask him questions about warning labels
11 and what is he going to do in the future as chairman of
12 Nabisco, not as a tobacco company employee.

13 They ask him about the current policies of
14 tobacco, the parent, current, right now, today. And
15 they ask him about corporate behavior, not only of the
16 company that he's been associated with for a year and a
17 half when he was deposed but for Reynolds Tobacco,
18 which he is not associated with at all.

19 So that's the reason we object to any of this
20 deposition, because there's no way to cut it down in
21 any way to have any left that would be appropriate.

22 As I mentioned before, the first point, these
23 are separate corporations; there's no dispute about
24 that. He's the chairman of a different company.
25 They're not a party to this case.

1 Secondly, he's not a scientist at all.

2 THE COURT: Let me just ask you a question.
3 I'm a little bit confused here. And I do understand
4 what you're saying as far as that goes.

5 I was thinking back over it, some of the
6 questions that were asked, as I read through this
7 thing, and take Page 9, for example. And they're
8 talking about RJ Reynolds doing something.

9 Okay. Like the question: I would ask you to
10 assume that in January of 1954, RJ Reynolds endorsed an
11 ad about The Frank Statement.

12 We're talking about --

13 MR. REID: Sure, The Frank Statement.

14 THE COURT: And again on Line 16, 17: Would
15 that be the philosophy of RJ Reynolds today?

16 So I was somewhat confused as to what we're
17 talking about there, as to whether it's RJ Reynolds
18 Tobacco or we're talking about RJ Nabisco.

19 MR. REID: Those questions are all talking
20 about the tobacco company, because that's the company.

21 THE COURT: I know they are.

22 MR. REID: And as you go on, he explains that
23 it's a separate company, it's a subsidiary and so
24 forth.

25 That's really the basis. They're asking him

1 a lot of questions about what the tobacco company meant
2 when it signed the Frank Statement, what's the view
3 today of the tobacco company about The Frank Statement.

4 They've taken the deposition -- in fact,
5 they've read to the jury the tobacco company
6 executive --

7 THE COURT: But he says --

8 MR. REID: -- Mr. Schindler.

9 THE COURT: But the answer is: I do think
10 Reynolds is our tobacco company. As you know, we own
11 100 percent of it.

12 And then he goes on and says: I think when
13 you sell a product like cigarettes, public health has
14 got to be a paramount concern.

15 He has some knowledge.

16 MR. REID: He may have some opinions about
17 things, but the question we're dealing with here is the
18 legal issue as to whether what he says is an admission
19 by a party in the case. That's the exception they're
20 going to try to use as we go through this. And it's
21 not.

22 If you continue to look at this, Your Honor,
23 you'll also -- once you get beyond his testimony about
24 the problem that's created by the two separate
25 companies, the two separate corporations, you get into

1 all of the questions about science. And asking him his
2 opinion about causation and do you think it's a cause
3 of cancer and opinions about that.

4 And then they asked him for -- a lot of
5 questions about what somebody did, what somebody
6 thought in the tobacco company, long before he was ever
7 associated with any company, back when he was eight
8 years old, in fact, The Frank Statement.

9 So they ask him a lot of questions about
10 individual knowledge that he might have about something
11 that somebody else did long before he was around. So
12 he'd have no firsthand knowledge of that.

13 And then they'd go to the other extreme and
14 ask him about in 1997, does the parent company plan to
15 do something in the future, or does the parent company
16 plan to make the tobacco company do something in the
17 future?

18 He talks about, are you going to do some sort
19 of warnings, which would clearly be preempted, but he
20 talks about some sort of plans about warnings that you
21 might have in the future as the chairman of the parent
22 corporation.

23 So, when you go through each of those, that
24 is, you've got separate companies, you've got his
25 personal history of lack of knowledge of all of these

1 things, you've got his lack of any scientific basis,
2 any basis for answering these questions about
3 causation, and the fact that he has no personal or
4 firsthand knowledge of many of the things that happened
5 many years before he was associated with Nabisco, you
6 have a situation that it ought to be excluded.

7 Some of the legal issues that I raised, Your
8 Honor -- first of all, to the extent if you look at
9 Rule 90.803, this can't be an admission, because he
10 doesn't speak for the company that is the party here.

11 We cited Florida cases, Dania Jai-Alai and
12 the Ferris case, and the Factory Insurance Association
13 case, which talks about parents and wholly-owned
14 subsidiaries being separate and so forth.

15 We also, then, as I mentioned, cite cases
16 around the country that have been -- and we attached
17 two or three to our brief, that have dealt with this
18 particular situation, that is, RJR Nabisco and RJ
19 Reynolds Tobacco Company.

20 So, to the extent they're trying to claim it
21 somehow binds the subsidiary, that's clearly -- the law
22 is clearly to the contrary.

23 Secondly, as to the relevance, all of the
24 discussion about causation, his opinions, asking him
25 about the toxicology of cigarette smoke, they ask him

1 about scientific causation, this man is a corporate
2 lawyer who worked in mergers and acquisitions for
3 20-some years before he became the chief executive of
4 this company.

5 And then the remoteness problem. He's -- he
6 didn't even come into this role until after this
7 lawsuit started. So, he comes into the role after the
8 lawsuit started for a different company, and they
9 questioned him extensively about what another company
10 did in 1950, and do you still believe that the Frank
11 Statement is accurate or not, and things such as that.

12 And then they go, as I say, to the other
13 extreme into the future and say: What is RJ -- what is
14 Nabisco, the parent, going to do about third-world
15 countries and things like that.

16 These are just examples we'd get into if we
17 went into it. So, on balance, there is no basis for
18 reading his testimony.

19 Now, there is no prejudice to the plaintiff,
20 because the plaintiff took the deposition of the
21 chairman of the company that's the party to this case,
22 and, Judge, all of the same questions were asked. I
23 mean, you remember they went through The Frank
24 Statement, and the jury has heard all of that. So it's
25 all cumulative, in addition.

1 But they've heard all of that. And there's
2 no prejudice to the plaintiffs not to be able to show
3 another deposition of somebody -- when you couple that
4 with all of the problems that exist with this
5 deposition, no prejudice. On the one hand, the jury
6 has heard all of this from the chief executive of the
7 tobacco company. Coupled with all of the problems, we
8 believe that the deposition ought to just be excluded
9 in its entirety.

10 Excuse me one second, Judge. Mr. Moss
11 reminds me, the parent was actually a party in this
12 case, Your Honor, in the beginning, and was dismissed.

13 So that's another basis for drawing this
14 distinction.

15 That's the general comment I wanted to make.

16 MR. HEIM Your Honor, maybe I ought to
17 follow up with Bible for just a minute so you have in
18 front of you the complete picture as to Bible and
19 Goldstone.

20 And I thought the Court might be -- might
21 have a sense of deja vu if I just read a little
22 colloquy between Your Honor and Walt Cofer, because it
23 sounds so much like --

24 THE COURT: I've got to run and get a
25 picture.

1 MR. HEIM That's right. You have to go get
2 the picture off your wall.

3 MR. ROSENBLATT: Keep that picture in mind,
4 Judge.

5 MR. HEIM I was just struck by this. Your
6 Honor said -- this is at the Broin transcript at 12961,
7 and Your Honor had this to say, and this was the
8 response by Mr. Cofer, and I'll just adopt it as my
9 argument.

10 The Court said: So we have to first discuss
11 whether or not they're going to be used and under what
12 circumstances and how much. Let's do the Bible first.
13 Okay. So I'll hear from both sides.

14 And then Walt Cofer said: Our position is
15 clear, Your Honor. Wrong CEO, not a party, not a
16 complete deposition. It's cumulative.

17 Does that sound like Cofer?

18 Your Honor allowed plaintiffs' extraordinary
19 discovery of not one but two CEOs. They have presented
20 testimony of both proper CEOs to the jury. They read
21 Bill Campbell's. They showed the videotape of
22 Mr. Morgan's deposition. The jury has heard it.

23 These are the CEOs of the tobacco
24 manufacturer. And this -- this deposition that he's
25 talking about, Bible's, was taken in an unrelated case.

1 It's too late. It's not a party, and it's cumulative.

2 And, finally, the deposition is not complete.

3 And it goes on from there. So --

4 THE COURT: What did I rule?

5 MR. HEIM You excluded it.

6 THE COURT: Oh.

7 MR. HEIM But I'm hesitant to make that
8 argument in view of Your Honor's comments about --

9 THE COURT: I couldn't remember.

10 MR. HEIM -- rulings in Broin.

11 But I thought it sounded so much like what we
12 just heard. And it is -- in fact, what has happened
13 here is that you -- the jury has heard Bill Campbell,
14 who was the CEO of Philip Morris, and they did watch
15 the videotape of Mr. Morgan, who followed him as the
16 CEO of Philip Morris.

17 So, it is exactly the same situation. That's
18 why I described it as *deja vu*.

19 It's the same situation. He's not a CEO of
20 this party. He's a CEO of the parent, just as
21 Mr. Goldstone was CEO of the parent, and it was taken
22 in the Chiles case.

23 THE COURT: What do you call a parent, it's
24 RJR or Philip Morris Companies?

25 MR. HEIM It's Philip Morris companies, Inc.

1 THE COURT: Inc.

2 MR. HEIM Which is not a party in this
3 action.

4 And the two CEOs of the parties in this
5 action have been taken, and this -- in fact, it's
6 curious. It's even more than that. Judge Postman
7 permitted -- he said, if you want to take a deposition
8 of Mr. Bible in this case, you can go and do that, if
9 you want to try to do that.

10 And, of course, they never did that. They
11 never proceeded to take Mr. Bible in this case. Judge
12 Postman would rule on admissibility later. But he
13 actually said, if you want to do it, you can go do it.
14 They never proceeded to do that. Instead, they're
15 trying to do exactly what they did in Broin, which is
16 put in the same -- the same deposition that Your Honor
17 excluded in the Broin case.

18 So, for the same reasons, that's why I said I
19 would just adopt what Mr. Cofer said. Wrong CEO, not a
20 party, it's cumulative, and they've already presented
21 the testimony of the CEOs in this case.

22 THE COURT: Would that prevent him from being
23 a fact witness, the fact that he's not a party?

24 MR. HEIM Well, I --

25 MR. MOSS: It's hearsay.

1 MR. REID: Hearsay. It would be an
2 admission.

3 MR. HEIM It depends on what the
4 testimony --

5 THE COURT: If he's not a party --

6 MR. HEIM It would depend on what the
7 testimony was.

8 THE COURT: That's the point.

9 MR. HEIM But I think most of these
10 questions, as I recall this, were framed in terms of
11 more or less opinion testimony.

12 Mr. Bible, who was another one of these CEOs
13 who was not with the tobacco company for a substantial
14 period of time and then came back to the parent --

15 THE COURT: For example, if there was a
16 meeting between corporate heads, and he attended the
17 meeting, corporate head of Philip Morris, how do you
18 call it, Philip Morris --

19 MR. HEIM USA.

20 THE COURT: -- USA, had met and they
21 discussed general company policy and things of that
22 nature, yeah, he might be a fact witness in that
23 regard.

24 The fact that he may be the corporate head of
25 Philip Morris --

1 MR. HEIM Companies, Inc.

2 THE COURT: -- Companies -- I mean, it's
3 Companies, Inc.?

4 MR. HEIM Yes, sir.

5 THE COURT: Doesn't necessarily mean that he
6 has a hands-on, working knowledge of what the other
7 company, Philip Morris USA, may be doing.

8 MR. HEIM Correct.

9 THE COURT: You can understand that.

10 Although, he probably does have some working
11 knowledge of what they're doing, as the overall --

12 MR. HEIM As Your Honor knows, Philip Morris
13 Companies, Inc. owns a number of subsidiaries. One is
14 the tobacco subsidiary. One is Kraft food. One is
15 Miller Brewing. There's a number --

16 THE COURT: So, basically the question is,
17 what do you really know about the operation of the
18 company, that's the question, and what it's doing and
19 so forth.

20 MR. MOSS: That's not --

21 THE COURT: If they got reports, for example,
22 on a regular basis and had to review them and had to be
23 the final authority on some of the decision-making
24 process, that may be -- I don't really know.

25 MR. HEIM I think Your Honor will find

1 there's nothing like that in the deposition.

2 THE COURT: Yes.

3 MR. REID: That's what I was going to say.

4 The deposition doesn't go into that kind of material.

5 THE COURT: Oh, I understand.

6 MR. REID: It goes into the same material it
7 did with Mr. Schindler.

8 THE COURT: I was trying to make the
9 distinction, why somebody from another company could,
10 in fact, be a witness even though he isn't a party. So
11 I say it depends on the question and the type of
12 information gathered and garnered from him in the
13 deposition.

14 And as I say, I read through the deposition
15 as if he's a CEO to the party in question establishing
16 policy or speculation as to what the company might or
17 might not want.

18 MR. REID: There's one little twist I think
19 with Mr. Goldstone, and that is he became the CEO after
20 this lawsuit started. So, by definition, almost any
21 factual activity he would have undertaken would not be
22 relevant to this case because it would have happened
23 after.

24 THE COURT: Not necessarily. He may have
25 reviewed a lot of stuff as part of his job.

1 MR. REID: Again, there's none of that.
2 There's no talk of that. They're asking about what
3 somebody else -- as you see when go through it and read
4 the deposition, you'll see it's -- it's Mr. Schindler's
5 deposition all over.

6 MS. LUTHER: Judge, just for what it's worth,
7 I haven't had the opportunity to read either Bible or
8 Goldstone's deposition. But Liggett was not a party to
9 the State of Florida case at the point in time those
10 depositions were being taken, so we didn't have an
11 opportunity to cross examine.

12 So, I don't know if that's relevant or not,
13 since I haven't read their testimony. But in light of
14 the rule that you need to be a party to offer testimony
15 against Liggett, I think that I need to preserve the
16 record.

17 THE COURT: There is some mention of LeBow, I
18 think, in the deposition.

19 Your position, sir, is what?

20 MR. ROSENBLATT: Our position is, Judge, that
21 Bible is the number one man in the world for Philip
22 Morris. Our position is that Goldstone is the number
23 one man in the world for RJ Reynolds.

24 And our position is that, in a case of this
25 scope and sweep, where obviously the decision is

1 totally discretionary with Your Honor, no honest lawyer
2 would admit that -- would debate it if you allow it,
3 it's not reversible, and if you disallow it, it's not
4 reversible. It's discretionary.

5 Should they be permitted to hide in this
6 case?

7 Now, Mr. Heim is maybe a third right. Judge,
8 I can give you a file this thick, Judge, of the efforts
9 that we made to try to take Bible's deposition. And he
10 outsmarted us at every turn. And, finally, in
11 frustration, we said, the hell with it. It's just not
12 worth it. It's just becoming -- it's just becoming
13 insane.

14 And we tried and we tried and we tried, and
15 we couldn't get him. And at this point -- at this
16 point today, I will say -- and, of course, there's not
17 a chance in the world I'll get a straight answer, but I
18 would say today, if they -- if the defense says they
19 will bring in Bible and Goldstone, then we don't
20 need -- we don't need the depositions. I'll cross
21 examine them without a deposition if they say they'll
22 bring them in.

23 But, of course, they're not going to commit
24 to bringing him in.

25 Bible and Goldstone can tomorrow morning fire

1 the CEOs of the tobacco companies, the companies of
2 which they are chairmen. They wholly own the tobacco
3 companies.

4 And, Judge, as you pointed out, on Page 9 --
5 and Goldstone recognized this -- on Page 9 of his
6 deposition, when he's asked the question: Would that
7 be the philosophy of RJ Reynolds today under your
8 leadership, that is, that the public health is the
9 paramount consideration in business? And, you know, he
10 doesn't quibble and say, well, you know, technically
11 I'm not really the tobacco company; I'm this merger and
12 acquisitions lawyer.

13 I mean, he dealt with reality. He's been
14 selected as the number one guy, and he says: As you
15 know, we own 100 percent of it, and I think that when
16 you sell a product like cigarettes, public health has
17 got to be a paramount concern, definitely.

18 They really should not be permitted, because
19 we're not in a Federal court, we don't have the
20 subpoena power, they should really not be permitted --
21 the number one -- and as I say, in a case -- I mean,
22 they'll get up and talk about the law, and the law is
23 it's discretionary. That's what the law is.

24 And a judge looks at the totality of
25 circumstances. And we should -- the jury should have

1 an opportunity in this case, a class action, the only
2 class action and the only smokers' class action in the
3 history of tobacco litigation ever to go to trial --
4 and the same thing actually was with LeBow. I don't
5 think LeBow -- LeBow was the president and CEO of the
6 parent company. He -- there was another CEO of the
7 tobacco company.

8 And I don't think we should engage in these
9 fictions.

10 Now, with respect to Goldstone also, I'd
11 point out to the Court that when the national
12 settlement fell through, Judge, at the congressional
13 level, it was Goldstone who voluntarily took center
14 stage. This is a decision he made, to go out in front
15 and have -- speak to the National Press Club in
16 Washington, D.C.

17 He was on the cover of New York Times
18 magazine, and he's been totally outspoken. He's been
19 out there in front as the number one guy.

20 And he was very strident, and he had the
21 right to take that position. But he didn't delegate it
22 to the CEO of the tobacco company. He dealt with
23 reality. He's the spokesman for RJ Reynolds, as Bible
24 is the spokesman for Philip Morris.

25 They were deposed. Obviously, a judge felt

1 that they could be deposed in the Attorney General
2 case. The Attorney General of the State of Florida
3 didn't represent any citizens of the State of Florida,
4 and we do. We represent many thousands of them. And
5 the jury should have an opportunity to hear from the
6 number one -- from the number one Philip Morris person
7 in the world and from the number one RJ Reynolds
8 person.

9 MR. REID: Judge, if I could just make a
10 couple of comments.

11 On the LeBow issue, of course, he was a
12 director of the tobacco company, as well. So that's a
13 different situation, to that extent.

14 You know, I think counsel concedes the point.
15 This rises to a serious 403 problem, because he
16 essentially just wants to get the CEO, the number one
17 person as he says, here so he can ask the questions
18 that are inappropriate to be asked.

19 We're not really dealing with -- I'm not sure
20 he ever asked to depose Mr. Johnson in this case to
21 start with. Maybe he can tell me he did. As far as I
22 know, he didn't.

23 MR. HEIM Goldstone.

24 MR. REID: Goldstone, I mean. I don't think
25 he was ever sought to be deposed in this case.

1 But the point is, Your Honor, what we're
2 really dealing with is whether the witness is
3 competent, and there is some law -- we are dealing with
4 law here. When counsel says there's no law here, it's
5 discretionary, there is law.

6 Is he competent to talk about something that
7 happened when he's been the CEO of one company for a
8 year and a half, to talk about something when he was
9 eight years old, 40 years before? And when you read
10 the deposition, he doesn't say, did you go back and
11 look at everything and did you develop factual opinions
12 in light of what the Court was asking?

13 He asked the same questions. Do you think
14 smoking causes disease? Do you think you should be
15 warning people in the third-world about cigarettes? Do
16 you think you should have the same warnings that
17 Mr. LeBow -- that's where LeBow comes up, because he
18 took out a pack of L&M's and said, do you think you
19 ought to be doing what Mr. LeBow is doing? Do you
20 think smoking causes these diseases?

21 And it goes on and on.

22 So we're talking about competence to ask the
23 questions that he wants to ask. We know exactly what
24 we're talking about here because we have the
25 deposition.

1 And I will point out on this issue of cross
2 examination, in the governor's case, it was a
3 completely different issue. The reason that you have
4 the right to cross examine, sometimes the cases talk
5 about -- there were completely different issues in that
6 case from this case.

7 In attempting to bring that deposition in
8 over here, when you read it, you'll find out it was
9 nothing more -- it was taken by Mr. Mbtley, actually,
10 who bristled at me in comparison to Mr. Rosenblatt,
11 actually, in the deposition. I don't know if they
12 talked to each other ahead of time or not.

13 MR. ROSENBLATT: I didn't catch that.

14 THE COURT: I didn't hear it.

15 MR. REID: When Mr. Mbtley said: Aren't you
16 doing the other case?

17 And he said: Don't compare me with him or
18 something like that.

19 That's beside the point.

20 MR. ROSENBLATT: Trying to make a little
21 trouble on the side.

22 MR. MOSS: It seems to be working.

23 MR. REID: But the point is, Your Honor, when
24 you read it, you know, there's no prejudice to the
25 plaintiffs. All of this is in front of the jury.

1 All he wants to be able to do is say I
2 brought in the number one person and beat him around
3 the head the same way he did with the other ones.

4 It's a 403 problem The fact he has nothing
5 to argue in return tells you it's a 403 problem

6 What I suggest, since nobody is prejudiced at
7 all, the jury has heard all of these questions over and
8 over and over, including the head of the tobacco
9 company, they ought to be excluded, and it shouldn't be
10 allowed again.

11 THE COURT: Well, I would like time to look
12 this thing over and digest those cases.

13 I mean, you only presented two of them
14 Di am i ts or D y m i ts, which might be material. And you
15 have one in here, the U.S. -- it's Economy versus RJ
16 Reynolds Tobacco.

17 MR. REID: Kirby versus RJ Reynolds.
18 Different Kirby.

19 THE COURT: Do you have that one in here?

20 MR. REID: It's attached to the memorandum
21 Mbtion in Limine.

22 THE COURT: Let me see if I have it.

23 MR. REID: It's the very last one.

24 THE COURT: I don't think I have that one.

25 MR. REID: D-y-m-i-t.

1 THE COURT: I have that one, and Economy.

2 Those are the only two.

3 MR. REID: You don't have the third one?

4 THE COURT: No, I don't have the third one.

5 MR. REID: I'll get it.

6 Your Honor, let me -- can I just add one
7 other factual piece of information that I forgot to
8 mention?

9 Nabisco didn't purchase RJ Reynolds Tobacco
10 Company until the '80s.

11 THE COURT: Until when?

12 MR. REID: Until the '80s.

13 THE COURT: The '80s.

14 MR. REID: So that adds another difficulty.
15 I mean, you've got a parent that didn't purchase the
16 subsidiary here until the '80s, long after most of the
17 things they're asking, you know, about happened.

18 So to the extent that bears on it, I just
19 wanted to share that with you.

20 THE COURT: I would like to review it. I'd
21 like to read those depositions again in light of what we just
22 said and see if I could assimilate it.

23 MR. REID: Could I ask you one question, Your
24 Honor?

25 Do you have the second amended objections?

1 That's the one we just filed. And it's the same form
2 we've been using.

3 THE COURT: Yes.

4 MR. REID: Great. Okay.

5 THE COURT: So I'll review these two tonight.

6 MR. HEIM Your Honor, I should hand up to
7 the Court the Bible deposition with the highlighting
8 that took place, and if you're going to review Bible --

9 THE COURT: I have Bible.

10 MR. HEIM -- you're better off -- yes, but
11 what you don't have, if you remember, on Friday,
12 counsel changed and said they wanted the entire Bible
13 deposition read.

14 So, that required us to go back and make some
15 more objections. Since you haven't read it yet --

16 THE COURT: I have read it.

17 MR. MOSS: You didn't read it with what they
18 have.

19 THE COURT: I didn't read it in light of what
20 you're arguing.

21 MR. HEIM I understand.

22 THE COURT: Now I want to look at it again
23 and see -- just look, like we're talking about a CEO
24 depo.

25 MR. HEIM Yes.

1 THE COURT: Nobody had raised the issue.

2 MR. HEIM No. I understand that.

3 THE COURT: So now I want to look at it in a
4 different light.

5 MR. HEIM All right. When you're looking at
6 it in that light, would Your Honor prefer to have in
7 front of you the same deposition, the Bible deposition,
8 with the additional markings of objections? Because I
9 can give you that.

10 THE COURT: Yes, sure.

11 MR. HEIM So I might as well do that.

12 And I might point out, Your Honor, that this
13 deposition, of course, taken in the Chiles case, which
14 had a lot of different issues, is not -- it's one of
15 those depositions where, if it had been taken in the
16 Engle case and had I been there or a lawyer
17 representing Philip Morris there, you could have made a
18 decision whether you wanted to ask any clarifying
19 questions about the questions that were asked by the
20 lawyer for the plaintiff.

21 But since you aren't there, you know, you're
22 just dealing with somebody else's deposition. And
23 that's why the rule -- basically the rule says you're
24 supposed to use depositions taken in the same case, not
25 depositions taken in another case.

1 THE COURT: How come yours is thicker than
2 this one?

3 MR. HEIM Because I think mine has exhibits
4 attached to it.

5 THE COURT: Mine is only 60-some-odd pages.

6 MR. HEIM That's all mine is. Mine is 60 --
7 less than that. You're right. It's 67 pages. It just
8 has exhibits attached to it.

9 It's harder to put in your briefcase.

10 THE COURT: Putting it in the briefcase is no
11 problem Carrying it is a different problem

12 MR. REID: Judge, I gave you the Kirby case
13 just now.

14 THE COURT: Yes. Kirby. Right.

15 Okay. All right. So I won't watch the ball
16 game. So what?

17 MR. HEIM Oh, no. Watch the ballgame.

18 MR. ROSENBLATT: Just watch the last quarter.

19 (Discussion off the record.)

20 THE COURT: All right. Let's say assume,
21 just for the sake of assumption, that they are correct
22 and I do not allow the testimony. We have to have
23 something to do Tuesday and Wednesday.

24 MR. ROSENBLATT: Right.

25 THE COURT: We have Sandi fur.

1 MR. ROSENBLATT: Sandifur is --

2 THE COURT: But that's another --

3 MR. SCHNEIDER: 280 pages.

4 THE COURT: How much?

5 MR. SCHNEIDER: 280.

6 THE COURT: And I haven't looked at that one,
7 I don't think.

8 MR. SCHNEIDER: No, you have not.

9 THE COURT: Because I just got it.

10 MR. ROSENBLATT: And Nick Brookes.

11 THE COURT: Although, looking at it, it
12 doesn't look like there's a lot in it. There's not much.

13 MR. SCHNEIDER: There's about -- I'd say
14 about half of it is marked.

15 THE COURT: I would say less, from what I can
16 see.

17 MR. SCHNEIDER: I hope they marked it right.

18 THE COURT: In any event, I don't know if I'm
19 going to be able to read all three of these things in
20 one night.

21 MR. SCHNEIDER: It would take a substantial
22 period of time.

23 THE COURT: But --

24 MR. ROSENBLATT: Sandifur is not a video,
25 Judge.

1 MR. SCHNEIDER: That's right.

2 MR. ROSENBLATT: Now, Cahan is a problem
3 because you're going to -- and apparently -- and Nick
4 Brookes is a problem

5 Obviously, because of the short week, I --

6 THE COURT: I know.

7 MR. REID: Would you like to know what our
8 overall position on Cahan is? Would that help you with
9 our overall position on Cahan?

10 THE COURT: Sure. Why not? I'll listen to
11 anything.

12 MR. HEIM: And you have in this case.

13 THE COURT: I've heard almost everything.

14 MR. REID: We have objected, generically, to
15 Dr. Cahan, and it's contained in the first three or
16 four pages of our document, and then we've gone
17 through --

18 THE COURT: Cahan. Cahan.

19 MR. REID: -- we've gone through and made
20 specific objections.

21 But I want to tell you what our general
22 position is. I said this the other day, that it's
23 similar to some of the problems we faced with Father
24 Drinan in terms of the witness' scope of what the
25 witness likes to talk about.

1 We have a -- we have a serious cumulative
2 problem. He's a thoracic surgeon, lung surgeon, cancer
3 surgeon, Dr. Cahan. You remember Dr. Staples was here
4 and he's the same thing. He passed around the lung and
5 heart pieces and talked about surgery on them.

6 With Dr. Cahan, notwithstanding that's his
7 area of specialty, he gives opinions that cancer is the
8 cause -- that smoking is the cause of 15 or so
9 diseases. I mean, in addition to lung, emphysema, COPD
10 and heart and cardiovascular, he opines it causes head
11 and neck cancer, urology problems, bladder, cervix,
12 leukemia, early menopause, miscarriages, phlebitis,
13 kidneys and stroke.

14 He gives opinions that tobacco/nicotine is
15 addictive. He gives opinions that there is a
16 fraudulent public relations and legal strategy that's
17 improper.

18 He gives opinions that there is a suppression
19 of data and a description of evidence. That's in his
20 deposition. He talks about his involvement with
21 smoking bans in New York City and what he's done to try
22 to get New York City to ban smoking and his involvement
23 in the smoking ban.

24 He talks about the lack of cooperation about
25 the industry, kind of a throw-back to the same kind of

1 testimony that's elicited regarding The Frank
2 Statement.

3 Now, in this case so far, and we tried to
4 count these, and we may be off one or two, we've had
5 nine witnesses who talked about causation. And
6 Dr. Staples is the most significant one who's dealt
7 with the thoracic surgery, that same identical
8 specialty.

9 They want to add a tenth with Dr. Cahan.
10 We've had ten witnesses who have dealt with addiction.
11 They want to add an eleventh. I'll say as a sub-part
12 of that, not only is it cumulative, but he's got
13 absolutely no basis in his experience to give opinions.

14 He's not a psychologist, psychiatrist. He's
15 had no training in pharmacology, none of the areas you
16 would expect one to have to give opinions that a
17 substance is addictive. He gives opinions.
18 Nonetheless, not only is he cumulative, he's also
19 completely incompetent to give testimony.

20 He has a long section about youth marketing.
21 You know, we've had lots of testimony from plaintiffs'
22 witnesses about youth marketing.

23 He talks about that we target -- he goes
24 through and does exactly what several of the witnesses
25 have done. He has his own personal ad collections he's

1 going to bring in. He's going to go through those ads
2 and tell the jury what they mean. Not only that
3 they're plain English, the jury can understand them,
4 but you have a completely incompetent witness in the
5 area of advertising and marketing who's going to tell
6 the jury what these companies are trying to do with
7 these ads and why they're so bad.

8 He has a long section about his opinions
9 about CTR. But he's said he's not read their material
10 and doesn't know much about it, but they're no good
11 anyway, essentially, and he goes through and he
12 basically attacks CTR.

13 So you've got cumulative problems. You've
14 got out-of-his-area -- out-of-his-expertise problems,
15 lack of competence.

16 And then you have what I'll call
17 outrageousness problems. For instance, a question was
18 asked by counsel in his deposition: Gee, have you done
19 a study comparing the tobacco companies to the
20 Holocaust?

21 And he says he has, and he compares the
22 number of deaths and so forth. He talks about that.

23 He talks at great length about how Newt
24 Gingrich has called him a tobacco nazi and how proud he
25 is of that. And then he has a whole section where he

1 goes through famous person after famous person after
2 famous person and tells their story. And he talks
3 about how he met Yule Brynner because his mother-in-law
4 was in "The King and I."

5 And he went in, he said: I couldn't see his
6 bald head because of all of the smoke in the room, and
7 Yule Brynner said -- and he accents it -- it will never
8 get me.

9 He saw him years later, and he talks about
10 what Yule Brynner said.

11 Leonard Bernstein, Fredrick Lerner or
12 Fredrick Lowe of Lerner and Lowe.

13 MR. ROSENBLATT: "My Fair Lady."

14 MR. REID: "My Fair Lady." There are others.
15 I can't remember the other stars. He goes through all
16 these famous people, that he talks about what they said
17 to him or what he said to them

18 Your Honor, that's throughout the deposition.

19 This deposition, for all of those reasons,
20 just ought to be completely excluded, and that's our
21 overriding position.

22 THE COURT: Could it cut the trial short?
23 Just read that one.

24 MR. REID: It could have eliminated about 30
25 witnesses.

1 MR. ROSENBLATT: He actually made it sound
2 like a very interesting deposition to me, Judge.

3 THE COURT: It was.

4 MR. ROSENBLATT: It piqued your curiosity.

5 THE COURT: I read it.

6 MR. ROSENBLATT: We're not ready to argue
7 Cahan.

8 THE COURT: I know. I did read it, and it
9 was interesting.

10 MR. ROSENBLATT: Fascinating man.
11 Fascinating man. 50 years at Sloan-Kettering. A half
12 century.

13 THE COURT: You're not going to get into that
14 until January.

15 Okay. I had a thought. I wasn't sure where
16 we're going to go with it. We have still to do, before
17 I think you rest, the privilege issues to discuss and
18 the Minnesota issues. I'm not sure if they're going to
19 be one and the same. If they are, great.

20 I was just wondering and thinking about, if I
21 do, if I knew in advance how much material we were
22 going to be talking about on the privilege issue, say,
23 the number of documents, it might be advisable to --
24 and I'm just thinking out loud here -- to talk in terms
25 of having a special master review it and advise the

1 Court the position the master might have, vis-a-vis the
2 crime fraud exception issue, much as we did in the
3 Broin case.

4 And I thought that was done early on in this
5 case, but I'm not sure it had ever got to fruition.

6 MR. MOSS: I don't think it ever got
7 anywhere.

8 THE COURT: Two things. I know that there
9 was a Zolen hearing up in Minnesota. We haven't had a
10 Zolen hearing here or a semblance of one. I think
11 we're going to have to be doing that kind of thing in
12 the first place.

13 Now if we're dealing with hundreds of
14 documents, the time between now and the time we get to
15 it would be an advantageous time for, say, a master to
16 review that stuff.

17 MR. MOSS: Are you anticipating the master
18 will hold the Zolen hearing?

19 THE COURT: I don't know. I was just
20 thinking about it, you know.

21 I'm really just trying to kick it around in
22 my head.

23 MR. MOSS: I think it's a worthwhile effort
24 here to talk about that.

25 THE COURT: Because it may be protracted. It

1 may be the kind of hearing that's going to take up some
2 time.

3 Of necessity, you might have to have some
4 evidentiary matters resolved. And if you're dealing
5 with a lot of documents, that's a problem. If you're
6 going to cut the documents down and not deal with a
7 whole bunch of documents, like you did in Broin, when
8 you had the B&W, you only had 28 or ended up with 28 --

9 MR. ROSENBLATT: Approximately.

10 THE COURT: Not like the 100 that might be
11 valuable. Here I'm sure we'll have a lot more
12 documents. But think about it and see what you want to
13 do before we recess on, what, Wednesday afternoon or
14 something like that.

15 MR. HEIM: The other thing that I didn't want
16 to let pass, Judge, that we have yet to do, and at
17 least I had suggested it to the Court, and I don't want
18 it to pass because I think it's fundamental to what
19 I've been trying to say over the course of several
20 weeks, if not months, with this issue with regard to
21 marketing to youth.

22 As Your Honor knows, I made a motion.
23 Plaintiffs are going to respond to that in writing, as
24 I understand it, and then we will have some argument, I
25 believe Your Honor said, with regard to that motion.

1 And I just -- I don't know whether it's
2 possible to do that before the break or not. If it is,
3 I'd like to do it. If it isn't, then I guess we can't
4 do it.

5 But I do want to -- I do want to just offer
6 this one thought to Your Honor on this subject, because
7 as you know, it continues to bother me, and that is
8 just simply this, for Your Honor to think about it, if
9 the Court deems it worthy of thought, that if you
10 take -- if you forget about preemption entirely, just
11 forget preemption, and just look at the issue of
12 relevance, pure and plain relevance of the youth
13 marketing evidence, and you look at it in the context
14 of Dr. Engle's claim and Frosene Steevens' claims and
15 Mr. Angell's claims, all of whom are representative
16 plaintiffs, Your Honor will see that none of those
17 plaintiffs have any testimony to offer that makes youth
18 marketing relevant to -- Dr. Engle will have testified
19 that he didn't start smoking in reliance on
20 advertising, and the others will have testified,
21 because I know what they've said in their deposition,
22 and the point about all of that -- and two of them, in
23 fact, said that they began smoking when they were
24 adults.

25 So, the point of what I'm making is that

1 these are the representative plaintiffs in this case.
2 They are -- have been certified by another -- by the
3 Court as being representative of the claims of this
4 class, and they are typical of the plaintiffs' claims
5 in this class. And that's the basis upon which this
6 class was certified.

7 So, if they have no claim that in any way
8 turns upon marketing to youth because they have
9 testified and will testify that they were totally
10 uninfluenced by any advertising and/or didn't start
11 smoking when they were underage, then what in the world
12 would it have to do with the claims of the class?
13 Forget preemption. What in the world can it have to do
14 with that?

15 And at the very least, it would have nothing
16 to do with the common issues in this case. It couldn't
17 possibly.

18 So, you know, I just -- I don't want to let
19 that get lost.

20 THE COURT: Well, I assume they're going to
21 address that in their brief.

22 MR. HEIM But the point -- and I assume they
23 are. But that has nothing to do with preemption.
24 That's pure and plain relevance.

25 THE COURT: I would want that topic

1 discussed, whoever is going to do the response, because
2 it is an issue, and they've raised it before, and
3 they've got solid grounds on their motion, which has
4 been filed, and it may have an effect on the case. I
5 don't know.

6 Every time you start thinking about things
7 like that, you start thinking about other things that
8 might apply. And you get yourself to the point --

9 MR. ROSENBLATT: I think the immediate
10 problem, Your Honor, is counsel has made precisely that
11 argument. My understanding of this was, we're going to
12 file our papers, then either we'll have an argument
13 about it at some time. But the immediate problem is
14 what are we going to do with this jury tomorrow and
15 half a day Wednesday?

16 THE COURT: I don't know.

17 MR. ROSENBLATT: I mean, I don't really
18 think --

19 THE COURT: I don't know really until I look
20 at this stuff again.

21 MR. ROSENBLATT: I don't think we have the
22 luxury -- I try to be quiet and I try to contain
23 myself, but I don't think we needed that whole thing
24 about Dr. Cahan. You know, they're going -- they're
25 going to repeat again and again -- we're not dealing

1 with Dr. Cahan's deposition this week.

2 THE COURT: He was trying to use the time.

3 MR. ROSENBLATT: Yes. Well, I think the time
4 should be used. We're talking about Sandifur and what
5 else after Sandifur.

6 MR. REID: I was -- let me apologize if I was
7 out of line. I was under the impression we were going
8 to deal with Dr. Cahan tomorrow.

9 THE COURT: No.

10 MR. REID: Apparently that's been changed
11 since last Friday when I was told. That's the reason.
12 If I had known it was next week, I wouldn't have said
13 it.

14 THE COURT: I'm waiting for some sort of
15 response from them on that issue, Cahan. That's what I
16 thought. I thought it was put off until --

17 MR. ROSENBLATT: That was not clear to me.

18 MR. HEIM Your Honor, on this other subject
19 of a response on the issue of the relevance and the
20 preemption of the youth marketing subject, perhaps
21 counsel could check -- I know that Mr. Rosenblatt isn't
22 going to write that, and my informed guess would be
23 that Mrs. Rosenblatt would write that brief.

24 Perhaps counsel could suggest to the Court
25 tomorrow when would be a time that would be convenient

1 for plaintiffs' counsel to respond.

2 MR. ROSENBLATT: Okay.

3 THE COURT: All right. Yes. I'm sort of in
4 a quandary, because if we don't utilize these two
5 depositions tomorrow, I'm not sure what we're going to
6 do with the jury.

7 I guess we'll just have to play it by ear and
8 face that when we get to it.

9 I would like to give some serious
10 considerations to these issues that came up today,
11 because I think they're entitled to that.

12 MR. ROSENBLATT: So, you know, even if you
13 were to rule favorably, Your Honor, these are very
14 brief depositions.

15 THE COURT: I know.

16 MR. ROSENBLATT: So that would not take the
17 whole day. So I guess the next thing we would deal
18 with would be Sandifur.

19 THE COURT: I'll do my best, folks.

20 MR. ROSENBLATT: No. I'm saying, even as we
21 go along tomorrow --

22 THE COURT: I'll do my best, which is always
23 trouble with depositions.

24 MR. ROSENBLATT: Right.

25 THE COURT: You know.

1 I mean, like just academically speaking, in
2 the deposition, once you've asked a question, which is
3 an objectionable question, the objection is raised at
4 the deposition, but the answer is given and you just
5 keep going.

6 Then, if it turns out later that that
7 objection is sustained, that whole line of questions is
8 thrown out of whack and may not be utilized.

9 But live, in trial, just as you did hear, you
10 ask a question, which is objected to, but there's a way
11 to come back and go in on the other side and ask a
12 nonobjectionable question on the same subject matter
13 and you can cure it. And it puts the Court in a heck
14 of a position in trying to read through these
15 depositions and getting appropriate information in
16 front of the jury.

17 MR. ROSENBLATT: Sandifur, of course, is
18 deceased.

19 THE COURT: Yes. No, but I'm --

20 MR. ROSENBLATT: Yes.

21 THE COURT: -- musing about the evils of a
22 deposition. And it is a terrible way to try a case.
23 It's an awful way to try a case, because it puts
24 everybody in a position.

25 All right. I guess we will go ahead and

1 recess and see you tomorrow.

2 MR. MOSS: Regular time.

3 THE COURT: See you 9:30.

4 (Court was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25