

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE)	
PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO)	
ANIMALS,)	Civil Action
)	No. 03-2006
Plaintiff,)	
)	March 17, 2009
v.)	5:35 p.m.
)	
FELD ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,)	Washington, D.C.
)	
Defendant.)	

TRANSCRIPT OF BENCH TRIAL PROCEEDINGS - DAY 22
AFTERNOON SESSION
BEFORE THE HONORABLE EMMET G. SULLIVAN,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: **MEYER GLITZENSTEIN & CRYSTAL**
Catherine A. Meyer, Esq.
Tanya Sanerib, Esq.
Delcianna J. Winders, Esq.
Eric R. Glitzenstein, Esq.
1601 Connecticut Avenue, NW, #700
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 588-5206

For the Defendant: **FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI LLP**
John M. Simpson, Esq.
Lisa Zeile Joiner, Esq.
Kara L. Petteway, Esq.
Michelle C. Pardo, Esq.
Lance L. Shea, Esq.
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004-2623
202-662-0200

Court Reporter: **Scott L. Wallace, RDR, CRR**
Official Court Reporter
Room 6509, U.S. Courthouse
Washington, D.C. 20001
202.326.0566
scottlyn01@aol.com

AFTERNOON SESSION, MARCH 16, 2009

00:04 (5:35 p.m.)

00:04 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

00:04 CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION OF DR. DENNIS SCHMITT

00:04 BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN:

00:04 Q. Dr. Schmitt, let's take a look at another reference or
00:04 two in the Oosterhuis chapter we were just discussing. Before
00:04 we go over to one additional one, you were talking about cracks
00:04 being something that you see fairly regularly in the FEI
00:04 elephants, correct?

00:05 A. Yes.

00:05 Q. In effect, all the elephants on the inspection, just
00:05 about, had some evidence of toenail cracks, correct?

00:05 A. On the inspection, I believe five did, some very, very
00:05 minor, but yes.

00:05 Actually, in looking at this, can I make a comment about
00:05 what you left up here?

00:05 Q. Sure.

00:05 THE COURT: Go ahead.

00:05 THE WITNESS: The statement it makes: "Invariably, it
00:05 must walk and stand in its own feces and urine." Mostly talking
00:05 primarily about zoos and actually in those facilities that don't
00:05 tether their elephants, that's more likely because they can walk
00:05 around and there's nobody there to pick up the feces or sweep the
00:05 urine.

00:05 THE COURT: Wouldn't it be more likely that they'd stand
00:05 in their own urine and feces if they're chained up, though?

00:05 THE WITNESS: No, because it's behind them.

00:05 THE COURT: So, what you're saying is -- they can move a
00:06 little bit on the chains, though, can't they.

00:06 THE WITNESS: Yeah, but usually they back up. And the
00:06 urine drains away and they're not walking and mashing and
00:06 standing in their urine and feces, chained up.

00:06 THE COURT: All right.

00:06 THE WITNESS: It's more likely to actually be the case --

00:06 THE COURT: If they're not chained up, they're not going
00:06 to walk around stepping in it, are they?

00:06 THE WITNESS: No -- yeah, they are. They do. In zoos,
00:06 you come in often and they've stepped in it, they've laid in it.

00:06 THE COURT: All right.

00:06 BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN:

00:06 Q. And the fact is that when they're chained up, they can't
00:06 walk away from any feces or urine that collect under their feet
00:06 and it's not cleaned up, correct?

00:06 A. They can move forward, yes.

00:06 Q. A foot or so?

00:06 A. Well, it's more than that, yes.

00:06 Q. But in your report about Susan, for example, I know you
00:06 disagree with the word "urine scalding" or that phrase, right?

00:06 A. Yes.

00:06 Q. Even though you've seen it in Feld's own medical records
00:06 with respect to Susan, right?

00:07 A. I saw someone reference to scalding, yes. And I think
00:07 that was not a diagnosis, but kind of a general term they used.

00:07 Q. But you disagree because of the pH. You don't
00:07 disagree --

00:07 A. That's one of the reasons.

00:07 Q. -- Susan is getting urine on her legs, right?

00:07 A. Yes, on the inside of her legs.

00:07 Q. And she's chained up with a medical condition where she's
00:07 urinating on her legs and can't move from that position for many
00:07 hours at a time, right?

00:07 A. It happens when she's out in the pastures as well. It
00:07 splatters as it comes out and it's washed off twice a day, as is
00:07 noted here. "It may cause infection if feet are not washed
00:07 daily." It says "daily," and we're washing them and they're
00:07 getting exercise and doing all those things and she's being
00:07 treated and medicated.

00:07 Q. I'm not talking about your efforts to treat the
00:07 condition. What I'm talking about are the conditions under
00:07 which the animals are maintained.

00:07 Using Susan as an example, simple physics would suggest
00:07 that an animal that can move who's got urine coming out is
00:08 moving away from the urine more than an animal that's chained up
00:08 in a position where she can't move from the place where the

00:08 urine and feces are coming out.

00:08 Doesn't the simple law of physics dictate that
00:08 conclusion?

00:08 **A.** You're drawing the wrong conclusion from the wrong
00:08 information. You don't see it on any of the other elephants
00:08 there. This elephant has a lot of polyps, so as she urinates,
00:08 it's not a normal urine stream. It splatters on her legs no
00:08 matter where she's at. It's not because she's standing in it.
00:08 It's not the simple physics of where she's standing.

00:08 **Q.** So your position is that, contrary to what these experts
00:08 are saying about standing in feces and urine when you're chained
00:08 to one spot, that has nothing to do with the development of the
00:08 foot problems and other leg problems?

00:08 **A.** Would you show me where it says they were chained in one
00:08 spot?

00:08 **Q.** This says, "Captive elephants must stand and walk in
00:09 their own feces and urine." I assume that means they're talking
00:09 about being in the same location where their feces and urine
00:09 are, right?

00:09 **A.** Yes.

00:09 **Q.** Let me ask you about another part of Oosterhuis, and it's
00:09 directly in connection with this question because you're talking
00:09 about cracks. And you would agree, would you not, that when
00:09 abscesses, toenail abscesses are developing, that's a far more
00:09 serious medical problem, right?

00:09 A. Can be.

00:09 Q. Well, an abscess is by definition -- and I know you had
00:09 your discussion about the degree to which you have infection,
00:09 but an abscess by definition involves some infection, right?

00:09 A. Yeah.

00:09 Q. Isn't abscess dying off of some tissue?

00:09 A. Necrotic tissue; it's not an infection. You can have
00:09 sterile abscesses and, in fact, part of the toenails are a
00:09 definition of sterile abscesses, where you have necrotic tissue
00:09 developing, falling off and it forms an abscess, but not
00:09 necessarily an infection.

00:09 Q. But abscesses are, in fact, viewed as a more serious
00:10 concern, right?

00:10 A. Yes.

00:10 Q. And in fact, many of these elephants, the FEI elephants,
00:10 have in fact had nail bed abscesses, have they not?

00:10 A. Yes, that's what they've been characterized as.

00:10 Q. That's -- they've been characterized as that because
00:10 that's what they have, right?

00:10 A. It doesn't say "nail bed infection"; it says "nail bed
00:10 abscesses."

00:10 Q. Let's read from Oosterhuis. This is page 37 on the
00:10 right-hand side. It says "abscesses" -- quote: "Abscesses are
00:10 commonly seen in many captive elephants and their causes are
00:10 usually not obvious. It is our opinion that they are rarely the

00:10 result of some puncture or some other outside insult to the
00:10 foot. Rather, they are caused by internal blood supply
00:10 disruption, which is a sign or symptom of the multitude of
00:10 problems associated with keeping elephants in captivity. We
00:10 feel that the elephant is not genetically programmed to
00:10 withstand the constant gravitational pressure of living on hard
00:10 surfaces and carrying the excessive weight typical of most
00:11 captive elephants. Elephants certainly didn't evolve too to
00:11 stand motionless for long periods of time."

00:11 Do you see that?

00:11 **A.** I see that.

00:11 **Q.** So chaining an elephant would keep it motionless for the
00:11 period of time it's chained, correct?

00:11 **A.** No.

00:11 **Q.** Except if they're engaging in stereotypical behavior,
00:11 right?

00:11 **A.** No.

00:11 **Q.** Well, explain to me, if an elephant is chained in one
00:11 spot for 15 hours straight, how much moving can it be doing?

00:11 **A.** They can move a couple steps forward a couple steps
00:11 backward. That's about four. And then a couple to the side,
00:11 each way, depending on how -- what the chaining procedures are
00:11 at the facilities. So they're not motionless. They're not
00:11 standing absolutely motionless, no.

00:11 **Q.** Well, the chaining procedures at CEC, for example, have

00:11 one chain in back, one chain in front, and the extent of the
00:11 elephant's motion is literally a foot and a half or so up and a
00:11 foot and a half or so back, correct?

00:11 **A.** No.

00:11 **Q.** How can an elephant move considerably beyond what I just
00:12 described?

00:12 **A.** Well, some of the pictures I saw show that, at least in
00:12 the configurations of the CEC, they can move about four to five
00:12 foot from side to side. That's about 10 foot from side to side.
00:12 And I would estimate they can move, given the slack in the
00:12 chains and various things, they can move three to four foot
00:12 front to back each way, so that would be about a six foot
00:12 minimum.

00:12 **Q.** All chained on the hard surface there, correct?

00:12 **A.** Yes.

00:12 **Q.** Well, let me read again from the Oosterhuis article.
00:12 Quote -- and this is on page 38, and after talking about being
00:12 on the hard surfaces, it says, quote: "It is our opinion that
00:12 when these factors are combined with abnormal behavioral
00:12 movement, poor conformation or previous injuries, the foot is
00:12 destined to develop abscesses. Any abnormal pressure on the
00:12 nails, as seen on the lateral nails of the stereotypical rocking
00:13 elephant, will result in a disruption of the blood supply to the
00:13 sensitive tissue behind the nail. When this tissue is subject
00:13 to constant or intermittent abnormal pressure, it will

00:13 eventually become devitalized, like a bad bruise, and then form
00:13 a sterile nail abscess. This abscess then follows the path of
00:13 least resistance as the body tries to get rid of it. It usually
00:13 ruptures toward the surface at the cuticle line or at the
00:13 interface between the bottom of the nail and the pad. As soon
00:13 as it ruptures, it becomes an infected abscess."

00:13 Do you see that?

00:13 **A.** I see that.

00:13 **Q.** And in fact, is it not the case that many of FEI's
00:13 elephants have had exactly these kinds of nail bed abscesses?

00:13 **A.** The general description fits that. The rocking elephant,
00:13 actually, in the description usually gets cracks on the outside
00:13 lateral surface, on the outside toenails, lateral toenails, as
00:13 described in the literature.

00:13 Most of these cracks I see are not in the lateral from a
00:14 stereotypical rocking elephant, but the sterile nail abscess
00:14 can, as described, subsequent to the publication of this book --
00:14 and this is not scientifically validated literature; it was
00:14 their opinion -- shows that in actuality, we see necrotic nail
00:14 tissue growing both in wild and captive elephants. We're not
00:14 sure to the extent.

00:14 **Q.** The reality, though, is many of FEI's elephants have, in
00:14 fact, developed nail bed abscesses, correct?

00:14 **A.** Yes.

00:14 **Q.** Let's look over at page 44 of the same article. It says,

00:14 over on the right-hand side, near the bottom: "The bottom line
00:14 is that abscess prevention is the best course of action.
00:14 Prevention of abscesses requires exercise to strengthen foot
00:15 structure and maintain good blood flow to the foot; reduction in
00:15 weight to reduce pressure on the foot; three, allowing the
00:15 elephant to live on soft, yielding surfaces."

00:15 Do you see that?

00:15 **A.** Yes.

00:15 **Q.** And then also: "Four, elimination of behavioral motions
00:15 that cause abnormal stress on the foot."

00:15 Do you see that?

00:15 **A.** Yes.

00:15 **Q.** And again, in the context of this article, what they're
00:15 talking about are the kind of stereotypical behaviors that we
00:15 have discussed and you discussed in your testimony, right?

00:15 **A.** Would you point that out to me?

00:15 **Q.** Well, a couple pages earlier, were they not talking about
00:15 the constant rocking back and forth, which is the swaying
00:15 behavior that the elephants engage in?

00:15 **A.** Not the weaving, but the -- where they develop a pattern
00:15 of going to the side, yes.

00:15 **Q.** Well, isn't weaving when they go back and forth and that
00:15 puts stress on the feet and, in turn, opens up the cracks in the
00:15 feet?

00:16 **A.** I don't think they described it that way.

00:16 Q. Let's look back at page 38, in the middle of that
00:16 paragraph. It's near the top. Second sentence says: "Any
00:16 abnormal pressure on the nails, as seen in the lateral nails of
00:16 the stereotypical rocking elephant."

00:16 Aren't they referring to the rocking elephants that we've
00:16 seen repeatedly in the videotapes?

00:16 A. It's usually the ones going like this (indicating).
00:16 That's the rocking elephants versus the one that's shifting
00:16 away.

00:16 Q. That's the classic behavior we've seen in all these
00:16 elephants that have been chained up for lengthy periods of time,
00:16 right?

00:16 A. Wrong. You haven't seen all the elephants chained up for
00:16 lengthy periods of time.

00:16 Q. Okay. Did you see a video of the CEC inspection?

00:16 A. Yes.

00:16 Q. Did you watch the whole video?

00:16 A. Yes.

00:16 Q. Well, we saw a portion of that video where the elephants
00:17 were being fed at the beginning, correct, after they were
00:17 chained for the night?

00:17 A. Yes.

00:17 Q. Okay. Is it not the case that for the next two hours on
00:17 that video, those -- Karen is rocking back and forth?

00:17 A. Karen is, yes.

00:17 Q. So Karen is engaging in that rocking back and forth for
00:17 the next two hours during that inspection, correct?

00:17 A. Yes. While the plaintiffs' experts were standing right
00:17 in front of them, yes.

00:17 Q. So it's the fault of the plaintiffs' experts that she was
00:17 rocking back and forth; is that your position?

00:17 A. I think it increased the length and time of the behavior,
00:17 yes.

00:17 Q. Can we take a look at plaintiffs' -- we'll call it
00:17 Exhibit 133.

00:18 And this is a video that's already been admitted into
00:18 evidence, Your Honor.

00:18 THE COURT: All right.

00:18 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And we see some elephants rocking back
00:18 and forth in an asphalt parking lot.

00:18 (Videotape played.)

00:18 THE WITNESS: I see an elephant weaving of the left and
00:18 the elephant on the right is -- well, not really.

00:18 BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN:

00:18 Q. But you see at least one elephant engaging in that
00:18 behavior?

00:18 A. Yes.

00:18 Q. And there's no plaintiffs' experts around in this video,
00:18 are there?

00:18 A. No.

00:18 Q. And that's rocking back and forth on the hard surface
00:18 we're talking about, correct?

00:18 A. She was shifting right. She wasn't rocking. She wasn't
00:18 taking steps to put the lateral pressure on the nails.

00:18 Q. That's not putting pressure on one foot and then the
00:18 other in that video?

00:18 A. It's shifting weight. It's not putting pressure with the
00:18 lateral movement.

00:18 Q. So, in your view, shifting weight is different than
00:18 putting pressure on one foot and then the other?

00:19 I want to make sure I understand your testimony.

00:19 A. I want to make sure I understand your question.

00:19 THE COURT: The foot is coming off the ground, isn't it?

00:19 THE WITNESS: I haven't noticed it. It may have at times,
00:19 but i haven't really noticed it.

00:19 THE COURT: Roll it back. It looks like it's coming off
00:19 the ground.

00:19 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Could we start it over at the
00:19 beginning.

00:19 (Videotape played.)

00:19 BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN:

00:19 Q. Okay. The feet are coming up almost off the ground,
00:19 aren't they, and then shifting back?

00:19 A. Shifting on to the front of the foot, yes.

00:19 Q. So isn't that the same thing as shifting pressure from

00:19 one foot to the other?

00:19 **A.** She took a step in, yes. It's shifting weight from one
00:19 side to the other, but it's not rocking. When you think of
00:19 stereotypical elephant rocking, it's doing this (indicating)
00:19 with the feet or up and back, stereotypically.

00:19 **Q.** Were you here for Dr. Friend's testimony?

00:19 **A.** Yes.

00:19 **Q.** Do you remember him identifying this as the kind of
00:19 stereotypic behavior that he has seen?

00:19 **A.** He said if it extended for a period of time, yes.

00:20 **Q.** And he also said this is the kind of stereotypic behavior
00:20 he's seen on the trains, right?

00:20 **A.** Yes.

00:20 **Q.** And did you also -- it's even more clear here. You can
00:20 see they're going up on one foot and then the other, right?

00:20 **A.** At least on the right foot, it's coming off up on the
00:20 toes. It's just a matter of severity here. And when it
00:20 becomes -- and yes, it raises a flag. It raises concern. I
00:20 don't see it affecting the elephant.

00:20 **THE COURT:** At what point does it become stereotypical
00:20 behavior?

00:20 **THE WITNESS:** Usually, at least in my opinion, regardless
00:20 of what animal it is --

00:20 **THE COURT:** As on here?

00:20 **THE WITNESS:** If -- classically, it's a repeated behavior.

00:20 And usually, you think of it more in pacing --

00:20 THE COURT: All right. But --

00:20 THE WITNESS: -- in other animals. In elephants, we think
00:20 of it and it's --

00:20 THE COURT: Isn't this repetitious?

00:20 THE WITNESS: It's repetitious, but to the point of --

00:20 THE COURT: Isn't that repeated?

00:20 THE WITNESS: It's repeated, but that doesn't mean it's
00:20 completely stereotypic.

00:21 THE COURT: I thought you just said that. Didn't you just
00:21 say that any repeated behavior is stereotypical?

00:21 THE WITNESS: I don't believe I quite put it that way. If
00:21 I did --

00:21 THE COURT: I thought I just asked you. I said, at what
00:21 point does it become stereotypical? You said repetition.

00:21 THE WITNESS: It's repetition of movements. That's what
00:21 we think of.

00:21 THE COURT: You said classically, it's a repeated
00:21 behavior. And my question was: At what point does it become
00:21 stereotypical behavior? And the answer was, it's a repeated
00:21 behavior, and usually, you think of it more in pacing.

00:21 So, what we're seeing here -- it appears to be repetitious
00:21 behavior.

00:21 THE WITNESS: Yes, it does.

00:21 THE COURT: But it's not stereotypical?

00:21 THE WITNESS: I don't know at what point it becomes
00:21 stereotypical in that regard, and --

00:21 THE COURT: All right.

00:21 THE WITNESS: -- and my expertise is when it affects the
00:21 animal, when it becomes a physical problem.

00:21 BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN:

00:21 Q. You were here for Dr. Friend's testimony where he said he
00:21 would record this behavior after five seconds?

00:22 A. Yes.

00:22 Q. So, in -- as a behaviorist, he would start looking at it
00:22 as stereotypical behavior at the five second mark, correct?

00:22 A. Under his ethogram, yes.

00:22 Q. In terms of manifestation, let's take another look at the
00:22 citation from the Oosterhuis piece, page 45. And in terms of
00:22 the crack development that we've been discussing and what we
00:22 were looking at in the videotape as a possible precursor, it
00:22 says, quote: "Cracks -- nail cracks are usually the result" --
00:22 this is the second paragraph down.

00:22 "Nail cracks are usually the result of a repetitive
00:22 movement that puts abnormal pressure on the nail. The
00:22 environment of the elephant's enclosure can exacerbate this
00:22 pressure. An example is the stereotypical rocking elephant,
00:22 where an elephant stands in one place on a hard surface and
00:22 rocks back and forth. This puts abnormal pressure on the
00:22 lateral toes of the front feet, eventually leading to nail

00:23 cracks."

00:23 Now, this would explain, would it not, why so many of
00:23 FEI's elephants are developing nail cracks?

00:23 **A.** The location is explained on the lateral toes, but it
00:23 doesn't explain most of the cracks we see. They're not in the
00:23 lateral toes.

00:23 **Q.** So it would explain at least some of the nail cracks we
00:23 see?

00:23 **A.** It's one possibility, yes.

00:23 **Q.** Well, I think you just said it would explain some of the
00:23 nail cracks we're seeing.

00:23 **A.** It's a possibility, yes.

00:23 **Q.** Finally, on the elephants' foot article, if we can look
00:23 at the end, page 147 -- and this is where there are concluding
00:23 remarks written by Murray Fowler.

00:23 Do you see that?

00:23 **A.** Yes.

00:23 **Q.** And this was an attempt to bring together the consensus
00:24 views of everyone in attendance, right?

00:24 Let me actually try to make it easier, rather than having
00:24 you --

00:24 **A.** I'm trying to remember the actual event.

00:24 **Q.** Well, over on the left-hand side, before we get to
00:24 various recommendations, it says, quote -- and this is above the
00:24 number 1 down on the left-hand side. It says: "The items

00:24 represent the collective wisdom of the assembled elephant
00:24 managers, curators, keepers, veterinarians and elephant
00:24 enthusiasts. General agreement was reached concerning the
00:24 following."

00:24 And then over at number 5, it says, quote: "Each
00:24 elephant's facility should minimize the amount of time elephants
00:24 spend on hard, unyielding surfaces."

00:24 Do you see that?

00:24 **A.** Yes.

00:24 **Q.** Was that indeed the consensus recommendation, as you
00:24 recall it?

00:24 **A.** Yes, it was.

00:24 **Q.** I think you mentioned earlier that Gary West was a former
00:25 Ringling Brothers veterinarian?

00:25 **A.** Yes.

00:25 **Q.** Let's take a look at the Fowler and Mikota book. I think
00:25 we've referred to this one. The name of this one is *Biology,*
00:25 *Medicine and Surgery of Elephants.*

00:25 Are you familiar with this publication?

00:25 **A.** Yes.

00:25 **Q.** It's gone through several editions, correct?

00:25 **A.** No, no.

00:25 **Q.** This is just a one-edition publication?

00:25 **A.** Yes.

00:25 **Q.** And I think this was put out -- something that you did

00:25 cite in your expert report, correct?

00:25 **A.** Yes.

00:25 **Q.** And if we could take a look over at Chapter 19 of this
00:26 publication, page number 266 -- actually, make it 265, over on
00:26 the right-hand side, first real paragraph. And Dr. West says,
00:26 quote: "Traumatic diseases reported in elephants are often
00:26 related to working accidents, performances or loading for
00:26 transport".

00:26 Do you see that?

00:26 **A.** Yes.

00:26 Did you show the chapter? I'm sure who wrote the
00:26 chapter.

00:26 **Q.** Let's go back to the beginning of that. 263 is where
00:26 it's "Musculoskeletal System," by Gary West.

00:26 **A.** Okay.

00:26 **Q.** And as far as you know, this is the Gary West who worked
00:27 for Ringling Brothers?

00:27 **A.** Yes.

00:27 **Q.** And so he refers to: "Traumatic diseases reported in
00:27 elephants are often related to working accidents performances or
00:27 loading for transport."

00:27 Do you see that?

00:27 **A.** I saw it when it was up there, yes.

00:27 **Q.** And is it not the case that a number of the elephants
00:27 that we were discussing indeed had injuries associated with

00:27 their travel in the circus?

00:27 **A.** None that I'm aware of.

00:27 **Q.** You're not aware of any of those?

00:27 **A.** Traumatic diseases as a result of their travel?

00:27 **Q.** I'm talking about injuries they suffered while travel on
00:27 the Blue Unit.

00:27 **A.** I thought you were referring to specifically while they
00:27 were being transported.

00:27 **Q.** Is it not the case that they have in fact suffered
00:27 injuries while being transported and participating in the
00:27 circus?

00:28 MR. SHEA: Objection, vague. Compound.

00:28 THE COURT: He can answer it.

00:28 Do you understand the question? If you don't understand,
00:28 tell him.

00:28 THE WITNESS: Okay. Can I ask --

00:28 THE COURT: You can tell him you don't understand it.

00:28 THE WITNESS: Okay. What are you -- what kind of things
00:28 would you consider traumatic? If they take a misstep and sprain
00:28 their leg, yeah, that's a sprain. But is that a traumatic
00:28 disease? No.

00:28 BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN:

00:28 **Q.** So they suffered some leg injuries. It's just a question
00:28 of severity; is that what you're saying?

00:28 **A.** Yes.

00:28 Q. If we could take a look over at page 266 on the left-hand
00:28 side, about halfway down through the page, there's a statement
00:28 that says: "Mechanical trauma due to repetitive loading stress
00:28 on hard surfaces is probably a major factor in the development
00:28 of joint disease."

00:28 Do you see that?

00:28 A. Yes.

00:29 Q. And this is in a part of the article talking about the
00:29 development of degenerative joint disease. And that's the same
00:29 thing, is it not, as what we usually refer to as arthritis?

00:29 A. I'm not sure from that statement.

00:29 Q. Let's look down at the left-hand column, down near the
00:29 bottom, by Dr. West. There's a statement that begins with
00:29 "Occasional" -- excuse me -- "Occupational injuries can
00:29 contribute to joint disease. Performance of certain behaviors
00:29 may put excessive stresses on the joints. Chaining elephants
00:29 for prolonged periods limits their movements and may also
00:29 contribute to the development of DJD, degenerative joint
00:29 disease. Animals that constantly pull or resist chaining may
00:29 cause joint damage."

00:29 Do you see that?

00:29 A. Yes.

00:29 Q. And in terms of chaining, let me make sure I understand
00:29 your testimony. You said that the chains -- you've seen
00:30 chaining injuries in the past in some institutions, right?

00:30 A. Yes.

00:30 Q. And you don't dispute that, in fact, the elephants here
00:30 are chained for long periods of time, right?

00:30 A. Correct.

00:30 Q. Now, if we could take a look at your expert report, over
00:30 at page 24, let's take Zina as an example. You're discussing
00:30 stereotypic behaviors and then you talk about Dr. Ensley's
00:30 report and the elevated scar tissue from chaining. And then you
00:30 say, under "Zina" -- this is the first paragraph under Zina --
00:30 you say: "These are calluses, a normal response of the skin to
00:30 protect underlying tissues. They are not the result of injury.
00:31 Some elephants respond with more callus formation than others to
00:31 the same stimulus."

00:31 Do you see that?

00:31 A. Yes.

00:31 Q. And you say that several other times. If you go down, I
00:31 see the same statement with respect to Susan, I think it is.
00:31 And then under "Mysore" over on page 21, you again say -- refers
00:31 to leg scars on her back legs from chaining: "Again, this is
00:31 not scarring, but calluses, a natural response of skin to
00:31 protect the underlying tissues from injury."

00:31 Correct me if I'm wrong, but what you're saying is
00:31 they're calluses forming in response to the chains, right?

00:31 A. They may be. I'm not actually certain, but they're
00:31 spots. They're not chaining injuries as such. It's just excess

00:31 tissues. Some of them may be more like calluses, some of them
00:32 may be more like warts, as I've viewed them.

00:32 Q. But it's -- as I understand what you're saying, it's
00:32 happening because the chain is rubbing up against the skin,
00:32 right?

00:32 A. It's against the skin, yes.

00:32 Q. So it's the skin's effort to protect itself against this
00:32 insult from the chain, right?

00:32 A. I've seen that, yes. And in some of these elephants, I
00:32 think that may be true.

00:32 Q. One other question I wanted to ask you about Dr. West's
00:32 piece. Over on the right-hand side on page 267, there's a
00:32 reference to tuberculosis and Dr. West says, quote: "In humans,
00:33 tuberculosis may cause osteomyelitis, which may exhibit as foot
00:33 ulcers or mimic pyogenic osteomyelitis. Ten percent of
00:33 extrapulmonary TB in humans results in chronic osteomyelitis.
00:33 In one case of an elephant with systemic atypical
00:33 mycobacteriosis" -- I'm probably completely mangling these --
00:33 the organism was isolated from the hip." Then a citation.
00:33 "Tuberculosis should be considered in a differential diagnosis
00:33 of musculoskeletal disease that has an unusual presentation or
00:33 is nonresponsive to treatment."

00:33 Do you see that?

00:33 A. Yes.

00:33 Q. Is that in accord with your understanding as a

00:33 veterinarian?

00:33 **A.** It's comparing humans and in this one case, they did find
00:33 that this was a systemic atypical mycobacteriosis. It doesn't
00:33 say that it was tuberculosis, so I'm not sure what the organism
00:34 was in this case. In fact, if I'm correct, I think it was not a
00:34 tuberculosis organism, but Shigella or Szulgai that we found in
00:34 two elephants, African elephants. But as a matter of accord,
00:34 that could be -- still be considered in a differential diagnosis
00:34 that has an unusual presentation.

00:34 **Q.** Okay. And again, it's the case, is it not, that a number
00:34 of elephants that have been euthanized by Feld Entertainment
00:34 were euthanized because they had serious and difficult to treat
00:34 musculoskeletal problems, correct?

00:34 **A.** As they aged and developed the typical diseases we find
00:34 in aging animals of any kind, we did find tuberculosis, but we
00:34 didn't find any lesions suggestive of that anywhere else.

00:35 **Q.** And then one other question about Dr. West. Now, when
00:35 the animals developed these kinds of conditions that we've been
00:35 talking about, the musculoskeletal problems, they're frequently
00:35 treated with what are called NSAIDS, right? The NSAIDS?

00:35 **A.** Non-steroid anti-inflammatories.

00:35 **Q.** And examples would be -- Banamine is one?

00:35 **A.** That's one.

00:35 **Q.** Aquitaine?

00:35 Maybe I'm getting that wrong.

00:35 A. No. Adiquin.

00:35 Q. Adiquin. I'm sorry. But it's a series of these drugs
00:35 that are used?

00:35 A. Yeah. We usually start out with, like, ibuprofen, like
00:35 you buy at Wal-Mart.

00:35 Q. But the records reflect pretty frequent use of these
00:35 medications, correct?

00:35 A. Correct. They can be used for many things.

00:35 Q. Let me ask you one question about Dr. West's statement.

00:35 On page 267 on the left-hand side of his article or his

00:35 contribution, his chapter, he says, quote: "Chronic use" --

00:36 this is near the top, I think, the third sentence from the top:

00:36 "Chronic use of NSAIDS" --

00:36 Is that how it's usually referred to?

00:36 A. Yeah.

00:36 Q. -- "NSAIDS may, however, suppress" --

00:36 Maybe you should read that for me. You'll probably do a
00:36 better job.

00:36 A. "Chronic use of NSAIDS may, however, suppress

00:36 proteoglycan synthesis, which is an important constituent of

00:36 cartilage. Therefore, NSAIDS are useful in acute inflammation,

00:36 but chronic use could contribute to cartilage loss.

00:36 Corticosteroids are potent anti-inflammatory drugs, but can have

00:36 detrimental effects. They would be contraindicated in reactive

00:36 or infectious arthritis or in an elephant with unknown

00:36 tuberculosis status. Also, corticosteroids may inhibit
00:37 chondrocyte development and the release of hyaluronan by the
00:37 synovial membrane."

00:37 **Q.** But just looking at the part about the NSAIDS, the
00:37 suggestion is that using NSAIDS on a chronic, long-term basis
00:37 could have actually a counterproductive effect in treatment,
00:37 correct?

00:37 **A.** It could, in very chronic, long-term use. It's been
00:37 reported in other species.

00:37 **Q.** Now, in regard to reproductive issues, there was a
00:37 reference, I think, earlier to the herd, the FEI herd; is that
00:37 right? In reference to FEI's herd of elephants.

00:37 **A.** In regards to what?

00:37 **Q.** Well, that's what I was going to ask, actually. I mean,
00:37 there is no herd of FEI elephants in the traditional, wild
00:37 elephant sense, correct?

00:37 **A.** I'm not sure what you're asking me with that question.

00:38 **Q.** Well, I'm not sure what I mean either because we've heard
00:38 this reference to a herd of FEI elephants, I think used by FEI,
00:38 and that's something that plaintiffs have used. And I think you
00:38 were asked about the FEI elephant herd, so I'm trying to
00:38 understand what you would mean by it.

00:38 The reality is that FEI has a number of elephants and
00:38 they're divided up at various institutions -- I mean various
00:38 locations and some are on the road and some are at Williston and

00:38 some are at the CEC, correct?

00:38 A. Correct.

00:38 Q. And most of those elephants don't interact with most of
00:38 the other elephants, correct?

00:38 A. Correct.

00:38 Q. And there's a pretty intensive human intervention and
00:38 management of those animals, correct?

00:38 A. Correct.

00:38 Q. And one of your objectives is to have the elephants in
00:38 FEI's possession create more elephants, right?

00:38 A. Yes.

00:38 Q. But elephants are not native to North America, are they?

00:39 A. No -- well, no, not Asian elephants.

00:39 Q. Not these elephants?

00:39 A. Not these elephants.

00:39 Q. And I think there was a reference to potential
00:39 reintroduction, right? But you're not creating these new
00:39 elephants for reintroduction purposes, are you?

00:39 A. No.

00:39 Q. And in fact, in the book chapter that we talked about a
00:39 little earlier, you referred to several distinct -- or several
00:39 possible subspecies of Asian elephants, right?

00:39 A. Possible, yes.

00:39 Q. And if there ever were a reintroduction of Asian
00:39 elephants, one would, at least as an initial matter, try to

00:39 reintroduce a subspecies into the appropriate subspecies,
00:39 correct?

00:39 **A.** That might be a consideration, although certainly, there
00:39 are -- the Sumatran elephant seems to be very distinct and the
00:39 Borneo elephant seems to be very distinct. Most of the other
00:40 Asian elephant population is not that distinct.

00:40 **Q.** But in your breeding efforts, you're not making any
00:40 particular efforts to keep subspecies distinct, are you?

00:40 **A.** We don't have any Borneo or Sumatran elephants.

00:40 **Q.** But when you talk about genetic diversity, you're talking
00:40 about maximizing the diversity among the FEI elephants, correct?

00:40 **A.** That's what we're talking about in the SSP and TAG as
00:40 well. We're not trying to maintain subspecies. We're talking
00:40 about the Asian elephant as a species, and there are no Sumatran
00:40 or Borneo elephants in North America.

00:40 **Q.** So when you talk about your being the director of
00:40 conservation, and I think you said before -- and correct me if
00:40 I'm wrong -- that before you, there was no director of
00:40 conservation, correct?

00:40 **A.** No. There is a vice president in charge of animal
00:40 stewardship and research and conservation.

00:41 **Q.** But in terms of conservation, the principle focus is not
00:41 developing these animals for reintroduction into the wild in
00:41 Asia, right?

00:41 **A.** No.

00:41 Q. And your report talks about FEI's conservation
00:41 activities, but those relate more to education and research and
00:41 those kinds of things that, in your view, do and will benefit
00:41 wild Asian elephants, correct?

00:41 A. Yes.

00:41 Q. And it's your view that FEI does engage in activities
00:41 that help to conserve the species in the wild?

00:41 A. Yes.

00:41 Q. Okay. If Judge Sullivan were to rule in this case that
00:41 the activities engaged in by FEI do constitute a take and,
00:41 therefore, they cannot take place without a permit from the Fish
00:41 and Wildlife Service, would you be involved, do you know -- and
00:41 maybe this is too speculative of a question -- would you be
00:41 involved in efforts to obtain a permit for FEI under what's
00:41 called an enhancement permit?

00:42 A. I don't know what an enhancement permit is.

00:42 Q. Well, if there were a permitting scheme under which FEI
00:42 could try to obtain a permit on the grounds that it's helping to
00:42 enhance the conservation and propagation of wild Asian
00:42 elephants, is there any reason why you wouldn't take the
00:42 information that you put in your report and try to convince the
00:42 Fish and Wildlife Service to give FEI a permit on that basis?

00:42 MS. JOINER: Objection. This calls for speculation and
00:42 assumes facts that are not in evidence.

00:42 THE COURT: I'm interested in his answer. I recognize

00:42 it's speculative.

00:42 THE WITNESS: I don't know why that information wouldn't
00:42 be applicable to the type of application you're talking about.

00:42 BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN:

00:42 Q. Again, you've engaged in other forms of advocacy on
00:42 behalf of FEI and the circus industry, right? We talked about
00:42 the Congressional testimony you gave --

00:42 A. Yes, yes.

00:42 Q. -- the questions and answers on tuberculosis.

00:42 A. Yes. If you consider that, yes.

00:42 Q. I'm simply saying that if in fact the permitting process
00:43 were to come into play, as the director of conservation, is
00:43 there any reason why you wouldn't participate in trying to
00:43 convince the Fish and Wildlife Service to give a permit on the
00:43 basis of the conservation activities that you're familiar with
00:43 and have been engaged in?

00:43 A. No reason that I know of.

00:43 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Nothing further, Your Honor.

00:43 THE COURT: All right.

00:43 **REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF DR. DENNIS SCHMITT**

00:43 **BY MR. SHEA:**

00:43 Q. Dr. Schmitt, who wrote the current TB guidelines -- TB
00:43 testing guidelines?

00:43 A. Current?

00:43 Q. Yes.

00:43 A. They were adopted by USDA in 2003. That was a result of
00:43 the task force on tuberculosis in nondomestic animals, primarily
00:43 the elephant, under the guidance of the American Zoo -- American
00:44 Association of Zoo Veterinarians.

00:44 Q. And were you involved in that effort?

00:44 A. Yes.

00:44 Q. And have there been new guidelines proposed?

00:44 A. We've had some -- we've been drafting new guidelines for
00:44 about three years. In that process, the last group meeting we
00:44 had was over two years ago. We exchanged e-mails, trying to get
00:44 some consensus. There wasn't a discussion of the entire
00:44 redevelopment. That passed to the U.S. Animal Health
00:44 Association. And as I indicated, the task force was dissolved
00:44 by Zoo Veterinary Association and is now taken over by the U.S.
00:44 Animal Health. Those have been approved by that association and
00:44 forwarded to USDA.

00:44 Q. All right. Has USDA acted on that at this point?

00:44 A. No.

00:44 Q. And you were involved in that effort for the --

00:44 A. Yes.

00:44 Q. -- for the proposed guidelines?

00:44 A. Yes.

00:45 Q. Is FEI monitoring its elephants for tuberculosis in
00:45 accordance with the law, with the current guidelines?

00:45 A. Yes.

00:45 Q. Dr. Schmitt, are elephants in other keeping systems,
00:45 other than FEI's, are they found to have TB nodules upon
00:45 necropsy?

00:45 A. Yes.

00:45 Q. Dr. Schmitt, has it been proven scientifically that
00:45 stress levels in elephants cause TB?

00:46 A. No.

00:46 Q. And has TB in elephants been linked to immune system
00:46 suppression in elephants?

00:46 A. No.

00:46 Q. That's different than in humans, isn't it?

00:46 A. Yes.

00:46 Q. Now, do you recall Mr. Glitzenstein asking you about
00:46 various factors to consider with respect to elephant foot
00:46 problems, various management factors?

00:46 A. Yes.

00:46 Q. What is FEI doing with respect to those management
00:46 factors in its elephants?

00:46 A. Providing exercise, good nutrition, by -- for instance,
00:46 elephants on the traveling unit, when they're in an outdoor
00:46 venue where they can be housed outdoors, are placed on wooden
00:47 flooring platforms so it takes away the hard surface. They
00:47 provide adequate husbandry and veterinary care for any cracks
00:47 that occur. So they're doing all those things.

00:47 And yes, they're still on some hard surfaces, but they're

00:47 doing -- all the other factors that were listed there are being
00:47 addressed in an active manner. And there's bedding provided.
00:47 Given lots of hay. A lot of time they use the hay, excess hay,
00:47 hay waste, actually, because they use it for bedding.

00:47 Q. Now, you've heard Dr. Susan Mikota's name quite a bit
00:47 during cross-examination today, correct?

00:47 A. Yes.

00:47 Q. For what institution, if you know, is she the
00:47 veterinarian?

00:47 A. The Elephant Sanctuary in Hohenwald, Tennessee.

00:47 Q. And who operates that sanctuary?

00:48 A. Carol Buckley and Scott Blais, I think.

00:48 Q. Dr. Schmitt, do elephants that don't -- captive elephants
00:48 that don't exhibit stereotypic behavior get nail cracks?

00:48 A. Yes.

00:48 Q. Mr. Glitzenstein asked you about Karen being at the CEC
00:48 inspection. Was she at the CEC inspection?

00:48 A. No.

00:48 Q. Where was she?

00:48 A. She was in Auburn Hills.

00:48 Q. Dr. Schmitt, is consulting with FEI your entire
00:48 veterinary practice?

00:48 A. No.

00:48 Q. How many hours, roughly, do you spend per week working in
00:48 your consultation portion of your practice with FEI?

00:48 **A.** How many hours? I'm available by phone any time for
00:49 anybody, not just FEI.

00:49 About 40 hours.

00:49 **Q.** And how many additional hours a week do you spend on your
00:49 veterinary practice, just generally?

00:49 **A.** It will vary from five to ten to another 20 or 30.

00:49 **Q.** And again, that additional five to 30 hours would be for
00:49 clients other than FEI; is that right?

00:49 **A.** Yes, yes.

00:49 **Q.** Dr. Schmitt, as a veterinarian, do you see it as
00:50 beneficial to begin training elephants soon after birth?

00:50 **A.** Their response, they figure -- when it clicks to them
00:50 that the learning process and the interaction -- you've got
00:50 to -- what I've seen is you've got to say ahead of them.
00:50 They're fast. They learn pretty fast once they get it and they
00:50 understand the learning process. So sometimes you have to go
00:50 back to kindergarten. They kind of forget and go back to
00:50 basics. But they're a learning sponge once they understand what
00:50 it is that's going on.

00:50 **Q.** Are there benefits to the young elephant from being
00:50 trained soon after birth?

00:50 **A.** Yes.

00:50 **Q.** What are those?

00:50 **A.** Some of the ones medically speaking are because we're
00:50 trying to monitor for herpes virus. We talked about the

00:50 bruising of the tongue as a primary thing, so we ask for daily
00:51 exams maybe multiple times to indicate disease, but it's often
00:51 very far long in the process by that time, so we're -- it's a
00:51 more difficult procedure for them to learn.

00:51 But in most cases, we've seen older ulcers in the roof of
00:51 the mouth that appear to have some age that's been associated,
00:51 so that's another thing that we're asking that to occur.

00:51 Viruses usually cause temperatures, so being able to take
00:51 routine body temperatures on an elephant and allowing you to
00:51 manipulate it in many ways are -- if they do become active with
00:51 a herpes virus infection, you need to provide ICU type treatment
00:51 with fluids and drug administrations and other things, so any of
00:51 that training where they trust and understand that you're trying
00:51 to help them helps us medically as well.

00:51 And just routine behavior so they're learning, you know,
00:52 their space, your space and safety issues and other things as
00:52 well -- it's all basic information that you never know when it's
00:52 going to be useful as a -- as something you may be able to
00:52 utilize for them later.

00:52 **Q.** Now, you were asked questions about Susan and her weight
00:52 loss and TB.

00:52 Do you recall that?

00:52 **A.** Yes.

00:52 **Q.** In your opinion, did the tuberculosis cause any weight
00:52 loss in Susan?

00:52 A. No.

00:52 Q. Why?

00:52 A. She's been negative for over ten years on trunk washes
00:52 and actually, as we saw, digestive problems, with changes in her
00:52 digestive track as she's aged. We changed her nutritional
00:52 levels, fiber levels and some other things and she's -- she has
00:52 good body condition even though she has some conformational
00:52 challenges. She's been almost a little overweight in some
00:53 cases.

00:53 Q. Dr. Schmitt, you were asked a number of questions about
00:53 Ricardo; is that correct?

00:53 A. Yes.

00:53 Q. Are any of the entries that Mr. Glitzenstein showed you
00:53 out of the medical records, did those have anything to do with
00:53 Ricardo's death?

00:53 A. No.

00:53 Q. Dr. Schmitt, are you familiar with FEI's elephant named
00:53 Vance?

00:53 A. Yes.

00:53 Q. Do you know whether Vance has ever tested positive for TB
00:53 by trunk wash?

00:53 A. Yes.

00:53 Q. Do you know what the -- so then he was diagnosed with the
00:54 disease; is that correct?

00:54 A. Yes.

00:54 Q. Do you know what the USD recommended regarding Vance as a
00:54 result of his TB status?

00:54 A. Treatment and culture. And I think we treated him for
00:54 almost three years.

00:54 Q. I see. Was that treatment successful?

00:54 A. Yes.

00:54 MR. SHEA: Those are all the questions I have, Your Honor.

00:54 THE COURT: Any other questions?

00:54 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Nothing further, Your Honor.

00:54 THE COURT: Doctor, thank you very much. Please step
00:54 down. And do not discuss your testimony with anyone.

00:55 All right. What's next?

00:55 MR. SHEA: We have some exhibits we want to offer, Your
00:55 Honor.

00:55 THE COURT: All right.

00:55 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, with the Court's
00:55 permission, can several of us leave and talk to Mr. Ensley to see
00:55 if we want to put any rebuttal on?

00:55 THE COURT: Why don't I just give you about ten minutes to
00:55 do that? I'll just take a ten-minute recess to do that.

00:55 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Maybe we should have them finish and
00:55 then we can take a recess. I see my lead counsel giving me --

00:55 THE COURT: All right.

00:55 MS. JOINER: Thank you, Your Honor.

00:55 If it's okay, can we do the transcripts first and then

00:55 we'll move to exhibits?

00:55 THE WITNESS: That's fine.

00:55 MS. JOINER: Okay. I believe that we have brought
00:55 courtesy copies with us today of Angela Martin's deposition for
00:55 Court and counsel, which we'll distribute. I also believe that
00:55 we have the designations for the 30(b)(6) Wildlife Advocacy
00:56 Project, which was played in court, but we have the list of the
00:56 actual designations.

00:56 THE COURT: All right.

00:56 MS. JOINER: That particular list would be Defendant's
00:56 Exhibit 346. Mark it as that, if we could, please.

00:56 The next deposition transcript that we have marked is for
00:56 Sasha Houk, and if we could identify this as Defendant's
00:57 Exhibit 347.

00:57 MS. WINDERS: And for the record, we have spoken with the
00:57 defendant and we're going to mark ours as Plaintiffs' 191.

00:57 THE COURT: Are there any objections to the exhibits where
00:57 they counter?

00:57 MS. WINDERS: No.

00:57 THE COURT: All right, that's fine. And the Defendant's
00:57 Exhibit number?

00:57 MS. WINDERS: Will Call 191.

00:57 THE COURT: All right, WC 191.

00:57 MS. JOINER: And we also have the electronic version of
00:57 the --

00:57 THE COURT: And Plaintiffs' -- what was that, 191?

00:57 MS. WINDERS: Yes, Your Honor.

00:57 MS. JOINER: And for the electronic designations for
00:57 Mr. Houk's transcript, could we call that 347A?

00:58 THE COURT: Sure. Admitted.

00:58 (Defendant's Exhibits 346, 347 and 347A admitted into the
00:58 record.)

00:58 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 191 admitted into the record.)

00:58 MS. JOINER: And the next one that we have is the
00:58 deposition designation for Jeffrey Pettigrew, which we would call
00:58 Defendant's 348, and then the transcript, which you have copies
00:58 of, we would call 348A, Your Honor.

00:58 THE COURT: All right.

00:58 (Defendant's Exhibits 348 and 348A admitted into the
00:58 record.)

00:58 MS. WINDERS: And Plaintiffs' counter designations will be
00:58 Plaintiffs' Will Call 192. We also have a very short rebuttal
00:58 designation, so I don't know whether we should designate that
00:58 separately.

00:58 THE COURT: Probably separately.

00:58 Well, it's all going to come in. It's nonjury. It might
00:58 be easier to designate it now.

00:58 MS WINDERS: Okay. We can put that all in as 192.

00:58 THE COURT: Do you object to that?

00:58 MS. JOINER: I'm not sure what they are, but if they give

00:59 me a list.

00:59 THE COURT: Oh, they haven't told you?

00:59 MS. WINDERS: It's -- the rebuttal is 149, line 2 to 11,
00:59 and the counter is 149, line 12 to 22.

00:59 MS. JOINER: 149, 2 to 11 --

00:59 MS. WINDERS: And 149, 12 to 22.

00:59 MS. JOINER: I'm guessing that we probably don't object,
00:59 but we can look at that during the break, Your Honor.

00:59 THE COURT: Sure.

00:59 MS. JOINER: Okay. And that's what we had for deposition
00:59 transcripts. And if we could move to exhibits.

00:59 THE COURT: All right.

01:00 MS. JOINER: And with your permission, I'm just going to
01:00 follow down the list that we had. There are a series of clips
01:00 that were played from the Plaintiffs' Will Call 113, which was
01:00 the *Lord of the Jungle* film with Dr. Poole, and we would like to
01:00 just assign defense numbers to those seriatim.

01:00 So the first time stamp is 19:24 to 20 minutes 32 seconds.
01:00 And we would call that 349A.

01:00 THE COURT: All right. Any objections?

01:00 MS. WINDERS: We have no objection to any of the elephant
01:00 *Lord of the Jungle* exhibits.

01:00 THE COURT: All right.

01:00 (Defendant's Exhibit 349A admitted into the record.)

01:00 MS. JOINER: With your permission, I could just go down

01:00 the list with the time stamps.

01:00 THE COURT: Fine.

01:00 MS. JOINER: The next one is 44:35 to 44:59, would be

01:00 349B. 45:20 to 45:37 would be 349C. 45:46 to 47 minutes 8

01:01 seconds would be 349D. 49, 12 seconds to 51 minutes, I believe

01:01 it's 30 seconds is 349E. And the final one is one hour, 25

01:01 minutes, 15 seconds to one hour, 25 minutes and 39 seconds, which

01:01 would be 349F.

01:01 THE COURT: All right.

01:01 (Defendant's Exhibits 349B through 349F admitted into

01:01 the record.)

01:01 MS. JOINER: The next exhibit that we would like to move

01:01 in was marked with Ms. Sinnott and it's a little unclear to me

01:01 whether it's in already or not, which was the Exhibit 309, the

01:01 red line version between the two different train declarations.

01:02 THE COURT: I don't recall. I don't know if we can tell.

01:02 That's not Carol's complete list, is it?

01:02 Oh, it is.

01:02 THE COURTROOM CLERK: Red line version? Is that what

01:02 you're talking about?

01:02 MS. JOINER: Yes, 309.

01:02 THE COURTROOM CLERK: 309.

01:02 THE COURT: Was that admitted?

01:02 THE COURTROOM CLERK: Received in evidence, 2-10.

01:02 THE COURT: I'm sorry. It was received?

01:02 THE COURTROOM CLERK: Yes.

01:02 THE COURT: It's admitted.

01:02 MS. JOINER: All right. Thank you.

01:02 The next exhibit that we have is Exhibit 173A, which is
01:02 the 1999 Blue Unit video footage. Our time stamp we have, I
01:02 believe, listed incorrectly in our notice. We have 7 seconds to
01:02 40 seconds. When I looked at that last night, we thought that we
01:02 had actually played longer than that during court, that it was
01:03 actually 7 seconds to 2 minutes and 40 seconds. And that's what
01:03 we would seek to admit.

01:03 THE COURT: All right. Admitted.

01:03 MS. WINDERS: I don't believe we have an objection to
01:03 that. If I could just watch it when we have a break.

01:03 THE COURT: All right. It will be admitted.

01:03 (Defendant's Exhibit 173A admitted into the record.)

01:03 MS. JOINER: The next three exhibits, Exhibit 40, 41 and
01:03 42, are the written warnings to Mr. Rider. We would move these
01:03 in as party admissions. There were no hearsay objections. The
01:03 objection -- the other objection that plaintiffs had raised was
01:03 cured by his testimony because he testified that he had a
01:03 differing viewpoint and that was brought out during examination
01:03 as well as during his deposition.

01:03 MS. WINDERS: Plaintiffs' do object to those three
01:03 exhibits. We believe they're incomplete because, as defense
01:03 counsel mentioned, Tom Rider testified that when these forms were

01:03 completed, they included a narrative that included his side of
01:04 the story and those are not included in these exhibits.

01:04 In addition, we object to these as inadmissible character
01:04 evidence. It's extrinsic evidence going to credibility, which is
01:04 a completely collateral matter. So, of course defendant was
01:04 entitled to cross-examine him on them, but we don't think they
01:04 come in as evidence.

01:04 THE COURT: Yeah. Why isn't that character evidence?

01:04 MS. JOINER: It's character evidence -- I don't agree that
01:04 it's character evidence in terms of the performance of his duties
01:04 on the job. And they don't reflect anything with regard to care
01:04 or treatment of elephants.

01:04 THE COURT: But he could have been cross-examined about
01:04 these points. Is it appropriate to allow them -- why is it now
01:04 appropriate to allow them to be admitted in your case in chief if
01:04 he could have been cross-examined on those points and impeached?

01:04 MS. JOINER: I believe that he was cross-examined on them.
01:04 I believe he identified the documents and I believe that he
01:04 admitted to signing them, so I think in the sense that it's a
01:04 party admission, that he was disciplined for other matters, it
01:05 could come in in that event.

01:05 THE COURT: I agree. It's admitted.

01:05 (Defendant's Exhibits 40, 41 and 42 admitted into the
01:05 record.)

01:05 MS. JOINER: The next two exhibits, 166 and 167, are

01:05 documents regarding Robert Tom and his employment with the
01:05 company. They were marked on cross-examination with Robert Tom.
01:05 These are both the forms -- both of them are the same form that
01:05 Carrie Coleman testified to when she was questioned about a third
01:05 form with Mr. Tom. So Ms. Coleman explained this is the form
01:05 that was used for disciplinary action. They are maintained in
01:05 the 16 Wagon in the normal course of business.

01:05 As to these two particular exhibits, 166 and 167, Mr. Tom
01:05 was shown them during cross-examination and he admitted that he
01:05 received them and signed them, albeit he didn't agree with the
01:05 substance of them.

01:06 THE COURT: Any objection?

01:06 MS WINDERS: Yes. We have the same objection we raised
01:06 before, which is that they're extrinsic evidence going to
01:06 character, but also we have a hearsay objection. We don't
01:06 believe that Ms. Coleman waived the foundation to establish that
01:06 these two documents are business records. One of the
01:06 requirements of Rule 8036 is that the document is based on
01:06 information from someone with personal knowledge. The one that
01:06 did come in with Carrie Coleman, she had personal knowledge of
01:06 those incidences. There's been no such testimony for these.

01:06 And in addition, she testified she didn't have access to
01:06 the files in which these records are kept, so we don't think she
01:06 satisfied the requirements of 8036.

01:06 THE WITNESS: Ms. Joiner?

01:06 MS. JOINER: I know she definitely was not shown these two
01:06 particular documents, but they're produced by the company and
01:06 they are the form and I don't think that there's any question in
01:06 terms of the source of them or where they're coming from.
01:06 They're company records.

01:06 THE COURT: Right. They're admitted over objection.
01:06 (Defendant's Exhibits 166 and 167 admitted into the
01:07 record.)

01:07 MS. JOINER: The next document that I have is Exhibit 152.
01:07 This is, again, the same form, the same written warning for
01:07 Margaret Tom. Ms. Tom is somewhat different than Mr. Tom. She
01:07 recognizes her signature, but she doesn't deny signing it, but
01:07 she does not recollect it. It's the same form that Ms. Coleman
01:07 testified to, same procedure with the employment record. That's
01:07 Exhibit 152 that we would seek the entry of.

01:07 THE COURT: Any objection?

01:07 MS. WINDERS: Again, we have the hearsay objection and the
01:07 extrinsic evidence objection.

01:07 THE COURT: All right. It's admitted.

01:07 (Defendant's Exhibit 152 admitted into the record.)

01:07 MS. JOINER: The second exhibit for Ms. Tom is a
01:07 handwritten document that is Exhibit 148 that she testified to
01:07 writing and signing. And plaintiffs did not lodge an objection
01:07 to that particular exhibit.

01:07 THE COURT: Any objection now?

01:08 MS. WINDERS: No objection.

01:08 THE COURT: Admitted.

01:08 (Defendant's Exhibit 148 admitted into the record.)

01:08 MS. JOINER: My pile is getting full over here.

01:08 Exhibit 16 we would like to move into evidence, Your

01:08 Honor. These are Mr. Rider's responses, the first and all

01:08 supplemental responses to the following interrogatories: Numbers

01:08 2, 15, 16, 17 and 24.

01:08 THE COURT: All right.

01:08 MS. WINDERS: Your Honor, as we've done with other

01:08 interrogatories the defendants entered, we have a completeness

01:08 objection. We believe, particularly here where there's been a

01:08 suggestion that the parties haven't been completely forthcoming

01:08 in their interrogatory responses, it's only fair to look at all

01:08 of the responses in context. We're not going to rely on the

01:08 other stuff for the truth of the matter, but for completeness, we

01:08 think it should come in.

01:08 THE COURT: Any objection?

01:08 MS. JOINER: Yes. On this particular one in particular,

01:09 with Mr. Rider being the main plaintiff, I think that

01:09 interrogatories in particular are litigation pieces, written with

01:09 the assistance of counsel, so if an adverse --

01:09 THE COURT: Nevertheless, they were signed under oath by

01:09 him, I assume.

01:09 MS. JOINER: Signed under oath by him.

01:09 If an adverse party -- I regard interrogatories akin to
01:09 somewhat as a party admission. If an adverse party wants to
01:09 bring that into play, into evidence, I think an adverse party can
01:09 do that. I don't think that the proponent can offer
01:09 interrogatory responses in that manner.

01:09 THE COURT: Couldn't they recall him and ask him, In
01:09 addition to all the questions Ms. Joiner asked you, weren't you
01:09 asked the following questions also, or elicit answers about
01:09 questions without even referring to the interrogatories that tend
01:09 to rehabilitate his testimony?

01:09 MS. JOINER: Yes, sir. In theory, they could recall him
01:09 and put him on the stand. The question that we have in
01:09 Mr. Rider's instance in particular is that if he did not have the
01:09 aid of reading a piece of paper, I'm not sure what that testimony
01:10 would look like. So there are a host of interrogatory responses
01:10 that Mr. Rider has put in that he didn't testify to when he was
01:10 on the stand and could have in the case-in-chief.

01:10 THE COURT: What about that last point? Couldn't you call
01:10 him or not?

01:10 MS. WINDERS: Again, we're not introducing any of this for
01:10 the truth of the matter. It's strictly for completeness. And I
01:10 think Rule 106 and *United States versus Sutton*, the D.C. decision
01:10 we talked about a few days ago, permits this kind of thing to
01:10 come in for completeness. If it would be preferable, we're happy
01:10 as long as the objections come in, the definitions come in and

01:10 the pages on which questions appear, so that the answers can be
01:10 viewed in the full context of the interrogatories and the
01:10 objections.

01:10 THE COURT: I'm not sure -- I'm not sure whether this
01:10 comes in. I know this issue came up in *Stevens*. I'm just not
01:10 sure. I'll take that under advisement, you know. I'll issue a
01:10 minute order probably later this evening or tomorrow on this
01:11 issue.

01:11 What's next?

01:11 MS. JOINER: One more similar. Exhibit 21 is API's
01:11 interrogatory responses. And I believe that plaintiffs actually
01:11 put -- they either put an interrogatory response in or had
01:11 Ms. Paquette read it into the record.

01:11 So we would like to follow up and add the responses for
01:11 numbers 21, 22 and 23 and put all of those in. I think as it
01:11 stands now, only the most recent one of some of those may be in.

01:11 THE COURT: Counsel.

01:11 MS. WINDERS: We have the same completeness objection as
01:11 with Mr. Rider's interrogatory responses. In addition, the
01:11 January 30th, 2008 response wasn't listed on the 72-hour notice.
01:11 I don't know if -- now you just said you would include all of
01:11 them.

01:11 MS. JOINER: Well, I think that my recollection of that
01:11 was that the January 30th, 2008 response is the one that counsel
01:11 put in with Ms. Paquette, where they either identified it or had

01:12 her read it into the record.

01:12 MS. WINDERS: Nevertheless, we think that the three
01:12 answers to the same question should be considered
01:12 contemporaneously.

01:12 THE COURT: 21, 22 and 23?

01:12 MS. JOINER: Yes.

01:12 THE COURT: I'll take it under advisement.

01:12 What else?

01:12 MS. JOINER: The next one, Exhibit 124, Defense
01:12 Exhibit 124, is already in evidence, albeit in a slightly
01:12 different format. Our version is the Archele Hundley
01:12 declaration, which was the one filed in this case. Plaintiffs
01:12 have used the same document. It just doesn't have the header
01:12 from the case. So we would like to move in Defendant's
01:12 Exhibit 124.

01:12 MS. WINDERS: No objection.

01:12 THE COURT: I'm sorry?

01:12 MS. WINDERS: No objection, Your Honor.

01:12 THE COURT: Admitted.

01:12 (Defendant's Exhibit 124 admitted into the record.)

01:12 MS. JOINER: And the same thing for Defense Exhibit 157,
01:12 which is Mr. Tom's declaration. The same situation there, Your
01:12 Honor.

01:12 THE COURT: Any objection?

01:12 MS. WINDERS: No objection.

01:12 THE COURT: Admitted.

01:13 (Defendant's Exhibit 157 admitted into the record.)

01:13 MS. JOINER: Exhibit 266. We'd like to move for the
01:13 admission of the three summary of financial activities that came
01:13 from the Elephant Sanctuary annual reports. These were
01:13 identified -- I believe the foundation was laid with Ms. Buckley.
01:13 The pdf pages of this particular exhibit are 10, 46 and 77.

01:13 Plaintiffs did not lodge a hearsay objection to this, only
01:13 that it was untimely at the time it was done. But as Your Honor
01:13 will recall, we were doing expert discovery at the same time we
01:13 were doing pre-trial disclosures.

01:13 THE COURT: Any objection?

01:13 MS. WINDERS: No. We would only just like to note for the
01:13 record that it was belatedly disclosed.

01:13 THE COURT: All right. Admitted.

01:13 (Defendant's Exhibit 266 admitted into the record.)

01:13 MS. JOINER: The next exhibit is Exhibit 302A. These were
01:13 four photographs that Dr. Joyce Poole identified for us during
01:13 her testimony from her Website of various wild elephants.

01:14 THE COURT: Any objection?

01:14 MS. WINDERS: No objection.

01:14 THE COURT: Admitted.

01:14 (Defendant's Exhibit 302A admitted into the record.)

01:14 MS. JOINER: Defendant's Exhibit 305 is the Red Unit
01:14 schedule that was highlighted with Ms. Hundley on the stand. The

01:14 unhighlighted version is already in evidence. We would like to
01:14 move in this highlighted version as 305.

01:14 THE COURT: Objection?

01:14 MS. WINDERS: No objection.

01:14 THE COURT: Admitted.

01:14 (Defendant's Exhibit 305 admitted into the record.)

01:14 MS. JOINER: Defense Exhibit 307 are the clip orders that
01:14 Ms. Pardo created on the stand with Mr. CuvIELlo. It's her
01:14 handwritten list of those time stamps. We would like to move
01:14 that into evidence.

01:14 THE COURT: Any objection?

01:14 MS. WINDERS: No objection.

01:14 THE COURT: It's admitted.

01:14 (Exhibit 307 admitted into the record.)

01:14 MS. JOINER: The next exhibit is taken from Plaintiffs'
01:14 Will Call 92, which is in evidence in part, and the pages that we
01:15 would like to make sure that are in are API 5662 to -63, 5630
01:15 through -37, 5616 through -21, 5566 through -68, and 5649. And I
01:15 would mark those as Defense Exhibit 350. These would be party
01:15 admissions.

01:15 THE COURT: Any objection?

01:15 MS. WINDERS: No objection.

01:15 THE COURT: Admitted.

01:15 (Defendant's Exhibit 350 admitted into the record.)

01:15 MS. JOINER: The remaining materials on our list, Your

01:15 Honor, are judicial notice, which I believe you took at the time
01:15 that the various witnesses were on the stand.

01:15 There is an issue, in light of the -- in light of the way
01:15 we're proceeding with the inspection tapes, that if the
01:15 inspection tapes are not coming in wholesale, the inspection
01:16 videos, then there are certain things that -- there were time
01:16 portions that we marked in plaintiffs' case that I need to move
01:16 in now if we're doing it that way.

01:16 THE COURT: All right.

01:16 MS. JOINER: The first one is from Defendant's Exhibit
01:16 26 -- and I have an A after it, but I think we used that number
01:16 today. So this is at one hour, zero minutes, 23 seconds to one
01:16 hour, 1 minute, 11 seconds, from the Auburn Hills inspection.
01:16 And I would call that Defense Exhibit 351.

01:16 Is that where we are.

01:16 THE COURT: All right. Any objection?

01:16 MS. WINDERS: No objection.

01:16 THE COURT: All right. Admitted.

01:16 (Defendant's Exhibit 351 admitted into the record.)

01:16 MS. JOINER: The next one is from Plaintiffs' Will Call
01:16 142, which are CEC inspection videos played with Ms. Buckley.
01:17 The time stamps for that are 1 hour, 7 minutes, 30 seconds, one
01:17 hour, 10 minutes, 54 seconds. I would call that Defense
01:17 Exhibit 352.

01:17 THE COURT: Any objection?

01:17 MS. WINDERS: No objection. We have no objection to any
01:17 of the inspection videos.

01:17 MS. JOINER: Oh, okay. If Your Honor will permit, I have
01:17 two more time stamps I could read for those.

01:17 THE COURT: All right. 352 is admitted.

01:17 (Defendant's Exhibit 352 admitted into the record.)

01:17 MS. JOINER: Okay. Both from -- again, from plaintiffs'
01:17 142. The next is one hour, 14 minutes and 20 seconds to one
01:17 hour, 17 minutes, 11 seconds. We would call that Defense
01:17 Exhibit 353.

01:17 THE WITNESS: Admitted.

01:17 (Defendant's Exhibit 353 admitted into the record.)

01:17 MS. JOINER: And I believe that the final one is 1 hour,
01:17 25 minutes, 15 seconds to 1 hour, 25 minutes and 39 seconds. And
01:17 we would call that Defense Exhibit 354.

01:17 THE COURT: All right. Admitted.

01:18 (Defendant's Exhibit 354 admitted into the record.)

01:18 MS. JOINER: Now, one final thing I would like to make a
01:18 record of. I forgot to put it on our 72-hour list, but I did
01:18 have three clips from Defendant's Exhibit 174 from the LA cam,
01:18 which Ms. Buckley -- they were played for her; she laid the
01:18 foundation, and I would like to make a record of those. I did
01:18 not put them on the 72-hour notice list, though.

01:18 THE COURT: All right. Any objection?

01:18 MS. WINDERS: I would want to review those and review the

01:18 transcript before we resolve that.

01:18 THE COURT: All right.

01:18 MS. JOINER: Okay.

01:18 THE COURT: That's fine. When do you plan to do that,
01:18 though? Can you do that this evening?

01:18 MS. WINDERS: Yes, absolutely.

01:18 THE COURT: That's fine.

01:18 MS. JOINER: Would you permit me to the put the time
01:18 stamps on the record right now?

01:18 THE COURT: Yes, absolutely.

01:18 MS. JOINER: Let's call it Defendant's Exhibit 174A, would
01:18 be the June 23, clip 16 at 12 minutes, 18 seconds to 13 minutes,
01:18 38 seconds.

01:18 The next one would be 174B, which is it is June 26th, clip
01:19 6 at 51 minutes, 45 seconds to 52 minutes, 36 seconds.

01:19 And the final one would be 174C, which would be June 27th,
01:19 clip 5 at 33 minutes to 33 minutes and 30 seconds.

01:19 THE COURT: Okay. I'll reserve ruling on that.

01:19 MS. JOINER: Thank you, Judge.

01:19 THE COURT: Is that it?

01:19 MS. JOINER: I do not have any more exhibits, but
01:19 Mr. Simpson has one that he's worked on with plaintiffs.

01:19 MR. SIMPSON: Your Honor, there was a completeness
01:19 objection to our Defendant's Exhibit 71A and we stipulated with
01:19 the plaintiffs to certain documents that they will be submitting

01:19 as a Plaintiffs' Exhibit.

01:19 MS. WINDERS: It will be Plaintiffs' Exhibit 190A through
01:19 L.

01:19 THE COURT: 190A through L?

01:20 MS. WINDERS: Yeah.

01:20 THE COURT: 190A through L. Plaintiffs' Exhibit 71 -- 71A
01:20 is already in the record.

01:20 MR. SIMPSON: 71A was offered and there was a completeness
01:20 objection. We were directed to try to work it out. We have.

01:20 THE COURT: All right. This is 190A through L admitted --
01:20 Plaintiffs'.

01:20 190A through L admitted.

01:20 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 190A through L admitted into the
01:20 record.)

01:20 THE COURT: All right. Now, with respect to -- is that
01:20 it, counsel?

01:20 MR. SIMPSON: One more thing, Your Honor. There were
01:20 interrogatory answers that we offered in the direct examinations
01:20 of the ASPCA, the FFA and AWI. They offered the entire set of
01:20 interrogatories in for completeness and then they handed a case
01:20 and Your Honor came back. I don't have the transcript yet from
01:20 that session, but I believe it was when we were playing the
01:20 videotaped deposition of Mr. Glitzenstein, you indicated they
01:20 weren't all coming in; they needed to give us a list. So we have
01:21 yet to get that list.

01:21 MS. WINDERS: Your Honor, we have the transcript and we've
01:21 reviewed it and actually, they were admitted and I can point you
01:21 to the transcript cites if you would like.

01:21 THE COURT: What's the transcript cite?

01:21 MS. WINDERS: It's from March 10th in the p.m. session,
01:21 page 6 for ASPCA; same session, page 61 for FFA; and for AWI, I
01:21 don't have those pages handy.

01:21 MR. SIMPSON: That's what I'm talking about. They came in
01:21 with ASPCA. They came in with Markarian. And then when they
01:21 offered for AWI, this issue came up again. We had a colloquy
01:21 about what completeness meant and Your Honor took it back under
01:21 consideration and then came back and said we're not going to have
01:21 all the interrogatory answers come in wholesale; they needed to
01:21 provide a list. And as I understand it, Mr. Crystal agreed to do
01:21 that.

01:21 THE COURT: That's my recollection as well.

01:21 MR. CRYSTAL: If I could speak to this, Your Honor.

01:21 I believe we had the ASPCA and the Fund For Animals. At
01:21 that time, the Court did say that -- those are the cites -- that
01:21 the whole transcripts would come in. We had another discussion
01:22 about it and Mr. Simpson addressed it for the first time with AWI
01:22 and did ask you to consider that issue.

01:22 I understood that the resolution was that the whole
01:22 responses would come in. I did mention that in the alternative,
01:22 if the Court thought that was inappropriate, we could designate

01:22 answers. I believe ultimately, given where we are right now,
01:22 it's the same issue that I think you're taking now under
01:22 advisement with regard to Mr. Rider.

01:22 THE COURT: We're talking about interrogatory responses
01:22 from other parties as well, though, right?

01:22 MR. CRYSTAL: Exactly.

01:22 THE COURT: I think it's the same issue. I'm not so sure
01:22 the interrogatory responses should become a part of, essentially,
01:22 rebuttal testimony.

01:22 MR. CRYSTAL: What we were suggesting was, just to be
01:22 clear, for purposes of completeness, we believe there's been a
01:22 suggestion that certain questions may not have been answered.
01:22 And it's important for the Court to understand what all the
01:22 questions were.

01:22 Our principle concern is that the Court understand the
01:22 questions, so we -- our suggestion was -- we think, again, and I
01:23 think we've made clear that we're not asking the Court to
01:23 consider as substantive evidence the answers that AWI gave about
01:23 things Tom Rider saw. We think the Court can sort that out.

01:23 But if the Court thought it were appropriate, we can
01:23 designate the pages with objections and making clear what all the
01:23 questions were and leave out pages that just have parts of other
01:23 answers. We don't have a problem with that, but we don't think
01:23 it's necessary.

01:23 But at the very least, we think it's important for the

01:23 Court to understand what all the questions were. That's our
01:23 position.

01:23 THE COURT: All right. I'll give it a few more minutes'
01:23 thought. Anything else?

01:23 MR. SIMPSON: That's it, Your Honor. With that, we would
01:23 rest.

01:23 THE COURT: All right. Let me -- with Rider, though, your
01:23 argument, counsel, is that other answers that Rider gave under
01:23 oath to interrogatories should come in, essentially, in rebuttal
01:23 phase of the -- either rebuttal phase of your case or pursuant to
01:23 a completeness argument?

01:23 MS. WINDERS: We don't want Rider's answers in for the
01:24 truth of the matter. We don't intend to rely on them.

01:24 THE COURT: What do you want them in for?

01:24 MS. WINDERS: What we want in from the interrogatories --
01:24 what we're really concerned about, as Mr. Crystal just mentioned,
01:24 were the actual questions themselves, so that the questions --
01:24 the responses that defendant is moving in can be viewed in
01:24 context of the entirety of the questions; and in addition, the
01:24 objections --

01:24 THE COURT: You're not asking that his answers become a
01:24 part of the record, which would be problematic; you're asking
01:24 that -- well, the questions are there. You're essentially saying
01:24 for completeness purposes, you want the Court to also focus on
01:24 other questions, notwithstanding the answers?

01:24 MS. WINDERS: Right. We believe the Court can disregard
01:24 the answers. Our concern is the questions, the objection, the
01:24 definitions.

01:24 THE COURT: All right. I'm not going to let them in. So
01:24 what are those numbers that I'm keeping out now, so your record
01:24 is clear? 21, 22 and 23, I think, or not?

01:24 Ms. Joiner, what were those? I just want to make sure the
01:24 record is clear.

01:24 THE COURTROOM CLERK: 21, 22, 23.

01:25 THE COURT: No, I want to hear from the attorneys.

01:25 MS. JOINER: I'm sorry. Were you asking which numbers?

01:25 THE COURT: I want to make sure the record is clear with
01:25 respect to -- actually, I should ask plaintiff.

01:25 What are those numbers that you offered that I'm denying
01:25 admissibility?

01:25 MS. WINDERS: We have not offered those as exhibits. We
01:25 were making a completeness objection.

01:25 THE COURT: All right. If you want to -- all right.
01:25 Well, if you want to preserve your record, if you want to give
01:25 them numbers, you can do so, so the record is crystal clear.

01:25 MS. WINDERS: Our next numbers would be 192, 193 and 194.
01:25 And just to be clear, with regard to API, we did have a separate
01:25 completeness issue, which were the responses to specific
01:25 questions the defendant was relying on. They omitted the last
01:25 round of responses and we definitely think that those should come

01:25 in. Otherwise, you're looking at two out of three responses to
01:26 the same questions.

01:26 THE COURT: What number is that?

01:26 MS. WINDERS: That's Defendant's Exhibit 21.

01:26 THE COURT: Ms. Joiner?

01:26 MS. JOINER: I think those were already in. I think they
01:26 were read in, but I'm happy to include them in Exhibit 21.
01:26 That's fine.

01:26 THE COURT: All right. Then they're admitted. What's the
01:26 number, for the benefit of the court clerk?

01:26 MS. JOINER: That is Exhibit 21. And --

01:26 THE COURT: Defendant's Exhibit 21 admitted, right?

01:26 MS. JOINER: Okay.

01:26 THE COURT: 21's admitted. 21 was already admitted. The
01:26 plaintiffs wanted to offer something in connection with 21; is
01:26 that correct?

01:26 I just want to make sure if that's --

01:26 MS. WINDERS: Yeah. 21 was one of the ones you were going
01:26 to take under advisement when we had this recurring issue.

01:26 THE COURT: I'm not letting them come in. I'm not letting
01:26 the questions come in. The answers are not being offered for the
01:27 truth of the matter asserted and the questions are not coming in.

01:27 MS. WINDERS: Okay. But 21, we have a separate issue and
01:27 I believe defendant has agreed to put those responses in.

01:27 THE COURT: 21 is admitted and the responses are as

01:27 follows. Which ones? What are they?

01:27 MS. JOINER: We will put in questions numbers 21, 22 and
01:27 23. And we would do that for all three sets of interrogatories
01:27 for this particular plaintiff.

01:27 THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

01:27 MS. JOINER: No, sir. I don't have anything else at this
01:27 time.

01:27 THE COURT: All right. And you still want a few minutes
01:27 to talk about whether you wish to call your rebuttal witness?

01:27 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: We would appreciate that, Your Honor.

01:27 THE COURT: All right. That's fine. We'll take a short
01:27 recess.

01:41 (Thereupon, a break was had from 6:58 p.m. until 7:17
01:46 p.m.)

01:46 THE COURT: Counsel, what's next?

01:47 MS. MEYER: Your Honor, we're not going to call any
01:47 witnesses for rebuttal. We just have a few documents we would
01:47 like to move in for rebuttal.

01:47 THE COURT: Go ahead.

01:47 MS. MEYER: And I have one housekeeping matter as well.

01:47 THE COURT: Have you conferred with your opponent to see
01:47 if they have any objections?

01:47 MS. MEYER: I have not.

01:47 THE COURT: How many exhibits do you have?

01:47 Why don't you do that. It's a painless way to do it, so

01:47 we know where the battle lines are drawn. All right? I'll give
01:47 you a couple minutes to do it. You don't have many, do you?

01:47 MS. MEYER: Pardon me?

01:47 THE COURT: You don't have many, do you?

01:47 MS. MEYER: No.

01:47 THE COURT: All right. I'll just be right back here in
01:47 the jury room. Why don't you take a few minutes to do it.

01:53 (Thereupon, a break was had from 7:19 p.m. until 7:32
02:01 p.m.)

02:01 THE COURT: All right, counsel.

02:01 MS. MEYER: We made a little bit of progress, Your Honor,
02:01 but not everything was resolved. The first thing that was the
02:01 easy one is not actually a rebuttal exhibit, but it's just a
02:01 housekeeping matter. We wanted to move in as an exhibit the
02:01 actual USDA certificate that we got from Secretary Vilsack, which
02:01 we never actually moved in as an exhibit. And the defendant has
02:02 agreed to that, so we'd like to make that --

02:02 THE COURT: Is there a number or something?

02:02 MS. MEYER: We'll just make it Plaintiffs' Will Call 196.

02:02 THE COURT: Admitted.

02:02 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit WC 196 admitted into the record.)

02:02 MS. MEYER: And then the next thing, Your Honor, is we
02:02 have three e-mails, internal FEI e-mails that we want to admit as
02:02 rebuttal evidence. And all three of them go to the point that
02:02 has been made by defendant in its case, that there has been a

02:02 coverup of the fact that Mr. Rider's expenses were being paid by
02:02 some animal rights groups, including some of the plaintiffs, and
02:02 that the defendant did not know about this until it stumbled upon
02:02 it in 2005 during discovery. And all three of these e-mails, one
02:02 of which actually was used in some of the cross-examination of
02:02 some of their witnesses, talk about -- are from 2002 or 2003.

02:03 And they're internal FEI e-mails and they discuss the fact that
02:03 Tom Rider is out on the road doing media and his expenses are
02:03 being paid by animal rights groups, including the plaintiff.

02:03 So we would like to have those admitted as well. They're
02:03 willing to agree to one of them, as I understand it.

02:03 MR. SIMPSON: Yes.

02:03 THE COURT: Which one?

02:03 MS. MEYER: The one they're willing to agree to is
02:03 FEI38333 to 3841 -- 38341.

02:03 THE COURT: All right. And why not the other two?

02:03 MR. SIMPSON: Your Honor, our basic objection, I think, to
02:03 all of this that's coming in is that it's improper rebuttal.
02:03 This is not something that's new. This is not something that
02:03 couldn't have been anticipated. And frankly, with respect to the
02:03 second two e-mails, while parts of them are internal company
02:03 documents, they contain hearsay from outside parties. They
02:03 wouldn't be admissible under any exception.

02:03 The third e-mail, actually, ironically discusses a funding
02:04 source for Mr. Rider other than the plaintiffs, which is an area

02:04 of inquiry that we were not allowed to go into in discovery. All
02:04 of his other funding sources were kept secret and confidential.
02:04 Now, this happened to be one that was probably pretty widely
02:04 known.

02:04 On the other hand, there were many others that weren't.
02:04 And that was cut off in discovery, so I don't think at this point
02:04 they get to bring that in and try to show that, well, by the way,
02:04 other people were paying him as well.

02:04 But just to make a record with respect to the scope of
02:04 rebuttal, I'd refer Your Honor to -- and this is probably the
02:04 best I could do -- there are a couple of cases, but this is
02:04 probably the best one: *George Washington University versus*
02:04 *Lawson*, which is a D.C. Court of Appeals case by Judge Farrell in
02:04 2000, 745 A.2d at 323, which sets out the traditional standard
02:04 for rebuttal evidence. And it's pretty well known that it's only
02:05 going to be proper if it's something new that could not be
02:05 anticipated in advance. And I don't think any of these documents
02:05 meet that standard. And that's Judge Farrell's opinion at page
02:05 327. And this was a testimonial rebuttal, not documentary, but I
02:05 think the standard is the same thing.

02:05 And in the circuit, I don't have a published decision from
02:05 the circuit, and I know the DC Circuit rule says you're not
02:05 supposed to cite them in the D.C. Circuit, but I'll give Your
02:05 Honor the cite anyway. It's 193 U.S. Appellate, Lexis 3333 4,
02:05 which is *Heatherly versus Zimmerman*, which is a per curiam

02:05 opinion by the court.

02:05 And both of these cases were medical malpractice cases in
02:05 which rebuttal testimony was offered. And in one case, it was
02:05 deemed to be properly excluded. That was the *Heatherly* case.
02:05 And the other case, it was deemed to be improperly admitted, but
02:05 there was no prejudicial error to the defendant, so that was the
02:06 result of that.

02:06 But as to the first e-mail that's in controversy, the
02:06 Roberson e-mail, we think it's hearsay in addition to the fact
02:06 that we think it's improper rebuttal evidence.

02:06 And the second one, which is an e-mail that talks about
02:06 funding from a group called IDA, we think it's also hearsay and
02:06 also, I think, they're trying to have a sword and a shield with
02:06 their media strategy objection.

02:06 The other two documents -- we would have the same
02:06 objection, based on improper rebuttal -- are photographs that
02:06 were shown during Mr. French's examination and, as I understand
02:06 it, were excluded at the time. And now they're being offered in
02:06 rebuttal with Mr. French gone, so I don't think that's proper
02:06 rebuttal.

02:06 And then the last one is a series of public complaints
02:06 that were made to the company and there was a response by the
02:06 company. They showed one such complaint to Mr. Sowalsky in his
02:07 cross, which we wouldn't object to, but we think all the other
02:07 ones they to bring in are cumulative and also outside the proper

02:07 scope of rebuttal.

02:07 MS. MEYER: I actually hadn't gotten to those two
02:07 categories, Your Honor.

02:07 On the e-mails, it's our position that the defendant has
02:07 raised this issue with the Court; it has said that -- during its
02:07 case, it has said that they did not know -- they had no idea that
02:07 Mr. Rider's funding was being paid for by some of the plaintiff
02:07 organizations. We have internal e-mails from the corporation
02:07 that show they did know that and we think it should be made part
02:07 of the record of this case. And it's the classic kind of
02:07 information that is rebuttal to something that they have said in
02:07 their defense against our claims.

02:07 THE COURT: What evidence do you have that this falls
02:07 under rebuttal testimony or rebuttal evidence.

02:07 MS. MEYER: We had three the e-mails that we wanted to put
02:07 in. I'm actually willing to forego the third one that he was a
02:07 problem with about IDA, so we're really only now disputing over a
02:07 second e-mail. They agreed to the first one.

02:08 The second one is a clear admission by a defendant. It's
02:08 an internal e-mail. By passing it on -- you know, this is what's
02:08 going on about Tom Rider -- they're adopting it as the truth.
02:08 It's an admission anyway.

02:08 THE COURT: How does that differ from the first one that
02:08 they have no objection to?

02:08 MS. MEYER: It isn't. It's just a different one on a

02:08 different date about a different --

02:08 THE COURT: The first one comes in. The second one is
02:08 cumulative. And you've withdrawn the third one, so what's next?

02:08 MS. MEYER: Okay. The second category --

02:08 THE COURT: What's the exhibit number for the one I just
02:08 admitted?

02:08 MS. MEYER: We'll have it be Exhibit 197, then.

02:08 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 197 admitted into the record.)

02:08 MS. MEYER: All right. The second category of documents,
02:08 Your Honor, are those five photographs of the pens that I showed
02:08 to Mr. French when he was on the stand. He said yes, this is
02:08 what I was talking about when I testified. We now use pens.

02:08 It's our position --

02:08 THE COURT: Why is that rebuttal testimony?

02:08 MS. MEYER: Because, Your Honor, our claim is they keep
02:08 the elephants on chains. They came in and put a case on saying
02:08 we don't use chains that much anymore. We use pens now.

02:08 Mr. French testified about the size of the pens. And I had him
02:08 say this is what I'm talking about when I'm talking about pens.

02:09 We have photographs.

02:09 You got them -- they admitted in questioning from you that
02:09 they would not be prejudiced by having these put in the record
02:09 and I think they should go into the record.

02:09 THE COURT: The point I'm getting at is what does it
02:09 rebut? It's actually corroborative of their testimony, isn't it?

02:09 What does it rebut?

02:09 I guess technically, I could say -- it's not really
02:09 rebuttal, though. What does it rebut?

02:09 MS. MEYER: We tried to get it in during
02:09 cross-examination. I think it should come in whether it comes in
02:09 because it's a demonstrative or --

02:09 THE COURT: How are you prejudiced if it doesn't come in?

02:09 MS. MEYER: I think it's important for the Court to know
02:09 what they're talking about when they say they use pens.

02:09 THE COURT: I heard the testimony. It's a nonjury. I
02:09 don't have to wonder whether the jury knows what's going on. I
02:09 heard the testimony.

02:09 MS. MEYER: These are photographs, Your Honor, so you can
02:09 look at them and see --

02:09 THE COURT: How are you prejudiced if they come in? Those
02:09 photos corroborate your testimony, don't they, Mr. Simpson? How
02:09 are you prejudiced if I let them in?

02:09 I could say it's nonjury, I guess. We talked about this
02:09 over there. You could open your case-in-chief even though -- you
02:10 know, but I guess -- I don't think -- first of all, I don't think
02:10 it's rebuttal testimony -- evidence, but I don't think that
02:10 it's -- the defendants are prejudiced either. Are they?

02:10 MR. SIMPSON: It would be hard for me to articulate that.

02:10 THE COURT: All right. I'll admit them. I've seen the
02:10 tapes, I know what penning is. I'll admit them just because --

02:10 I'll just allow them to become a part of the evidentiary record.

02:10 So what's the number?

02:10 MS. MEYER: That's Exhibit 198.

02:10 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 198 admitted into the record.)

02:10 THE COURT: All right. What else?

02:10 MS. MEYER: The last category is just some complaints that
02:10 were received by FEI from members of the public that went to the
02:10 circus, were disturbed by what they saw, wrote a complaint, and
02:10 FEI's response. We're not introducing this for the truth of the
02:10 matter of the complaints, but really, because you actually
02:10 asked --

02:10 THE COURT: I know. I asked the question about why
02:10 members of the public complained.

02:10 I think that comes in, Mr. Simpson, because the answer was
02:10 no, they don't do it; just those activists do it.

02:11 MR. SIMPSON: Well, because there are thousands of
02:11 complaints that come into this Website, some of which are very
02:11 profane and threatening, and they cherry picked what they want
02:11 you to see. And I don't know that that presents a fair picture
02:11 of what the company actually gets in terms of the complaints.

02:11 And I think Mr. Sowalsky's testimony was many of these
02:11 things are orchestrated; people go to a Website and there's
02:11 something going on and they say, we'll send an e-mail, and then
02:11 they get sent.

02:11 So to me, they showed him one and there was a response

02:11 to -- that ought to come in. The rest of this I think is
02:11 extraneous and cumulative.

02:11 THE COURT: Yeah. This is one Website complaint by
02:11 someone --

02:11 MS. MEYER: Pardon me?

02:11 THE COURT: -- by someone who identified himself or
02:11 herself?

02:11 MS. MEYER: These are letters from parents who have taken
02:11 their kids to the circus. It's exactly what you --

02:11 THE COURT: I'll let them in. I asked the question. I
02:11 think that's proper rebuttal.

02:11 MS. MEYER: So we'll make that Exhibit 199.

02:11 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 199 admitted into the record.)

02:11 THE COURT: All right. Is that it?

02:11 MS. MEYER: That's it, Your Honor.

02:11 THE COURT: I want to get back to -- I want to be clear.
02:11 I'm not sure what the former courtroom deputy wrote down with
02:12 respect to these interrogatory answers, rule of completeness.

02:12 Look, the rule is clear. They just don't come in because
02:12 it would be nice to have this other question and answer. There
02:12 has to be a compelling reason for additional evidence by an
02:12 opponent to come in to make the otherwise proffered answer or
02:12 answer testified to truly complete.

02:12 Now, I'm not inclined to allow those interrogatory answers
02:12 to come in under that theory, period. So I'm going to leave them

02:12 out of here. Now, if I understood Mr. Crystal correctly, you and
02:12 Mr. Simpson had agreed to allow some of them to come in; is that
02:12 right?

02:12 MR. CRYSTAL: No. We had suggested that sort of what we
02:12 considered to be a compromise would be to let at least the
02:12 objections and definitions come in, which were at the beginning
02:12 of the responses, because they obviously are relevant to the
02:12 specific questions that have now been included, so the Court can
02:12 see what the objections and definitions were.

02:13 And our other suggestion had been -- which I think the
02:13 Court had already suggested it was not inclined to allow -- was
02:13 the specific pages on which other questions were asked. And I
02:13 understood you to say earlier that you were not going to allow
02:13 that, which I appreciate.

02:13 THE COURT: I'm not going to allow that. Why should I
02:13 allow those objections in?

02:13 MR. CRYSTAL: We've already explained our view and I think
02:13 the Court already issued its ruling on that, so I would ask that
02:13 at minimum, we be allowed, for completeness, to designate the
02:13 pages -- they're at the beginning of the responses -- that
02:13 contain the objections and definitions and just add that to the
02:13 specific responses and questions that the plaintiff designated
02:13 with regard to all of the interrogatories.

02:13 THE COURT: And you object to that?

02:13 MR. SIMPSON: I don't object to the objections.

02:13 THE COURT: That's fine. All right. Now, do we need a
02:13 designation, though, for --

02:13 MR. CRYSTAL: Yes. We need to give the specific pages.

02:13 THE COURT: All right. Carol will be here tomorrow. Do
02:13 you want to give me a number now that -- and then you can --

02:13 MR. CRYSTAL: Sure. These are the numbers that were
02:13 assigned?

02:13 We already talked about making them 193, 194 and 195.
02:14 There are still two more sets, the API and the Tom Rider. Or do
02:14 we not need to do that?

02:14 (Discussion had off the record.)

02:14 MS. JOINER: We have Tom Rider as Defendant's Exhibit 16
02:14 and API as Defendant's Exhibit 21.

02:14 MR. CRYSTAL: Okay. So by tomorrow, we can provide those
02:14 additional pages.

02:14 THE COURT: That's fine.

02:14 MR. CRYSTAL: And that will be for those five.

02:14 THE COURT: That's fine.

02:14 MR. CRYSTAL: Thank you.

02:14 THE COURT: Yes. Both sides are going to have to huddle
02:14 with Carol tomorrow -- I say tomorrow; I'm not so sure it's fatal
02:14 if it's not done before closing argument. But I mean, as I
02:14 normally do in jury trial cases, someone on each side is going to
02:14 have to sign a sheet that Carol has; we prepared this some time
02:14 ago, after we started reading opinions about evidence getting

02:14 back to fact finders that shouldn't find its way into the jury
02:14 room in criminal cases. It's very problematic.

02:14 But I'm going to have to require that as well. I mean,
02:15 everybody needs to be comfortable with what the record is and
02:15 what it isn't for purposes of any further review.

02:15 Now, the timing of that -- it's difficult to say when the
02:15 timing should take place. She's not here. It is nonjury. I
02:15 don't think it necessarily has to take place tomorrow.

02:15 I think she'll be in tomorrow. I think she will, won't
02:15 she, Jim?

02:15 THE COURTROOM CLERK: As far as I know, Your Honor.

02:15 THE COURT: I have a nagging recollection that there's an
02:15 evidentiary ruling that I owe counsel that has to do with one of
02:15 the learned treatises. Am I correct? Or did I give you a ruling
02:15 on that?

02:15 MR. SIMPSON: There's a ruling I think outstanding on the
02:15 elephant resource husbandry guide and there was a letter from the
02:15 Washington Humane Society that we wanted to submit in response
02:15 that Julie Strauss wrote, which was their -- they call 33.

02:15 THE COURT: And they objected to that, didn't they?

02:15 MR. SIMPSON: That's correct. And those are --

02:15 THE COURT: What is your exhibit number? What is that
02:15 last exhibit number?

02:16 MR. SIMPSON: Our response was Defendant's Exhibit 34 --
02:16 340. Excuse me.

02:16 THE COURT: 340.

02:16 MS WINDERS: There's also another issue still pending.

02:16 THE COURT: Just a minute.

02:16 Refresh my recollection on that 340, counsel. What was
02:16 that document?

02:16 MR. SIMPSON: It was a letter that the Washington Humane
02:16 Society wrote the company making a complaint about an elephant
02:16 tethering and the deputy general counsel wrote back a response,
02:16 so we just submitted that for completeness.

02:16 THE COURT: What's the objection to that?

02:16 MR. SIMPSON: I think the objection was it was one of
02:16 their exhibits and they didn't think we could use one of their
02:16 exhibits.

02:16 MS WINDERS: Our objection was that the -- the primary
02:16 objection was that they waived their completeness objection.
02:16 This is one of our May Call Exhibits and they're now saying that
02:16 because we didn't call it, they're entitled to make a
02:16 completeness objection.

02:16 But the exhibit they're trying to complete, they didn't
02:16 make a completeness objection when we did the objections to their
02:16 pretrial statement, which your court order required, which Rule
02:17 26(a)(2) required. They didn't make an objection at the
02:17 time that they --

02:17 THE COURT: How are you prejudiced?

02:17 MS WINDERS: If you want to let it in and give it whatever

02:17 weight --

02:17 THE COURT: Thank you. 340 is in, over objection.

02:17 (Defendant's Exhibit 340 admitted into the record.)

02:17 THE COURT: What else? That book. Let me -- refresh my
02:17 recollection about the husbandry book.

02:17 Didn't I have counsel submit five pages from that book?

02:17 MR. SIMPSON: Correct.

02:17 THE COURT: All right. I just haven't ruled on that.

02:17 I'll do that. I'll issue a minute order and rule on that one.

02:17 MS WINDERS: There's also a third exhibit.

02:17 THE COURT: What's the third one?

02:17 MS WINDERS: That's is something plaintiffs sought to move
02:17 in and defendants objected to its relevance. We submitted
02:17 briefing about its relevance to defendant's commercial activity,
02:17 which is pertinent under the SPA and issues that are going to be
02:17 appealed. So that was also briefed.

02:17 THE COURT: I'm sorry. What's the exhibit number?

02:17 MS WINDERS: That was page 10 of Plaintiffs' Will Call 86,
02:17 so we will probably give it a new exhibit number, which would be
02:17 Will Call 200.

02:18 THE COURT: Mr. Simpson?

02:18 MR. SIMPSON: Our objection, basically, was it's
02:18 irrelevant because if we get that far in the case, if there's an
02:18 appeal and we get to that issue, it's going to be a legal
02:18 question. We think it's foreclosed by Fish and Wildlife regs.

02:18 But we have briefed it. It's pending before Your Honor in
02:18 that same --

02:18 THE COURT: All right. I'll issue a minute order
02:18 resolving both of those. All right.

02:18 What else? Anything else?

02:18 MS. JOINER: One more thing quickly, Your Honor. Before
02:18 the break, counsel had asked about additional designations for
02:18 Mr. Pettigrew. We have no objection to those.

02:18 Would it be okay if we file our exhibits tomorrow morning
02:18 rather than this evening?

02:18 THE COURT: You can do that. You're here now. You might
02:18 as well do it now.

02:18 MS. JOINER: I'm talking about the ones we have to do
02:18 electronically.

02:18 THE COURT: Oh, okay. That's fine. That's fine. Okay.

02:19 (Discussion had off the record.)

02:19 THE COURT: All right, counsel. It's hard to speak for
02:19 Carol. I don't know. I'm going to -- I don't know. I know we
02:19 talked before Carol left. I don't think it's fatal. I think I
02:19 prefer it before opening argument and I don't know whether she's
02:19 coming in.

02:19 THE COURTROOM CLERK: I have not heard from her. She's
02:19 due back tomorrow.

02:19 (Discussion had off the record.)

02:20 THE COURT: If she gets in early, counsel, I'll ask you to

02:20 work it out with her tomorrow.

02:20 (Discussion had off the record.)

02:20 THE COURT: I heard this word "appeal, appeal, appeal." I
02:21 haven't heard the word "settlement." Sometimes people settle
02:21 cases even after trials.

02:21 I can't -- I won't talk about settlement, but there's some
02:21 wonderful thoughts I've had about how a -- do you folks have any
02:21 interest in talking to someone? We have time to do proposed
02:21 findings? Anything I can do, if I appoint someone to talk to
02:21 you?

02:21 I just thought I'd ask. It kept nagging -- I kept hearing
02:21 "appeal," which is fine. But no one is interested?

02:21 MR. SIMPSON: I can't speak for the plaintiffs, Judge.

02:21 THE COURT: What about you, though?

02:21 MR. SIMPSON: I think we're going to have to go the
02:21 distance.

02:21 THE COURT: Yeah, yeah. It's a very interesting case.

02:21 MS. MEYER: We made settlement offers over the years.

02:21 THE COURT: All right. That's fine. Fair enough. I had
02:21 to raise it. That's what it was. It kept gnawing at me.

02:21 Okay. That's fine. All right. 10:00.

02:22 I was going to tell you what an excellent job you have
02:22 done. Annie reminded me. But I'll reserve that for the public
02:22 record. It's been a real pleasure.

02:22 What people don't understand is that it's a sealed docket

02:22 that we all have that's just overpowering. It's the public
02:22 docket that everyone knows about, so there are a lot of things
02:22 that we moved around to accommodate counsel. But it's been a --
02:22 a well tried case, exceptionally well tried. But I'll reserve
02:22 comment for the benefit of the public.

02:22 The public does have an interest in the case as well. If
02:22 you change your mind about settlement, just give me a call. But
02:22 in any event, we'll start at 10:00.

02:22 And how do you want to break up your time? I said two
02:22 hours; I'm not going to go back on that, but don't feel obligated
02:22 to fill out the time, you know.

02:22 MS. MEYER: I don't think I'm going to take two hours, but
02:22 I will want some time for rebuttal.

02:23 THE COURT: That's up to you, how you split it up. You
02:23 have two hours rebuttal.

02:23 MS. MEYER: No, no. I'm going to go first. I haven't
02:23 decided yet.

02:23 THE COURT: All right. Okay. Counsel, do you need two
02:23 hours?

02:23 MR. SIMPSON: I don't think the whole time, but we'll have
02:23 to see how it unfolds here.

02:23 THE COURT: So let's think about it for a second. Once in
02:23 the area, you would argue until 11:00 or so and then maybe
02:23 counsel will argue -- I don't know -- if it goes two hours, it
02:23 may go to lunch. At some point, we have to factor -- we have to

02:23 break this up.

02:23 So -- but we can do this -- you'll know before 10:00 how

02:23 you're going to structure it. You have to -- I'm not sure

02:23 whether we'll need two court reporters or not. We'll have a

02:23 lunch break.

02:23 See you on Wednesday at 10:00.

02:23 MR. SIMPSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

02:23 THE COURT: Have a good evening.

02:23 (Proceedings adjourned at 7:54 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Scott L. Wallace, RDR-CRR, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Scott L. Wallace, RDR, CRR
Official Court Reporter

Date

I N D E XEXAMINATIONSPage

CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION OF DR. DENNIS SCHMITT BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN	2
REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF DR. DENNIS SCHMITT BY MR. SHEA	30

EXHIBITSDESCRIPTION

Exhibit 307 admitted	51
plaintiffs' Exhibit WC 196 admitted	62
Plaintiffs' Exhibit 191 admitted	39
Defendant's Exhibits 348 and 348A admitted	39
Defendant's Exhibit 349A admitted	40
Defendant's Exhibits 349B through 349F admitted	41
Defendant's Exhibit 173A admitted	42
Defendant's Exhibits 166 and 167 admitted	45
Defendant's Exhibit 157 admitted	50
Plaintiffs' Exhibit 197 admitted	67
Plaintiffs' Exhibit 198 admitted	69
Plaintiffs' Exhibit 199 admitted	70
Defendant's Exhibit 340 admitted	75
Defendant's Exhibits 346, 347 and 347A admitted	39
Defendant's Exhibits 40, 41 and 42 admitted	43
Defendant's Exhibit 152 admitted	45
Defendant's Exhibit 148 admitted	46
Defendant's Exhibit 124 admitted	49
Defendant's Exhibit 266 admitted	50
Defendant's Exhibit 302A admitted	50
Defendant's Exhibit 305 admitted	51
Defendant's Exhibit 350 admitted	51
Defendant's Exhibit 351 admitted	52
Defendant's Exhibit 352 admitted	53
Defendant's Exhibit 353 admitted	53
Defendant's Exhibit 354 admitted	53
Plaintiffs' Exhibit 190A through L admitted	55