```
1
     STATE OF ILLINOIS
                                                          1
                                                                                   INDEX
2
                                                          2
                            )
                                                              WITNESS
                                                                                                     EXAMINATION
                                ss:
 3
                                                          3
     COUNTY OF C O O K
                            )
                                                              JEFFREY COE, M.D.
 4
       IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
                                                          4
                                                                By Mr. Duffy
                                                                                                          4
 5
             COUNTY DEPARTMENT - LAW DIVISION
                                                          5
                                                                By Mr. Clinton
                                                                                                          94
 6
     CHERYL D. REICHENBACH,
                                                          6
 7
                                                          7
            Plaintiff.
 8
                                 ) No. 16 L 4776
                                                          8
       VS.
 9
     ARONBERG GOLDGEHN DAVIS
                                 )
                                                          9
10
     & GARMISA,
                                 )
                                                         10
11
            Defendant.
                                                         11
12
            The discovery deposition of JEFFREY COE,
                                                         12
                                                                             EXHIBITS
     M.D., taken in the above-entitled cause, before
13
                                                         13
                                                              NUMBER
                                                                                                  MARKED FOR ID
14
     Steven J. Maza, a notary public of Cook County,
                                                              Dr. Coe Deposition
                                                         14
15
     Illinois, on the 9th day of April 2019 at 22
                                                         15
                                                                Exhibit No. 1
                                                                                                          4
16
     North Morgan Street, Chicago, Illinois, at the
                                                         16
     hour of 1:37 p.m.
                                                         17
17
     The deposition concluded at 3:17 p.m.
18
                                                         18
19
                                                         19
20
                                                         20
21
                                                         21
22
                                                         22
23
     Steven J. Maza, CSR
                                                         23
     License No. 084-002479
24
                                                         24
                                                      1
                                                                                                               3
 1
     APPEARANCES:
                                                                               (Witness sworn.)
                                                          1
 2
                                                          2
                                                                              JEFFREY COE, M.D.,
 3
          THE CLINTON LAW FIRM, LLC
                                                          3
                                                              called as a witness herein, having been first
          111 West Washington Street, Suite 1437
                                                              duly sworn, was examined and testified as
                                                          4
 5
          Chicago, Illinois 60602
                                                          5
                                                              follows:
 6
          (312) 357-1515
                                                          6
                                                                                 EXAMINATION
 7
          ed@clintonlaw.net
                                                          7
                                                              BY MR. DUFFY:
 8
          BY: MR. EDWARD X. CLINTON, JR.,
                                                          8
                                                                       Let the record reflect this is the
 9
               Representing the Plaintiff;
                                                          9
                                                              deposition of Dr. Jeffrey Coe taken pursuant to
10
                                                         10
                                                              agreement of the parties and continued from time
11
          DONOHUE, BROWN, MATHEWSON & SMYTH
                                                         11
                                                              to time until today's date by agreement of the
12
          140 South Dearborn Street, Suite 800
                                                         12
                                                              parties.
13
          Chicago, Illinois 60603
                                                         13
                                                                       Dr. Coe, have you given a deposition
          (312) 422-0900
14
                                                         14
                                                              before?
15
          john.duffy@dbmslaw.com
                                                         15
                                                                       I have.
                                                                  Α.
16
          BY: MR. JOHN J. DUFFY,
                                                         16
                                                                       I will dispense with the ground rules
               Representing the Defendant.
17
                                                         17
                                                              then.
18
                                                         18
                                                                       What I would like to do is I am going
19
          ALSO PRESENT: Cheryl Reichenbach
                                                         19
                                                              to mark what -- just say it's next No. 1.
20
                                                         20
                                                                               (Whereupon, Dr. Coe Deposition
21
                                                         21
                                                                                Exhibit No. 1 was marked for
22
                                                         22
                                                                                identification.)
23
                                                         23
                                                              BY MR. DUFFY:
24
                                                         24
                                                                       It's a copy of a report that you have
                                                                  Q.
```

1	authored for Ms. Reichenbach in this case, and I	1	Q. And where did you go to college?
2	know you have got a copy?	2	A. University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.
3	MR. CLINTON: I have got a copy.	3	Q. What did you study in Ann Arbor?
4	BY MR. DUFFY:	4	A. I majored in zoology. It was a
5	Q. So just for identification, I have now	5	pre-medical course. I graduated in 1966.
6	handed you Exhibit No. 1, which is a December 6,	6	Q. And when did you go to medical school?
7	2018 report that you signed in this case,	7	Did you go immediately to medical
8	correct?	8	school?
9	A. That's correct, with my curriculum	9	A. Immediately. I came back to Chicago
10	vitae attached to the end.	10	and went to the University of Chicago here in
11	Q. Thank you.	11	Chicago 1966 and graduated in 1970.
12	And it's dated December 6, 2018?	12	Q. Where did you
13	A. Yes, that's correct.	13	A. Ancient history.
14	Q. And it's based on an examination that	14	Q. Where did you do your internship?
15	you conducted also on December 6, 2018?	15	A. At the University of Michigan Medical
16	A. That's correct.	16	Center, again, in Ann Arbor.
17	Q. So you did the examination and wrote	17	Q. And where did you do your residency?
18	the report all in the same day?	18	A. Also, in Ann Arbor, and this was in
19	A. It's pretty much the custom at the	19	pediatrics, just for your information.
20	office to date the reports on the date of the	20	Q. That was what I was going to ask next.
21	examination.	21	So how many years was your pediatrics
22	This report was actually written in a	22	residency at Michigan?
23	day or two after the visit.	23	A. One year in addition to the internship.
24	Q. Why do you date it two days prior to it	24	Q. And have you had any other residencies?
	5		7
1	haing writton?	1	A. No. Then I went later on and became a
1 2	being written?  A. Because that was the actual date of	1 2	A. No. Then I went later on and became a board certified specialist in occupational
3	examination. It's easier for me to refer to it	3	medicine.
4	that way.	4	Board certification in that field at
5	Q. Okay. Is the report accurate?	5	the time I did it was based on educational
6	A. Yes, it's complete, and it's accurate.	6	achievement, working for a period of five years
7	It's as I wrote it.	7	solely in occupational medicine and then
8	Q. And have you had a chance to review it	8	completion of the specialty board examination.
9	before today's deposition?	9	Q. And when did you take the boards for
10	A. I have.	10	occupational medicine?
11	Q. And is it complete?	11	A. In 1990.
12	A. Yes.	12	Q. Have they changed the board exams
13	Q. I went through your curriculum vitae,	13	today?
14	but I like to ask these questions anyway just to	14	A. No. The only thing they changed was
15	get a sense of who everybody is.	15	that beginning in 1997, they required triannual
16	When were you born?	16	recertification.
17	A. 1945.	17	Q. What does triannual certification mean?
18	Q. And where were you born?	18	A. Every three years you had to recertify
19	A. Here in Chicago.	19	either by application or at seven years
20	Q. Where did you go to high school?	20	recertify by examination.
21	A. Lakeview High School, a city high	21	Q. And you don't have to do that?
22	school on the north side.	22	A. No. I don't like to use the word
23	Q. When did you graduate?	23	grandfather at this point, but, yes, that's
43			

24

2000 -- excuse me, 1962.

6

24 correct, I do not.

- Q. So folks who received an occupational medicine board certification have to take an exam every three years to show that they are current?

  A. Yes, that's correct.

  Q. Does the occupational medicine board currently require a residency in occupational medicine?
  - currently require a residency in occupational
    medicine?
     A. It suggests that. There are still
    alternate paths, one being a residency such as

the residency program here at the University of

Illinois in Chicago where I actually teach.

Another is — there is still a second path to board certification, which is through work in the field with completion of an advanced degree and also completion of the board certification examination, but I do want to tell

- certification examination, but I do want to tel you that that's frowned upon at this point and residency certification is the preferred route.

  Q. When did it switch to residency
- A. I think in the mid 1990s at that point.
- Q. So your board certification came in several years before the changes were made?

board on the first try?

A. I did.

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

9

- Q. Have you ever been the subject of a reprimand from the Board of Occupational Medicine for testimony that you have given in lawsuits?
  - A. No, I have not.
  - Q. Have you been the subject of investigations by that board?
    - A. No, I have not.
  - Q. I was looking at your curriculum vitae before today's deposition, and I wanted to just talk a little bit about your medical practice since you obtained your license.

So on Exhibit No. 1, the first page of your curriculum vitae there is a heading there entitled Medical Practice, do you see that?

- A. I do.
- Q. And it says from 1972 to 1974, you were an attending physician at the University of Michigan, is that right?
  - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And did you leave that job of your own volition or were you terminated?

11

- 1 A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Have you agreed to voluntarily undergo the triannual recertification?
  - A. No. I have not.
  - Q. You have a medical license in Illinois?
- 6 A. I do.

certification?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 7 Q. And other states?
- 8 A. Yes, that's correct, also in the states 9 of New York and Michigan.
  - Q. Are they current in New York and Michigan?
  - A. No, they are not. They are inactive at this time.

I really don't work in those states. I have no need for those licenses.

- Q. And how about your Illinois license, that's current?
  - A. Yes, that's correct.
  - Q. Other than while -- strike that.

Have you taken -- other than the occupational medicine board examination, have you taken any other medical boards?

- A. No, I have not.
  - Q. Did you pass the occupational medicine

- A. No, I left it at my own volition.
- Q. From 1974 to 1976, you served as the Director Employee Health Service and attending physician at Coler Memorial Hospital in New York City?
  - A. Yes, that's correct.
  - Q. And can you describe for me what that job entailed?
- 9 A. Sure. I'm sorry, John, you are 10 finished?
  - Q. No, go ahead. I am thinking.
  - A. Sure, I would be glad to.

So it's pretty much what it sounds like. So Coler Memorial Hospital is one of the city hospitals New York City. It's actually a large hospital. We don't hear it about very much, but it had 700 beds at the time, and it had over a thousand employees, and I was the director of employee health.

So I was in charge of the hospital employee health programs, which included clinical responsibilities of examining hospital employees who might have been injured or became ill at work and being the administrator of the



hospital employee health program system, which included rules and regulations and plans and procedures for employee health.

I was also an attending physician in that system. Attending physician under that title meant that I would from time to time do consultations with people who were hospitalized with the potential for work-related health problems. It was already clear that that was my area of specialty.

- Q. And in that role from 1974 to 1976, were you employed as an employee of the Coler Memorial Hospital?
- A. Yes -- I was actually an employee of the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation.
- Q. Thank you for that correction.

  In that role -- strike that. Le

In that role -- strike that. Let me ask you a different question.

When you were working as an employee of the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, you were also maintaining a private practice that allowed you to see patients at Coler Memorial? that would be defendant in the New York City
Health and Hospitals Corporation at Worker's
Compensation hearings?

- A. I suppose that was potentially true, although I don't recall that there were any such cases at the time.
- Q. Did you give any deposition testimony while you served in that capacity?
  - A. I don't believe that I did.
- Q. And you also saw patients at the hospital who may have been exposed to particular agents in their jobs, right?
  - A. From time to time, yes, that's correct.
- Q. Silica?

- A. Yes, that was one possibility.
  - Q. Asbestos was another?
  - A. Another, that's correct.
- Q. Did you ever have occasion to testify in those cases for the patients that you saw?
- A. No, I did not.
- Q. In 1976, you left the job with New York City?
- 23 A. Yes, that's correct.
  - Q. Did you leave on your own or were you

- A. No. I was just solely an employee of the Health and Hospitals Corporation.
  - It was a full-time position.
- Q. Okay. And so that job in large measure had you dealing with employees of the hospital who were either sick or injured on the job, does that sound right?
- A. Yes, that's generally correct, but with occasional consultations for patients who might be in the hospital who might have had a problem that related in some way to a workplace.

This usually dealt with some type of occupational exposure. So if someone had a chronic lung disease and there was a concern that they might have had silica or asbestos exposure, I would also be consulted about that.

Q. I see.

So just to be clear, you would evaluate employees of the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation who were injured or found sick on the job, correct?

- A. That was one of the things that I would do.
  - Q. And would you be one of the physicians

terminated?

- A. No, I left on my own.I moved back to Chicago.
- Q. Okay. When you came back to Chicago, you listed on your curriculum vitae that you were in general practice?
  - A. That's correct.
- 8 Q. And where was your general practice9 located during that time?
  - A. It was on the near west side. It's actually not far from where we are sitting here today.
    - Q. And did you have hospital privileges?
    - A. I did not.

It was an outpatient medical practice, medical office.

- Q. So just for benefit of lay people, would you describe what hospital privileges are.
- A. Sure. It's made by application. It's the ability to admit patients to a hospital.
- **Q.** And so --
  - A. It's to be on the staff of a hospital.
  - Q. And so during the time that you were a general practitioner, you did not have the



1	ability to admit any of your patients to a
2	Chicago area hospital, true?
3	A. That's correct.
4	Q. Did you ever apply for privileges to a
5	hospital during this period of time?
6	A. No, I did not.
7	Q. Why not?
8	A. Well, there's really no need for it.
9	This is an outpatient medical clinic work, and
	*
10	if patients were sick or required
11	hospitalization, if they were injured and
12	required more urgent care, they was simply
13	referred to one of a number of local medical
14	centers for care.
15	You know, I mean, as you know, not to
16	belabor the point, we are surrounded by them as
17	we sit here in this neighborhood.
18	Q. Have you ever applied for hospital
19	privileges at Rush?
20	A. No, I have not.
21	Q. So in 1979, it looks like you stopped
22	being a general practitioner?
23	A. Yes, that's correct.
24	Q. Was there a gap between the cessation
	17
l	17
	17
1	of your general practice and starting at
1 2	
	of your general practice and starting at
2	of your general practice and starting at Republic LTV Steel?
<b>2</b> 3	of your general practice and starting at Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.
2 3 4	of your general practice and starting at Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not. Q. Okay.
2 3 4 5	of your general practice and starting at Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not. Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but
2 3 4 5 6	of your general practice and starting at Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not. Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long,
2 3 4 5 6 7	of your general practice and starting at Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not. Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of your general practice and starting at Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not. Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates. Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of your general practice and starting at Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not. Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates. Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of your general practice and starting at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at Republic LTV Steel?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of your general practice and starting at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. That's correct. It was Republic Steel,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of your general practice and starting at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at Republic LTV Steel?  A. That's correct. It was Republic Steel, then Republic Steel was purchased by LTV Steel, so I have used both titles.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of your general practice and starting at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. That's correct. It was Republic Steel, then Republic Steel was purchased by LTV Steel, so I have used both titles.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of your general practice and starting at Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at Republic LTV Steel?  A. That's correct. It was Republic Steel, then Republic Steel was purchased by LTV Steel, so I have used both titles.  Q. Where was the Republic Steel located at?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of your general practice and starting at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at Republic LTV Steel?  A. That's correct. It was Republic Steel, then Republic Steel was purchased by LTV Steel, so I have used both titles.  Q. Where was the Republic Steel located at?  A. Here. It's 116th Street and Avenue O,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of your general practice and starting at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. That's correct. It was Republic Steel, then Republic Steel was purchased by LTV Steel, so I have used both titles.  Q. Where was the Republic Steel located at?  A. Here. It's 116th Street and Avenue O, so it's on the southeast side of Chicago.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of your general practice and starting at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. That's correct. It was Republic Steel, then Republic Steel was purchased by LTV Steel, so I have used both titles.  Q. Where was the Republic Steel located at?  A. Here. It's 116th Street and Avenue O, so it's on the southeast side of Chicago.  Q. And were you an employee of the company
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of your general practice and starting at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at Republic LTV Steel?  A. That's correct. It was Republic Steel, then Republic Steel was purchased by LTV Steel, so I have used both titles.  Q. Where was the Republic Steel located at?  A. Here. It's 116th Street and Avenue O, so it's on the southeast side of Chicago.  Q. And were you an employee of the company at that time?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of your general practice and starting at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at Republic LTV Steel?  A. That's correct. It was Republic Steel, then Republic Steel was purchased by LTV Steel, so I have used both titles.  Q. Where was the Republic Steel located at?  A. Here. It's 116th Street and Avenue O, so it's on the southeast side of Chicago.  Q. And were you an employee of the company at that time?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of your general practice and starting at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. That's correct. It was Republic Steel, then Republic Steel was purchased by LTV Steel, so I have used both titles.  Q. Where was the Republic Steel located at?  A. Here. It's 116th Street and Avenue O, so it's on the southeast side of Chicago.  Q. And were you an employee of the company at that time?  A. Yes.  Q. And was strike that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of your general practice and starting at  Republic LTV Steel?  A. No, there was not.  Q. Okay.  A. So it's all blended together, but because this curriculum vitae was getting long, these are not precise dates.  Q. All right. So in 1980, you took the position as regional medical director at Republic LTV Steel?  A. That's correct. It was Republic Steel, then Republic Steel was purchased by LTV Steel, so I have used both titles.  Q. Where was the Republic Steel located at?  A. Here. It's 116th Street and Avenue O, so it's on the southeast side of Chicago.  Q. And were you an employee of the company at that time?  A. Yes.

Sure, I would be glad to.

So Republic and then its successor, LTV Steel, is a large sort of multi-line steel company, a steel producer going from iron ore to finished products.

1

2 3

4

5

6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

3

4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

They have a number of plants here in the midwest in what was described as the midwest

I was the regional medical director. The regional medical director position was located here in Chicago at the plant on the southeast side.

I had clinical responsibilities. That's to say I was the physician present at the plant. I would see sick or injured employees. I would be the first provider for acute injuries, and then I had to administrative responsibilities, which is to say I was the administrator for their health and safety programs as it affected employee health, and these could be preventive programs, injury maintenance programs, rehabilitation programs, vocational restoration programs, alternative placement programs.

I also participated with safety

19

### professionals in that position. 1 2

# And you held that job for four years?

In total, yes, that's correct, but, John, this might make this clearer for you.

For part of that period of time, I don't know if anybody's memory goes back as far as mine does about this, too, there was a slowdown in the steel industry, and it was during that period of time that my employer, Republic Steel, sent me to graduate school where I received a Ph.D degree in occupational medicine.

## When did you receive the occupational Q. medicine Ph.D?

The actual degree was granted in 1985, Α. but it was based on work that I did in 1982, '83 and '84.

## Q. So after you got the Ph.D, you left Republic Steel?

I came back and worked for Republic Steel briefly, and then we agreed to part ways because of further retrenchment in the steel industry and an offer of a position not here in the Chicago area any longer, which didn't appeal

18

20



		_	
1	to me.	1	loss and safety prevention programs.
2	Q. So let me make sure I understand that.	2	So I was hired as the area medical
3	So when you left Republic Steel, it was	3	director for loss prevention. I was, in fact,
4	because there was a reduction in force?	4	the Liberty Mutual resource, so the companywide
5	A. Yes, that's correct.	5	resource for workplace health and safety
6	Q. And they were no longer in need of your	6	programs.
7	services as the regional medical director in	7	I didn't have any clinical
8	this area?	8	responsibilities. This wasn't a clinical job.
9	A. That's correct.	9	I didn't see or examine patients. I didn't do
10	Q. They offered you a position in another	10	evaluations of any sort.
11	city?	11	I was an educational resource, so I
12	A. Yes.	12	would review claims and cases for them. I would
13	Q. What was that?	13	travel to Liberty policyholder locations and
14	A. They offered me the medical director of	14	with other health and safety inspectors and
15	the corporation position in Cleveland.	15	personnel carry out audits or evaluations of
16	Q. And that was not something, obviously,	16	work places.
17	you wanted to do?	17	I would present educational programs to
18	A. That's correct.	18	Liberty staff and Liberty policyholders about
19	Q. The period between that and joining	19	workplace health and safety medical issues, so
20	Liberty Mutual Insurance Company, were you	20	that's the loss prevention medical director job.
21	unemployed during that period of time?	21	Q. You did case reviews for Worker's
22	A. No, actually I wasn't. So one was	22	Compensation matters?
23	concurrent with the next.	23	A. To some extent, although that wasn't my
24	Q. So in 1984 after you left Republic	24	principal responsibility. I was not a part of
	21		23
1	Steel, you joined an insurance company?	1	the claims department.
2	A. Yes, that's correct.	2	Q. But you did review Worker's
3	Q. And your title was an area medical	3	Compensation cases
4	director in loss prevention?	4	A. Yes
5	A. That's correct.	5	THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry I didn't get
6	Q. What were you job duties as the area	6	your question.
7	medical director of Liberty Mutual Insurance	7	BY MR. DUFFY:
8	Company?	8	Q. It's a true statement that you reviewed
9	A. That was a great job.	9	Worker's Compensation cases for Liberty Mutual?
10	So at Liberty Mutual, and I don't mean	10	A. From time to time usually regarding
11	to just be talking here. You can stop me if	11	occupational exposures.
12	this is too much.	12	Q. And sometimes you also audited various
13	Q. No. All educational.	13	workplaces that were insured by Liberty Mutual?
14	A. Liberty Mutual is large multi-line	14	A. Yes, that's correct.
15	insurer. It insured just about everything at	15	Q. Did you ever testify for Liberty
16	that point, but here in the Chicago midwest	16	Mutual?
 17	region, it was at the time one of the largest of	17	A. No, I did not.
18	the Worker's Compensation insurers.	18	Q. When was the first time you gave a
-9 19	I'm not sure, as we sit here in 2019,	19	deposition?
20	whether that still is actually the case, but it	20	A. Probably in about 1991, '92, something
21	certainly was at the time.	21	like that.
22	Liberty was an unusual and interesting	22	Q. And you left the strike that.
	mutual insurance company, and it had a very	23	You worked at Liberty Mutual for about
23	macaa moarance company, and it mad a very		



large commitment to client interaction and to

22

24 four years till about 1989?

that was developing, and I felt really that 1 Yes, that's correct. 2 Did you leave of your on volition or 2 rather than just sit there and wait for calls to 3 3 come in, that I would find a different position were you terminated? 4 No, I left of my own volition. 4 that was more active. 5 Then you served for a single year as a 5 And that was in 1990 when you joined Q. 6 medical director doing clinical services for the 6 Mercy Hospital? 7 United States Occupational Health in Chicago? 7 Α. Yes, that's correct. 8 Well, it's U.S. Occupational Health. 8 And the title you have listed here in 9 It was an occupational health provider, 9 your CV is occupational medicine consultant? 10 so located downtown a provider of clinical 10 Yes. That's the title that they gave occupational health services. It's name was 11 11 me. 12 12 U.S. Occupational Health. What did you do as an occupational 13 So you did not work for the Federal 13 medicine consultant at Mercy Hospital? Government? 14 It's pretty much what it sounds like. 14 That's correct. So Mercy Hospital Medical Center here 15 Α. 15 16 It's a private business? in Chicago had a system of outpatient medical Q. 16 17 It was. That's correct. 17 clinics. Three of them at the time. There are Α. actually more at this point. 18 Were you a part owner? 18 Q. 19 Α. No, I was not. 19 The system was called the Mercyworks. Where was it located? 20 Q. 20 They ran it together as one word. 21 205 West Randolph. 21 These were outpatient medical clinics Α. 22 Who were the principles of U.S. 22 that provided injury care consultations and Q. 23 23 Occupational Health? advice, whatever was required for the clients, 24 You know, I don't actually know. 24 and most of the clients were small to medium 25 I know that the principal physician at sized industrial companies located here in or 1 1 2 the time was a Dr. Fischer, F-I-S-C-H-E-R, but I 2 surrounding Chicago. 3 3 actually don't know who owned the company. Now, this system had doctors at each of 4 What did you do as the medical 4 their locations. These were outpatient clinics, 5 director? 5 not dissimilar to the clinic that I had worked in back in 1976 through '79, so there were 6 Well, it was interesting. I did 6 7 clinical services. So I carried out evaluations 7 doctors at the clinic. 8 and examinations usually relating to workplace 8 But Mercyworks as a system because of 9 9 health and safety. the nature of the services that they had 10 Again, they were trying to develop a 10 promised to their industrial clients needed workplace health and safety private consulting 11 someone with broader occupational health 11 12 business similar to what I had done for Liberty 12 insurance -- experience, so someone who had seen 13 Mutual, similar to what I had done for Republic 13 occupational diseases, someone who was more 14 of LTV Steel, but through a private provider. familiar with vocational placement, with 14 15 And you stayed only a single year? 15 questions of accommodations, with questions of 16 Α. Yes, that's correct. 16 vocational change, so they needed someone to be 17 Did you leave of your own volition or 17 the consultant for this system of outpatient Q. 18 were you terminated? 18 clinics. 19 Again, I left of my own volition. 19 Α.

That was my job. My job was carried out from the Mercy Hospital main facility. I would go to the various clinics as required. I would carry out examinations or evaluations.

You held this job for one year?

A little over a year. Actually, I

26

Why did you leave after one year?

one, but in a way, there was no ready market for

that type of service or at least there was none

I mean the concept I think was a good

It wasn't really working.

20

21

22

23

24

Q.

28

27

20

21

22

23

think it was closer to a year and a half.

- Q. And you left Mercy after that period of time?
- 4 A. I did.

- Q. And was it of your own volition or were you terminated?
- A. No. Again, that was because of my own volition.
- Q. Why did you leave after a year and a half?
- A. Well, it was interesting, but I felt in a way that they needed something different, and this is often the case in occupational medicine. It's something that I teach about, too, from time to time.

In occupational medicine, sometimes these outpatient clinics are looked at as channels to funnel patients into the hospital system to use the hospital consultants, usually in orthopedics, neurosurgery or other specialties, to use the hospital medical center facilities for diagnostic testing, clinical laboratory services.

Now, I didn't feel this was necessarily

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still have those privileges?

A. No. I mean I haven't applied for them again, so I have no idea, but, no, really I have no connection to that medical center.

Q. Currently, do you have admitting privileges at area hospitals?

A. I do, actually, at the University of Illinois Medical Center here in Chicago, and I am still on the courtesy staff of Sherman Hospital in Elgin, Illinois.

Now, that's not something active. It's not something I do anything with, but I am still on the courtesy staff.

- Q. And your admitting privileges at UIC's hospital are current?
- A. I believe they are.
- Q. When you say you believe, why do you say that?

A. Sure. I think that's a -- maybe it's a question that needs some explanation.

My specialty is occupational medicine.

Occupational medicine is an outpatient medical specialty. I don't admit patients to the

in the best interest of all the patients at all the time in the cases that I saw, and rather than further discuss this with them, I elected to open my own practice and finally after all these years in occupational medicine to do it my own way.

So I began my own specialty practice in occupational medicine. That's this practice called Occupational Medicine Associates of Chicago. The date of this was 1991.

- Q. So by my count, in your curriculum vitae you had seven jobs in the first 18 years of your medical practice, does that sound right?
  - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. All right. And since 1991, to be fair to you, you have been in the same practice, which is where we are today?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. When you were at Mercy Hospital, did you have privileges to admit patients to Mercy Hospital?
  - A. Yes.

Q. Was that the first hospital in the area to which you were given admitting privileges?

hospital.

There really is little need for it in the clinical practice that I have carried out now for more than 20 years. So I do from time to time -- at least I have seen patients in the hospital for inpatient consultations if there is a work-related question that arises.

Because of that, I have staff privileges, but to be clear for you, I haven't admitted a patient to the hospital during my whole career, which stems from 1972 through the present.

- Q. So when you say you believe you have admitting privileges at UIC, you are not certain, correct?
- A. That's correct, because it simply doesn't come up.
- Q. When you go to UIC to see a patient, they have already been admitted by another physician, correct?
- A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And your consultation is limited only to the occupational medicine associated with their hospitalization?



A. Yes, if there is an occupational medicine question, if there is some work issue.

- Q. Starting in 1991, it sounds like you became more active in doing medical/legal work?
- A. Well, what I did and what I have done through my whole career has pretty much a consist medical/legal implication.

I work in occupational medicine, work-related medicine, and I think, as all of you know, just about everything at a workplace, something arising from a workplace, something coming out of work activities has the potential for being a legal action either in Worker's Compensation or a variety of other civil litigations other than Worker's Compensation, so just about everything that I have done throughout my career has some legal implication.

Now, to answer your question, yes, from about 1991 from the time I had my practice called Occupational Medicine Associates of Chicago, one of the things that I have done in this practice is carry out evaluations, and evaluations usually are in a medical/legal

matter, and because of those evaluations, there

A. It's highly variable, but let's say less than ten percent.

- Q. How much of your time is spent teaching as an adjunct at UIC?
- A. It varies, again, quarter to quarter, semester to semester.

So it may be -- so let's go back and maybe make that a little clearer for you.

- Q. Yeah, let me reask the question.
- A. Sure.

- Q. In 2018, how much time did you spend teaching at UIC?
  - A. Probably ten hours in total.
- Q. Ten for the whole year?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So less than one percent of your time?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And how about seeing private patients, what percentage of your time is spent doing private patients who have no medical/legal requirements for you?
- A. It's about ten percent, but it varies tremendously week to week, month to month.

has been medical/legal testimony.

- Q. Okay. So just to be direct, you started doing medical/legal evaluations and testimony in 1991, correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. Since that time, you have been consistently doing medical evaluations and then testimony for those patients since 1991?
- A. As one of the things that I do in this practice, yes, that's correct.
- Q. So let's break down the work that you do.

So in terms of the medical/legal work where you evaluate patients, write reports and you give testimony, what percentage of your time is spent doing that?

- A. About a third.
- Q. And what constitutes the time you would spend in your practice for evaluating patients at UIC Hospital?
  - A. Minimal at this point.
- 22 Q. Less than ten percent?
- 23 A. Yes.
  - Q. Less than five percent?

- Q. Well, let's say in 2018, what percent of your practice was seeing private patients with no request for you to do a report and give testimony?
  - A. About ten percent.
- Q. And so I have got, roughly, 50 percent of your time so far?
  - A. Yeah.
- Q. So I am just trying to get a better estimate of your practice as it is today.
- A. It might help you since I already told you about a third of the practice has to do with evaluations, if I just told you what the rest of it was, that might make it clearer for you.
  - Q. Sure, go ahead.
- A. So another third of I what I do has to do with routine types of clinical examinations in my practice of occupational medicine.

So for me, what's that all about? Job placement, physical examinations. This is for people who are starting work or for people who are returning to work, what can they do, what's appropriate for them, routine types of physical examinations that require licensure.



So these are people like locomotive 1 engineers, long hall truck drivers, some regulated positions like nuclear plant 4 operators. These are people who need a license 5 or a certificate for their job, and still in 6 this third of the practice, I do some examinations for people who at least potentially 8 are exposed to hazards in their workplace. So 9 these are people like hazardous waste workers, chemical or nuclear industry workers. These are usually annual examinations looking for some early sign of an occupational disease.

John, just to keep this straight, all of that stuff is a third of what I do.

# Okay. What else do you do?

Α. Just say about that third, so these are all referred to me either by employers or by potential employers.

#### Q. Okay.

2

3

7

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Okay. Now, we have got the third that deals with medical evaluations, and I can explain that further for you.

So there is a third in the middle. The third in the middle is working as an advisor or

So the first is Canadian National Railroad, the CN. So CN North America, you know, it's a Canadian railroad, but they have a large North American contingent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

37

The North American part of the CN is better known as the Illinois Central Gulf. The CN purchased that railroad. So I am the medical director of that railroad.

I am the medical director of Packaging Company of America, which is a -- sounds like an American company. It's actually an international multi-line paper and liner board manufacturing company. Goes from paper mills to finished products.

I am the medical director of the Pregis, P-R-E-G-I-S, Corporation. Pregis is another packaging company that makes plastic inserts. So it makes the foamed inserts that go around furniture or computers and boxes, and it's maybe best known for making bubble wrap actually. They are the bubble wrap manufacturer.

And then, finally, I am the medical director of a company called VTMI, which is

39

a consultant. I do this for companies, for insurers, for third-party administrators, labor organizations, some municipal type organizations from time to time. I advise these people about workplace health and safety matters.

In this second third of the practice, the principal activity is me working as the medical director for four companies, and that's how I spend most of my time, and the clinical examinations, that ten percent part that I mentioned to you before, those are all examinations for employees for companies for which I am the medical director, and I see these people if they get hurt or sick in the local Chicago area.

They are not private patients. They are all employees of the companies for which I am the medical director, so nobody walks into this office. We don't do that kind of work here.

- So in 2018, you were the medical director of four different employers?
  - Α. Yes, that's correct.
  - Q. What were the names?

Veolia, V-E-O-L-I-A, Track Maintenance Incorporated.

It's a railroad service provider that handles track work and track maintenance work throughout the United States, but mostly in the south and in the west coast.

Okay. Let me make sure if I can -make sure I understand the time you spent.

So you spent about a third of your time in 2018 doing medical/legal evaluations and testimony for those folks, correct?

- Yes. that's correct.
- You do about one-third of your time in clinical examinations for job placement examinations, physicals for truckers, train engineers, and then also physicals for hazardous material workers, correct?
  - Α. That's correct.
- And then another third of your time is done as a consultant for insurers and employers in the municipalities, specifically Canadian National Railroad the Packaging Company of America, Pregis Corporation, and VTMI, correct?
  - A. That's correct.

40



McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

43

1	Q. Then the other stuff that we have seen	1	assistant professor at UIC?			
2	on your résumé, the UIC teaching is less than	2	A. None. They don't pay me.			
3	one percent in 2018?	3	It's a voluntary service.			
4	A. It is, that's correct.	4	Q. Do you teach any classes there?			
5	Q. So is there a reason why you didn't	5	A. I did not teach last year, but the			
6	list your work as medical director at the	6	classes that I have taught have usually been			
7	Canadian National Railroad and these other	7	about work-related lower back pain and lower			
8	companies?	8	back injuries and then impairment and disability			
9	A. No, not really. I mean I don't know.	9	including impairment evaluation.			
10	I have never actually put that on my curriculum	10	Q. When did you last teach that course?			
11	vitae.	11	A. That was about five years ago.			
12	If there were questions, I would	12	I believe it was 2013 I did that.			
13	certainly answer them.	13	Q. Was that the last time you taught at			
14	Q. It's a third of what you do, but you	14	UIC Medical School was 2013?			
15	omitted it from your CV?	15	A. No, I'm sorry, that's the last time I			
16	<ul> <li>A third of what I do is advising</li> </ul>	16	taught the impairment evaluation course.			
17	various organizations. It's not just those, but	17	Q. Sure. In fairness to you, when was the			
18	there are other organizations.	18	last time you taught at UIC?			
19	There are insurers, third-party	19	A. 2017.			
20	administrators, other organizations, too.	20	Q. Do you have plans to teach at UIC this			
21	Q. And your private patients are, roughly,	21	year?			
22	ten percent of your practice in 2018?	22	A. No, I don't actually. I have been			
23	A. Again, I don't actually have any	23	cutting back here. If you have noticed, I am			
24	private patients in the sense that I think that	24	getting somewhat older, and I decided to cut			
	41		43			
1	you might be using the term.	1	back in this practice, so that's one of the			
2	Q. Okay, fair enough. Thank you.	2	things I am doing less of.			
3	I want to switch now from the time that	3	I do still have the residents in			
4	you spent in 2018 in your practice to the	4	occupational medicine. These are the doctors in			
5	percentage of revenue that you bring in.	5	training to become specialists in occupational			
6	A. Sure.	6	medicine who come here to the office to work			
7	Q. What percentage of revenue that you	7	with me. I am still doing that, and I show them			
8	collected in 2018 concerned medical/legal work?	8	techniques of evaluation here at my office.			
9	A. Probably 30 or 40 percent, something in	9	Q. Is that part of the residency rotation			
10	that range.	10	is to come here?			
11	Q. And what percentage of your revenue in	11	A. It's offered as an option for a			
12	2018 concerned the clinical examinations for job	12	clinical rotation in the occupational medicine			
13	placement physicals for truck drivers and haz	13	residency program.			
14	mat workers?	14	Q. And when is the last time the residents			
15	A. About 20 percent.	15	came rotating here through your offices for			
16	These are estimates on my part.	16	that?			
17	Q. And then when percentage of your income	17	A. So I get one at a time.			
18	came from being an advisor and consultant for	18	The last actually was about six months			
19	insurers, employers and the medical director at	19	ago.			
20	the four companies that you mentioned?	20	Q. And one resident came for that?			
21	A. Well, it's the remainder of it, so it's	21	<ul> <li>A. Yes. There is only one at a time, so</li> </ul>			

22

23

24

another 30 to 40 percent.

What percentage of your income in 2018

was derived from your work as an adjunct

42

22

23

24

we only do one resident at a time.

Q. In reviewing Exhibit No. 1, which was

your December 6 report, I didn't notice that you

1 2 3	had listed off the materials that you had reviewed?  A. I didn't.	1 2 3	Q. You did not review the second one before issuing your report December 6, 2018, correct?
4	Q. Is that standard for your reports in	4	A. That's correct.
5	your cases?	5	Q. But did you review that report?
6	A. Pretty much, particularly if there are	6	A. I have.
7	a large number of different types of records,	7	Q. Did that change your opinions?
8	and so what I do is go through, and I want to be	8	A. No, it didn't.
9	clear for you that I don't mean this anything	9	I mean let me just say. It's
10	in this report to be an exhaustive list of	10	interesting. It was very interesting to hear
11	everything that I looked at.	11	what Dr. Rinella has to say, but it didn't
12	What I put down here is what was of	12	change any of my opinions.
13	significance to me in my understanding of this	13	Q. And did you review Dr. Veselik's
14	matter. I mean there is the probably ten pounds	14	deposition?
15	of records sitting over on the floor, but what	15	A. I did. Again, this was after I wrote
16	was of interest to me, what was of concern to me	16	my report.
17	is what I needed to know to understand this	17	Q. And so Dr so you came to your
18	case. That's what's in my report.	18	conclusions without reading either Dr. Rinella
19	Q. The important stuff is in your report?	19	or Dr. Veselik's testimony, correct?
20	A. To me, that's correct.	20	A. Their recent testimony, that's correct.
21	Q. And, obviously, you wrote the report,	21	Dr. Rinella, again, had the prior
22	so if it's important, you want to put it in	22	deposition that I did read.
23	here, correct?	23	Q. And you mentioned that in your report,
24	A. That's correct.	24	correct?
	45		47
1	O Co did you mariou Dr. Hariala	1	A T don't know if T did but
1	Q. So did you review Dr. Horio's	1	A. I don't know if I did, but
2	deposition taken in 2018?  A. Afterwards. So I received that after I	2	Q. You did.
3		3	A. Good, then it just goes to show how on
4	wrote my report, but, yes, I have reviewed that.  Q. So you came to your conclusions without		top of things I am.
5	•	5	Q. So did you review the records of Dr. Horio for Ms. Reichenbach?
6	reading what Dr. Horio had to say, correct?	<b>6</b> 7	
7	A. Yes, that's correct. Nor did what he	_	A. I believe they were contained in the records that I saw.
8 <b>9</b>	actually say change any of my conclusions.  Q. All right. But just to be clear, you	8 9	
	came to your conclusions before reading	10	
10 11	Dr. Horio's deposition, correct?	11	A. Yes.  Q. Did you review Dr. Veselik's records?
12	A. Yes, that's correct.	12	Q. Did you review Dr. Veselik's records? A. Yes.
13	Q. Dr. Horio's deposition was provided to	13	Q. Did you review Horio, Rinella and
14	you after December 6, 2018?	14	Veselik's records before you authored the report
15	A. That's correct.	15	marked as Exhibit 1?
16	Q. And did you review Dr. Rinella's	16	A. Up through 2011, 2012.
17	deposition?	17	Q. So you didn't look at any medical
18	A. His second deposition. There are two.	18	records after 2012?
19	Q. Correct. I'm sorry.	19	A. That's correct.
20	He gave one in 2029, correct?	20	Q. Why?
21	A. That's correct.	21	A. I didn't have them at the time,
22	Q. You read that before you authored your	22	although I later received additional medical
~~	v. Tou reau chat befole you auchored your	1//	0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
22	•		_
23 24	report December 6 of 2018?  A. I did.	23	records.  Q. And did those change any of your

46

2	A. No.
3	Q. When did you receive the records after
4	2012?
5	A. So some of them came more recently.
6	So, for example, some of them were part of the
7	deposition testimony. They were attached to the
8	depositions that were later given, Dr. Rinella
9	specifically.
10	Q. How did Dr. Horio?
11	A. No, I didn't I don't think I had any
12	attachments to his deposition.
13	Q. So you only looked at Dr. Horio's
14	records up through 2012?
15	A. Yes, that's correct.
16	Q. How about Dr. Veselik, did you review
17	any of his records after 2012?
	•
18	A. No. It's my understanding that he
19	was after a certain period of time, he was no
20	longer actually the principal family physician
21	for Ms. Reichenbach, and there is another
22	physician, but I don't believe I had his
23	records.
24	Q. Dr. Shapiro?
	49
1	A No another family physician
1	A. No, another family physician.
2	Q. Oh, I see.
3	Did you review Dr. Shapiro's records?
4	A. I did. I am glad you brought that up.
5	That's right. I did have a number of
6	Dr. Shapiro's treatment medical records.
7	Q. Did you have those before writing your
8	report?
9	A. Yes, I did.
10	Q. Did you get any updated records from
11	Dr. Shapiro after 2012 after you wrote your
12	report?
13	A. No. I don't know if there were any.
14	The last record I had from Dr. Shapiro was
15	actually years earlier. It was 2004.
16	Q. Ms. Reichenbach gave a deposition in
17	this case. Did you review that?
18	A. I did.
19	Q. Did you review her trial testimony in
20	the divorce action?
21	A. I don't know that I actually reviewed
22	that. I don't think I did.
23	I reviewed her deposition testimony.
	Q. So according to your memory, you don't
24	

opinions?

```
1 know if you reviewed her trial testimony in her
2 divorce case?
3     A. That's correct.
4     Q. Did you review the depositions of any
5 of the attorneys in this case?
6     A. I did. I reviewed the depositions of
7 two attorneys in this matter.
```

The first was Jay Franks, and then the second was -- what's her name? I'm sorry.

Karen Altman, A-L-T-M-A-N. So I did. I reviewed their deposition testimony.

# Q. Why did you read the attorneys' depositions?

 A. Well, I was curious about what they actually had to say. Let me just stop and tell you for a second.

At this point in my career, I take cases that I find to be interesting. I don't really take every case that comes along.

A case that is interesting to me is something that's new or something that's different or something that has an unusual problem or some workplace connotation, workplace implication.

I have never seen a legal malpractice

case. I have seen medical malpractice cases. I have seen all sorts of civil litigation, but I had never seen a legal malpractice case, so that was one of the things that was interesting to me in this matter, and so one of the things I wanted to learn was what the lawyers actually had to say, and their deposition testimony, that of Mr. Franks and Ms. Altman, that very

something as to how they plan to put together a case and what their feelings were about the judges and how they had planned out their presentations.

So this was one of the things that was interesting to me. It was one of the things that I found interesting in this matter, and let me just say another thing here, too.

Obviously, we are sitting here today because of something that occurred at those legal proceedings that has to do with Ms. Reichenbach and her disability, her level of impairment, her ability to function vocationally, and so I wanted to know what it was all about because from the medical records,

- 1 the whole matter seemed particularly clear to 1 2 2 3 When were your first contacted? 3 Q. 4 Probably in the spring or early summer 4 5 of 2018. I think it was actually in June 5 6 6 of 2018 that contact was made with my office 7 here in this matter. 7 8 You have some notes in front of you for 8 9 your work in this case? 9 10 Α. T do. 10 Would you take a moment to review those 11 11 12 and just confirm that first day of contact that 12 13 you had? 13 14 Α. Sure. June 26, 2018, probably sometime 14 15 around then. 15 16 16 Q. And who was the first person that 17 contacted you? 17 So this is the office of Mr. Clinton. 18 18 19 I don't know who at the office 19 20 contacted me. 20 21 How did he get your name? 21 Q. 22 22 I don't know. Α. 23 Q. Have you ever worked with Mr. Clinton 23 24 before? 24 53

In your work giving testimony, what percentage would you estimate you had testified for plaintiffs versus defendants? It depends on what kind of matter.

No, I have not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Α.

So in Worker's Compensation cases, which is the bulk of what I do, 90 percent of what I do, about 50 percent of the evaluations are on behalf of petitioners, about 50 percent on behalf of respondents, as they are referred to in these actions. Again, that's nine out of ten things that I do in the medical/legal part of this practice.

The rest of it is a mixed bag of civil actions that might include even a case like this or some type of personal injury case, usually something arising from a workplace or disability hearing case. These could be a pension or a disability review board. Now, the bulk of those cases are on behalf of plaintiffs.

When say the bulk, can you give me a percentage of that?

Α. Sure. 80 percent are on behalf of plaintiffs.

So for the general civil medical/legal matters that you are retained, 80 percent of your testimony is for the plaintiff, correct?

As an estimate on my part, yes, that's correct.

Would that have been true in 2018? 0.

Α.

Have you ever testified as an expert 0. against a physician in a medical malpractice case?

I believe there was one case a number Α. of years ago, and I don't keep a case book like that, but it would have been maybe five, seven years ago, something like that.

Q. And --

> Α. It was a burn case. Excuse me.

And were you testifying for the plaintiff or the physician?

> Α. There for the plaintiff.

Have you ever been asked to give expert testimony for a defendant physician?

Α. Yes.

Q.

Q. How many times?

Once.

55

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 Α. Yes. What hospital did he admit to? 3 Q.

Was it local?

I don't know.

This was -- again, it had to do with a standard of care for an occupational medicine physician, so it really doesn't have anything to do with hospitals. It's all about outpatient clinical care.

Has your testimony ever been barred by Q. a trial court?

Α. Not that I know of, no.

In your work in occupational medicine, have you had occasion to study the data on the median age for people to retire in the United States?

17 Α. No, I have not.

> Do you have any general understanding Q. as to what that data concludes?

No, I do not. All I know is I am getting older, and I'm not retiring, but still.

How old are you? Q.

Α. I am 74.

> Do you plan to continue to keep working Q.

54

### 1 indefinitely? Well, it's a topic of debate around my 2 3 house, but at least for the near future. 4 Does a patient's expected retirement 5 date impact your recommendations about what jobs 6 they can or cannot undertake? 7 It's always a consideration, so there 8 are, obviously -- and I don't need to belabor 9 the point for you. 10 There are a lot of different considerations having to do with function, with 11 12 ability, with workplace factors, but age is 13 certainly one of them and estimated career span, yes, of course. 14 15 Okay. And did you have those conversations with Ms. Reichenbach as to when 16 17 she expected to retire? 18 Α. 19 Q. But it is important to know that, 20 correct? 21 It's important to know that generally Α. 22 if there is a position on offer. 23 So, for example, in what I do, there is 24 often a position on offer, and the question that 1 comes up --2 Q. May I interrupt for one minute? 3 Did you ask Ms. Reichenbach when she 4 Q. 5 expected to retire? 6 No. Α. 7 Did you ask her when she would be Q. 8 eligible for Social Security? 9 No, I did not. Α. 10 when you examined her, she was 60 --Q. She was 60-years old. 11 Α. 12 Q. 13 I think she was 60-years old. Α. So one day after your examination, she 14 Q. turned 61? 15 16 Α. I believe that's correct. 17 Generally, do you know that individuals 18 of her age are eligible for Social Security 19 retirement benefits starting at age 62?

Yes, that is an option, though at

And as of December 7 of 2019,

Ms. Reichenbach will be eligible for retirement

benefits from Social Security, correct?

reduced benefit levels.

That would be correct, if she has 2 sufficient years of work to actually qualify for 3 those benefits, which I do not know. 4 You didn't ask? 5 I did not. Α. 6 If she had the option for going to 7 Social Security retirement benefits at age 62, 8 does that affect your evaluation of her 9 employment going forward? 10 No, not necessarily. 11 It's never really a question that's 12 been asked --13 Q. -- in my experience in almost 40 years 14 Α. 15 of this medical practice. 16 Ms. Reichenbach's injury occurred in 17 Hawaii on vacation, is that right? 18 Yes. Speaking of that specific injury, 19 yes, that's correct. 20 Q. That was in 2004? 21 It was June of 2004. Α. 22 So we are coming up on about 15 years 23 post injury? 24 That is correct. 59 And during that time, she has not 1 undergone the spinal surgery that was discussed 2 in Dr. Rinella's 2009 deposition, obviously? 3 4 She has not. 5 Okay. And you read Dr. Rinella's 6 deposition that was taken in this case? 7 I read both of them, ultimately, yes, 8 that's correct. 9 And the one in this case that was taken Q. 10 in 2018, you reviewed? 11 Α. Yes. And, obviously, there has not been an 12 0. 13 indication or a recommendation for him for the spinal surgery that's been discussed in his 2009 14 15 deposition, correct? 16 I mean that's correct. I mean he 17 clearly every time he has had the opportunity to 18 talk about this or write about it has said it's 19 up to Ms. Reichenbach that when she is ready, 20 then the surgery would be performed. 21 As he has said repeatedly, it is not a

question of if, but when, and it is for symptom

Q. Would it surprise you to learn that the

20

21

22

23

24

58

22

23

24

control.

1			
_	median retirement age for an American is	1	comparisons from year to year and place to
2	62-years old?	2	place.
3	<ul> <li>A. No, it really wouldn't surprise me.</li> </ul>	3	Q. So you had no data set to compare the
4	Again, I will be clear for you. That's	4	range of motion for the lumbar spine that were
5	not something that I specifically know that type	5	in the medical records provided to you?
6	of demographic data, but, no, that would not	6	A. That's correct. I had no reliable data
7	surprise me.	7	set, so the numbers that I have used for normal
8	Q. You work with any number of individuals	8	are the standard population norms used in
9	in the employment market in your work as medical	9	evaluations.
10	director, correct?	10	Q. Well, I guess my question was slightly
11	A. I do.	11	different.
12	Q. I noticed that you performed a physical	12	You didn't see any medical records for
13	examination of Ms. Reichenbach?	13	Ms. Reichenbach measuring the range of motion of
14	A. I did. It's part of the evaluation	14	her lumbar spine?
15	that I carried out.	15	A. No, I didn't.
16	Q. You did a range of motion for the	16	Q. So you don't have anything to compare
17	lumbar spine, is that right?	17	it to versus your physical examination, correct?
18	A. I did.	18	A. That's correct.
19	Q. And you found her flexion to be normal?	19	Q. You did a range of motion for her hips
20	A. Yes. Flexion is forward bending. That	20	as well?
21	is normal.	21	A. I did.
22	Q. And her extension was normal?	22	Q. And the range of motion for forward
23	A. The her extension is limited. That was	23	flexion on the right was normal, correct?
24	limited to 15 degrees out of 35 degrees. It's	24	A. The yeah, forward flexion is
	61		63
	•		•
1	about a 50 percent deficit.	1	bringing the knee up to the chest, but, yes,
2	Q. And	2	that's normal on both sides actually.
3	A. Extension, again, is backwards bending.	3	Q. And how about the abduction?
	Q. Backwards, okay.	4	A That I a william the law away from the
4	<b>4</b>	4	A. That's pulling the leg away from the
4 5	And then the right lateral bending,	5	midline of the body. That's also normal, and
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
5	And then the right lateral bending,	5	midline of the body. That's also normal, and
5 6	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?	5 6	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg,
5 6 7	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also.	5 6 7	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.
<b>5 6</b> 7	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was	5 6 7 8	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion
<b>5 6</b> 7 8	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was 25 degrees.	5 6 7 8 9	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have
5 6 7 8 9	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was 25 degrees. Left lateral bending is 20 degrees.	5 6 7 8 9	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was 25 degrees.  Left lateral bending is 20 degrees. Normal lateral bending should be	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures surrounding the hips. It's not actually in the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was  25 degrees.  Left lateral bending is 20 degrees. Normal lateral bending should be  40 degrees.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures surrounding the hips. It's not actually in the hip joint or at least it didn't appear to be
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was 25 degrees. Left lateral bending is 20 degrees. Normal lateral bending should be 40 degrees.  Q. Did you see any other evaluations of	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures surrounding the hips. It's not actually in the hip joint or at least it didn't appear to be when I saw her.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was  25 degrees. Left lateral bending is 20 degrees. Normal lateral bending should be  40 degrees. Q. Did you see any other evaluations of the range of motion of her lumbar spine in the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures surrounding the hips. It's not actually in the hip joint or at least it didn't appear to be when I saw her.  Q. And then you also did a range of motion
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was  25 degrees.  Left lateral bending is 20 degrees. Normal lateral bending should be  40 degrees.  Q. Did you see any other evaluations of the range of motion of her lumbar spine in the medical records?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures surrounding the hips. It's not actually in the hip joint or at least it didn't appear to be when I saw her.  Q. And then you also did a range of motion for her cervical spine?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was  25 degrees. Left lateral bending is 20 degrees. Normal lateral bending should be  40 degrees. Q. Did you see any other evaluations of the range of motion of her lumbar spine in the medical records?  A. You know, it's interesting to me	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures surrounding the hips. It's not actually in the hip joint or at least it didn't appear to be when I saw her.  Q. And then you also did a range of motion for her cervical spine?  A. Oh, I did, that's correct.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was 25 degrees. Left lateral bending is 20 degrees. Normal lateral bending should be 40 degrees. Q. Did you see any other evaluations of the range of motion of her lumbar spine in the medical records?  A. You know, it's interesting to me because part of what I do is teach about	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures surrounding the hips. It's not actually in the hip joint or at least it didn't appear to be when I saw her.  Q. And then you also did a range of motion for her cervical spine?  A. Oh, I did, that's correct.  Q. And was that normal?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was  25 degrees.  Left lateral bending is 20 degrees. Normal lateral bending should be  40 degrees.  Q. Did you see any other evaluations of the range of motion of her lumbar spine in the medical records?  A. You know, it's interesting to me because part of what I do is teach about evaluations and all the rest. I really didn't	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures surrounding the hips. It's not actually in the hip joint or at least it didn't appear to be when I saw her.  Q. And then you also did a range of motion for her cervical spine?  A. Oh, I did, that's correct.  Q. And was that normal?  A. It was decreased. She had some no, excuse me, that was normal. That is normal.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also.     So right lateral bending was  25 degrees.  Left lateral bending is 20 degrees.     Normal lateral bending should be  40 degrees.  Q. Did you see any other evaluations of the range of motion of her lumbar spine in the medical records?  A. You know, it's interesting to me because part of what I do is teach about evaluations and all the rest. I really didn't see much about that.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures surrounding the hips. It's not actually in the hip joint or at least it didn't appear to be when I saw her.  Q. And then you also did a range of motion for her cervical spine?  A. Oh, I did, that's correct.  Q. And was that normal?  A. It was decreased. She had some no, excuse me, that was normal. That is normal.  Q. So her cervical range of motion was
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was  25 degrees.  Left lateral bending is 20 degrees. Normal lateral bending should be  40 degrees.  Q. Did you see any other evaluations of the range of motion of her lumbar spine in the medical records?  A. You know, it's interesting to me because part of what I do is teach about evaluations and all the rest. I really didn't see much about that.  There is some comments from time to time in some of the records about flexion that	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures surrounding the hips. It's not actually in the hip joint or at least it didn't appear to be when I saw her.  Q. And then you also did a range of motion for her cervical spine?  A. Oh, I did, that's correct.  Q. And was that normal?  A. It was decreased. She had some no, excuse me, that was normal. That is normal.  Q. So her cervical range of motion was normal, correct?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And then the right lateral bending, what was that? Was that normal or abnormal?  A. No, that's decreased also. So right lateral bending was 25 degrees.  Left lateral bending is 20 degrees. Normal lateral bending should be 40 degrees.  Q. Did you see any other evaluations of the range of motion of her lumbar spine in the medical records?  A. You know, it's interesting to me because part of what I do is teach about evaluations and all the rest. I really didn't see much about that. There is some comments from time to	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	midline of the body. That's also normal, and adduction, the opposite one, crossing the leg, that's normal.  So I found full normal range of motion in Ms. Reichenbach's hips, though she does have pain, and she has pain from structures surrounding the hips. It's not actually in the hip joint or at least it didn't appear to be when I saw her.  Q. And then you also did a range of motion for her cervical spine?  A. Oh, I did, that's correct.  Q. And was that normal?  A. It was decreased. She had some no, excuse me, that was normal. That is normal.  Q. So her cervical range of motion was normal, correct?

62

Q. The only range of motion limitation you found was in the lumbar spine, correct?							
Α.	That's correct. That's where the						
problem	is here.						
Q.	Sure.						

Did you review the Lemont Park District employment records for Ms. Reichenbach?

A. No, I haven't seen the records, so I did know about that job, but that's entirely from Ms. Reichenbach's testimony about what she did and how she did it and so on.

I haven't seen a job description for, for example.

- Q. Okay. Did you ask for any of her employment records?
  - A. No, I did not.
- Q. Did she tell you during the examination that she was employed?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. In reviewing the attorneys' depositions, did you come to learn that they were trying to prove that she was completely unable to work?
  - A. Well, you know, it was kind of a

for a spouse in a divorce action involving whether or not the spouse was employable?

- A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And let me back up because I can't remember your answer to this question.

When you were speaking with Ms. Reichenbach for her December 6 evaluation, did you ask her whether she was employed?

A. I did.

- Q. And she told you she was?
- A. She told me about the position at the Lemont Park District, which is a part-time position, so she did tell me about that, yes, that's correct.
- Q. And did she tell you about other jobs that she had held since the trial?
- A. She told me about other things that she had applied for and other things that she had done.

So, for example, she was a representative for Mary Kay Cosmetics, made some amount of money doing that representative work.

She had applied for retail type positions at various big box or other stores in

question to me.

It appeared from the attorneys' deposition testimony that the standard that they seemed to be utilizing was permanent and total disability for any gainful employment. That's what I read from what they were describing.

That is in my experience a somewhat unusual and highly restrictive standard. It's not anything that I have seen used in any of the legal action I customarily participate in, but that's what they were talking about, according to what I read.

Q. Okay. And --

A. I usually say they use colorful terms like you have to be bedridden or brain damaged.

Q. Have you ever had occasion to testify for a spouse in a divorce action on employability?

A. There was once -- actually, one time, yes, many years ago, but there was a case like that in Indiana.

- Q. So a different state?
- A. A different state.
  - Q. So you have never testified in Illinois

her local area. She had not, apparently, successfully attained those positions, but she had made applications.

So what I knew about her work record was the Lemont Park District, the Mary Kay representative work.

- Q. Okay. And did you request Mr. Clinton to obtain those employment records for your review so that you could incorporate them in some way or not incorporate them in your report?
  - A. No, I did not request them.
  - Q. Why not?

A. Well, I didn't really see the point in it. I mean it was clear enough that the types of jobs that she was talking about, unless there is some grows discrepancy and she had a full-time position working somewhere else that no one knows anything about, were very part-time jobs.

They were what I would call limited employment, and they were largely at will type of employment positions where she could work at them as she felt able where she could move around in those positions.



- - A. I didn't see any point in obtaining specific records, things like payroll records, hourly timecards, for example.
    - Q. Okay.

- A. I felt I had sufficient information.
- Q. So you relied on completely what Ms. Reichenbach told you were her job duties and responsibilities, correct?
  - A. No, in part.

There is additional information that was contained in the various depositions that I reviewed.

- Q. Okay. Other than depositions and what she told you, that was the basis for your conclusion about what she did at her work?
- A. Sure, that's correct. That's the basis for what I understood about her work activities at or around the time I saw her.

So in your first opinion, you indicate that she has a significant work restriction in 2014 due to her L1 vertebral body injury from 2004, a lumbar degenerative disc disease and degenerative arthritis and thoracolumbar kyphoscoliosis. Five years of Latin. Five years of Latin.

# Is that correct?

- A. So, yes, that is my opinion.

  So as of 2004, she would have required work restriction because of these conditions.
- Q. And you have a limitation that you say it would have required significant work restriction in 2014. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Why did you limit it to that year?
- A. I think that was the question that they were a series of questions that were posed to me, and I think that was a question.
  - Q. I see.

So it was you were just answering the question the lawyers had posed to you?

- A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. All right. The restrictions in 2014,

- 1 Q. Have you seen her since December 6, 2 2018?
  - A. No, only here today.
- 4 Q. Have you spoken with her by telephone?
  - A. No, I have not.
    - Q. Is it standard for you to get the employment records for an individual for whom you do an evaluation and provide expert medical testimony?
    - A. No, it's not. In fact, it would be quite uncommon, so I do have to rely on histories and other information.
      - Q. Sure.

If you please turn to Page 14 of your report, which we have marked as Exhibit No. 1, I wanted to go through your opinions, if I could.

- A. Sure.
- Q. In paragraph one, you have an opinion that you have written there, correct?
- A. Yes. There are a number of these numbered paragraphs, but, yes, that's correct.
- Q. I'm just going to go through them in numbers because it's the best way for us to go back and read them in the transcript.

- in your opinion, would have include activity
  concerning repetitive bending or twisting, is
  that right?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. So she would not be able to do that in 2014?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. And there would be a limitation of lifting to the sedentary physical demand level?
    - A. Which is ten pounds or less on an occasional basis, and just for fullness here, occasional means a third or less of the workday.
      - Q. Let me break that down.

So one of the limitations that you have a conclusion about concerning Ms. Reichenbach in 2014 is that she could not lift more than ten pounds other than on an occasional basis, correct?

- A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. So it's ten pounds or less on an occasional basis, correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. If she was working in a job that had a requirement of lifting 50 pounds or more, that



- would be against your advice, correct?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Would you be surprised to see if she could lift 50 pounds?
  - A. No. I mean she certainly could. It's just that it's not recommended. It wasn't recommended by her treating physicians, and it certainly wouldn't be recommended by me for the reason that I went on to state to try to control the progressive deterioration, progressive deterioration in her spinal anatomy.
  - Q. In 2014, was, in your opinion, Ms. Reichenbach completely unable to work in any capacity?
    - A. No.
- Q. The standard that you were talking about earlier that you read in the deposition, would you have been able to provide that testimony that she was completely unable to work in any capacity?
  - A. No.
- Q. In paragraph two, you have other opinions, correct?
- 24 A. I do.

degenerative change.

5

Now, she needs restrictions. The restrictions that I stated, and these are estimates on my part in the absence of functional testing, so it's a whole other topic we could talk about, but would be lifting ten pounds or less on an occasional basis, trying to avoid repetitive bending or twisting, so that already limits the world of employment. That doesn't exclude any employment, but that limits the world of employment for her.

So that's employability and/or work ability due to spinal deformity, stiffness and the issue of chronic pain.

- Q. So the significant limitation in her employability and work ability would be the fact she could not lift more than ten pounds or do repetitive bending or twisting, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Anything else?
- A. No, those would be the bases of it at that time.
  - Q. You know, one of the things you mention in paragraph three is that Ms. Reichenbach

Q. And in there, you indicate that as a result of Ms. Reichenbach's injury in 2004 and the progressive nature of her spinal abnormalities, she had a significant limitation in her employability and work ability in 2013 and 2014, is that right?

- A. Because of the various symptoms that were arising and the anatomic abnormality, but, yes, that's correct.
- Q. Would you define for us what you mean by significant limitation in her employability and work ability?
  - A. Well, sure.

So as I said in paragraph one, so she needed restrictions. The restrictions that were posed by some treating physicians at or around that time and also that seemed reasonable to me based on the clinical examination that I carried out and what I had learned about the condition of her spine, and that's from treatment medical records, diagnostic tests and other opinions that were contained in the records that I reviewed, was that she has got significant multi-cause instability in her spine with

suffers from chronic pain. Do you see that?

- A. I do.
- Q. And in your interview with Ms. Reichenbach, did you ask her whether she was taking any pain medication?
  - A. I did.
  - Q. And what did she tell you?
- A. She told me that she took over-the-counter analgesic type medication trying to avoid prescription or narcotic pain medication, which is certainly reasonable for someone with a chronic really open-ended medical condition.
- Q. So what over-the-counter medication did she tell you she was taking?
  - A. So mainly Tylenol at that time.
- Q. And you could get a prescription from a physician such as yourself for higher doses of nonnarcotic pain medication, is that correct?
- A. There are some nonnarcotic pain medications that could or might be helpful for her type of spinal pain.
- Q. And what kind would you recommend that are nonaddictive?



McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

Well, for example, Tramadol. It's another choice that can sometimes be used. It's of a higher level of analgesia, better for pain control, and it is believed to be nonaddictive.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

It though may be sedating, which is another issue, but, again, that's individually variable.

- Could there be other medications that 0. are nonsedating and nonaddictive?
- There are the antiinflammatory classes of medications usually now nonsteroidal antiinflammatory medicines.

These are things that range from over-the-counter to prescription, the Motrins, ibuprofens and others of the world.

Now, these can be helpful. They can be useful if they are used chronically, but they also do have side effects, and I would say that in addition to the kind of problems that we are talking about here today, Ms. Reichenbach has other medical conditions that make some of these medications less useful for her like gastrointestinal tract inflammation and so on, but they are things that can be tried.

maybe sure I understand your testimony.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

77

2 You did not see any of Ms. Reichenbach's physicians in the medical 3 4 records that you reviewed write prescriptions 5 for pain medication after 2005, is that a correct statement?

Not for chronic medication.

From time to time they would say, well, you could try this, but I did not see them prescribe chronic long-term analgesic maintenance.

Let me then just be very clear because my question was specific.

In your review of Ms. Reichenbach's medical records, you did not see any prescriptions for pain medication after 2005, is that a correct statement?

I can't tell you that. I would have to look back through all of the records.

I can tell you that none of them prescribed chronic, that is to say day after day, prescription pain medication.

And you don't recall if there were prescriptions that were intermittent?

79

- Okay. And in reviewing the medical records, did you see any physician recommend any pain management medications for Ms. Reichenbach?
- Not beyond the things that we have talked about here today that they usually leave it to her.
  - Q. Okay, let me be specific.

Did any physicians recommend any prescription pain medication in the records that you reviewed?

- Early on in her clinical course, so in the years 2004, 2005, they did. After that, no.
- Okay. So just to be clear, no physician in any records that you reviewed recommended prescription pain medication after the year 2005?
- Not chronic long-term prescription medication. So from time to time some of these treating doctors would say, well, you could have this or you could have that, but nobody prescribed chronic maintenance analgesic medication of a prescription nature.
- Okay. I felt that was my question, but let me just ask that question again just to

- That's correct. Α.
- You would have to go back and review Q. the records, correct?
  - That's correct. Α.
- Based on Ms. Reichenbach's injury, would you describe her recovery as a good one?
  - It's not actually a medical term.

I think what I could tell is you this, that the actual acute injury, the burst fracture of the L1 vertebra healed. It healed with deformity.

That's a success in that it did not require surgery in and of itself. The sequelae of that fracture contributed to the breakdown in the preexistent degenerative and developmental condition in her spine.

That's another mouthful, but before this accident, she had some degenerative arthritis in her spine down around L3, L4 and below, and she had scoliosis, although it was asymptomatic and of a mild extent, and after the accident, that breakdown developed.

The breakdown was the ongoing problem. That's the poor outcome from the injury. The

78

actual vertebral fracture did heal and solidify.

Q. Is it common for burst fractures of vertebrae to result in surgery?

A. No, I don't think it's common. It depends on the extent of the fracture.

If the collapse gets to be 50 percent or more and the patient remains symptomatic, if there is no sign of progressive healing, then the practice now is to actually try to operate to solidify the vertebrae.

This is the vertebroplasty, basically, a cement injection into the vertebrae. So that is done under certain circumstances, but most L1 vertebral fractures are of less than 50 percent magnitude and do heal without surgery.

- Q. So Ms. Reichenbach's fell within that more than 50 percent don't require surgery, correct?
- A. She was actually at 50 percent collapse, but she did not require surgery.
  - Q. It was conservatively managed?
- A. It was, that's correct.
- Q. And that was through a brace, a back brace, right?

discussed a lot by Dr. Rinella, but the ultimate outcome here, the path is to at some point operate on this.

As Dr. Rinella says, I was just reading it again, it's not a question of whether, it's just a question of when in his estimation.

- Q. And that's the only long-term limitation to her employment that you would add to the short-term limitations in paragraph one, correct?
- A. The surgery will require considerable time lost from any type of gainful activity that she might have been engaged in, and then will require its own group of restrictions when the extent of healing is determined. That wouldn't be until a year and a half after the surgery though.
- Q. So in your estimation, she would be out of work for a year and a half after the surgery?
  - A. I think that's a reasonable estimation.
- Q. Any other long-term ramifications for her employment other than the surgery and the convalescing of, basically, a year and a half?
  - A. No.

- A. Yeah. Once it was finally identified and it was clear that this actually had progressed without the bracing, so this -- Dr. Shapiro, the initial treating physician, and Dr. Rinella next, the bracing seems to have allowed the pressures to be modified on that vertebra, and the vertebra then healed without further collapse, so it remains at some degree of collapse around 40 to 50 percent, something in that range.
- Q. In paragraph three of your report, you indicate that Ms. Reichenbach's injury and degenerative disc disease in the thoracic lumbar kyphoscoliosis have both short-term and long-term effects on her employability, right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. The short-term affects are the ones that you discussed in paragraph one, correct?
- A. That's correct. That's the work restriction, the limitations.
- Q. And the long-term effects are the fact that she may have to undergo surgery in the future?
  - A. That's correct. I mean this has been

Q. Now, if she has the surgery you indicate in paragraph four, it would limit her employability?

A. Yes. that is correct.

I mean this is the sad truth of this matter that the surgery is for a purpose. The purpose is to prevent further breakdown and deterioration, further collapse in her spine.

A secondary purpose is pain control, but it would not increase her employability. This is not to make her more employable. This is just to try to make this -- to prevent this from getting any worse, and that's the cruel truth here that this is the massive surgery that Dr. Rinella has described, and it does have a purpose. It does have a role, but one of the roles is not to make her more employable.

- Q. If she has the surgery, what would be the additional limitations other than the year and a half convalescing that she would have on her employment?
- A. Well, then you really don't want her to do a lot of bending. She's got a multilevel fusion in her back.



Assuming all goes well, Dr. Rinella's spent some period of time in his testimony describing the complications that can occur, but let's assume it all goes well.

She has a completely stiff back. The stiffness extends from T10, which, basically, is the bottom of the ribcage, through the sacrum. She just is going to be quite stiff, and so where previously restrictions were stated to limit bending, limit twisting, try to avoid those activities.

After the surgery, she really needs to avoid those activities, and that's to protect the surrounding structures, particularly her hips now.

- Q. The surgery that Dr. Rinella is testifying about, does it involve a fusion all the way from T10 down to the sacrum?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay.

- A. That's as he described it. He is going to fuse all of those levels.
  - Q. When you discussed with Ms. Reichenbach your recommendations for her in terms of future

that you were not her physician?

A. Yes

Q. How do you do that?

A. Well, you tell them that they are here
for the purpose of evaluation in a medical/legal
matter; that she was referred more specifically
for this evaluation by her attorney in this
case; that I was going to be carrying out an
examination that would be used as part of a
legal proceeding. I was not her treating
physician.

I often get people who say, well, doc, can you write me a prescription, and I can't do that for them.

- Q. Because the only way you can write a prescription is if she is your patient?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. So who do you work for then?
- 19 A. In this case, I am carrying out this 20 service, this evaluation for her attorney in a 21 specific legal action.
  - Q. So you were hired by her attorney, not by Ms. Reichenbach?
    - A. That's correct.

# assistance for her condition, you recommended an exercise program, is that right?

- A. It's what Dr. Rinella recommended.
- 4 Q. Okay.
  - A. It's what the other treating physicians even Dr. Veselik and the later family physician recommended, but, yes, I would also concur, and I am putting it this way because I made no specific recommendations for her. I am really not a treating physician in this matter.
    - Q. Is she your patient?
    - A. No.
  - Q. Why did you see her if she is not your patient?
  - A. I saw her for the purpose of evaluation in a legal action. That's a different matter than having her as my patient.
- 18 Q. Did you prescribe any medications for 19 her?
  - A. No
- Q. Did you prescribe any exercises for 22 her?
- 23 A. No, I didn't.
  - Q. Did you make clear to Ms. Reichenbach

- Q. And who paid you? Was it the attorney or Ms. Reichenbach?
- A. You know, I actually don't know the details of that.

I can tell you that the bill for my service was sent to her attorney.

- Q. All right. And have you been paid?
- A. I believe I have.
  - Q. How much have you charged to date?
- A. There was a charge for our retained fee for looking at this case. That I believe was \$4000 at the time.

Then there might have been later charges. I am not sure if we've done this yet for the office visit. That's \$175 for an office visit, and then for time reviewing the medical records and additional information that would include the depositions, I have spent almost another ten hours in this matter at this point, and I don't believe a bill has been sent for that. Then there is the time spent in this deposition today, so I mean it does all add up.

MR. CLINTON: Is this a good time to take a minute break --



1	MR. DUFFY: Sure.	1	Q. And this memorandum asking 13 questions
2	MR. CLINTON: John, just a minute?	2	is dated November 8 of 2018?
3	THE WITNESS: Sure.	3	A. Yes.
4	(whereupon, a short break was	4	Q. When did they pay the \$4000 to you?
5	taken.)	5	A. Probably in June or July.
6	BY MR. DUFFY:	6	I really don't know.
7	Q. So let me kind of understand your	7	Q. Do you have any billing records
8	charges.	8	indicating when you were paid?
9	You charge the \$4000 retainer, correct?	9	A. I don't. I can try to find that for
10	A. That's correct.	10	you, but I don't in the file.
11	Q. And has that been exhausted by your	11	Then the examination, as you know, was
12	work on the case?	12	in December 2018.
13	A. I believe so.	13	Q. Did you speak with Mr. Jochum by
14	Q. And would that be the retainer that was	14	telephone?
15	necessary to conduct your evaluation, review	15	A. I believe I spoke to him once in this
16	records and write your report?	16	matter.
17	A. That is correct.	17	Q. Did he inform you that he had attended
18	Q. Then you had additional ten hours of	18	the deposition of Dr. Rinella?
19	review of medical records and depositions that	19	A. No, not specifically, no.
20	were sent to you after you did your report?	20	Q. Did Mr. Jochum describe Dr. Rinella's
21	A. And in preparation for this deposition	21	testimony to you over the telephone?
22	today, so all of that, yes.	22	A. No.
23	Q. And you have been paid \$4000, correct?	23	Q. Did Dr. Mr. Jochum ask you strike
24	A. Yes.	24	that.
	89		91
1	Q. And do you have a bill that's	1	Did Mr. Jockum inform you that the
2	outstanding currently for any of the time that	1 2	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians
2	outstanding currently for any of the time that	2	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians
2	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records,	2	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they
2 3 4	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?	2 3 4	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?
2 3 4 5	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.	2 3 4 5	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.
2 3 4 5 6	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?	2 3 4 5 6	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this
2 3 4 5 6 7	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an	2 3 4 5 6 7	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically. What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential. Q. I know I understand your area of expertise MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could.  A. Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise  MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the  MR. DUFFY: I just want to ask about a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could.  A. Sure.  Q. You indicated earlier that you were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise  MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the  MR. DUFFY: I just want to ask about a specific question, so if I could my last
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could.  A. Sure.  Q. You indicated earlier that you were given a list of questions by the attorneys for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise  MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the  MR. DUFFY: I just want to ask about a specific question, so if I could my last question read back, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could.  A. Sure.  Q. You indicated earlier that you were given a list of questions by the attorneys for Ms. Reichenbach?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise  MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the  MR. DUFFY: I just want to ask about a specific question, so if I could my last question read back, please.  (Whereupon, the record was read
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could.  A. Sure.  Q. You indicated earlier that you were given a list of questions by the attorneys for Ms. Reichenbach?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise  MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the  MR. DUFFY: I just want to ask about a specific question, so if I could my last question read back, please.  (Whereupon, the record was read as requested.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could.  A. Sure.  Q. You indicated earlier that you were given a list of questions by the attorneys for Ms. Reichenbach?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you have that list of questions with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise  MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the  MR. DUFFY: I just want to ask about a specific question, so if I could my last question read back, please.  (Whereupon, the record was read as requested.)  MR. DUFFY: Please answer that question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could.  A. Sure.  Q. You indicated earlier that you were given a list of questions by the attorneys for Ms. Reichenbach?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you have that list of questions with you, sir?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise  MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the  MR. DUFFY: I just want to ask about a specific question, so if I could my last question read back, please.  (Whereupon, the record was read as requested.)  MR. DUFFY: Please answer that question.  THE WITNESS: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could.  A. Sure.  Q. You indicated earlier that you were given a list of questions by the attorneys for Ms. Reichenbach?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you have that list of questions with you, sir?  A. I do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise  MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the  MR. DUFFY: I just want to ask about a specific question, so if I could my last question read back, please.  (Whereupon, the record was read as requested.)  MR. DUFFY: Please answer that question.  THE WITNESS: No.  BY MR. DUFFY:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't. Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour? A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour. Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could. A. Sure. Q. You indicated earlier that you were given a list of questions by the attorneys for Ms. Reichenbach? A. Yes. Q. Do you have that list of questions with you, sir? A. I do. Q. May I see it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise  MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the  MR. DUFFY: I just want to ask about a specific question, so if I could my last question read back, please.  (Whereupon, the record was read as requested.)  MR. DUFFY: Please answer that question.  THE WITNESS: No.  BY MR. DUFFY:  Q. Okay, thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could.  A. Sure.  Q. You indicated earlier that you were given a list of questions by the attorneys for Ms. Reichenbach?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you have that list of questions with you, sir?  A. I do.  Q. May I see it?  A. Sure. I took them as recommendations	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise  MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the  MR. DUFFY: I just want to ask about a specific question, so if I could my last question read back, please.  (Whereupon, the record was read as requested.)  MR. DUFFY: Please answer that question.  THE WITNESS: No.  BY MR. DUFFY:  Q. Okay, thank you.  Where would you go to learn when you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	outstanding currently for any of the time that you have amassed in reviewing medical records, depositions or preparing for your deposition?  A. No, I don't.  Q. Okay. What do you charge per hour?  A. I believe that's billed at \$400 an hour.  Q. Give me one moment to look at my notes, if I could.  A. Sure.  Q. You indicated earlier that you were given a list of questions by the attorneys for Ms. Reichenbach?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you have that list of questions with you, sir?  A. I do.  Q. May I see it?  A. Sure. I took them as recommendations for topics to address.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	testimony of Ms. Reichenbach's actual physicians was not favorable to the case and that they needed you to come in and testify instead?  A. No, not specifically.  What I understood here was that this was a question about vocational potential.  Q. I know I understand your area of expertise  MR. CLINTON: Let him finish the  MR. DUFFY: I just want to ask about a specific question, so if I could my last question read back, please.  (Whereupon, the record was read as requested.)  MR. DUFFY: Please answer that question. THE WITNESS: No.  BY MR. DUFFY:  Q. Okay, thank you.  Where would you go to learn when you were first paid?

90

Q. Could we take a short break? Could you
ask her now? Is she here?
A. No, because everybody is gone, and we
are the only ones here, but I can find that out
for you, of course.
Q. That would be great if you could.
A. Sure.
Q. I'll send a subpoena for the materials
in your file, and I will ask for that as well.
A. Of course.
Q. Thank you.
Did you ask for anything that
Mr. Clinton's office refused to provide you?
A. No.
Q. Did you have everything you needed to
reach your conclusions and write your report on
December 6, 2018?
A. Yes.
MR. DUFFY: Those are all the questions I

the collapse is affecting nerves on the right side of her spine.

It's pinching some of those nerves, and that accounts for some of her right hip, right buttock and thigh pain. She has other sources of pain also.

Q. Okay. What do you mean in -- I am going to read No. 7 to you.

A. Sure.

Q. Based on the this evaluation, I would describe Ms. Reichenbach's condition as one of chronic severe back pain and stiffness with some right lumbar radiculopathy symptoms unimproved by treatments today and progressive in nature, then you have parentheses in view of radiological identified progression of spinal deformities.

What do you mean -- just trying to trying to understand the words.

A. This is like a whole mouthful of words there that really try to capture the situation here.

So the symptoms are pain and stiffness. We have talked a little bit about the stiffness

EXAMINATION

BY MR. CLINTON:

have, Doctor.

Q. I just have a couple questions based often -- what is kyphoscoliosis and degenerative arthritis?

Thank you for your time.

THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

A. So let's take them separately.

Kyphoscoliosis refers to a complex group of abnormal curves within the spine.

Kyphosis, k-y-p-h, is the forward backwards bending, and this is the bending that's present at L1 in Ms. Reichenbach's spine.

Scoliosis is a sideways or S-shaped curve in the spine. Hers is largely convex to the right, so she has got two different abnormal curves in her spine, a forward backward bending, forward curve and a side to side curve that's reducing the size of the rib column on her right side.

Now, the second term is degenerative arthritis. This is breakdown in her spine. It's wear and tear. It's got various components, but it's a breakdown of the bones of the spine causing some surrounding collapse, and, unfortunately, in Ms. Reichenbach's case,

on clinical examination.

The pain is her subjective complaint. I would say about that subjective complaint, it's been consistent to me and to all the treating physicians whose records I have seen, too.

Right lumbar radiculopathy is some pinching of the nerves on the right side of her spine from multiple sources. That's from the L1 fracture, the L3,4 breakdown and the deformity, that twisting and bending of her spine, pinching the right-sided nerve roots.

Radiculopathy symptoms are pain,

numbness, tingling or burning on her right side.

Unimproved by treatments to date,
because that's really the case. I mean
Dr. Rinella I think has been quite clear in this
matter that the only other thing to do, the only
other avenue that hasn't been explored is the
surgery, this large surgery to stabilize her
spine.

Progressive in nature because it has gotten worse over time. Dr. Rinella and other records have documented the increasing degree of

```
curvature. That would be the progressive
                                                             STATE OF ILLINOIS
 1
                                                         2
                                                                                        ss:
                                                                                    )
 2
     breakdown, unfortunately, in her spine.
                                                         3
                                                             COUNTY OF C O O K
 3
             If she were to have the surgery, would
                                                         4
 4
     she have greater ability to work, in other
                                                         5
                                                               IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
 5
     words, to carry weight and things like that?
                                                         6
                                                                    COUNTY DEPARTMENT - LAW DIVISION
 6
              No, sadly, she would not.
                                                         7
                                                             CHERYL D. REICHENBACH,
 7
         Q.
             Why is that?
                                                         8
                                                                    Plaintiff.
 8
              Because then her spine would be fused.
                                                         9
                                                               vs.
                                                                                         ) No. 16 L 4776
 9
              Right at the moment, she has more range
                                                        10
                                                             ARONBERG GOLDGEHN DAVIS
                                                        11
                                                             & GARMTSA.
10
     of motion, although it is in association with
                                                        12
                                                                    Defendants.
11
     pain, and it is in association with the abnormal
                                                        13
                                                                    I, JEFFREY COE, M.D., being first duly
12
     alignment stresses that are causing her spine to
                                                        14
                                                             sworn, on oath say that I am the deponent in the
13
     deform evermore over time.
                                                        15
                                                             aforesaid deposition taken on the 9th day of
14
              Now, the surgery, this large scale
                                                        16
                                                             April 2019; that I have read the foregoing
15
     surgery that Dr. Rinella's talked about, would
                                                        17
                                                             transcript of my deposition, as taken aforesaid,
     stop the progression. It would stop the
16
                                                             and affix my signature to same.
                                                        18
                                                        19
17
     collapse in her spine, but it would leave her
                                                                                    JEFFREY COE, M.D.
    with greater stiffness.
18
                                                        20
19
              So this surgery, again, is to try to
                                                             SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN before me this ____ day of
20
     control pain, and it's to prevent further
                                                        21
                                                                           _ 2019
21
    breakdown, but it would not increase her
                                                        22
22
     employability.
                                                             Notary Public
23
         MR. CLINTON: Thank you.
                                                        23
24
              That's all I have.
                                                        24
                                                    97
                                                                                                             99
         MR. DUFFY: No further questions for me.
                                                             STATE OF ILLINOIS
                                                                                    )
 1
                                                         2
                                                                                        ss:
 2
                                                                                    )
              You can either waive signature --
                                                         3
                                                             COUNTY OF C O O K
 3
         THE WITNESS: Is anything happening in the
                                                         4
                                                                    I, Steven J. Maza, a notary public within
     immediate future where you need this read
 4
                                                         5
                                                             and for the County of Cook County and State of
 5
     overnight or something?
                                                             Illinois, do hereby certify that heretofore,
 6
                                                         6
         MR. DUFFY: Oh, no, no, no.
                                                         7
                                                             to-wit, on the 9th day of April 2019, personally
7
         THE WITNESS: I would reserve the signature
                                                             appeared before me, at 22 North Morgan Street,
 8
     then, thanks. I would be glad to read it.
9
                                                             Chicago, Illinois, JEFFREY COE, M.D., in a cause
         MR. CLINTON: Okay.
                                                             now pending and undetermined in the Circuit
                                                        10
10
                     (Whereupon, the proceedings were
                                                             Court of Cook County, Illinois, wherein CHERYL
                      concluded at 3:17 p.m.)
                                                        11
11
                                                        12
                                                             D. REICHENBACH is the Plaintiff, and ARONBERG
12
13
                                                        13
                                                             GOLDGEHN DAVIS & GARMISA is the Defendant.
                                                                    I further certify that the said JEFFREY
                                                        14
14
15
                                                        15
                                                             COE, M.D. was first duly sworn to testify the
                                                             truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth
                                                        16
16
                                                             in the cause aforesaid; that the testimony then
                                                        17
17
18
                                                        18
                                                             given by said witness was reported
                                                        19
                                                             stenographically by me in the presence of the
19
                                                        20
                                                             said witness, and afterwards reduced to
20
                                                        21
                                                             typewriting by Computer-Aided Transcription, and
21
                                                        22
                                                             the foregoing is a true and correct transcript
22
                                                        23
                                                             of the testimony so given by said witness as
23
                                                             aforesaid.
                                                        24
24
                                                    98
                                                                                                            100
```

```
1
            I further certify that the signature to
 2
     the foregoing deposition was reserved and that
 3
     there were present at the deposition the
 4
     attorneys hereinbefore mentioned.
 5
            I further certify that I am not counsel
 6
     for nor in any way related to the parties to
 7
     this suit, nor am I in any way interested in the
 8
     outcome thereof.
9
            IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF: I have hereunto
10
     set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this
     10th day of April 2019.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
                 NOTARY PUBLIC, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
                                                   101
 1
                 McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc.
               200 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 2900
                 Chicago, Illinois 60601-1014
            DATE: 4-10-19
 3
            THE CLINTON LAW FIRM, LLC
 4
            111 West Washington Street, Suite 1437
            Chicago, Illinois 60602
 5
            TO: MR. EDWARD X. CLINTON, JR.
    IN RE: Reichenbach vs. Aronberg
    COURT NUMBER: 16 L 4776
 6
    DATE TAKEN: 4-9-19
    DEPONENT: Jeffrey Coe, M.D.
     Dear Mr. Clinton:
     Enclosed is the deposition transcript for the
 9
     aforementioned deponent in the above-entitled
10
     cause. Also enclosed are additional signature
     pages, if applicable, and errata sheets.
11
     Per your agreement to secure signature, please
12
     submit the transcript to the deponent for review
     and signature. All changes or corrections must
13
     be made on the errata sheets, not on the
     transcript itself. All errata sheets should be
14
     signed and all signature pages need to be signed
     and notarized.
     After the deponent has completed the above,
16
     please return all signature pages and errata
     sheets to me at the above address, and I will
    handle distribution to the respective parties.
17
18
     If you have any questions, please call me at the
     phone number below.
19
20
     Sincerely,
21
     Cindy Alicea
                           Court Reporter Present:
     Signature Department Steven J. Maza
22
     cc: Mr. John Duffy
23
24
                                                   102
```



	2009	79	administrative	anybody's	95:12
Exhibits	60:3,14	28:6	19:16	20:6	backward
	<b>2011</b> 48:16		administrator 12:24 19:18	apparently 68:1	94:15
or. Coe Exhibit 1	48:16 <b>2012</b>	8	administrators		backwards
3:15 4:21 5:6 11:15 44:23 48:15 70:15	48:16,18 49:4,14,17	8	38:2 41:20	appeal 20:24	62:3,4 94:10 <b>bag</b>
44.23 40.13 70.13	50:11	<b>9</b> 1:2	admit	appeared	54:14
	2013	80	16:20 17:1 30:20	66:2	barred
\$	43:12,14 74:5	54:23 55:2	31:24 56:3	application	56:10
175	2014	83	admitted	8:19 16:19	based
88:15	71:3,14,24 72:6,16	20:16	32:10,19	applications	5:14 8:5 20:16 74
400	73:12 74:6	84	admitting	68:3	80:5 94:3 95:10
90:7	2017	20:17	30:24 31:6,15 32:14	applied	bases
4000	43:19		advanced	17:18 31:3 67:18,23	75:21
88:12 89:9,23 91:4	2018	9	9:15	apply	basically
	5:7,12,15 35:11 36:1		advice	17:4	81:11 83:23 85:6
1	38:21 40:10 41:3,22	90	27:23 73:1	Arbor	basis
	42:4,8,12,23 46:2, 14,23 47:2 53:5,6,14	54:7	advise	7:2,3,16,18	69:20,22 72:11,1
	55:6 60:10 70:2	92	38:4	area	21 75:7 bedridden
4:19,21 5:6 11:15	90:22 91:2,12 93:17	24:20	advising 41:16	13:10 17:2 20:24 21:8 22:3,6 23:2	66:15
44:23 48:15 70:15	2019		advisor	30:23 31:7 38:15	beds
16th	22:19 58:22	Α	37:24 42:18	68:1 92:8	12:17
18:16 <b>3</b>	2029	A I T M A N	affect	arises	began
	46:20	A-L-T-M-A-N	59:8	32:7	30:7
91:1 <b>4</b>	205	51:10	affected	arising	beginning
70:14	25:21	abduction 64:3	19:19	33:11 54:17 74:8	8:15
5	25	ability	affecting	arthritis	behalf
59:22 61:24	62:9	16:20 17:1 52:22	95:1	71:5 80:19 94:5,20	54:9,10,20,23
8	26	57:12 74:5,12 75:13,	affects	asbestos	belabor
30:12	53:14	16 97:4	82:17	14:15 15:16	17:16 57:8
945		abnormal	age	assistance	believed
6:17	3	62:6 94:8,14 97:11	56:15 57:12 58:18,	86:1	77:4
962		abnormalities	19 59:7 61:1	assistant	bending
6:24	30	74:4	agents	43:1	61:20 62:3,5,8,1
966	42:9,22 <b>35</b>	abnormality	15:12	Associates	72:2 75:8,18 84:
7:5,11	61:24	74:8	agreed	30:9 33:20	85:10 94:10,15 96:11
970	3:17	absence	10:2 20:21 agreement	association 97:10,11	benefit
7:11	98:11	75:4	4:10,11	assume	16:17 58:21
972		accident	ahead	85:4	benefits
11:19 32:11		80:18,22	12:11 36:15	Assuming	58:19,24 59:3,7
<b>974</b> 11:19 12:2 13:11	4	accommodations 28:15	alignment	85:1	big
976	40	accounts	97:12	asymptomatic	67:24
12:2 13:11 15:21	42:9,22 59:14 62:12	95:4	allowed	80:21	bill
28:6	82:9	accurate	13:23 82:6	attached	88:5,20 90:1
979		6:5,6	alternate	5:10 49:7	billed
17:21	5	achievement	9:10	attachments	90:7
980		8:6	alternative	49:12	billing
18:8	50	action	19:22	attained	91:7
982	36:6 54:8,9 62:1	33:13 50:20 66:10,	Altman	68:2	bit
20:16	72:24 73:4 81:6,14,	17 67:1 86:16 87:21	51:10 52:9	attended	11:13 95:24
984	17,19 82:9	actions	amassed	91:17	blended
21:24		54:11,15	90:3	attending	18:5
985	6	active	America	11:20 12:3 13:4,5	board
20:15	6	27:4 31:12 33:4	39:2,10 40:23 <b>American</b>	attorney 87:7,20,22 88:1,6	8:2,4,8,12 9:2,6, 16,23 10:21 11:1
989	5:6.12.15 44:24	activities	39:4,5,11 61:1	attorneys	39:12 54:19
24:24	46:14,23 47:2 67:7	33:12 69:23 85:11,	amount	51:5,7 90:13	boards
<b>990</b> 8:11 27:5	70:1 93:17	13 <b>activity</b>	67:22	attorneys'	8:9 10:22
8:11 27:5 <b>990s</b>	60	38:7 72:1 83:12	analgesia	51:12 65:20 66:2	body
990 <b>S</b> 9:22	58:10	38:7 72:1 83:12 actual	77:3	audited	64:5 71:3
9:22	60-years	6:2 20:15 80:9 81:1	analgesic	24:12	bones
24:20 30:10,15 33:3,	58:11,13	92:2	76:9 78:21 79:10	audits	94:22
19 34:4,8	61	acute	anatomic	23:15	book
997	58:12,15	19:15 80:9	74:8	authored	55:12
8:15	62	add	anatomy	5:1 46:22 48:14	born
	58:19 59:7	83:8 88:22	73:11	avenue	6:16,18
2	62-years	addition	Ancient	18:16 96:19	bottom
	61:2	7:23 77:19	7:13	avoid	85:7
0		additional	and/or	75:8 76:10 85:10,13	box
32:4 42:15 62:10	7	48:22 69:16 84:19	75:12		67:24
02.7 72.10 02.10		88:17 89:18	Ann	В	boxes
	7	address	7:2,3,16,18		39:19
000		90:21	annual	back	brace 81:23,24
<b>000</b> 6:24	58:22 95:8				R 1:23 2/I
000 6:24 004	700	adduction	37:11	7:9 16:3,4 20:6,20	·
000 6:24 004 50:15 59:20,21 71:4, 10 74:2 78:12	<b>700</b> 12:17	adduction 64:6	answering	28:6 35:7 43:7,8,23	bracing
000 6:24 004 50:15 59:20,21 71:4,	<b>700</b> 12:17 <b>74</b>	adduction 64:6 adjunct	answering 71:21	28:6 35:7 43:7,8,23 44:1 67:4 70:24	<b>bracing</b> 82:3,5
000 6:24 004 50:15 59:20,21 71:4, 10 74:2 78:12	<b>700</b> 12:17	adduction 64:6	answering	28:6 35:7 43:7,8,23	bracing



	1		ı	1	1
break	31:5,9	clinical	concern	conversations	
34:11 72:13 88:24	centers	12:22 19:12 23:7,8	14:14 45:16	57:16	
89:4 93:1	17:14	25:6,10 26:7 29:22	concerned	convex	
breakdown	Central	32:3 36:17 38:9	42:8,12	94:13	damaged
80:14,22,23 84:7	39:6	40:14 42:12 44:12	concluded	сору	66:15
94:20,22 96:10 97:2,	certificate	56:9 74:18 78:11	98:11	4:24 5:2,3	data
21	37:5	96:1	concludes	corporation	56:14,19 61:6 63:3,6
briefly	certification	clinics	56:19	13:16,22 14:2,20	date
20:21	8:4,17 9:2,14,17,19,	27:17,21 28:4,18,21	conclusion	15:2 21:15 39:16	4:11 5:20,24 6:2
bring	21,23	29:17	69:21 72:15	40:23	30:10 57:5 88:9
42:5	certified	Clinton	conclusions	correct	96:15
bringing	8:2	5:3 53:18,23 68:7	46:5,8,10 47:18	5:8,9,13,16 8:24 9:5	dated
64:1	cervical	88:23 89:2 92:10 94:2 97:23 98:9	93:16	10:1,8,18 11:22 12:6	5:12 91:2
broader	64:15,20		concur	14:8,21 15:13,17,23	dates
28:11	cessation	Clinton's 90:23 93:13	86:7	16:7 17:3,23 18:11	18:7
brought	17:24	closer	concurrent	20:3 21:5,9,18 22:2,	day
50:4	chance	29:1	21:23	5 24:14 25:1,15,17	5:18,23 53:12 58:14
bubble	6:8	CN	condition	26:16 27:7 30:14,18 32:15,16,20,21 34:4,	79:21,22
39:20,21	change	-	74:19 76:13 80:16	5,10 35:18 38:23	days
bulk	28:16 46:8 47:7,12	39:2,5,7 <b>coast</b>	86:1 95:11	40:11,12,17,18,23,	5:24
54:7,19,21	48:24 75:1	40:6	conditions	24 41:4 45:20,23,24	dealing
burn	changed	Coe	71:11 77:21	46:6,7,11,12,15,19,	14:5
55:16	8:12,14		conduct	20,21 47:3,4,19,20,	deals
burning	channels	4:2,9,13,20 <b>Coler</b>	89:15	24 48:19 49:15 51:3	37:21
96:14	29:18	12:4,14 13:12,24	conducted	55:3,5 57:20 58:16,	dealt
burst	charge	collapse	5:15	24 59:1,19,24 60:8,	14:12
80:9 81:2	12:20 88:10 89:9	81:6,20 82:8,9 84:8	confirm	15,16 61:10 63:6,17,	debate
business	90:6	94:23 95:1 97:17	53:12	18,23 64:16,21,22,	57:2
25:16 26:12	charged	collected	connection	23,24 65:2,3 67:3,14	December
buttock	88:9	42:8	31:5	69:6,14,22 70:19,21	5:6,12,15 44:24
95:5	charges	college	connotation	71:8,23 72:7,18,19,	46:14,23 47:2 58:22
- <u></u> -	88:14 89:8	7:1	51:23	21 73:1,23 74:9	67:7 70:1 91:12
С	chemical	colorful	conservatively	75:18 76:19 79:6,17	93:17
	37:10	66:14	81:21	80:1,3,4 81:18,22	decided
call	chest	column	considerable	82:18,19,24 83:10	43:24
68:20	64:1	94:17	83:11	84:4 87:17,24 89:9,	decreased
called	Chicago	comments	consideration	10,17,23 90:24 correction	62:7 64:18
4:3 27:19 30:9 33:20	6:19 7:9,10,11 9:12	62:20	57:7	13:17	defendant
39:24	16:3,4 17:2 18:17	commitment	considerations		15:1 55:21
calls	19:10 20:24 22:16	22:24	57:11	Cosmetics 67:21	defendants
27:2	25:7 27:16 28:2 30:10 31:9 33:21	common	consist	count	54:4 <b>deficit</b>
Canadian	38:15	81:2,4	33:7	30:11	62:1
39:1,3 40:21 41:7	choice	companies	consistent		define
capacity	77:2	28:1 38:1,8,12,17	96:4	couple	74:10
15:8 73:14,20	chronic	41:8 42:20	consistently	94:3 <b>court</b>	
capture	14:14 75:14 76:1,12	company	34:7	24:5 56:11	<b>deform</b> 97:13
95:21	78:17,21 79:7,10,21	18:18 19:3 21:20	constitutes	courtesy	deformities
care	95:12	22:1,8,23 26:3	34:18	31:10.14	95:17
17:12,14 27:22 56:6, 9	chronically	39:10,11,13,17,24	consultant	crossing	deformity
	77:17	40:22	27:9,13 28:17 38:1 40:20 42:18	64:6	75:13 80:11 96:10
career 32:11 33:6,17 51:17	circumstances	companywide		cruel	
F7.40	81:13	23:4	consultants	84:13	degenerative
carried	city	compare	29:19 consultation	curious	71:4,5 75:1 80:15,18 82:13 94:4,19
26:7 28:19 32:3	6:21 12:5,15 13:15,	63:3,16	32:22	51:14	degree
61:15 74:18	21 14:19 15:1,22	comparisons	consultations	current	9:16 20:11,15 82:8
carry	21:11	63:1	13:7 14:9 27:22 32:6	9:4 10:10,17 31:16	96:24
23:15 28:22 33:22	civil	Compensation	consulted	curriculum	degrees
97:5	33:14 52:3 54:14	15:3 22:18 23:22	14:16	5:9 6:13 11:11,16	61:24 62:9,10,12
carrying	55:1	24:3,9 33:14,15 54:6	consulting	16:5 18:6 30:11	demand
87:8,19	claims	complaint	26:11	41:10	72:9
case	23:12 24:1	96:2,3	contact	curvature	demographic
5:1,7 22:20 23:21	classes	complete	53:6,12 90:22	97:1	61:6
29:13 45:18 50:17	43:4,6 77:10	6:6,11	contacted	curve	department
51:2,5,19,20 52:2,4,	clear	completely	53:3,17,20	94:13,16	24:1
11 53:9 54:15,16,18	13:9 14:18 32:9 45:9	65:22 69:12 73:13,	contained	curves	depends
55:10,11,12,16 60:6,	46:9 53:1 61:4 68:14	19 85:5	48:7 69:17 74:22	94:8,15	54:5 81:5
9 66:20 87:8,19	69:4 78:13 79:12	completion	contingent	custom	deposition
88:11 89:12 92:3	82:2 86:24 96:17	8:8 9:15,16	39:4	5:19	4:9,13,20 6:9 11:12
94:24 96:16	<b>clearer</b> 20:4 35:8 36:14	complex 94:7	continue	customarily	15:7 24:19 46:2,11,
cases	20:4 35:8 36:14 Cleveland	-	56:24	66:10	13,17,18 47:14,22
15:6,19 23:12 24:3,9		complications 85:3	continued	cut	49:7,12 50:16,23
30:2 45:5 51:18 52:2	21:15		4:10	43:24	51:11 52:8 60:3,6,15
54:6,20	client 22:24	components 94:22	contributed	cutting	66:3 73:17 88:22
<b>causing</b> 94:23 97:12	clients	computers	80:14	43:23	89:21 90:4 91:18
94:23 97:12 cement	27:23,24 28:10	39:19	control	CV	depositions
81:12	clinic	concept	60:23 73:9 77:4 84:9	27:9 41:15	49:8 51:4,6,13 65:21
center	17:9 28:5,7	26:22	97:20		69:17,19 88:18 89:19 90:4
7:16 27:15 29:21	17.5 20.5,1	20.22	convalescing		03.13 30. <del>4</del>
			83:23 84:20		



derived 98:1,6 54:8 62:13,18 63:9 fair fuse hazardous 30:15 42:2 42:24 duly evermore 85:22 37:9 40:16 describe fairness fused hazards 4.4 97:13 12:7 16:18 80:6 duties exam 97.8 37.8 43:17 91:20 95:11 22:6 69:13 9:3 familiar fusion heading 84:24 85:17 describing examination 28:14 11:16 66:6 85:3 4:6 5:14,17,21 6:3 family future heal Ε 49:20 50:1 86:6 description 57:3 82:23 85:24 8:8,20 9:17 10:21 81:1,15 65:12 58:14 61:13 63:17 favorable 98:4 healed earlier 65:17 74:18 87:9 details 80:10 82:7 50:15 73:17 90:12 92:3 91:11 94:1 96:1 88.4 **Federal** healing early G examinations deterioration 37:12 53:4 78:11 25:13 81:8 83:15 73:10,11 84:8 26:8 28:22 36:17,20, gainful health fee easier determined 24 37:7,11 38:10,12 88:10 66:5 83:12 12:3,19,21 13:1,3,8, 40:14,15 42:12 15 21 14 2 19 15 2 feel 83:15 educational gap examine develop 8:5 22:13 23:11,17 29:24 17:24 19:18.19 23:5.14.19 23:9 26:10 feelings gastrointestinal 25:7.8.9.11.12.23 effects examined 26:9.11 28:11 38:5 developed 52:11 77:18 82:15.21 77:23 4.4 58.10 hear 80:22 fell elected gave examining 12:16 47:10 developing 81:16 24:18 27:10 46:20 30:3 hearing 12:22 Elgin felt 50:16 exams developmental 27:1 29:11 68:23 general 54:18 31:11 hearings 8:12 69:2,11 78:23 16:6,8,24 17:22 18:1 eligible exclude 55:1 56:18 diagnostic field 15:3 58:8,18,23 generally 14:8 57:21 58:17 75:10 held 8:4 9:15 29:22 74:21 employability difficult excuse file 20:2 28:23 67:16 66:18 74:5,11 75:12, 6:24 55:16 64:19 helpful 62:24 16 82:15 84:3,10 91:10 93:9 give 76:21 77:16 exercise direct finally 15:7 34:15 36:3 97:22 86.2 30:4 39:23 82:1 54:21 55:20 90:9 high employable director exercises find giving 6:20,21 67:2 84:11,17 86:21 27:3 51:18 91:9 higher 12:3.19 18:9 19:8.9 54:2 employed exhausted 76:18 77:3 glad 21:7.14 22:4.7 23:3. 13:12 65:18 67:8 92:22 93:4 highly 20 25:6 26:5 38:8 89:11 finish 12:12 18:24 50:4 employee exhaustive 13,18,22 39:8,9,15, 98:8 35:1 66:8 92:10 12:3.19.21 13:1.3. 24 41:6 42:19 61:10 45:10 hip 12.14.20 14:1 18:18 finished good disability **Exhibit** 26:22 48:3 80:6 64:12 95:4 12:10 19:4 39:14 19:19 43:8 52:21 54:17,19 4:21 5:6 11:15 44:23 Fischer 88:23 employees hips 48:15 70:15 63:19 64:9.11.23 Government 12:18,23 14:5,19 26:2 disc expected 85:15 19:14 38:12,17 flexion 25:14 71:4 82:13 57:4.17 58:5 graduate 61:19,20 62:21,22 hired employer discrepancy experience 23:2 87:22 20:9 63:23,24 6:23 20:10 28:12 59:14 66:7 graduated 68:16 floor histories employers discuss 37:17,18 38:22 expert 45.15 70:12 7.51155:8,20 70:8 grandfather 30:3 history 40:20 42:19 foamed discussed employment expertise 8:23 7:13 39:18 60:2,14 82:18 83:1 59:9 61:9 65:7,15 92:9 folks granted Horio 85:23 66:5 68:8,21,22 70:7 explain 9:1 40:11 20:15 46:6 48:6,13 49:10 disease 75:9,10,11 83:8,22 Horio's 37:22 force great 14:14 37:12 71:4 84:21 explanation 46:1.11.13 49:13 22:9 93:6 21:4 82:13 end 31:21 greater hospital forward diseases 5:10 explored 59:9 61:20 63:22,24 12:4,14,16,20,22 97:4.18 28:13 engaged ground 13:1,13 14:5,10 96:19 94:9,15,16 dispense 15:11 16:13,18,20, 83:13 exposed found 4:16 15:11 37:8 22 17:2,5,18 27:6, 4:16 engineers 14:20 52:16 61:19 group dissimilar 13,15 28:20 29:18, 37.2 40.16 exposure 83:14 94:8 64.8 65.2 19,21 30:19,21,23 entailed 28:5 14:13,16 fracture grows District 31:11,16 32:1,6,10 80:9,14 81:1,5 96:10 exposures 12:8 68:16 34:20 56:3 65:6 67:12 68:5 69:5 entitled fractures 24:11 auess hospitalization divorce 11:17 extends 81:2.14 63:10 50:20 51:2 66:17 estimate 17:11 32:24 **Franks** 85:6 Gulf 67:1 hospitalized 36:10 54:3 55:4 extension 51:8 52:9 39:6 doc estimated 61:22,23 62:3,22 front hospitals 87:12 57:13 extent 53:8 н 12:15 13:15,21 14:2, **Doctor** estimates 23:23 80:21 81:5 frowned 20 15:2 31:7 56:8 83:15 42:16 75:4 9.18 half hour doctors estimation full 29:1,10 83:16,19,23 90:6,8 28:3,7 44:4 78:19 83:6,18,20 64:8 84:20 F hourly documented evaluate full-time hall 69:9 96:24 14:18 34:14 F-I-S-C-H-E-R 14:3 68:17 69:1 37.2 hours doses evaluating 26.2 fullness handed 35:13 88:19 89:18 76:18 facilities 34:19 72:11 house downtown evaluation 29:22 function handles 57:3 25:10 43:9,16 44:8 59:8 facility 52:22 57:11 40.4 hurt drivers 61:14 67:7 70:8 functional 28:20 happening 86:15 87:5,7,20 38:14 37:2 42:13 fact 75:5 due 89:15 95:10 23:3 70:10 75:16 funnel Hawaii 71:3 75:13 evaluations 82:21 29:18 ı 59:17 DUFFY 23:10,15 26:7 28:22 furniture factors haz ibuprofens 4:7,23 5:4 24:7 89:1, 33:22.23.24 34:3.7 39:19 42:13 77:15 6 92:11,16,18 93:19 36:13 37:21 40:10



idea inserts July 21:7,14 22:3,7 23:2, lung 19,20 25:6 26:4 31:4 39:18 91:5 Lemont 14:14 identification inspectors June 65:6 67:12 68:5 69:5 27:15,16,21 29:21 30:13 31:5,9,23 34:7 4.22 5.5 53:5,14 59:21 90:22 23:14 level М instability 37:21 38:8,13,18,21 identified 91:5 52:21 72:9 77:3 39:7.9.15.23 41:6 82:1 95:16 74:24 levels M.D. 42:19 43:14 48:17. ill insurance 58:21 85:22 4:2 22 50 6 52 2 24 55 9 12:24 21:20 22:1,7,23 Liberty made 59:15 61:9 62:15 Illinois 28:12 21:20 22:7,10,14,22 9:24 16:19 53:6 k-y-p-h 63:5.12 70:8 74:20 9:12 10:5,16 31:9,11 23:4,13,18 24:9,13, insured 67:21 68:3 86:8 76:12 77:21 78:1 39.6 66:24 22:15 24:13 15 23 26:12 magnitude Karen 79:3,15 80:7 88:16 immediately insurer 51:10 license 81:15 89:19 90:3 10:5,16 11:14 37:4 7:7,9 22:15 Kav main medical/legal impact insurers 67:21 68:5 licenses 28:20 33:4,7,23 34:1,3,13 22:18 38:2 40:20 10:15 57.5 kind maintaining 35:21 40:10 42:8 41:19 42:19 38:19 54:5 65:24 impairment licensure 54:12 55:1 87:5 43:8,9,16 52:22 interaction 76:23 77:19 89:7 36:24 maintenance medication implication lift 22:24 knee 19:21 40:1,4 78:21 76:5,9,11,14,19 interest 72:16 73:4 75:17 33:7.17 51:24 64:1 79:11 78:9,15,18,22 79:5, lifting 30:1 45:16 important knew majored 7,16,22 interesting 72:9.24 75:6 45:19,22 57:19,21 68:4 medications 22:22 26:6 29:11 inactive kyphoscoliosis limit make 76:21 77:8,11,22 47:10 51:18,20 52:5, 71:16 84:2 85:10 20:4 21:2 35:8 36:14 10:12 71:6 82:14 94:4,7 78:3 86:18 include 15,16 62:16 **Kyphosis** limitation 40:7,8 77:21 84:11, medicine intermittent 54:15 72:1 88:18 65:1 71:12 72:8 12,17 86:24 94:9 8:3,7,10 9:2,6,8 79:24 74:4.11 75:15 83:8 makes included 10:21,24 11:5 20:12, international 39:17,18 62:24 limitations 12:21 13:2 14 27:9.13 29:13.16 L including 39:12 72:14 82:20 83:9 making 30:5,8,9 31:22,23 43:9 internship 84:19 39:20 L1 32:23 33:2,8,9,20 7:14,23 limited malpractice income 71:3 80:10 81:13 36:18 44:4,6,12 interrupt 32:22 61:23,24 52:1,2,4 55:9 42:17.23 94:11 96:9 56:6,13 62:22 68:20 58:2 incorporate L3 managed medicines interview limits 81:21 68:9.10 80:19 77:12 76:3 75:9.10 management Incorporated L3,4 medium investigations liner 40:2 96:10 78:3 27.24 11:9 39:12 manager increase L4 memorandum 84:10 97:21 involve 80:19 list 92.23 91:1 41:6 45:10 90:13,16 increasing 85:17 manufacturer labor Memorial listed 96:24 involvina 12:4,14 13:13,24 38:2 16:5 27:8 45:1 indefinitely manufacturing laboratory memory litigation iron 39:13 29:23 20:6 50:24 19:3 52:3 Indiana Lakeview mark mention litigations issue 66:21 4:19 75:23 6:21 33:2 75:14 77:6 indicating 33:15 marked large mentioned issues local 4:21 48:15 70:15 91:8 12:16 14:4 19:2 38:11 42:20 47:23 23:19 17:13 38:14 56:1 indication market 22:14.24 39:4 45:7 Mercy issuing 68:1 26:23 61:9 60:13 96:20 97:14 27:6,13,15 28:20 located 47:2 individual largely Mary 29:2 30:19,20 16:9 18:14 19:10 70:7 68:21 94:13 67:21 68:5 Mercyworks 25:10:20:28:1 individually massive largest 27:19 28:8 J locations 84:14 22:17 Michigan 23:13 28:4 individuals Jay lateral mat 7:2,15,22 10:9,11 locomotive 58:17 61:8 51:8 62:5,8,10,11 42:14 11:21 **Jeffrey** 37:1 industrial Latin material mid long 4:2.9 40:17 9:22 28:1,10 71:6,7 job 18:6 37:2 materials industry lawsuits middle long-term 11:23 12:8 14:4,6,21 20:8 23 37:10 45:1 93:8 37:23 24 11:6 78:17 79:10 82:15, 15:21 18:22 20:2 midline inflammation lawyers matter 21 83:7,21 22.6 9 23.8 20 52:7 71:22 33:24 45:14 51:7 64:5 lay inform 28:19 23 36:19 37:5 longer 52:6,16 53:1,7 54:5 midwest 20:24 21:6 49:20 40:14 42:12 65:9,12 84:6 86:10,16 87:6 19:6 22:16 91:17 92:1 16:17 looked 69:13 72:23 88:19 91:16 96:18 information mild learn 29:17 45:11 49:13 matters 52:7 60:24 65:21 7:19 69:11,16 70:12 80:21 15:12 30:12 57:5 loss 23:22 38:5 55:2 88:17 92:20 mills 67:15 68:15,19 22:4 23:1,3,20 initial learned means 39:13 Jochum 82:4 lost 72:12 74:19 mine 91:13,20.23 83:12 meant injection leave 20:7 **Jockum** lot 11:23 15:24 25:2 13:6 81:12 Minimal 57:10 62:23 83:1 26:17,20 29:9 78:5 measure injured 34:21 84:23 12:23 14:6,20 17:11 97:17 14.4 minute 12:9 20:4 37:13 89:2 lower 19:14 left measurement 58:2 88:24 89:2 joined 12:1 15:21 16:2 43.7 injuries 62:23 mixed 22:1 27:5 LTV 19:16 43:8 20:18 21:3,24 24:22 measuring 54:14 18:2,10,12 19:1 joining 25:4 26:19 29:2 63:13 injury modified 26:14 19:20 27:22 54:16 21:19 62:10 median 82:6 joint lumbar 59:16,18,23 71:3 leg 56:15 61:1 moment 61:17 62:14 63:4.14 74:2 80:5,9,24 82:12 64:12 64:4.6 medical 53:11 90:9 97:9 65:2 71:4 82:13 judges 7:6,7,15 10:5,22 inpatient legal money 32:6 52:12 33:13,17 52:1,4,20 95:13 96:7 11:13,17 16:15,16 67:22 66:10 86:16 87:10, 17:9,13 18:9 19:8,9



pressures month November 16:20 17:1,10 23:9 plants ore 35:24 91:2 19:3 29:18 30:1,20 31:24 19:5 82:6 months nuclear organizations 32:5 34:8,14,19 plastic pretty 35:19,21 36:2 38:16 5:19 12:13 27:14 38:3 41:17,18,20 44.18 37:3 10 39:17 orthopedics 41:21,24 motion number point 33:6 45:6 17:13 19:5 45:7 50:5 61:16 62:14 63:4,13, 8:23 9:18,22 17:16 prevent 29:20 pay 43:2 91:4 55:11 61:8 70:20 19,22 64:8,14,20 outcome 22:16 27:18 34:21 84:7,12 97:20 65:1 97:10 numbered payroll 51:17 57:9 68:13 prevention 80:24 83:2 **Motrins** 70:21 outpatient 69:5,7 83:2 88:19 22:4 23:1,3,20 16:15 17:9 27:16,21 pediatrics policyholder numbers preventive mouthful 7:19 21 23:13 63:7 70:23 28:4.17 29:17 31:23 19.20 pension policyholders 80:17 95:20 numbness 56:8 previously move 96:14 outstanding 54:18 23:18 85:9 people principal 68:23 poor over-the-counter 13:7 16:17 36:21 80:24 23:24 26:1 38:7 moved O population 37:1,4,7,9 38:4,14 16:3 76:9.14 77:14 49:20 56:15 87:12 multi-cause overnight 63:8 principles obtain percent 74:24 posed 25:22 98:5 68:8 34:22,24 35:2,16,23 multi-line 71:18,22 74:16 owned prior obtained 36:1,5,6 38:10 41:3, 19:2 22:14 39:12 position 5:24 47:21 26:3 11:14 22 42:9,15,22 54:7, 14:3 18:9 19:9 20:1, multilevel private obtaining owner 8,9,23 55:2 62:1 23 21:10.15 27:3 13:22 25:16 26:11. 84:23 25:18 69:7 81:6,14,17,19 82:9 57:22,24 67:11,13 multiple 14 35:19,21 36:2 occasion percentage 96:9 15:18 56:14 66:16 68:17 38:16 41:21,24 P 34:15 35:20 42:5,7, positions privileges municipal occasional 11,17,23 54:3,22 37:3 67:24 68:2,22, 16:13,18 17:4,19 P-R-E-G-I-S 38:3 14:9 72:11,12,17,21 performed 24 69:2 30:20,24 31:2,7,15 municipalities 39:16 60:20 61:12 possibility 32:9,14 40:21 occupational p.m. period problem 15:15 mutual 98:11 8:2,7,10 9:1,6,7 8:6 17:5 20:5,9 14:10 51:23 65:4 21:20 22:7,10,14,23 10:21,24 11:4 14:13 post packaging 21:19,21 29:2 49:19 59:23 80.23 23:4 24:9,13,16,23 20:11.13 24:11 25:7. 39:9,17 40:22 85:2 potential problems 26:13 8 9 11 12 23 27 9 12 paid permanent 13:8 33:12 37:18 13:9 77:19 28:11.13 29:13.16 88:1,7 89:23 91:8 66:4 procedures 30:5.8.9 31:22.23 92:21 Ν person potentially 32:23 33:1,8,20 13:3 pain 53:16 proceeding 36:18 37:12 44:4 5 15:4 37:7 names 43:7 64:10 75:14 personal 12 56:6.13 pounds 87:10 38:24 76:1.5.10.19.20.22 54:16 45:14 72:10,17,20, proceedings occur narcotic 77:3 78:3,9,15 79:5, personnel 24 73:4 75:7,17 85:3 52:20 98:10 76:10 16,22 84:9 95:5,6, occurred 23:15 practice producer 12,23 96:2,13 97:11, **National** petitioners 52:19 59:16 11:13,17 13:23 16:6, 20 19:3 39:1 40:22 41:7 54:9 8.15 18:1 30:4.7.8. offer products paper nature Ph.d 13.16 32:3 33:19.22 28:9 74:3 78:22 20:23 57:22,24 39:12,13 19:4 39:14 20:11.14.18 34 10 19 36 2 10 12 offered professionals paragraph 95:14 96:22 21:10,14 44:11 physical 18 37:6 38:6 41:22 70:18 73:22 74:14 necessarily 20:1 36:20,23 61:12 42:4 44:1 54:13 professor office 75:24 82:11,18 83:9 29:24 59:10 63:17 72:9 59:15 81:9 5:20 16:16 38:19 84:2 43:1 needed physicals practitioner 44:6,8 53:6,18,19 paragraphs program 28:10 16 29:12 16:24 17:22 40:15.16 42:13 88:15 90:23 92:22 9:11 13:1 44:13 86:2 70:21 45:17 69:2 74:15 parentheses pre-medical 93:13 physician 92:4 93:15 programs 11:20 12:4 13:4,5 7.5 12:21 19:19,20,21, offices neighborhood 95.15 19:13 26:1 32:20 precise 44:15 Park 22,23 23:1,6,17 17:17 49:20,22 50:1 55:9, older 18:7 65:6 67:12 68:5 69:5 progressed nerve 18,21 56:7 76:18 preexistent 43:24 56:21 part 96:12 78:2,14 82:4 86:6,10 80:15 omitted 20:5,21 23:24 25:18 progression nerves 87:1.11 preferred 41:15 38:10 39:5 42:16 95:16 97:16 95:1,3 96:8 physicians one-third 44:9 49:6 54:12 55:4 9.19 progressive neurosurgery 14:24 73:7 74:16 **Pregis** 61:14 62:17 69:15 40:13 73:10 74:3 81:8 29:20 78:8 79:3 86:5 92:2 39:16 40:23 75:4 87:9 ongoing 95:14 96:22 97:1 nonaddictive 96:5 preparation part-time 80:23 promised 76:24 77:4 9 pinching open 67:12 68:18 89:21 28:10 nonnarcotic 95:3 96:8,11 participate preparing protect 30:4 76:19,20 place open-ended 66:10 90:4 nonsedating 85:13 63:1.2 prescribe participated 76:12 prove 77:9 placement 79:10 86:18,21 operate 19:24 nonsteroidal 65:22 19:23 28:14 36:20 prescribed 81:9 83:3 parties provide 77:11 40:14 42:13 78:21 79:21 operators 4:10.12 70:8 73:18 93:13 normal places prescription pass 61:19,21,22 62:6,11 37:4 provided 23:16 76:10,17 77:14 78:9, 10:24 27:22 46:13 63:5 opinion 63:7,23 64:2,5,7,8, plaintiff 15,17,22 79:22 17,19,21,23 70:18 71:1,9 72:1 path provider 55:3.18.19 87:13,16 9:14 83:2 73:12 19:15 25:9,10 26:14 norms plaintiffs prescriptions opinions paths 40:3 63:8 54:4.20.24 79.4 16.24 47:7,12 49:1 70:16 9:10 pulling north plan 73:23 74:21 patient present 6:22 39:2,4,5 64.4 52:10 56:24 opportunity 32:10,18 81:7 86:11, 19:13 23:17 32:12 purchased notes planned 94:11 60:17 14.17 87:16 18:12 39:7 53:8 90:9 52:12 presentations opposite patient's purpose notice plans 52:13 84:6,7,9,16 86:15 44:24 13:2 43:20 patients preserved option 87:5 noticed plant 44:11 58:20 59:6 62:22 13:23 14:9 15:10.19 43:23 61:12 19:10.14 37:3



pursuant recommendation repetitive retiring scoliosis sitting 16:11 45:15 52:18 60:13 72:2 75:8,18 56:21 80:20 94:12 put recommendations retrenchment secondary situation report 57:5 85:24 86:9 4:24 5:7.18.22 6:5 41:10 45:12,22 20.22 95:21 84.9 36:3 44:24 45:10.18. 52:10 90:20 returning Security size 58:8,18,24 59:7 recommended 19.21 46:4.23 47:2. 94:17 putting 36:22 5.16.23 48:14 50:8. 86:8 73:6,7,8 78:15 86:1, revenue sedating sized 12 68:10 70:15 42:5,7,11 77:5 28:1 record 82:11 89:16,20 review sedentary slightly Q 4:8 50:14 68:4 92:14 93:16 6.8 23.12 24.2 46.1 72.9 63:10 REPORTER records 16 47:1.5.13 48:5.9. semester slowdown qualify 45:7,15 48:5,8,9,11, 24:5 59:2 11,13 49:16 50:3,17 35:6 20:8 reports quarter 14,18,23 49:3,14,17, 19 51:4 53:11 54:19 send small 5:20 34:14 45:4 23 50:3,6,10 52:24 65:6 68:9 79:14 80:2 93:8 35:5 27:24 62:15,21 63:5,12 representative 89:15,19 question sense Social 65:7,8,15 68:8 69:6, 67:21,22 68:6 reviewed 13:19 24:6 31:21 6:15 41:24 58:8,18,24 59:7 8 70:7 74:21,22 24:8 45:2 46:4 reprimand 32:7 33:2,18 35:9 separately solely 78:2,9,14 79:4,15,19 50:21,23 51:1,6,11 11:4 57:24 59:11 60:22 8:7 14:1 94:6 80:3 88:17 89:16,19 Republic 60:10 69:18 74:23 63:10 66:1 67:5 solidify sequelae 90:3 91:7 96:5,24 18:2,10,11,12,14,23 78:10 14 79:4 71:17,19,22 78:23, 80:13 81:1,10 recovery 19:1 20:10,19,20 reviewing 24 79:13 83:5,6 series sort 44:23 65:20 78:1 80.6 21:3,24 26:13 92:7,12,13,16 19:2 23:10 71:18 reduced questions request 88:16 90:3 served sorts 58:21 36:3 68:7,11 reviews 6:14 28:15 41:12 12:2 15:8 25:5 52:3 requested reducing 23:21 71:18 90:13.16 91:1 sound service rib 94:17 93:19 94:3 98:1 92:15 12:3 26:24 40:3 43:3 14.7 30.13 reduction require 94.17 87:20 88:6 sounds 21:4 9:7 36:24 80:13 ribcage 12:13 27:14 33:3 R services refer 81:17,20 83:11,14 21:7 25:6,11 26:7 39:10 right-sided required radiculopathy 28:9 29:23 sources 8:15 17:10,12 27:23 referred 96:12 95:13 96:7,13 set 95:5 96:9 17:13 37:17 54:10 28:21 71:10,13 Rinella radiological 63:3.7 south 47:11,18,21 48:13 87.6 requirement 95:16 severe 40:6 refers 49:8 82:5 83:1.4 railroad southeast requirements 84:15 85:16 86:3 94:7 39:2,3,7,8 40:3,22 **Shapiro** 18:17 19:11 91:18 96:17,23 reflect 35:22 41:7 49:24 50:11,14 82:4 span Rinella's 4:8 reserve ramifications Shapiro's . 57·13 46:16 48:9 60:3,5 refused 98.7 83:21 speak 50:3.6 85:1 91:20 97:15 93:13 residencies ran Sherman 91:13 region 7:24 role 27:20 31:10 speaking 19:7 22:17 residency 13:11,18 84:16 Randolph short 59:18 67:6 regional 7:17.22 9:7.10.11. roles 89:4 93:1 specialist 84:17 18.9 19.8 9 21.7 19.20 44:9.13 range short-term 8:2 roots 42:10 61:16 62:14 regulated resident 82:14,17 83:9 specialists 44:20,22 96:12 63:4,13,19,22 64:8, show regulations rotating residents 14 20 65:1 77:13 9:3 44:7 48:3 specialties 44:15 44:3.14 82:10 97:9 13:2 sick 29:21 rehabilitation rotation reach resource specialty 14:6,21 17:10 19:14 44:9.12 93:16 19:21 23:4.5.11 38:14 8:8 13:10 30:7 Reichenbach respondents roughly read 31:22.24 side 5:1 48:6 49:21 50:16 36:6 41:21 46:22 47:22 51:12 54:10 6:22 16:10 18:17 specific 52:21 57:16 58:4,23 60:5,7 66:6,12 70:24 responsibilities route 19:11 77:18 94:16, 59:18 69:8 78:7 73:17 92:13,14 95:8 60:19 61:13 63:13 12:22 18:23 19:12, 9:19 18 95:2 96:8,14 79:13 86:9 87:21 65:7 67:7 69:13 routine 98.48 17 23:8 69:14 sides 92:12 72:15 73:13 75:24 36:17,23 62:23 responsibility reading 64:2 specifically 76:4 77:20 78:3 46:6,10 47:18 83:4 23:24 rules sideways 40:21 49:9 61:5 87:6 85:23 86:24 87:23 ready rest 4:16 13:2 91:19 92:5 94:12 88:2 90:14 26:23 60:19 36:13 54:14 62:18 Rush sign spend Reichenbach's reask restoration 17:19 37:12 81:8 . 34:19 35:11 38:9 59:16 64:9 65:10 résumé 35:9 19:22 signature spent 74:2 79:3,14 80:5 reason restriction 41.2 34:16 35:3,20 40:8.9 98:2.7 81:16 82:12 92:2 71:2,11,14 82:20 41:5 73:9 signed 42:4 85:2 88:18,21 94:11,24 95:11 reasonable restrictions S spinal related 5:7 74:17 76:11 83:20 71:24 74:15 75:2.3 significance 60:2,14 73:11 74:3 14:11 83:14 85:9 recall S-SHAPED 75:13 76:22 95:16 45:13 relating 15:5 79:23 restrictive 94:12 spine significant 26:8 receive 66:8 sacrum 61:17 62:14 63:4,14 71:2,13 74:4,11,23 reliable 20:13 49:3 result 85:7.18 75:15 64:15 65:2 74:20,24 63:6 74:2 81:3 received sad 80:16,19 84:8 94:8, silica relied 9:1 20:11 46:3 48:22 retail 84:5 14:15 15:14 11,13,15,20,23 95:2 69:12 recent 67:23 sadly 96:9,11,21 97:2,8, similar rely retained 47:20 97.6 12.17 26:12.13 70:11 55:2 88:10 recently safety spoke simply remainder retainer 19:18,24 23:1,5,14, 49.5 91:15 17:12 32:16 42:21 recertification spoken 89:9.14 19 26:9.11 38:5 single remains 8:16 10:3 retire scale 70:4 25:5 26:15 81.7 82.8 recertify 56:15 57:17 58:5 spouse 97:14 sir remember 8:18,20 retirement school 66:17 67:1,2 90:17 67:5 recommend 57:4 58:19,23 59:7 6:20,21,22 7:6,8 spring sit



76:23 78:2,8

repeatedly

60:21

20:10 43:14

17:17 22:19 27:2

53.4

61:1

stabilize	surgery	55:3,21 56:10 65:10	train	unemployed	waste
96:20	60:2,14,20 80:13	66:3 70:9 73:19 79:1	40:15	21:21	37:9
staff	81:3,15,17,20 82:22	85:2 91:21 92:2	training	unimproved	ways
16:22 23:18 31:10,	83:11,16,19,22 84:1,	testina	44:5	95:13 96:15	20:21
14 32:8	6,14,18 85:12,16	29:22 75:5	Tramadol	United	wear
standard	96:20 97:3,14,15,19	tests	77:1	25:7 40:5 56:15	94:21
45:4 56:6 63:8 66:3,	surprise	74:21	transcript	University	week
8 69:1 70:6 73:16	60:24 61:3,7	thigh	70:24	7:2,10,15 9:11 11:20	35:24
started	surprised	95:5	travel	31:8	weight
34:3	73:3	thing	23:13	unusual	97:5
starting	surrounded	8:14 52:17 96:18	treating	22:22 51:22 66:8	west
18:1 33:3 36:21	17:16	things	73:7 74:16 78:19	updated	16:10 25:21 40:6
58:19	surrounding	14:22 33:21 34:9	82:4 86:5,10 87:10	50:10	word
state	28:2 64:11 85:14	44:2 48:4 52:5,6,14,	96:5	urgent	8:22 27:20
66:22,23 73:9	94:23	15 54:12 67:17,18	treatment	17:12	words
stated	switch	69:8 75:23 77:13,24	50:6 74:20	utilizing	95:19,20 97:5
75:3 85:9	9:20 42:3	78:4 97:5	treatments	66:4	work
statement	sworn	thinking	95:14 96:15		9:15 10:14 12:24
24:8 79:6,17	4:1,4	12:11	tremendously	v	17:9 20:16 23:16
states	symptom	third-party	35:24	v	25:13 33:2,4,8,12
10:7,8,14 25:7 40:5	60:22	38:2 41:19	trial	V-E-O-L-I-A	34:11,13 36:21,22
56:16	symptomatic	thoracic	50:19 51:1 56:11	40:1	38:19 40:4 41:6
stayed	81:7	82:13	67:16	vacation	42:8,24 44:6 53:9
26:15	symptoms	thoracolumbar	triannual	59:17	54:2 56:13 59:2
steel	74:7 95:13,23 96:13	71:5	8:15,17 10:3	variable	61:8,9 65:23 67:22
18:2,10,11,12,14	system	thousand	truck	35:1 77:7	68:4,6,22 69:21,23
19:2,3 20:8,10,19,	13:1,5 27:16,19	12:18	37:2 42:13	varies	71:2,11,13 73:13,19
21,22 21:3 22:1	28:3,8,17 29:19	till	truckers	35:5,23	74:5,12 75:12,16
26:14		24:24	40:15	variety	82:19 83:19 87:18
stems	Т	time	true	33:14	89:12 97:4
32:11	·	4:10,11 8:5 10:13	15:4 17:2 24:8 55:6	Veolia	work-related
stiff	T10	12:17 13:6 15:6,13	truth	40:1	13:8 32:7 33:9 43:7
85:5,8	85:6,18	16:9,23 17:5 18:19	84:5,14	versus	workday
stiffness	taking	20:5,9 21:21 22:17,	turn	54:4 63:17	72:12
75:13 85:6 95:12,23,	76:5,15	21 24:10,18 26:2	70:14	vertebra	worked
24 97:18	talk	27:17 29:3,15 30:2	turned	80:10 82:7	20:20 24:23 28:5
stop	11:13 60:18 75:6	32:4,5 33:19 34:6,	58:15	vertebrae	53:23
22:11 51:15 97:16	talked	15,18 35:3,11,17,20	twisting	81:3,10,12	Worker's
stopped	78:5 95:24 97:15	36:7 38:4,9 40:8,9,	72:2 75:8,18 85:10	vertebral	15:2 22:18 23:21
17:21	talking	13,19 42:3 43:13,15,	96:11	71:3 81:1,14	24:2,9 33:13,15 54:6
stores	22:11 66:11 68:15	18 44:14,17,21,22	Tylenol	vertebroplasty	workers
67:24	73:16 77:20	48:21 49:19 60:1,17 62:20,21 66:19	76:16	81:11	37:9,10 40:17 42:14
straight	taught	69:24 74:17 75:22	type	Veselik	working
37:13	43:6,13,16,18	76:16 78:18 79:8	14:12 26:24 38:3	49:16 86:6	8:6 13:20 26:21 37:24 38:7 56:24
Street	teach	83:12 85:2 88:12,16,	54:16 61:5 67:23	Veselik's	68:17 72:23
18:16	9:12 29:14 43:4,5,	21,23 90:2 93:21	68:21 76:9,22 83:12	47:13,19 48:11,14	
stresses	10,20 62:17	96:23 97:13	types	view	workplace 14:11 23:5,19 26:8,
97:12	teaching	timecards	36:17,23 45:7 68:14	95:15	11 33:10,11 37:8
strike	35:3,12 41:2	69:9		visit	38:5 51:23 54:17
10:19 13:18 18:21	tear	times	U	5:23 88:15,16	57:12
24:22 91:23	94:21	55:23		vitae	workplaces
structures	techniques	tingling	U.S.	5:10 6:13 11:11,16	24:13
64:10 85:14	44:8	96:14	25:8,12,22	16:5 18:6 30:12	world
study	telephone	title	UIC	41:11	75:9,11 77:15
7:3 56:14	70:4 91:14,21	13:6 22:3 27:8,10	32:14,18 34:20 35:4,	vocational	worse
Stuff	ten	titles	12 41:2 43:1,14,18,	19:22 28:14,16 92:7	84:13 96:23
37:14 41:1 45:19	34:22 35:2,13,14,23	18:13	20	vocationally	wrap
subject 11:3,8	36:5 38:10 41:22	today	UIC's	52:23	39:20,21
subjective	45:14 54:12 72:10, 16,20 75:6,17 88:19	8:13 16:12 30:17	31:15	volition	write
96:2,3	89:18	36:10 52:18 70:3	ultimate	11:24 12:1 25:2,4	34:14 60:18 79:4
subpoena	term	77:20 78:5 88:22	83:1	26:17,19 29:5,8	87:13,15 89:16
93:8	42:1 80:7 94:19	89:22 95:14	ultimately 60:7	voluntarily	93:16
success	terminated	today's		10:2	writing
80:12	11:24 16:1 25:3	4:11 6:9 11:12	unable 65:23 73:13,19	voluntary	50:7
successfully	26:18 29:6	told	uncommon	43:3	written
68:2	terms	36:11,13 67:10,11,	70:11	VTMI	5:22 6:1 70:19
successor	34:13 66:14 85:24	17 69:13,20 76:8		39:24 40:23	wrote
19:1	testified	top	undergo 10:2 82:22		5:17 6:7 45:21 46:4
suffers	4:4 54:3 55:8 66:24	48:4	_	W	47:15 50:11
76:1	testify	topic	undergone		
sufficient	15:18 24:15 66:16	57:2 75:5	60:2	wait	Υ
59:2 69:11	92:4	topics	understand	27:2	ļ - <u> </u>
suggests	testifying	90:21	21:2 40:8 45:17 79:1 89:7 92:8 95:19	waive	year
9:9	55:17 85:17	total	understanding	98:2	7:23 25:5 26:15,20
summer	testimony	20:3 35:13 66:4	45:13 49:18 56:18	walks	28:23,24 29:1,9
53:4	11:5 15:7 34:1,4,8,	track	understood	38:18	35:14 43:5,21 63:1
suppose	15 36:4 40:11 47:19,	40:1,4	69:23 92:6	wanted	71:16 78:16 83:16,
15:4	20 49:7 50:19,23	tract	undertake	11:12 21:17 52:7,23	19,23 84:19
	51:1,11 52:8 54:2	77:23	57:6	70:16	years
	1	I	1 07.0	1	7:21 8:6,18,19 9:3,



24 20:2 24:24 30:5,	
24 20.2 24.24 30.5,	
12 32:4 43:11 50:15	
55:12,14 59:2,14,22 66:20 71:6,7 78:12	
66:20 71:6,7 78:12	
York	
10:0 10 10:4 15	
10.9,10 12.4,15	
10:9,10 12:4,15 13:15,21 14:19 15:1, 21	
21	
Z	
zoology 7:4	
7:4	
7.4	
I.	

