	Case 3:18-cv-05536-RJB Document	439-2	Filed 10/18/19	Page 1 of 20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	UNITED STATES WESTERN DISTRIC AT TA	Γ OF W		
 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 	ERIC KLOPMAN-BAERSELMAN, as Personal Representative for the Estate of RUDIE KLOPMAN-BAERSELMAN, deceased, Plaintiff, v. AIR & LIQUID SYSTEMS CORPORATION, et al., Defendants.	FIN. VID	SE NO. 3:18-cv-05 AL RED-LINED I EOTAPED DEPC OTA MOTOR SA	NOTICE OF DSITION OF
16	MATTERS ()F EXA	MINATION	
17	MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 1:			
18	Toyota's knowledge of hazards of asbestos before 1994.			
19	MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 2:			
20	A description of what brakes, clutches, gaskets, and heat insulators looked like on Toyota			
21	passenger vehicles in the United States between 1965 and 1994, and a general description of			
22 23	Toyota's recommended work practices to replace	e inem d	uring this same th	ne perioa.
23 24				
∠- ⊤	FINAL RED-LINED NOTICE OF VIDEOTAPED DEPO 1	SITION (DF ТОҮОТА МОТО	R SALES, U.S.A., INC

')
-		

4

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 3:

Toyota's relationship with Chilton Book Company and Haynes Publishing Group with respect to the specific Chilton and Haynes Toyota automotive manuals in Rudie Klopman-Baerselman's garage that are dated between 1965 and 2007.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 4:

Information regarding the meaning of Toyota's 2006 codes of conduct #1 and #3.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 5:

Toyota's position, subjective beliefs, and opinions about the proper and reasonable conduct of a manufacturer and seller of asbestos-containing automotive products in the United States between 1965 and 1994, without reference to privileged materials or work product.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 6:

Information regarding compensation for Toyota's designated 30(b)(6) witness(es) for

13 their work and testimony in this lawsuit.

14

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 7:

Information about the history of Toyota on its website.

16

17

18

15

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 8:

The identity of the suppliers of Toyota's asbestos-containing brakes, clutches, gaskets, and heat insulation between 1965 and 1994, including the time period (start date and end date) of such supply.

19 20

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 9:

Information regarding all material safety data sheets (MSDS) that mention asbestos
Toyota received, distributed, or is currently in possession, custody, or control of that are dated
between 1965 and 1994.

24

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 10:

The brand name, manufacturer, and supplier of the asbestos-containing brakes, clutches, gaskets, and heat insulators installed as original equipment in Rudie Klopman-Baerselman's Toyota vehicles manufactured between 1960 and 1994.

5

6

7

4

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 11:

Information about whether or not Toyota distributed asbestos-containing vehicles and replacement parts to Oregon and Washington between 1965 and 1994.

8 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 12:

Information regarding Toyota's position, statements, and recommendations regarding the importance of replacing OEM Toyota asbestos-containing parts with Toyota Genuine Parts between 1965 and 1994.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 13:

Information regarding Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association (MVMA) documents that identify the brand name, manufacturer, or supplier of the asbestos-containing brakes, clutches, gaskets, and heat insulators installed as original equipment in Rudie Klopman-Baerselman's Toyota vehicles manufactured between 1965 and 1994.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 14:

Toyota's position, belief, and opinion regarding whether Rayloc brand brakes and clutches, Bendix brand brakes, Borg Warner brand clutches, EIS brand brakes, Victor brand gaskets, and Fel-Pro brand gaskets can be used as replacement parts with Toyota vehicles between 1965 and 2002.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 15:

The time period (start date and end date) when Bendix was a manufacturer of

24

brakes for Toyota vehicles between 1965 and 1994 and any and all cautions, warnings, or 1 2 notifications regarding asbestos ever received by Toyota from Bendix.

3

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 16:

Toyota's knowledge, understanding, information, position, and opinion regarding the frequency with which the brake shoes, brake pads, clutch components, gaskets, and heat insulators in its vehicles wear out, need to be replaced, and need to be inspected, including the time period and manner in which Toyota communicated such information between 1965 and 1994. 8

9

11

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 17:

10Toyota's recommendations regarding how to properly inspect and/or remove and replace the brakes, clutches, gaskets, and heat insulators in its vehicles, including the work practices, 12 procedures, and tools involved in such work, and the time periods when Toyota recommended 13 such work practices between 1965 and 1994.

14

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 18:

15 Toyota's knowledge regarding whether removing, replacing, and/or inspecting the brakes, clutches, gaskets, and heat insulators in its vehicles creates any dust, as well as the time 16 17 period when Toyota knew this between 1965 and 1994.

18

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 19:

19 The time period (start date and end date) and manner in which Toyota recommended that 20 its customers use compressed air when working with brakes, clutches, gaskets, and/or heat insulators on its vehicles between 1965 and 2007, and the time period when Toyota discontinued 21 22 such recommendations.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 20:

24

23

The time period and manner in which Toyota recommended that its customers grind, file, 1 2 scrape, or sand the brakes, clutches, and gaskets in its automobiles between 1965 and 2017, and 3 the time period when Toyota discontinued such recommendations.

4

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 21:

5 Toyota's knowledge of the temperatures reached by the catalytic converter and/or 6 exhaust manifold areas in its vehicles between 1965 and 1992, and how those temperatures affect 7 the gasket material on such components.

8 9

10

11

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 22:

Information regarding Toyota's marketing, sale, distribution, or involvement in any way with dust suppression systems or equipment for brakes, clutches, or gaskets, including through any of its divisions, subsidiaries, distributors, or dealers between 1965 and 2017.

12

13

14

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 23:

The time period when Toyota first learned that its vehicles included components that contained asbestos.

15

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 24:

The time period when Toyota learned the laws and regulations pertaining to asbestos in 16 California, and the content of each such law and regulation, as well as any automobile certification Toyota had to obtain from California from 1958 to 1994. 18

19

17

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 25:

20 Toyota's knowledge and awareness of EPA recommendations regarding asbestos 21 between 1965 and 1994, including the EPA "Don't Blow It Video" and EPA "Guidance for 22 Preventing Asbestos Disease Among Auto Mechanics" (aka the EPA Gold Book), and any 23 actions Toyota took in response to such publications.

24

1
2
2

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 26:

The time period when and manner in which Toyota first learned that breathing asbestos dust could be hazardous to human beings.

4

5

7

8

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 27:

Information regarding the existence of Toyota facilities where mechanics performed

6 automotive repair and maintenance work in the United States between 1958 and 1994.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 28:

Toyota's knowledge of federal safety standards regarding asbestos in automotive parts,

including the time period and extent of such knowledge and awareness between 1958 and 1994.

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

9

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 29:

Toyota's membership in any and all automotive and engineering associations in Japan

12 and the United States, and the time period of such membership before 1994.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 30:

Information regarding Toyota's investigation into the hazards of asbestos between 1965 and 1994.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 31:

Information regarding Toyota's advertising and slogan, "We Really Care," used in the 1980s.

19

20

22

23

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 32:

Information regarding the earliest asbestos lawsuits filed against Toyota, including the

21 allegations, disease type, occupation, and Toyota's response thereto.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 33:

24

Toyota's knowledge regarding whether its own employees were developing asbestos related lung disease, the time period of such knowledge, the identity of such individuals, the job
 title of such individuals, and Toyota's response thereto.

4

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 34:

Information regarding any and all testing, studies, research and development Toyota
has performed or caused to be performed regarding asbestos, and the amount of money spent on
the same between 1965 and 1994.

8

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 35:

9 Any and all individuals and experts Toyota has hired to perform research and
10 development regarding safety on the asbestos-containing components of Toyota vehicles
11 between 1965 and 1994.

12

13

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 36:

Toyota's control over the words on its packaging, including Toyota's ability to provide warnings about asbestos with its products.

15

16

17

18

19

14

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 37:

Toyota's knowledge of "do-it-yourselfers" as referenced in Toyota's manuals between 1965 and 1994.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 38:

All information regarding any warnings, cautions, or notifications Toyota gave anyone

20 regarding asbestos between 1965 and 2017.

21

22

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 39:

Information regarding any recall or removal of asbestos-containing parts or vehicles

23 performed by Toyota between 1965 and 2007.

24

Case 3:18-cv-05536-RJB Document 439-2 Filed 10/18/19 Page 8 of 20

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 40:

The meaning of NOTES, CAUTIONS, and WARNINGS sections in Toyota's manuals.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 41:

Information regarding Toyota's historical and current document retention policies from 1965 to 1994.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 42:

Information regarding any writings in which Toyota has contended, stated, or indicated in any way that asbestos is hazardous or dangerous.

9

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 43:

The basis of Toyota's contention, position, and opinion, if made, that it has been scientifically proven that asbestos in automobiles is safe, without reference to privileged 2

materials or work product.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 44:

Toyota's knowledge and contentions regarding any public health or epidemiological institutions that have concluded there is no safe level of exposure to asbestos when it comes to mesothelioma risk, without reference to privileged materials or work product.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

16

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 45:

Information regarding Toyota's awareness of a single government, medical, regulatory, educational, scientific, or public health organization in the world (e.g., OSHA, EPA, American Cancer Society, World Health Organization, National Institutes of Health, IARC, etc.) that agrees with Toyota's contention, if made, that repeatedly grinding and sanding asbestoscontaining clutches and gaskets does not increase a person's risk of developing mesothelioma, without reference to privileged materials or work product.

24

4

5

6

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 46:

Information regarding any facts, documents and witnesses that support Toyota's contention that Rudie Klopman-Baerselman was exposed to asbestos in the Dutch merchant marines, including the names of all companies and entities that Toyota contends are responsible for exposing Mr. Klopman-Baerselman to asbestos in the merchant marines, to the extent known, and without reference to privileged materials or work product.

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 47:

Information regarding any companies or entities other than Toyota that Toyota contends are responsible for exposing Rudie Klopman-Baerselman to asbestos, to the extent known, and without reference to privileged materials or work product.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 48:

Information about the manner in which Toyota searched for information and documents and prepared for the topics identified in this deposition notice.

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 49:

Information regarding Toyota Motor Sales's investigation into the hazards of asbestos in

16 automobiles that began in approximately 2000.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 50:

All documents reviewed and individuals interviewed in preparation to testify as the

30(b)(6) witness for Toyota Motor Corporation in asbestos litigation.

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 51:

Toyota's positions, beliefs, and opinions regarding the accuracy of the testimony of the witnesses who have testified about Toyota in this case.

23

22

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 52:

24

1	The facts, documents, and witnesses with information supporting Toyota's affirmative
2	defenses, without reference to privileged materials or work product:
3	a) No. 1 that Plaintiff's claimed injuries and damages are the result of their or
4	Plaintiffs' decedent's comparative or contributory fault;
5	b) No. 2 that Plaintiffs' claimed injuries and damages were due to actions of third
6	parties beyond the control of TMC;
7	c) No. 11 that if Plaintiffs have incurred any injury or damage, which TMC denies,
8	TMC alleges that the risk of such injury or damage to Plaintiffs was not
9	foreseeable;
10	d) No. 13 that the state of the medical and scientific knowledge, as well as the
11	published literature and other materials reflecting the state of the medical and
12	scientific knowledge, at all times pertinent to TMC's asbestos-containing products
13	was such that TMC neither knew, nor could have known, that its asbestos-containing
14	products presented a foreseeable risk of harm to Plaintiffs or Plaintiffs'
15	decedent in the normal and expected use of the products;
16	e) No. 17 that pursuant to RCW 4.22.070, the percentage of fault that allegedly caused
17	Plaintiffs' injuries, if any, should be apportioned among the following parties or
18	entities: A. Plaintiffs for failure to use or properly use safety equipment, improper
19	use of asbestos-containing products, use of cigarettes or other tobacco products,
20	and any other factors that future discovery may disclose regarding the degree of
21	fault attributable to the Plaintiffs; B. The other named defendants in this lawsuit; C.
22	Asbestos manufacturers and/or suppliers and/or contractors not named in this
23	lawsuit whose products were present or likely to be present at any of Plaintiff's
24	

work sites; D. Asbestos manufacturers and/or suppliers and/or contractors that have filed bankruptcy petitions, to specifically include, but not limited to, Johns Manville Corporation, Celotex, Carey Canada, Eagle-Picher, H.K. Porter, Unarco Industries, Amatex Corporation, Standard Asbestos Company, Forty-Eight Insulations, Inc., and Keene Corporation and all related corporate entities of the same; E. Asbestos manufacturers and/or suppliers and/or contractors not named in this lawsuit who enter into settlement agreements or releases with the Plaintiffs; F. The employers of Plaintiffs who failed to provide a safe work environment and/or adequate warnings or instructions regarding the proper application and use of asbestos-containing products, including, when appropriate, the United States government for any military installation, naval shipyard or energy facility, and any other government entity where Plaintiffs were employed; G. Other named defendants or other entities that contributed to Plaintiffs' alleged injuries having specific factual or procedural defenses against them that bar Plaintiffs' cause of action against the defendants or entities; H. TMC reserves the right to amend the allegations of this section to, as future discovery may warrant, include additional parties or entities that may have contributed to Plaintiffs' alleged injuries; f) No. 25 that as a result of Plaintiffs' decedent's education, training and experience, they were knowledgeable of the proper use of the product and any inherent risk of any improper use of the product. Nevertheless, Plaintiffs failed to utilize the product in a manner reasonable expected of a person with their training and experience.

g) No. 38 that at all times material herein there was no known substitute for asbestos

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

FINAL RED-LINED NOTICE OF VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, U.S.A., INC. -

in the products distributed by TMC. The unavoidable composition of the products is a bar to recovery in strict liability against TMC;

h) No. 40 that Plaintiffs' alleged injuries were solely and proximately caused or contributed to by their contributory negligence and/or their acts or omissions including, but not limited to, the following: A. Plaintiffs failed to exercise ordinary care for their own safety when they knew, or should have known, of the hazards incident to their work; B. Plaintiffs failed to use appropriate protective clothing and equipment when they knew, or should have known, that the materials with which they were working might be harmful; C. Plaintiffs failed to use products distributed by TMS [sic] in the proper and intended manner and subjected such product to abnormal uses not reasonably foreseeable by TMS [sic]; D. Plaintiffs failed to advise, request or demand that her employers provide appropriate protective clothing and equipment and/or a suitable and safe workplace; E. Plaintiffs failed to heed advice and warnings concerning proper and safe working conditions and use of the materials with which they were working; F. Plaintiffs failed to use the safety equipment provided by their employers and/or failed to follow their employers' safety procedures; G. Plaintiffs habitually used tobacco; H. Plaintiffs voluntarily and knowingly assumed the risks that caused their damages, if any, therefore

MATTER OF EXAMINATION NO. 53:

General information regarding Toyota's relationship with Toyota Tsusho Corporation of Japan, Toyota Tsusho South Pacific (TTSPH), Toyota Tsusho Inc. and Asco Motors, including whether Asco Motors is a fully approved Toyota automotive distributor.

SCHEDULE OF DOCUMENTS

FINAL RED-LINED NOTICE OF VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, U.S.A., INC. -12

1

2

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 1:

All of Toyota's annual reports from 1965 to 1994 that include the word asbestos.

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 2:

Toyota's advertising and marketing materials in which it used the slogan "We Really

Care" and are dated in the 1980s.

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 3:

All communications between Toyota and Chilton Book Company and Haynes

Publishing Group that reference asbestos or compressed air between 1965 and 2007.

9

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 4:

All writings regarding Toyota's analysis of the cost and price difference between

asbestos-containing and asbestos-free automotive component parts between 1965 and 1994. 1

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 5:

Writings regarding the asbestos content of Toyota's brakes, clutches, gaskets, and heat

insulators between 1965 and 1994. 4

5

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 6:

All writings regarding the identity of Toyota's suppliers of asbestos-containing brakes,

7 clutches, gaskets, heat insulators in Toyota vehicles between 1965 and 1994.

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 7:

All material safety data sheets (MSDS) Toyota received, distributed, or is currently in

20 possession, custody, or control of that reference asbestos between 1965 and 1994.

21

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 8:

22 All writings regarding the brand name, supplier, and distributor of each OEM asbestos-23 containing component (e.g., brakes, clutches, gaskets, heat insulators) of the specific make,

24

model, and year of each Toyota vehicle identified at deposition by Eric Klopman-Baerselman,
 Thomas Klopman-Baerselman, Steven Klopman-Baerselman, Lorene Shoell, Michael Heyer,
 and Ray Smith in this case.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 9:

All Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association (MVMA) documents pertaining to brakes, clutches, gaskets, heat insulators in Rudie Klopman-Baerselman's Toyota vehicles for model years between 1965 and 1994.

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 10:

All writings in Toyota's possession, custody, or control that mention Bendix brakes associated with Toyota vehicles between 1965 and 1994.

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 11:

All writings in which Toyota recommended that its customers grind, file, scrape, or sand
the brakes, clutches, and gaskets associated with Rudie Klopman-Baerselman's Toyota vehicles
for model years between 1965 and 1994.

15

16

17

18

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 12:

All writings in Toyota's possession, custody, or control relating to Toyota's marketing, sale, distribution, or involvement in any way with dust suppression systems for brakes, clutches, or gaskets, including through any of its divisions, subsidiaries, distributors, or dealers between 1965 and 1994.

- 19
- 20

21

22

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 13:

All writings, if any, documenting when Toyota first learned that breathing asbestos dust could be hazardous to human beings.

- 23
- **DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 14:**

24

All of the literature Toyota reviewed during its investigation into the hazards of asbestos that began in 2000, including any and all literature that supports Toyota's contention, position, or opinion that the asbestos in automotive products is safe, without reference to privileged materials or work product. 4

5

6

7

1

2

3

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 15:

All literature and publications of any kind in Toyota's possession, custody, or control that Toyota considered in concluding that the asbestos in automotive friction products is safe, without reference to privileged materials or work product.

9

8

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 16:

10 All writings regarding any and all testing, studies, research and development Toyota has 11 performed or caused to be performed regarding asbestos between 1965 and 1994, without 12

reference to privileged materials or work product.

13

14

15

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 17:

All writings regarding any and all individuals and experts Toyota hired, if any, to perform research and development on the asbestos-containing components of Toyota vehicles between 1965 and 1994.

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

16

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 18:

All writings regarding any warnings, cautions, or notifications Toyota gave anyone regarding asbestos, including the original and legible copies of said warnings, between 1965 and 1994.

21

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 19:

All writings in which Toyota has contended, stated, implied, or indicated in any way that
 asbestos is hazardous, dangerous or harmful, including to the environment, to human beings, to
 mechanics, to families, to wives, or to children.

4

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 20:

Any and all writings regarding Toyota's sale, marketing, or distribution of equipment to
minimize, clean, wet down or vacuum asbestos dust, brake dust, clutch dust, gasket dust, or any
other kind of dust.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 21:

All writings in which Toyota references the EPA Gold Book/Guidance for Preventing Asbestos Disease Among Auto Mechanics.

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 22:

All writings that support any contention by Toyota that Rudie Klopman-Baerselman was exposed to asbestos in the Dutch merchant marines or at Tektronix, without reference to privileged materials or work product.

15

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 23:

All writings supporting Toyota's contention that any companies or entities other than
Toyota are responsible for exposing Rudie Klopman-Baerselman to asbestos, without reference
to privileged materials or work product.

19

20

22

23

DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 24:

The writings supporting each of Toyota's below affirmative defenses, without reference

21 to privileged materials or work product:.

a) No. 1 that Plaintiff's claimed injuries and damages are the result of their or

Plaintiffs' decedent's comparative or contributory fault;

24

Case 3:18-cv-05536-RJB Document 439-2 Filed 10/18/19 Page 17 of 20

b) No. 2 that Plaintiffs' claimed injuries and damages were due to actions of third parties beyond the control of TMS;

c) No. 4 that Plaintiffs' claimed injuries and damages are the direct and proximate result of knowing assumption of risk;

d) No. 5 that Plaintiffs have failed to join a necessary and/or indispensable party.

e) No. 7 that Plaintiffs' damages, if any, were caused by alteration and/or unintended use and/or misuse of the product;

f) No. 8 that if Plaintiffs have incurred any injury or damage, which TMS denies,TMS alleges that the risk of such injury or damage to Plaintiffs was not foreseeable;

g) No. 10 that the state of the medical and scientific knowledge, as well as the
published literature and other materials reflecting the state of the medical and
scientific knowledge, at all times pertinent to TMS's asbestos-containing products
was such that TMS neither knew, nor could have known, that its asbestos-containing
products presented a foreseeable risk of harm to Plaintiffs or Plaintiffs'

decedent in the normal and expected use of the products;

h) No. 12 that pursuant to RCW 4.22.070, the percentage of fault that allegedly caused
Plaintiffs' injuries, if any, should be apportioned among the following parties or
entities: A. Plaintiffs for failure to use or properly use safety equipment, improper
use of asbestos-containing products, use of cigarettes or other tobacco products,
and any other factors that future discovery may disclose regarding the degree of
fault attributable to the Plaintiffs; B. The other named defendants in this lawsuit; C.
Asbestos manufacturers and/or suppliers and/or contractors not named in this

lawsuit whose products were present or likely to be present at any of Plaintiff's work sites; D. Asbestos manufacturers and/or suppliers and/or contractors that have filed bankruptcy petitions, to specifically include, but not limited to, Johns Manville Corporation, Celotex, Carey Canada, Eagle-Picher, H.K. Porter, Unarco Industries, Amatex Corporation, Standard Asbestos Company, Forty-Eight Insulations, Inc., and Keene Corporation and all related corporate entities of the same; E. Asbestos manufactures and/or suppliers and/or contractors not named in this lawsuit who enter into settlement agreements or releases with the Plaintiffs; F. The employers of Plaintiffs who failed to provide a safe work environment and/or adequate warnings or instructions regarding the proper application and use of asbestos-containing products, including, when appropriate, the United States government for any military installation, naval shipyard or energy facility, and any other government entity where Plaintiffs were employed; G. Other named defendants or other entities that contributed to Plaintiffs' alleged injuries having specific factual or procedural defenses against them that bar Plaintiffs' cause of action against the defendants or entities; H. TMS reserves the right to amend the allegations of this section to, as future discovery may warrant, include additional parties or entities that may have contributed to Plaintiffs' alleged injuries; i) No. 20 that as a result of Plaintiffs' decedent's education, training and experience, they were knowledgeable of the proper use of the product and any inherent risk of any improper use of the product. Nevertheless, Plaintiffs failed to utilize the product in a manner reasonable expected of a person with their training and experience;

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

FINAL RED-LINED NOTICE OF VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, U.S.A., INC. -

j) No. 25 that at all times material herein there was no known substitute for asbestos in the products distributed by TMS. The unavoidable composition of the products is a bar to recovery in strict liability against TMS;

k) No. 27 that Plaintiffs' alleged injuries were solely and proximately caused or contributed to by their contributory negligence and/or their acts or omissions including, but not limited to, the following: A. Plaintiffs failed to exercise ordinary care for their own safety when they knew, or should have known, of the hazards incident to their work; B. Plaintiffs failed to use appropriate protective clothing and equipment when they knew, or should have known, that the materials with which they were working might be harmful; C. Plaintiffs failed to use products distributed by TMS in the proper and intended manner and subjected such product to abnormal uses not reasonably foreseeable by TMS; D. Plaintiffs failed to advise, request or demand that her employers provide appropriate protective clothing and equipment and/or a suitable and safe workplace; E. Plaintiffs failed to heed advice and warnings concerning proper and safe working conditions and use of the materials with which they were working; F. Plaintiffs failed to use the safety equipment provided by their employers and/or failed to follow their employers' safety procedures; G. Plaintiffs habitually used tobacco; H. Plaintiffs voluntarily and knowingly assumed the risks that caused their damages, if any, therefore barring this action and/or reducing their recovery; and I. TMS reserves the right to add additional acts or omissions by Plaintiffs as discovery may warrant; 1) No. 29 that Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' decedent were not injured by products for

FINAL RED-LINED NOTICE OF VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, U.S.A., INC. - 19

which TMS is responsible. The asbestos, if any, contained in said products was not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

1	harmful in the amounts, if any, expected to be released, was locked in, encapsulated
2	and firmly bound so that it did not release fibers sufficient to pose any health
3	hazard;
4	m) No. 33 that at all times since its enactment, TMS fully complied with the
5	requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) and the rules and
6	regulations promulgated thereunder; and
7	n) No. 34 that complete and adequate instructions and warnings accompanied the
8	product and were given to purchasers and, therefore, TMS owned no additional
9	duty to Plaintiffs or Plaintiffs decedent.
10	DOCUMENT REQUEST CATEGORY NO. 25:
11	If Toyota has withheld any document based on a claim of privilege, please produce a
12	privilege log identifying all such documents.
13	
14	DATED this day of October 2019.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
	FINAL RED-LINED NOTICE OF VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, U.S.A., INC 20