The transcript of the Oregon trial provides the evidence that Mr. Kelman was attempting to say the two medico-legal policy papers were not connected (in setting policy which aids to provide undue credibility to his opinion when serving as a professional defense witness in mold litigation). The transcript shows that at the same time, he had to admit their close connection. This altering and obfuscating testimony transpired after Mr. Kelman attempted to shut down the line of questioning of the two papers' dubious origins and their close relationship by shouting *"ridiculous"* when ask about the involvement of think-tank money.

Mr. Kelman was forced to discuss the two medico-legal policy papers together only after a prior testimony of his from Arizona (2004) was permitted into the 2005 Oregon mold trial over the defense attorney's objection. All courts overseeing the libel case of <u>Kelman &</u> <u>GlobalTox v. Kramer</u>, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation that this is why she used the phrase, "altered his under oath statements" to describe Mr. Kelman's obfuscating and flip flopping testimony of February 18, 2005. <u>The courts then crafted their</u> <u>opinions to make Mrs. Kramer's writing in question appear to have made an allegation of</u> <u>perjury that it did not make</u>.

## HOW THE SAN DIEGO COURTS FRAMED A US CITIZEN FOR LIBEL OVER A WRITING IMPACTING PUBLIC HEALTH AND BILLIONS OF INSURANCE INDUSTRY DOLLARS

## THE 2006 & 2010 APPELLATE OPINIONS OMITTED FOURTEEN KEY LINES FROM THE MIDDLE OF MR. KELMAN'S TESTIMONY IN OREGON

In both the 2006 anti-SLAPP Appellate Opinion and the "reviewing" 2010 Appellate Opinion, fourteen key lines were deleted from the middle of the Oregon case transcript. This completely changed the color of Mr. Kelman's testimony on February 18, 2005. It made it appear that Mr. Kelman willingly discussed the connection of the US Chamber Mold Statement to that of ACOEM's; aiding to make Mrs. Kramer's accurate description of "*altered his under oath statements*" appear false. From the actual transcript illustrating the 14 key lines the Appellate Court omitted from the transcript in their opinions.

1

1       MR. VANCE: And, you participated in those revisions?         2       BRUCE J. KELMAN: Well, of course, as one of the authors.         2       MR. VANCE: All right. And, isn't it true that the Manhattan Institute paid GlobalTox \$40,000 to make revisions in that statement?"         3       KELMAN: That is one of the most ridiculous statements I have ever heard.         4       MR. VANCE: Well, you admitted it in the Killian deposition [ <i>sic bench trial</i> ], sir.         5       BRUCE J. KELMAN: No. I did not. (Typd.Opn.pp.4)         6       (Omitted From the 2006 & 2010 Opinions):         7       MR. VANCE: Your Honor, may I approach. Would you read into the record, please, the highlighted parts of pages 905 and 906 of the trial transcript in that case.         8       MR. KECLE: Your Honor, I would ask that Dr. Kelman be provide the rest of the transcript under the rule of completeness. He's only been given two pages.         9       JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript?         10       MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a –         11       JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.         12       MR. VANCE: Thave the entire transcript from pages –         13       MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir?         14       JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta.pp.26)         15       (Back In The 2006 & 2010 Opinions) <td< th=""><th></th><th></th></td<>		
BRUCE J. KELMAN: Well, of course, as one of the authors.         MR. VANCE: All right. And, isn't it rue that the Manhattan Institute paid GlobalTox \$40,000 to make revisions in that statement?"         KELMAN: That is one of the most ridiculous statements I have ever heard.         MR. VANCE: Well, you admitted it in the Killian deposition [ <i>sic bench trial</i> ], sir.         BRUCE J. KELMAN: No. I did not. (Typd.Opn.pp.4)         Gunitted From the 2006 & 2010 Opinions):         MR. VANCE: Your Honor, may I approach. Would you read into the record, please, the highlighted parts of pages 905 and 906 of the trial transcript in that case.         MR. KECLE: Your Honor, I would ask that Dr. Kelman be provided the rest of the transcript under the rule of completeness. He's only been given two pages.         JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript?         MR. KECLE: I do not.         MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a –         JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.         MR. VANCE: Thave the entire transcript from pages –         JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.         MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript.         MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript.         MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript.         MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript.         MR. KELMAN: "And, th	1	
<ul> <li>\$40,000 to make revisions in that statement?"         KELMAN: That is one of the most ridiculous statements I have ever heard.         MR. VANCE: Well, you admitted it in the Killian deposition [sic bench trial], sir.         BRUCE J. KELMAN: No. I did not. (Typd.Opn.pp.4)     </li> <li>(Omitted From the 2006 &amp; 2010 Opinions):</li> <li>MR. VANCE: Your Honor, may I approach. Would you read into the record, please, the highlighted parts of pages 905 and 906 of the trial transcript in that case.     </li> <li>MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I would ask that Dr. Kelman be provided the rest of the transcript under the rule of completeness. He's only been given two pages.</li> <li>JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript.</li> <li>MR. KACLE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a –</li> <li>JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have?</li> <li>MR. VANCE: How the entire transcript from pages –</li> <li>JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.</li> <li>MR. VANCE: The appy to give it to him, Your Honor, JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)</li> <li>(Back In The 2006 &amp; 2010 Opinions)</li> <li>MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir?</li> <li>MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".</li> <li>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered his under oath statements"</li> <li>All courts in the case of Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>KELMAN. That is one of the most indication statements if have even head.</li> <li>MR. VANCE: Well, you admitted it in the Killian deposition [<i>sic bench trial</i>], sir. BRUCE J. KELMAN: No. I did not. (Typd.Opn.pp.4)</li> <li>(Omitted From the 2006 &amp; 2010 Opinions): MR. VANCE: Your Honor, may I approach. Would you read into the record, please, the highlighted parts of pages 905 and 906 of the trial transcript in that case. MR. KECLE: Your Honor, I would ask that Dr. Kelman be provided the rest of the transcript under the rule of completeness. He's only been given two pages. JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript most new pages. JUDGE VANDYKE: Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a –</li> <li>JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have? MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a –</li> <li>JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.</li> <li>MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor. JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)</li> <li>(Back In The 2006 &amp; 2010 Opinions) MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir? MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".</li> <li>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered his under oath statements"</li> <li>All courts in the case of Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in the stable in the s</li></ul>		\$40,000 to make revisions in that statement?"
6       (Omitted From the 2006 & 2010 Opinions):         7       MR. VANCE: Your Honor, may I approach. Would you read into the record, please, the highlighted parts of pages 905 and 906 of the trial transcript in that case.         8       MR. KECLE: Your Honor, I would ask that Dr. Kelman be provided the rest of the transcript under the rule of completeness. He's only been given two pages.         9       JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript?         10       MR. KECLE: I do not.         11       MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a –         11       JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have?         12       MR. VANCE: I have the entire transcript from pages –         12       JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.         13       MR. VANCE: Vour Honor, Jupges do you have?         14       MR. VANCE: I have the entire transcript.         15       MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir?         16       (Back In The 2006 & 2010 Opinions)         17       MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".         18       ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered his under oath statements"         20       UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered his under oath		
MR. VANCE: Your Honor, may I approach. Would you read into the record, please, the highlighted parts of pages 905 and 906 of the trial transcript in that case.         MR. KECLE: Your Honor, I would ask that Dr. Kelman be provided the rest of the transcript under the rule of completeness. He's only been given two pages.         JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript?         MR. KECLE: I do not.         MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a –         JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have?         MR. VANCE: I have the entire transcript from pages –         JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.         MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor.         JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)         (Back In The 2006 & 2010 Opinions)         MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".         MINMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, <u>''altered his under oath statements''</u> All courts in the case of <u>Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer</u> , suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."         Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.         Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection o	5	BRUCE J. KELMAN: No. I did not. (Typd.Opn.pp.4)
<ul> <li>the highlighted parts of pages 905 and 906 of the trial transcript in that case.</li> <li>MR. KECLE: Your Honor, I would ask that Dr. Kelman be provided the rest of the transcript under the rule of completeness. He's only been given two pages.</li> <li>JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript?</li> <li>MR. KECLE: I do not.</li> <li>MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a –</li> <li>JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have?</li> <li>MR. VANCE: I have the entire transcript from pages –</li> <li>JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.</li> <li>MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)</li> <li>(Back In The 2006 &amp; 2010 Opinions)</li> <li>MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir?</li> <li>MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".</li> <li>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered his under oath statements"</li> <li>All courts in the case of Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in the case of with the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in the case of with the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in the case of the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in the case of the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in the case of universe mathematica and the connection of ACOEM to the US Chamb</li></ul>	6	- · · ·
b       transcript under the rule of completeness. He's only been given two pages.         9       JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript?         10       MR. KECLE: I do not.         MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a –         11       JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have?         12       MR. VANCE: I have the entire transcript from pages –         13       JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.         14       MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor.         14       JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)         15       (Back In The 2006 & 2010 Opinions)         16       transcript, sir?         17       MR. KANN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".         18       ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered bis under oath statements"         20       All courts in the case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."         26       Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.         27	7	
<ul> <li>JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript? MR. KECLE: I do not. MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a – JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have? MR. VANCE: I have the entire transcript from pages – JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript. MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor. JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)</li> <li>(Back In The 2006 &amp; 2010 Opinions) MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir? MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".</li> <li><u>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, <i>"altered his under oath statements"</i></u></li> <li>All courts in the case of <u>Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer</u>, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in</li> </ul>	8	
<ul> <li>MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a – JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have?</li> <li>MR. VANCE: I have the entire transcript from pages – JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.</li> <li>MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor. JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)</li> <li>(Back In The 2006 &amp; 2010 Opinions) MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir?</li> <li>MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".</li> <li><u>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, <i>"altered his under oath statements"</i></u></li> <li>All courts in the case of <u>Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer</u>, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a</li> <li><i>case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand.</i>"</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in</li> </ul>	9	JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript?
11       JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have?         12       MR. VANCE: I have the entire transcript from pages –         13       MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor.         14       JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.         13       MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor.         14       JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)         15       (Back In The 2006 & 2010 Opinions)         MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir?         17       MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".         19       ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered his under oath statements"         21       MI courts in the case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."         26       Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.         27       Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in the first of the true for the sentence.	10	
12       JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.         13       MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor.         14       JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)         15       (Back In The 2006 & 2010 Opinions)         16       transcript, sir?         17       MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir?         17       MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".         19       ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered his under oath statements"         20       UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered his under oath statements"         21       All courts in the case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a         25       case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."         26       .Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.         27       Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in	11	JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have?
<ul> <li>MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor. JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)</li> <li>(Back In The 2006 &amp; 2010 Opinions) MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir?</li> <li>MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".</li> <li><u>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S</u> <u>UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE.</u> <u>"altered his under oath statements"</u></li> <li>All courts in the case of <u>Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer</u>, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in</li> </ul>	12	1 1 0
<ul> <li>(Back In The 2006 &amp; 2010 Opinions) MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir? MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".</li> <li><u>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S</u> <u>UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE,</u> <u>"altered his under oath statements"</u></li> <li>All courts in the case of <u>Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer</u>, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a</li> <li>case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in</li> </ul>	13	MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor.
<ul> <li>MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that transcript, sir?</li> <li>MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".</li> <li><u>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S</u></li> <li><u>UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE,</u></li> <li><u>"altered his under oath statements"</u></li> <li>All courts in the case of <u>Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer</u>, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's</li> <li>unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon</li> <li>viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a</li> <li>case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in</li> </ul>	14	JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)
<ul> <li>transcript, sir?</li> <li>MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".</li> <li><u>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S</u></li> <li><u>UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE,</u></li> <li><u>"altered his under oath statements"</u></li> <li>All courts in the case of <u>Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer</u>, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's</li> <li>unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon</li> <li>viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a</li> <li>case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in</li> </ul>	15	
<ul> <li>MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000 for it.".</li> <li><u>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S</u> <u>UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE,</u> <u>"altered his under oath statements"</u></li> <li>All courts in the case of <u>Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer</u>, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr. Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in the alternation of a case in Arizona in the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in the case of the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in the case of the sentence in the case of the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in the case of t</li></ul>	16	
<ul> <li>for it.".</li> <li>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S</li> <li>UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE,</li> <li><i>"altered his under oath statements"</i></li> <li>All courts in the case of Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's</li> <li>unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon</li> <li>viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a</li> <li>case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in</li> </ul>	17	MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your
19       ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S         20       UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE,         21       "altered his under oath statements"         22       All courts in the case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's         23       unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon         24       viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a         25       case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."         26       .Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.         27       Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in	18	
ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S         20       UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE,         21       "altered his under oath statements"         22       All courts in the case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's         23       unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon         24       viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a         25       case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."         26       .Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.         27       Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in		
21 22 All courts in the case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's 23 unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon 24 viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a 25 case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand." 26 .Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr. 27 Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in		
All courts in the case of <u>Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer</u> , suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, " <i>Upon</i> <i>viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a</i> <i>case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand.</i> " Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr. Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in		
<ul> <li>viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a</li> <li>case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in</li> </ul>		All courts in the case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's
<ul> <li><i>case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand.</i>"</li> <li>Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in</li> </ul>	23	unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon
<ul> <li>26 Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.</li> <li>27 Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in</li> </ul>	24	viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a
27 Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in	25	case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand."
	26	.Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.
28 promoting false science in US public health policy for the purpose of misleading US courts.	27	Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in
	28	promoting false science in US public health policy for the purpose of misleading US courts.

П