

1 MR. VANCE: And, you participated in those revisions?

2 BRUCE J. KELMAN: Well, of course, as one of the authors.

3 MR. VANCE: All right. And, isn't it true that the Manhattan Institute paid GlobalTox
4 \$40,000 to make revisions in that statement?"

5 KELMAN: That is one of the most ridiculous statements I have ever heard.

6 MR. VANCE: Well, you admitted it in the Killian deposition [*sic bench trial*], sir.

7 BRUCE J. KELMAN: No. I did not. (Typd.Opn.pp.4)

8 **(Omitted From the 2006 & 2010 Opinions):**

9 MR. VANCE: Your Honor, may I approach. Would you read into the record, please,
10 the highlighted parts of pages 905 and 906 of the trial transcript in that case.

11 MR. KECLE: Your Honor, I would ask that Dr. Kelman be provided the rest of the
12 transcript under the rule of completeness. He's only been given two pages.

13 JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript?

14 MR. KECLE: I do not.

15 MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a –

16 JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have?

17 MR. VANCE: I have the entire transcript from pages –

18 JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.

19 MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor.

20 JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)

21 **(Back In The 2006 & 2010 Opinions)**

22 MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that
23 transcript, sir?

24 MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your
25 company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000
26 for it."

27 **ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S**
28 **UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE,**
"altered his under oath statements"

29 All courts in the case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's
30 unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "*Upon*
31 *viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a*
32 *case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand.*"
33 .Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.
34 Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in
35 promoting false science in US public health policy for the purpose of misleading US courts.

1 As evidenced by the transcript of Mr. Kelman's Oregon testimony, once forced to
2 discuss the two papers together, he was trying to say they were not connected while having
3 to admit they were.

4 (from Mrs. Kramer's Appellate Brief of 2009)

5 "Declaration of Kramer submitted to the courts, July 2005: He [Kelman] went on to
6 say GlobalTox was paid for the 'lay translation' of the ACOEM Statement. He
7 then altered to say 'They're two different papers, two different activities.' He
8 then flipped back again by saying, 'We would have never been contacted to do a
9 translation of a document that had already been prepared, if it hadn't already
10 been prepared.' By this statement he verified they were not two different papers,
11 merely two versions of the same paper. And that is what this lawsuit is really all
12 about.

13 The rambling attempted explanation of the two papers' relationship coupled with
14 the filing of this lawsuit intended to silence me, have merely spotlighted Kelman's
15 strong desire to have the ACOEM Statement and the Manhattan Institute Version
16 portrayed as two separate works by esteemed scientists.

17 In reality, they are authored by Kelman and Hardin, the principals of a corporation
18 called GlobalTox, Inc. – a corporation that generates much income denouncing the
19 illnesses of families, office workers, teachers and children with the purpose of
20 limiting the financial liability of others. One paper is an edit of the other and both
21 are used together to propagate biased thought based on a scant scientific
22 foundation.

23 Together, these papers are the core of an elaborate sham that has been perpetrated
24 on our courts, our medical community and the American public. Together, they are
25 the vehicle used to give financial interests of some indecent precedence over the
26 lives of others.'(Appellant Appendix Vol.1 Ex.8:157-158) (Response to Court's
27 Query, pp.10-11)"¹

28 ¹ The evidence in the case file shows that the US Chamber's Mold Position Statement cites false
authorship of being co-authored by a physician employed by the Regents of the University of
California, now retired. In reality, the paper was only authored by Bruce Kelman & Bryan Hardin of
Veritox – two PhD's with no background in mold research. The billing records, canceled checks
made out only to GlobalTox and under oath testimony of the UCLA physician stating he did not
author the US Chamber Mold Statement are in the files of this case and the files of the first case; in
which the Appellate court framed Mrs. Kramer for libel for the words, "*altered his under oath*
statements". The evidence on record also shows the Appellate Court was aware when they rendered
their crafty 2010 opinion that the US Chamber Mold Statement had recently been submitted by a DC
PAC via an Amicus to lend credibility to Mr. Kelman's expert defense opinions. It is a mold case in
AZ involving two deceased newborns & a \$25M Travelers' Insurance policy. They knew that IF they
acknowledged the subject paper of Mrs. Kramer's writing, the US Chamber Mold Statement cited
false authorship, Mr. Kelman's expert opinion on behalf of Travelers's would have been discredited.