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	
 \$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) (Omitted 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. 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. JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript. MR. KACLE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a – JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have? MR. VANCE: How the entire transcript from pages – JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript. MR. VANCE: The appy to give it to him, Your Honor, JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26) (Back In The 2006 & 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.". ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered his under oath statements" 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." Since July of 2005, she has provided never		
 KELMAN. That is one of the most indication statements if have even head. 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) (Omitted 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 most new pages. JUDGE VANDYKE: Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a – JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have? MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a – 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. 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.". ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered his under oath statements" 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." 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 stable in the s		\$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 & 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)
 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. 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.". ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, "altered his under oath statements" 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." 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 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	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	
 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. 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.". <u>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, <i>"altered his under oath statements"</i></u> All courts in the case of <u>Kelman & 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 of ACOEM to the US Chamber in 	8	
 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. 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.". <u>ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, <i>"altered his under oath statements"</i></u> All courts in the case of <u>Kelman & 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 <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 	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?
 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. 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.". <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> All courts in the case of <u>Kelman & 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 of ACOEM to the US Chamber in 	12	1 1 0
 (Back In The 2006 & 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.". <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> All courts in the case of <u>Kelman & 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 of ACOEM to the US Chamber in 	13	MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor.
 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.". <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> All courts in the case of <u>Kelman & 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 of ACOEM to the US Chamber in 	14	JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)
 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.". <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> All courts in the case of <u>Kelman & 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 of ACOEM to the US Chamber in 	15	
 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.". <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> All courts in the case of <u>Kelman & 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 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	16	
 for it.". ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE, <i>"altered his under oath statements"</i> 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." 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 	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 & 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		
 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 of ACOEM to the US Chamber in 		All courts in the case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's
 <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 	23	unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "Upon
 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 	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

As evidenced by the transcript of Mr. Kelman's Oregon testimony, once forced to discuss the two papers together, he was trying to say they were not connected while having 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 say GlobalTox was paid for the 'lay translation' of the ACOEM Statement. He then altered to say 'They're two different papers, two different activities.' He then flipped back again by saying, 'We would have never been contacted to do a translation of a document that had already been prepared, if it hadn't already been prepared.' By this statement he verified they were not two different papers, merely two versions of the same paper. And that is what this lawsuit is really all about.
- The rambling attempted explanation of the two papers' relationship coupled with the filing of this lawsuit intended to silence me, have merely spotlighted Kelman's strong desire to have the ACOEM Statement and the Manhattan Institute Version portrayed as two separate works by esteemed scientists.
- In reality, they are authored by Kelman and Hardin, the principals of a corporation called GlobalTox, Inc. a corporation that generates much income denouncing the illnesses of families, office workers, teachers and children with the purpose of limiting the financial liability of others. <u>One paper is an edit of the other and both are used together to propagate biased thought based on a scant scientific foundation.</u>
- Together, these papers are the core of an elaborate sham that has been perpetrated on our courts, our medical community and the American public. Together, they are the vehicle used to give financial interests of some indecent precedence over the lives of others.'(Appellant Appendix Vol.1 Ex.8:157-158) (Response to Court's Query, pp.10-11)"¹
- 20 21

1

2

3

The evidence in the case file shows that the US Chamber's Mold Position Statement cites false 22 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 23 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 24 author the US Chamber Mold Statement are in the files of this case and the files of the first case; in 25 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 26 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 27 AZ involving two deceased newborns & a \$25M Travelers' Insurance policy. They knew that IF they 28 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.