to give you a moment, Mr. Foreperson and Jurors 2 and 3, to change seats actually. So that you can see better.

If you would do that for me. Then we'll proceed to hear Ms. Zois' closing.

Mr. Foreperson, go ahead and move down as well.

I don't think it really matters if you're seated in order. As long as you're seated clustered so that we can see the TV so you're not peering over the end of the box.

Everybody comfortable? All right. Thank you.
All right. Go ahead, Counsel.

MS. ZOIS: May it please the Court.

## CLOSING ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS

MS. ZOIS: Since this is the first time I've had an opportunity to address you directly I wanted to make sure that I thanked you all on behalf of the Allen family. They've waited three and half years to get answers in this case. And I knew that you all have jobs and families that you're taking time away from them to be here to listen to Dennis Allen's story. And so for that we're very grateful.

You might be wondering how it is that you get so lucky to be selected for this jury. Luck probably didn't have a whole lot to do with it. Fate maybe. But it's because you're a member of this community. It's

because you have a driver's licences in Baltimore City or you're registered to vote in Baltimore City. And cases like this are decided by members of the community because they affect the community.

The other job that you're going to have to do is you're going to have be the finders of fact in this case. You've heard two sides of this story. You all are the ones that decide what the facts are in this case.

Once you decide what the facts are you're going to have to apply the law to it. Her Henor gave you all the instructions on the law. One of the ones that I want to point out right new is the burden of preef because a lot of people come in and they're little bit confused about what that means.

Most of the time people think well the burden of proof is I have to be beyond a reasonable doubt 100 percent. But in a givil case it's not like that. In a civil case the plaintiff we have the burden of proof it

has to be more likely than not. It has to be 51 percent to 49 percent. It doesn't have to be clear and convincing. Nobody has to be positive. You don't have to be absolutely sure. It's more likely than not. What the plaintiff is saying makes a little more sense than what the defense is saying.

.3

The other job that you're going to have when you're back there is you're going to have to explain to each other why it is you feel about the facts in the case. So you're going to have to be able to support your position if someone says, hmm, I don't know if Kayexalate causes intestinal necrosis. You're going to have to be able to respond to that.

So what I'm going to try and do is I am not going to marshal the evidence. I am not going to go through all the evidence in this case. We'd be here for another eight days if I tried to do that. And I'm not going to do that.

So what I am going to do though is I'm going to talk about the things that I think you all are probably going to be struggling with back in the jury deliberation room. And that means I'm probably going to leave a lot out. Which means I have to believe some things were just so clear that I probably don't even need to bring it up right now.

So I'm going to start with some of the things that the defense said in their opening statement. I kind of -- it was a long time ago. And I want to remind you of some of the things that they said.

They said ~~ I took careful notes. Dr. Burks used his very best efforts. He should be credited for saving Dennis Allen's life. He followed the standard order set. He took prompt action. He used every avenue possible in this case.

So the first thing that I want to do with you all is walk through how did defendant treat Mr. Allen.

And I'm going to start on the morning of the 18th.

Dr. Burks had an order in to have Mr. Allen's blood drawn at 4:30 in the morning. That was the right thing to do. Because we know that Mr. Allen didn't have hemodialysis the day before. He had it on the 13th, the 14th, the 15th, the 16th. He skipped a day. So his labs that morning were going to be really important because he

didn't have hemodialysis the day before.

And Dr. Burks testified that it's his practice when he gets to work that day he looks at the labs. Well that makes sense because you've get all these patients you need to treat. You need to know what their labs say so you know what to do for them later that day. Because a lot of what a doctor does is going to depend on what those numbers say on the labs.

So what happened? We talked about why the labs are important but -- we know the order was made to get the labs drawn. And for some reason the heapital chart says that the order was completed. Where are the labs? We haven't seen the labs that were drawn at 4:30 in the morning.

But what we do know ~-

MR. SHAW: I object to this whole line of questioning -- I mean of argument, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MS. ZOIS: But what we do know is that Demetrius Jones came in here and she told you she didn't take his labs that morning. And she didn't take his labs that morning because she was told by the nurse that he was having dialysis done that day.

MR. SHAW: Objection, Your Henor.

MS. ZOIS: So they didn't need take the labs,

THE COURT: Overruled.

MS. ZOIS: So we know the labs weren't taken.

But what happens next? I'm fast-forwarding a little bit. After Mr. Allen is being transferred to the ICU for emergency surgery with a dead colon Dr. Burks goes into his chart and writes a four page summary. Which I sincerely doubt is not in that jury extract.

And he writes "Laboratory data is unavailable as the patient had refused his labs in the morning."

MR. SHAW: Objection, Your Honor.

MS. ZOIS: What we know is --

THE COURT: Overruled.

MS. ZOIS: -- Dr. Burks didn't know what the labs were at seven, eight, nine, 10, 11, 12.

Dr. Kaplan said something interesting. He said, you know, Cynthia Allen was in the room with him the whole time that night. And she was by his side this entire hospitalization, by the way. And she brought it to the nurse's attention that she was looking at the numbers on the monitor and she went out and get the nurse.

And there's a note at 12 o'clock that does say numbers are a little off. And what happened after that is Mr. Allen went into bardycardia. He started to have a life threatening event with his heart. Because his

potassium levels had gotten so out of whack and had been allowed to get so high that it was impacting his heart.

So I would suggest that a doctor using his best efforts in taking every possible avenue and using everything available to him would have followed up on those labs that morning ==

MR. SHAW: Objection. Move to strike, Your Honor.

MS. ZOIS: -- would have figured out earlier -THE COURT: Can Counsel -- Counsel, approach.

(Counsel approached the bench, and the
following ensued:)

THE COURT: So >=

MR. SHAW: I object. There was absolutely no evidence that it was a breach of the standard of care by Dr. Burks that morning. No evidence from anybody.

So for her to make this suggestion that he wasn't using his best care is implicating and implying that he breached the standard of care.

It's tetally inappropriate. And there's no == and there's no testimony beyond that that any failure to get the labs cost him injury. There's no expert opinion on that. So there's not expert opinion to buttress this == to support this. It's objectionable.

I wa I we I move for a mistrial on it, Your

Honor.

MS. ZOIS: This is -- I am incredibly -- I'm not even sure where to start.

I am not going to -- thank you, Your Honor. I am not going to argue that his failure to check the labs was a breach of the standard of care.

THE COURT: So where are we headed?

MS. ZOIS: What are we doing? We're showing that when defense counsel claims that this doctor used every effort possible and did everything he could do and should be credited of saving his life but that is incorrect. And that even by the defendant's own testimony he said he was too busy with other patients to check the labs.

So it goes to their defense in the case. And it goes to the defendant's credibility when he takes the stand and says I did everything possible. I was trying to (indiscernible at 4:04:59).

I mean, none of what I have said has suggested that this was a breach of the standard of care. But it's all factually accurate pieces of what happened. And that this testimony that the experts didn't say, including Dr. Seneth (phonetic), that had treatment been initiated earlier the cardiac event would have never occurred.

So there has been expert testimony to that

effect. 1 MR. SHAW: The testimony --2 MS. ZOIS: And I --3 I'm sorry. Go ahead. 4 MR. SHAW: MS. ZOIS: Frankly, I find the objections 5 6 (indiscernible at 4:05:31). I -- this is beyond obstructive. It's argument. It's closing. 7 MR. SHAW: It's based upon improper -- it's 8 based on something that's not in evidence. I am very 9 reluctant to object during closing. But when Plaintiffs' 10 Counsel stands up in front of the jury and essentially 11 says, in so many words, Dr. Burks didn't do his best 12 duty. Didn't do what he was supposed to do. That by 13 14 implication is a breach of the standard of care. THE COURT: Overruled. 15 And I will also add that it is perfectly 16 appropriate for Plaintiffs' Counsel to draw the jury's 17 attention back to promises made by Counsel at opening to 18 say that the evidence did not fulfil the promises of 19 20 Counsel at opening. 21 MR. SHAW: Okay. THE COURT: The objection is overruled. 22 So I'm going to continue to object -MR. SHAW: 23 24

MS. ZOIS: Your Honor.

25

1	THE COURT: Mr. Shaw.
2	MR. SHAW: == because otherwise how do I
3	preserve it? I'm going to object to every question or
4	every statement unless the Court gives me a continuing
5	objection.
6	THE COURT: I'm sure the jury will be
9	delighted.
8	Do whatever you feel is appropriate to preserve
9	your record.
10	MR. SHAW: All right. Thank you, Your Henor.
11	Will you give me a continuing objection?
12	THE COURT: I will give you a sentinuing
13	objection as to what particular issue?
14	MR. SHAW: Any issue about
15	THE COURT: I want to be clear. No. I will
16	not give you a continuing objection because it's not
17	(indiscernible at 4:06:53). Usually there's ne evidence.
18	The evidence is up to my sysballs. So no.
19	MR. SHAW: Gkay,
20	THE COURT: Come on.
21	MR. SHAW: All pight: Thank you.
22	(Counsel returned to the trial table, and the
23	fellewing anamad:)
24	THE GOURT: Grattuled,
25	Go ahead, Ms. Zels.

1 MS. ZOIS: Thank you. As I was saying, a doctor using his best 2 3 efforts going above and beyond the call of duty in trying to save their patient's life would have checked those 4 5 labs. 6 MR. SHAW: Objection. 7 MS. ZOIS: And == THE COURT: Overruled. 8 MS. ZOIS: -- the defendant I'm not really sure 9 10 what he did. He was a little bit all over the place. I called the lab. I didn't call the lab. I checked the 11 lab. I asked the nurse. Nobody is really sure. 12 But what we do know is that after Mr. Allen has 13 a dead colon and is on his way to get it taken it 14 hopefully he writes this note in his discharge report. 15 16 That the patient refused his labs. Now let's get to --17 Objection. 18 MR. SHAW: MS. ZOIS: -- what happens when he --19 20 THE COURT: Overruled. 21 MS. ZOIS: -- has a cardiac event. The testimony from the defendant is he did use 22 23 his best efforts. He did everything possible. Did everything to a tee. But what we know is that in the 24 record there's absolutely no evidence that any form of 25

1 calcium was ever administered to Mr. Allen --2 MR. SHAW: Objection, Your Honor. 3 MS. ZOIS: -- to control his heart. THE COURT: Overruled. 4 MS. ZOIS: So what we do know -- based on 5 6 evidence provided by the defendant hospital what we do know -- well before I even get there. 7 8 Calcium is the thing that stabilizes the heart. 9 It's the thing that gets into the heart and it stabilizes 10 the heart. It's arguably the most important drug to give 11 when you have a patient that has a cardiac event. What we know from the chart, and now I'm going 12 backwards, is that according to Dr. Burks note he writes 13 14 calcium gluconate unavailable per pharmacy. That's in his note. 15 His testimony was well I ordered the calcium 16 17 chloride and that was a verbal order. And not in the chart. Verbal orders are supposed to be in the chart. 18 19 It's supposed to be charted by the doctor and by the 20 nurse. Again, not in the chart, 21 What we also know --MR. SHAW: Objection. 22 23 MS. ZOIS: -- is that the hospital had --24 THE COURT: Overruled. MS. ZOIS: -- only 253 doses of calcium 25

1 gluconate that was available to patients in their hospital. 2 3 MR. SHAW: Objection. MS, ZOIS: What we also know --4 THE COURT: Overruled. 5 MS. ZOIS: -- is that one of those doses went 6 to some other patient on the very same day that Dennis 7 Allen needed it after Dennis Allen needed it on March the 8 18th. 9 10 And the testimony that you heard today from the hospital representative said this is from omnicell. This 11 represents every bit of calcium gluconate that was used 12 at the hospital. Those 253 vials, one dose on March the 13 18th. 14 MR. SHAW: Objection. 15 THE COURT: Overruled. 16 MS. ZOIS: We also know that dectors have 17 access to crash carts. They're the carts that are on the 18 19 floor that you actually have to bust open to break the seal to get into to use the drugs. 20 21 And what we know is that the crash eart had calcium chloride on it. 22 MR. SHAW: Objection. 23 MS. 2015: And we know that the crash cart 24 wasn't opened. 25

THE COURT: Overruled.

MS. ZOIS: So in response to this cardiac event Dr. Burks orders the cocktail. I find that offensive. When I hear the word cocktail I'm thinking about Happy Hour. I'm not thinking about lifesaving beverages.

But what he says is he went to the order set and went click, click, click, click, click, click, click.

That's what he did. Click, click, click, click, click.

So without really thinking about Dennis Allen as an individual and Dennis Allen's issues and his issues that he has with renal problem, with his kidney problem, with all the reasons that he's in there he just goes click, click, click, click, click, click.

And one of the things that was interesting that you heard today was allegedly accessibility to the calcium stuff wasn't even on the order set because they pulled it off because there was a shortage. So I don't know how he clicked on the calcium. But he says he did.

Now when he's ordering all of these drugs obviously if he's click, click, click, click he's not thinking about the Kayexalate. He's not thinking about how giving the Kayexalate to a patient like Dennis Allen is going to affect Dennis Allen. He's just following the set. He's not thinking, hmm, Dennis Allen probably has renal issues. He already has problems processing things.

He's not thinking I shouldn't give this man this drug because he might be more susceptible to an injury.

1.1

In fact, Dr. Burks doesn't even know that a major complication associated with Kayexalate is exactly what Dennis Allen died from. Major complications of ischemic colitis and bowel perforation. He doesn't even know that information. He should have known that information.

So this is the hospital's guidelines. And I kind of want to talk about this for a minute. The very first witness that you heard from, Ms. Young, who came in the very first day. Long time ago. She went through how they came up with the guideline. And it wasn't willynilly. They put three years into this.

The 2009 FDA warning came out about Kayexalate so the hospital did the right thing. They said well we need to figure this out. And we need to come up with some guidelines on how to deal with this. So what did they do? They did the literature survey. They read all of the literature. Not just this piece here or that piece there. They read through the entire literature.

What else did they do? They consulted the experts in the hospital. University of Maryland Medical System is a huge hospital. They've got lots of people they can talk to about this.

So they form a committee. They come up with the guidelines based on what the literature says. And then they circulate it to the experts in the departments who are going to have to deal with hyperkalemia. That's how these guidelines were formed. They were formed by the experts at the University of Maryland Medical System. And they were supposed to be done for best practices. Which means patient safety. All that makes sense.

Except Dr. Burks never pulled this guideline up. His medical training didn't even tell him major complications are intestinal necrosis and bowel perforation. He didn't have this information.

When Mr. Gaston said, well, why didn't you just look at the guidelines. Well I relied on my own medical training. And I relied on my own literature. And I relied on my own research. And stepped in. He said I rely on up to date. Well ironically the up to date article on this issue says you don't prescribe Kayexalate when hemodialysis is readily available.

MR. SHAW: Objection. That was not in the evidence, Your Henor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MS. 2018: Se gaing back a little bit. So those are the guidelines.

And it's what he knew or should have knewn. He

should have known that giving Kayexalate has major complications of intestinal necrosis and bowel perforation. He should have known that.

Now the research that the hospital consulted, the very first piece of literature, that's in these guidelines says it's a == it's a one == up to a 1.8 percent of occurrence that a person is going to end up with these major complications. That's not a small number. That's almost two out of 100 people are going to have intestinal necrosis and bowel perforation. And this is the literature that the hospital was using.

So the administration of the Kayexalate it sucked. The defendants want to say it was in the middle of an emergency. It was his crisis, he -- his heart was going out of control, it was we had to get it done. But the truth of it is his cardiac event was over. He had it under control. And he administered the Kayexalate after Mr. Allen had the nebulizer on.

And we know that -- I'm sure that if it's a life threatening emergency and as Defense Counsel said in opening he gave him the Kayexalate so that he didn't die right before his very eyes you would think that Dr. Burks would have brought that Kayexalate in. Dr. Burks wasn't in the room.

The Kayexalate was brought in by a nurse with a

Styrofoam cup and a straw in it. And Mr. Allen was given the instruction, here, drink this. Does that sound like at the time Dr. Burks' patient is going have a cardiac event and there's some emergency that he should be attending to?

Because if that's the case then Dr. Burks should have been in that room. Not sending a nurse in there to give the Kayexalate.

Before Dr. Burks leaves from the hospital he doesn't know what the major risks are. But he should have known. And if he should have known he should have told the night nurse, Shamir (phonetic).

And he should have told the doctor on duty that night, Caleb (phonetic), I gave this guy Kayexalate. And I want you to be on the look out for a couple things. The signs and symptoms of that are bloody stools and abdominal pain. So I want you to make sure that if any of that happens you take care of it, you page me, because we've got to figure that out quick. Dr. Burks didn't do that.

And what happened that night was horrible. It was absolutely horrible. Mr. Allen was having blood bowel movement after bloody bowel movement after blood bowel movement. Was in excruciating pain. Was crying out in pain. And you know this is a man that broke his

leg, strapped on some two by fours with a belt and drove himself to the hospital.

We know this is a man that doesn't know fear. This is a man that when gunshots ring out in front of his house he doesn't run away, he runs towards the gunshots. So this man is calling his children and saying, you think I'm erazy, do you love me. No, Pop, we don't think you're crazy. Of course, Pop, we love you. Then get me out of here.

Because he was dying and he knew it. And nobody else did. Not the nurse on duty that night. Not the doctor on duty that night. Not his wife that sat by his bed and, honey, everything's going to be okay.

You're where you need to be. You're in the hospital.

Not Dennis, not Daniel. They said, Pop, you've spent the better -- you get better and we'll get you out of there.

You're going to get better. I'm going to pick you up and I'm going to take you out of there. But we can't take you out.

Mr. Allen couldn't get himself out of that bed if he wanted to. He was in this vulnerable position where there was nothing he could do to help himself. He couldn't convince his family to take him out of there.

And, frankly, that would have been the wrong thing to do.

But they're plagued with guilt to this very day about

that.

1.7

So that night was herrible. And we're going to come back to that. As much as I don't want to. And I don't think you want me to do that. We're going to come back to that.

So what happens the next morning? Dr. Burks gets to work that next morning and he's advised by an intern that major complications associated with ischemic colitis are necrosis and the bowel perforation.

And I missed a slide.

What we also know is that Dennis and Daniel were taking care of their father (indiscernible at 4:20:40). They were changing him themselves. Cynthia said I don't want the rectal tube. I'm going to do this myself. And Daniel and Dennis would help him. And three times they're trying to get the nurse's attention. They're saying, uh, I think there's blood in here. Uh, there's more blood in here.

And by the third time Dennis runs out and says this is full of blood. This is crimson. You need to get this tested. Because the first two ended up in the toilet.

So we know that the night before at 9:55 p.m. somebody at the hospital knew. Because somebody tested occult blood feces. So that happened the night before.

So we know that his bowels are dying. And his colon is bleeding as of earlier than this. Because is about the time he got to (indiscernible at 4:21:42).

So what happens the next day? Oh. I forgot this part. In the response to Mr. Allen's tears and crying out in pain they gave him a little gauze, put something on his belly. No pain medication. The man has a colon inside of him that's dying by the second. They give him something for gas. Basically the equivalent of Tums. And they do this at 1:27. So we know they knew that he was in pain.

But the chart from that night doesn't have a whole lot of information on it. But the chart for the next morning does.

Dr. Burks gets to the hospital and is advised, again like I said, by the intern that major complications associated with Kayexalate are ischemic colitis and bowel perforation.

So what does Dr. Burks do? Again, he's now figured out that he gave Kayexalate that has these major complications. His patient is on his way to emergency surgery to have his colon removed. This is part of his four page report that he writes after the fact.

On the morning of March 19th, not true, he was noted to copious bloody bowel movements. It wasn't the

morning of March 19th. Because as you just saw the lab from the night before. And again, remember this is after he's figured out, oh, I think I made a mistake.

So he starts off doing the right thing. He does. He starts off doing the right thing because he pulls Cynthia Allen out of the room and says, Ma. Allen, can I talk you for a minute. Cynthia somes out in the hallway. I'm serry. I made a mistake, I gave your husband a drug that's injured his colon. He's going to need to ge surgery. It will only take a couple hours. Everything is going to be okay. We caught it in time.

And Ms, Allen was not comfortable with that.

She said you know what, Dr. Burks, we've got a room full of kids down the hallway. You need to go tell them that.

I'm not doing that. You need to go tell them that.

So Dr. Burks walks down the hallway and tells the family this information. And Dennis is like, what, what, What are you talking about. Like break it down for me. Like I dan't == you're going to have to tell me this in lay-people terms. I don't understand all this medical Kayexalate, ischemic solitis, necrotle bowel, perforation. Huh: Break it down for me.

And he did. And he sald I made a mistake. I gave your dad a drug that injured his selen. He's geing to be in surgery for a double of hours. We caught it in

time. And Dennis said okay. I understand. 1 So that's what the family is told. One to two 2 3 hours. It's all going to be okay. It wasn't okay. It wasn't okay. Dr. Burks 4 never spoke to that family again. 5 One of the things I think you're going to be 6 talking about back in the jury deliberation room is did 7 Kayexalate cause Mr. Allen intestinal necrosis. The 8 answer to that, folks, is absolutely it did. Yes, it 9 did. And you don't need to look any further than what 10 the hospital says about it. The defendant hospital. 11 Let's take a look at what they said before they 12 load it up. 13 MR. SHAW: Objection. 14 THE COURT: Basis? 15 MR. SHAW: Offensive actually. 16 MS. ZOIS: Intestinal ischemia --17 THE COURT: Overruled. 18 MS. ZOIS: -- due to conflict with Kayexalate. 19 This is not that is. That's Dr. Burks note. 20 Bowel necrosis due to Kayexalate. Guess whose 21 note that is. That's the ICU team that took him over. 22 Given the constellation of symptomocology we 23 were considering -- mesenteric ischemia or ischemic 24

colitis. The medical Intensive Care Unit team had

25

pointed out that the patient had received Kayexalate the night before and there were several case reports of mucosa level ischemia.

That's the crew that was taking care of him before he went up to the ICU.

Dr. T. The guy that's actually operating on him. The one that's elbow deep into belly trying to get rid of all the necrotic tissue. Trying to get rid of all the dead issue in this colon. Says given overall statement of patient's profusion this may have likely been induced by the Kayexalate.

The autopsy. The hospital autopsy report says "the findings may be suggestive of Kayexalate colitis."

Nothing there about low blood pressure, low blood flow. Nothing. These doctors got it right. They knew the Kayexalate killed his colon and they put it in their report.

So these guidelines are a little bit of surprise when we sent -- the Allen family sent questions to the hospital because they have questions. And they wanted answers. They still want answers. One of the questions was, hey, Hospital, what guidelines do you have in place for this condition. What are your policies about that.

And the hospital says objection, legal jargon.

UMMS had a hyperkalemia order set. You know, the click, click, click, click, click. That thing. That's it.

Didn't tell us about the guidelines. Just this. Just told us about the order set.

1.8

And then specifically the Allen family question was "Recommendation or warnings for administering Kayexalate to patients such as Dennis Allen."

What was the answer? Hmm. "Order set."

That's it. Not the major complications. Just the order set.

given to any of the defendants' experts before they testified. Did you netice that? We asked every single one of them why didn't you get these guidelines. Why didn't you get these before you gave your sworn testimeny and your opinion under eath. Did you have this information. Did you knew about it. No. They didn't have it.

I don't know when they got it. None of them wouldn't answer the quastion. The slesset I got was when Dr. Seneth said well I think they were Dropbes and I know I looked at them last night.

But back to the sate 1.8 percent of patients have bowel perforation assording to the hospital. This is not me. This is the literature searched at the

hospital.

So the question is did Defendant breach the standard of care. Did Dr. Burks act as a reasonable and prudent doctor that a same doctor under a similar circumstances would do. And we say absolutely he breached that standard of care. Absolutely he did.

He prescribed Dennis Allen Kayexalate when he absolutely should not have done this. There's a 1.8 percent chance he's going to have bowel perforation or ischemic colitis. Which is exactly what happened in this case. And which is why you shouldn't do it.

And one of the jury instructions that Your Honor told you about is the susceptibility to injury instruction. You have to consider someone has other issues going on. And they would be more susceptible or at a higher risk of developing a problem. You need to think about that.

You can't do click, click, click, click.

That's not going to work. You need to think about the patient. You need to apply the order set to the patient.

You need to think about these things before you just start ordering drugs.

So he does order the shifting agents. And I'm putting this up here for a reason. Because the shifting agents are the things that get potassium away from the

heart. It bides them time. Because they need to get the potassium out; right? So the shift agents are given can last a pretty long time.

Again, this is the hospital guidelines. This isn't me telling you this. This is the hospital guidelines telling you this.

The insulin and dextrose at the block of six hours. The nebulizer can last up to three hours. Sodium bicarbonate can last up to six hours. So that gives you enough time to get hemodialysis. That's plenty of time to get hemodialysis.

They got hemodialysis after it was ordered in an hour and 15 minutes.

And Dr. Leo came in and told you you give

Kayexalate as a last resort. You do not give this toxic

drug to a patient when hemodialysis is readily available.

Hemodialysis is the gold standard. Kayexalate has

problems. Hemodialysis, again it's the hospital it's not

me, this is what the hospital says, rapidly removes large

amounts of potassium.

Most importantly, treatment of choice for patients with life threatening hyperkalemia. It is the gold standard in eliminating potassium in renal failure patients.

We heard a whole lot about the condition that

Mr. Allen was in when he got the hospital. They talked about that for hours. We know -- you know, we know he was in renal failure. That was the right choice. Hemodialysis was the right choice.

And yet the == the claim of, oh, we didn't know when the hemodialysis guy was going to get there.

Whether the machines could break. We didn't know if had the == that whole song and dance.

I've get to ge back to this one. Just wait.

Just wait. We have time. And these can be repeated.

You can do these again. Take whatever time is necessary
to avoid giving this man Kayexelate who is in renal
failure. Who you know is mare susceptible to this
injury. They didn't do that. Dr. Burks didn't do that
because (indiscernible at 4:33:24).

So this brings me to this. Informed consent. Before a doctor is allowed to do something to a patient that has material risks they have to get what is called informed consent. They have to have a senversation with the patient. They need to say, hey lock, let's talk about this. This thing I'm about to do has got some problems. Let's talk about it and then you decide. You have to consent. You have to understand it and then give me your consent before I do this.

That piece never happened. He failed to obtain

informed consent. They're not disputing that. They haven't said oh yeah we gave it. They haven't said that. Because they can't say that because Dr. Burks didn't know enough to even properly get Mr. Allen's informed consent.

So the five elements that are required are there. And we know Dr. Burks didn't bother to look at the guidelines to find out what the material risks even were. So we know he didn't give this. Because he wasn't capable of giving this.

Which is why the defense is well this was an emergency. We didn't have time to do that. We didn't have to do that. This was an emergency situation. Whose got time for that. Who has time to talk about all these things. We don't have time for that. So that's why they say they didn't do it.

But we know is the Kayexalate ordered on a routine basis. Not STAT. Not I need this in here now. It was hey whenever you can get to it. (Indiscernible at 4:35:19).

More importantly than that is the albuterol.

One of those potassium shifting agents. The thing that
he was on right before they brought the Kayexalate into
the room, routine priority.

So what we know now it wasn't click, click, click because this was ordered after all the other

medications were at 12:37. This was ordered at 12:55.

And it was ordered routinely. Emergency was over. There was no cardiac strips that were printed out. The bells and whistles didn't go off again. Ms. Allen was there and said his color came back into his face. There's no cardiac alarm going off to point that Kayexalate was still (indiscernible at 4:36:03).

And again, I'll just bring you back to if Dr.

Burks truly thought that Mr. Allen was in a life

threatening event at that very moment do you think he's

sending the nurse in to deliver the Kayexalate. He

should be in that room. If his patient is about die

because of a life threatening event, cardiac event, he'd

be in that room. Or at least I hope he would.

So next question. Was the defendants breach in the standard of care a cause of Mr. Allen's death. It doesn't have to be the cause. It has to be a cause of Mr. Allen's death.

And what do we have? We say yes. We know what the hespital told us. What did he die of. He died of ischemic colitis. This is the hospital's official death certificate for vital records. They didn't write kidney disease, they didn't write cirrhosis, they didn't write sleep apnea, they didn't write congestive heart failure. They wrote ischemic colitis within 24 hours of his death.

By a doctor that presumably would have the entire medical chart available to them.

So the hospital tells us that's what he died of. The story is different now. But right after he died that doctor said he died of ischemic colitis.

We also know the pathology report said that the appendix is normal. And (indiscernible at 4:37:48) for all that means.

The defenses' theory in the case is that on the 13th for a couple of minutes, nobody can really say for how long, and on the 15th for a couple of minutes, nobody can really say for how long, that he had low blood flow. And the low blood flow impacted his colon to the point where it killed it. Really? When the colon can go six hours without blood supply and rebound.

So the doctors that they brought in here, although they all cenfuse me and they all said semething a little bit different and I'm not entirely sure they're all on the same page, but they're trying to convince you that the short periods of low blood flow to the colon are what caused Mr. Allen's death.

All right. Well if that's true the low blood flow only affected that one organ. The one organ that the Kayexalate went through. Common sense, folks. Like I said before, use your common sense when you get back

there.

Because what we know == Dr. Odze, he's a beast by the way, came in here. His job is to determine cause of death. That's what he does. He's a pathologist. He's a professor at Harvard Medical School.

He came in and told you not more likely than not. He said I am 100 percent sure that this man died of Kayexalate induced colitis. 100 percent. He didn't mean to go there but he did.

And you know what else he did? He also told you he looked at all the pathology slides from his body. He had liver problems to begin with. But guess what? No dead tissue in the liver. No dead tissue in the kidney. No dead tissue in the brain. No dead tissue in the brain. No dead tissue in the appendix.

Appendix is important because the appendix is the area -- oh. This is what we were supposed to Google, by the way. \$100,000 expert that's telling us to Google information.

Mr. Gaston went and asked him and asked him and asked him and asked him well don't you agree that the appendix shares the same blood supply as the colon. Right? The artery that comes down to the colon. The same artery that comes down to the appendix; right? So if you're losing blood flow to the colon you've got a problem with the appendix

too. The appendix is normal.

11.

So the only areas that Mr. Allen had dead tissue are the areas that the Kayexalate went through; right? Common sense.

But this is what they want you to be convinced of, you know. Even though the defense experts came in they didn't talk about, well, you know the hospital's own records say it was Kayexalate induced. And the surgeon said it was Kayexalate induced. And the critical care team said it was Kayexalate induced. No. They didn't talk about that.

They came up with this new theory that is not anywhere in the medical records. Nobody says this in the medical records from defendant hospital. The theory they come up with is -- and I'm being generous here. Because nobody could say it was (indiscernible at 4:41:21).

minutes on hemodialysis on the 15th. One more minute on the 18th. Oh that's what did it. That's what did it.

That's what caused the low blood flow. These little box of hypotension are what caused Dennis Allen's celen to deteriorate in 24 hours. And just happened to start === just happened to start on the night of the 18th. That's just a coincidence. That's just a coincidence that it started there.

Or maybe -- again, common sense. Maybe you drink the Kayexalate. It starts to go through your system. At first you only see a little bit of blood in the feces. Next one we see a little bit more. And then by the third one it's crimson. It is a bedpan of blood.

That's when the (indiscernible at 4:42:22) starts. That's when the man that has never shown fear or pain in his life is acreaming out to his children to get him out of the hospital.

What makes more sense? That all of this started way back here or that all this started within hours of drinking the Kayexalate? Common sense, folks.

That's how long your colon can survive without blood without irreversible damage. That's why I put that up there. Six hours. But they're blaming a couple little times where he got hemodialysis to kill his colon.

The Hail Mary of all defenses. Was is Mr.

Allen going to die anyway. Really? Does that mean his

life wasn't worth saving? Does that mean that his life

wasn't worth looking at the guidelines to figure out the

major complication of Kayexalate is what he died of?

(Indiscernible at 4:43:36).

By the time he gets into the hospital, and we heard all about how sick he was before he got there. He had been the University of Maryland before. They

prescribed statin. He took it. He's in the hospital for rhabdomyolysis which is statin induced. And he's in trouble.

So they need to give him hemodialysis. They need to help him out; right? But while he's there he speaks with the nephrology department. And at the nephrology department in a consult ultimately will need long term dialysis to optimize condition in preparation for liver/kidney transplant if the patient wishes to go to transplant.

Oh the patient wishes to go to transplant.

We will initiate transplant evaluation process while inpatient per patient's wishes.

So the nephrology department doesn't think he's going to die anyway. The nephrology department says we're going to do something that nobody's done for him because nobody's tried this yet. So we're going to get him on long term hemodialysis. We're going to give him hemodialysis every day that he's here that he needs it. They did. 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th. Didn't get it on the 17th.

But on the very day that this incident the nephrologist is in there at 11:30, tapping that toe, where are the labs, we're ready. Right. Are we doing this today?

Dr. Burks in the transfer note (indiscernible at 4:45:23). This is after his surgery when he's in the acute care after the surgery. On transplant list. These are their records. These are the hospital's records.

Not he's going to die anyway. He's terminal. Let's get him into hospice. Let's do palliative care for immediate family. Let's talk about that. Let's see how he wants to go. Let's see how -- if he has any last wishes.

None of that.

They did not have an end of life care plan for him. You know what? They didn't give the family that choice. The last time they saw him was the morning of the 19<sup>th</sup>. And what he was saying was (indiscernible at 4:46:18). He wasn't given the opportunity to have that discussion with his family. They took that away from them. They did not give him that opportunity.

There's nothing in this chart to say that he was terminally ill. Nothing. He's not in ICU. No hospice recommendation. Not palliative care. If they thought he was going to die anyway that's the right thing to do.

What's the right thing to do? You say, family, this is what's going on and you have a meeting. Your dad is sick. And we don't feel he's going to make it out of the hospital. So what we need to do is figure out -- you

guys figure out with him. Ask him. What does he want to do. (Indiscernible at 4:47:08).

1,

1.8

So he's not dying from the inside out and suffering and in pain. Do you think the congregation might want to come up and say good bye to him. Can you think of anybody else that he'd want to talk to before he passes. Do you think there's anything that he might want to say to you before he dies other than get me out of here. They took that away from this family.

that. And they took that opportunity away from this family. What this family is stuck with is the last moments of this man's life were horrible. And those are the memories they have with him. The memories they have with him is Daniel wishing he had thrown him over his shoulder and driven him in his truck out of that hospital. That's the memories they are left with.

Not I leve you, we're going to be good, we're going to carry on with your legacy and tradition in the church. You were the best father ever. You are an amazing human being, Mom's going to be okay. We got == mom's going to be okay. We've get this. Go home. We'll be okay. And we're going to live everyday of our life honoring your legacy and living the life that you taught us. We are going to love people. We are going to love

every person whether they love themselves or not. And we're going to continue to do everything you taught us to do.

That didn't happen. Didn't happen.

I put this up here -- this man loved Baltimore. And he loved his church. And he formed this church in 2012. During the middle of all this oh he's so sick. Oh he's (indiscernible at 4:49:25). He's in and out of the hospital. He can't think straight. He can't walk. He can't do anything. He's on death's door. He's got one foot in the grave. That's the man who started this church.

So I hate this part. And I hate to do it to this family. But in order for me to my job and tell Dennis Allen's story I've got to go there. I've got to do it. I've got to it. I've got to it you. I've got it to them. I don't want to. It's hard.

But Dennis Allen after drinking the Kayexalate was completely immobile. Could not get himself out of the hospital bed on his own. Could not get anyone to listen to him. Could not get the message across to his family I'm dying. I know I'm dying. My colon is dying. It's time for me. He couldn't get the attention of the nurse. Couldn't get attention of the doctor.

He's got bloody bowel movements. He's crying

in pain. All night long. The last 24 hours of this man's real life were horrible. They were horrendous. He screaming out, can't get anyone's attention. And his family is going through it with him.

They're thinking the doctors have got to help or do something. We're in the hospital. We're where we're supposed to be. These people are supposed to know what they're doing in here. They didn't know Dennis Allen. This hospital did not know Dennis Allen. Dr. Burks did not know Dennis Allen.

Dennis Allen was a strong man who did not show fear. Who did not complain. And for him to have broken down to the point where he's looking at his family and saying get me out of here. If you love me and you don't think I'm crazy get me up out of here. This is what he kept saying to them. They're left with that for the rest of their lives.

These 24 hours are the unimaginable horror. So that's his claim. That's Dennis Allen's claim.

And there's a line I put on the verdict sheet for him. So those 24 hours that's for him. That's the estate claim.

With respect to the family. His wife. 35 years. Soul mates. She came down to Baltimore to take of care of her sick aunt. Met him on the steep when she

was with Shelly. That was it. That was it. They built their life together. They built their church together. They have beautiful children together. She said he was my beat friend. He was my everything to me.

She didn't sleep in their bed for almost three years after he passed away. There's no man on this planet I don't think whose shees are biggest enough to fill Dennis Allen's shees.

Was her father. I don't care what anybody says. That was her dad. His eight shildren got up on that stand and told you about this man. And what I can absolutely guarantee you is I can stay up here for days and days and days and nights and never even be able to scratch the surface of what an amazing human being this man was. I cannot do this man justice.

If I pulled in every single person whose life he's touched in the last 35 years we'd be here for a really long time. And you hear from the people that he reached out to. You hear from the people that everybody gave up on that he helped. You hear from the young men at the Hickey School that were touched by his story.

Because someone gave him a second chance.

And each one of his children are amazing people because of who he was. He taught them work ethic. He

taught them to love people. He taught them to give back to the community. And raise your children that way too.

He's selfless. Help people that can't help themselves. And that's what they continue to do. But they continue to do it and they miss him. They miss him a lot. And just because you're a 48 year old woman or younger than that doesn't mean that you don't need your dad anymore. It doesn't mean you don't love your dad and miss your dad and want your dad's advice every day you need it.

So for this family you have to understand their loss because of how amazing of a man that he was. Pop-Pop.

So when Mr. Gaston in his opening said to you at the end of this case you're going to understand why this case we're going to be asking for fair compensation in the amount of \$10 million. Now you understand.

And what we're going to ask you to do on the verdict sheet is for his estate, for him, for those horrible 24 hours we're going to ask you to give him two million dollars for the very worst day of his life for a very amazing man who spent 35 years loving people and taking care of other people. And this was so bad that it broke him down to the point of fear.

And for each one of the children, and I'm not

saying this is fair, you give to one or give them all 1 (indiscernible at 4:55:58). For each one of the children 2 3 we're going to ask you to give them one million dollars. And his wife also. 4 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 5 Counsel, would you please appreach. 6 7 MR. SHAW: Your Honor, it's going to take me about four minutes or so to set == set up. 8 9 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, would you 10 like a bathroom break or would you like to keep going Anybody -- we're going keep going through. 11 All right. Mr. Shaw, why don't you go ahead 12 13 and take the time to set up. 14 And, Counsel, please approach briefly. 15 (Counsel approached the bench, and the following ensued:) 16 THE COURT: You finished like on the dot hour. 17 18 I was impressed. So I just want to be clear that before when Mr. Shaw objected (indiscernible at 4:56:57) that, 19 20 Counsel, that were a Motion for Mistrial. And I'm not 21 going to leave threads untied at the close of the case or at any other point in time. 22 23 But I should be clear that I obviously

But I'm denying the Metion for Mistrial, I

overruled the objection.

24

don't (indiscernible at 4:57:12) as to the argument up to defendants based on the argument provided by Plaintiff during her closing. Nothing has denied the defense a fair trial.

I also do just note that the standard of care question in the jury's verdict sheet specifically mentions standard of care of the Kayexalate and not anything else to the extent that that (indiscernible at 4:57:36) of Dr. Burks.

Okay. All right.

MR, SHAW: I had one more concern. The plaintiffs used the statement that was stricken from evidence that Mr. Allen had refused the blood draw. We went through the jury extract and removed that. And then they turn around and used it.

THE COURT: (Indiscernible at 4:57:58).

MR. SHAW: So I object to that.

THE COURT: I reversed my ruling on the Motion in Limine because I found pursuant to your argument that it was pathologically germane.

MR. SHAW: Well then I --

THE COURT: So that was admissible.

MR. SHAW: Then that has to be put back in the jury extract. So I have to -- because that's still where the line is drawn on that.

1	THE COURT: I bet (indiscernible at 4:58:15).
2	So
3	MR. SHAW: I'm sorry?
4	THE COURT: We're on to closing.
5	MR. SHAW: Can I have a break.
6	THE COURT: I'm sorry?
7	MR. SHAW: Can I go to a comfort break while
8	we're setting up?
9	THE COURT: Yes, absolutely.
10	I'll just have the jury wait.
11	MR. SHAW: All right.
12	(Counsel returned to the trial table, and the
13	following ensued:)
14	(Brief pause.)
15	THE COURT: Mr. Shaw, whenever you are ready.
16	Before you proceed to closing if Counsel will approach
17	for
18	MR. SHAW: I'm sorry. I can't hear you.
19	THE COURT: Would counsel before you
20	finish what you're doing. But before you proceed to
21	closing I would ask that Counsel approach just for a
22	brief moment. I know you wish to use the restroom and
23	that's fine.
24	(Brief pause.)
25	MR. SHAW: Your Honor, we can come up right

now,

THE COURT: Yes. Would you approach just for a moment. And you don't all have to approach. But somebody from each side.

(Counsel approached the bench, and the following ensued:)

THE COURT: Sorry, Okay, I just -- I just wanted to be clear. The issue of what was redacted was about IV drug use. There was never any redaction that pertained to a blood draw or an IV because I reversed my original ruling in limine. And so that has been obviously throughout the ease has been in evidence. I just -- I think we were getting confused.

But the issue of redaction in the jury extract had to do with the decedent's past IV drug use. Not with respect to the blood draw or any IV itself.

MR. SHAW: So I ==

THE COURT: Just wanted to be closr.

MR. SHAW: == distinctly remember asking that first day and the Court denied a metion == or granted the plaintiffs Metion ==

THE COURT: Are you == I eriginally granted the plaintiffs' metion in limine to exclude evidence that the decedent was alleged to have declined to get blood draw or to have an TV then.

I think within == I think the next day, I might be mistaken, I reversed myself finding that I had to vacate the summary judgment order and then ordering -and I said that that causes me to reconsider the motion in limine. And I reversed myself allowing evidence of those issues in as pathologically germane, MR. SHAW: My -- my belief is that before that reversal that statement that he refused the blood draw is redacted from each jury extract. THE COURT: Okay. Well in as much as there's no contributory negligence issue I'm not sure what's that going to do. But at this point == it was redacted. And it was also --

MR. SHAW: I'm not just speaking (indiscernible at 5:04:41). That wasn't in evidence because I thought

THE COURT: Okay. But what I'm saying is that since I gave everybody notice at the front end that it was no longer going to be inadmissible if the correction wasn't made that's not on the Court.

And in any event, there's no basis for contributory negligence instruction has been given. It's not in the verdict sheet.

You're welcome to talk about until you're blue in the face if you feel like that's appropriate.

MR. SHAW: I don't want --

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	THE COURT: I don't mean that to be smart. I
2	just mean, you know, it's fair game.
3	MR. SHAW: I didn't want to talk about it, And
4	I thought it was out of evidence, And that's why I was
5	objecting. One of the reasons I objected
6	THE COURT: I appreciate that,
7	MR. SHAW: she brought it up.
8	THE COURT: I just wanted to be sure we were
9	clear. Okay. All right. Thank you.
10	MS. ZOIS: The defendant also mentioned it in
11	his testimony.
12	THE COURT: I'm quite sure that's the case. I
13	just don't recall. Okay.
14	Thank you.
15	(Counsel returned to the trial table, and the
16	following ensued:)
17	THE COURT: Mr. Shaw, whenever you are ready.
18	I know that there's some technology you're
19	setting up. So whenever you're ready, sir.
20	MS. ZOIS: Your Honor, with Court's permission
21	to step out in the hall?
22	(Brief pause.)
23	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Shaw, every good,
24	go ahead.
25	MR. SHAW: Your Honor, can we wait for Dr.

1	Burks has stepped out for moment. Can we wait for him?
2	THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any idea how
3	long he'll be gone?
4	MR. SHAW: Pardon me?
5	THE COURT: Any idea how long he'll be gone?
6	MR. SHAW: I think just for a moment.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	(Brief pause.)
9	MR. SHAW: Your Honor, I'm going to start
10	without him.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	MR. SHAW: Because I have some introductory
13	things.
14	THE COURT: That's fine. Go ahead.
15	MR. SHAW: May I go ahead and start?
16	THE COURT: Yes, you may,
17	MR. SHAW: May it please the Court.
18	CLOSING ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS
19	MR. SHAW: Good afternoon, ladies and
20	gentlemen.
21	THE JUROKS: Good afternoon.
22	MR. SHAW: This is my last change to talk to
23	you directly. And I do want to tell you that we are very
24	grateful for your service. Grateful for your attention,
25	And I'll thank you more and a little bit better detail at
- 1	