		2
		3
		4
		5
	FREDERICK, MARYLAND 21701	6
		7
		8
		9
		10
		11
COURT HOUSE		12
		13
		14
		15
		16
		17
		18
		19
		. 20
		21

22

23

24

25

1

designation, and I said, Counsel, you probably want to ask her about the carpal tunnel issue, because I don't know, because my expert designation isn't until August 25th, 2012, you probably want to get into this area with her, because I don't know, as I, as we sit here. So, I think it's unfair now for Counsel to get up and suggest that we're making the claim, withdrawing the claim when at the time of her discovery deposition I allowed them the opportunity to explore that area before my expert designation, and then I sent a letter to Counsel saying by the way you don't have to worry about any of that, because we're not making that claim. So, that's my objection, Your Honor, I think it's inappropriate.

THE COURT: So, let's just, let me just, I will remind the jury again that opening statements are not evidence, and we'll go ahead and move on.

MR. BRATT: Thank you.

THE COURT: And whatever is proven is proven.

MS. ZOIS: Thank you, y (sic).

MR. GILLCRIST: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. BRATT: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Counsel returned to the trial tables and the following occurred:)

(Husher turned off.)

THE COURT: Just want to remind you, ladies and

MARYLAND

REDERICK, 15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gentlemen, like I said earlier opening statements are an outline of what Counsel expects to prove. It's not evidence. What's proven to your satisfaction will be what's proven later.

So --MR. GILLCRIST:

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. GILLCRIST: -- ladies, and -- thank you, Your Honor. So, ladies and gentlemen, in fact, during the discovery phase there were answers to interrogatories signed by both Ms. Exline-Hasline (sic) and her attorney saying that she had (unclear - one word) complaints to were caused by Ms. Sapp. We, as the lawyers, we try and do our jobs right, when and investigate these things, and low and behold, those (unclear - two words) were withdrawn. But we submit to you that it gives you a (sic) overall, it helps complete the picture in this case, um, in terms of what my client has said to have cost, and, and ultimately again, what she actually costs is what issue, is what it (sic), at issue in this case, excuse me.

So, she had these EMG studies, she had nerve conduction studies, she missed time from work in her work loss statement that she gave to use in discovery. the time that that contended was missed because of this accident it was related to her Carpal Tunnel Syndron (sic), Syndrome, related to the problems that had nothing to do with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

-REDERICK, 15 this, this accident whatsoever. Be that as it may, we're here now to talk about and for you to hear what was caused by this accident, and again, ultimately you'll have to make that decision.

You'll hear testimony from, uh, doctors, you'll hear testimony from Dr. McGrail that is associated with Georgetown University. He's a neurosurgeon, a very competent neurosurgeon who did what's called an independent medical examination. That is, when someone's been sued, like Ms. Sapp, they have a right to help learn about the claims that are being made and they can do that, they can arrange or attorneys can arrange to have someone else independent of her treating doctors examine her and weigh in in terms of what was caused by the accident, that's all that Dr. McGrail did. And he will talk to through a videotape deposition and tell you what his opinions are, and submit to you his opinions are Um, these problems that she's having with her very sound. low back are simply not related to this accident.

You'll hear from a Dr. Gary London who's a neurologist, and Dr. London did what's called a peer review. So, he did something slight different than what Dr. McGrail He didn't examine the patient, he wasn't obligated to or required to, but he did very carefully go through the Plaintiff's medical records and he's gonna' weigh in for you as to what was caused by accident and these ongoing problems

CIRCUIT COURT FOR FREDERICK COUNTY COURT HOUSE ICK, MARYLAND

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FREDERICK, 15 that Ms. Exline-Hasslin (sic) is claiming were simply not caused by this accident.

You'll hear from the Plaintiff's own treating You ask that you consider that testimony as well. Dr. Naff, I think, or Neff (sic), um, is going to testify to you, I think tomorrow for Ms. Exline-Hassler, and he's an impressive doctor, he's going to make an impressive opinion on you, I'm sure, when he testifies on direct examination, but please listen to his whole testimony. We hope that we will be able to show that, uh, the information that he had that he relied upon was no accurate to begin with. we'll ask him about things like the MRI scans and such. Ultimately, you're gonna' have this mass of evidence before you, and, and we apologize for that. We wish you, we wish we, I think we all wish we could just give you a, a two page outline and let you decide the case, but of course it doesn't work that way. So, we have to present the evidence to you, we are going to present the evidence to you. In the end we're going to ask you to return a verdict for our client.

Now, Ms. Zois said that we all agree, we all agree she had a low back injury from this accident. That's not accurate, um, it's your job to decide what injuries she had from this accident if a (sic), if any at all. When she goes into her doctor's and gives them a history of having injured her low back in the accident, so be it. The doctors that

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

you'll hear from have relied on that history. So, if Ms. Exline-Hassline (sic) had a worsening of her low back because of this accident, and reported that, and if that's true then the doctor's are going to be true when they give you assessments or their diagnosis. So, when Ms. Zois says that even the Defense doctors agree . . . well, the Defense doctors give the opinion that she had strains, muscular strains to the neck and the low back, why, because that's what she reported. They're assuming the accuracy of what she reported to her doctors. Your job will be to really test whether that history that she gave to her doctors was We submit to you that it was not accurate, because she's gonna' say that she did not have any low back pain leading up to this accident. We contend that the evidence In fact, we (unclear - one word) that shows that she did. the evidence quite clearly shows that she did. She's not only complaining of low back for years, she's prescript (sic), getting filled, uh, her prescriptions because of problems that she's continuing to have.

So, um, ladies and gentlemen, I have already spoken enough, and I would just close by saying thank you again, uh, for listening to me now. I will have an opportunity at the end of the evidence to speak to you again directly, and argue to you what the evidence has shown in the case, but you're going to be the ones deciding this case, you're going to be

MARYLAND

REDERICK,

the ones that goes back to the jury room and makes a decision based on all the evidence, and sitting here I know Ms. Sapp and Howard are confident that you will make, um, the fair (unclear - one word) correct decision in this case. Thank you very much.

MR. PORCARELLI: Your Honor, in light of all the points made by Mr. Gillcrist, and out of respect for the jury and their time, if it's okay with Your Honor may I reserve my opening remarks for the beginning of the Defense case?

THE COURT: You certainly may. Counsel, why don't you just approach real brief, I wanna' do some logistics, because it's a little bit after 4:00 and we're gonna' do some timing things.

(Counsel approached the bench and the following occurred:)

(Husher turned on.)

MR. BRATT: Good afternoon again, Your Honor.

MS. ZOIS: Um --

THE COURT: Hi did. I didn't know what you wanted to do.

MS. ZOIS: I just want to object to the request to take opening out of order, but . . .

THE COURT: Certainly, why doesn't, wouldn't Counsel have the opportunity to do that?

MS. ZOIS: Well, it's not he wouldn't have the