IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

BEAUMONT DIVISION

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DEC 3 - 1969
JAMES R. COCHRAN, CLERK
By Deputy Margaret Driver

CLARENCE BOREL	I	
	I	
VS	I	CIVIL ACTION NO. 6449
	I	
FIBREBOARD PAPER PRODUCTS CORPORATION, ET AL	I	

MOTION FOR MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT
of
JOHNS-MANVILLE PRODUCTS CORPORATION

TO SAID HONORABLE COURT:

COMES NOW the Defendant, Johns-Manville Products Corporation, and files this, its motion under Rule 12(e) for more definite statement, and as grounds therefor would show the Court:

I.

Plaintiff in Paragraph 5 of his original complaint alleges that during the years 1936 to 1969, while he was employed as an insulator, he was required to handle large quantities of the products manufactured and distributed by the eleven named Defendants. It is further alleged that in addition to the fact that Plaintiff actually used the products manufactured by the above named Defendants which contained asbestos, that on many of the jobs, while not himself using the specific products manufactured by the Defendants, he was nevertheless exposed to the dangerous materials and specifically asbestos dust and fibers which were used by other workers in the same area at which Plaintiff was working. In Paragraph 6, it is alleged that during the period of time in which Plaintiff was employed as an insulator from the years 1936 to 1969, inclusive, in the course of his employment, in violation of the Commercial Code, and alternatively due to the negligence and carelessness of the Defendants, he

98

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10085/1

was caused to come in contact with the insulation products produced and manufactured and distributed by Defendants, and as a consequence thereof sustained permanent and disabling injuries.

The Defendant objects to each and all of said allegations and asks the Court to require the Plaintiff to make said allegations more specific for the following reasons:

(a) Said allegations are too vague and indefinite and do not inform this Defendant of the name of the insulation or insulation material or the manufacturer of the material with which Plaintiff contends he came into contact with, and which he alleges and contends caused injury to his body.

(b) Said allegations wholly fail to allege a time and place of each alleged contact with a product containing asbestos manufactured by this Defendant or any other means of identification of the time and place where he allegedly sustained injury as a result of contact or exposure to a product containing asbestos.

(c) The date and time and place of the alleged injury is too vague and indefinite and if Plaintiff sustained an injury, the date, time and place of employment and the name of the employer should be alleged.

(d) Because the allegations leave it to speculation and conjecture as to which of the Defendants' products the Plaintiff came in contact with, the time and place thereof, and this Defendant is entitled to specific allegations in order that it might be informed of the specific nature of the claim or claims by the Plaintiff as against this particular Defendant.

(e) The Plaintiff fails to allege the dates, time, place of employment, the name of his employer and the name of the product with which he allegedly came in contact with after

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10085/2

the date the Commercial Code was adopted in the State of Texas or the state where the alleged exposure occurred.

II.

Said petition in its entirety fails to allege a date or dates of alleged injury, a date or dates of alleged contact with a specific product, and the name of the product, or the area or job where Plaintiff allegedly received his injury, and it should not be incumbent upon this Defendant to answer such vague and indefinite claims.

III.

Said petition is too vague and indefinite as to where Plaintiff first suffered any injury as alleged, and definite information as to this alleged claim and the time and place of any subsequent injury should be required of Plaintiff before this Defendant is required to answer this complaint.

IV.

In Paragraph 6 of said complaint it is alleged that during the period of time in which Plaintiff was employed as an insulator from the years 1936 to 1969, inclusive, due to the negligence and carelessness of the Defendants he was caused to come into contact with the insulation produced and manufactured and distributed by the Defendants and as a result thereof sustained severe permanent disabling injuries.

This Defendant respectfully requests the Court to require the Plaintiff to be more specific and to allege the date or dates on which contact with the product of this Defendant was had and the day or date on which he first claims that he sustained an injury and the date or dates on which he claims he first knew that he had sustained an injury; such information should likewise be alleged as to the other named Defendants. This Defendant is entitled to know the claim or

100

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10085/3

claims being made against it which allegedly occurred over a period of some thirty-three years, and Defendant should not be required to speculate as to when or where the Plaintiff claims he sustained an alleged injury.

V.

This Defendant requests the Court to require the Plaintiff to be more specific as to Paragraph 9, wherein it is alleged that at all times material hereto (1936 to 1969) the manufacture, sale and distribution of insulation materials with which Plaintiff came in contact was under the exclusive control of Defendants, their agents, servants and employees, etc., for the following reasons:

(a) Because it is not alleged with any degree of definiteness the time, the place, the name of the product, nor the manufacturer with which the Plaintiff came in contact, and it is obvious that this Defendant was not at all times in the exclusive control of the manufacture, sale and distribution of insulation materials of the remaining ten Defendants.

(b) The Court should require the Plaintiff to be specific as to the time and place when this Defendant was allegedly in control of the distribution of insulation products relative to the alleged time and place of his alleged injury.

WHEREFORE, this Defendant prays that the Court set this Motion for hearing, and grant its Motion for More Definite Statement in order that Defendant can know the nature of the claim and have sufficient detail as to definite materials, dates, time and place that this Defendant can investigate the claim and file an appropriate answer.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon Pate

GORDON R. PATE
1119 Beaumont Savings Building
Beaumont, Texas

Attorney for Defendant, JOHNS-MANVILLE PRODUCTS CORPORATION

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10085/4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A copy of this motion for more definite statement and proposed order was mailed to Mr. Ward Stephenson, Stephenson Building, Orange, Texas, attorney for Plaintiff, by Certified Mail on the 3rd day of December, 1969, and a copy of the motion and proposed order was mailed to all other counsel for Defendants of record on the same date.

Gordon Dale
OF COUNSEL

102

The Borel v. Fibreboard Case File (1969-1972), Motion for more definite statement
ACL Doc 10085 · Page 5 of 6
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10085/5

CIVIL ACTION NO. 6449

CLARENCE BOREL

VS

FIBREBOARD PAPER PRODUCTS CORPORATION, ET AL

MOTION FOR MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT

of

JOHNS-MANVILLE PRODUCTS CORPORATION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

BEAUMONT DIVISION

GORDON R. PATE
ATTORNEY AT LAW
1119 BEAUMONT SAVINGS BUILDING
BEAUMONT, TEXAS 77701

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10085/6