IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

BEAUMONT DIVISION

FILED
U. S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

MAR 30 1970

JAMES R. COONEY, CLERK
BY DEPUTY Margaret Turner

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

ANSWERS AND OBJECTIONS OF DEFENDANT, CONBUSTION ENGINEERING, INC., TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES UNDER RULE 33, FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

Now comes the defendant, Combustion Engineering, Inc., in the above-entitled and numbered cause, and makes and files the following answers and objections to Interrogatories heretofore served upon said defendant under Rule 33, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, denominated as First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants:

1.

Defendant, Combustion Engineering, Inc., did not manufacture any type of insulating materials prior to December 31, 1967.

However, R & I Refractory and Insulation Corporation, which was acquired by Combustion Engineering, Inc., by purchase in June, 1963, but which was operating as a separate entity until December 31, 1967, at which time it was merged with Combustion Engineering, Inc., began, on or about April 2, 1964, to manufacture the following insulating materials:

(1) Griptex, a mineral fiber block insulation, consisting of mineral wool, packaged in cardboard cartons of about 3 cubic feet capacity.

361

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/1

(2) Detrick Blanket insulation, being spun mineral fibers felted in large flat sheets and encased between metal fabrics, consisting of mineral wool and wire facings, packaged in cardboard cartons of about 12 cubic feet capacity.

(3) Detroc Asbestos Board, being asbestos board insulating material, comprised of asbestos Portland cement, packaged in crates of 10 sheets per crate.

(4) Detrick Easy Seal Cement, insulating cement comprised of asbestos and clay, packaged in 40 pound bags.

(5) Detrick Bonding Cement, insulating cement, comprised of mineral wool, asbestos and clay, packaged in 50 pound bags.

(6) Detrick Thinsuliner cement, insulating cement, comprised of clay, asbestos and Portland cement, packaged in 50 pound bags.

(7) Detrick Pyroscat, light-weight fire-proofing protective treatment for structural steel, being a preblended mixture of high temperature aggregates, asbestos fibers, hydraulic binder and other materials.

(8) Detrick casing cement, comprised of asbestos and Portland cement, packaged in 50 pound bags.

(9) Detrick T-60 Insulating Finish, insulating finish cement, comprised of mineral wool, asbestos and Portland cement and clay, packaged in 50-pound bags.

(10 Detrick MHD Finishing Cement, finishing cement, consisting of asbestos and Portland cement, packaged in 50 pound bags.

362

The Borel v. Fibreboard Case File (1969-1972), Answers to interrogatories
ACL Doc 10144 · Page 2 of 16
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/2

(11) Detrick No. 7 Asbestos Cement, straight asbestos fiber cement, comprised of asbestos, packaged in 100-pound bags.

(12) Detrick Asbestos Ropes, consisting of two types, blue fiber rope and white fiber rope, comprised of long fiber amosite, finished in 100 foot coils 1/2 to 2 inches in diameter.

(13) Loose wool, comprised of wool fibers, packaged in 40-pound bags.

(14) Granulated wool, comprised of wool fibers, packaged in 40-pound bags.

(15) Slag Fiber, which is the material of which all mineral wool is made.

(16) Super No. 711 Mineral Wool Cement, insulating cement, comprised of asbestos, wool and clay, packaged in 50-pound bags.

(17) Utility Thermal Finish Cement, thermal finishing cement, comprised of asbestos, wool, Portland cemand and clay, packaged in 50-pound bags.

(18) Hilite, insulating and finishing cement, comprised of mineral wool, asbestos, Portland cement and clay, packaged in 50-pound bags.

Prior to the year 1940 and until the year 1959, but not since the year of 1959, the said R & I Refractory and Insulation Corporation manufactured the following insulating blocks:

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/3

(1) No. 12 insulating blocks, comprised of expanded perlite, cement binder, 5% amocite fiber, packaged in cardboard coartons of about 3 cubic feet capacity.

(2) No. 18 insulating Block, comprised of expanded vermiculite, cement, and diatomaceous clay, packaged in cardboard cartons of about 3 cubic feet capacity.

(3) No. 19 insulating blocks, comprised of expanded vermiculite, cement and diatomaceous clay, packaged in cardboard cartons of about 3 cubic feet capacity.

Prior to its acquisition by and merger with Combustion Engineering, Inc., and beginning prior to the year 1940, R & I Refractory and Insulation Corporation manufactured and still manufactures (now operating as C-E Refractory Division of Combustion Engineering, Inc.) the following insulating materials:

(1) Super Stic Tite, an insulating cement comprised of asbestos, wool and clay, packaged in 50-pound bags.

(2) Super Finish Stic Tite, finishing insulating cement, comprised of asbestos, wool, Portland cement and clay, packaged in 50-pound bags.

(3) R & I Insulated Felt (Blankets), laminated sheets secured with galvanized wire, comprised of mineral wool, packaged in cardboard cartons of about 12 cubic feet capacity.

(4) Loose wool, comprised of mineral wool, packaged in 40 pound bags.

(5) Stic Tite, insulating cement, comprised of asbestos, wool and clay, packaged in 50-pound bags.

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/4

(6) Super Finish, insulating finish cement, comprised of asbestos,wool, Portland cement and clay, packaged in 40 pound bags.

(7) Pourinsul, granulated fibrous material, consisting of clay, wool and Portland cement, packaged in 40-pound bags.

(8) Packinsul, granulated mineral fibers, comprised of wool, packaged in 40-pound bags.

(9) Finish Stic Tite, insulating finish cement, comprised of wool, asbestos, Portland Cement and clay, packaged in 25 and 50 pound bags.

(10) Guninsul, insulating seal material, comprised of wool, banded vermiculite and clay, packaged in 50 pound bags.

(11) Casabloc, insulating pouring cement, comprised of wool, vermiculite and cement, packaged in 50 pound bags.

(12) Mix A, semi-expansion insulation, comprised of asbestos, mineral wool and clay, packaged in 50 pound bags.

As stated, on December 31, 1967, R & I Refractory and Insulation Corporation merged with Combustion Engineering, Inc., and has since that time operated as a Division of Combustion Engineering, Inc.

The Borel v. Fibreboard Case File (1969-1972), Answers to interrogatories
ACL Doc 10144 · Page 5 of 16
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/5

2.

This defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 2 and says the same is argumentative; and defendant denies the products manufactured by it were of a dangerous nature, and says that each of the products manufactured by it were suitable and reasonably fit for the purpose for which the products were intended.

3.

Defendant has not made the studies referred to.

4.

See answer to Interrogatory No. 3.

5.

Defendant, Combustion Engineering, Inc., did not, prior to December 31, 1967, package and sell any products containing asbestos. However, R and I Refractory and Insulation Corporation, which was formerly owned by Combustion Engineering, Inc., and which merged with Combustion Engineering, Inc., on December 31, 1967, packaged and sold the products listed in answer to Interrogatory No. 1 to contractors throughout the United States, through representatives, distributors and direct salesmen, some of which products, as shown by the answer to Interrogatory No. 1, contained asbestos and other materials, and the answer to Interrogatory No. 1 is here referred to; and in addition, sold, but did not package, the following products:

366

The Borel v. Fibreboard Case File (1969-1972), Answers to interrogatories
ACL Doc 10144 · Page 6 of 16
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/6

(1) Duriseal, a blend of asphalt mastics, comprised of asphalt and asbestos fibers, obtained pre-packaged in drums of 5, 30 and 55 gallon capacity.

(2) Permiseal, insulating sealer and weather-coating, comprised of asphalt and asbestos fibers, obtained pre-packaged in drume os 5, 30 and 35 gallon capacity.

(3) Weathercoat, protective coating, comprised of asphalt and asbestos fibers, packaged in 5, 10 and 55 gallon drums, and obtained pre-packaged.

6.

Defendant's products were used generally throughout the United States.

7.

Defendant objects to interrogatory No. 7 because same is argumentative and ambiguous, unintelligible and irrelevant to any issue in this case. Subject to such objection, defendant answers same No.

8.

No studies have been made directly by this defendant.

9.

No.

10.

No, defendant's experience has not indicated the need for doing so, and defendant does not regularly inspect the areas where workers are using products manufactured by defendant, and does not have any control over such work areas or sites where such products are used, and defendant does not make surveys in the field where such products are used.

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/7

11.

Defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 11 for the reason that same is argumentative, ambiguous, immaterial and irrelant, and is not within the purview of the Rule relating to Interrogatories to a Party, and is not a proper matter for discovery and cannot lead to the discovery of matters which are relevant, or to proper matters of discovery.

12.

Defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 12 for the reason that same is argumentative, ambiguous, immaterial and irrelevant, and is not within the purview of the Rule relating to Interrogatories to a Party, and is not a proper matter for discovery and cannot lead to the discovery of matters which are relevant or to proper matters of discovery.

13.

Defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 13 for the reason that same is argumentative, ambiguous, immaterial and irrelevant, and is not within the purview of the Rule relating to Interrogatories to a Party, and is not a proper matter for discovery and cannot lead to the discovery of matters which are relevant or to proper matters of discovery.

14.

No.

15.

See answer to No. 10. Defendant does not make dust samplings in the field.

The Borel v. Fibreboard Case File (1969-1972), Answers to interrogatories
ACL Doc 10144 · Page 8 of 16
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/8

16.

Defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 16 on the grounds that same are irrelevant and immaterial in that plaintiff does not claim he has asbestos-induced cancer, and subject to this objection answers said interrogatory No. 16 no.

17.

Defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 17 on the grounds that same is immaterial and irrelevant in that plaintiff does not claim he has the disease of mesothelioma.

18.

Beginning in 1969, the following warning has been placed on this defendant's products containing asbestos, such warning being to all who use such products: "CAUTION: This product contains asbestos fibers. Excessive inhalation of asbestos may be harmful. If adequate ventilation is not possible, wear respirators approved by the U. S. Bureau of Mines." This was done because there was much discussion about the matter and acting on the advice of industry spokesmen it was decided to transmit this information to workers using the product if they did not already have this information

19.

Interrogatory No. 19 is objected to on the grounds that it is irrelevant and immaterial in that plaintiff does not claim he has cor pulmanale.

20.

Defendant recognizes that asbestos is a durable material but does not recognize that asbestos fiber exists for an invinity of years.

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/9

21.

Defendant recognizes that year by year more asbestos is used in the United States, but the remainder of the interrogatory No. 21 is answered no.

22.

No.

23.

No.

24.

See answer to No. 10 above.

25.

No.

26.

Defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 26 for the reason that same is ambiguous, argumentative, orrelevant and immaterial and assumes a fact not in evidence.

27.

See answer to Interrogatory No. 26 above.

28.

See answer to Interrogatory No. 26 above.

29.

Yes, these products can be distinguished by their appearance.

30.

Yes, generally speaking.

370

The Borel v. Fibreboard Case File (1969-1972), Answers to interrogatories
ACL Doc 10144 · Page 10 of 16
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/10

31.

Combustion Engineering, Inc., was incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware October 25, 1912, and Windsor, Connecticut, is one of its domiciles.

32.

Combustion Engineering, Inc., has been engaged in the manufacture of products containing asbestos and which are commonly used by insulators and asbestos workers since December of 1967. However, it acquired by purchase, in June, 1963, R and I Refractory and Insulation Corporation, which had manufactured insulation containing asbestos, the latter having begun the manufacture of such products in about the year 1938.

33,

Defendant contends respirators are currently on the market which will materially reduce inhalationof asbestos dust and fibers. Such respirators are available under the United States Bureau of Mines Schedule 21B. Tests upon which said approval are based were designed and conducted by that governmental agency and are described in the Respiratory Productive Devices Manual published by the American Industrial Hygiene Association, American Conference of Governmental Hygienists, 1963. One such respirator, "Dustfoe 77", Catalog No. 10-9600, is manufactured by the Mine Safety Appliances Company.

34.

See answer to No. 32 above. Further answering such interrogatory No. 34, defendant says such products have not been placed "upon the open market to be purchased and used by the public" but are sold within a specific trade for a specific use.

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/11

35.

No; no tests have been made, but defendant has had no harmful effects on personnel involved with the manufacture of these products.

36.

Not to the knowledge of this defendant.

37.

Defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 37 in that it is not within the purview of the Rule relating to Interrogatories to a party, calls for an opinion and an assumption, and is argumentative, ambiguous, irrelevant and immaterial, and assumes facts not in evidence.

38.

(1) Generally mixed with water.

(2) Defendant does not manufacture.

(3) Defendant manufactures no bricks or blocks of all asbestos. Asbestos containing pro-blocks are generally scribed or cut with a saw or knife.

(4) Defendant does not manufacture.

(5) Generally mixed with water.

(6) Defendant does not manufacture.

(7) Defendant does not manufacture.

The worker can avoid inhalation of asbestos dust or fibers by working in properly ventilated places and by wearing face masks and inhalators, if there is any asbestos dust or fibers. Insofar as defendant's products are concerned, when the cements are mixed with water, there is no dust present and can be used without contributing dust to the environment.

372

The Borel v. Fibreboard Case File (1969-1972), Answers to interrogatories
ACL Doc 10144 · Page 12 of 16
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/12

39.

The number of employees who have worked for this defendant for 20 years or more and had any indication of lund disease was three, and upon reexamination in November, 1968, no evidence of asbestosis was indicated.

40.

Defendant does not have the medical information or knowledge referred to.

41.

Defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 41 for the reason that the matter called for therein is immaterial and irrelevant to any issue in this cause, and same is not the subject of discovery nor within the purview of the Rule in regard to interrogatories to a party, and cannot lead to matters which are the subject of discovery, and said interrogatory is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this cause.

42.

Defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 42 for the reason that the matter called for therein is immaterial and irrelevant to any issue in this cause, and same is not the subject of discovery nor within the purview of the rule in regard to interrogatories to a party, and cannot lead to matters which are the subject of discovery.

43.

Defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 43 for the reason that the matter called for therein is immaterial and irrelevant to any issue in this cause, and same is not the subject of discovery nor within the purview of the rule in regard to interrogatories to a party, and cannot lead to matters which are the subject of discovery.

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/13

44.

President of Combustion Engineering, Inc., - Arthur J. Santry, Jr., 62 Vineyard Lane, Greenwich, Connecticut.

There is at present no Chairman of the Board.

45.

No answer required.

46.

Defendant objects to Interrogatory No. 46 for the reason that same calls for a conclusion and an opinion, and such matter is not within the purview of the rule relating to interrogatories, and is an attempt by the plaintiff to bolster the witness and lead to the introduction of medical articles, and defendant should not be required to pass on thequalifications of Dr. Selikoff.

47.

Defendant objects to Interrogatories Nos. 47 to 84, Incl., and each of them, for the reason that same call for conclusions and opinions on questions of law.

48.

Defendant, Combustion Engineering, Inc., objects to Interrogatory No. 85 on the ground that the plaintiff is inquiring into medical facts which will necessarily have to be developed through expert testimony at the time of the trial, and said interrogatory is argumentative and improper; and said question is too general and is not limited to the products manufactured by this defendant but deals with "asbestos" as a general term, and the types of products containing asbestos which are manufactured by this defendant contain different percentages and different types of asbestos than those manufactured by the other defendants, and this defendant should not be called upon

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/14

to answer a question which calls for a medical conclusion and may also be one of the ultimate issues to be tried in this case because there is a wide difference of medical and expert opinion.

Charles S. Pipkin

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT,
Combustion Engineering, Inc;
1014 San Jacinto Bldg., P.O.Box 1632,
Beaumont,Texas.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, §

COUNTY OF JEFFERSON . §

CHARLES S. PIPKIN, being duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that he is attorney for the defendant, Combustion Engineering, Inc., in the above cause and as such is duly authorized to make, dile and serve the foregoing answers to interrogatories and this affidavit, and that he does so acting on such authority and authorization; that he has read over the foregoing answers and the same are true and correct.

Charles S. Pipkin

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me, the undersigned authority, this 25 day of March, 1970, to certify which witness my hand and seal of office.

Lucia S. Butcher

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR
JEFFERSON COUNTY, TEXAS.

375

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/15

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 30th day of March, 1970, a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument was mailed to the following named attorneys of record:

Mr. Ward Stephenson, Attorney,
Stephenson and Thompson,
Stephenson Building,
Orange, Texas. 77630
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF, S.R.Potter

Mr. W.N.Arnold, Jr., Attorney,
Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman, Bates
& Jaworski,
Bank of the Southwest Bldg.,
Houston, Texas 77002
ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT, ARMSTRONG CONTRACTING AND SUPPLY CORP.,
AND PHILIP CAREY CORPORATION

Mr. Robert E. Barnes, Attorney,
P.O.Box 5098,
Beaumont, Texas 77706
Attorney for Defendant,
RUBEROID COMPANY, A DIVISION
OF GAF CORPORATION

Mr. Dale Dowell, Attorney,
707 Beaumont Savings Bldg.,
Beaumont, Texas 77701
Attorney for Defendant,
OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORP.

Mr. George A. Weller, Attorney,
P.O.Box 350,
Beaumont, Texas 77704
Attorney for Defendant
FIBREBOARD PAPER PRODUCTS
CORPORATION

Mr. Gerald P. Coley, Attorney,
Vinson, Elkins, Searls & Connally,
First City National Bank Bldg.,
Houston, Texas 77002
Attorney for Defendant
UNARCO INDUSTRIES, INC.

Mr. James W. Mehaffy, Attorney,
San Jacinto Bldg.,
Beaumont, Texas 77701
Attorney for Defendant,
STANDARD ASBESTOS MANUFACTURING
AND INSULATING COMPANY

Mr. Ben L. Reynolds, Attorney,
Royston, Rayzor and Cook,
877 San Jacinto Bldg.,
Houston, Texas 77002
Attorney for Defendant,
EAGLE-PICHER INDUSTRIES, INC.

Mr. Gordon R. Pate, Attorney,
1119 Beaumont Savings Bldg.,
Beaumont, Texas 77701
Attorney for Defendant,
JOHNS-MANVILLE PRODUCTS CORP.

Mr. George E. Murphy, Attorney,
615 San Jacinto Bldg.,
Beaumont, Texas
Attorney for Intervenors,
NATIONAL SURETY CORPORATION and
[illegible]

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT,
COMBUSTION ENGINEERING, INC.

376

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10144/16