GED:MB 2/19/71 0-1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FEB 24 1971
JAMES R. GOONEY, CLERK
BY DEPUTY

RECEIVED
CLERK, U. S. DISTRICT COURT
FEB 24 1971
EASTERN DIST. OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT, TEXAS

CLARENCE BOREL

vs.

FIBREBOARD PAPER PRODUCTS CORPORATION, ET AL

CIVIL ACTION NO. 6449

OBJECTION OF DEFENDANT, PITTSBURGH CORNING CORPORATION TO THE DISMISSAL OF THE CROSS-ACTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTION AGAINST THE DEFENDANTS, OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORPORATION AND STANDARD ASBESTOS MANUFACTURING AND INSULATING COMPANY

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

COMES NOW, the Defendant, PITTSBURGH CORNING CORPORATION, and files this its objection to the motion of the Plaintiff and Defendants, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation and Standard Asbestos Manufacturing and Insulating Company, requesting that the Court enter a proposed judgment disposing of all claims and causes of action, including all cross-actions and counterclaims, against the Defendants, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation and Standard Asbestos Manufacturing and Insulating Company, and it also files its objections to the judgment entered by the Court on February 3, 1971 in behalf of Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation and to the proposed judgment in behalf of Standard Asbestos Manufacturing and Insulating Company. The interlocutory judgment on file herein reflects that Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation has entered into a compromise with the plaintiff and thereby have asserted they are no longer necessary or proper parties to this suit or any cou nterclaim or cross-action herein. An interlocutory judgment has been entered by the Court decreeing that Owens Corning Fiberglas Corpora tion should be in all things dismissed from this suit, both as to Plaintiff's cause of action and the cause of action asserted by National Surety Co rporation as intervenor. It is the understanding of counsel for Pittsburgh Corning Corporation that a similar judgment will be entered in behalf of Standard Asbestos

1252

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10140/1

Manufacturing and Insulating Company. If the order or orders of the Court can be construed as dismissing Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation and Standard Asbestos Manufacturing and Insulating Company from this lawsuit for all purposes, including the dismissal of the cross-action of Pittsburgh Corning Corporation and the cross-action of other defendants, then Pittsburgh Corning Corporation objects to the dismissal of its cross-claim against the defendants, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation and Standard Asbestos Manufacturing and Insulating Company, and as grounds therefor would show:

1.

Plaintiff's Second Amended Original Complaint on file herein alleges that the Defendants, Fibreboard Corporation; Combustion Engineering, Inc.; Johns-Manville Products Corporation; Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation; Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc.; Pittsburgh Corning Corporation; Unarco Industries, Inc.; Philip Carey Corporation; Standard Asbestos Manufacturing and Insulating Company; Ruberoid Company; and Armstrong Cork Company, were jointly guilty of negligence and breach of warranties proximately causing damage to Plaintiff's decedent which resulted in his death.

Pittsburgh Corning Corporation, as one of the alleged joint tort feasors, filed a cross-action against each and all of the Defendants for contribution. Each and all of the cross-defendants are before the Court on the cross-action of Pittsburgh Corning Corporation and each of said cross-defendants has filed answers to said cross-action.

The defendants, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation and Standard Asbestos Manufacturing and Insulating Company, have entered into a compromise settlement agreement with plaintiff, where they have been dismissed from this suit; however, this Defendant is not a party to such compromise settlement agreement and has in nowise entered into a compromise agreement with the Plaintiff and does not agree that said cross-defendants may be dismissed.

2.

Plaintiff alleges that all of the defendants are jointly and severally liable and if this be true, then this Defendant will be entitled to contribution

1253

The Borel v. Fibreboard Case File (1969-1972), Objections to dismissal of Owens-Corning and Standard Asbestos Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 10140 · Page 2 of 5 asbestosclaims.law/library/10140/2

on its cross-action and is entitled to have the said defendants remain as cross-defendants on its cross-action for contribution. Likewise, it is entitled to treat each of said co-defendants and cross-defendants as adverse parties on its cross-action. Under the law, in order for this Defendant to be entitled to credit for the payments heretofore made by the co-defendants and cross-defendants caused or contributed to cause the Plaintiff's damage, and since said co-defendants are also cross-defendants of Pittsburgh Corning Corporation, and have answered said cross-action and are before this Court, this Defendant would object to the dismissal of its cross-action, if such has in fact occurred, against the cross-defendants for contribution. Under Rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, there is no authority in the Court to dismiss the cross-claim or third party claim of this Defendant against the co-defendants, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation and Standard Asbestos Manufacturing and Insulating Company, and this Defendant objects thereto and objects to the judgment or judgments heretofore entered without a hearing and without evidence being heard.

3.

This Defendant would further show that this cause has been pending on this docket for some period of time, numerous depositions have been taken of various witnesses, interrogatories have been propounded to and answers made by representatives of the cross-defendants dismissed, and it would be highly prejudicial to the rights of this Defendant for the Court to enter the order and dismiss the cross-defendants from this suit.

WHEREFORE, this Defendant prays that the Court consider the motion of the cross-defendants, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation and Standard Asbestos Manufacturing and Insulating Company, and each of them, and that the Court decree that the dismissal of Plaintiff's case against said Defendants shall in nowise operate to prejudice the cross-claim of Pittsburgh Corning Corporation.

Respectfully submitted,

WELLS, DUNCAN, BEARD,
GREENBERG AND HUNT

By George E. Duncan
George E. Duncan, Attorney for Defendant, PITTSBURGH CORNING CORPORATION

1254

The Borel v. Fibreboard Case File (1969-1972), Objections to dismissal of Owens-Corning and Standard Asbestos Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 10140 · Page 3 of 5 asbestosclaims.law/library/10140/3

GED:MB 2/19/71 0-1

CERTIFICATE OF SER VICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing instrument was served on the following attorneys by mailing a true and correct copy thereof to their respective offices on the 23rd day of February, 1971.

Mr. Ward Stephenson
Stephenson & Thompson
Stephenson Building
Orange, Texas 77630

Mr. Dale Dowell
707 Beaumont Savings Building
Beaumont, Texas 77701

Mr. Gordon R. Pate
1119 Beaumont Savings Building
Beaumont, Texas

Mr. Gerald P. Coley
First City National Bank Building
Houston, Texas 77002

Mr. Robert E. Barnes
P. O. Box 5098
Beaumont, Texas 77704

Mr. W. N. Arnold
800 Bank of the Southwest Building
Houston, Texas 77002

Mr. George A. Weller
P. O. Box 350
Beaumont, Texas 77704

Mr. James W. Mehaffy, Sr.
1400 San Jacinto Building
Beaumont, Texas 77701

Mr. Charles S. Pipkin
1014 San Jacinto Building
Beaumont, Texas 77701

Mr. Ben L. Reynolds
San Jacinto Building
Houston, Texas 77002

Mr. John G. Tucker
Beaumont Savings Building
Beaumont, Texas 77701

Mr. Frank E. Bean
Room 2010
500 Jefferson Street
Houston, Texas

Mr. George Murphy
San Jacinto Building
Beaumont, Texas 77701

George E. Duncan

George E. Duncan

OF COUNSEL

1255

The Borel v. Fibreboard Case File (1969-1972), Objections to dismissal of Owens-Corning and Standard Asbestos
ACL Doc 10140 · Page 4 of 5
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10140/4

CIVIL ACTION NO. 6449

CLARENCE BOREL

vs.

FIBREBOARD PAPER PRODUCTS CORPORATION, ET AL

OBJECTION OF DEFENDANT, PITTSBURGH CORNING CORPORATION TO THE DISMISSAL OF THE CROSS-ACTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTION AGAINST THE DEFENDANTS, OWENS CORNING FIBERGLAS CORPORATION AND STANDARD ASBESTOS MANUFACTURING AND INSULATING COMPANY

LAW OFFICES OF
WELLS, DUNCAN AND BEARD
BEAUMONT SAVINGS BUILDING
BEAUMONT, TEXAS
77701

The Borel v. Fibreboard Case File (1969-1972), Objections to dismissal of Owens-Corning and Standard Asbestos
ACL Doc 10140 · Page 5 of 5
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/10140/5