1		
2		SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
3		LAW DIVISION, CIVIL PART ESSEX COUNTY
4		DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
5		A.D.#
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11	ROLANDO FERNANDES,	)
12		)
13	Plaintiff,	)
14		) TRANSCRIPT
15	VS.	) OF
16		) TRIAL
17	DAR CONSTRUCTION CO., ET AL.,	)
18		)
19	Defendant.	)
20		
21	Dlago	Facey County Counthouse
22	Fiace:	Essex County Courthouse 465 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
23		Newark, New Jersey 07102
24	Date:	February 2, 2011
25		
	BEFORE: HONORABLE THOMAS R. VENA, J	.S.C. AND JURY
	TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:	

1	
2	SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
3	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL PART ESSEX COUNTY
4	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
5	A.D.#
6	
7	
8	
9	JARED P. DU VOISIN, ESQ.
10	(Tompkins, McGuire, Wachenfeld & Barry)
11	APPEARANCES:
12	GERALD H. CLARK, ESQ.
13	(Keefe Bartels Clark) Attorney for the Plaintiff
14	JOSEPH K. COBUZIO, ESQ.
15	JARED P. DUVOISIN, ESQ. (Tompkins, McGuire, Wachenfeld & Barry)
16	Attorneys for the Defendant
17	Transcriber, Sherry M. Bachmann G&L TRANSCRIPTION OF NJ
18	40 Evans Place
19	Pompton Plains, New Jersey 07444
20	Sound Recorded Recording Operator, K. Fagan
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

•

1		II	NDEX2			
2						
3						
4						
5		Voir				
6	<u>Witnesses</u>	<u>Dire</u>	<u>Direct</u>	<u>Cross</u>	<u>Redirect</u>	<u>Recross</u>
7	FOR THE PLAINTIFF					
8	Dr. Edward Decter	4	6	25	48	49
9						
10	ARGUMENT					
11	BY: Mr. Clark			62 67		
12				75 85		
13	BY: Mr. Cobuzio			66		
14 .				74 76		
15				81		
16	BY: Mr. DuVoisin			71		
17						
18	THE COURT					
19	Decision			77 97		
20	Discussion Re Jury Char	ge		100		
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

1	1
2	Colloquy
3	THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. Please be seated.
4	JURORS: Good morning. THE COURT: Glad everyone arrived safely.
5	We're all present and accounted for, ready to proceed from where we left off. We have another witness on
6	behalf of the defendant. Ready, Mr. Cobuzio? MR. COBUZIO: Yes, Your Honor. We call to
7	the stand Dr. Edward Decter. THE COURT: Dr. Decter, please take the
8	stand. COURT OFFICER: Step up to the stand. Raise
9	your right hand. DR. DECTER: Let me put this down. May I
10	leave this right here? THE COURT: Yes. Sure.
11	DR. EDWARD DECTER, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN
12	COURT OFFICER: State your name, please. THE WITNESS: Edward Decter, D-e-c-t-e-r.
13	THE COURT: Please be seated. Good morning. THE WITNESS: Good morning.
14.	THE COURT: Mr. Cobuzio, whenever you're ready.
15 16	MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

2 1 2 Decter - Voir Dire Direct 3 VOIR DIRE DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COBUZIO: Doctor, just try and keep your voice up. Q The 4 acoustics here -- Doctor, can you kindly give the jury the benefit of your educational background? 5 Yes, sir. I did my undergraduate schooling at the Α University of Maryland in College Park, Maryland. I 6 then after the University of Maryland went to Guadalajara, Mexico, for two years where I studied 7 medicine and I transferred into Creighton Medical School in Omaha, Nebraska, where I graduated in 1975. 8 I then did a one-year internship in general surgery at Temple University Hospital in Pennsylvania 9 and then I completed a four-year orthopedic residency at the Hospital for Joint Diseases, Orthopedic 10 Institute in Manhattan. I graduated Joint Disease in 1980, and I've been in practice in the State of New 11 Jersey since 1980. Q Are you board certified? 12 Yes, sir. Α What is board certification? 0 13 It means you've passed the qualifying examination А given by the American Board of Orthopedic Surgery. 14 There's about 22 specialty boards in the United States, of which orthopedics, which is the discipline of 15 medicine of the musculoskeletal system. Do you have any hospital affiliations? Q 16 Yes, sir. I'm a full attending at St. Barnabas А Medical Center and St. -- in Livingston. I'm the chief 17 of orthopedics and medical director of the Short Hills Surgical Center in Short Hills, New Jersey, and that's 18 where I do my outpatient surgery. Q Do you, in fact, operate on people? 19 Α I do. And have you been in the operating room Q 20 recently? I'm there every week, sir. From here, I'm going Α 21 to there. I had to push things back today to accommodate the Court. 22 Do you have a practice where you actually Q treat patients as well? 23 Yes, sir. I have a very nice orthopedic treating Α practice. Yes, sir. 24 And do you have any -- are you a physician Q for any professional teams or amateur teams? 25 I was a team physician for four professional А sports teams in my career, and one was the Red Bull, which was the professional indoor -- Red Bull, which was the professional soccer team. I stopped doing that about two years ago. The New Jersey Gladiators, which were the professional arena indoor football team, the

2 Decter - Direct 3 Ironmen, which was a professional indoor arena soccer team, and the indoor professional lacrosse team. I've 4 been the team physician for St. Benedict's Prep across the street for -- forever, and I had run a sports medicine program in the City of Newark for many years. 5 Do you lecture to other physicians with Q 6 regard to hip replacements? А I have given some lectures regarding the Leinbach 7 hip prosthesis, which is a type of prosthesis that is used for fractures and I've given some lectures on 8 that. I helped write the protocol for the Leinbach hip replacement years ago, very early 80's. 9 MR. COBUZIO: Okay. At this time, Judge, I would like to qualify the doctor in the field of 10 orthopedics as an expert. THE COURT: Mr. Clark? 11 MR. CLARK: No objection, Your Honor. Thank you. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Dr. Decter is qualified as an expert in this court and accepted as so in the field 13 of orthopedics. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COBUZIO: Now, doctor, you've rendered actually three 14 Q reports where you actually touched the patient and 15 physically examined him. Is that right? А Yes, sir. 16 That's one before the hip surgery and two Q after the hip surgery. Is that right? 17 Yes. One on October 19th, 2007, the other one on Α October 31st, 2008, and on June 11th, '09. 18 And you're aware that Dr. -- do you know who Q Dr. Reber (phonetic) is? 19 Α Sure. Q Who is he? 20 He's a colleague of mine. He was actually in our А practice for a couple of years and he went out on his 21 own. Okay. You're aware in this case that he's 22 rendered a few reports, only one of which where he actually touched the patient and that was before the 23 hip surgery. You're aware of that? Α Yes, sir. 24 Okay. Now, Dr. Reber in this matter testified as to the CT scan, which you had available to 25 you at the time of your reports and you also reviewed again today. Is that right? Α Yes, sir. And his testimony on the stand for this jury Q was that the fractures that Mr. Fernandes sustained actually went into the hip joint. I know there's a

3

1

1	4
2	Decter - Direct
3	fancy word for that, but I can't say and I don't think the jury can say it. It's the hip joint.
4	A Into the acetabulum or the ball and socket, which makes up the hip. This is very paramount to understand
5	this. This is key to understanding the case. Q Okay. And is there any objective evidence by
6	way of radiology reports, which suggest that the fracture actually went into the hip joint and if you
7	could please explain to the jury what that is, what you relied on for purposes of expressing your opinion here?
8	THE WITNESS: Your Honor, do you mind if I stand?
9	THE COURT: I don't mind at all. (Witness moves away from microphone)
10	THE WITNESS: There was a CAT scan done on plaintiff's hip on November 9th, 2004, which was about
11	a month after the accident and CAT scan stands for computerized axial tomography. It cuts through a body
12	part and transacts and this was done at Northfield Imaging and it says here, there are multiple fractures
13	identified in this patient. There is a fracture present involving the anterior aspect of the sacrum
	with disruption and I just happened to have a pelvis and a sacrum here to demonstrate what we're
15 16	talking about. BY MR. COBUZIO:
10	Q If you want to step down and show the jury that, here. All right. A So there was a fracture through the sacrum, and it
18	talks about the superior anterior portion of the sacrum. That's the sacrum. It's the bone in your back
19	here and the reason it's called sacrum is the sacrum bone is the last bone in your body to So there was a
20	fracture there and it says that it had some cordical disruption was visualized, meaning the cortex, the
21	outer part of the bone is called the cortex. The inner part is called the medullary canal, and so there's less
22	Then there was a fracture involving the superior lateral aspect of pubic ramus bilaterally and it says,
23	this is in close proximity to the medial portion of the acetabuli bilateral.
24	This is important. It says, it's in close proximity. It doesn't say that it extended into the
25	acetabulum or into the joint. Why is this important? It's important because if the socket and the ball and socket is not disrupted, the articular surface or the end of the bone is not going to be affected. So this is important as well. So if it was a fracture, this is the socket we're talking about. The is the pubic ramus here. Okay. There was a fracture that came close to

1	5
2	Decter - Direct
3	this area, and I'll show it to you here on the film. But it did not enter the acetabulum the articulating
4	surface of the hip joint. Q Just so we can put it in context, doctor,
5	sorry to interrupt, it's important for purposes of your opinion just so the jury can orient themselves a little
6	bit with your testimony, is it your testimony that the hip replacement is not related to the trauma?
7	A Yes. Q Okay. And, now, let please continue to
8	explain why. A there's a fracture of the bilateral interior
9	intracranial that's this down here, intracranial in this area. So there's a fracture interiorly and
10	superiorly with approximation to the medial aspect of the acetabulum
11 12	Now, when you look at the blown-up pictures of this CAT scan that I just read to you, this is one
12	of the most important things to really see. Can you all see it? This is the transaxial cut of the hip done
14	in a transaxial projection. So they're taking the hip joint and they're cutting through it, so they can see
14	the boney architecture and they can actually see the hip joint. All right? Now, what it shows here is something that's
16	very important. This is the transaxial view. This is the ball of the hip joint, and this is the hip joint.
17	Now, remember I talked about cortical disruption or cortex? Cortex is the outer area of a bone. So you
18	can see this line right here. It is the outer cortex and in here is the inner cortex. Okay? Do you all see the outer and inner cortex? The fracture involved the
19	outer cortex and does not propagate in the hip joint. This is the hip joint.
20	Had this fracture gone all the way through, then I would opine that there is a probability that
21	this hip replacement would have been related to the fracture, but it does not. The total integrity of the
22	inner cortex now, what you see right here, this spot right here, that's a cyst. That's an arthritic cyst.
23	Okay? This CAT scan was done, as I said, one month after the accident and the gentleman already has
24	osteoarthritis of his right hip. Q Are you referring to an x-ray, doctor?
25	A I'm referring to this x-ray right here, 12/7/04. Q Doctor, just while you're on it, all your
	opinions in this matter are within a reasonable degree of medical probability. Is that correct? A That is correct.
	Q Continue, doctor, with regard to the x-ray

1	6
2	Decter - Direct
3	and the osteoarthritis. A This is the x-ray, $12/7/04$ , two months after the
4	accident. You're seeing narrowing of the joint space, okay? This doesn't happen in two months. That's been
5	there before. That is not something that happened in two months' time. That not
6	He also has an osteo or a spur in the superior portion of his acetabulum and he already has
7	them on hip two months after the accident. Q Doctor, let me stop you there for a minute.
8	This man has been pretty much a laborer and plumber most of his adult life. He was approximately 52 years
9	old at the time of the accident. Based on your practice and training, is this something you would see
10	in a person who had a working history such as that? MR. CLARK: Judge, I just want to object
11	because I've looked at all his reports and I've looked at them last night and this stuff, this new thing is
12	not in any of the reports. This is something that's just come up.
13	THE COURT: What new thing? The question wasn't a new thing. Somebody have arthritis when
14	they're that age, essentially, is what he asked. I think Dr. Decter is more qualified to answer that
15	question. MR. CLARK: Yes. But this whole thing about
16	this sudden thing about somehow saying that the hip is not related is not in his reports at all. It's all
17	new. THE COURT: Okay. Noted. Continue.
18	MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, doctor. Thank you, Judge.
19	THE WITNESS: So there's evidence two months after the accident that the gentleman has
20	osteoarthritis in his right hip. BY MR. COBUZIO:
21	Q Do your findings or strike that do your opinions with regard to the fracture not going into the
22 23	joint space, are they consistent with what's depicted on the CT scan?
24	A It's what's in the CT scan is what is read by the radiologist, even as to lay people, who are not
24	doctors, you can clearly see the fracture here. It's plain as day. But you can also see that the fracture has not gong into the joint and that's key. That's
ZJ	has not gone into the joint, and that's key. That's paramount. Now, another important study that was done in this case was what's called an arctigram (phonetic) of the right hip.
	Q Please explain to us, doctor, what findings were made with regard to the arctigram? Again, that's

1	7
2	Decter - Direct
3	another objective test done by a radiologist. It was done by a radiologist. Is that right?
4	A Yes. It was. Q And it's something that you relied upon for
5	purposes of your opinion. Is that correct? A Yes.
6	Q Please explain to the jury the significance of the arctigram from 2005.
7	A It says here, an arctigram done in July of '05, which is about nine months after the accident, a
8	arctigram did this MRI of the hip and it says there's an area of sub no fractures are seen and no
9	joint effusion and the opinion was degenerative subcortical cyst change along the right acetabulum.
10	There was no fracture of either the hip and there's no joint space and the are normal.
11	Q What does that suggest what does that tell you, doctor, by way of by way of lay opinion for
12	purposes of this jury to understand? A It's consistent with the osteoarthritis that was
13	seen two months after the accident. Q Can one develop osteoarthritis within two
14	months following a traumatic accident?
15	A Within a reasonable degree of medical probability, it's unlikely. That would be my testimony. Another very important study was what's called an MR a right
16	hip arthrogram where they injected contrast or they injected steroid into the hip and Novocaine and they
17	did an x-ray, and this was done on 7/8/05. It says, in front view and a view of the hip shows
18	hypertrophic spurring in the and mild joint space narrowing. That's what we're looking at here, this
19	hypertrophic boney overgrowth and some joint space narrowing, consistent with the arthritis that is
20	identified two months after the accident. Q Does he also have arthritis on the other side
21	now? A He has a little bit, but not as much as the right
22	side. Then they did a repeat right hip arthrogram in 2008, three years later, and it says here, the right
23	hip shows mild hip joint narrowing and spur coordination. If this gentleman had an arthritic a
24	post-traumatic arthritic condition, you would have seen rapid progression over three years time, progression of
25	the disease process because there would have been a joint that was incongruent or not fitting in the ball and socket. But because this fracture did not go into the ball and socket, there was no incongruity ever established. That's very, very important to understand that the radiologist doesn't say there was advancement

1	8
2	Decter - Direct
3	of the arthritis. There was mild arthritis. That's what it was and, yet, this gentleman went onto have a
4	total hip replacement. Q And it's your opinion, therefore, that the
5	hip replacement, based on your review of the medical records supplied, all the medical records in this case,
6	that the hip replacement MR. CLARK: Objection. Leading, Judge.
7	Asked and answered. THE COURT: I'll allow it.
8	BY MR. COBUZIO: Q Is it your testimony then, doctor, that the
9	hip replacement was not necessary nor was it causally related to this accident?
10	A I'm going to say that I don't believe that the hip replacement in my medical opinion was caused by this
11	accident because the arthritis was very present two months after the accident and didn't progress over
12	time. That's number two. And, number three, the fracture didn't go into the joint, as I understand
13	there was testimony that it went into the joint. And if you understand nothing more about this case, the
14	most tell tail thing is the blow-up of this film that shows it does not violate or affect the second cortex.
15	If there was a fracture of the second cortex, my testimony would be a lot different today.
16	Q Doctor, you agree, however, that the plaintiff in this case did, in fact, suffer from pelvic
17	fractures and you identified those for A Absolutely. There's no doubt the gentleman had
18	pelvic fractures around the hip. Q Do fractures heal?
19	A Fractures heal. Q And
20	A The fractures were not in the hip joint. Now, that's the key here.
21	Q Were they displaced or not displaced? Can you describe them?
22	A Yes. There was some displacement here of the fractured yes.
23	Q But there's no surgery necessary to fix them. Is that correct?
24	A You don't have to fix these types of fractures.
25	The only time you have to stabilize these fractures, if you have an unstable pelvis or someone has excessive bleeding, I see trauma or people fracture their sacrum because there's a lot of blood supply back there, and there's disruption of the whole pelvic rim, that you would need what's called an external fixator on the pelvis and pull the pelvis back together to try

1	9
2	Decter - Direct
3	and stop the bleeding. Q When you examined this plaintiff, Mr.
4	Fernandes, your last exam, which was after the hip replacement, remember, Dr. Reber never saw him after
5	the hip replacement you, in fact, put him through different ranges of motion after to move his hip, move
6	his leg. Is that right? A Now, just let me get that report in front of me.
7	Q Sure. June 11th. June 11, 2009. A Can you please repeat your question?
8	Q Sure. You examined the plaintiff on June 11, 2009, after his hip replacement, at least a year or
9	more, and you did a physical exam of his hips and what did you find?
10	A Well, I examined his back and his hips. I did both.
11	Q I'm going to get to the back. We'll keep them separate.
12	A But his hips showed full, unrestricted motion. He complained of pain and palpation on the right sacral
13 14	iliac from back in this area where he had the fracture. He complained of pain back there, and he was also
14 . 15	walking with use of a cane at that time as well. Q What is full range of motion, unrestricted of the hip?
16	A It means he had full flexion, extension, internal, external rotation, abduction where you bring the leg
17	out and adduction where you bring the leg in. Q Now, Dr. Reber in this matter testified
18	and I'm going to refer to the back. Dr. Reber testified as to a disk bulge or bulges in the back to
19	be caused by the trauma. Are there any studies available to you, MRIs or CT scans available to you,
20	which you would rely on for purposes of forming an opinion as to whether or not the bulges were causally
21	related to the trauma? A First of all, bulges are when you have a disk
22	in your back, okay, these are the disks in your lower back and these are the vertebral bodies and these are
23	the nerves that are throughout your back, go down your leg, the sciatic nerve and These are the disks. In
24	the adult population, a bulging disk is not necessarily is not pathological and especially with the absence
25	of an annular tear, the annulus that goes around the disk, if that's torn and there's a bulge, you can see that that is post-traumatic. Okay? But a bulge in and of itself in a degenerative spine, which is what this gentleman has, and I'll read you the report. It says, mild degenerative disk disease L4, greater than L4, 5, no significant central canal stenosis or

1	10
2	Decter - Direct
3	herniated disks identified. Q Does that suggest that the disk pathology was
4	caused by an acute trauma?
5	A No. Au contraire, is the degenerative disk, it can bulge. It doesn't have the water content to bulge. If this report says there was an annular tear, which is
6	the disk, then there could be a good argument that it's post-traumatic, but there's no annual tear here
7	and bulging disks in the adult population are very physiological.
8	Q Are there any other MRIs of the lumbar spine, which support your opinion or the CT scans of the
9	lumbar spine, which support your opinion that this is a degenerative condition?
10	A Well, then there was another MRI done of the lumbar spine. There was one done in '05.
11	Q Excuse me for one second, doctor. I'm getting distracted by the back of the room. I don't
12	want the jury to be distracted, so doctor, please continue.
13	A There was another MRI done in November of 2008. Q And is there anything on that MRI to suggest
14	that the disk pathology was caused by an acute trauma? A No. It shows what is called bilateral facet
15	hypertrophy changes. At L3, 4, they talk about an annular bulge but no I mean, a bulging disk but no
16	annular tear. And at L5, S1, they talk about an annular disk bulging and bilateral facet hypertrophy.
17	And what that, again, means in English, the facet on the articulating surface is here. That holds the spine
18	together. Hypertrophy means overgrowth or arthritis and that's what that is, an arthritic spine.
19	Q Is that something you expect in a man of his age or his with his employment history?
20	A Well, it's not uncommon as we get older to have degeneration of our disks and develop arthritis in our
21	back. Q So it really doesn't even matter about what
22	your employment was? Anybody can get it? A Well, yes. Most people do get it.
23	Q Now, doctor, you examined the plaintiff, you actually put your hands on him on June 11, 2009. Were
24	there any objective findings in the lumbar spine? A I found that he was able to bend at 70 degrees.
25	He then complained of discomfort. The discomfort I thought he was complaining of was more his right sacral iliac where he had the fracture and that's why I thought it was related to that. I then did a straight leg raising test to put his leg perpendicular to his body. That was negative. That's checking for any type

1	11
2	Decter - Direct
3	of nerve entrapment or sciatic nerve injury. His motor
4	strength testing was noted to be normal, and his reflexes were noted to be normal.
5	Q Did you find any permanent disabilities associated with the lumbar spine, doctor? A I thought it was more from his sacral iliac joint
6	A I thought it was more from his sacral iliac joint where he had the fracture, sir. You know, I don't think his lumbar spine I mean, you know, the ham
7	bone is connected to the hip bone and all that stuff is connected, but I think it was more from the sacral
8	fracture where his pain was. Q In fact, it was a there was a TMG NCB
9	study done. That's a nerve conduction study by Dr. Robaton (phonetic). Did that support your findings
10	that there was no reticular component? A Yeah. There was no there was no when he had
11	his surgery, the surgeon thought he had some sciatic nerve entrapment and he released the sciatic nerve,
12	which is by the area that you're operating. There was no EMG documentation to support that. He had two EMGs,
13	I believe. Q Doctor, is there anything in your report of
14 . 15	June are there any findings in your report of June 11, 2009, which would suggest to you that Mr. Fernandes is incapable of gainful employment?
16	A I certainly think that this gentleman is capable of gainful employment. Yes, sir.
17	Q All right. Did you have an opportunity to review the left shoulder the records with regard to the left shoulder, in particular, the x-rays?
18	A Yeah. There was a report that I generated. Q What was the date of that report, sir?
19	A That's May 10th May 20th, 2010. Q This is a report based on your actual review
20	of the films. Is that right? A Yes.
21	Q And you reviewed the film. What did it tell you?
22	A It said that there is, indeed, a very small avulsion of the inferior glenoid. The glenoid is the
23	shoulder socket that's analogous to the hip socket, except it's much more shallow. I said, the age is
24	indeterminate. If, in fact, the plaintiff did not sustain a dislocation of the left shoulder at the time
25	of this accident, I cannot causally relate a small chip avulsion (boney bankart) to the accident in question.
	The way you get a little chip fracture or what's called a boney bankart lesion is by dislocating your shoulder and there was no history that I could see that he dislocated his shoulder.

1	12
2	Decter - Direct
3	Q Doctor, have you told us all our opinions with regard to the right hip, the left shoulder, and
4	the lumbar spine? A I've given you anything you've asked me.
5	Q Okay. Well, is there any other evidence in the treating records other than what you've testified
6	to, to support your conclusions? A I totally concur, he sustained pelvic fractures as
7	a result of this accident. I do not believe the fracture extended into the joint. He had preexisting
8	osteoarthritis, which was evident two months after the accident. He had some degeneration of his lumbar
9	spine, none of which was traumatically induced. I believe he may have had a temporary exacerbation of an
10	underlying degenerative condition, sprained his back and as far as his shoulder is concerned, there's no
11 12	history or record that he dislocated his shoulder and that he had this little boney fragment that, in the
13	absence of a dislocation and it was age determinate, you couldn't tell how old that fracture was or that piece of bone was there.
14	MR. COBUZIO: No further questions, doctor. Thank you very much.
15	THE COURT: Cross-examine. MR. CLARK: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	13
2	Decter - Cross
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CLARK:
4	Q Doctor, you're testifying in court here today on behalf of essentially Mr. Cobuzio's client. Is that right?
5	A Yes, sir. Q Now, your client you never treated my
6	client. Is that right? A No. There was no doctor/patient relationship.
7	That's correct.
8	Q So, really, your client in this case is Mr. Cobuzio or Mr. Cobuzio's office. Is that right? A Yes. That's the same as Dr. Reber examined the
9	patient for you, I examined the patient for Mr. Cobuzio. That's correct, sir.
10	Q So your client is, essentially, Mr. Cobuzio and Mr. Cobuzio's office, right?
11	A Yes, sir. Q Now, what percent of your career do you do
12	is devoted to doing the forensic evidence where you write reports, defense medical exams, and testify in
13	court as opposed to actually treating patients? What's the percentage breakdown?
14	A I'll tell you exactly. I'll give you the percentage. On a normal work week, I'll see between
15	100 and 125 private treating patients where there's a doctor/patient relationship and then I'll do about 400
16	to 500 surgeries a year and I'll do approximately about 30 of these what are called forensic or medical legal
17	evaluations where there is no doctor/patient relationship. So that's sort of the breakdown, sir, as
18	to how it is. Q So what would be the percentage to actually
19	treating patients and what percentage is the forensic part, testifying and writing reports?
20	A Well, I just gave it to you. I said, I see about 100, 125 to 30.
21	Q Yes. But what's the percentage? A You mean, in a work week? It's about 30 percent
22	of my work week. Q Thirty percent is what, court or patient?
23	A Is what? Q Thirty percent is what?
24	A Seventy percent is treating patients and operating and about thirty percent is about doing forensic
25	medical legal work. Q Now, of the portion doing the legal work,
	mostly but not all it is on behalf of defendants or defense law firms. Isn't that right?
	A I would say that 95 percent is on behalf of defendants. Yes, sir.

14 1 2 Decter - Cross 3 Now, doctor, this part of your career in terms of testifying in court on behalf of defendants, 4 that's big business for you. Isn't it? Well, is it a big business? It's a percentage of Α my income. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, Dr. Reber 5 even does work for -- you know, with us, too. 6 He does work for what? Q He does work -- he does independent medical exams Α 7 on behalf of defendants. In fact, doctor, you are a five percent  $\bigcirc$ 8 shareholder or greater in a company called ExamWorks Group, Inc. Are you not? A I'm not. No. 9 You have nothing to do with ExamWorks, Inc.? 0 10 I don't own any stock in ExamWorks, Inc. А You're on a -- do you have any relationship Q 11 with ExamWorks, Inc.? А Yes. I do work for them. Yes. I do independent 12 medical evaluations for them. For ExamWorks, Inc., and their clients, 0 13 right? Yes. А 14 Q Did I write the name of the company down, ExamWorks, Inc.? 15 Yeah. А So your testimony here today is that you're Q 16 not a shareholder of ExamWorks, Inc.? А I do not own any stock in ExamWorks, Inc. 17 Have you ever had any interest in ExamWorks, Q Inc.? 18 I did. Α Yes. ExamWorks, Inc., has a website, right? Q 19 А Yes. I'm going to show you plaintiff's Exhibit 48, Q 20 which is a copy of the -- section of ExamWorks, Inc. Just read along with me, if you would. 21 Α Sure. MR. COBUZIO: Can I see the exhibit before 22 you show the witness? BY MR. CLARK: 23 This is your website, right, doctor? 0 It's ExamWorks, Inc.'s website. I sold my company Α 24 to ExamWorks. Read along with me, if you would. ExamWorks, Q Inc., is a leading provider of independent medical 25 exams and IND-related services to the defense legal industry, third-party administrators. Hold it. Who crossed out -- who --Α Stop. Stop. 0 You crossed something out. А

1	15
2	Decter - Cross
3	Q Stop. Stop.
4	MR. COBUZIO: Objection, Judge. MR. CLARK: Judge, side bar, please. THE COURT: Okay.
5	MR. COBUZIO: My copy doesn't have the
6	redaction, so I don't know what we're talking about. THE COURT: We'll find out. Excuse us. (Discussion at side bar - unable to transcribe)
7	(End of discussion at side bar) BY MR. CLARK:
8	Q You're aware ExamWorks, Inc., has a website, correct?
9	A Yes. I've never read it. I didn't create it. I don't own ExamWorks. I sold my company to ExamWorks.
10	That's what I did, two years ago. MR. COBUZIO: Objection. Objection, Judge,
11	to any questioning then dealing with the webpage. The doctor says, he has never read it, he doesn't know
12	what's on it, and he sold his company to them. He has no affiliation. You can't get anymore than that,
13	Judge. MR. CLARK: Judge, I want to cross-examine
14	him on his representation to this jury that he has nothing to do with ExamWorks, Inc.
15	MR. COBUZIO: That's not what he said. Objection. Objection.
16	THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Wait. MR. COBUZIO: That's not what he said, Judge.
17	He's mischaracterizing the testimony. He said, he gets referral work through ExamWorks, that's it.
18	THE COURT: You can explore that relationship, but you can't ask him to testify about
19	something that he doesn't have any information about. So let's move away from the website and, if you want to
20	ask him what he knows about ExamWorks, I'm a little aloft as to what the relevance is, but I'll give you
21	some latitude. But let's move it along. BY MR. CLARK:
22	Q Isn't it true, doctor, that ExamWorks, Inc.,
23	ExamWorks, Inc., is in business to do defense medical exams on patients like this on behalf of clients, defense law firms. Isn't that true?
24	A It's part of it. It does bill review, it does peer review, it does medical legal evaluations. It
25	<pre>will take plaintiff work, so it does many things besides just what plaintiff is trying to characterize that it does just defense medical legal evaluations. It does bill review. It does other things, too. Q Doctor, ExamWorks, Inc., is an recently, right?</pre>

1	16
2	Decter - Cross
3	A It did, October 28th, 2010.
4	Q That means it put itself on the New York Stock Exchange for it to be traded, right?
5	A Yes. When I sold my company, I sold it to businessmen. They, in turn, took it and took it
6	public. Eddie Decter, orthopedic surgeon, Q I'm going to show you a copy of the
7	registration statement MR. COBUZIO: Objection.
8	BY MR. CLARK: Q of ExamWorks, Inc., when it did the IPO.
9	Do you see that? MR. COBUZIO: Objection for relevance, Judge.
10	THE COURT: What's the relevance of that? THE WITNESS: What does that have to do with
11	anything? It went public. I told you it went public. THE COURT: Okay. Don't answer the question.
12	MR. COBUZIO: Doctor, please refrain from answering until the objection can be ruled upon. THE WITNESS: Sure.
13	BY MR. CLARK:
14 .	Q Doctor, isn't it true that ExamWorks, Inc., and you have a service agreement? A Yeah. I do independent medical exams for them.
15	Whatever that agreement is, I do work for them. Okay? I do work for ExamWorks. They have cases for me to
16	review. I do it. I get paid per case. I'm a piecemeal worker. I do it. Yes.
17	Q And isn't it true, doctor, that with the years December 31, 2008 and 2009 and for the six months
18	ending June 30, 2009 and 2010, the company paid Dr. Decter \$279,000, \$819,000, \$398,000, and \$503,000,
19	respectively, for IME services performed on behalf of ExamWorks clients?
20	A You know, I can't I don't have that information in my hand. I didn't bring my W-2 or 1099, whatever it
21	is. I'll tell you what I make a year, sir. I'm not Q Okay, doctor. Well, why don't we if you
22	forget, take a look at MR. COBUZIO: Judge, objection.
23	BY MR. CLARK:
24	Q take a look at the SEC document and see if that refreshes your recollection as to whether or not that is correct.
25	MR. COBUZIO: Wait. Objection, Judge. He's showing him a document that's never been produced in discovery, number one, and number two is, it's an out- of-court document. MR. CLARK: The doctor said he doesn't
	remember. I'm using it to refresh his recollection.

1	17
2	Decter - Cross
3	THE WITNESS: Sir, if it's in the SEC thing, I got it.
4	THE COURT: Wait a minute now. Wait a minute now. Let me respond to the objection. Please do not
5	if you're offering him a document to attempt to refresh his recollection, that purpose is not to
6	convince the doctor somehow or another that the document you're showing him is authoritative and,
7	therefore, should be something that he should rely on because, for all of the reasons Mr. Cobuzio brought up,
8	this document is not admissible. Hand him a piece of paper, whether it's what you used to wrap your lunch in
9	or whatever it is, you can use it and ask him if the witness if the witness' recollection is now
10	refreshed with regard to how much money he made from ExamWorks, Inc., nothing more.
11	BY MR. CLARK: Q Doctor, I'm going to show you plaintiff's
12	Exhibit 47. Take a look at Page F-30 at the bottom, carrying over to the next page. Does that refresh your
13	recollection as to how much money you made in the years 2008 to 2010 doing defense medical exams on behalf of
14	<pre>the clients of ExamWorks, Inc.? Does that refresh your memory?</pre>
15	A Yeah. Let me read it, okay? This would be accurate, sir. Yes.
16	Q Thank you. A You're welcome.
17	Q So if we add up \$279,000, \$819,000, \$398,000, and \$540,000,
18	A Thank you, sir. Q Is that
19	A You can add it up. Go ahead. Q Okay. Isn't it true that you have personally
20	made over \$2,036,000 a year in 2008 and 2009 doing exams on behalf of clients like Mr. Cobuzio and his
21	office? Isn't that true? A Yes. And I've also made more money than that
22	doing surgery in my medical practice because this is really about 30 percent of my income. So that's the
23	<pre>way it is. That's the facts.     Q Doctor, isn't it also true that when</pre>
24	ExamWorks, Inc., this defense medical exam company went public, Now, you said that you're not currently a
25	stockholder of ExamWorks, Inc. Is the SEC disclosure document incorrect when it says, the company is a part of the
	THE COURT: Now, you're doing exactly what I told you not to do.
	MR. CLARK: All right.

18 1 2 Decter - Cross 3 MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge. THE WITNESS: Sir, my --4 MR. COBUZIO: No. Don't answer. THE COURT: No. No. There's no question. 5 MR. COBUZIO: It's been ruled upon. BY MR. CLARK: 6 You're not a stockholder of ExamWorks, Inc., Q anymore? 7 MR. COBUZIO: Objection, Judge. Asked and answered. 8 THE COURT: Three times. THE WITNESS: I am no longer a stockholder of 9 this company. THE COURT: No. No. Don't answer the 10 question. Now, we've got the answer. MR. COBUZIO: Third time. 11 BY MR. CLARK: All right. Well, it's true, is it not, Dr. Q 12 Decter, that your wife, Jean Decter, is a 3.6 percent shareholder of the company. Is that true? 13 It is true. Α Okay. You're still married, correct? 0 14 I am still married. Yes, sir. Α Okay. 3.6 percent your wife currently owns? Q 15 I don't even -- you know more than I do, to be Α honest with you, sir. Well, she owns, does she not, 1 million, 69, 16 Q 700, and 7,000 shares of ExamWorks, Inc.? 17 No. А That's not right? 0 18 А That's not right anymore. 0 It was at one time? 19 А My children -- can I answer the question or not? I don't know if I can answer. 20 THE COURT: No. You're not answering the question. What you're attempting to do is explain your 21 answer to the question. THE WITNESS: Answer the -- I'm sorry. 22 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, just note my objection. I mean, what's the relevance of all this? 23 BY MR. CLARK: Doctor, isn't it true that when the IPO --Q 24 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, I objected. THE COURT: Okay. Let's hear the question. 25 BY MR. CLARK: Doctor, isn't it true that when the company Q went public in October, it was selling between \$16 and \$18 a share? Yes, sir. А Doctor, isn't it true that, as of yesterday, Q

1	19
2	Decter - Cross
3	the sell price of ExamWorks, Inc., was \$21.88? MR. COBUZIO: Objection, Judge. He's
4	testifying now? Judge, I mean, come on. Mr. Clark is testifying.
5	THE COURT: Well, that often happens in cross-examination. If Dr. Decter happens to know
6	whether or not that is true, he can say, yes, he could say, no, that's not it, or he can say, I have no idea.
7	THE WITNESS: I didn't check it. I don't know what it was yesterday, so.
8	BY MR. CLARK: Q Do you want to take a look at the e-trade for
9	now? MR. COBUZIO: Objection, Judge.
10	THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't deny anything you're saying is factual. It is what it is, sir.
11	Whatever the stock closed at yesterday, it closed at yesterday.
12	BY MR. CLARK: Q 21.88 times 1,069,707 is \$23,405,000. Isn't
13	that right? A Well, that's right, but the point is, sir, that my
14	children own more of the stock and my wife doesn't own all of that stock anymore, so it is what it is.
15	Q \$23,405,189. Doctor, isn't it also true that the commission of ExamWorks, Inc., is to rely on the
16	local professional presence, enhance quality of service, and improve workloads of the defense medical
17	review process? A   If I can see what you're reading and that's what
18	it says, then that's what it says. THE COURT: No. No. If you know.
19	THE WITNESS: I don't know. I didn't see the website.
20	THE COURT: Next question. THE WITNESS: I don't know.
21	BY MR. CLARK: Q Isn't it true that ExamWorks, Inc., is
22	<pre>dedicated to serving its client? A You're always dedicated to serving your patients,</pre>
23	your clients. That's what you're trying to do. You're trying to
24	Q But ExamWorks, Inc., doesn't serve it doesn't serve patients, right? It only serves clients?
25	A There are many times where there's take-over treatment.
	Q Doctor, are you aware that a cubic yard of dirt weighs over a ton?
	A I am not aware of that, sir. Q Doctor, do you disagree with the report of

20 1 2 Decter - Cross 3 Dr. Schmauz (phonetic) --MR. COBUZIO: Objection, Judge. You've 4 already ruled on this issue. MR. CLARK: This is cross-examination, Judge, 5 and --THE COURT: So? 6 MR. CLARK: Dr. Reber was cross-examined on the -- of other doctors in this case. 7 MR. COBUZIO: No. He wasn't. MR. CLARK: Multiple --8 MR. COBUZIO: Your Honor ruled on that. THE COURT: Objection is sustained. 9 MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge. BY MR. CLARK: Doctor, you reviewed the record in this case, 10 Q correct, the records of Dr. Schmauz, Dr. Prower 11 (phonetic), Dr. Hartspan (phonetic), Dr. Chote (phonetic)? 12 Whatever is in my report, sir, in the four corners Α of my report, that's what I reviewed. 13 Q Thank you. You said, the four corners of your report, right? 14 .. A I said, whatever I said in my report, that's what I reviewed. 15 In fact, in your report of October 19th, Q 2007, you said there was widening of the sacral iliac 16 joints, there were fractures of the superior lateral aspects of the pubic range bilaterally, there was 17 bilateral fractures in the pubic range, there was a fracture to the medial aspect of the left --18 Excuse me, but you're wrong. You're Α misrepresenting something, okay? I said there was no 19 widening of the sacral iliac joint. That's what my report says. I didn't say there was widening. That's 20 not what the report says. MR. COBUZIO: Please get the report in front 21 of you, doctor. THE WITNESS: I have the report in front of 22 me. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 23 BY MR. CLARK: 0 You said in the -- section that this 24 individual sustained pelvic fractures as demonstrated on the CAT scan and that these are causally related to 25 this accident. You said that, right? I did. The fractures were caused by the accident. А I'm not disputing that at all, not for one second. All right, doctor. And, also, in your report of October 10, 2008, you said that he sustained a fracture of the left sacrum and left pubic rami. He's

1	21
2	Decter - Cross
3	undergone a total hip replacement for osteoarthritis, and it was our opinion that the above injuries are
4	causally related to the accident. You wrote that, correct?
5	A Excuse me. Can I get the Q Did you write that?
6	A Can I get the report in front of me? I have
7	<pre>multiple reports. Give me a second. Just give me a second. What date are you talking about? Q October 10, 2008.</pre>
8	A Okay. Let me get it in front of me here.
9	Q Doctor, the better strike that. THE COURT: Well, MR. COBUZIO: Wait. Wait.
10	MR. CLARK: Sorry.
11	THE WITNESS: I don't have that report in front of me. So do you have it? May I please have it? MR. CLARK: Sure.
12	THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. BY MR. CLARK:
13	Q read A Sure.
14 .	Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum
15	and left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip replacement for osteoarthritis. A Right.
16	Q It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the accident. Did I read that
17	right? A I want to answer. Can I still look at it first?
18	Q The question is, did I read that right? A Yes. But I want to read it.
19	Q You had an opportunity to prepare before
20	this, right, read your right reports? A Yes, sir. I'm sure on redirect I'll be asked the question.
21	Q Now, doctor, as far as the back goes, you found no permanent injury in the back. Isn't that
22	right? A That's correct.
23	Q Okay. Now, you testify in court a lot. Don't you?
24	A Last year, I testified, I think, 24 times. Q And you testified here that the plaintiff's
25	injuries are from degenerative changes. You testified about that, right?
	A The injuries are not from degenerative changes. The structural findings on the MRI are degenerative. Q You say that all the time in all these cases. Don't you?

1	22
2	Decter - Cross
3	A No, sir. That's not true. Q Okay. Do you recall the case in February
4	of 2007 when you when you were the defense medical expert
5	MR. COBUZIO: Objection, Judge. BY MR. CLARK:
6	Q and you testified that the plaintiff had no permanent injury?
7	MR. COBUZIO: Objection, Judge.
8	BY MR. CLARK: Q Do you recall that testimony?
9	THE COURT: Hang on. What's the objection? MR. COBUZIO: Same objection Mr. Clark made,
10	something that wasn't produced in discovery pursuant to a notice to produce. MR. CLARK: It's cross-examination, Judge.
11	refreshes his memory. THE COURT: I'll allow it.
12	MR. COBUZIO: Allow the doctor to at least read the testimony.
13	THE WITNESS: Without having the report in front of me of the case you're talking about, sir, I
14	have no specific recollection. BY MR. CLARK:
15	Q All right. Well, how about the <u>MEDINA</u> (phonetic) case? Do you remember the <u>MEDINA</u> case from
16	Essex County, December of 2008 when you were the defense expert and you testified that we had both
17	defendants and maintained that the plaintiff had not sustained the herniation as a result of the accident
18	and that her back pain was a result of degenerative changes. Do you recall that case?
19	A No, sir. Q How about the <u>RUBO</u> (phonetic) from 2010 in
20	Essex County? MR. COBUZIO: Judge, unless we know the case,
21	then BY MR. CLARK:
22	Q Where you testified that Rubo MR. COBUZIO: Objection. Objection.
23	THE COURT: When he starts objecting, you stop talking.
24	MR. COBUZIO: I mean, this is used this testimony is being used. We don't know anything about
25	those cases. We don't know if the man fell off a ladder or fell off, you know, one step. We don't know the pathology in the spine. We don't know the pathology in the hips. We don't know the x-rays. We don't know the MRIs, and you're using one statement out of transcripts to try and impeach the witness. It's

1	23
2	Decter - Cross
3	not permissible. THE COURT: All that is true and,
4	nevertheless, he can confront him with the report. What your obligation, Mr. Clark, is to show him the
5	report, ask him whether or not that's his report, and then ask him questions with regard to that report and,
6	if he can answer the question, he can. If he can't, he can't.
7	BY MR. CLARK: Q Doctor,
8	MR. COBUZIO: Judge, my objection, though, is every case is different. Are we going to hear are
9	we here to opine as to every case the doctor ever testified to? How is that relevant?
10	BY MR. CLARK: Q Dr. Decter,
11	THE COURT: I'm not I'm going to allow it. It's cross-examination.
12	BY MR. CLARK: Q Doctor, here's your report from the <u>FRABONI</u>
13	(phonetic) case. Do you remember the <u>FRABONI</u> case in District Court where you were the expert, Dr. Decter?
14 .	A That's not my medical report, sir. Sir, it's not my medical report.
15	THE COURT: He said, no. Next. THE WITNESS: It's not my report, sir.
16	BY MR. CLARK: Q Do you recall writing in that case that it
17	was your MR. COBUZIO: Objection, Judge. He said,
18	it's not his report. MR. CLARK: I'm not talking about the report.
19	I'm asking him if he recalls that case or recalls THE WITNESS: I have no specific recollection
20	of any case that you've asked me about, sir. I do not have without the charts in front of me, I can't
21	recall a case from 2008. I'm sorry. BY MR. CLARK:
22	Q Maybe I can help you refresh your recollection, Dr. Decter.
23	A Okay. Q Do you recall the <u>FRABONI</u> case? Do you
24	recall giving an opinion that it was your medical opinion that the above-named individual may have
25	sustained temporary soft tissue injury of the lumbar spine, but it was your medical opinion and conclusion that he did not sustain permanent injury to his lumbar spine as a result of this accident. Do you recall that? MR. COBUZIO: Judge, what are we doing with
	inter construction charge, while are we doing with

24 1 2 Decter - Cross 3 this? Objection. THE WITNESS: No, sir. THE COURT: Thank -- so you've got to cut it 4 out, Mr. Clark. You can't do that anymore. Until the 5 doctor can identify something as something that he --MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge. 6 THE COURT: -- he said, what you're trying to do is to testify. Don't do that. 7 BY MR. CLARK: Doctor, can you recall one case where you Q 8 came to court and testified that actually the disk bulge was related to the accident and that the 9 plaintiff had suffered permanent injury? There's no cases like that. Are there? 10 If there was an annular tear and the patient had А physical findings to go along with the mechanical 11 nature of that, I would say it's a permanent injury. But if you're asking me name, date, case, courthouse, I 12 can't tell you that, sir. Doctor, the better ExamWorks, Inc., does, the Q 13 better you do. Isn't that right? No, sir. I don't get it. А 14 The better ExamWorks serves its clients, the Q client being people like Mr. Cobuzio's law firm and 15 defense law firms, the better you do and your family 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	25
2	Decter - Redirect
3	does. Isn't that right?
4	A I don't really understand your question. But you're saying, if the stock goes up, my family does better? Yeah. That's the math. That's correct.
5	MR. CLARK: No further questions. Thank you,
6	doctor. THE COURT: Redirect? REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COBUZIO:
7	Q Doctor, does any of this influence your opinions that you gave here today?
8	A No, sir. I came here and I told the truth. I told the truth about the fracture, and the jury can see
9	the truth. I'm not making anything up. It's black and white. This is not extended to the joint. If Dr.
10	Reber said this extended to the joint and was cause to the arthritis from two months after the accident, I'm
11	quite surprised with him. He's a good friend of mine. He's a good guy in our practice, but you can all
12	see that. This is not into the joint. It does not affect the articulation of this hip. Therefore, I do
13	not believe that the total hip and, truthfully, I won't even go there. I don't believe this total hip
14	was caused by the accident at all. You don't see the arthritis develop two months afterwards and that's
15	what's there in plain day sight, it's blown up by
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
ZJ	

<ul> <li>obvious.</li> <li>Q And you actually reviewed the film itself as well. Is that right?</li> <li>A I did. It's the same thing as the film in the faright corner down there and it's the same thing where</li> <li>there's an osteoarthritic lesion two months after the accident. That doesn't exist from this accident.</li> <li>Q Thank you, doctor.</li> <li>A It predated the accident.</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, doctor. No further questions.</li> <li>THE COURT: Recross?</li> <li>RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CLARK:</li> <li>Q Doctor, the board is not really black and white, right?</li> <li>A No. It's in color, actually.</li> <li>Q That's right. What is in black and white is your report of October 10, 2008. Read along with me, if you would. Well, actually, now, it's in orange</li> <li>because I highlighted it.</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip</li> <li>replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the accident.</li> <li>A The fractures are causally related to the</li> <li>accident.</li> <li>Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Thank you.</li> <li>THE COURT: Sustained. That's enough.</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Thank you.</li> </ul>	1	26
<ul> <li>obvious.</li> <li>And you actually reviewed the film itself as well. Is that right?</li> <li>A I did. It's the same thing as the film in the faright corner down there and it's the same thing where</li> <li>there's an osteoarthritic lesion two months after the accident. That doesn't exist from this accident.</li> <li>Q Thank you, doctor.</li> <li>A It predated the accident.</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, doctor. No further questions.</li> <li>THE COURT: Recross?</li> <li>RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CLARK:</li> <li>Q Doctor, the board is not really black and white, right?</li> <li>A No. It's in color, actually.</li> <li>Q That's right. What is in black and white is your report of October 10, 2008. Read along with me, if you would. Well, actually, now, it's in orange</li> <li>because I highlighted it.</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip</li> <li>replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the accident.</li> <li>A The fractures are causally related to the fractures were caused by the accident, not the osteoarthritis was caused by the accident.</li> <li>Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.</li> </ul>	2	Decter - Recross
<ul> <li>Q And you actually reviewed the film itself as well. Is that right?</li> <li>A I did. It's the same thing as the film in the faright corner down there and it's the same thing where</li> <li>there's an osteoarthritic lesion two months after the accident. That doesn't exist from this accident.</li> <li>Q Thank you, doctor.</li> <li>A It predated the accident.</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, doctor. No further questions.</li> <li>THE COURT: Recross?</li> <li>RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CLARK:</li> <li>Q Doctor, the board is not really black and white, right?</li> <li>A No. It's in color, actually.</li> <li>Q That's right. What is in black and white is your report of October 10, 2008. Read along with me, if you would. Well, actually, now, it's in orange</li> <li>because I highlighted it.</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip</li> <li>replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the</li> <li>accident.</li> <li>A The fractures are causally related to the</li> <li>accident.</li> <li>Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be this goes now beyond the scope of redirect.</li> <li>THE COURT: Sustained. That's enough. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you.</li> </ul>	3	plaintiff's attorney for you all to see and it's quite
5 A I did. It's the same thing as the film in the faright corner down there and it's the same thing where there's an osteoarthritic lesion two months after the accident. That doesn't exist from this accident. Q Thank you, doctor. A It predated the accident. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, doctor. No further questions. Dector, the board is not really black and white, right? A No. It's in color, actually. Q That's right. What is in black and white is your report of October 10, 2008. Read along with me, if you would. Well, actually, now, it's in orange because I highlighted it. A Right. Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the accident. A The fractures are causally related to the fractures were caused by the accident, not the osteoarthritis was caused by the accident. Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 3 MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 3 MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 3 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.	4	Q And you actually reviewed the film itself as
<pre>6 there's an osteoarthritic lesion two months after the accident. That doesn't exist from this accident. 7 Q Thank you, doctor. A It predated the accident. 8 MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, doctor. No further questions. 9 THE COURT: Recross? RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CLARK: 10 Q Doctor, the board is not really black and white, right? 11 A No. It's in color, actually. Q That's right. What is in black and white is 12 your report of October 10, 2008. Read along with me, if you would. Well, actually, now, it's in orange 13 because I highlighted it. A Right. 14 Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip 15 replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the accident. A The fractures are causally related to the 16 accident. A You read it right, but what it says is the 19 fractures were caused by the accident, not the osteoarthritis was caused by the accident. 0 Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying 11 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be  this goes now beyond the scope of redirect. 22 THE COURT: Sustained. That's enough. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 23 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.</pre>	5	A I did. It's the same thing as the film in the far
<ul> <li>Q Thank you, doctor.</li> <li>A It predated the accident.</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, doctor. No further questions.</li> <li>THE COURT: Recross?</li> <li>RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CLARK:</li> <li>Q Doctor, the board is not really black and white, right?</li> <li>A No. It's in color, actually.</li> <li>Q That's right. What is in black and white is your report of October 10, 2008. Read along with me, if you would. Well, actually, now, it's in orange because I highlighted it.</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the accident.</li> <li>Q I read that but the question is, did I read that right, doctor?</li> <li>A You read it right, but what it says is the fractures were caused by the accident.</li> <li>Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be this goes now beyond the scope of redirect.</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.</li> </ul>	6	there's an osteoarthritic lesion two months after the
<pre>questions. 9 THE COURT: Recross? RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CLARK: 10 Q Doctor, the board is not really black and white, right? 11 A No. It's in color, actually. Q That's right. What is in black and white is 12 your report of October 10, 2008. Read along with me, if you would. Well, actually, now, it's in orange 13 because I highlighted it. A Right. 14 Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the accident. A The fractures are causally related to the accident. Q I read that but the question is, did I read that right, but what it says is the fractures were caused by the accident, not the osteoarthritis was caused by the accident. Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying 14 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be  this goes now beyond the scope of redirect. 26 MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 27 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.</pre>	7	Q Thank you, doctor.
<pre>RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CLARK: 10 Q Doctor, the board is not really black and white, right? 11 A No. It's in color, actually. Q That's right. What is in black and white is 12 your report of October 10, 2008. Read along with me, if you would. Well, actually, now, it's in orange 13 because I highlighted it. A Right. 14 Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip 15 replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the accident. A The fractures are causally related to the 16 accident. Q I read that but the question is, did I 18 read that right, doctor? A You read it right, but what it says is the 19 fractures were caused by the accident, not the osteoarthritis was caused by the accident. Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying 21 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be  this goes now beyond the scope of redirect. 23 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind. 24 Not read The WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind. 25 Not the with the state the the the the the the the the the t</pre>		
<pre>white, right? 11 A No. It's in color, actually. Q That's right. What is in black and white is 12 your report of October 10, 2008. Read along with me, 13 because I highlighted it. A Right. 14 Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, 15 replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that 16 accident. A The fractures are causally related to the 17 accident. Q I read that but the question is, did I 18 read that right, doctor? A You read it right, but what it says is the 19 fractures were caused by the accident. 20 Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying 21 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be  this goes now beyond the scope of redirect. 23 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind. 24 Mathematical States of the states of th</pre>		RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CLARK:
Q That's right. What is in black and white is your report of October 10, 2008. Read along with me, if you would. Well, actually, now, it's in orange because I highlighted it. A Right. 14 Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the accident. A The fractures are causally related to the accident. Q I read that but the question is, did I read that right, doctor? A You read it right, but what it says is the fractures were caused by the accident. Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying 10 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be this goes now beyond the scope of redirect. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 23 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.		white, right?
<pre>if you would. Well, actually, now, it's in orange because I highlighted it. A Right. 4 Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip 15 replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the accident. A The fractures are causally related to the accident. Q I read that but the question is, did I read that right, doctor? A You read it right, but what it says is the 19 fractures were caused by the accident. 0 Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying 11 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be  this goes now beyond the scope of redirect. 22 THE COURT: Sustained. That's enough. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 23 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.</pre>		Q That's right. What is in black and white is
<ul> <li>A Right.</li> <li>14 Q He sustained a fracture of the left sacrum, the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip</li> <li>15 replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the</li> <li>16 accident.</li> <li>A The fractures are causally related to the</li> <li>17 accident.</li> <li>Q I read that but the question is, did I</li> <li>18 read that right, doctor?</li> <li>A You read it right, but what it says is the</li> <li>19 fractures were caused by the accident, not the osteoarthritis was caused by the accident.</li> <li>20 Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying</li> <li>21 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be this goes now beyond the scope of redirect.</li> <li>22 THE COURT: Sustained. That's enough.</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Thank you.</li> <li>23 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.</li> </ul>		if you would. Well, actually, now, it's in orange
<pre>the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that the above injuries are causally related to the accident. A The fractures are causally related to the accident. Q I read that but the question is, did I read that right, doctor? A You read it right, but what it says is the fractures were caused by the accident, not the osteoarthritis was caused by the accident. Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be  this goes now beyond the scope of redirect. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.</pre>		A Right.
<pre>16 accident. A The fractures are causally related to the 17 accident. Q I read that but the question is, did I 18 read that right, doctor? A You read it right, but what it says is the 19 fractures were caused by the accident, not the osteoarthritis was caused by the accident. 20 Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying 21 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be  this goes now beyond the scope of redirect. 22 THE COURT: Sustained. That's enough. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 23 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.</pre>		the left pubic rami. He has undergone total hip replacement for osteoarthritis. It is my opinion that
<pre>17 accident.</pre>	16	accident.
18 read that right, doctor? A You read it right, but what it says is the 19 fractures were caused by the accident, not the osteoarthritis was caused by the accident. 20 Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying 21 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be this goes now beyond the scope of redirect. 22 THE COURT: Sustained. That's enough. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 23 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.	17	accident.
<ul> <li>osteoarthritis was caused by the accident.</li> <li>Q Doctor, you have 43 million reasons for testifying</li> <li>MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be  this goes now beyond the scope of redirect.</li> <li>THE COURT: Sustained. That's enough. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.</li> </ul>	18	read that right, doctor?
<pre>testifying 21 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, this is supposed to be this goes now beyond the scope of redirect. 22 THE COURT: Sustained. That's enough. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 23 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.</pre>		osteoarthritis was caused by the accident.
this goes now beyond the scope of redirect. 22 THE COURT: Sustained. That's enough. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 23 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.		testifying
MR. COBUZIO: Thank you. 23 THE WITNESS: Sir, I don't never mind.		this goes now beyond the scope of redirect.
		MR. COBUZIO: Thank you.
24 doctor.		MR. COBUZIO: You don't have to answer,
THE WITNESS: I wouldn't I won't even lower myself.		THE WITNESS: I wouldn't I won't even
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, doctor. THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Cobuzio, what's next? MR. COBUZIO: Judge, I have one read-in and	20	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, doctor. THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Cobuzio, what's next?

1 27 2 Decter - Recross 3 I'll --MR. CLARK: Judge, could we take a brief -- a 4 break? THE COURT: Okay. 5 MR. COBUZIO: I'd -- it's two lines. MR. CLARK: Can we take a break? 6 THE COURT: Before the two lines? MR. CLARK: Yes. 7 MR. COBUZIO: Well, Judge, I'm done after the two lines, so that would be the logical time to take a 8 break. THE COURT: Do the two lines. 9 MR. COBUZIO: I mean, I don't want the jury to go out and come back in. 10 THE COURT: Do the two lines. MR. COBUZIO: I'm trying to think ahead. 11 MR. CLARK: What two lines are you reading? Where are we at? 12 MR. COBUZIO: Yes. This is a reading from the transcript of Mr. Fernandes, the plaintiff in the 13 case, and the question was, Q "Did you have any difficulty at any time in 14 those three to four days you were there just prior to your accident or at any -- location? 15 А No." 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	28
2	Colloquy
3	That's it, Judge. I'm finished. THE COURT: What are the magic words, Mr.
4	Cobuzio?
5	MR. COBUZIO: I'm sorry, Judge. Defense rests, Judge. THE COURT: Thank you very much. Rebuttal,
6	Mr. Clark?
7	MR. CLARK: Yes, Judge. But I'd like to take a break before rebuttal. Very briefly. THE COURT: Okay. All right. We're going to
8	take a break, mid-morning break, 15 minutes and then we'll go for another half an hour and take our lunch
9	break. Okay? Fifteen minutes. Please don't discuss the case, even though the defendant has rested.
10	(Break)
11	THE COURT: You guys are getting to be experts at this. We'll have to get you in here and give you regular jurors for all the cases. At \$5 a
12	day, you can handle that, right? Defendant has rested. Mr. Clark, is there any rebuttal?
13	MR. CLARK: No, Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen,
14 .	the evidential and testimonial portion of our
15	proceeding is complete. We are actually ahead of schedule. We do have some fighting we have to do
16	amongst ourselves. We can't do that in front of you. That's as I think I might have mentioned before,
17	that's the, you know, toothpaste and the tooth concept. We can't talk in front of you about what it is that you're going to be told and what it is that you're
18	going to be instructed as to the law because you'll hear stuff that you're not supposed to hear and we
19	can't really it's hard to tell you, remember what somebody just said, well, pretend you didn't hear that.
20	So what we're going to do is it's going to take at least an hour or two to really thrash out
21	the lawyers really are entitled to know what it is I'm going to tell you with regard to what the law is before
22	they make their closing statements. So I have to spend an hour or two it's going to be after lunch doing
23	that, explaining what I'm going to charge you as to the law, getting their input as to what they think should
24	be charged, and hashing all that out.
25	Then we would be ready at, oh, I don't know, 2:30, 3:30 or so to have summation and charge. I'm not going to make you come hang around all that time to well, we wouldn't even be able to finish the summation and charge in the amount of time we had left in a day. So we're going to start we're going to resume for
	you we're going to resume this case for us after

1	29
2	Colloquy
3	lunch, but for you, we're going to resume at 9:30
4	tomorrow morning and all you're going to hear about tomorrow morning, all that's happening since all our
5	the evidential and testimonial portion is complete. By tomorrow morning, you're going to hear, first, the lawyers are going to argue to you why the think, you
6	know, that they should their clients should succeed
7	and, after that, you'll hear from me with regard to what the law is, and then the rest is up to you. But until that happens and you're all in the
8	same room in the process of deliberating, please don't discuss the case, even amongst yourselves, certainly
9	not with anybody else. Even though all the evidence is in, you still know it's not proper to do that, as well
10	as not proper to conduct your own investigation or something of that nature.
11	Be careful going home. It's supposed to be better weather tomorrow, but you know, we'll see.
12	Thank you. You're excused for the day. See you tomorrow.
13	(Jury excused for the day)
14 .	(Tape Off - Tape On) THE COURT: Okay. What do you want to put on
15	the record, MR. COBUZIO: Yes, Your Honor. There are two
16	stipulations that we want to put on the record. The first stipulation deals with the amount of medical bills that the defendant will stipulate to as
17	reasonable and customary, however, not causally related, and that is \$75,000, which is a compromised
18	number from the workers' compensation lien in terms of the medicals that were paid.
19	The other stipulation MR. CLARK: Can I comment on it first before
20	the second? MR. COBUZIO: Yes. Yes.
21	MR. CLARK: Just so the record is clear, Judge, we have there was an \$85,000 workers'
22	compensation component dealing with the meds, and we
23	agreed that, to compromise that, we're going to say that is \$75,000. I just want the record to be clear
24	that that's not all the plaintiff is claiming for past meds.
25	You have plaintiff's Exhibit 34, which has about \$11,000 in past meds from Dr. Wu (phonetic) dealing with exams and office treatments, et cetera. We also talked about so that's it. I just want that to be clear.
	THE COURT: Okay? MR. COBUZIO: That's fine, Judge. Judge, the

•

1	30
2	Colloquy
3	second stipulation deals with the past lost wage claim,
4	which you may recall was the subject of some discussion in light of Mr. Clark wanting to reopen the case and
5	put in tax returns. Your Honor asked us to try to agree on a number. We originally agreed to \$44,000
6	being the workers' compensation payment for temporary disability. However, Mr. Clark and I agreed that the
7	lost wage past lost wage component would be \$100,000. Mr. Clark says, I think we're going to be able to handle that in the charging conference, but the
8	number that will go on the boards as the stipulated amount will be \$100,000 and, again, the defendant still
9	challenges causation, in other words, whether or not all that time was lost as a result of the work-related
10	injuries or the injuries. THE COURT: Okay.
11	MR. CLARK: Judge, just may I comment on that stipulation?
12	THE COURT: Go right ahead. MR. CLARK: Yes. I always said when we have
13	the discussions that it would be a net number and they've agreed to that, and I think the jury charge
14 .	
15	the number, and so that that would affect that because our agreement is, as I understand it, 100,000 is, in
16	fact, a net number. Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. But let me have it in
17	front of me, so I can be more intelligently understanding what it is that you're saying. Okay? So
18	we'll do that this afternoon. MR. COBUZIO: All right. Do you want us to
19	hand you any of the material? We'll give you that this afternoon then, Judge?
20	THE COURT: Yes. MR. COBUZIO: Okay.
21	THE COURT: Yes. MR. COBUZIO: Then we have motions that have
22	to be made. MR. CLARK: I handed I handed in our
23	proposed charge as far as the standard stuff like negligence. I just cited to the model jury charge, so
24	I didn't THE COURT: Yes. And I have some questions
25	<pre>with regard to things that you didn't ask for that would ordinarily be there, but we'll you know, we'll talk about it this afternoon MR. CLARK: Yes. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge.</pre>
	THE COURT: The first thing we'll do is

1	31
2	Colloquy
3	motions you have. We'll do that at 1:30. Okay? You
4	have something you want me to look at? MR. COBUZIO: I have something for you, Judge. If you want it now or I'll give it to you after
5	lunch. I don't know when you want to read it. THE COURT: With regard to a motion?
6	MR. COBUZIO: With regard to a motion on punitive damages, Judge, and I believe there should be
7	we're making are you making a motion on duty because it's
8	MR. CLARK: Yes. I was going to I was going to move for a directed verdict on liability.
9	Yes. MR. COBUZIO: Okay. So we'll argue the duty
10	issue at that time. MR. CLARK: The one that Judge Lombardi
11	decided or MR. COBUZIO: Yes. I mean, right now, Judge,
12	as it stands, Judge Lombardi issued an opinion on duty that there were material questions of fact that the
13	jury must consider before it can decide duty, and I think Your Honor has to make a decision as a matter of
14 .	law that either we did or we did not owe a duty to Mr. Fernandes because the jury is not going to consider
15	that question now that you've heard all the evidence. So that will assuming Mr. Clark is really making
16	that motion for a directed verdict and well, he's making a motion for a directed verdict, which is
17	something different than duty, but the issue really is is whether or not we owe a duty.
18	THE COURT: Okay. I got it. On punitive, so you have and you have something
19	MR. COBUZIO: Can he approach, Judge? THE COURT: Yes. Yes. You have something
20	other than what I already got from you with regard to the you gave me something, Mr. Clark, about as
21	part of your proposed jury charge on punitives. I know that.
22	MR. COBUZIO: Judge, I just would remark, our trial brief that I handed to you in the beginning has
23	all the arguments on duty. Do you want the jury charges now, too, Judge?
24	THE COURT: No. I'm not going to have time to.
25	MR. COBUZIO: Okay. That's fine. THE COURT: And we don't have time, I think. You'll have it done, soon. It's not something you have
	to you have to MR. COBUZIO: Yes. We've got a lot of work to do here. We have to redact the exhibits. We've got
	to do mere, we have to redact the exhibits, we ve got

32 1 2 Colloquy 3 to, you know, argue about the charges, so --THE COURT: Okay. So what we'll do is we'll 4 do -- you know, we'll do the motion, we'll do the charges, and then you can redact and you can do them 5 right here, and if you have, you know, an issue, I'll deal with it. 6 MR. COBUZIO: Fair enough, Judge. THE COURT: All right? And if there's 7 something that I need to think about while you guys are redacting, I can think. 8 MR. COBUZIO: Yes. We're just going to follow Your Honor's -- my intention is just to follow 9 Your Honor's ruling with regard to the conclusions of other physicians who weren't called to testify. 10 MR. CLARK: Judge, --THE COURT: I need somebody to tell me ready, 11 set, think. You know? MR. CLARK: With regard to duty, that's in 12 our trial brief, too, which -- well, our trial -- our summary judgment brief is our trial brief. That's our 13 argument as to duty. I think most of the facts will probably match up with -- at trial. 14 As far as punitive damages goes, I have cases, which are highlighted, flagged, and I can hand 15 them in, if I can just get them back at some point or I can give cites or something. Like I have -- and as also on punitive damages, I had meant to argue that on 16 sort of my feet so to speak and, also, in the jury 17 charge. THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. 18 MR. CLARK: Would you like these? These cases are highlighted and flagged. There's one that's 19 actually right on it. It's a construction accident case. 20 THE COURT: No. I'll -- on the punitive damage issue? 21 MR. CLARK: Yes. THE COURT: Probably not. I don't want to 22 pretend I'm going to do more than --MR. CLARK: Can I give you two cites then? 23 Can I give you a cite? THE COURT: I've got to be honest with 24 everybody. I'm not going to read any of the cases that Mr. Cobuzio cites. I'm only going to read what he says 25 about them. MR. CLARK: All right. So I'll just -- I'll just -- I have it all highlighted here. THE COURT: Yes. I mean, there's not enough time to do that. If there are cases that I'm not familiar with that I think I have to read, you know,

1 33 2 Argument - Clark 3 we'll take a break. We have the luxury of having the afternoon without a jury to deal with whatever we have 4 to deal with, right? MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Till 1:30. (Luncheon recess) 6 THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone. Good afternoon. Are we on the record? 7 COURT CLERK: We certainly are. I wouldn't miss it. 8 THE COURT: All right. Outside the presence of the jury, we're on the record. Let's do motions 9 first. Then we'll take a break and then do charge conference, okay? Motions. 10 MR. CLARK: Judge, at this time, plaintiff would like to make a motion for a directed verdict on 11 the issue of liability. We did submit a trial brief, which included a summary judgment motion. The duty of 12 a general contractor is set forth in our brief, and the general contractor's duty is set forth under ALLOWAY 13 and the progeny cases. It is essentially that a general contractor 14 . really has a non-delegable duty to manage safety on the worksite and ensure OSHA compliance among its 15 subcontractors. Among the things that OSHA requires is compliance with the general safety, health provisions, 16 which require that the workers be trained, that there be supervision, that there be safety inspections, that 17 there be oversight, that there be investigations. The evidence in this case is overwhelming, that the 18 defendants DAR failed to comply with its duties under New Jersey law that they manage safety and force the 19 OSHA regulations with respect to the general health and safety regulations with respect to specific regulations 20 applicable to this matter, include the trench safety regulations. 21 There's a number of items in the trench safety regulations, but perhaps the most pertinent item 22 is the item that says, if the trench is over five feet, it must be protected by an OSHA-compliant, suring 23 protection system or it needs to be sloped back or benched to, I believe it's 30 degrees of repose, and 24 that was not done in this case. Under the OSHA regulation, there has to be daily inspections on every 25 shift and as needed during the shift to ensure that the regulations are being complied with. It has to be done by a competent person and an OSHA-competent person as defined in the statute. The admission of the defendant through its answers to interrogatories, its deposition testimony,

1	34
2	Argument - Clark
3	as confirmed at the trial testimony was that Norberto
4	Jean Salle is designated as the person most knowledgeable in safety. He inspected the trench. He
5	concluded it was not likely to collapse. That's if you view the evidence favorable to the defendant, which is that the trench was less than four feet.
6	The overwhelming evidence in this case is
7	that the trench was more than five feet deep and, therefore, they can't get out from under it by saying,
8	well, we inspected and concluded it was not likely to collapse. But even if we're going to view the fact in the light favorable to the defendant that it was less
9	than five feet, the defendant admitted that it inspected the trench and concluded it was not likely to
10	collapse. There's an admission on the record from
11	Norberto Jean Salle that well, there's a number of admissions, including that. They did really nothing to
12	comply with OSHA and enforce the health and safety provisions. Was DAR negligent in this case? I don't
13	see how any reasonable juror could conclude otherwise, and I think the issue should be taken away from the
14	jury at this point given the overwhelming evidence. I would also note that one of the defenses in
15	opening was we hired a competent contractor and one of the early rulings in the case was that because our
16	position was that Fritas (phonetic) was not a competent contractor and, among the things we wanted to do to
17	show that was to show Fritas' prior OSHA violations and citations of that, specifically related to trench
18	excavation. And just for the record, I would note and
19	this was in Lindsey Gallagher's file, which was produced in connection with this deposition in the
20	discovery phase of this case. Fritas was cited a number of times in the past, 2002, I believe, 2003.
21	THE COURT: I don't know what this has to do with your
22	MR. COBUZIO: There's no testimony as to that.
23	THE COURT: your motion, Mr. Clark. MR. CLARK: The point of the motion, Judge,
24	is that we were not allowed to enter that unless the defendants argued that we hired a that one of the
25	defenses was that they hired a competent contractor. So that defense was essentially abandoned. So the so that there is no viable defense here of having hired a competent contractor. They stayed away from that and, ergo, we did not, you know, bring up the OSHA violations. So because of that and the overwhelming

1	35
2	Argument - Cobuzio
3	evidence, we file a motion for a directed verdict on the issue of liability. Thank you, Judge.
4	MR. COBUZIO: Your Honor, may I respond briefly?
5	THE COURT: Mr. Cobuzio? MR. COBUZIO: First of all, the OSHA
6	violations that Counsel just referenced never came into the case and can't come into the case. Secondly, our
7	defense is, was, and we have maintained that we hired a
8 9	competent contractor, somebody who had knowledge with regard to trench excavation, in this case Mr. Fritas, so that's still in the case. I really don't know where that's going.
10	With regard to my associate is going to argue the issue of duty. But just for purposes of, if
11	Your Honor finds duty, the question for the jury is, was our conduct reasonable under the circumstances? Mr. Carlson testified and the OSHA regulations indicate
12	that our conduct has to be reasonable. The employer has the primary responsibility
13	for the safety of its employees. We can discharge our responsibility for trench excavation, if we hire a
14	a competent contractor. It's our position, we have hired
15	that with his testimony. I mean, that's what trials
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 36 2 Argument - Clark 3 are for, so there's a question as to whether or not our conduct was reasonable, if Your Honor -- if Your Honor, 4 in fact, finds as a matter of law there's a duty. And with that, Your Honor, I'll tag my associate, and he can argue the issue of why there is no duty. 5 MR. CLARK: I would just --6 MR. COBUZIO: Can we finish? Let me just finish, Judge. 7 MR. CLARK: Yes. I just wanted to comment on the same motion, though, before you go into duty. 8 MR. COBUZIO: Okay. All right. All right. MR. CLARK: Judge, I'm reading from my notes of January 25th, 2011, the pretrial motions. One of 9 the motions was to bar evidence of the prior OSHA 10 citations. We had extensive discussion about it, and Your Honor's ruling was as follows. Leave the OSHA 11 violations out for now unless the defense indicates that Fritas is a competent contractor. The OSHA 12 violations issues came up. It was objected to, and we did not press forward because I believe they had 13 abandoned the defense of a competent contractor and now that everything is closed and the jury is gone, now, 14 they want to argue in closing that they did, in fact, hire a competent contractor. 15 Well, then in that case, I would like to reopen and bring in the OSHA violations because the 16 reason I didn't do that was because of the related objections and, now, they want to have their cake and 17 eat it too and argue in closing that he was, in fact, a competent contractor. Well, then I should be able to bring into evidence -- and this is the reason I didn't 18 because Your Honor's ruling. 19 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, --MR. CLARK: Leave the OSHA violations out, 20 unless the defense indicates that Fritas is a competent contractor. 21 MR. COBUZIO: Judge, it's always been a defense in the case. I told them that it's the expert 22 reports, that we hired a competent contractor to do the job. This is almost absurd. It's like the lost wage 23 thing. We're going back into it. Your Honor said for now, leave them out. Leave them out of opening. And 24 then the testimony came in from Mr. Carlson, OSHA. Mr. Clark had the OSHA violations. He tried to get them in 25 through Fritas. I objected. It's inadmissible I objected to it and, certainly, an OSHA hearsay. violation isn't against Mr. Fritas. There wasn't even a foundation that DAR even knew about it. So this is -- the competent contractor defense has always been in it and it's really not a

1	37
2	Argument - Clark
3	defense, Judge. It's what I have to do to be reasonable under the circumstances. So with regard to
4	that, Judge, it's for the jury. MR. CLARK: Judge, they if they were going
5	to argue that they hired a competent contractor and that is why this issue came up and it was objected to
6	and sustained and they filed a motion to bar any evidence of the OSHA violations based on some legal
7	principles and the Court's ruling, I take umbrage with defendant's argument that the Court's ruling was
8 9	absurd. The Court's ruling was not absurd. It was a reasonable ruling. It says, leave the OSHA violations
10	out for now, unless the defense in the case is that Fritas is a competent contractor. If they were going to open the door in the trial that he was a competent
11	contractor, the ruling was that they could come in. MR. COBUZIO: I did, Judge, and he never
12	admitted them and I never said Your Honor's ruling was absurd.
13	MR. CLARK: Because MR. COBUZIO: I'm saying what you're doing is absurd, to reopen after you rested, yet again, and the
14	case is closed and we dismiss the jury, all of a sudden, you want to reopen the whole case again and put
15	in an OSHA violation. If you had if you had a belief when Fritas was testifying that I have abandoned
16	the competent contractor defense, then you didn't read my expert report.
17 18	We should have had a side bar and the Judge could have ruled on it in terms of this witness or
19	getting it in through Carlson. In fact, you ever tried to get it in through Carlson. You even tried to ask him about it, and Carlson was prepared to respond to
20	it. It's one OSHA violation before this accident, and there's no foundation that DAR even knew about it. It
21	was never established. MR. CLARK: See, that's the argument, when
22	you say a competent contractor, the question is knew or should have known. First of all, Norberto Jean Salle testified, yeah, he knew about Fritas' checkered OSHA
23	safety past MR. COBUZIO: No. He didn't.
24	MR. CLARK: and their history. It's in his deposition. Okay? But we didn't go there because
25	of the Judge's ruling and, secondly, it's not one violation. There is a series of violations, which involve the very statutes we're talking about here and it's not that they're against DAR. It goes squarely on the defense of DAR hiring an incompetent contractor. THE COURT: All right. Let's hear from Mr.

1	38
2	Argument - DuVoisin
3	DuVoisin on the issue of duty, and we'll deal with it
4	all at once. MR. DU VOISIN: Thank you, Judge.
5	MR. CLARK: Just for the record, I'm just I'm also making a motion to bar any reference or
6	argument enclosing that they hired a competent contractor based on all that. Thank you, Judge.
7	THE COURT: Okay. MR. DU VOISIN: Thank you, Judge. We just
8	heard a lot about OSHA regulations, and this discussion about duty has to start with the notion and this is from <u>COSTA V. GIACCIONE</u> (phonetic) or I don't know how
9	you pronounce that, but MR. CLARK: <u>GAICCIONE</u> .
10	MR. DU VOISIN: 408 N.J. Super. 372 to 373 that non-compliance with OSHA regulations or compliance
11	with OSHA regulations, this is quote, "does not necessarily place a tort duty of care on the general
12	contractor." That's not what OSHA regulations in terms of the duty of care that's owed are irrelevant
13	for the Court's consideration. Now, what's relevant, Judge, and I'll be
14	very quick the Court has to determine this is from ALLOWAY whether a reasonable jury, Judge,
15	weighing the evidence in plaintiff's favor could determine the existence of fact based on the
16	foreseeability of the risk of the injury, the relationship of the party, and the opportunity to take
17	corrective measures would support the determination that there was duty, and that's from 157 N.J. at 240.
18	Now, we can compare this case with the ALLOWAY case, for instance. In ALLOWAY, the
19	plaintiff's employer and the general contractors that they sought to held liable had mutual employees. The
20	foreman, I believe, for the subcontractor who employs the plaintiff also was an employee of the general
21	contract. That's not the case here. There's no contract in this case putting the
22	onus on the general contractor to provide for safety as there was in ALLOWAY. I would put to Your Honor that
23	this case is also similar to <u>SLACK V. WHELAN</u> (phonetic) where, again, the Court granted summary judgment on the
24	issue of duty. In that case, the Court observed that there was no control and matter over the
25	"subcontractor's work," and I know Mr. Clark might say, well, that involved a homeowner, but the Court in the <u>SLACK</u> case specifically indicated that they would find the same, if it was a general contractor or a homeowner.
	There was no control over the manner and

•

1	39
2	Argument - DuVoisin
3	means of the subcontractor's work, as was demonstrated in this case, and really DAR did nothing but schedule
4	and coordinate the work. That does not give rise to a duty of care in this case, Judge.
5	And, finally, to contrast in the <u>COSTA</u> case, which I cited for Your Honor earlier, that was a
6	homeowner, but the Court found he was a general contractor, found he owed a duty of care because he
7	oversaw the operation, purchased materials for the subcontractors, and had a history with this particular
8	kind of construction. In this case, DAR did not purchase materials for Fritas, it didn't oversee
9	Fritas' work, and it didn't have history with trench excavations, which is why they hired Fritas to do this
10	job. That's what the case is all about. So, Judge, in closing, I would just say, the
11 12	facts that have now been educed in evidence don't give rise to the level where a reasonable jury could conclude that a duty of care was even owed to get this
13	to an issue of whether DAR's conduct was reasonable. Thanks, Judge.
	THE COURT: Thank you very much. Anybody want to add anything else on this particular set of
15	motions? MR. COBUZIO: Your Honor,
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

•

1	40
2	Argument - Cobuzio
3	MR. CLARK: Okay. Sorry. No. You can go. MR. COBUZIO: Judge, you know, I just I
4	just want to refresh the Court's recollection very briefly that Mr. Carlson testified as to the definition
5	of a competent contractor, that Fritas was the competent contractor, what the competent contractor
6	standard means in terms of reasonableness of the GC's responsibilities under OSHA and, frankly, you know,
7	it's always been in the case. I have notes, too, from Your Honor's ruling.
8	The prior OSHA violations you ruled were inadmissible hearsay, could not be allowed. One, you didn't know
9	the nature and scope of the violation. Two, the conduct, which resulted in the OSHA's violations, you
10	didn't know that either. And, three, you didn't know whether or not DAR even knew about it and you said, the
11	complexion of the case may change, but if we stay with a competent contractor, just keep it out of your
12	openings and, frankly, it's always been in the case. I never stipulated that I wasn't going to put up a
13	competent contractor defense, so you know, to say now that it's not in the case and now allow me to argue
14	that to a jury, which is a motion that Mr. Clark just made orally, I think, would be would be,
15	respectfully, improper.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	41
2	Argument - Clark
3	THE COURT: Okay. You get the last word. MR. CLARK: Judge, just address the duty
4	or THE COURT: Sure.
5	MR. CLARK: As to the duty, Judge, one of the things Mr. DuVoisin said was that violation of an OSHA
6	regulation is not ipso facto negligence. Also, it's compliance with an OSHA regulation does not entitle
7	them to a summary judgment. I agree with Mr. DuVoisin's recitation of the
8	law on that. In fact, that's in our proposed jury charge. That's the one point I want to make on the
9	duty. The other point I want to make on the duty is that I think the law says that a duty is a question
10	of law for the Court, whether or not a duty exists is a question of law for the Court, whether or not there's
11	been a breach of that duty, i.e., the facts, is a question of fact for the jury.
12	So the jury should not be deciding whether or not there's a duty here. It should only be Your Honor,
13	and I would note that Judge Lombardi, having looked at everything, already found such a duty and I believe
14	that duty is bodied in our proposed jury charge. As far as <u>SLACK V. WHELAN</u> goes, that was a
15	homeowner case and the Appellate Division in COSTA V.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

•

1	42
2	Argument - Clark
3	<u>GACCIONE</u> could not have been anymore clear that the facts in <u>SLACK V. WHELAN</u> represent an exceptionally
4	unusual circumstance, which really has no applicability to this case. So I believe there is a duty as Judge
5	Lombardi found. If I comment on the OSHA violations issue,
6	I'll just be repeating myself. The THE COURT: Don't do that.
7	MR. CLARK: I won't. Thank you. MR. COBUZIO: Judge, I just have to just
8	respond because Judge Lombardi didn't find that. I can show you the transcript, Page 48. It's this and
9	I'll read it to Your Honor. It's this Court's Judge, and I agree the issue of duty now is before you
10	to decide as a matter of law before the jury can get it, but what Judge Lombardi found, it's this Court's
11	determination that listening to all the factual issues raised and referring to the record and the deposition
12 13	testimony, et cetera, this Court does find that, I think, there is genuine issues of material fact that
	exist as to foreseeability of injury, relationship of the parties, other negligence and control
15	considerations, whether they had an opportunity and I say this is because there are some facts that are certainly in dispute, wherein, it might determine
16	certaining in dispute, wherein, it might determine
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

2

3 whether there should be a duty or not. That was his opinion, so, you know, the issue of duty has never been 4 decided. It's not like it's a res judicata issue. It's for Your Honor to decide based on the evidence. 5 THE COURT: I'm satisfied that it is. I'm also satisfied that with regard to Mr. Clark's motion 6 relative to liability to the degree to which it asks for the Court to find as a matter of law the existence 7 of a duty, that motion is granted. I'm satisfied that ALLOWAY stands for the proposition that the general 8 contractor has a non-delegable duty of care. I'm somewhat -- it is somewhat interesting from an academic 9 prospective as to how that occurs in an employment situation and how it is that a general contractor can 10 be held liable in what is a third-party action when, clearly, absent extraordinary circumstances, an 11 employer, who may be the one more directly negligent, cannot be held liable under the terms of the workers' 12 compensation statute. Nevertheless, I believe the Supreme Court in 13 ALLOWAY made it clear that a third-party action against the general contractor can be maintained in a general 14 ..-- and that is because a general contractor under circumstances similar to what's occurred here has a 15 responsibility for the safety of the individuals working on the job site. 16 For that reason, there is, as a matter of law, a duty on the part of the general contractor and, 17 in this case, a duty on the part of DAR to exercise reasonable care in the maintenance of its work site. 18 Now, that duty is not imposed by or strictly or solely designed by the existence of or breach thereof of any 19 OSHA regulation. A breach of OSHA regulation or regulations can well be evidence of negligence, but is 20 not per se negligence and a breach in and of itself does not create a finding, even if there had been a 21 finding of breach, not necessarily a breach of a duty of care. 22 That's despite some of the testimony from the experts, it may have much to do with what the standard 23 of care is for the conduct of a general contractor, but it doesn't per se describe the standard of care, nor 24 would a finding of a breach of a -- or a violation of an OSHA violation automatically mean that there's been 25 a breach of duty care and, thus, since there is a duty of finding a negligence. That is a question for the jury to determine. Further, what is clear is that there is a

factual dispute that will allow the jury to determine not only whether or not there's been a breach of the

1 44 2 Argument - Clark 3 duty of care and -- but there is even a factual dispute as to whether or not the perimeters of the OSHA 4 regulations have been violated. There is a significant dispute here. As I believe the defense expert made 5 quite clear, it's the key to determining liability is where and how deep was the trench of the location where 6 it collapsed on the plaintiff. Nobody is disputing that there was a trench 7 and that the plaintiff was in the trench and that the trench collapsed, but that's about all the parties 8 agree on, where it was, how deep it was, and the like and whether or not it caused -- proximately caused 9 injury and the nature and extent to that injury is what's in dispute here and that's what the jury is here 10 to determine. Now, the defendant didn't abandon any of its 11 defenses with regard to meeting the challenge of exercising --12 (Tape Off - Tape On) THE COURT: -- the Court's ruling with regard 13 to prior violations --(Tape Off - Tape On) 14 THE COURT: -- closer to --(End of Tape 1) 15 THE COURT: -- why the Court barred the introduction of those prior -- any prior OSHA 16 violations. I didn't know then, I don't know now what those violations were, who they were against, how many 17 there were, what were they for and, frankly, that all goes to the reason why one doesn't admit evidence of 18 prior bad acts because, to admit evidence of prior bad acts would be -- would be necessary to show the 19 existence of some pattern, custom, or habit to the degree to which there was any --20 Suffice it to say, the Court did not find and does not find now that there was a basis to, in effect, 21 under the rules, have a trial within a trial or trials, multiple trials within a trial to determine whether or 22 not what the circumstances were and the degree to which they are comparable and, therefore, constituting a 23 pattern, custom, or habit. That doesn't mean that simply because -- that 24 at no point did the defendant in any way abandon any defenses that they might have. To suggest, however, 25 that simply hiring a competent contractor or a contractor that they believed to be competent was enough to -- in and of itself to constitute a defense, this Court does not believe that that is so. That doesn't mean that Mr. Cobuzio is barred from suggesting that one of the ways in which they met

1	45
2	Argument - Clark
3	their duty was by hiring somebody that they had experience with over the period of however many years
4	that they had experience with. All add to the testimony, I did not for a single moment bar any
5	evidence of any conduct relative to knowledge that the defendant might have with regard to the abilities or
6	lack thereof of the subcontractor employer in this case.
7	The degree to which its knowledge was relevant, that information was admissible and, to some
8 9	degree, was testified to both by the plaintiff and by the defendant. For all those reasons, the plaintiff
9 10	the remainder of the plaintiff's motion for a directed verdict on liability is denied, as well as the plaintiff's motion to bar the defendant from suggesting
11	in his closing that Fritas was a competent contractor. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge.
12	THE COURT: What's next? MR. COBUZIO: Judge, I handed the Court
13	before the break a motion to bar the plaintiff's claim for punitive damages. I, essentially, set forth as concisely as possible the arguments that I'm going to
14.	that I raised. The strongest well, they're all strong
15	arguments why the punitive damage claim should be dismissed. First and foremost, the complaint does not
16	include a claim for punitive damages and I attached that and I realized it wasn't filed by Mr. Clark or by
17	a prior law firm, and a reading of the complaint filed by the prior law firm reveals that in the damage
18	clause, the claim for punitive damages was never made. The rules do require that it be made, and that's the
19 20	Punitive Damages Act, 2A:15-5.1. An award of punitive damages must be specifically prayed for in the
20	complaint. Now, it's anticipated that Mr. Clark may argue that he filed an amended complaint on motion when
22	he sought to bring in the wife's per quod claim. In this particular case, Judge, again, the prior complaint
23	was not filed by Mr. Clark, but the complaint that he did file well, the complaint that he did serve with
24	the motion let's be precise about that the complaint served with the motion, the motion to amend
25	included per quod claim, had stuck in it a punitive damage claim in the damage clause, and I would say to you, Your Honor, the Court was pretty clear on our
	motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim. They ordered that that complaint be dismissed.
	So there is no filed complaint, which includes a punitive damage claim. The order is dated

.

1	46
2	Argument - Clark
3	February 29th, 2008, and it reads, the amended
4	complaint of plaintiffs, Maria Fernandes and Rolando Fernandes, be and hereby is dismissed with prejudice.
5	And so that complaint that amended complaint was never filed, number one. Number two is
6	somewhat surreptitiously, perhaps. If there was a new claim for damages being made for punitive damages and the plaintiff wanted to amond his complaint the would
7	the plaintiff wanted to amend his complaint, he would have to put the Court on notice and not stick it into the amended complaint. So even if Your Waper was to
8	the amended complaint. So even if Your Honor was to deem it filed, it certainly behooves one to believe that that was the true intent of the plaintiff and,
9	i.e., to put in the per quod claim and then stick in a punitive damage claim.
10	But, again, that complaint was never filed. It was dismissed. The only complaint that is filed
11	with the Court, which the Court can rely on, is the first complaint.
12	The next anticipated argu THE COURT: But it was filed and then it was
13	dismissed, right? MR. COBUZIO: No. It was a motion it was
14	a motion to MR. DU VOISIN: Yes.
15	MR. COBUZIO: Was it filed? THE COURT: To amend. That motion was
16	MR. COBUZIO: The motion to amend. THE COURT: Motion to amend. That motion was
17	granted. Wasn't it? MR. COBUZIO: Yes. That's true, Judge.
18	That's I'm sorry. And then there was a motion brought by us to dismiss.
19	THE COURT: Which was also granted. MR. COBUZIO: Which was also granted, so the
20	complaint was dismissed. I apologize for that. The second argument deals the anticipated argument is
21	that Counsel wants to amend the pleadings to conform to the evidence, and that's not appropriate in this
22	situation. That's not what you do under 4:9-2. An amendment to pleadings to conform with the evidence is
23	either upon consent of the parties and, of course, I'm not giving that or, in the Court's discretion,
24	presentation of the merits of the action will thereby be subserved and, in this particular case, this is a
25	<pre>damage aspect, punitive damages. That's not the merits of the claim, Judge. The merits of the claim is negligence, duty, that kind of thing.</pre>
	and the factor were to the construction of a

.

1	47
2	Argument - Clark
3	cognizable claim for punitive damages in this case.
4	And, finally, I would just add that, typically, punitive damage claims are handled in a separate
5	proceeding before the same jury and it wouldn't be appropriate at this time. So I've given you four reasons why it should
6	be dismissed. Certainly, I'm standing on the strongest argument and that is, it was never pled. Thank you,
7	Judge. THE COURT: Mr. Clark?
8	MR. CLARK: Yes, Judge. With respect to a
9	punitive damages claim, one of the things to get the claim at trial is it has to be asked for in the
10	complaint, it has to be prayed for in the complaint. I think when the Punitive Damages Act speaks in terms of
11	praying for it in a complaint, what they mean is the wherefore clause because that is the prayer for relief is the wherefore clause. A punitive damages claim is
12	not a separate cause of action. It's a damages remedy, and the proposed amended complaint was attached to the
13	motion. It was inserted, you know, clear as day into the wherefore clause and I would agree that it wasn't
14 .	discussed in the factual section, but I think that the Punitive Damages Act simply is asking that it be put in
15	the wherefore clause and that you ask for it. I don't think it's a separate cause of action where it has to
16	be discussed and argued and all that. A per quod claim, I believe, is a derivative
17	claim. It's derivative of the underlying claim, so I think to the extent the motion requested to amend the
18	pleading to include a per quod claim, I believe that it was appropriate to include it in the wherefore clause
19	because the damages that are sought in a per quod claim derived from the underlying claim.
20	The proposed amended pleading was included with the papers, so I do take umbrage of any suggestion
21	that it was somehow surreptitious or slipped in there. It was in there. It was in the proposed amended
22	pleading. THE COURT: It was in the proposed amended
23	pleading. MR. CLARK: Yes.
24	THE COURT: We all agree. We'll also agree that it was not mentioned in the in the motion
25	<pre>ital it was not mentioned in the in the motion itself, either in the notice of motion or in the certification of whatever was offered in support of the motion to amend the complaint, right?</pre>

1 48 2 Argument - Clark 3 THE COURT: If what you're saying now is that you have -- that your intention in making that motion 4 was to amend the complaint to include a punitive damages section, then you knew full well that's what you were asking for. That's what you're telling me 5 now. And if you knew full well that's what you were 6 asking for, why didn't you tell the Court? MR. CLARK: Well, in a case -- in a case like 7 this, why didn't we tell the Court? Well, one, I believe that we did tell the Court inasmuch as it was 8 attached in the amended pleading. Number two, --THE COURT: If that was so, why would you 9 have to send anything other than the amended pleading? You could say, Dear Court, please amend our pleading in 10 the form attached hereto without saying anything about why. 11 MR. CLARK: The Court rules requires that the proposed amended pleading be attached and I think that, 12 you know, it was a one-page certification, two paragraphs, and it does say, we are doing it to name 13 the wife for a per quod claim. When we reviewed the file, it wasn't there. It was a one-page ...certification. It was, in my view, something of a pro 14 forma motion and if --15 THE COURT: Pro forma for purposes of adding the per quod claim. 16 MR. CLARK: To add that cause of action. THE COURT: Right. That was its purpose. 17 MR. CLARK: Correct, but the punitive damages --18 THE COURT: No other purpose. MR. CLARK: Well, it was also to clean up the 19 pleading. The language of that pleading is different from the other law firm. It's different than the form 20 that we use in a case such as this. So it was also generally to clean it up. But the punitive damages 21 claim, it's not a separate cause of action. It's a prayer for relief. It's a damage. 22 THE COURT: Let's face it, Mr. Clark, --MR. CLARK: I'm sorry? 23 THE COURT: Be honest. MR. CLARK: Yes. 24 THE COURT: That's in there because the form that you just said, the cleaning up the language that 25 you use, had it in there. So it just carried over on the form. MR. CLARK: No. It's more than a form. Т mean, we definitely would have looked at that and said, this needs punitive -- we need to ask in the complaint --

1 49 2 Argument - Clark 3 THE COURT: Then why didn't you tell the Court that? 4 MR. CLARK: In hindsight, I suppose we could have made it more clear, but it is attached to the pleading. The rule requires that the pleading be 5 attached. The pleading was attached and it was included in there, so if we -- Judge, if we had -- if 6 we had filed a motion and attached a pleading without 7 it in the wherefore clause and then got the order and then filed it with it in there, I can certainly see 8 that. THE COURT: But on the other hand, you're 9 suggesting, I believe, that the dismissal of that amended complaint with prejudice doesn't serve as a 10 dismissal of that punitive damage claim because the Court didn't say, oh, by the way, that punitive damage 11 claim, we're dismissing that, too. MR. CLARK: I quess -- I quess it somewhat 12 goes both ways as well because when the defendant filed the motion and if we look -- and I have the motion 13 papers here and I'm sure the in the court file, but when the defendant filed the motion, it all talks about 14 the per quod claim. It doesn't mention anything about also moving to dismiss the punitive damages claim or 15 sort of teeing up the punitive damages claim on its merits as it's now being teed up. So --16 THE COURT: Did you make a motion to reconsider, to the Court that dismissed the complaint 17 to reconsider and preserve the demand for punitive damages when the Court signed the order dismissing the 18 amended complaint in its entirety with prejudice? MR. CLARK: No. Because the motion papers 19 were so clear that it was only moving to dismiss the per quod claim and --20 THE COURT: You're talking out of both sides of your mouth. 21 MR. CLARK: I'm sorry? THE COURT: The papers were so clear that 22 we're only dismissing the per quod claim, but the papers weren't so clear that you were only asking to 23 add the per quod claim? MR. CLARK: In hindsight, it could have been 24 done a better form, certainly, in hindsight. It is --THE COURT: You can't have it both ways. 25 It's either dismissed with prejudice, including the punitive damages claim, or it isn't asked for in the first place. You can't have it both ways. It's either, you're asking the Court to read behind what is actually there. MR. CLARK: The other -- the other question,

1	50
2	Argument - Clark
3	too, is how does it relate under the Punitive Damages Act. The Punitive Damages Act simply says, it must be
4	requested in the complaint. The question becomes, is a dismissal of a per quod claim in an amended complaint,
5	which includes the request to the prayer for punitive damages is the dismissal of the per quod claim, does
6	that also render it unaskable at trial when the punitive damages claim when the PDA says it has to
7	be requested? I think that would be something of a new
8	issue, so to speak, or a legal issue. I say to the Court that it wasn't simply a matter of form. It was definitely thought about and
9	said, this case needs a punitive damages claim in the wherefore clause, so it was put in there more than in a
10	form way. We attached it in the proposed amended
11	pleading. There was no opposition to it on the motion and, when it was moved to dismiss, nothing was said
12	about the punitive claim, so the question remains, does that render the plaintiff unable to ask to make that
13	claim at the time of trial? Is that what the Punitive Damages Act and the Legislature meant when it said, it
14	has to be asked for in the complaint, that if it also happens to get dismissed, a tagalong way, so to speak,
15	does that render that as you know, to end the query. But, again, in all candor to the Court in
16	answering your questions directly, yes, it was more than a form. You put it in there. I repeat myself
17	again. I don't think we were being surreptitious or anything like that because it was attached in the
18	proposed amended pleadings the rule requires, and it was a one-page certification.
19	So I don't know what more I can say about
20	that. I suppose, in the future, if we have a situation like this, we will specifically put it in the
21	certification requesting it. THE COURT: Good idea. MR. CLARK: And I don't know what more I
22	could say on the procedural aspect, unless Your Honor
23	has any questions. THE COURT: Okay. No.
24	MR. CLARK: With respect to the substantive aspect, the standard for whether or not there's
25	sufficient evidence for a jury to consider punitive damages would be whether or not the defendant's actions were wanton or willful or with reckless disregard for the rights of the plaintiff. I believe that there is sufficient evidence in this case related to compensatory damages. We have not sought to enter any
	evidence that would only be relative to punitive

1	51
2	Argument - Clark
3	damages in the compensatory phase of the trial. However, with that said, I believe that there
4	is sufficient evidence in this case already to raise a question for the jury as to the punitive damages claim.
5	Their federal regulations, I think we have raised at least a question of fact as to whether or not the
6	defendants disregarded the federal regulations, OSHA compliance, or what we've talked about.
7	There is a case, which is similar. <u>SMITH V.</u> <u>WHITTAKER</u> , I think, is a key case on punitive damages.
8	It's 160 N.J. 221, and that kind of really kind of lets that Supreme Court 1999, lays out the general standard.
9	So I looked and I tried to find some cases in the OSHA context. Then I found was the Third Circuit federal
10 11	Third Circuit case called <u>SANTILLIAN</u> (phonetic), 289 Federal Appx. 491. It's the Third Circuit coming out
12	of the Virgin Islands. And alien worker from the Dominican Republic can sue the construction site owner and project manager
13	asserting negligence claims for serious and permanent injuries when the worker fell two stories, head first
	onto a concrete floor. And the trial Court awarded entered judgment for \$50,000 in punitive damages
15	against the project manager but set aside \$100,000 punitive damages award against the owner.
16	I think that case is somewhat instructive in terms of applying the punitive damages standard.
17	Standard in the Third Circuit coming out of the Virgin Islands is very similar to New Jersey State law, which is both based on the second statement of torts.
18	Among the things the Court talks about is that we conclude the District Court was correct to
19	uphold the jury's decision to award punitive damages against but erred when it struck the jury's decision
20	to award punitive damages against Zela (phonetic). Among the things talked about was that the behavior of
21	the defendant in failing to manage safety and enforce the OSHA regulations was anything less than reckless
22	and indifference to the rights of others. And this part is interesting. When the
23 24	accident occurred, Nasser (phonetic), instead of calling an ambulance, placed Santillian in his car,
25	poured rum over him, I guess that's what they do in the Virgin Islands. The poured rum over him, left him at the emergency room door, and lied repeatedly about
2 J	what had occurred both with the medical staff at the hospital who needed the information in order to treat Santillian and to the police in order to cover up the fact that the accident had occurred at the construction site.

1	52
2	Argument - Clark
3	The Court found that Zela and Nassar failed to follow safety regulations at the site set by OSHA.
4	There was no safety equipment was being used. Santillian was on the roof without protection. A
5	forklift was used, being pushed towards Santillian two stories up.
6	The Court said, the jury's decision to award punitive damages against Zela was reckless in retaining
7	Nasser to oversee the construction of the target building pursuant to the Restatement of Torts Second,
8	and I think the same applies here in terms of DAR both retaining Fritas under these circumstances to dig these
9	trenches and its own actions of failing to enforce the regulations on his job site. The absence of an
10	accident a prior evidence alone is not sufficient proof that the construction of the building was
11	conducted in a proper manner. What is clear from the evidence presented at
12	trial and I think this is analogous at our case is that the conditions at the target building
13	construction site were extremely poor. There was no safety equipment of any kind provided to the workers.
14	I think there's plenty of testimony in our case in that regard, Your Honor.
15	The relevant permits from the local authorities had not been secured. Well, that one
16	doesn't apply here. Workers' compensation coverage was not paid in that case. That also does not apply here.
17	There was ample evidence at trial via the testimony of witnesses for a reasonable jury to conclude that the
18	project manager was aware of these conditions from the time the project commenced through the date of the
19	accident. Despite her testimony to the contrary, the
20	knowledge of poor conditions and the decision to continue to employ Nasser as the manager of the
21 22	construction site to form the basis of the liability. So I think there is sufficient evidence in this case,
	Judge, on the merits to bring the punitive damages question to the jury and, procedurally, it would only
23	come after. In the event there is a compensatory damage verdict, at that point, the jury would you
24	know, if the claim is permitted, the jury would consider it at that point.
25	I don't have any additional evidence that I believe I would offer. The defendant would have the opportunity to bring evidence of its financial condition because that's relevant, if they want to do that under the <u>TAR</u> (phonetic) case. So procedurally speaking, as far as we're concerned, it would be

.

1	53
2	Argument - Clark
3	nothing more than an additional jury charge and, if the
4	defendant would so choose, to present evidence as to the financial condition.
5	I think this was so that's it on the punitive damages issue, Judge. Thank you.
6	THE COURT: Thank you. All right. On August 29th, 2006, the complaint in this case was filed. The complaint did not ask for, did not seek, there was no
7	prayer for relief for punitive damages. Motion was made and filed October 17th, 2007, to amend the
8	complaint. The notice of motion says, notice of motion to amend the complaint. On the notice of motion, it
9	requests for an order granting leave to file an amended complaint to name Maria Fernandes as a plaintiff.
10	That's what the notice was provided directed to Mr. Cobuzio. Please take notice, that's why we're filing
11	this motion. In support thereof, Mr. Clark writes, dated
12	October 9th, 2007, under penalty of law for making any willfully false statement says, "this office took over
13	the handling of this file from a previous law firm on or about June 25th, 2007. Upon review of the file, it
14 .	appears that no per quod claim on behalf of the plaintiff's wife had been filed. Accordingly,
15	plaintiff makes within to amend complaint to name Maria Fernandes as a plaintiff for her per quod claim. This
16	motion is made pursuant to Rule 4:9-1." How hard would it have been to say when you
17	said, Mr. Clark, upon review of the file, it appears that no per quod claim was made to say, no per quod
18	claim or punitive damages claim was made? You didn't. You didn't put the Court or Mr. Cobuzio on notice of
19	the fact that you contained therein your first amended complaint and jury demand, which was filed on January
20	7th, 2008. An insertion of the words punitive damages twice, one at the end of Count 1 and one at the end of
21	Count 2. Subsequently, that complaint was dismissed in
22	its entirety with prejudice by the same Judge that granted the motion to amend the complaint. So not only
23	was that to the degree to which anybody could interpret that motion as resulting in a leave to grant an
24	amendment to include a punitive damages claim, it was improvidently granted.
25	It being improvidently granted, it was, nonetheless, granted and the complaint was nonetheless filed. However, that complaint in its entirety was dismissed with prejudice. It no longer exists. The only complaint that exists that is before this Court having been tried or being tried is the motion is

1	54
2	Argument - Clark
3	the complaint that was filed in 2006 by the plaintiff
4	through its then Counsel's office. There is no punitive damage claim in this case. That having been said, let me also note for
5	the record that there has been nothing that provided that has been provided to this Court that this Court
6	can glean that provides an opportunity for a reasonable jury to conclude that there was any willful or wanton
7	behavior on the part of the defendant general contractor that proximately caused any injury to the
8	plaintiff and on the merits alone. If there had been a cognizable demand for punitive damages, it would
9	be dismissed in any event. Motion is granted. MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge.
10	MR. CLARK: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: You're welcome. Anything else?
11	Take a break and move to charges? MR. COBUZIO: Yes. Judge, I don't know if
12	this is an appropriate time to talk about whether six or eight are going to deliberate. I don't know what
13	your procedure is. THE COURT: During the charge conference,
14	after break. MR. COBUZIO: Charge? Okay. Okay. Thanks,
15	Judge.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

55

Colloquy

55

(Break)

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

56

Colloquy

56

THE COURT: Okay. All are present and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

57

## Colloquy

57 outside the presence of the jury. Mr. Cobuzio, you

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

58

Colloquy

58 have something in the way of proposed charges?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

59

Colloquy

59

MR. COBUZIO: Yes, Your Honor.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

60

Colloquy

60

MR. CLARK: Do I have a copy?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

61

Colloquy

61

MR. COBUZIO: Oh, I gave it to -- I gave it

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

62

Colloquy

62 to you before lunch.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

63

Colloquy

63

MR. CLARK: You gave me the verdict sheet.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

64

Colloquy

64

MR. COBUZIO: No. We gave you the verdict

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

65

Colloquy

65 sheet --

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

66

Colloquy

66

MR. CLARK: That's it. All I got was a

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

67

Colloquy

67 verdict sheet.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

68

Colloquy

68

MR. COBUZIO: Yes. I gave you this. You had

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

69

# Colloquy

69 it laying on the -- here, have another one, with the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

70

Colloquy

70 verdict sheet and the proposed charges.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

71

Colloquy

71

MR. CLARK: Okay. All right. I'll collect

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

72

Colloquy

72 the -- this is extra.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

73

Colloquy

73

MR. COBUZIO: Yes.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

74

Colloquy

74

MR. CLARK: All right. I thought it was just

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

75

Colloquy

75 a verdict sheet. Let's see, have I got mine now?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

76

Colloquy

76 Thanks.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

77

Colloquy

77

THE COURT: Okay. All right. In the 112

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

78

Colloquy

78 standard charges, we have no requests from Mr. Clark.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

79

Colloquy

79 Mr. Cobuzio, you're just looking for -- making sure

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

80

Colloquy

80 burden of proof, preponderance of the evidence, and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

81

Colloquy

81 false in one, false in all is in the case.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

82

Colloquy

82

MR. COBUZIO: I'm just trying to -- I'm

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

83

# Colloquy

83 following you. Where are you now, Judge?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

84

Colloquy

84

THE COURT: 1:-- 1.12, the general provisions

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

85

Colloquy

85 for a standard charge. That goes through -- well, at

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

86

Colloquy

86 least up through the credibility charge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

87

Colloquy

87

MR. COBUZIO: Okay.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

88

Colloquy

88

THE COURT: The only request that's being

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

89

# Colloquy

89 made is by you and you're asking for the standard

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

90

Colloquy

90 charge -- the model charge on burden of proof,

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

91

Colloquy

91

preponderance of the evidence, and false in one, false

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

92

Colloquy

92 in all.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

93

Colloquy

93

MR. COBUZIO: That's correct.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

94

Colloquy

94

THE COURT: Mr. Clark, do you want to be

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

95

Colloquy

95 heard on the false in one, false in all charge?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

96

Colloquy

96

MR. CLARK: No. No. I leave it up to Your

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

97

### Colloquy

97 Honor's -- you know, I rely on Your Honor's discretion

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

98

### Colloquy

98 as to it. You've seen more of these than I have, so --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

99

Colloquy

99

THE COURT: Yes. I don't see any -- do you

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

100

Colloquy

100 want to talk to me about that, Mr. Cobuzio? Is there

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

101

Colloquy

101 something that you find to be dramatic that -- I mean,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

102

Colloquy

102 I don't know exactly what the standard is in terms of

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

103

Colloquy

103 when one charge is false in one, false in all, but in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

104

Colloquy

104 my view, the general charge as to credibility makes it

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

105

Colloquy

105 clear that the jury is entitled to believe or

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

106

Colloquy

106 disbelieve a witness and is entitled to believe all of

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

107

Colloquy

107 what they say or none of what they say or part of what

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

108

Colloquy

108 they say. That's what the credibility charge says.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

109

Colloquy

109

The false in one, false in all charge really

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

110

Colloquy

110 essentially says the same thing, only it highlights the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

111

Colloquy

111 proposition that a -- specifically, if a juror finds

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

112

Colloquy

112 that somebody told a falsehood in one thing, they're

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

113

Colloquy

113 entitled to disbelieve everything they say in the

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

114

Colloquy

114 entirety of the testimony.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

115

Colloquy

115

I, as a general rule, reserve that charge for

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

116

Colloquy

116 when I get the sense of somebody getting -- that the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

117

Colloquy

117 jury could conclude somebody had gotten on the stand

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

118

Colloquy

118 and is willfully blind.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

119

Colloquy

119

MR. COBUZIO: I'll leave it to Your Honor's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

120

Colloquy

120 discretion.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

121

Colloquy

121

THE COURT: So I'm not going to charge false

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

122

Colloquy

122 in one, false in all. So the reasons I just described.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

123

Colloquy

123 Okay. Moving onto the Chapter 5 charges, negligence.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

124

Colloquy

124 Before we do that, we have the expert testimony charge.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

125

Colloquy

125 We qualified four people -- five people, I believe, as

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

126

Colloquy

126 experts.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

127

Colloquy

127

MR. COBUZIO: I believe that's true, Judge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

128

Colloquy

128 So you had three, I had two. Yes.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

129

Colloquy

129

THE COURT: I know that Mr. Clark tried to

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

130

Colloquy

130 get a hypothetical question asked and answered on

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

131

Colloquy

131 cross-examination of a defense expert, but I don't see

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

132

Colloquy

132 the charge -- optional charge on hypothetical questions

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

133

Colloquy

133 being particularly applicable here and you're not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

134

Colloquy

134 asking for it, so --

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

135

Colloquy

135

MR. COBUZIO: Correct, Judge.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

136

Colloquy

136

THE COURT: The actual charge on the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

137

Colloquy

137 conflicting expert testimony, I don't think that that's

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

138

Colloquy

138 necessary, although there clearly is conflicting expert

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

139

Colloquy

139 testimony. All right. No other requests in that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

140

Colloquy

140 regard. We move onto Chapter 5. 510A is being asked

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

141

Colloquy

141 for by both parties, negligence and ordinary care.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

142

Colloquy

142

It's at that point that I will incorporate

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

143

Colloquy

143 some of what Mr. Clark included in his request to

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

144

Colloquy

144 charge.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

145

Colloquy

145

MR. COBUZIO: What would that be there,

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

146

Colloquy

146 Judge?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

147

Colloquy

147

THE COURT: Violation of the statute, effect

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

148

Colloquy

148 of OSHA, contractor's non-delegable duty. Is there

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

149

Colloquy

149 something about any of that?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

150

Colloquy

150

MR. COBUZIO: Your Honor, there -- I'm trying

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

151

Colloquy

151 to follow you. Certainly, we're at 510B. There is a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

152

Colloquy

152 standard charge with regard to standards of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

153

Colloquy

153 construction, custom, and usage in the industry or

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

154

Colloquy

154 trade, which is 510H. I mean, there's an actual model

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

155

Colloquy

155 jury charge. If Your Honor is referring to Mr. Clark's

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

156

Colloquy

156 request -- and I'm not sure I'm there yet, Judge, or

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

157

Colloquy

157 you're there, but if you're incorporating Mr. Clark's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

158

Colloquy

158 request that actual standards be identified in the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

159

Colloquy

159 charge, I would object to that simply because you're

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

160

Colloquy

160 really repeating the evidence and, now, you're putting

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

161

Colloquy

161 the evidence in from the bench, which, one, seems to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

162

Colloquy

162 give it a little bit more credibility and, two, you can

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

163

Colloquy

163 also put in then, you know, -- I would argue, if you're

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

164

# Colloquy

164 going to go down that road, then you should also put in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

165

Colloquy

165
the citations referenced in my expert's report with

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

166

Colloquy

166 regard to controlling employers and reasonableness and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

167

Colloquy

167 what's a competent person.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

168

Colloquy

168

So there is a standard charge. It's dated, I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

169

Colloquy

169 think, the 10th -- March 10th. It's 5.10H, and I think

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

170

Colloquy

170 it covers what Mr. Clark wants, which is that if

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

171

Colloquy

171 there's violations of industry standards, you can be

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

172

Colloquy

172 considered per se negligence. I think to include what

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

173

Colloquy

173 Mr. Clark is proposing, which appears to be attached to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

174

Colloquy

174 his proposed jury charge, all the citations to the OSHA

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

175

Colloquy

175 regulations, I think that's -- I would object to that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

176

Colloquy

176 and I think that's improper. I mean, you're repeating

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

177

Colloquy

177 the evidence from the plaintiff's case in a charge with

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

178

Colloquy

178 particularity, which is prejudicial to the defendant.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

179

Colloquy

179 I think the charge should just be equal charge as to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

180

Colloquy

180 both.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

181

Colloquy

181

THE COURT: Mr. Clark?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

182

Colloquy

182

MR. CLARK: With respect to -- I heard Mr.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

183

Colloquy

183 Cobuzio address two aspects of the proposed charge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

184

Colloquy

184 The proposed charge we submitted a few days ago is

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

185

Colloquy

185 modeled after 5.10H and 5.30D. There's two aspects Mr.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

186

Colloquy

186 Cobuzio addressed. One is the aspect dealing with

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

187

Colloquy

187 standards in the industry standards and the second was

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

188

Colloquy

188 dealing with the OSHA statute itself.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

189

Colloquy

189

With respect to the industry standards, the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

190

Colloquy

190 charge says that evidence has been produced as to the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

191

Colloquy

191 standard in the industry such as those -- Judge, do you

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

192

Colloquy

192 mind if I sit --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

193

Colloquy

193

THE COURT: Go right ahead.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

194

Colloquy

194

MR. CLARK: -- because, that way, I can also

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

195

Colloquy

195 look at the model jury charge on the computer.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

196

Colloquy

196

THE COURT: Yes. No problem.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

197

Colloquy

197

MR. CLARK: And I think that this -- I think

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

198

Colloquy

198 it is consistent to reference the standards that the

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

199

Colloquy

199 experts refer to. The Court is free to accept or

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

200

Colloquy

200 reject those standards and, if there's other standards

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

201

Colloquy

201 that Counsel wants to put in there, I don't have any

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

202

Colloquy

202 problem with Counsel putting those standards in there.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

203

Colloquy

203 But I think that this charge fairly -- you know, is in

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

204

Colloquy

204 line with the model jury charge and adopted to this

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

205

Colloquy

205 case in terms of its standards.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

206

Colloquy

206

I would just say that there's a good case,

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

207

Colloquy

207 <u>CONSTANTINO V. VENTRIGLIA</u> (phonetic), Appellate

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

208

Colloquy

208 Division -- 324 Super. 437, Appellate Division 1999,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

209

Colloquy

209 which really discusses in detail about charging the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

210

Colloquy

210 jury as to industry standards and OSHA regulations in a

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

211

Colloquy

211 construction accident case. So I think that case is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

212

Colloquy

212 very helpful.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

213

Colloquy

213

But in any event, I think that the proposed

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

214

Colloquy

214 charges that deals with the industry standards is in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

215

Colloquy

215 line with the model jury charge. It is, I believe,

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

216

Colloquy

216 fairly adapted to this case.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

217

Colloquy

217

THE COURT: I think -- I think it is. The

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

218

Colloquy

218 part that I think, though, that's troubling for Mr.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

219

Colloquy

219 Cobuzio and the one I want to address with you, Mr.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

220

Colloquy

220 Clark, is whether or not in the course of charging

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

221

Colloquy

221 relative to and explaining to the jury what the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

222

Colloquy

222 standards are, we're telling the jury that the OSHA

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

223

Colloquy

223 regulations, a violation thereof, could be evidence of

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

224

Colloquy

224 negligence but is not in and of itself negligence. If

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

225

Colloquy

225

we read verbatim the actual OSHA regulations and ask

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

226

Colloquy

226 the jury to determine whether or not those regulations

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

227

Colloquy

227 have been violated, aren't we (a) confusing them, (b)

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

228

Colloquy

228 asking them to make -- to reach conclusions that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

229

Colloquy

229 they're not -- that ought to be based on the testimony

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

230

Colloquy

230 as opposed to what is evidence of negligence as opposed

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

231

Colloquy

231 to per se negligence and doesn't it make more sense

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

232

Colloquy

232 simply to tell them everything that you just said but

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

233

Colloquy

233 to tell them that, to the degree to which they heard

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

234

Colloquy

234 testimony indicating that defendant violated OSHA

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

235

Colloquy

235 violations, if they can conclude that, then they can

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

236

Colloquy

236 accept that as evidence of negligence as opposed to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

237

Colloquy

237 reading the entirety of the OSHA regulations to them,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

238

Colloquy

238 which is going to totally confuse them.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

239

Colloquy

239

MR. CLARK: Yes. I would like to respond to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

240

Colloquy

240 that, Your Honor.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

241

Colloquy

241

THE COURT: Okay.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

242

Colloquy

242

MR. CLARK: Charging the OSHA regulations --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

243

Colloquy

243 you know, this is not sort of like a unique area of the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

244

Colloquy

244 law. It's really no different than an auto accident

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

245

Colloquy

245 red light, green light case. A jury may rely upon a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

246

Colloquy

246 statute to determine the reasonableness of the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

247

Colloquy

247 defendant's conduct and whether or not the defendant

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

248

Colloquy

248 was negligent. They may rely upon the statute, so long

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

249

Colloquy

249 as the plaintiff is within the class of persons

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

250

Colloquy

250 supposed to be protected by the statute. It's no

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

251

Colloquy

251 different than in an auto accident case, if there's a

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

252

Colloquy

252 red light, green light case, the jury would ordinarily

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

253

Colloquy

253 be charged the red light, green light statute and the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

254

Colloquy

254 same principle applies.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

255

Colloquy

255

Simply because someone violated a motor

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

256

Colloquy

256 vehicle law doesn't mean it's negligence per se and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

257

Colloquy

257 compliance with the law, of the motor vehicle law

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

258

Colloquy

258 doesn't give the defendant a dismissal. The jury still

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

259

Colloquy

259 has to determine all the facts and circumstances, but

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

260

Colloquy

260 it's not different than charging the jury the red

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

261

Colloquy

261 light, green light statute or charging them a left turn

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

262

Colloquy

262 statute because it's something they can consider.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

263

Colloquy

263

We're definitely not asking that they be

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

264

Colloquy

264 charged the entirety of the OSHA regulations, only the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

265

Colloquy

265 ones that are fairly applicable to this case and I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

266

Colloquy

266 think that would be a standard operation in any

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

267

Colloquy

267 negligence case to read to the jury what the applicable

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

268

Colloquy

268 statute that they may consider and it's all in the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

269

Colloquy

269 qualified language in there. It's may, and that is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

270

Colloquy

270 modeled.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

271

Colloquy

271

If we were to scroll down and look at the

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

272

Colloquy

272 motor vehicle -- an auto case, you would -- I believe

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

273

Colloquy

273 we would find the same thing, and I can pull that up.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

274

Colloquy

274

THE COURT: Yes. I'm familiar with that.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

275

Colloquy

275

MR. CLARK: And for whatever it's worth,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

276

Colloquy

276 Judge, in my experience in these cases at trial -- and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

277

Colloquy

277 Your Honor will do whatever thinks is fit in this case,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

278

Colloquy

278 but in other cases that I have tried, whether it be a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

279

Colloquy

279 ladder fall-down case, the jury is charged -- has been

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

280

Colloquy

280 charged in my experience the general safety regulations

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

281

Colloquy

281 that may fairly apply and, also, is charged with

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

282

Colloquy

282 specific regulations. I can recall a ladder case some

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

283

Colloquy

283

years ago where the jury was charged the applicable

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

284

Colloquy

284 ladder statute. As long as the qualifying language is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

285

Colloquy

285 in there -- and I believe it is -- as it also is in the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

286

Colloquy

286 model jury charge that the jury may consider it and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

287

Colloquy

287 it's put in its proper light, I think the jury would

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

288

Colloquy

288 actually be more confused having heard things about

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

289

Colloquy

289 OSHA but then they're not charged, you know, the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

290

Colloquy

290 controlling statute.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

291

Colloquy

291

I'll read from 5.30D, Violation of Traffic

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

292

Colloquy

292 Act, citing to  $\underline{\text{EWING V. BURKE}}$ , 316 Super., Appellate

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

293

Colloquy

293 Division '98. The Appellate Division held that the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

294

Colloquy

294 trial Court committed plain error in failing to modify

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

295

Colloquy

295 the model charges to include reference to a relevant

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

296

Colloquy

296 motor vehicle statute that was applicable to the facts

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

297

Colloquy

297 and circumstances of the particular case.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

298

Colloquy

298

The Appellate Division stated, ordinarily,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

299

Colloquy

299 therefore, if there is evidence tending to establish

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

300

Colloquy

300 that a vehicle was operated in violation of a motor

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

301

Colloquy

301 vehicle statute, the statutory duties should be charged

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

302

Colloquy

302 to the jury in order to assist the jury in arriving at

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

303

Colloquy

303 the appropriate verdict.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

304

Colloquy

304

Of course, there's no private right of action

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

305

Colloquy

305 under the motor vehicle statute as there is no private

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

306

Colloquy

306 right of statute under the OSHA statute. However, when

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

307

Colloquy

307 a statute -- and I think the charge says this -- when

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

308

Colloquy

308 the statute establishes an acceptable standard of care

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

309

Colloquy

309 in society and it is alleged that that has been

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

310

Colloquy

310 violated and the Court finds that there's sufficient

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

311

Colloquy

311 evidence, a jury could reasonably conclude such a

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

312

Colloquy

312 statute has been violated. I think the law is clear

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

313

Colloquy

313 under the model jury charge and as stated in the  $\underline{\rm EWING}$ 

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

314

Colloquy

314 case, for example, that it would be plain error to not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

315

Colloquy

315 charge the jury that.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

316

Colloquy

316

And some of the language in this model jury

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

317

Colloquy

317 charge -- because it's very analogous, a violation of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

318

Colloquy

318 the Traffic Act, it's very analogous to this situation

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

319

Colloquy

319

as to whether or not they get charged the applicable

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

320

Colloquy

320 statute. It says, if you find that the defendant has

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

321

Colloquy

321 violated that standard of conduct, -- I'm sorry. In

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

322

Colloquy

322 this case, in support of the charge of negligence made,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

323

Colloquy

323 it is asserted that the defendant violated a provision

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

324

Colloquy

324 of the motor vehicle laws. That provision is referred

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

325

Colloquy

325 to, is known as N.J.S.A. blank and reads as follows,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

326

Colloquy

326 blank, and they quote the statute as we did in our

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

327

Colloquy

327 case.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

328

Colloquy

328

The statute has set up a standard of conduct

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

329

Colloquy

329 for the users of our streets and highways. If you find

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

330

Colloquy

330 that the defendant has violated that standard of

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

331

Colloquy

331 conduct, such a violation is evidence to be considered

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

332

Colloquy

332 by you in determining whether negligence, as I have

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

333

Colloquy

333 defined to you, has been established. It's the same

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

334

Colloquy

334 under  $\underline{\text{ALLOWAY}}$  and the other cases. If you find that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

335

Colloquy

335 they have violated an OSHA regulation, it is evidence

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

336

Colloquy

336 they can consider and it charge was on to say, you may

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

337

Colloquy

337 find that such violation constituted negligence on the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

338

Colloquy

338 part of the defendant or you may find that it did not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

339

Colloquy

339 constitute such negligence, and I believe that same

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

340

Colloquy

340 sort of qualifying language is in there in the charge

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

341

Colloquy

341 that we have submitted dealing with the applicable

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

342

Colloquy

342 statute in this case.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

343

Colloquy

343

Your finding on this issue may be based on

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

344

Colloquy

344 such violation alone, but in the event that there is

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

345

Colloquy

345 other additional evidence bearing on the issue, you

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

346

Colloquy

346 will consider such violation, together with all such

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

347

Colloquy

347 additional evidence in arriving as to your ultimate

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

348

Colloquy

348 decision.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

349

Colloquy

349

And it says in the case, it says  $\underline{\mbox{PHILLIPS V.}}$ 

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

350

Colloquy

350 <u>GREMENTE</u> (phonetic). It's at the bottom of the model

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

351

Colloquy

351 jury charge. The above may be modified to cover

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

352

Colloquy

352 violations of certain other statutes or ordinances,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

353

Colloquy

353 which set up a standard of conduct to be observed in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

354

Colloquy

354 given circumstances for the benefit of the Class 2,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

355

Colloquy

355 which plaintiff belongs. Defense expert agreed that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

356

Colloquy

356 OSHA was set up to protect workers and preserve our

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

357

Colloquy

357 natural resources -- our human resources. I don't

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

358

Colloquy

358 think there's any dispute that plaintiff falls within

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

359

Colloquy

359 the class of persons to benefit from the OSHA Act.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

360

Colloquy

360

I think it's clear. I think the Court will

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

361

Colloquy

361 be correct. It's plain error to not charge it and to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

362

## Colloquy

362 read it and, as I said, in other similar cases, I have

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

363

Colloquy

363 found that that has been done in at least two other

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

364

Colloquy

364 cases that went to verdict in this context. Thank you,

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

365

Colloquy

365 Judge.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

366

Colloquy

366

MR. COBUZIO: Judge, may I respond?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

367

Colloquy

367

THE COURT: Yes.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

368

Colloquy

368

MR. COBUZIO: Briefly, Judge. First of all,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

369

Colloquy

369 I wasn't involved in those other cases. I have no idea

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

370

# Colloquy

370 what the evidence was. I have no idea whether it was

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

371

Colloquy

371 even challenged. So to suggest that because it

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

372

Colloquy

372 happened somewhere else, it should happen here, I don't

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

373

Colloquy

373 think, is something the Court can rely on.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

374

Colloquy

374

Secondly is the motor vehicle model jury

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

375

Colloquy

375 charge, I haven't seen one in a while, I haven't tried

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

376

Colloquy

376 an auto case in a while, but as I recall it, the model

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

377

Colloquy

377 charge as developed by the Supreme Court committee on

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

378

Colloquy

378 model jury charges actually gives you a line where it

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

379

Colloquy

379 says, if you -- a plug-in where they say that you're

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

380

Colloquy

380 supposed to plug in the actual statute.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

381

Colloquy

381

The model jury charge I have given you, which

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

382

Colloquy

382 is the charge adopted by the Supreme Court is fair to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

383

Colloquy

383 both parties, 5.10H, and nowhere in there does it say

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

384

Colloquy

384 to you or provide you instruction where you're supposed

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

385

Colloquy

385 to plug in the OSHA citations that are being alleged to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

386

Colloquy

386 have been violated.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

387

Colloquy

387

Now, that said, Judge, if you were to do

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

388

## Colloquy

388 that, my suggestion to you is, Judge, you're restating

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

389

Colloquy

389 the plaintiff's case as closing argument from the bench

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

390

Colloquy

390 in a charge and I think that the jury is going to infer

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

391

Colloquy

391 that, therefore, it must be. And in that regard, I

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

392

Colloquy

392 think the charge that we have as our model where the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

393

Colloquy

393 Court does -- the Supreme Court does not tell us where

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

394

Colloquy

394 to plug in the OSHA violations or the OSHA citations, I

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

395

Colloquy

395 think that's the appropriate charge, the fair charge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

396

Colloquy

396

Mr. Clark is going to be able to close

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

397

Colloquy

397 talking all about that stuff. We do know Gallagher

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

398

Colloquy

398 talked about it on the stand and now you're plugging it

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

399

Colloquy

399 into a charge and Your Honor is going to say it to the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

400

Colloquy

400 jury and I think that's prejudicial to the defendant.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

401

Colloquy

401 So, therefore, I would rely on the model charge as

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

402

Colloquy

402 adopted by our Supreme Court rules committee or model

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

403

Colloquy

403 jury -- what's the proper term there, Judge? Model

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

404

Colloquy

404 jury charge committee. There we go. Thanks, Judge.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

405

Colloquy

405

THE COURT: Right. Civil.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

406

Colloquy

406

MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

407

Colloquy

407

THE COURT: Do you have that cite, Charity,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

408

Colloquy

408 because I can't find it anywhere, the cite that we were

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

409

Colloquy

409 talking about.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

410

Colloquy

410

LAW CLERK: Yes. It's the case that I --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

411

Colloquy

411 this is the part that --

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

412

Colloquy

412

(Tape Off - Tape On)

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

413

Colloquy

413

MR. CLARK: May I briefly respond or --

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

414

Colloquy

414

THE COURT: Go ahead.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

415

Colloquy

415

MR. CLARK: We're not asking the Court to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

416

Colloquy

416 sort of bolster our case. We're following the model

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

417

Colloquy

417 jury charge. As, again, the Court in  $\underline{\rm EWING}$  said, it

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

418

Colloquy

418 would be plain error to not charge the applicable

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

419

Colloquy

419 statute and the jury -- Mr. Cobuzio's argument that he

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

420

Colloquy

420 just made would equally apply to the model jury charge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

421

# Colloquy

421 It says, in this case, in support of the negligence

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

422

Colloquy

 $422\,$  made, it is asserted that the defendant violated a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

423

Colloquy

423 provision of the motor vehicle laws.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

424

Colloquy

424

The same argument could be made there in a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

425

Colloquy

425 motor vehicle case. Judge, don't say that because

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
A.D.#	

# INDEX2

426

Colloquy

426 you're just supporting the plaintiff's claim that they

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

427

Colloquy

427 violated the motor vehicle law and the charge goes onto

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

428

Colloquy

428 cite the applicable statute. It says, it -- the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

429

Colloquy

429 standard of conduct.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

430

Colloquy

430

Mr. Cobuzio is incorrect to say that the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

431

Colloquy

431 Judge is just sort of bolstering the plaintiff's case

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

432

Colloquy

432

because the same argument could be made there and the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

433

Colloquy

433 qualifying language is in the charge. If you find the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

434

Colloquy

434 defendant has violated the standard of conduct, such

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

435

Colloquy

435 violation is evidence to be considered by you. You may

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

436

Colloquy

436 find that such violation constituted negligence on the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

437

## Colloquy

437 part of the defendant or you may find that it did not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

438

Colloquy

438 constitute such negligence.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

439

Colloquy

439

So the qualifying language is in the model

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

440

Colloquy

440 jury charge. It should be in the charge I submitted,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

441

Colloquy

441 and Mr. Cobuzio's argument that by stating the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

442

Colloquy

442 applicable statute and citing it as it's cited in the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

443

Colloquy

443 statute would bolster plaintiff's case is incorrect

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

444

Colloquy

444 because the model jury charge provides that it's not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

445

Colloquy

445 bolstering it and the plain language is in there that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

446

Colloquy

446 says, you may consider it and you may find or you may

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

447

Colloquy

447 not find, and as you continue down the model jury

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

448

Colloquy

448 charge, it specifically cites to it and, again, the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

449

Colloquy

449 notes to the model jury charge cite to  $\underline{\text{PHILLIPS V.}}$ 

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

450

Colloquy

450 <u>GREMENTE</u>, that the above may be modified to cover

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

451

Colloquy

451 violations of certain other statutes or ordinances,

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

452

Colloquy

452 which was done in this case.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

453

Colloquy

453

The other form charge there, it actually

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

454

Colloquy

454 cites it. In this case, plaintiff argues that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

455

Colloquy

455 defendant was negligent because it violated provision

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

456

Colloquy

456 of the motor vehicle laws. The provisions referred to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

457

Colloquy

457 as N.J.S.A. 39:4-89, and then it quotes it, driver of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

458

Colloquy

458 vehicle shall not follow vehicle more closely, et

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

459

Colloquy

459 cetera, et cetera, and as the Court held in the  $\underline{\rm EWING}$ 

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

460

Colloquy

460 case, I think it would be plain error in this case to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

461

Colloquy

461 now charge the jury the applicable statutes and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

462

Colloquy

462 regulations, which is not only the OSHA regulation but,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

463

Colloquy

463 also, the New Jersey Administrative Code that's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

464

Colloquy

464 referenced in our papers and the building permit is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

465

Colloquy

465 entered in as evidence. Thank you, Judge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

466

Colloquy

466

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. As the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

467

Colloquy

467 Supreme Court said in <u>ALLOWAY</u> and I quote, "Moreover,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

468

Colloquy

468 in the area of workplace safety, the common law

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

469

Colloquy

469 provides ample remedial relief that is flexible and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

470

Colloquy

470 adaptive of changing circumstances." Further, the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

471

Colloquy

471  $\underline{\text{ALLOWAY}}$  Court noted that in cases dealing with OSHA

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

472

Colloquy

472 violations and its predecessor the Construction Safety

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

473

Colloquy

473 Act, view regulatory enforcement and not independent

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

474

Colloquy

474 civil remedial action as the central means to achieve

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

475

Colloquy

475 workplace safety, citing  $\underline{CAINE}$ , which is at 278 N.J.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

476

Colloquy

476 Super. at 143.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

477

Colloquy

477

The Court recognized in that case it was --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

478

Colloquy

478 the Court recognized that while it might be feasible to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

479

Colloquy

479 make liability turn -- quoting from <u>ALLOWAY</u> -- "turn on

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

480

Colloquy

480 the violation of an OSHA regulation, a sounder approach

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

481

Colloquy

481 accords the violation relevance but not dispositive

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

482

Colloquy

482 weight."

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

483

Colloquy

483

To the degree to which we cite the regulation

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

484

Colloquy

484 in its specific language, not only does it serve to

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

485

Colloquy

485 potentially confuse the jury, but it may cause that

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

486

Colloquy

486 confusion in this Court's view to rise to the level

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

487

Colloquy

487 whereby the liability question turns upon the violation

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

488

Colloquy

488 as opposed to -- the violation of the OSHA statute as

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

489

Colloquy

489 opposed -- OSHA regulation as opposed to the common law

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

490

Colloquy

490 standard, which is the concept under which this case is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

491

Colloquy

491 being tried.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

492

Colloquy

492

The Court will certainly charge the jury with

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

493

Colloquy

493 regard to the relevance -- which is what <u>ALLOWAY</u> stands

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

494

Colloquy

494 for -- the relevance of a violation of an OSHA statute

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

495

Colloquy

495 and for them to determine whether or not there has been

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

496

Colloquy

496

a violation and whether there has been or hasn't been,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

497

Colloquy

497 whether or not the common law duty, which will be

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

498

Colloquy

498 explained to them, has been breached.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

499

Colloquy

499

So I'm going to read a somewhat modified

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

500

Colloquy

500 5.10H with an insertion of the OSHA reference without

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

501

Colloquy

501 specifically quoting verbatim the OSHA regulations.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

502

Colloquy

502 Okay.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

503

Colloquy

503

MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

504

Colloquy

504

MR. CLARK: Judge, the other important part

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

505

Colloquy

505 about this -- and I think it would confuse the jury is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

506

Colloquy

506 -- and I think it's critical to charge the jury the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

507

Colloquy

507 OSHA regulation in this case. They're going to make

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

508

Colloquy

508 arguments that, if it's less than five feet deep, it

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

509

Colloquy

509 doesn't require suring and they're going to make

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

510

Colloquy

510 arguments that it wasn't less than five feet deep and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

511

Colloquy

511 -- it was less than five feet deep and, therefore, it

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

512

Colloquy

512 didn't -- I think it's critical in this case to charge

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

513

Colloquy

513 the applicable OSHA regulation in that regard because

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

514

Colloquy

514 that's not the law. The law is if it's less than five

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

515

## Colloquy

515 feet deep, a competent person has to inspect it and

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

516

Colloquy

516 conclude it's not likely to collapse. If the jury is

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

517

Colloquy

517 not charged that, they're going to -- they're going

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

518

Colloquy

518 to --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

519

Colloquy

519

THE COURT: But that makes your point, Mr.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

520

Colloquy

520 Clark, and that makes a point that I made and that is,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

521

Colloquy

521 it could be a breach and, therefore, negligence if the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

522

Colloquy

522 pit -- if the trench was less than five feet and it

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

523

Colloquy

523 could be not negligence if it was more than five feet.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

524

Colloquy

524 Now, it would be unlikely but, you know, who is to say?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

525

Colloquy

525

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

526

Colloquy

526

The standard is not in and of itself the OSHA

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

527

Colloquy

527 regulation. It is evidence of negligence, not per se

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

528

Colloquy

528 negligence. So just like you're free to argue and not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

529

Colloquy

529 just because it's in the OSHA regulations, you're free

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

530

Colloquy

530 to argue that nobody -- that even if it was less than

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

531

Colloquy

531 five feet, they should have had trench boxes because

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

532

Colloquy

532 the need was there and there has been testimony to that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

533

Colloquy

533 effect. Similarly, Mr. Cobuzio is free to argue that

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

534

Colloquy

534 it wasn't and if he wanted to, he would be free to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

535

# Colloquy

535 argue that, even if it was deeper than five feet, it is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

536

Colloquy

536 not necessarily a breach of a duty of care, depending

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

537

Colloquy

537 upon the circumstances.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

538

Colloquy

538

MR. CLARK: But that would -- Your Honor made

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

539

Colloquy

539 a good point. You said, who is to say? The Court is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

540

Colloquy

540 to say. The Court has to correctly recite the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

541

Colloquy

541 applicable statute and it's true that violation of the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

542

Colloquy

542 statute doesn't make -- render liability. The traffic

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

543

Colloquy

543 accident is the exact same thing, and the Court in the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

544

Colloquy

544

CONSTANTINO case said, the actual jury instructions may

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

545

Colloquy

545 have prevented the jury from considering the OSHA

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

546

Colloquy

546 safety standards relied upon by plaintiff's expert to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

547

Colloquy

547 establish the standard of care.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

548

Colloquy

548

New Jersey laws consistently allowed OSHA

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

549

Colloquy

549 standards to be considered for that purpose, even where

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

550

Colloquy

550 the allegedly negligent party is not subject to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

551

Colloquy

551 regulation or enforcement by OSHA. Because the case

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

552

Colloquy

552 must be retried, we observed that the federal OSHA

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

553

Colloquy

553 safety regulations may have been relevant and, perhaps,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

554

Colloquy

554 violated in this situation, even if not applicable to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

555

Colloquy

555 the statute.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

556

Colloquy

556

And the standards expressed in the OSHA

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

557

Colloquy

557 regulations may be recognized and accepted as -- and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

558

Colloquy

558 the failure to charge them in that case was reversible

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

559

Colloquy

559 error. I think, Judge, it's going to confuse the jury

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

560

Colloquy

560 even more and it's to Your Honor to say based upon the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

561

Colloquy

561 law as to what that statute says. It would be no

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

562

Colloquy

562 different than having a left turn case and the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

563

Colloquy

563 defendant getting up and saying, well, under the left

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

564

Colloquy

564 turn statute, it says, A, B, and C, and then the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

565

Colloquy

565 plaintiff gets up and says, well, no, under the left

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

566

Colloquy

566 turn statute, it says C, D, and F, and now the jury is

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

567

Colloquy

567 left to go nowhere without the Court bringing it back

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

568

# Colloquy

568 to the -- where it should be, which is what the Court

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

569

Colloquy

569 says.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

570

Colloquy

570

I think in this case, with so much discussion

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

571

Colloquy

571 of these OSHA regulations, I think that it would be --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

572

Colloquy

572

it would cause the jury to go off, to wander far as to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

573

Colloquy

573 what that regulation says and rely on the jury's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

574

Colloquy

574 recollection of what the regulation says. I mean,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

575

Colloquy

575 clearly, the Court should charge the jury the

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

576

Colloquy

576 applicable statute. I mean, there's no -- you know,

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

577

Colloquy

577 the Appellate Division held that the Court committed

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

578

Colloquy

578 plain error in failing to modify the charges to include

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

579

Colloquy

579 reference to the relevant motor vehicle statutes

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### <u>I N D E X</u>2

580

Colloquy

580 because, if Your Honor doesn't, the jury is going to be

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

581

# Colloquy

581 left to remember, wait, what did that statute -- wait,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

582

Colloquy

582 who is right about what the statute says, Cobuzio or

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

583

Colloquy

583 Clark, and I think that would be a worse case and I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

584

Colloquy

584 think it would be against -- and I know the <u>ALLOWAY</u>

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

585

Colloquy

585 case does have language that says, the common law has

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

586

Colloquy

586 ample remedial relief and it does and that's why the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

587

Colloquy

587 negligence charge is in there.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

588

Colloquy

588

But you can't just leave it at the negligence

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

589

Colloquy

589 charge. That's what they did in the <u>CONSTANTINO</u> case.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

590

Colloquy

590 They left it at the regular negligence charge, didn't

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

591

Colloquy

591 charge them the OSHA violation, and it was a reversible

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

592

Colloquy

592 error because the jury was left to speculate, wait,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

593

Colloquy

593 maybe I can't consider that OSHA and, wait, is Clark

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

594

Colloquy

594 right about it or is Cobuzio right about it?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

595

Colloquy

595

In our charge, we don't misstate what the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

596

Colloquy

596 statute says. It's quoted verbatim. And we're not

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

597

Colloquy

597 giving them a book. It's about maybe two or three

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

598

Colloquy

598 pages of applicable controlling statutes on it. I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

599

Colloquy

599 think that, you know, this trial has been, I have to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

600

Colloquy

600 say, quite clean and to -- you know, I think it would

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

601

Colloquy

601 be respect-- you know, I think it would be plain error

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

602

Colloquy

602 to not charge the applicable statute.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

603

Colloquy

603

If this was a case where it was passing

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

604

Colloquy

604 reference to OSHA, but the whole case was about OSHA

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

605

Colloquy

605 and other things. That's --

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

606

Colloquy

606

THE COURT: Well, you know, I didn't have in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

607

Colloquy

607 front of me and I do want to take a look at it, do you

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

608

Colloquy

608 have the cite for <u>CONSTANTINO</u>? Oh, you have the

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

609

Colloquy

609 actual --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

610

Colloquy

610

MR. CLARK: We said in this -- I said, it's

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

611

Colloquy

611 modeled after model jury charge 5.10H and 5.30D, which

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

612

Colloquy

612 is the model jury charge when you have a statute and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

613

Colloquy

613 it's very clear in there. The jury is going to be left

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

614

Colloquy

614 to speculate and wonder as to what the applicable

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

615

# Colloquy

615 statute is and what it says, if the Court doesn't

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

616

Colloquy

616 charge it.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

617

Colloquy

617

MR. COBUZIO: Judge, that's the whole case.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

618

Colloquy

618 I mean, the jury is -- Your Honor ruled, if the jury

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

619

Colloquy

619 doesn't like -- if Mr. Clark doesn't like the ruling

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

620

# Colloquy

620 and we're rehashing it again, but you know, the jury

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

621

Colloquy

621 heard the evidence, the jury heard the testimony and,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

622

## Colloquy

622 now, you're being asked to read a seven-page charge to

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

623

Colloquy

623 the jury with regard to one issue.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

624

Colloquy

624

I mean, I would just point out, Judge, the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

625

Colloquy

625 first paragraph of the charge is one of the issues that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

626

# Colloquy

626 came up on a motion in limine and that is whether or

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

627

Colloquy

627 not those provisions even applied. So it just seems to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

628

Colloquy

628 me that the better course of prudence in this matter

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

629

Colloquy

629 would be to read the Supreme Court model charge as Your

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

630

Colloquy

630 Honor indicated earlier based on your review of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

631

Colloquy

631 <u>Alloway</u>.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

632

Colloquy

632

MR. CLARK: And I agree with Mr. Cobuzio.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

633

Colloquy

633 The Supreme Court model charge is 5.30D. It would be

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

634

Colloquy

634 plain error to not charge the applicable statute.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

635

Colloquy

635

MR. COBUZIO: That's the auto charge, Judge.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

636

Colloquy

636 That's the charge where the Supreme Court tells you to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

637

Colloquy

637 plug in the statute. Nowhere in this charge the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

638

Colloquy

638 Supreme Court has approved and they tell you to plug in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

639

Colloquy

639 a statute.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

640

Colloquy

640

MR. CLARK: Page 2 of the model charge that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

641

Colloquy

641 Mr. Cobuzio refers to, <u>PHILLIPS V. GREMENTE</u>, the above

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

642

Colloquy

642 may be modified to cover violations of certain other

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

643

Colloquy

643 statutes or ordinances, which set up a standard of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

644

Colloquy

644 conduct to be observed in given circumstances for the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

645

Colloquy

645 benefit of the class to which the plaintiff belongs.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

646

Colloquy

646

MR. COBUZIO: That's the auto charge.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

647

Colloquy

647

THE COURT: Okay. Everybody be quite for a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

648

Colloquy

648 minute, please.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

649

Colloquy

649

(Tape Off - Tape On)

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
	DUCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

650

Colloquy

650

THE COURT: I mean, I'm -- the old -- is, I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

651

Colloquy

651 may not always be right, but I'm always sure. Because

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

652

Colloquy

652 I'm not always right, I can recognize, while I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

653

Colloquy

653 certainly don't encourage lawyers to object to a ruling

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

654

Colloquy

654 once it's been made, I do believe that, without having

NEW TEDOEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
A.D.#	

<u>I N D E X</u>2

655

Colloquy

655 previously read the <u>CONSTANTINO</u> case, I read it as

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

656

Colloquy

656 consistent with  $\underline{\text{ALLOWAY}}$  and it is, but when looked at

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

657

Colloquy

657 even more closely, it says, while certainly not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

658

Colloquy

658 suggesting that there's anything incorrect in <u>ALLOWAY</u>,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

659

Colloquy

659 the Court in <u>CONSTANTINO</u>, which is cited as 324 N.J.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

660

Colloquy

660 Super. 437, the Appellate Division noted that when

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

661

Colloquy

661 circumstances arise wherein as I believe it was the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

662

Colloquy

662 defendant's expert made clear -- at least clear to me

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

663

Colloquy

663 in a way that was understandable to me and the jury,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

664

Colloquy

664 the crux of this case really factually is whether or

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

665

Colloquy

665 not the -- how close to the house was the trench and

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

666

Colloquy

666 how deep was the trench.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

667

Colloquy

667

A standard that both parties are relying on

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

668

Colloquy

668 is the standard set in the OSHA regulation. If there's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

669

Colloquy

669 something specific in the regulation that you object

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

670

Colloquy

670 to, Mr. Cobuzio, I'll hear you and if you don't want to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

671

Colloquy

671 do that, you know, you want to --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

672

Colloquy

672

MR. COBUZIO: No, Your Honor, because you may

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

673

Colloquy

673 recall the motions in limine that were filed in this

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

674

Colloquy

674 case with regard to the OSHA standards, my expert is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

675

Colloquy

675 saying that certain OSHA standards did not apply. For

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

676

Colloquy

676 example, the first two pages of Mr. Clark's proposed

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

677

Colloquy

677 charge dealing with the joint responsibility --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

678

Colloquy

678 remember, we're talking about 1916 and the grafting of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

679

Colloquy

679 responsibilities to the general contractor in a non-

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

680

Colloquy

680 federally financed case, you know, construction case

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

681

Colloquy

681 and --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

682

Colloquy

682

THE COURT: And that's all to -- and I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

683

Colloquy

683 understand that it's all to vague with regard to the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

684

Colloquy

684 applicability of standards and determination the Court

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

685

Colloquy

685 has made with regard to duty. That decision has been

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

686

Colloquy

686 made. But with regard to specifics, for instance, 29

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

687

Colloquy

687 CFR 1926.652.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

688

Colloquy

688

MR. COBUZIO: Judge, I have no objection to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

689

Colloquy

689 652 and the competent person definition. I would

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

690

Colloquy

690 object to all other references to the standards. I

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

691

Colloquy

691 mean, Your Honor could very easily charge the jury with

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

692

Colloquy

692

the model charge approved by the Supreme Court and you

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

693

Colloquy

693 could say, you have heard the various OSHA regulations

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

694

Colloquy

694 dealing with the issue of the trench, the trench depth,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

695

Colloquy

695 and competent person. OSHA says this and then, you

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

696

Colloquy

696 know, go on with your curative instruction as to

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

697

Colloquy

697 whether or not there's been a breach of that, it's not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

698

Colloquy

698 evidence of negligence, that kind of thing.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

699

Colloquy

699

But to cite all seven pages of OSHA

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

700

Colloquy

700 regulations to this jury would likely confuse them,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

701

Colloquy

701 doesn't provide any applicable -- any appropriate

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

702

Colloquy

702 standard. I think that the 652 reference in Mr.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

703

Colloquy

703 Clark's Page 5, competent person definition provided

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

704

Colloquy

704 that it's -- I'm sure it's the complete definition, I

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

705

Colloquy

705 just don't know, would be appropriate.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

706

Colloquy

706

But there's also -- I mean, to charge them

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

707

Colloquy

707 like for example, with the aluminum hydraulic suring

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

708

Colloquy

708 for trenches, Subpart G, I mean, you've got testimony

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

709

Colloquy

709 that it was OSHA compliant. You have testimony from

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}_2$

710

Colloquy

710 the expert that it was --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

711

Colloquy

711

MR. CLARK: Testimony from Fritas that it was

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

712

Colloquy

712 OSHA compliant.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

713

Colloquy

713

MR. COBUZIO: And you have testimony -- and

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

714

Colloquy

714 you have testimony from the defense expert that it's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

715

Colloquy

715 OSHA compliant. So to say -- and that -- if you were

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

716

Colloquy

716 to charge from the bench that, please note that plywood

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

717

Colloquy

717 is not intended, you know, we've got to read all the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

718

Colloquy

718 rules. I mean, we've got the technical manual for

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

719

Colloquy

719 OSHA, so I don't think that's appropriate.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

720

Colloquy

720

Counsel can argue it. I'm not saying Counsel

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

721

Colloquy

721 can't argue it in closing, but if you want to give the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

722

Colloquy

722 jury some guidance, I can short circuit this argument

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

723

Colloquy

723 and just tell you that I would agree to those two

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

724

Colloquy

724 citations.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

725

Colloquy

725

MR. CLARK: Well, I would agree to take out

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

726

Colloquy

726 Subpart -- I would agree that we're at the proposed

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

727

Colloquy

727 jury charge, Page 6. I would definitely agree to take

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

728

Colloquy

728 out the hydraulic suring.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

729

Colloquy

729

MR. COBUZIO: Well, I don't agree to his

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

730

Colloquy

730 charge, Judge. I agree to the model charge set forth

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}_2$

731

Colloquy

731 by the Supreme Court 5.10H --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

732

Colloquy

732

MR. CLARK: All right. So, look, --

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

733

Colloquy

733

MR. COBUZIO: And then if Your Honor needs to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

734

Colloquy

734 make a reference to -- if Your Honor needs to make a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

735

Colloquy

735 reference to OSHA, I would agree for purposes of moving

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

736

Colloquy

736 this along to 652, the definition of a competent

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

737

Colloquy

737 person, and that's it.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

738

Colloquy

738

MR. CLARK: Wait. So we're just going to

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

739

Colloquy

739 charge the part that the defendant wants to rely on,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

740

Colloquy

740 but we're not going to charge the part that the

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

741

Colloquy

741 plaintiff wants to rely on? See, that's --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

742

Colloquy

742

MR. COBUZIO: No. For purposes of the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

743

Colloquy

743 charge. Your Honor is going to say, there has been

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

744

Colloquy

744 testimony with regard to OSHA violations in this matter

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

745

Colloquy

745 and, of course, Mr. Clark is going to argue those to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

746

Colloquy

746 the jury.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

747

Colloquy

747

But for purposes of providing instruction

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

748

Colloquy

748 with regard to the relevant issue in this case and that

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

749

Colloquy

749 is the trench depth, the trench location, that kind of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

750

Colloquy

750 thing, I'll consent to that provision on the model jury

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

751

Colloquy

751 charge, not on Mr. Clark's charge because the first

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

752

Colloquy

752 part -- let me just finish, Jerry -- on the first part,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

753

Colloquy

753 Page 3, all that, Judge, is really in the model jury

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

754

Colloquy

754 charge and, frankly, our expert disagrees with the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

755

Colloquy

755 second paragraph as to the grafting of those

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

756

Colloquy

756 responsibilities on a general contractor in this

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

757

Colloquy

757 particular type of setting. I mean, we actually have a

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

758

Colloquy

758 letter of interpretation, which says it doesn't include

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

759

Colloquy

759 that. We argued all that in the motion in limine in

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

760

Colloquy

760 the beginning and Your Honor said, all OSHA regulations

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

761

Colloquy

761 can go in and be considered.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

762

Colloquy

762

MR. CLARK: Yes. And I want to bring that up

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

763

Colloquy

763 because the interpretation letter that you used was a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

764

Colloquy

764 guided OSHA, take some federal court cases out of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

765

Colloquy

765 another jurisdiction and says, this is what OSHA needs.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

766

Colloquy

766 Defense Counsel -- those regulations in  $\underline{\text{ALLOWAY}}$  are

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

767

### Colloquy

767 clear. The Court was clear that, pursuant to the plain

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

768

Colloquy

768 terms of 1926.16, the contractor, the prime contractor

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

769

Colloquy

769 has all the obligations referenced as employer

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

770

Colloquy

770 obligations under this part. It's clear under  $\underline{\text{ALLOWAY}}$ 

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

771

Colloquy

771 that they apply.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

772

Colloquy

772

So the fact that, you know, the defense

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

773

Colloquy

773 expert gets up and says, well, that doesn't apply,

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

774

Colloquy

774 meaning he's going against what the Supreme Court says

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

775

Colloquy

775

in <u>ALLOWAY</u>, 1926.16, the non-delegable duty under OSHA,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

776

Colloquy

776 it's directly in <u>ALLOWAY</u>.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

777

Colloquy

777

And, Judge, I appreciate Counsel's

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

778

Colloquy

778 willingness to move this along and say, well, I'll

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

779

Colloquy

779 agree to you know charge the jury 1926.652, but you

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

780

Colloquy

780 can't charge part of an applicable regulation and not

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

781

Colloquy

781 the other part, specifically, the part about 1926.16 as

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

782

Colloquy

782

to what  $\underline{\texttt{ALLOWAY}}$  talks about that the prime contractor

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

783

Colloquy

783 has all the duties and responsibilities that are

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

784

Colloquy

784 referenced as employer obligations and that employer as

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

785

Colloquy

785 contractor/subcontractor has to be charged, if the jury

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

786

Colloquy

786 is going to be charged the specific regulation of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

787

Colloquy

787 1926.652 because that speaks in terms of employer

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

788

Colloquy

788 obligation and the employer obligation under the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

789

Colloquy

789 statute is non-delegable. It's the prime contractor.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

790

Colloquy

790 It has all the employer obligations, so it has to be

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

791

Colloquy

791 told to the jury. We're going to tell them the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

792

Colloquy

792 specific statute.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

793

Colloquy

793

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to craft

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

794

Colloquy

794 something that's going to include the specific -- that,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

795

Colloquy

795 at a minimum, is going to include, Mr. Clark, 1926.652

796 as cited by you in your proposed charge, as well as the

Colloquy

796

INDEX2

A.D.#\_\_\_\_\_

ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

NEW JERSEY

LAW DIVISION, CIVIL

SUPERIOR COURT OF

PART

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

797

Colloquy

797 definition of competent person. Whether I add anything

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

798

Colloquy

798 else, --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

799

Colloquy

799

MR. CLARK: Judge, if I would just -- if I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

800

Colloquy

800 would just implore upon the Court to the extent I can,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

801

Colloquy

801 1926.16 is critical and it is in the  $\underline{\text{ALLOWAY}}$  case,

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

802

Colloquy

802 specifically referred to in there.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

803

Colloquy

803

THE COURT: Well, you know, the law that that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

804

Colloquy

804 proposition that that stands for can be --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

805

Colloquy

805

MR. CLARK: That is the non-delegable duty.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

806

Colloquy

806 That is the -- that's the -- 1926.16 is the non-

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

807

Colloquy

807 delegable duty.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

808

Colloquy

808

THE COURT: Yes. But I can tell them it's a

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

809

Colloquy

809 non-delegable duty without citing the specific language

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

810

Colloquy

810 in the -- in the regulation.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

811

Colloquy

811

MR. CLARK: But if we --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

812

Colloquy

812

MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

813

Colloquy

813

MR. CLARK: But if we read to them the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

814

Colloquy

814 specific trench regulation, which says, employer does

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

815

Colloquy

815 this or employer does that but not tell them employer

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
L	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

816

Colloquy

816 means prime contractor and the prime contractor has all

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

817

Colloquy

817 the obligations listed as employer obligations under

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

818

Colloquy

818 the statute, they're going to be left adrift and it's

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

819

Colloquy

819 going to be confusing. And <u>ALLOWAY</u> is --

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

820

Colloquy

820

MR. COBUZIO: Judge, --

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

821

Colloquy

821

MR. CLARK: And <u>ALLOWAY</u> is very clear. It

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

822

Colloquy

822 cites 1926.16. It says, as prime contractor, Pat

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

823

Colloquy

823 Pavers may be liable for any of its subcontractor's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

824

Colloquy

824 violations, as well as its own, by the terms of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

825

Colloquy

825 1926.16. That regulation states, by contracting for

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

826

Colloquy

826 full performance of the work, the prime contractor

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

827

Colloquy

827 assumes all obligations prescribed as employer

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

828

Colloquy

828 obligations under the standards. And if we're going to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

829

Colloquy

829 read to the jury the employer obligations under the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

830

Colloquy

830 statute, under the trench depth statute, you've got to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

831

Colloquy

831 tell them 1926.16, which is that the prime contractor

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

832

Colloquy

832 has the employer obligations because, otherwise, Mr.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

833

Colloquy

833 Cobuzio is going to get up in closing and say, you're

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

834

Colloquy

834 going to hear the Judge say what the employer has to do

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

835

Colloquy

835 and he's not the employer. The employer is Fritas and,

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

836

Colloquy

836 if we don't charge them the non-delegable duty, which

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

837

Colloquy

837 is derived from 1926.16, they're going to be left to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

838

Colloquy

838 drift.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

839

Colloquy

839

THE COURT: Well, look, the final word on

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

840

# Colloquy

840 this is -- at least until you hear the charge is,

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

841

Colloquy

841 there's nothing in 1926.652 that provides for what an

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

842

Colloquy

842 employer has to do or not do. It describes at least

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

843

Colloquy

843 the way you cited it, only describes the protection

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

844

Colloquy

844 that needs to be afforded. So that's -- I certainly

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

845

Colloquy

845 intend to charge -- I intend to charge that and the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

846

Colloquy

846 specific language with that with regard to the trench.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

847

Colloquy

847 Whether I specify any specific ones or not, I have to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

848

Colloquy

848 yet decide, but I certainly intend to define for the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

849

Colloquy

849 jury what the duty is of general contractors.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

850

Colloquy

850

MR. CLARK: Just the only thing I would say,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

851

# Colloquy

851 Judge, is, if we only read them 1926.652, the jury is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

852

Colloquy

852 going to say -- it says, each employee shall be

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

853

Colloquy

853 protected. Okay. But who is supposed to protect them?

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

854

Colloquy

854

THE COURT: I'm going to tell them -- I'm

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

855

Colloquy

855 going to tell them that.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

856

Colloquy

856

MR. CLARK: And that's in 1926.16.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

857

Colloquy

857

THE COURT: I'm going to tell them that,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

858

Colloquy

858 whether I say that specific or not.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

859

Colloquy

859

MR. CLARK: Right. Sure. Thank you, Judge.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

860

Colloquy

860

MR. DU VOISIN: I have to say this. You

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

861

Colloquy

861 know, you've got the controlling employer in the multi-

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

862

Colloquy

862 citation policy where it defines, you know, that this

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

863

Colloquy

863 means the controlling employer is not normally required

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

864

Colloquy

864 to inspect for hazards that's -- You've got a slippery

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

865

Colloquy

865 slope going there.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

866

Colloquy

866

Both experts testified that the controlling

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

867

Colloquy

867 employer in this case would be the general contractor

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

868

# Colloquy

868 and, again, you know, they don't have to have the same

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

869

Colloquy

869 level of knowledge. It's in the statute. So once you

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

870

Colloquy

870 start going down that slippery road, you're cracking

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

871

Colloquy

871 the charge that I think was going to be overburdening

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

872

Colloquy

872 this jury and repeating really the evidence from the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

873

Colloquy

873 bench.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

874

Colloquy

874

THE COURT: Well, I'm going to try not to.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

875

Colloquy

875

MR. DU VOISIN: Thank you, Judge.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

876

Colloquy

876

THE COURT: All right. Next thing we have to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

877

# Colloquy

877 do is -- Charity, take this and write down the cite and

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

878

Colloquy

878 just print out a copy, so we have it. You can return

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

879

# Colloquy

879 that to Mr. Clark. We have to talk about comparative

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

880

Colloquy

880 negligence. Mr. Clark says there isn't any in this

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

881

Colloquy

881 case. Mr. Cobuzio, you say there is?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

882

Colloquy

882

MR. COBUZIO: Well, isn't that -- isn't that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

883

Colloquy

883 the <u>CAINE</u> case, Judge, that Your Honor already cited,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

884

Colloquy

884

CAINE V. HARTZ MOUNTAIN, which deals with comparative

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

885

Colloquy

885 negligence, comparative negligence of the plaintiff in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

886

Colloquy

886 this particular case, Judge? We have a man who is the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

887

Colloquy

887 plumber for 19 years. He's the follow who testified

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

888

Colloquy

888 that he knew and recognized hazards associated with

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

889

Colloquy

889 trench excavation.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

890

Colloquy

890

He had been doing it in Portugal for a number

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

891

Colloquy

891 of years in trenches. He was the fellow on site the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

892

Colloquy

892 day before the -- the four days before the accident

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

893

Colloquy

893 digging the trench and, in fact, digging the trench in

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

894

Colloquy

894 locations which there's been testimony that they're

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

895

Colloquy

895 greater than five feet and, now, he's the fellow who is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

896

Colloquy

896 in the trench for the last day of excavation and,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

897

# Colloquy

897 again, because he knew or should have known that there

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

898

Colloquy

898 is a possibility, if the argument is going to be

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

899

Colloquy

899 believed by the plaintiff, is comparative negligence

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

900

Colloquy

900 should be charged to the jury.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

901

Colloquy

901

I would also point out, Judge, that in the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

902

Colloquy

902 brief that Mr. Clark submitted, he's relying on the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

903

Colloquy

903 Suter doctrine from machine cases. Now, I'm familiar

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

904

Colloquy

904 with the Suter doctrine and, essentially, that deals

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

905

Colloquy

905 with, you know, the assigned risk, no meaningful task

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

906

Colloquy

906 -- no meaningful choice, excuse me, and in that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

907

Colloquy

907 particular case, you're holding the manufacturer of a

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

908

Colloquy

908 machine strictly liable for the injury of an employee.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

909

Colloquy

909 This is not a strict liability setting. This is a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

910

Colloquy

910 negligence case and, therefore, the jury should be

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

911

Colloquy

911 charge with comparative negligence.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

912

Colloquy

912

Just, I would just point out, just for the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

913

Colloquy

913 Court's edification the multi-citation policy for the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

914

Colloquy

914 prior motion we argued where I talked about the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

915

Colloquy

915 controlling employer. I just wanted to give you the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

916

# Colloquy

916 cite for that. If I could just hand something up to

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
A.D.#	

#### INDEX2

917

Colloquy

917 you, so you can see it, just to have in your repertoire

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

918

Colloquy

918 of information because that deals with the controlling

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

919

Colloquy

919 employer, how it's defined. Thank you, Judge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

920

Colloquy

920

THE COURT: Thanks.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

921

Colloquy

921

MR. CLARK: Judge, on the controlling

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

922

Colloquy

922 employer, I'll just say this. 1926.16 is clear that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

923

Colloquy

923 the prime contractor -- and let's just right off

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

924

Colloquy

924  $\underline{\texttt{ALLOWAY}}$  , the prime contractor has all the obligations

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

925

Colloquy

925 defined as employer obligations under the Act. Whether

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

926

Colloquy

926 it's a controlling employer or this employer, that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

927

Colloquy

927 employer doesn't matter. The fact is clear that they

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

928

Colloquy

928 have the obligation and if we're going to read one

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

929

Colloquy

929 part, and at that point, I'm repeating myself.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

930

Colloquy

930

THE COURT: Let's get back to comparative

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

931

Colloquy

931 negligence.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

932

Colloquy

932

MR. CLARK: On comparative negligence, Judge,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

933

Colloquy

933 I'll put my briefs away. I'll put all my stuff away.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

934

Colloquy

934 The gentleman goes to work. His job is a plumber.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

935

Colloquy

935 He's not a foreman. He's not a boss. He's a plumber.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

936

Colloquy

936 He digs the trenches, he hooks up the pipes, and the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

937

Colloquy

937 trench caves in on him. I just -- he's going to work.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

938

Colloquy

938 His choice is, dig the trench and do the job or, I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

939

Colloquy

939 guess, go somewhere else.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

940

Colloquy

940

I don't -- I just don't see if this were just

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

941

Colloquy

941 a plain old negligence case, the comparative negligence

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

942

Colloquy

942

is knowing and unreasonably encountering a known risk.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

943

Colloquy

943 Would it have been unreasonable for him to stay at work

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

944

Colloquy

944 and do the job his boss told him to do? There's no --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

945

Colloquy

945 you know, he wasn't horsing around. He wasn't

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

946

Colloquy

946 wrestling next to the trench. He's in the trenching

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

947

Colloquy

947 hooking up the pipe and, without warning, the thing

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

948

Colloquy

948 caves in. Even the defendant said, we looked at it and

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

949

Colloquy

949 there was no indication of a potential cave in. It was

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

950

Colloquy

950 cross-examination of the plaintiff.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

951

Colloquy

951

There was no indication of a potential cave

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

952

Colloquy

952

in. The last thing defense rested their case with was

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

953

Colloquy

953 a quote from the plaintiff. There was no prior

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

954

Colloquy

954 problems with that trench, right? So how could we say

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

955

Colloquy

955 that he knowingly and unreasonably encountered a known

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

956

Colloquy

956 risk, putting aside all the whether  $\underline{\text{SUTER}}$  applies or

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

957

# Colloquy

957 whether the  $\underline{\text{GREEN}}$  case, which was a hoist, was not a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

958

Colloquy

958 products liability case although a workplace setting

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

959

Colloquy

959 case. Just under plain old restatement of torts law, I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

960

Colloquy

960 don't think there's anything upon which a jury could

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

961

Colloquy

961 conclude that he knowingly and unreasonably had a known

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

962

Colloquy

962 risk. He's at his job. The trench caves in without

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

963

Colloquy

963 warning.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

964

Colloquy

964

THE COURT: All right. It is without doubt

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

965

Colloquy

965 that in and of itself, a workplace safety case is not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

966

Colloquy

966 -- does not automatically bar the introduction of

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

967

Colloquy

967 comparative negligence on the part of the plaintiff.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

968

Colloquy

968 Like any other case, because there is no workers'

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

969

Colloquy

969 compensation bar, the relative negligence of the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

970

Colloquy

970 parties is clearly admissible.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

971

Colloquy

971

It's another example of what's good for the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

972

Colloquy

972 goose is good for the gander scenario where, if the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

973

Colloquy

973 general contractor is going to be held liable in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

974

Colloquy

974 negligence as opposed to enjoying the benefit of the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

975

Colloquy

975 workers' compensation law, well, then similarly, when

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

976

Colloquy

976 negligence becomes a issue, everyone's issue becomes at

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

977

Colloquy

977 issue.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

978

Colloquy

978

However, -- and to the degree to which there

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

979

Colloquy

979 is any evidence of negligence, comparative negligence

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

980

Colloquy

980 will be charged, which is exactly what happened in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

981

Colloquy

981 <u>CAINE</u>. In <u>CAINE</u>, the factual scenario was not at all

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

982

Colloquy

982 like what was the situation in this case. Yes. It's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

983

Colloquy

983 true that the workers' compensation scenario doesn't

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

984

Colloquy

984 apply. The <u>SUTER</u> scenario doesn't apply. You can't

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

985

# Colloquy

985 simply say that an employee has no real choice. It has

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

986

Colloquy

986

to -- that the employee has no option other than to go

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

987

Colloquy

987 where there is danger or risk losing their job. That's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

988

Colloquy

988 the benefit that the workers' compensation statute

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

989

Colloquy

989 provides because they have no meaningful choice.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

990

Colloquy

990

But in  $\underline{\text{CAINE}}$  , the Court made clear that there

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

991

Colloquy

991 are circumstances in an employment or construction

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

992

Colloquy

992 safety or construction injury setting where there may

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

993

Colloquy

993 very well be evidence of comparative negligence. In

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

994

Colloquy

994 <u>CAINE</u>, it was a situation where the -- where the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

995

Colloquy

995 employee was assuming risks not specifically intended

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

996

Colloquy

996 to assume as part of his employment. He acted in a way

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

997

Colloquy

997 in which the Court permitted and, in fact, compelled a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

998

Colloquy

998 comparative negligence scenario.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

999

Colloquy

999

Here, nobody has been presented -- there has

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1000

Colloquy

1000 been absolutely no evidence that the plaintiff did or

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1001

Colloquy

1001 didn't do anything that he should or shouldn't have

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1002

Colloquy

1002 done. Reasonable minds cannot differ with regard to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1003

Colloquy

1003 what the plaintiff did or didn't do. There is, in this

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1004

Colloquy

1004 Court's view, not a scintilla of evidence to the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1005

Colloquy

1005 contrary. Plaintiff, Mr. Fernandes, -- the only

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1006

Colloquy

1006 evidence there is -- well, what did he do? He got into

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1007

Colloquy

1007 the trench where his boss told him to go. Yes. He

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1008

Colloquy

1008 knew there was risks, but he didn't necessarily know

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1009

Colloquy

1009 specifically what the risk was or why there was a risk

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1010

Colloquy

1010 and whether or not actions were taken to protect him or

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1011

Colloquy

1011 not protect him or whether they were sufficient or not.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1012

Colloquy

1012 That wasn't for him to decide, and they have no

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1013

Colloquy

1013 evidence of the fact that it was for him to decide, and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1014

Colloquy

1014 there was no evidence that he concluded that it was

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1015

Colloquy

1015 unsafe and got into the trench anyway or let's put it

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1016

Colloquy

1016 this way, improperly unsafe. No comparative negligence

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1017

Colloquy

1017 in this case.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1018

Colloquy

1018

Life expectancy. You didn't ask for that.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1019

Colloquy

1019 Do you want a charge, Mr. Clark?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1020

Colloquy

1020

MR. CLARK: Yes, Your Honor. I believe it's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1021

Colloquy

1021 25.2 years.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1022

Colloquy

1022

THE COURT: 25.2?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1023

Colloquy

1023

MR. CLARK: I believe so. Let me just --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1024

Colloquy

1024

THE COURT: I'll take your word for it. Mr.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1025

Colloquy

1025 Cobuzio, if you want to double check that, you are free

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1026

Colloquy

1026

to. You've just got to get the guy's date of birth and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1027

Colloquy

1027 look in the Lawyer's Diary. Okay. Tax consequences of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1028

Colloquy

1028 personal injury award, you want that in there, right?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1029

Colloquy

1029

MR. CLARK: No. Because we stipulated that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1030

Colloquy

1030 it's a net number. We've got to talk about that,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1031

Colloquy

1031 Judge, but let me just --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1032

Colloquy

1032

THE COURT: Well, pain and suffering is not a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1033

Colloquy

1033 net number.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1034

Colloquy

1034

MR. COBUZIO: Not pain and suffering, but,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1035

Colloquy

1035 Judge, just on Your Honor's ruling before, I do intend

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1036

Colloquy

1036 to close to the jury with the plaintiff's conduct

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1037

Colloquy

1037 because it goes to the issue of proximate cause of the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1038

Colloquy

1038 injury.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1039

Colloquy

1039

THE COURT: Okay.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1040

Colloquy

1040

MR. COBUZIO: Okay.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1041

Colloquy

1041

THE COURT: That's certainly permissible in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1042

Colloquy

1042 terms of proximate cause.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1043

Colloquy

1043

MR. CLARK: And, Judge, while we're at --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1044

Colloquy

1044 we're shadowing our closings, I do intend to reserve

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1045

Colloquy

1045 the right to use a time unit analysis.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1046

Colloquy

1046

THE COURT: Well, you were supposed to tell

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1047

Colloquy

1047 me that before now.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1048

Colloquy

1048

MR. CLARK: I'm sorry. And it's 25.1 years.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1049

Colloquy

1049

THE COURT: 25.?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1050

Colloquy

1050

MR. CLARK: .1.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1051

Colloquy

1051

THE COURT: Charity, we have on the computer

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1052

Colloquy

1052 a -- because there is no model charge on time unit, we

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1053

Colloquy

1053 have on the computer a charge. Would you print that up

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1054

Colloquy

1054 for me? You don't have to do it right now, just as

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1055

Colloquy

1055 soon as we get done here. Okay. Tax consequences.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1056

Colloquy

1056 Medical expenses, non-auto payment, the amount of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1057

Colloquy

1057 payment is fair and reasonable.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1058

Colloquy

1058

MR. COBUZIO: Judge, yes. I've got to talk

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1059

Colloquy

1059 to you on that one, Judge. Let me just get to that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1060

Colloquy

1060 charge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1061

Colloquy

1061

MR. CLARK: What number is it?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1062

Colloquy

1062

MR. COBUZIO: Let's see. The problem we have

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1063

Colloquy

1063 on that is that there has to be something because we're

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1064

Colloquy

1064 stipulating to past medical of \$75,000. Is that where

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1065

Colloquy

1065 we're at?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1066

Colloquy

1066

THE COURT: Right.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1067

Colloquy

1067

MR. COBUZIO: Let's see. Comparative

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1068

Colloquy

1068 negligence. Let me just get to it, Judge. Damages.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1069

Colloquy

1069

MR. CLARK: 8.11A.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1070

Colloquy

1070

MR. COBUZIO: Yes. Well, see, that's just

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1071

Colloquy

1071 it, Judge. You've got to back up because you've got to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1072

Colloquy

1072 go to 8.1, which is damages, effective instructions.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1073

Colloquy

1073 You have to take out B, which is future lost wages.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1074

Colloquy

1074

THE COURT: Yes. So that's obvious.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1075

Colloquy

1075

MR. COBUZIO: Okay. And then you would have

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1076

Colloquy

1076 to take out Number 2 because there is no wife, no per

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1077

Colloquy

1077 quod claim.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1078

Colloquy

1078

THE COURT: Right.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1079

Colloquy

1079

MR. COBUZIO: Okay. I just want to make sure

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1080

Colloquy

1080 we're clear.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1081

Colloquy

1081

THE COURT: Yes.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1082

Colloquy

1082

MR. COBUZIO: Then we have to have some

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1083

Colloquy

1083 language in here to make this fair, if we're talking

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1084

Colloquy

1084 about future medical. Did we pass -- did we pass up

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1085

Colloquy

1085 past lost earnings because that charge comes next in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1086

Colloquy

1086 the sequence before you get to medical. So we'll work

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1087

Colloquy

1087 them backwards.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1088

Colloquy

1088

THE COURT: I don't think so. Past --

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1089

Colloquy

1089

MR. COBUZIO: 8.11 is damages, past lost

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1090

Colloquy

1090 earnings, and then there's future lost earnings, which

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1091

Colloquy

1091 is out and then you go to medical, which is -- let me

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1092

Colloquy

1092 get to it -- medical is 8.11A. So they're both 8.11.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1093

Colloquy

1093

THE COURT: A comes before --

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1094

Colloquy

1094

MR. COBUZIO: Yes, Judge. I have them out of

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1095

Colloquy

1095 order, so I'm just trying to follow, right? But we're

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1096

Colloquy

1096 stipulating to \$75,000 in medical expenses, but there

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1097

Colloquy

1097 has to be some language in there to state that the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1098

Colloquy

1098 stipulation of past medical expenses is not a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1099

Colloquy

1099 concession by the defendants that they're causally

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1100

Colloquy

1100 related to the accident. I mean, I don't want the

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1101

Colloquy

1101 stipulation to have an adverse inference to the jury

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1102

Colloquy

1102 that we agree that everything is related,

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1103

Colloquy

1103 notwithstanding of the fact that we've agreed to the

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1104

Colloquy

1104 number.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1105

Colloquy

1105

So they'll hear the number, but I don't want

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1106

Colloquy

1106 the stipulation to be an inference that, hey, look, if

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1107

Colloquy

1107 they agreed to the medical, what's the deal here? So

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1108

Colloquy

1108 there has to be some sort of qualification, qualifying

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1109

Colloquy

1109 remarks that it's not a concession by the defendants

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1110

Colloquy

1110 that they were causally related, and that was the

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1111

Colloquy

1111 stipulation Mr. Clark and I had.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1112

Colloquy

1112

So how you craft that, you know, it would

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1113

Colloquy

1113 just have to include that. I had a proposal to put it

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1114

Colloquy

1114 in midway through the charge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1115

Colloquy

1115

THE COURT: Well, right from the beginning,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1116

Colloquy

1116 we say, the fact I instruct you on damages should not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1117

Colloquy

1117 be considered as any suggestion of mine about which

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1118

Colloquy

1118 party is entitled to prevail. Instructions on damages

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1119

Colloquy

1119 are given for guidance in the event you find plaintiff

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1120

Colloquy

1120 is entitled to a verdict. I'm required to provide

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1121

Colloquy

1121 instructions on damages in all cases where the trial

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1122

Colloquy

1122 includes a claim for damages.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1123

Colloquy

1123

MR. COBUZIO: But, Judge, the charge goes on.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1124

Colloquy

1124 If you determine that any of these bills were not fair

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1125

Colloquy

1125 and reasonable to any extent, that's what we've kind of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1126

Colloquy

1126 taken away from the jury with regard to the 75,000 and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1127

Colloquy

1127 that's where -- unless the Judge just molds the verdict

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1128

Colloquy

1128 for the 75,000 at the end and not even charge it.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1129

Colloquy

1129

(End of Tape 2)

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1130

Colloquy

1130

MR. CLARK: -- you're not stipulating it's

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1131

Colloquy

1131 recoverable. You're disputing it's related.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1132

Colloquy

1132

MR. COBUZIO: Well, no. What I'm saying is,

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1133

Colloquy

1133 you can mold the verdict for the 75,000 after -- you

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1134

Colloquy

1134 don't have to charge this because we've stipulated the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1135

Colloquy

1135 75,000 being the medical and mold it. But if you don't

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1136

Colloquy

1136 do that and you put it in the charge -- it goes on, if

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1137

Colloquy

1137 you determine that any of these bills were not fair and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1138

Colloquy

1138 reasonable to any extent or necessary, you can deduct

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1139

Colloquy

1139 from that and that goes against the stipulation. I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1140

Colloquy

1140 mean, the jury then is going to say, well, it's really

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1141

Colloquy

1141 not 75. It could be 65, and that's not what we

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1142

Colloquy

1142 stipulated to.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1143

Colloquy

1143

MR. CLARK: I mean, I agree with Mr. Cobuzio.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1144

Colloquy

1144 There should be something in there that it says, the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1145

Colloquy

1145 parties have stipulated to 75,000, you know, however

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1146

Colloquy

1146 the -- there should be something in there to show

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1147

Colloquy

1147 because he's -- but so there should be something. But,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1148

Colloquy

1148 also, again, just keep in mind there is the plaintiff's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1149

Colloquy

1149 Exhibit 34 as past meds from Dr. Wu, \$11,070.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1150

Colloquy

1150

And I want to make clear on the record here,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1151

Colloquy

1151 so that there's no misunderstanding. I just want to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1152

Colloquy

1152 alert everyone to Dr. Wu's testimony that he billed

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1153

Colloquy

1153 \$11,070, but he said, you know, he gave the plaintiff a

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1154

Colloquy

1154 break because he couldn't fully pay. So I just want

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1155

Colloquy

1155 everyone to alert to that, but we do claim because I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1156

Colloquy

1156 suppose he wouldn't be expected to be paid, you know,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1157

Colloquy

1157 if he had the money.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1158

Colloquy

1158

MR. COBUZIO: Yes. I mean, but that's a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1159

Colloquy

1159 separate item within that charge, Judge, because that's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1160

Colloquy

1160 where the jury will actually be left to determine

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1161

Colloquy

1161 whether it's related. We give that to them and then

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1162

Colloquy

1162 they can discount that bill or not award that bill, so

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1163

Colloquy

1163
it's really a two-part charge.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1164

Colloquy

1164

THE COURT: Well, I don't see how you can

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1165

Colloquy

1165 have it both ways. Explain to me why, Mr. Cobuzio,

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	
	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
A.D.#	

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1166

Colloquy

1166 you're not stipulating as to the fair and reasonable

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1167

Colloquy

1167 value of Dr. Wu's --

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1168

Colloquy

1168

MR. COBUZIO: Simply, Judge, based on Dr.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1169

Colloquy

1169 Wu's testimony alone, we believe that there is a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1170

Colloquy

1170 cognizable challenge to the fact that the erectile

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1171

Colloquy

1171 dysfunction and urological disabilities are related to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1172

Colloquy

1172 the cause of action based on his testimony. So --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1173

Colloquy

1173 so --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1174

Colloquy

1174

THE COURT: Right. But aren't you saying the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1175

Colloquy

1175 same thing about the \$75,000?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1176

Colloquy

1176

MR. COBUZIO: No. The \$75,000, I have

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1177

Colloquy

1177 stipulated to be reasonable and customary. In other

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1178

Colloquy

1178 words, I'm not challenging the \$75,000 and, therefore,

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1179

Colloquy

1179 the jury doesn't have to really consider it. But with

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1180

Colloquy

1180 Dr. Wu's \$11,000, the jury needs to consider it because

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1181

Colloquy

1181 the charge goes on. If you find it's not related, in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1182

Colloquy

1182 other words, in other words, if you believe Cobuzio

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1183

Colloquy

1183 that it's not related, then they don't have to award

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1184

Colloquy

1184 it. If you believe that some of it's related, then

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1185

Colloquy

1185 they would have to award it. You're giving them the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1186

Colloquy

1186 ability to challenge that number. The \$75,000 by

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1187

Colloquy

1187 stipulation, they can't challenge because it's a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

1188

Colloquy

1188 stipulation. And if -- because we're stipulating to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1189

Colloquy

1189 it, there has to be something in there to say, the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

1190

Colloquy

1190 defendants, however, by stipulation do not concede that

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1191

Colloquy

1191 it's causally related, just so -- the idea of a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1192

Colloquy

1192 stipulation doesn't mean that we think everything is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1193

Colloquy

1193 related.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1194

Colloquy

1194

THE COURT: I still don't see the difference

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1195

Colloquy

1195 -- maybe it's just me -- between \$75,000 and the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1196

Colloquy

1196 \$11,000.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1197

Colloquy

1197

MR. CLARK: The testimony -- I brought this

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1198

Colloquy

1198 out with Dr. Reber. I said, Dr. Reber, there's a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1199

Colloquy

1199 stipulation that there was \$75,000 in medical bills

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1200

Colloquy

1200 related to all this treatment you've talked about and I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1201

Colloquy

1201 said, you know, -- he testified that, yes, that's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1202

Colloquy

1202 reasonable, necessary, and related. He said, in fact,

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1203

Colloquy

1203 I think it's even low. So that's the testimony on

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1204

Colloquy

1204 that. And then as to the \$11,070, there's testimony

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1205

Colloquy

1205 from Dr. Wu, same effect.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1206

Colloquy

1206

Judge, there's one thing I just do want to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1207

Colloquy

1207 note for the record here. Plaintiff had another IME

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1208

Colloquy

1208 with Dr. Siegal (phonetic) in December. We have been

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1209

Colloquy

1209 waiting and waiting for the report. Plaintiff told me

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1210

Colloquy

1210 that Dr. Siegal told him that all your stuff is related

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1211

Colloquy

1211 to the accident and we haven't gotten a report from Dr.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1212

Colloquy

1212 Siegal and Dr. Siegal hasn't been called.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1213

Colloquy

1213

I just think I should bring that out because

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1214

Colloquy

1214 I think it somewhat relates to the strength of the

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1215

Colloquy

1215 evidence against Dr. Wu's bill of \$11,070 because Dr.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1216

Colloquy

1216 Wu testified it's all related and I don't see where the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1217

Colloquy

1217 evidence from the defendant is in this case that it's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1218

Colloquy

1218 not related because they never called Dr. Siegal and I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### INDEX2

1219

Colloquy

1219 just note parenthetically as to the history of the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1220

Colloquy

1220 recent IME and waiting for the report that never came,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1221

Colloquy

1221 and my representation to the Court as to what the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1222

Colloquy

1222 plaintiff told me Dr. Siegal told him about relation.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1223

Colloquy

1223 I think it's relevant to whether or not there's

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1224

Colloquy

1224 evidence to contest that \$11,000 bill.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1225

Colloquy

1225

MR. COBUZIO: Judge, without giving up my

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1226

Colloquy

1226 closing argument, obviously, that's an issue that we

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1227

Colloquy

1227 don't concede. We had effective cross-examination and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1228

Colloquy

1228 the concessions made on direct examination of Wu that I

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1229

Colloquy

1229 can argue to the jury to put that at issue. The

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1230

Colloquy

1230 \$75,000 is the stipulated amount for the medical care

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1231

Colloquy

1231 that we agreed to, so that we didn't have to go through

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1232

Colloquy

1232 the bills and all the testimony.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1233

Colloquy

1233

And all I'm saying, Judge, is that the two

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1234

Colloquy

1234

are separate because the jury doesn't have to consider

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1235

Colloquy

1235 the \$75,000. It's stipulated. The \$11,000, they have

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1236

Colloquy

1236

to consider because we're challenging causation. But

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1237

Colloquy

1237 the fact that we stipulated could be interpreted by the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1238

Colloquy

1238 jury as negative against the defendant. Hey, the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1239

Colloquy

1239 stipulated to it, so why are they bothering? That's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1240

Colloquy

1240 all I'm asking, just a qualifying remark saying, hey,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1241

Colloquy

1241 look, we stipulate to that amount, it's fair and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1242

Colloquy

1242 reasonable, but a stipulation is not a concession on

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1243

Colloquy

1243 liability.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1244

Colloquy

1244

MR. CLARK: I think we can craft something

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1245

Colloquy

1245 that says, the parties have stipulated as to \$75,000.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1246

Colloquy

1246 However, there's an additional exhibit in evidence and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1247

Colloquy

1247 you've heard testimony about an additional bill from

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1248

Colloquy

1248 Dr. Wu, and the parties do not stipulate about that,

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1249

Colloquy

1249 however, plaintiff claims that. I think something to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1250

Colloquy

1250 that effect would satisfy these concerns.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1251

Colloquy

1251

THE COURT: Okay. You're the one that has

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1252

Colloquy

1252 the concerns. Why didn't you write it?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1253

Colloquy

1253

MR. COBUZIO: I do. What do you mean, why

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1254

Colloquy

1254 did I write it? I'm sorry, Judge?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
	DOCKET NO. 1 /150 00

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1255

Colloquy

1255

THE COURT: Why didn't you give me a --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1256

Colloquy

1256

MR. COBUZIO: Okay. Yes, Judge. If you have

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1257

Colloquy

1257 the model jury charge in front of you, one, two, three,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1258

Colloquy

1258 four, about five lines down, it says, the amount of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1259

Colloquy

1259 payment is the fair and reasonable value of such

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1260

Colloquy

1260 medical expenses. Do you see that?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1261

Colloquy

1261

THE COURT: Yes.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1262

Colloquy

1262

MR. COBUZIO: I add at that point, here, it

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1263

Colloquy

1263 is stipulated that \$75,000 of past -- and I pick up,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1264

Colloquy

1264 medical expenses were fair and reasonable, however,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1265

Colloquy

1265 defendant does not concede that these expenses are

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1266

Colloquy

1266 causally related to the accident. And then you take

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1267

Colloquy

1267 out the rest of the sentence from, you know, where it

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1268

Colloquy

1268 says, you have heard testimony because it's stipulated.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1269

Colloquy

1269

MR. CLARK: Then we should insert a sentence

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1270

Colloquy

1270 after that that says, in addition, an address of the --

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1271

Colloquy

1271 I don't know if you put the dollar amount. There's an

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1272

Colloquy

1272 additional bill of \$11,070 --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1273

Colloquy

1273

MR. COBUZIO: Right.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1274

Colloquy

1274

MR. CLARK: -- from Dr. Wu, which plaintiff

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1275

Colloquy

1275 claims is reasonable, necessary, related and defendant

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1276

Colloquy

1276 does not stipulate to that, something to that effect.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1277

Colloquy

1277

MR. COBUZIO: And then you would just pick up

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1278

Colloquy

1278 the charge. If you determine that any of these bills

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1279

Colloquy

1279

-- meaning Dr. Wu's bills -- were not fair and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1280

Colloquy

1280 reasonable to any extent and then they can discount

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1281

Colloquy

1281 them. And then the last two sentences of the charge,

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
A.D.#	

## INDEX2

1282

Colloquy

1282 you can strike because you've already said it up at the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1283

Colloquy

1283 top.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1284

Colloquy

1284

THE COURT: The amount of payment that's a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1285

Colloquy

1285 fair and reasonable value of such medical expenses,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1286

Colloquy

1286 which the parties have stipulated is \$75,000. However,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1287

Colloquy

1287 the defendant does not concede that the bills were

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1288

Colloquy

1288 causally related. As to Dr. Wu, -- or as to the bills

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1289

Colloquy

1289 of Dr. Wu, which -- and I say, the bills of Dr. Wu, of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1290

Colloquy

1290 if you determine that any of these bills were not fair

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1291

Colloquy

1291 and reasonable or that any of these services could not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1292

Colloquy

1292 reasonably and necessary -- is that what we're doing?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1293

Colloquy

1293

MR. CLARK: Can we say, the dollar amount of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1294

Colloquy

1294 the Dr. Wu bills, it's \$11,070 just because I think if

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
A.D.#	

INDEX2

1295

Colloquy

1295 you're putting the \$75,000, I just don't want the jury

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1296

Colloquy

1296 to confuse that. It's only \$75,000, not the additional

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1297

Colloquy

1297 \$11,070.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1298

Colloquy

1298

THE COURT: Okay. Any future medical

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1299

Colloquy

1299

expenses? Are we conceding that inflation and interest

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1300

Colloquy

1300 offset each other?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1301

Colloquy

1301

MR. COBUZIO: I agree to the model charge,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1302

Colloquy

1302 Judge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1303

Colloquy

1303

THE COURT: Well, the model charge has -- all

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1304

Colloquy

1304 that, must consider the effects of inflation and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1305

Colloquy

1305 interest.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1306

Colloquy

1306

MR. CLARK: Inflation is low right now and so

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
PART	ESSEX COUNTY

### INDEX2

1307

Colloquy

1307 are interest rates.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1308

Colloquy

1308

MR. COBUZIO: Judge, I concede to the model

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1309

Colloquy

1309
-- I'll concede to the model charge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1310

Colloquy

1310

THE COURT: Okay. That means they consider

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1311

Colloquy

1311 inflation and interest.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1312

Colloquy

1312

MR. COBUZIO: Oh, wait a minute. I'd just

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1313

Colloquy

1313 let them wipe each other out, Judge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1314

Colloquy

1314

THE COURT: That's what I'm asking.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1315

Colloquy

1315

MR. COBUZIO: Yes. That's it, Judge. I'm

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1316

Colloquy

1316 sorry. I didn't understand the charge, frankly. My

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1317

Colloquy

1317 associate explained it to me. I didn't read it.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1318

Colloquy

1318

THE COURT: Okay. That's what we have

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1319

Colloquy

1319 associates for, right? Somebody has to know what's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1320

Colloquy

1320 going on.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1321

Colloquy

1321

MR. COBUZIO: I'm still -- Judge, by the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1322

Colloquy

1322 comparative negligence ruling, Judge, and I just --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1323

Colloquy

1323 I've got to be reheard on that, just like Mr. Clark was

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1324

Colloquy

1324 able to be reheard because, you know, the voluntarily

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1325

Colloquy

1325

-- and known risk, understanding the hazards of the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1326

Colloquy

1326 situation, this is an experienced plumber who got into

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1327

Colloquy

1327 a trench, had the ability to tell his employer. At

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1328

Colloquy

1328 least his employer said, Mr. Fritas that, if he wanted

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1329

Colloquy

1329 to use a trench box, if he felt it was necessary, I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1330

Colloquy

1330 wouldn't have fired him and it's the actual excavation

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1331

Colloquy

1331 of the trench that's at issue and to suggest that his

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1332

Colloquy

1332 comparative negligence, knowing that he could have done

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1333

Colloquy

1333 something, knowing what he was getting into being an

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1334

Colloquy

1334 experienced person doesn't get before a jury on

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1335

Colloquy

1335 comparative negligence. I think that, Judge, there's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1336

Colloquy

1336 certainly that evidence that the jury can infer whether

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1337

Colloquy

1337 they agree or not.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1338

Colloquy

1338

But for Your Honor to make a ruling that you

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1339

Colloquy

1339 find there's no evidence, that's for the fact finder.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1340

Colloquy

1340 That's not for, respectfully, Your Honor to conclude

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1341

Colloquy

1341 that based on the plaintiff's case and the defense

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1342

Colloquy

1342 case, which are really different, that there's nothing

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1343

Colloquy

1343 that the jury can consider. I mean, you're allowing me

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1344

Colloquy

1344 put it in on proximate cause. The jury should be able

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1345

Colloquy

1345 to hear that on comparative negligence.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1346

Colloquy

1346

And I think, Judge, in the <u>CAINE</u> case, it's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1347

Colloquy

1347 almost the exact same situation. I mean, I said in my SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY PART ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>INDEX</u>2

1348

Colloquy

1348 proposed jury instructions -- and I apologize for the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1349

Colloquy

1349 lateness of the hour, but this is too critical -- the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1350

Colloquy

1350 motion to bar lacks merit. I mean, the  $\underline{\text{SUTER}}$  case is a

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1351

Colloquy

1351 machine case. It's strictly products liability. The

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1352

Colloquy

1352 Appellate Division in  $\underline{\text{CAINE}}$  concluded that the trial

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1353

Colloquy

1353 Judge had properly submitted the issue of plaintiff's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1354

Colloquy

1354 fault to the jury.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1355

Colloquy

1355

The fault here, Judge, that the plaintiff can

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1356

Colloquy

1356 be charged with is his failure to do something, knowing

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1357

Colloquy

1357 that there's risk associated with trench collapses.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1358

Colloquy

1358 The position of the defendant is, hey, look, he could

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1359

Colloquy

1359 have -- he could have said something to his employer.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1360

Colloquy

1360 He didn't have a fear of retribution. The plaintiff

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1361

Colloquy

1361 says otherwise. That's for the jury to consider based

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1362

Colloquy

1362 on the credibility of the witnesses. So I would ask

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1363

Colloquy

1363 Your Honor to reconsider that ruling on comparative

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1364

Colloquy

1364 negligence.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1365

Colloquy

1365

THE COURT: Well, you haven't really offered

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1366

Colloquy

1366 me anything that convinces me to differ from my prior

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1367

Colloquy

1367 ruling. I think if you look at <u>CAINE</u>, I mean, my job

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1368

Colloquy

1368 is not to convince you, I understand that, but perhaps

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1369

Colloquy

1369 before we continue this, let's go back to -- so my

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1370

Colloquy

1370 ruling stands on the comparative negligence.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1371

Colloquy

1371

But since I was -- with regard to Mr. Clark's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1372

Colloquy

1372 second section, do you wish to -- I assume you wish to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1373

Colloquy

1373 be heard on that wherein he seeks jury charge that

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1374

Colloquy

1374 instructs the jury with regard to negligent hiring of

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1375

Colloquy

1375

an incompetent contractor. That's on Pages 8 and 9 and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1376

Colloquy

1376 so on -- 8 and 9, principally. Mr. Cobuzio?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1377

Colloquy

1377

MR. COBUZIO: Yes, Judge. The plaintiff in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1378

Colloquy

1378 this case has failed to establish that DAR had any

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1379

Colloquy

1379 knowledge of Fritas' prior conduct. The incompetent

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1380

Colloquy

1380 contractor charge, I would think, is essentially an

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1381

Colloquy

1381 improper charge because you're only charging with

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1382

Colloquy

1382 regard to OSHA violations and negligence, but in terms

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1383

Colloquy

1383 of allegations about hiring independent -- an

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1384

Colloquy

1384 incompetent contractor, there's no testimony that DAR

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1385

Colloquy

1385 knew. We had Mr. Fritas here, who testified that they

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1386

Colloquy

1386 utilized trench boxes in prior cases. We know that

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1387

Colloquy

1387 they utilized it on that day and -- or that -- with

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1388

Colloquy

1388 regard to the connection by the road. In this

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1389

Colloquy

1389 particular case, Norberto never conceded that he knew

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1390

Colloquy

1390 anything about Mr. Fritas' prior conduct and, for that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1391

Colloquy

1391 reason, Judge, I would suggest that that charge not be

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1392

Colloquy

1392 given.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1393

Colloquy

1393

THE COURT: Okay. This is similar goose and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1394

Colloquy

1394 gander arguments, which was what made me think of it.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1395

Colloquy

1395 Mr. Clark, I need your response.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1396

Colloquy

1396

MR. CLARK: Yes.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1397

Colloquy

1397

THE COURT: Let me simply add that Mr.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1398

Colloquy

1398 Cobuzio argues that, regardless of the fact that I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1399

Colloquy

1399 don't perceive there to have been any evidence of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY
	DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1400

Colloquy

1400 negligence on the part of the plaintiff is not enough

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1401

Colloquy

1401 to justify not charging comparative negligence on the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1402

Colloquy

1402 one side of his mouth.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1403

Colloquy

1403

On the other side of his mouth, he says that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1404

Colloquy

1404 I should exercise my judgment and examine whether or

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1405

Colloquy

1405 not I've seen any evidence of the hiring of incompetent

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1406

Colloquy

1406 subcontractor and toss that claim. So I tossed the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1407

Colloquy

1407 comparative claim. Why shouldn't I toss the negligent

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1408

Colloquy

1408 retention of incompetent subcontract claim?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1409

Colloquy

1409

MR. CLARK: Because the comparative

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1410

Colloquy

1410 negligence claim is vis-à-vis the plaintiff himself.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1411

Colloquy

1411 The hiring of the incompetent contractor claim is the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1412

Colloquy

1412 principal with the contractor, the DAR vis-à-vis

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1413

Colloquy

1413 Fritas.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1414

Colloquy

1414

THE COURT: The defendant itself.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1415

Colloquy

1415

MR. CLARK: I'm sorry?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1416

Colloquy

1416

THE COURT: The defendant itself. There's no

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1417

Colloquy

1417 respondeat superior here. It's got to be the conduct

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1418

Colloquy

1418 of the defendant. So you're alleging that the conduct

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1419

Colloquy

1419 of the defendant in hiring repeatedly over a 20-year

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1420

Colloquy

1420 period an incompetent contractor justifies a charge

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1421

Colloquy

1421 wherein the jury can find liability based upon that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1422

Colloquy

1422 fact alone, not that -- not a finding that Fritas is

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1423

Colloquy

1423 incompetent and, therefore, DAR is responsible. That's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1424

Colloquy

1424 not in this case. It can't be. There's no respondeat

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1425

Colloquy

1425 superior. The question is whether or not there's any

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1426

Colloquy

1426 evidence of DAR having hired an incompetent contractor.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1427

Colloquy

1427

MR. CLARK: I -- the second -- the second

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1428

Colloquy

1428 point on this and it is squarely within this -- and  ${\rm I'm}$ 

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1429

Colloquy

1429 looking at my thing and it should have been double

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1430

Colloquy

1430 indented. The second thing, it's the main defense in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1431

Colloquy

1431 the case that Fritas was a competent contractor and the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1432

Colloquy

1432 standard is on Page 9 and it cites to  $\underline{\text{PUKRENE}}$ 

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1433

Colloquy

1433 (phonetic) and the Restatement Second of Torts. It's

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1434

Colloquy

1434 footnote 18, but the body of it is, the employer of a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1435

Colloquy

1435 negligently selected contractor may be subject to

NEW TEDOEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1436

Colloquy

1436 liability for physical harm caused by its failure to

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1437

Colloquy

1437 exercise reasonable care to select a competent care for

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1438

Colloquy

1438 contractor and it goes on a little bit, but --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1439

Colloquy

1439

THE COURT: I didn't say that they're -- you

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1440

Colloquy

1440 know, I have to cut this short. We've got to go. But

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1441

Colloquy

1441 the question -- I didn't say that there isn't potential

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1442

Colloquy

1442 for a cause of action. I'm simply saying much like the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1443

Colloquy

1443 point I made with regard to comparative negligence,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1444

Colloquy

1444 which inured to your benefit, I'm making the same point

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1445

Colloquy

1445 with regard to an incompetent contractor and the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1446

Colloquy

1446 defendant's knowledge thereof. What evidence is there

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1447

Colloquy

1447 of that?

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1448

Colloquy

1448

MR. CLARK: Okay. In other words, for the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1449

Colloquy

1449 plaintiff to prevail -- and this is right from the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1450

Colloquy

1450 Restatement of Torts, for hiring, plaintiff must show

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1451

Colloquy

1451 that Fritas was, in fact, incompetent or unskilled to

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1452

Colloquy

1452 safely perform the job for which it was hired, that the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1453

Colloquy

1453 harm that resulted or rose out of that safety and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1454

Colloquy

1454 competence, and that the principal knew or should have

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1455

Colloquy

1455 known -- knew or should have known, and there was

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1456

Colloquy

1456 testimony in this case that on hundreds of DAR/Fritas

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1457

Colloquy

1457 jobs, they knew Fritas didn't use -- that the trench

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1458

Colloquy

1458 protection was never used. There was testimony from

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1459

Colloquy

1459 DAR that they were on site every day, certainly over

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1460

Colloquy

1460 the ten-year period and over hundreds of trenches, if

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1461

Colloquy

1461 you believe some -- if you believe the testimony of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1462

Colloquy

1462 some of the witnesses. They should have known that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1463

Colloquy

1463 Fritas doesn't do anything to comply with the safety

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1464

Colloquy

1464 regulations.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1465

Colloquy

1465

THE COURT: I haven't heard anybody but you

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1466

Colloquy

1466 say that. I didn't hear a single witness say that over

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1467

Colloquy

1467 -- there are hundreds -- hundreds examples of them not

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1468

Colloquy

1468 using -- I just don't see --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1469

Colloquy

1469

MR. CLARK: We read in the testimony from

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1470

Colloquy

1470 Samuel Matteuz (phonetic). I believe his testimony was

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1471

Colloquy

1471 100 trenches, DAR/Fritas jobs all over five feet, no

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1472

Colloquy

1472 protection. There's the testimony from Norberto. I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1473

Colloquy

1473 was on site every day. I'm the project manager. I go

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1474

Colloquy

1474 to the site every day. There was testimony from

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1475

Colloquy

1475 Horvath (phonetic) that on all those many, many

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1476

Colloquy

1476 trenches, I think his was 20 trenches or 30 DAR/Fritas

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1477

Colloquy

1477 trenches over five feet, less than five are protected

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1478

Colloquy

1478 and it's only when it's like the county roads and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1479

Colloquy

1479 they're on the street. There was testimony from Andre

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1480

Colloquy

1480 Fernandes to that effect.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1481

Colloquy

1481

THE COURT: All right. I'm simply indicating

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1482

Colloquy

1482 that I do not find that that testimony rises to the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1483

Colloquy

1483 level wherein the jury could reasonably find that (a)

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1484

Colloquy

1484 Fritas was incompetent, and that's different from being

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1485

Colloquy

1485 negligent, okay, it's -- that rises to the level of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1486

Colloquy

1486 incompetent, and (b) that DAR knew or should have known

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1487

Colloquy

1487 that they were incompetent. It's not the cases that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1488

Colloquy

1488 talk about that, incompetence, negligence, retention of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1489

Colloquy

1489

a subcontractor require much more than that to even

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1490

Colloquy

1490 make a prima facie showing.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1491

Colloquy

1491

MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1492

Colloquy

1492

MR. CLARK: Thank you, Your Honor.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1493

Colloquy

1493

THE COURT: All right? Past lost wages, we

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1494

Colloquy

1494 know what we're doing with that.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1495

Colloquy

1495

MR. COBUZIO: Judge, you just need to craft

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1496

Colloquy

1496 that exception, the caveat that it's stipulated,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1497

Colloquy

1497 however, this is not a concession of liability or not a

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1498

Colloquy

1498 concession that it's causally related to the accident,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1499

Colloquy

1499 just so they don't infer -- have an adverse inference

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1500

Colloquy

1500 from that stipulation.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1501

Colloquy

1501

THE COURT: Well, we say that in the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1502

Colloquy

1502 beginning. I think that covers it.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1503

Colloquy

1503

MR. CLARK: And that it's a net number.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1504

Colloquy

1504 Which one --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1505

Colloquy

1505

MR. COBUZIO: Just take out that paragraph

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1506

Colloquy

1506 regarding take home and taxes and just call it, the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1507

Colloquy

1507 plaintiff has a right to be compensated for any

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1508

Colloquy

1508 earnings lost as a result of injuries caused by

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1509

Colloquy

1509 defendant's negligence. In this matter, it's been

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
PART	ESSEX COUNTY

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1510

Colloquy

1510 stipulated, it's \$100,000.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1511

Colloquy

1511

MR. CLARK: But it's net. That is a net.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1512

Colloquy

1512

MR. COBUZIO: No. Take out everything else.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1513

Colloquy

1513

MR. CLARK: It has to be net because the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1514

Colloquy

1514 regular personal injury charge talks about taxes.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1515

Colloquy

1515

MR. COBUZIO: Well, that's why I'm saying,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1516

Colloquy

1516 take that out.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1517

Colloquy

1517

MR. CLARK: Okay. Whatever. I don't have

NEW TEDOEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1518

Colloquy

1518 it.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1519

Colloquy

1519

MR. COBUZIO: Judge, just take it out and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1520

Colloquy

1520 then just add, the stipulation is not a concession of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1521

Colloquy

1521 liability. Defendant still challenges causation. And

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1522

Colloquy

1522 then just take everything out about taxes and net.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1523

Colloquy

1523 That's the number. They can't deviate from the number.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1524

Colloquy

1524

THE COURT: Well, if it can't go up and it

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1525

Colloquy

1525 can't go down, why are we charging it at all?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1526

Colloquy

1526

MR. COBUZIO: That's -- I would agree, Judge.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1527

Colloquy

1527

THE COURT: Let's just mold the verdict in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1528

Colloquy

1528 that one.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1529

Colloquy

1529

MR. COBUZIO: I think that's easier, Judge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1530

Colloquy

1530

THE COURT: Can't go up, can't go down, can't

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1531

Colloquy

1531 change.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1532

Colloquy

1532

MR. COBUZIO: Just add it.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1533

Colloquy

1533

MR. CLARK: All right. Then there should be

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1534

Colloquy

1534 no discussion at all in this case about lost wages.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1535

Colloquy

1535 There shouldn't be any -- there shouldn't be any --

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1536

Colloquy

1536 there shouldn't be any closing or anything about he's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1537

Colloquy

1537 making a claim or he's not making a claim.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1538

Colloquy

1538

MR. COBUZIO: I don't have a problem on the

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1539

Colloquy

1539 -- there should be -- but I have -- we have to add

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1540

Colloquy

1540 somewhere that there's no claim in this case being made

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1541

Colloquy

1541 for future earnings lost, and we'll mold the verdict

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1542

Colloquy

1542 for 100,000.

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1543

Colloquy

1543

MR. CLARK: See, --

	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

### <u>I N D E X</u>2

1544

Colloquy

1544

MR. COBUZIO: But they have to know there's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1545

Colloquy

1545 no claim for the future.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1546

Colloquy

1546

MR. CLARK: See, here -- just -- but just so

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1547

Colloquy

1547 it's clear. A component of the damages in this case,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1548

Colloquy

1548 he liked to work. He worked every day.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1549

Colloquy

1549

MR. COBUZIO: I understand.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1550

Colloquy

1550

MR. CLARK: It is part in parcel of the case

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1551

Colloquy

1551 and, now, he's been held up in his apartment building

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1552

Colloquy

1552 without --

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1553

Colloquy

1553

MR. COBUZIO: I have no problem with that,

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1554

Colloquy

1554 but the jury has to know if they're going to hear that

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1555

Colloquy

1555 and some instruction that there's no claim being made

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1556

Colloquy

1556 for future earnings loss. Otherwise, they'll factor

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1557

Colloquy

1557 that in that he can't work for the rest of his life and

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1558

Colloquy

1558

to some component of damages. You're taking the past

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1559

Colloquy

1559 earnings away from them, but they may factor it in in

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1560

Colloquy

1560 the non-economic loss claim. That's all I'm saying.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1561

Colloquy

1561

MR. CLARK: And I'm just requesting, if the

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1562

Colloquy

1562 Court can just say, the parties have resolved or

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1563

Colloquy

1563 something along the lines that any wage claim has been

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1564

Colloquy

1564 resolved by the parties and, therefore, it's not to be

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1565

Colloquy

1565 considered or something like that. But --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1566

Colloquy

1566

THE COURT: All right. And how many jurors

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1567

Colloquy

1567 are going to deliberate? Do we agree?

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1568

Colloquy

1568

MR. COBUZIO: I'd like all -- Judge, half of

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1569

Colloquy

1569 them are asleep. I think it's -- and it's always been

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1570

Colloquy

1570 my practice, let them all deliberate. They sat here

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1571

Colloquy

1571 through this tortured testimony for eight days. Kathy

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1572

Colloquy

1572 has sat here for eight days. Maybe we can let her

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1573

Colloquy

1573 deliberate. But it's --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1574

Colloquy

1574

COURT CLERK: I can give you a verdict right

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEI	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1575

Colloquy

1575 now.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1576

Colloquy

1576

MR. COBUZIO: I prefer that all eight because

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1577

Colloquy

1577 all eight may not have been listening all at the same

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1578

Colloquy

1578 time, and I would agree to a seven/eight. I think it's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1579

Colloquy

1579 five/six, the --

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1580

Colloquy

1580

THE COURT: My position always is, if you can

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1581

Colloquy

1581 agree with that, I think that that's a good -- that's

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## $\underline{I N D E X}2$

1582

Colloquy

1582 good for the jurors considering the amount of time they

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1583

Colloquy

1583 had to spend, but if you can't agree, I don't think I

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1584

Colloquy

1584 can impose that.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1585

Colloquy

1585

MR. CLARK: What is the -- what is it, if

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1586

Colloquy

1586 it's -- it's seven to one is the -- okay. Yes. We'll

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

#### INDEX2

1587

Colloquy

1587 agree to eight. That's fine, Judge. Thank you.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# INDEX2

1588

Colloquy

1588

THE COURT: Okay.

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## <u>I N D E X</u>2

1589

Colloquy

1589

MR. COBUZIO: Thank you, Judge.

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1590

Colloquy

1590

(Day's Proceedings Concluded)

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1591

Colloquy

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1592

Colloquy

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1593

Colloquy

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1594

Colloquy

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1595

Colloquy

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1596

Colloquy

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1597

Colloquy

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1598

Colloquy

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

## INDEX2

1599

Colloquy

NEW TEDOEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1600

Colloquy

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1601

Colloquy

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06
	DOCKET NO. E /130 00

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1602

Colloquy

NEW TEDOEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1603

Colloquy

NEW TEDCEV	SUPERIOR COURT OF
NEW JERSEY	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1604

Colloquy

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1605

Colloquy

NEW JERSEY	SUPERIOR COURT OF
	LAW DIVISION, CIVIL
PART	ESSEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-7138-06

# <u>I N D E X</u>2

1606

Colloquy

#### CERTIFICATION

I, SHERRY M. BACHMANN, the assigned transcriber, do hereby certify the foregoing transcript of proceedings on tape number 1, index number from 0001 to end; tape number 2, index number from 0000 to end; and tape number 3, index number from 0001 to 1484, is prepared in full compliance with the current Transcript Format for Judicial Proceedings and is a true and accurate non-compressed transcript of the proceedings as recorded.

SHERRY M. BACHMANN AOC #454 G&L TRANSCRIPTION OF NJ

Date: May 2, 2011