STATE OF NEW YORK : FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

SUPREME COURT : COUNTY OF ONONDAGA

-----X

In Re: SMALL SMILES LITIGATION :

Index No. 2011-6084 : Index No. 2011-2128 Index No. 2011-6223 LCP Case No. 011-2011 :

. ----->

JURY TRIAL

September 18 2013

Onondaga County Courthouse 401 Montgomery Street Syracuse, New York 13202

BEFORE:

HONORABLE DEBORAH H. KARALUNAS, Justice of the Supreme Court and a Jury

1	APPEARANCES:
2	POWERS & SANTOLA, LLP
3	Attorneys for Plaintiffs 39 North Pearl Street
3	Albany, New York 12207
4	BY: PATRICK J. HIGGINS, ESQ.
5	
6	HACKERMAN FRANKEL, P.C. Attorneys for Plaintiffs
_	4203 Montrose, Suite 600
7	Houston, Texas 77006 BY: RICHARD FRANKEL, ESQ.
8	P. KEVIN LEYENDECKER, ESQ.
9	
10	SMITH, SOVIK, KENDRICK & SUGNET Attorneys for Defendants New FORBA
10	250 South Clinton Street
11	Syracuse, New York 13202 BY: KEVIN E. HULSLANDER, ESQ.
12	ROBERT CAHALAN, ESQ.
13	
14	AHMUTY, DEMERS & McMANUS Attorney for Defendant Padula
14	200 IU Willets Road
15	Albertson, New York 11507
16	BY: JOHN A. McPHILLAMY, ESQ.
17	WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER
40	Attorneys for Defendants Aman, Bonds & Khan
18	677 Broadway Albany, New York 12207
19	BY: MICHAEL STEVENS, ESQ.
20	THERESA B. MARANGAS, ESQ.
21	O'CONNOR, O'CONNOR, BRESEE & FIRST, P.C.
	Attorneys for Defendants Old FORBA,
22	DeRose, Padula, Mueller & Roumph 20 Corporate Woods Boulevard
23	Albany, New York 12211
24	BY: DENNIS FIRST ESQ. DANIELLE MEYERS, ESQ.
2 4 25	DANIELLE METERO, LOQ.
20	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al

(Morning Session - September 18, 2013.)

THE COURT: Okay. Jim, would you shut that door. Are any of the jurors in the courtroom? I don't see any, but I want to be sure that none of them are.

So the Court had a few motions to decide. I know I had reserved decision with respect to whether or not the defendant dentists could testify as expert witnesses in this case.

Uhm, and I believe under the authority of Stark v. Semeran, 244 AD2d 894, Fourth Department case from 1997, that the fact that they were not disclosed as expert witnesses does not -- will not bar them from testifying as experts in this case.

However, the Court is not going to hear cumulative, duplicative testimony from many people. So with that said, they are fact witnesses in this case, and I'm not going to allow lengthy opinion testimony from the defendants in this case because the Stark case says you don't have to disclose them, but the Court still has discretion not to allow cumulative testimony so you can't have, you know, four or five experts testifying about the same thing. So the motion to

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 1 2 preclude then defendants from giving opinions is 3 denied. 4 I asked for expert disclosure from counsel, 5 and I think I got it from Old FORBA, and no, I got 6 it from -- I got it from the dentists and New 7 FORBA. Would Old FORBA and the plaintiffs, do you 8 9 have that to pass up or --10 MR. HIGGINS: I'm sorry, Judge. We can 11 have that in fifteen minutes. I'll go back to the 12 hotel and get it. 13 THE COURT: All right. Not a problem. 14 MR. HIGGINS: Very well. 15 THE COURT: And then there was also -- I 16 didn't ask either party to -- any party to prepare 17 orders with respect to the motions in limine. 18 Anyone want to do a draft of the proposed --19 MR. HIGGINS: Of course, Judge, I will do 20 a draft. I will do a draft on the plaintiff's 21 motion or all of them. 22 THE COURT: It's up to you. You guys can 23 do it. 24 MR. HIGGINS: I'll do the whole thing. 25 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.

1	Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al
2	There is also a motion by the plaintiffs brought
3	by an Order to Show Cause to preclude New FORBA
4	from asserting untimely objections to the
5	deposition testimony of Dr. Adair and Michael
6	Lindley.
7	Secondly, to preclude them from offering
8	additional deposition testimony of Dr. Steven
9	Adair, Michael Lindley and Kenneth Knott that was
10	not timely designated.
11	Third, from calling Michelle Sobotka and
12	Hillary Doyle as witnesses in this case.
13	Fourth, from to preclude Doctors Aman,
14	Bonds and Khan from calling Dr. Albino Bellini as
15	a witness in this case.
16	I understand that he is not testifying so
17	that that motion or that is is that correct?
18	MS. MARANGAS: Your Honor, we wish to
19	reserve our right to produce him. There was a
20	little bit of confusion yesterday. Clarified it
21	with plaintiff's counsel late in the day.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Nobody clarified to the
23	Court, so I didn't address that motion because I
24	didn't realize it was still a motion that was
25	before me.

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 MS. MARANGAS: I apologize, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. I won't address that 4 then. And to preclude Old FORBA from calling 5 Crystal Hutchins, Kathleen Pfohl, Sandra Rossetti 6 and Nadine Vandewalker as witnesses because they 7 were not disclosed in response to discovery 8 requests. So with respect to the -- let's start 9 with Old FORBA, who is going to argue that motion? 10 MS. FOLEY: Your Honor, I will be arguing 11 that on behalf of the plaintiffs. THE COURT: All right. Come up to the 12 13 podium. 14 MS. MEYERS: Okay. 15 THE COURT: I'm not really needing 16 argument, but I have some specific questions I 17 want to ask, but I want to be sure the court 18 reporter can hear you. 19 MS. MEYERS: Okay. 20 THE COURT: Okay. So I want to know why the late disclosure of these witnesses? 21 22 MS. MEYERS: Uhm, are you referring to the 23 late disclosure? To be clear, we disclosed our 24 witness list on time. It was a timely disclosure 25 of the witness list.

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 THE COURT: Didn't identify those 3 individuals. MS. MEYERS: When we produced the trial 4 5 witness list, we identified them in the identical 6 manner that the plaintiffs had identified them. 7 They said two to three witnesses, hour long. 8 THE COURT: Do two wrongs make a right? 9 MS. MEYERS: No, two wrongs do not make a 10 right. As soon as they asked us for the names, I 11 think eleven days later --THE COURT: Within two hours the paper say 12 you supplied them. Okay. 13 14 MS. MEYERS: And in no manner are we 15 attempting to conceal these witnesses from them. 16 In fact, that they -- they knew about these 17 witnesses, at least one of them they actually 18 contacted. 19 THE COURT: All right. So Crystal 20 Hutchins, Sandra Rossetti and Nadine Vandewalker 21 were not identified by plaintiffs or defendants in 22 any of the disclosure that took place by name. 23 Although, there were some salary charts that 24 referenced them -- these individuals. 25 Uhm, there was a discovery demand addressed

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al to Old FORBA that asked for the identity of names and addresses of all persons who were witnesses to any of the occurrences or to any of the events surrounding any of the occurrences that are the subject of this action, or were witnesses to any of the conditions that are the subject of this action or were witnesses to any of the plaintiff's injuries, and those individuals were not identified in the response to that discovery demand.

MS. MEYERS: Your Honor, if I may. By way of background, we received in the plaintiff's demand, and they were voluminous, and so the parties agreed we had, I believe it was nine disks of discovery materials to turn over.

So in lieu of actual a formal response to the disclosure, we agreed that we would just turn over the disks and instead of making a formal response.

Uhm, now, I know in -- to be forthright with the Court, they had requested insurance information, and at that point we didn't have any witnesses that we were aware of by specific name.

Uhm, they had disclosed in their disclosure

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 that they knew hygienists, they knew office 3 managers, and they knew dental assistants had 4 personal knowledge of the case, and so when we 5 turned all of the documents, there were lists of 6 these employees in there, we felt it was 7 sufficient to put them on notice. 8 We didn't try to conceal any witnesses, and 9 in hindsight should we have explicitly listed 10 them, perhaps. But in no way were these witnesses 11 ever concealed from them, and, in fact, like I 12 said before, they were actually contacting, 13 reaching out to the witnesses, and I did a search 14 and we got this motion in on -- I believe I read 15 it at six o'clock on Monday night. 16 THE COURT: I read your papers. You did a 17 search and you came up with some documents that 18 identified those three individuals. Hutchins. 19 Rosetti and Vandewalker. MS. MEYERS: That's right. 20 21 THE COURT: By on those salary like 22 charts, and then there was also the Kathleen Pfohl 23 who was identified in an office chart. I know. 24 So I understand that. Those were disclosed by

name, the three on September 3rd, 2013.

25

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 Uhm, let me -- so really you're saying you 3 don't believe it was late disclosure to identify 4 them by name on September 3rd, notwithstanding the 5 discovery demands and the Court's order, that 6 order of disclosure of witnesses and the length of 7 time each witness would testify by August 23rd? 8 MS. MEYERS: I would submit to you that 9 we -- there was no intent to conceal these 10 witnesses or that so -- yeah, I would submit that 11 we did timely disclose our intention to call the 12 clinic employees at the time of trial. 13 THE COURT: Can you tell me when, how and 14 who first contacted each of those individuals 15 about testifying at this trial? 16 MS. MEYERS: Uhm, I can tell you that Mr. 17 First began contacting them a couple of months 18 before trial. 19 Specifically, I think some of these have 20 been actually within the past month or so that we 21 have actually talked to them and located them, so 22 I can't give you the specific dates right now. I 23 can probably provide that to the Court. 24 THE COURT: Okay. With respect to Miss 25 **Hutchins?**

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 MS. MEYERS: I do want to clarify, Miss 3 Vandewalker we have -- have known about for 4 several months. I think back in maybe May we 5 contacted her and that was actually in response to 6 Mr. Levendecker contacted her first, and she 7 actually -- we became aware of that through -- Mr. 8 Leyendecker contacted her, not by Mr. Leyendecker, 9 but through Mrs. Vandewalker we learned that 10 information. THE COURT: I'd like an offer of proof 11 12 with respect to Miss Hutchins if the Court were to 13 allow her to testify, what would she testify to? 14 MS. MEYERS: Uhm --15 MR. FIRST: Can I interject, Judge? THE COURT: Certainly. 16 17 MR. FIRST: Miss Hutchins is a dental 18 assistant who worked at the clinic in Syracuse 19 from when it opened in 2004 until the sale in 20 2006. She will testify to the procedures there as 21 a dental assistant, what her role was, what her 22 observations were during the relevant time period. 23 And, you know, she obviously has firsthand 24 knowledge. 25 She was in the general time period involved.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al
I don't believe -- we haven't been able to connect
her to actually Jeremy Bohn, but she was there,
and I think that the jury should be entitled to
hear from her, and I don't know, I think this is
clear to the Court, but these names were well
known to the plaintiffs. There is nothing new
about this. I mean they --

THE COURT: Well, the names may be well known, but their relevance to the lawsuit and the claims that are made in this lawsuit and the defenses to this lawsuit is what the witness identification list is for in discovery, so the fact that their names were among the thousands probably of names that appeared on documents doesn't mean that they had information that was relevant to the claims in this case.

So for you to say that they saw these names on documents with perhaps the exception of Kathleen Pfohl, who is identified on the office chart, I believe, of Jeremy, I saw no reference on any of the office charts to Miss Hutchins, Miss Rossetti or Miss Vandewalker --

MR. FIRST: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- so -- so basically she's --

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al she didn't treat Mr. Bohn, but -- Jeremy, but you're saying she would just testify generally to the -- to the procedures and the role -- her role? MR. FIRST: Exactly.

MR. FIRST: You know, how the office worked, what she observed and things of that sort.

You know, Your Honor, they're very broad claims being made in that case that may seem general, but it is nothing compared to the broadness of the claims being made in this case and that's why I respectfully submit that that is relevant. Very

THE COURT: Well, that's -- I guess the problem I'm stuck on because if it was very relevant, as you are saying, Mr. First, why weren't these people identified by name at the time of when discovery was still ongoing so that the plaintiffs would make -- be able to make a determination as to whether or not they wanted to take discovery of these individuals before we get into the courtroom.

And why weren't they identified on the witness list by name on August 23rd when at least

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 what I understand they were already contacted by 3 you with regard to -- with regard to testifying at trial. 4 5 MR. FIRST: The plaintiffs didn't identify 6 them. 7 THE COURT: I understand that. 8 MR. FIRST: And the -- you know, as soon 9 as they asked for it, I gave it to them. There 10 was no surprise. I mean Miss Vandewalker was 11 actually contacted we know, and the others may 12 have been contacted, too, for all I know, but that one I knew was. 13 14 THE COURT: What would Miss Rossetti 15 testify to? Offer of proof? 16 MR. FIRST: She's a hygienest who would 17 testify to her role as a hygienest, which I know 18 is a little different from the dental assistant 19 that she works in the hygiene bay and does the 20 hygienic care at the clinic. She was one of 21 several. She was there during the relevant time 22 period. 23 THE COURT: So the role of a hygienest at 24 Small Smiles dental clinic is your offer of proof 25 of what she will testify to?

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al

MR. FIRST: Yeah. She will testify as to how it worked and the -- in the hygiene department, because Jeremy Bohn was there, how it worked, how the system was, how it was set up. I can prove that through other people, too, she was actually in there. It's relevant. You know, the same time period as this case.

THE COURT: How about Nadine Vandewalker?

MR. FIRST: Nadine Vandewalker was the office manager, and she was what is called a front office person. She was not clinical, but she will give the jury insight as to how the office worked and the front and in the office and the front end of the clinic. Largely the appointments and things like that, and contact -- the initial point of contact with the public.

She -- that's what she did. And she -- each of these people kind of represent a different aspect of the clinic.

THE COURT: And Kathleen Pfohl?

MR. FIRST: She's a hygienest also, and she actually was involved in the care and treatment of Jeremy Bohn. She has no specific memory of him, but her name is in the chart.

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. 3 MR. FIRST: Thank you. All right. 4 THE COURT: All right. New FORBA? Mr. 5 Hulslander? So with respect to the witnesses, you 6 also did not identify in response to discovery --7 defendant's discovery responses either Michelle 8 Sobotka or Hillary Doyle. 9 They were first disclosed, Michelle Sobotka 10 on September 5th; and Hillary Doyle on September 11 9th. So I basically have the same questions of 12 you, why the late disclosure? 13 MR. HULSLANDER: It was in the answer to 14 interrogatory. She was the office manager from --15 THE COURT: She was identified as the 16 office manager, but in response to the question 17 that asked about because there was a specific 18 question which asked who were the office managers 19 at each of the facilities, but the question about 20 what witnesses had knowledge about -- again, I'm 21 going to pull out the demand here. 22 MR. HULSLANDER: Well, we hadn't talked to 23 Sobotka. We haven't talked. We hadn't talked to Hillary. As soon as we were able to -- all of us 24 25 were trying to contact these people. There were

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 investigators that were chasing them down. We 3 were all trying to contact these people for 4 months, and so as a result, initially, I wasn't 5 able to identify a witness when I never talked to 6 her. 7 I mean Sobotka was an office manager and also a dental assistant, and then a lead dental 8 9 assistant throughout this time period from 2004 10 until the end of the clinic. 11 I wasn't going to identify a witness that I 12 have not talked to, and I don't think that's 13 appropriate especially when --14 THE COURT: So when did you talk -- when 15 did someone on behalf of New FORBA first speak with them? 16 17 MR. HULSLANDER: I had -- I had breakfast 18 with her. That was the first time I talked to 19 her. First time anyone from my office talked to 20 her about -- substantively about the case, other 21 than just the meeting for breakfast and on the 22 following Friday we identified her. 23 THE COURT: When was this breakfast? 24 MR. HULSLANDER: I mean the following 25 Monday we identified her. So I'm thinking the

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al breakfast was Sunday morning in Parish, Labor Day weekend.

THE COURT: Okay. So that's the first time anyone from your office contacted her? I know you have "of counsel" and somebody else was -- somebody else had -- somebody else contacted her? How did you meet her in Parish, Kevin?

MR. HULSLANDER: We finally chased her down. Okay. Karen Krogman in my office chased her down where she works. We've been looking for her for months.

Investigators were after her for months, from plaintiffs and all of the parties were after her. She was avoiding everyone. We went into the office where she worked. She wasn't particularly friendly at the time.

We did get her cellphone number. I then contacted her by cellphone. Left her several messages. Finally got a hold of her. Established a meeting place. Went to her on Sunday during Labor Day. Met with her and identified her.

So I wasn't going to -- I wasn't going to identify a witness that was going to testify at

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al trial without me talking to her. These guys knew about her. They were after her, too. So I mean it would have been disingenuous for me to identify a witness, especially when, you know, the Court is concerned about scheduling and who we're going to call and when we are going to call them, and I'm not going to identify a witness that I'm not going to call or that I haven't talked to. And frankly the same goes for Hillary. Hillary Doyle is a dental assistant.

THE COURT: Wait! Tell me what -- make me an offer of proof with respect to Michelle Sobotka.

MR. HULSLANDER: Michelle Sobotka has intimate knowledge of the workings of the Small Smiles center in New York. She received e-mails. She dealt with the dentists on a daily basis. She was not only office manager, she was a dental assistant.

She was able to discuss the policies and procedures at the Small Smiles. She is able to discuss the communication -- the communications with the higher-ups at Small Smiles.

She's able to discuss what went on at Small

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al

Smiles on a daily basis. And that's the offer of
proof. The substance of her testimony, depending
on the plaintiff's case, as always with every case
where a defendant defends a case, depending on
what they offer for proof, but that's what she's
going to testify about and she's my only
representative. I have a bankrupt client, Judge,
with no employees.

THE COURT: I find it difficult to understand why in a case of this significance, with the millions of dollars in attorneys' fees that have been spent in preparing this case and the depositions and the -- you know, everything that is happened in this case, that all of the sudden somebody appears a week before trial, and if this person is that important to your case, it seems very suspect to me that nobody spoke with her and that this witness just appears in the week before the trial.

If she was that important, I mean you guys -- these are your Old FORBA employees and New FORBA's employees, and you guys knew who these people were.

MR. HULSLANDER: So did they!

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al
THE COURT: Well, they knew she was an
office manager. However, she wasn't identified as
a witness with any knowledge.
MR. HULSLANDER: Why were they after her?
Why were they after her?
THE COURT: You have to determine whether
or not she had any knowledge.
MR. HULSLANDER: That's exactly right!
That's what we were doing, too. We were after her
and that's when we found her. I can't I mean I
can't say we weren't trying to find her. We were.
We were trying to find her, Judge. You know this
is
THE COURT: When did you first find her?
MR. HULSLANDER: Sunday.
THE COURT: That's when you first met her?
MR. HULSLANDER: Labor Day weekend.
THE COURT: Met with her?
MR. HULSLANDER: That Sunday of Labor Day
weekend.
THE COURT: When did you first find her?
MR. HULSLANDER: Several days before.
THE COURT: How about Miss Doyle, when did
you first contact her?

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 MR. HULSLANDER: I contacted her. 3 THE COURT: When I say "when did you," I 4 mean anyone on behalf of New FORBA? 5 MR. HULSLANDER: Yeah. The first time was 6 two days before I identified her as a witness. 7 When was that? THE COURT: Okay. 8 9 MR. HULSLANDER: Two days before I 10 identified her as a witness. The only way I got 11 to Doyle was through Sobotka because Doyle -- just 12 like we've been trying to get Doyle, Doyle was the 13 dental assistant on this case. Jeremy Bohn, she 14 treated Jeremy Bohn, and it's her name that is all 15 over this chart. That's why they were after her. Everyone is 16 17 after her. We have an investigator, investigators 18 were after her. She wasn't cooperative. The only 19 reason we got her to cooperate was because Sobotka 20 contacted her and said, you know, I'm a good guy. 21 That's basically it. 22 So as soon as I was able to talk to her on 23 the phone substantively, I identified her. I mean 24 this is a fluid process, Judge. I mean we haven't 25 started the trial yet.

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al

THE COURT: You know, I didn't practice a whole lot in State Court, Kevin. I was mostly in Federal Court, and I would never have not identified a witness as directed by a Court on the deadlines that were imposed. And we were stuck with that. When the Court imposed a deadline for disclosure of witnesses that was it. You were done.

MR. HULSLANDER: That's --

THE COURT: And -- and -- and --

MR. HULSLANDER: That's Federal Court, though, Judge. I know what the rules are in Federal Court.

THE COURT: But what I'm finding, and it's the same thing with the deposition designations here, is that it seems to me that there is really been -- I'm not blaming you, plaintiffs are guilty of this as well, a lack of respect for the Court.

I really do feel like people think I have nothing better to do and I have no other cases, and I do. I mean I was up until two this morning reading transcripts, two yesterday morning reading the deposition transcripts because of the late designations.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al

I find that a little bit disrespectful that everybody is expecting that at this 11th hour on this case going -- which has been going on for years that I have to be making decisions because I'm just getting material.

Mr. Cahalan of your office in his papers in opposition to this motion, you know, he complains that your office only had seven days, this is with respect to the transcripts, only seven days to review the transcripts and make objections and counter designations.

Uhm, my order which required the designations and the counter designations and then the submission of the transcripts with those to me by September 9th.

Now this trial was scheduled to begin on September 16th, which meant I would only have seven days, having never read any one of the transcripts or participated in, presumably you guys have all done that because you participated in them and got them ready for trial. So basically I didn't hear anybody say, hey, Judge, you know, that schedule you set, that's going to be impossible, you will never be able to read all

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 those transcripts and rule on all those objections 3 and all those counter designations along with 4 everything else that is happening in that week. 5 So your scheduling order you ought to make us do 6 this earlier because you will need more time to do 7 this. 8 And it just -- it just baffles me that --9 and by the way, I read all the transcripts. Well, 10 all the plaintiffs' transcripts, although I'm 11 having trouble putting my hands on where I left 12 the last transcript. I am not going to preclude 13 anybody because it worked both ways. 14 I've read the transcripts, the objections, 15 the designations, the counter designations, the 16 supplemental objections, the supplemental counter 17 designations and I'm -- I'm ruling on the 18 transcripts on the merits because I was able to 19 accomplish that. 20 But with respect to the witnesses, the 21 Court's going to reserve decision. Hillary Doyle 22 you said she will testify. Make an offer of 23 proof. 24 MR. HULSLANDER: Yes, she is. 25 THE COURT: Kevin, I'm not just addressing

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 this to you. I know you're standing up here now. 3 This is a comment for all of the attorneys in the 4 room that you really have to think about what the 5 role of the Court is in a trial and why we do 6 these things. It's not just for you guys. It's 7 for the ability to run a trial smoothly and I --8 that's it. Okay. So Miss Doyle will testify? 9 MR. HULSLANDER: Miss Doyle was a dental 10 assistant involved in the care of Jeremy Bohn. 11 She will be able to testify to what was done. 12 What she did. What observations she made of 13 Jeremy. What observations she made of the 14 dentists. 15 What her involvement was that she had in the 16 care and treatment of Jeremy Bohn. What she did 17 with respect to the chart and the policies and 18 procedures that she followed at the Small Smiles 19 dental center in Syracuse. That's what she's 20 going to testify to. 21 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm going 22 to reserve decision on that because I do want to 23 get the jurors who are here in and we will do 24 opening statements. 25 MR. HULSLANDER: Just so you know, I have

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Levendecker 2 great respect for the Court. 3 THE COURT: I understand that, Kevin. 4 Okay. You can bring in the jurors. 5 (Jury seated in the jury box at 9:40 a.m.) 6 THE COURT: Morning. Please be seated. 7 Okay. As I told you yesterday, this morning we're going to have opening statements by the attorneys. 8 9 Are you guys ready? All right. 10 MR. LEYENDECKER: May it please the Court. 11 Your Honor, may I approach the easel? 12 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 13 MR. LEYENDECKER: Good morning. I'd like 14 to spend twenty minutes plus or minus talking to 15 you about what I expect to prove in this case and 16 what it's going to show. 17 And I expect the proof is going to show, 18 ladies and gentlemen, that the answer to this 19 question, is it proper for a corporation to 20 pressure and influence doctors to perform more 21 procedures on their patients and threaten them 22 with their jobs if they don't? 23 I fully expect the proof in this case is 24 going to say the answer to that question is 25 absolutely, positively no. Not for a dentist.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker

Not for an internist. Not for a therapist. Not

for a surgeon. Absolutely improper, that's what I

expect the evidence is going to show.

Neither this community, nor any other community can tolerate an environment where doctors are focusing on the profit desires of the corporations that employ them, as opposed to being focused on what their patients need.

Because once that happens, those patients will be exposed to unnecessary risk of harm, injury and abuse. And nobody, and I mean nobody, is entitled to unnecessarily expose and needlessly expose our community to unnecessary risk of harm, injury and abuse.

I expect in this case that you're going to hear and the defendants, I expect, Dr. Michael DeRose, Mike Roumph, Dr. William Mueller, Danny DeRose and Dr. Padula will take the stand.

I expect they will raise their right hand to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and I fully expect them to testify that the only pressure that -- the only influence that -- the only threats they made to the dentists that worked in their clinics where to show up at

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker 8:00 a.m., work until lunch, and then continue to work hard until 5:00 p.m.. That's what I expect them to testify to.

Now, you're going to get to see a lot of documents in this case. Lots of documents. And one thing a good lawyer cannot do, and make no mistake about it, there are good lawyers in this courtroom on behalf of both the plaintiff and Kelly Varano and her son, Jeremy, that's who I represent, and on behalf of each of the defendants, the Old FORBA defendants, the New FORBA defendants and the doctors. Very good lawyers.

But one thing, no matter how good a lawyer is, one thing that a lawyer cannot do is he cannot change the words that appear on a piece of paper.

We all know lawyers work with their clients.

They get them ready for their testimony. Lawyers no matter how good they are, cannot change what is written on a piece of paper, and at the end of this trial, you're going to get to decide, you've seen -- you will have seen the testimony from the defendants, and you will have seen the words that they wrote at the time the events were unfolding,

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker words that I believe you will hear that they never expected would be exposed in this kind of light, and you will get to decide, is that testimony consistent with what I expect the proof is going to show on those documents.

Now, the defendants, in my judgment, believe that the big dispute in this case is over whether Jeremy Bohn needed to see a dentist, whether Jeremy Bohn needed some treatment on his teeth.

But let me clarify for you, that is not what the dispute in this case is about. Jeremy did need to see a dentist. Jeremy did need some treatment on a few of his teeth.

That Jeremy needed to see a dentist and he needed some treatment on a few of his teeth does not give them a pass for what Jeremy endured.

Because when you live in a situation where dentists are pressured and influenced to perform more procedures on their patients, to put those profits first at their corporate employers, you expose those patients to unnecessary risk of harm and abuse, and I expect the proof in this case is going to demonstrate that Jeremy suffered that abuse.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker

So the fact that he needed to see a dentist and needed treatment does not give them a pass for what they did to him.

So what are some of the things that happened to Jeremy when he went to Small Smiles. Well, his very first visit was on May 23rd of 2006. He was about three years old.

About a week prior to that time, Jeremy woke up with some swelling on his face. And on that same day his mother, Kelly Varano, took him to the pediatrician, same day he woke up with swelling on his face, that's what I expect the proof is going to show.

The pediatrician, I expect you will hear from, is going to say she looked in his mouth, and by the way, he was perfectly cooperative with her, he knew her, had rapport, he trusted her, felt comfortable.

Opens his mouth and she says, I expect you will hear from her, and the proof will show, I think he's got an abscess tooth.

What does she do? Prescribes some penicillin. Recommends to Jeremy's mom, you should take him to see the dentist.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker

So a couple of days later she does that. I expect the proof will show she took him to the family dentist that treated Jeremy's older sisters for a long time. And at that dentist he, Jeremy, was very uncooperative. Very uncooperative.

New environment. Didn't know anyone. The dentist said, looks like the swelling is down, but I think he needs to be seen by a child specialist.

I expect that you will hear in this case
that the family dentist thought a child specialist
who has training in how to interact with young
children who are uncooperative, to get their
cooperation, to make them feel comfortable, to
help them understand it is important to have a
positive attitude about seeing a dentist be
willing and cooperative with their dental care,
that that dentist I expect the proof will show
said the specialists are at Small Smiles.

And so Jeremy's mom, a couple of days later, took him to Small Smiles. And on that very first day, the very first thing that happened to Jeremy, I expect you will see it in the record and hear it from the witnesses, is Dr. Koury Bonds, this gentleman in the back, strapped him down from his

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker
 ankles to his shoulders so that he could conduct a

routine oral examination of his mouth.

And to get that permission to strap him down in that papoose board, he represented to Jeremy's mother that there were no known risks associated with doing that, and she had to sign a form acknowledging the form itself, says there are no known risks.

Now, he didn't write the form. He didn't make the decision about what should or should not be disclosed to Jeremy's mother. That form that contained the no known risk language, ladies and gentlemen, I expect the proof will show Dr.

Mueller drafted that form and drafted that "no known risks" language, and that he presented to the board of FORBA, and they all agreed, we're going to insist that each and every one of our dentists, and each and every one of our clinics this is what the parents are going to be told.

That's what I expect the proof is going to show in this case.

So they didn't leave to Dr. Bonds what the risks or benefits were of the purposed treatment.

They didn't leave that to his judgment. They

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Levendecker insisted you're going to tell the parents there are no known risks, and what I expect the proof to show, ladies and gentlemen, Dr. Mueller, these individuals that were the owners and founders of FORBA and Dr. Bonds all knew that the preeminent pediatric dental association in the country, I expect you will hear testimony about it, had guidelines, and those guidelines describe a number of very serious and potential physical and psychological risks associated with the use of a 12 papoose board. 13 And yet they insisted that each and every 14 dentist, including Dr. Bonds, tell the parents

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there were no known risks and to get that permission.

Now, on May 23, 2006, when Dr. Bonds first met Jeremy, Dr. Bonds did not find that Jeremy had any infection. You will get to see the dental records that's going to come in. You will see that Dr. Bonds did not find that Jeremy had any abscess teeth. He didn't make any diagnosis of an abscess tooth. Dr. Bonds didn't diagnose Jeremy with any pain. He didn't diagnose Jeremy with any discomfort. He didn't diagnose Jeremy with

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker anything.

But after he had him strapped down and he got permission to do that, after he had him strapped him down so he can look in his mouth, he took him out of that papoose board. Carried him to another room and strapped him down again so he could pull two teeth.

Now, Jeremy was not at that Small Smiles on May 23, 2006 as a child who had fallen off a jungle gym, that had nerves exposed and is in a great deal of pain that needed emergency care.

He was taking the penicillin from the pediatrician and the infection was gone. There was no need to strap him down not once, but twice on that day to get the care taken care of.

One or two months later, August 31st, 2006, staying at a time frame when Old FORBA owned that clinic, Jeremy is treated by Dr. Naveed Aman, one of the gentleman in the back.

Dr. Aman on that date performs four unnecessary pulpotomies and crowns on Jeremy's top four teeth.

Now, Dr. Bonds thought he needed some fillings, but what I expect the proof is going to

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Levendecker show is that a few months prior to the time that Dr. Bonds performed this unnecessary pulpotomies and crowns, he had been admonished by his supervisor, by the lead dentist at Small Smiles, because he was not generating enough money for the clinic. I expect that you will get to see that

document. And that after being admonished for not generating enough money for the clinic, Dr. Bonds and his supervisor, the lead dentist, excuse me, Dr. Aman, I apologize. Dr. Aman. Dr. Aman and his supervisor, the lead dentist, created a plan for what they were going to do.

And that plan, ladies and gentlemen, was for Dr. Aman to increase the amount of revenues he was generating for the clinic by doing more procedures on each of his patients.

I expect that you will get to see that piece of evidence in this case. You will get to see his signature on it.

About six weeks later, Jeremy's third visit to the clinic, I expect the proof is going to show, he returned and was treated by Dr. Bonds again.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker

On that date, Dr. Bonds, again, did not diagnose Jeremy with any infection. Did not diagnose Jeremy with any discomfort. Did not diagnose Jeremy with any pain. Did not diagnose Jeremy with any abscess.

But he strapped him down again from his ankles to his shoulders, and he drilled and filled three of his teeth. And he started drilling and filling those teeth even though he knew full well -- you're going to get to see the document, his operative report, even though he knew full well that Jeremy's heart was racing at more than 200 beats per minute and that his oxygen saturation was under 90 percent.

I fully expect you will hear testimony in this case that a three-year-old whose heart is racing at more than the 100 beats per minute and oxygen saturation is under 90 percent is a clear signal of a child in serious distress.

Now, Dr. Bonds while he had Jeremy strapped down to do those fillings did not give him any local anesthesia. Did not give him any Novocain. Had not given him any nitric oxide or laughing gas. Those things take time.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker

As we all know when you go to dentist, you get a shot and it takes time for your mouth to get numb. If you've ever had nitrate, it takes time to get you nitrated up. Takes time for that to take effect. Makes things longer.

The longer it takes with the patient, the fewer patients you can see during the day.

Those examples from his first visit with the papooses, to the second visit with the unnecessary pulpotomies and crowns, to the third visit where he -- and you will see the x-rays, you will decide for yourself if you think the fillings are nothings or whether they have enough size that they were.

But you will see the operative report where he started drilling and filling on Jeremy's teeth when he knew his heart was racing at more than 200 beats per minute.

Now, why did all that happen? Well, in -during the months of those first couple of visits
that Jeremy was treated at the Small Smiles while
it was being operated by Old FORBA, during those
months in 2006, Dr. Michael DeRose, Dr. William
Mueller, Daniel DeRose, Dr. Padula, the patriarch

1 Bo

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker of the family, Dr. Eddie DeRose were each putting \$300,000 a month in their pockets.

That was the amount of FORBA profits that they were putting in their pockets month in and month out in 2006.

They actually had been putting \$250,000 each in their pockets in the second half of 2005, but apparently their American dream was larger than \$250,000 a month, and by the way, those are taxpayer dollars primarily. Those profits were coming from Medicaid. That's what I expect the proof to show.

Now, I also expect the proof to show the only way they were able to put those profits in their pockets is because the very first thing Old FORBA did when it opened the clinic in the State of New York, or any other state for that matter, was to deceive the authorities as to who the true owner of that clinic was.

Because I expect the proof to show, for example, in New York that to own a dental clinic you need to be a licensed dentist in this state, and a for-profit corporation cannot lawfully own a dental clinic in the State of New York.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Levendecker

MR. FIRST: I object to counsel -- I'm sorry, Mr. Leyendecker, addressing the law of the Court to the jury.

MR. LEYENDECKER: I expect the proof will demonstrate that, ladies and gentlemen. I also expect the proof will show that these gentlemen decided to send Dr. Padula to New York to get his license so they can put him on -- down on the paperwork and represent to the authorities in the State of New York that he was the true owner, but the reality is that the proof will demonstrate that the very management agreements Mr. First said only relate to nondental, those management agreements caused each and every penny of profit from the New York clinics and every other clinic they were operating across the country to go to FORBA, and they took those profits, and they distributed themselves.

Now, \$250,000 a month, \$300,000 a month, I don't mean the whole group, I mean individually, those distributions reached, I expect the proof will show, reached as high as \$500,000 a month before they sold that business.

But that wasn't enough because the real

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker prize I expect we will hear is what they would get if they sold that business. And on September 26, 2006, about a month after Jeremy had undergone those unnecessary pulpotomies and crowns, they sold the business, and when they did, Dr. Michael DeRose put \$56 million in his pocket.

Michael Roumph, I expect the evidence will show, put \$37 million in his pocket. Dr. William Mueller put \$56 million in his pocket. I expect the proof will show that Daniel DeRose put \$100 million in his pocket.

Dr. Adolph Padula, the doctor they sent to get his license and to pretend he was the owner, when he was not, \$56 million; and the patriarch of the family, Dr. Eddie DeRose, I expect the proof will show, put \$65 million in his pocket.

So that takes us to New FORBA. I think what you will hear from the witness stand and/or perhaps from some of the depositions in the case is that New FORBA's plan was to double the number of clinics in the country so that they could flip it and get their payday, too. I expect that you will hear evidence about that.

Now, we heard a lot yesterday about

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker pioneers, and the American dream, and all about trying to find access for needy young children who otherwise didn't have it. We heard a lot about that.

What I want to ask you to do as you reflect throughout the course of this case on that American dream and what it is we are being pioneers in. I want you to think about three things.

Number one, who do you think was applying the pressure and the influence and threats. It's the people that had the most to gain from it. I expect the evidence will show that Dan DeRose set the tone from the top and that it was either the FORBA way or the highway. Number one.

Number two, this notion that we're all about the kids. They started this business on October -- they opened the first clinic, I believe, October of 2001. November 2003, just about at the two-year anniversary after when they opened the first clinic, they were hiring, looking to hire investments bankers on Wall Street and wanting to know how much could this business be worth.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Leyendecker

And what they were told in 2003, two years after they started the business, it could be worth between 400 and \$500 million. I expect that is what the proof will show.

Now, at that time, they hadn't opened the Syracuse or Albany or Rochester clinic so they had to grow it some more, some more.

Two years into the business, before they wanted to say how much can we get if we sell it, and the third piece of information that I expect the proof to show, I want you to think about as you are considering this, was this all about helping poor kids or could there be something else at play.

They sold the business to an entity that did not have a single dentist, not one dentist in its -- in its ownership group. Not a healthcare organization. They sold it to the Wall Street hedge fund types, bankers.

Now, I don't know whether this is a big case. I tend not to think about cases as being big or small. I tend to think that this is a very important case. I don't know if it's big, but I know it's important.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First

You will have an opportunity, ladies and gentlemen, to decide whether this community is going to tolerate corporations that pressure and influence and threaten doctors in ways that will help them make profits, and in ways that are absolutely calculating to expose patients to unnecessary risk of harm and abuse.

That's what you're going to get to decide at the end of the day. I thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. First.

MR. FIRST: Good morning. Ladies and gentlemen, this case is entitled, Jeremy Bohn against these defendants. The subject of this case is the care and treatment that Jeremy Bohn received at the Syracuse clinic on May 23rd and August 31st.

Keep your eye on that ball. Keep your eye on the facts of this case that relate to what's being decided because a lot of things are being thrown at you, just like I told you yesterday, that have nothing to do with the care and treatment that Jeremy Bohn received on those dates.

I told you my clients made a lot of money in

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First
this business, and they did, particularly when the
business was sold. No doubt about that.

But it all comes back -- it all comes back because the only question before you is whether Jeremy Bohn received appropriate care when he went to the Small Smiles clinics on those days.

Now, don't lose perspective. Keep your eye on the ball. I think you'll see that the proof is going to show you that the care and treatment that he received on those days was within the standard of care.

Jeremy Bohn arrived at that office at that clinic with severe dental disease. He had a severe dental disease that was dangerous to his health. That caused swelling and pain and difficulty in his life and that is what was being addressed at the time of these visits.

You'll see that he was treated appropriately to arrest what was an infectious disease. Let me go into some of the facts in more detail because I think you really haven't seen the full picture of what was going on here in terms of Jeremy Bohn's condition.

The proof's going to show, and I don't say

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First this accusatorily towards anyone, it's just a fact, that before he went to Small Smiles, before Jeremy went to Small Smiles at the age of three and a half, he had very poor dental hygiene.

You'll also see that he'd never been to a dentist before, and like a lot of children, he had an affection for sweets, and his favorite sweet and one that he would consume regularly were gummy bears, and it was a bad combination of events that led him to develop this severe dental disease.

To the point where in May of 2006, the left side of his face swelled up. It became swollen because the gums had swollen and the cheek had swollen because of an infection. That's what causes that is an infection.

And it had gotten so bad that he had to get care from somebody at that point in time. And the first person -- the first care provider that Miss Varano took Jeremy to was the pediatrician, and the pediatrician at that point in time looked at Jeremy and said, oh, he has abscess. A tooth abscess.

But she didn't only say that. She actually got to look in his mouth and found that he had

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First multiple cavities in his premolar teeth on both sides. So this is a pediatrician that looked in his mouth and diagnosed those conditions.

But in addition to that, you have lay

testimony from Miss Varano, and Mr. Bohn's father, who may not be here I understand, but has testified under oath at a deposition and that testimony will be that his top teeth were discolored and brownish and had a gap in them. These are baby teeth by the way. And you will also hear that at least according to Mr. Bohn they had rot. His words, not mine.

So let there be any doubt about his condition he presented at Small Smiles with a severe case of infectious dental disease.

So what did the pediatrician do, Dr.

Vivienne Taylor? She recommended he get some dental care. Okay. Mrs. Varano brings him to Dr.

Patel. That's on May 17th, 2006. And Dr. Patel describes Jeremy as being very, very uncooperative.

So there was very little he can do with him and didn't do very much. He did manage to look into his mouth and found that two teeth, which he

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First specifically notes in his chart "B" and "I" are in very bad shape. That there's exposure on one of them and the other one looks bad. His words.

Now, those two teeth are behind the canines on the bottom. I'll defer to the dentists on that. I believe that's where they are. And that's -- those are the teeth that Dr. Patel specifically noted looked very bad. He didn't do a full exam. He did recognize the need for Jeremy Bohn to get immediate dental care, and he recommended that he go to Small Smiles.

Now, let me back up a second because something was said about -- said by Mr.

Leyendecker that I think you have to consider in the proof.

Dr. Taylor did prescribe an antibiotic.

Where when you have an infection, what you hear about is you prescribe an antibiotic, and she prescribed penicillin. Penicillin is a well-known antibiotic. I'm sure you all know that.

Antibiotics do not cure a tooth abscess.

All they do is control the amount of swelling in the gums and the cheek. They do not get rid of the underlying problem and that is exactly why Dr.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First Taylor referred Jeremy for dental care.

So Dr. Patel recommends that he go to Small Smiles and that is located about forty -- I believe around forty to fifty miles from where they lived, and Mrs. Varano didn't really want to go that far so she decided to call around and see if she could find a place closer to take Jeremy.

She calls around, I believe her testimony will be, to about seven dentists or so, and she couldn't find one dentist willing to see Jeremy and that's because there's a lack of access to care. A lack of access to care for children like Jeremy, which is the whole reason why FORBA was started.

Now, when I say that Jeremy had an infectious disease, I think there's a lot of misunderstanding that cavities and tooth decay are directly related to eating sugar and things like that. But actually, the sugar prompts bacteria. Bacteria is what actually causes decay and sets the wheels in motion for the decay and that is an infectious disease that will spread unless it's arrested. And it's very insidious and it can result in serious lifetime problems.

2

3

4

6

5

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First

It could and most immediately it causes problems in kids because it's painful. They lose their ability to concentrate, miss time from school, and it can have an impact on their adult teeth if it's left untreated.

So those are baby teeth, but there are consequences to not treating these teeth. So that brings us to coming to Small Smiles.

Now, at Small Smiles on May 23rd, 2006, Jeremy was seen by Dr. Bonds. Unfortunately, like his behavior at Dr. Patel's office, this is a kid who has had an abscess. He's not comfortable. He's in a new place going to a dentist for a first time. He's out of control. And that's what it says in the chart, "he's out of control."

And yet he had this condition which Dr. Bonds diagnosed and which had been previously diagnosed of a dental abscess. And you heard yesterday, and it is true, dental abscesses left untreated, and antibiotics don't treat them, they just control the effects of them, left untreated can cause catastrophic problems in a person, including a child.

So here he is at Small Smiles with this

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First severe dental disease and needs immediate treatment. Dr. Bonds diagnoses him. Does what a dentist does in fully examining him, he finds, of course, the abscesses, but in addition to that, he has nine other issues with his teeth as Dr. Taylor had indicated, he has multiple cavity and that was correct, and Dr. Bonds went through that very specifically and came up with a treatment plan to treat Jeremy.

Now, you heard a lot and it's said to inflame the situation about the papoose and about the consent, but let me tell you this, he needed this treatment. He had to have this treatment.

And he was placed in a papoose, as is often done in dental offices and medical offices. We heard a lot about that yesterday during the jury selection. It's done as a last resort.

Unfortunately, Jeremy was sick, and he was out of control, and he was frightened, I'm sure.

But he needed this dental treatment, and Dr.

Bonds went through everything with Miss Varano. I
think the testimony will be even from her point of
view that he spent a lot of time with her. As
much time as she would expect. Explained what the

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First treatment plan was. Talked to her about the use of the papoose, the use of the medical -- protective stabilization. She consented to its use, and you will hear a lot about, oh, the consent wasn't right, didn't list risks specifically, none, no.

There was no injury or problem to Jeremy

There was no injury or problem to Jeremy from the use of this papoose. To the contrary, Dr. Bonds successfully extracted these teeth and dealt with the most immediate problem, and by the way, the teeth were "B" and "I," "B" and "I."

The exact same teeth that were noted specifically by Dr. Patel before Jeremy ever arrived at Small Smiles.

So that's what happened on the first visit.

He was medically stabilized during the extractions for twenty minutes. And by the way, it is always documented, it's always documented when that's done. How long it is done for. It's documented what the vital signs are. So we know looking at the record what happened, even if the memories aren't always there.

So then he returns, Jeremy that is, after having his extractions. The immediate problem

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First there, of course, it is always preferable to restore a tooth, if you can, but these teeth were beyond repair, and obviously abscess which is an infection inside the tooth that spreads to the gums and the cheek.

So he returns three months later, and at that point Dr. Naveed Aman sees him. And the teeth that had been previously diagnosed as having decay, those four front top teeth, the same ones described as yellow and brown and gapped and rot, rotted, Dr. Aman addressed in that visit.

And what he did was he performed a pulpotomy and crowns. Put crowns on them. Now, it's important to keep in mind that with those baby teeth, the pulp chamber which is below the enamel, and the dent in his, barely below the surface. It's very easy for that chamber to be invaded by decay, and Dr. Aman determined that with his presentation this was the best way to go, to do the pulpotomy, preserve the root of the tooth.

Pulpotomy does not involve the root. The roots are left intact. It is actually a relatively quick procedure. He did it under -- by the way, Dr. Bonds did it as well. He did it

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First
 under -- he did his procedure extractions under
 anesthesia. Local anesthesia that is, and Dr.

Aman did as well under local anesthesia.

And Jeremy Bohn was given crowns that were white in color. They looked, I'm sure, better than what he came in with, but more importantly than that, he was -- the infectious disease that was running rampant in his mouth was arrested by that treatment. And that's the critical point that he was allowed to heal, dentally speaking, and go on.

Now, I'm going to stop there because there were only two visits that occurred at Small Smiles while my clients owned FORBA, and it is after that the business was sold, as you heard, to New FORBA, and they operated or they were the management company after that. So I'm not going to address that specifically, but let me say this to you, suffice it to say that after these visits to Small Smiles, Jeremy's mouth stabilized. This infectious disease was arrested. He was allowed to lose his baby teeth naturally and normally, except, of course, for the two extractions, and he -- his adult teeth came in and he was returned to

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First dental health. Meaning that after that he learned hygiene habits. He started regularly going to a dentist.

He has had some issues like a lot of kids do with cavity, but has had as far as we know no major problems. He was essentially cured of the serious dental disease that he came with.

Keep your eye on the ball, ladies and gentlemen. It's not pleasant to go to the dentist. It was not fun for Jeremy to have those infections and to have that swelling and to have that pain and to go in to a scarey dental office and be treated. Like a lot of kids I'm sure he cried. In his case he was out of control according to multiple providers, not only Small Smiles. It's -- you know, that's just unfortunate but that's what happened. So keep your eye on the ball.

Now, let me talk, by the way, in addition to what -- in addition to the fact that he's gone on to dental health, he also has thrived, at least at the time of the deposition, there's been a gap since the deposition, also thrived in school.

Done well in school. Appears to be a

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First well-adjusted child.

And Mr. Leyendecker talks about risks and problems. There will not be one iota of proof I expect in this courtroom from a medical provider or psychological provider saying that Jeremy Bohn was in any way harmed or injured in the care from -- the care he received at Small Smiles. Not one iota. Keep your eye on the ball.

Now, let me tell you about my clients. I want to start with Eddie DeRose, who Mr.

Leyendecker refers to as the patriarch. Dr. Eddie DeRose practiced in Pueblo, Colorado many years.

As I indicated yesterday, he has Parkinson's, and unfortunately he will not be here because of his condition. He is an older gentleman now.

But he practiced for years and years in Pueblo, and he had a dental office in Pueblo, and shortly after he started practicing, he decided he was going to really emphasize the practice of children or caring for children. That was his interest and that's what he did, and he developed a practice where a lot of kids came to his office.

About I think roughly a third of which were Medicaid kids. Meaning poor kids. Poor kids.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First
When I say Medicaid kids, I mean poor kids who
qualify under the Medicaid program. It was not
most of his practice, but it was a part of it, and
through the years it became apparent that more and
more kids as they found out, the families found
out about would come from all over, all over the
place, sometimes hundreds of miles to get
treatment for their kids at Dr. Eddie DeRose's
office.

It became so essential to take care of these poor kids that the State of Colorado actually approached him and said, could you open a place that would accept Medicaid from these poor kids' families in other places such as Colorado Springs, or Denver, and they did that.

You know, they talk -- Mr. Leyendecker talked about, oh, they're going to sell this business within a couple of years. They forget about all the history. They don't want to ignore the whole history and evolution of this business or this practice.

This practice started back -- way back and the additional clinics were built in the 90s. It got to the point because they were getting so many

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First
people from New Mexico, kids from New Mexico, that
the State of New Mexico asked them, would you open
an office down here so you can care for our kids
down here, and he did. He opened an office in
Sante Fe and Albuquerque and people -- these kids
came from all around.

The reason why they came -- well, they were

The reason why they came -- well, they were treated well, but they also -- because there was a real lack of access and FORBA came out of that history. It didn't start in 2001. It started years before that.

But in 2001, because of this tremendous need, there was an opportunity to maybe give this advantage to poor kids in other places outside of Colorado and New Mexico, and it's out of that that FORBA evolved.

Now, FORBA started in 2001. You heard Dan DeRose referred to as the head of FORBA and he was. Dan was a little different than his dad and his brother in that he had a business background, and he was familiar with how to start a business and try to get something going.

And it was that expertise that allowed this to evolve the way they did. So FORBA started with

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First
Dr. Eddie DeRose, Dr. Michael DeRose, Dan DeRose,
and Dr. Rudy Padula and Dr. Bill Mueller. Dr.
Bill Mueller I want to talk about in a second
because for -- little more than a second because
it is important that you understand who he is and
who he was.

At the time FORBA was forming, Dr. Mueller was a very prominent pediatric dentist who came out of the Children's Hospital. He ran the residency program for pediatric dentists at the Children's Hospital in Denver.

He was prominent and well-known, and the reason why he became involved in this is that he and Eddie served -- Dr. Eddie, sometimes they call these doctors by their first name, Dr. Eddie DeRose on a committee concerning -- they had a shared interest in treating these poor kids, and he sat on a committee with him, and they often would confer and talk about this issue and how best to get access because it is no secret. It is well-known, I don't think they will dispute it, that there is a real problem with access for these poor kids getting into dental facilities to get care.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First
And that's what FORBA was all about "For
Better Access." And they described in questions
yesterday about big business, small business.
This started as a small business. All these guys
had to take loans and start from scratch to try to
do this. They took a lot of risk. There was no
guarantee. Hindsight is always clear. There is
no question, they had demand.

But there was no certainty that they would be successful. It's only in hindsight now you know that they were successful.

So what -- why is it that there is such a problem among this population? Statistically speaking, 80 percent of the decay among children in this country are in 20 percent of the population. That's just a fact.

Twenty percent of the population and that population tends to be poor and this population has the greatest problem. Why is that? There's a lot of ideas, reasons why. There is a lack of dental education. Lack of good hygiene habits. Lack of access to care. Diet. A lot of different reasons are talked about.

But it's a fact that that is where a large

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First part of the problem rests, and the Surgeon General has written about it. The Center for Medicaid Services, CMS has written about it, and also the AAPD, the American Association of Pediatric Dentistry also has written about it. It's well-known. Not disputed in this case.

The basic recommendation because you are dealing with this infectious disease is to treat it definitively and aggressively, because if you don't, and if the patient doesn't come or even if the patient does come back, you will be doing it over again. Those are the treatment recommendations.

Every case is different. Every doctor has to look at what the situation is and make his own decisions on care and treatment, but that's what the overall recommendations are for the treatment of this condition.

Now, lack of access, why is there a lack of access? The reason why is the vast, vast majority of dentists will not take Medicaid as reimbursement for services. There are a lot of reasons for that. Part of it is the reimbursement rates are very low. There is also a high --

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First 2 well-known high broken appointment rate --3 MR. HIGGINS: Objection, Your Honor. 4 Standard of care motion in limine. 5 THE COURT: Yeah. You have about two or 6 three more minutes here, too, Mr. First. 7 MR. FIRST: I have a little more than 8 that, Judge. 9 THE COURT: I know we talked about a half 10 an hour each. 11 MR. FIRST: Okay. Any way the -- there is a lack of access because of most dentists won't 12 13 take Medicaid and because there is a high broken 14 appointment rate. So there is nowhere for them to 15 go. As Mrs. Varano experienced seven calls and 16 there was no place to take Jeremy. 17 So what my clients did was come up with a 18 way to accommodate those problems causing lack of 19 access. And the way they did that is that they 20 built a substantial facility from -- they built a 21 substantial facility, usually with three or four 22 dentists, multiple hygienists and assistants, and 23 they were able because of economy of scale, 24 because of the ability to purchase things in bulk, 25 to overcome -- they would overbook patients just

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First so you take into account this high broken appointment rate so people wouldn't be sitting around. The average dentists cannot do that. He cannot have people sitting around, so they were able to overcome these issues.

So as I indicated yesterday, the dental management company took care of all the nonclinical functions of the clinic. Got the property. Took care of the rent. Did the HR, human relations, provided the equipment. Did the technology. And the dentists were enabled to practice dentistry. And that's all they really had to focus on.

The lead dentist, the lead dentist would basically run the office. These clinics, including the one in Syracuse, were set up in accordance with the law. Dr. Rudy Padula was the owner to the clinic. He's a licensed dentist in this state, and they were operating or run day to day mostly by the lead dentist, and each of the dentists made their own clinical decisions.

Now, you see that quote over there, plaintiff's counsel focused on it a lot, and we talked about this in voir dire.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First

First of all, let's make no mistake about it that the proof will show that they did monitor how much revenue, how much work was done in a clinic on a given day. Every business in America does that. Every business in America does that. Every business in America does that. And you do keep track of -- they try to keep track of what is going on. Nobody was expected to do any more than work their regular hours and work hard.

Let me say this to you, there was never any lack of work to do because of the epidemic going on among this population with dental decay.

Nobody had to do anything. Nobody felt any pressure to do anything that didn't need to be done.

There were so many patients waiting to be treated, the proof is going to show, there was never any reason to do something that a dentist did not feel was indicated.

So all this pressure was just so-called pressure. It's about working hard and it only concerned folks from time to time who may not have been working hard.

In other words, if there was an under performance, that's all you will see is the under

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First performance, you're not going to see all the clinics that never had any issues of that sort

whatsoever.

They popped out these e-mails and they want to say, oh, you were pressuring, pressuring, pressuring, but in reality these are just unique situations. All unique unto themselves.

So it all comes back, by the way, 90 percent of the dentists in America treat and the proof is going to show this work on a fee-for-service basis. What they make. The guys with the shingles out, which are most dentists in America, what they make is directly related to the amount of dentistry that they do and the amount of which is ultimately the amount of procedures that they perform and to suggest that because you work because according to fee or service that that means you are doing something wrong really doesn't make a lot of sense and that's essentially what they are saying in this case.

That they, my clients, somehow convinced by the ends of 200 dentists to do something, do things that aren't appropriate, jeopardize their license and the like. Doesn't make any sense.

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/First 2 So at the end of this case it all comes back 3 to Jeremy Bohn. Keep your eye on the ball. 4 Because that's really what is at issue in this 5 case is the care and treatment he received. And 6 at the end of this case I'm going to ask you for a 7 verdict of -- a verdict of no cause for action 8 because they're not going to prove fraud because 9 there wasn't any fraud. They're not going to 10 prove deviation from accepted practice, and 11 they're not going to prove the other claims in 12 this case. Thank you. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. First. 14 We're going to take a morning recess. Fifteen 15 minutes. Come back for the last two. 16 (Proceedings in recess at 10:38 a.m..) 17 (Jury seated in the jury box at 10:55 a.m..) 18 THE COURT: Be seated. Ready to proceed? 19 MR. HULSLANDER: Yes. May it please the 20 Court. It's a beautiful, sunny day in Syracuse, 21 New York. Let's appreciate that, ladies and 22 gentlemen. Beautiful, sunny morning. Good 23 morning. 24 (Jurors responded with "good morning.") 25 MR. HULSLANDER: You know who I am. You

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Hulslander 2 listened very attentively, as you should, to Mr. 3 Levendecker, and you remember Mr. Levendecker said to you "this is an important case." I'm not sure 4 5 how big it is. Mr. Higgins thinks it's a big one. 6 Mr. Leyendecker wasn't able to say that. Not sure 7 it's big, but it's important. 8 Indeed it's important to Mr. Leyendecker and 9 Mr. Higgins and Mr. Frankel, and those lawyers 10 from Texas, and Mr. Moriarty, Mr. Hackerman, Mr. 11 Dorr, it's an important case for all of them. 12 Ladies and gentlemen, you hardly heard 13 anything about Jeremy Bohn. He's the plaintiff. 14 You hardly heard Mr. Levendecker say anything 15 about Jeremy Bohn. 16 You know, he put this statement up here. 17 Where is Jeremy's name on this? Where is the 18 Syracuse center on this statement? Where is --19 what about Jeremy? 20 You know, it's not what he told you, it's 21 what he didn't tell you, ladies and gentlemen. 22 Did he tell you that Jeremy actually went and saw 23 Dr. Bellini after his time at Small Smiles and did 24 very well. Did very well. No problems with his 25 teeth. No problems with going to the dentist. No

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Hulslander fear of the dentist.

Did he tell you that Jeremy is doing very well in school. That he has no social issues. He's got no problems. He's got no psychological problems. He's got no physical problems. Jeremy is doing awesome.

He didn't tell you that Jeremy is just a normal kid. Is this case about Jeremy Bohn or is it about something else, ladies and gentlemen? Is it about Jeremy Bohn or is it about something else?

It will be for you to examine these witnesses, examine their credibility, consider the 195 documents that he wants you to consider and see behind it. Look behind it. Keep your eye on the ball, Mr. First said that, yes. Don't get caught up in to this drama brought on by these lawyers.

Now, he talked about good lawyers, and he talked about, well, lawyers can't change the facts. Well, guess what, Mr. Leyendecker can't change the fact that his client wasn't injured at Small Smiles. That his client wasn't harmed at Small Smiles.

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Hulslander 2 That his client sustained no damages or 3 injury or harm at all and his client is doing very 4 well. He can't change the fact, certainly, that 5 he will not be calling an expert treating 6 psychologist, psychiatrist, pediatrician, 7 whatever, to talk about how this apparent trauma 8 that he would have you believe happened affected 9 Jeremy. 10 Let's not talk about that. That's right. 11 He can't change that fact. That's why he didn't 12 say anything to you about it, ladies and 13 gentlemen, because we're not here for Jeremy. 14 We're here for some other reason. 15 Now, ladies and gentlemen, let's talk about 16 what happened here. You heard, gummy bears, gummy 17 bears. Every three days gummy bears, that's what 18 you will hear from Mrs. Varano, gummy bears, gummy 19 bears. 20 You heard -- you may hear from the father, 21 Mr. Bohn, who talked a lot about gummy bears. 22 Now, it doesn't take a dentist to tell you that 23 gummy bears are going to cause your teeth to rot. 24 It doesn't tell you -- take a dentist to tell you 25 that.

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Hulslander 2 MR. HIGGINS: Objection. 3 MR. HULSLANDER: It doesn't take --MR. HIGGINS: Objection. 4 5 THE COURT: Mr. Hulslander. Would counsel 6 approach, please. 7 (A discussion off the record at the Bench, all counsel present.) 8 9 THE COURT: Sustained. 10 MR. HULSLANDER: Now, you heard Mr. First 11 talk about what was going on with Jeremy's teeth. 12 We know, even though Kelly Varano testified that 13 she brushed them every day herself, and she even 14 took floss and flossed them every day herself. 15 But we also know that with an infected, 16 abscessed tooth, that that was developing over a 17 long period of time. Starts with a cavity. 18 Starts with a cavity. Then the cavity gets 19 deeper. Time passes. Tooth begins to die and rot and becomes infected with bacteria over time. 20 21 And we know, ladies and gentlemen, that he 22 went to see his pediatrician. His pediatrician, 23 who is not a dentist, looked at his mouth, said, 24 he's got an infection from an abscess tooth, and 25 not only does he have an infection from an abscess

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Hulslander tooth or teeth, but he has rampant decay. So his teeth have been in a condition which requires dental treatment. His teeth.

You know in some ways, gee, thank the Lord that there was this abscess and infection because the pediatrician got him to a dentist, Dr. Patel, a family dentist. Not a pediatric dentist. A family dentist, and the family dentist couldn't do a thing. And why was that?

Well, Mrs. Varano says, uhm, he just was stubborn and wouldn't open up his mouth. Well, Dr. Patel says he was very, very uncooperative. Out of control. Not able to be treated. He referred her to Small Smiles to be treated for this infection, this abscess, this decay.

And he went to Small Smiles and they examined him, and they treated him, and they treated him for that abscess, and they got him better from that abscess and that infection. They took those teeth out.

Why? Because everyone knows that infection can endanger you. It can endanger your health.

It can endanger your safety. It can lead to other problems, certainly. They took those teeth out.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Hulslander
The teeth were causing -- the decayed teeth were
causing this infection which was creating a risk
to Jeremy's health.
Now, Mr. Leyendecker talked about

Now, Mr. Leyendecker talked about unnecessary treatment. As if -- as if Jeremy's teeth were in pristine condition. He's got two abscessed teeth and yet he doesn't have any other cavities? No other problems? No other issues? Does that make sense?

Does that -- is that what you would expect if he's got two teeth so decayed and so infected that they actually have to be removed. Yet, oh, all this other treatment they were just doing it for money, according to Mr. Leyendecker.

These three dentists, who are licensed to practice dentistry, who have worked to help kids their -- not entire life, but certainly during their time at Small Smiles, they were risking their license by doing unnecessary treatment?

Well, let's back up. Do you really think that some -- a kid with that kind of progressed infection that's on antibiotics and has to have two teeth extracted indeed doesn't have any other cavity? No other problems?

٠.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Hulslander

Why? Because apparently Miss Varano brushed them every day and flossed them every day for two and a half years. Common sense. Common sense.

Yes, they did establish a treatment plan.

And you will hear -- you heard Mr. Leyendecker say, well, you know, procedures, you know, they were really addressing all these procedures just to make money.

Well, just think about it, if they didn't develop a treatment plan for this young man, he'd be back in that chair with more teeth needing to be pulled due to abscess and infection. So they indeed treated this man.

And they treated him -- treated this child over a period of time. And you'll see that in -- Mr. Leyendecker didn't really get past that October visit and there is a reason why, because Jeremy did well. He came in to that first visit, and just like with Dr. Patel, he was incredibly uncooperative. Couldn't even get his mouth open. Couldn't see inside his mouth and he continued to be that way, but he got better with the dentist over time.

He did not need to be papoosed for his own

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Hulslander safety. He was able to go to the dentist without being papoosed, and they saw him multiple times after September 26th, when my client bought FORBA.

And you know what, Jeremy actually improved during that time, and not only did he -- his behavior improve, but his teeth improved. And you will hear from the experts, ladies and gentlemen, that it's important to take care of baby teeth.

Don't think for one minute that you can let those teeth rot and those -- that term "rot" that isn't my word, that's his father's word. His father said "his teeth were rotting. I could see some rot there." So he knew. His father knew.

Certainly, we know that his dental hygiene improved. That his mouth improved. He went to Dr. Bellini after this and he didn't have any problem with the dentist and he's had no further problems with teeth. Thank God he got the treatment that he got from Small Smiles.

Oh, yeah. But let's not think about that.

What is that? Let's not think about the good treatment he got from these three dentists. Why?

Because you remember what Mr. Leyendecker started with here, started with this statement, is it

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Hulslander 2 proper for a corporation to pressure and influence 3 doctors to perform more procedures on their 4 patients and threaten them with their jobs if they 5 don't? 6 Let's look at that statement. As you know, 7 that's not the issue. Not more procedures. He 8 needs to prove that they were pressuring and 9 influencing the doctors to perform malpractice. 10 He's got to prove malpractice. Not just 11 that he was -- they were performing more 12 procedures. He's got to establish that this was 13 malpractice by these three dentists. That's what 14 he's got to establish and that's why he wants you 15 just to sort of, well, yeah, they did more 16 procedures but, you know, the truth is, ladies and 17 gentlemen, he's got to show malpractice. 18 MR. HIGGINS: Objection, Judge. Misstates 19 the law. 20 MR. HULSLANDER: Now --21 MR. HIGGINS: Objection. 22 MR. HULSLANDER: Now --23 THE COURT: Overruled. 24 MR. HULSLANDER: Thank you. Now, let's 25 look at this statement right here because it's a

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Hulslander good one. But I have to change it. Just change it just a little. Okay.

Is it proper for a corporation to pressure and influence dentists -- is it proper for a corporation to pressure and influence dentists to work harder and help more kids and if they don't to let these dentists go.

You know, all these 195 documents that they are going to show you, none of them, none of them encourage the dentists or pressure the dentists to commit malpractice. None of them say, well, do pulpotomies whether these kids need them or they don't. None of them say that.

What they do say is they want the dentists to work harder and produce more. Just like any employer would. Just like any dentist would who worked for himself. The harder you work, the more you bill, the more you make.

Come on! Yes! They want him to work harder, and the ones that didn't work hard and do what they needed to do were let go. Because FORBA -- by the way, FORBA, FORBA, "For Better Access." That's where FORBA came from, "For Better Access." Helping kids.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Hulslander

Oh, yes, these guys made money. And, boy, Mr. Leyendecker stood here and four times he pointed his finger, I guess that's what they do maybe in Texas, but pointed his finger at these gentlemen like they are criminals because they made some money. That's not nice. That ain't right, not in America.

So, ladies and gentlemen, you'll see e-mails, you'll see e-mails that were colorfully worded to say the least. You'll see e-mails that involve private e-mails that no one really expected anyone to see, like you guys that have ever sent an e-mail, and I'm sure that they wished they worded it differently or wish they didn't send. I hit the send button, ooh.

You will see e-mails that look to inflame
you. That are about the offices in Topeka and
Boise and Albuquerque, out west, Denver, Pueblo.

You know what, they still have to prove that it happened in the Syracuse office and that there is some connection. And I only heard Mr.

Leyendecker talk about one e-mail. And, yes, there were performance reviews; and yes, the performance reviews wanted doctors to work harder

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens 2 and produce more and perform more good work for 3 these kids that needed it. 4 And yet these gentlemen right here, they're 5 criminals? They're criminals? 6 Jeremy Bohn, ladies and gentlemen, is a 7 success story. It's a FORBA success story that 8 you're about to hear. Keep your eye on the ball 9 and don't get caught in the drama of this case. 10 Thank you. 11 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hulslander. 12 MR. STEVENS: I have some help. Dr. 13 Bonds, Dr. Aman, and Dr. Kohn who pronounces his 14 name "Haun" who you haven't yet met, three 15 dentists treating children. 16 You deserve to know something about these 17 individuals so you can -- can make a decision, 18 informed decision as to how they act, what their 19 mission was, what their goals and aspirations were 20 for their own careers and for the children they 21 helped. 22 Dr. Bonds was born in South Carolina. Went 23 to Howard University College of Dentistry. 24 Graduated. Was able to secure one of the vaunted 25 residencies in this country at Columbia University

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens and took a course called Advance Education in General Dentistry, and that was a residency which was geared for idealists all about public health and serving the underserved.

Primary care was the topic of this residency. Going out in to the community and treating patients at Phoenix House and covering drug addicts, going to a clinic in PS-2 in New York City right there in the school. Going into a home for -- a group home for teens with special problems.

Taking his turn on the mobile van that goes into the largely Dominican neighborhood around Columbia University and treating people who had no other access.

And also working in the dental clinic on the 8th floor of Columbia Presbyterian Hospital. This opened Dr. Bonds' eyes to a segment of society that often sees the dentist when it is too late.

Teeth that are lost, health that is ruined that doesn't have to be, and he learned what can be done by an individual.

Dr. Bonds didn't stop there. His next residency, and he applied for it, and he got one

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens at Harlem Hospital. Harlem hospital in New York City, and there he worked in the hospital, and for that year treating sick patients for their dental problems, patients in the HIV clinic, patients with diabetes, patients with oral cancers, patients from the community. Patients who couldn't afford private specialists and were grateful for the help and patients who needed help because this -- the mouth was the last thing that they were thinking about helping.

At Harlem Hospital he met his wife. She was here from the Syracuse area. That's how he ended up in Syracuse, because he found that there was a place opening up that was serving the underserved, and he made an application and within -- this is now a couple of years later, he gets a job in 2005, I believe, at Small Smiles clinic, and they are doing exactly what he wants to do with his life, they are giving him an opportunity to treat one poor kid after another, to make a difference in their lives and he knows it and he believes it, and he likes this work.

Dr. Bonds didn't start off at Small Smiles as a dentist. He started off as a dental

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens assistant, and for a year he worked chairside to the lead dentist, Dr. Bob Turner. And that further education, that clinical -- that observational time he spent working chairside with all the kids who came in was training. It was training in how to do this work well.

When Jeremy Bohn came in to see Dr. Bonds that's who he saw on the first visit. He came in as a kid who had what dentists call rampant caries. A technical term from the pediatric dentist is ECC, early childhood caries. It's the infectious disease you heard about.

There was a fluoride treatment applied there. They want to stabilize whatever they can. But the big thing is he needed care. You heard more of the story than I really have to tell you everything that happened before he came to us is kind of proof of what went on.

There were three generalized things that Dr. Bonds found that were important to the diagnosis of Jeremy.

He found that the caries, the decay, were generalized, meaning all over and that is a sign that you are at risk because kids with generalized

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens decay, and it is typically kids that have not had dental treatment before they run the risk of getting worse.

Going through the mouth. He found here poor oral hygiene, and they found that he had a high caries risk assessment and that's the thing that says, we're worried for his future.

You know that Jeremy was out of control.

They wrote that exact phrase on the sheet. But it's been suggested to you that in order to help Jeremy, that he was just in the very almost -- phrase that was used "strapped down."

What you will see is one of these papooses, one of these cocoons, and it has two blankets that come over with Velcro. They don't use any hand straps at Small Smiles.

The papoose is the last option that Dr.

Bonds uses, not the first, contrary to what is being suggested to you. Techniques are used.

Methods are taught that you are chairside and taught him all the various types of things to try, and you will hear about them during the course of the trial.

The key thing is he doesn't even consider

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens
doing what the child needs without the parent's
consent. You will see another page in this form
which is a consent form, and you know what the
consent form is the least part of the process, and

It is something to help get this done. Like it is having a parent or assistant hold a child who is, you know, moves. Movements are too dangerous for his own good with sharp, steel instruments in the mouth.

in another way, the papoose is the least part.

He explains the papoose. That's the important thing between the doctor and the patient, the dentist and the patient, the private communication. And what you heard on opening statement that as if he was told what to say, well, Dr. Bonds does not write what is in the -- in the consent form.

But he's the only one who decides what to tell the parents, and he tells the parents what he believes. This is needed and in this case he believed it was. The child won't like it. He'll continue to cry. There could be some swelling. Could even be a little bit of bruising. We hope there won't be, and in fact -- but in terms of

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens
this device, this -- these two blankets that wrap
around being safe, the way Dr. Bonds uses these,
uses this device, never too tight, never too long,
watching Jeremy every second. Watching the

patient every second.

He knows from his experience exactly how this is. He wouldn't say otherwise if he didn't believe it to be true. And, of course, it wasn't too tight. It was very short -- very short period of time, and when I say watching him every second, I mean his face is in the patient's face almost down. You can't be closer. You can't be more attentive than that relationship.

So Jeremy has twelve teeth that have decay, and they are seen by Dr. Bonds on the very first day and they make these marks, these little marks in this identity gram to indicate which of the teeth have decay, and if you count them up, there are twelve of those teeth that have decay. That's two with the abscesses and ten of those and made a treatment plan, not for all twelve, but for eleven of those, and two had to be extracted, and over time, all the rest were dealt with. Over time.

In fact, one of the later treatment plan

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens deals with that 12th teeth -- 12th tooth and that's actually kind of interesting one, on the sixth visit, by the way, I should have had a little chronology up here for you, because you deserve it, but Jeremy came to Small Smiles and came to see Dr. Bonds and Dr. Aman and Dr. Khan ten times.

On the sixth visit, he sees Dr. Kahn, and Dr. Kahn is the lead dentist and Dr. Kahn addresses to "S" which is already to be seen to be a problem, and he says, I think that this tooth will need on the next visit a pulpotomy.

On the next visit when he examines the tooth to determine -- by the way, you need a pulpotomy if the nerve is going to be involved because you don't -- an inflamed or infected nerve underneath the crown or you will have problems later.

What does Dr. Kahn do on that 7th visit?

Although the mother has already agreed and signed off on the proposed treatment plan to perform a pulpotomy, on examination, Dr. Kahn finds, I don't need to do that.

He doesn't say this is money on the table.

My goal is to get this in for the company. He

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens says, Jeremy doesn't need this. I'm not doing it. That's the kind of thing we are dealing with in this case.

On the second visit, Jeremy comes in and sees this sweet man sitting back there, Dr. Naveed Aman. And in the clinics they are known by their first name. The kids know them as Dr. Naveed, know Dr. Bonds is Dr. Koury, K-O-U-R-Y. And Dr. Naveed sees Jeremy on the second visit. And you say, is there a continuity of care, you know, do they talk to each other?

Well, they work side by side and talk to each other all the time, and the fact that Dr.

Naveed now goes in and examines Jeremy on the second visit, it's like having -- it's like having a second opinion and get to check each other's work and see what is going on and you get to give the best care.

Now, I'll go back to his real name, Dr.

Aman. Dr. Aman was a dentist who was trained in Pakistan, and after going through the finest dental school in Pakistan and taking residency there, he worked for seven years as a dentist before he came to this country.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens

His father is a physician who is an academic physician with an interest in public health and still teaches at age 77.

Dr. Aman is proud to carry on a tradition.

He's the oldest brother in the family. When he came to this country, already as a trained, experienced practicing dentist, seeing a population of kids who needed care.

He trained again at Boston University

College of Dentistry. He was trained twice. And he performed his own residency here, and while at Boston University, I think he interviewed with Small Smiles.

So Dr. Aman who is both qualified and motivated sees Jeremy who has -- who is one of these kids with ECC, early childhood caries and just wants to stabilize the mouth.

Those four bad front teeth which have already been found by Dr. Bonds to at least need fillings now three more months have past and decay is a little further, and when he examines Jeremy, he goes out and tells the mom, I think I need to do a little more to stabilize your son.

They stabilize the inside of the tooth which

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens
is the pulpotomy, and put those little white
crowns on you heard about. And the key thing is
they were successful. They were 100 percent

successful. They stood Jeremy in good stead.

new ones come in.

Unlike fillings in the upper front teeth
which can sometimes fall out and sometimes not
work and sometimes have new cavities form around
them and have infection, these are secure and
stable, and it worked and Jeremy kept those teeth
until they were ready to leave his mouth and the

So I told you something about Dr. Bonds, and I told you something about Dr. Aman. Dr. Kahn has a very similar story in terms of his training in Pakistan and second training also at Boston University. And you heard that Dr. Khan, the lead dentist, one that also has to deal with all these e-mails that what they call the pressure to produce and the -- to get everyone to be more efficient, Dr. Khan is the one who turns down the work, who proves him wrong, who says, it's been agreed to, it's been signed off on and been given permission, but I'm not doing it because it's in Jeremy's best interest not to.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al Opening/Stevens

You heard the other lawyers here talk about the fact that Jeremy is doing well. Well, the evidence will show that that's the truth.

We engaged a psychologist, Frank Doberman who looked at the records, the testimony, the education, school, medical, hospital, other records, just everything and interviewed Jeremy, and Jeremy is doing great.

And he's a delightful boy, and after talking with Jeremy for 30, 45 minutes, and asking him some pretty good questions, having him make drawings that are pretty interesting, smiling family, funny sense of humor, calls his sister "the she devil," the -- at the end of the interview, Dr. Doberman, who is a child and family psychologist, asked Jeremy, is there anything else that I should have asked you or I didn't?

And Jeremy replied to him, you forgot to ask me how awesome I am. How awesome I am. This is Jeremy in a nutshell.

And on behalf of Dr. Aman and Dr. Bonds, I hope to think we can take credit for him being awesome. That we helped him on his way to good health. We helped him on his way to good oral

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 health for whatever little bit that played in 3 making Jeremy what he is today and we're proud. 4 At the end of this case, when they ask the 5 question, did my three clients act in a reasonable 6 and prudent manner as would other dentists under 7 the same circumstances, I urge you that the answer 8 will be, yes, they did. Thank you. 9 THE COURT: Thank you. Okay. We are done 10 with opening statements. I want you to have a 11 good four days, five days. I will see you on 12 Monday morning. We will start again at 9:00 a.m.. 13 I'm going to remind you of this every day, 14 don't talk about the case with anybody. Don't do 15 any research at all on any parties or issues in 16 this case. Thank you very much. Enjoy the nice 17 afternoon. 18 (Jury excused.) 19 (Open Court, all counsel present, outside the 20 presence of the Jury.) 21 THE COURT: Okay. Uhm, I've got gotten 22 through the deposition transcripts. I just was a 23 little bit confused, and I don't think I actually 24 brought this stuff down. Everybody can we seated. 25 Mr. Hulslander, you submitted some

1	Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al
2	additional pages for the Adair deposition.
3	MR. HULSLANDER: Counter designations.
4	THE COURT: Counter designations, and you
5	have in someplaces like a single line, and then
6	there's a single line right below it. I don't
7	have the document.
8	MR. HULSLANDER: I know why because they
9	left out the line. They like go down, and then if
10	you looked at their designations, they would leave
11	out a line from time to time.
12	THE COURT: Okay. So they weren't because
13	it was like they were two together. One line and
14	then one line after that.
15	MR. HULSLANDER: Yes.
16	THE COURT: You didn't mean you wanted to
17	designate the stretch between those two? Those
18	were just single line you wanted to add?
19	MR. HULSLANDER: Okay. Can I check it. I
20	mean I did that a week ago, Judge, at two o'clock
21	in the morning so I mean I can't
22	THE COURT: Sure. Sure.
23	MR. HULSLANDER: Can I check it and let
24	you know?
25	THE COURT: Sure. I guess what I need to

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 talk with you guys about, I want to rule on the 3 motions. I want to tell you what transcript 4 portions are coming in. I'm going to need to know 5 that answer before I can finalize that. 6 Do you want to come back this afternoon at 7 some point and -- but I would want Mr. Hulslander, 8 your designations. I think everything else I 9 understood. 10 I did not yet do Andrus and Knott, who were 11 the defendants' designations because that's not 12 going to happen on the plaintiff's case, so I 13 haven't gotten to those yet. 14 MR. LEYENDECKER: Your Honor, we are --15 THE COURT: Not Andrus. Knott, Reilly. Reilly. 16 17 MR. HULSLANDER: Reilly. 18 MR. FRANKEL: Your Honor --19 THE COURT: Andrus, Knott's I haven't done 20 either. Those are the individuals, though, who 21 are suppose to be coming to testify so I haven't 22 done their transcripts yet either. 23 MR. FRANKEL: Your Honor, the designations 24 they made in the last three or four days that were 25 the subject of our motion to exclude, we haven't

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al had a chance to object to those.

I mean we -- our position was we have them very light, we didn't believe that they were timely, and we moved, and so if Your Honor is inclined to let them put them in any way, we at least would like the opportunity to review them and file objections.

THE COURT: Certainly I will give you that opportunity to do that. But, you know, what I did was I just read every transcript. I took a blue pen for New FORBA, a red pen for Old FORBA, added the new line next to the new designations, wrote on if it is an objection, so my transcripts are all marked up.

Thankfully the plaintiff had done a great job of marking up the transcripts with the defendants' first set of designations so I had to add all the new stuff that came in.

You are free to object. I won't -- I won't rule, but I tried to make rulings based on the law.

MR. LEYENDECKER: Your Honor, let me see if I can simplify that. We are ones that took those depositions, and I'm the one that prepared

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al the few objections you may have seen to some of the original counter designations. I don't think there will be a lot of objections since we took them. So I'm not worried we will have a big issue that somehow you exerted a lot of energy and come back and say we won't want you to redo that. I will say I don't really have a good feel how much more they put back in the last few days, and I just didn't get a sense of that. I'm not anticipating a lot of objections. 12 THE COURT: So I'm certainly glad to take that. What I did was I looked at the transcripts. You know, I looked to generally what objections might come in.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For the most part, there were portions of the counter designations that don't really qualify as counter designations because, you know, they're suppose to help elicit the part that is already put in, so to the extent that -- that some of it was just a totally new subject or that, I didn't need you to tell me that it's not proper.

But I will take your objections so I was trying to do this so that you could get your videotapes edited. Tell me when it is you will

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 submit your objections and I'm glad to -- I'm 3 guessing it won't be that much time for me. I 4 don't mind doing it again, those parts, but when 5 do you want -- when are you going to want to have 6 your video? 7 MR. LEYENDECKER: I will make it easy for 8 you. We will deal with what you done so far. We 9 will live -- you read the transcripts and called 10 it cover to cover, you've seen it, we will live 11 with what you got there. 12 THE COURT: Okay. And to the extent that 13 the defendants think that it's without having a 14 formal objection the reason why I'm doing that is 15 because you guys were late with those 16 designations. 17 And so I'm -- I ruled based on what the law 18 is on those portions of the transcripts. The 19 alternative was that I just exclude the late 20 designations. So the defendants have any problem 21 with that? Do you want to see their --22 plaintiff's objections before I rule? 23 MR. HULSLANDER: Plaintiff's objections? 24 THE COURT: To your counter designations. 25 MR. HULSLANDER: He just said he wasn't

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 going to object. 3 MR. LEYENDECKER: I'm saying --THE COURT: No. No. I think what he is 4 5 saying is he's going to go with what I have ruled 6 without formally objecting. However, I want the 7 record ---MR. HULSLANDER: Isn't that the same 8 9 thing? He's not objecting. MR. LEYENDECKER: Can I ask a technical 10 11 question? 12 THE COURT: Yes. 13 MR. LEYENDECKER: There what Your Honor 14 just described as counter designations might sort 15 of complete or balance the testimony that is being 16 offered. Then there is what you described as new 17 stuff. 18 My understanding in the plaintiff's case is 19 the counter designations may come in as part of 20 their case, but the new stuff can only be offered 21 by them in their part of the case or am I missing 22 what you are describing, Your Honor? 23 THE COURT: Well, I guess I'm not saying 24 that it comes in their case or not because they 25 were there witnesses. I guess there's a lot that

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 would go into the mix of whether new parts can 3 come in from those transcripts. 4 MR. HULSLANDER: You know, Judge, I'm 5 not -- as long as you accepted our counter 6 designations, I'm fine. I'm going to go with what 7 you decided and --THE COURT: Okay. 8 9 MR. HULSLANDER: -- I mean it's not like 10 it's a critical part. It's critical that we get 11 read stuff that they omitted. 12 However, we're going to live by your ruling, 13 so let's move on. I will live by your ruling and 14 I will -- I'm not going to continue to raise 15 objections. 16 THE COURT: I hear what you're saying, Mr. 17 Hulslander. I think the concern that I have is I 18 want a record because I have no doubt that 19 whatever happens in this case it's going up on 20 review. 21 So what I'm saying to you is to the extent I 22 may have crossed out some of your counter 23 designations on the theory that they weren't 24 properly counter designations, are you saying that 25 you're waiving any objection to that fact that the

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 plaintiffs didn't formally make an objection? 3 MR. HULSLANDER: No. What I'm saying is 4 you're going to rule, and I don't think you need 5 to take exception to your rulings in order for us to get to the Fourth Department. That's not the 6 7 law any more. So I'm not -- if I wanted to -- if I want --8 9 if I want to fight about something you ruled on, I 10 will let you know. And if we -- if you're going 11 to say that we can't bring in parts of the 12 deposition unless it's purely responsive, even 13 though they were asking the questions and these 14 witnesses are unavailable, then I don't know, I 15 have to see what you did. I'm not thinking it 16 will be a lot. It's not going to be tremendously 17 complex. 18 MR. LEYENDECKER: I simply read the 19 depositions. If they wanted to ask there own 20 questions --21 MR. HULSLANDER: They can ask their own 22 questions. 23 MR. LEYENDECKER: -- free to do what they 24 wanted to do or not want to do. 25 MR. HULSLANDER: Sure.

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al

MR. FIRST: Your Honor, the counter designations that don't relate directly to what they are offering can come in at some point if it's otherwise relevant to the case.

So I just don't know. It's just maybe adding another step if that's the grounds for keeping it out because we can read that in our own case, certainly.

THE COURT: This is what I'm going to do,
I want the plaintiffs to -- I want the record to
be preserved. If I'm taking your objections late
and counter designations, I'm going to give the
plaintiffs an opportunity to make objections to
the counter designations.

I want the record to be complete. So you can submit that to me. What that means is that if you can have -- respond to those by, you know, tomorrow at some point then --

MR. LEYENDECKER: If I can get those before lunch, I can get it back to you by three o'clock this afternoon with comments on them.

THE COURT: Okay. Then do you want to come back tomorrow for me to tell you what my rulings are alternatively because I'm the nice

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al person, I'm glad to have them scanned in and you can -- I just crossed out -- you will see where I crossed out the transcripts. I think I should probably not offer up my secretary that way, but scan in the transcripts.

MR. LEYENDECKER: I think, Your Honor, if we can get our hands on them PDQ, which we'll study them, get them back this afternoon, and the defendants will have a chance to look at that and see what they want to do, if anything.

MR. HULSLANDER: There is another issue, though, because Mr. Higgins e-mails us last night and says that the father, Mr. Bohn, is not coming and that they're going to offer his deposition.

So if that's true, then they need to designate what they will read, even though it is late. You know, I'm not going to file an Order to Show Cause to preclude them from offering that deposition. It's not the way I practice. But I will do -- I do think we are entitled to see what they are going to read to this jury.

MR. HIGGINS: I totally agree with that,

Judge. It was on the agenda for today. Mr. Bohn
is a nonparty. He was deposed in the fall of 2012

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al with Kelly Varano and everyone, Jeremy Bohn. We were planning to call him on Friday, September 21st, when the case was suppose to start on the 16th. Okay. He is currently a short haul trucker. He is on Saturday morning. He's taking a bus to Minnesota, Greyhound bus, and he will be gone training for a long haul trucking position for approximately two or three weeks. He doesn't know, it's up to them.

So basically my understanding is under 3117-A3, small 2, he is now out of the state so at this point either party will be able to read in testimony substantively and so, or if he comes back, we would like to call him out of turn. I don't know if he will come back or not. So I did tell them that yesterday and so you know I can do that in the next hour. He's not a critical witness.

The defendants obviously want to use him because the word "rot" is in that transcript.

They can substantively do that. It's not a counter designation. Because if he is out of the state, then they can read it on their case and we understand that. So just that is -- that is an

1	Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al
2	issue, and I'll get that I think I have a
3	transcript here. He's a nonparty. It's like a
4	100 pages. It's not a video. Doesn't have to be
5	cut. Okay. So.
6	MR. HULSLANDER: I think they missed the
7	deadline.
8	MR. HIGGINS: Well, we're more than
9	willing to be have Mr. Bohn precluded if this
10	Court
11	MR. HULSLANDER: Well
12	MR. HIGGINS: Excuse me, let me finish
13	counsel.
14	MR. HULSLANDER: Don't point at me.
15	MR. HIGGINS: Let me finish.
16	MR. HULSLANDER: Do not point at me.
17	THE COURT: Hey, gentlemen!
18	MR. HIGGINS: We are willing to preclusion
19	of Mr. Bohn if this Court wants to preclude all
20	the other witnesses, either way we will invite the
21	Court's ruling.
22	MR. FIRST: Your Honor, since we are
23	moving on to these other issues, you know, under
24	the rule of goose versus gander, I have been
25	served, and everything on the defense side has

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al been served with new designations on exhibits as well way past Your Honor's deadline. I also don't practice that way. I didn't want to bring on an Order to Show Cause, but I feel constrained to ask the Court to consider rejecting the use of any of those exhibits that have been provided late by the plaintiffs.

MR. FRANKEL: Well, Your Honor, I don't know how Mr. First practices, but he might want to read your order, which is dated July 10. It says paragraph two, the parties are expected to make a good faith effort to include all exhibits that they may use at trial, at trial, but will not be precluded from -- from adding to their exhibit list before or during trial. That's your order.

THE COURT: That's an order that somebody here drafted that I signed. Probably in a state of stupor of some kind.

MR. LEYENDECKER: Just to be clear on how much, I'll take responsibility for it. I went from about 350 or 375 down to 190. I think I might have added a handful or less that weren't part of that 350. I was thinking maybe I been doing us favor by cutting in half and putting in a

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 couple that I missed going through. So I will 3 heat whatever heat I have to favor that. THE COURT: Miss Marangas? 4 5 MS. MARANGAS: Morning, Your Honor. If I 6 may indulge the Court. We asked for an 7 opportunity to revisit the plaintiff's Order to 8 Show Cause regarding the preclusion of Dr. 9 Bellini. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MS. MARANGAS: Certainly every 12 opportunity, Your Honor, we will seek to reduce 13 the number of witnesses and the length of the 14 testimony of the witnesses that will be testifying 15 in this case. Our witness disclosure list went out 16 17 properly on August 23rd, 2013 in compliance with 18 your order, Your Honor. 19 At that time, we had not made a decision on 20 Dr. Bellini. Dr. Bellini has been known to the 21 plaintiffs all along in this case. He is the only 22 subsequent treating dentist. In fact, the 23 plaintiffs have reserved at times to use him as a 24 witness in this case. They certainly knew about 25 his records or familiar with his records.

Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al

It took substantial time to continue to get updated records from Dr. Bellini, and Mr. McPhilliamy, who is in the back of the courtroom here, has been making extensive efforts to get those records from Dr. Bellini and to actually supply them to the plaintiffs and everybody else in this case, so absolutely no prejudice in our disclosing Dr. Bellini; and yes, it was, in fact, added to our list ten days later on September 3, 2013, well before the beginning of this trial.

And he is a known treater in the case.

There is no reason that the plaintiffs can claim prejudice in this case or surprise. We also had an issue with expired Arons Authorizations, and we were attempting to get updated Arons

Authorizations in order to talk to Dr. Bellini subsequently about the treatment to make a decision regarding whether to produce at this trial. We're not looking to make this trial any longer than it has to be, Your Honor.

We proceed to have Dr. Bellini added to the witness list and the right to potentially call him based upon the proof in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 MS. MARANGAS: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Somebody want to be heard on 4 behalf of the plaintiffs. 5 MR. LEYENDECKER: Your Honor, I'll just 6 say this on the Arons Authorizations, we gave 7 them -- I believe I have to go see exactly who we 8 gave them a pile of those in November of 2011. 9 And I remember now coming back to me is about 30 10 days or so we were suppose to start a trial 11 getting a request that says, can you please get me 12 new Arons for Jeremy right now, and I don't have 13 any idea what they did or didn't do between 14 November of 2011 and 30 days ago. 15 So we know who Dr. Bellini is. I -- this --16 I -- the real problem want to call him -- don't 17 want to call him, they do. I don't know what do 18 they want to do. "Let us know" I think is really 19 where we are. 20 MR. FRANKEL: Really the preclusion 21 motion, Your Honor, was really about -- I don't 22 want to go back to the hotel today, look on the 23 web, on my file and serve and see the next witness 24 and the next witness. 25 Last night we didn't talk about it, Mr.

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al

Andrus, Dr. Andrus we now have designations that was after I served the preclusion and a week after you had ordered that he come.

They're filing designations. We want some more testimony from Dr. Andrus. We have to -- I thought the purpose of your order, and it's obviously common in Federal court, is to have an efficient system so you start to narrow things so we go from 300 exhibits to 190, we have fewer witnesses and decide not to use experts so we can have a more efficient thing, not that we expand it and every day there is another witness we want to add and another witness we want to add.

So that is really the purpose of the motion with respect to Dr. Bellini. It is just -- it has to stop. We can't keep adding is what I'm -- that's our position. And we just ask that you enforce the order that you signed, otherwise you might as well tear it up if the deadlines don't mean anything.

THE COURT: I don't have to tear it up because you guys already tore it up. All right.

My -- what I'm going to do right now is I haven't gotten -- I don't think I have any more

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 designations last night. I'm not sure. Maybe I 3 did. 4 MR. HULSLANDER: No, it was Monday. He is 5 wrong. I did Andrus on Sunday. I served it on 6 Monday. He's wrong. Didn't get mine yesterday. 7 He got mine on Monday morning and there is about 15 of them. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. HULSLANDER: Believe me, you know. 11 THE COURT: So because everyone seems to 12 think my time is unlimited, too, I'm going to make 13 everybody come back tomorrow. We're going to be 14 here at nine o'clock. I'm going to give rulings 15 on I hope everything that is outstanding. And 16 other than your objections to the counter 17 designations that you just received, is there 18 anything else that I will be expecting to receive 19 from you guys today? 20 MR. HULSLANDER: I'm going to fix Adair. 21 THE COURT: You're going to fix Adair for 22 me, right. Okay. 23 MR. FIRST: I just got designations during 24 this trial this morning on Richard Lane who is a 25 witness who worked for us and was deposed. I

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 haven't looked at it yet, but I saw that it came 3 in. MR. LEYENDECKER: Let me -- we started 4 5 like exhibits, Your Honor, we started with this 6 much on Richard Lane and we -- I have done work 7 down -- it is this. There is nothing new in there. I have taken it from here down to here. 8 9 Unfortunately, sounds like you may very well 10 done a lot of work. I'm sorry for that. We have 11 not had it -- we have gone from here to here on 12 Lane. MR. FIRST: I haven't seen it. I saw that 13 14 it came in. 15 THE COURT: Okay. So nine o'clock 16 tomorrow morning. We don't have to have all of 17 you guys come back in. I'm sure your clients 18 might appreciate a little -- I understand there 19 has been some money flowing around here that maybe 20 not everybody needs to be here tomorrow morning. 21 MR. HULSLANDER: What are we doing 22 tomorrow, going through the designations? 23 THE COURT: I will let you know what the 24 designations are and the transcripts. I will rule 25 on the motion with respect to the late disclosed

1	Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al
2	witnesses. Yeah, the deposition objection and
3	counter designations. And perhaps we'll spend a
4	few moments going over the witnesses again. Do we
5	have any more idea whether Andrus and Knott
6	MR. HULSLANDER: They're not coming.
7	THE COURT: They're not coming?
8	MR. HULSLANDER: I mean I'm going to try
9	to get I keep trying to get them to come. Do
10	we have an order signed by Your Honor on that?
11	THE COURT: On what?
12	MR. HULSLANDER: On the compelling me to
13	bring Andrus and Knott? Because I need that order
14	signed so that I can try to compel them even more
15	than I already am.
16	THE COURT: Well, I looked at so many
17	papers in the last week, I can't tell you if I
18	signed that order or didn't sign that order. But
19	my Law Clerk is back here in the corner, and she
20	reviews all orders before I do. Did I get that?
21	THE CLERK: You did. You signed it.
22	MR. HULSLANDER: Okay.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	MR. HULSLANDER: If I can get that order,
25	that will help me maybe get them here, but

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 unlikely. 3 THE COURT: So if I signed it, my 4 secretary, just like my Court Clerk and my Law 5 Clerk, who are all awesome, would have already 6 sent it to you because I didn't sign that order 7 today. MR. HULSLANDER: Because I didn't get it 8 9 and he didn't get it. MR. FRANKEL: Your Honor asked us to 10 11 submit it to you. We submitted it, I think, 12 Monday. 13 MR. HULSLANDER: Monday. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. FRANKEL: Monday morning? I lost 16 track of the day. I think Monday morning I 17 brought it to Janice and said, here are the orders 18 you asked for. 19 THE COURT: I probably signed it yesterday. And did you get it to me yesterday? 20 21 MR. HULSLANDER: If we can get it. 22 THE COURT: And Janice would have -- she 23 filed orders in Small Smiles yesterday afternoon. 24 So my guess is she -- what does he do e-mail them 25 to you?

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 MR. HULSLANDER: Yes. 3 MR. FRANKEL: Maybe coming. 4 MR. HULSLANDER: Okay. THE COURT: You will have it now, I'm 5 6 sure. If you don't have it right now, if you want 7 to come upstairs, we will make sure you get a 8 copy. 9 MR. LEYENDECKER: Last question, Your 10 Honor, where can I find your marked up transcripts 11 so I can review those and have it back to you this 12 afternoon, all the depositions? 13 MR. HULSLANDER: Doing that tomorrow now. 14 MR. LEYENDECKER: I thought you let us 15 look at those, and I will get back to you this 16 afternoon with any objections on them on the new 17 stuff. 18 THE COURT: No. What I was -- so to the 19 extent there have been new counter designations, 20 what I want you to do is to identify any 21 objections you have to those counter designations 22 that were received after August 30th. 23 MR. LEYENDECKER: Okay. That may take 24 longer than three this afternoon. I thought I 25 would be looking at the transcripts marked up by

1 Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al 2 the end of the day today. No problem. 3 THE COURT: That's fine. MR. HULSLANDER: We can come and look at 4 them before tomorrow at nine? No? Now we will 5 6 come back here at nine and go through them 7 together? 8 THE COURT: I will tell you what I'm going 9 to do. Either I'll -- yeah, I will rule tomorrow 10 morning on the outstanding issues I have before 11 me, and I will let you know what transcript 12 portions are coming in. 13 MR. HIGGINS: Judge, one final 14 housekeeping issue, during Mr. Stevens' closing, 15 he referred to two exhibits -- I'm sorry, his 16 opening sorry. 17 THE COURT: I only wish it was the 18 closing. 19 MR. HIGGINS: We had seen those exhibits 20 beforehand. We didn't have any objection. I 21 notice they weren't identified for the record. 22 They are still not identified. I ask that they be 23 identified so we know what the are jurors looking 24 at during the opening. 25 THE COURT: Okay. You can have that

1	Bohn v. Small Smiles, et al
2	marked.
3	MS. MARANGAS: I can take care of that,
4	Your Honor. Defendant's No. ABK 1243-A with
5	today's date of September 18, 2013.
6	THE COURT: Anything else? See you
7	tomorrow morning at nine.
8	MS. MARANGAS: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	(Proceedings adjourned.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	