ASHLEY PARTLOW,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case Number: 24-C-09-008243

KENNEDY KRIEGER INSTITUTE, INC.,
et al.,

Defendants.

REPORTER'S OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS (Excerpt - Defense Opening Statement)

Baltimore, Maryland

Tuesday, October 21, 2019

BEFORE:

HONORABLE LAWRENCE P. FLETCHER-HILL, Associate Judge (and a jury)

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

BRIAN S. BROWN, ESQUIRE

KRISTIN R. HOSSEINZADEH, ESQUIRE

For the Defendants:

MICHAEL B. BROWN, ESQUIRE

BARRY C. GOLDSTEIN, ESQUIRE

MICHAEL E. BLUMENFELD, ESQUIRE

* Proceedings digitally recorded *

Transcribed by:
PATRICIA A. TRIKERIOTIS
Official Court Reporter
111 N. Calvert Street
Suite 515, Courthouse East
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Р	a (g e
Opening Statement by Mr. Brown on Behalf of the Defendant		3	

PROCEEDINGS

		(Exc	cerpt -	- Opening	g Statement	bу	the	defense
began	at	3:02	p.m.)					

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Brown, when you're ready, you may proceed.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.

May it please the Court, courtroom personnel, the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, good afternoon.

I'd like to say hello. You know my name is Michael Brown.

Mr. Barry Goldstein, Mr. Michael Blumenfeld, also assisting in the trial.

Ms. Cecilia Davoli -- Dr. Cecilia Davoli will be the representative for Kennedy Krieger. She's been there for 29 and a half years working there. She is a doctor. You will see here in and out throughout the trial.

not evidence. And the reason that they tell you that is because people can say whatever they want and not have to back it up. Let me give you an example, Mr. Brown first came out and told you that we placed Ashley into the house. Then he came back up later and showed you a slide that said the landlord put up an advertisement that didn't even mention Kennedy Krieger; that Ms. Martin,

Ms. Partlow's mother, went and rented the house or didn't even know it that Kennedy Krieger was around or involved at all. He told you that.

First he told you one thing; then he told you another thing. This is why opening statements aren't true. And this is why they aren't evidence. Because people can say whatever they want, including things that aren't true or accurate.

The fact of that matter is is what Kennedy

Krieger was doing at that time was trying to get

landlords to do something in Baltimore. Those of us who

were around in the '80s and '90s know what it was like

for lead paint poisoning back there. Thousands and tens

of thousands of kids running around with lead poisoning.

Nobody doing nothing about it. The State couldn't help

them. The City couldn't help them. They didn't have the

resources.

Somebody had to try and do something. And that's what Kennedy Krieger did at no cost, with all that they had. And you can sit around and say that Kennedy Krieger was running around -- one of the things that was said was that Kennedy Krieger intentionally left lead in the house to poison people. Really, you all? Really?

Please listen to the evidence when you hear it in this case. Please listen to everything. And I ask

you to please wait until after you hear our side of the case so you can hear the true evidence of the case.

Because I'm certain that after you've heard it all, rather than what we've got running out of our mouths at opening statement, you will make the determination that Kennedy Krieger did nothing wrong. In fact, they did something to try to help solve the problem that was running rampant in Baltimore for decades when nobody else was doing anything about it.

Now, this is the caption of the case. It is
Ashley Partlow versus Ruth Marie Mayo. The question that
you're going to have to answer is whether or not Kennedy
Krieger was negligent. The answer to that question is
"No."

You're going to be asked whether or not we caused an injury to Ms. Partlow. The reality and the evidence will show you that the answer to that question is "No." And the reason why is because Mr. Brown is right about one thing that we agreed on, Ms. Partlow, unfortunately, had lead poisoning for years before she got to that Federal Street building. Any permanent injury that she was going to have was already done, most unfortunately, before she got there.

At least Kennedy Krieger, you will see from the evidence in this case, put her in a house where her blood

lead levels begin to drop and go down from the levels
that they were at from the many residences that she lived
at that poisoned her with lead. And the facts are going
to be undisputed in this case when you see that.

Mr. Brown talked about the burden of proof, and we talk about it too, because it's important that you realize that they have to prove by a preponderance of the evidence two things. One, that we substantially caused -- I'm too big to stand in front of the screen, I apologize.

(Laughter.)

MR. BROWN: I can't do like Mr. Brown and stand in front of you all -- caused her lead poisoning and her alleged injury. To have to cause, so that we prove that we did both of those things, I submit to you, the evidence will show that they cannot meet this burden at all.

Now, one, you hear an awful lot of talk already in opening statement about what landlords are supposed to be doing to a house. Landlords are supposed to be taking care of repairs. Landlords are supposed to be making sure houses are in habitable condition so that the tenants living there safely. We're not the landlord; Mr. Polakoff is.

She benefitted from the R&M Study, you will see

that as we go through the blood lead levels. And her blood lead levels went down while she lived at that house. That man showed you one test. Wait until I show you the rest of them. She went all the way down to a 13 from the 21 she had before she got there. But he didn't show you that; did he?

Now, Ms. Partlow is now working and successful.

And here's the problem I've got with these cases. What
you want to do is tell Ms. Partlow that whatever she's
doing now isn't good enough; that she can't be
successful, even though she's maintaining her own house,
taking care of her own child, got a job, got a car, like
most Americans in this country are doing. And you're
going to tell me she's not successful? That's crap.

And it's not fair to say that just to try and get money in a case like this and blame Kennedy Krieger for damages. She is successful, and you will see that when go through the evidence in this case. I wish some of my family members were as successful as she is. She was not injured by Kennedy Krieger at all in this case.

Now, Ms. Partlow claims that her lead poisoning was caused by -- and here's another thing you didn't hear in opening statement. She lived at 231 North Duncan Street between July 1992 and September 1993. Even she admits that she was lead poisoned there. And her experts

are going to tell you the same thing.

She lived at Linden Avenue, September 1993 to May 1994. And even Ms. Partlow's witnesses are going to tell you that she was blood poisoned there from lead. Her blood lead level of 21 was from March 30th, 1994, before she ever moved into the Federal Street house, when Mr. Polakoff was the landlord. It was like that before she got there. And experts for both parties have to agree, and they will agree, that she was lead poisoned before she moved into that house.

Now, one other thing I need you to pay attention to, because you heard Mr. Brown talk about Dr. Klein. Dr. Klein has said and he's going to come in here and tell you that she had lead poisoning at all six of these places before she ever got to Federal Street. You didn't hear that; did you? Their own expert is going to come in and tell you that she had sustained permanent injury from exposure to lead before she ever got into the house on Federal Street.

How then, I ask you, can the evidence show that we caused harm and permanent injury to Ms. Partlow when even her own expert is going to tell you she was permanently injured before she ever stepped foot in that Federal Street house.

Now, this is how much time she spent in this

house over the course of her 30 years. She lived in all these other places over that period of time. She was here for an eight-month stretch, yet today you heard that that eight months is the cause of all of her lead poisoning. And even though she had exposure in other places, we are the ones who are responsible for whatever injuries she currently has. It simply is not true, and it defies logic and common sense.

That is how long she has lived, and that is how long she was at Federal Street.

Now, let's talk about this lawsuit because today all you heard about is us. But back in the time when the lawsuit was filed, you heard about a whole bunch of other folks who were responsible for causing Ms.

Partlow's blood lead levels and her permanent injury.

Back then, they filed a lawsuit against all these other folks. And then I just showed you this list of all of these people. Where are they today?

All you hear about today is Kennedy Krieger, when even their own expert says that all of these houses, which would include every landlord and every property owner, was responsible for her lead poisoning. Today, just us, just Kennedy Krieger.

All these folks got sued. There were all these counts in the complaint. And now we're the only

remaining defendant in the lawsuit. The original compliant had 30 counts in it, and now it's down to just one against us. But now all you hear is that Kennedy Krieger is the root of all of Ms. Partlow's problems with regard to exposure to lead. I ask you to examine that and listen to the evidence as to whether or not that makes any sense to you because the evidence will show it simply cannot be.

Now, lead poisoning, we heard about it, and Mr. Brown did a really nice job of explaining the way that lead works, so I'll try not to belabor that point. It's poisoning when the lead is high enough to cause potential injury. Once you get that lead above a number, and these are the numbers that Ms. Partlow had before she ever got to Federal Street, it causes permanent injury. When blood lead levels go down, the injured person does not get better, but it also doesn't get worse.

The fact of the matter is the evidence will show you because she unfortunately was exposed to lead at high levels at these other places, it wasn't going to go down, but at least it's not going to get worse. And that's what the goal was for Kennedy Krieger when it got involved in the program, was to try and make sure her condition did not get worse, not to eliminate lead, not to ensure that there would be no potential damages,

simply to try to keep it from getting worse.

Despite any representations that you have heard, it was never a promise that we could cure her. There was never a promise that we could fix her. All we could do is try and keep the lead down in the residence so she wasn't going to get worse. And you'll see that's what we did.

And the real reason is is because lead is a problem everywhere. And in Baltimore, it was caused by many different sources. While it was also caused by landlords, it was caused by lead paint manufacturers, home builders and repair contractors, demolition and leaded gas manufacturers. You will hear experts come in, and they will tell you that in Baltimore back in the 1990s, walking down the street, you would get exposed to lead. Open your windows up, lead is blowing in through the windows. Open your door up when you go into your door at night, lead blowing in through the door because it was caused by so many different sources.

Paint. The paint manufacturers put lead in their paint. They were trying to tell people to eat and lick the lead. That's what was going on back there. That's one of the sources of lead that we have that's caused all the poisoning. Look at some of the paint manufacturer's comic books that they were trying to get

kids to eat and use lead.

Leaded gasoline. Some of us are old enough to remember when gas still had lead in it. That leaded gasoline got reduced because the lead was getting in the environment, and getting in the air, and everyone was breathing it in, not just us, but also children. Lead affects children.

When we're adults, we're okay, but when you're a kid you're susceptible to it. It was coming to the children through paint. It was coming to them through gasoline. And the sources and pathways, I told you about this a little bit, were from all these different sources.

Children were getting lead poisoning from drinking water. Children were getting lead poisoning from breathing in and out in Baltimore. From the food, from toys that they were playing with, and from parent's jobs and hobbies, and just from being outside. There's no dispute, the science is going to show you, that those are all the different sources of lead.

Now, back in Baltimore back then -- you can see some of these codes here, and I will try and slide up in here. But you see these dark areas? Those will show you where lead poisoning amongst children were the worst in Baltimore. And you can see right where this house is, which is the house in question, Federal Street. But the

other houses that she lived in were in the same condition before she even got to the house on Federal Street.

So it defies logic to put it on us now, and not put it on these other houses, these other landlords, these other property owners, the environment, leaded gasoline, and leaded paint. I ask you to consider that when you look at the evidence.

Back then, just 20 years ago, 95 percent of
Baltimore City neighborhoods had high leads of level -- I
mean, high levels of lead. It was described, literally,
as a sea of lead back then at the point in time that
we're talking about when Ms. Partlow was a child. It was
everywhere, and children who were going outside to play
or on playgrounds were getting exposed every single day.

Not one expert is going to come in here and they can tell you where a specific source of lead poisoning came from, not one, because they know it had to come from all these different sources, not just from Kennedy Krieger. And every one of the experts for the plaintiffs are going to have to admit that to you.

And I submit to you that Kennedy Krieger was not a source of any lead that harmed Ms. Partlow. Tens of thousands of children were lead poisoned. And Baltimore City had, unfortunately, one of the highest lead poisoning rates in the entire country. More

children were admitted to Kennedy Krieger Hospital for lead poisoning than for any other condition back then.

Kennedy Krieger, as Mr. Brown tells you, one of the worldwide leaders in treating children was doing its best to try and keep up. There were no state laws to regulate lead in housing and protect children. Landlords were allowing their properties to contain lead paint.

People who didn't have the money to go live somewhere far out in the County couldn't run around and find housing that didn't have lead in it. Almost all the houses in Downtown Baltimore had it on the east side and the west side, so somebody had to try and do something to eliminate it and reduce it. People were looking for some way to do it, and that's what we tried to do.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and together we developed the R&M Study. Now, you may have the impression that this was some type of renegade project that Kennedy Krieger came up with on its own without consultation. It was sanctioned, approved, adopted, and co-authored by the United States government. And the United States Environmental Protection Agency worked with us in order to get that program off the ground.

Now, Kennedy Krieger -- Mr. Brown is right about something. But in case you all don't know,

treatment, prevention, rehabilitation, and research and advocacy were the things that we focused on. If you don't know us, I can say to you that it is one of the great facilities in Baltimore. And its whole purpose is dedicated to taking care of children. That's all it does; that's all it's ever done; that's all it will ever do.

And, yes, John F. Kennedy did -- in fact, was the name that we used in order to be formed for Kennedy Krieger because it was formed in his honor after he was assassinated in 1963. And we did it and named it after him because he had a long commitment of helping people who had developmental issues. That's the same thing that Kennedy Krieger was trying to do.

Now, there's a hospital on Broadway, and that services children with special needs for medical care; a school on Fairmont Avenue, an elementary school and middle school with special needs; and Greenspring Avenue is where a high school is for kids with special needs.

And, yes, it's world renowned for its care of children and adults with severe neurological injuries, but specializing in children.

Now, it's a non-profit organization, and it does employ 2500 people who live in and around Baltimore with a goal of helping children and trying to improve

their lots in life, regardless of what their conditions or injuries or problems are, including children with lead paint.

Now, that lead clinic was started in East
Baltimore and remained open until 2000. And then it
closed because, finally, by the time we got to 2000, the
problem with lead started to go down in Baltimore. And
you will see and hear evidence that Kennedy Krieger was
one of the biggest reasons why that lead began to shrink
in Baltimore, that lead was no longer a problem with our
children, and that lead was finally not ruining and
destroying lives.

The clinic was started by a man named Julian Chisolm. He was world renowned for his work in reducing lead poisoning. And Dr. Chisolm was a -- served as a mentor to Dr. Mark Farfel, who you will hear from by deposition. He was the principal investigator for the R&M Study. Now, Dr. Farfel, you will hear by deposition, was the principal investigator. Later on, after he was done working at Kennedy Krieger, he went to go work as a director of the World Trade Center Health Registry. And he was responsible for measuring the health effects of the 911 attacks in New York City.

Now, one of the other partners that we had was Kurt Schmoke, who along with the Baltimore City Health

Department, the Department of Housing and Community

Development, trying to help us come up with solutions in order to try and stem the problem of lead poisoning for children in Baltimore City. He got us able to help us get state and federal agencies involved in it as well.

And what the study said is that participants would live in homes that received repairs, but that the best thing you could do is reduce exposure to lead paint and dust. You cannot eliminate lead in Baltimore City. No one is going to come in here and say that Kennedy Krieger promised to eliminate lead. Nobody is going to prove that. They will not put up a shred of evidence that says that we promised to eliminate it because you couldn't. In Baltimore back then, it was everywhere.

What we tried to do in this program is make sure that homes were safer than the homes that had not been treated with any repairs of any kind. Because all you could do is try and take the lead down. You couldn't eliminate it. So all these houses where Ms. Partlow was living before she got to this house on Federal Street all had untreated lead where the poisoning is just continuing to circulate and circulate.

Kennedy Krieger at least started to try to put people in houses to reduce the lead because there wasn't the money to make all the houses lead free in Baltimore.

If there was, we never would have had the epidemic that we had in the 1980s and the 1990s. The whole goal was to try to make houses safer than what was required by Baltimore City at that time.

And when I say this was not just Kennedy

Krieger's own project, all of these state and federal and city agencies joined in in order to develop this program.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, The Environmental Protection Agency, Johns Hopkins, the City of Baltimore, University of Maryland, everybody came together in order to try and do something to diminish the impact of poisoning on the kids in Baltimore. And we're doing something when everybody else is doing nothing.

And that's why we're here today.

I ask you to listen to the evidence in this case as to what we did in this case and what we did with this program was helpful or not. Surely, I think the evidence will show you one thing. Every single child who was in these houses had lower blood lead levels than they had before they got in them.

Now, you're going to hear from a number of witnesses at Kennedy Krieger, and one of them is Pat Tracy. She's was an outreach supervisor. She made home visits and scheduled clinic appointments. She reported with results of lead in blood tests, and she reported all

the blood lead levels to the state.

I ask you to listen closely when she testifies as to what this program was really about, how it went down, what the purpose was, and how it was implemented. If you still think, after this lady is done testifying, that were just running around trying to poison people for fun, I submit to you that that will not be your impression after you're done hearing her testimony.

You're also going to hear from Susan

Kleinhammer. She's a current owner and teacher of lead

remediation course. She used to work for Baltimore City

in lead remediation. And she worked with the R&M Study

to determine a more effective way to reduce lead. Reduce

lead because that's all anyone could do is reduce it.

Kennedy Krieger was not Ms. Partlow's landlord.

Kennedy Krieger was not responsible for making repairs in the house. Kennedy Krieger is not responsible for trying to clean all the lead out of the house. It never promised it would do that, and you'll see when you see the documents in this case.

Now, Ms. Partlow benefitted from the study because her blood levels went down. And as I mentioned, she's working and is successful. She was not injured.

Now, here's the program. You were told that Kennedy Krieger controlled ERI. Kennedy Krieger did not do these loans. The State gave the loans to the landlords in order to do the work. What was happening back then is landlords were leaving property empty with lead poisoning all around them. This program at least got some landlords to motivate to try and do some work on these houses.

Mr. Polakoff is one of those folks. The landlords contracted with the remediation companies to perform lead reduction repairs. And the landlords rented to families who would benefit from those repairs. Now, the landlord, you're going to hear from him tomorrow, at East Federal Street was Larry Polakoff. And Kennedy Krieger, again, was not the landlord of 1906 East Federal Street.

Ms. Partlow only spoke to the landlord when she leased the premises. She never talked to Kennedy Krieger before she picked that apartment. Even Mr. Brown told you that Ms. Martin, Ms. Partlow's mother, went and looked at the house and chose it and decided to move into it without ever talking about Kennedy Krieger, or talking to Kennedy Krieger about the house. She had a lease agreement with Mr. Polakoff, not with Kennedy Krieger.

Mr. Polakoff was responsible for all repairs to the property, not Kennedy Krieger.

And when she was in the house, she looked at on

her own because she saw that ad in a newspaper, which is important to note. It never said anything about the R&M Study. It never said anything about Kennedy Krieger, Mr. Brown even told you that. What she said, Ms. Martin, Ms. Partlow's mom, is that the house was in good condition when she went to go look at it. It was freshly painted. And she says, and you will see documents, that when she walked in to look at that house, she didn't see any chipping, flaking, or peeling paint anywhere in the house.

Now, she found the house on her own. She signed that rental agreement with the landlord, not with us. And Ms. Martin signed that lease addendum with Chase Real Estate, not with Kennedy Krieger. You'll see the lease yourself as part of the evidence in this case that she signed it with Chase. And this says, right here in the lease, that tenants agree to notify the owner of repairs that are necessary on the house, not Kennedy Krieger.

You've been led to believe that we were responsible for any repairs to the house, but the landlord agreed that he would make the repairs necessary to keep the premises in safe and sanitary condition. And he agrees to make the repairs. And if there are any defective conditions the tenant shall notify the landlord

immediately. Kennedy Krieger is not a party to that contract. While it's been made to look that way, we are not. This is the landlord's responsibility.

Here's another thing, Ms. Martin looked -- and this is Ms. Partlow's mother, went to the house and she was asked to write down what problems that she had with the house when she went and inspected it. The only thing she pointed out was the hallway light and the bathroom toilet. There was no chipping, flaking, or peeling paint when she moved into that house. There's none listed anywhere there.

Again, the lease addendum asks her that if you see any chipping, flaking, or loose, or peeling paint, that you're supposed to notify the landlord in writing.

If you see any. There was no notification of that. So I understand that there may be dust in the house, and you will see that there is because it comes from everywhere, through the windows in the summertime. It comes in through the doors. It comes in on people's clothes and on their shoes. But there was no chipping, flaking, or peeling paint, and she didn't notify the landlord of any repairs with regard to that.

And also the lease agreement said that to notify the parents that eating or chewing lead paint is dangerous to children. That you should notify the

landlord in writing immediately if you find chipping,
flaking, loose, or peeling paint. The landlord, not
Kennedy Krieger. The notice is supposed to be given to
the landlord. We have somehow, according to the
plaintiffs, been made responsible for everything in this
house. And all the evidence is going to show you that it
was the landlord's responsibility, not our
responsibility.

Now, Ms. Partlow's mother, Ms. Martin, didn't speak to anybody from Kennedy Krieger until more than a week after she moved into the house. So to the extent you were given the impression that we induced her into moving into the house, that's just not true because she never even met us until after. We went by to go see her after to ask her if she wanted to join the R&M Study for her daughter Antoinette. And she had the option to say no, and she chose to put her child in the study.

Ms. Partlow was not even in the study. She was her sister, but she derived the same benefits from being in the household that her sister did because she was in the R&M Study.

The consent form said the repairs would not completely remove exposure to lead dust, and all it could do was reduce it. And you will see the consent form that Ms. Martin signed with Kennedy Krieger that said, as Mr.

Brown showed you, we understand your house is going to have special repairs done in order to reduce exposure to lead. Reduce it. No one promised to get rid of it because you can't.

And they're talking about how we're doing a study to learn how well different practices work for reducing exposure to leaded paint. Again, reduce, not eliminate.

Now, Pat Tracy is going to come and tell you how the R&M Study consent form worked, what their practice was, to review the consent form with the parents. What they did when they went through the consent form is go through it line by line with the parents, with every single parent. That was the absolute fully established practice.

So if people were saying they don't remember what happened, I can understand why because it was 25 years ago, but that was the practice. And you're going here KKI employees come in and tell you that's exactly what they were trained to do, and that's exactly what they did.

They would have, again, emphasized that lead could not be removed from the house, was not removed from the house, because it couldn't be because dust would still continue to come in.

Now, you're going to hear from Dr. Lainie Ross. She is a board certified pediatrician and ethicist. She got her M.D. from Penn, a Ph.D. from Yale, and she's served on IRBs for 14 years. And she is not from Australia.

And Mr. Brown is right about one thing, the reason he got an expert from Australia is because he couldn't find one in the United States to say what he needed her to say in this case. He can say she was the best, but she's not. She's nowhere near as qualified as this woman.

And she's going to tell you, because she's published hundreds of articles on medical ethics, that she -- that the study was done ethically; the study was done appropriately; the study was done in full consideration of the children involved in the study; that it was a proper, appropriate well-done study, which actually had impact on children in Baltimore when nobody else was doing anything to help during this problem.

Now, you're also going to hear from Steven

Joffee, who's also a doctor. He's a board certified

pediatrician. He's from the University of California San

Francisco School of Medicine. And he's also going to

come in and talk to you.

They're both going to tell you that that

consent form complied with all ethical standards. And the study was properly designed and implemented. So they will contradict what Ms. Sprig (phonetic) says when she comes here from Australia to talk about that.

Now, Ms. Partlow did benefit from the study.

We were shown in great dramatic fashion that the only benefit she got was five dollars, and that she got 15 dollars every time she filled out the form. And what you're going to find out is the study homes were benefitted by living in homes where the conditions were better than where they were before they moved in there. There's no question, because those other homes that they were living in were not cleaned, were not repaired. And her blood lead levels were shooting up.

They received cleaning education as to the best way to clean the house. Yes, he's right, we did ask the mother to do the cleaning in the house. We're not suppose to come in there. You know, people can help themselves, contrary to the belief that folks in East Baltimore can't clean their own floors; they can. And what you need to do is just educate folks the best way in order to clean property — properly to take sure that the dust levels are lower for their children in the house. And she got that cleaning education. We gave her free supplies in order to do that.

We gave the family free nutritional counseling. We did monitoring of blood lead levels at no cost to the family. We monitored the dust levels in the house at no cost to the family. We did a lot more than give her five dollars, and the evidence is going to show that clearly.

They were educated about lead paint poisoning.

They were educated about lead poisoning symptoms. They were educated about lead paint testing, primary and secondary sources of lead. All at no cost to the family. Lead paint poisoning and preventive measures, they were educated about those. And nutrition and diet in order to try to keep the children healthy. All of these benefits were provided to every single family, in addition to the five dollars. Cleaning procedures were done to try and help reduce lead paint.

Now, you're also going to hear from Jennifer Steziack (phonetic). She's a registered nurse. She worked in the lead clinic. And she routinely interviewed and interacted with R&M Study participants. She confirmed that Ms. Partlow did not play in the basement of 1906 East Federal Street. That's what she's going to come in and tell you.

You heard in opening statement that no -- that the basement was dirty and Ms. Partlow -- Ms. Martin was getting toys down there -- the kid's toys down there.

Well, she's going to tell you that at the time this happened, that there was no play in the basement with the children. They didn't play down there. We've got documents that are going to show that to you.

You will see that these pamphlets were handed out and they were -- these are also some things that were provided in part of the questionnaire. Now, this questionnaire was filled out in order to get information and provide information to the parent who lived in the home. She was given pamphlets of, "Before Your Baby Was Born," "Preventing Lead Paint -- Lead Poisoning," and "Keeping Your Home Lead Safe."

And the questionnaire asks, where does the kid play. So when Mr. Brown was talking to you about the basement earlier, it says, "Inside, not in the basement," yet you were told that that's where lead toys were being brought out, and that's where sources of exposure were from.

Now, the repairs that were made to the house were done by a contractor who inspected the house on December 15th, 1993. The paint was intact, no peeling, chipping, or flaking paint. The landlord worked with Ms. Kleinhammer, who you're going to hear testify in this case, to identify remediation work to try and reduce the lead in the home before any family moved in. Never mind

Ms. Partlow's family just ended up being the one that moved in, but it was being done to whoever was going to move into the premises because we're trying to reduce the lead exposure to whoever was going to be in there with their family.

Now, the landlord is going to testify that if the R&M Study wasn't there, he wouldn't even made the repairs to the house that were made. Because like many landlords, they weren't going to put a penny in it if they didn't have to. And that's not a criticism as much as a statement of fact. He's going to tell you that he was responsible for making the repairs. He's going to tell you he was responsible for complying with Baltimore City Housing Code. And he is going to tell you that he was the responsible party, not Kennedy Krieger. He is the one that signed the lease with Ms. Jackie Martin, not Kennedy Krieger.

Now, the goal was always to reduce exposure in lead. Yes, \$3500 is what was spent in that remediation level because different homes required different levels of remediation. And we requested, but you didn't hear this, that the landlord make additional repairs on top of the repairs that were made. But from that \$3500, because all the people who were involved were working on this at great discounts in order to try and do something

beneficial for children, this is all the repairs that were made for that \$3500 into that house. Those are all of them, many, many repairs. And you'll hear about that in great detail.

Testing was done after the repairs were made.

And you see this? The floors are supposed to be at the

Level 200, and those are clear and stable levels -- clear

and standard levels. 500 for the sills, and 800 from the

wells. Now, you see here, it says, this "right half of

the sill," it was over 500. It was 791. So when the

testing was done, it was above the level. And what does

the evidence show you what happened?

They went back and did the cleaning, again, and look how low it came after the next cleaning, now it's 36 instead of 791. So even when the testing showed that there were dust lead levels that raised concern, repairs were again made. The windowsill was re-cleaned and retested, and it did pass the testing inspection.

After that, the property was ready to go. And you will see on these graphs how much the levels were reduced. This is where the levels were before anybody went in to try and improve the condition of the house. This is where they were afterwards on the first floor. Again, reducing the lead.

The second floor, you can see how the lead

levels are reduced from where they are here, down to the lower levels. Everything is reduced, exactly what was promised. And with regard to the first floor sills, you can see how they came down to virtually nothing, reducing lead.

You can't tell me the evidence will show that this is not making the house safer for Antoinette and for Ashley when they lived there. And the evidence will show you that it did.

And the second floor sills, where the bedrooms were, they came down from levels of over 10,000 down to 34, again, improving the condition of the rooms, reducing lead. So at least Ms. Partlow's permanent lead injury does not get worse. That's all the effort was to do; that's all the promise was to do. And the evidence will show that's exactly what happened.

Now, the wells on the first floor came down to levels from 144,130 down to 1,803. Again, more evidence that the levels continue to go down more and more with all the effort that Kennedy Krieger is putting in to try and clean the homes. And the second floor wells, the same thing, reduced. Reduced from very high levels down to very low levels. Remember the family was only there for eight months time.

Now Ms. Tracy is going to tell you that she did

inspections; she knows that the inspections were done.

And while they were only there for eight months,
inspections were done in May, July, and November over
that short period of time. And it's going to show you
that there was no evidence of chipping, flaking, or
peeling paint in the house anywhere. That house was in
better shape than it would have been in if Kennedy
Krieger had not gone in and done this program.

Now, the questionnaire shows you that -- and I'm blocking it again -- that the walls were painted, and that there's no flaking paint. That's a zero. No flaking paint noted in the house anywhere. So it certainly was not left in the condition where children like Ashley and Antoinette could run around and put paint chips in their mouth.

Now, you're going to hear testimony from

Patrick Connor, who is one the experts that's going to

testify in the case. And he's going to tell you he

doesn't have any opinions about the conditions of 1906

East Federal Street while Ms. Partlow lived there. So

we've got an expert coming in who doesn't have any

opinions about the house. He's going to say intact lead

is not considered a lead hazard. And he's going to say

you can clear doors and windows successfully; you can

clean them. And that if homes pass clearance standards,

they had been cleared for occupancy. This home passed all the clearance standards, and the evidence is going to show you that it did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, you're also going to hear from Dave Jacobs, who is a Ph.D. These are his qualifications. And he has worked for years, decades, and has testified before Congress many times regarding lead paint poisoning and prevention. And he's going to tell you exactly what I've been trying to say this whole time -- maybe it will be more effective if somebody else comes in and say it rather than me in opening statement -- but lead dust cannot be completely eliminated; that those levels were significantly reduced after the repairs; and that there's no question that we made the house safer, this house and many other ones that never would have been safer for families like the Parklow family, and for many other families in East and West Baltimore, if we had done nothing -- if we did nothing.

What we did do for sure was protect children from having worse conditions from lead poisoning. At least we didn't allow them to get worse because we could not eliminate it, and we could not cure it. But we sure did do something while, again, most of the country was doing nothing to help us here in Baltimore.

Now, for Ms. Partlow, was -- I talked to you

about these other two points, and now I'm talking to you about this third one. The blood lead levels went down when she lived at 1906 East Federal Street. You were pointed out about this 21 here. There was a test result here, and there was a test result here. And by the time she left Federal Street, her blood lead level was down to 13.

And while you can't eliminate blood lead levels or exposure to lead anywhere, the evidence will show that we did something to improve her exposure levels to lead, whereas it wasn't happening before she got there.

And then look what happened when she left. It started to go right back up again. Five days after she left the house, and was in a house that was not in the R&M Study, her blood lead levels were going up again. Yet, you're being told that Kennedy Krieger is the cause of her injuries, and that you should award damages against us for the fact that she had blood lead levels that were high during the time she was there, even though it shows a descending order. And it was higher before she got there, and that it was higher when she left. Yet, we're the bad guy.

Dr. Klein, we heard Mr. Brown talk about him in opening statement, all of his testimony, all of it that he's ever given that he gives is for plaintiffs in law

suits. We got one expert from Australia, we got another one from Israel. He has worked for Ms. Partlow's attorney, Mr. Brown, for the last 15 years, averaging over 50 cases a year testifying for Mr. Brown's law firm. 750 cases over 15 years, and he's made hundreds of thousands of dollars saying what plaintiff's lawyers need him to say.

And even he admits that here blood lead levels were caused by those previous homes, that 1906 East Federal Street passed clearance standards, and that Ms. Partlow had permanent brain injury before she ever moved into 1906 East Federal Street.

And he will admit something that you didn't hear about. He's going to admit that she benefitted from living in the R&M Study home, in addition to all the other benefits the evidence is going to show that I laid out to you earlier.

And he claims that Ms. Partlow is mentally retarded. I don't even know what to do with that.

I understand what this is all supposed to be about, but to call somebody who is handling her business like her "mentally retarded" is an insult and disrespectful.

You're also going to hear from John Rinehart.

He's got a medical degree from Harvard. This is one of our experts again. He is a pediatric lead poisoning

expert, and he is one of the best, and everybody is going to have to admit that he is. And he's currently in charge of all lead poisoning cases down in South Carolina. He's written a number of articles about lead poisoning in children. And he's gotten numerous awards, including this one from the Maryland House of Delegates.

And he is going to tell you that Ms. Partlow had high blood lead levels before she moved into Federal Street; that that prior lead poisoning caused all of her IQ loss, whatever she has sustained; and that she had no additional IQ loss from living at 1906 East Federal Street.

Again, I ask you to wait and listen to the experts until the case is over before making your determination as to the facts. I honestly believe that if you all do that, you'll understand that the evidence shows that Kennedy Krieger is not responsible for any injuries to Ms. Partlow.

Now, he's going to talk about how her blood lead levels went down. I just went through that with you. You're going to hear him talk about it, so you don't have to hear it out of my mouth. You can hear it from an expert.

Now, the last thing is that Ms. Partlow is working and is successful. And we, again, think that the

evidence is going to show you that she was not injured by anything that Kennedy Krieger did. Is she successful? The answer is yes. I'm not sure what people have an expectation for people to do other than have jobs, take care of their children, have their own place, and handle their business. And that's exactly what she's doing on her own. That is the goal for all of us. That is the example we want to show to our children is that we take care of our own business and handle our own responsibilities. The evidence is going to show you that's exactly what Ms. Partlow is doing today.

Now, she has one -- you're going to hear about some of her employment potential. When you hear some of the work that she's done; that she was a health assistant in the health assistant training program when she was at Sure Up, Inc. You're going to hear the very nice things they have to say about her, as well as many of the promotion opportunities that she has had over the course of her young life. She's only 30 years old. She still has so much of her life ahead of her.

Now, you're also going to hear from Gloria

Morote, and she's going to come in, and she is a forensic

neuropsychologist with 25 years of experience. And she's

going to tell you what IQ tests are about. You hear

people talk about the loss of IQ. You're going to see

exactly from Dr. Morote what IQ is about.

She personally tested Ms. Partlow herself. She will tell you that her IQ score is a full scale score of 80, but she thinks Ms. Partlow could have done better on the test. And that if she tried harder, she could have gotten even a higher score. She'll tell you exactly why she believes that.

She also thinks that Ms. Partlow has no intellectual or neurocognitive impairments, despite the fact that she was, in fact, exposed to lead, and had elevated blood lead levels from lead.

She's licensed to work as a certified nursing assistant, Mr. Brown told you that already. She graduated from high school. She is going to tell you that she has no doubt that Ms. Partlow is capable of earning her associates degree, no doubt.

You're also going to hear from Dr. Gretchen

Meyer, who is an expert in neurodevelopment pediatrics.

She's been doing that for more than 15 years, former Navy

Captain, now testifies as an expert in cases like this.

And she's going to tell you Ms. Partlow has no

behavioral, psychological, or psychiatric disorders.

She's fine, and the evidence is going to show that.

She's also going to say she has the intellectual and

educational abilities to maintain employment and pursue

that associate's degree that the experts are talking about.

You obviously are the ones that get to make that decision yourselves, but you'll hear evidence for you to weigh with regard to that issue.

And you'll also hear from Dr. Sheryl Ranson, who is going to come in. She's an expert in vocational assessment. She's been doing it for over 42 years. She does life care planning, vocational rehabilitation, and mental health counseling. She is going to tell you the same thing.

All three of them are going to tell you, that despite the fact that she was exposed to lead as a child, that Ms. Partlow is capable of employment as a CNA and capable of obtaining her associate degree.

Now, Plaintiff's expert, Dr. Barry Horowitz, which you heard Mr. Brown talk about him a little while ago. So when you hear him come in, keep in mind that he's done about 3000 evaluations of cases that are all for plaintiffs. 3000 he's done for plaintiffs and plaintiff's lawyers, as opposed to the hundreds and thousands of dollars that Dr. Klein made. This man has made millions testifying and writing these reports, just churning them out.

And he is going to tell you that there was

psychological testing that was supposed to be done. He's going to come in and testify on behalf of

Ms. Partlow. Even though he's supposed to do all 11

parts and have her take the whole test, the man is going to admit to you that he only had her test on four sub

parts. He is man enough to admit that Ms. Partlow is not disabled, contrary to assertions and representations that have been made, and that she can perform daily activities and maintain employment, like she's already doing today.

Now, Plaintiff's expert, Dr. Mark -- or Mr.

Lieberman, he is not a doctor. He assumes that she is

cognitively disabled because she has reported that she

has difficulty concentrating, remembering, and making

decisions, so do I. He assumed her earning capacity was

based on no high school degree, even though she already

has a job, that she has pretty much always had a job.

He didn't consider that she had a high school degree. He

didn't consider that Ms. Partlow's success in obtaining a

CNA certification was indeed an accomplishment because it

is.

And so he's going to tell you that she could have worked -- he agreed that she could have worked as a CNA, and that's going to be in his testimony, and that she still can. Again, Ms. Partlow is only 30 years old.

Now, you're also going to hear from Plaintiff's

expert, Dr. Michael Conte. And he considers that Ms.

Partlow as not having a high school degree, even though she has a degree. You all figure that one out. She has a degree, but the man is basically treat her as if she does not, assumes that she can't work as a CNA, and ignores her consistent history of maintaining employment since she got out of high school, which she had done, by the way.

All the evidence shows that she can be successful, that she can work as a CNA, and that she's already been successful in raising her daughter on her own. She certainly can do anything she puts her mind to, and the evidence will show you that.

Again, to remind you that Ms. Partlow was injured by Kennedy Krieger; and again, that we were not the landlord; that she benefitted from the R&M Study.

Again, the blood levels went down when she was in the house. And that she is working and successful.

And did we cause -- did we act reasonably when we implemented this study in conjunction with the EPA,

The U.S. Department of Housing, Johns Hopkins, and

University of Maryland, all of us together? Yeah, we did, and the evidence is going to show you that. The answer is, yes.

And did we cause injury to Ms. Partlow? The

answer is no. We weren't negligent, and we didn't cause any injury to Ms. Partlow.

Now, I thank you for listening to me. I was rushing because it's four o'clock. You all have been here all day, and I'm trying to get this stuff done. I realize that my style might not be everybody's cup of tea, but I am who I am. I am my mother's son, and I am who I am.

But I ask you just one thing, please listen to the evidence in this case. Please hear what the evidence shows about Kennedy Krieger and its commitment, and how hard the people over there have worked to try and change the lives of Baltimore people, like Dr. Cecilia Davoli. Please give them the honor of being able to have your time while you are stuck here, to listen to the evidence in this case. They deserve a shake.

While Ms. Partlow is a really good person, so are the men and women who work at Kennedy Krieger every single day and take care of their families the same way. Please give them the benefit of your time to hear all the evidence before you make your determination in this case.

I thank you so much for just hearing me out, you all. I really appreciate it. I look forward to talking to you again later in the trial.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Brown.

1			(End	of	Excerpt	. –	Open	ing	Statement	on	behalf	
2	of	the	Defense	cor	ncluded	at	3:56	p.n	n.)			
3												
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												
20												
21												
22												
23												
24												
25												

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Patricia A. Trikeriotis, Chief Court

Reporter of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, do

hereby certify that the proceedings in the matter of

Ashley Partlow vs. Kennedy Krieger Institute, Inc.,

et al., Case Number 24-C-09-008243, on October 21, 2019,

before the Honorable Lawrence P. Fletcher-Hill, Associate

Judge, were duly recorded by means of digital recording.

I further certify that the page numbers 1 through 43 constitute the official transcript of excerpts of these proceedings as transcribed by me or under my direction from the digital recording to the within typewritten matter in a complete and accurate manner.

In Witness Whereof, I have affixed my signature this $24^{\rm th}$ day of October, 2019.

Patricia A. Trikeriotis Chief Court Reporter