

Deposition of:

Trial Volume 1

October 21, 2019

In the Matter of:

Partlow, Ashley v. Mayo, Ruth Marie

Veritext Legal Solutions

800.808.4958 | calendar-dmv@veritext.com |

```
Page 1
1
 2
                          ) IN THE
    ASHLEY PARTLOW,
3
                           ) CIRCUIT COURT
        Plaintiff
4
                           ) FOR
5
     vs.
                           ) BALTIMORE CITY
6
    RUTH MARIE MAYO,
               et al., ) Case No. 24-C-09008243
7
        Defendants
8
9
10
11
                  Volume 1
12
             The Trial in the above-entitled matter
13
    was commenced on Monday, October 21, 2019, at
14
     12:09 p.m., at the Circuit Court for Baltimore
15
     City, 100 N. Calvert Street, Room 113,
    Baltimore, Maryland 21202 before the Honorable
16
17
     Lawrence Fletcher-Hill.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
    REPORTED BY:
25
    Bonnie L. Russo
```

	Page 2				
1	APPEARANCES:				
2	ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF:				
3	BRIAN S. BROWN, ESQUIRE				
4	KRISTIN R. HOSSEINZADEH, ESQUIRE				
5	BROWN & BARRON, LLC				
6	7 St. Paul Street				
7	Suite 800				
8	Baltimore, Maryland 21202				
9	410-698-1717				
10					
11	ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT KENNEDY KRIEGER				
12	INSTITUTE, INC.:				
13	MICHAEL A. BROWN, ESQUIRE				
14	MICHAEL BLUMENFELD, ESQUIRE				
15	NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP				
16	100 S. Charles Street				
17	Suite 1600				
18	Baltimore, Maryland 21201				
19	443-392-9401				
20	-and-				
21	BARRY C. GOLDSTEIN, ESQUIRE				
22	WARANCH & BROWN, LLC				
23	1301 York Road, Suite 300				
2 4	Lutherville, Maryland 21903				
25	Telephone: 410-821-4500				

				Page 3
1		I N	D E X	
2				PAGE
3	OPENING	STATEMENT OF	PLAINTIFF	31
4	OPENING	STATEMENT OF	DEFENDANT	8 0
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

- 1 opportunity to wrap up and sum up the case for
- 2 you.
- All right. Do any of you have any
- 4 questions?
- 5 | I think I've already told you about
- 6 | breaks. So if you need a break, if you need a
- 7 | rest, just tell me. You're able to stand right
- 8 | where you are if that would refresh you during
- 9 the case.
- 10 All right. Counsel, is there
- 11 | anything else preliminarily that you want them
- 12 instructed on?
- MR. BRIAN BROWN: No, Your Honor.
- 14 MR. MICHAEL BROWN: No, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: All right. Then we're
- 16 ready for opening statements.
- Mr. Brown, when you're ready, you
- 18 | may proceed.
- MR. BRIAN BROWN: Thank you very
- 20 much.
- 21 | MR. BRIAN BROWN: Good afternoon,
- 22 everybody.
- Ladies and gentlemen, this case, I
- 24 think, is going to disturb you with the
- 25 | evidence you're going to hear. I think it's

going to disappoint you. And, ladies and gentlemen, I think the evidence you're going to hear in this case is going to shock you.

This case is about whether Kennedy
Krieger Institute, KKI, can use children like
my client, Ashley Partlow, as a human research
test subject in a dangerous experiment about
lead.

The evidence in this case is going to tell you that Ashley, who was only five years old then, and is here now, who didn't have a voice for herself, was placed into harm's way by Kennedy Krieger Institute.

Ashley was placed into a house that Kennedy Krieger Institute, KKI, knew had lead. They knew that she was going to be exposed to dangerous lead paint and dangerous lead dust in that house. They knew it, and they put it -- they put her there anyway.

And what is the evidence going to show you about why they put her in there? To find a cheap way for landlords to fix their houses. That's what the evidence in this case is going to show you.

Kennedy Krieger. Ashley was a

little girl, and they knew that, and in the 1 2 design of a study -- which I'll talk to you in a little bit about -- put her into a leaded 3 4 house full of lead paint, full of lead dust, and then said, "Let's figure out how much lead 5 6 dust Ashley is going to be exposed to. Let's 7 look at her blood lead levels and compare it to 8 the repairs that we did and see how it worked." That's what the evidence is going to show you 9 in this case. 10

Now, I'm Brian Brown. Mr. Mike

Brown is over there. People get us confused a

lot.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But Mr. Mike Brown is going to stand up, and he's going to tell you that Kennedy is a good institution. He is going to tell you that Kennedy was named after President Kennedy; and that's a nonprofit organization here in Baltimore; and that they have done good things, good things even with lead paint. You'll hear that.

And you're going to hear that they employ lots of people here in the city. And you know what? Every single word of that is true. Kennedy has done good things.

But in this case, ladies and gentlemen, with this experiment, when they used kids like Ashley as a test subject, Kennedy made bad choices. Kennedy lost its way. And that's what we're going to show you in this case. That's what we're going to show you.

Now, remember I said a second ago how do I know? How do I know that Kennedy was concerned not about fixing the houses so they had no lead and they were safe for kids? How do I know they were finding a cheaper way? Because the evidence is going to show you that.

Kennedy's own documents over and over and over again, they talk about the purpose of the study. Less costly, more cost effective. Cost, cost, cost. It's all about the money. That's what this case is going to show you.

It is imperative that we investigate low-cost methods. Low cost. Kennedy's own documents. What is the rationale of their study? And look at this, their own documents. We already showed that comprehensive abatement, taking the lead out of the house, is associated with substantial reductions in PbD.

1 And by the way, ladies and gentlemen, Pb is the chemical abbreviation for 2 And D stands for dust. 3 lead. 4 So they know that if you do a good 5 job and get it all out, it results in substantial reductions in lead dust in the 6 7 house. 8 But the evidence will show you that, in this study, the R&M study that we're here 9 10 for today, that's not what KKI did. 11 Again, all over their own documents. 12 Lower cost, lower cost. Another word for 13 cheap. That's what they were looking for. 14 Now, we're here in this courtroom 15 today, and we're on this side of the table. And the defendants are over there on that side 16 17 of the table. But just because we're on the 18 opposite side of the table and opposite side, 19 opposite sides of the room, doesn't mean we 20 don't agree on some things. We do agree on

We agree that lead is a poison. And in a little while, during my opening, I'll give you a little lesson about lead. And you'll hear it during the trial as well.

21

22

23

24

25

some things.

Page 36

We agree that, back in the early
'90s when this study was going on, lead in the
city was a big problem. And we agree that lead
dust from lead paint -- and just so you know,
ladies and gentlemen, what happens is, when
lead paint frictions in window and door frames
and things like that, or if it chips and peels,
it all turns into dust.

And we agree that lead dust is the most common way that kids get exposed to lead. And we agree that children living in homes with lead paint dust are likely to become poisoned and permanently injured. Both sides agree to that.

But you all know that, if we agreed on everything, we wouldn't be standing here before you today.

We disagree on a lot of things. We disagree that it was okay to place families in a house that Kennedy knew would expose children to poisonous lead dust. And I am telling you right now my promise to you, ladies and gentlemen, is that I will show you that, when Kennedy designed the study in this case, they knew, they knew that Ashley and children like

her, children without a voice to make a
decision for themselves, they knew that she was
going to be exposed to poison.

They think it was okay not to tell
Ashley's mom and children -- parents of other
kids like Ashley what was going on with the
study. The evidence in this case will show you
that they didn't even bother to tell Ashley's
mom what was going on, that Ashley was going to
be living in a house full of poison and that
she was going to be a test subject.

They're going to tell you that

Ashley and the kids like her would have been

poisoned anyway. So we fixed these houses up a

little bit. No harm, no foul. It's up in East

Baltimore. It's our turf. We can do what we

want. We can use kids like Ashley as test

subjects.

They're going to say that's okay.

They're going to be poisoned anyway, so what's the big deal? They're going to tell you the end justifies the means. And the evidence will show you, ladies and gentlemen, and we already know, that's not true.

They're going to come into court and

tell you, "We acted just like a reasonable researcher would have. We did what any responsible researcher like us would have

done."

I'll tell you about them in a minute -- who are going to come in and tell you that's not true.

Kennedy failed to follow the rules. The rules are designed to keep kids like Ashley and all of us safe.

We have witnesses coming in -- and

That's what the evidence is going to show you in this case.

Let met stop before I continue for one second. Don't want to seem like I'm rude. I want to introduce myself, my co-counsel.

My name is Brian Brown. And together with Kristin Hosseinzadeh, we are going to be representing, and you'll be seeing a lot of us throughout this trial.

And I want to thank you. And His Honor already did a really good job with something that I was going to say anyway, but I'm going to say it myself.

You all are making a big sacrifice.

And it might just sound like lawyer talk, but

1 it's not. And I want to tell you a little bit 2 about why I say that.

I've been around a while. And you can tell from my gray hair and my little 58-year-old paunch, that I've been doing this a while. And I can't talk to you again until the trial is over.

At the end of the trial -- except to say "Good morning." I can tell you, "Good morning."

But if it's -- at the end of the trial, His Honor, whichever way it turns out, will say to you all, "If you would like to, you can talk to the lawyers, if you want to."

And every single time I've talked to a jury after a trial, every person to a person has said, "I can't believe I got picked. I was so pissed at the beginning. I got picked."

But then, at the end, you know what people tell me? "I learned something about an area of science," or medicine or whatever the trail that I'm doing that day is about, "that I would have never have known before. I learned about how our system works. That was really interesting to me. And" -- and to me, this is

the best part, "I met people from other walks
of life that I would have never have seen in a
million years unless I got called for jury
duty."

So I know that this is a long trial, and you're sitting in our box, and you're listening to us. Keep that in mind. Because I really think, at the end of this trial, you're going to see this as a valuable experience.

And on behalf of Ashley and Ms.

Hosseinzadeh, the Court -- I think maybe I can even speak for the defendants in this one instance -- we want to say thank you very much for your time and the effort and attention we all know you're going to put into this case.

So you've heard this is about lead.

Part of this case is about lead. So what is lead? What exactly is lead? Why is lead bad?

We all hear -- you know, we all

generally -- some of you told us, when you answered the questions, you've heard generally things about lead and lead paint and lead poisoning. But let me tell you a little bit, please, about what lead is.

Lead is a poison. It's toxic.

There is nothing good about having lead in the human body. Period. End of discussion.

It's a heavy metal. But why is that important? Lead and calcium and iron are very similar chemically. If you look at the -- if you remember from high school or college -- the periodic table of elements, all right, lead and iron and calcium are alike. But the difference is you're going to hear evidence that of course our bodies love iron and calcium. Our bodies need iron and calcium. But lead is a poison.

But the problem is, when our body takes in lead, when our body takes in lead, it can't tell the difference. It thinks it's getting iron and calcium. But it's getting poison. But it takes it in, and it says, "Awesome. I'm getting iron. I'm getting calcium."

And we have something, all of us, up in our brains called the blood-brain barrier.

And normally, normally, when something bad gets into our system, and it get up into the brain, the blood-brain barrier says, "Nope. Can't come in." And then we excrete it through our normal bodily functions.

When lead gets into our bodies, it's thinking iron, calcium, and it goes right into our brains. And why is that bad? Because lead attacks the brain. Lead attacks the nervous system.

From age zero to age seven or eight or so, when our brains are developing the fastest, when all the connections are being made in our brains, the things called synapses that you'll hear one of our experts come in and tell us about the developing brain, it messes that up and makes it so our brains don't develop correctly. And when that happens, it causes permanent brain damage and learning problems. And that's what happened to Ashley.

And children are more at risk to

lead injury than adults are because that's when

our brains are developing, when we're little.

As we get older, and our brains aren't

developing as quickly, when they're finished

developing, that's the end of the story. And

lead is still dangerous at very, very, very

high levels, but not like you're child when

there is no safe level of lead.

And here's one of the things about

lead that's tough. You see Ashley here. 1 2 She was only 5 when she was injured. 30 now. But the thing is, if we -- all of us, if we see 3 4 a person on the street or in this building, and they're in a wheelchair or on crutches or with 5 a cane or using a -- blind and using a cane 6 7 like a blind person would use, we stop, we open 8 the door, we ask them if they need help. 9 But a person who has an injury from lead poisoning, like Ashley did, you can't see 10 11 that. Ashley looks fine today. She's not. 12 And that's something that lead does 13 that's very, very tough to handle for people 14 because, just looking at them, you're saying, 15 "Why is this person having a problem?" And you 16 wouldn't know just by looking. And the 17 evidence is going to show you that's what 18 happen with Ashley. 19 So how does lead get into a child's 20 Well, we all have kids or no kids or a body? 21 grandkid. And we all know that everything goes 22 into the child's mouth. They play on the

They get on the floor. They crawl

Their fingers are in their mouth.

Their toys get into their mouth. It all

23

24

25

floor.

around.

1 happens.

And why is that tough? Why is that hard? Because that's the most common way that kids get lead. That's the most common way, by ingesting the lead dust that their normal childhood behavior causes them to do. And that's what the evidence is going to show you what happened in this case.

And I'll show you how I know that in one second. But I have to be honest, I forgot to mention something here a second ago about Ashley.

You might be think to yourself why is Ashley sitting here now? She's 30 years old. This happened when she was five years old.

I will tell you that there's legal reasons for that that really aren't concerning about the issue in this case that you're going to decide. Okay? That's -- so we're here for Ashley's case that happened when she is five. The fact that she's older now really does not -- it will not go into your decision making process at all.

So how do we know with Ashley that

lead got into her by dust? Okay. How do we know that she had this problem? And we'll get to the hows in a little bit.

But we have records in this case from Kennedy back in November of '94, after she had moved into the house that I'll tell you about in a little bit, she went to Kennedy because of her lead.

And what do we know? That Jackie

Martin -- Jackie Martin, by the way, you will

meet her. She's Ashley's mom. She's going to

testify in this case. She took her to Kennedy

when she was 1906 East Federal Street, the

address in this house.

And what did mom say to Kennedy
Krieger when she was there? Way before there
was any lawsuit, by the way. She said,
"Constant finger sucking. Constant finger
sucking," right when she was living at 1906
East Federal Street.

And what did Kennedy tell us about Ms. Martin, Ashley's mom? What kind of reporting was she? Was she reliable? Was she a good reporter? She was a great informant. And this was way, way back in 1994.

Really quickly I want to run this.

You're going to hear a term during our trial called micrograms per deciliter, microgram per deciliter. That's a unit of measurement. It's how lead is measured in our blood.

When you hear us saying numbers,
Ashley had a certain lead level and had another
lead level, it's always in terms of micrograms
per deciliter. Always.

And this is the best way to describe it. A penny weighs about two grams. Two grams. If a penny is cut into two million pieces, two million pieces, that would be 1 microgram per deciliter. Very, very, very small amount to get lead into your blood.

So I gave you a brief description before about how lead affects kids. Lead lowers IQ, causes attention problems. It makes you not the person who you could have been. It causes problems with memory, something called processing speed.

And you will hear Dr. Pearl, our psychologist, a neuropsychologist, come into court probably tomorrow to tell you about the testing that he did on Ashley and the deficits

that he found.

It causes problem with coordination and motor skills, the ability to express yourself verbally, and a whole -- this is a fancy word -- a whole constellation, a whole grouping of cognitive problems.

And the evidence in this case is going to show you that Ashley was poisoned by lead at 1906 East Federal Street because of this study, the R&M study that we're here today to talk about.

The most important thing, ladies and gentlemen, there is no such thing as a safe level of lead. It doesn't exist.

So you've been hearing me talk about this study. The study, the study, the study. Well, now I'm going to talk to you about what the evidence is going to show you, ladies and gentlemen, about the study.

What Kennedy did was they came to a conclusion -- they came -- they observed lead poisoning in Baltimore is a big problem. We know that. And I said that's one of the things, you know, we live on. Back in the '90s when this study was done, lead poisoning in

Baltimore was a big problem. The question is what are you going to do about it?

What Kennedy decided to do is take houses that they knew had lead paint and that they knew had lead dust, and then they said, "Here's what we're going to do. We're going to do different levels of repairs in three levels of houses. And then we're going to put the kids into these houses and see, by measuring their blood level and by measuring the mere accumulation of dust lead in the house, then the blood, then the house, and we're going to compare them. And we're going to see which is the cheapest, most cost effective way to see how to do these repairs."

They used the kids as test subjects.

And how do we know this? Well, this is no dispute. There was three levels of repair.

The first grouping of houses had \$1,650 worth of repair. The second level, the level at issue in this case, 1906 East Federal Street, had \$3,500 worth of repairs. The third level had almost double and in some cases double that amount, of 6,000 to \$7000 worth of repairs.

They left lead in the house -- those

- 1 houses, each of those three levels, on purpose.
- 2 | They put the kids into these houses on purpose
- 3 knowing that these houses had lead and knowing
- 4 that the lead dust in the house, which is the
- 5 most common way for kids to get exposed, would
- 6 reaccumulate in the houses after they did that
- 7 level of repair. That's what they knew.
- 8 That's what they did. That's what the evidence
- 9 in this case is going to show you.
- 10 And that's why I said I think this
- 11 | evidence is going to disappoint and shock you
- 12 coming from an institution like Kennedy.
- You know what else? There were
- 14 houses in the study, ladies and gentlemen, that
- 15 had no lead. A level 4 house had a
- 16 comprehensive abatement. They got all the lead
- 17 out. And some of the houses in the City of
- 18 | Baltimore had no lead in them at all because
- 19 | they were new. And those two groups are what
- 20 | you call -- you'll hear about -- it's called a
- 21 | control group.
- 22 Ashley wasn't in a control group,
- 23 | ladies and gentlemen. Ashley was a human test
- 24 subject. That's what the evidence is going to
- 25 | show you in this case.

So now you may be thinking, even before I got to it, well, how did Ashley end up in the study to begin with?

Here's what the evidence is going to show you. 1906 East Federal Street was a boarded-up, vacant house owned by a company -- by a man -- owned by a man named Mr. Lawrence Polakoff, Lawrence Polakoff. Mr. Polakoff is going to be here tomorrow, and you'll hear him testify.

And there's what happened. His house was boarded up, it was vacant, it was not making money for his company. And Kennedy Krieger went out to the landlords of Baltimore City, to the property owners of Baltimore City, and said, "Hey, guys, we're doing this study. And if you agree to put your property into the study" -- some of which were vacant, just like Mr. Polikoff's property at 1906 East Federal Street -- "if you agree to put your property in the study, we will get you a loan that you will never have to pay back. We will decide how much repair is going to be done to the property though. And here is the contract. You must use our company called Environmental

Restoration, Inc., to do the repairs."

So the evidence is going to show you they solicit him to come in, they told him how much repairs were going to be done, they told him who was going to do it, and they got him a free loan.

But the condition of the loan being free, that it would never have to pay back, is that he had to promise that he would only rent the property to families who had kids in the study. That's what the evidence is going to show you. That's what the evidence is going to show.

And shocking you all, Mr. Polakoff is going to come into court tomorrow and tell you that, on top of all that, on top of the free repairs, on top of the never-paid-back loan, on top of telling him, "To get that loan, you have to put a child -- a family with a child in the study who qualifies to be in the study into the house," on top of all, "Your property is going to be lead safe." That's what they told Mr. Polakoff.

And the evidence will show you that that certainly was not, in fact, true.

So I anticipate that Mr. Brown is going to come to you, when he has a chance to talk, to say, "We weren't the landlord. We had anything to do with it. Mr. Polakoff signed the lease with Jackie Martin."

And by the way, you'll hear about a woman named Katina Higgins. Ms. Higgins and Jackie were friends. They moved into the property together. Katina had a child who was in the study, Myron. And Ashley's sister Charnice, who was then known as Anquenette -- she changed her name -- but was then known as Anquenette, she qualified for the study.

So Mr. Polakoff rented the property to Jackie and her family, solicited by KKI. He said, "This is awesome. We're doing the repairs for \$3,500." And that was going to be lead-safe. That's what Kennedy told them.

That's what the evidence is going to show you in this case. So when you hear Mr. Brown say Mr. Polakoff was the landlord, remember when you hear the evidence that Kennedy solicited Mr. Polakoff to put his property into the study. Kennedy told Mr. Polakoff how much repairs were to be done. And Kennedy said,

"You only get that free loan if you put a family with children into the study." Kennedy got Ashley and her family into that house. And that's what the evidence is going to show you.

And here's something that's incredible. Because Kennedy knew that the house at 1906 East Federal Street was full of lead when Ashley moved in. And they knew that in two ways. The first way -- I don't have a slide up here for it -- they did dust testing of the house. And they tested the house for lead dust, lead dust.

And in order for the property to qualify for this study, it had to have at least two infants in excess of the then Maryland standard for clearance of lead dust. And it met that standard.

It also had to have lead by then XRF testing. And that machine there is called an XRF device. It looks like a radar gun that a police officer would point at you to see if you're speeding.

But what you do is you can they put it on a surface, they pull the trigger, and then they see if there's lead on the surface.

And this is testing that Kennedy itself did throughout the house.

And as -- I'm not going to go
through each single room. But as you see, they
went through the whole house. And every single
room in the house, every single hallway,
bathrooms, hallway, bedrooms, kitchen, every
single room in the house had lead-based paint.
And that was true even after, even after,
Kennedy did their \$3,500 worth of repairs.
Every single surface that was tested had lead
all over the place in the house, but they let
Ashley move in anyway. 3,500 bucks, ladies and
gentlemen. That's what the evidence is going
to show you.

So they test the property. They do the repairs. What happens next in May of 1994? Mr. Polakoff, just like he promised, just like he promised, put an ad in the paper. And he was looking for people to move into his newly repaired property.

Now, Mr. Polakoff didn't say, "This house is part of a study." Kennedy didn't have him do that. He just advertised it like it was a -- like a regular house. And Jackie and

- 1 Katina saw the ad, and they went to Chase
- 2 | Management. That's Mr. Polikoff's company.
- 3 And they had to pay \$25 for a key deposit.
- 4 They got the key. They went. And you know
- 5 | what? They looked at the house, and they moved
- 6 in.
- 7 | Why did they move in? Because it
- 8 | did look nice. They had just done this \$3,500
- 9 of repairs. There wasn't any chipping paint.
- 10 The surfaces seemed smooth. It had the amount
- 11 of bedrooms that they wanted. It looked good
- 12 to them.
- But the evidence is going to show
- 14 you, ladies and gentlemen, that -- you've all
- 15 | heard the expression the lipstick on a pig.
- 16 That's exactly what this was. It was covering
- 17 | up a house full of poison.
- 18 And Mr. Polakoff, on behalf of
- 19 | Kennedy, who solicited him into this study with
- 20 his properties, never let Ashley's mom Jackie
- 21 | know that this was a study house before they
- 22 moved in.
- But what happened next? A few days
- 24 later, five days after they moved in, Kennedy
- 25 comes knocking. Kennedy comes knocking. And

they said, "Hey, can we come in? We want to talk to you. We want to tell you about something that we're doing."

1.0

Oh, by the way, this is the rental application for when they moved into the property. Here's Ashley's name. And -- the people that are living in the property are listed, and there's Ashley's name.

So what happened next? Kennedy comes in, and they say, "We're doing a study. Can you tell us about yourselves?"

And what do we know here? We know that Kennedy interviewed mom in May of '94.

And how did they know that Ashley was there?

Ashley is listed as a person in the study in that house.

But Ashley was too old to be in the study. Her little sister was in the study, but Ashley was too old. And that 2 and the 5 there, 2 means female, 5 means her age. Okay?

So from the very beginning when Kennedy came knocking after they moved in, after Jackie was there, before Jackie knew that this house was some kind of experiment to compare blood lead levels to dust levels, then

Kennedy came knocking.

And they had mom, Ms. Martin, sign something called a consent form. And you're going to hear evidence in this case that, when a study happens, when people are doing research, they have to tell people what's going on.

And the evidence in this case is going to show you that Kennedy was not transparent. Kennedy did not tell Ms. Martin what was going on. And Kennedy went around Ashley, who at five years old had no voice of her own, who couldn't speak for herself, they presented mom with this form.

And here's something that's unbelievable to me, as long as I've been working on this case. In the consent form, what does it say? "We understand that your house is going to have some special repairs." Going to have. Not has already had. Not that we made your house so you'll be lead safe. But we're going to do something more. It's going have special repairs.

this case that, except to come in and take

The evidence is going to show you in

their dust lead swipes -- dust lead vacuum

samples for this case, they didn't lay a finger

in this house after Ashley moved in. Not one

bit of repairs.

To his credit, Mr. Polakoff, the landlord, when he had a complaint about a leaky faucet for a light switch that didn't work or something like that, he came in and fixed that stuff.

But Kennedy, "We understand your house is going to have special repairs," never happened. Never happened. That's what the evidence is going to show you in this case.

And there's not one word about what -- the risk of living in a house full of lead and a house full of lead dust about risks. And you're going to hear experts testify in this case. You're going to hear Dr. Spriggs and Mr. Goebel.

And I want to get something out of the way right now. Dr. Spriggs, Dr. Merle Spriggs, is an expert in bioethics. She has a Ph.D. She's that kind of doctor, not an M.D. doctor. She's a Ph.D. doctor. And she also has studied the R&M study itself as part of her

1 research.

But here is the thing. I'm sure Mr. Brown is going to stand up and tell you that Mr. Brian Brown had to get an expert to come in and testify all the way from Australia. And it's true. Dr. Spriggs is from Australia. And she has flown in -- I think she's arrived. I'm not sure. But she's going to be her, and she's going to testify.

But you know what? I want the best expert when presenting my case for my clients. And if it's the closest expert or the furthest away expert, that's what I'm going to use.

And Dr. Spriggs is going to come to court and tell you about this study and how it was poorly designed, how it didn't inform

Ashley and her mom of the risks, how it was unethical to use children like Ashley as human test subjects.

And Mr. Goebel, he worked for the
United States Government for years and years
and reviewed and approved thousands of consent
forms. And by the way, he's only from
Frederick. So -- and he's going to tell you
about why the consent form was inappropriate

and not correct.

And what do we know, number one?

That risk warnings do not appear on the form.

Nowhere on the consent form does it tell Ashley and her mom "You are living in a house full of lead and lead dust." Not there. And that's what the evidence is going to show you.

What did the consent form say? And this is what you're going to hear from the experts. You're going to hear that it doesn't say "This house has lead paint and lead dust."

Nowhere on the form does it say that.

You're going to hear what is on the form. Doesn't even tell her that repairs were done before. And it doesn't say, "And in this particular area, watch out. There's lots of lead there." Doesn't tell her that.

absolutely no repairs done to the basement whatsoever. And ladies and gentlemen, the evidence is going to show you that the basement was full of lead and full of lead dust and that Ashley's mom kept her toys down there and brought them up so she could play.

It didn't tell you -- didn't tell

Ashley's mom that the purpose of the study was to look at partial clean-ups on the children's blood. Didn't tell her that.

Didn't tell her that there were other houses in the study that had more repairs and that, in fact, there were other houses in the study that didn't have any lead in it whatsoever.

And it didn't say "You're signing this consent form for Charnice," Anquenette back then. We're not even dealing with Ashley. She's too old for the study.

His Honor is going to tell you that Kennedy owed the same responsibilities to Ashley as it owed to any child who was in the study.

And that's because the evidence is going show you that Kennedy decided what house was going to be in the study, Kennedy decided how much lead -- how much of lead repairs were going to be in the study, Kennedy decided who was going to do the work, Kennedy decided -- excuse me -- Kennedy knew there was a consent form.

Kennedy owed the same

responsibilities to Ashley as they owed to anyone else in the study. They knew that she was only five years old. They knew that she could get injured and damaged permanently because of lead poisoning.

But they're going to come in and say, "Oh, Ashley wasn't in the study. We didn't have to pay attention to her." They didn't give any warnings about Ashley in that consent form, even though, if you remember, the questionnaire listed Ashley's name. That's what the evidence is going to show you. And I already told you it doesn't say that other houses have no lead whatsoever.

And they didn't say the most important thing. "Living in this house can poison your child. Living in this house can cause brain damage to your child." It's not there.

So let's look at this. This is a diagram of Ashley's blood lead levels.

And I want to start by saying this:

Ashley moved into that house, as you saw, in

May of 1994. I couldn't have credibility with

you, I don't think you would trust anything

that I say, if I didn't tell you something that
was obvious in the case.

Ashley had lead exposure before she ever moved into 1906 East Federal Street.

You'll see that, in September of '93, before she moved in, she had a blood lead level --

7 remember that word, microgram per deciliter? 8 She had a blood lead level of 18 micrograms per

9 deciliter.

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

Then she moved into the property on May 19, 1994. And her blood lead level goes up to 21 in August. Why is that so important? They did the clean-up.

And I'm going to see if this thing -- oops. Go back one.

You see these dots here. These dots represent what's call the dust lead loadings.

That's how they measure lead dust in a house.

Don't get confused with lead in the blood.

20 This is how they measure lead dust in a house.

And before they moved in, when they had done their \$3,500 worth of repairs, the lead dust in the house was pretty low, pretty low.

But two months later, many areas of

the house the dust lead in the house went up, just like Kennedy expected it to do. Because remember, the whole purpose of the study was to see how lead reaccumulates in the houses versus how it affects the child's blood lead level.

So just as they expected it to do, the dust lead levels in the house went up. Why is that important? Because watch. As the dust lead went up, what else went up? Ashley's blood lead levels.

So the evidence is going to show you, it's going to show you, ladies and gentlemen, that exactly what Kennedy wanted to happen happened. They were trying to do a comparison study. And they were right, as dust reaccumulates, kids get exposed to lead.

Now, you're going to hear, I expect, while Ashley was already poisoned when she got there, her blood lead only, only, went up 3 micrograms per deciliter when she moved in. No harm, no foul. She was already poisoned when she got there. Dig deal.

You're to hear evidence it is a big deal. It's a big, big deal. Because the longer you are exposed to lead, the more

Page 65

damaged that it does. And you're going to hear from Dr. Klein, a pediatrician, come into court and tell you, sort of in doctor words, the lesson I gave you in lead before and tell you that, the more you're exposed to lead, not just with the led levels but also the length of time that you are exposed to a poison like lead continues to cause damage. And that's what happened in this case.

I want to say one more thing about this 21. You see the 21 there on August 30th, 1994? This is the blood lead slip. And I didn't have this highlighted, but you'll see right there it's August the 30th, 1994.

I expect Kennedy to come into court and try to tell you that Ashley had a blood lead level of 21 before she moved into the property and that therefore her blood lead was the same at both places.

Ladies and gentlemen, I will tell you right now I give you my word that you will not believe that. You will believe that that entry of the 21 before she moved in is a mistake.

And the reason I'm showing you this

is because this is a blood lead slip. There is no blood lead slip from the lab from March of lead slip from the lab from March of

You will see within the document they show you themselves that it's a contradiction, that it can't have been in March of 1994. It's a mistake. Ashley's only level of 21 was in August of 1994, right when the dust lead was reaccumulating in her house, right when she was continuing to be poisoned in this house.

So why is this important? Part of the so-called consent form is "We're going to send you information about what we find out in your house. We're going to tell you what your kid's blood lead levels are. And we're going to tell you about the dust levels in the house."

Never happened or at least never timely happened. How do I know this? Based on a letter in September of 1994 about a dust swipe -- a dust collection cyclone test they did in July of 1994.

Now, remember when Ashley's blood lead level was? August of '94. The evidence

is going to show you that, even though they did
testing in July, they didn't tell her until
September.

And what did they tell her? They say, "Okay. We did the test in July. It's almost two months later. And the chart below is going to tell you some areas where dust was collected in your homes. And we put an asterisk in areas where lead was higher than might be found in a completely renovated house."

So remember, they know there's renovated houses, completely renovated. And they're telling her, "Look, on the floor, of all places, lead is high, lead dust is high there."

What did we learn about lead and how kids get exposed earlier? Because kids are down on the floor playing. And then they put everything into their mouths.

And the evidence is going to show you that what do they say? "You clean it up."

I told you that the evidence in this case was going to shock you and disappoint you.

And the same thing happened later.

November test, February notification. And what do they say? There is the outcome. Clean it yourself. Clean it yourself.

Dust from repairs, and what do we know? What do we know? Two years after Ashley moved out of the house in 1997, the house was tested for lead again with the same kind of XRF device, the same kind of radar gun machine that I showed you earlier.

And what do we know about that?

Remember, they told Ashley's mom, "We're going to do special repairs." That's what the evidence is going to show you.

But two years later, lead all over the house, including the basement. All over the house in virtually all the same places that were tested by KKI the first time.

What special repairs? The evidence is going to show you there were no special repairs done after Ashley moved into the property. Everywhere is lighting up red. Lead was everywhere just like before. 1993, before Ashley moved into the property. 1997, after she moved out.

1 Now, you might be thinking, well, 2 they could have put that lead in there after Ashley moved out. So how do we know this? I'm 3 4 going to tell you right now the evidence will show you that the application of new lead-based 5 paint in Baltimore City was banned in the late 6 '50s, early '60s. 7 8 So if it was there in 1997, it was there when Ashley was living there back in 9 10 1995. Because it couldn't have been placed 11 there in between, the application of new 12 lead-based paint. 13 And, look, the evidence speaks for 14 itself anyway, ladies and gentlemen. 15 going to show you that it's virtually the same 16 places before and after. Except this time the 17

testing that my office had done actually included the basement. But Kennedy didn't even bother to do that.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's what the evidence is going to show you in this case. There were no special repairs.

Now, one of the things that a study has to do when a studier or researcher comes in, they have to come in, and they have to tell

you, as I said, the risks. And there's no section called "Risks."

They also have to tell you what they think the benefits are of the study. And the reason for that, the evidence will show you, is that a person has the right to make an intelligent choice, to weigh the risks and weigh the benefits.

Do you know what they said the benefit is? \$5. Five bucks. They said,
"We'll give you \$5 if you answer this questionnaire. And then, oh, boy, if we come in again and answer another questionnaire when we come back, we'll give you 15 bucks."

That's the so-called benefit of the study. We'll mail you a check for \$15. We'll provide you with the blood level lead results for your kids.

You know what, ladies and gentlemen?

That's not a benefit. The evidence is going to show you that it was the normal standard in pediatric care to have lead testing done at certain times. They would have had the lead testing done anyway.

"We'll contact you to discuss a

summary of the dust lead test, and we'll reduce
the risk of exposure." You saw that, a letter
two months later with an asterisk that said
"Clean it yourself."

The evidence will show that's not a benefit. The so-called benefit to Ashley.

They're saying, "This is a benefit to you because you were doomed anyway."

They're going to show you all kinds of statistics that says how many houses had lead and how many kids had lead. And it's true. But you know what? Not every house in the city had lead like 1906 East Federal Street. And not every kid in the city had blood lead levels way up at 21 micrograms per deciliter like Ashley did.

They're going to try to say, "It's okay that we use your children as human test subjects because no harm, no foul. Its east Baltimore. It's our turf. That's who we are. We can do whatever we want." That's what the evidence in this case is going to show you.

So -- excuse me for one second.

As I told you, lead causes a brain injury. It causes permanent brain damage. And

part of my job in this case is to show you what
we're going to prove about what happened to
Ashley.

So Ashley did graduate high school.

And she even went to a school down on the

Eastern Shore. And she was able to get her

nursing assistant license. And you might

think, well, that's great. She's doing okay.

But she's not doing okay. She's never held a

job as a nursing assistant.

You're going to hear from our expert Mark Lieberman, who's going to tell you about the vocational process, what kind of jobs that Ashley can actually do based on the problems that she has, based upon the deficits that she has.

Today she is -- drives a van for an adult care facility. She doesn't use her nursing certificate. And she doesn't use the abilities that a high school graduate should really have. Because she doesn't have those abilities.

And you'll hear from Mark Lieberman, who's a vocational counselor, come in and talk to you about all of the records that he

reviewed and the problems that Ashley has and how she is limited on the kinds of work that she's going to be able to do.

You're going to hear that Ashley sustained IQ loss as a result of her exposure to lead. And as I told earlier, you she was exposed before she got to 1906 East Federal Street. And for sure some of that IQ loss came from exposure before she ever got there.

But what you're going to hear from

Dr. Klein is that lead continues to do harm.

Even if you're hurt before, it doesn't mean

that you can't continue to be hurt. One pack a

day versus two packs a day. Look at it that

way if that helps you.

Lead continues to do injury the longer you are exposed. And remember, in Ashley's case, in Ashley's case, her highest blood lead level was when she was living at this supposedly lead-safe house at 1906 East Federal Street.

And Dr. Klein -- remember I told you about Dr. Hurwitz. Dr. Klein is our pediatrician. Dr. Klein practiced medicine in Baltimore for 30 years. He was a pediatrician

1 here in Baltimore.

And you'll hear that he wrote the curriculum that new doctors are taught about lead poisoning at Sinai and at University of Maryland Hospital. You will hear that he treated and monitored hundreds and hundreds of hundreds of kids here in Baltimore for lead paint.

But just like Dr. Spriggs, I have to tell you now that Dr. Klein is coming from far away. Dr. Klein decided back in 2004 -- back in 2004, Dr. Klein decided to live out his lifelong dream and move to Israel. And that was after 30 years of practice here in Baltimore. So he moved to Israel. He is still practicing medicine over there. And he still knows all about lead poisoning here in Baltimore.

And he's going to come to court.

He's coming in, just like Dr. Spriggs, and he's going to come into court and tell you about lead, what it did to Ashley, and how it affected her ability to be the person she could have been if not for exposure to lead.

So, ladies and gentlemen, we're

2.0

Page 75

going to prove some things to you. We're going to prove to you that Ashley was poisoned by lead. And we're going to prove to you that she was poisoned by lead at 1906 East Federal Street, that she was poisoned because KKI was negligent in the way they designed and the way they conducted this study by putting children in harm's way to use them as test subjects.

If KKI had acted reasonably, had they followed the rules that researchers are supposed to follow, she would not have been poisoned at 1906 East Federal Street. And because of that, Ashley is never going to be who she could have been. She has permanent brain damage, very disable -- varied disabilities and behavior problems, all because KKI was negligent.

I want to talk to you about one more thing. His Honor is going to give you some instructions on the law -- actually a few more things.

As I told you, Ashley was exposed to lead before she got there. But we don't have to show you what damage came from what house or what source of exposure and what came from

1 | another. All we have to show you is that

2 | Ashley's exposure to lead at 1906 East Federal

Street was what's called a, not the,

4 substantial factor in her injuries. And to be

5 | substantial, it had to be enough to contribute.

6 That's it.

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So think about that when you're listening to the evidence. Even if Ashley was exposed before, it doesn't mean that Kennedy is not responsible. And His Honor is going to tell you not to ferret out, not to figure out how much damage came from one house and how much came from another house. That's not your job.

So before I get to my last little part of the discussion, I want to tell you a little bit about the trial. So this is -- as you know, it's going to be a pretty long trial. And sometime I wish I could present I case that went straight from point A to Z.

But because of witnesses' schedule and people coming from out of town, things are not going to go in the exact order. So I might put somebody up to talk about Ashley's injuries before you even found out about the property

and the house and all that to begin with. It's not going to be what we call linear.

And also you might hear me introduce Exhibit No. 17, for example, before Exhibit No. 2 or Exhibit No. 1 ever got into evidence.

They're all premarked most of the time. And they don't always come in in the exact same order. So that's a little procedural stuff.

The last thing I want to talk to you about is something called the burden of proof.

And I've been doing this more in our trials lately because of TV, and every show you see on TV is a crime show. Every time is a crime show.

You saw -- if you all came back to the chambers when we were doing jury selection, and if you had been on a jury before, His Honor will always ask you, "Was this a criminal case that you sat on before or a civil case that you sat on before?"

This is a civil case. A civil case has a burden or proof that's different from a criminal case. A criminal case you have to prove your case beyond a reasonable doubt.

You've heard that term, "beyond a reasonable

doubt." Why is it such a high, high, high
burden? Because you're talking about people's
freedom. Okay?

This is not a criminal case. This is a civil case. And in a civil case, it's what's called a preponderance of the evidence. And all that means is what we are trying to show more likely so than not so, more likely than not. Literally it's 50.00001 percent, and we've met our burden.

And you'll see all we have to do is slightly tip that scale with a feather, and the plaintiff, Ashley, has met her burden of proof.

But I want to tell you something else before I sit down and say thank you for listening to me and ask you to give the same kind of attention you gave to me to Mr. Brown.

I want to tell to you that we're not going to just prove it with a feather. We're going to prove it with lead, ladies and gentlemen. We are going to prove our case and then some.

Thank you very, very much for listening to me so attentively. I really appreciate it. Ashley appreciates it.

Page 79 1 I look forward to talking to you at the end of this case when I'll ask you to 2 3 return a verdict in favor of the plaintiff. 4 Thank you. 5 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Brown. 6 All right. Members of the jury, 7 we're going to take a short break before the 8 defense opening just so you have a few minutes 9 to refresh yourselves. And let's take about ten minutes. And that should give you all a 10 11 chance to use the restroom. 12 Leave your notebooks here on the 13 Please don't discuss the case in the chairs. 14 jury room during the break. And we'll see you 15 again in about ten minutes. 16 THE CLERK: All rise for the jury, 17 please. 18 THE COURT: And, Counsel, about ten 19 minutes. 2.0 (A short recess was taken.) 21 THE CLERK: All rise, please. THE COURT: Counsel, you can come 22 23 up. 24 Everyone else may be seated. Thank

25

you.