1 2 ALAMEDA COUNTY 3 SEP 2 0 2011 4 **CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT** 5 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 10 11 RG10521382 Case No. HENRY S. BISSETT and 12 MARY A. BISSETT, 13 Plaintiffs, VERDICT FORM 14 vs. 15 KAISER GYPSUM CORPORATION and BIG 'B' LUMBERTERIA, INC., 16 Defendants. 17 18 19 WE, THE JURY in the above-entitled action, find the following special verdict on the questions 20 submitted to us: 21 22 QUESTION NO. 1: Did Kaiser Gypsum manufacture an asbestos-containing joint compound 23 that Henry S. Bissett was exposed to? 24 No Yes ANSWER: 25 If you answered "No" to Question No. 1, then do not answer any further questions and sign and 26 return the Verdict Form. If you answered "YES" to question No. 1, then answer the next Question. 27 28

-1-

1	
2 3	QUESTION NO. 2: Did the Kaiser Gypsum joint compound fail to perform as safely as an
4	ordinary consumer would have expected?
5	ANSWER: Yes No
6	If you answered "No" to Question No. 2, then go to Question No. 5. If you answered "YES" to
7	question No. 2, then answer the next Question.
8	
9	QUESTION NO. 3: Was the Kaiser Gypsum joint compound used in a way that was reasonably
	foreseeable to Kaiser Gypsum?
10	ANSWER: Yes No
11	If you answered "No" to Question No. 3, then go to Question No. 5. If you answered "YES" to
12	question No. 3, then answer the next Question.
13	
14	QUESTION NO. 4: Was the Kaiser Gypsum joint compound's design a substantial factor
15	
16	contributing to Henry S. Bissett's risk of developing malignant mesothelioma?
17	ANSWER: Yes No
18	Answer the next Question.
19	
	QUESTION NO. 5: Did Kaiser Gypsum joint compound have potential risks that were known
20	or knowable through the use of scientific knowledge available at the time of manufacture and
21	distribution?
22	ANSWER: Yes No
23	If you answered "No" to Question No. 5, then go to Question No. 11. If you answered "YES" to
24	question No. 5, then answer the next Question.
25	disease to the same and the same disease.
26	QUESTION NO. 6: Did the potential risks present a substantial danger to users of the product?
27	ANSWER: Yes No
28	7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	-2-

1	If you answered "No" to Question No. 6, then go to Question No. 11. If you answered "YES"				
2					
3	question No. 6, then answer the next Question.				
4	QUESTION NO. 7: Would ordinary consumers have recognized the potential risks?				
5	ANSWER: Yes No				
-6	If you answered "No" to Question No. 7, then go to Question No. 11. If you answered "YES" to				
7 8	question No. 7, then answer the next Question.				
9	QUESTION NO. 8: Did Kaiser Gypsum fail to adequately warn or instruct of the potential				
10	risks?				
11	ANSWER: Yes No				
12	If you answered "No" to Question No. 8, then go to Question No. 11. If you answered "YES" to				
13	question No. 8, then answer the next Question.				
14					
15	QUESTION NO. 9: Was the product used in a way that was reasonably foreseeable to Kaiser				
16 Gypsum?					
17	ANSWER: Yes No				
18	If you answered "No" to Question No. 9, then go to Question No. 11. If you answered "YES" to				
19	question No. 9, then answer the next Question.				
20					
21	QUESTION NO. 10: Was the lack of sufficient instruction or warning a substantial factor				
22	contributing to Henry S. Bissett's risk of developing malignant mesothelioma?				
23	ANSWER: Yes No				
24	Answer the next Question.				
25					
26					
27					
28					

-3-

H					
1	QUESTION NO. 11: Was defendant Kasier Gypsum negligent?				
2	ANSWER: Yes X No				
If you answered "No" to Question No. 11 and answered "Yes" to Questions No. 4 or No.  then go to Question No. 13. If you answered "No" to Question No. 11 and answered "No" or did					
					5
6					
7					
8	QUESTION NO. 12: Was such negligence a substantial factor contributing to Henry S. Bissett'				
9	risk of developing malignant mesothelioma?				
10	ANSWER: Yes X No				
11	If you answered "No" to Question No. 12 and answered "Yes" to Questions No. 4 or No. 10,				
12	then go to Question No. 13. If you answered "No" to Question No. 12 and answered "No" or did not				
13	have to answer Questions No. 4 and No. 10, then do not answer any further questions and sign and				
14	return the Verdict Form. If you answered "YES" to question No. 12, then answer the next Question.				
15					
16	QUESTION NO. 13: What do you find to be the total amount of economic damages suffered by				
17   18	the Plaintiffs?				
	ANSWER:				
19   20	Past Economic Loss				
	Medical Expenses \$				
21	Household Services \$ \(\frac{12,003}{}\)				
22	Future Economic Loss				
23	Medical Expenses \$				
24	Household Services \$ 108,024				
25	Pension \$ <u>\$1,853</u>				
26	Social Security \$ 94,120				
27	TOTAL ECONOMIC DAMAGES \$ 266,000				
28					

- 1		
1	QUESTION NO. 15: What do you find to	be the total amount of non-economic damages
2	suffered by Plaintiff Mary A. Bissett?	
3	ANSWER	
4	Past non-economic loss	•
5	Loss of Love	
7	Companionship Comfort	
8	Care Assistance	
9	Protection Affection	
10	Society	33500
11	Moral Support	\$ 33,500
12	Loss of Sexual Relations	\$
13	Future non-economic loss	
14	Loss of Love	
15	Companionship Comfort	
16	Care Assistance	
17	Protection	•
18	Affection Society	23 SNO
19	Moral Support	\$ 33,500
20	Loss of Sexual Relations	\$ 33,500
21		
22	TOTAL NON-ECONOMIC DAMAGES	\$ 134,000
23		
24	TOTAL DAMAGES:	\$ 666,000
25	Answer the next Question.	
26		
27		
28		

-6-

1	
2	QUESTION NO. 16: If 100% represents the total fault that was the cause of Plaintiffs' injury,
3	what percentage of this 100% was due to the fault of the defendants and others listed below?
4	ANSWER:
5	<u> </u>
6	To Defendant KAISER GYPSUM  To GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORPORATION  \( \frac{10}{0}\) \( \frac{0}{0}\)
7	To GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORPORATION \(\frac{\infty}{\sum}\)\"
8	To Plaintiff HENRY S. BISSETT 20 %
9	
10	TOTAL: 100%
11	
12	
13	Dated: September 20, 2011 Thomas a har
14	Dated: September 20, 2011  FOREPERSON
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
26 27	
Z 1	

28