JOHN T. MURRAY v. RITE AID OF OHIO, INC, ET AL

1	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
2	CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OH
3	
4	***********
5	JOHN T. MURRAY, As Administration of the Estate of Dale D. Dukeshire, Jr.
6	deceased, et al,
7	Plaintiffs,
8	vs. CV 18 905172
9	RITE AID OF OHIO, INC., and JAMES GALLAGHER, MD, et al.,
10	Defendants.
11	**************************************
12	
13	The virtual deposition of ROBERT S. LITMAN, R.PH., C.PH., CGP, taken by the defendants
14	under the Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure in the above-entitled action, pursuant to notice, before
15	Kristina Guthrie, Professional Court Reporter, held via Zoom video conferencing, on Monday, November 9,
16	2021, commencing at approximately 12:01 p.m.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	REALTIME REPORTERS, LLC KRISTINA GUTHRIE, REPORTER
23	713 Lee Street Charleston, West Virginia 25271
24	(304) 344-8463 realtimereporters.net

```
1
                        APPEARANCES:
 2
    APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS:
 3
         Mark M. Abramowitz, Esquire
         Christopher Stombaugh, Esquire
         DiCELLO LEVITT & CASEY, LLC
 4
         7556 Mentor Avenue
         Mentor, Ohio 44060
 5
         440-953-8888
 б
         mabramowitz@dlcfirm.com
 7
    APPEARING ON BEHALF OF RITE AID OF OHIO, INC.:
 8
         Tamela J. White-Farrell, Esquire
 9
         FARRELL WHITE & LEGG, PLLC
         914 Fifth Avenue
         Huntington, West Virginia 25701
10
         304-522-9100
11
         tjw@farrell3.com
         John M. McManus, Esquire
12
         McMANUS LAW, PLLC
13
         117 W. Fourth Street, Suite 201
         Royal Oak, MI 48067
         248-268-8989
14
         john@mcmanusfirm.com
15
    APPEARING ON BEHALF OF JAMES GALLAGHER, MD:
16
17
         Chad W. Beck, Esquire
         REMINGER CO, LPA
         101 West Prospect Avenue, Suite 1400
18
         Cleveland, Ohio 44115
19
         216-687-1311
         cbeck@reminger.com
20
         Stephen Griffin, Esquire
21
         Griffin Law
22
         4051 Whipple Avenue, NW
         Canton, Ohio 44718
23
         234-360-8090
         sgriffin@griff-law.com
24
```

1	Also Present:
2	Mrs. Dukeshire
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

JOHN T. MURRAY v. RITE AID OF OHIO, INC, ET AL

1	EXAMINATION INDEX	
2	ROBERT S. LITMAN, R.PH., C.PH., CGP	PAGE
3	Examination by Ms. White-Farrell	6
4	Examination by Mr. Abramowitz	101
5	Examination by Ms. White-Farrell	101
6	EXHIBIT INDEX	
7	1 Notice of Deposition	PAGE 10
8	2 Bills and Correspondence	10
9	3 Interpretation of Toxicology Results, Chief Medical Examiner in North Carolina	14
11	4 Explanation of Overdose Risk Score	14
12	5 Morphine Equivalent Dosing	14
13 14	Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics Of carfentanil After Recreational Exposure, a Case Report	15
15	7 Module 5 - Wolters Kluwer	16
16	8 Notes of Robert S. Litman	17
17	9 Record Concerning MMEs	65
18	10 Calculation of Days Early	78
19	000	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

COURT REPORTER: We're here today for the deposition of Robert S. Litman, R.PH., C.PH., CGP in the Court of Common Pleas in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, in the matter of John T. Murray, et al. versus Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc., et al., being Civil Action No. CV 18 905172. Today's date is November 8th of 2021, and the time on the monitor is 12:01. My name is Kristy Guthrie and I'm a court reporter representing Realtime Reporters out of Charleston, West Virginia. If counsel will please identify themselves and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of Dukeshire, Ms. Dukeshire, as well	1	PROCEEDINGS
the Court of Common Pleas in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, in the matter of John T. Murray, et al. versus Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc., et al., being Civil Action No. CV 18 905172. Today's date is November 8th of 2021, and the time on the monitor is 12:01. My name is Kristy Guthrie and I'm a court reporter representing Realtime Reporters out of Charleston, West Virginia. If counsel will please identify themselves and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	2	COURT REPORTER: We're here today for the
in the matter of John T. Murray, et al. versus Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc., et al., being Civil Action No. CV 18 905172. Today's date is November 8th of 2021, and the time on the monitor is 12:01. My name is Kristy Guthrie and I'm a court reporter representing Realtime Reporters out of Charleston, West Virginia. If counsel will please identify themselves and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	3	deposition of Robert S. Litman, R.PH., C.PH., CGP in
Aid of Ohio, Inc., et al., being Civil Action No. CV 18 905172. Today's date is November 8th of 2021, and the time on the monitor is 12:01. My name is Kristy Guthrie and I'm a court reporter representing Realtime Reporters out of Charleston, West Virginia. If counsel will please identify themselves and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	4	the Court of Common Pleas in Cuyahoga County, Ohio,
Today's date is November 8th of 2021, and the time on the monitor is 12:01. My name is Kristy Guthrie and I'm a court reporter representing Realtime Reporters out of Charleston, West Virginia. If counsel will please identify themselves and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	5	in the matter of John T. Murray, et al. versus Rite
Today's date is November 8th of 2021, and the time on the monitor is 12:01. My name is Kristy Guthrie and I'm a court reporter representing Realtime Reporters out of Charleston, West Virginia. If counsel will please identify themselves and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	6	Aid of Ohio, Inc., et al., being Civil Action No. CV
the time on the monitor is 12:01. My name is Kristy Guthrie and I'm a court reporter representing Realtime Reporters out of Charleston, West Virginia. If counsel will please identify themselves and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White-Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	7	18 905172.
My name is Kristy Guthrie and I'm a court reporter representing Realtime Reporters out of Charleston, West Virginia. If counsel will please identify themselves and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	8	Today's date is November 8th of 2021, and
reporter representing Realtime Reporters out of Charleston, West Virginia. If counsel will please identify themselves and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	9	the time on the monitor is 12:01.
Charleston, West Virginia. If counsel will please identify themselves and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	10	My name is Kristy Guthrie and I'm a court
If counsel will please identify themselves and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	11	reporter representing Realtime Reporters out of
and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	12	Charleston, West Virginia.
with the noticing attorney, please. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	13	If counsel will please identify themselves
MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White- Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	14	and whom they represent, and I guess we'll start
Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	15	with the noticing attorney, please.
Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	16	MS. WHITE-FARRELL: This is Tamela White-
MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	17	Farrell. I and John McManus are here on behalf of
of Dr. James Gallagher. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	18	Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc.
MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	19	MR. BECK: This is Chad Beck here on behalf
22 and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler 23 on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	20	of Dr. James Gallagher.
on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of	21	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: We have Mark Abramowitz
	22	and Christopher Stombaugh from DiCello Levitt Gusler
24 Dukeshire, Ms. Dukeshire, as well	23	on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Estate of
	24	Dukeshire, Ms. Dukeshire, as well

1 MR. GRIFFIN: -- for Dr. Gallagher. 2 (Audio interference). I'm sorry, Steven. 3 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Му 4 apology. I didn't mean to cut you off there. Sorry 5 about that. COURT REPORTER: Do we have someone else 6 7 that needed to -- I believe. WITNESS: I am Robert Litman, the expert 8 9 witness, pharmacist. Thank you. And I 10 COURT REPORTER: Great. forgot to state, if anyone has an objection to me 11 12 swearing in the witness remotely if they could say 13 so at this time. Are there no objections? 14 you. 15 All right, I am going to put you under oath 16 if you'll please raise your right hand. ROBERT S. LITMAN, R.PH., C.PH., CGP, 17 18 was called as a witness, pursuant to notice, and 19 having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION 21 BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 22 Would you state your name for the record, Ο. 23 please. Robert Litman. 24 Α.

Rehabilitation Center.

23

24

1 And you are a pharmacist; true? Q. 2 Α. True. 3 What is Ultimed Health Advisors, Inc.? Q. 4 Α. That is my company, my business company. 5 It's a consulting firm. We provide retail pharmacy management services, long term care pharmacy, 6 7 nursing home consulting, and also, I also use it for 8 my legal consulting. 9 Q. What percent of the income of Ultimed Health Advisors is for legal consulting? 10 11 Α. It's approximately 10 to 15 percent I would 12 say. It's a rough estimate. 13 Are you currently employed anywhere else as 14 a pharmacist? Α. 15 Yes. 16 Where? Ο. Well, under my company, Ultimed, I have 17 18 several long-term care nursing home accounts that I 19 Do you need the names of the homes? service. 20 relay the names of the homes. Coral Gables Nursing 21 and Rehab Center, Okeechobee Nursing and Rehabilitation Center, Hampton Court Nursing and 22

I also do independent consulting for a

- 1 | fellow named Robert Rosenthal, Bobby Rosenthal, who
- 2 | was the former President of Florida Healthcare
- 3 | Association. He also has management contracts for
- 4 | long-term care facilities and I work with him, you
- 5 | know, doing troubled -- helping fix troubled homes.
- 6 Q. When was the last time you worked at a 7 retail pharmacy?
- 8 A. I believe that was 2017.
- 9 Q. And what retail pharmacy was that?
- 10 A. It was Black and White Pharmacy. It's on 11 Flagler Street in Miami.
- 12 Q. Do you have all of the -- you know, before
- 13 | I do that, Ultimed Health Advisors, Inc., where is
- 14 | it incorporated, in Florida?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Other than yourself, are there any
- 17 other owners?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Do you have all of the information you need
- 20 | to render any opinion you would attempt to render in
- 21 | this matter?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Have you asked for any information that has
- 24 | not been provided to you?

1 Not that I can think of off the top of my 2 head. 3 Have you interviewed anyone from the Q. Dukeshire family? 5 No, I have not. Α. Have you interviewed anyone at all whether 6 Ο. 7 it be a party to this lawsuit or a colleague or a, for instance, a retail pharmacist, have you 8 interviewed anyone at all for purposes of this case? 10 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 11 answer. 12 Α. No, I haven't. 13 I sent to the court reporter this morning my Notice of Deposition. Have you seen it before? 14 Yes. 15 Α. 16 Have you brought with you your file? Ο. 17 Α. Yes. 18 Would you share with me what you brought? Ο. 19 I brought a -- well, let me -- excuse me 20 I brought these. I don't know if you one second. 21 can see these records. I brought -- these are 22 mostly depositions that I have reviewed. And I put 23 all my bills and correspondence on a USB drive. 24 Ο. Okay.

1	A. So they're not on paper. I have on a
2	drive.
3	Q. I will mark your bills and correspondence
4	well, I'll mark the Notice of Deposition as
5	Exhibit 1.
6	DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 1
7	(Notice of Deposition was marked for
8	identification purposes as Deposition
9	Exhibit No. 1.)
10	I'll mark your bills and correspondence as
11	Exhibit 2 and at a break, we will work with the
12	court reporter to determine how to get those
13	transmitted to her; okay?
14	DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 2
15	(Bills and Correspondence were marked for
16	identification purposes as Deposition
17	Exhibit No. 2.)
18	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Wait, we have to I need
19	to enter an objection here. We believe there's some
20	attorney-client privileged material inside of the
21	bills. We are happy to provide a redacted version
22	of them. We believe you are absolutely owed the
23	numbers but any sort of detail about what was
24	discussed between counsel and the experts witness

1 that are listed on those bills will be redact it. 2 Is that subject to us claiming our 3 privilege on those matters? Is that okay? 4 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: I don't have any 5 problem with that so long as the Goose/Gander role applies that the defendant can likewise redact 6 7 anything that it contends is work product. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Well, of course. I mean, 8 I believe those rules go both ways. 9 10 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Yep. Okay. So at a 11 break, let's talk about the housekeeping aspect of 12 that rather than wasting time on the record; okay? 13 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Fair enough. 14 BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: On medical records, Doctor, on page 2 of 15 Ο. 16 your November -- on page 3 of your November 18, 17 2020, report, you listed a number of medical 18 records. 19 I'm trying to find that report. One Α. 20 What page was that? I'm sorry. second. 21 Q. Page 3. 22 All right. And the question again? Α. Well, first, I was just orienting you, but 23 0. 24 the question is, is this a list of all of the

- 1 medical records for Mr. Dukeshire or Janet Dukeshire 2 that you've received and reviewed in this case?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. If you --
- 5 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Object to the time of --
- 6 A. -- as of that time. I believe this is the 7 US.
- Q. Do you have any more medical records other than what are on this list?
- 10 A. To be -- I can't be sure at this point.
- 11 | There may have been some other materials I may have
- 12 reviewed since I got, created this opinion letter
- 13 | but I would have to go through my files at home,
- 14 | because I prepared all of this prior to, you know,
- 15 this, you know, when I submitted this report.
- 16 Q. Do you rely on any medical record whether
- 17 | they be listed in this report or otherwise as the
- 18 | basis of any opinion you would offer?
- 19 A. Yes. It's based on all of the records that
- 20 I reviewed on this paper, yes.
- 21 Q. What about medical records that you have at
- 22 home, is there any opinion that you have that you
- 23 | would rely upon any medical record that is not
- 24 included in this list?

24

0.

1 There may be some files I've added since I 2 created this document. They were research documents 3 that I, were checking from the other expert reports that I read trying to verify the data that was 5 presented. So I do have some other studies that I've put in my file. 6 7 My question is medical records. Let's focus on medical records. 8 9 Α. Oh, medical records from the patient? No. This is the complete list of medical records. 10 11 Ο. All right. So that the record is clear, 12 the list on page 3 of your report is the complete 13 list of all medical records that you've reviewed? MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 14 15 answer. I believe so. I believe that is the 16 Α. complete list. 17 18 And what are the studies that you have at Ο. 19 home that you did not bring with you? Actually, I brought them with me here in 20 Α. 21 paper but not on the hard drive. They are -- one is 22 from the chief medical examiner at North Carolina

and it was the interpretation of toxicology results.

I'll mark that as Exhibit 3.

1		DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 3
2		(Interpretation of Toxicology Results,
3		Chief Medical Examiner in North Carolina
4		was marked for identification purposes as
5		Deposition Exhibit No. 3.)
6	Q.	All right. Any others?
7	A.	The explanation of an overdose risk score.
8	Q.	The explanation, the overdose risk score.
9	I'll mark	that as Exhibit 4.
10		DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 4
11		(Explanation of Overdose Risk Score was
12		marked for identification purposes as
13		Deposition Exhibit No. 4.)
14	A.	A
15	Q.	morphine equivalent dosing, I'll mark as
16	Exhibit 5	•
17		DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 5
18		(Morphine Equivalent Dosing was marked for
19		identification purposes as Deposition
20		Exhibit No. 5.)
21	A.	Right. This is from now, if you can see
22	this, on t	this, our Experts Industry highlight,
23	Insights.	
24	Q.	And that's Exhibit 5.

1	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Hang on here one second,
2	I'm sorry, Tammy. I know you're on a roll and I
3	want to get things listed up so we can get this to
4	you. So Exhibit 4 is explaining overdose risk.
5	WITNESS: That was 4.
6	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: And what's in 5?
7	MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 5 was the last one he
8	held up which I think was the Morphine equivalence.
9	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Thank you. I'm sorry,
10	Tammy. I got some sticky notes now to keep track of
11	this.
12	WITNESS: This one.
13	MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Exhibit 6 is the
14	Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of Carfentanil
15	After Recreational Exposure, A Case Report.
16	DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 6
17	(Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of
18	Carfentanil After Recreational Exposure, A
19	Case Report was marked for identification
20	purposes as Deposition Exhibit No. 6.)
21	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: All right.
22	A. And this was from Wolters Kluwer
23	Q. Wolters Kluwer, this is No. 7.
24	DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 7

1 (Module 5 - Wolters Kluwer was marked for 2 identification purposes as Deposition 3 Exhibit No. 7.) 4 Α. It's a module Addressing and assessing 5 opiate use disorder. All right. No. 7, module 5. 6 Q. 7 Any more independent research that you've done? 8 No. I believe that should cover 9 everything. 10 Have you consulted any trade journals or 11 Ο. 12 retail pharmacies concerning the filling of 13 prescriptions one to two days before a prior prescription will expire? 14 I don't believe I have. 15 Α. No. 16 Going back to the deposition notice, Exhibit 1, do you have any notes regarding this 17 18 case? 19 Yes, I do. Α. 20 We'll make your notes the next exhibit Ο. 21 which I believe is 8. 22 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Am I right, Ms. Court 23 Reporter? 24 COURT REPORTER: Correct.

1	DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 8
2	(Notes of Robert S. Litman were marked for
3	identification purposes as Deposition
4	Exhibit No. 8.)
5	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: This is again subject to
6	review for any attorney-client privilege work
7	product information that might be inside of them
8	which we would ask for a review before presenting.
9	WITNESS: All right. This is the report
10	that I put together. It's a five-page report on the
11	prescriptions from, based on the list I was
12	provided.
13	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Exactly. If it's a draft
14	report, we're not going to be producing that.
15	WITNESS: What do you mean a draft report?
16	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: You used the term
17	
17	"report." Again, Tammy, I'm going to be speaking
18	"report." Again, Tammy, I'm going to be speaking here. It's not to be insulting, use the term draft
18	here. It's not to be insulting, use the term draft
18 19	here. It's not to be insulting, use the term draft on a report.
18 19 20	here. It's not to be insulting, use the term draft on a report. WITNESS: I don't really I don't
18 19 20 21	here. It's not to be insulting, use the term draft on a report. WITNESS: I don't really I don't understand what you mean by draft. I mean, you

1 WITNESS: Didn't you ask me for notes, 2 Tammy? 3 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: I did. 4 WITNESS: Yeah. These are the notes, 5 right. BY MR. WHITE-FARRELL: 6 7 And what are those notes from? Were they from the patient profile or are they from 8 9 prescriptions? Are they from medical records? What's the source of those notes? 10 11 Α. Those are from Rite Aid's medical records. 12 So the patient profile? Ο. 13 Α. Yes. 14 0. Okay. Did you match those notes with the 15 Oarrs report? 16 I did from the reports that I had. didn't have the complete reports, but what I did 17 18 have I did match to some of the Oarrs statement. 19 All right. And what are you saying to 20 yourself on these notes that are Exhibit 8? 21 Α. I was just merely noting the dates, the 22 drugs dispensed, the prescriptions, the quantities, the date supplied, the number of days that that 23 24 prescription should cover and then the doctor who

1 wrote it. And it goes from April 4, 2013, through 2 August 21, 2017. 3 COURT REPORTER: May I ask --4 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Yes. 5 WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. It goes 6 through October 9, 2017. 7 COURT REPORTER: May I asked Oarrs data -O-r-r data? 8 9 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: O-a-r-r-s. 10 COURT REPORTER: Thank you. 11 WITNESS: Right. 12 BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 13 What is it that you are communicating 14 through these notes? 15 Α. Well, I was doing these to assess the 16 dispensing frequency, the retail status, when they would be filling scripts and to establish how long 17 18 these prescriptions should be lasting on each 19 dispensing and how often they were refilled or 20 refilled early, or in many, in several cases, they 21 may have been refilled a little late. 22 On how many -- well, strike that. Ο. Are you looking -- when you're using the 23 24 words "refill," are you referring to C-IIs?

- A. I know. I realize there's no refills in C-IIs. They're all new prescriptions.
- 3 Q. All right.
- A. So I've used the term refills. It should be from one new prescription to the next new prescription.
- Q. So let's complete that thought. For each of the prescriptions that Dale Dukeshire had for a C-II substance, he had to present a new prescription; didn't he?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. And which meant there had to be a new original prescription; true?
- 14 A. That's true.
- Q. Which meant that he had to see his provider in order to or have some direct communication with his provider in order to have that new prescription written?
- 19 A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. So where you have referred to early refill, what you're really referring to is presentation of a new prescription before an old one completely expired; right?
 - A. Yes. Correct.

1 Do have you experience in, at any pharmacy 2 in policies of refilling prescriptions or filling 3 new prescriptions to prevent a patient from running out on the day that they are to expire? 5 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 6 answer. 7 Α. I'm not sure I understand that question. You're asking if I worked at a pharmacy where they 8 9 had policies addressing that? 10 Ο. Yes. 11 Α. Yes, I have. 12 And what is the purpose of a policy --Ο. 13 let's take an anti-hypertensive, for instance. patient that's on an anti-hypertensive, you do not 14 15 want them to run out of that drug because you want 16 them to keep a steady state of control of their blood pressure; right? 17 18 That's correct. Α. Yes. 19 Same way with an anti-diabetic medication; Ο. 20 right? 21 Α. Yes. 22 And when patients are on chronic pain therapy, those patients require around the clock 23 24 pain medication; true?

1 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 2 answer. 3 Not necessarily. Α. 4 Ο. Don't they require the same steady state of maintenance of their medication as does someone who 5 is on an anti-hypertensive or anti-diabetic 6 7 medication? MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 8 9 answer. 10 I don't believe so. Α. No. 11 Ο. Not chronic pain patients that are 12 prescribed chronic opiate therapy. That's your 13 testimony? Α. 14 Yes. 15 O. And why is it that you say that? 16 Because pain is very subjective and one day Α. a patient may have worse pain than another day. 17 18 There may be a weather influence on the pain. There 19 may be a physical excursion that occurred that 20 exacerbated the pain. Pain can change from moment 21 to moment. It is not like a chronic diabetic 22 condition in which blood sugar needs to be maintained between 90 and 120. It's nothing like 23 24 that.

1	As I said, it's very subjective and some
2	days a patient may not need any pain medication even
3	if they have a chronic issue. Some days they may
4	require a little bit more. It depends on the
5	conditions. So chronic pain cannot be equated to a
6	chronic disease state like diabetes or hypertension.
7	Q. It depends on the individual patient;
8	right?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And is it a positive thing for a pharmacist
11	to have a personal relationship with a patient?
12	A. Could you repeat that question?
13	Q. Is it a positive occurrence for a
14	pharmacist to have a personal relationship with a
15	patient and know them?
16	A. I believe that's a benefit to know your
17	patients.
18	Q. What information do you have about what
19	Ms. Boroff and Ms. Shriver knew about Dale Dukeshire
20	other than what you've read in their depositions?
21	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can
22	answer.
23	A. I only know from what I've read in their
24	depositions.

24

apologize.

1 Have you actually read Ms. Boroff's Ο. 2 deposition? It's not on your list. 3 Α. I'm not sure. I believe -- yeah. believe I have. I should have added it. Sorry. 5 We'll get to your list in a minute. Ο. 6 Α. Okay. 7 You mentioned that you've worked at pharmacies that have policies with respect to fills 8 9 of new prescriptions such as C-IIs and refills of expiring prescriptions. Do you remember that? You 10 11 said you worked with pharmacies with policies in 12 that regard? MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 13 14 answer. 15 Α. Yes, I remember. 16 Ο. Under what policies have you worked with respect to either early fills or fills of a new 17 18 prescription? 19 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Just for clarity. 20 kind -- because we're dealing with two different 21 types of drugs in the question. Which are you 22 referencing? In terms of C-II versus non-C-II? I'm

not a pharmacist so I (audio interference).

1 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: However the way the 2 witness wants to do it. I'll flow with it. 3 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Thank you. 4 WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you repeat the 5 question? BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 6 7 I want to know about the policies Sure. 8 that you've worked under. 9 Α. Oh, okay. The policies, it depends. varies from pharmacy to pharmacy. The pharmacies in 10 11 which I have been a personal manager at, I have 12 ensured that there would be a policy of no early refills on C-IIs. 13 14 Ο. Have you worked at -- so for purposes of 15 this deposition, whenever a patient presents a new 16 prescription for a C-II, you're calling that early refill? 17 18 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 19 answer. 20 So you're saying any time they present a 21 prescription, it's early? No. Well, I don't 22 understand. That's what I didn't understand your 23 Ο. 24 So what I'm trying to -- let's take the answer.

C-IIs first.

1

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- A. Right.
- Q. When you say "no early refill," what do you mean by that?
- A. I'm sorry. I used the term refill. We do
 not fill a new C-II prescription for people for the
 same medication if it arrives early, you know,
 earlier than the usage should be by based on the
 instructions in the original prescription.
 - Q. Now, you said that was at pharmacies at which you were a manager. Have you worked at pharmacies in which you were not the manager and the policy was different?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of. The pharmacies that I've worked at that I was not the manager were primarily through agencies, pharmacy agencies, and I was not there routinely and I did not have a chance to look at their policies and procedures.
 - So they may have had them but I did not have a chance to read them. The pharmacies that I've been the manager at, I've gone through the policy and procedure manuals.
- Q. Is there any industry standard or protocol or published best practices from a trade association

1 that would adopt your personal practice versus that which Rite Aid had here which was a 48-hour rule? 2 3 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 4 answer. 5 I'm sorry. Every time he objects, I forget Α. the question. What was the question? 6 7 Is there any written standard, trade organization policy, document, or thing you can 8 9 refer me to that says your personal method of no fill except on the day of expiration is superior to 10 11 a practice such as what Rite Aid had which was a 48-hour rule? 12 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 13 14 answer it. 15 Ο. Again, every time you do that it throws me 16 off. I'm sorry. I hate to ask you to repeat it. Τ 17 know you're going to raise the objection again. 18 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Before you say the 19 question, for the record, I'm objecting. apologize, Tammy, but I'm objecting now. Ask the 20 21 question. 22 All right, I understand. You asked about trade journals that reflect my personal policy. 23

I have not, I'm not really familiar with

trade journals, although, there are many guidelines
on dispensing narcotics that will reflect that what
I call early refills or early requests for new
prescriptions, I should say, where they would be
considered a red flag of an opiate use disorder or
drug seeking behavior.

And that's listed in publications such as the Pharmacist's Manual which is a DEA publication. It lists red flags and warnings that pharmacists should clear before filling C-II prescriptions.

- Q. Is there any written standard that you can refer me to from any source that says that the standard of care in the industry is to only fill on the date that a prior C-II expires?
 - MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer.
- A. Not that I'm aware of. I feel I could probably do some research and find some policies that reflect that. But, again, the fact that early, seeking early new prescriptions, rather than use the term "refills", would be a red flag for pharmacists to have to clear before dispensing.
- Q. I'll come back to that in a little while. How many times did Dale Dukeshire present with his controlled, his C-II prescription having expired?

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 In other words, not present either a day or two 2 early or on the day of an expiration.
 - A. I'm sorry. The question that you're asking is how many times did he present it early?
 - Q. No. Did he present late meaning the prescription had expired and he's several days late.
 - A. Okay. Initially, in his therapy in 2013 and 2014, he was pretty much on time. We did have a couple -- one, two, three, four -- I have five, six incidences in 2013 and '14 which he came for early fills.
- There were, when we start getting into

 2016, his -- well, to me it became problematic and

 the problems were becoming obvious with his opiate

 use disorder.
 - 2016, there were about ten different instances he brought it in early, in the early part of the year. And then if you consider two days early, there were at least 22 incidences where he brought it early, two days.

In 2016, it was -- one, two, three -- in

And we have, I actually have one that he brought ten days early, one he brought eight days early, another six days early, another four days

1 early. So there's quite a few. I mean, he did have 2 a total of 112 prescriptions filled in that four-3 year period and there were approximately 17 different doctors writing narcotic prescriptions for 5 him. I'll get to that in a little while. 6 Q. 7 My question was, did you tabulate and count the number of times that he actually presented 8 9 prescriptions late meaning they had expired and he was coming after the fact to get a prescription 10 11 filled. I did document a few of them. I don't have 12 13 -- I was really looking for early refills. said, in 2013 and 2014, he was pretty much on time 14 with the exception of a handful of refills that he 15 16 did come early. I did not document the late refills. 17 18 Is Exhibit 8 --Ο. 19 -- '16 and '17. I don't believe there were 20 any late refills. 21 0. In Exhibit 8 which are just your notes, are 22 there any other notes that you have regarding the 23 case?

MR. ABRAMOWITZ:

Objection, but you can

1 answer. 2 I may have some more notes at home. I'm Α. 3 not sure. I'd have to go through it. I tried to bring my whole file with me today and I did, I might 5 have had some handwritten notes I left at home. If you'd pick up the pile that you held up 6 Ο. 7 at the very beginning, on the very back page it looked like there were some notes. 8 9 Α. I may be have some notes for this. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Can we pull this apart now 10 11 as well to get those exhibits together? 12 WITNESS: And I do have notes throughout 13 my, you know, throughout myself. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: I mean, there are various 14 15 notes on some of these hand, on these printed things 16 here. MS. WHITE-FARRELL: On these depositions? 17 18 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Some are depositions. Ι 19 think maybe on a break, if it's okay with you, 20 Tammy, at break we can maybe find a way to figure 21 this out. I do not have a scanner. I have no cell 22 coverage here. We just have Internet at the location we're at, so logistically we might need to 23

figure something else, if that's okay.

1 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Okay. We'll do that at 2 a break. BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 3 4 0. What depositions -- if you would look at 5 page 3 and 4 of your November 18, 2020, report and compare the depositions you have and tell me what 6 7 depositions are not listed on that -- what 8 depositions you have that are not listed on that 9 list. 10 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Aside from Boroff that 11 we've already established? 12 MS, WHITE-FARRELL: Right. 13 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, could you repeat that objection or comment? 14 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Aside from Boroff that 15 16 we've already established. 17 COURT REPORTER: Thank you. 18 WITNESS: That's the only deposition that I 19 believe I'm missing here. Again, I would want to check through my, you know, to see if there's any 20 21 other records I have or on my drive but I believe 22 this is everything that I've read except for the 23 Emily Boroff deposition. 24 BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL:

21

22

23

24

- 1 Now you're not a physician; right? Q. 2 Α. No, I am not. 3 You're not here to talk about medical Q. 4 diagnoses or medical treatment. Is that true? 5 I am here to talk about pharmacy issues. Α. All right. As far as cause of death, are 6 Ο. 7 you likewise deferring to a physician on causation and cause of death? 8 9 Α. Well, I would really say on that that the coroner's report well documents the cause of death 10 11 and my work, you know, reviewing notes says that 12 it's very consistent with the coroner's report, that 13 the cause of death is consistent based on my files. 14 Ο. Okav. So other than the coroner's report, 15 would you say anything else with respect to cause of 16 death? 17 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Other than rebuttal 18 testimony for your expert witnesses? 19 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Translate. I don't
 - MR. ABRAMOWITZ: I'm not trying to coach him. I want to make sure we're clear here. Giving rebutting comments made by your experts is different than him giving an independent opinion. So I just

know what you're trying to coach him here on.

21

24

- 1 want to make sure we're clear that if whatever 2 answer he gives here does not include the potential 3 for rebutting whatever testimony experts might talk 4 about related to pharmacological issues in his cause 5 of death. 6 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Okay. Now, I 7 understand what you were saying. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: 8 My apologies. BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 9 The medical records that you have listed 10 Ο. 11 here, I'm trying to understand, since you are a 12 pharmacist, what, if anything, is it from these medical records that you would base any opinion? 13 I'm sorry. I really don't understand the 14 15 question. 16 You're here to offer pharmacy opinions; Ο. right? 17 18 Yes. Α. 19 Is there any information that you gleaned
- A. Well, are you talking about from the other depositions or from other expert reports?

particular opinion that you have?

from any of these medical records that supports any

Q. I'm talking about from the medical records.

- 1 You've listed Gallagher & Gallagher, Sandusky County 2 EMS.
- $3 \mid A$. I have.
- Q. Belleview Hospital, Bethesda Care Center
 and a total of close to 20 medical records. I'd
 like to know, do you intend to point to any one
 particular medical record and say that it
- 8 demonstrates X as it relates to any opinion you 9 would offer?
- 10 A. No. I don't believe so.
- Q. Okay. Did you gain anything from any of the medical records that you reviewed as it relates to the case?
- A. I was -- I guess the medical records did provide me with information on Mr. Dukeshire's comorbidities and, you know, medical issues.
- Q. Do you agree that from time to time

 Mr. Dukeshire had health problems for which he

 sought acute healthcare interventions such as at

 emergency departments?
- MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can answer.
- 23 A. Yes. I saw that he did.
- Q. Do you agree that he had chronic health

- 1 conditions including, for instance, a chronic wound 2 on his buttocks and low back pain as in accordance 3 with some of the medical records you reviewed? Α. Yes. 5 When you talk about the 17 doctors from whom Mr. Dukeshire obtained prescriptions, which 6 7 doctors in particular are you referencing? I'm afraid I don't have their first names 8 but I have last names. Dr. Diamond, Dr. Maderer, 9 Dr. Huddleson, Dr. Laussane, Dr. Milner, Dr. Walsh, 10 11 Dr. Vargos, Dr. John Smith -- I have the first name 12 on that one -- Dr. Ronald Curl, Dr. George -- I 13 can't read my writing -- Stepanek, Dr. Patricia Matu, James Huddleston. I think I mentioned him 14 15 already. Dr. Jeffrey Dickenson. Those are some of
 - I have a few -- as you see, the extra doctors I put in blue and I highlighted it and I can't read a couple of the things I highlighted over.
- Q. And you're referencing to Exhibit 8, your list of your, your yellow pad notes; right?
- 23 A. Yes.

the other doctors.

16

17

18

19

20

24

Q. How many of these physicians, if you know,

4

5

6

15

16

21

22

23

24

wrote prescriptions for an acute episodic event such as a septic knee?

MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer.

- A. I don't know off the top of my head. There were various doctors. He went to emergency rooms, dentists, various doctors for various issues.
- Q. Did you consider for any of your opinions, the clinical context in which Mr. Dukeshire saw any of these 17 physicians, and what I mean by that is was it an emergency medicine visit? Was it a septic knee? Was it his chronic ulcer on his bottom? Did you consider that at all with respect to any of those 17?
- 14 A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. And how did you factor that into your analysis?
- A. Well, my analysis is actually just raw
 data. There was no factoring or figuring anything
 out. It was just literally transcribing the raw
 data and looking at the prescribing frequencies.
 - I did not take into account the causes of his acute treatments based on these other doctors but I'm not convinced that these other doctors were aware that he was being treated for, chronically for

1 pain. 2 Do you know the converse that they did not 3 know? 4 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 5 answer. No. I don't know what they knew or did not 6 Α. 7 know. Do you agree that Mr. Dukeshire's death was 8 9 investigated? 10 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer. 11 Α. I can't, do not know. 12 Okay. Do you agree that the Ohio Board Ο. 13 Pharmacy has not issued any criticism of which you or anyone is aware of Rite Aid or any of its 14 15 pharmacists arising out of Dale Dukeshire's death? 16 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer. 17 Α. Not specifically, no. 18 Generally, are you aware whether or not Ο. 19 there's been any investigation, criticism, citation, 20 disciplinary action or otherwise, issued against 21 Emily Boroff or Ms. Shriver from the Ohio Board of 22 Pharmacy arising out of Dale Dukeshire's death? 23 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 24 answer.

1 Not to my knowledge. And likewise, the Ohio Board of Pharmacy 2 Ο. 3 regulates Rite Aid of Ohio; true? 4 Α. I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question? 5 The Ohio Board of Pharmacy also regulates Ο. the retail pharmacy known as Rite Aid of Ohio; 6 7 doesn't it? Yes, it does. 8 Α. 9 O. Has the Ohio Board of Pharmacy taken any adverse action against Rite Aid of Ohio arising out 10 11 of Dale Dukeshire's death? 12 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer. 13 Α. Not that I'm aware of. Do you have any photographs in this case? 14 Ο. 15 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 16 answer. 17 Α. No. 18 The pile that you held up, are those 0. Okay. 19 all depositions with notes on them? 20 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 21 answer. 22 Yes, they are. Almost all of them have Α. 23 notes. But they're all depositions? 24 Ο.

not given a deposition.

1 Α. Yes. 2 Okay. The literature that we marked, I Ο. 3 think they are Exhibits 3 through 7, is that all of 4 the independent material, meaning non-medical 5 record, non-deposition, that you have in this case? MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 6 7 answer. Yes, I believe so. 8 Α. 9 Ο. Okay. Are there any text books, Internet search results, standards, or protocols of any kind 10 11 that you've not identified here on the record that 12 you would use for any purpose in this case? 13 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, as there's some 14 purposes we can't know yet. 15 Α. -- not that I'm aware of, no. (audio 16 interference.) Do you have any written statements or 17 18 affidavits from any witness regarding the case? 19 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 20 answer. 21 Α. Are you referring to expert reports? 22 I'm talking about an affidavit or a No. Ο. statement from someone such as a fact witness that's 23

1 Α. No. 2 Have you seen the expert reports from the Ο. 3 Rite Aid witnesses? Α. T --5 Such as Dr. Weiner, Dr. Lucas, Ο. Dr. Dragovich? 6 7 Α. Yes. I did review several of the doctors' 8 reports. 9 0. What, if any, disagreement do you have with 10 Dr. Weiner's report? 11 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 12 answer. I don't know off the top of my head. I'd 13 have to review that. I don't believe that was --14 15 O. Did you bring it with you? 16 It's on the thumb drive, electronically. Okay. But as you sit here today in 17 Ο. 18 answering the question, you can't identify any 19 particular item with Dr. Weiner that you disagree 20 with? 21 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection. I don't think 22 he's saying he can't -- you said identify everything. Your question --23 24 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: -- I said anything.

1 WITNESS: Not that I -- I would have to 2 look at the report again and his summary to give 3 that opinion. BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 5 Going back to your report of November 18, 0. 2020, is this the only version of this document that 6 7 exists? MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection. 8 Any drafts are 9 work product and under Ohio, they are not -- they are excluded from discovery. 10 11 Α. Well, I did make an earlier draft that I 12 had to edit. Actually, I probably made several before I submitted it to Mr. Abramowitz. 13 I usually have to review my own work and go through things and 14 15 I add things as I do, so there were a couple of 16 drafts that I did right before I submitted it to him before I submitted the original one. 17 18 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: But do you have --19 Since you wrote this in November of 2020 --20 is that when you wrote it, November of 2020? 21 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection; attorney-22 client. That's his attorney work product. 23 Α. Yes. Have you had occasion to review the 24 Ο.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

22

documents since then?

- A. I did look at some of the documents in the last 48 hours.
- Q. Do you have any changes that you would make to this document?
 - A. There probably would be a few addendums I would have added but I think that the report is pretty complete as it is.
 - Q. What are the addendums you would add?
 - A. Well, it would be based on another expert's report, one of the medical doctors. Let me see which doctor that was. I don't have his data here. One of the expert reports, once of the physicians changed the Lucas County Coroner's report and added in his own therapeutic and toxic blood levels for
- 16 | carfentanil. Dr. McManus?
- 17 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: No, Lucas.
- A. Lucas. Dr. Lucas, right, Dr. Lucas. And I would have made a comment on my report about his addition of a therapeutic or a toxic level that was not provided by the Ohio coroner.
 - O. And what would that be?
- A. Well, that he basically cherry picked the data and did not provide the entire report which

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- actually contradicted his therapeutic and toxic goal Range. It's -- the way he wrote it in his report it was misleading to believe that this data was accurate when it was in fact not accurate and he was kind of cherry picking the data.
- 6 Q. What data was that?
 - A. That was the data referring to the toxic therapeutic or toxic levels, blood levels, of carfentanil.
 - Q. And what do you contend was misleading about that?
 - A. Well, the initial report from the Lucas County Coroner's office did not have a listing for a therapeutic or a toxic level for that drug because they're really is none and he found an isolated study based on six patients and, which he took the lowest levels for toxicity and just inserted it in there as if it was a fact, in which case the actual mean, an average for the overdose levels was almost three or four times higher than what he indicated on his report.
- Q. And that's based on the study that he relied upon.
- 24 A. Yes.

5

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1 Q. Is that right?
 - A. Based on the study that he referenced.
- Q. Okay. Any other addendum you would make to your report?
 - A. Not that I can think of at this time.
- Q. Of the -- you've listed on page 1 of your report retail pharmacies where you've managed. Have you worked as a staff pharmacist at any retail pharmacy or have you always been a manager?
- 10 A. I have worked, as I mentioned earlier, I
 11 have worked agency. I have worked for two different
 12 agencies, Healthcare Consultants and Empire Pharmacy
 13 Consultant agencies where I was placed in a
 14 pharmacy, and I still get offers from them from time
 15 to time and I would work there as a staff
 16 pharmacist.
 - It was always on a per diem basis.

 Whenever I've worked in retail, I've pretty much always been the manager. I can't think of a time when I was a staff pharmacist.
 - Q. What do you mean on page 2 of your report where you say that you devote time to active clinical practice of pharmacy in retail pharmacies?
 - A. Okay. That means that I do clinical

12

13

14

15

16

17

1 | practice and work in retail pharmacies.

- Q. Well, you then have the word "or." You say
 you do clinical practice of pharmacy in retail
 pharmacies and long-term care facilities or pharmacy
 instruction, so I don't understand what you --
- A. -- that should be "and." And pharmacy
 instruction at accredited schools. I teach clinical
 rotations. So the students are sent to me by the
 different universities and are kind of like an
 entourage.
 - They follow me around as I work and I do stop to lecture and teach throughout the day as for evaluating charts or seeing patients or even going through pharmacy shelves if we're at a retail setting. I may just, you know, go through the shelves and talk to them about different therapies and drugs and things like that.
- So it shouldn't be "or," it should be "and."
- Q. All right. And what do you mean here when you say that you have reviewed well over 150,000 medical charts?
- A. That's part of my job. That's what I do for, you know, in the nursing homes. I review the

- 1 | patient's medical charts, the drug regimen. They're
- 2 | called drug regimen reviews. We review the
- 3 | medication therapies, we look at the labs, we look
- 4 | at physician orders, we look at ancillary notes.
- 5 | Basically, we look at the whole chart.
- 6 Q. And that's in the long-term care context;
 7 right?
- 8 A. Well, it's long-term care. I've also done
- 9 it for the agency, for healthcare administration in
- 10 which I would review patients for the Medicaid
- 11 | Waiver program, and these were mostly patients
- 12 residing in ICFMRs, intermediate care facilities for
- 13 the mentally retarded, and so I would do chart
- 14 reviews for them as well.
- 15 That was a separate type of work I did.
- 16 | I've done so much in pharmacy it's hard to keep
- 17 | track of everything. I've been doing this for over
- 18 | 40 years.

- 19 Q. But you've not reviewed 150,000 charts as a
- 20 | retail pharmacist?
- A. No. But I filled well over 500,000
- 22 prescriptions as a retail pharmacist. It's probably
- 23 close to a million at this point.
 - Q. Okay. A retail pharmacist does not obtain

24

a DUR.

- 1 a medical chart and review a medical chart in the 2 ordinary course and scope of their practice; right? 3 Well, not in a medical chart but they do 4 review medical profiles and drug regimens for 5 patients. So when I do the chart in the nursing homes we do the whole chart. When we're doing it in 6 7 the retail setting, we're just looking at the medications and doing a review of medications. So I 8 would call that a drug regimen review. Now, you are familiar with the DUR process; 10 Ο. 11 right? 12 Α. Yes, I am. 13 And I take it from your report you have no criticism of the DUR process that any pharmacist 14 followed here? 15 16 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer. I honestly had trouble determining how they 17 Α. 18 measured their DURs at this pharmacy. There was no 19 documentation or indication that there was any 20 pharmacist interventions that would arise from doing
- Q. So you have no criticism of any DUR process that was or was not followed; true?
 - A. Well, I didn't see a process. I didn't see

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- a DUR process being followed at all.
 - Q. Do you -- are you going to --
 - A. -- to me, that's problematic.
 - Q. Are you going to come to the trial of this matter and say that Ms. Boroff, Ms. Shriver, or any pharmacist deviated from a standard of care with respect to a DUR process and Dale Dukeshire?
 - A. Yeah. I'd be willing to testify that they lacked the DUR process.
- Q. And what specifically did they lack?

 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can
 answer.
 - A. Well, I didn't see any consulting. They basically glossed over several glaring red flags that were very problematic and are well documented and outlined in the DEA's pharmacist manual.
 - They basically, in my opinion, were just taking each individual prescription as it came in and filled it as quickly as possible without any clinical intervention or DUR processing being, you know, being done.
- Q. What is your basis to say there was no consulting? That you see no documentation of consulting?

1 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 2 answer. I saw no indication, no records of 3 Α. 4 consulting. The fact that the prescriptions were 5 being filled early consistently, especially in 2016 and '17 without any interventions, documentation, 6 7 that there was no pharmacist logs or communication logs or anything that would provide any information 8 for anybody, you know, assessing his prescriptions. Do you know of any particular conversations 10 Ο. 11 that any Rite Aid pharmacist had with Dale Dukeshire in his lifetime? 12 13 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection but you can 14 answer. 15 Α. I believe there was in one of the 16 depositions I read, there may have been a communication at one time during the four-year 17 18 period that I noted. 19 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: And Tammy, are we getting 20 -- it's been about an hour. 21 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Sure. You want to take 22 a break? 23 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: If it's okay. If it's a 24 good time for you now or if you want to --

1 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Yeah, that's fine. 2 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Great. 3 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Okay. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Thank you. 5 (Short break in proceedings.). BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL. 6 7 Ο. We'll start where we left off and it's about the documentation of consulting or no 8 9 documentation of consulting. 10 Do you agree that conversations happened 11 between pharmacists and their patients and even 12 family members that do not recorded? 13 Α. Yes. There are conversations that are not recorded. 14 15 Ο. And do you agree that a patient has the 16 right to refuse counseling? Yes. A patient does have a right to either 17 Α. 18 accept or refuse counseling, but in my opinion there 19 are circumstances in which the pharmacist should 20 offer counseling even if it's unsolicited. 21 Ο. Do you have any factual basis to say that 22 Dale Dukeshire did not understand the addictive nature of opiates? 23 24 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can

in my report.

0.

23

24

1 answer. 2 I'm sorry. Could you rephrase that? Α. 3 Do you have any factual basis to say that Ο. Dale Dukeshire in his lifetime did not understand 5 the addictive nature of opiates? 6 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer. 7 Α. I don't have any documentation of No. that. 8 9 Q. In your report you do not mention the DUR therapy or DUR processes; do you? 10 11 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 12 answer. I would have to look through my report 13 Α. again, but I don't recall if I mentioned DURs in my 14 15 report. 16 Ο. Look at your report and tell me if there's anything that you refer to that relates to the new 17 18 opinion that you've offered today regarding the DUR 19 process. 20 I don't see anything that I mentioned Α. 21 specifically using the terms DUR, but several of the 22 issues that evolved in the DUR process are mentioned

And which are those?

1 Things talking about accessing the Oarrs 2 prior to dispensing narcotics. That's part of the 3 DUR process. The corresponding duty that is mentioned in my report is part of the DUR process. 5 So although it's not listed as under DUR, those are aspects of the DUR process that the Rite Aid 6 7 pharmacists failed to do. Are there any other new opinions that are 8 9 not in your report that you would attempt to offer 10 at trial? 11 Α. The only opinion that I can think of at 12 this time would be the coroner's report alteration 13 done by the defense expert. And that's by the pharmacologist Dr. Lucas; 14 Ο. 15 right? 16 Α. Yes. But you're not a pharmacologist; are you? 17 0. 18 I'm a clinical pharmacist and retail Α. No. 19 pharmacist. 20 And you're not a toxicologist; are you? Q. 21 Α. No. I'm not a toxicologist by trade. 22 What qualifies you then to say that Ο. 23 Dr. Lucas is wrong?

MR. ABRAMOWITZ:

Objection, but you can

1 answer.

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. I know how to read a study and I looked at the data that he took, the study that he took his data from and he selectively cherry picked the data that would benefit him or his, you know, his employers rather than the actual data, the complete set of data which indicated something completely different.
 - I don't have to be a pharmacologist to be able to realize that he did not provide all the data that was in his report.

I'm not sure of the status of carfentanil

- Q. Do you agree that carfentanil is a C-I, it's an illegal substance?
 - in this country right now if it's a C-I or C-II. I know that there is a brand named drug called Wildnil which is Carfentanil. It's used in zoological practices, veterinary practices for sedation of large animals like rhinos, elephants, hippos things like that. They would use it, I believe, with horses.
 - So I'm not sure what the schedule status of carfentanil at this time, since I know that in the past it has been used as a C-II in veterinary

1 practicing. 2 Do you agree that there's no legitimate 3 medical purpose for the use carfentanil in humans? Α. Yes. I would agree with that. 5 Exhibit 8 were notes. That's based upon 0. the patient profile as I understand it, your yellow 6 7 notes? Oh. My yellow notes. Which exhibit was 8 Α. 9 it? 10 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Note Exhibits 8 list down 11 here are records, exhibit 8 notice of the 12 deposition. 13 (Inaudible.) 14 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: No. 8. 15 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: My apologies, Tammy. Is it Exhibit 8. 16 WITNESS: Yes, I have it. 17 18 BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 19 I just want to make sure I understand. You 20 have not gone back to the medical record for any of 21 those acute fills or prescriptions to determine what 22 the health care problem was relating to the reason that the patient got acute fills; right? 23 24 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can

24

1 answer. 2 Not necessarily. In several of the -- I Α. 3 believe in several of the records that I may have reviewed there may have been indications why he was 5 going to the dentist or the emergency room. Have you matched those up to the patient 6 0. 7 profile into your chart that you created as Exhibit 8 8? 9 Α. I don't believe that I have. 10 Ο. Do you agree that Mr. Dukeshire's Oarrs 11 report was, in fact, accessed by the Rite Aid 12 pharmacist? MR. BRAHMOISM: Objection, but you can 13 14 answer. 15 Α. I believe they may have looked at the Oarrs 16 report on one or two occasions, that I'm aware of. But according to their own depositions I believe 17 18 Ms. Shriver in her deposition said that she if she 19 knows a patient she doesn't have to look it up, if she knows who it is and she's comfortable she 20 21 doesn't bother accessing it. 22 So I don't believe that there was access to

the Oarrs reports on every prescription that was

presented to that pharmacy.

don't know.

1 You're not here to tell the jury that it's 2 the standard of care to check the Oarrs report for 3 every prescription presented; are you? 4 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection. Are we talking 5 about C-I or C-II? I'm sorry. It would be C-II. 6 Q. 7 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Okay. Thank you. I am here to say that the pharmacists 8 9 should be checking the Oarrs report on every C-II prescription. 10 11 Is there any writing, standard, 12 publication, or document that you can point me to 13 that supports that proposition? MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 14 15 answer. 16 I don't know the documents off the top of my head, specifically, but I would believe that the 17 18 pharmacist manual, you know, a document produced by 19 the DEA may have that information in there. 20 Board of Pharmacy records from Ohio may have 21 something, although I have not seen it myself 22 directly or have not looked it up but it may be in those records. I'm not familiar with that so I 23

8

9

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1 Have you looked it up from any source that 2 you can point me to that would say that the standard 3 of care requires a pharmacist to check an Oarrs report with each knew C-II prescription that is 5 presented? Off the top of my head, no. I can't come 6
 - up with any documents that would confirm that; although there maybe some out there that I'm not aware of or that I have not reviewed thoroughly.
- 10 What is the Acugenasis team, Ο. 11 a-c-u-q-e-n-a-s-i-s team?
- The Acugenasis team is a group of researchers at the Imperial College of London that are doing drug studies and studies on 14 chemotherapeutics and I had done some work in the biomechanical engineering field with a professor named James Moore who runs that team.
 - And he asked me if I would work with some of his Ph.D. students and the Acugenasis team on development of these testing apparatus for determining skin cancers.
 - Does that have any role or relationship to Ο. outpatient pharmacy practice?
 - I mean, the goal of them was to Α. Not yet.

19

20

21

22

short time.

three days.

1 produce this test they were doing. It was a topical 2 test and they wanted to get it into retail pharmacies and wanted to know how pharmacists would 3 interact with the patient on both the recommendation 5 and evaluation of these tests. 6 And so I was their consultant in it from 7 the retail pharmacy field and give them an idea of where this could be placed, whether OTC status, 8 9 prescriptions status, how pharmacists would interact in interpreting the results and how to get 10 11 physicians involved in this process as well. 12 I think you told me you last worked in a Ο. retail pharmacy in 2017. Is that right? 13 That's right. 14 Yes. 15 Ο. Was that full time? Part time? Per diem? What basis was that? 16 I believe that was the Black and White 17 Α.

Q. Did you have to exercise your independent pharmacist judgement from time to time in filling

days a week, one week and three days a week the

pharmacy and I was the pharmacy manager there for a

other week. Every other week I'd be working two or

I was there, I believe, working two

1 prescriptions when you worked last as a retail 2 pharmacists? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Ο. Do you agree that in the everyday practice 5 of pharmacy a retail pharmacist must exercise his or her pharmacist judgement? 6 7 Α. Absolutely. Have you ever offered the opinion that you 8 9 offer here today anywhere else that a C-II can only be filled on the day that it expires or a day after 10 11 that? 12 You're asking if I have testified as this Α. before? 13 Have you ever offered that opinion anywhere 14 0. before? 15 16 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 17 answer. 18 No. I don't believe I've been asked that Α. 19 before. 20 Going to your report, page four --Q. 21 Α. Okay. 22 -- what is it from the Social Security Ο. Administration records that you would rely upon; 23 24 anything?

discovery responses.

23

24

1 Not that I can think of right now. 2 Would you rely upon anything from the Ο. 3 Freemont and Sandusky police departments? 4 Α. I don't recall the exact records but 5 perhaps it would play into my opinion. Q. And how? 6 7 Well, if there was a history of DUIs, any type of, you know, drug-related, you know, events 8 9 that may have occurred, you know, that he was in trouble with the police, anything like that. 10 11 Ο. Was Rite Aid or any of its pharmacists ever 12 put on notice that Dale Dukeshire had any DUIs? MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer. 13 14 Α. Not that I'm aware of. 15 Ο. Was Rite Aid or any of its pharmacists ever 16 on notice that Dale Dukeshire had any drug related 17 instances or events happen in his life? 18 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer. 19 Α. Not that I'm aware of. 20 Back to your report, there's a list of Q. 21 legal documents, discovery responses. Tell me what 22 you would rely upon, if anything, from any of those

MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can

18

23

24

1 answer. 2 I honestly would have to look at them 3 I mean, I'm sure that there's information from responses to Rite Aid as to their policies and 5 procedures, on their training a pharmacist, and dispensing of narcotics and C-II drugs and things 6 7 like that. What do you understand Rite Aid's training 8 Ο. to be of its pharmacists with respect to C-II drugs? MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 10 11 answer. 12 From my opinion, it's virtually nothing. Α. 13 The pharmacists, as I, that I read their depositions said that they had no training. One of them I 14 15 believe said they had no training. The other might 16 have watched a video, one video or something like

Q. And what training do you contend should have occurred?

there was any at all, it was minimal.

21 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection. You can answer 22 it if you can.

A. Well, I believe that the pharmacists need to at least sign off that they've reviewed the DEA's

I don't recall exactly. But the training, if

Α.

1 document, the pharmacists manual, that they have at least reviewed Rite Aid's policies and procedures on 2 dispensing of C-II drugs, that they really need to 3 4 do -- I mean at least, you know, in Florida, we have 5 to do continuing education on a yearly basis addressing narcotics and C-II dispensing and opiate 6 7 dispensing. They should require specialty courses in 8 9 that and training in that. There's quite a bit. mean, pharmacists can always be learning more. 10 11 There's always more we need to know. 12 And the environment changes, you know. Tn 13 the last ten years or so it's become a major Prior to this they were not a major 14 problem. 15 problem. So, you know, things change and policies 16 have to develop to address those changes in the community. 17 18 Are you familiar with the continuing Ο. 19 education that the State of Ohio required of 20 pharmacists prior to Dale Dukeshire's death as it 21 relates to controlled substances? 22 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can answer. 23

I believe that they do require a course in

- 1 opiate use disorder or something similar to that for 2 their continuing education.
- Q. Do you have any basis to say that

 Ms. Boroff and Ms. Shriver or any Rite Aid

 pharmacist was not in compliance with the required

 continuing education on opiate dependance?
- 7 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 8 answer.
- 9 Α. Well, I'm sure that they were compliant with the regulations to do the continued education 10 11 to renew their license. That does not mean that 12 they were well educated and informed in the, the 13 risk of dispensing opiates, the MMEs, assessment of MMEs for dispensing of opiates and other issues that 14 may deal with the red flags and clearing red flags 15 16 prior to dispensing opiates.
- Q. Isn't the MME for opiates a physician responsibility?
- MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can answer.
- A. Yes. It is a physicians responsibility as well as a pharmacist's responsibility.
- Q. What source, document, publication, regulation, can you refer me to that MME calculation

1 is a pharmacist's obligation? 2 I don't have it in front of me, but there 3 is a record that I reviewed that I can provide to you that mentions pharmacists, intervention, and 5 accessing MMEs. If you would and we'll make that Exhibit 9. 6 Q. 7 DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 9 (Record Concerning MMEs was marked for 8 9 identification purposes as Deposition Exhibit No. 9.) 10 11 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Can you write that down so 12 I can dig out that file? 13 WITNESS: It's about pharmacists (audio interference, speaking inaudibly.) 14 15 BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 16 You mentioned the pharmacist manual, you've mentioned that several times. Where is this 17 18 publication? Is it online? Is it hard copy? Where 19 do we get a copy of it? 20 You can find it easily online. You can Α. 21 also request a copy from the DEA. They will send 22 you one, and most likely they'll refer you to their website and tell you to download it. 23 24 And the DEA pharmacist manual provides 0.

21

22

23

24

1 specific guidance with respect to the filling of 2 opiate prescriptions. Is that true? Yes, it is. 3 Α. Ο. Those are quidelines not standards of care. 5 Isn't that true? 6 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 7 answer if you can. I wouldn't be able to answer that question 8 9 without actually looking at the document. I don't have it in front of me right now. 10 11 Ο. Turning to the next page of your report, do 12 you agree with Rite Aid's statement in their policy 13 that you quote in block quotes at the middle of page 5 that begins with the phrase "Rite Aid acknowledges" 14 15 that misuse and abuse of prescription drugs is a 16 growing national epidemic?" Do I agree with the statement? 17 Α. 18 Yes. Ο. 19

A. Well, in some ways I do agree with it. I mean, they have developed certain procedures and I think a lot of them are based on the pharmacists manual; however, you know, they say that procedures for assisting validation and dispensing the substances however they don't add that there's any

24

Α.

- 1 checks or balances as to whether the pharmacists 2 have reviewed this, have they, you know, have they utilized it or is it mandatory or is this optional 3 for the pharmacists. 5 There's nothing that says it's a regulation. They just say we acknowledge that 6 7 there's an abusive of drugs and in order to address this we have set up procedures. But, you know, the 8 9 procedures obviously have been failing because their policies have allowed for, you know, basically a 10 11 violation or ignoring of red flags. 12 Their pharmacists have ignored many red 13 It's hard to -- I mean, I agree with the state that they acknowledge that there's a problem 14 15 but I question whether that they really done a lot 16 to really prevent abuse or diversion. 17 Ο. And that's because in this case you contend 18 red flags were ignored? 19 Α. Yes. 20 Is there any specific written procedure of Ο. 21 Rite Aid that, of which you have criticism? 22 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection.
 - I wouldn't be able to determine that right at this

I don't have the policies in front of me so

1 And I could in the future look through 2 specifically at all their policies and can point out failings and things like that, I'm sure. 3 4 Ο. Well, you've been involved in this case for 5 how long? Objection. 6 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: It was the 7 work of the attorney work product as to when we retained services or when we started he reviewing 8 9 matters for us. I mean, generally, you can -- I mean the cases he's been on since the beginning as 10 11 he -- certificate of merit -- (audio interference) 12 -- we're not letting him share anything beyond that. 13 So, you've known of this case for at least 14 two vears. Is that correct? Α. 15 Yes. 16 And through the present day, have you formulated any criticism of any written policy or 17 18 procedure published by Rite Aid? 19 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 20 answer. 21 Α. Again, I would have to have that in front 22 of me to look at it to make, to determine that. do have objections with the way the pharmacists who 23

were filling Dale Dukeshire's prescriptions. I have

1 issues with that. I would have to look at their 2 specific policies again. 3 And again, I've looked at these records, as 4 you said, it's been a couple of years. It's nothing 5 I look at every day for the last two years. something I looked at two years ago and then I 6 7 looked at it again a few days ago. So it's been a long period of time between, you know, the time I 8 initially looked at and now. 10 In the time that you have spent in Ο. 11 reviewing materials in this case, have you 12 formulated any opinion critical of any written document published by Rite Aid? 13 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Other than what's in his 14 15 report? 16 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Any written document -there's no criticism of a written document in his 17 18 report, so if there is point it out to me. 19 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: I mean, the first heading 20 is Rite Aid designed a blind spot, that would be a 21 culmination of the procedures he's pointing at. 22 just want to make sure, in these pages -- there's a lot of policy and procedures out there beyond what 23 24 are applicable and what's been provided in this

Ο.

1 case. 2 I'm just trying, I quess, maybe if you 3 rephrase it maybe I would be very helpful. 4 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: I'll do it one more 5 time, because this is about the fifth time I've asked the question. 6 7 BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Is there any particular written policy or 8 9 procedure by Rite Aid that as of this date you have formed any opinion critical of? 10 11 Α. Well, I believe that their 48-hour, 12 allowing 48-hour overlap of C-II prescriptions to be filled, I am critical of that policy. 13 Any other? 14 Ο. 15 Α. That's the only written policy that I can 16 answer that at this time. 17 Ο. So let's go to the six steps that are 18 listed in your report. You agree that for each C-II 19 prescription that was presented to Rite Aid it was a 20 valid prescription? 21 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer. 22 You're asking me if every prescription was Α. a valid prescription presented to Rite Aid? 23

Every original C-II prescription.

1 I can't answer that because I don't know if 2 they were valid based on, they may have been valid 3 based on a physician, a licensed physician writing it and it may have been valid based on a physician 5 with a patient relationship. 6 But it may not have been valid if there was 7 not a legitimate medical purpose for the use of 8 these drugs. 9 Q. And what did you undertake, if anything, prior to today's deposition to determine whether or 10 11 not any of the prescriptions presented were not for 12 legitimate medical purpose? 13 Did you undertake any activity? Other than reviewing the records provided, 14 15 no. 16 Did you identify from any medical record or Ο. records provided that any prescription that was 17 18 presented to Rite Aid was not for a legitimate 19 medical purpose? MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection. Are you overly 20 21 broad but you can answer. 22 Well, I realize that he had chronic Α. conditions that were treated by Dr. Gallagher; 23 24 however, there were other physicians that he would

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- seek out that would write narcotics and those may not have been for a legitimate medical purpose; although, the physicians may have been duped into thinking they were.
 - Q. And so my question is simply, do you have any factual basis to say that Rite Aid was on notice that any particular prescription was not for a legitimate medical purpose?

MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection.

- A. Well, as far as I know Rite Aid did not validate many of the prescriptions, so there would not be any record of that.
- Q. Do you know from any source that Rite Aid was on notice that any of the prescriptions were not for a legitimate medical purpose?
- 16 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer.
- 17 A. Not that I know of.
- Q. Each time a C-II original prescription was presented, steps 1 through 6 were completed by Rite Aid. Were they not?
- 21 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, over broad.
- 22 | Answer if you can.
- A. No. I don't believe they did.
- Q. Which one of the step or steps was not

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

completed? And I'd like to know when.

- 2 Well, just -- I would say that the 3 validation of the prescription, to validate a 4 prescription from, and I'm going to say this for any 5 of the other 12 doctors other than Dr. Gallagher was writing for narcotics, that those prescriptions 6 7 should all be validated when the physicians call, informed that they were receiving, you know, routine 8 9 opiate prescriptions from a, not a pain management 10 doctor.
 - So the pharmacists failed to validate each of these other extra-when I say "extra" I mean other than Dr. Gallagher prescriptions, and using professional judgement, whether to dispense or not dispense a prescription and report suspicious activity such as seeking early refills, coming to the pharmacy and saying I lost my prescription, somebody stole my prescription I need another one, that type of thing.

Those are suspicious activities and behaviors that I believe the Rite Aid pharmacists did not pursue to follow up on.

Q. I know it's your opinion that it was a suspicious activity that Mr. Dukeshire presented new

- prescriptions 48-hours before an old one expired; right? That's your opinion.
- 3 A. Yes. And some of them more than 48 hours.
- 4 | Some of them were, you know, 72 hours, some of them
- 5 were even longer. I mean, there was a variety. And
- 6 as time went on from 2015, '16, '17, the numbers and
- 7 | the shortened refills -- I shouldn't say refills --
- 8 | shortened presentation of new prescriptions became
- 9 more frequent and more often.
- 10 Q. How many, if any, new refills -- well,
- 11 | strike that.
- 12 Did Dale Dukeshire ever present claiming
- 13 | that his prescription was stolen, lost, or destroyed
- 14 and it was actually, and a new prescription was
- 15 | actually obtained and filled?
- 16 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer
- 17 | if you can.
- 18 A. Not to my knowledge.
- 19 Q. What is your comment regarding the Nexgen
- 20 | system that's on the next page of your report. I'm
- 21 | not sure I understand what you're trying to
- 22 | communicate there.
- MR. ABRAMOWITZ: For the record we're on
- 24 | page 6 of his report, 7. We're on page 6 you're

23

24

1 referencing? 2 Let me count them here. It would be six, 3 where you talk about, at the top of the page, where you talk about the Nexgen system. 5 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Thank you for that. 6 WITNESS: I'm sorry can you repeat the 7 question for this? BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 8 9 0. Yeah. I'm trying to understand what you're trying to communicate in that first paragraph. 10 11 Α. I was just saying that there seems to be a 12 gap in the Nexgen system. There's basically a hole 13 in that they allow for a 48-hour early presentation of new C-II prescription without flagging it, that 14 15 they find that to be acceptable. 16 Where in my opinion, that is a problem with the, it's an inherent systematic problem with the 17 18 Rite Aid computer system, that they should be 19 flagging these as red flags when they come in, you 20 know, less than, you know, 24 hours, you know, 21 before acceptable refill status is obtained.

Q. If other similar situated retail pharmacies like Walgreens and Giant Eagle have a policy that permits a 48 or 72 hour fill, would you have the

1 same opinion critical of those? 2 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection. Are you 3 referencing the opioid MBL and the settlements that 4 were recently achieved in Ohio based on some of 5 those specific pharmacies, you know, in requesting to exit the litigation based on their policies and 6 7 practice and how it hurt the community? No. It's just a simple question. 8 about the witness, not a dialog about the MDL. I'm sure you need me to repeat the question given that 10 objection? 11 12 Α. Yes. I do. I'm sorry. 13 My question is, if other similarly situated retail pharmacies such as Walgreens, Giant Eagle, 14 Kroger, Walmart have fill policies that would allow 15 16 for 48 or even 72 hours of fill before a prior C-II expires, would you likewise be critical of them? 17 18 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection. 19 Α. Yes, I would. 20 Okay. Do you know of anybody that agrees Ο. 21 with you? 22 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can answer. 23 24 Well, I haven't presented this opinion to Α.

- 1 my colleagues or anything like that; although, when
- 2 | I do train my students I do specifically spend an
- 3 | afternoon discussing opiate prescriptions,
- 4 | verification of opiate prescriptions, and so I do
- 5 | teach that in my pharmacy rotations, that they you
- 6 | have to go above and beyond the policies of the
- 7 | pharmacy you're working at.
- Q. For an individual pharmacists, that's what you teach?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Is there a text book or a publication that
- 12 | you rely upon for that statement or is it a personal
- 13 | practice?
- MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can
- 15 | answer.
- 16 A. It is my personal practice; although, I do
- 17 provide my students with a copy of the pharmacists
- 18 | manual, and we review that, you know, during the
- 19 | afternoon course. We'll take a break from doing
- 20 | charts and we'll talk about the pharmacist's manual
- 21 or go through the different red flags are and how to
- 22 | clear a red flags and that type of thing.
- 23 Q. Now, in the next paragraph on page 6 you
- 24 | say that Mr. Dukeshire was dispensed 112 narcotic

1 prescriptions. 2 Α. Yes. 3 Ο. I don't understand your statement then, on 4 average were dispensed 144 days early. 5 How do you come up with an average of 144? That was based on the 100 -- that was based 6 Α. 7 on what I consider early fillings in that four-year period of those 112 prescriptions. If I added up 8 the days that were filled early it turned out, in that four-year period, it was 144 days early. 10 11 Ο. So that's really a sum, not an average? 12 Yes. Yes. I would agree with that. Α. 13 Did you calculate what the average was, 14 meaning was it one day? Two days? Zero days? 15 you calculate it? 16 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 17 answer. 18 I did calculate that out and I'm afraid I Α. 19 don't have that document with me, but I can provide 20 it for you later. 21 Q. Yes. And we'll make that Exhibit 10. 22 DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 10 (Calculation of Days Early was marked for 23 24 identification purposes as Deposition

1	Exhibit No. 10.)
2	A. Okay.
3	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Again, subject to or
4	review for attorney-client privilege in that
5	exhibit.
6	And just so we're clear, Tammy, that is the
7	document with the calculation of the average?
8	MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Yes.
9	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Thank you.
10	Have you worked in pharmacies where
11	pharmacist's write notes on the back of the original
12	prescription?
13	A. I have in the past, yes.
14	Q. And was that the custom and practice at
15	that particular, those particular pharmacies?
16	A. Well, that was the practice at the
17	pharmacies that I worked at probably in the 1980's
18	and '90s. More recently, the pharmacies that I
19	worked at may have pharmacist's log books or
20	communication logs, which whenever I've managed a
21	pharmacy I always send install a pharmacist's
22	communication log book.
23	So rather than look at the Post-it notes on
24	past prescriptions it will all be in one area so

pharmacists can look and see what another pharmacist
has been doing if they don't happen to be on shift
at the same time.

Q. Do you know of any particular instance with respect to Mr. Dukeshire where pharmacists wrote a note on the back of the prescription that did not get communicated to another pharmacist at a later time if they needed it?

MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, over board and you can answer.

A. Well, I wouldn't know specifically whether, you know, the pharmacist was reading the other pharmacist's communications. But I know the system was set up so that it was difficult and that if you needed to look at past prescription you had to go into the back files, the whole hard copy files, and look back to see it.

There was no one central place where you can make notes from one pharmacist to another. So it was very difficult and it would be time consuming to have to go back through those files without having a centralized area where you would just refer to a communication log or a computer note when, you know, when you bring up that patient's profile.

1 Can you name one instance where a 2 pharmacist had information on the back of one of 3 Dale Dukeshire's original prescriptions that did not 4 get appropriately communicated to another 5 pharmacist? 6 Objection. Over broad. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: 7 You can answer if you can. I can't answer that specifically. 8 9 Ο. What are the red flags that you contend were overlooked in this case? 10 11 Α. Well, there's several hard red flags to me 12 and then some suttle red flags, but the hard red 13 flags would be the, you know, the increasing, as time went on the increasing desire for him to fill 14 15 new prescriptions early, that's a red flag, seeking 16 early refills. The other really hard red flag is what we 17 18 call doctor shopping, where a patient goes to an 19 emergency -- he's getting chronic pain meds from a 20 pain medication doctor like Dr. Gallagher but then 21 they're also going to emergency rooms, they're going 22 to dentists, they're going to other doctors, orthopedists, to seek out prescriptions for other 23

narcotics because their pain management doctors are

not giving them enough drugs.

- Q. Any other red flags that you contend were overlooked in this case?
- A. Well, those are the two big red flags. But the fact that the patients, I mean, the pharmacists did not talk with the patients about coming in and seeking early fills of their prescriptions, that there was virtually no counseling, that the patient, you know, was perhaps overusing his medication.

There's no questioning that I had seen, no documentation on that. I'm sure there were other things that I'm not remembering at this point. But I think those two red flags, the two hard flags would definitely have to be cleared, the ones I mentioned before about doctor shopping and early refills, early fills.

- Q. I want to make sure I have the number of physicians that you -- I, early in the deposition I thought you said there were 17 physicians but in your report you say 12. Which one is it?
- A. It's both. There were 17 from the onset of the Rite Aid prescriptions. But once he started seeing Dr. Gallagher at that point there were only 12 other physicians other than Dr. Gallagher, once

1 he started becoming a patient of Dr. Gallagher's. Prior to that there were five other doctors that he 2 3 sought medications from. Ο. Okay. Now, I got it. 5 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: We've been going about another hour and I've had to much to water drink so 6 7 I need to take a break. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: I'm with you. I got you. 8 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: All right. Let's take 9 another break. 10 11 (Short break in proceedings.) BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 12 13 Doctor, I don't which page of your report is, you say Both pharmacists who were deposed claim 14 15 a lack of knowledge as to narcotic drugs such as 16 other opiates. What are you saying by that in your report? 17 18 That was based on the information I read in Α. 19 their depositions. I was actually pretty shocked to 20 find out that one of the pharmacists did not know 21 that what heroin was, which is, you know, pretty 22 much explained in every continuing education on opiate use disorder. 23

The required courses from boards of

1 pharmacy I'll mention it, and the pharmacists didn't To me it seemed she had a 2 know what it was. 3 complete lack of knowledge of opiates. And then 4 that actually brings to mind another red flag that I 5 forgot to mention, was the assessment of morphine milli equivalents in dispensing of drugs and looking 6 7 at the risks involved in patients taking high MMEs. As you mentioned earlier you said that's 8 9 what doctors do. What I said pharmacists do it, And when we look at it we could, I don't know 10 11 if you're familiar with what MMEs are, but an MME is 12 a morphine milli equivalent and it gives you a risk 13 factor based on your MME cut, daily MME count. So an MME of 50 is generally a warning. 14 15 When you get to an MME of 90 it may become a red 16 flag that the patient's taking very high doses and has a very high risk of overdose death. 17 18 So this is when a pharmacists vigilance 19 needs to go up when they do an assessment of MMEs on their patients. By 2016, Mr. Dukeshire was 20 21 receiving approximately 135 MMEs every day of 22 opiates, which is in the very high risk range. That would actually would, should trigger 23 24 another red flag for the pharmacist to do more due

- diligence in clarifying the scripts, counseling the patient, and actually warning the patient of the dangers of high MMEs on a daily basis.
- Q. When did you come up with the MME red flag opinion?
- MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, attorney-client work product, but for that objection you can answer.
- 9 A. Well, throughout the case I thought about
 10 MMEs but I didn't really apply it to this case
 11 probably until within the last few weeks.
- Q. And what was it that caused you to apply it to this case in the last few weeks?
- MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can answer.
- A. It was just, you know, I was contacted again by the attorneys after a long period of time that we hadn't talked and I wanted to refresh myself so I was looking through some different files. I reviewed the pharmacist's manual and things like that again.
- And the issue of MMEs came up in some of
 the literature I read. So I said, let me go back
 and take a look and calculate how many MMEs

- 1 Dukeshire was taking on a daily basis. And when I 2 did that I realized he was taking an extremely high 3 MME count. 4 So I didn't put in my report initially that 5 I did, you know, a year or so ago but, you know, it's something that I would add as an adjunctive or 6 7 addendum to it as far as a red flag. Is there a particular writing or source or 8 9 guideline that you can refer me to as to what MME would have been acceptable non-red flag range for a 10 11 chronic pain patient such as Dale Dukeshire? 12 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 13 answer. I wouldn't know specifically that, you 14 15 know, met all of the criteria of your question. But 16 one of the documents I gave you, you know, that we have in the exhibits that details MMEs and the 17 18 importance of assessment of MMEs. 19 What is heroin? Ο. 20 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, you can answer.

 - Α. It is a synthetic opiate. It's called diacetylmorphine. It's a stronger opiate than say, then morphine itself.
 - Is it a C-I? 0.

22

23

24

- A. In the United States it's a C-I. In various other countries like Europe it's a C-II.

 Q. For any opinion that you have, do you rely
- 5 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 6 answer if you can.

upon any Ohio statute or regulation?

- A. That's a good question. I think -- I don't know the Ohio standards and regulations by heart. I would have to go through them, but I think they would be similar to the general federal regulations on assessments of, you know, narcotic dispensing.
- Q. As you sit here today, is it a correct statement that you cannot point me to any Ohio regulation or statute that you contend was not met?

 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can answer.
- A. Not off the top of my head. But I'm sure that if I had the Board of Pharmacy regulations in front of me I could find a listing of regulations and red flags that would have, that would pertain to what you're asking, but I personally don't have that knowledge memorized.
- Q. At any time have you undertaken to look at the Ohio statute or regulations to determine if any

1 was not complied with in this case? 2 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 3 answer. I don't recall if I looked at specifically 4 Α. 5 at that Ohio regs. I may have. I believe I was looking at the federal regulations, and whenever 6 7 there's conflicting regulations being state and federal, the strictness of the two are to be 8 9 followed. 10 So I think the answer to my question is no. 0. 11 Is that right? 12 Objection. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: 13 It's, I don't remember. I may have looked at the Ohio Board of Pharmacy regulations. 14 15 Q. As you sit here today, can you recall 16 identifying anyone that was not met? MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection; asked and 17 18 answered but you can answer. 19 Not off the top of my head. Again, I would 20 have to look at a regulations. 21 0. What claimed lack of understanding about 22 narcotic prescriptions do you claim the pharmacists had here? 23 The lack of understanding? You know --24 Α.

1	Q. You say
2	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Wait, he's answering.
3	A. Ho ahead. I'm sorry.
4	Q. You say in your report, "The claimed lack
5	of understanding about narcotic prescriptions, if
6	true, would also be a violation of Rite Aid's e
7	training and supervision of their pharmacists."
8	So I'm trying to understand what claimed
9	lack of understanding about narcotic prescriptions
LO	existed.
11	A. Well, according to the depositions of the
L2	pharmacists that I read, as I mentioned, they didn't
L3	know what heroin was, they didn't due, calculate
L4	MMEs, and I don't believe they were asked about it
L5	so I don't know their knowledge about it but I did
L6	not see anything in the record that showed they
L7	address that or looked at the MMEs on the patients.
L8	The fact that they were filling the drugs
L9	without calling doctors, when multiple doctors are
20	writing scripts they weren't calling doctors, when
21	patients were coming in with, when a patient,
22	Mr. Dukeshire was coming in several days early for
23	new prescriptions there were not calls to doctors.
	1

It was pretty much, you know, they were

23

24

1 isolating every prescription as it came in as one 2 prescription and we'll just fill that one 3 prescription without looking at the whole big picture of how many scrips he's been getting, how 5 frequently he's seen coming for early fills. 6 They didn't bother -- in my knowledge I saw 7 no record of them calling these other 12 doctors to let them know that the patient was receiving 8 9 narcotics from other physicians. All these things accumulate to my assessment that they have a lack of 10 understanding about narcotic prescriptions and the 11 12 potential harm that could be caused by things such as early fills and multiple physicians prescribing. 13 How much of your current work load is 14 15 consumed by expert witness work? It varies from month to month. I would say 16 Α. last month zero. This month about 15 percent of my 17 18 Many months I do no expert witness work. work. The 19 expert witness work tends to come in waves where 20 you'll get a case and do a lot of work for a week or 21 so and then it sits idle for a year or two.

And that's pretty much what happened with this case as well. And so I don't do expert witness work all the time. I do pharmacy work all the time.

- Q. How many active cases do you have right now?
 - A. Five, maybe six that are active. I'm not actually sure. I actually spoke to a lawyer last week who wanted to refer me a case and I asked him, you know, I said something about, well, we did good on the other case that you did.

And he says that case is still active. And that was six years ago. And I didn't even know the case was still active. I thought it had already settled. So that's why I said five and then I would change it to six because I wanted to add that case.

I haven't been in contact with the lawyer for six years but he considers it still an active case.

- Q. What percentage of your case work is for the plaintiff versus for the defense?
 - A. I would say it's about 50/50.
- Q. What do you charge for record review?
- A. Well, do you want to know what I charged for this case? Because I've changed my fees last year and I'm still basing this case on previous billing. So do you want my current or do you want the one that's on this case?

1 Q. Both. 2 Okay. On this case I charged \$300 an hour 3 for record reviews, \$400 an hour for depositions and trial testimony. That was old fees. 5 My new fees are, let me get this straight. \$350 an hour for reviews and \$500 for depositions 6 7 and trial testimony. So I raised my rates a little 8 bit about a year ago. 9 Ο. Okay. Have you ever been qualified to testify at trial by a court? 10 11 Α. Have I ever testified at trial by court? 12 Yes. 13 Ο. How many occasions? I believe there were four trial 14 testimonies. 15 16 Have you ever testified in Ohio at trail? Ο. No, not at trial. 17 Α. I have worked on another 18 Ohio case. 19 Do you know of any evidence in this case 20 that by filling a prescription up to two days early 21 from when a prior C-II prescription expired that 22 Rite Aid was on notice that Dale Dukeshire was

MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can

abusing any of his medicines?

23

24

1	answer.
2	A. Can you repeat the first part of the
3	question?
4	Q. Sure. Do you have evidence that by
5	allowing the 48-hour time period to apply that Rite
6	Aid was on actual notice that Dale Dukeshire was
7	abusing any of his prescriptions?
8	A. I can't answer that. I don't know what
9	Rite Aid knew or did not know based on that.
10	Q. Do you have any knowledge from any source
11	that Rite Aid was on notice that Dale Dukeshire was
12	not taking his meds appropriately?
13	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can
14	answer.
15	A. Not that I know from their records.
16	Q. From any source?
17	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can
18	answer.
19	A. Well, when you look at any source there was
20	deposition of a nurse practitioner that had spoken
21	to Dr. Gallagher, I believe, talked to Dale
22	Dukeshire's family, that showed concern that he may
23	according to her the family told her he crushing
24	and snorting medication, that he was buying pills on

Α.

1 street and that type of thing. So there was some 2 knowledge from a nurse practitioner who tried to 3 intervene. 4 Ο. But my question was, was Rite Aid ever on notice that Mr. Dukeshire was not taking his 5 medicines appropriately? 6 7 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 8 answer. Not that I know of. 9 Α. Do you have any evidence that Rite Aid was 10 Ο. 11 ever on notice that Mr. Dukeshire was taking street 12 drugs? MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 13 14 answer. Not that I noticed in the records. 15 Α. 16 From any source, was Rite Aid on notice Ο. 17 that he was taking street drugs? 18 Α. Not that I know of. 19 Do you agree that's it's not in the 20 pharmacist's scope of practice to say whether or not 21 a patient's pain is legitimate? 22 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 23 answer.

That's not the pharmacist's duty; although,

- 1 | a pharmacist does have to have confidence that there
 2 | is a legitimate medical reason for each prescription
 3 | that's being dispensed.
 - Q. Was the 12 physicians that wrote episodic scripts, did each of those physicians just write one script?
- A. I'd have to look at the records.

 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can
- 9 | answer.

5

6

19

21

- A. There were a couple of physicians that
 wrote the scripts a couple times. Dr. Stephanie
 George wrote two prescriptions, and James Huddleston
 wrote two prescriptions, and Robert Cook also wrote
 two prescriptions.
- So there were several, there were three doctors that wrote multiple scripts, two scrips for him, in addition to the, you know, the other 108 from Dr. Gallagher, whatever, over 100 from
- Q. Looking at my notes here. Give me a few
- 22 A. Sure.

minutes.

Dr. Gallagher.

Q. Do you agree that pharmacists do not and cannot render medical opinions?

1 Objection, but you can MR. ABRAMOWITZ: 2 answer. 3 Yes. I understand that. Α. 4 Ο. And pharmacists cannot and do not render 5 medical diagnoses? 6 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can 7 answer. We do not render though; although, we 8 Α. Yes. 9 do have to document them in many cases. When you -- for the record, you are unaware 10 Q. 11 of any specific conversation that any of the 12 pharmacists had with Dale Dukeshire or with Mrs. Dukeshire; true? 13 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection. 14 15 Α. Only from what I've read in the depositions. 16 Okay. The universe what you know about 17 Ο. 18 those conversations, if any, are in the depositions? 19 That is correct. Α. Let me check with Mr. McManus. We may be 20 Ο. 21 about done, so let's take just a five minute, a 22 quick break. (Short break in Proceedings.) 23 BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 24

- Q. Mr. Litman, have we discussed all of the opinions with will attempt to offer in this case?
- A. I believe you've covered most of my opinions; although, specifically, my summary, you know, and how I look at the whole thing has not been isolated. Everything has been kind of thrown into that one report.
 - Q. What do you mean by that?
- A. I mean that, you know, going into the dispensing patterns of this pharmacy, when I look at the dispensing volume of prescriptions that they're processing, you know, between 200 and 300 a day in a 12-hour period, allowing two to three minutes per prescription, it seemed to me that, you know, that Rite Aid was, you know, kind of woefully blind as to clearing red flags because it would interfere with their dispensing of prescriptions.

They literally had, the pharmacists literally had two to two and half, maybe three minutes to process a prescription and that includes verifying it, calling physicians, insuring that it's not too soon, you know, all these different factors that are involved.

And their system was kind of set up for

1 failure because the weren't checking. They didn't 2 give their pharmacists enough time to process things 3 properly and as well as not really verifying that the pharmacist were well trained and well versed in, 5 you know, opiate use disorders and dispensing of opioid products, clearing red flags. 6 7 It seems like there was just a whole, you know -- I guess it's all summarized in my report. 8 9 But I guess we just didn't discuss it today, some of the details that were in my report. 10 11 That's why I said when you asked if there's 12 anything else, I think there were other things in my 13 report that were not brought to light in our discussion today. 14 15 Ο. Anything else that I've not brought to 16 light other than what you just mentioned? Not that I can think of off the top of my 17 Α. 18 head, but I think that those were very important key 19 points. 20 Ο. Can you take a moment and look at your 21 report and double check for me? 22 Α. Okay. About the flags, standard of care, the 23

violation of standard of care and not informing

1 other physicians along with primaries that he's 2 seeing other doctors. That's important to discuss 3 that. (Reading to himself, inaudible.) 4 One statistic I listed in the report that 5 we didn't bring up is that, you know, when you keep isolating these new prescriptions and say, it's an 6 7 isolated script, they were filling it two days early, there not a problem in that, but when you 8 look at the pattern of that over a period of time like we did this four-year period of time we came to 10 11 a summary of early fills over that period of time of 12 144 days. And that doesn't even include the one day 13 early refills. That -- I didn't even include those. 14 If we included those it would be even more. 15 16 Mr. Dukeshire probably -- they basically dispensed an extra five months worth of medications to this 17 18 patient. So there was no control on his usage, no 19 monitoring of him being in compliance with a 20 physicians quidelines for using these drugs. 21 And that was in my report that was not 22 discussed today. Let's go on -- I think we've covered most of my opinions that are listed in the 23 24 report.

1	Q. Well, look at your report and tell me if
2	there's any that we have not because and the
3	question is broader than that because you gave me
4	two extra opinions today, a DUR opinion and a MME
5	opinion.
6	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can
7	answer.
8	A. Okay. I think aside from those other two
9	opinions that I've added that we have my opinions in
10	the report.
11	Q. All right. Have you likewise, have you
12	shared with me the basis for your opinions, meaning
13	where the things that you rely upon for the opinions
14	you would attempt to offer?
15	A. Well, I mentioned the pharmacist manual,
16	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: I'm sorry. Objection.
17	A. The pharmacist manual and I rely on my 40
18	years of experience as a pharmacist, my 35 years of
19	experience a pharmacy professor in providing solid,
20	sound, ethical pharmaceutical care to my patients.
21	Q. Anything else?
22	MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Objection, but you can
23	answer.
24	A. I think that's the summary of where I

1 developed my opinions. 2 MS. WHITE-FARRELL: Those are all my 3 questions. Thank you. This is Chad Beck. I don't have 4 MR. BECK: 5 any questions for the witness. 6 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: I might have few -- well I 7 have just one question to clarify here. 8 EXAMINATION BY MR. ABRAMOWITZ: 9 Mr. Litman, about thirty minutes or so 10 Ο. 11 Tammy used the term, "was Rite Aid on notice." 12 How did you take that term to mean? Can 13 you just explain to us what your understanding is? She asked if they were on notice, I assume 14 15 a third-party entity had contacted Rite Aid, like 16 the DEA or the Board of Pharmacy contacted them and, 17 you know, and said that they were flagged or, you 18 know, having an issue with the dispensing of 19 narcotics. 20 That's what you meant right, Tammy? 21 EXAMINATION 22 BY MS. WHITE-FARRELL: 23 Q. I meant notice from any source. 24 Okay. I assumed that you meant a third-Α.

1 party source. 2 I mean, they really, you know, should have been on notice themselves based on the, based on the 3 filling patterns. 5 On notice of what? Ο. MR. ABRAMOWITZ: That, for the record, 6 we'll hand the question over to Tammy, just so it's 7 cleared for the record. 8 9 Α. I'm sorry. Repeat the question again? On notice of what. 10 Ο. 11 Α. On notice that their, that Mr. Dukeshire 12 had an opiate use disorder, that he was consistently 13 requiring early fills of his C-II prescriptions, that I quess it looks like a blindness on Rite Aid's 14 15 part to not want to intercede and just got the 16 scripts filled. I think their motivation was to fill, sell 17 18 drugs, and they weren't really looking out for the 19 safety or well being of the patients or community. 20 They just wanted to make their sales. So that's how 21 I feel that, you know, they should have put 22 themselves on notice. 23 But when you said it I thought you were

referring to another regulatory agency putting them

```
1
   on notice for, you know, either somebody reported
 2
    something to the DEA or the Board of Pharmacy about
 3
   that pharmacy.
 4
              MS. WHITE-FARRELL: All right.
                                               Those are
 5
   all my questions.
              Do you want to read and sign, Mark?
 6
 7
              MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Yes, please. I'm sorry --
                                  Mark, are you sending
 8
              MS. WHITE-FARRELL:
 9
   these exhibits to me and then me to the court
   reporter or are you sending them to the court
10
11
   reporter directly?
12
              MR. ABRAMOWITZ:
                               I'm happy to send them
13
   both to you at the exact same time if you'd like it,
   and include Chad or Stephen on that as well.
14
15
   Whatever ever you guys like, copy everybody at the
16
    same time.
              (Short discussion off the record.)
17
18
              COURT REPORTER: And I quess Mr. Beck do
19
   you want to order a copy on the doctor's behalf
20
   since there's several of you on here?
21
              MR. BECK: Yes, ma'am.
22
              (Having chosen to read and sign, the
23
             deposition concluded at 2:50 p.m.)
24
```

1	ERRATA SHEET
2	I, ROBERT A. LITMAN, do hereby certify that
3	the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my deposition with the exception of the following corrections:
4	PAGE LINE CORRECTION
5	TAGE DINE CONNECTION
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	State of, County of,
20	Sworn to before me,
21	Notary Public, this, day of,
22	2021.
23	
24	Notary Public

1	STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA			
2	COUNTY OF KANAWHA, to wit:			
3	I, Kristina Guthrie, Professional Reporter			
4	and Notary Public within and for the County and			
5	State aforesaid, duly commissioned and qualified, do			
6	hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were			
7	duly transcribed by me from stenographic notes taken			
8	in the foregoing proceedings to the best of my skill			
9	and ability.			
10	I do further certify that the said			
11	proceedings were correctly taken by me in shorthand			
12	notes, and that the same were accurately written out			
13	in full and reduced to typewriting by means of			
14	computer-aided transcription.			
15	Given under my hand this 15th day of			
16	November, 2021.			
17	OFFICIAL SEAL			
18	STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA NOTARY PUBLIC Kristina L. Guthrie 7/131 en Street, Charleston, WV 25301			
19	My Commission Expires December 1. 2025			
20	Kristina Guthrie, Professional			
21	Reporter and Notary Public			
22				
23				
24				

	45:21		13,16,23 21:5 22:1,	accounts 7:18
\$	20 35:5	5	8 23:21 24:13,19	accredited 46:7
¢200 00.0	200 97:12	F 44.40.47.00.04	25:3,18 27:3,13,18 28:15 30:24 31:10,	accumulate 90:10
\$300 92:2		5 14:16,17,20,24 15:6,7 16:1,6 66:14	14,18 32:10,15	
\$350 92:6	2013 19:1 29:7,10 30:14		33:17,21 34:8	accurate 44:4
\$400 92:3		50 84:14	35:21 37:3 38:4,10,	achieved 76:4
\$500 92:6	2014 29:8 30:14	50/50 91:18	16,23 39:12,15,20 40:6,13,19 41:11,	acknowledge
•	2015 74:6	500,000 47:21	21 42:8,13,18,21	67:6,14
1	2016 29:13,16,17		43:17 48:16 49:11	acknowledges
	50:5 84:20	6	50:1,13,19,23 51:2,	66:14
1 10:5,6,9 16:17	2017 8:8 19:2,6		4,24 52:6,11 53:24 55:10,15,24 57:4,7,	action 5:6 38:20
45:6 72:19	59:13	6 15:13,16,20 72:19	14 60:16 61:13,18,	39:10
10 7:11 78:21,22	2020 11:17 32:5	74:24 77:23	24 62:10,21 63:22	active 45:22 91:1,
79:1	42:6,19,20		64:7,19 65:11 66:6	3,8,10,14
100 78:6 95:18	2021 5:8	7	67:22 68:6,19 69:14,19 70:21	activities 73:20
108 95:17	21 19:2	7 15:23,24 16:3,6	71:20 72:9,16,21	activity 71:13
		40:3 74:24	74:16,23 75:5 76:2,	73:16,24
112 30:2 77:24 78:8	22 29:20	72 74:4 75:24 76:16	18,22 77:14 78:16	actual 44:18 54:6
12 73:5 82:20,24	24 75:20	12 74.4 75.24 76.16	79:3,9 80:9 81:6 83:8 85:6,14 86:12,	93:6
90:7 95:4	2:50 103:23	8	20 87:5,15 88:2,12,	Acugenasis
12-hour 97:13		o	17 89:2 92:24	58:10,12,19
120 22:23	3	8 16:21 17:1,4	93:13,17 94:7,13,	acute 35:19 37:1,
12:01 5:9		18:20 30:18,21	22 95:8 96:1,6,14 100:6,16,22 101:6,	22 55:21,23
135 84:21	3 11:16,21 13:12,24	36:21 55:5,10,11,	9 102:6 103:7,12	add 42:15 43:9
	14:1,5 32:5 40:3	14,16 56:8	absolutely 10:22	66:24 86:6 91:12
14 29:10	300 97:12	8th 5:8	60:7	added 13:1 24:4
144 78:4,5,10 99:12	35 100:18		abuse 66:15 67:16	43:7,14 78:8 100:9
15 7:11 90:17		9		addendum 45:3
150,000 46:21 47:19	4	9 19:6 65:6,7,10	abusing 92:23 93:7	86:7
16 30:19 74:6	4 14:9,10,13 15:4,5	90 22:23 84:15	abusive 67:7	addendums 43:6,
	19:1 32:5	905172 5:7	accept 51:18	
17 30:3,19 36:5 37:9,13 50:6 74:6	40 47:18 100:17	90s 79:18	acceptable 75:15,	addictive 51:22 52:5
82:19,21	48 43:3 74:3 75:24	903 79.10	21 86:10	
18 5:7 11:16 32:5	76:16	A	access 56:22	addition 43:20 95:17
42:5	48-hour 27:2,12		accessed 56:11	address 63:16
1980's 79:17	70:11,12 75:13 93:5	a-c-u-g-e-n-a-s-i-s	accessing 53:1	67:7 89:17
		58:11	56:21 65:5	addressing 16:4
2	48-hours 74:1	Abramowitz 5:21	accordance 36:2	21:9 63:6
		6:3 9:10 10:18 11:8,13 12:5 13:14	account 37:21	adjunctive 86:6
2 10:11,14,17 11:15		15:1,6,9,21 17:5,	4500uiit 57.21	,

ITE AID OF OHIO, IN	IC, ET AL		11/09/2021 Ind	lex: administrationC-
administration	analysis 37:16,17	87:11	basically 43:23	boards 83:24
47:9 60:23	ancillary 47:4	assisting 66:23	47:5 49:14,17 67:10 75:12 99:16	Bobby 8:1
adopt 27:1	animals 54:19	association 8:3	basing 91:22	book 77:11 79:22
adverse 39:10	answering 41:18	26:24	basis 12:18 45:17	books 40:9 79:19
Advisors 7:3,10 8:13	89:2 anti-diabetic	assume 101:14 assumed 101:24	49:22 51:21 52:3 59:16 63:5 64:3	Boroff 23:19 32:10,15,23 38:21
affidavit 40:22	21:19 22:6	attempt 8:20 53:9	72:6 85:3 86:1	49:5 64:4
affidavits 40:18	anti-hypertensive	97:2 100:14	100:12	Boroff's 24:1
afraid 36:8 78:18	21:13,14 22:6	attorney 5:15	Beck 5:19 101:4 103:18,21	bother 56:21 90:6
afternoon 77:3,19	apologies 34:8 55:15	42:22 68:7	beginning 31:7	bottom 37:11
agencies 26:16	apologize 24:24	attorney- 42:21	68:10	BRAHMOISM
45:12,13	27:20	attorney-client 10:20 17:6 79:4	begins 66:14	56:13
agency 45:11 47:9 102:24	apology 6:4	85:6	behalf 5:17,19,23 103:19	brand 54:16
agree 35:17,24	apparatus 58:20	attorneys 85:17		break 10:11 11:11 31:19,20 32:2
38:8,12 51:10,15	applicable 69:24	audio 6:2 24:23	behavior 28:6 behaviors 73:21	50:22 51:5 77:19
54:12 55:2,4 56:10 60:4 66:12,17,19	applies 11:6	40:15 65:13 68:11		83:7,10,11 96:22, 23
67:13 70:18 78:12	apply 85:10,12	August 19:2	Belleview 35:4	bring 13:19 31:4
94:19 95:23	93:5	average 44:19 78:4,5,11,13 79:7	benefit 23:16 54:5	41:15 80:24 99:5
agrees 76:20	appropriately 81:4 93:12 94:6	aware 26:14 28:16	Bethesda 35:4	brings 84:4
ahead 89:3	approximately	37:24 38:14,18	big 82:4 90:3	broad 71:21 72:21
\id 5:6,18 27:2,11 38:14 39:3,6,10	7:11 30:3 84:21	39:13 40:15 56:16 58:9 61:14,19	billing 91:23	81:6
41:3 50:11 53:6	April 19:1		bills 9:23 10:3,10, 15,21 11:1	broader 100:3
56:11 61:11,15 62:4 64:4 66:14	area 79:24 80:22	В	biomechanical	brought 9:16,18, 19,20,21 13:20
67:21 68:18 69:13,	arise 48:20	back 16:16 28:22	58:16	29:18,20,23 98:13,
20 70:9,19,23 71:18 72:6,10,13,	arising 38:15,22	31:7 36:2 42:5	bit 23:4 63:9 92:8	15
20 73:21 75:18	39:10	55:20 61:20 79:11 80:6,16,17,21 81:2	Black 8:10 59:17	business 7:4
82:22 92:22 93:6,9, 11 94:4,10,16	arrives 26:7	85:23	blind 69:20 97:15	buttocks 36:2
97:15 101:11,15	aspect 11:11	balances 67:1	blindness 102:14	buying 93:24
Aid's 18:11 62:8	aspects 53:6	base 34:13	block 66:13	c
63:2 66:12 89:6 102:14	assess 19:15	based 12:19 17:11	blood 21:17 22:22	
allowed 67:10	assessing 16:4 50:9	26:8 33:13 37:22 43:10 44:16,22	43:15 44:8	C-I 54:12,15 57:5 86:24 87:1
	20.0	45:2 55:5 66:21	blue 36:18	
allowing 70:12	assessment	l .	l	(:= 20.0 24.22
allowing 70:12 93:5 97:13	assessment 64:13 84:5,19 86:18 90:10	71:2,3,4 76:4,6 78:6 83:18 84:13	board 38:12,21 39:2,5,9 57:20 80:9	C-II 20:9 24:22 25:16 26:6 28:10,

70:12,18,24 72:18	causation 33:7	22:11,12,21 23:3,5,	Common 5:4	considered 28:5
75:14 76:16 87:2 92:21 102:13	caused 85:12	6 35:24 36:1 37:11 71:22 81:19 86:11	communicate	considers 91:14
C-IIS 19:24 20:2 24:9 25:13 26:1	90:12 cell 31:21	chronically 37:24	74:22 75:10 communicated	consistent 33:12,
C.PH. 5:3 6:17	Center 7:21,22,23 35:4	circumstances 51:19	80:7 81:4 communicating	consistently 50:5
calculate 78:13, 15,18 85:24 89:13	central 80:18	citation 38:19	19:13	consultant 45:13
calculation 64:24	centralized 80:22	Civil 5:6 claim 83:14 88:22	communication 20:16 50:7,17	59:6 Consultants
78:23 79:7	certificate 68:11	claimed 88:21	79:20,22 80:23	45:12
call 28:3 48:9 73:7 81:18	CGP 5:3 6:17	89:4,8	communications 80:13	consulted 16:11
called 6:18 47:2 54:16 86:21	Chad 5:19 101:4 103:14	claiming 11:2 74:12	community 63:17 76:7 102:19	consulting 7:5,7, 8,10,24 49:13,23,
calling 25:16	chance 26:17,20	clarify 101:7	comorbidities	24 50:4 51:8,9
89:19,20 90:7	change 22:20 63:15 91:12	clarifying 85:1	35:16	consumed 90:15
97:21	changed 43:14	clarity 24:19	company 7:4,17	consuming 80:20
calls 89:23	91:21	clear 13:11 28:10,	compare 32:6	contact 91:13
cancers 58:21 care 7:6,18 8:4	charge 91:19	21 33:22 34:1 77:22 79:6	complete 13:10, 12,17 18:17 20:7	contacted 85:16 101:15,16
28:13 35:4 46:4 47:6,8,12 49:6	charged 91:20 92:2	cleared 82:14 102:8	43:8 54:6 84:3	contend 44:10 62:19 67:17 81:9
55:22 57:2 58:3	Charleston 5:12	clearing 64:15	completed 72:19 73:1	82:2 87:14
66:4 98:23,24 100:20	chart 47:5,13 48:1, 3,5,6 56:7	97:16 98:6	completely 20:23	contends 11:7
carfentanil 15:14,	charts 46:13,22	client 42:22	54:7	context 37:8 47:6
18 43:16 44:9 54:12,14,17,23	47:1,19 77:20	clinical 37:8 45:23, 24 46:3,7 49:20	compliance 64:5 99:19	continued 64:10
55:3	check 32:20 57:2 58:3 96:20 98:21	53:18	compliant 64:9	continuing 63:5, 18 64:2,6 83:22
Carolina 13:22 14:3	checking 13:3	clock 21:23	complied 88:1	contracts 8:3
case 9:9 12:2	57:9 98:1	close 35:5 47:23	computer 75:18	contradicted 44:1
15:15,19 16:18 30:23 35:13 39:14	checks 67:1	coach 33:20,21 colleague 9:7	80:23 concern 93:22	control 21:16 99:18
40:5,12,18 44:18	chemotherapeuti cs 58:15	colleagues 77:1	concluded 103:23	controlled 28:24
67:17 68:4,13 69:11 70:1 81:10	cherry 43:23 44:5	College 58:13	condition 22:22	63:21
82:3 85:9,10,13 88:1 90:20,23 91:5,	54:4	comfortable	conditions 23:5	conversation 96:11
7,8,10,12,15,16,21, 22,24 92:2,18,19	chief 13:22 14:3	56:20	36:1 71:23	conversations
97:2	chosen 103:22 Christopher 5:22	comment 32:14 43:19 74:19	confidence 95:1	50:10 51:10,13 96:18
cases 19:20 68:10 91:1 96:9	chronic 21:22	comments 33:23	conflicting 88:7	converse 38:2

RITE AID OF OHIO,
convinced 37:23
Cook 95:13
copy 65:18,19,21 77:17 80:16 103:15,19
Coral 7:20
coroner 43:21
coroner's 33:10, 12,14 43:14 44:13 53:12
correct 16:24 20:24 21:18 68:14 87:12 96:19
correspondence 9:23 10:3,10,15
counsel 5:13 10:24
counseling 51:16, 18,20 82:8 85:1
count 30:7 75:2 84:13 86:3
countries 87:2
country 54:15
County 5:4 35:1 43:14 44:13
couple 29:9 36:19 42:15 69:4 95:10, 11
courses 63:8 83:24
court 5:2,4,10 6:6, 10 7:22 9:13 10:12 16:22,24 19:3,7,10 32:13,17 92:10,11 103:9,10,18

MURRAY v. O OF OHIO, INC, ET AL		
ced 37:23	criteria 86:15	
95:13	critical 69:12 70:10,13 76:1,17	
5:18,19,21 30:16 5,19	criticism 38:13,19 48:14,22 67:21 68:17 69:17	
7:20 • r 43:21	crushing 93:23	
r's 33:10,	culmination 69:21	
43:14 44:13	Curl 36:12	
: 16:24	current 90:14 91:23	
21:18 68:14 96:19	custom 79:14	
oondence	cut 6:4 84:13	
0:3,10,15	Cuyahoga 5:4	
el 5:13	CV 5:6	
eling 51:16, 82:8 85:1	D	
30:7 75:2 86:3	daily 84:13 85:3 86:1	
ies 87:2	Dale 20:8 23:19	
y 54:15	28:23 38:15,22 39:11 49:7 50:11	
5:4 35:1 44:13	51:22 52:4 61:12, 16 63:20 68:24 74:12 81:3 86:11	
29:9 36:19 69:4 95:10,	92:22 93:6,11,21 96:12	
e 62·0	dangers 85:3	

cover 16:9 18:24

coverage 31:22

created 12:12 13:2

covered 97:3

99:23

56:7

crushing 93:23	65:21,24 101:16 103:2		
culmination 69:21			
Curl 36:12	DEA's 49:16 62:24		
current 90:14	deal 64:15		
91:23	dealing 24:20		
custom 79:14	death 33:6,8,10,13,		
cut 6:4 84:13	16 34:5 38:8,15,22 39:11 63:20 84:17		
Cuyahoga 5:4	defendant 11:6		
CV 5:6	defense 53:13 91:17		
D	deferring 33:7		
daily 84:13 85:3 86:1	demonstrates 35:8		
Dale 20:8 23:19	dentist 56:5		
28:23 38:15,22	dentists 37:6		
39:11 49:7 50:11 51:22 52:4 61:12,	81:22		
16 63:20 68:24	departments 35:20 61:3		
74:12 81:3 86:11 92:22 93:6,11,21	dependance 64:6		
96:12	depends 23:4,7		
dangers 85:3	25:9		
data 13:4 19:7,8 37:18,20 43:12,24	deposed 83:14		
44:3,5,6,7 54:3,4,6,	deposition 5:3		
7,10	9:14 10:4,6,7,8,14, 16 14:1,5,10,13,17,		
date 5:8 18:23	19 15:16,20,24		
28:14 70:9	16:2,16 17:1,3 24:2		
dates 18:21	25:15 32:18,23 40:24 55:12 56:18		
day 21:4 22:16,17 27:10 29:1,2 46:12 60:10 68:16 69:5 78:14 84:21 97:12	65:7,9 71:10 78:22, 24 82:18 93:20 103:23		
99:13	depositions 9:22		

days 16:13 18:23 23:2,3 29:6,19,21,

23,24 59:20,22 69:7 78:4,9,10,14,

23 89:22 92:20

DEA 28:8 57:19

99:7,12

11/00/2021 11100
32:4,6,7,8 34:23 39:19,24 50:16 56:17 62:13 83:19 89:11 92:3,6 96:16, 18
designed 69:20
desire 81:14
destroyed 74:13
detail 10:23
details 86:17 98:10
determine 10:12 55:21 67:24 68:22 71:10 87:24
determining 48:17 58:21
develop 63:16
developed 66:20 101:1
development 58:20
deviated 49:6
devote 45:22
diabetes 23:6
diabetic 22:21
diacetylmorphine 86:22
diagnoses 33:4 96:5
dialog 76:9
Diamond 36:9
Dicello 5:22
Dickenson 36:15
diem 45:17 59:15
difficult 80:14,20
dig 65:12
diligence 85:1
direct 6:20 20:16
1.0

	directly 57:22 103:11
	disagree 41:19
,	disagreement 41:9
	disciplinary 38:20
	discovery 42:10 61:21,23
	discuss 98:9 99:2
)	discussed 10:24 97:1 99:22
	discussing 77:3
	discussion 98:14 103:17
	disease 23:6
	disorder 16:5 28:5 29:15 64:1 83:23 102:12
	disorders 98:5
	dispense 73:14,15
	dispensed 18:22 77:24 78:4 95:3 99:16
!	dispensing 19:16, 19 28:2,21 53:2 62:6 63:3,6,7 64:13,14,16 66:23 84:6 87:11 97:10, 11,17 98:5 101:18
	diversion 67:16
	doctor 11:15 18:24 43:12 73:10 81:18, 20 82:15 83:13
	doctor's 103:19
	doctors 30:4 36:5, 7,16,18 37:5,6,22, 23 43:11 73:5 81:22,24 83:2 84:9 89:19,20,23 90:7 95:16 99:2

doctors' 41:7

23:20,24 31:17,18

document 13:2 27:8 30:12,16 42:6 43:5 57:12,18 63:1 64:23 66:9 69:13, 16,17 78:19 79:7 96:9 documentation 48:19 49:23 50:6 51:8,9 52:7 82:11 documented 49:15 documents 13:2 33:10 43:1,2 57:16 58:7 61:21 86:16 doses 84:16 dosing 14:15,18 double 98:21 download 65:23 draft 17:13,15,18, 21 42:11 **drafts** 42:8,16 Dragovich 41:6 drink 83:6 drive 9:23 10:2 13:21 32:21 41:16

drug 21:15 28:6 44:14 47:1,2 48:4,9 54:16 58:14 61:16

drug-related 61:8

drugs 18:22 24:21 46:17 62:6.9 63:3 66:15 67:7 71:8 82:1 83:15 84:6 89:18 94:12,17 99:20 102:18

due 84:24 89:13

DUIS 61:7,12

Dukeshire 5:24 9:4 12:1 20:8 23:19 28:23 35:18 36:6 37:8 49:7 50:11 51:22 52:4 61:12,

16 73:24 74:12 77:24 80:5 84:20 86:1,11 89:22 92:22 93:6,11 94:5, 11 96:12,13 99:16 102:11

Dukeshire's 35:15 38:8,15,22 39:11 56:10 63:20 68:24 81:3 93:22

duly 6:19

duped 72:3

DUR 48:10,14,21, 22 49:1,7,9,20 52:9,10,18,21,22 53:3,4,5,6 100:4

DURS 48:18 52:14

duty 53:3 94:24

Ε

Eagle 75:23 76:14

earlier 26:8 42:11 45:10 84:8 early 19:20 20:20 24:17 25:12,16,21 26:3,7 28:3,18,19 29:2,4,10,18,19,20, 23,24 30:1,13,16 50:5 73:16 75:13 78:4,7,9,10,23 81:15,16 82:7,15, 16,18 89:22 90:5, 13 92:20 99:8,11, 14 102:13

easily 65:20 edit 42:12

educated 64:12

education 63:5,19 64:2,6,10 83:22

electronically 41:16

elephants 54:19

emergency 35:20 37:5,10 56:5 81:19,

Emily 32:23 38:21

Empire 45:12

employed 7:13

employers 54:6

EMS 35:2

engineering 58:16

ensured 25:12

enter 10:19

entire 43:24

entity 101:15

entourage 46:10

environment 63:12

epidemic 66:16

episodic 37:1 95:4

equated 23:5

equivalence 15:8

equivalent 14:15, 18 84:12

equivalents 84:6

establish 19:17

established 32:11,16

Estate 5:23

estimate 7:12

et al 5:5,6

ethical 100:20

Europe 87:2

evaluating 46:13

evaluation 59:5

event 37:1

events 61:8,17

everyday 60:4

evidence 92:19 93:4 94:10

evolved 52:22

exacerbated 22:20

exact 61:4 103:13

EXAMINATION 6:20 101:8,21

examiner 13:22

14:3

exception 30:15 excluded 42:10

excursion 22:19

excuse 9:19

exercise 59:23

60:5

exhibit 10:5,6,9, 11,14,17 13:24 14:1,5,9,10,13,16, 17,20,24 15:4,13, 16,20,24 16:3,17, 20 17:1,4 18:20 30:18,21 36:21 55:5,8,11,16 56:7 65:6,7,10 78:21,22 79:1,5

exhibits 31:11 40:3 55:10 86:17 103:9

existed 89:10

exists 42:7

exit 76:6

experience 21:1

100:18,19

expert 6:8 13:3 33:18 34:23 40:21 41:2 43:13 53:13 90:15,18,19,23

expert's 43:10

experts 10:24 14:22 33:23 34:3

expiration 27:10 29:2

expire 16:14 21:4

expired 20:23 28:24 29:6 30:9 74:1 92:21

expires 28:14 60:10 76:17

expiring 24:10

explain 101:13

explained 83:22

explaining 15:4

explanation 14:7, 8.11

Exposure 15:15,

extra 36:17 73:12 99:17 100:4

extra-when 73:12 extremely 86:2

F

facilities 8:4 46:4 47:12

fact 28:18 30:10 40:23 44:4.18 50:4 56:11 82:5 89:18

factor 37:15 84:13

factoring 37:18

factors 97:22

factual 51:21 52:3 72:6

failed 53:7 73:11

failing 67:9

failings 68:3

failure 98:1

Fair 11:13	firm 7:5		guideline 86:9	helping 8:5
familiar 27:24 48:10 57:23 63:18	five-page 17:10	G	guidelines 28:1 66:4 99:20	heroin 83:21 86:19 89:13
84:11	fix 8:5	Gables 7:20		
family 9:4 51:12	flag 28:5,20 81:15, 17 84:4,16,24 85:4	gain 35:11	Gusler 5:22 Guthrie 5:10	high 84:7,16,17,22 85:3 86:2
93:22,23	86:7,10	Gallagher 5:20 6:1 35:1 71:23 73:5,13	guys 103:15	higher 44:20
Farrell 5:17	flagged 101:17	81:20 82:23,24		highlight 14:22
federal 87:10 88:6,	flagging 75:14,19	93:21 95:18,19	н	highlighted 36:18,
feel 28:16 102:21	Flagler 8:11	Gallagher's 83:1	h-1f 07.40	19
fees 91:21 92:4,5	flags 28:9 49:14	gap 75:12	half 97:19	hippos 54:19
fellow 8:1	64:15 67:11,13,18	gave 86:16 100:3	Hampton 7:22	history 61:7
	75:19 77:21,22 81:9,11,12,13 82:2,	general 87:10	hand 6:16 31:15 102:7	Ho 89:3
field 58:16 59:7	4,13 87:20 97:16	generally 38:18	handful 30:15	hole 75:12
figure 31:20,24	98:6,23	68:9 84:14	handwritten 31:5	home 7:7,18 12:13,
figuring 37:18	Florida 8:2,14 63:4	George 36:12 95:12		22 13:19 31:2,5
file 9:16 13:6 31:4 65:12	flow 25:2	Giant 75:23 76:14	Hang 15:1	homes 7:19,20 8:5 46:24 48:6
files 12:13 13:1	focus 13:8		happen 61:17 80:2	honestly 48:17
33:13 80:16,21	follow 46:11 73:22	give 42:2 59:7 95:20 98:2	happened 51:10 90:22	62:2
85:19	forget 27:5	giving 33:22,24	happy 10:21	horses 54:21
fill 26:6 27:10 28:13 75:24 76:15,16	forgot 6:11 84:5	82:1	103:12	Hospital 35:4
81:14 90:2 102:17	formed 70:10	glaring 49:14	hard 13:21 47:16	hour 50:20 75:24
filled 30:2,11 47:21	formulated 68:17 69:12	gleaned 34:19	65:18 67:13 80:16 81:11,12,17 82:13	83:6 92:2,3,6
49:19 50:5 60:10 70:13 74:15 78:9	found 44:15	glossed 49:14	harm 90:12	hours 43:3 74:3,4 75:20 76:16
102:16		goal 44:1 58:24	hate 27:16	
filling 16:12 19:17	four- 30:2	good 50:24 87:7	head 9:2 37:4	housekeeping 11:11
21:2 28:10 59:24	four-year 50:17 78:7,10 99:10	91:6	41:13 57:17 58:6	Huddleson 36:10
66:1 68:24 89:18 92:20 99:7 102:4	Freemont 61:3	Goose/gander 11:5	87:17 88:19 98:18	Huddleston 36:14
fillings 78:7	frequencies 37:20	Great 6:10 51:2	heading 69:19	95:12
fills 24:8,17 29:11	frequency 19:16		health 7:3,10 8:13	humans 55:3
55:21,23 82:7,16	frequent 74:9	GRIFFIN 6:1	35:18,24 55:22	hurt 76:7
90:5,13 99:11 102:13	_	group 58:12	healthcare 8:2 35:19 45:12 47:9	hypertension
find 11:19 28:17	frequently 90:5	growing 66:16	heart 87:8	23:6
31:20 65:20 75:15	front 65:2 66:10 67:23 68:21 87:19	guess 5:14 35:14 70:2 98:8,9 102:14	held 15:8 31:6	
83:20 87:19	full 59:15	103:18	39:18	I
fine 51:1	future 68:1	guidance 66:1	helpful 70:3	ICFMRS 47:12
	3333			

idea 59:7	industry 14:22	13:23 14:2		letter 12:12
identification	26:23 28:13	interpreting 59:10	K	letting 68:12
10:8,16 14:4,12,19 15:19 16:2 17:3	influence 22:18	intervene 94:3	key 98:18	level 43:20 44:14
65:9 78:24 identified 40:11	information 8:19, 23 17:7 23:18 34:19 35:15 50:8	intervention 49:20 65:4	kind 24:20 40:10 44:5 46:9 97:6,15,	levels 43:15 44:8, 17,19
identify 5:13	57:19 62:3 81:2	interventions	24	Levitt 5:22
41:18,22 71:16	83:18	35:19 48:20 50:6	Kluwer 15:22,23	license 64:11
identifying 88:16	informed 64:12 73:8	interviewed 9:3,6,	16:1	licensed 71:3
idle 90:21	informing 98:24	investigated 38:9	knee 37:2,11	life 61:17
ignoring 67:11	inherent 75:17	investigation	knew 23:19 38:6 58:4 93:9	lifetime 50:12 52:4
illegal 54:13	initial 44:12	38:19	knowledge 39:1	light 98:13,16
Imperial 58:13	initially 29:7 69:9	involved 59:11	74:18 83:15 84:3	likewise 11:6 33:7
importance 86:18	86:4	68:4 84:7 97:23	87:22 89:15 90:6 93:10 94:2	39:2 76:17 100:11
important 98:18	inserted 44:17	isolated 44:15 97:6 99:7	Kristy 5:10	list 11:24 12:9,24 13:10,12,13,17
99:2	inside 10:20 17:7	isolating 90:1 99:6	Kroger 76:15	17:11 24:2,5 32:9
inaudible 55:13 99:3	Insights 14:23	issue 23:3 85:22		36:22 55:10 61:20
inaudibly 65:14	install 79:21	101:18	L	listed 11:1,17 12:17 15:3 28:7
incidences 29:10,	instance 9:8 21:13	issued 38:13,20	labs 47:3	32:7,8 34:10 35:1
20	36:1 80:4 81:1	issues 33:5 34:4	lack 49:10 83:15	45:6 53:5 70:18 99:4,23
include 34:2 99:13,14 103:14	instances 29:17 61:17	35:16 37:6 52:22 64:14 69:1	84:3 88:21,24 89:4, 9 90:10	listing 44:13 87:19
included 12:24	instruction 46:5,7	item 41:19	lacked 49:9	lists 28:9
99:15	instructions 26:9	J	large 54:19	literally 37:19 97:18,19
includes 97:20	insulting 17:18		lasting 19:18	literature 40:2
including 36:1	insuring 97:21	James 5:20 36:14	late 19:21 29:5,6	85:23
income 7:9	intend 35:6	58:17 95:12	30:9,16,20	litigation 76:6
incorporated 8:14	interact 59:4,9	Janet 12:1	Laussane 36:10	Litman 5:3 6:8,17,
increasing 81:13,	intercede 102:15	Jeffrey 36:15	lawsuit 9:7	24 17:2 97:1 101:10
	interfere 97:16	job 46:23	lawyer 91:4,13	load 90:14
independent 7:24 16:7 33:24 40:4	interference 6:2	John 5:5,17 36:11	learning 63:10	location 31:23
59:23	24:23 40:16 65:14 68:11	journals 16:11 27:23 28:1	lecture 46:12	
indication 48:19 50:3	intermediate	judgement 59:24	left 31:5 51:7	log 79:19,22 80:23 logistically 31:23
indications 56:4	47:12	60:6 73:14	legal 7:8,10 61:21	logs 50:7,8 79:20
	Internet 31:22 40:9	jury 57:1	legitimate 55:2 71:7,12,18 72:2,8,	London 58:13
individual 23:7 49:18 77:8	interpretation		15 94:21 95:2	LONGON 58:13

long 7:6 11:5 19:17 68:5 69:8 85:17 long-term 7:18 8:4 46:4 47:6,8 longer 74:5 looked 31:8 54:2 56:15 57:22 58:1 69:3,6,7,9 88:4,13 89:17 **lost** 73:17 74:13 **lot** 66:21 67:15 69:23 90:20 low 36:2 **lowest** 44:17 **Lucas** 41:5 43:14, 17,18 44:12 53:14, 23 M **made** 33:23 42:12 43:19

Maderer 36:9 maintained 22:23 maintenance 22:5 major 63:13,14 make 16:20 17:23 33:22 34:1 42:11 43:4 45:3 55:19 65:6 68:22 69:22 78:21 80:19 82:17 102:20

managed 45:7 79:20 management 7:6

8:3 73:9 81:24 manager 25:11

26:11,12,15,21 45:9,19 59:18

mandatory 67:3

manual 28:8 49:16

57:18 63:1 65:16, 24 66:22 77:18,20 85:20 100:15,17

manuals 26:22 mark 5:21 10:3,4, 10 13:24 14:9,15

103:6,8

marked 10:7.15 14:4.12.18 15:19 16:1 17:2 40:2 65:8 78:23

match 18:14,18 matched 56:6 material 10:20

materials 12:11 69:11

40:4

matter 5:5 8:21 49:5

matters 11:3 68:9

Matu 36:14

MBL 76:3

Mcmanus 5:17 43:16 96:20

MDL 76:9

meaning 29:5 30:9 40:4 78:14 100:12

means 45:24

meant 20:12,15 101:20,23,24

measured 48:18

Medicaid 47:10

medical 11:15,17 12:1,8,16,21,23 13:7,8,9,10,13,22 14:3 18:9,11 33:3,4 34:10,13,20,24 35:5,7,12,14,16 36:3 43:11 46:22 47:1 48:1,3,4 55:3, 20 71:7,12,16,19

72:2,8,15 95:2,24 96:5

medication 21:19, 24 22:5,7 23:2 26:7 47:3 81:20 82:9 93:24

medications 48:8 83:3 99:17

medicine 37:10

medicines 92:23 94:6

meds 81:19 93:12 members 51:12

memorized 87:22

mentally 47:13

mention 52:9 84:1.

mentioned 24:7 36:14 45:10 52:14, 20,22 53:4 65:16, 17 82:15 84:8 89:12 98:16 100:15

mentions 65:4

merit 68:11

met 87:14 88:16

met all 86:15

method 27:9 **Miami** 8:11

middle 66:13

milli 84:6,12

million 47:23

Milner 36:10

mind 84:4 **minimal** 62:18

minute 24:5 96:21

minutes 95:21 97:13,20 101:10

misleading 44:3,

10

missing 32:19

misuse 66:15

MME 64:17,24 84:11,13,14,15 85:4 86:3,9 100:4

MMES 64:13,14 65:5.8 84:7.11.19. 21 85:3,10,22,24 86:17,18 89:14,17

module 16:1,4,6

moment 22:20,21 98:20

monitor 5:9

monitoring 99:19

month 90:16.17 **months** 90:18

99:17

Moore 58:17

morning 9:13 morphine 14:15,

18 15:8 84:5,12 86:23

motivation 102:17

multiple 89:19 90:13 95:16

Murray 5:5

Ν

named 8:1 54:16 58:17

names 7:19.20 36:8,9

narcotic 30:4 77:24 83:15 87:11 88:22 89:5,9 90:11

narcotics 28:2 53:2 62:6 63:6 72:1 73:6 81:24 90:9 101:19

national 66:16

nature 51:23 52:5

necessarily 22:3 56:2

needed 6:7 80:8, 15

Nexgen 74:19 75:4.12

non-c-ii 24:22

non-deposition 40:5

non-medical 40:4

non-red 86:10

North 13:22 14:3

note 55:10 80:6,23

noted 50:18

notes 15:10 16:17, 20 17:2,22 18:1,4, 7,10,14,20 19:14 30:21,22 31:2,5,8, 9,12,15 33:11 36:22 39:19,23 47:4 55:5,7,8 79:11,23 80:19 95:20

notice 6:18 9:14 10:4,7 16:16 55:11 61:12,16 72:6,14 92:22 93:6,11 94:5, 11,16 101:11,14,23 102:3,5,10,11,22 103:1

noticed 94:15

noticing 5:15 **noting** 18:21

November 5:8

11:16 32:5 42:5,19, 20

number 11:17 18:23 30:8 82:17

numbers 10:23

74:6 nurse 93:20 94:2 nursing 7:7,18,20, 21,22 46:24 48:5 **O-A-R-R-S** 19:9 **O-R-R** 19:8 Oarrs 18:15.18 19:7 53:1 56:10,15, 23 57:2,9 58:3 oath 6:15 Object 12:5 objecting 27:19,20 objection 6:11 9:10 10:19 13:14 21:5 22:1,8 23:21 24:13 25:18 27:3, 13,17 28:15 30:24 32:14 35:21 37:3 38:4,10,16,23 39:12,15,20 40:6, 13,19 41:11,21 42:8,21 48:16 49:11 50:1,13 51:24 52:6,11 53:24 55:24 56:13 57:4,14 60:16 61:13,18,24 62:10, 21 63:22 64:7,19 66:6 67:22 68:6,19 70:21 71:20 72:9, 16,21 74:16 76:2, 11,18,22 77:14 78:16 80:9 81:6 85:6,7,14 86:12,20 87:5,15 88:2,12,17 92:24 93:13,17 94:7,13,22 95:8

> objections 6:13 68:23

96:1,6,14 100:6,16,

22

objects 27:5

obligation 65:1

obtain 47:24

obtained 36:6 74:15 75:21

obvious 29:14

occasion 42:24

occasions 56:16 92:13

occurred 22:19 61:9 62:20

occurrence 23:13

October 19:6

offer 12:18 34:16 35:9 51:20 53:9 60:9 97:2 100:14

offered 52:18 60:8. 14

offers 45:14

office 44:13

Ohio 5:4,6,18 38:12,21 39:2,3,5, 6,9,10 42:9 43:21 57:20 63:19 76:4 87:4,8,13,24 88:5, 14 92:16,18

Okeechobee 7:21

online 65:18,20

onset 82:21

opiate 16:5 22:12 28:5 29:14 63:6 64:1,6 66:2 73:9 77:3,4 83:23 86:21, 22 98:5 102:12

opiates 51:23 52:5 64:13,14,16,17 83:16 84:3,22

opinion 8:20 12:12,18,22 33:24 34:13,21 35:8 42:3 49:17 51:18 52:18 53:11 60:8,14 61:5 62:12 69:12 70:10 73:23 74:2 75:16 76:1,24 85:5 87:3 100:4,5

opinions 34:16 37:7 53:8 95:24 97:2,4 99:23 100:4, 9,12,13 101:1

opioid 76:3 98:6

optional 67:3

order 20:16,17 67:7 103:19

orders 47:4

ordinary 48:2

organization 27:8

orienting 11:23

original 20:13 26:9 42:17 70:24 72:18 79:11 81:3

orthopedists 81:23

OTC 59:8

outlined 49:16

outpatient 58:23

overdose 14:7,8, 11 15:4 44:19 84:17

overlap 70:12

overlooked 81:10 82:3

overly 71:20

overusing 82:9

owed 10:22

owners 8:17

Ρ

p.m. 103:23 pad 36:22

pages 69:22

pain 21:22,24 22:11,16,17,18,20 23:2,5 36:2 38:1 73:9 81:19,20,24 86:11 94:21

paper 10:1 12:20 13:21

paragraph 75:10 77:23

part 29:18 46:23 53:2,4 59:15 93:2 102:15

party 9:7 102:1

past 54:24 79:13, 24 80:15

patient 13:9 18:8, 12 21:3,14 22:17 23:2,7,11,15 25:15 51:15,17 55:6,23 56:6,19 59:4 71:5 81:18 82:8 83:1 85:2 86:11 89:21 90:8 99:18

patient's 47:1 80:24 84:16 94:21

patients 21:22,23 22:11 23:17 44:16 46:13 47:10,11 48:5 51:11 82:5,6 84:7,20 89:17,21 100:20 102:19

Patricia 36:13

pattern 99:9

patterns 97:10 102:4

people 26:6

percent 7:9,11 90:17

percentage 91:16

period 30:3 50:18 69:8 78:8,10 85:17 93:5 97:13 99:9.10. 11

permits 75:24

personal 23:11,14 25:11 27:1,9,23 77:12,16

personally 87:21

pertain 87:20 **Ph.d.** 58:19

pharmaceutical 100:20

pharmacies 16:12 24:8,11 25:10 26:10,12,14,20 45:7,23 46:1,4 59:3 75:22 76:5,14 79:10,15,17,18

pharmacist 6:9 7:1,14 9:8 23:10,14 24:23 34:12 45:8, 16,20 47:20,22,24 48:14,20 49:6,16 50:7,11 51:19 53:18,19 56:12 57:18 58:3 59:24 60:5,6 62:5 64:5 65:16,24 80:1,7,12, 19 81:2,5 84:24 95:1 98:4 100:15, 17,18

pharmacist's 28:8 64:22 65:1 77:20 79:11,19,21 80:13 85:20 94:20,24

pharmacists 28:9, 20 38:15 51:11 53:7 57:8 59:3.9 60:2 61:11,15 62:9, 13,23 63:1,10,20 65:4,13 66:21 67:1, 4,12 68:23 73:11, 21 77:8,17 80:1,5 82:5 83:14,20 84:1, 9,18 88:22 89:7,12 95:23 96:4,12 97:18 98:2

Pharmacodynami

cs 15:14,17

pharmacokinetic **s** 15:14,17 pharmacological 34:4 pharmacologist 53:14,17 54:9 pharmacy 7:5,6 8:7,9,10 21:1,8 25:10 26:16 33:5 34:16 38:13,22 39:2,5,6,9 45:9,12, 14,23 46:3,4,6,14 47:16 48:18 56:24 57:20 58:23 59:7, 13,18 60:5 73:17 77:5,7 79:21 84:1 87:18 88:14 90:24 97:10 100:19 101:16 103:2,3 photographs 39:14 **phrase** 66:14 physical 22:19 physician 33:1,7 47:4 64:17 71:3,4 physicians 36:24 37:9 43:13 59:11 64:21 71:24 72:3 73:7 82:18,19,24 90:9.13 95:4.5.10 97:21 99:1,20 **pick** 31:6 picked 43:23 54:4 picking 44:5 picture 90:4 pile 31:6 39:18 pills 93:24 **place** 80:18 plaintiff 91:17

plaintiffs 5:23 play 61:5 Pleas 5:4 point 12:10 35:6 47:23 57:12 58:2 68:1,2 69:18 82:12, 23 87:13 pointing 69:21 **points** 98:19 police 61:3,10 policies 21:2,9 24:8,11,16 25:7,9 26:18 28:17 62:4 63:2,15 67:10,23 68:2 69:2 76:6,15 77:6 **policy** 21:12 25:12 26:13,22 27:8,23 66:12 68:17 69:23 70:8,13,15 75:23 **positive** 23:10,13 Post-it 79:23 potential 34:2 90:12 **practice** 27:1,11 45:23 46:1,3 48:2 58:23 60:4 76:7 77:13,16 79:14,16 94:20 practices 26:24 54:18 practicing 55:1 practitioner 93:20 94:2 prepared 12:14 prescribed 22:12 prescribing 37:20 90:13 prescription 16:14 18:24 20:5,6, 10,13,17,22 24:18

25:16,21 26:6,9 28:24 29:6 30:10 49:18 56:23 57:3, 10 58:4 66:15 70:19,20,22,23,24 71:17 72:7,18 73:3, 4,15,17,18 74:13, 14 75:14 79:12 80:6,15 90:1,2,3 92:20,21 95:2 97:14,20 prescriptions 16:13 17:11 18:9, 22 19:18 20:2,8 21:2,3 24:9,10 28:4,10,19 30:2,4,9 36:6 37:1 47:22 50:4,9 55:21 59:9 60:1 66:2 68:24 70:12 71:11 72:11, 14 73:6,9,13 74:1,8 77:3,4 78:1,8 79:24 81:3,15,23 82:7,22 88:22 89:5,9,23 90:11 93:7 95:12, 13,14 97:11,17 99:6 102:13 present 20:9 25:20 28:23 29:1,4,5 68:16 74:12 presentation presented 13:5 30:8 56:24 57:3 58:5 70:19.23 71:11,18 72:19 73:24 76:24

presentation 20:22 74:8 75:13 presented 13:5 30:8 56:24 57:3 58:5 70:19,23 71:11,18 72:19 73:24 76:24 presenting 17:8 presents 25:15 President 8:2 pressure 21:17 pretty 29:8 30:14 43:8 45:18 83:19, 21 89:24 90:22 prevent 21:3 67:16

previous 91:22 primaries 99:1 primarily 26:16 printed 31:15 **prior** 12:14 16:13 28:14 53:2 63:14, 20 64:16 71:10 76:16 83:2 92:21 privilege 11:3 17:6 79:4 privileged 10:20 problem 11:5 55:22 63:14,15 67:14 75:16,17 99:8 problematic 29:13 49:3.15 problems 29:14 35:18 procedure 26:22 67:20 68:18 70:9 procedures 26:18 62:5 63:2 66:20,22 67:8,9 69:21,23 proceedings 5:1 51:5 83:11 96:23 process 48:10,14, 22,24 49:1,7,9 52:19,22 53:3,4,6 59:11 97:20 98:2 processes 52:10 processing 49:20 97:12 produce 59:1 produced 57:18 producing 17:14 **product** 11:7 17:7 42:9,22 68:7 85:7 products 98:6

professional

73:14 professor 58:16 100:19 **profile** 18:8,12 55:6 56:7 80:24 profiles 48:4 program 47:11 properly 98:3 proposition 57:13 protocol 26:23 protocols 40:10 **provide** 7:5 10:21 35:15 43:24 50:8 54:10 65:3 77:17 78:19 provided 8:24 17:12 43:21 69:24 71:14,17 provider 20:15,17 providing 100:19 publication 28:8 57:12 64:23 65:18 77:11 publications 28:7 published 26:24 68:18 69:13 **pull** 31:10 purpose 21:12 40:12 55:3 71:7,12, 19 72:2,8,15 purposes 9:9 10:8,16 14:4,12,19 15:20 16:2 17:3 25:14 40:14 65:9 78:24 pursuant 6:18 **pursue** 73:22 **put** 6:15 9:22 13:6 17:10 36:18 61:12 86:4 102:21

THE AID OF OHIO, II	NC, ET AL		11/09/2021	i index: puttingresult
putting 102:24	realize 20:1 54:10 71:22	24 85:4 86:7 87:20 97:16 98:6	regulatory 102:24	61:20 66:11 69:15, 18 70:18 73:15
Q	realized 86:2	redact 11:1,6	Rehabilitation	74:20,24 82:20 83:13,17 86:4 89:4
avalitied 00:0	Realtime 5:11	redacted 10:21	7:22,23	97:7 98:8,10,13,21
qualified 92:9	reason 55:22 95:2	refer 27:9 28:12	related 34:4 61:16	99:4,21,24 100:1, 10
qualifies 53:22 quantities 18:22	rebuttal 33:17	52:17 64:24 65:22 80:22 86:9 91:5	relates 35:8,12	reported 103:1
question 11:22,24	rebutting 33:23 34:3	referenced 45:2	52:17 63:21 relating 55:22	reporter 5:2,11
13:7 21:7 23:12 24:21 25:5 27:6,19, 21 29:3 30:7 34:15	recall 52:14 61:4 62:17 88:4,15	referencing 24:22 36:7,21 75:1 76:3	relationship 23:11,14 58:22	6:6,10 9:13 10:12 16:23,24 19:3,7,10 32:13,17 103:10,
39:4 41:18,23 66:8 67:15 70:6 72:5	received 12:2	referred 20:20	71:5	11,18
75:7 76:8,10,13	receiving 73:8	referring 19:24 20:21 40:21 44:7	relay 7:20	Reporters 5:11
86:15 87:7 88:10 93:3 94:4 100:3	84:21 90:8	102:24	relied 44:23	reports 13:3 18:16, 17 34:23 40:21
101:7 102:7,9	recently 76:4 79:18	refill 19:24 20:21	rely 12:16,23 60:23 61:2,22 77:12 87:3	41:2,8 43:13 56:23
questioning 82:10	recommendation	25:17 26:3,5 75:21	100:13,17	represent 5:14
questions 101:3,5	59:4	refilled 19:19,20, 21	remember 24:10,	representing 5:11
103:5	record 6:22 11:12	refilling 21:2	15 88:13	request 65:21
quick 96:22	12:16,23 13:11 27:19 35:7 40:5,11	refills 20:1,4 24:9	remembering 82:12	requesting 76:5
Juickly 49:19	55:20 65:3,8 71:16	25:13 28:3,20	remotely 6:12	requests 28:3
quote 66:13	72:12 74:23 89:16 90:7 91:19 92:3	30:13,15,17,20 73:16 74:7,10	render 8:20 95:24	require 21:23 22:4 23:4 63:8,24
R	96:10 102:6,8 103:17	81:16 82:16 99:14 reflect 27:23 28:2,	96:4,8 renew 64:11	required 63:19 64:5 83:24
	recorded 51:12,14	18	repeat 23:12 25:4	requires 58:3
R.PH. 5:3 6:17	records 9:21 11:15,18 12:1,8,19,	refresh 85:18	27:16 32:14 39:4 75:6 76:10 93:2	requiring 102:13
raise 6:16 27:17	21 13:7,8,9,10,13	refuse 51:16,18	102:9	research 13:2 16:7
raised 92:7	18:9,11 32:21 34:10,13,20,24	regard 24:12	rephrase 52:2	28:17
range 44:2 84:22	35:5,12,14 36:3	regimen 47:1,2 48:9	70:3	researchers 58:13
86:10	50:3 55:11 56:3 57:20,23 60:23	regimens 48:4	report 11:17,19 12:15,17 13:12	residing 47:12
rates 92:7	61:4 69:3 71:14,17	regs 88:5	15:15,19 17:9,10,	respect 24:8,17
raw 37:17,19	93:15 94:15 95:7	regulates 39:3,5	14,15,17,19 18:15 32:5 33:10,12,14	33:15 37:12 49:7 62:9 66:1 80:5
read 13:4 23:20,23 24:1 26:20 32:22 36:13,19 50:16	Recreational 15:15,18	regulation 64:24 67:6 87:4,14	41:10 42:2,5 43:7, 11,14,19,24 44:2,	responses 61:21, 23 62:4
54:2 62:13 83:18 85:23 89:12 96:15	red 28:5,9,20 49:14 64:15 67:11,12,18 75:19 77:21,22	regulations 64:10 87:8,10,18,19,24	12,21 45:4,7,21 48:13 52:9,13,15, 16,23 53:4,9,12	responsibility 64:18,21,22
103:6,22 reading 80:12 99:3	81:9,11,12,15,17 82:2,4,13 84:4,15,	88:6,7,14,20	54:11 56:11,16 57:2,9 58:4 60:20	results 13:23 14:2 40:10 59:10
	1	1	1	1

retail 7:5 8:7,9 9:8	roll 15:2	seeking 28:6,19	simply 72:5	24
16:12 19:16 39:6 45:7,8,18,23 46:1,	Ronald 36:12	73:16 81:15 82:7	sit 41:17 87:12	standards 40:10
3,14 47:20,22,24	room 56:5	selectively 54:4	88:15	66:4 87:8
48:7 53:18 59:2,7,	rooms 37:5 81:21	sell 102:17	sits 90:21	start 5:14 29:12
13 60:1,5 75:22 76:14	Rosenthal 8:1	send 65:21 79:21	situated 75:22	51:7
retained 68:8	rotations 46:8	103:12	76:13	started 68:8 82:22 83:1
retarded 47:13	77:5	sending 103:8,10	skin 58:21	
	rough 7:12	separate 47:15	Smith 36:11	state 6:11,22 21:16 22:4 23:6 63:19
review 17:6,8 41:7, 14 42:14,24 46:24	routine 73:8	septic 37:2,10	snorting 93:24	67:14 88:7
47:2,10 48:1,4,8,9	routinely 26:17	service 7:19	Social 60:22	statement 18:18
77:18 79:4 91:19	rule 27:2,12	services 7:6 68:8	solid 100:19	40:23 66:12,17 77:12 78:3 87:13
reviewed 9:22 12:2,12,20 13:13	,	set 54:7 67:8 80:14	sort 10:23	statements 40:17
35:12 36:3 46:21	rules 11:9	97:24	sought 35:19 83:3	
47:19 56:4 58:9	run 21:15	setting 46:15 48:7	sound 100:20	States 87:1
62:24 63:2 65:3 67:2 85:20	running 21:3	settled 91:11	source 18:10	statistic 99:4
reviewing 33:11	runs 58:17	settlements 76:3	28:12 58:1 64:23	status 19:16 54:14, 22 59:8,9 75:21
68:8 69:11 71:14	s	share 9:18 68:12	72:13 86:8 93:10,	statute 87:4,14,24
reviews 47:2,14		shared 100:12	16,19 94:16 101:23 102:1	
92:3,6	safety 102:19	shelves 46:14,16	speaking 17:17	steady 21:16 22:4
rhinos 54:19	sales 102:20	shift 80:2	65:14	step 72:24
risk 14:7,8,11 15:4	Sandusky 35:1	shocked 83:19	specialty 63:8	Stepanek 36:13
64:13 84:12,17,22	61:3		specific 66:1	Stephanie 95:11
risks 84:7	scanner 31:21	shopping 81:18 82:15	67:20 69:2 76:5	Stephen 103:14
Rite 5:5,18 18:11	schedule 54:22	short 51:5 59:19	96:11	steps 70:17 72:19,
27:2,11 38:14 39:3, 6,10 41:3 50:11	schools 46:7	83:11 96:23 103:17	specifically 38:17 49:10 52:21 57:17	24
53:6 56:11 61:11,	scope 48:2 94:20	shortened 74:7,8	68:2 77:2 80:11	Steven 6:3
15 62:4,8 63:2 64:4 66:12,14 67:21	score 14:7,8,11	showed 89:16	81:8 86:14 88:4 97:4	sticky 15:10
68:18 69:13,20	scrips 90:4 95:16	93:22		stole 73:18
70:9,19,23 71:18 72:6,10,13,19	_	Shriver 23:19	spend 77:2	stolen 74:13
73:21 75:18 82:22	script 95:6 99:7	38:21 49:5 56:18 64:4	spent 69:10	Stombaugh 5:22
89:6 92:22 93:5,9,	scripts 19:17 85:1 89:20 95:5,11,16	sign 62:24 103:6,	spoke 91:4	stop 46:12
11 94:4,10,16 97:15 101:11,15	102:16	22	spoken 93:20	straight 92:5
102:14	search 40:10	similar 64:1 75:22	spot 69:20	street 8:11 94:1,
Robert 5:3 6:8,17,	Security 60:22	87:10	staff 45:8,15,20	11,17
24 8:1 17:2 95:13	sedation 54:18	similarly 76:13	standard 26:23	strictness 88:8
role 11:5 58:22	seek 72:1 81:23	simple 76:8	27:7 28:11,13 49:6 57:2,11 58:2 98:23,	strike 19:22 74:11
			07.2,11 00.2 00.20,	

stronger 86:22	т	therapies 46:16	told 59:12 93:23	turned 78:9
students 46:8		47:3	top 9:1 37:4 41:13	Turning 66:11
58:19 77:2,17	tabulate 30:7	therapy 21:23 22:12 29:7 52:10	57:16 58:6 75:3 87:17 88:19 98:17	type 47:15 61:8
studies 13:5,18	taking 49:18 84:7,			73:19 77:22 94:1
58:14	16 86:1,2 93:12	thing 23:10 27:8 73:19 77:22 94:1	topical 59:1	types 24:21
study 44:16,22	94:5,11,17	97:5	total 30:2 35:5	
45:2 54:2,3	talk 11:11 33:3,5	things 15:3 31:15	toxic 43:15,20	U
subject 11:2 17:5	34:3 36:5 46:16	36:19 42:14,15	44:1,7,8,14	
79:3	75:3,4 77:20 82:6	46:17 53:1 54:19	toxicity 44:17	ulcer 37:11
subjective 22:16	talked 85:18 93:21	62:6 63:15 68:3	toxicologist	Ultimed 7:3,9,17
23:1	talking 34:22,24	82:12 85:20 90:9, 12 98:2,12 100:13	53:20,21	8:13
submitted 12:15	40:22 53:1 57:4		toxicology 13:23	unaware 96:10
42:13,16,17	Tamela 5:16	thinking 72:4	14:2	understand 17:21
substance 20:9		third- 101:24	track 15:10 47:17	21:7 25:22,23
54:13	Tammy 15:2,10 17:17 18:2 27:20	third-party 101:15		27:22 34:7,11,14
substances 63:21	31:20 50:19 55:15	thirty 101:10	trade 16:11 26:24 27:7,23 28:1 53:21	46:5 51:22 52:4
66:24	79:6 101:11,20			55:6,19 62:8 74:21 75:9 78:3 89:8 96:3
sugar 22:22	102:7	thought 20:7 82:19 85:9 91:10	trail 92:16	
sum 78:11	teach 46:7,12 77:5,	102:23	train 77:2	understanding 88:21,24 89:5,9
summarized 98:8	9	thrown 97:6	trained 98:4	90:11 101:13
	team 58:10,11,12,		training 62:5,8,14,	undertake 71:9,13
summary 42:2 97:4 99:11 100:24	17,19	throws 27:15	15,17,19 63:9 89:7	undertaken 87:23
	ten 29:17,23 63:13	thumb 41:16	transcribing	
superior 27:10	term 7:6 17:16,18	time 5:9 6:13 8:6	37:19	United 87:1
supervision 89:7	20:4 26:5 28:20	11:12 12:5,6 25:20	Translate 33:19	universe 96:17
supplied 18:23	101:11,12	27:5,15 29:8 30:14 35:17 45:5,14,15,	transmitted 10:13	universities 46:9
supports 34:20	terms 24:22 52:21	19,22 50:17,24		unsolicited 51:20
57:13	test 59:1,2	53:12 54:23 59:15,	treated 37:24 71:23	
suspicious 73:15,	testified 6:19	19,24 69:8,10 70:5,		usage 26:8 99:18
20,24	60:12 92:11,16	16 72:18 74:6 80:3, 8,20 81:14 85:17	treatment 33:4	USB 9:23
suttle 81:12	testify 49:8 92:10	87:23 90:24 93:5	treatments 37:22	utilized 67:3
swearing 6:12	testimonies 92:15	98:2 99:9,10,11	trial 49:4 53:10	
		103:13,16	92:4,7,10,11,14,17	V
sworn 6:19	testimony 22:13	times 28:23 29:4	trigger 84:23	
synthetic 86:21	33:18 34:3 92:4,7	30:8 44:20 65:17 95:11	trouble 48:17	valid 70:20,23
system 74:20 75:4,	testing 58:20		61:10	71:2,4,6
12,18 80:13 97:24	tests 59:5	today 5:2 31:4 41:17 52:18 60:9	troubled 8:5	validate 72:11
	text 40:9 77:11	87:12 88:15 98:9,	true 7:1,2 20:13,14	73:3,11
systematic 75:17	16AL 40.3 //. 11			
systematic 75:17		14 99:22 100:4		validated 73:7
systematic 75:17	therapeutic 43:15, 20 44:1,8,14	· ·	21:24 33:4 39:3 48:23 66:2,5 89:6	validated 73:7 validation 66:23 73:3

Vargos 36:11	wasting 11:12	90:14,15,18,19,20,
varies 25:10 90:16	watched 62:16	24 91:16
variety 74:5	water 83:6	worked 8:6 21:8 24:7,11,16 25:8,14
verification 77:4	waves 90:19	26:11,15 45:8,10,
verify 13:4	ways 11:9 66:19	11,18 59:12 60:1 79:10,17,19 92:17
verifying 97:21	weather 22:18	working 59:19,21
98:3	website 65:23	77:7
versed 98:4	week 59:20,21	worse 22:17
version 10:21 42:6	90:20 91:5	worth 99:17
versus 5:5 24:22 27:1 91:17	weeks 85:11,13	wound 36:1
veterinary 54:18,	Weiner 41:5,19	write 65:11 72:1
24	Weiner's 41:10	79:11 95:5
video 62:16	West 5:12	writing 30:4 36:13 57:11 71:3 73:6
vigilance 84:18	White 8:10 59:17	86:8 89:20
violation 67:11	White- 5:16	written 20:18 27:7
89:6 98:24	WHITE-FARRELL	28:11 40:17 67:20 68:17 69:12,16,17
Virginia 5:12	5:16 6:21 11:4,10, 14 15:7,13 16:22	70:8,15
virtually 62:12	18:3,6 19:4,9,12	wrong 53:23
82:8	25:1,6 31:17 32:1, 3,12,24 33:19 34:6,	wrote 19:1 37:1
visit 37:10	9 41:24 42:4 50:21	42:19,20 44:2 80:5
volume 97:11	51:1,3,6 55:14,18 65:15 69:16 70:4,7	95:4,11,12,13,16
	75:8 79:8 83:5,9,12	Υ Υ
	96:24 101:2,22 103:4,8	
Wait 10:18 89:2	Wildnil 54:16	year 29:18 30:3 86:5 90:21 91:22
Waiver 47:11	witnesses 33:18	92:8
Walgreens 75:23	41:3	yearly 63:5
76:14	woefully 97:15	years 47:18 63:13
Walmart 76:15 Walsh 36:10	Wolters 15:22,23 16:1	68:14 69:4,5,6 91:9,14 100:18
wanted 59:2,3	word 46:2	yellow 36:22 55:6,
85:18 91:5,12 102:20	words 19:24 29:1	8
warning 84:14 85:2	work 8:4 10:11 11:7 17:6 33:11	z
warnings 28:9	42:9,14,22 45:15 46:1,11 47:15 58:15,18 68:7 85:7	zoological 54:17