

Dear reader,

When defendants forced the injustice upon Plaintiff, they did not just act as individuals. As they claimed, Defendants Robert Gross, Daniel Barrow (along with Jae Schmidt) and Tomas Lawley conducted their “investigation” and “review” in the name of “Emory University Medical School”. They knowingly defamed Plaintiff and destroyed Plaintiff’s scientific career “in compliance with Emory’s policies”. They also “defended” their actions in the court of law with Emory’s funds. Yet, all were and are done behind the closed doors. As you may be or will be doing business with Emory University, you have reasons to expect the accountability of its administrators. After all, an uncaged power can devour anyone at anytime for any reason.

Besides, the American judicial system, at its best, only safeguards the bottom line of a just society. It is the people in general that uphold the integrity, conscience and dignity of human kind only upon which humanity and human civilization can flourish.

For some, with a sense of black humor, the following could be part of leisure reading.

Although the following only contains samples of the kind of defense Emory defendants and their attorneys have staged so far, it is long. Please bear it. Fortunately, defendants' answers only need to be read once.

**NOTE:** Plaintiff agreed to talk to an assistant of defense attorneys for more than two hours to clarify Defendants' alleged confusion on all discovery requests, one by one. It was Defendants' attorney who promised to respond and never delivered.

**Defendant Emory's responses to Plaintiff's questions:**

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies, prior to May 22, 2006, what Jae Schmidt and Robert Gross had known factually about the incident on May 17 between Plaintiff and Enrique Torre and specifies the sources.

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Note: Plaintiff agreed to talk to an assistant of defense attorneys over the phone for more than two hours to clarify Defendants' alleged confusion on all discovery requests, one by one. It was Defendants' attorney who promised to respond and never delivered.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies whether, on May 17, 2006, Enrique Torre did the following: struck Plaintiffs left side face with his swinging right hand and later he pushed Plaintiff on the chest several times, attempted to force into the dissection bench then used by the Plaintiff and only left after Plaintiff gave warnings.

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects

to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies which co-worker except Enrique Torre had complained about inability to share lab space and equipment with Plaintiff and provides factual recounts of such incidents. Defendant Emory also specifies whether the clean bench in the inner chamber of the tissue culture room on the 6th floor of Woodruff Memorial Research Building was sharable by two persons and how.

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory produces the attachment sent with Enrique Torre's e-mail to Jae Schmidt on June 1, 2006 (3:41PM). Specify the reason if it is not supplied to Plaintiff.

**A:** Emory objects to this request on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the request. Emory further objects on the grounds that this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Emory shows that it has already produced documents in response to Plaintiff's First Request for Production of Documents to Emory that are responsive to this request. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Emory to locate the allegedly provided information. Emory has not responded.

**Q:** Defendant Emory produces all documents and communication that would indicate Jae Schmidt scheduled to interview Ms. E on June 5, 2006 or any time. Indicate any information that is not supplied to Plaintiff and specify the reasons.

**A:** Emory objects to this request on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the request. Emory further objects to this request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Emory shows that it has already produced documents in response to Plaintiffs First Request for Production of Documents to Emory that are responsive to this request. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Emory to locate the allegedly provided information. Emory has not responded.

**Q:** Defendant Emory produces Jae Schmidt's or Neurosurgery Department's written notice to Enrique Torre informing him being placed on Administrative Leave around May 22, 2006. Specify the reasons if it is not supplied to Plaintiff.

**A:** Emory objects to this request on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the request. Emory further objects on the grounds that this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Emory shows that it has already produced documents in response to Plaintiff's First Request for Production of Documents to Emory that are responsive to this request. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Emory to locate the allegedly provided information. Emory has not responded.

**Q:** Defendant Emory produces the written document from the Neurosurgery Department to Enrique Torre around June 12, 2006 informing him about the outcomes of its investigation of the incident between Plaintiff and Enrique Torre on May 17, 2006. Specify the reasons if it is not supplied to Plaintiff.

**A:** Emory objects to this request on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the request. Emory further objects on the grounds that this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Emory shows that it has already produced documents in response to Plaintiff's First Request for Production of Documents to Emory that are responsive to this request. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Emory to locate the allegedly provided information. Emory has not responded.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies the factual grounds and purpose for the following underlined remarks in Jae Schmidt's e-mails to Robert Gross, etc. on June 12, 2006 (7:56PM) and to Jane/Linda on June 12, 2006 (6:59PM), respectively, that "Dr. XXX's behavior today, and the attempted intimidation of our administrative staff", "he (Plaintiff) was reluctant to leave my area today to the point that I had to have the police escort him out", "you ma[y] need to again alert the authorities if he becomes indignant".

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory produces Neurosurgery Department's letter to Thomas Lawley reporting their disciplinary actions against Enrique Torre as suggested by Daniel Barrow on May 30, 2006.

**A:** Emory objects to this request on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the request. Emory further objects on the grounds that this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies the rationale for Thomas Lawley not reviewing Neurosurgery Department's handling and decisions against Enrique Torre in Medical School's appeal process.

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies whether Thomas Lawley and members of the Defendant Emory's Medical School Appeal Committee (Linda Beard, Thomas C. Pearson, Jeanne Thigpen) verified if Jae Schmidt scheduled his talk with Ms. E on June 5, 2006 and the date on which Jae Schmidt prepared his memo of such conversation.

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects

to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies, according to Thomas Lawley and members of the Defendant Emory's Medical School Appeal (Linda Beard, Thomas C. Pearson, Jeanne Thigpen), whether Jae Schmidt and Defendant Barrow had discussed with Plaintiff regarding his job performance and "prior problems with other lab members" during their investigation.

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies the contents of the "statements" therein referred by members of the Defendant Emory's Medical School Appeal Committee in their report to Thomas Lawley on August 2, 2006 and their logic link to the conclusion, 'in our opinion the primary motivating factor for Dr. XXX's physical contact with Dr. Torre was not self defense. This is based on Dr. XXX's statements during this interview with us and the written statement from Ms. Jackson.'

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further responding, Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is duplicative and because Emory has already produced documents in response

to Plaintiffs First Request for Production of Documents to Emory that contain information responsive to this interrogatory. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Emory to locate the allegedly provided information. Emory has not responded.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies whether members of the Defendant Emory's Medical School Appeal Committee (Linda Beard, Thomas C. Pearson, Jeanne Thigpen) had the authorization to interview all parties involved including Defendant Emory's administrators to clarify any factual discrepancy and whether they took such actions as they noted in their report to Thomas Lawley on August 2, 2006 that "the parties involved often have very different opinions as to what was communicated during the interviews to investigate these events."

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory produces Jae Schmidt's (May 22, 2006), Daniel Barrow's (May 30, 2006), Claudia R. Adkinson's (June 13, 2006), Appeal Committee members' (Linda Beard, Thomas C. Pearson, Jeanne Thigpen) (July 20, 2006) written notes taken during their interviews with Plaintiff on the specified dates. Indicate the reasons if any information is not supplied to Plaintiff.

**A:** Emory objects to this request on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the request. Emory further objects on the grounds that this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible

evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Emory shows that it has already produced documents in response to Plaintiffs First Request for Production of Documents to Emory that are responsive to this request. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Emory to locate the allegedly provided information. Emory has not responded.

**Q:** Defendant Emory produces documents on file with Defendant Emory, signed by both Plaintiff and Robert Gross, recording the annual performance evaluations of Plaintiff in 2004, 2005, 2006. Specify the reasons if they are not supplied to Plaintiff.

**A:** Emory objects to this request on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the request. Emory further objects on the grounds that this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Emory shows that it has already produced documents in response to Plaintiff's First Request for Production of Documents to Emory that are responsive to this request. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Emory to locate the allegedly provided information. Emory has not responded.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies, according to Robert Gross, the scientific undertakings and achievements of Plaintiff during April 2003 and May 2006 in his laboratory as well as the grounds for him to repeatedly renew Plaintiffs employment and increase Plaintiffs financial compensation ("salary", "reimbursement", "remuneration").

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects

to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is excessive in its temporal scope and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies, as related to his e-mail to Jae Schmidt on May 30, 2006 (6:20:30 AM EDT), from whom Robert Gross received an e-mail request for reference regarding Plaintiff and how he responded.

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies Robert Gross' response following a request for employment reference regarding Plaintiff from Sarstedt around February 7, 2006.

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory specifies Robert Gross' communication with Dr. J at Washington University in late 2006 regarding employment reference for Plaintiff.

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects

to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory confirms whether Lissa Jackson made such remark to lab members as Robert Gross was "a master of non-communication".

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory confirms whether Lissa Jackson said to Plaintiff that Enrique Torre might consider himself having a privileged right over Plaintiff to use lab space and equipment due to his faculty status when Plaintiff complained about Enrique Torre did not respect others' plan to utilize shared space and equipments.

**A:** Emory objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Emory also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Emory produces all documents and communications that were related to all research grant applications(s) submitted and/or awarded enlisting Plaintiff as a researcher or contributor. Indicate any information that is not supplied to Plaintiff and specify the reasons.

**A:** Emory objects to this request on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Emory from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the request. Emory further objects on the grounds that this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further responding, Emory objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad and excessive in its temporal scope.

**Defendant Daniel Barrow's responses to Plaintiff's questions:**

**Q:** Defendant Barrow specifies his understanding of what factually occurred on May 17, 2006 between Plaintiff and Enrique Torre.

**A:** Defendant Barrow objects to this request on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by this interrogatory. Defendant Barrow further objects to this interrogatory because it is duplicative and because he has already produced documents in response to Plaintiff's First Request for Production of Documents to Defendant Barrow that contain information responsive to this interrogatory. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Barrow to locate the allegedly provided information. Defendant Barrow has not responded.

**Q:** Defendant Barrow specifies whether and when he became aware, if ever, of Ms. E's conversation with Jae Schmidt on June 5, 2006.

**A:** Defendant Barrow objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Defendant Barrow from reasonably ascertaining the information sought. Defendant

Barrow further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Barrow specifies the factual grounds for his remarks during his meeting with Robert Gross on May 30, 2006 that "both men (including Plaintiff) are guilty of immaturity and pettiness", "Dr. XXX's chronic problem successful interacting with other while Dr. Torre has not had such difficulties and the have been no prior complaints about him", "Dr. XXX's track record of personality conflicts coupled with his marginal scientific performance".

**A:** Defendant Barrow objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude Defendant Barrow from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Barrow also objects to this interrogatory because it is duplicative and because he has already produced documents in response to Plaintiffs First Request for Production of Documents to Defendant Barrow that contain information responsive to this interrogatory. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Barrow to locate the allegedly provided information. Defendant Barrow has not responded.

**Q:** Defendant Barrow specifies the factual grounds for the following remarks in his letter to Plaintiff dated June 9, 2006, "our investigation has highlighted numerous prior personal conflicts with other members of the laboratory before this current dispute. Your inability to consistently work in a collaborative and communicative manner is a hindrance to the efficiency and ultimate success of the laboratory and the Department's research enterprise", "there have been other concern regarding your performance. Specifically, Dr. Gross has

discussed your reluctance to accept criticism and guidance from your superiors and has counseled you on several occasions".

**A:** Defendant Barrow objects to this request on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by this interrogatory. Defendant Barrow further objects to this interrogatory because it is duplicative and because he has already produced documents in response to Plaintiffs First Request for Production of Documents to Defendant Barrow that contain information responsive to this interrogatory. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Barrow to locate the allegedly provided information. Defendant Barrow has not responded.

**Defendant Robert Gross' responses to Plaintiff's questions:**

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies the time and place of the conversations and what had been communicated to him by lab members and Jae Schmidt as he stated in his e-mail to Jae Schmidt on May 23, 2006 (9:51 PM), "After investigating the situation by speaking to all lab members (except Dr. XXX, who spoke with you while I was in the OR, but whose account you told to me)" as well as the reasons for him not to speak to Plaintiff when "investigating the situation".

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant Gross also objects to this

interrogatory because it is duplicative, as Plaintiff already has in his custody documents and information produced to Plaintiff in his lawsuit against Emory that are responsive to this interrogatory. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Defendant Gross will attempt to provide a supplemental response after clarification from Plaintiff as to the information sought. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Gross to locate the allegedly provided information. Defendant Gross has not responded.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies the purpose and factual grounds to use differentiating wordings in introducing Plaintiff and Enrique Torre in his e-mail to Jae Schmidt on May 18, 2006 (6:33 PM), "XX XXX (post doc; history of interpersonal problems in the lab) and Enrique Tones (Asst Prof)".

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Defendant Gross will attempt to provide a supplemental response after clarification from Plaintiff as to the information sought.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies the factual grounds and purpose for each of the following remarks in his e-mail to Jae Schmidt on May 23, 2006 (9:51 PM), "He (Enrique Torre) is an outstanding scientist and has been an excellent mentor to several students. He is extremely dedicated and impeccable in his approach to science and the scientific method. Dr. Torre has no history as far as I know of difficulty in working with others, and in fact his work in my lab

supports exactly the opposite", "I feel he was provoked beyond reason, and his is not part of any ongoing difficulty on his part," I'm sure he (Enrique Torre) regrets it, but I am not sure that if I was myself in his shoes would not have reacted in the same way", "I would be personally distraught if the current altercation were to negatively impact Dr. Torre's career, and feel that he should be reinstated as soon as possible".

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Defendant Gross will attempt to provide a supplemental response after clarification from Plaintiff as to the information sought.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies the meaning and purpose of the remark made in his e-mail to Jae Schmidt, etc. on June 12, 2006 (4:34 PM), "Recommendations? I am 'willing' to call him (Plaintiff) if you think that is not unwise".

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Defendant Gross will attempt to provide a supplemental response after clarification from Plaintiff as to the information sought.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies the meaning and purpose of the remark made in his e-mail to Jae Schmidt on June 12, 2006 (7:18 PM), "if she (Ms. E) supports him (Plaintiff), it might alter the balance that led to the current decision (termination)".

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Defendant Gross will attempt to provide a supplemental response after clarification from Plaintiff as to the information sought.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies the meaning and purpose of making the following statements in his e-mail on June 12, 2006 (7:18 PM), "No 'allies' of XX's were interviewed because there did not appear to be one, but he (Plaintiff) may consider her (Ms. E) to be so", "I am very saddened by the effects it has on Dr. XXX's career", "If more information is gathered that leads to consideration of a different outcome, I am not averse to reversing course. I don't want to preside over the destruction of someone's career if it is possible to avoid it".

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Defendant Gross will attempt to provide a supplemental response after clarification from Plaintiff as to the information sought.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies, as related to his e-mail to Jae Schmidt on May 30, 2006 (6:20:30 EFT), from whom he received an e-mail request for employment reference regarding Plaintiff as well as how he responded and reasons for his response.

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Defendant Gross will attempt to provide a supplemental response after clarification from Plaintiff as to the information sought.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies his response following a request for employment reference regarding Plaintiff from Sarstedt on and about February 7, 2006.

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies all his communication with Dr. J at Washington University in late 2006 regarding reference for Plaintiff.

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Defendant Gross will attempt to provide a supplemental response after clarification from Plaintiff as to the information sought.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies whether he agreed to and had provided employment reference regarding Plaintiff till May 2006.

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Defendant Gross will attempt to provide a supplemental response after clarification from Plaintiff as to the information sought.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies whether he added Enrique Torre in the "cc" list of his e-mail sent to Jae Schmidt on May 30, 2006 (6:20:30 EDT) and the purpose of so doing. Note: In that e-mail, Defendant Gross wrote, "if at all humanly possible I would like this issue resolved today. I will be out of town on Thursday and Friday. I would like to leave knowing that Dr. Torre is happily reinstated. Please let me know what I need to do", "[i]ronically. I received an email asking for a reference for Dr. XXX. Much as it would seem best for he and my lab just to help him get that job. I will need to be honest if I fill it out. I would like advice on how to give him the option on saying there is no reference available from me".

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections,

Defendant Gross shows that Plaintiff already has in his custody documents and information produced to Plaintiff in his lawsuit against Emory that are responsive to this interrogatory.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies, according to him, the scientific undertaking and achievements of Plaintiff during April 2003 and May 2006 in his laboratory. Defendant Gross also specifies how he regarded Plaintiff's "scientific understanding", "technical fluency", "working morale", "professionalism" and "work relationship" during the same period and factual grounds for such views.

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies the reasons for his to have signed an employment contract with Plaintiff in 2003 and renewed it in 2004, 2005 and 2006. Were Plaintiff's "scientific understanding", "technical fluency", "working morale", "professionalism", and "work relationship" considered by him?

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant Gross further objects to the interrogatory on the grounds that it is argumentative and not a proper interrogatory.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies what parts of data and writing in Plaintiff's paper manuscript entitled "Enhancement of neurite outgrowth from primary and stem-cell derived neurons by lentiviral vector mediated modulation of Rho GTPase" were contributed by others and in what ways and also specifies the current status of the manuscript toward publication.

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Gross specifies the truthfulness of the following statements, "in February 2006, after making a renewal offer during a meeting, Gross told Plaintiff one of his personal stories. He mentioned that he once received a disapproval of ability and performance from his supervisor likely when he was a resident. He proved him wrong a few months later and became friends. He was glad that Plaintiff did the same thing".

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Gross also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** All documents and communications that were related to Defendant Gross' remarks in his email to Jae Schmidt on May 23, 2006 (9:51 PM). Note: In that e-mail, Defendant Gross maliciously attacked Plaintiff's scientific abilities, job performance and interpersonal

relationship with false assertions. Also, Defendant Gross labeled Enrique Torre therein as "an outstanding scientist" "impeccable in his approach to science and the scientific method".

**A:** Defendant Gross objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad and so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the request. Defendant Gross also objects to this request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Defendant Gross shows that Plaintiff already has in his custody documents and information produced to Plaintiff in his lawsuit against Emory that are responsive to this request. Further responding, Defendant Gross will attempt to supplement this response upon clarification from Plaintiff as to the information requested. Note: Plaintiff has challenged Defendant Gross to locate the allegedly provided information. Defendant Gross has not responded.

**Defendant Thomas Lawley's responses to Plaintiff's questions:**

**Q:** Defendant Lawley specifies all the information regarding the May 17 (2006) incident between Plaintiff and Enrique Torre received by his Office prior to Plaintiff's appeal letter (June 16, 2006) and the sources of identified information.

**A:** Defendant Lawley objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Lawley also objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it is not reasonably

calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant Lawley further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of his personal knowledge.

**Q:** Defendant Lawley specifies all the information regarding the May 17 (2006) incident between Plaintiff and Enrique Torre received by his Office from June 19, 2006 through August 3, 2006 and the sources of identified information.

**A:** Defendant Lawley objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Lawley also objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of his personal knowledge.

**Q:** Defendant Lawley specifies his and his appointed ad hoc committee's factual understanding of what occurred on the morning of May 17, 2006 between Plaintiff and Enrique Torre.

**A:** Defendant Lawley objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory and to be not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant Lawley also objects to this interrogatory in that it appears to seek information beyond the scope of his personal knowledge. Without waiving and subject to said objections, Defendant Lawley shows that he does not have personal knowledge as to the ad hoc committee's factual

understanding of what occurred on May 17, 2006 other than the August 2, 2006 report that the ad hoc committee provided to him with its findings.

**Q:** Defendant Lawley specifies all the information regarding job performance of Plaintiff and Enrique Torre received by his Office prior to August 3, 2006 and the sources of identified information.

**A:** Defendant Lawley objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Lawley also objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant Lawley further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of his personal knowledge.

**Q:** Defendant Lawley specifies all actions taken by his Office including himself, Claudia R. Adkison and his appointed ad hoc committee from receiving Plaintiff appeal letter on June 19, 2006 through August 3, 2006 and the timeline of actions.

**A:** Defendant Lawley objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory and to be not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant Lawley also objects to this interrogatory in that it seeks information beyond the scope of his personal knowledge and, in particular, asks Defendant Lawley to describe all the actions taken by third parties.

**Q:** Defendant Lawley specifies whether he upheld the termination of Plaintiff's postdoctoral employment by Neurosurgery Department (Emory University Medical School) on different factual bases. If the answer is affirmative, Defendant specifies the reasons.

**A:** Defendant Lawley objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory and as to not be reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Defendant Lawley specifies the justification for his Office not to review the disciplinary actions of Neurosurgery Department against Enrique Torre, if any, when reviewing Neurosurgery Department's investigation into the May 17 (2006) incident, especially after Plaintiff's repeated alert of Enrique Torre's misconducts from June 16, 2006 on.

**A:** Defendant Lawley objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory. Defendant Lawley also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant Lawley further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of his personal knowledge.

**Q:** Defendant Lawley specifies the disciplinary actions of Neurosurgery Department against Enrique Torre, if any, and the propriety, fairness and compliance with Emory University's policies of such actions according to him.

**A:** Defendant Lawley objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory.

Defendant Lawley also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant Lawley further objects to this interrogatory on the basis that it seeks confidential personnel information of third parties without any provision for limitation of the dissemination of such information.

**Q:** Defendant Lawley specifies the justifications for his Office not to investigate Jae Schmidt's and Daniel Barrow's misconducts including concealment, forgery and negligence during their investigation into the May 17 (2006) incident after Plaintiffs repeated alert from June 16, 2006 on.

**A:** Defendant Lawley objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory and to not be reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant Lawley also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant Lawley further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of his personal knowledge.

**Q:** Defendant Lawley specifies the investigative actions taken by him after receiving his appointed ad hoc committee's report stating "Barrow's termination letter to Dr. XXX notes 'numerous prior personal conflicts with other members of the laboratory before the current dispute'. We can not find documentation of this in the records that we have for review" and

“[t]he parties involved often have very different opinions as to what was communicated during the interviews to investigate these events”.

**A:** Defendant Lawley objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the interrogatory and to be not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant Lawley also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**Q:** Hand-written notes taken by Defendant’s Office staff Claudia R. Adkinson and members of Defendant’s appointed ad hoc committee when meeting Plaintiff on June 13, 2006 and July 20, 2006, respectively.

**A:** Defendant Lawley objects to this request on the grounds that it is so vague as to preclude him from reasonably ascertaining the information sought by the request. Defendant Lawley also objects to this request on the ground that it seeks documents that, if they exist, would be in the possession of third parties. **Note:** By a court order, Defendant Lawley admitted that none of his committee members took note.