

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations
4:1-2					
10:10-19					
11:7-14					
17:1-9					
17:12-15 (up to "divisions")	Incomplete. FRE 106. Confusing and unnecessary. FRE 401-403.				
18:2-3					
18:24-19:2					
19:21-25					
34:4-11	Miscellaneous unless the completeness designations		30:20-31:3; 32:6-15;		

Chambers Copy

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations
	are included. Plaintiffs are attempting to show that Mr. Omole's job required regular contact with the U.S., which the completeness designations show is untrue. FRE 106, 401-403.		32:24-33:4 (completeness designation)		
			34:19-35:4 (completeness designation)		
			37:1-4		
35:15-36:6					
36:9-13					
36:17					
61:25-62:6	Incomplete to the extent the designation does not make clear it relates to		61:17-24 <i>OK</i>		

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations
	CNL personnel and follows discussion about COP public affairs personnel. FRE 106				
65:5-18	Misleading and prejudicial because testimony is not about the Parabe incident and the jury is left to infer that it is. FRE 401-403.		64:15-20 (completeness designation to make subject of question clear)		
65:21	Misleading and prejudicial because testimony is not about the Parabe incident and the jury is left to infer that it is. FRE 401-403.				
66:1-66:17 (up to "recall")	Misleading and prejudicial because testimony is not about the Parabe incident and the jury is left to infer that it is. FRE 401-403.				

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations
66:19	Misleading and prejudicial because testimony is not about the Parabe incident and the jury is left to infer that it is. FRE 401-403.				
67:1-3	Misleading and prejudicial because testimony is not about the Parabe incident and the jury is left to infer that it is. FRE 401-403.				
		76:4-5 Exhibit 289			
		78:23-79:5			
79:6-10 (except "that's described in exhibit 289")					

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations
80:18-81:7			79:20-80:5		
84:6-10 (except "in the document")	Speculation. FRE 602. Exclusion of reference to the document is disturbing and confusing. FRE 401-403.				
84:13-19					
85:1-8					
91:2-9					
96:8-14	Speculation. FRE 602. Hearsay. FRE 802.				
	Question is argumentative and inaccurately summarizes testimony. FRE 401-403.	Ad 15-17			

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations
96:18	Incomplete designation. FRE 106.	<i>ix never asked</i>			
96:23-97:4	Examiner is testifying and it is misleading and prejudicial. Question is argumentative and assumes facts not in evidence. FRE 401-403.				
111:25-112:14, and Exh. 86	112:6-14: Speculation? FRE 602. <i>Q/A</i>				
114:2-17	Lacks foundation. FRE 602. There is no foundation or evidence that deponent knows the laws of Nigeria. Calls for an improper legal opinion. FRE 701-702.				
115:1-6	Speculation and question is vague. FRE 401-403, <i>Q/A</i>				

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations
602.					
116:18-117:2	Speculation and deponent lacks foundation. FRE 602. Plaintiffs are attempting to use the deponent's confusion in a misleading manner. There is no dispute that the OBL-101 barge was at Parabe during the March 1998 Itsekiri takeover. FRE 401-403.				
			118:8-20		
120:1-4					
			120:5-18 (completeness designation)		

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations
120:19-22	Answers incomplete. <i>FRF 106.</i>				
120:25-121:2			120:23 (completeness designation)		
			121:3-10 (completeness designation)		
121:13-16					
			121:17-18 (completeness designation)		
121:22-24	Incomplete. <i>FRF 106.</i>				
122:15-25					
124:2-12,					

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations
15-17, and Exh. 85					
			124:13		
			125:6-13		
125:14-17			125:18-20		
			126:16-23		
128:2-25	128:7-15: Calls for speculation and deponent lacks foundation for what the MILAD meant in its letter. FRE 401, 403, 602.				
129:20-23					
130:1-3 and Exh. 291					

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE

(Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations
131:15-132:1	Speculation. FRE 602. 131:15-16, 131:20-22: Counsel is just reading the document into the record. The document is the best evidence of what it says. FRE 1002.				
			132:19-22		
132:23 (beginning with "Did")-133:9					
137:16-19 and Exh. 294	The exhibit is double hearsay. FRE 802, 805. Deponent has not laid a foundation for the document. FRE 602.				
140:8-11 and Exh. 295	Incomplete designation. FRE 109				

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations
140:24-141:2	Incomplete, nonresponsive and confusing. FRE 106, 401-403.				
141:6-8	Counsel's comments are not evidence. FRE 401-403.				
142:16-19	Testimony about deponent's lack of knowledge is irrelevant and misleading. FRE 401-406		141:10-18		
157:24-158:1	Incomplete, nonresponsive, question was rephrased. FRE 106, 401-403.		156:23-157:3		

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Objections to Counter-Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Objections to Counter-Designations
158:10-17	158:12-14: <i>Speculation.</i> FRE 602				
170:23-171:8	Deponent's speculation about what he thought Mr. Hastrup did is misleading. FRE 401-403, 602.		171:24-172:12		
Exhibit 271					
185:23-186:15	186:5-15: <i>Speculation.</i> FRE 602		186:22-25 (completeness designation)		
187:5-10			187:14-20		

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations
188:18-23	Speculation. FRE 602.				
190:5-13	190:5-10: Counsel is reading from the document and the evidence of what it says. FRE 1002.				
190:25-191:2	Asked and answered and speculation. FRE 601-403, 602				
202:19-203:25	203:20-25: Speculation. FRE 602			205:3-19 (completeness designation)	
207:8-14	Misleading and prejudicial. Plaintiffs are designating a small portion of testimony				

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)
 Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations
	relating to Akure to mislead the jury to believe that deponent's trip to Akure was related to the detention in Akure. As the completeness designations make clear, the deponent's trip to Akure was related to continued negotiations with the Haje through the Military Administrator. PRE 401-403.				
208:5-6	Misleading and prejudicial. Plaintiffs are designating a small portion of testimony relating to Akure to mislead the jury to believe		207:15-208:4 (completeness designation)		

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)
 Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations
	that deponent's trip to Akure was related to the detention in Akure. As the completeness designations make clear, the deponent's trip to Akure was related to continued negotiations with the Ilaje through the Military Administrator. FRE 401-403.				
208:14-15			208:7-13 (completeness designation)		
208:24-210:9					
210:20-211:17	210:20-211:6: There is no question designated. FRE 106. If the question was designated, the response is				

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations
	not responsive to the question and should be stricken. FRE 401-403.				
			211:18-212:10		
212:15-20					
223:10-21					
223:23 (beginning at "what")-224:2					
			224:3-9		
			224:14		
224:15-225:3	224:24-225:3: Lacks foundation, speculation. FRE 602.				
291:17-21	Argumentative and improper summary of deponent's prior				

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations
	testimony. Assumes facts not in evidence that there were regular communications. Irrelevant because testimony relates to time period after Parabe. FRE 401-403.				
291:23					
376:15 (starting with "Do you?") -17	Deponent is speculating. As the prior testimony makes clear, deponent was not involved in the negotiations. Mr. Hastrup was. Plaintiffs are attempting to mislead the jury that the 10 million naira ransom was for expenses of the takeover. The trial testimony		357:12-24		

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE

(Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations
	reflects that the CIC made demands up to 100 million naira, for far more than expenses. FRE 401-403, 602.				
376:19-21	Deponent is speculating. As the prior testimony makes clear, deponent was not involved in the negotiations, Mr. Haastруп was. Plaintiffs are attempting to mislead the jury that the 10 million naira ransom was for expenses of the takeover. The trial testimony reflects that the CIC made demands up to 100 million naira, for far more than expenses. FRE 401-403, 602.				
376:24-377:3	Deponent is speculating.				

PLAINTIFFS' OCTOBER 14, 2008 DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF SOLA OMOLE
 (Testifying By Way of Deposition Only)
 (Counter-Designations in italicized text)

Deposition September 1 & 2, 2005

Page/Line Cite	Defendants' Objections and Counter-Designations	Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendants' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations	Defendants' Cross-Examination Designations	Plaintiffs' Objections and Counter-Designations	Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' Objections and Designations to Counter-Designations
396:3 (starting with "Did") -17	As the prior testimony makes clear, deponent was not involved in the negotiations, Mr. Hastrup was. Plaintiffs are attempting to mislead the jury that the 10 million naira ransom was for expenses of the takeover. The trial testimony reflects that the CIC made demands up to 100 million naira, for far more than expenses. FRE 401-403, 602. Asked and answered, argumentative. FRE 401-403.				