JAMES C. BAKER

٦	DuPont's	Plaintiffs'	USA's	USA's	Plaintiffs	Plaintiffs Cross	DuPont's	DuPont's	DuPont's
	Desig-	Objections to	Objections to DmPont's	Amended	Objections to	Designations to USA's Counter	Objection's to USA's	Objections to Plaintiffs	Rebuttal Designations
		Designation	Counter-	Designations	Amended	Designations	Amended Counter	Counter Designations	
			q	Designations	Designations		Designations		
	9:5-17		***************************************	39:7-10					57:20-24
	10:11-24			39:15-40:5				***************************************	58:3-5
	14:2-15:6			47:6-48:13					58:3-5
<u> </u>	16:5-17:4	THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O		48:19-21					113:4-23
	17:22-			49:7-18					163:5-13
and a second constitution of the second constitu	18:17					The state of the s			
أسب	19:12-18			52:13-53:3		***************************************			
	22:25-			53:5-23					
24	11.75.15		A-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1	7.05-7.85					
	24.1-23-13				***************************************				
}		responsive/relevance/foundation.	Relevance						
OR in part;		Witness was a toxicologist with ISDA and lacks							
or re:		foundation to testify about drift language on labels, EPA history on drift or							
26:19-									
27:3, Susta	<u>2</u> 	1 6						,,,	
re: remaining	<u> </u>	hearsay/no							
objections.	(foundation ("anecdotally") —							
wa.									

······································	DuPont's	Plaintiffs'	USA's	USA's	Plaintiffs	Plaintiffs Cross	DuPont's	DuPont's	DuPont's
	Desig- nations	Objections to DuPont's Designation	Objections to DuPont's Counter- Designations	Amended Counter- Designations to DuPont's Designations	Objections to USA's Amended Counter Designations	Designations to USA's Counter Designations	Objection's to USA's Amended Counter Designations	Objections to Plaintiffs Counter Designations	Keburral Designations
ÒR.	29:14-31:6	31:4-6 demonstrates that 30:13-31:6 is hearsay/no foundation	30:13-31:6 Foundation, Hearsay	103:24- 104:14					
	33:13-	33:19-25 Non-		112:16-113:3					
SUSTAIN)#.22 2	lacks foundations regarding others'							
		thoughts or actions				***************************************			**************************************
	35:24-36:2			133:11-14					a companies and a companie
	40:6-44:4	41:17 — 44:4 Lacks	41:3-44:4 Foundation	158:8-12			ricon e material a m		
OR Cour		is a toxicologist and	Hearsay						
may give		does not have FIFRA regulatory							
Limiting!	<i>T</i>)	experience sufficient to give his							
18: 41:3-1	6	is not required on labels. To the extent							
that testi	mon/	he purports to be relating any							
not to be	なった。	conversations with EPA, it lacks							
オクオと		hearsay. Relevance							
		outweighed by							
		a prior smaller Sid			درددردرد _و ب				
		Wing incident. In					y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y 		
		addition to these objections,							
		testimony on pp.							

	DuPont's	Plaintiffs'	USA's	USA's	Plaintiffs	Plaintiffs Cross	DuPont's	DuPont's	DuPont's
	Desig-	Objections to DuPont's	Objections to DuPont's	Amended Counter-	Objections to USA's	Designations to USA's Counter	Objection's to USA's	Objections to Plaintiffs	Rebuttal Designations
		Designation	Counter- Designations	Designations to DuPont's	Amended Counter	Designations	Amended Counter	Counter Designations	
		responsive, lacks		Designations	Designations		Designations		
		foundation and							
	57:20-24	Lacks foundation;		161:4-7					
UNSTEIN		witness has no foundation in label				100 kalifoliakina wilatika ka			
		interpretation.			***************************************				***************************************
へいんがえ	58:3-5	Same as above		161:18-163:4					
	62:7-18	Lacks foundation. Witness testifies		195:4-19					
		"no" he was not							
		involved, but then							
とのでは、		gives answer for							
		foundation has been							
		established.							
	102:1-	Relevance/Prejudice							
	103:23	or confusion							
らだせら		outweighs probative value. Unrelated to					bhudur duwaka		
•		any issue in this case.			***************************************				
	131:16- 132:4								
	145:8-13	This objection relates to all	w						
OR '		1						····	••••••
a ive limiting	2,0	ISDA toxicologist							
えながられ	3								
tract with	258	sufficient to give his							-AV-14-A-manasassassassassassassassassassassassass
	1								

"DUPONT'S AMENDED NOTICE OF INTENT TO INTRODUCE VIDEO DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF JAMES BAKER (DKT. NO. 1268)

CONSIDERED

OF OPINIONS

LEATON OF LEPTONATION OF

		DuPont's Designations
Demonstrates that witness has no foundation, and that key statement is hearsay within hearsay. To the extent he purports to be relating any conversations with EPA, it lacks foundation and is hearsay. Relevance outweighed by prejudice. Relates to a prior, smaller, Sid Wing incident. In addition to these objections, testimony on pp. 147-153 is non-responsive, lacks foundation and hearsay.	views on what is or is not required on labels. 145:16-23	Plaintiffs' Objections to DuPont's Designation
		USA's Objections to DuPont's Counter- Designations
		USA's Amended Counter- Designations to DuPont's Designations
		Plaintiffs Objections to USA's Amended Counter Designations
		Plaintiffs Cross Designations to USA's Counter Designations
		DuPont's Objection's to USA's Amended Counter Designations
		DuPont's Objections to Plaintiffs Counter Designations
		DuPont's Rebuttal Designations

のできた。	
146:24	DuPont's Designations 145-16
relates to all designations through 152:25. Witness was an ISDA toxicologist and does not have FIFRA regulatory experience sufficient to give his views on what is or is not required on labels. 145:16-23 Demonstrates that witness has no foundation, and that key statement is hearsay within hearsay. To the extent he purports to be relating any conversations with EPA, it lacks foundation and is hearsay. Relevance outweighed by prejudice. Relates to a prior, smaller, Sid Wing incident. In addition to these objections, testimony on pp. 147-153 is non-responsive, lacks foundation and	Plaintiffs' Objections to DuPont's Designation This objection
	USA's Objections to DuPont's Counter- Designations
	USA's Amended Counter- Designations to DuPont's Designations
	Plaintiffs Objections to USA's Amended Counter Designations
	Plaintiffs Cross Designations to USA's Counter Designations
	Objection's to USA's Amended Counter Designations
	Objections to Plaintiffs Counter Designations
	Duron's Rebutal Designations

DUPONT'S AMENDED NOTICE OF INTENT TO INTRODUCE VIDEO DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF JAMES BAKER (DKT. NO. 1268)

	entra entra	
DUPONT'S	147:11-21 DV	DuPont's Designations
DUPONT'S AMENDED NOTICE OF INTENT TO INTRODUCE VIDEO DEPOSITION	This objection relates to all designations through 152:25. Witness was an ISDA toxicologist and does not have FIFRA regulatory experience sufficient to give his views on what is or is not required on labels. 145:16-23 Demonstrates that witness has no foundation, and that key statement is hearsay within hearsay. To the extent he purports to be relating any conversations with EPA, it lacks foundation and is hearsay. Relevance outweighed by prejudice. Relates to a prior, smaller, Sid Wing incident. In addition to these objections, testimony on pp. 147-153 is non-responsive, lacks foundation and	Plaintiffs' Objections to DuPont's Designation
OF INTENT TO		USA's Objections to DuPont's Counter- Designations
INTRODUCE V		USA's Amended Counter- Designations to DuPont's Designations
IDEO DEPOSIT		Plaintiffs Objections to USA's Amended Counter Designations
		Plaintiffs Cross Designations to USA's Counter Designations
JF JAMES BAKE		DuPont's Objection's to USA's Amended Counter Designations
TESTIMONY OF JAMES BAKER (DKT. NO. 1268)		DuPont's Objections to Plaintiffs Counter Designations
68)		DuPont's Rebuttal Designations

instruct	
147:24- 149:1	DuPont's Desig- nations
This objection relates to all designations through 152:25. Witness was an ISDA toxicologist and does not have FIFRA regulatory experience sufficient to give views on what is or is not required on labels. In addition to these objections, testimony on pp. 147-153 is non-responsive, lacks foundation and hearsay.	Plaintiffs' Objections to DuPont's Designation
	USA's Objections to DuPont's Counter- Designations
	USA's Amended Counter- Designations to DuPont's Designations
	Plaintiffs Objections to USA's Amended Counter Designations
	Plaintiffs Cross Designations to USA's Counter Designations
	DuPont's Objection's to USA's Amended Counter Designations
	DuPont's Objections to Plaintiffs Counter Designations
	DuPont's Rebuttal Designations

	DuPont's Desig- nations	Plaintiffs' Objections to DuPont's Designation	USA's Objections to DuPont's Counter- Designations	USA's Amended Counter- Designations to DuPout's Designations	Plaintiffs Objections to USA's Amended Counter Designations	Plaintiffs Cross Designations to USA's Counter Designations	DuPont's Objection's to USA's Amended Counter Designations	DuPont's Objections to Plaintiffs Counter Designations	DuPont's Rebuttal Designations
} >	149:4- 152:25	This objection relates to all							·····
OR		designations							
-566		Witness was an							
- 3 - 1 - 2		ISDA toxicologist							
		and does not have							
ラルサラルでで	3	FIFRA regulatory							
atore		experience sufficient to give his							
,		views on what is or			-				
		is not required on							
		to these objections,							
		testimony on pp.							
		147-153 is non-							
		responsive, lacks							
		foundation and							
								-	_

40217 (previously admitted)	757 (previously admitted)	756	Trial Exhibits Designed by DuPont
			Plaintiffs Objections to DuPont's Designated Exhibits
		and the state of t	USA's Objections to DuPont's Designated Exhibits

hearsay.