

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE: ASBESTOS PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION (No. VI)
This Document Relates To

FILED

JAN 25 2012

VALENT RABOVSKY and
ANN RABOVSKY,

MICHAEL E. KUNZ, Clerk
By _____ Dep. Clerk

Plaintiffs,

CIVIL ACTION NO. MDL 875

v.

EDPA CIVIL ACTION NO. 10-cv-03202

AIR & LIQUID SYSTEMS
CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 25th day of January, 2012, upon consideration of Goulds Pumps, Inc. (“Goulds”)’s Motion in Limine to Preclude or Limit Plaintiffs’ Experts’ Testimony Based on *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals* (Doc. 109), several defendants’ motions adopting the same,¹ together with Plaintiffs’ Response (Doc. 125) and Goulds’ Reply (Doc. 138), and upon

¹ Defendant Foster Wheeler Energy Corporation’s Motion in Limine Adopting Co-Defendant, Goulds Pumps, Inc.’s Motion in Limine to Preclude Plaintiffs Experts’ Testimony Based on *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals* (Doc. 118), Pennsylvania Electric Company’s Motion in Limine Adopting Co-Defendant, Goulds Pumps, Inc.’s Motion in Limine to Preclude Plaintiffs Experts’ Testimony Based on *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals* (Doc. 156), Motion for in Limine of Defendant, the Doe Run Resources Corporation, f/k/a St. Joseph Lead Co. Adopting Co-Defendant, Goulds Pumps, Inc., Motion in Limine to Preclude Plaintiffs’ Experts’ Testimony based on *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals* (Doc. 162), A.K. Steel Corporation’s Motion in Limine Adopting Co-Defendant, Goulds Pumps, Inc.’s Motion in Limine to Preclude Plaintiffs Experts’ Testimony Based on *Daubert v. Merrill Dow Pharmaceuticals* (Doc. 164), Joinder by Defendant CBS Corporation, Successor to Westinghouse Electric Corporation, in Motions in Limine to Preclude Plaintiffs’ Experts’ Testimony Regarding “Each and Every Exposure” Opinions and as Required by *Daubert v. Merrill Dow Pharmaceuticals* (Doc. 165). In response, Plaintiffs filed a Consolidated Respor
(continues)

consideration of Crane Co.'s Motion in Limine to Exclude the "Each and Every Exposure" Opinion (Doc. 115), two defendants' motions adopting it,² together with Plaintiffs' Response (Doc. 125), Crane Co.'s Reply (Doc. 142), and Crane Co.'s Supplemental Memorandum of Law on Plaintiffs' Causation Evidence (Doc. 171), in addition to oral argument heard on January 19, 2012, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Defendants' motions are **DENIED** for the reasons articulated in our Memorandum Opinion of January 25, 2012.

BY THE COURT:


DAVID R. STRAWBRIDGE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹(...continued)

in Opposition to Defendants' Joinders in the Motions in Limine to Exclude Plaintiffs' Expert Causation Testimony (Doc. 169), which we consider as well. All of these defendants, together with Goulds and Crane Co., hereinafter will be referred to collectively as "Defendants."

² Motion for in Limine of Defendant, The Doe Run Resources Corporation, f/k/a St. Joseph Lead Co. Adopting the Motion in Limine of Defendant, Crane Co., to Exclude "Each and Every Exposure" Opinion (Doc. 161), and Joinder by Defendant CBS Corporation, Successor to Westinghouse Electric Corporation, in Motions in Limine to Preclude Plaintiffs' Experts' Testimony Regarding "Each and Every Exposure" Opinions and as Required by *Daubert v. Merrill Dow Pharmaceuticals* (Doc. 165).