## CIVIL DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH OF ORLEANS STATE OF LOUISIANA

NO. 19-10545

DIVISION "N"

**SECTION 8** 

## HENRY PETE

## **VERSUS**

	<b>BOLAND MARINE AND MANUFACTUR</b>	RING CO. LI	.C, et al		
	<u>JURY INTERROGATOR</u>	<u>IES</u>			
1)	Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that the plaintiff, Henry Pete, employed as a longshoreman by the following company (companies) between 1 and 1968?				
	James Flanagan/New Orleans Stevedores	YES	_ NO		
	Ports America Gulfport, Inc./Atlantic & Gulf	YES	_ NO		
	SSA Gulf, Inc./Ryan Stevedoring/Ryan Walsh	YES	_ NO		
	Cooper T. Smith Stevedoring Co., Inc.	YES	_ NO		
	For the company (companies) for whom you Question #2. For the company (companies) for whom you Question #5.				
2)	Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that the plaintiff, Henry Pete, was exposed to and/or handled asbestos while employed with the following company (companies) between 1964 and 1968?				
	James Flanagan/New Orleans Stevedores	YES	_ NO		
	Ports America Gulfport, Inc./Atlantic & Gulf	YES	_ NO <u> </u>		
	SSA Gulf, Inc./Ryan Stevedoring/Ryan Walsh	YES	_ NO		
	Cooper T. Smith Stevedoring Co., Inc.	YES	NO		
	For the company (companies) for whom you Question #3. For the company (companies) for whom you Question #5.		_		
3)	Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that the following company (companies) was (were) negligent in exposing the plaintiff, Henry Pete, to asbestos and such negligent exposure(s) was (were) a substantial contributing factor in causing Henry Pete's injuries?				
	James Flanagan/New Orleans Stevedores	YES	_No		
	Ports America Gulfport, Inc./Atlantic & Gulf	YES	_ NO		
	SSA Gulf, Inc./Ryan Stevedoring/Ryan Walsh	YES	_ NO		
	Cooper T. Smith Stevedoring Co., Inc.	YES	NO		

No matter how you answered this Question, go to Question 4.

development of mesothelioma?	l contributi	ng factor in his			
James Flanagan/New Orleans Stevedores	YES	_ NO			
Ports America Gulfport, Inc./Atlantic & Gulf	YES	NO			
SSA Gulf, Inc./Ryan Stevedoring/Ryan Walsh	YES	NO			
Cooper T. Smith Stevedoring Co., Inc.	YES	NO			
No matter how you answered this Question, go to Question #5.					
5) Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that the plaintiff, Henry Pete, and his father, Preston Pete, were exposed to asbestos while employed by any of the following company (companies) between 1964 and 1968, that Henry was exposed to asbestos taken home by his father from this work, and that such exposure of plaintiff was a substantial contributing factor in his development of mesothelioma?					
James Flanagan/New Orleans Stevedores	YES	NO			
Ports America Gulfport, Inc./Atlantic & Gulf	YES	NO			
SSA Gulf, Inc./Ryan Stevedoring/Ryan Walsh	YES	NO			
Cooper T. Smith Stevedoring Co., Inc.	YES	NO			
No matter how you answered this Question, go to Question #6.					
6) Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that the Plaintiff was exposed to asbestos on South African Marine Corp. ("Safmarine") vessels between 1964 and 1968, that Safmarine was negligent in exposing the plaintiff to that asbestos and that such exposure was a substantial contributing factor in his development of mesothelioma?					
YESNO					
If you answered "YES" to Question #6, go to Question #7. If you answered "NO" to Question #6, go to Question #8.					
7) Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that between 1964 and 1968 South African Marine Corp. ("Safmarine") had care, custody, and control of/over asbestos cargo and that plaintiff's exposure to that asbestos was a substantial contributing factor in Plaintiff's development of mesothelioma?					
South African Marine Corp. ("Safmarine") had care, asbestos cargo and that plaintiff's exposure to that	custody, and asbestos w	control of/over			
South African Marine Corp. ("Safmarine") had care, asbestos cargo and that plaintiff's exposure to that	custody, and asbestos w	control of/over			
South African Marine Corp. ("Safmarine") had care, or asbestos cargo and that plaintiff's exposure to that contributing factor in Plaintiff's development of mes	custody, and asbestos w othelioma?	l control of/over vas a substantial			
South African Marine Corp. ("Safmarine") had care, of asbestos cargo and that plaintiff's exposure to that contributing factor in Plaintiff's development of mes	custody, and asbestos wothelioma?  To to Questive the plaintify while working and the work, and the cork, and the	ion #8.  If, Henry Pete, and his ng on South African at Henry was exposed nat such exposure of			

4) Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that the following company (companies) had custody, care, and control of/over asbestos cargo between 1964

and 1968 and such exposure was a substantial contributing factor in his

## No matter how you answered this Question, go to Question #9.

9) Only if you answered "YES" to Question(s) #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, or #8, answer Question #9. However, if you answer "NO" to all of these Questions (#3, #4, #5, #6, #7, and #8), STOP. The foreman must sign this Verdict Form and tell a staff member that you have reached a verdict.

Please express in dollars, the total monetary compensation that will fairly compensate, plaintiff, Mr. Henry Pete, for the damages, if any, he has sustained.

Past and Future Physical Pain and Suffering	\$ 2,000,000.00
Past and Future Mental Pain and Suffering	\$_2,300,000.00
Past and Future Physical Disability	\$ 3,000,000.00
Past and Future Loss of Enjoyment of Life	\$ 2,500,000.00
Past Medical Expenses	\$551,020.70
TOTAL	\$ 10,351,020.70

The foreperson must sign and date the Verdict Form and tell a staff member that the jury has reached a verdict.

New Orleans, Louisiana this 47 day of November, 2020.

Page 3 of 3