DAVID OTIS WILSON AND

DEBRA B. WILSON,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

THE ROE CHEMICAL COMPANY, INC.

Defendant.

TRANSCRIPTION OF SWORN DEPOSITION

MARTIN DONALD, M.D.

NOVEMBER 19

MAGNA LEGAL SERVICES

866-624-6224

WWW.MAGNALS.COM



- 1 PROCEEDINGS
- Q. Would you state your name, please.
- 3 A. Martin W. Donald.
- 4 Q. And you are a physician with an office in
- 5 Franklin?
- A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Dr. Donald, what is your specialty?
- 8 A. Internal medicine.
- 9 Q. And you are board certified in internal
- 10 medicine?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Are you board certified in neurology?
- 13 A. No. But at the time I took my board in
- 14 internal medicine, neurology was really considered
- 15 part of internal medicine. So I have training in
- 16 organic neurology as part of internal medicine.
- 17 Q. Did you examine David Wilson?
- 18 A. Yes. At the request of Roe Chemical
- 19 Company. I know its medical director.
- I saw Mr. Wilson in the hospital for my
- 21 personal examination. I had access to all of his
- 22 records and past history. Apparently he's seen more
- 23 than one doctor, besides Dr. Jason. Mr. Wilson told
- 24 me his version of the accident, his spilling the
- 25 pesticide on him, the symptoms, et cetera.



- 1 Apparently Dr. Jason made the diagnosis
- 2 after getting the results of blood tests from the
- 3 chemical company. I did a complete physical
- 4 examination. His deep reflexes were equal and
- 5 active. The superficial reflexes were present.
- 6 Sensation is apparently intact. Babinski signs are
- 7 negative. The patient swayed with the Romberg test,
- 8 but does not fall.
- 9 Q. Of what significance is the fact that he
- 10 swayed with the Romberg but didn't fall?
- 11 A. Well, that means that his swaying is
- 12 probably more a result of muscle weakness than it is
- 13 of central nervous system disease.
- Q. What other tests did you perform?
- 15 A. X-rays, blood chemistry tests, liver scan.
- 16 They were all negative. He refused to take an
- 17 electromyograph or submit to another biopsy, so I
- 18 had to rely on his previous tests, which in my
- 19 opinion, were done incorrectly.
- 20 Q. Would you tell me what an electromyogram is
- 21 and what it is designed to ascertain?
- 22 A. Well, they stimulate the muscles
- 23 electrically and see how they respond to a standard
- 24 electrical current. It is designed to show how the
- 25 muscle functions. An electromyogram is a test for



Page 4

- 1 the diagnosis of myopathy. His past test results
- 2 were very, in my opinion, inconclusive. They seemed
- 3 to indicate myopathy, but not to a medical
- 4 probability.
- 5 Q. Would you tell me what objective findings
- 6 you made, if any, that showed that Mr. Wilson, when
- 7 you had him in the hospital at that time, was
- 8 suffering from muscle weakness, if he was?
- 9 A. He swayed with the Romberg test.
- 10 Q. Is that a symptom of muscle weakness alone,
- 11 or can that be a symptom of other things?
- 12 A. It can be a symptom of many other things,
- 13 too numerous to list also. There are many things
- 14 which might cause swaying on the Romberg test.
- 15 Q. In other words, the fact that one swayed on
- 16 the Romberg does not necessarily indicate muscle
- 17 weakness, would it?
- 18 A. No, not necessarily.
- 19 Q. It could?
- 20 A. Sure.
- 21 Q. Anything else that you found?
- 22 A. The other thing was that he was clumsy in
- 23 his movements in walking and his gait.
- 24 Q. Would you describe that a little more in
- 25 detail? You say he was clumsy in his movements; you



- 1 mean in walking?
- 2 A. Yes. But he is a 51-year-old man, a farmer
- 3 at that.
- 4 Q. Anything else that you found objectively
- 5 that would indicate to you that he was suffering
- 6 from a muscle weakness?
- 7 A. His muscles generally were flabby. He was
- 8 soft. He was not very muscular for a farmer. In my
- 9 opinion he does have neuropathy but not myopathy.
- 10 He has arthritis and heart problems. He's not a
- 11 young man. He's been around toxic chemicals all of
- 12 his life, and apparently is not very careful with
- 13 them.
- Q. Now, of course, you did review hospital
- 15 records and a history of other records and what he
- 16 told you of his exposure?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Now how would you describe the present
- 19 muscle weakness you found?
- 20 A. I would describe it as moderate. This man
- 21 is like a weak individual who was just in very poor
- 22 physical condition but able to be up and around.
- 23 Q. All right. Do you think his condition will
- 24 improve over time?
- 25 A. It should.



- 1 Q. Why?
- A. All he needs to do is exercise. Even
- 3 assuming he had a toxic reaction to Dinitro, which I
- 4 do not believe, the chemical is out of his body.
- 5 Q. He indicated that he was impotent, but I
- 6 believe your report said he told you he had engaged
- 7 in intercourse; but it was not satisfactory. I
- 8 think you used that word.
- 9 A. Yes. He told me he had intercourse, but
- 10 that he would lose his erection after a few minutes.
- 11 He said it had happened before in his life, but now
- 12 it happened every time.
- 13 Q. Is it because of the flabbiness of his
- 14 muscles?
- 15 A. I doubt that. There are many causes for
- 16 impotence, but initially this may have been organic
- 17 from the effect of the nerve endings. I also think
- 18 it is primarily psychological.
- 19 Q. Well, at the present time, based upon your
- 20 examination, would you think that his present
- 21 condition would prevent intercourse?
- 22 A. Probably not. He does have pretty good
- 23 bowel and urinary function.
- Q. We have talked about, and you mentioned in
- 25 your testimony the amount of chemical. And I am



- 1 looking through the hospital records again, and I
- 2 see a report from the Duckworth Pathology Group
- 3 dated September 18, YR-5 signed by Dr. Duckworth.
- 4 And in that report he mentions the serum level. And
- 5 in there he indicates that since Mr. Wilson's
- 6 exposure to the compound occurred approximately one
- 7 month before, the serum level of 4.3 micrograms per
- 8 milliliter was good presumptive evidence of previous
- 9 toxic levels in his blood. Would you agree with
- 10 that statement?
- 11 A. The fact that Dinitro was in his blood one
- 12 month after the accident may suggest that it was in
- 13 his blood at the time of the accident. The fact
- 14 that the chemical was in the blood does not mean it
- 15 had a toxic effect and caused neuropathy.
- 16 Q. Do you believe the exposure caused his
- 17 problems?
- 18 A. No. I don't think so. There are no
- 19 published reports of people developing the type of
- 20 problems Mr. Wilson says he has from exposure to
- 21 Dinitro. Assuming the results seen in the animal
- 22 studies are applicable to humans, he would have
- 23 needed to have been exposed over a prolonged period
- 24 of time and to much higher doses. He denies this
- 25 occurred.



his bloodstream. This suggests he spilled it on
himself and walked around with the chemical on his
skin. You will have to ask him about that. I think
his symptoms are consistent with the complaints of

The tests indicate a significant level in

- veterans who suffer from Gulf War Syndrome.Dr. Jason did not appear to include that in his
- 8 differential diagnosis.
- 9 Q. Have you looked over the literature on this chemical compound?
- 11 And it supports my belief that this 12 man does not have neuropathy or myopathy caused by 13 acute exposure to Dinitro. The case reports that 14 Dr. Jason mentioned in his deposition relate to other chemicals that may have similar structures but 15 are not Dinitro. Plus, no large epidemiological 16 17 studies have been done on people exposed to these 18 chemicals. The data Dr. Jason relies upon is not the type of data from which sound scientific 19
- 21 The animal data cannot be extrapolated to humans.

conclusions about general causation can be drawn.

22 (Deposition concluded)

23

2.0

1

24

25



A	blood	3:3	3:1 4:1 8:8
able	3:2,15 7:9,11,13,14	compound	didn't
5:22	bloodstream	7:6 8:10	3:10
access	8:2	concluded	differential
2:21	board	8:22	8:8
accident	2:9,12,13	conclusions	Dinitro
2:24 7:12,13	body	8:20	6:3 7:11,21 8:13,16
active	6:4	condition	director
3:5	bowel	5:22,23 6:21	2:19
acute	6:23	considered	disease
8:13		2:14	3:13
agree	C	consistent	doctor
7:9	C	8:5	2:23
amount	2:1	course	don't
6:25	careful	5:14	7:18
animal	5:12	current	Donald
7:21 8:21	case	3:24	1:13 2:3,7
apparently	8:13		doses
2:22 3:1,6 5:12	causation	D	7:24
appear	8:20	D	doubt
8:7	cause	2:1	6:15
applicable	4:14	data	Dr
7:22	caused	8:18,19,21	2:7,23 3:1 7:3 8:7,14
approximately	7:15,16 8:12	dated	8:18
7:6	causes	7:3	drawn
arthritis	6:15	David	8:20
5:10	central	1:2 2:17	Duckworth
ascertain	3:13	DEBRA	7:2,3
3:21	certified	1:3	
assuming	2:9,12	deep	E
6:3 7:21	cetera	3:4	E
0.3 7.21	2:25	Defendant	2:1,1
В	chemical	1:7	effect
В	1:6 2:18 3:3 6:4,25	denies	6:17 7:15
1:3	7:14 8:3,10	7:24	electrical
Babinski	chemicals	deposition	3:24
3:6	5:11 8:15,18	1:12 8:14,22	electrically
based	chemistry	describe	3:23
6:19	3:15	4:24 5:18,20	electromyogram
belief	clumsy	designed	3:20,25
8:11	4:22,25	3:21,24	electromyograph
believe	company	detail	3:17
6:4,6 7:16	1:6 2:19 3:3	4:25	endings
biopsy	complaints	developing	6:17
3:17	8:5	7:19	engaged
3.17	complete	diagnosis	6:6



epidemiological	G	indicate	looking
8:16	2:1	4:3,16 5:5 8:1	7:1
equal	gait	indicated	lose
3:4	4:23	6:5	6:10
erection	general	indicates	
6:10	8:20	7:5	M
et	generally	individual	M.D
2:25	5:7	5:21	1:13
evidence	getting	initially	MAGNA
7:8	3:2	6:16	1:22
examination	good	intact	man
2:21 3:4 6:20	6:22 7:8	3:6	5:2,11,20 8:12
examine	Group	intercourse	Martin
2:17	7:2	6:7,9,21	1:13 2:3
exercise	Gulf	internal	mean
6:2	8:6	2:8,9,14,15,16	5:1 7:14
exposed			means
7:23 8:17	H	J	3:11
exposure	happened	Jason	medical
5:16 7:6,16,20 8:13	6:11,12	2:23 3:1 8:7,14,18	2:19 4:3
extrapolated	he's		medicine
8:21	2:22 5:10,11	K	2:8,10,14,15,16
	heart	know	mentioned
F	5:10	2:19	6:24 8:14
fact	higher		mentions
3:9 4:15 7:11,13	7:24	L	7:4
fall	history	large	micrograms
3:8,10	2:22 5:15	8:16	7:7
farmer	hospital	LEGAL	milliliter
5:2,8	2:20 4:7 5:14 7:1	1:22	7:8
findings	humans	level	minutes
4:5	7:22 8:21	7:4,7 8:1	6:10
flabbiness		levels	moderate
6:13	I	7:9	5:20
flabby	impotence	life	month
5:7	6:16	5:12 6:11	7:7,12
found	impotent	list	movements
4:21 5:4,19	6:5	4:13	4:23,25
Franklin	improve	literature	muscle
2:5	5:24	8:9	3:12,25 4:8,10,16 5:6
function	include	little	5:19
6:23	8:7	4:24	muscles
functions	inconclusive	liver	3:22 5:7 6:14
3:25	4:2	3:15	muscular
	incorrectly	looked	5:8
G	3:19	8:9	myopathy
			J • PJ



	I	1	1
4:1,3 5:9 8:12	P	probably	right
	$- \mid \overline{\mathbf{p}}$	3:12 6:22	5:23
N	$-\begin{vmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$:1	problems	Roe
N	part	5:10 7:17,20	1:6 2:18
2:1	2:15,16	prolonged	Romberg
name	Pathology	7:23	3:7,10 4:9,14,16
2:2	7:2	psychological	
necessarily		6:18	S
4:16,18	patient	published	S
needed	3:7	7:19	2:1
7:23	people	7.17	_ satisfactory
needs	7:19 8:17	Q	6:7
6:2	perform		= saw
negative	3:14	R	$\begin{bmatrix} 3a & 3a & 3a \\ 2:20 & 3a \end{bmatrix}$
3:7,16	period	R	
nerve	7:23	2:1	says 7:20
	personal	reaction	
6:17	2:21	6:3	scan
nervous	pesticide	really	3:15
3:13	2:25	2:14	scientific
neurology	physical		8:19
2:12,14,16	3:3 5:22	records	see
neuropathy	physician	2:22 5:15,15 7:1	3:23 7:2
5:9 7:15 8:12	2:4	reflexes	seen
NOVEMBER	Plaintiffs	3:4,5	2:22 7:21
1:14	1:4	refused	Sensation
numerous	please	3:16	3:6
4:13	2:2	relate	September
	- Plus	8:14	7:3
0		relies	serum
0	8:16	8:18	7:4,7
2:1	poor	rely	SERVICES
objective	5:21	3:18	1:22
4:5	present	report	show
objectively	3:5 5:18 6:19,20	6:6 7:2,4	3:24
5:4	presumptive	reports	showed
occurred	7:8	7:19 8:13	4:6
7:6,25	pretty	request	signed
office	6:22	2:18	7:3
2:4	prevent	respond	
opinion	6:21	3:23	significance
3:19 4:2 5:9	previous	result	3:9
	3:18 7:8	3:12	significant
organic	primarily		8:1
2:16 6:16	6:18	results	signs
OTIS	probability	3:2 4:1 7:21	3:6
1:2	4:4	review	similar
	1, 1	5:14	8:15
	I	1	I



			raye 4
skin	symptom	V	1
8:4	4:10,11,12		-
soft	symptoms	version	18
5:8	2:25 8:5	2:24	7:3
sound	Syndrome	veterans	19
8:19	8:6	8:6	1:14
specialty	system	vs	2
2:7	3:13	1:5	
spilled	3.13	W	3
8:2	T	$\frac{\mathbf{w}}{\mathbf{w}}$	
spilling	take	2:3	4
2:24	3:16	walked	4.3
standard	talked	8:3	7:7
3:23	6:24	walking	
state	tell	4:23 5:1	5
2:2	3:20 4:5	War	51-year-old
statement	test	8:6	5:2
7:10	3:7,25 4:1,9,14	weak	
stimulate	testimony	5:21	6
3:22	6:25	weakness	7
structures	tests	3:12 4:8,10,17 5:6,19	
8:15	3:2,14,15,18 8:1	Wilson	8
studies	thing	1:2,3 2:17,20,23 4:6	866-624-6224
7:22 8:17	4:22	7:20	1:23
submit	things	Wilson's	
3:17	4:11,12,13	7:5	9
suffer	think	word	
8:6	5:23 6:8,17,20 7:18	6:8	
suffering	8:4	words	
4:8 5:5	time	4:15	
suggest	2:13 4:7 5:24 6:12,19	WWW.MAGNAL	
7:12	7:13,24	1:24	
suggests	told		
8:2	2:23 5:16 6:6,9	X	
superficial	toxic	X-rays	
3:5	5:11 6:3 7:9,15	3:15	
supports	training	T 7	
8:11	2:15	Y	
Sure	TRANSCRIPTION	young	
4:20	1:12	5:11	
swayed	type	YR-5	
3:7,10 4:9,15	7:19 8:19	7:3	
swaying		$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	
3:11 4:14	U U		
SWORN	urinary	0	
1:12	6:23		
	1	I	I

