

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

**In re: Oil Spill by the Oil Rig  
“Deepwater Horizon” in the Gulf  
Of Mexico, on April 20, 2010**

**Applies to: *All Cases.***

\* **MDL No. 2179**  
\*  
\* **SECTION: J**  
\*  
\* **JUDGE BARBIER**  
\* **MAGISTRATE SHUSHAN**

\* \* \* \* \*

---

**ALL PARTIES OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF  
GREG GARRISON**

---

<u>From</u>		<u>To</u>		<u>Objecting Party</u>	<u>Objection</u>	<u>Ruling</u>
<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>			
20	12	20	15	BP	Vague	
20	19	20	21	BP	Vague	
					Compound; argumentative; relevance: Counsel asks a series of compound, argumentative questions in which he makes statements about a chart on page 38 of Exhibit 5937. However, the slurries that exhibited "settling" or "free fluid" were not the rig sample, MAC4. Therefore, this testimony is irrelevant and immaterial to the issues in the case.	
24	2	24	19	HESI		
					Vague and ambiguous; compound: Counsel asks a lengthy, compound, vague, and ambiguous question that is so unclear and imprecise that it makes the resulting testimony confusing and misleading.	
24	20	25	3	HESI		

28	7	28	23	HESI	Vague and ambiguous; relevance; non-responsive: Counsel asks, "How about the slurry?" without identifying to which slurry he is referring, making the question vague and ambiguous and the resulting testimony confusing and misleading. Further, references to slurries other than the MAC4 slurry lack relevance, and the testimony is irrelevant and immaterial to the issues in the case. Finally, the answer is non-responsive.	
28	24	29	7	HESI	Argumentative; vague and ambiguous; relevance: Counsel states, "So if -- am I clear, sir, in summarizing the foam stability testing of the different compositions of the cement slurries that your company tested, that none of the cement slurries by way of the different compositions indicated that the foam was stable?" This question is argumentative and is merely counsel testifying. Further, it does not identify to which slurry he is referring, making the question vague and ambiguous and the resulting testimony confusing and misleading. References to slurries other than the MAC4 slurry lack relevance, and the testimony is irrelevant and immaterial to the issues in the case.	
43	1	43	13	HESI	Relevance; argumentative: Counsel asks a series of questions about Fred Sabins. The questioning lacks relevance, and the testimony is irrelevant and immaterial to the issues in the case. Further, the question at 43:7-11 is argumentative; counsel is merely testifying.	

43	25	45	8	HESI	<p>Relevance; foundation; speculation; vague and ambiguous: The testimony lacks relevance and is immaterial to the issues in the case, as Fred Sabins has been excluded as an expert. Further, to the questioning at 43:25-44:6 and 44:21-45:8, there is no foundation for the witness to testify as to the qualifications of Sabins. The questioning necessarily calls for speculation and is merely bolstering the witness. Finally, the questioning at 45:2-8 is vague and ambiguous as to "a lot of knowledge."</p>	
59	12	59	23	HESI	<p>Compound; vague and ambiguous: Counsel first asks, "what is the procedure blending up a cement slurry? Now, you've prepared the cement slurry. What do you do next to create the foam in the lab?" The question is compound, and it is vague and ambiguous because it is unclear as to which question the response was given. This makes the resulting testimony confusing and misleading.</p>	
65	15	65	19	HESI	<p>Argumentative: Counsel previously asks the witness what a particular test result meant, and the witness answers. Counsel then states, "[A]nd it also tells you it doesn't form a 60 percent foam, quality foam." (65:15-17). This is not a question; it is merely argumentative, and counsel is testifying.</p>	

76	2	76	21	HESI	<p>Vague and ambiguous; assumes facts not in evidence; foundation: Counsel asks, "Would you consider - - would you consider changing the conditioning time one of the variables that you could play with to get a stable -- get an unstable slurry result into a stable slurry result?"</p> <p>The question is vague and ambiguous; it is so unclear and imprecise that the resulting testimony is confusing and misleading. It also assumes facts not in evidence. There is no foundation for the suggestion that HESI changed its conditioning times for that purpose.</p>	
94	13	94	20	HESI	<p>Misstates evidence; assumes facts not in evidence: Counsel asks, "And the...customer, because it doesn't have the software or the expertise, would have to rely on the cement company's expertise to design the cement program?" This question incorrectly suggests that BP lacked expertise and therefore was solely dependent on HESI to design the cement, which misstates the evidence and/or assumes facts not in evidence, as BP had cementing experts involved in the design of the cement program on the Macondo well.</p>	
121	5	121	24	BP	Non-responsive; FRE 602.	
149	22	150	3	HESI	<p>Vague and ambiguous: Counsel inquires whether the witness would recommend pumping downhole the "slurry design" he tested without specifying which of the 13 slurries he meant. The offer does not include the witness's question immediately preceding this offer, in which he asked, "the components and the things that I tested here, is that what you're asking?" The question is vague and ambiguous, making the</p>	

					resulting testimony confusing and misleading.	
152	5	152	16	HESI	Vague and ambiguous; misstates the evidence; assumes facts not in evidence: Counsel asks whether a cement company should stop work on a rig before pumping the job if it "had this cement slurry that [the witness] tested" without a stable foam stability test result. This question is vague and ambiguous in failing to identify a particular "cement slurry" tested by the witness, as he tested many. Further, it misstates the evidence and/or assumes facts not in evidence to suggest that HESI did not have a successful foam stability test prior to pumping the production interval cement job and is, therefore, an improper hypothetical.	
167	14	167	18	BP	Non-responsive; FRE 602	
169	7	169	13	BP	Relevance; Prejudice	
169	14	169	20	BP	Vague	
169	22	170	8	BP	Relevance; Prejudice	
171	6	171	11	BP	Vague; Relevance; Prejudice	
171	13	171	13	BP	Vague; Relevance; Prejudice	
171	14	171	19	BP	Relevance; FRE 701	
172	2	172	6	BP	Vague	
173	24	174	1	BP	FRE 602	
178	1	178	7	BP	Vague; FRE 602	
178	21	178	23	BP	FRE 602	
179	1	179	1	BP	FRE 602	
179	2	179	9	BP	Vague; FRE 701; FRE 702	
179	12	179	12	BP	FRE 701; FRE 702	
180	13	180	15	BP	FRE 702	
180	17	180	17	BP	FRE 702	
184	15	184	17	BP	Vague; FRE 602	
184	19	184	19	BP	FRE 602	
185	2	185	6	BP	Misstates the Record	
185	9	185	15	BP	FRE 702; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence	
185	17	185	17	BP	FRE 702	

186	2	186	5	BP	Vague	
187	10	187	12	BP	Vague	
187	19	187	23	BP	Misstates the Record; FRE 702	
188	6	188	8	BP	Relevance; FRE 701; FRE 702	
188	10	188	15	BP	Relevance; FRE 701; FRE 702	
188	20	189	5	BP	Vague	
189	8	189	11	BP	FRE 702	
189	14	189	14	BP	FRE 702	
189	18	189	22	BP	Relevance	
189	23	189	25	BP	Vague; Relevance	
193	17	193	21	BP	Relevance	
193	24	194	1	BP	FRE 701	
194	3	194	3	BP	FRE 701	
195	9	195	12	BP	Vague; Relevance; FRE 701	
195	14	195	14	BP	Relevance; FRE 701	
196	15	196	16	BP	Vague	
196	19	197	7	BP	Relevance; FRE 702	
199	22	200	1	BP	FRE 602; FRE 701	
200	3	200	4	BP	Vague; FRE 602	
200	6	200	6	BP	FRE 602	
202	22	203	1	BP	Vague	
203	5	203	13	BP	FRE 701; FRE 702	
203	15	204	1	BP	FRE 701; FRE 702	
204	3	204	6	BP	FRE 701; FRE 702	
206	20	206	24	BP	FRE 701; FRE 702	
207	1	207	1	BP	FRE 701; FRE 702	
207	9	207	11	BP	Vague; FRE 702	
207	13	207	13	BP	FRE 702	
210	8	210	14	BP	Vague; FRE 701; FRE 702	
210	16	210	16	BP	FRE 701; FRE 702	
210	24	211	9	BP	Argumentative; FRE 701	
211	12	211	24	BP	FRE 702	
211	25	212	4	BP	Argumentative; FRE 701; FRE 702	
219	5	219	13	BP	Vague; FRE 602; FRE 702; Prejudice	
221	14	221	18	BP	FRE 602; FRE 702; Prejudice	
221	20	222	4	BP	FRE 602; FRE 702; Prejudice	
222	6	222	14	BP	FRE 602	
222	16	222	16	BP	FRE 602	
222	18	222	18	BP	FRE 602	

223	17	223	20	BP	Argumentative; FRE 602	
223	22	223	22	BP	FRE 602	
225	10	225	15	BP	Argumentative	
230	18	230	24	BP	Misstates the Record	
235	11	235	12	BP	FRE 602	
235	14	235	14	BP	FRE 602	
240	20	240	22	BP	Vague	
242	14	242	20	BP	Vague; FRE 702	
247	21	248	5	BP	Vague	
248	14	248	23	BP	Vague; Argumentative; Misstates the Record	
248	25	249	1	BP	Vague	
249	4	249	10	BP	Vague; FRE 702	
249	13	249	17	BP	Vague; FRE 702	
251	10	251	16	BP	Argumentative	
252	3	252	8	BP	FRE 602	
253	13	253	18	BP	Argumentative; Vague; FRE 602; FRE 701; FRE 702; Prejudice	
254	13	254	19	Transocean	Testimony lacks foundation (Fed.R.Evid.602) and is inadmissible opinion testimony outside the witness's area of expertise (Fed. R. Evid. 701, 702).	
254	20	255	4	BP	Vague; Argumentative; FRE 701	
254	20	255	6	Transocean	Testimony lacks foundation (Fed.R.Evid.602) and is inadmissible opinion testimony outside the witness's area of expertise (Fed. R. Evid. 701, 702).	
255	6	255	6	BP	FRE 701	
255	25	256	8	BP	FRE 702	
256	10	256	19	BP	FRE 702	
258	10	258	11	BP	Vague; FRE 602	
258	13	258	13	BP	FRE 602	
259	17	260	4	BP	FRE 602	
260	13	260	15	BP	Vague; Prejudice	
261	17	261	19	BP	Vague; FRE 602	
261	21	261	21	BP	FRE 602	
261	22	262	1	BP	Misstates the Record; Vague; FRE 602; Prejudice	
262	3	262	3	BP	FRE 602; Prejudice	

262	4	262	9	BP	Relevance; Prejudice; FRE 602	
266	9	266	12	BP	Relevance; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence	
266	25	267	3	BP	FRE 602	
267	6	267	6	BP	FRE 602	
274	8	274	12	BP	FRE 702	
274	14	274	18	BP	FRE 702	
275	23	276	4	BP	FRE 702	
276	6	276	6	BP	FRE 702	