

**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  
MARK HAFLE**

---

<u>From</u>		<u>To</u>		<u>Objecting</u>	<u>Objection</u>	<u>Ruling</u>
<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Party</u>		
15	9	16	9	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment, Inadmissible by Statute	
15	9	19	7	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
19	16	22	15	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
20	11	20	20	HESI	Assumes facts not in evidence: The witness was asked whether he and other team members were concerned that Jesse Gagliano was not keeping accurate records of the variables used in the Opticem modeling being performed over the life of the well. The statement about Mr. Gagliano is not in evidence.	
20	21	21	2	HESI	Assumes facts not in evidence, vague and ambiguous: The witness was asked if he and his team knew there might be problems with the variables Jesse Gagliano was using in Opticem modeling. The assumption that there were problems with the variables is not in evidence, and the question is vague and ambiguous because it does not adequately identify "problems."	

22	20	37	13	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
37	24	40	8	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
38	14	38	22	HESI	Assumes facts not in evidence, vague and ambiguous: The witness was asked if despite the fact that he was heavily relying on Halliburton to produce a cement slurry that would produce a successful cement job, he had ongoing concerns about Mr. Gagliano. The statement that he was heavily relying on Halliburton to produce a cement slurry that would produce a successful cement job assumes facts not in evidence, and the term "ongoing concerns" is vague and ambiguous.	
40	19	46	2	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
47	10	55	21	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
56	2	57	13	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
57	24	58	2	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
58	6	58	19	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
58	24	61	13	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
61	19	63	17	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
63	22	70	14	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	

66	21	66	25	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
----	----	----	----	-----	--	--

67	2	67	2	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
----	---	----	---	-----	--	--

67	4	67	6	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997). Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
----	---	----	---	-----	---	--

67	8	67	8	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
----	---	----	---	-----	--	--

67	9	67	11	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
----	---	----	----	-----	--	--

					<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997). Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
67	14	67	14	M-I		
71	3	72	6	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
72	11	74	2	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
74	8	75	5	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
75	17	76	8	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
78	3	78	22	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
79	17	80	4	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
80	9	81	15	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
82	23	83	4	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
85	15	87	11	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	



88	17	104	23	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
96	16	97	1	HESI	Assumes facts not in evidence, misstates the evidence, vague and ambiguous: The witness was asked if despite his knowledge that Mr. Gagliano routinely provided BP with untimely lab results, the BP Macondo team did not ensure that all lab results for the slurry pumped on April 19th to 20th were received and reviewed before pumping. The statement that lab results were routinely provided untimely assumes facts not in evidence and misstates the evidence. Further, the terms "routinely" and "untimely" are vague and ambiguous.	
97	2	97	10	HESI	Misstates the evidence, lacks foundation: The witness was asked whether it was true that BP pumped the cement job on the production casing interval without having lab test results indicating foam stability of the slurry, using .08 GPS or .09 GPS of the retarder additive, SCR-100L, or final UCA strengths for either slurry. It is anticipated that the evidence will show otherwise, as lab test results were provided for at least one of those slurries prior to the cement job. The question lacks foundation in the evidence.	
105	2	109	15	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	

107	19	107	22	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

107	23	107	25	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

108	3	108	3	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	---	-----	---	-----	--	--

108	4	108	6	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	---	-----	---	-----	--	--

108	9	108	9	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	---	-----	---	-----	--	--

108	10	108	12	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

108	15	108	15	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--



108	16	108	19	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

108	22	108	22	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

108	23	109	1	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	---	-----	--	--

109	4	109	4	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	---	-----	---	-----	--	--

109	5	109	8	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	---	-----	---	-----	--	--

109	10	109	12	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

109	15	109	15	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

109	18	109	21	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
109	18	115	11	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	



109	24	109	24	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

109	25	110	4	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	---	-----	--	--

110	7	110	7	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	---	-----	---	-----	--	--

110	8	110	12	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	---	-----	----	-----	--	--

110	15	110	15	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

110	16	110	20	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

110	23	110	23	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

110	24	111	2	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	---	-----	--	--



111	5	111	5	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
115	17	133	2	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
131	23	132	14	Transocean	Hearsay (Fed. R. Evid. 802).	
133	18	149	25	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
150	5	151	22	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
152	4	152	20	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
153	5	155	12	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
155	23	157	23	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
158	2	158	17	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
159	20	160	24	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
161	4	161	7	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th	

					Amendment	
161	19	166	14	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
166	19	167	25	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
168	5	169	20	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
169	25	170	19	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
171	15	176	12	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
173	1	173	4	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	

173	6	173	6	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	---	-----	---	-----	--	--

173	7	173	8	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	---	-----	---	-----	--	--

173	10	173	10	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

173	11	173	17	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

173	19	173	19	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

173	20	173	23	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--



173	25	173	25	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
176	18	177	16	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
180	19	181	1	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
181	22	187	23	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
188	6	188	13	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
188	20	198	4	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
198	8	203	8	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
203	14	205	11	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
205	19	206	1	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
206	7	210	24	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	

207	18	207	20	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

207	22	207	22	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

207	23	207	25	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	----	-----	----	-----	--	--

208	2	208	2	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
-----	---	-----	---	-----	--	--

208	3	208	5	M-I	<p>This testimony should be stricken as not relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 402. See Fed. R. Evid. 402. Additionally, no adverse inference should be imputed against M-I for this witness' invocation of the Fifth Amendment because this witness (1) is not a current or former employee of M-I, (2) was not under M-I's control, and (3) does not have compatible interests with M-I in this litigation. See <i>FDIC v. Fid. &amp; Deposit Co. of Md.</i>, 45 F.3d 969, 977-78 (5th Cir. 1995); see also <i>LiBuitti v. United States</i>, 107 F.3d 110, 123 (2nd Cir. 1997).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no independent evidence to corroborate this adverse inference against M-I. See <i>State Farm Life Ins. Co. v. Gutterman</i>, 896 F.2d 116, 119 n.3 (5th Cir. 1990). Finally, imputing an adverse inference from this unaffiliated, third-party witness to M-I would be significantly more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. See Fed. R. Evid. 403.</p>	
211	3	216	15	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
218	15	220	12	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
220	17	222	7	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
222	13	222	16	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
222	20	223	12	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
223	17	229	11	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
229	21	232	2	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
232	20	242	11	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
242	16	245	17	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	

245	24	248	25	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
249	13	250	16	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
250	19	253	10	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
253	14	261	20	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
262	9	267	2	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
263	6	263	18	Transocean	Vague; calls for speculation; lacks foundation (Fed. R. Evid. 602).	
267	9	268	8	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
269	7	269	17	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
270	8	273	3	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	
273	10	276	21	BP	Relevance, Prejudice, 5th Amendment	