PAGE LINE SUMMARY OF JOHN DOE, M.D.

DEPOSITION DATE: AUGUST 4, 2017

Plaintiff Name Vs. Healthcare Providers Defendant

EXHIBITS

Exhibit number	Description	Depsum Page
1	Witness Curriculum Vitae	4

Page: Line	Summary	Subject	
Examination by Attorney			
4:5-11:2	John Doe, stated her name for record. Exhibit 1 was Dr. XXX curriculum vitae. He was	Introduction	
	an orthopedic surgeon. He was a practicing orthopedist and had office five days a week.		
	He had done medical legal work since 1976. He knew the difference between		
	workman's compensation and litigation work. He usually worked for the plaintiff. He		
	had worked for the defense firm before. He explained the amount that he charged for his		
	work. He had also testified in trials.		
11:3-17:23	Dr. Doe had never met Regina in person. He agreed that Regina had undergone a	Dr. Joe's review of	
	surgery for spinal stenosis. He explained the term spinal stenosis. He agreed that	Regina's medical	
	bladder dysfunction was a sign of spinal stenosis. He stated that the symptom of real	records	
	stenosis for bladder was bladder incontinence. He explained about the congenital spinal		
	stenosis.		
	Dr. Doe also reviewed Regina's MRI and CAT scan. He had reviewed all records after		
	June of 2015. He agreed that there are some downsides in reviewing medical records.		
17:24-20:25	Dr. Doe had opined that Regina had spinal stenosis as a result of the cord compression	Dr. Joe's opinion for	
	due to osteophytes. He explained that the bone spurs were due to degeneration. A	Regina's spinal	
	person with cord compression would have pain, difficulty in walking, tingling and	stenosis	
	weakness. He agreed that Regina's compression had existed before this wreck itself.		
21:1-26:25	Dr. Doe explained that the symptoms would sometimes never show itself and may be	Dr. Joe's opinion of	
	diagnosed when they are being scanned for some other condition. He stated that trauma	Regina's symptoms	
	could have aggravated the pre-existing condition. He agreed that the accident could had	after collision and	
	caused her the symptoms by aggravating her condition for which she was asymptomatic	the cause of surgery	
	before the accident. His difference of opinion was that the preexisting osteophyte disk		
	complex pre-existed before her automobile wreck and it was possible that the wreck		
	aggravated the condition causing the symptoms necessitating surgery.		