

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT  
THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF ILLINOIS  
MADISON COUNTY**

**HOLIDAY SHORES SANITARY DISTRICT, )  
Individually and on behalf of all others similarly )  
situated, )**

**Plaintiff, )**

**Cause No. 2004-L-000710**

**v. )**

**SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION, INC. and )  
GROWMARK, INC., )**

**Defendants. )**

**DEFENDANT SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION, INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND  
RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION DIRECTED  
TO  
DEFENDANT SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION, INC.**

COMES NOW Defendant Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc. ("Syngenta") and, for its Objections and Responses to Plaintiff's First Requests for Production Directed to it, states as follows:

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Illinois Supreme Court Rules, Plaintiff, by its attorneys, Korein Tillery, LLC, and Baron & Budd, PC, requests Defendant Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., to produce and permit inspection of the following documents and things, in their best available form, at Korein Tillery, One U.S. Bank Plaza, 505 North 7th Street, Suite 2600, St. Louis, Missouri 63101-1625, or in such other reasonable location and form as is mutually agreed to by the parties, no later than twenty-eight (28) days after service of this request.

These Requests are to be answered in accordance with the following definitions and instructions, and these definitions and instructions are hereby incorporated by reference into each

Request.

### **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

1. Syngenta objects to the extent that the First Requests for Production seek to impose obligations and burdens on it greater than those permitted or imposed by the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure, Illinois Supreme Court Rules and applicable law. To the extent that Syngenta produces documents, it will produce documents reasonably available to it in the form in which they are maintained in their ordinary and usual course of business, whether or not a better form of the documents exists. To the extent there are issues about the legibility of any documents produced, Syngenta will cooperate with Plaintiff to attempt to obtain and produce a more legible copy.

2. Syngenta objects to the extent that the First Requests for Production seek disclosure of documents and/or information which is protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, insurer-insured privilege, joint defense privilege, consulting expert privilege, or other applicable legal privilege or protection.

3. Syngenta objects to the extent that the First Requests for Production seek documents and/or information concerning persons or entities which are not parties to this action and/or are outside the possession or control of Syngenta, or which documents/information are in the public domain and/or are equally available to the Plaintiff(s).

4. Syngenta objects to the Definitions and Instructions to the extent that the Definitions attempts to give some meaning to certain terms other than their typical, normal meaning or definition, and to the Instructions to the extent that they seek to impose upon Syngenta obligations and duties beyond those permitted by the applicable provisions of the

Illinois Code of Civil Procedure and the Illinois Supreme Court Rules. Syngenta will utilize the common, accepted meaning of words and phrases and respond to these discovery requests as permitted by applicable law.

5. Syngenta objects to the 109 requests for production and further subparts contained in the First Requests for Production to the extent that they are overbroad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, harassing, duplicative, seek documents/information which are irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seek documents/information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and seeks documents/information which is beyond the scope of permissible discovery..

6. Syngenta objects to these Requests to the extent they require it to collect, assemble or produce information or documents that are not already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff.

7. Syngenta hereby incorporates each of the foregoing general objections into each of its answers below.

## DEFINITIONS

As used in these Requests, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

1. “Address” means the street address, city, state, zip code, and country.
2. “Atrazine” or “atrazine-containing product(s)” means atrazine, any product (including herbicides) containing atrazine, and atrazine degradate chemicals, including but not limited to desethylatrazine, deethylatrazine, deisopropylatrazine, diaminoatrazine, diaminochlorotriazine (or desethyldeisopropylatrazine), hydroxyatrazine, desethylhydroxyatrazine, and ammeline.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to the terms/phrases “Atrazine,” “product(s)” and “atrazine-containing products” on the grounds that the same are vague, ambiguous, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta further objects to the phrase “atrazine degradate chemicals” as the same is vague, ambiguous and only partly defined. The claims in this case as framed by the Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint involve only Atrazine three (3) specific breakdown substances (i.e., deethylatrazine, deisopropylatrazine and diaminoatrazine), and the Amended Complaint seeks damages arising from the presence of only Atrazine in the plaintiff’s drinking water supply. Nowhere in the pleadings are the terms desethylatrazine, diaminochlorotriazine (or desethyldeisopropylatrazine), hydroxyatrazine, desethylhydroxyatrazine, and ammeline even mentioned, much less pleaded to be the bases of any cause of action against Syngenta. Accordingly, these Definitions seek information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seek information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and are beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta will respond to these Requests only with respect to Atrazine and the three (3) identified breakdown products set forth in the Amended Complaint, all as limited herein and in the General Objections above.

3. “Concerning” means relating to, referring to, describing, evidencing or constituting.
4. “Date” means the exact day, month, and year, if ascertainable, or if not, a description of the temporal relationship of the occurrence for which the date is sought to the closest dates which are ascertainable.
5. “Defendants” means Dow Agrosiences, LLC, Drexel Chemical, Co., Growmark, Inc., Makhteshim-Agan of North America, Inc., Sipcam Agro USA, Inc., Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., United Agri Products, Inc., D/B/A UAP Loveland Products, Inc., and any predecessors, divisions, subdivisions, foreign subsidiaries, foreign subsidiaries of predecessors, domestic or foreign corporate parents, and/or affiliates.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to the Definition of “Defendants” to the extent that it includes any entities which are not Defendants in the case and it includes “any predecessors, divisions, subdivisions, foreign subsidiaries, foreign subsidiaries of predecessors, domestic or foreign corporate parents, and/or affiliates” on the grounds that

the same is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and seeks information which is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Certain of the predecessors of Syngenta date back to at least the mid-1700's and it is unreasonable to demand that Syngenta search for responsive information that far back in time. Syngenta further objects to any discovery directed to "foreign subsidiaries, foreign subsidiaries of predecessors, ... or foreign corporate parents, and/or affiliates" on the grounds that plaintiff has failed to sustain its legally-required burden of demonstrating requisite control by any such entities over Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc. or Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc.'s control over the documents of any of its "foreign subsidiaries, foreign subsidiaries of predecessors, ... or foreign corporate parents, and/or affiliates." Additionally, Syngenta objects to this Definition on the grounds that the same violates the due process rights of any "foreign subsidiaries, foreign subsidiaries of predecessors, ... or foreign corporate parents, and/or affiliates" of Syngenta, including any such entities located in or organized or existing under the laws of the nation of Switzerland. Additionally, Syngenta objects to this Definition as to any entity other than Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., as the other entities set forth in the Definition are independent, third entities all but one (1) of which (Growmark) is not a party in this case and Syngenta has no control over any such independent third party entities or their documents.

6. "Degradate(s)" means any of the chemicals into which atrazine breaks down, including but not limited to chlorotriazines, deethylatrazine, deisopropylatrazine, and diaminoatrazine.
7. "Document(s)," "data," and/or "electronically stored information" is to be interpreted broadly to include but not limited to writings, records, files, correspondence, reports, memoranda, calendars, diaries, minutes, notes, research material, electronic messages, voicemail, e-mail, telephone message records or logs, computer and network activity logs, hard drives, backup data, removable computer storage media such as usb devices, hard drives, cd/dvd media, and memory storage devices, Web pages, databases, presentations, spreadsheets, software, books, ledgers and journals, orders, invoices, bills, drawings, images, photographs, video, and digital recordings. Information that serves to identify, locate, or link such material, such as file inventories, file folders, indices, and metadata, is also included in this definition.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to the terms/phrases "Document(s)," "data," and/or "electronically stored information" to the extent that the same seek information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, joint defense privilege, insurer-insured privilege, consulting expert privilege, or any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta specifically objects to the production of "databases" or other documents that are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, insurer-insured privilege, joint defense privilege, consulting expert privilege, or any other applicable legal privilege or protection.

8. "Health effects" means any effect or potential effect, adverse or otherwise, to human health or the health of other living organisms.
9. "Identify" means to provide sufficient information to allow a reasonable person to locate and comprehend the subject. For example, with respect to a person, this means to provide the full name, last known address (or date of death, if applicable), job title, employer name; with respect to an entity, this means to provide the name, address, principal place of business, and state of incorporation (if applicable); with respect to a document, this means to provide the title, date, author, recipient, subject matter, description, and current custodian.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to the Definition of the term "Identify" on the grounds that the same is overbroad, burdensome, seeks information which is protected by privacy and confidentiality rules, regulations and laws, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the phrase "comprehend the subject" is vague, ambiguous, and places upon Syngenta the untenable burden of determining what another person may or may not "comprehend." With respect to the identity of a person, Syngenta objects to the extent that the term "Identify" seeks personal identifying information regarding the home location of present or former employees, or to the extent such information is protected from disclosure by HIPAA, social security, privacy or other non-disclosure rules, regulations or laws; thus, Syngenta will not provide home address information without an appropriate court order. Additionally, Syngenta objects to disclosing the state of incorporation of entities other than itself on the grounds that the same is burdensome, available in the public domain and equally available to Plaintiff. Finally, with respect to the identity of a document, Syngenta is working and will work in good faith with Plaintiff's counsel to construct privilege logs which provide all the parties sufficient information regarding the identity and production of documents and the bases upon which the same are withheld from production.

10. "Or" shall be construed either conjunctively or disjunctively to bring within the scope of these Requests for Production any information which might otherwise be construed to be outside their scope.
11. "Remediate" and "remediation" mean action to clean up, mitigate, correct, abate, minimize, eliminate, control, or prevent the presence, spreading, migration, leaking, leaching, volatilization, spilling, or transport of a substance or further release of a substance into the environment.
12. "Representative" means any partner, agent, employee, consultant, attorney, accountant, or anyone else acting or purporting to act for, at the direction of, or on behalf of another.

13. "State agency(ies)" means any and all agencies which regulate aspects of the herbicide industry, including but not limited to that state's Departments of Environmental Protection and/or Conservation.
14. "Study" or "studies" means all internal and external studies and all research, surveys, tests, investigations, assessments, drafts, and summaries of same and all communications concerning such study or studies.
15. "Triazine" or "triazine-containing product(s)" means triazine, any product (including herbicides) containing triazine, and triazine degradate chemicals.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to these Definitions on the grounds that the same are overbroad, oppressive, harassing, seek information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seek information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and are beyond the scope of permissible discovery. To date, Syngenta has only searched for and collected documents and information which relates to Atrazine, which is the subject of this lawsuit. Syngenta objects to the term "degradant" on the grounds that the same is overbroad and burdensome; as noted above, Syngenta construes such term to refer to the three (3) breakdown substances of Atrazine set forth in Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and as set forth in Response to Definition 2 above; however, the same is still objectionable as this case as framed by the Plaintiff's Amended Complaint involves Atrazine only, and seeks damages arising only from the presence of Atrazine in the plaintiff's drinking water supply. Nowhere in the Plaintiff's Amended Complaint are the terms "triazine" or "triazine-containing product(s)" even mentioned, much less pleaded to be the bases of any cause of action against Syngenta. Accordingly, these Definitions seek information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seek information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and seek information which is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta will respond to these Requests only with respect to Atrazine and the three (3) identified breakdown products set forth in the Amended Complaint.

16. "Water resource" or "water supply" means groundwater, surface water, and/or any system for the provision to the public of water for human consumption.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to the Definitions of "water resource" or "water supply" to the extent that these phrases include groundwater, on the grounds that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint does not claim any alleged damages to any of its or others' groundwater, such that the same are overbroad, oppressive, harassing, seek information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seek information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and seek information which is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the phrase "for the provision of..." is vague and ambiguous.

17. "You," "your," "yours," or "Syngenta" means the answering defendant and any of its merged, consolidated, or acquired predecessors, divisions, subdivisions, foreign

subsidiaries, foreign subsidiaries of predecessors, domestic or foreign corporate parents, and/or affiliates including, but not limited to J.R. Geigy Limited, Ciba Crop Protection, Zeneca Agrochemicals, Ciba-Geigy Limited, and Novartis Agribusiness. This definition includes present or former officers, directors, agents, representatives, employees, and all other persons acting or purporting to act on behalf of Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., or its predecessors, subsidiaries, and/or affiliates. "Predecessors" means any business firm, whether or not incorporated, which had all or some of its assets purchased or acquired by Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., whether by merger, consolidation, or otherwise. "Subsidiaries" further means any business firm, whether or not incorporated, which is or was in any way owned or controlled, in whole or in part, by Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., or its predecessors. Representative means any partner, agent, employee, consultant, attorney, accountant, or anyone else acting or purporting to act for, at the direction of, or on behalf of another.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to the terms "You," "your," "yours," "Syngenta," "Predecessors" and "Subsidiaries" on the grounds that the same are overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, meant to annoy Syngenta, seek information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seek information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and seek information which is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. See Objections to Definition 5. above which are incorporated herein. Certain of the subsidiaries, predecessors and/or affiliates of Syngenta date back to at least the mid-1700's and it is unreasonable to demand that Syngenta search for responsive information that far back in time. Syngenta further objects to any discovery directed to "foreign subsidiaries, foreign subsidiaries of predecessors,... or foreign corporate parents, and/or affiliates including, but not limited to J.R. Geigy Limited, Ciba Crop Protection, Zeneca Agrochemicals, Ciba-Geigy Limited, and Novartis Agribusiness" on the grounds that plaintiff has failed to sustain its legally-required burden of demonstrating requisite control by any such entities over Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc. or Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc.'s control over the documents of any of its "foreign subsidiaries, foreign subsidiaries of predecessors, ... or foreign corporate parents, and/or affiliates." Additionally, Syngenta objects to this Definition on the grounds that the same violates the due process rights of any "foreign subsidiaries, foreign subsidiaries of predecessors, ... or foreign corporate parents, and/or affiliates" of Syngenta, including any such entities located in or organized or existing under the laws of the nation of Switzerland. Moreover, Syngenta objects to the phrase "purporting to act on behalf Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., or any of its predecessors, subsidiaries and/or affiliates" on the grounds that the same places upon Syngenta an untenable burden of determining what may have been in the mind of or the intent of third party persons or entities, including those over whom/which Syngenta has no control. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, and subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc. will produce any responsive information that is reasonably within its possession in compliance with appropriate Requests.



## INSTRUCTIONS

The following instructions apply to these Requests:

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to all Instructions to the extent that they are beyond the scope of permissible discovery as permitted by the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure and the Illinois Supreme Court Rules, or seek to impose obligations or duties upon Syngenta beyond those permitted by the Code, the Rules or applicable law.

1. Produce documents as maintained in the ordinary course of your business, or segregate the documents according to the Request in response to which they are produced, as required by Rule 214.

RESPONSE: Syngenta will respond to these Requests in compliance with Illinois Supreme Court Rule 214, the case law construing the same, any agreements reached between the parties and their counsel, and/or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

2. In the event the request is one to which you object, the reasons for the objection shall be stated with reasonable particularity;
3. If you object to part of a request, specify the part to which you object and produce the materials responsive to the remaining parts, as required by Rule 214; **and**
4. With respect to any category of documents which you contend is in some way burdensome or oppressive, state the specific reasons for such objection, and produce examples of the responsive documents.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to Instructions 2, 3 and 4 on the grounds that they seek to impose obligations and duties on Syngenta beyond those permitted by the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure ("Codes") and the Illinois Supreme Court Rules ("Rules"). If Syngenta objects to a Request, then Syngenta will meet and confer with Plaintiff's counsel as provided in Rule 201(k). If an accommodation can be reached by the parties, then Syngenta will respond accordingly. If an agreement cannot be reached, the objections and the resolution thereof will take place according to the Rules and applicable law. Syngenta is under no duty or obligation to reconstruct or re-write Plaintiff's discovery requests, or to produce exemplar documents, if the Plaintiff's Requests are objectionable.

5. If you are not in possession, custody or control of any documents described in any one or more of the following requests, a written statement that you are not in possession, custody or control of any such documents and the name and address of the person who has possession, custody or control of any such documents is a sufficient response to the request. However, production of such documents shall be required if possession, custody or control of the same is in or with any of your agents, employees, servants, contractors, representatives, corporate parents, subsidiaries or affiliates.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to Instruction 5 on the grounds that the same is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, and harassing, seeks information which is irrelevant

and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and seeks information which is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects to Instruction 5 on the grounds that it seeks to impose an obligation to produce information, documents or persons which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, joint defense privilege, insurer-insured privilege, consulting expert privilege, or any other applicable legal protection or privilege. Moreover, Syngenta objects to producing any documents in the possession of any "agents, employees, servants, contractors, representatives, corporate parents, subsidiaries or affiliates" which are located outside the United States on the grounds that plaintiff has failed to sustain its legally-required burden of demonstrating requisite control by any such entities over Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc. or Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc.'s control over the documents of any such persons or entities. Additionally, Syngenta objects to this Definition on the grounds that the same violates the due process rights of any such non-United States persons or entities, including any such entities located in or organized or existing under the laws of the nation of Switzerland.

6. If your response to any request should make reference, in whole or in part, to, or require the use of data, information, or records contained in any computerized form, please indicate the extent to which the answers relied on such data and attach a partial or whole copy of the record.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to Instruction 6 to the extent that it seeks to impose upon Syngenta obligations or duties beyond those permitted by the Code or the Rules. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, and subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, Syngenta will comply with its obligations under Illinois Supreme Court Rules 201, 213 and 214.

7. If any document is withheld from production hereunder on the basis of a claim of privilege or work product protection, please provide, for each such document, a description sufficiently detailed to allow Plaintiffs to evaluate the legitimacy of your claim of privilege. Such description shall include: the title and general subject matter of the document, the date of the document, the identity of all persons who participated in creating the document, the identity of each person who signed the document or over whose name the document was issued, the identity of each addressee and recipient of the document, the number of pages which comprise the document, a description of the nature and substance of the document, its attachments, if any, its present custodian and a description of the basis for each claimed privilege or work product protection.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to Instruction 7 to the extent that it seeks to impose upon Syngenta obligations or duties beyond those permitted by the Code or the Rules. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, and subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, with respect to documents, Syngenta is working and will work in good faith with Plaintiff's counsel to construct privilege logs which provide all the parties sufficient information regarding the identity and production of documents or

the bases upon which the same are withheld from production.

8. If any document which forms a part of, or the entire basis for, any response to these requests has been destroyed, disposed of, or is no longer within your control, for each such document set forth the following explanations: (a) state when it was destroyed or disposed of; (b) identify the name, title and address of the person who destroyed the document; (c) identify the name, title and address of the person who directed that it be destroyed or disposed of; (d) detail the reasons for the destruction or disposition; (e) describe the nature of the document; (f) identify the persons who created, sent and received the document; (g) state the date the document was prepared and transmitted (if different); (h) state, in as much detail as possible, the contents of the document; and (i) if it still exists, provide a copy of draft of such document.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to Instruction 8 to the extent that it seeks to impose upon Syngenta obligations or duties beyond those permitted by the Code or the Rules. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, and subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, with respect to documents, Syngenta is working and will work in good faith with Plaintiff's counsel to construct privilege logs which provide all the parties sufficient information regarding the identity and production of documents or the bases upon which the same are withheld from production or otherwise been destroyed.

### **REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION**

1. Produce any and all studies and/or documents referring or relating to assessments or studies of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products and their risks to the environment that are in your possession, custody, or control, including drafts and/or published and unpublished assessments and/or studies done by you, at your request, or at the request of third parties.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms "constituents" and "environment" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects to inquiry regarding any alleged environmental effects of Atrazine on the grounds that the Amended Complaint in paragraph 8. refers to adverse reactions in humans and the purported common questions alleged in paragraph 23 address

only whether Atrazine is harmful to humans, so that this Interrogatory is overbroad, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, and seeks information which is beyond the permissible scope of discovery.

2. Produce any and all studies and/or documents referring or relating to assessments or studies of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products related to health effects that are in your possession, custody, or control, including drafts and/or published and unpublished assessments and/or studies done by you, at your request, or at the request of third parties.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, much of the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain from the USEPA web site and otherwise (see certain studies listed in Plaintiff’s Attachment A to its First Request to Produce filed contemporaneously herewith) and is equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond as limited above at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

3. Produce any and all communications with, proposals to and from, and all documents referring or related to any laboratories that have done any studies regarding the health effects of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not

reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond as limited above at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

4. Produce any and all studies, including drafts, published studies, unpublished studies, and/or documents referring or relating to assessments or studies of worker health at any facility in which you manufacture atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazine, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products, relating to potential health effects resulting from their exposure to such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, much of the information requested in this Interrogatory is available in the public domain from the USEPA web site and otherwise (see certain studies listed in Plaintiff's Attachment A to its First Request to Produce filed contemporaneously herewith) and is equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond as limited above at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

5. Produce any and all records and/or documents referring or related to records of any medical testing program conducted by you or at your request for workers at any facility in which you manufacture atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time,

geography or specific or limited customers or areas, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, much of the information requested in this Interrogatory is available in the public domain from the USEPA web site and otherwise (see certain studies listed in Plaintiff's Attachment A to its First Request to Produce filed contemporaneously herewith) and equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond as limited above at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

6. Produce any and all records and/or documents referring or related to records of cancers or other illnesses in humans or other living organisms that you have tracked from 1958 to present.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas, or to the State of Illinois, and is not limited at all to the allegations or claims of the Amended Complaint, to technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, or to the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

7. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to the following characteristics of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products:
  - a. Fate and transport characteristics in soil and/or water;
  - b. Solubility in water;
  - c. Biodegradation;
  - d. Photo-decomposition;
  - e. Run-off characteristics;
  - f. Ability to contaminate and extent of contamination of water resources;
  - g. Health effects caused by ingestion;
  - h. Breakdown products;
  - i. The ability or inability to distinguish your atrazine, atrazine-containing products,

- triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradants of such products from those originating from any other manufacturer;
- j. Effect of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products on the reproductive organs of amphibians;
  - k. Effect of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products on fertility;
  - l. Studies or other documents that discuss atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products causing or potentially causing fetal death;
  - m. Studies or other documents that discuss atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products as potential endocrine disruptors;
  - n. Studies or other documents that discuss atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products causing or potentially causing breast cancer;
  - o. Studies or other documents that discuss atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products causing or potentially causing harm at concentrations in water at or below three parts per billion (3 ppb);
  - p. Studies or other documents that discuss atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products causing or potentially causing harm to humans or animals at levels below three parts per billion (3 ppb);
  - q. Documents which discuss proposals to restrict or ban atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “constituents” and “harm” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Additionally, Syngenta objects to the phrase “endocrine disruptors” on the grounds that the same is overbroad, vague, ambiguous and undefined; Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects to inquiry regarding any alleged environmental effects of Atrazine on the grounds that the Amended Complaint in paragraph 8. refers to adverse reactions in humans and the purported common questions alleged in paragraph 23 address only whether Atrazine is harmful to humans, so that Request 7, sub-paragraphs j., k., l., m., n., and p. are overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, seek information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seek

information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and seek information which is beyond the permissible scope of discovery. Syngenta further objects to sub-paragraph i. in that it improperly shifts the burden of proof from Plaintiff to this Defendant. Moreover, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain from the USEPA web site and otherwise (see certain studies listed in Plaintiff's Attachment A to this First Request to Produce) and is equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond as limited above at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

8. Produce any and all documents referring, related to, or constituting communications between you, your employees, your agents, your representatives and/or any industry groups of which you are a member and domestic or foreign governmental agencies, pesticide industry associations, other pesticide manufacturers, customers, water providers, the public, or other persons or entities regarding the health effects of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, their use, and/or their regulation.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that terms "constituents" and "industry groups [and] associations" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Even assuming that Plaintiff intends the Request to be limited to "human health effects," Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

9. Produce any and all documents referring, related to, or constituting communications between you, your employees, your agents, your representatives and/or any industry groups of which you are a member and domestic or foreign governmental agencies, pesticide industry associations, other pesticide manufacturers, customers, water



providers, the public, or other persons or entities regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, contaminating water resources.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms “constituents” and “industry groups [and] associations” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “contamination” assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal, permissible presence at certain levels of Atrazine and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, in raw and treated drinking water. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta’s freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

10. Produce any and all documents referring to, relating to, or constituting any representations you have made or caused to be made to the public, to water providers, or to a governmental entity that atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products are not a health-hazard to humans or other living organisms, including representations that additional studies regarding the health effects of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products are unnecessary.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is

beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

11. Produce any and all documents referring, related to, or constituting procedures, limitations, guidelines, or approval processes that those hired or contracted by you must follow regarding the publication of studies performed for you.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal guidelines, rules, regulations and laws, including those of the USEPA, regarding the reporting of certain laboratory or research investigations or reports to various governmental entities and/or organizations. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

12. Produce any and all documents referring, related to, or constituting procedures, limitations, guidelines, or approval processes that those hired or contracted by you must follow regarding the publication of studies performed for you specifically regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, seeks information which is

irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal guidelines, rules, regulations and laws, including those of the USEPA, regarding the reporting of certain laboratory or research investigations or reports to various governmental entities and/or organizations. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

13. Produce any and all documents referring, related to, or constituting you retaining the right or a portion of the right to publish, limit publication, and/or prevent publication of studies performed for you.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal guidelines, rules, regulations and laws, including those of the USEPA, regarding the reporting of certain laboratory or research investigations or reports to various governmental entities and/or organizations. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

14. Produce any and all documents referring, related to, or constituting you[r] retaining the right or a portion of the right to publish, limit publication, and/or prevent publication of studies performed for you specifically regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that

this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal guidelines, rules, regulations and laws, including those of the USEPA, regarding the reporting of certain laboratory or research investigations or reports to various governmental entities and/or organizations. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

15. Provide any and all documents referring or relating to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products contaminating or having the potential to contaminate water resources.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, 15 and 16 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that the term "contamination" assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal, permissible presence at certain levels of Atrazine and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, in raw and treated drinking water. Also, Syngenta objects to inquiry regarding any alleged "contaminating or having the potential to contaminate water resources," in that the same is really inquiring with respect to environmental effects (and the like) of Atrazine, which inquiry is objectionable on the grounds that the Amended Complaint in paragraph 8 refers to adverse reactions in humans and the purported common questions alleged in paragraph 23 address only whether Atrazine is harmful to humans, so that this Request is overbroad, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, and seeks information which is beyond the permissible scope of discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, the information requested

in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain from the USEPA web site and otherwise (see certain studies listed in Plaintiff's Attachment A to its First Request to Produce filed contemporaneously herewith) and equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

16. Produce any and all documents that discuss or evidence any monitoring or testing programs done by you, at your direction, or that you are aware of that monitored water resources for the presence of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, 15 and 16 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain from the USEPA web site and otherwise (see certain studies listed in Plaintiff's Attachment A to its First Request to Produce filed contemporaneously herewith) and equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

17. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to steps you have taken to prevent atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products from contaminating domestic or foreign water resources.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, 15 and 16 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that the term "contamination" assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal, permissible presence at certain levels of Atrazine and the three

(3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, in raw and treated drinking water. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, or even to the United States, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

18. Produce any and all documents discussing or evidencing the remediation of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products from a water resource or soil, including, but not limited to, warnings, handbooks, or manuals.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, 15 and 16 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited to water but includes soil which is beyond the scope of Plaintiffs complaint, is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery in that the Plaintiff's Amended Complaint only alleges purported causes of action based on Atrazine and not other components or component products. Syngenta further objects to the extent that this Request improperly seeks to inquire regarding post-remedial measures and/or post-sale duties to warn. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same,

subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

19. Produce any and all documents discussing or evidencing the treatment of water resources contaminated with atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, including, but not limited to, documents referencing or referring to costs and/or methodology of such treatment.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 15 and 16 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the extent that this Request improperly seeks or is construed to inquire regarding post-remedial measures and/or post-sale duties to warn. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

20. Produce any and all documents related to the appropriate response, program and/or protocol that you, a potential responsible party, water providers, and/or the state or local government should take where a water sample from a water resource, including public water supply system, evidences levels of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, including but not limited to documents regarding any testing, cleanup or remediation that should take place, who should take action, and who should pay for it.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, 15 and 16 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the

grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited customers or areas or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request also seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the extent that this Request improperly seeks legal conclusions as to “who should take action, and who should pay for it,” or is construed to inquire regarding post-remedial measures and/or post-sale duties to warn. Finally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request calls for legal conclusions. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

21. Produce any and all documents referring or related to any surveys or studies, including the surveys/studies themselves, which describe potential impacts on public drinking water supplies and/or wells due to contamination by atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term/phrases “constituents” and “potential impact” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that the term “contamination” assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal, permissible presence at certain levels of Atrazine and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, in raw and treated drinking water. Syngenta also objects to the extent that this Request includes “wells,” as there are no allegations in the Amended Complaint regarding groundwater or wells, and, thus, this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Interrogatory seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Interrogatory is at least partially available in the public



domain from the USEPA web site and otherwise (see certain studies listed in Plaintiff's Attachment A to its First Request to Produce filed contemporaneously herewith) and equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

22. Produce any and all documents which refer or relate to your Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDSs), and any other product safety and handling documents regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, including the MSDSs and other product safety and handling documents themselves, any documents that discuss or analyze the MSDSs or other documents in any way, and any drafts.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms/phrases "constituents" and "other product safety and handling documents" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

23. Produce any and all documents which refer or relate to labels, warnings, representations, or other documents regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, that were provided to customers and/or downstream users, including the labels, warnings, representations, and other documents themselves and any drafts.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms/phrase "constituents," "downstream users," and "representations" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Subject to the foregoing objections, and

without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

24. Produce any and all documents which refer or relate to labels, warnings, representations, or other documents regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, that were provided to water providers, including the labels, warnings, representations, communications and other documents themselves and any drafts.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms “constituents,” “representations,” and “communications” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is duplicative, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

25. Produce any and all documents which refer or relate to warnings provided to water providers, customers of water providers, or to the general public regarding the potential health effects and/or the contamination of water resources by atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, including the warnings themselves and any drafts.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, 15 and 16 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that the term “contamination” assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal, permissible presence at certain levels of Atrazine and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, in raw and treated drinking water. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is duplicative, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes

substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonably agreeable date in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

26. Provide any and all documents regarding your decision to or not to provide warnings to public water providers, to distributors, to downstream users, to consumers, to government regulators, or to the general public relating to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms/phrase “constituents” and “downstream users” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is duplicative, not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the extent that this Request improperly seeks or is construed to inquire regarding post-remedial measures and/or post-sale duties to warn. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta’s freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

27. Produce any and all documents which refer or relate to changes in labels pertaining to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, including the labels themselves, drafts of the labels, and/or proposed labels.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that

this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the extent that this Request improperly seeks or is construed to inquire regarding post-remedial measures and/or post-sale duties to warn.

28. Produce any and all documents which refer or relate to federal and/or state regulations of labels pertaining to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, including the labels themselves, drafts of the labels, and/or proposed labels.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the extent that this Request improperly seeks or is construed to inquire regarding post-remedial measures and/or post-sale duties to warn. Finally, Syngenta objects to this Request on the grounds that it calls for legal conclusions and legal information which are matters of public record and equally available to Plaintiff.

29. Produce a list of the names and addresses of all individuals who were involved in the consideration, development, adoption and circulation of any warnings related to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing, and the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the extent that

this Request improperly seeks or is construed to inquire regarding post-remedial measures and/or post-sale duties to warn. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

30. Produce a list of the names and addresses of the group, department, title(s), or people who had final approval of any warnings related to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is duplicative, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing, and the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the extent that this Request improperly seeks or is construed to inquire regarding post-remedial measures and/or post-sale duties to warn. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

31. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to health-related inquiries or complaints regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, including the inquiries/complaints themselves, that you have received (or of which you are aware) from consumers, employees, contractors, downstream users, water providers or other persons or entities. Produce all documents referring or relating to your response to any such inquiries or complaints.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is duplicative, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing, and the terms/phrase "constituents" and "downstream users" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or

specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the extent this capital request seeks private and/or confidential/personal information. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

32. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to inquiries or complaints regarding water contamination by atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, including the inquiries/complaints themselves, that you have received (or of which you are aware) from consumers, employees, contractors, downstream users, water providers or other persons or entities. Produce all documents referring or relating to your response to any such inquiries or complaints.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is duplicative, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing, and the term/phrase "constituents" and "downstream users" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "contamination" assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal, permissible presence at certain levels of Atrazine and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, in raw and treated drinking water. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the extent this capital request seeks private and/or confidential/personal information. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

33. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to inquiries or complaints regarding the efficacy of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products, including the complaints themselves, that you have received (or of which you are aware) from consumers, employees, contractors, downstream users, water providers or other persons or entities. Produce all documents referring or relating to your response to any such inquiries or complaints.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta assumes that by use of the term "efficacy" Plaintiff intends/means "effectiveness;" otherwise, Syngenta objects to that term and also objects to the term/phrase "constituents" and "downstream users" all on the grounds that they are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the extent this capital request seeks private and/or confidential/personal information. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

34. Produce any and all documents relating to the use of mesotrione as an alternative and/or competitor to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms "alternatives" and "constituents" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that inquiry into "mesotrione" is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing in that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint does not address or assert purported liability or damages based on "mesotrione," and Syngenta also objects on the grounds that inquiry into "alternatives" are all vague, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, seek information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seek information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and are beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in

Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

35. Produce a list of the names and addresses of everyone who was involved in discussions regarding the feasibility of marketing and producing mesotrione.

RESPONSE: Syngenta objects to this Request on the grounds that inquiry into “feasibility,” “producing[tion],” and “mesotrione” are overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing in that Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint does not address or assert purported liability or damages based on “mesotrione,” and Syngenta also objects on the grounds that inquiry into “alternatives....of which you have knowledge” are all vague, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, seek information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seek information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and are beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

36. Produce any and all documents relating to any consideration or deliberation by you to start making, manufacturing, and/or producing, atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products, including those identifying: the individuals involved in that decision making process; on what criteria or reasoning that decision was based; what studies or investigation (internal or otherwise) were done by you prior to the consideration or deliberation; and any individual(s) or departments who made any recommendations to the ultimate decision maker(s).

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects to inquiry regarding any effects of Atrazine other than human effects on the grounds that the Amended Complaint in paragraph 8 refers to adverse reactions in humans and the



purported common questions alleged in paragraph 23 address only whether Atrazine is harmful to humans, so that this Request is overbroad, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, and seeks information which is beyond the permissible scope of discovery. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

37. Produce any and all documents relating to any consideration or deliberation by you to stop manufacturing, producing, and/or making atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products, including those identifying: the individuals involved in that decision making process, on what criteria or reasoning that decision was based; what studies or investigation (internal or otherwise) were done by you prior to the consideration or deliberation; and any individual(s) or departments who made any recommendations to the ultimate decision maker(s).

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects to inquiry regarding any effects of Atrazine other than human effects on the grounds that the Amended Complaint in paragraph 8 refers to adverse reactions in humans and the purported common questions alleged in paragraph 23 address only whether Atrazine is harmful to humans, so that this Request is overbroad, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, and seeks information which is beyond the permissible scope of discovery. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

38. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to alternatives to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products which you have developed, are developing, have sold, are selling, or of which

you have knowledge, including documents referring or relating to:

- a. When it was first developed;
- b. Who developed it;
- c. Why it was developed;
- d. In what markets is it used, including but not limited to those markets where these products are no longer being used;
- e. For each such market, the date on which you first sold it;
- f. For each such market, the quantities you have sold, by year;
- g. The cost of producing it;
- h. All health risks posed by exposure to this alternative.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms “alternatives” and “constituents” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that inquiry into “alternatives” is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing in that Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint does not address or assert purported liability or damages based on “alternatives to atrazine.” Syngenta also objects on the grounds that inquiry into “alternatives to atrazine” and sub-paragraphs a.-h., inclusive, seek information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seek information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and are beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

39. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to the efficacy of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products, including but not limited to documents comparing crops grown with and without these products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta assumes that by use of the term “efficacy” Plaintiff intends/means “effectiveness;” otherwise, Syngenta objects to that term and also objects to the term “constituents” all on the grounds that they are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects to inquiry regarding any effects of Atrazine other than human effects on the grounds that the Amended Complaint in paragraph 8 refers to adverse reactions in humans and the purported common questions alleged in paragraph 23 address only whether Atrazine is harmful to humans, so that this Request is overbroad, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, and seeks information which is beyond the permissible scope of discovery. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without

waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

40. Produce any and all marketing plans, strategies, or objectives, or documents discussing marketing plans, strategies, or objectives that refer or relate to the sale of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

41. Produce any and all documents that discuss your corporate policy governing the procedures by which a product is researched, developed, tested, and marketed, and specifically all documents which discuss how these procedures were applied to the development of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request seeking documents regarding Syngenta’s “corporate policy governing the procedures by which a product is researched, developed, tested and marketed” for products other than Atrazine is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive harassing, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery, in that Syngenta develops and has developed literally hundreds of products in multiple fields in addition to and besides crop protection products, and Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint is limited to only one crop protection product, Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in

Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects to inquiry regarding any effects of Atrazine other than human effects on the grounds that the Amended Complaint in paragraph 8. refers to adverse reactions in humans and the purported common questions alleged in paragraph 23 address only whether Atrazine is harmful to humans, so that this Request is overbroad, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, and seeks information which is beyond the permissible scope of discovery.

42. Produce any and all documents that discuss your expenses, costs, budget, and financial reports referring or relating to research and development of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta objects to Request 42 on the grounds that the same seeks documents which constitute trade secrets and are highly confidential from business and competitive standpoints, including among various Defendants who are parties to parallel litigation. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery in that, among other things, Plaintiff's claim for punitive damages has been dismissed by the Court.

43. Produce any and all documents that discuss your expenses, costs, budget, and financial reports referring or relating to the cost of production of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta objects to Request 43 on the grounds that the same seeks documents which constitute trade secrets and are highly confidential from business and competitive standpoints, including among various Defendants who are parties to parallel litigation. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade

Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery in that, among other things, Plaintiff's claim for punitive damages has been dismissed by the Court.

44. Produce any and all documents relating or referring to your marketing and/or selling of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products in pure or partially-made forms. This request includes, but is not limited to documents depicting the names of the products, who you sold the products to, the quantities sold, when you sold the products, and/or the chemical make-up/composition of the respective product(s) that you marketed and/or sold.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta objects to Request 44 on the grounds that the same seeks documents which constitute trade secrets and are highly confidential from business and competitive standpoints, including among various Defendants who are parties to parallel litigation. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery in that, among other things, Plaintiff's claim for punitive damages has been dismissed by the Court.

45. Produce any and all contracts of sale between you and any customer regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 15 above. Syngenta objects to Request 45 on the grounds that the same seeks documents which constitute trade secrets and are highly confidential from business and competitive standpoints, including among various Defendants who are parties to parallel litigation. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome,

oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

46. Produce any and all documents relating or referring to any calculations or analyses you made, attempted to make, are in possession of, or are aware of regarding your share of the regional, national, and/or international markets and/or that of other manufacturers, co-ops, and/or wholesalers pertaining to sales of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta objects to Request 46 on the grounds that the same, to the extent they may exist, seeks documents which constitute trade secrets and are highly confidential from business and competitive standpoints, including among various Defendants who are parties to parallel litigation. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Further objecting, Syngenta states that inquiry into Syngenta’s “share of the regional, national, and/or international markets and/or that of other manufacturers, co-ops, and/or wholesalers” seeks legal conclusions, seeks information that is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery on the grounds that, among other things, the law in the State of Illinois does not recognize market share, enterprise, or any other theory of collective liability, and is also burdensome, oppressive, harassing, and seeks to embarrass and annoy Syngenta and the other parties referenced in said Request. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that the information sought in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain via web sites and otherwise, and is equally available to the Plaintiff.

47. Produce a printout of any database referring or relating to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products that you have developed, manufactured, marketed, supplied, or sold, including databases referring or relating to: (a) their names; (b) the dates during which they were developed, manufactured, marketed, supplied, or sold; (c) the geographic markets (i.e., country,

state, county, city) in which they were developed, manufactured, marketed, supplied, or sold; (d) the name of the entity, business, corporation, or individual who purchased them; and (e) the estimated annual quantity of products sold.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 15 above. Syngenta objects to Request 47 on the grounds that the same seeks documents which constitute trade secrets and are highly confidential from business and competitive standpoints, including among various Defendants who are parties to parallel litigation. Additionally, Syngenta objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents/databases protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, joint defense privilege, common interest doctrine, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery in that, among other things, Plaintiff's claim for punitive damages has been dismissed by the Court.

48. Produce any and all advertisements that you have placed regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products in any magazines, newspapers, periodicals, trade journals, catalogues, directories, brochures, circulars, or similar written or printed material.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 15 above. Syngenta objects to Request 48 on the grounds that the same seeks documents which constitute trade secrets and are highly confidential from business and competitive standpoints, including among various Defendants who are parties to parallel litigation. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain from publications, web sites and otherwise and is equally available to

Plaintiff.

49. Produce any and all documents and communications regarding your decision to or not to advertise relating to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms “communications” and “constituents” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the extent that this Request improperly seeks or is construed to inquire regarding post-remedial measures and/or post-sale duties to warn.

50. Produce any and all documents that relate to how you have used, marketed, and/or sold atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products after these products were no longer in use in a given location.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is non-sensical and calls for guess and speculation by Syngenta as to what is meant or intended by Plaintiff.

51. Produce any and all documents that relate to focus groups or surveys created, issued, organized, funded, led, supervised, contracted, or otherwise provided for by you regarding consumer, governmental, and/or the general public reactions and/or responses to questions and/or comments about potential or actual water contamination and/or health effects caused by atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects



on the grounds that the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Additionally, Syngenta objects to this Request on the grounds that, to the extent any such documents may exist, it seeks documents/information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, joint defense privilege, common interest doctrine, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection.

52. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products being banned or restricted in use by any governmental body or water provider, including copies of the actual orders, statutes, postings, or other documents that banned or restricted the use of the products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing, and the phrase “restricted in use” is vague, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, and calls for guess and speculation on the part of Syngenta. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that documents/information sought in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain via web sites and otherwise, and is equally available to the Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

53. Produce any and all documents and/or communications between yourself and any lobbyist regarding or relating to the manufacture, distribution, sale, regulation, registration, labeling, and/or potential legislation of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such

that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

54. Produce any and all documents and/or communications related to any proposed legislation to limit defendants' liability for contamination by atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Additionally, Syngenta objects to the extent that documents/information sought in this Request are available in the public domain via local, state and federal legislative web sites, records and otherwise, and are equally available to the Plaintiff.

55. Provide any and all documents between yourself and any foreign, U.S. or State politician, regulator, or agency including, but not limited to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), regarding or relating to the registration, reregistration, manufacture, distribution, sale, monitoring, banning, restricting, labeling, and setting of maximum contaminant level (MCL) of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, potential legislation or regulations concerning atrazine, and contamination of water resources due to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, 15 and 16 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “contamination” assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal, permissible presence at certain levels of Atrazine and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, in raw and treated drinking water. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta’s freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Additionally, Syngenta objects to the extent that documents/information sought in this Request are available in the public domain via state, federal and international (including the European Union [EU]) legislative web sites, records, the USEPA and its web site, and otherwise, and equally available to the Plaintiff.

56. Produce any and all documents which mention, concern, or relate to any representations made by you or any industry group of which you were a member to the public or to a state or federal agency relating to atrazine including, but not limited to any benefits or detriments of using atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents of such products in pesticides.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is duplicative and the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and docket from the USEPA web site and otherwise (see certain studies listed in Plaintiff’s Attachment A to its First Request to Produce filed contemporaneously herewith) and is equally available to Plaintiff.

Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

57. Produce any and all documents constituting or relating to any disclosures you made to the EPA, pursuant to the federal Toxic Substances Control Act or otherwise, regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical, parent Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and docket from the USEPA web site and otherwise (see certain studies listed in Plaintiff's Attachment A to its First Request to Produce filed contemporaneously herewith) and equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

58. Produce any and all documents constituting or relating to any disclosures made to the EPA, pursuant to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act or otherwise, regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such

that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and docket from the USEPA web site and otherwise (see certain studies listed in Plaintiff's Attachment A to its First Request to Produce filed contemporaneously herewith) and equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

59. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Senator Al D'Amato's 1994 proposed amendment to the Safe Drinking Water Act regarding testing for endocrine disruption.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that phrase "endocrine disruption" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects to the extent that documents/information sought in this Request are available in the public domain via federal legislative web sites, records, and otherwise, and are equally available to the Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

60. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to the July 2, 1987 report to the EPA by Monsanto showing the 1995 results of groundwater screening for atrazine, including copies of the report itself evidencing any notes made by you.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 7 above. Syngenta objects on the grounds that the dates referenced are confusing, possibly invented and non-sensical. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois,

includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, and includes groundwater for which Plaintiff does not plead any alleged liability or seek any damages, such that this Request is overbroad, oppressive, harassing, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and docket from the USEPA web site and otherwise and are equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

61. Produce any and all documents constituting or relating to any representations made to the EPA that atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products are not drinking water contaminants.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and docket from the USEPA web site and otherwise and are equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

62. Produce any and all documents relating to your involvement with any trade organizations or committees or other groups (whether formal or informal) involved in the development, study, or use of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products, including but not limited to: American Chemical Society (ACS), American Chemical Council (ACC), Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association (SOCMA), Crop Life America, American

Crop Protection Association, National Agricultural Chemicals Association, Chemical Manufacturers Association, Ecorisk, Center for Regulatory Effectiveness, Chlorine Chemistry Council, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Weed Science Society of America, Illinois Corn Marketing Board, Illinois Corn Growers Association, Indiana Corn Marketing Council, Indiana Corn Growers Association, Iowa Corn Promotion Board, Iowa Corn Growers Association, Kansas Corn Commission, Kansas Corn Growers Association, Kentucky Corn Growers Association, Missouri Corn Merchandising Council, Missouri Corn Growers Association, Nebraska Corn Board, Nebraska Corn Growers Association, North Dakota Corn Growers Association, Ohio Corn Growers Association, Virginia Grain Producers Association, Wisconsin Corn Growers Association, National Corn Growers Association, Corn Farmers Coalition, and the Triazine Network. This request is meant to include all meeting minutes from all such organizations, committees or groups as well as all communications both internal and to and from other members relating to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites of the referenced organizations, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

63. Produce any and all documents which mention, concern or relate to the book "Our Stolen Future," by authors Theo Colborn, Dianne Dumanoski and John Myers, New York, 1996, including documents identifying when and how you became aware of the book and of the authors' opinions, and your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry's reaction to the book, and any individual's attempts to discredit the authors' opinions.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms "industry[']s]" and "discredit" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or

specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites of the referenced organizations, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Syngenta further objects to the inquiry regarding “your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry’s reaction to the book” on the grounds that the same is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and calls for guess and speculation on the part of Syngenta. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

64. Produce any and all documents which mention, concern or relate to the article “The Economics of Atrazine,” by Frank Ackerman, International Journal of Environmental Health, 2007, including documents identifying when and how you became aware of the article and of the author’s opinions, your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry’s reaction to the paper, any individual’s attempts to discredit the author’s opinions, and all copies of this article that evidence notes written by you.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “industry[’s]” and “discredit” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites of the referenced organizations, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Syngenta further objects to the inquiry regarding “your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry’s reaction to the paper” on the grounds that the same is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and calls for guess and speculation on the part of Syngenta. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a



reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

65. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Tyrone Hayes, including but not limited to contracts of employment, work files, employment files, studies that he was involved in or commented on, internal memoranda, and/or communication with him during or after his employment with you regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that term “communications” and the phrase “including but not limited to” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, and calls for Syngenta to engage in guess and speculation. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is overbroad, seeks production of certain documents not in Syngenta’s possession or control, and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, certain of the information sought in this Request is available in the public domain, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

66. Produce any and all documents which mention, concern or relate to the following articles authored or coauthored by Tyrone Hayes, including documents identifying when and how you became aware of the papers and of the author’s opinions, and your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry’s reaction to the paper, any individual’s attempts to discredit the author’s opinions, and/or all copies of these articles that evidence notes written by you:
- a. “Hermaphroditic, Demasculinized Frogs After Exposure to the Herbicide Atrazine at Low Ecologically Relevant Doses,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, April 16, 2002;
  - b. “Feminization of Male Frogs in the Wild,” *Nature*, October, 2002;
  - c. “Atrazine-Induced Hermaphroditism at 0.1 ppb in American Leopard Frogs (*Rana pipiens*): Laboratory and Field Evidence,” *Environmental Health Perspectives*, April, 2003;
  - d. “A Risk-Based Assessment of Endocrine System Responses in Fish, Amphibians, and Reptiles to Atrazine,” *Novartis Crop Protection, Inc., Novartis Number 710-97*, 1997;

- e. "Atrazine Produces Hermaphrodites in Frogs: Connecting Laboratory and Field Studies," *University of CA, Berkeley*, 2001;
- f. "Atrazine-Induced Hermaphroditism at 0.1 ppb in American Leopard Frogs (*Rana pipiens*): Laboratory and Field Evidence," *Environmental Health Perspectives*, October 23, 2002;
- g. "There is No Denying This: Defusing the Confusion about Atrazine," *BioScience* 2004 Dec. vol. 54(12) 1138-1149., 2004;
- h. "Welcome to the Revolution: Integrative Biology and Assessing the Impact of Endocrine Disruptors on Environmental and Public Health," *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 321-329, 2005;
- i. "Characterization of Atrazine-Induced Gonadal Malformations in African Clawed Frogs (*Xenopus laevis*) and Comparisons with Affects of an Androgen Antagonist (cyproterone acetate) and Exogenous Estrogen," *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 2006;
- j. "Pesticide Mixtures, Endocrine Disruption, and Amphibian Declines: Are We Underestimating the Impact," *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 2006;
- k. "Atrazine-Induced Aromatase Expression is SF-1 Dependent. Implications for Endocrine Disruption in Wildlife and Reproductive Cancers in Humans," *Environmental Health Perspectives*, Vol. 115, No. 5, May 2007;
- l. "Herbicide Atrazine Activates SF-1 by Direct Affinity and Concomitant Co-activators Recruitments to Induce Aromatase Expression Via Promoter II," *Biochem. Biophysic. Res. Comm.* 355 (2007) 1012-1018, 2007.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "industry's" and "discredit" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain from the USEPA web site and equally available to Plaintiff. Syngenta further objects to the inquiry regarding "your knowledge and/or involvement in the industry's reaction to the papers" on the grounds that the same is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and calls for guess and speculation on the part of Syngenta. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

67. Produce any and all documents which mention, concern or relate to the article, "The Story of Syngenta & Tyrone Hayes at UC Berkeley: The Price of Research," Goldie Blumenstyk, The Chronicle of Higher Education v.50, i.10, October, 2003, including documents identifying when and how you became aware of the paper and of the author's opinions, and your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry's reaction to the paper, any individual's attempts to discredit the author's opinions, and all copies of this article that evidence notes written by you.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "industry[']s]" and "discredit" are is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta further objects to the inquiry regarding "your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry's reaction to the paper" on the grounds that the same is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and calls for guess and speculation on the part of Syngenta. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and is equally available to Plaintiff. Syngenta further objects to the inquiry regarding "your knowledge and/or involvement in the industry's reaction to the papers" on the grounds that the same is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and calls for guess and speculation on the part of Syngenta. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonably agreeable date in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

68. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Dawn Forsythe, including but not limited to contracts of employment, work files, employment files, communication with her during or after her employment with you, and/or internal memoranda between you and her or about her regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products. This request includes, but is not limited to, copies and drafts of, and any documents referring or related to the papers/documents mentioned in her interview with Frontline--the "Iowa paper" that she refers to where her "whole section on breast cancer was dropped" and the paper by wildlife biologists regarding endocrine disruptions, including any copies of the papers or drafts evidencing notes by you.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work

product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the phrase “endocrine disruption” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta also objects on the grounds that “Frontline—the ‘Iowa paper’” and “the paper by wildlife biologists regarding endocrine disruption” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, and overbroad. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from the publications identified herein and from web sites, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

69. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Paul Wotzka and his research, statements, and efforts regarding atrazine contamination in Minnesota.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 7 above. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the phrase “his efforts” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta

states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

70. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Daniel M. Byrd, III and/or any other member of Consultants in Toxicology, Risk Assessment and Public Safety (CTRAPS), including but not limited to any correspondence with him/them, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to him/them, any contracts entered into with him or them, any reports, proposals, or other documents he/they submitted on your behalf, any work files and/or studies he/they was/were involved in for you or commented on, and any drafts of any documents prepared by him/them evidencing notes by you regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

71. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Glen Van der Kraak of the University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, including but not limited to any correspondence with him, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to him, any contracts entered into with him, any reports, proposals, or other documents he submitted on your behalf, any work files and/or studies he was involved in for you or commented on, and any drafts of any documents prepared by him evidencing notes by you regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA (to the extent it may apply) and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection, including those of the nation of Canada and the Province of Ontario. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable national and provincial laws and state constitutional equivalents thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

72. Produce any and all documents referring or related to John P. Giesy, including but not limited to any correspondence with him, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to him, any contracts entered into with him, any reports, proposals, or other documents he submitted on your behalf, any work files and/or studies he was involved in for you or commented on, and any drafts of any documents prepared by him evidencing notes by you regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms "constituents" and "degradates" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and,

therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

73. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Timothy Pastoor, including but not limited to any correspondence with him, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to him, any contracts entered into with him, any reports, proposals, or other documents he submitted on your behalf, any work files and/or studies he was involved in for you or commented on, and any drafts of any documents prepared by him evidencing notes by you regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form

requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

74. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Stephen Safe, including but not limited to any correspondence with him, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to him, any contracts entered into with him, any reports, proposals, or other documents he submitted on your behalf, any work files and/or studies he was involved in for you or commented on, and any drafts of any documents prepared by him evidencing notes by you regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, any privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

75. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Suzanne Williams, including but not limited to contracts of employment and work files that are in your possession regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.



RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

76. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Tim Gross, including but not limited to any correspondence between Tyrone Hayes and him, any other correspondence between you and him, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to him, any contracts that you entered into with him, any reports, proposals, or other documents he submitted on your behalf, any work files and/or studies he was involved in for you or Ecorisk or commented on, and any drafts of any documents prepared by him evidencing notes by you regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and

immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

77. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Ron Kendall, including but not limited to contracts of employment, work files and/or studies he was involved in for you or Ecorisk or commented on that are in your possession regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms "constituents" and "degradates" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad, calls for production of documents that are not within Syngenta's possession or control, is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is

currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

78. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Darcy Kelley, including but not limited to contracts of employment, work files and/or studies Darcy Kelley was involved in for you or Ecorisk or commented on that are in your possession regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad, calls for production of documents that are not within Syngenta's possession or control, is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

79. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Louis du Preez, including but not limited to any correspondence with him, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to him, any contracts entered into with him, any reports, proposals, or other documents he submitted on your behalf, any work files and/or studies he was involved in for you or commented on, and any drafts of any documents prepared by him evidencing notes by you regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request

seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, and any privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection, including those of the nation of South Africa. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state and national laws and constitutional equivalents thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

80. Produce any and all documents referring or related to James Carr, including but not limited to any correspondence with him, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to him, any contracts entered into with him, any reports, proposals, or other documents he submitted on your behalf, any work files and/or studies he was involved in for you or commented on, and any drafts of any documents prepared by him evidencing notes by you regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad, calls for production of documents that are not within Syngenta's possession or control, is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is

irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

81. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Jay Vroom, Crop Protection Research Institute, or CropLife Foundation, including but not limited to any correspondence with him/them, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to him/them, and any contracts entered into with him/them pertaining to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

82. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Alex Avery and/or the Center for Global Food Issues at Hudson Institute, including but not limited to any correspondence with him/them, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid,

or any other transfer of value from you to him/them, and any contracts entered into with him/them pertaining to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

83. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Jere White, the Triazine Network, the Kansas Corn Growers Association, the Kansas Grain Producers Association, and/or any other agricultural or farm associations, cooperatives, trade associations, or any other organization that advertises, endorses, supports, or in any way promotes the use of atrazine and/or atrazine-containing products, including but not limited to any correspondence with him/them, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to him/them, and any contracts entered into with him/them pertaining to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to this Request to the extent that it inquires regarding "and/or any other agricultural or farm associations, cooperatives, trade associations, or any other organization that advertises, endorses, supports, or in any way promotes the use of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents," on the grounds that the same is vague, ambiguous, seeks information that is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in

this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, HIPAA and other privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

84. Produce any and all documents referring or related to your involvement with local and/or national media regarding the present lawsuit, including but not limited to any correspondence with them and/ any press releases issued and/or drafted, and any copies or drafts of such documents evidencing notes by you.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms/phrases "local and/or national media" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, unlimited, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, joint defense privilege, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in

this Request is available in the public domain and web sites of the referenced organizations, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff.

85. Produce any and all documents referring or related to Jim Tozzi and/or the Center for Regulatory Effectiveness, including but not limited to any correspondence with him/them, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to him/them, and any contracts entered into with him/them pertaining to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term “constituents” is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, any privacy rules, regulations and laws, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, is not limited to the allegations of Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint, and, therefore, includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is at least partially available in the public domain and from web sites, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta’s freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof.

86. Produce any and all documents which mention, concern, or relate to any of the following articles by Paul MacLennan, *et al.*, including, but not limited to, documents identifying when and how you became aware of the papers and of the authors’ opinions, and your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry’s reaction to the paper, and any individual’s attempts to discredit the authors’ opinions:
- a. “Cancer Incidence Among Triazine Herbicide Manufacturing Workers,” 2002.
  - b. “Mortality Among Triazine Manufacturing Workers,” 2003.
  - c. “Mortality Among Workers at Two Triazine Manufacturing Plants,” 1996.
  - d. “Review of Epidemiologic Studies of Triazine Herbicides and Cancer,” 1997.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms “industry[’s]” and “discredit” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects to the inquiry regarding “your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry’s reaction to the



paper” on the grounds that the same is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and calls for guess and speculation on the part of Syngenta. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites of the referenced organizations, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta’s freedoms of speech, assembly, association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

87. Produce all documents and/or communications relating to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products from the files of:

- a. Ackerman, L.;
- b. Alexander, C.;
- c. Arni, P.;
- d. Arthur, A.;
- e. Austin, H.;
- f. Bachmann, M.;
- g. Baker, D.;
- h. Ballantine, L.;
- i. Baranyanie, J.;
- j. Batastini, G.;
- k. Beall, C.;
- l. Bennet, R.;
- m. Brady, J.;
- n. Breckenridge, Charles;
- o. Brill, I.;
- p. Brinkley, C.;
- q. Brusick, D.;

r.	Caballa, S.;
s.	Cassidy, D.;
t.	Ceresa, C.;
u.	Chau, R.;
v.	Cheung, M.;
w.	Chow, E.;
x.	Christensen, B.;
y.	Clarkson, J.;
z.	Cockrell, K.;
aa.	Cole, P.;
bb.	Davidson, IWF;
cc.	DeGeare, M.;
dd.	Delzell, E.;
ee.	Dickson, G.;
ff.	Drake, J.;
gg.	Druschell C.;
hh.	Dunsire, J.;
ii.	Fitzgerald, R.;
jj.	Ford, Sherry;
kk.	Fritz, H.;
ll.	Gass, R.;
mm.	Gersprach, R.;
nn.	Giknis, M.;
oo.	Gilles, P.;
pp.	Gonzalez-Valero, Juan;
qq.	Green, J.D.;
rr.	Hazelette, J.R.;
ss.	Hedley, D.;
tt.	Hofherr, W.;
uu.	Honeycutt, R.;
vv.	Hool, G.;
ww.	Hosmer, Alan;
xx.	Hui, X.;
yy.	Hummel, H.;
zz.	Infurna, R.;
aaa.	Iyer, V.;
bbb.	Jack, L.;
ccc.	Jessup, D.;
ddd.	Johnson, E.;
eee.	Kahrs, R.;
fff.	Katz, R.;
ggg.	Keller, J.;
hhh.	Knight, Frank;
iii.	Kuhn, J.;
jjj.	Langauer, M.;
kkk.	Lobdell, B.;

lll.	Lowe, Kimberly Nesci;
mmm.	Madrid, S.;
nnn.	Maibach, H.;
ooo.	Mainiero, J.;
ppp.	Martin, Duane;
qqq.	Marty, J.;
rrr.	McCormick, G.C.;
sss.	McFarland, Janis;
ttt.	Merritt, Andrew;
uuu.	Metha, C.;
vvv.	Miles, J.;
www.	Morris, Jeffrey;
xxx.	Morseth, S.;
yyy.	Mueller, D.;
zzz.	Murphy, T.;
aaaa.	Newby, L.;
bbbb.	Nichols, M.;
cccc.	O'Connor, DJ;
dddd.	Ogorek, B.;
eeee.	Orr, G.R.;
ffff.	Parish, Thomas;
gggg.	Parshley, Tom;
hhhh.	Paul, H.;
iiii.	Pettersen, J.;
jjjj.	Philips, J.;
kkkk.	Richards, R.;
llll.	Richter, A.;
mmmm.	Rosenheck, L.;
nnnn.	Rossi, Lois;
oooo.	Rudzki, M.;
pppp.	S. Emeigh, Hart;
qqqq.	Sabol, E.;
rrrr.	Sathiakumar, M.;
ssss.	Selman, Frank;
tttt.	Simoneaux, B.;
uuuu.	Slaughter, N.;
vvvv.	Smith, P.
www.	Spickler, Larry;
xxxx.	Spindker, M.;
yyyy.	Stalder, G.;
zzzz.	Stephens, Dr. James;
aaaaa.	Sumner, D.;
bbbbb.	Terranova, P.;
ccccc.	Thakur, A.;
dddd.	Thede, B.;
eeee.	Thompson, S.;

fffff.	Tierney C.;
ggggg.	Tierney, Dennis;
hhhhh.	Tompkins, Jim;
iiii.	Turnier, J.;
jjjjj.	Wester, R.;
kkkkk.	Wetzel, L.;
llll.	Woodard, G.;
mmmmm.	Woodard, M.;
nnnn.	Yau, ET;
ooooo.	Yokley, R.;
ppppp.	Youreneff, M.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms “constituents,” and “communications” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that the Request does not give sufficient identifying information regarding certain persons, and Syngenta does not presently recognize all such persons to know whether they are current or former employees such that the Request is vague, ambiguous and calls for guess and speculation on the part of Syngenta. To the extent the referenced persons are not current or former employees of Syngenta, the Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and seeks documents/information which is not in the possession of Syngenta but third parties over whom Syngenta has no control. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

88. Produce any and all documents referring or related to the following individuals, including but not limited to any correspondence with them, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to them, and any contracts entered into with them pertaining to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products:
  - a. Bennet, R.;
  - b. Breckenridge, Charles;

- c. DeGeare, M.;
- d. Delzell, E.;
- e. Dickson, Gary;
- f. Honeycutt, R.;
- g. Robert, Bruce;
- h. Sathiakumar, M.;
- i. Smith, Ernest;
- j. Solomon, Keith;
- k. Squire, Dr. Robert;
- l. Steeger, Thomas;
- m. Stroker, Tammy.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms “constituents” and “communications” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Syngenta objects to the extent that the Request does not give sufficient identifying information regarding certain persons, some persons are not past or present employees of Syngenta, and Syngenta does not presently recognize all persons to know whether they are current or former employees such that the Request is vague, ambiguous and calls for guess and speculation on the part of Syngenta. To the extent the referenced persons are not current or former employees of Syngenta, the Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and seeks documents/information which is not in the possession of Syngenta but third parties over whom Syngenta has no control. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta’s freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

- 89. Produce any and all documents referring or related to the Ecorisk panel, including but not limited to documents discussing its formation, purpose, goals, marketing to potential members, recruitment of members, communications about and with all members,

communications with any political organization, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to them, and any contracts entered into with them pertaining to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms “constituents” and “communications” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. To the extent that EcoRisk is a legal entity separate and apart from Syngenta, and the participants thereof are not current or former employees of Syngenta, the Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and seeks documents/information which is not in the possession of Syngenta but third parties over whom Syngenta has no control. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects to the inquiry regarding “communications with any political organization” on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta’s freedoms of speech, assembly, and association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Moreover, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites of the referenced organization, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

90. Produce any and all documents referring or related to the Acetochlor Registration Partnership (ARP), including but not limited to any correspondence with them, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to them, and any contracts entered into with them pertaining to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. To the extent that the Acetochlor Registration Partnership (ARP) is an organization/partnership/ entity separate and apart from Syngenta, the Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and seeks documents/information which is not in the possession of Syngenta but third parties over whom Syngenta has no control. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this

Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites of the referenced organization, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

91. Produce any and all documents relating or referring to atrazine studies, discussions, symposia, meetings held, organized, or performed by the Endocrine Disruptors Group at the University of Missouri-Columbia, including documents referring or related to any and all members of that group.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the phrase "Endocrine Disruptors" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. To the extent that the "Endocrine Disruptors Group" is an organization separate and apart from Syngenta, the Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and seeks documents/information which is not in the possession of Syngenta but third parties over whom Syngenta has no control. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites of the referenced organization, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff.

92. Produce any and all documents referring or related to the Atrazine Monitoring Ecological Effects Workgroup, including but not limited to any correspondence with them, any documents evidencing monies, contributions, donations, or fees paid, or any other transfer of value from you to them, and any contracts entered into with them pertaining to atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. To the extent that the

“Atrazine Monitoring Ecological Effects Workgroup” is an organization separate and apart from Syngenta, the Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and seeks documents/information which is not in the possession of Syngenta but third parties over whom Syngenta has no control. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites of the referenced organization, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff.

93. Produce any and all documents which mention, concern or relate to the article “Triazine Herbicide Exposure and Breast Cancer Incidence: An Ecologic Study of Kentucky Counties,” by Michele A. Kettles, et al., Environmental Health Perspectives, Vol. 105, No. 11, November 1997, pp. 1222-1227, including documents identifying when and how you became aware of the article and of the authors’ opinions, your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry’s reaction to the paper, any individual’s attempts to discredit the authors’ opinions, and all copies of this article that evidence notes written by you.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms “industry[’s]” and “discredit” are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites of the referenced organizations, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Syngenta further objects to the inquiry regarding “your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry’s reaction to the paper” on the grounds that the same is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and calls for guess and speculation on the part of Syngenta. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.



94. Produce any and all documents which mention, concern or relate to the article "Cancer Incidence Among Pesticide Applicators Exposed to Atrazine in Agricultural Health Study," by J.A. Rusiecki, A. De Roos, et al., Journal of the National Cancer Institute 96, 2004, pp 1375-1382, including documents identifying when and how you became aware of the article and of the authors' opinions, your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry's reaction to the paper, any individual's attempts to discredit the authors' opinions, and all copies of this article that evidence notes written by you.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms "industry['s]" and "discredit" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites of the referenced organizations, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Syngenta further objects to the inquiry regarding "your knowledge of and/or involvement in the industry's reaction to the paper" on the grounds that the same is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and calls for guess and speculation on the part of Syngenta. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

95. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to lawsuits and/or consent decree(s) between the EPA and the National Resources Defense Counsel ("NRDC") regarding atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites, including those of the USEPA and the NRDC, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the Request seeks to invade the confidentiality of settlement communications and agreements and the Illinois and U.S. laws and public policy which promote and/or protect the settlement of disputes.

96. Produce any and all documents and communication which mention, concern or relate to your meetings with EPA in 2004 and/or 2005 that relate or refer to NRDC's lawsuit against the EPA regarding atrazine.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "communication" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography, and is not limited to Illinois, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain and web sites, including those of the USEPA and the NRDC, and otherwise, and are equally available to Plaintiff. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks to violate and invade Syngenta's freedoms of speech, assembly, association guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, its freedom to petition for redress of grievances under the First Amendment, its rights to procedural and substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and its rights to equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Illinois and other applicable state constitutional equivalents thereof. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the Request seeks to invade the confidentiality of settlement communications and agreements and the Illinois and U.S. laws and public policy which promote and/or protect the settlement of disputes.

97. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to each person employed or hired by you who has provided testimony (by deposition, trial, hearing, affidavit, or other sworn manner), as well as the testimony itself, in any litigation or administrative proceeding involving contamination of water resources and/or the health effects by/of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, 15 and 16 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms "constituents" and "contamination" are vague,

ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, certain of the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain through public court files; to the extent that any such documents are governed by or subject to a protective order, then Syngenta cannot produce the same outside the limits thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond (including advising Plaintiff of any issues surrounding requested documents that are subject to a protective or other similar order or restraint) at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

98. Produce any and all documents, including communications, referring or relating to any litigation or administrative proceeding involving contamination of water resources and/or the health effects by/of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, 15 and 16 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that the term "contamination" assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal, permissible presence at certain levels Atrazine and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, in raw and treated drinking water. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request gives vastly overbroad, especially in not restricting the communications to which it refers, and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Further objecting, Syngenta states that certain of the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain through public court files; to the extent that any such documents are governed by or subject to a protective order, then Syngenta cannot produce the same outside the limits thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing

on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond (including advising Plaintiff of any issues surrounding requested documents that are subject to a protective or other similar order or restraint) at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

99. Produce any and all documents that relate or refer to the trial and appellate litigation of *Lemaire v. CIBA-GEIGY Corp.*, 99-1809 (La.App. 1 Cir. 6/22/01), 793 So.2d 336, including but not limited to requests for information, documents, witness statements, and/or other information concerning atrazine and responses thereto, communications to and from any of your expert witnesses concerning their testimony or potential testimony in the lawsuits, including requests for information, documents and/or other information concerning plant operations, atrazine distribution, atrazine, and/or the health effects of atrazine.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2 and 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms "constituents" and "communications" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Additionally, Syngenta objects to the extent that the Request seeks documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, joint defense privilege, common interest doctrine, insure-insured privilege, consulting expert privilege, and any other applicable Illinois, Louisiana or other legal privileges or protections. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, certain of the information requested in this Request is available in the public domain through public court files; to the extent that any such documents are governed by or subject to a protective order, then Syngenta cannot produce the same outside the limits thereof. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond (including advising Plaintiff of any issues surrounding requested documents that are subject to a protective or other similar order or restraint) at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

100. Produce any and all documents referring to, relating to, or constituting insurance policies in which you are a named insured or additional insured and which you claim covers you

for the events alleged against you in this action.

RESPONSE: See objection to Definition 7 above. Syngenta further objects to this Request to the extent that the requested documents are extremely voluminous. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, and subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, Syngenta states that it will respond to this Request with a listing of the insurers, policy dates and policy periods at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

101. Produce any and all documents referring or relating to communications between you and any insurer or potential insurer concerning atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, and insurer-insured privilege. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that it will respond to this Request at a reasonable date and time in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

102. Produce any and all documents which referring or relating to risk and/or cost assessments regarding potential third party claims for property and/or water resource(s) contamination as a result of releases of atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7 and 15 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms "constituents" and "contamination," and the phrase "risk and/or cost assessments" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Additionally, Syngenta objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, insurer-insured privilege, the consulting expert privilege, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

103. Produce any and all records of any citation(s) issued to you by any governmental agency, domestic or foreign, concerning contamination of water resources by atrazine, atrazine-

containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 15, 16 and 17 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the term "constituents" is vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that the term "contamination" assumes facts not in evidence and mischaracterizes the legal, permissible presence at certain levels of technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, in raw and treated drinking water. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

104. Produce any and all records of fines or penalties assessed against you by any governmental agency, domestic or foreign, concerning contamination of water resources by atrazine, atrazine-containing products, triazines, triazine-containing products, and/or constituents or degradates of such products.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 15 and 16 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that the terms "constituents" and "contamination" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

105. Produce any and all documents relating to your corporate history, including at a minimum, documents relating to:

- a. The date of formation or first incorporation;
- b. The state in you were formed or first incorporated;
- c. Your present state of incorporation (if different from initial incorporation);
- d. Any corporate or business name changes;
- e. Any purchases by or mergers with you of any other business or corporation, and the dates these occurred;
- f. The states and countries in which you are authorized to do business;

- g. The name and address of all parent and subsidiary corporations;
- h. Organizational charts of your present and historical corporate structures;  
and
- i. The corporate relationship among all of your parent and subsidiary corporations.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 7 and 17 above. Syngenta further objects to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, seeks to annoy Syngenta, harassing, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois, and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks information which is available in the public domain through various means, including web sites and governmental documents, and is equally available to Plaintiff. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request calls for legal conclusions to the extent it seeks information regarding the "corporate relationship among all of your parent and subsidiary corporations." Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that it will respond to this Request at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

- 106. Produce any and all documents (such as organizational charts or rosters) identifying your present and historical members of management, including:
  - a. Board of Directors member[s];
  - b. Chief Executive Officer;
  - c. Chief Financial Officer;
  - d. Director of Marketing, or equivalent, who was responsible for marketing atrazine or atrazine-containing products throughout the United States;
  - e. Director of Marketing, or equivalent, who was responsible for marketing atrazine or atrazine-containing products throughout Illinois;
  - f. Toxicologist, or equivalent, who was responsible for assessing the health risks associated with atrazine;
  - g. Endocrinologist, or equivalent, who was responsible for assessing the health risks associated with atrazine;
  - h. Environmental Health and Safety Manager, or equivalent, who was responsible for environmental, health and safety issues.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 2, 7, 9 and 17 above. Syngenta objects to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, harassing, seeks to embarrass and annoy senior officers and directors of Syngenta, seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request is vastly overbroad and is not limited in time, geography or specific or limited markets, or to the State of Illinois (except for sub-paragraph e.), and includes substances other than technical and/or commercial grade Atrazine, and the three (3) breakdown substances identified by Plaintiff in its Amended Complaint and set forth in Response to Definition 2 above, such that this Request seeks information which is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case, seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence at trial, and is beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Additionally, Syngenta objects on the grounds that this Request seeks information which is available in the public domain through various means and is equally available to Plaintiff. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request calls for legal conclusions to the extent it seeks information regarding the "corporate relationship among all of your parent and subsidiary corporations." Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, to the extent it has responsive information, it will respond regarding persons presently holding the positions set forth in sub-paragraphs d. (limited to the State of Illinois)-h., inclusive, at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

107. Produce any and all documents which you identified in, referred to, or relied upon in answering the accompanying set of Interrogatories.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7 above. Syngenta further objects to this Request to the extent it seeks documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, joint defense privilege, insurer-insured privilege, consulting expert privilege, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Subject to the foregoing objections, and subject to all of the objections set forth in its Objections and Responses to Plaintiff's First Requests for Production and Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories, filed contemporaneously herewith, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

108. Produce your current records retention policies and any prior records retention policies



for documents of the type requested in these Requests for Production or inquired about in the accompanying Interrogatories.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definition 7 above. Syngenta further objects on the grounds that this Request is not reasonably limited in time or geography or to Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc. Syngenta also objects on the grounds that the phrase "of the type requested" is vague and ambiguous. Subject to the foregoing objections, and without waiving the same, subject to the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order, and to the extent that the requested information or documents are already in existence and reasonably available in the form requested by Plaintiff, Syngenta states that upon completion of its review of business records it has available and it is currently reviewing, it will respond regarding its document retention policies at a reasonable date and place in the future to be agreed to between the parties or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

109. Produce all versions of each document in your possession listed in Attachment A to this First Requests for Production, including but not limited to any copies that evidence notes or other writings by you, and all documents referring or relating to the documents listed in Attachment A.

RESPONSE: See objections to Definitions 7 and 17 above. Syngenta further objects to this Request to the extent it seeks documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, self-critical analysis privilege, common interest doctrine, joint defense privilege, insurer-insured privilege, consulting expert privilege, and any other applicable legal privilege or protection. Syngenta further objects to this Request on the grounds that the same is: overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing; not reasonably limited in time, geography or to Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc.; vague and ambiguous in that in certain instances there is insufficient information to locate the referenced document or the information provided is incorrect with respect to author, title, date and/or identifying information such that Syngenta has been unable to locate the same; seeks information which is in the possession of third parties over which Syngenta has no control; certain of the referenced documents are available in the public domain or through the USEPA web site, or otherwise and, therefore, are equally available to Plaintiff; and that the time and expense involved in searching for and retrieving the requested documents in Request 109 and all the documents requested in Plaintiff's First Request to Produce is extra-ordinary and should be reimbursed to Syngenta and no such provision has yet been established between the parties or by order of the Court.

Dated: June 22, 2009

**AS TO OBJECTIONS ONLY:**

**REEG LAWYERS, LLC**

Respectfully submitted,

BY: Kurtis B. Reeg

Kurtis B. Reeg, ARDC #3126350

One North Brentwood Blvd., Suite 950

St. Louis, MO 63105

Telephone: (314) 446-3350

Facsimile: (314) 446-3360

[kreeg@reeglawfirm.com](mailto:kreeg@reeglawfirm.com)

– and –

**ADAMS & REESE, LLP**

Mark C. Surprenant, (*admitted pro hac vice*)

One Shell Plaza, Suite 4500

New Orleans, LA 70139

Telephone: (504) 581-3234

Facsimile: (504) 566-0210

*Attorneys for Defendant Syngenta Crop  
Protection, Inc.*

# CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2009, I caused to be served the attached via **Hand Delivery**, upon the following counsel:

TO: Stephen M. Tillery, Esq.  
Christine Moody, Esq.  
Korein Tillery, L.L.C.  
U.S. Bank Plaza  
505 North 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3600  
St. Louis, MO 63101

with a copy sent via United States mail, properly addressed and postage paid, upon the following counsel:

Mr. Scott Summy  
Baron & Budd  
3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 1100  
Dallas, TX 75219

**Attorneys for Plaintiff  
HOLIDAY SHORES SANITARY DISTRICT**

John A. Schwartz