

Hampshire's Supplemental Responses to Requests for Admissions Abate II 11/23/93

- a. 1921 - 1929;
- b. 1930 - 1935;
- c. 1936 - 1940;
- d. 1941 - 1945;
- e. 1946 - 1950;
- f. 1951 - 1955;
- g. 1956 - 1960;
- h. 1961 - 1965;
- i. 1966 - 1970;
- j. 1971 - 1975;
- k. 1976 - 1980;
- l. 1981 - 1985.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 44:

Admitted as to periods a through g. Denied as to periods h through l.

REQUEST NO. 45:

In the following time periods, John H. Hampshire owned stock in the United States Gypsum Company:

- a. 1930-1935;
- b. 1936-1940;
- c. 1941-1945;
- d. 1946-1950;
- e. 1951-1955;
- f. 1956-1960;
- g. 1961-1965;
- h. 1966-1970;
- i. 1971-1975;
- j. 1976-1980;
- k. 1981-1985.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 45:

Denied. Hampshire has no knowledge with respect to John H. Hampshire's ownership of stock in United States Gypsum Company.

REQUEST NO. 46:

Between 1921 and 1980 your company vehicles included:

- a. Automobile;
- b. Station Wagon;
- c. Van;
- d. Pick-Up Truck;
- e. Stake Body Truck;

LAW OFFICES
THOMAS & LIBOWITZ, P.A.
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
FIFTH FLOOR
600 N. CHARLES STREET
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
21201-4305



Hampshire's Supplemental Responses to Requests for
Admission Abate II 11/23/93

f. Tractor Trailer.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 46:

Admitted as to a through f.

REQUEST NO. 47:

Between 1921 and 1980 your company name appeared on the following company vehicles:

- a. Automobile;
- b. Station Wagon;
- c. Van;
- d. Pick-Up Truck;
- e. Stake Body Truck;
- f. Tractor Trailer.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 47:

Denied as to a through d. Admitted as to e and f.

REQUEST NO. 48:

At various times between 1930 and 1985, your company vehicles supplied, delivered and/or transported asbestos-containing products to the jobs listed in Part I, Request No. 3 above.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 48:

Denied, except at various times Hampshire's vehicles transported materials that may have contained asbestos to all jobsites or jobsite types admitted in Request No. 3 to be worksites where Hampshire may have used asbestos-containing materials in construction of buildings, although Hampshire has no record of working or transporting any materials to Maryland Shipbuilding and Drydock or Allegany Ballistic Labs. Further, notwithstanding the aforesaid, Hampshire objects to this request in the context of the claim of Mary Matilda Wilson (Case No. 92230504), as there is no record that Hampshire ever transported any such materials to a worksite where Charles Wilson was allegedly working, so that this