

1 Alan J. Gould SBN 68446
2 Law Office of Gould and Hahn
3 5801 Christie Ave, suite 385
4 Emeryville, CA 94608
5 Tel. 510-428-2229, fax 510-428-2232
6 panel@eastbaylaw.com

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Attorneys (co-counsel) for Plaintiffs
Andrew Shalaby and Sonia Dunn-Ruiz

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANDREW SHALABY and SONIA
DUNN-RUIZ,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

NEWELL RUBBERMAID, INC.,
IRWIN INDUSTRIAL TOOL
COMPANY, INC., a wholly owned
subsidiary of NEWELL
RUBBERMAID, INC.;
BERNZOMATIC, an Unincorporated
Division of IRWIN INDUSTRIAL
TOOL COMPANY; THE HOME
DEPOT, INC.; and DOES 2 through
100, inclusive

Defendants.

And related cross-complaints.

Case Number Case No. C 07cv2107
MMA

**DECLARATION OF DR. ROBERT
N. ANDERSON IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT
EXPERT DISCOVERY AND IN
SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND
RELATED MOTIONS**

Date: Febraury 6, 2009
Time: 2:30 p.m.
Courtroom: 5
Judge: Hon. Michael M. Anello

1 I, Robert N. Anderson, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an expert witness retained by Plaintiff Andrew W. Shalaby and
3 Sonia Shalaby (hereinafter “Plaintiffs”) in this action.

4 2. I have been retained to examine all available evidence and testimony and
5 provide an expert opinion as to the cause of the breach of a Bernzomatic-brand MAPP
6 gas cylinder and torch, which caused Plaintiff’s injuries on April 21, 2006. A photo
7 of the actual MAPP gas cylinder and torch causing Plaintiff’s injuries, taken before
8 the accident, was provided to me and is shown in fig. 1 below.



9
10
11
12 fig. 1
13
14
15
16
17
18
19



20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

3. Based on the preliminary information provided, there was reason to suspect that the brazed “bushing” of the subject cylinder had failed. The “bushing” as referenced herein is the threaded assembly welded on top of the cylinder, as shown in fig. 2 above, at the area of insertion of the card. The area of insertion of the card shows the area of defect on an exemplar purchased in September 2008.

4. On or about September 24, 2008 I was contacted directly by Plaintiff Andrew W. Shalaby and asked whether or not his recent recollection of certain events could be accurate and consistent with the physical description of the damage to the

1 Bernzomatic MAPP gas cylinder which had caused his injuries on April 21, 2006.
2 Mr. Shalaby also revealed to me that his right index finger had not been substantially
3 injured, indicating that his earlier belief that he may have been holding the cylinder
4 by the torch handle and depressing the button at the time of the explosion could not
5 have been correct. I observed this to be the case, because his index finger as shown
6 in fig. 3 below would have rested directly over the area of the breach, fig. 4 (from an
7 exemplar), and would have been badly injured..



8
9
10
11
12
13
14 fig. 3



Fig. 4 (exemplar)

15 Mr. Shalaby brought to my attention the existence of a safety “fracture groove”
16 located on the Bernzomatic TS4000 torch handles such as the one Mr. Shalaby was
17 using at the time of his injuries. Mr. Shalaby provided me with a package insert
18 accompanying his purchase of a TS4000 torch and cylinder kit a few days earlier. The
19 insert explains the fracture groove and its intended purpose, as shown in fig. 5 below.
20

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 fig. 5



1 5. To confirm Mr. Shalaby's recollection of events, and further investigate
2 based on the above observations, on September 26, 2008 I performed stress tests on
3 three TS4000 torch handles, and on the "bushing" of a new Bernzomatic MAPP gas
4 cylinder. The torch handles were tested on a machine measuring the amount of force
5 required to fracture the fracture grooves, as shown in figure 6 below:



13 fig. 6



14 fig. 7

15 The fracture grooves of the two torch handles fractured at 22, 23, and a third torch
16 handle utilizing a reduced-thickness fracture area (a re-design of approximately June
17 2005) fractured at 26 foot-pounds (fig. 7, re-design shown as "Exp. 1").

18 6. Next, we tested the amount of force required to cause a fracture or
19 separation at the bushing by applying force at the torch handle, below the fracture line,
20 as shown in fig. 8.



21 fig. 8



22 fig. 9

23 The cylinder used was one evidencing no defects at the bushing (compare fig. 9 to fig.
24
25
26
27
28

1 2 on page 2). A force of 152 pounds was applied directly to the torch handle, below
2 the fracture groove (fig. 8). The cylinder bushing (valve) began to bend at 15 foot-
3 pounds of force, and bent as shown in fig. 9, but did not breach or separate.

4
5 7. The above tests revealed the following:

6
7 (a) The observations of figures 3 and 4 above indicate Mr. Shalaby could
8 not have held the cylinder / torch assembly by the torch handle at the
9 time of explosion because his index finger did not sustain any significant
10 injuries.

11
12 (b) Consistent with the defendants' experts Dr. Thomas Eager's findings, as
13 well as Mr. Shalaby's recollection, a force was applied to the tip of the
14 torch handle, at the point of greatest leverage.

15
16 (c) Consistent with the fact that the bushing area was the area of breach as
17 shown in the exemplars in fig. 10 and 11 below (taken from the "Gertz"
18 and "Vanderlinde" cases posted at www.bernzomaticinjuries.com ,
19 located under the "lawsuits" tab), it would have been impossible for Mr.
20 Shalaby to have been holding the assembly by the torch handle itself. If
21 the assembly were held by the torch handle, any force applied to the
22 torch tip would not be able to transfer to the bushing area, but would
23 cease at the point of origin, the torch handle itself. This evidences
24 establishes that Mr. Shalaby was holding the assembly by the yellow
25 MAPP cylinder, consistent with his September 2008 recollection.
26
27
28



fig. 10

fig. 11

- (d) Consistent with the fact that the subject cylinder was not bent at the “dome” in the manner shown in fig. 9 (as opposed to at the “separation” bends shown in figs 10 and 11 above), the force applied to the tip of the torch handle Mr. Shalaby was using at the time of his injury was well below 15 foot-pounds (absence of bending means force was below 15 foot-pounds).
- (f) Consistent with Mr. Shalaby’s recollection, the point of impact was at very top of the torch, at the tip, above the fracture groove. It would have been impossible for the point of impact to have been below the fracture groove, because the direction of force was opposite the direction of the angle of the silver torch tube, exactly as shown in the exemplars, figs. 10 & 11 above, and any force sufficient to breach the cylinder would have broken the red plastic trigger button and left evidence of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

impact on the torch handle. As attested-to by the two rangers examining the torch handle and cylinder, there was no damage to the button or anywhere on the torch handle. In addition, the amount of force required to breach the cylinder below the fracture groove would have been well in excess of the amount of force someone with Mr. Shalaby's size and build could have exerted (well in excess of 152 pounds of direct force).

8. The defendants have expressed a theory, based on an alleged statement Mr. Shalaby made to a paramedic at the time of injury, that Mr. Shalaby had kicked the cylinder assembly into a campfire, and it exploded. I was unaware that photos of the actual injuries had existed prior to December 2008. Mr. Shalaby advises me that the hospital in San Diego had recently found photographs of his injuries, and he received the photos on or about November 6, 2008. I have examined the photos shown in figures 12-17 below.



fig. 12



fig. 13



fig. 14



fig. 15



fig. 16



fig. 17



Fig. 18

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 9. Figures 12-16, and the overall magnitude of the injuries, indicate Mr.
12 Shalaby was at the epicenter of the “ball of fire” which engulfed him from head to
13 tow. Fig. 17 reveals that the inside of his right hand was not burned because it was
14 protected from the flames by the cylinder, with exception of injury to the exact portion
15 of his hand which was exposed (fig. 18). Figures 17 and 18 in particular indicate that
16 the cylinder was in Mr. Shalaby’s hand at the moment of breach, while Defense expert
17 Thomas Eager accurately explained that the MAPP gas cylinder would only breach
18 when placed in a fire if a pressure relief valve located on top of the cylinder would
19 have failed, and the injury would have been localized from only one direction, not
20 circumferentially from head to toe. The recently discovered photos therefore disprove
21 the defendants’ theory that the cylinder had been kicked, on grounds of impossibility,
22 consistent with Defense Expert Thomas Eager’s opinion on this issue.¹

23
24 10. It is my conclusion that Mr. Shalaby’s recollection of late September

25
26 ¹I also note that the cylinder and torch did not have any ash, soot, or evidence
27 of having been kicked into the fire, per the relevant deposition witnesses, further
28 disproving Defendants’ theory that the cylinder had been kicked into a fire.

1 2008, that he had tapped or nudged a piece of firewood at the moment of the
2 explosion, while holding the cylinder substantially as shown in fig. 19 below, is
3 wholly consistent with the evidence.



4
5
6
7
8
9 fig. 19

10 This conclusion is fully supported by the findings of my September 26, 2008 tests,
11 consistent with my earlier findings disclosed prior to the close of expert discovery,
12 and consistent with the burn injury patterns noted on the photos Mr. Shalaby received
13 from the hospital in November 2008, which I learned of and examined for the first
14 time in December 2008. These injuries could not have occurred absent a defective
15 cylinder or fracture groove design. The area where the horizontal surface of the
16 cylinder meets the vertical surface of the narrow neck (see fig. 2 above) should not
17 separate at any force less than that which is required to fracture the safety fracture
18 groove. The fracture groove separating at 26 foot-pounds establishes the minimum
19 amount of force the cylinder must withstand so that the fracture groove may perform
20 its intended function. The minimum force the cylinder bushing must withstand is
21 therefore “greater than” 26 foot-pounds. The absence of a bend at the dome area (see
22 fig. 9) establishes the force could not have exceeded 15 foot-pounds. In this instance
23 the separation occurred at an estimated 3 foot-pounds or less. The absence of any
24 evidence impact to the torch handle, and the fact that the fracture groove was not
25 fractured, further prove with engineering certainty Mr. Shalaby’s injuries were caused
26 by a defective cylinder.
27

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

11. I do not recall whether or not I saw any literature on the TS 4000 torch handle's fracture groove prior to the close of discovery, but my focus was directed entirely towards examination of the cylinder bushing prior to learning of Mr. Shalaby's recollection of events in late September 2008. Prior to September 2008, Mr. Shalaby had no detailed recollection, therefore I did not learn of the fact that a tapping or nudging force had been applied to the tip of the torch, and I proceeded to conduct experiments based on a belief that the cylinder bushing area had separated without application of any force, other than perhaps the weight of the cylinder itself. As soon Mr. Shalaby had contacted me directly on or about September 24, 2008 and explained to me that he believed there was an application of force as described in his declaration, I conducted the necessary experiments within approximately two days, and prepared my report three days later. A true and correct copy of my report is attached as exhibit A hereto.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and within my personal knowledge, and where opinions are specified, said opinions are within my best judgment, and if sworn as a witness I can and will testify competently thereto.

Executed December 15, 2008 in Los Altos, California

Robert N. Anderson
Robert N. Anderson, P.E.