Case: 1	:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 1 of 161 PageID #:1500
	1
1 2	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION
3 4 5	HELEN MONROE, Administrator of the Estate of deceased, Plaintiff,
6	vs. Chicago, Illinois
7	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, MELISSA GILLIAM, October 12, 2010
8	Defendants. ) 10:39 o'clock a.m.
9	TRANCORTET OF PROCEEDINGS
10	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES B. ZAGEL
11	For the Plaintiff:
12	CORBOY & DEMETRIO BY: Kenneth Thomas Lumb
13	33 North Dearborn Street Suite 2100
14	Chicago, Illinois 60602 (312) 346-3191
15	For Defendant Gilliam:
16	HICKEY, MELIA & ASSOCIATES, CHARTERED
17	BY: Richard J. Hickey Daniel Cobb Hofert
18	77 West Washington Street Suite 800 Skiesse Illingie 20202
19 20	Chicago, Illinois 60602 (312) 422-9408
20 21	Court reporter:
21	Court reporter:
22	Blanca I. Lara, CSR, CP, RPR 219 South Dearborn Street Room 2504
23 24	Chicago, Illinois 60604 (312) 435-5895
24	
_0	

Case: 1	:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 2 of 161 PageID #:1501
1	Appearances (continued:)
2	
3	
4	For the United States:
5	THE HONORABLE PATRICK J. FITZGERALD, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
6	BY: Gina Elizabeth Brock
7	Linda Wawzenski Assistant United States Attorney 219 South Dearborn Street
8	Suite 500
9	Chicago, Illinois 60604
10 11	
12	
12	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Case: 1	:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 3 of 161 PageID #:1502
1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION
2	WITNESS PAGE
3	GWENN GARMON
4	Direct Examination By Mr. Hickey:
5	Cross Examination By Mr. Lumb
6	Cross Examination By Ms. Wawzenski
7	Redirect Examination By Mr. Hickey
8	Recross Examination By Mr. Lumb
9	DONALD CARL WOOD
10	Direct Examination By Mr. Hickey
11	Cross Examination By Mr. Lumb
12	Cross Examination By Ms. Brock
13	Redirect Examination By Mr. Hickey
14	MELISSA LYNN GILLIAM
15	Direct Examination By Mr. Hickey
16	Direct Examination (Resumed) By Mr. Hickey
17	Cross Examination By Mr. Lumb
18	Cross Examination By Ms. Brock
19	Redirect Examination By Mr. Hickey
20	PATRICE BOND
21	Direct Examination By Ms. Wawzenski
22	Cross Examination By Mr. Hickey
23	Cross Examination By Mr. Lumb
24	Redirect Examination By Ms. Wawzenski
25	Recross Examination By Mr. Hickey

## Case: 1:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 4 of 161 PageID #:1503

2	

1	HELEN MONROE
2	Direct Examination By Mr. Lumb
3	Closing Argument By Ms. Brock
4	Closing Argument By Mr. Lumb
5	
6	
7	EXHIBITS
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

(	Case: 1	:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 5 of 161 PageID #:1504
		5
	1	(Proceedings taken in open court:)
	2	THE CLERK: 04 C 7358, Monroe versus the United
	3	States.
	4	MS. BROCK: Good morning, Your Honor.
10:38:57	5	Gina Brock for the United States.
	6	MR. LUMB: Good morning, Your Honor.
	7	Kenneth Lumb, L-u-m-b, on behalf of plaintiff.
	8	MR. HOFERT: Dan Hofert on behalf of Dr. Gilliam.
	9	THE COURT: The short answer to the questions raised
10:39:10	10	by the motion filed today, it would be my intent to hear the
	11	testimony of Patrice Bond subject to continuing the hearing to
	12	another day. I recognize that I'm probably imposing on myself
	13	the burden of hearing an examination that looks very much like
	14	a deposition, but I'd rather start getting the show on the
10:39:43	15	road. So we will hear evidence, but if there's more than
	16	required, I'll give you another period on another day, as well.
	17	Okay? So you can remain in the courtroom or wander
	18	about, just don't go too far.
	19	MR. LUMB: Thank you, Your Honor.
10:40:02	20	MR. HOFERT: Thank you.
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
		·

C	Case: 1	:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 6 of 161 PageID #:1505
		6
	1	(Whereupon, the Court directed his attention to other
	2	matters on his call, after which the following
	3	further proceedings were had herein:)
	4	
11:11:10	5	THE CLERK: 2004 C 7358, Monroe versus the United
	6	States.
	7	MS. BROCK: Gina Brock for the United States.
	8	MS. WAWZENSKI: And Linda Wawzenski for the United
	9	States, Your Honor.
11:11:28	10	MR. LUMB: Good morning again, Your Honor.
	11	Kenneth Lumb, L-u-m-b, on behalf of the plaintiff.
	12	MR. HICKEY: Richard Hickey on behalf of Dr. Gilliam.
	13	THE COURT: Okay.
	14	MR. HICKEY: And Dan Hofert of our office is here as
11:11:43	15	well.
	16	THE COURT: Thank you.
	17	We're here for a hearing today on Dr. Gilliam's status
	18	with the federal government. Because of my schedule today, we
	19	are going to have to break up this hearing, but we will finish
11:12:03	20	it today, one way or the other. And it's not a case where
	21	we're going to be sitting here at 8:00 o'clock at night, but
	22	there'll some down time for all of you for which I offer my
	23	apology.
	24	Who calls the first witness?
11:12:20	25	MS. BROCK: The plaintiff and Dr. Gilliam are trying

C	Case: 1	:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 7 of 161 PageID #:1506
		7
	1	to change the status quo, so they go first.
	2	THE COURT: Right.
	3	MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, we had discussed this before.
	4	Dr. Gilliam filled out an employment application and was
11:12:34	5	working as an employee and was under the understanding she had
	6	immunity. It's our position that the U.S. Attorney is trying
	7	to change the
	8	THE COURT: No, I understand your position very well,
	9	the question is is who's calling the first witness.
11:12:48	10	MR. LUMB: I think it's our position that it's the
	11	United States' burden and their position is the opposite.
	12	THE COURT: I'm not concerned about the burden, I'm
	13	concerned about who wants to put on a witness.
	14	MR. HICKEY: If it's not subject to burden, I'll be
11:13:04	15	happy to call the first witness.
	16	THE COURT: Okay.
	17	MS. BROCK: Your Honor, I notice that Dr. Wood is in
	18	the courtroom. He's not a party, so we'd ask that he be
	19	excluded until after he testifies.
11:13:15	20	THE COURT: Sure.
	21	(Whereupon Dr. Wood exited the courtroom.)
	22	MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, we'd like to call Dr. Garmon
	23	as the first witness, as an adverse witness.
	24	(Brief pause).
11:13:49	25	THE COURT: Over here.

	Case: 1	:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 8 of 161 PageID #:1507 Garmon - direct by Hickey 8
	1	(Brief pause.)
	2	THE COURT: Face me and raise your right hand.
	3	(Witness duly sworn.)
	4	THE COURT: Please be seated.
11:13:59	5	GWENN GARMON, DEFENDANT GILLIAN WITNESS, SWORN
	6	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	7	BY MR. HICKEY:
	8	Q. Doctor, could you please state your full name and spell
	9	your name for the record.
11:14:09	10	A. Gwenn Garmon. G-w-e-n-n, G-a-r-m-o-n.
	11	Q. Dr. Garmon, I'm going to hand you what was marked as
	12	Defendant's Exhibit Number 9 and ask you to please take a look
	13	at this.
	14	(Document tendered to the witness).
11:14:28	15	BY MR. HICKEY:
	16	Q. Have you had a chance to look at it?
	17	A. Yes.
	18	Q. This is a copy of your CV?
	19	A. Correct.
11:14:45	20	Q. And it's accurate?
	21	A. Yes.
	22	Q. Now, you are a part-time attending at the VA, is that
	23	correct?
	24	A. Are you taking that from the CV?
11:14:59	25	Q. No, I'm asking you.

	Case: 1	:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 9 of 161 PageID #:1508 Garmon - direct by Hickey
		9
	1	A. Oh
	2	Q. You are a part-time attending at the VA, is that correct?
	3	A. Part of my time is with clinical work.
	4	Q. Okay. All right. Are you a part-time attending doctor?
11:15:18	5	A. I'm not sure what you're asking.
	6	Q. Okay. Do you understand the concept of full-time at the
	7	VA?
	8	A. Yes.
	9	Q. Okay. And you're not full-time, correct?
11:15:50	10	A. I am full-time.
	11	Q. Did you give a deposition in this matter on May 16th of
	12	2008?
	13	A. Yes.
	14	Q. And you indicated you were represented by counsel at that
11:16:00	15	time, correct?
	16	A. Correct.
	17	Q. And you were sworn to tell the truth, correct?
	18	A. Correct.
	19	Q. Page 57, line 2.
11:16:17	20	Doctor, all I'm going to ask you now is, were you
	21	asked these questions and did you give these answers. It calls
	22	for a yes or no, okay?
	23	A. Yes.
	24	Q. Line 2:
11:16:26	25	

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 10 of 161 PageID #:1509 Garmon - direct by Hickey
		10
	1	"Question: Are you full-time.
	2	"Answer: No.
	3	"Question: Part-time?
	4	"Answer: Yes."
11:16:34	5	Were you asked those questions, did you give
	6	those answers?
	7	A. Yes.
	8	Q. Thank you.
	9	Doctor, the time that you do spend, 75 to 85 percent
11:16:48	10	of that time is administrative, correct?
	11	A. Yes. Now, there is one point of clarification. I was
	12	part-time status in that year that I was deposed and I'm now
	13	full-time status.
	14	Q. Okay. Doctor, you did not recall the breakdown between
11:17:03	15	clinical and administrative time back in 2001, is that correct?
	16	A. I do recall. It's about the same currently.
	17	Q. Again, Doctor, did you give a deposition in this case?
	18	A. Yes.
	19	Q. And you were under oath?
11:17:27	20	A. Yes.
	21	Q. And I'm going to ask you were you asked these questions and
	22	did you give these answers, Page 9, starting at line 2 for
	23	context.
	24	Doctor, again, my only question to you is a yes, no
11:17:46	25	question, were you asked these questions and did you give this

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 11 of 161 PageID #:1510 Garmon - direct by Hickey
	1	answer:
	2	"Question: How would you divide the time in which
	3	between administrative and clinical care?
	4	"Answer: My time here in the administrative care
11:17:58	5	comprises 75 to 80 percent.
	6	"Question: And the clinical care would be the
	7	balance?
	8	"Answer: Yes.
	9	"Question: And that would be true in 2001?
11:18:08	10	"Answer: I don't recall."
	11	Did you give those answers to those questions,
	12	Doctor?
	13	A. Yes.
	14	Q. Okay. Now, Doctor, your role is Director of Women's
11:18:24	15	Healthcare at the Jesse Brown VA, correct?
	16	A. Correct.
	17	Q. And that's a clinic for women vets, is that right?
	18	A. Correct.
	19	Q. It has primary care as well as interdisciplinary care,
11:18:38	20	correct?
	21	A. Correct.
	22	Q. It has multispecialty clinic aspects to it, correct?
	23	A. Correct.
	24	Q. Now, you were an internist, correct?
11:18:46	25	A. Correct.

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 12 of 161 PageID #:1511 Garmon - direct by Hickey 12
	1	
	2	Q. So you would give care as a primary care physician, correct?
	2 3	A. Correct.
	_	
	4	Q. Okay. You are not a specialist in surgery, correct?
11:18:56	5	A. Correct.
	6	Q. You're not excuse me.
	7	You've not done a residency in OB-GYN, correct?
	8	A. Correct.
	9	Q. So you're not credentialed to see patients as a
11:19:07	10	gynecologist, correct?
	11	A. Correct.
	12	Q. And you're not credentialed to see patients in the various
	13	specialties, correct?
	14	A. Correct.
11:19:17	15	Q. Another specialty that might see patients at the clinic
	16	would be a gynecologic oncologist, correct?
	17	A. Correct.
	18	Q. You do not supervise a gynecologic oncologist being in the
	19	room with them, correct?
11:19:33	20	A. Correct.
	21	Q. Various other people who are specialists that come to the
	22	clinic, you do not go in the room and supervise them, correct?
	23	A. Correct.
	24	Q. Now, a gynecologist who works at the clinic, because you do
11:19:45	25	not have education, training, or background in that area, you

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 13 of 161 PageID #:1512 Garmon - direct by Hickey 13
	1	would not personally supervise that gynecologist, correct?
	2	A. Correct.
	3	Q. You wouldn't have the education, training, or experience to
	4	review such a person, correct?
11:19:59	F	A. Correct.
11.19.59	6	Q. Now, you do supervise certain staff people at the clinic,
	7	correct?
	, 8	A. Correct.
	9	Q. And you identify those as nurse practitioners, nurses,
11:20:15	4.0	social workers, a psychiatrist, and an administrative officer,
11.20.13	11	correct?
	12	A. Correct.
	13	Q. Now, typically, a staff member's treatment of a VA patient
	14	would not be supervised by any other physician directly,
11:20:33	4 5	correct?
	16	A. Correct.
	17	Q. Hypothetically, if the VA hired a full-time full salaried
	18	gynecologist to work at the clinic, you would not be the one to
	19	supervise that person from a clinical aspect, correct?
11:20:52	20	A. Correct.
	21	Q. Your supervision is from the administrative perspective,
	22	correct?
	23	A. Correct.
	24	Q. You did not provide reviews for any surgeons, correct?
11:21:01	25	A. When?

(	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 14 of 161 PageID #:1513 Garmon - direct by Hickey 14
	1	Q. At the relevant time.
	2	A. No.
	2	Q. Okay. And you did not have credentials to provide reviews
	4	
44 04 40	4 5	for surgeons at the relevant time, 1999 through 2001, correct? A. Correct.
11:21:16	6	
		Q. And you did not know who would supervise Dr. Gilliam from
	7	surgery, correct?
	8	A. Correct.
	9	Q. All right. Now, Doctor, I'm going to switch.
11:21:23	10	For a patient to come now, I want you to understand
	11	I'm switching to give the Court an understanding of how
	12	Dr. Gilliam would come to see a patient. So are you with me
	13	there?
	14	A. Uh-huh.
11:21:42	15	Q. Can I ask that you answer yes or no.
	16	A. Yes.
	17	Q. Just because it's being recorded.
	18	All right. The patient, first of all, had to be a VA
	19	beneficiary, correct?
11:21:52	20	A. Correct.
	21	Q. Another VA physician had to refer the patient to
	22	Dr. Gilliam for more complicated gynecologic care, correct?
	23	A. Correct.
	24	Q. Then VA personnel would take charge of making the
11:22:08	25	appointment and setting the appointment, correct?

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 15 of 161 PageID #:1514 Garmon - direct by Hickey
		15
	1	A. Correct.
	2	Q. And then it would be documented on VA records, correct?
	3	A. Correct.
	4	Q. And where Dr. Gilliam would see the patient would be at the
11:22:18	5	VA clinic itself, correct?
	6	A. Most of the time.
	7	Q. Unless she was seeing the patient presurgical or on the
	8	surgical aspect, correct?
	9	A. Correct.
11:22:29	10	Q. Okay. Now, you have no documentation ever produced of
	11	Dr. Gilliam seeing a patient, a VA patient, outside the VA
	12	facility, correct?
	13	A. No, that's incorrect.
	14	Q. Okay. You have no knowledge of whether Dr. Gilliam ever
11:22:51	15	saw a VA patient outside the VA, that's correct?
	16	A. No, that's not correct.
	17	Q. Okay. There were obstetrical patients, is that correct?
	18	A. Correct.
	19	Q. And obstetrical patients might have to go for things such
11:23:09	20	as ultrasounds, correct?
	21	A. Correct.
	22	Q. And those ultrasounds and that equipment might be located
	23	outside the VA, correct?
	24	A. Correct.
11:23:19	25	Q. All right. You have no knowledge as to how many patients,

C	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 16 of 161 PageID #:1515 Garmon - direct by Hickey 16
	1	if any, Dr. Gilliam may have seen outside of Jesse Brown,
	2	correct?
	3	A. No, that's not correct.
	4	Q. You gave a deposition in this matter, again that was back
11:23:41	5	on May 16th, 2008, correct?
11.20.41	6	A. Correct.
	7	Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you on Page 65, starting at line 24
	8	and going on to Page 66, through line 3.
	9	Doctor, again, my question to you is, were you
11:23:57	10	THE COURT: I think she understands this now.
	11	MR. HICKEY: Okay. I'm sorry, Judge. Some judges
	12	require foundation each time.
	13	THE COURT: No, just read it.
	14	MR. HICKEY: Yes.
11:24:06	15	BY MR. LUMB:
	16	Q. (Reading:)
	17	"Question: Do you have any knowledge has to how many
	18	patients, if any, she might have seen outside of
	19	Jesse Brown, I mean VA patients? "Answer: I don't
11:24:17	20	know."
	21	Did you give that answer?
	22	A. Yes.
	23	Q. Now, Dr. Gilliam had to comply with the policies and
	24	procedures of the VA when she was seeing patients at the VA,
11:24:31	25	correct?

(	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 17 of 161 PageID #:1516 Garmon - direct by Hickey 17
	1	
	1	A. Correct.
	2	Q. Dr. Gilliam could not bring her own assistant to help her
	3	treat patients at the VA clinic, correct?
	4	A. Incorrect.
11:24:41	5	Q. Page 39 to Page 40, were you asked these questions and did
	6	you give these answers:
	7	"Question: If Dr. Gilliam needed any, when Dr.
	8	Gilliam provided treatment at the clinic, could Dr.
	9	Gilliam bring her own assistants in to help her treat
11:25:15	10	patients at the clinic?
	11	"Answer: No.
	12	"Question: Did she have to use assistants that
	13	were given to her or is designated to her by the VA?
	14	"Answer: Yes."
11:25:24	15	Did you give those answers to those the
	16	questions?
	17	A. Yes, but I think you
	18	MR. HICKEY: Move to strike, Your Honor.
	19	THE COURT: The answer "yes" may stand but I will
11:25:36	20	permit the witness to answer whatever she wishes because it'll
	21	save us a little time.
	22	Go ahead.
	23	BY THE WITNESS:
	24	A. I think I understood your question to mean any patient that
11:25:47	25	she needed assistance for whether it be in the OR or in the

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 18 of 161 PageID #:1517 Garmon - direct by Hickey 18
	1	clinic, and that's why I answered yes. She could call an
	2	assistant to help her in the operating room.
	3	Q. In the operating room, that would be something within
	4	Dr. Wood's jurisdiction, correct?
11:26:05	5	A. Correct.
	6	Q. That would not be something you were in charge of, correct?
	7	A. Correct.
	8	Q. So if we went through any week between 1999 and 2001, you
	9	wouldn't know what assistants were available in the surgical
11:26:17	10	section, correct?
	11	A. I knew because the doctors would come through the clinic
	12	and talk with us about patient care and some of the operations
	13	that they were involved in. And it was quite common with the
	14	gynecologists prior to Dr. Gilliam to bring assistants from the
11:26:35	15	University of Illinois over to help her in the operating room.
	16	MR. HICKEY: We move to strike as non-responsive, Your
	17	Honor.
	18	THE COURT: Right. But we're going to get to it
	19	anyway and I'd rather not have her repeat it.
11:26:45	20	MR. HICKEY: Right.
	21	BY MR. HICKEY:
	22	Q. Doctor, I'm not talking about before Dr. Gilliam came
	23	there, I was talking specific time frame. You could not say
	24	what assistants were present at any given week in the OR area,
11:27:01	25	correct?

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 19 of 161 PageID #:1518 Garmon - direct by Hickey 19
	1	A. I don't recall of any assistant during that time.
	2	Q. Okay. And so how many times did you scrub and go into a
	3	procedure in the surgical area, not in the clinic but in the
	4	surgical area, with Dr. Gilliam?
11:27:17	7 5	A. None that I recall.
	6	Q. Okay. If Dr. Gilliam had complaints about staff at the
	7	clinic, she would go to you, correct?
	8	A. Me or her supervisor at the University of Illinois.
	9	Q. Okay. Page 45, line 11, again were you asked these
11:27:53	₃ <b>10</b>	questions and did you give these answers:
	11	"Question: If Dr. Gilliam had complaints or problems
	12	with the assistants that were provided to her for
	13	treatments of patients at the VA, who would she have
	14	gone to see?
11:28:05	5 <b>15</b>	"Answer: Either myself or Dr. Wood.
	16	"Question: Would it depend on whether the
	17	problem would be in surgery or in the clinic?
	18	"Answer: Correct.
	19	" if it was in the clinic, she would see you; if
11:28:17	7 20	it was the surgery, she would see Dr. Wood?
	21	"Answer: Correct."
	22	Did you give those answers to those questions?
	23	A. Yes.
	24	Q. Now, moving to 1999, do you recall all the different people
11:28:41	1 25	who might have been interviewed for various positions at the

С	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 20 of 161 PageID #:1519 Garmon - direct by Hickey
		20
	1	VA, Jesse Brown VA?
	2	A. I'm unaware of any of that.
	3	Q. Okay. In 1999, was it your position that at the request of
	4	Dr. Elias, who was chairman of OB-GYN at U. of I., that you had
11:29:08	5	a lunch with Dr. Gilliam?
	6	A. Yes.
	7	Q. Have you read Dr. Elias' deposition?
	8	A. Yes.
	9	Q. Okay. Do you have any notes you made contemporaneously
11:29:26	10	with that meeting?
	11	A. I don't recall.
	12	Q. You were asked to produce notes at your deposition. You
	13	did not produce any notes of such a meeting, does that refresh
	14	your recollection in any way?
11:29:41	15	A. No, I'm sorry, it doesn't.
	16	Q. Okay. Would it be fair to say that 11 years ago you cannot
	17	recall everything you said to Dr. Elias or everything he said
	18	to you?
	19	A. Correct.
11:29:57	20	Q. Would it be fair to say that 11 years ago you cannot recall
	21	everything you said to Dr. Gilliam or everything she said to
	22	you?
	23	A. At the lunch meeting?
	24	Q. Yes.
11:30:08	25	A. Correct.

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 21 of 161 PageID #:1520 Garmon - direct by Hickey 21
	1	Q. You do not recall any other conversations with Dr. Gilliam
	2	prior to her starting at the VA, correct?
	3	A. Correct. I don't recall.
	4	Q. Okay. And you did not evaluate or it's your position
11:30:35	5	you did not evaluate whether Dr. Gilliam was an appropriate
	6	candidate, from a medical perspective, to work at the VA,
	7	correct?
	8	A. Correct.
	9	Q. You do not know if the VA sent out or received any
11:30:51	10	documents as to whether Dr. Gilliam had the appropriate
	11	credentials to treat patients at the VA, correct?
	12	A. Do you mean in order to become credentialed and privileged
	13	at the VA? I'm sorry, I don't understand your question.
	14	Q. You do not know if the VA sent out or reviewed any
11:31:21	15	documents as to whether Dr. Gilliam had the appropriate
	16	credentials to treat patients at the VA, that's true, isn't
	17	it?
	18	A. Well, let me say that I just know that any physician who
	19	treats patients in a hospital or a clinic facility needs to be
11:31:35	5 20	credentialed and privileged to do so.
	21	Q. Okay. Page 23, line 19, were you ask this question and did
	22	you give this answer:
	23	"Question: Okay. And did the VA send out and review
	24	any documents as to whether Dr. Gilliam had the
11:31:51	25	appropriate credentials to treat patients at the VA?

C	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 22 of 161 PageID #:1521 Garmon - direct by Hickey 22
	1	"Answer: I don't know."
	2	Did you give that answer to that question?
	3	A. Yes.
	4	Q. To the extent that the VA did review Dr. Gilliam's
11:32:11	5	credentials, that would be done by the credentialing and
	6	privileging department, correct?
	7	A. Yes.
	8	Q. You are not an expert in the procedure of credentialing and
	9	privileging as it existing back in 1999 through 2001, correct?
11:32:25	10	A. Correct.
	11	Q. You are not a member of the credentialing or privileging
	12	committee, correct?
	13	A. Correct.
	14	Q. You were not a member of the credentialed or privileging
11:32:37	15	committee back in 1999 to 2001, correct?
	16	A. Correct.
	17	Q. You were not a part of the process of Dr. Gilliam getting
	18	privileged or credentialed at all, as far as you could recall,
	19	correct?
11:32:49	20	A. Correct.
	21	Q. That process was overseen by the Department of Surgery and
	22	the Office of Credentialing and Privileging, correct?
	23	A. Correct.
	24	Q. And from the department of surgery, the person, the
11:33:01	25	reviewer, was Dr. Wood, correct?

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 23 of 161 PageID #:1522 Garmon - direct by Hickey
		23
	1	A. Correct.
	2	Q. And you would not know who was involved from the Office of
	3	Credentialing and Privileging, correct?
	4	A. Correct.
11:33:08	5	Q. All right. Now, Doctor, again, I'm going to just switch
	6	topics, so I don't want to lose you here. Just in the
	7	referenced contracts with outside providers for various things.
	8	You do not know contracting officers for the VA or GS
	9	78 type persons, correct?
11:33:29	10	A. What types?
	11	Q. GS 78.
	12	A. No, I don't know that.
	13	Q. Okay. You do not know if such contracting officers or even
	14	GS employees, correct?
11:33:44	15	A. Correct.
	16	Q. You've never dealt with one face to face, correct?
	17	A. Correct.
	18	Q. You do not know if the contracts with the vendors are
	19	essentially forms, correct?
11:33:58	20	A. Correct.
	21	Q. You do not know how they are produced, correct?
	22	A. Correct.
	23	Q. You do know if they're drafted wholesale new at any point
	24	in time, correct?
11:34:06	25	A. Correct.

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 24 of 161 PageID #:1523 Garmon - direct by Hickey 24	
	1	Q. You would not have had any contact with U.I.C. directly	
	2	regarding any contract with UIC, correct?	
	3	A. Correct.	
	4	Q. You are not an expert in the contracting process, are you,	
11:34:20	5	Doctor?	
	6	A. No.	
	7	Q. You are not an expert in the interpretation of contract	
	8	terms, are you, Doctor?	
	9	A. Correct.	
11:34:26	10	Q. You could only look at a contract and give your own	
	11	personal interpretation, correct?	
	12	A. Correct. Or I could ask questions about it.	
	13	Q. Okay. Now, switching again, with regard to Dr. Gilliam in	
	14	particular. You do not know, at least as of the time of your	
11:34:45	15	deposition, if Dr. Gilliam was even on the medical staff of the	
	16	Jesse Brown VA, correct?	
	17	A. The issue at that time was I wasn't remembering the	
	18	language in the medical staff bylaws, so I could not answer	
	19	that I knew it.	
11:35:02	20	Q. Well, were you asked this question and did you give this	
	21	answer, Page 29, line 22:	
	22	"Question: Was Dr. Gilliam on the medical staff of	
	23	the VA, Jesse Brown VA?	
	24	"Answer: I don't know."	
11:35:15	25	Did you give that answer to that question?	

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 25 of 161 PageID #:1524 Garmon - direct by Hickey
		25
	1	A. Yes.
	2	Q. Okay. Dr. Desai was chief of staff, correct?
	3	A. Correct.
	4	Q. He was an attending, correct?
11:35:31	5	A. Correct.
	6	Q. He was on the medical staff, correct?
	7	A. Correct.
	8	Q. Dr. Wood was chief of surgery, correct?
	9	A. Correct.
11:35:38	10	Q. He was an attending, correct?
	11	A. Correct.
	12	Q. He was on the medical staff, correct?
	13	A. Correct.
	14	Q. I'm going to show you an exhibit, Defendant's Exhibit 10.
11:35:44	15	(Document tendered to the witness.)
	16	BY MR. HICKEY:
	17	Q. Have you had a chance to review Exhibit 10?
	18	A. Yes.
	19	Q. Does that bear your name?
11:36:37	20	A. Yes.
	21	Q. Does it bear your signature?
	22	A. Yes.
	23	Q. Now, it's correct, Doctor, that you do not have any
	24	recollection of having any conversations about Dr. Gilliam,
11:36:47	25	about her assignment with anyone at U.I.C., correct?

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 26 of 161 PageID #:1525 Garmon - direct by Hickey 26
	1	MS. BROCK: Could we have a time frame, Your Honor?
	2	THE COURT: Might be helpful.
	3	MR. HICKEY: On Page 50, line 21 to 24.
	4	MS. WAWZENSKI: No, no, no. It's about your question,
11:37:09	5	could we have a time limit during which you're asking her about
	6	contacts with the U. of I.
	7	BY MR. HICKEY:
	8	Q. As of the time of your deposition, I'm going back and forth
	9	to the time when Dr. Gilliam started, do you have any
11:37:22	10	recollection of having any conversations about Dr. Gilliam
	11	about her assignment with anyone at U.I.C.?
	12	A. Yeah, I recall a meeting with the head of the department,
	13	his name is Dr. Sherman, and Dr. Wood was involved, and I'd
	14	gone through the agenda with my boss, the chief of staff,
11:37:52	15	Dr. Desai, and I cannot recollect the date of that meeting, but
	16	it was to raise issues about the use of our contract time and
	17	to address some issues that I felt were emerging needs for
	18	women veterans. I can't recall the date.
	19	Q. Okay. So that could be any time 1999 through 2002?
11:38:15	20	A. Yes.
	21	Q. Okay. Finally, Doctor, you did not know how one became
	22	designated as a medical staff member in 2001, correct?
	23	A. I couldn't remember the specific language.
	24	Q. Okay. And you did not know how one became a designated
11:38:35	25	medical staff member in 1999 or 2000, correct?

С	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 27 of 161 PageID #:1526 Garmon - cross by Lumb
		27
	1	A. Again, I couldn't remember the specific language in the
	2	bylaws.
	3	MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Your Honor.
	4	CROSS EXAMINATION
11:38:57	5	BY MR. LUMB:
	6	Q. Good morning, Doctor. My name is Tim Lumb. I believe I
	7	have, I believe, very few questions for you.
	8	Are you still a clinical instructor at U.I.C.?
	9	A. Yes.
11:39:19	10	Q. And you have been affiliated with U.I.C. since 1991,
	11	correct?
	12	A. Correct.
	13	Q. And are you still the director of women's health at the
	14	Westside VA?
11:39:29	15	A. Yes.
	16	Q. And you have been a director there since 1994, correct?
	17	A. Correct.
	18	Q. And when you started in 1994, the Westside VA had already
	19	been providing gynecologic services, correct?
11:39:42	20	A. Correct.
	21	Q. Your appointment in 2008 was as a part-time attendant,
	22	correct?
	23	A. Correct.
	24	Q. Doctor, I'm going to show you what has been marked
11:40:05	25	Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 5.

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 28 of 161 PageID #:1527 Garmon - cross by Lumb
		28
	1	(Document tendered to the witness).
	2	BY MR. LUMB:
	3	Q. Do you recognize that, Doctor?
	4	A. Yes.
11:40:27	5	Q. And through that document
	6	It's on August 3rd, 1999, correct?
	7	A. Correct.
	8	Q you recommended that Melissa Gilliam be appointed as a
	9	part-time gynecologist at the Westside VA, correct?
11:40:45	10	A. Correct.
	11	Q. And to whom was that addressed?
	12	A. This was to the Chief of Staff. We had the folder reviewed
	13	at that time and the completed folder included the application
	14	that was required to determine eligibility for appointment at
11:41:05	15	the VA.
	16	Q. And who is the Chief of Staff?
	17	A. Chief of staff Dr. Desai.
	18	Q. Dr. Desai.
	19	And on August 9th of 1999, Dr. Gilliam was appointed
11:41:23	20	to the medical staff of the Westside VA, correct?
	21	A. Correct. I subsequently went back to read the language in
	22	the bylaws.
	23	Q. No, I'm just talking about the appointment letter on
	24	August 9th of
11:41:44	25	A. Oh, I understand.

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 29 of 161 PageID #:1528 Garmon - cross by Lumb 29
	1	Q 1999.
	2	I understand that you have that already.
	3	I think you mentioned you were called to a meeting
	4	with Dr. Gilliam before she became before she started
11:41:56	5	working at the VA, is that correct?
	6	A. Yes.
	7	Q. And was anyone else present other than you and Dr. Gilliam?
	8	A. No, I believe it was just the two of us.
	9	Q. And you discussed her potentially working at the VA,
11:42:18	10	correct?
	11	A. Correct. Laid a little bit of groundwork about the kind of
	12	patients that are at the VA, the kind of needs that there are,
	13	a little bit of background about the care that was provided
	14	through the previous gynecologist.
11:42:31	15	Q. And I think you mentioned another meeting some time either
	16	before or after Dr. Gilliam began working at the VA, correct?
	17	A. Meaning with who?
	18	Q. I think you mentioned Dr. Elias, Dr. Sherman Elias?
	19	A. Correct. That was you know, it's coming back to me. It
11:42:48	20	was later, because we had discussed some of the issues
	21	regarding Dr. Gilliam's maternity leave and I had to bring over
	22	some additional credentialing and privileging packages for
	23	gynecologists that would fulfill the contract agreement.
	24	Q. Was there a representative of the VA contracting office at
11:43:10	25	either of those meetings?

С	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 30 of 161 PageID #:1529 Garmon - cross by Lumb 30
	1	
	-	A. No. $(A = A + A)$
	2	Q. Was there any participation whatsoever by the VA's
	3	contracting office in either of those meetings?
	4	A. No.
11:43:21	5	Q. Just one more question, Doctor. If this was already
	6	mentioned, I didn't hear it.
	7	When Dr. Gilliam worked at the VA between 1999 and
	8	2001, was she ever required to sign in or sign out?
	9	A. No, we kept track of time with the clinic schedules and
11:44:21	10	with procedures schedules and operating schedules.
	11	Q. After the fact?
	12	A. Excuse me?
	13	Q. After the fact?
	14	A. The schedules were available before the fact. I'm not sure
11:44:33	15	of the timing. No, I don't know.
	16	Q. Was she ever required by anyone at the VA to either sign in
	17	or sign out to keep track of her time?
	18	A. No.
	19	Q. Thank you.
11:44:44	20	MR. LUMB: That's all I have.
	21	
	22	
	23	CROSS EXAMINATION
	24	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
11:44:54	25	Q. Dr. Garmon, can you describe for us the genesis of the

## Case: 104-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 31 of 161 PageID #:1530 Garmon - cross by Wawzenski

1 women's health program at the Jesse Brown VA? 2 The beginning of my time there started in 1994, and it was Α. 3 kind of an exciting time at the VA, actually. Congress had 4 developed a couple of new laws to approach the increasing 5 number of women veterans that we were seeing at the Veterans 6 Administration. And one of the public laws allowed for eight 7 comprehensive centers to begin across the country, Chicago was 8 selected as one of those centers.

9 And it really was designed to address the needs of the 10 If you recall, the veterans hospitals were female veterans. 11 really referred to as a male veterans hospital and it still is 12 dominated by male veterans. And women political interest 13 groups and some of the VA organizations were rallying around 14 Congress to begin to meet their needs entirely just like the 15 So my task was to address this inequity and assure that men. 16 we were providing equitable care to males and women alike, and 17 part of that came with this huge grant to begin a comprehensive 18 center for female veterans; that began in Chicago in 1994.

19 The other thing that was truly needed was a what I would call an ultimate advocate for the female veterans. 20 Small 21 fish in a big pond, again, required intensive and active work 22 on my part to ensure that we were meeting their needs. There 23 were a lot of complaints that even simple screening measures 24 weren't available at all the VA's across the country and this 25 provoked these new laws and expanded services in the VA

11:45:21

11:45:40

11:45:59

11:46:24

11:46:45

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 32 of 161 PageID #:1531 Garmon - cross by Wawzenski 32
	1	centers.
	2	Q. Now, when you first began your work as head of the women's
	3	health program, how were obstetrical and gynecological services
	4	provided for female veterans?
11:47:05	5	A. It was provided on a consultant basis, on an as-needed
	6	basis. If a primary provider identified a complicated
	7	gynecology need or obstetrical need, there would be a consult
	8	entered for the University of Illinois to address. They would
	9	send over a consultant who was credentialed and privileged at
11:47:26	10	the VA on an as-needed basis and that consultant would evaluate
	11	that patient and determine the course of action.
	12	Many times it would require a procedure, which he
	13	would do on station at the VA, or even operating room procedure
	14	which he would do on station at the VA.
11:47:40	15	Q. Now, you mentioned you would turn to the University of
	16	Illinois for this. Why would Jesse Brown go to the U. of I.
	17	for this kind of service?
	18	A. There weren't gynecology
	19	MR. HICKEY: Foundation; objection.
11:48:19	20	THE COURT: I think she's addressing institutional
	21	policy as opposed to predicting somebody's state of mind, and
	22	for that reason, I will accept the answer.
	23	You can answer the question, if you remember the
	24	question.
11:48:35	25	BY THE WITNESS:

## Case: 1 04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 33 of 161 PageID #:1532 Garmon - cross by Wawzenski

	1	A. There weren't gynecologists available at the VA at the
	2	time. In fact, there wasn't even a pay scale available to be
	3	able to provide a competitive salary for gynecologists.
	4	This has been an evolving process and they've made
11:48:52	5	great leaps and bounds in progress in providing care to the
	6	female veteran. At that time, there wasn't a pay scale. They
	7	were called a scarce specialty and there were a number of
	8	strategies to obtain that kind of service outside of the VA,
	9	one of which was a consultation with an affiliate such as the
11:49:13	10	University of Illinois.
	11	Q. And what do you mean by an affiliate?
	12	A. Most VA's are affiliated with an academic institution. The
	13	Jesse Brown VA is affiliated with the University of Illinois
	14	and also Northwestern.
11:49:28	15	Q. Now, you mentioned that, at the beginning, this process
	16	started with consultants from the U. of I. coming to the VA to
	17	provide gynecological services. Did that change at some point?
	18	THE COURT: I'm going to stop you now.
	19	MS. WAWZENSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
11:49:45	20	THE COURT: We're going to take a break to hear
	21	another case. Mr. Walker may be able to tell you when we might
	22	next resume.
	23	The latest we would resume again is about 12:30.
	24	
	25	(Recess.)

Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 34 of 1 Garmon - cross by Wawzens	
		34
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLIN	
2	EASTERN DIVISION	
3	HELEN MONROE, Administrator of the ) Estate of deceased, )	
4		No. 04 CV 7358
5	Plaintiff,	
6	vs.	Chicago, Illinois
7	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, MELISSA GILLIAM,	October 12, 2010
8	Defendants.	12:47 o'clock p.m.
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	S
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES B.	ZAGEL
11	For the Plaintiff:	
12	CORBOY & DEMETRIO BY: Kenneth Thomas Lumb	
13	33 North Dearborn Street Suite 2100	
14	Chicago, Illinois 60602 (312) 346-3191	
15	For Defendant Gilliam:	
16	HICKEY, MELIA & ASSOCIATES, CHA	RTERED
17 18	BY: Richard J. Hickey Daniel Cobb Hofert	
	77 West Washington Street Suite 800 Chicago Illingia 60602	
19 20	Chicago, Illinois 60602 (312) 422-9408	
20	Court reporter:	
22	Blanca I. Lara, CSR, CP, R	PR
23	219 South Dearborn Stree Room 2504	t
23	Chicago, Illinois 60604 (312) 435-5895	4
24		
20		

Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 35 of 161 PageID #:1534 Garmon - cross by Wawzenski	35
1	Appearances (continued:)	
2		
3		
4	For the United States:	
5	THE HONORABLE PATRICK I ETTZGERALD	
6	THE HONORABLE PATRICK J. FITZGERALD, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY BY: Gina Elizabeth Brock	
7	Linda Wawzenski	
8	Assistant United States Attorney 219 South Dearborn Street Suite 500	
9	Chicago, Illinois 60604	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 36 of 161 PageID #:1535 Garmon - cross by Wawzenski 36
	1	(Proceedings taken in open court:)
	2	THE COURT: You may resume.
	3	MS. WAWZENSKI: Can you read back the last question?
	4	(Question read.)
12:47:43	5	BY THE WITNESS:
	6	A. Yes, it changed after I started, and I don't remember the
	7	exact date, but Dr. Kahn was the consultant who spoke with me
	8	about the gynecological care that he was providing and actually
	9	gave me a little bit of a historical perspective that the
12:48:01	10	numbers were increasing in the VA and he had limited time to
	11	provide for the consultative services.
	12	So I went to my boss, and I think HR was involved, and
	13	said we need more access to a gynecologist, how do we go about
	14	doing that. And because gynecology was considered a scarce
12:48:22	15	commodity, a specialty at the time, the suggestion was that we
	16	contract with an organization to provide the gynecology
	17	services.
	18	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	19	Q. And who was the first gynecologist that became a contract
12:48:36	20	employee at the VA?
	21	A. Dr. Dorina Scaunas. And there was quite a bit of an
	22	overlapping between Dr. Kahn and Dr. Scaunas. In fact,
	23	Dr. Scaunas asked Dr. Kahn to assist her in cases as needed.
	24	He actually loved working there. He loved the patient
12:48:59	25	clientele and helped Dorina Scaunas with cases and consultative

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 37 of 161 PageID #:1536 Garmon - cross by Wawzenski 37
	1	advice.
	2	Q. And with who did the VA contract to provide Dr. Scaunas to
	3	the Women's Health Center?
	4	A. With the University of Illinois.
12:49:10	5	Q. And at one time were any of these services provided to VA
	6	patients at the University of Illinois?
	7	A. I don't recall any cases going over to the University of
	8	Illinois during Dr. Scaunas' time as a contractor.
	9	Q. But in later times, did services get performed at the U. of
12:49:32	<u>10</u>	I.?
	11	A. Yes.
	12	Q. Now, Dr. Gilliam was the physician who followed Dr. Scaunas
	13	in the contract position, correct?
	14	MR. HICKEY: Objection the form.
12:49:47	<sup>,</sup> 15	THE COURT: Because it's leading?
	16	MR. HICKEY: Yes.
	17	THE COURT: Okay.
	18	MR. HICKEY: And lacks foundation.
	19	THE COURT: Sustained.
12:49:53	3 20	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	21	Q. Who was the physician who followed Dr. Scaunas as a
	22	contract employee for the VA Women's Health Center?
	23	A. There's a little bit of a history there. There wasn't a
	24	gynecologist that the university could provide for some time
12:50:08	3 25	after Dr. Scaunas left the university to go to private

## Case: 104-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 38 of 161 PageID #:1537 Garmon - cross by Wawzenski

practice, and at that time Dr. Sherman Elias and myself talked several times about strategies and how to meet the needs of our female veterans, and we came about the strategy to provide the care at the University of Illinois location and then his whole team of providers could enter into caring for the veterans at their location.

7 It was at that time that I contacted our contracting 8 officer. Actually, worked closely with them with any kind of 9 questions or concerns. And it was at that point that she 10 suggested that we re-write and modify the current contract that 11 we had to include both sides for care; in other words, both the 12 VA clinic and the University of Illinois.

So the contract was modified at that point. And I don't recall how long veterans were sent over to the university for care, but it was until Dr. Gilliam was available. I think she was newly employed there at that time and came over as the contractor.

We also found it quite advantageous, to tell you the truth. We used it more in the future because, for instance, if a specialist happened to see the patient for care, the patient could also be seeing that specialist's outpatient clinic at the University of Illinois. So we maintained that language in our contract even to this date.

24 Q. You mentioned that you dealt with the contracting officer25 at the VA for these specific contracts for gynecological care.

12:50:32

12:50:52

12:51:10

12:51:29

12:51:48

38

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 39 of 161 PageID #:1538 Garmon - cross by Wawzenski 39
	1	Was there any portion of the contract that you were asked to
	2	draft for the contracting officer?
	3	A. Yes; she asked me to draft the statement of work; in other
	4	words, what were our needs in the VA. She helped me craft it,
12:52:09	ə 5	but wanted to know what specifically our needs were in the VA.
	6	Q. Now, when Dr. Gilliam began working at the Women's Health
	7	Center, did you yourself ever have to authorize her annual
	8	leave or sick leave while she was there?
	9	A. I mean, she didn't have any annual leave or sick leave.
12:52:31	10	No, the answer is no.
	11	Q. And were the other employees that you supervised in the
	12	Women's Health Center, did they need your authorization to take
	13	any annual leave or sick leave?
	14	A. Oh, yes.
12:52:41	15	Q. And did you perform any type of evaluation of Dr. Gilliam
	16	on an annual basis?
	17	A. No.
	18	Q. Did you do evaluations for the physicians and other staff
	19	that were members of the women's health community as a VA
12:53:02	2 20	employee?
	21	MR. HICKEY: Objection; overbroad.
	22	THE COURT: Overruled.
	23	BY THE WITNESS:
	24	A. Yes, the VA has specific requirements for a mid-year review
12:53:10	25	and then an annual performance appraisal.

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 40 of 161 PageID #:1539 Garmon - cross by Wawzenski 40
	1	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	2	Q. Are there annual training requirements for VA employees?
	3	A. Yes, they're called mandatory training requirements and
	4	they need to be completed on an annual basis.
12:53:23	5	Q. And do you monitor those annual training requirements for
	6	your employees?
	7	A. I do more so now because it has been decentralized, but at
	8	that time I believe it was centralized and the education
	9	department tracked the completion of the mandatory training.
12:53:40	10	Q. And could you view whether or not an employee had performed
	11	the required training? Could you check that to make sure that
	12	they had done it?
	13	A. Yes.
	14	Q. Was Dr. Gilliam subject to those same training
12:53:52	15	requirements?
	16	A. No.
	17	Q. Was she subject to any training requirements as a
	18	contractor?
	19	A. Yes; there were there were several having to do with
12:54:01	20	safety and security: Infectious control, cyberspace kind of
	21	security, safety in the clinic. I don't recall the exact
	22	names, but they all had to do with safety and security.
	23	Q. As the service chief, did you approve any employee requests
	24	for training outside of the VA facility for continuing medical
12:54:25	25	education?

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 41 of 161 PageID #:1540 Garmon - cross by Wawzenski
		41
	1	A. Yes.
	2	Q. Did your section have a budget for this?
	3	A. We had a budget under the education department.
	4	Q. And did Dr. Gilliam ever request continuing medical
12:54:39	5	education training from that budget?
	6	A. No, not that I recall.
	7	Q. If she had submitted a request, would you have approved it?
	8	MR. HICKEY: Objection, Your Honor.
	9	THE COURT: Overruled.
12:54:50	10	BY THE WITNESS:
	11	A. Actually, I remember making a mistake on that. Subsequent
	12	to Dr. Gilliam's time there in which one of the contract
	13	gynecologists wanted to improve her training in ultrasound, and
	14	there was a course offered for a team, and I thought that if
12:55:14	15	they wanted to go and improve their skills. And I thought it
	16	was a good idea and I
	17	MR. HICKEY: Objection to the relevance.
	18	THE COURT: Well, depending on how it ends, it could
	19	be relevant or it could not be relevant. So let's see how it
12:55:27	20	ends.
	21	BY THE WITNESS:
	22	A. So a team of our providers went, including our contract
	23	gynecologist, and when it came time to provide for the bills
	24	and receive reimbursement I was told that I was not allowed to
12:55:44	25	reimburse a contract a contract like I would an employee.

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 42 of 161 PageID #:1541 Garmon - redirect by Hickey 42
	1	And so I went back to the gynecologist, I apologized
	2	profusely, and she thought she could get it covered under her
	3	education budget at the university of Illinois but I thought I
	4	would cover it in case she couldn't, but she ended up getting
12:56:06	5	it covered.
	6	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	7	Q. Did you distribute earning statements to the employees at
	8	the Women's Health Center?
	9	A. Yes.
12:56:11	10	Q. Did you ever give an earning statement to Dr. Gilliam?
	11	A. No.
	12	Q. You talked on direct examination about the issues of
	13	credentialing someone like Dr. Gilliam. Is everyone who has
	14	any kind of contact with patients as a physician at the VA
12:56:31	15	required to be credentialed?
	16	A. Yes.
	17	Q. Is everyone who is credentialed at the VA a VA employee, to
	18	your knowledge?
	19	A. No.
12:56:44	20	MS. WAWZENSKI: I have no further questions.
	21	THE COURT: Anything further?
	22	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
	23	BY MR. HICKEY:
	24	Q. Doctor, when I questioned you before, you indicated that
12:56:57	25	you did not review any of the surgeons who were working at that

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 43 of 161 PageID #:1542 Garmon - redirect by Hickey
		43
	1	multispecialty clinic area, do you recall that, when I
	2	questioned you earlier?
	3	A. Do I recall it? Yes.
	4	Q. Okay. And has your testimony then changed in any way?
12:57:17	5	A. No.
	6	Q. So you wouldn't have reviewed any of the surgeons who were
	7	involved in that area of the clinic, correct?
	8	A. What do you mean by "reviewed"?
	9	Q. You just testified about reviewing nurses, and nurse
12:57:32	10	practitioners, and the administrators as employees in your
	11	area, correct?
	12	A. Correct. The performance evaluation, in other words.
	13	Q. Performance evaluation, yes.
	14	Dr. Gilliam was not a nurse practitioner, or a nurse,
12:57:45	15	or an administrator, correct?
	16	A. Correct.
	17	Q. You did not have the education training to review a surgeon
	18	such as Dr. Gilliam, correct?
	19	A. Correct. What we have are peer reviews that occur.
12:57:59	20	Q. That's correct.
	21	And Dr. Wood would be in charge, as a director of
	22	surgery, in performing her evaluation, correct?
	23	A. I don't think so. The peer reviews are from peer to peer,
	24	as I understand it, but there is some documentation of an
12:58:17	25	annual evaluation that occurs for all staff members, all

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 44 of 161 PageID #:1543 Garmon - recross by Lumb 44
	1	employees of the VA, and for physicians they're just a little
	2	bit different in format as compared to a nurse practitioner or
	3	a nurse.
	4	Q. Okay. And Dr. Gilliam's credentials were reviewed after
12:58:35	5	the peer review, correct?
	6	A. I don't know the sequence.
	7	Q. Her credentials were up for review and reinstatement and
	8	her credentials were reviewed and reinstated in 2001, correct?
	9	A. Part of the contract required that the University of
12:58:57	10	Illinois supervisor
	11	Q. No. My question to you, I'm not asking about your personal
	12	interpretation of the contract: Dr. Gilliam was up for review
	13	in 2001 and her credentials were renewed in 2001, correct?
	14	A. Correct.
12:59:13	15	Q. Thank you.
	16	RECROSS EXAMINATION
	17	BY MR. LUMB:
	18	Q. Doctor, you testified to your belief that Dr. Gilliam was a
	19	contractor, is the word you used, correct?
12:59:36	20	A. Correct.
	21	Q. And part of the basis of that belief is that you believed
	22	that U.I.C. Hospital was responsible for making sure that
	23	Dr. Gilliam complied with the VA's policies and procedures,
	24	correct?
12:59:47	25	A. Correct.

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 45 of 161 PageID #:1544 Garmon - recross by Lumb 45
	1	Q. And another basis of that opinion is that you believed the
	2	VA did not set hours for Dr. Gilliam's work or times for her
	3	clinics, correct?
	4	A. Well, yes and no. There were times for clinic, and there
01:00:04	5	were times for procedures, and there were times for operations,
	6	but those were after discussion of preferable days and times
	7	with the contractor.
	8	Q. Do you believe or was the basis of your opinion regarding
	9	Dr. Gilliam's status that the VA, in 1999 and 2001, did not set
01:00:26	10	the hours for Dr. Gilliam's work or the times for her clinics?
	11	A. Yes and no.
	12	Q. They did but they didn't?
	13	A. Right. It's qualified to some degree, because in order to
	14	identify support staff or appointment slots you would have to
01:00:50	15	put something into a system, a scheduling system, but as I
	16	mentioned, that was after discussion about preferences with the
	17	contractor.
	18	Q. Doctor, in fact, isn't it true that the sole basis of your
	19	belief that Dr. Gilliam was a contract provider or a
01:01:06	20	contractor provider is the contracting documents themselves?
	21	A. I would say no, the sole belief is not that.
	22	Q. Pages 45 and well, let me ask you this, in addition to
	23	those things that I discussed just a few moments ago, the basis
	24	for your opinion regarding Dr. Gilliam's status are the
01:01:49	25	contracting documents themselves, correct?

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 46 of 161 PageID #:1545 Garmon - recross by Lumb 46
	1	A. No.
	2	Q. Starting on line 22 on Page 45, I'm going to ask you if you
	2	
	4	gave these answers to these questions at your deposition:
		"Question: Now, you've indicated before that I think
01:02:16	-	you felt that Dr. Gilliam was a contract employee?
	6	"Answer: I know she was a contracted employee.
	7	"Question: What do you base that on?
	8	"Answer: The contractual agreement that the
	9	University of Illinois and the VA entered into."
01:02:28	10	Did you give those answers to those questions?
	11	A. I did.
	12	Q. And, in fact, Dr. Gilliam is not identified anywhere in any
	13	of those contracting documents, correct?
	14	A. By me, no.
01:02:39	15	Q. By anyone, correct?
	16	A. I'm sorry?
	17	Q. By anyone, correct?
	18	A. What do you mean "by anyone"?
	19	Q. You answered my question by my question was, Dr. Gilliam
01:02:50	20	is not identified anywhere in the contracting documents by
	21	anybody as a contractor, correct?
	22	A. No, her name in not in the contract document.
	23	Q. And based upon your experience at the VA, where you would
	24	expect to see that identification for a contractor, is in a
01:03:10	25	credentialing and privileging form, correct?

(	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 47 of 161 PageID #:1546 Garmon - recross by Lumb 47
	1	A. I don't recall that the form has an option for that in all
	2	of the earlier forms that the VA has had.
	3	Q. That wasn't my question, Doctor. You would expect that a
	4	contract provider would be identified as such in the
01:03:27	5	credentialing and privileging form, that's where you would
01.00.21	6	expect to find it as the chief of Women's Health, correct?
	7	A. Not the only place.
	8	Q. Pardon me?
	9	A. No. No, not the only place. We have other standard forms
01:03:40	10	in the VA that I would expect to see it.
01.00.40	11	Q. Is that one of the places you would expect to see it, the
	12	credentialing and privileging form?
	13	A. Not necessarily but possibly.
	14	Q. Again, Page 46 of your deposition, starting at line 7:
01:04:07	15	"Question: Is there any sort of other document that
01.04.07	16	would identify Dr. Gilliam as being the person
	17	designated in the contract?
	18	"Answer: The contract doesn't designate a name,
	19	it just requires a person or two or three.
01:04:21	20	"Question: But am I correct, there's no document
01.04.21	21	that designates Dr. Gilliam as being that employee?
	22	"Answer: The credentialing and privileging
	23	document would identify her as the gynecologist in
	23 24	this contractual relationship."
01.04.04	24 25	Did you give those answers to those questions at your
01:04:34	20	Dia you give chose answers to those questions at your

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 48 of 161 PageID #:1547 Wood - direct by Hickey
		48
	1	deposition?
	2	A. Yes.
	3	Q. Now, Doctor, you didn't personally provide any direct
	4	supervision of Dr. Gilliam's surgical care, correct?
01:04:56	5	A. Correct.
	6	Q. But you're not a surgeon, correct?
	7	A. Correct.
	8	Q. And, indeed, if the VA had hired what you believe was a VA
	9	federal employee gynecologist, your supervision of that
01:05:08	10	Doctor likely wouldn't have been any different than your
	11	supervision was of Dr. Gilliam, correct?
	12	A. Correct.
	13	MR. LUMB: That's all I have. Thank you.
	14	MS. WAWZENSKI: Nothing further, Your Honor.
01:05:20	15	THE COURT: You may step down.
	16	(Witness excused.)
	17	MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, may we call as our next
	18	witness, Dr. Donald Wood?
	19	THE COURT: Absolutely.
01:06:00	20	(Brief pause).
	21	MR. HICKEY: He was just right outside.
	22	THE COURT: That's okay.
	23	(Brief pause)
	24	THE COURT: Face me and raise your right hand.
01:06:40	25	(Witness duly sworn.)

C	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 49 of 161 PageID #:1548 Wood - direct by Hickey 49
	1	THE COURT: Please be seated.
	2	DONALD CARL WOOD, DEFENDANT GILLIAM WITNESS, SWORN
	3	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	4	BY MR. HICKEY:
01:06:55	5	Q. Doctor, would you say your full name and spell your last
	6	name for the record.
	7	A. Donald Carl Wood, W-o-o-d.
	8	Q. Doctor, could you explain to the Court your educational
	9	background.
01:07:11	10	A. After graduating from high school I went to the University
	11	of Illinois, received a Bachelor's Degree in Science in
	12	zoology. During the last year I did research at the
	13	Oceanographic Institute at Woods Hole and did a project in cell
	14	physiology which I continued when I went to medical school
01:07:45	15	following graduating from the university.
	16	My medical school education was at the Abraham Lincoln
	17	School of Medicine which is the University of Illinois at
	18	Chicago now. And in obtaining the medical degree I went to a
	19	straight surgical internship and residency at the University of
01:08:11	20	Illinois. And during that time, did research on malignant
	21	melanoma and the comparison of melanoma with melanosities and
	22	discovered a very interesting histologic all-or-none test,
	23	which is pretty rare, and that put me into the area of
	24	oncology.
01:08:39	25	I studied then as a fellow as an attending. I was

## Case: 104-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 50 of 161 PageID #:1549 Wood - direct by Hickey

50

1 chosen to be an attending at the University of Illinois in the 2 department of surgery and worked with Dr. Tapas Dasgupta in the 3 division of surgical oncology. 4 He trained me as an American Cancer Society fellow in 5 surgical oncology for 2 years. And I then became an attending 6 at the University of Illinois and an attending at the Westside 7 VA, and also at Cook County Hospital where my responsibilities 8 were for all types of cancer, say for going into the skull, 9 elbow, head and neck, breast, colorectal cancer, and melanoma

- 01:09:33 10 and sarcomas.
  - 11 Q. Doctor, could you please explain for the Court what
  - 12 positions you held at the Westside VA now known as Jesse Brown13 VA.
  - A. The first position I held was as a resident in surgery. It
    was an exchange between the university, and since the VA was
    across the street we trained there. So I was a junior resident
    and a senior resident at the VA hospital.
- 18 Q. All right. Doctor, just so we can move along a little
  19 quicker, did you hold any administrative positions at the VA?
  o1:10:15 20 A. Yes, I was assistant Chief of Surgery from 1975, I believe,
  21 I could be wrong, until I became Chief of Surgery which was in
  22 1992, and those were all part-time positions.
  - 23 Q. Doctor, were you a staff physician at the VA?
  - 24 A. Yes.

01:09:01

01:09:57

01:10:42 25 Q. Were you an attending?

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 51 of 161 PageID #:1550 Wood - direct by Hickey
		51
	1	A. Yes.
	2	Q. Were you Chief of Surgery as of 1999?
	3	A. Yes.
	4	Q. Okay. Doctor, given your position at the VA in the late
01:10:56	5	'90s, and most particularly in 1999, was there an effort made
	6	to try to recruit physicians to improve quality of care at the
	7	VA?
	8	A. Quality of care was always an issue, and with the
	9	responsibility as being a service chief one had the privilege
01:11:19	10	of not only the support of the department heads at the
	11	university, but also I believe it was a mandate from central
	12	office that we raise the quality of care and improve that
	13	quality of care.
	14	And so it was always a priority that we recruit and
01:11:45	15	bring over from the university good people that could not only
	16	do the job but add to research, care of the patients, teaching,
	17	mentoring, all of that.
	18	Q. Doctor, as part of the inducement to get physicians to come
	19	and work at the VA, was immunity from being sued an important
01:12:07	20	incentive?
	21	A. Well, yes. I always assumed that it would be.
	22	Q. Would the loss of immunity from being sued from working at
	23	the VA have an impact on your ability to recruit and provide
	24	quality physicians at the VA?
01:12:25	25	A. It it would not only have an impact, I wouldn't have

С	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 52 of 161 PageID #:1551 Wood - direct by Hickey
		52
	1	been there either. That would be if I wasn't covered for
	2	what I did by the people that employed me, I'd walk away from
	3	it because that's my my family, my life.
	4	Q. Doctor, was that a subject that was often discussed among
01:12:53	5	physicians at the VA, the fact that they had this protection of
	6	the immunity?
	7	A. It was always assumed. I don't know that we ever discussed
	8	it. It was part of our world view in the way we worked. It
	9	was a presumption and an assumption.
01:13:11	10	Q. Okay. Now, Doctor, in 1999, you're listed on the
	11	credentialing form for Dr. Melissa Gilliam coming to the VA.
	12	Did you have an opportunity to speak with Dr. Gilliam as part
	13	of this process?
	14	A. I can't remember if I was involved in the initial
01:13:36	15	interviews, but certainly when she came with us she worked in
	16	the women's clinic and then she also came up to the surgical
	17	services for introduction to it and for the things that we were
	18	looking for her to do.
	19	Q. Doctor, I'm going to show you Defendant's Exhibit Number 3
01:14:08	20	and ask you to take a look this, please.
	21	(Document tendered to the witness).
	22	(Brief pause).
	23	BY MR. HICKEY:
	24	Q. First, do you recognize that document?
01:14:41	25	A. Yes, sir.

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 53 of 161 PageID #:1552 Wood - direct by Hickey
		53
	1	Q. Does your name appear on it?
	2	A. Yes.
	3	Q. Is that your signature at the bottom of the first page?
	4	A. Yes.
01:14:46	5	Q. And is your signature also on the second page?
	6	A. Yes, it is.
	7	Q. Does this indicate that you had reviewed Dr. Gilliam and
	8	recommended her approval as of the date it bears with your
	9	signature which is June 14th, 1999?
01:15:10	<b>10</b>	A. Yes, it does.
	11	Q. Okay. And, Doctor, if I were to refresh your recollection
	12	about Dr. Gilliam's credentials with her receiving her
	13	undergraduate at Yale and then a scholarship at Oxford, and the
	14	her M.D. at Harvard, was this the type of physician that you
01:15:31	15	were actively trying to recruit to be at the VA to provide
	16	healthcare to the vets?
	17	A. Absolutely.
	18	Q. Was it the type of person who, when you would've spoken
	19	with her, you would've talked about the research opportunities
01:15:50	<b>20</b>	and the teaching opportunities?
	21	A. Absolutely.
	22	Q. Doctor, would you have told Dr. Gilliam, during this period
	23	when she was being recruited there, that she would be treated
	24	differently than other surgeons under your direction as Chief
01:16:06	s <b>25</b>	of Surgery?

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 54 of 161 PageID #:1553 Wood - direct by Hickey 54
	1	A. I don't recollect saying that, no.
	2	Q. Would you have told her that she would not have the
	3	protection of the immunity that other surgeons operating and
	4	being on staff as attending physicians that the VA would have?
01:16:23	5	A. I don't know that it was ever a question.
	6	Q. Okay. Would you have raised any inference along those
	7	lines?
	8	MS. BROCK: Objection.
	9	(Brief pause).
01:16:41	10	THE COURT: Wrong case; implication. It's the
	11	recipient who infers.
	12	MR. HICKEY: Okay. May I restate my question, Your
	13	Honor?
	14	THE COURT: Yes.
01:16:51	15	BY MR. HICKEY:
	16	Q. Doctor, would you have made any implication
	17	THE COURT: Would you have implied to her
	18	BY MR. HICKEY:
	19	Q. Would you have implied to her that she
01:17:01	20	THE COURT: anything with respect to her status,
	21	immunity status?
	22	THE WITNESS: I don't believe so, no.
	23	BY MR. HICKEY:
	24	Q. Now, Doctor, would you have treated her the same as all of
01:17:19	25	the other physicians under your supervision in terms of the way

5 1 you supervised her? 2 A. I would not have treated her differently. I treat her as 3 colleague and I would treat her as a very favorable colleague 4 in the area where she held expertise. 01:17:40 5 Q. Okay. Doctor, I'm going to show you a copy of Exhibit 8. 6 MS. BROCK: Your Honor, I would object to this 7 affidavit on hearsay grounds. 8 (Brief pause).
<ul> <li>A. I would not have treated her differently. I treat her as</li> <li>colleague and I would treat her as a very favorable colleague</li> <li>in the area where she held expertise.</li> <li>01:17:40</li> <li>Q. Okay. Doctor, I'm going to show you a copy of Exhibit 8.</li> <li>MS. BROCK: Your Honor, I would object to this</li> <li>affidavit on hearsay grounds.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>3 colleague and I would treat her as a very favorable colleague</li> <li>4 in the area where she held expertise.</li> <li>01:17:40</li> <li>5 Q. Okay. Doctor, I'm going to show you a copy of Exhibit 8.</li> <li>6 MS. BROCK: Your Honor, I would object to this</li> <li>7 affidavit on hearsay grounds.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>4 in the area where she held expertise.</li> <li>01:17:40</li> <li>5 Q. Okay. Doctor, I'm going to show you a copy of Exhibit 8.</li> <li>6 MS. BROCK: Your Honor, I would object to this</li> <li>7 affidavit on hearsay grounds.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>01:17:40</li> <li>Q. Okay. Doctor, I'm going to show you a copy of Exhibit 8.</li> <li>MS. BROCK: Your Honor, I would object to this</li> <li>7 affidavit on hearsay grounds.</li> </ul>
6 MS. BROCK: Your Honor, I would object to this 7 affidavit on hearsay grounds.
7 affidavit on hearsay grounds.
8 (Brief pause).
9 THE COURT: Are you using this for its truth or for
01:18:15 10 some other purpose?
11 MR. HICKEY: To have him identify his signature. I'm
12 going to have him testify to the contents but there was
13 THE COURT: I understand why you want to do this.
14 Overruled.
01:18:24 15 (Document tendered to the witness).
16 BY MR. HICKEY:
17 Q. Doctor, have you had a chance to look at Exhibit 8?
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. Does your signature appear on it?
01:18:33 20 A. Yes.
21 Q. Is that on the last page?
22 A. Yes, it is.
23 Q. And did you make sure that the affidavit was accurate at
24 the time you signed it?
01:18:42 25 A. Yes, I did.

(	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 56 of 161 PageID #:1555 Wood - cross by Lumb 56
	1	Q. All right. Doctor, in your position as Chief of Surgery
	2	for Dr. Gilliam and others, were you supervising them in their
	3	preoperative and operative and then post-operative care of
	4	patients?
01:19:01	5	A. I had the responsibility of oversight.
	6	Q. Okay. And as the way you were supervising Dr. Gilliam in
	7	particular, were you treating her as an employee of the VA in
	8	these circumstances?
	9	A. Yes.
01:19:19	10	Q. Doctor, at the time that Dr. Gilliam was treating patients
	11	at the VA, would you agree that she was not under supervision
	12	by anyone from the University of Illinois?
	13	A. She was not under the supervision. She had the privilege
	14	of consulting across the street, but when she was at the VA,
01:19:57	15	she was working at the VA as a as a practitioner there.
	16	Q. Okay. And would she be subject to the policies and
	17	procedures of the VA while she was there?
	18	A. Absolutely.
	19	Q. Was she subject to the disciplinary procedures the same as
01:20:14	20	other employee physicians taking care of patients at that
	21	facility?
	22	A. Yes.
	23	MR. HICKEY: That's all the questions I have of this
	24	witness at this time, Your Honor.
01:20:45	25	CROSS EXAMINATION

57
ime
or
de
who
f
f

С	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 58 of 161 PageID #:1557 Wood - cross by Lumb
		58
	1	the operative notes dictated by the surgeons under your
	2	direction?
	3	A. Probably I missed a number, but I I had a special desire
	4	to make sure that these things were done timely.
01:22:17	5	Q. You attempted to, correct?
	6	A. Yes.
	7	Q. And you certainly reserved the authority to be able to do
	8	that, correct?
	9	A. Yes.
01:22:23	10	Q. And, in fact, you countersigned the operative note or
	11	you signed the operative note regarding the cone biopsy for
	12	Regina Romero on July 18th of 2001 and the soon-thereafter
	13	hysterectomy, correct?
	14	A. Yes.
01:22:45	15	Q. And you weren't involved in the procedure as a
	16	A. No, I was not.
	17	Q. Now, in the 1999 to 2001 time frame, were there somewhere
	18	around 34 or 35 surgeons at that VA facility?
	19	A. Yes.
01:23:07	20	Q. And did you have the authority to direct all of those 35,
	21	34 or 35 surgeons in their day-to-day activities?
	22	A. Yes, I did.
	23	Q. And that authority wasn't any different for Dr. Gilliam
	24	than for any other VA employees, correct?
01:23:25	25	A. No, it was not.

(	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 59 of 161 PageID #:1558 Wood - cross by Lumb 59
	1	Q. Now, when Dr. Gilliam was appointed as a part-time
	2	attending in 1999, was it your understanding that she was a VA
	3	employee?
	4	A. Yes, it was.
01:23:44	5	Q. And you specifically talked about her employment status
	6	with her soon after she began, correct?
	7	A. Yes, I believe we did.
	8	Q. And those conversations had to do with her inquiring what
	9	was her chain of command, correct?
01:24:01	10	A. That was part of it, yes.
	11	Q. Now, do you know or are you familiar with Dr. Scaunas?
	12	A. Yes.
	13	Q. And was she also affiliated with U.I.C. and with the VA at
	14	the time?
01:24:19	15	A. Yes, she was. She was her predecessor.
	16	Q. Did you consider her a VA employee?
	17	A. Yes.
	18	Q. Now, certainly from 1993 on, as the Chief of Surgery, you
	19	were familiar with the activities of the surgeons under your
01:24:44	20	supervision, correct?
	21	A. Yes.
	22	Q. And was it the mode of operation or the custom and practice
	23	at the Westside VA to treat them all as employees once they
	24	began working at the medical center?
01:24:58	25	A. My oversight was not so much as employees as the fact that

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 60 of 161 PageID #:1559 Wood - cross by Lumb 60
	1	we wanted to make sure that there was a high quality of
	2	delivery of care pre-op, inter-op, and post-op, and that was my
	3	oversight as a professional to my colleagues.
	4	Q. Good point. Setting aside the administrative issues, as
01:25:23	5	the Chief of Surgery it was the custom and practice to retain
	6	the authority to directly control the surgical activities
	7	pre-op, post-op, and during surgery of every surgeon at the
	8	Westside VA, correct?
	9	A. Yes.
01:25:39	10	Q. Now, you had authority to research and discuss what
	11	Dr. Gilliam did on a day-to-day basis and to reprimand and
	12	mentor her, correct?
	13	A. Yes.
	14	Q. And she was subject to all of the same disciplinary
01:25:53	15	procedures as any other VA surgeon, correct?
	16	A. Yes.
	17	Q. And that's the way it operated on a day-to-day basis,
	18	correct?
	19	A. Yes, it is.
01:26:01	20	Q. Now, Dr. Gilliam had zero authority to treat any patient
	21	outside of the any VA patient outside of the Westside VA
	22	without your expressed approval, correct, or the chief of
	23	staffs?
	24	A. I I don't understand that question. She she was
01:26:33	25	she could treat any VA patient that came to her through the

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 61 of 161 PageID #:1560 Wood - cross by Lumb
		61
	1	women's clinic. She was not an independent practitioner in the
	2	sense that she could go out into the community and practice in
	3	that sense.
	4	Q. Let me make that more clear. If Dr. Gilliam believed that
01:26:56	5	a VA patient needed to be transferred to another facility or a
	6	civilian facility, she would have to go through the same chain
	7	of command to get that permission as any other VA employee,
	8	correct?
	9	A. Yes; any VA physician or surgeon.
01:27:13	10	Q. Now, before Dr. Gilliam arrives at Westside VA, the number
	11	of women patients had been increasing, correct?
	12	A. Yes.
	13	Q. And it became obvious to you and to the Westside VA that it
	14	would make sense to actually procure the equipment and the
01:27:43	15	personnel to provide that kind of care in-house, correct?
	16	A. Yes.
	17	Q. And so essentially that was the opposite of outsourcing,
	18	correct?
	19	A. Right. It was a matter of finances, which were always
01:27:56	20	tight. And if we sent if she sent a patient over to the
	21	University of Illinois who was a VA patient, the University of
	22	Illinois would charge the VA for the care given. So after so
	23	many things, machine or some instrumentation was needed, it was
	24	the collective wisdom of the staff that we would purchase this.
01:28:21	25	And this, I think, I believe, happened under when

(	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 62 of 161 PageID #:1561 Wood - cross by Lumb
		62
	1	Dr. Gilliam came that we had purchased, and her predecessor
	2	also purchased instrumentation and the like.
	3	Q. Now, between 1999 and 2001 Dr. Gilliam was required by the
	4	VA to be on-site at Westside for several different sets of
01:28:45	5	clinic hours, correct?
	6	A. Yes.
	7	Q. And the patients that she saw were determined by the VA,
	8	correct?
	9	A. Yes; they came to the women's clinic and she saw them
01:29:01	10	there.
	11	Q. And a VA employee made those appointments3, correct?
	12	A. Yes.
	13	Q. Now, I think you have in front of you Dr. Gilliam's
	14	credentialing and privileging, the initial privileging
01:29:29	15	application.
	16	A. Yes.
	17	Q. And that form indicates that she applied for and was
	18	granted an appointment as a part-time attending physician,
	19	correct?
01:29:39	20	A. Yes.
	21	Q. That's a category of an employee, correct?
	22	A. Yes.
	23	Q. And that was the same category you had back in '74 or '75,
	24	correct?
01:29:49	25	A. Yes.

(	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 63 of 161 PageID #:1562 Wood - cross by Lumb 63
	4	
	1	Q. And were you then or had you ever been aware of any kind of
	2	change in her status between 1999 and 2001?
	3	A. No.
	4	Q. Doctor, I want to turn very quickly to Regina Romero
01:30:20	5	herself.
	6	Do you remember that patient?
	7	A. Yes.
	8	Q. As Chief of Surgery, were you aware of the complication
	9	that occurred on July 18th soon after it occurred?
01:30:32	10	A. Yes.
	11	Q. And, indeed, before the cone biopsy, Dr. Gilliam discussed
	12	with you what she was going to do and what her plan was,
	13	correct?
	14	A. Yes.
01:30:46	15	Q. And either in the recovery room after that procedure or in
	16	the ICU, you were informed of the complication that occurred,
	17	correct?
	18	A. Yes.
	19	Q. And as Dr. Gilliam's supervisor, she informed you that a
01:31:11	20	complication had occurred and you went over with her the
	21	options and what should or shouldn't be done, correct?
	22	A. I
	23	Q. Or you together went over those things?
	24	A. I don't know if it was myself specifically, but several of
01:31:26	25	the attending there went over this with her and I was aware of

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 64 of 161 PageID #:1563 Wood - cross by Lumb 64
	1	what went on.
	2	Q. And you were aware of her plan
	3	A. Yes.
	4	Q and you approved it, correct?
01:31:37	5	A. Yes.
01.51.57	6	Q. Now, setting aside specific gynecological issues for which
	7	you might've had to consult another gynecologist, if you had
	8	disagreed with her plan, you had the authority, as the Chief of
	9	Surgery, to put a stop to it or change it or to delay it,
04 - 04 - 50	10	correct?
01:31:53	11	A. We'd discuss it. We would discuss.
	12	Q. And, in the end, you got the final vote, correct?
	13	A. Yes, but that seldom, if ever, happened.
	14	Q. And you had conversations with Dr. Gilliam after that, the
01:32:19	15	second procedure, on July 18th up through the point when Regina
	16	Romero passed away, correct?
	17	A. Yes.
	18	Q. And likely you had a conversation with her every time you
	19	saw her, correct? Dr. Gilliam.
01:32:35	20	A. Yes, I believe we did.
	21	Q. And that was because you knew, as the Chief of Surgery,
	22	that Ms. Romero's case was a serious situation that required
	23	competent oversight, correct?
	24	A. Yes.
01:32:47	25	Q. And you provided that oversight regarding or that

C	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 65 of 161 PageID #:1564 Wood - cross by Brock 65
	1	oversight of all of the surgeons taking care of Ms. Romero,
	2	correct?
	3	A. Yes.
	4	Q. Doctor, to sum up, was Dr. Gilliam, between 1999 and 2001,
01:33:04	5	subject to the same level of day-to-day direction by you as any
01.33.04	6	other surgeon employed by the VA in working at Westside?
	7	A. Yes, she was.
	8	Q. One other question. Was Dr. Gilliam subject to peer review
	9	procedures in morbidity and mortality
01:33:27	10	A. Yes, she was.
01.33.27	11	Q procedures at the VA?
	12	And only if the VA for care provided by the VA,
	13	correct?
	14	A. That's right.
01:33:39	15	Q. And I don't want to get into any specifics, but if you or
01.00.00	16	other VA employees felt that it was appropriate that
	17	Dr. Gilliam be trained, or suspended, or any type of action
	18	taken in response to quality of care, you had authority to do
	19	that, correct?
01:33:59	20	A. I had the authority to start the process if that was that
01100100	21	onerous.
	22	Q. And the same authority with any other VA employee, correct?
	23	A. Yes.
	24	Q. Thank you, Doctor.
01:34:12	25	MR. LUMB: That's all I have.
	-	

С	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 66 of 161 PageID #:1565 Wood - cross by Brock	
			66
	1	CROSS EXAMINATION	
	2	BY MS. BROCK:	
	3	Q. Hello, Dr. Wood.	
	4	A. How are you?	
01:34:24	5	Q. Good. Thanks. How are you?	
	6	A. Good.	
	7	Q. Did you at one time hold privileges at Michael Reese	
	8	Hospital?	
	9	A. Yes.	
01:34:28	10	Q. Was that between 1991 and 1994?	
	11	A. I believe so.	
	12	Q. You were never employed by Michael Reese Hospital, were	
	13	you?	
	14	A. No, I never received a paycheck from them.	
01:34:38	15	Q. You never actually were employed by Michael release	
	16	A. No.	
	17	Q is that correct?	
	18	A. Yes, that is correct.	
	19	Q. Thank you.	
01:34:45	20	When you saw patients at Michael Reese Hospital, we	re
	21	you required to comply with all of their procedures and	
	22	policies and regulations?	
	23	A. Yes.	
	24	Q. Do you currently receive a pension from the federal	
01:34:59	25	government?	

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 67 of 161 PageID #:1566 Wood - cross by Brock 67
	1	A. Yes.
	2	Q. And when you worked at the VA, did you receive a paycheck
	3	from the federal government?
	4	A. Yes.
01:35:04	5	Q. When you worked at the VA, did you receive a paycheck from
	6	the University of Illinois for work that you did at the VA?
	7	A. I received a check from the University of Illinois, but not
	8	for work that I did at the VA.
	9	Q. What was the check from the University of Illinois for?
01:35:23	10	A. In an academic setting if I may explain this?
	11	Q. Go ahead.
	12	A. In an academic setting, although I'm an attending and a
	13	professor of surgery at the University of Illinois, the
	14	Department Chief would have to put together my salary or any
01:35:51	15	other attending and it just couldn't be from the university, it
	16	would be from our time at the VA, our time at Cook County
	17	Hospital, part-time at Michael Reese, and I was never involved
	18	in a financial situation or who did I leave out? University
	19	of Illinois? And in that academic setting, that allowed you to
01:36:19	20	go to these institutions to work there, care for the patients,
	21	mentor, teach the students, give the highest quality of care.
	22	So it was it was a situation where you worked at
	23	the institution that you worked at and you did the best you
	24	could and you were employed there.
01:36:38	25	Q. Did you receive federal benefits when you worked at the VA?

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 68 of 161 PageID #:1567 Wood - cross by Brock
		68
	1	Sick leave, vacation leave
	2	A. Yes.
	3	Q insurance and so forth?
	4	A. Yes.
01:36:47	5	Q. If you take a look, this is marked Defendant's Exhibit 3.
	6	It's the initial clinical privileges application that you were
	7	given.
	8	A. Yes.
	9	Q. Under category number 3, just a minute ago you testified
01:37:10	10	that that was that it said "category of employment," it
	11	actually says "category of staff membership," doesn't it?
	12	A. That's what it says.
	13	Q. Okay. And if you take a look at Exhibit Number 8, the
	14	affidavit, who wrote this affidavit?
01:37:31	15	A. Who wrote it?
	16	Q. Yeah.
	17	A. This is a reflection of a conversation that I had with
	18	attorney Hofert and myself and this is the sum total of those
	19	discussions.
01:37:53	20	Q. And Mr. Hofert is representing Dr. Gilliam in this case?
	21	A. I believe so, yes.
	22	Q. And he actually typed this up and brought it to you and you
	23	reviewed it and corrected it and signed it?
	24	A. To be specific, I think his secretary did this.
01:38:08	25	Q. Okay. Thank you.

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 69 of 161 PageID #:1568 Wood - cross by Brock 69
	1	A. Okay.
	2	Q. Do you consider any physician who did anything in the
	3	operating room at the VA to be a VA employee if they were
	4	credentialed?
01:38:22	5	A. Yes, I do.
	6	Q. While you were Chief of Surgery at the VA, was it your
	7	practice to countersign operating reports to ensure that the
	8	physicians complied with the rule to get their dictations of
	9	the operations done within a timely fashion?
01:38:41	10	A. Yes, it was.
	11	Q. And did your countersignature signify only that you were
	12	the Chief of Surgery and responsible for everything that went
	13	on in the surgical service?
	14	A. Yes.
01:38:56	15	Q. You were not in the operating room when Dr. Gilliam treated
	16	Regina Romero, is that correct?
	17	A. No, I was not.
	18	Q. You have no knowledge of any conversation between yourself
	19	and Dr. Gilliam prior to Dr. Gilliam performing a cone biopsy
01:39:17	20	on Regina Romero about the planned procedure, is that correct?
	21	A. I do not remember a specific conversation related to that
	22	specific case.
	23	Q. Before you countersigned the operating report for Regina
	24	Romero, did you inquire into Dr. Gilliam's employment status?
01:39:39	25	A. No.

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 70 of 161 PageID #:1569 Wood - cross by Brock 70
	1	Q. Did you ever ask the VA's human resources department about
	2	the employment status of Dr. Gilliam?
	3	A. No, but the Chief of Staff would have.
	4	Q. Did you ever ask Dr. Garmon about Dr. Gilliam's employment
01:39:55	5	status?
	6	A. No.
	7	Q. You never had a conversation with the VA's Chief of Staff
	8	about Dr. Gilliam's employment status, did you?
	9	A. In my in my purview of this whole situation, her
01:40:19	10	employment status was never a question that I would even raise.
	11	That was done by other departments within the VA.
	12	Q. At your deposition, Page 18, at your deposition on
	13	April 22nd, 2010, were you asked this question and did you
	14	given this answer:
01:40:42	15	"Question: Just so I can get it clear on the record,
	16	you never had a conversation with the Chief of Staff
	17	about Dr. Gilliam's employment status to the best of
	18	your memory, is that correct?
	19	"Answer: To the best of my memory, yes."
01:40:55	20	MR. HICKEY: Objection.
	21	
	22	
	23	BY MS. BROCK:
	24	Q. Did you give that answer to that question?
01:41:01	25	MR. HICKEY: Objection to the question. In fairness,

Case: 104-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 71 of 161 PageID #:1570 Wood - cross by Brock				
	1	I would ask if she could read on.		
	-			
	2	THE COURT: Is that okay with you?		
	3	MS. BROCK: Sure.		
	4	THE COURT: Go ahead. Start all over from the		
01:41:09	5	beginning.		
	6	BY MS. BROCK:		
	7	Q. (Reading:)		
	8	"Question: Did you ever have occasion to inquire		
	9	about Dr. Gilliam's employment status with the Chief		
01:41:15	10	of Staff of the hospital?		
	11	"Answer: Only when it was in regard to the		
	12	credentialing which the Chief of Staff would sign off		
	13	on.		
	14	"Question: Did you actually have a conversation		
01:41:24	15	with the Chief of Staff about Doctor		
	16	"Answer: Not in my memory. I can't remember.		
	17	"Question: Just so I can get it clear on the		
	18	record, your never had a conversation with the Chief		
	19	of Staff about Dr. Gilliam's employment status to the		
01:41:38	20	best of your memory, is that correct?		
	21	"Answer: To the best of my memory, yes."		
	22	Did you give those answers to those questions?		
	23	MR. HICKEY: Objection. Not impeaching.		
	24	THE COURT: He can answer it.		
01:41:53	25	THE WITNESS: Pardon?		

С	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 72 of 161 PageID #:1571 Wood - redirect by Hickey 72
	1	THE COURT: You can answer.
	2	BY THE WITNESS:
	3	A. That that was my statement as recorded.
	4	BY MS. BROCK:
01:42:07	5	Q. If Dr. Gilliam worked 20 hours a week at the VA pursuant to
	6	a contract between the VA and the University of Illinois, would
	7	you consider her to be a part time employee?
	8	A. Yes.
	9	Q. Did you ever tell Dr. Gilliam what hours she had to work at
01:42:29	10	the VA?
	11	A. No.
	12	Q. Did you ever tell Dr. Gilliam what days of the week she had
	13	to work at the VA?
	14	A. No.
01:42:36	15	Q. Did you require Dr. Gilliam to punch in or keep track of
	16	her hours or anything of this sort?
	17	A. Not at that time, no.
	18	Q. Did you ever see the contract between the University of
	19	Illinois and the VA under which Dr. Gilliam worked at the VA?
01:42:51	20	A. No.
	21	Q. Was Dr. Gilliam required to have you approve a procedure
	22	before she did it?
	23	A. No.
	24	Q. Is a cone biopsy considered a surgery?
01:43:14	25	A. Yes.

(	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 73 of 161 PageID #:1572 Wood - redirect by Hickey 73
	1	MS. BROCK: No further questions.
	2	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
	3	BY MR. HICKEY:
	4	Q. You were just asked if Dr. Gilliam was required to get your
01:43:37	5	approval before she performed surgery, do you recall that
	6	question?
	7	A. Yes.
	8	Q. You did not require any of your surgeons that were
	9	employees at the VA to get approval before they performed
01:43:51	10	surgery, correct?
	11	A. That's correct.
	12	Q. So she was treated just the same as all the other surgeons
	13	under you, is that correct?
	14	A. That's right.
01:43:58	15	Q. You were asked questions about if you told Dr. Gilliam her
	16	specific days of the week she could operate or be at the VA and
	17	things like that, do you recall questions to that effect?
	18	A. Yes, I do.
	19	Q. You didn't tell any of those other surgeons the days of the
01:44:16	20	week they could operate or be in the facility to see patients
	21	pre-op or post-op, or thing likes that, correct?
	22	A. No, I didn't, but to put this to it, when they could
	23	operate was subject to the chief operating room nurse who did
	24	the schedule with myself. So if they Thursdays, they should be
01:44:39	25	there to do cases on Thursday, that's that's the only

C	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 74 of 161 PageID #:1573 Wood - redirect by Hickey 74
	1	confinement that our service gave with them.
	2	Q. Thank you.
	3	And that way, she was treated the same as everybody
	4	else?
01:44:55	5	A. Yes.
	6	Q. Now, you were read a section of the deposition about your
	7	inquiry into Dr. Gilliam's employment status. Were you also
	8	asked these questions and did you give these answers, Page 14,
	9	starting at line 22 on to Page 15. I'll read you the
01:45:14	10	questions:
	11	"Question: Have you ever had occasion to inquire into
	12	Dr. Gilliam's employment status?
	13	"Answer: Yes.
	14	"Question: When was that?
01:45:28	15	"Answer: When I was credentialing her."
	16	Did you give those answers to those questions, as
	17	well?
	18	A. Yes.
	19	Q. Okay. Doctor, just in summary here, there's been questions
01:45:47	20	about employment status and not. In the way that Dr. Gilliam
	21	was controlled, to the extent that a surgeon is controlled, not
	22	a clerk who's told exactly what to do it and how to do it but
	23	how surgeons are controlled, did the VA control Dr. Gilliam
	24	just as if it controlled any other surgeon?
01:46:11	25	A. Yes, she was controlled in that manner.

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 75 of 161 PageID #:1574 Wood - redirect by Hickey 75
	1	Q. And you did not tell any patients at the VA or hold out to
	2	anyone that she was not an employee, is that fair to say?
	3	Sorry for the double negative in there. Let me restate it
	4	A. I would have no reason to ever say that to anyone.
01:46:33	5	Q. Okay. Thank you very much.
	6	MR. LUMB: Nothing further, Your Honor.
	7	MS. BROCK: Nothing further.
	8	THE COURT: You can step down.
	9	(Witness excused.)
01:47:06	10	MR. LUMB: Your Honor, if we could call Dr. Gilliam to
	11	the stand.
	12	THE COURT: Face me and raise your right hand.
	13	(Witness duly sworn.)
	14	THE COURT: Please be seated be seated.
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	MELISSA LYNN GILLIAM, DEFENDANT, SWORN
	22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	23	BY MR. HICKEY:
	24	Q. Doctor, would you please state your full name and spell
01:47:34	25	your name for the record.

С	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 76 of 161 PageID #:1575 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 76
	1	A. Melissa Lynn Gilliam.
	2	Q. Dr. Gilliam, could you briefly, starting with
	3	undergraduate, explaining your educational background to the
	4	Court.
01:47:45	5	A. Sure. I did my undergraduate degree at Yale University
	6	where I majored in English literature. Then I went to Oxford
	7	University for 2 years where I studied philosophy and politics.
	8	I then returned to the United States and went to Harvard
	9	University for medical school. I began a residency in general
01:48:09	10	surgery a the University of Chicago and decided to change to
	11	obstetrics and gynecology. I went to the University of
	12	Illinois and did a Master's in Public Health, and then went to
	13	Northwestern University for my residency in obstetrics and
	14	gynecology.
01:48:30	15	Q. I'm going to show you a copy of Defendant's Exhibit 1.
	16	Do you recognize that, Doctor?
	17	A. Yes, I do.
	18	Q. What is it?
	19	A. My curriculum vitae.
01:48:53	20	Q. Was it prepared by you or at your direction?
	21	A. Yes.
	22	Q. And at least as of the date of it, which I believe is March
	23	of 2009, did this fairly and accurately reflect your education
	24	and training, your credentials as far as publications and
01:49:17	25	presentations and research
01110111	_•	

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 77 of 161 PageID #:1576 Gilliam - direct by Hickey
		77
	1	A. Yes.
	2	Q to the extent that a CV can?
	3	A. Yes, it does.
	4	Q. Are you board certified in anything?
01:49:24	÷ 5	A. Yes, I am.
	6	Q. In what?
	7	A. Obstetrics and gynecology.
	8	Q. Okay. After you well, Doctor, you were in your OB-GYN
	9	residency in the beginning of 1999 at Northwestern, when was
01:49:46	s <b>10</b>	that scheduled to end?
	11	A. At the end of June of 1999.
	12	Q. Okay. At that period of time, did you start a process of
	13	being recruited to join a particular staff?
	14	A. Yes, I did.
01:50:03	3 <b>15</b>	Q. Can you explain that to the Court for us.
	16	A. I had originally plann3d to do a fellowship, but for family
	17	reasons wasn't able to leave Chicago. So my chairman at the
	18	time at Northwestern contacted the University of Illinois
	19	because there was a colleague there who had expertise in the
01:50:23	3 20	area that I was interested in learning more.
	21	Q. Did you speak to a Dr. Sherman Elias?
	22	A. Yes, I did.
	23	Q. Who was he?
	24	A. He was the Chairman at the University of Illinois, chairman
01:50:38	3 25	of Obstetrics and Gynecology.

C	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 78 of 161 PageID #:1577 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 78
	1	Q. Was it a single conversation?
	2	A. No, it was multiple conversations.
	3	Q. Okay. How did the subject of the VA come up?
	4	A. The original faculty member that I spoke to was someone
01:50:50	5	named Richard Dorman. And when they started to look for ways
	6	to expand my employment or make it possible to employee me, to
	7	find the finances for my employment, the idea of the VA as a
	8	possible place came up. And so I was contacted and told that
	9	this would be an option for me.
01:51:11	10	Q. Did you have a concern at that time about an opportunity to
	11	do research?
	12	A. I had come with a desire and a plan to be an academic
	13	researcher. And so that was one of the things that had come up
	14	that would be a place that I could do research.
01:51:31	15	Q. Was it also important to you to have an opportunity to
	16	engage in academic pursuits and teach residents and medical
	17	students that might be at the VA?
	18	A. Yes; I only looked at academic positions.
	19	Q. Okay. Doctor, did anyone ever tell you that you were going
01:51:54	20	to have to get independent medical malpractice insurance for
	21	the time you were at the VA?
	22	A. No.
	23	Q. Had you had experience working at a VA environment before
	24	that time?
01:52:06	25	A. I worked when I was in residency, the Harvard medical

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 79 of 161 PageID #:1578 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 79
	1	students rotated at the what's called the West Roxbury VA.
	2	Q. And you had discussions at that time of the VA system
	3	providing immunity to the physicians who worked in the VA
	4	environment?
01:52:27	5	A. Yes, I did.
	6	Q. And was that an important consideration to you in
	7	considering this opportunity to work at the VA?
	8	A. Absolutely.
	9	Q. Did anyone ever tell you, regardless of whether it was from
01:52:41	10	the U. of I. or the VA system, that you would not be provided
	11	that indemnity when you went to work at the VA?
	12	A. No. In fact, I was told that I had coverage from both
	13	places.
	14	Q. All right. Doctor, at some point in time did you have a
01:53:00	15	lunch meeting with Dr. Garmon?
	16	A. I had a lunch meeting with Dr. Garmon and Dr. Elias at the
	17	same time, in January of 1999.
	18	Q. Okay. Can you just tell us what you recall, given that
	19	it's 11 years later.
01:53:14	20	A. Sure. We met in a faculty dining room affiliated with the
	21	main university center, and the question was about the
	22	potential of the VA as a place for me to work. And I then had
	23	some questions I don't know if questions more than concerns
	24	about what types of opportunities and why I would go to the VA.
01:53:40	25	And so Dr. Garmon explained her own history of

## Case: 1 04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 80 of 161 PageID #:1579 Gilliam - direct by Hickey

80

		80
	1	initially being at U.I.C. and then working at the VA. And she
	2	actually mentioned some of the things that she mentioned today
	3	about the history of the VA and the Women's Center. And so we
	4	kind of talked about it as a mission. We talked about research
01:53:59	5	opportunities at the VA and grants that were specific to the VA
	6	that might be particular to me.
	7	We talked about other people who had been at the VA
	8	and the advantages for the VA of having somebody on faculty
	9	there. Basically, made it sound like it would be a positive
01:54:19	10	opportunity for me.
	11	Q. Doctor, in this period of time, then, in early 1999 and
	12	extending through the spring, did you have opportunities to
	13	speak to other people at the VA?
	14	A. I'm sorry, before I went or
01:54:31	15	Q. Yes. Not before the lunch but this was before the start
	16	date at the VA.
	17	A. I don't recall specific conversations.
	18	Q. Did you get tendered an application to become an employee
	19	at the VA?
01:54:49	20	A. Yes, I did.
	21	Q. I'm going to show you Defendant's Exhibit Number 2.
	22	(Document tendered to the witness).
	23	BY MR. HICKEY:
	24	Q. Do you have Exhibit 2 in front of you, Doctor?
01:55:15	25	A. Yes, I do.

C	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 81 of 161 PageID #:1580 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 81
	4	
	1	Q. And if you look at the very first page, in one of the top
	2	boxes it says the word "instructions" at the left.
	3	A. Yes.
	4	Q. And on the second line it talks about this is to determine
01:55:27	5	your eligibility for appointment in a Veterans Health
	6	Administration, do you see that?
	7	A. Yes, I do.
	8	Q. And was it your understanding that you were applying for a
	9	job as an employee under an appointment to the Veterans Health
01:55:44	10	Administration?
	11	MS. BROCK: Objection; leading.
	12	THE COURT: I'll let it stand.
	13	BY THE WITNESS:
	14	A. Yes.
01:55:49	15	BY MR. HICKEY:
	16	Q. Doctor, can you turn to Page 3.
	17	A. Yes.
	18	Q. Do you see where it says
	19	A. I'm sorry. Page 4?
01:56:10	20	Q. Page 3. I'm sorry about that.
	21	Do you see the box at the bottom where it says
	22	"signature of applicant"?
	23	A. Yes.
	24	Q. Could you just read that line next to where it says "note."
01:56:23	25	A. (Reading:)

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 82 of 161 PageID #:1581 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 82
	1	"A false statement on any part of your application may
	2	be grounds for not hiring you or for terminating you
	3	after you begin work. Also, you may be punished by a
	4	fine or imprisonment."
01:56:35	5	Q. Doctor, was this consistent with your understanding that
	6	you were applying to be hired?
	7	A. Yes.
	8	Q. Is that your signature that appears on line 3?
	9	A. Yes, it is.
01:56:47	10	Q. Doctor, could you turn to Page 4.
	11	A. Yes.
	12	Q. In the first line, could you read that.
	13	A. (Reading:)
	14	"In order for the Department of Veterans Affairs to
01:57:05	15	assess and verify my educational background,
	16	professional qualifications, and suitability for
	17	employment, I "
	18	and then colon.
	19	Q. Is that consistent with your understanding that you were
01:57:13	20	making an application for employment?
	21	A. Yes, it was.
	22	Q. Do you see the section where it says "purposes and uses"?
	23	A. Yes.
	24	Q. And in the first sentence, does that similarly refer to the
01:57:27	25	information being collected to determine your qualifications

С	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 83 of 161 PageID #:1582 Gilliam - direct by Hickey
		83
	1	and suitability for employment?
	2	A. Yes; it says "suitability for employment."
	3	Q. And then under the "effects of nondisclosure," in the last
	4	line of that section, does it indicate regulations and VA
01:57:51	5	personnel policies and thus may prevent you from obtaining
	6	employment, et cetera?
	7	A. Yes.
	8	Q. And then under the disclosure for social security numbers,
	9	the first line, does it indicate that disclosure of your social
01:58:08	10	security number is mandatory to obtain the employment?
	11	A. Yes.
	12	Q. Did you disclose your social security number?
	13	A. I believe it was on Page 1.
	14	Q. Okay. After you filled this out, did you tender it to the
01:58:28	15	VA?
	16	A. Yes.
	17	Q. Did anyone contact you and tell you that this was not an
	18	application for employment, that it was something else?
	19	A. No.
01:58:37	20	Q. Did anyone ever contact you and provide you with a revised
	21	form that did not contain any references to employment?
	22	A. No.
	23	Q. Did anyone ever tell you that there would be a position
	24	taken at a later time that you were not employed at the VA?
01:58:55	25	A. No.

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 84 of 161 PageID #:1583 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 84
	1	Q. Doctor, just to digress for a minute. You were here in the
	2	courtroom when Dr. Garmon referred to a meeting with Dr. Alias
	3	regarding your maternity leave; do you recall that testimony?
	4	A. Yes.
01:59:15	5	Q. Can you just tell the Judge when that situation about
	6	maternity leave took place so that the Court has some
	7	understanding of a time frame.
	8	A. I don't know when the conversation took place, but my
	9	daughter was born in 2002.
01:59:30	10	Q. So an issue concerning your maternity leave would come up
	11	shortly before your daughter was born?
	12	A. I assume so.
	13	Q. Doctor, did you apply for clinical privileges at the VA?
	14	A. Yes, I did.
01:59:52	15	Q. We've already marked and identified Exhibit 3 and I believe
	16	the Court has a copy of it.
	17	Did you sign Exhibit 3?
	18	(Brief pause.
	19	BY THE WITNESS:
02:00:11	20	A. Yes, I did. Sorry.
	21	BY MR. HICKEY:
	22	Q. Sure.
	23	Was there anything on any of your clinical privilege
	24	application which indicated that you would be treated
02:00:24	25	differently than any of the other attending staff physicians in

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 85 of 161 PageID #:1584 Gilliam - direct by Hickey
		85
	1	surgery at the VA facility?
	2	A. No, there wasn't.
	3	MR. HICKEY: If I may, Your Honor. This is
	4	plaintiff's 6 which I'll tender it up to you.
02:01:22	2 5	THE COURT: We're going to break after this exhibit.
	6	MR. HICKEY: Okay.
	7	THE COURT: Probably to about 2:45.
	8	(Document tendered to the Court and witness).
	9	BY MR. HICKEY:
02:01:32	<sup>2</sup> 10	Q. Doctor, do you see Plaintiff's Exhibit 6?
	11	A. Yes, I do.
	12	Q. And was this sent to you by the Department of Veteran
	13	Affairs?
	14	A. Yes, it was.
02:01:40	<b>15</b>	Q. And did this confirm your reappointment to the medical
	16	staff of the VA?
	17	A. Yes, it does.
	18	Q. And does it indicate that the approval is contingent upon
	19	continuing faculty appointment at the VA and medical staff
02:01:59	ə 20	participation?
	21	A. Yes, it does.
	22	Q. And that you have to follow the medical staff bylaws,
	23	rules, and regulations of the VA?
	24	A. Yes, it does.
02:02:06	<b>5 25</b>	Q. Okay. Now, does this indicate that you were given a

C	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 86 of 161 PageID #:1585 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 86
	1	different status than any other surgeons located at the VA?
	2	A. No, it does not.
	3	Q. Did this indicate that you would be in any way considered
	4	less than an employee of the Veteran Affairs?
02:02:27	5	A. No, it does not.
02.02.21	6	MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Your Honor.
	7	THE COURT: You can be seated.
	8	MR. HICKEY: Pardon?
	9	THE COURT: You can be seated. You're not done,
02:02:37	10	but
02102101	11	MR. HICKEY: I'm not done.
	12	THE COURT: That's all right.
	13	MR. HICKEY: It's a good place to break.
	14	THE COURT: You can step down.
02:02:48	15	(Witness temporarily excused).
02.02.40	16	(Recess.)
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
10:14:56	25	

Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 87 of 1 Gilliam - direct by Hicke	
		87
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLIN	
2	EASTERN DIVISION	010
3	HELEN MONROE, Administrator of the ) Estate of deceased, )	
4		No. 04 CV 7358
5	Plaintiff,	
6	vs.	Chicago, Illinois
7	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, MELISSA GILLIAM,	October 12, 2010
8	Defendants.	2:50 o'clock p.m.
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	3
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES B.	ZAGEL
11	For the Plaintiff:	
12	CORBOY & DEMETRIO BY: Kenneth Thomas Lumb	
13	33 North Dearborn Street Suite 2100	
14	Chicago, Illinois 60602 (312) 346-3191	
15	For Defendant Gilliam:	
16	HICKEY, MELIA & ASSOCIATES, CHA	RTERED
17	BY: Richard J. Hickey Daniel Cobb Hofert	
18	77 West Washington Street Suite 800	
19	Chicago, Illinois 60602 (312) 422-9408	
20		
21	Court reporter:	
22	Blanca I. Lara, CSR, CP, R 219 South Dearborn Stree	
23	Room 2504 Chicago, Illinois 60604	
24	(312) 435-5895	
25		

Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 88 of 161 PageID #:1587 Gilliam - direct by Hickey	88
1	Appearances (continued:)	
2		
3		
4	For the United States:	
5		
6	THE HONORABLE PATRICK J. FITZGERALD, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY	
7	BY: Gina Elizabeth Brock Linda Wawzenski	
8	Assistant United States Attorney 219 South Dearborn Street	
9	Suite 500 Chicago, Illinois 60604	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 89 of 161 PageID #:1588 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 89
	1	(Proceedings taken in open court:)
	2	
		THE COURT: You may begin.
	3	MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Judge.
	4	MELISSA LYNN GILLIAM, DEFENDANT, SWORN
01:47:16	5	DIRECT EXAMINATION (resumed)
	6	BY MR. HICKEY:
	7	Q. Doctor, when you started working at the VA, on or about the
	8	beginning of August 1999, did you sign a written employment
	9	agreement with the VA?
02:50:47	10	A. Could you explain employment agreement?
	11	Q. A written contract of employment between yourself and the
	12	VA.
	13	A. No, I did not.
	14	Q. Did you sign one between yourself and U.I.C.?
02:50:58	15	A. No, I did not.
	16	Q. Okay. Doctor, did it make a difference to you whether all
	17	the money, that you were compensated under this arrangement
	18	that had been worked out, came from the VA or not?
	19	A. No.
02:51:13	20	Q. So did it make a difference if you got a single check and
	21	all the money was from the VA?
	22	A. No.
	23	Q. Did it make a difference if you got one check from the VA
	24	and one from U.I.C.?
02:51:24	25	A. No.

C	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 90 of 161 PageID #:1589 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 90
	1	Q. Did it make a difference if you got one check from U.I.C.?
	2	A. No.
	3	Q. The benefits that you received, what was your understanding
	4	about where the money came from to pay for those benefits?
02:51:38	5	A. Basically the majority of my salary came from the VA and
	6	that was what enabled them to have the ability to bring me on.
	7	Q. In addition to the salary, the benefits, did the money for
	8	the benefits also come from the VA? Again, the majority of it.
	9	A. I don't know how they used the money that came from the VA.
2:52:00	10	Q. All right. Now, Doctor, did you participate in negotiating
	11	any contract between U.I.C. and the VA?
	12	A. No, I did not.
	13	Q. Did anyone ever show that to you?
	14	A. No.
02:52:16	15	Q. All right. Getting back to your privileges, Doctor. In
	16	2001 were you up for examination on your privileges?
	17	A. Yes.
	18	MR. HICKEY: Exhibit 4.
	19	(Document tendered to the witness).
02:52:40	20	BY MR. HICKEY:
	21	Q. Have you had a chance to see Exhibit 4?
	22	A. Yes.
	23	Q. Okay. Was this the application for renewal of privileges?
	24	A. Yes.
02:53:13	25	Q. And on the third page, did you sign it?

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 91 of 161 PageID #:1590 Gilliam - direct by Hickey
		91
	1	A. Yes.
	2	Q. And at the bottom, do you see that it was approved by two
	3	different people?
	4	A. Yes.
02:53:26	5	Q. Was it your understanding that it would have to be approved
	6	by two different people?
	7	A. Yes.
	8	Q. Can you explain that to the Judge.
	9	A. I had, just in terms of the chain of command, I had to
02:53:42	2 10	raise the reporting for any surgical services, I would report
	11	and discuss that with Dr. Wood; for anything to do with the
	12	clinic itself, I would discuss that with Dr. Garmon.
	13	Q. And then in the last page, was that approved by the chief
	14	of the the service chief, as well as the medical center
02:54:04	15	director?
	16	A. That is correct.
	17	Q. Okay.
	18	MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, with your permission, this
	19	was marked as actually Plaintiff's Exhibit 8 but I was going to
02:54:25	5 20	use it.
	21	THE COURT: That's fine.
	22	(Document tendered to the witness).
	23	BY MR. HICKEY:
	24	Q. Doctor, showing you Exhibit 8.
02:54:38	25	Did you receive actually written notification that

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 92 of 161 PageID #:1591 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 92
	1	your privileges had, in fact, been renewed?
	2	A. Yes.
	2	
		Q. Was there any indication, either on your application for
	4	renewal of privileges or in that notification that they were
02:54:56		renewed, that you were going to be treated differently than
	6	other surgeons who were on staff as attendee at the VA?
	7	A. No.
	8	Q. Was there any indication in any of those documents that you
	9	would not benefit from the immunity provided to surgeons
02:55:17	7 10	treating patients at the VA?
	11	A. No.
	12	Q. Was there anything in there to indicate that you wouldn't
	13	be able to engage in the same sort of academic pursuits with
	14	teaching residents and med students for the research
02:55:32	· 15	activities?
	16	A. No.
	17	Q. Thank you, Doctor.
	18	Doctor, just on a day-to-day basis, would you explain
	19	to the Court what kind of uniform would you wear, what type of
02:55:52	2 20	ID badge would you have when you worked at the VA?
	21	A. I would wear my street clothes and then I would have a
	22	jacket and I would have a VA badge, and then if I was operating
	23	that day I would for example, if I was wearing scrubs from
	24	the university, I would come over and change into the VA
02:56:12	· 25	scrubs, which are very distinctive, to do a surgery at the VA.

	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 93 of 161 PageID #:1592 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 93
	1	Q. Did you have anything identifying you as a University of
	2	Illinois employee when you were actually treating patients at
	3	the VA?
	4	A. No, I did not.
02:56:30	5	Q. When you interacted with patients at the VA, did you tell
	6	them you were a University of Illinois physician?
	7	A. No, I told them I was at the VA.
	8	Q. When you were assigned patients at the VA, did they come
	9	from referrals from VA physicians?
02:56:48	10	A. Yes, or yes.
	11	Q. And those patients had to be Vets who had VA benefits
	12	available to them?
	13	A. Or eligibility to have the benefits.
	14	Q. Okay. Now, Doctor, you've heard testimony from Dr. Garmon
02:57:08	15	about assistants, people you would work with. I'd like to draw
	16	your attention to that for a moment.
	17	When you were operating, were you allowed to bring
	18	anyone from the University of Illinois to the VA to perform any
	19	procedure with you?
02:57:21	20	A. It had to be very specific. So medical students were
	21	were allowed to come to the VA, but I, for example, couldn't
	22	bring a gynecology resident, I couldn't bring a resident or
	23	another attendant to assist me. So we actually ended up using
	24	the general surgery faculty at the VA to do that.
02:57:49	25	Q. Now, the medical students you mentioned, those medical

C	ase: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 94 of 161 PageID #:1593 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 94
	1	students would be rotating through the VA at various times, is
	2	that correct?
	3	A. Right.
	4	Q. And that was with the agreement that the VA had with the
02:58:06	5	medical school about supplying residents, is that correct?
	6	A. Medical students.
	7	Q. I'm sorry. Medical students.
	8	A. Yes.
	9	Q. And that was part of your teaching at the VA was to teach
02:58:18	10	those medical students, is that correct?
	11	A. Yes. Specifically, we had it was called the fourth year
	12	women's health elective, and so those were often the medical
	13	students who were focused on women's health.
	14	Q. Okay. Now, when you worked at the VA for those number of
02:58:35	15	years, did you interact with other VA surgeons who were at that
	16	location? Did you understand how they interacted with policies
	17	and procedures at the VA?
	18	A. To some extent. I don't know if I had a deep knowledge.
	19	Q. Now, other physicians, when they would make decisions to
02:58:57	20	order tests or not, were they in any way restricted by the
	21	tests that were allowed by the VA?
	22	A. Yes.
	23	Q. When you ordered tests, were there restrictions on your
	24	ability to order tests?
02:59:12	25	A. Yes.

(	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 95 of 161 PageID #:1594 Gilliam - direct by Hickey
		95
	1	Q. Can you explain that to the Court.
	2	A. It was more of a it was a menu approach. There would be
	3	things that were available to do and things that you were not
	4	able to do. So I would do what was permitted at the VA.
02:59:29	5	Q. When you were going to order medicines, were you asked to
	6	order them or prescribe them based on the formulary approved by
	7	the VA?
	8	A. Yes.
	9	Q. Is that the same as it was with other physicians and
02:59:44	10	surgeons at the VA?
	11	A. Yes.
	12	Q. When you wore going to use equipment at the VA, was it the
	13	VA equipment that you used?
	14	A. Yes.
02:59:52	15	Q. Doctor, at times did you make decisions about recommending
	16	whether a patient should come back for follow-up visits?
	17	A. Yes.
	18	Q. Okay. Now, no one at the VA would tell you how to
	19	independently exercise your medical judgment
03:00:09	20	A. No.
	21	Q is that fair?
	22	A. Yes.
	23	Q. But when you were making those recommendations, was that
	24	the same as any other physician seeing patients at the VA?
03:00:20	25	A. Yes.

<ul> <li>90</li> <li>1 Q. Doctor, did you have a title at the VA?</li> <li>2 A. Yes.</li> <li>3 Q. What was your title?</li> <li>4 A. Chief of Gynecology.</li> <li>03:00:32 5 Q. Doctor, did you actually then work on some of the policies</li> <li>6 and procedures at the VA?</li> <li>7 A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>8 Q. Did you actually work on some templates for approaches to</li> <li>9 care for patients?</li> <li>03:00:50 10 A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>11 Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.</li> <li>12 A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues</li> <li>13 that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to</li> <li>14 the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>03:01:10 15 And there were questions around how do we select who would be</li> <li>16 eligible for fertility services and what were the implications</li> <li>17 of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what</li> <li>18 those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>19 And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop</li> <li>03:01:28 20 those procedures, and we even planned some research around the</li> <li>21 topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists</li> <li>22 at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>23 procedures for services.</li> <li>24 Q. Doctor, you've heard testimony about time for procedures.</li> </ul>	C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 96 of 161 PageID #:1595 Gilliam - direct by Hickey
<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was your title?</li> <li>A. Chief of Gynecology.</li> <li>Doctor, did you actually then work on some of the policies and procedures at the VA?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Did you actually work on some templates for approaches to care for patients?</li> <li>O A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.</li> <li>A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>OB:01:10</li> <li>And there were questions around how do we select who would be eligible for fertility services. We had to talk about what those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop those procedures, and we even planned some research around the topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design procedures for services.</li> </ul>			96
<ul> <li>3 Q. What was your title?</li> <li>4 A. Chief of Gynecology.</li> <li>03:00:32 5 Q. Doctor, did you actually then work on some of the policies</li> <li>and procedures at the VA?</li> <li>7 A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>8 Q. Did you actually work on some templates for approaches to</li> <li>9 care for patients?</li> <li>03:00:50 10 A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>11 Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.</li> <li>12 A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues</li> <li>13 that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to</li> <li>14 the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>03:01:10 15 And there were questions around how do we select who would be</li> <li>eligible for fertility services. We had to talk about what</li> <li>those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>19 And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop</li> <li>03:01:28 20 those procedures, and we even planned some research around the</li> <li>topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists</li> <li>22 at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>23 procedures for services.</li> </ul>		1	Q. Doctor, did you have a title at the VA?
<ul> <li>A. Chief of Gynecology.</li> <li>B. Doctor, did you actually then work on some of the policies and procedures at the VA?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Did you actually work on some templates for approaches to care for patients?</li> <li>C. Can you explain some of that to the Court.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.</li> <li>A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>Can there were questions around how do we select who would be eligible for fertility services. We had to talk about what those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop those procedures, and we even planned some research around the topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design procedures for services.</li> </ul>		2	A. Yes.
03:00:325Q. Doctor, did you actually then work on some of the policies and procedures at the VA?7A. Yes, I did.8Q. Did you actually work on some templates for approaches to care for patients?03:00:5010A. Yes, I did.11Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.12A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to 		3	Q. What was your title?
<ul> <li>and procedures at the VA?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Did you actually work on some templates for approaches to care for patients?</li> <li>03:00:50</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.</li> <li>A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>And there were questions around how do we select who would be eligible for fertility services and what were the implications of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop those procedures, and we even planned some research around the topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design procedures for services.</li> </ul>		4	A. Chief of Gynecology.
<ul> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Did you actually work on some templates for approaches to care for patients?</li> <li>03:00:50</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.</li> <li>A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>And there were questions around how do we select who would be eligible for fertility services. We had to talk about what those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop those procedures, and we even planned some research around the topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design procedures for services.</li> </ul>	03:00:32	5	Q. Doctor, did you actually then work on some of the policies
<ul> <li>8 Q. Did you actually work on some templates for approaches to care for patients?</li> <li>03:00:50</li> <li>10 A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.</li> <li>12 A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>03:01:10</li> <li>15 And there were questions around how do we select who would be eligible for fertility services and what were the implications of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>19 And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop those procedures, and we even planned some research around the topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design procedures for services.</li> </ul>		6	and procedures at the VA?
<ul> <li>9 care for patients?</li> <li>03:00:50</li> <li>10 A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>11 Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.</li> <li>12 A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues</li> <li>13 that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to</li> <li>14 the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>03:01:10</li> <li>15 And there were questions around how do we select who would be</li> <li>eligible for fertility services and what were the implications</li> <li>of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what</li> <li>those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>19 And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop</li> <li>those procedures, and we even planned some research around the</li> <li>topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists</li> <li>at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>procedures for services.</li> </ul>		7	A. Yes, I did.
03:00:5010A. Yes, I did.11Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.12A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues13that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to14the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.03:01:101515And there were questions around how do we select who would be16eligible for fertility services and what were the implications17of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what18those services would be and who would be eligible.19And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop03:01:282020those procedures, and we even planned some research around the21topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists22at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design23procedures for services.		8	Q. Did you actually work on some templates for approaches to
<ul> <li>Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.</li> <li>A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>And there were questions around how do we select who would be eligible for fertility services and what were the implications of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop those procedures, and we even planned some research around the topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design procedures for services.</li> </ul>		9	care for patients?
<ul> <li>A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues</li> <li>that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to</li> <li>the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>And there were questions around how do we select who would be</li> <li>eligible for fertility services and what were the implications</li> <li>of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what</li> <li>those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop</li> <li>those procedures, and we even planned some research around the</li> <li>topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists</li> <li>at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>procedures for services.</li> </ul>	03:00:50	10	A. Yes, I did.
<ul> <li>that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to</li> <li>the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>And there were questions around how do we select who would be</li> <li>eligible for fertility services and what were the implications</li> <li>of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what</li> <li>those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop</li> <li>those procedures, and we even planned some research around the</li> <li>topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists</li> <li>at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>procedures for services.</li> </ul>		11	Q. Can you explain some of that to the Court.
<ul> <li>14 the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.</li> <li>03:01:10</li> <li>15 And there were questions around how do we select who would be eligible for fertility services and what were the implications of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>19 And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop those procedures, and we even planned some research around the topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design procedures for services.</li> </ul>		12	A. I can think of a couple of examples, but one of the issues
<ul> <li>And there were questions around how do we select who would be</li> <li>eligible for fertility services and what were the implications</li> <li>of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what</li> <li>those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop</li> <li>those procedures, and we even planned some research around the</li> <li>topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists</li> <li>at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>procedures for services.</li> </ul>		13	that came up was, we were providing sterilization services to
<ul> <li>16 eligible for fertility services and what were the implications</li> <li>17 of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what</li> <li>18 those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>19 And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop</li> <li>03:01:28 20 those procedures, and we even planned some research around the</li> <li>21 topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists</li> <li>22 at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>23 procedures for services.</li> </ul>		14	the women's Vets and some issues came up of fertility services.
<ul> <li>of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what</li> <li>those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop</li> <li>those procedures, and we even planned some research around the</li> <li>topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists</li> <li>at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>procedures for services.</li> </ul>	03:01:10	15	And there were questions around how do we select who would be
<ul> <li>18 those services would be and who would be eligible.</li> <li>19 And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop</li> <li>03:01:28 20 those procedures, and we even planned some research around the</li> <li>21 topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists</li> <li>22 at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>23 procedures for services.</li> </ul>		16	eligible for fertility services and what were the implications
19 And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop 03:01:28 20 those procedures, and we even planned some research around the 21 topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists 22 at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design 23 procedures for services.		17	of providing fertility services. We had to talk about what
<ul> <li>203:01:28</li> <li>20 those procedures, and we even planned some research around the</li> <li>21 topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists</li> <li>22 at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>23 procedures for services.</li> </ul>		18	those services would be and who would be eligible.
<ul> <li>topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists</li> <li>at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>procedures for services.</li> </ul>		19	And so I worked with the staff psychiatrist to develop
<ul> <li>22 at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design</li> <li>23 procedures for services.</li> </ul>	03:01:28	20	those procedures, and we even planned some research around the
23 procedures for services.		21	topics. We ended up working also with one of the psychiatrists
		22	at Northwestern to try to get her input for how we could design
24 Q. Doctor, you've heard testimony about time for procedures.		23	procedures for services.
		24	Q. Doctor, you've heard testimony about time for procedures.
03:01:52 25 Were you given a day on which you needed to schedule	03:01:52	25	Were you given a day on which you needed to schedule

С	case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 97 of 161 PageID #:1596 Gilliam - direct by Hickey 97
	4	
	1	procedures?
	2	A. The surgical procedures?
	3	Q. Yes.
	4	A. I typically did those on Wednesdays.
03:02:03	5	Q. Okay. And when those would be scheduled, would they be
	6	scheduled by the VA scheduling person?
	7	A. Right. Yes.
	8	Q. Okay. Was this a situation where you could just schedule
	9	surgeries on any day of the week or were you to work within the
03:02:20	10	framework of what the VA provided you of when to schedule?
	11	A. Yes. Yes, I was subject to their availability, the OR
	12	availability of what the nurse, the head nurse said I could do
	13	who would be available to assist.
	14	Q. Was it the same situation with the clinic, that there were
03:02:36	15	certain set times for your clinic?
	16	A. Yes.
	17	Q. Doctor, at any time when you seeing a patient either in the
	18	clinic or in a surgical setting, did you hold yourself out to
	19	them as anything but an employee of the VA?
03:03:06	20	A. No.
	21	Q. Did you attend various training sessions as an employee of
	22	the VA?
	23	A. Yes, I did.
	24	Q. Did you attend medical conferences with other employees of
03:03:20	25	the VA?

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 98 of 161 PageID #:1597 Gilliam - cross by Lumb 98
	1	A. Yes, I did.
	2	Q. Did you go to staff meetings at the VA?
	3	A. Yes, I did.
	4	Q. And, Doctor, at all times when you worked at the VA, did
03:03:37	5	you believe yourself to be covered by the immunities provided
	6	for physicians working at the VA?
	7	A. Yes, I did.
	8	Q. Did anyone at any time, during the entire time you worked
	9	there, represent to you that you would not be covered by that
03:03:52	10	immunity?
	11	A. No. In fact, I specifically asked them and was told that I
	12	was covered.
	13	MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Your Honor.
	14	CROSS EXAMINATION
03:04:22	15	BY MR. LUMB:
	16	Q. Good afternoon, Doctor.
	17	A. Good afternoon.
	18	Q. Between 1999 and 2001, or whenever you left the VA, were
	19	you ever required by any VA employee to actually sign in or
03:04:55	20	sign out?
	21	A. No, I was not.
	22	Q. I want to talk very briefly about Regina Romero
	23	specifically.
	24	On July 18th of 2001, were you the only physician in
03:05:21	25	the OR during the cone biopsy?

C	Case: 1	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 99 of 161 PageID #:1598 Gilliam - cross by Lumb 99
	1	A. Yes, I was.
	2	Q. On July 26th of 2001, Ms. Romero was taken back to the
	3	operating room for an exploratory laparotomy, correct?
	4	A. That is correct.
03:05:38	5	MR. LUMB: Your Honor, I'd like to show what's been
	6	marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 3.
	7	(Document tendered to the witness).
	8	BY MR. LUMB:
	9	Q. Is that the operating memo from July 26th, exploratory
03:06:04	10	laparotomy?
	11	A. That is correct.
	12	Q. You are listed as an assistant on that, correct?
	13	A. That is correct.
	14	Q. Did you participate in the care during that procedure?
03:06:12	15	A. I believe I was about the third assistant, so it was
	16	Q. What does that mean?
	17	A fairly minor.
	18	I might have helped the suction or but the general
	19	surgeon had his regular team present.
03:06:31	20	Q. Now, during that procedure well, first of all, did you
	21	have privileges to perform an exploratory laparotomy other than
	22	for an abdominal hysterectomy?
	23	A. No, I did not.
	24	Q. And, in fact, in performing an abdominal hysterectomy,
03:06:46	25	you're not even going into the peritoneum itself, correct?

С	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 100 of 161 PageID #:1599 Gilliam - cross by Lumb 100
	1	A. Yes, you are.
	2	Q. But other than dealing with the uterus, you did not have
	3	privileges for laparotomies, correct?
	4	A. If there was a case that required the uterus ovaries, but
03:07:03	5	outside of a gynecological procedure I did not perform
	6	laparotomies at the VA.
	7	Q. Now, during this procedure a bowel resection was performed,
	8	correct?
	9	A. Yes, that is correct.
03:07:16	10	Q. A portion of the jejunum was removed?
	11	A. That is correct.
	12	Q. A portion of the bowel, is that right?
	13	A. That is correct.
	14	Q. Did you have privileges to perform that type of a
03:07:25	15	procedure?
	16	A. No, I did not.
	17	Q. Were you acting in everything you did under the
	18	supervision, the direct supervision of the surgeon who was
	19	performing the resection?
03:07:37	20	A. That is correct.
	21	Q. He told you where to put suction and where to hold the
	22	retractor, and all that type of thing?
	23	A. I don't believe I I did not do quite that much, but if
	24	but yes.
03:07:46	25	Q. You were operating essentially or acting essentially at

Ca	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 101 of 161 PageID #:1600 Gilliam - cross by Lumb 101
	1	the level of a medical student or a resident, correct?
	2	A. That would be correct.
	3	Q. Did you have privileges to perform a or to insert the
	4	type of tube that was inserted?
03:08:05	5	A. No, I did not.
	6	Q. That was what type of device was that?
	7	A. There's a gastric tube and a jejunotomy. So a gastric tube
	8	placement.
	9	Q. Did you have privileges to perform a primary anastomosis?
03:08:24	10	A. No, I did not.
	11	Q. And that was performed during that procedure, is that
	12	correct?
	13	A. That is correct.
	14	Q. I'm going to show you Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 2.
03:08:28	15	(Document tendered to the witness).
	16	BY MR. LUMB:
	17	Q. You have seen that before, correct?
	18	A. Yes, I have.
	19	Q. That is Dr. Lipnick's progress notes or a brief operative
03:08:54	20	note after or it's progress notes regarding the July 26th
	21	surgery, correct?
	22	A. That's correct.
	23	Q. I don't know if I asked you this before, but Dr. Lipnick
	24	was the lead surgeon for the July 26th laparotomy, correct?
03:09:06	25	A. That is correct.

C	Case: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 102 of 161 PageID #:1601 Gilliam - cross by Lumb
		102
	1	Q. He was a VA employee, correct?
	2	A. That is correct.
	3	Q. And in that note, Dr. Lipnick stated that he supervised the
	4	pre-op and operative assessment of the patient and the
03:09:30	5	procedure itself, correct?
	6	A. That is correct.
	7	Q. And you agree with that statement, he provided the direct
	8	supervision of the preoperative care and the operative
	9	procedure, correct?
03:09:39	10	A. Yes.
	11	Q. Now, I want to get a little more general, from 1999 to the
	12	time you left the VA. Did anyone at U.I.C. ever do any kind of
	13	morbidity or mortality meeting or procedure, or whatever it's
	14	called, regarding any of your care at the VA?
03:10:10	15	A. No, they did not.
	16	Q. Did they have any authority to do that?
	17	A. No, they did not.
	18	Just to be clear, Dr. Wood did invite one of the gyne
	19	oncologists to come to the VA for an M&M report.
03:10:30	20	Q. Okay. He invited an additional expert in that area?
	21	A. Yes.
	22	Q. But the M&M process and the procedure was done at the VA,
	23	correct?
	24	A. That is correct.
03:10:41	25	Q. Now, at any time after Ms. Romero's injury, did anyone

C	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 103 of 161 PageID #:1602 Gilliam - cross by Lumb
		103
	1	suggest in any way, shape, or form that the U.I.C. lawyer
	2	should be informed of the complications?
	3	A. I not that I'm aware of. Not that I recall.
	4	Q. Did anyone suggest that a U.I.C. lawyer should be involved
03:11:09	5	in meeting with the family?
	6	A. No.
	7	Q. And finally, just to be clear, from the time you first
	8	started at the VA until the time you left in 2001 or 2002,
	9	regarding any activity at the VA, did Dr. Elias or anyone at
03:11:46	10	U.I.C. provide any kind of supervision, direction, control at
	11	al1?
	12	A. No, this was made very clear that I could not that
	13	Dr. Elias had no authority. So if I had an issue, I would go
	14	to Dr. Wood or to Dr. Garmon.
03:12:04	15	Q. And it was made clear by VA employees that the VA had that
	16	control, correct?
	17	A. By both Dr. Elias and by the VA that if I needed something
	18	in surgery or if I had an issue, that it went to Dr. Wood or to
	19	Dr. Garmon.
03:12:22	20	Q. Finally, I want to show you Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 10.
	21	MS. BROCK: Again, Your Honor, that is an affidavit.
	22	We would object.
	23	THE COURT: For what purpose?
	24	MR. LUMB: I just want to enter it into evidence.
03:12:46	25	THE COURT: In the evident that the government might

Cá	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 104 of 161 PageID #:1603 Gilliam - cross by Lumb 104
	1	want to use it to impeach?
	2	MR. LUMB: If they want to.
	3	THE COURT: I'm sustaining the objection.
	4	MR. LUMB: Then that's all I have. Thank you.
03:13:02	5	THE COURT: I think we're going to take a short break
	6	here, but I do have a question for you.
	7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
	8	THE COURT: About Oxford. What happened to the "e" in
	9	PPE?
03:13:15	10	THE WITNESS: What happened to the "e"? The economics
	11	part?
	12	THE COURT: Yeah.
	13	THE WITNESS: Why didn't I do the full PPE?
	14	THE COURT: Yes.
03:13:19	15	THE WITNESS: Because you can make a choice
	16	THE COURT: Okay.
	17	THE WITNESS: which two of the three.
	18	THE COURT: In my day, you could not make a choice.
	19	THE WITNESS: I was frightened of economics at the
03:13:29	20	time.
	21	THE COURT: We'11 be back soon.
	22	THE CLERK: All rise.
	23	(Recess.)
	24	THE CLERK: This Court resumes in session.
	25	THE COURT: You may begin.

Ci	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 105 of 161 PageID #:1604 Gilliam - cross by Brock 105
	1	MS. BROCK: Thank you, Your Honor.
	2	CROSS EXAMINATION
	3	BY MS. BROCK:
	4	Q. Dr. Gilliam, let me ask you about the privileges and
03:57:37	5	credentialing process.
	6	Before a doctor, any doctor, can treat a patient at a
	7	hospital, a VA or any hospital, that physician has the
	8	hospital has to grant that physician privileges, is that right?
	9	A. That's correct.
03:57:55	10	Q. Okay. And what is the procedure for applying for
	11	privileges at the VA?
	12	A. You complete paperwork.
	13	Q. This application that you testified to earlier marked
	14	Defendant's Exhibit 2, was that application sent to you by the
03:58:10	15	credentialing department at the VA as part of a packet of
	16	information that you should send back in in order to get
	17	credentialed and privileges at the VA?
	18	A. Could you show me which one you're talking about?
	19	Q. Yes. I've written on mine, but it's Defendant's Exhibit 2,
03:58:23	20	the application.
	21	A. I don't recall if it was sent to me or if I picked it up.
	22	MR. HICKEY: Objection; that is not a privilege
	23	application. 3 is the privilege application.
	24	MS. BROCK: Well, I've shown her the document that
03:58:38	25	THE COURT: It doesn't matter, just read me the title

Ci	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 106 of 161 PageID #:1605 Gilliam - cross by Brock 106
	1	of the document.
	2	MS. BROCK: Application for positions of podiatrists
	3	and optometrists.
	4	THE COURT: Okay. Then we don't confuse them.
03:58:49	5	BY MS. BROCK:
	6	Q. Did you answer that question? I didn't hear it.
	7	A. I don't recall how it was given to me.
	8	Q. Okay. Is it possible that it was sent to you by the
	9	credentialing department as part of a packet of information
03:59:12	10	that you had to submit to the credentialing department in order
	11	to get privileged?
	12	A. It's possible.
	13	Q. Did your status at the VA, whatever that status was, did
	14	that status change in any way between the time that you first
03:59:23	15	applied for privileges and the second time you applied for
	16	renewed privileges?
	17	A. Not that I'm aware of.
	18	Q. When you worked at the University of Illinois well, let
	19	me back up a minute. When you were working at the VA, were you
03:59:41	20	also working for the University of Illinois?
	21	A. Yes.
	22	Q. And you spent about 20 hours a week at the VA and the
	23	remainder of your time was at the University of Illinois?
	24	A. I had a few other places that I that I went to. I went
03:59:56	25	to the Board of Health at one point.

Ca	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 107 of 161 PageID #:1606 Gilliam - cross by Brock 107
	1	Q. But the majority of the remainder of your time was spent at
	2	the University of Illinois?
	2	A. Yes, that is correct.
	4	Q. Okay. And when you worked at the University of Illinois,
04:00:06	5	did you have medical malpractice insurance?
04.00.08	6	A. Yes, I did.
	7	Q. And who provided you with that?
	, 8	A. The University of Illinois.
	9	Q. Okay. I mean, you didn't go out yourself and purchase
04:00:18	10	medical malpractice?
04.00.10	11	A. No, I did not.
	12	Q. Okay. And who told you that you had coverage in both
	13	places?
	14	A. I was told I had coverage at the VA.
04:00:28	15	Q. Who told you that?
	16	A. I learned that from Dr. Wood, but I also discussed it with
	17	other faculty at the VA.
	18	Q. When did you finish your residency at Northwestern?
	19	A. 1999.
04:00:43	20	Q. What month?
	21	A. June of 1999.
	22	Q. Okay. Before you could begin treating patients at the VA,
	23	or, for that matter, at the University of Illinois, the
	24	credentialing process had been completed, right?
04:01:01	25	A. Yes, that is correct.

Ca	ase: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 108 of 161 PageID #:1607 Gilliam - cross by Brock
		108
	1	Q. And when did you receive privileges from the University of
	2	Illinois?
	3	A. I don't remember the exact date.
	4	Q. When did you receive privileges from the VA?
04:01:08	5	A. I don't remember the exact date.
	6	Q. Did you receive one paycheck while you were working at the
	7	VA and the University of Illinois?
	8	A. That is correct.
	9	Q. And was that paycheck issued from the University of
04:01:26	10	Illinois?
	11	A. That is correct.
	12	Q. Did your employee benefits come from the University of
	13	Illinois?
	14	A. That is correct.
04:01:32	15	Q. And that's sick leave, vacation, insurance, and so forth?
	16	A. Yes, that is correct.
	17	Q. Okay. Did your W-2 form come from the University of
	18	Illinois?
	19	A. That is correct.
04:01:40	20	Q. Did you ever treat a VA patient at the University of
	21	Illinois?
	22	A. Yes, I did.
	23	Q. When you treated a VA patient at the University of
	24	Illinois, were you required to use U. of I. equipment?
04:02:05	25	A. I was required to get permission from the VA and I was

Ca	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 109 of 161 PageID #:1608 Gilliam - cross by Brock 109
	1	required to get an agreement with the VA that that patient
	2	could be seen, if it's and then I would take that, then the
	3	patient can come and be seen at the U. of I.
	4	Q. So my question is, when you treated the VA patient at the
04:02:25	5	University of Illinois, were you required to use University of
	6	Illinois equipment?
	7	A. You mean as opposed to going to the VA and getting
	8	equipment and bringing it to the U. of I.?
	9	Q. That's correct.
04:02:36	10	A. That is correct.
	11	Q. When you treated a VA patient at the University of
	12	Illinois, did you wear a University of Illinois name tag and
	13	uniform?
	14	A. Yes, that is correct.
04:02:45	15	Q. When you treated a VA patient at the University of
	16	Illinois, were you required to follow University of Illinois
	17	policy and procedures and regulations?
	18	A. It depended specifically on what services I was approved of
	19	providing at U. of I. so, for example, I took all the calls
04:03:05	20	for the VA. So once I was off campus and a patient came in
	21	with an ectopic, I had to get approval to have her labs drawn
	22	at U. of I. So it depended on what had been approved of in
	23	advance. So for example, they did obstetrical care at U. of
	24	I., and that was doable, you know, the services of obstetrical,
04:03:30	25	but sometimes if that was different, I had to get individual

Ca	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 110 of 161 PageID #:1609 Gilliam - cross by Brock 110
	1	
	2	approval.
		Q. Who made the decision to perform the biopsy on Regina
	3	Romero on July 18th, 2001?
	4	A. I did.
04:03:55	5	Q. Is a biopsy a surgery?
	6	A. When you say "biopsy" which procedure are you referring to?
	7	Q. Is a cervical biopsy a surgery?
	8	A. Are you referring to the conization as a biopsy?
	9	Q. This is just a general question, is a cervical biopsy
04:04:27	10	surgery?
	11	THE COURT: Why don't you ask her is a cervical biopsy
	12	always a surgery.
	13	MS. BROCK: Okay.
	14	BY THE WITNESS:
04:04:32	15	A. Yes, it's a surgical procedure.
	16	BY MS. BROCK:
	17	Q. Page 20, at your deposition, were you asked these questions
	18	and did you give these answers:
	19	"Question: Was it in an operating room or was it an
04:04:48	20	outpatient procedure?
	21	"Answer: Well, you can do outpatient procedures
	22	in an operating room, so I would say it was an
	23	outpatient, but if it was a procedure done, it's
	24	clinic-based procedure.
04:04:59	25	"Question: Is it a surgery?

С	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 111 of 161 PageID #:1610 Gilliam - cross by Brock 111
	4	
	1	"Answer: No, it's called a colposcopy with biopsy."
	2	Did you give those answers?
	3	A. Yeah, that's what I'm not clear which procedure you're
	4	referring to. So there's a colposcopy, right, which is a
04:05:09	5	verification.
	6	Q. Okay.
	7	A. So I did a colposcopy. I don't recall if biopsies were
	8	done at that time. But the point is, you do a colposcopy and
	9	it's an office-based procedure. Whether it's surgery or not,
04:05:29	10	it's just a technical distinction.
	11	Q. And did you have privileges to perform that procedure at
	12	the VA?
	13	A. Yes, I did.
	14	Q. And that's why you performed it on July 18th?
04:05:38	15	A. Yes.
	16	Q. You were authorized to perform it on that date?
	17	A. That is correct.
	18	Q. But you didn't have privileges to do a laparotomy that was
	19	done later, is that correct?
04:05:49	20	MR. HICKEY: What day? What time?
	21	BY THE WITNESS:
	22	A. So a laparotomy just means that you open the abdominal
	23	cavity. I could absolutely open an abdominal cavity. Could I
	24	open an abdominal cavity to do a surgical bowel resection, no,
04:06:08	25	could not. I had many privileges at the VA, including I could

Ca	ase: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 112 of 161 PageID #:1611 Gilliam - cross by Brock 112
	1	open an abdomen.
	2	Q. Why were you in the operating room when Dr. Lipnick did the
	3	laparotomy and the bowel resection?
	4	A. Because I had met the family, I felt that I knew
04:06:25	5	Ms. Monroe, and that this was a patient that I've operated on,
	6	and I felt like it was the proper and honorable thing to do was
	7	to be present.
	8	Q. Thank you.
	9	When you were at the Westside VA, was there any other
04:06:40	10	gynecologist at the Westside VA?
	11	A. At the same time I was?
	12	Q. Correct.
	13	A. No.
	14	Q. Did you ever see the contract that the University of
04:06:58	15	Illinois entered into with the VA?
	16	A. No, I did not.
	17	Q. When was your child born? When did you go on your
	18	maternity leave?
	19	A. She was born in 2002.
04:07:13	20	Q. What month?
	21	A. January 5th, 2002.
	22	Q. Okay. And did you take a maternity leave?
	23	A. Yes, I did.
	24	Q. Okay. And when was that maternity leave over?
04:07:24	25	A. I took an initial maternity leave and then I came back, I

Ca	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 113 of 161 PageID #:1612 Gilliam - cross by Brock
		113
	1	believe, four days a week, but I don't know the exact date.
	2	Q. Was it a month or two months? Can you give any estimation
	3	at all?
	4	A. It was a few months but not a month.
04:07:47	5	Q. Okay. When you returned to work after the maternity leave,
	6	did you return to work at the University of Illinois?
	7	A. Yes, I did.
	8	Q. Did you return to work at the VA?
	9	A. Yes, I did.
04:07:55	10	Q. And how long did you stay at the VA?
	11	A. I don't remember the I don't remember the exact amount
	12	of time I stayed after that.
	13	Q. What were the circumstances under which you left the VA?
	14	A. I received a Career Development Award from the National
04:08:14	15	Institutes of Health which covered 75 percent of my time for
	16	research. So I received that I was awarded that in August,
	17	and so then I changed my clinical responsibilities.
	18	Q. To what?
	19	A. So I became 75 percent research and 25 percent clinical.
04:08:30	20	And so I had a much smaller clinical responsibility. I don't
	21	remember all of the specifics.
	22	Q. Were you still at the University of Illinois?
	23	A. Yes, I was.
	24	Q. And you weren't doing anything at the VA, is that correct?
04:08:43	25	A. I don't believe so, but I'd have to check. I can't

C	Case: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 114 of 161 PageID #:1613 Gilliam - cross by Brock 114
	1	remember exactly when that transition was made. I received a
	2	couple of other grants at the same time, so I think by then
	3	that's when I stopped.
	4	Q. Now, in your view, if I understand you correctly, you
04:09:00	5	believe that, at least in 2001, that you were employed by both
	6	by the VA and the University of Illinois, is that right?
	7	A. I believe that since 1999 I was employed by both.
	8	Q. When did that end, in your mind?
	9	A. You know what, I'd have to check the exact date of from
04:09:18	10	when I stopped working at the VA.
	11	Q. Did you ever have an exit interview with the VA?
	12	A. Around the time of the Ms. Romero case, I had many, many
	13	discussions with the VA. It was a real turning point at the VA
	14	and about the safety of the setup of the VA. I had multiple
04:09:43	15	entries with multiple people at the VA, and specifically about
	16	the services and the systems of care that we had in place.
	17	Q. Did you ever have an exit interview? An exit interview
	18	with the VA?
	19	A. What do you mean by an exit interview?
04:09:56	20	Q. Did you ever submit a letter of resignation to the VA?
	21	A. I don't remember what the procedures were for as I
	22	transitioned.
	23	Q. Who did you never mind.
	24	When you were served with the complaint and summons in
04:10:12	25	this case, in late October or early November of 2005, did you

C	ase: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 115 of 161 PageID #:1614 Gilliam - cross by Brock 115
	1	contact the University of Illinois?
	2	A. Yes, I believe I did.
	3	Q. Why?
	4	A. Because I had a yeah, I think I had to fill out a form
04:10:31	5	for them.
	6	Q. When you got the summons and the complaint, did you
	7	understand which patient was suing you?
	8	A. Yes.
	9	Q. And you contacted the University of Illinois and told them
04:10:44	10	about the lawsuit?
	11	A. I believe that's what I did.
	12	Q. And yet, at that time you were working with the University
	13	of Chicago, is that right?
	14	A. Well, what was the year and the date?
04:10:54	15	Q. November 2005.
	16	A. Yes, I began at the University of Chicago in August
	17	of 2005.
	18	Q. And did the University of Illinois provide you with these
	19	attorneys who are representing you in this lawsuit?
04:11:08	20	A. That is correct.
	21	MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, I object.
	22	THE COURT: Well, there's no issue, and the
	23	implication, I think, is not binding on the witness.
	24	MS. BROCK: No further questions.
04:11:25	25	REDIRECT EXAMINATION

C	ase: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 116 of 161 PageID #:1615 Gilliam - cross by Brock
		116
	1	BY MR. HICKEY:
	2	Q. Doctor, I'd like to see if I can clarify a couple of
	3	things. You were asked questions by counsel for the plaintiff
	4	about the cone biopsy. So I'm going to refer to that now.
04:11:53	5	A. Okay. Thank you.
	6	Q. Cone biopsies have been performed prior to time you were at
	7	the VA?
	8	A. Yes, that is correct.
	9	Q. Okay. They've been performed and I meant to say,
04:12:04	10	they've been performed on the VA?
	11	A. Yes, that's correct.
	12	Q. And then you were asked by counsel for the plaintiff about
	13	whether anyone from the VA told you to notify an attorney at
	14	the University of Illinois. Do you recall questions to that
04:12:22	15	effect?
	16	A. Yes, I do.
	17	Q. Back at the time of the Ms. Romero incident, no one from
	18	the VA directed you to notify anyone at the U. of I about the
	19	incident, is that correct?
04:12:37	20	A. No, they did not.
	21	Q. Did they indicate to you that they were handling that
	22	matter within the VA?
	23	A. Yes, they did. I'm sorry, I don't remember the person's
	24	name, but there was someone who was the head of I think he
04:12:50	25	was the head of ethics. I think he was a retired physician who

Ca	ase: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 117 of 161 PageID #:1616 Gilliam - cross by Brock 117
	1	was the one who stepped in and then I I stepped back.
	2	Q. Fine.
	3	Doctor, counsel for U.S. asked you questions about
	4	your application for privileges and when that was forwarded and
04:13:16	5	when you received privileges. Do you recall questions to that
	6	effect?
	7	A. Yes, I do.
	8	Q. Just to refresh you
	9	MR. HICKEY: If I may, Your Honor. I believe you have
04:13:29	10	copies of these already, Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 6.
	11	THE COURT: What are they?
	12	MR. HICKEY: That's her application.
	13	THE COURT: Yeah, I've seen them.
	14	MR. HICKEY: 6 is the letter confirming privileges
04:13:42	15	that had been given.
	16	THE COURT: Seen them both.
	17	BY MR. HICKEY:
	18	Q. Just to refresh you on this.
	19	(Document tendered to the witness).
04:13:45	20	BY MR. HICKEY:
	21	Q. Your application for privileges were signed by you on or
	22	about what date?
	23	A. On May 13th, 1999.
	24	Q. And you had received a letter dated August 9th, 1999,
04:14:00	25	confirming that you'd already been given privileges by that

C	Case: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 118 of 161 PageID #:1617 Gilliam - cross by Brock
		118
	1	date?
	2	A. Yes, that's correct.
	3	Q. Having seen those, does it refresh your recollection that
	4	you would've received privileges on or about the beginning of
04:14:14	5	August of 1999?
	6	A. That is correct.
	7	Q. Okay. And then to further clarify, counsel had actually
	8	referred to Exhibit 2.
	9	MR. HICKEY: I believe Your Honor has seen this
04:14:33	10	(indicating)?
	11	THE COURT: I've seen that, too.
	12	BY MR. HICKEY:
	13	Q. This is what you identified earlier as your application for
	14	employment that you filled out and signed on or about what
04:14:46	15	date?
	16	A. April 24th, 1999.
	17	Q. Okay. So the application for the employment is different
	18	than the credential application?
	19	A. Yes, that is correct.
04:15:00	20	Q. And then just to follow up on that, Doctor.
	21	MR. HICKEY: Exhibit 4, I believe the Court has
	22	already seen it.
	23	THE COURT: I've seen that.
	24	
04:15:18	25	BY MR. HICKEY:

	Case: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 119 of 161 PageID #:1618 Bond - direct by Wawzenski 119
	1	Q. When you reapplied for privileges, you reapplied in
	2	connection with Exhibit 4, is that correct?
	3	A. That is correct.
	4	MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, that's all that I have at
04:15:5	55 5	this point for clarification. Thank you.
	6	MR. LUMB: Nothing further, Your Honor.
	7	THE COURT: Anything from you?
	8	MS. BROCK: Nothing further.
	9	THE COURT: You can step down.
04:16:0	o4 10	(Witness excused.)
	11	THE COURT: Do you have another witness?
	12	MS. WAWZENSKI: Your Honor, we have a witness from
	13	Milwaukee.
	14	THE COURT: We're going to be here until we're done.
04:16:1	9 15	MS. WAWZENSKI: Great.
	16	(Brief pause).
	17	THE COURT: Face me and raise your right hand.
	18	(Witness duly sworn.)
	19	THE COURT: Please be seated.
04:17:2	24 20	PATRICE BOND, GOVERNMENT WITNESS, SWORN
	21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	22	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	23	Q. Would you please state your name.
	24	A. Patrice Bond.
04:17:3	<sup>31</sup> 25	Q. And, Ms. Bond, where are you employed?

C	ase: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 120 of 161 PageID #:1619 Bond - direct by Wawzenski 120
	4	
	1	A. I'm employed for the Department of Veterans Affairs at the
	2	Great Lakes Acquisition Center.
	3	Q. What is your job title there?
	4	A. Supervisory Contract Specialist.
04:17:45	5	Q. And what do you do in that position? What are your duties?
	6	A. Primarily I supervise contracting officers in preparation
	7	of solicitations for new contracts, and I review solicitation
	8	documents before they're issued, and all other supervisory-type
	9	functions, hiring, firing, and annual appraisals.
04:18:16	10	Q. What is the jurisdiction of the Great Lakes Acquisition
	11	Center? What states do you cover?
	12	A. Illinois, Wisconsin, upper Michigan, and then there's seven
	13	medical centers within those states.
	14	Q. So the Jesse White Medical Center would've been one of the
04:18:37	15	centers that
	16	A. Jesse Brown, yes.
	17	Q. Jesse Brown that you covered, correct?
	18	A. Yes.
	19	Q. Now, can you explain for us what kind of contracts would a
04:18:47	20	VA Medical Center enter into with one of their affiliates?
	21	A. We do basically medical sharing contracts with the
	22	affiliates, we also do sales, but the majority of our contracts
	23	are medical sharing contracts.
	24	Q. And what is a medical sharing contract?
04:19:06	25	A. Where we contract services for physicians or any Allied

121

Health professional where the VA might not be able to hire, for
 whatever reason, and the services are needed. So we do a
 contract for those services.

4 Q. Now, a contract for a physician's services, how does the
5 process begin for a VA Medical Center to get a contract in
6 place?

A. At the facility level it would have to be determined that
there is a need. And generally, it goes through a number of
chains within the facility, starting with the service line that
has the need and then it goes through the medical executive
board, it goes through the director and the Chief of Staff.

12 And there's a number of documents that have to be 13 completed. So those documents are completed and then they're 14 forwarded to my office. That would also include HR certifying 15 that this is a particular type field or occupation that they 16 It also goes through fiscal which would be an can hire. 17 indicator to us that there are funds that are available. And 18 for affiliates, that also goes to the director of our VISN and 19 also the medical chief officer, which they're both located at the VISN business office at Hines. 20

Q. Now, what happens when all of that material is gatheredtogether and comes to you at the GLAC?

A. Okay. We review it to make sure everything is there that's
needed. We do market research, and then we require a statement
of work from the end user. So we also work with them to

04:19:47

04:19:29

- 04:20:11

04:20:40

04:21:01

Ca	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 122 of 161 PageID #:1621 Bond - direct by Wawzenski 122
	1	determine that the statement of work is appropriate.
	2	From all of those documents, we create a solicitation
	3	document, and then we make sure it goes through all the
	4	internal reviews and approvals, and then we issue that
04:21:24	5	solicitation document to the potential contractor.
	6	Q. Let me hand you what I've marked as Government Exhibit 1.
	7	(Document tendered to the witness).
	8	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	9	Q. And ask you to take a look at that and tell me what it is.
04:21:53	10	A. Okay. This is an executed contract. It looks like it was
	11	I would say it was reviewed and signed by the Board of
	12	Trustees of the University of Illinois on June 4th, 1998, and
	13	accepted by the contracting officer June 16th of 1998.
	14	Q. And do you recognize the name of the contracting officer
04:22:25	15	that signed it on behalf of the United States?
	16	A. Yes.
	17	Q. And who is that?
	18	A. Bruce Blackburn.
	19	Q. And did you work with Mr. Blackburn at the GLAC?
04:22:35	20	A. No, he was gone by the time I started working there, but
	21	I'm familiar with his name.
	22	Q. And for what position is this contract for?
	23	MR. HICKEY: Objection, Your Honor. The contract
	24	speaks for itself. This witness has no foundation. She wasn't
04:22:53	25	working there at the time, didn't sign it.

C	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 123 of 161 PageID #:1622 Bond - direct by Wawzenski 123
	1	THE COURT: You can ask the witness what this
	2	contracts purports to be for and I would accept that.
	3	MS. WAWZENSKI: Thank you.
	4	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
04:23:03	5	Q. What does this contract purport to be for?
	6	A. Gynecology services, a .5 FTEE.
	7	Q. Which would be 20-hour per week?
	8	A. Yes.
	9	Q. Is that FTEE?
04:23:26	10	A. Correct.
	11	Q. And is this for the Jesse Brown facility?
	12	A. Yes, it is.
	13	Q. And how do you know that? What is there that tells you
	14	that it's Jesse Brown?
04:23:39	15	A. Well, on the first page, VACHCS - WSD, that's VA Chicago
	16	Healthcare System, Westside Division. So Jesse Brown was once
	17	called Westside.
	18	And also on Page 2, Item 4, where it says submit the
	19	invoice. Page 3, the first paragraph. I'm sure all throughout
04:24:16	20	the contract document it'll be clear what facility this is for.
	21	Page 4, again, I see it references VACHCS - WSD.
	22	Q. And what was the duration of this contract? How long was
	23	it supposed to last for?
	24	A. On Page 3, the second full paragraph says this was for a
04:24:43	25	one-year period, from June 1st, 1998 through May 30th, 1999.

C	Case: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 124 of 161 PageID #:1623 Bond - direct by Wawzenski 124
	1	Q. Does this contract name a specific physician to fill this
	2	position?
	3	MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, may I just show a continuing
	4	objection to this witness?
04:25:08	5	THE COURT: You may. It's overruled.
04.25.06	6	THE WITNESS: I can answer?
	7	THE COURT: Yes.
	8	BY THE WITNESS:
	9	A. I'm sorry. No, it just references that it has to be a
04:25:29	10	board qualified or certified gynecologist.
04.20.20	11	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	12	Q. Now, we talked about the contracting process that your
	13	section at the GLAC in that you gather all of this material
	14	together that you've gotten, the financial information, the
04:25:53	15	statement of work, and everything else, and what happens when
	16	your staff completes a solicitation? What happens next with
	17	these materials?
	18	A. We send the solicitation document, along with a cover
	19	letter. In this case, it would have gone to the University of
04:26:11	20	Illinois to their contract area, and they review it and submit
	21	to us a proposal.
	22	Q. And what happens when the university sends it back to the
	23	GLAC?
	24	A. If we are in agreement with everything as it's submitted to
04:26:29	25	us, we would move forward and execute the contract. In most

(	Case: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 125 of 161 PageID #:1624 Bond - direct by Wawzenski 125
	1	
		cases, we ask that they submit with their proposal different
	2	types of submittals. So if everything is intact, we just move
	3	forward with executing the contract; by that, we would sign it
	4	and then send the signed contract back to the university
04:26:59	-	accepting their terms.
	6	Q. Let me hand you now what we've marked as Government
	7	Exhibit 2.
	8	(Document tendered to the witness).
	9	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
04:27:24	10	Q. And ask you to take a look at that and tell me what this
	11	is.
	12	A. This is another contract which includes some amendments and
	13	modifications to the contract.
	14	Q. And when does this contract first go into effect?
04:28:08	15	MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, may I just show the same line
	16	of objection?
	17	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
	18	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	19	Q. You may answer.
04:28:23	20	A. Oh, okay. This is a 1 year contract for September 1st,
	21	2000 through August 31st, 2001.
	22	Let's see. There was an amendment. The solicitation
	23	was issued for September 1st, 2000 through August 31st, 2001,
	24	and then there was an amendment to the solicitation changing it
04:28:59	05	from a 12-month contract to a 9-month contract. That's
07.20.00	20	

C	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 126 of 161 PageID #:1625 Bond - direct by Wawzenski 126
	1	amendment number 1, at the bottom of it it says is B 0189.
	2	Q. So the time period would have beenwhat?December 1st of
	3	2000 through August 31st o f2001?
	4	A. Correct.
04:29:20	5	Q. And I'm going to turn your attention using the numbers at
	6	the bottom of the page. They are stamped numbers that are
	7	proceeded by a "B" and then a number. I'm going to ask you to
	8	turn to page B 0192, 192.
	9	A. Okay.
04:29:44	10	Q. And ask you what was this contract for?
	11	A. Gynecology services. This was also for the Jesse Brown
	12	well, what was then the Westside Division.
	13	Q. And what does it say about where the services were to be
	14	performed?
04:30:04	15	A. They could be performed either at the Westside Division or
	16	at the University of Illinois.
	17	Q. And turning to the next page, B 193, does that also say, in
	18	the statement of work, that the services could be performed at
	19	either location?
04:30:25	20	A. Yes, the first full paragraph, the last sentence says:
	21	"Services performed at the VA and/or U.I.C. facility."
	22	and further down it also says that:
	23	" services can be at the Women Veterans Health
	24	Center and/or the women's Health Associates Clinic at
04:30:54	25	U.I.C."

С	Case: 1:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 127 of 161 PageID #:1626 Bond - direct by Wawzenski		
		127	
	1	So from this it could be at either medical center or	
	2	at either of the clinics.	
	3	Q. Let me ask you to turn to page B 195 of this statement of	
	4	work and ask you to look at number 5, Personnel Policy. The	
04:31:06	5	last sentence in that section says that:	
	6	"The parties agree that the contractor, its employees,	
	7	agents, and subcontractors, shall not be considered	
	8	VA employees for any purpose."	
	9	Given your position as supervisor at the GLAC, is this	
04:31:35	10	standard language in contracts between the VA medical centers	
	11	and affiliates?	
	12	MR. HICKEY: Objection, Your Honor.	
	13	THE COURT: Overruled.	
	14	MR. HICKEY: Parol evidence.	
04:31:46	15	THE COURT: This is somebody presumably fully familiar	
	16	with practices and she's testifying to that.	
	17	MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, my position is that the	
	18	United States has not stipulated that the contract is	
	19	ambiguous. Until they stipulate, they should not	
04:31:59	20	THE COURT: Read the question back.	
	21	(Question read.)	
	22	THE COURT: She's entitled to ask whether this is	
	23	standard language. We're not talking about what it means.	
	24	You can answer.	
04:32:33	25	BY THE WITNESS:	

С	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 128 of 161 PageID #:1627 Bond - direct by Wawzenski 128
	1	A. Could I answer?
	2	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	3	Q. Yes.
	4	A. Yes, it is standard.
04:32:37	5	Q. And why do you put that language in contracts?
	6	MR. HICKEY: Objection. Now it's parol evidence,
	7	Your Honor.
	8	THE COURT: It's still her understanding of the
	9	purpose. And this is a contract now, she can testify to that.
04:32:50	10	Whether it effectuates that purpose is one of the issues here.
	11	BY THE WITNESS:
	12	A. It's standard language because VA contracting officers are
	13	not they don't have the authority or I should say, we
	14	don't have the authority to do personal services contracts.
04:33:08	15	And my understanding of the difference between
	16	personal services and nonpersonal services is how who
	17	supervises or oversees the contractor's employee. So by
	18	putting this in here, we're letting not just the affiliates, we
	19	put it in all of our contracts, that so that it is clear
04:33:38	20	that there are no expectations on behalf of the VA that the
	21	individual that's placed for services would be considered a VA
	22	employee.
	23	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	24	Q. Let me ask you to turn to Page 203 of the contract, which
04:33:59	25	is headed "Indemnification and Medical Liability Insurance"

Ca	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 129 of 161 PageID #:1628 Bond - direct by Wawzenski 129
	1	and there are subparts to this.
	2	Is this language that you have in all contracts with
	3	affiliates who are providing physician services at VA
	4	Hospitals?
04:34:19	5	MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, objection, foundation.
	6	THE COURT: Overruled.
	7	BY THE WITNESS:
	8	A. Yes, that's standard.
	9	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
04:34:28	10	Q. And what is your understanding of what this language in
	11	this particular contract says?
	12	A. It basically is saying that the contractor's employee is
	13	not a VA employee and that the contractor is responsible for
	14	maintaining their medical liability insurance.
04:34:51	15	Q. Does the VA require some kind of proof from the affiliate
	16	of the existence of some kind of malpractice insurance?
	17	A. Yes.
	18	Q. And in a contract with the University of Illinois, in the
	19	contract that you worked on, what kind of proof of insurance
04:35:10	20	does the university provide to the VA?
	21	A. We've always been told from them that they're self-insured.
	22	So they provide us instead of a certificate of insurance that
	23	we get from other types of companies, we get a booklet which
	24	goes into detail about them being self-insured, but not a
04:35:36	25	regular certificate.

С	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 130 of 161 PageID #:1629 Bond - cross by Hickey 130
	1	Q. And Government Exhibit 2 that we've been discussing, this
	2	would've been in effect, then, in July and August of 2001,
	3	correct?
	4	A. Yes.
04:35:52	5	MS. WAWZENSKI: I have nothing further, Your Honor.
	6	CROSS EXAMINATION
	7	BY MR. HICKEY:
	8	Q. Ms. Bond, you never contacted Dr. Gilliam before she went
	9	to work at the VA, did you?
04:36:24	10	A. No.
	11	Q. You never directed anyone to contact Dr. Gilliam, did you?
	12	A. No.
	13	Q. You have no knowledge of whether anyone from the VA
	14	tendered any such document to Dr. Gilliam, correct?
04:36:39	15	A. Such document?
	16	Q. It's Government Exhibit 2.
	17	Is that correct?
	18	A. Well, these typically don't go to employees, they just go
	19	to who we're contracting with. So I don't know what happens
04:36:54	20	after we issue it.
	21	Q. So it wouldn't go to an employee like Dr. Gilliam, is that
	22	what you're saying?
	23	A. Never.
	24	Q. Okay. Just so I'm clear, you're indicating that Government
04:37:06	25	Exhibit 2 went into effect sometime on or around December 1st,

Ca	ase: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 131 of 161 PageID #:1630 Bond - cross by Hickey 131
	1	2000?
	2	A. Correct.
	3	Q. You're not going to be taking the position with this Court
	4	that Government Exhibit 2 was in effect in August of 1999?
04:37:30	5	A. No. According to everything that I see here,
	6	September 1st, 2000, was the beginning of this contract.
	7	Q. Okay. And you have no documents with you that indicate
	8	that an employee that had been working for the VA since
	9	August 1st of 1999 would've been notified of any change in
04:38:10	10	status as of September 1st, 2000?
	11	A. People that work for the VA, all of those communications
	12	would go through our HR department. We only handle contract
	13	employees.
	14	Q. Okay. So you have no knowledge of any notices going out to
04:38:30	15	anyone, any employee of the VA, about a change that would've
	16	taken place on or around September 1st, 2000, is that fair to
	17	say?
	18	A. Not if I understand the question, no. You're saying an
	19	employee of the VA being notified about this?
04:38:44	20	Q. Right.
	21	A. The contract?
	22	Q. Because of your position, you wouldn't have any knowledge
	23	of whether anyone would be notified of a change in status, is
	24	that fair to say? That would be through HR?
04:38:59	25	A. No, that's not fair to say.

Ca	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 132 of 161 PageID #:1631 Bond - cross by Hickey 132
	1	Q. All right. Let me ask you a question then. Did you
	2	personally sign this contract, Government Exhibit 2, at any
	3	time?
	4	A. No, I did not.
04:39:17	5	Q. Did you personally talk to anyone at the U. of I. back in
	6	August or September of 2000?
	7	A. No.
	8	Q. Okay. Did you ever contact any physician working at the
	9	Jesse White VA to discuss this contract from September 2004?
04:39:50	10	A. No.
	11	Q. You had no knowledge as to whether any individual physician
	12	at the Jesse White VA was given a copy of this contract, is
	13	that correct?
	14	A. No, I don't know.
04:40:06	15	Q. And you never had any contract with Dr. Gilliam, is that
	16	correct?
	17	A. No, I haven't. No.
	18	Q. "No" means you agree with me that
	19	A. No, I never had a contract with Dr. Gilliam.
04:40:26	20	Q. And when you say "I," you mean the VA?
	21	A. The VA well, I never administered a contract that Dr.
	22	Gilliam was working on.
	23	Q. Thank you.
	24	CROSS EXAMINATION
04:40:44	25	BY MR. LUMB:

C	Case: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 133 of 161 PageID #:1632 Bond - cross by Lumb 133
	1	Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Bond.
	2	A. Good afternoon.
	3	Q. Has any part of your job description at the VA included,
	4	from 1998 through 2002, any kind of ongoing administration for
04:41:04	5	enforcement of contracts?
	6	A. Yes.
	7	Q. Has any part of your job description included any of those
	8	types of activities regarding the Westside VA?
	9	A. Yes.
04:41:18	10	Q. Any activities included regarding the contract that you've
	11	talked about here?
	12	A. No.
	13	Q. It's fair to say you have no personal knowledge as to the
	14	day-to-day relationship and the interactions between 1999 and
04:41:37	15	2001 of Dr. Gilliam and any of the VA employees at the Westside
	16	VA, correct?
	17	A. Correct.
	18	Q. Now, ma'am, it is and was, in 1999 and 2001, the policy of
	19	the Veterans Health Administration to hire healthcare clinical
04:42:00	20	staff employees whenever feasible, correct?
	21	A. Yes.
	22	Q. That's the first answer, correct?
	23	A. Yes.
	24	Q. And according to VA rules, hiring of staff must be done
04:42:15	25	under appropriate employee appointment authority, including

C	Case: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 134 of 161 PageID #:1633 Bond - cross by Lumb
		134
	1	38 USC 7405, correct?
	2	A. I have no knowledge of that.
	3	Q. Pardon me?
	4	A. I have no knowledge of that.
04:42:23	5	Q. Are you familiar with VA directive 1663?
	6	A. Yes.
	7	Q. And that directive deals with healthcare resources
	8	contracting, correct?
	9	A. Yes.
04:42:34	10	Q. And that's what you believe these contracts were, correct?
	11	A. Yes.
	12	Q. Under Title 38, USC 8153, right?
	13	A. Yes.
	14	Q. And VA directive 1663 requires the VA to hire staff under
04:42:58	15	appropriate appointment authorities, including 38 USC 7405,
	16	correct?
	17	A. Okay, I didn't know the numbers, but if that's what's in
	18	there, that's correct.
	19	Q. All right. And that's the provision in federal law that
04:43:14	20	gives the VA the power to hire as employees either full-time
	21	attendees or part-time attendees, correct?
	22	A. Yes.
	23	Q. Okay. And that's the first thing that ought to be tried,
	24	correct?
04:43:26	25	A. Yes.

Ca	ase: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 135 of 161 PageID #:1634 Bond - cross by Lumb 135
	1	Q. The VA is not in the business of outsourcing just to
	2	outsource, correct?
	3	A. Correct.
	4	Q. Now, under VA directive 1663, when a qualified doctor can't
04:43:39	5	be recruited, the medical center must then either send patients
	6	to a different VA Medical Center, correct?
	7	A. Correct.
	8	Q. And then only after those options are exhausted may they
	9	may a contract for services be considered, correct?
04:43:53	10	A. Yes.
	11	Q. Now, how did the Westside VA, or how did the VA at all,
	12	attempt to recruit an employee gynecologist at the Westside VA?
	13	A. Well, the 1663 was not enforced during this time frame.
	14	Q. Okay. So requirements for 1663 to attempt to recruit an
04:44:25	15	employee physician, you're saying was not enforced during this
	16	time period?
	17	A. Correct.
	18	Q. So that was not complied with, correct?
	19	A. Correct.
04:44:33	20	Q. In this case, did the Westside human resources manger
	21	provide written certification of any recruitment efforts?
	22	A. I wouldn't know that. We only maintain contracts for
	23	6 years and 3 months. So we wouldn't even have a document
	24	contract file to look at.
04:44:54	25	Q. Doesn't VA directive 1663 require that certification in

Cá	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 136 of 161 PageID #:1635 Bond - cross by Lumb 136
	1	this type of contract?
	2	A. In this type but it wouldn't apply to this particular
	3	contract.
	4	Q. Because the VA wasn't complying with that directive in this
04:45:07	5	time period?
	6	A. It was implemented yet. We've just been doing it for maybe
	7	4 years. There was a draft document that was out maybe
	8	4 years, but it's only been maybe 3 or 4 years that we've
	9	actually been using the 1663 to contract for healthcare
04:45:33	10	services.
	11	Q. 1663 has been in place for more than 4 years, correct?
	12	A. The draft maybe, but the signed one, no.
	13	Q. Do you know when the first version of 1663 became
	14	effective?
04:45:46	15	A. It's been maybe 3 or 4 years.
	16	Q. Now, did you mention that this was an FTE-based contract?
	17	A. Yes.
	18	Q. And were key personnel required to be identified in
	19	FTE-based contracts?
04:46:05	20	A. They are now, but back in 2000 it wasn't done, so
	21	Q. In fact, you're referring to if you turn to page Bravo
	22	196 of Exhibit 2.
	23	A. You want me to respond to that?
	24	Q. I just want you to turn to that page.
04:46:34	25	A. Okay.

C	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 137 of 161 PageID #:1636 Bond - cross by Lumb
		137
	1	Q. Do you see at the top?
	2	A. Uh-huh.
	3	Q. That is a page from the 2001 contract or the 2000
	4	contract?
04:46:46	5	A. Yes.
	6	Q. The second contract, correct?
	7	A. Yes.
	8	Q. And the top of that page, Paragraph 8, it says:
	9	" key personnel on temporary emergency
04:46:58	10	substitutions: The contractor shall assign to this
	11	contract the following key personnel:"
	12	and then blank, correct?
	13	A. Yes.
	14	Q. And at that time period the VA was not requiring compliance
04:47:10	15	with identification of key personnel during this time period,
	16	is that your testimony?
	17	A. I didn't do this one, so I don't know. I can tell you how
	18	we do it now, but I don't know back then what the requirements
	19	were.
04:47:28	20	Q. Fair enough.
	21	Do you know if there were any conversations between
	22	Westside VA officials and any employees at the contractor
	23	before the contracting the contracting process began?
	24	A. No, I wasn't involved in the contracting process at all for
04:47:47	25	this contract.

Ca	ase: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 138 of 161 PageID #:1637 Bond - cross by Lumb
		138
	1	Q. Do you know if there were any discussions between Westside
	2	VA officials and the U. of I. officials regarding the contract
	3	at which a contracting officer was not present?
	4	A. No, I don't know.
04:48:03	5	Q. And, in fact, VA rules prohibit those types of discussions
	6	without a contracting officer being present, correct?
	7	A. That's true. Yes.
	8	Q. And did whoever assigned to this contract from your office
	9	provide a written certification that the contracting officer
04:48:26	10	conduct all contracting negotiations?
	11	A. No way for me to know from looking at this document.
	12	Q. But that is required, the required document in the file,
	13	correct?
	14	A. Based on the time, I'm not sure. We do have prior to
04:48:48	15	1663 we had what we called a director's approval memo, and a
	16	director and the Chief of Staff should have signed it saying
	17	that they weren't involved in any of the procurement process.
	18	If that was done, I don't know.
	19	Q. Can you turn to page B 193. The same exhibit, I believe.
04:49:14	20	This is the statement of work for the second contract,
	21	correct?
	22	A. Yes.
	23	Q. And about the middle of the page it requires the physician
	24	to be available for consultations on a 24-hour per day basis,
04:49:36	25	correct?

C	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 139 of 161 PageID #:1638 Bond - cross by Lumb	Ì
		1	139
	1	A. Yes.	
	2	Q. Turn to the next page, please.	
	3	About a quarter of the way down the page, under	
	4	"special contract requirements," could you read that.	
04:49:54	5	A. The first paragraph?	
	6	Q. Could you just tell us the location in that paragraph	
	7	specified for where the services were to be provided.	
	8	A. (Reading:)	
	9	"To furnish to and at the Department of Veterans	
04:50:10	10	Affairs Medical Center, Chicago Healthcare System,	
	11	Westside Division, for services and prices specified	
	12	in the section entitled Schedule of Supplies and	
	13	Services of this contract."	
	14	Q. Under Paragraph 1 below that, Services, Subsection (d) as	S
04:50:27	15	in Delta, can you read that for us.	
	16	A. (Reading:)	
	17	" the services to be performed by the contractor	
	18	would be under the direction of the Chief of Staff	
	19	and Dr. Gwenn Garmon."	
04:50:35	20	Q. And the contract was for 3 years, correct?	
	21	A. No, it's for I thought it was for 1 year.	
	22	Q. Can you go back to Page 194, Paragraph 2, term of contra	ct.
	23	Can you read that first sentence.	
	24	A. (Reading:)	
04:50:54	25	"This contract is effective for 3 years from date of	

C	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 140 of 161 PageID #:1639 Bond - redirect by Wawzenski 140
	1	award."
	1 2	
	2	Q. Next page, 195. Can you read paragraph A 1, work hours.
	3 4	A. (Reading:)
		The services covered by this contract shall be
04:51:19	5	furnished by the contractor as defined herein. The
	6	contractor will not be required, except in case of
	7	emergency, to furnish such services during off-duty
	8	hours as described below."
	9	Q. And skip down to subparagraph 1, work hours.
04:51:30	10	A. (Reading:)
	11	"Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m."
	12	Q. And I'm not sure if I had it marked, but this contract has
	13	a requirement that any contractor providing services under it
	14	sign in and sign each time they are providing specific services
04:52:03	15	at the Westside VA, correct?
	16	A. Yes, I did see that.
	17	Q. Okay. Just to be clear, you have no personal knowledge
	18	whether this contract, in terms of control over activity, was
	19	complied with, correct?
04:52:34	20	A. No, I don't.
	21	Q. And you have no knowledge as to what control VA employees
	22	actually exercised over Dr. Gilliam on a day-to-day basis,
	23	correct?
	24	A. No.
04:52:44	25	Q. Thank you.

C	ase: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 141 of 161 PageID #:1640 Bond - redirect by Wawzenski 141
	1	MR. LUMB: That's all I have.
	2	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
	3	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	4	Q. Ms. Bond, you testified that, in your department, contracts
04:53:03	5	are not kept for longer than 6 years at a time, correct?
	6	A. Correct.
	7	Q. Now, if we look at Government Exhibit 2, this one is
	8	obviously older than 6 years.
	9	A. Yes.
04:53:14	10	Q. And this one was available to you nevertheless, even though
	11	it's older than 6 years.
	12	But the other contract, Government Exhibit 1, this is
	13	a copy of the contract that is not in your files, is that
	14	correct?
04:53:29	15	A. Correct.
	16	Q. Do you remember where this one came from?
	17	A. We have a building where all the contracts are archived and
	18	stored until it's time for them to be destroyed.
	19	Q. Okay. And what is the time period covered by Government
04:53:47	20	Exhibit 1?
	21	A. June 1st, 1998 through May 30th, 1999.
	22	Q. And does this contract, as far as you can tell, include any
	23	amendments that extended it?
	24	A. No. There are none here, no.
04:54:09	25	Q. Was there anything in this contract that you can see that

C	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 142 of 161 PageID #:1641 Bond - redirect by Wawzenski 142
	1	prohibited it from being extended?
	2	A. I do see the bylaws which would allow the VA to extend four
	3	an additional 6-month period.
	4	Q. Okay. And then the contract that we've got marked as
04:55:13	5	Government Exhibit 2 was originally for a 1 year period,
	6	correct?
	7	A. Originally, yes.
	8	Q. And then it was extended for subsequent periods after that,
	9	up to a 3-year time period, correct?
04:55:30	10	A. I see modifications to which exercised option year 1, so I
	11	don't know what happened after that period.
	12	Q. And then modification 1, which is just prior to that one,
	13	is for the earlier time period, correct?
	14	MR. HICKEY: Objection to the form of the question,
04:56:08	15	Your Honor.
	16	BY THE WITNESS:
	17	A. It actually added a FAR clause which
	18	THE COURT: Go ahead. Finish the answer.
	19	BY THE WITNESS:
04:56:15	20	A which was which was not included in the solicitation,
	21	so it was added by a modification.
	22	BY MS. WAWZENSKI:
	23	Q. Which would allow for the extension of that contract?
	24	A. Yes.
04:56:30	25	Q. And that's the FAR language is standard language in

Ca	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 143 of 161 PageID #:1642 Bond - recross by Hickey 143
	1	these kinds of contracts to allow for the extension of the
	2	contracts, correct?
	3	A. Yes.
	4	MS. WAWZENSKI: No further questions, Your Honor.
04:56:50	5	RECROSS EXAMINATION
	6	BY MR. HICKEY:
	7	Q. Ms. Bond, I'm just trying to understand. You were asked
	8	about Exhibit 1, and you were asked a question that suggested
	9	it was not from your files, so I'm directing you to that. I'm
04:57:12	10	directing you to that frame of discussion, okay?
	11	A. Okay.
	12	Q. And you indicated that there's a building where things are
	13	archived?
	14	A. Yes.
04:57:18	15	Q. All right. Wasn't Exhibit 1 given to you by the U.S.
	16	Attorney's Office?
	17	A. If I'm not mistaken, this was one that was requested and we
	18	pulled it from the archives.
	19	Q. Did you personally pull it from the archives?
04:57:34	20	A. No, I did not personally pull it.
	21	Q. Did you tell anyone to pull only part of it?
	22	A. No, I just gave a contract number and all the contract
	23	documents are bound together. So this would be all that was
	24	there.
04:57:52	25	Q. So this would've been everything that they found?

С	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 144 of 161 PageID #:1643 Bond - recross by Hickey
		144
	1	A. Yes.
	2	Q. Okay. And everything there found did not include any
	3	extension, correct?
	4	A. Correct.
04:58:03	5	Q. And if there had been an extension, there would be evidence
	6	of that, correct?
	7	A. Correct.
	8	Q. Now, for Exhibit 2, again I'm just a little confused. This
	9	was originally if we went to Page B 189, this was originally
04:58:31	10	signed on January 10th of 2001, is that right?
	11	A. By the VA, yes.
	12	Q. Okay. And December 29th, 2000, by Michael Thompson's
	13	secretary, is that right?
	14	A. Correct.
04:58:48	15	Q. And so that was made retroactive back to September 1st,
	16	2000 or excuse me, December 1st, 2000?
	17	A. From what I see, it was issued to the university on
	18	November 30th, 2000 for them to accept this change, and it was
	19	signed by the university on December 29th, 2000, and then
04:59:20	20	submitted to us, "us" being GLAC, on January 4th, 2001, and
	21	then signed by the GLAC contracting officer on January 10th,
	22	2001.
	23	Q. So you're saying that B 189 is a change form, that's
	24	amendment number 1?
04:59:42	25	A. Yes.

Ca	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 145 of 161 PageID #:1644 Bond - recross by Hickey 145
	1	Q. Okay. There's no if we went from Page 190 through the
	2	end of Exhibit 2, there's no signature, correct?
	3	A. Can I just add something?
	4	Q. Ago ahead?
04:59:57	5	A. With this being an amendment, this was before the contract
	6	was actually executed. So they are amending the solicitation
	7	itself.
	8	Q. Okay. So just then so we're clear, the first signature by
	9	the VA would be in December 2001, is that correct?
05:00:35	10	A. The first signature from the VA would be January 10th,
	11	2001.
	12	Q. Okay. And when you say the first contract was for
	13	9 months, you're referring to that B 189 page and language in
	14	there about 9 months, is that correct?
05:00:57	15	A. Yes.
	16	Q. But the language that counsel had you read, about the term
	17	that's in the boilerplate on B 194, says 3 years?
	18	A. Yes, it does.
	19	Q. So there's a direct conflict there, correct?
05:01:23	20	A. Yes, there is. A lot of times when different people do new
	21	solicitation documents, they use a boiler and they don't check
	22	everything and this appears to be one of those times.
	23	MR. HICKEY: Thank you.
	24	MR. LUMB: Nothing further, Your Honor.
05:01:46	25	MS. BROCK: Nothing, Your Honor.

Ca	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 146 of 161 PageID #:1645 Monroe - direct by Lumb 146
	1	THE COURT: You can step down.
	2	(Witness excused.)
	3	MR. LUMB: I believe our last witness is Ms. Monroe.
	4	THE COURT: Face me and raise your right hand.
05:02:29	5	(Witness duly sworn.)
	6	THE COURT: Please be seated.
	7	HELEN MONROE, PLAINTIFF, SWORN
	8	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	9	BY MR. LUMB:
05:02:38	10	Q. Could you introduce yourself, please.
	11	A. My name is Helen Monroe.
	12	Q. Mrs. Monroe, you are Regina Romero's mother, correct?
	13	A. Yes, I am.
	14	Q. In 2001 when she died, how old was Regina?
05:02:53	15	A. 46 years old.
	16	Q. And you got three other children, correct?
	17	A. Yes, I do.
	18	Q. I want to take you directly back to 2001.
	19	A. Okay.
05:03:07	20	Q. July and August of 2001 to be specific.
	21	Now, Regina went to the Westside VA for a biopsy
	22	procedure on July 18th, correct?
	23	A. Right.
	24	Q. And she remained an inpatient in the Westside facility from
05:03:24	25	that date to the date she died, correct?

Ca	ase: 1:(	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 147 of 161 PageID #:1646 Monroe - direct by Lumb 147
	1	A. She was to come home that evening.
	2	Q. But she was admitted on that date and stayed there until
	3	she died?
	4	A. Yes.
05:03:35	5	Q. In Early September, correct?
	6	A. Yes.
	7	Q. How often did you visit her?
	8	A. Twice a day.
	9	Q. I want to take you now to August 16th, 2001.
05:03:45	10	At that point, were you asked on that day, were you
	11	asked to have a meeting with several VA employees?
	12	A. Yes, I was.
	13	Q. Can you tell us who those employees were by title and name.
	14	A. Mr. Americanos asked me and my husband to please come with
05:04:03	15	him to a room so we could have a meeting, and they took us into
	16	a big larger room.
	17	Q. Who else went in the room with you?
	18	A. There was Mr. Lipnick, Mr. Americanos, and I believe they
	19	call her a secretary or a case worker.
05:04:24	20	Q. Social worker?
	21	A. Social worker, yes.
	22	Q. And it was your understanding they were all VA employees,
	23	is that correct?
	24	A. I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.
05:04:32	25	Q. It was your understanding that they were all VA employees?

Ca	ase: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 148 of 161 PageID #:1647 Monroe - direct by Lumb 148
	1	A. Yes, they were. Uh-huh.
	2	Q. What did Mr. American tell you in that meeting?
	3	A. Mr. American told me that there was an accident with my
	4	daughter and they were going to compensate us for the problem.
05:04:57	5	Q. And when he said an accident, what care was he discussing?
05:04:57	6	A. She was cut wrong.
	7	Q. And what date of care was he discussing?
	8	A. On the 18th.
	9	Q. And was that the first, the very first procedure, the
05:05:14	10	biopsy?
05:05:14	11	A. Yes.
	12	Q. Did he state to you anything about Dr. Gilliam being an
	13	independent contractor?
	14	A. No.
05 05 00	15	
05:05:26	16	Q. Did he tell you that the United States was not going to take responsibility for Dr. Gilliam's care?
	17	A. No.
	18	
		Q. Did he direct you to U.I.C or anyone other than United
	19 20	States for compensation?
05:05:39		A. No. O Thenk you That's all I have
	21	Q. Thank you. That's all I have.
	22	THE COURT: Anyone else?
	23	MS. BROCK: I have no questions.
	24 25	MR. LUMB: No questions, Your Honor.
05:05:55	25	THE COURT: You may step down. Thank you.

Ca	ase: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 149 of 161 PageID #:1648 Monroe - direct by Lumb 149
	1	(Witness excused.)
	2	THE COURT: You have somebody?
	3	MS. BROCK: No.
	4	THE COURT: Okay. You want to come up here.
05:06:05	5	(Brief pause).
	6	THE COURT: There's one thing I would like to clarify,
	7	and that is, in the arguments of both the plaintiff and
	8	Dr. Gilliam, there's a kind of a flavor of an estoppel-based
	9	argument that the government didn't make things clear to
05:06:48	10	Dr. Gilliam, or, for that matter, to anybody else exactly what
	11	her status was. And my question to you is, are you actually
	12	going to rely on the doctrine of estoppel given the particular
	13	status of the government with respect to estoppel arguments?
	14	MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, if I may clarify our
05:07:08	15	position. It's our position that Dr. Gilliam had an agreement
	16	that she was to be provided indemnity. She worked under that
	17	agreement. The government is bringing a contract that's not
	18	between Dr. Gilliam and them, but between U. of I. and them.
	19	We're saying any agreement they made should not work to the
05:07:31	20	detriment of Dr. Gilliam.
	21	THE COURT: Okay.
	22	MR. HICKEY: So that's our first position, and if I
	23	haven't made that clear, I apologize to the Court.
	24	As a fallback, if the Court injected that, we would
05:07:45	25	say if the Court is going to impose this contract for which

150

1 Dr. Gilliam had no part and no notice, that we would say then 2 -- I understand the case law on estoppel, but there are certain 3 places estoppel which we would say that the government should 4 not be able to hold this to Dr. Gilliam, but that's a fallback 5 position. 05:08:09 6 THE COURT: I got it. I got it. 7 MR. LUMB: Just quickly, Judge. The evidence that's 8 been educed, it does seem estoppel-like evidence or apparent agency-type evidence, isn't produced primarily for that 9 10 purpose. We believe it shows the belief of the people actually 05:08:22 11 providing the care at the VA what her relationship was and that 12 belies the contract language. 13 Certainly as an alternative theory, I think estoppel 14 may apply, but that is not, in any way, shape, or form, the 15 main argument or the purpose for most of that testimony. 05:08:41 16 THE COURT: You want to make brief closing statements? 17 MS. BROCK: Sure. If you would like to hear them. 18 THE COURT: Sure. 19 MS. BROCK: Who would you like to hear from first? 20 THE COURT: Well, actually you can address the issue 05:09:00 21 since we now heard the evidence of who has the burden here. 22 CLOSING ARGUMENT 23 BY MS. BROCK: At the present time, there's an amended 24 complaint naming Dr. Gilliam individually. Dr. Gilliam wants

those counts of the complaint dismissed, that was the purpose

05:09:21

# Case: 1:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 151 of 161 PageID #:1650 closing argument - by Ms. Brock

	1	of her motion for summary judgment, so claiming that she was
	2	actually an employee of the VA. So therefore, because the VA
	3	exercised control over her, that was the argument in the
	4	summary judgment. Therefore, I believe that plaintiff joins
05:09:37	5	that motion of Dr. Gilliam. So therefore, I believe
	6	Dr. Gilliam and the plaintiff are the ones that want to change
	7	the status quo and therefore they have the burden to prove.
	8	THE COURT: Okay.
	9	MS. BROCK: So I just have little to say. I'll just
05:09:54	10	start with your motion for summary judgment or your decision
	11	on the summary judgment, because you ordered the hearing to
	12	take place just to address those issues that had not been
	13	decided.
	14	I wanted to bring to the Court's attention to an case
05:10:21	15	decided in the Fifth Circuit earlier this year, Creel v. United
	16	States, 598 F.3d 210 and I'll hand it up.
	17	(Document tendered to the Court).
	18	MS. BROCK: I've already given a copy to the other
	19	party.
05:10:34	20	That's where the court in that case analyzed the case
	21	the same way you did, using the same factors, and decided that
	22	the physician that was contracting with the United States was
	23	an independent contractor. He went through the same factors
	24	that you did.
05:10:52	25	You've already decided that factors A, B, C and D

C	Case: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 152 of 161 PageID #:1651 closing argument - by Ms. Brock 152
	1	indicate that she was not an employee. And then if we just
	2	talk about the others then:
	3	" whether the employer or the workman supplies the
	4	tools, instrumentalities, and the place of work for
5:11:05	5	the person doing the
	6	work"
	7	that was factor E. That's an important factor, as
	8	you pointed out in your decision.
	9	In this case, the testimony was that Dr. Gilliam saw
5:11:23	10	patients both at the VA and at the University of Illinois. She
	11	was authorized to do that under the contract. That while she
	12	was seeing VA patients at the University of Illinois, she was
	13	using University of Illinois equipment, and so forth. While
	14	she was seeing patients at the VA, she was using VA equipment,
5:11:41	15	and so forth.
	16	Factor F, the length of time for which she was
	17	employed. She worked there, she started there in '99 and she
	18	treated this patient, the issue was in 2001, so over a two year
	19	period. The Court can decide which way that cuts, if it's
5:12:06	20	short or long, or if it's incisive.
	21	The method of payment. The payment, I don't think
	22	there was actually any testimony on this. It's under the
	23	contractor's testimony that payment is made by the VA to the
	24	University of Illinois. And then Dr. Gilliam testified that
5:12:27	25	her payment came from the University of Illinois, and only from

### Case: 1:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 153 of 161 PageID #:1652 closing argument - by Ms. Brock

153

	1	the University of Illinois, that she received no employee
	2	benefits from VA or salary directly from the VA.
	3	"Whether or not the work is a part of the regular
	4	business of the employer"
05:12:45	5	is factor number H. The hospital, the VA hospital, a
	6	doctor working there is exactly what they do. Although she was
	7	a specialist, she was a gynecologist, and she testified that
	8	she was the only gynecologist employed at the VA during that
	9	period of time.
05:13:06	10	And then factor I, I think, has got to go toward the
	11	fact that she's not an employee. Whether or not the parties
	12	believe they are creating the relation of master and servant,
	13	just look at the contract, it's as clear as you can be. I'm
	14	not sure if the VA wants to continue to enter into these
05:13:30	15	contracts, I don't know how much more clear they can be than
	16	what they say in the contract. If they don't want to create
	17	anything more than an independent contractor position, I don't
	18	know how they can be anymore clearer than they are in the
	19	contract.
05:13:45	20	And then the last one, whether the principal is or is
	21	not in business, you know, that, I think, cuts in favor of her
	22	not being an employee.
	23	A couple of small points I wanted to make. Depending
	24	on how you decide, I have different requests for you. If you
05:14:09	25	decide that Dr. Gilliam was controlled by the VA to such an

#### Case: 1:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 154 of 161 PageID #:1653 closing argument - by Mr. Lumb

154

1 extent that she should be considered an employee for an FTCA 2 purpose, then we would like to leave, under federal of Civil 3 Procedure 14(a)(1), to file a third-party complaint against the 4 University of Illinois. 5 THE COURT: And the truth of the matter is, it's 05:14:29 6 inevitable when this case started that somebody is going to 7 file a coverage case with respect to the U. of I., You, Dr. Gilliam, somebody is going to sue them, unless the time has 8 9 run, but I don't think it has. They are going to be here. 10 MS. BROCK: Right. If you decide that she is not an 05:14:51 11 employee of the VA, there are -- in the complaint, in the 12 amended complaint, there's an assertion that the VA is 13 nevertheless responsible for her actions under an apparent 14 agency theory, and that's not allowed under the FTCA. So we 15 would ask that you strike those. 05:15:14 16 So that's all I have. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 MR. HICKEY: Thank you for your patience, Your Honor, 19 for all of this. 20 THE COURT: Counsel, I do want to remind you of one 05:15:38 21 thing, I am paid to sit here. So I cash the checks. So qo 22 ahead. 23 24 CLOSING ARGUMENT 25 BY MR. LUMB: As the Seventh Circuit said in the 05:15:50

155

Quilico case, I think, Your Honor has already cited, and I'll
 quote from it:

3 "... the legislative history of Section 4116 indicates 4 that it was the intent of Congress that the immunity 5 granted to the VA physicians and surgeons be broad 05:16:08 6 because the benefits of Section 4116 coverage were 7 seen as "an aid in the recruitment of much needed personnel" .... " and I'm skipping the citation of 8 Congressional record. The Seventh Circuit goes on: 9 "...it's obvious, after reviewing the legislative 10 05:16:29 11 histories to Sections 4114 and 4116, that Congress in 12 adopting this legislation was attempting to secure 13 the services of the most qualified physicians and 14 surgeons in their respective specialties in a 15 particular geographic area and that immunity from 05:16:48 16 liability was beyond all doubt intended as an 17 inducement. Immunity from liability is a substantial 18 inducement in our litigious society of today. Such a 19 grant of immunity under Section 4116 the physicians and surgeons employed on a temporary basis for a 20 05:17:09 21 fixed period of time under Section 4114 furthers the 22 Section 4114 goal of improving the recruitment of the 23 most qualified specialized medical personnel and the 24 overall quality of medical care in VA hospitals. It 25 was the obvious intent of Congress that those doctors 05:17:32

(	Case: 1:0	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 156 of 161 PageID #:1655 closing argument - by Mr. Lumb 156
	4	
	1	recruited to serve on a temporary basis for a fixed
	2	period of time should also enjoy immunity protection
	3	of Section 4116. We hold that Congress intended to
	4	extend Section 4116 immunity to all Section 4114
05:17:50	5	physicians and surgeons operating in the VA program."
	6	Your Honor, Dr. Gilliam was appointed. Now,
	7	Section 4114 has been superseded, but she was appointed
	8	pursuant to the successor provisions. Your Honor has now heard
	9	from Dr. Woods essentially the same thing, the VA faces a
05:18:17	10	difficult job in recruiting physicians, it won't be able to
	11	recruit physicians without an offer of immunity. That offer of
	12	immunity was made clear and understood by Dr. Gilliam coming
	13	into this agreement.
	14	The government has introduced Government Exhibit 1
05:18:37	15	which was a contract that was not in existence when Dr. Gilliam
	16	started. She was not bound by that contract. There's no
	17	contract between the University of Illinois and the VA at the
	18	time she started.
	19	They have produced nothing to indicate that she agreed
05:18:59	20	to that. She was told that she would be equivalent to an
	21	employee. You heard Dr. Wood refer to her as an employee. You
	22	even heard Ms. Bond refer to her as an employee. We've
	23	introduced into evidence Defendant's Exhibit 2 which is the VA
	24	employment application that throughout it it refers to
05:19:21	25	employment.

# Case: 1:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 157 of 161 PageID #:1656 closing argument - by Mr. Lumb

	1	There's nothing that was ever told to her, given to
	2	her in writing, or even implied that she would not be afforded
	3	this immunity. It was vital. If she had been told that she
	4	didn't have immunity, she would not have worked there the rest
05:19:43	5	of that day. And the U.S. has no evidence to the contrary.
	6	It's our belief that the U.S. has the burden of proof
	7	because they have submitted the documents, like the employment
	8	application. They're taking immunity away from her. Dr.
	9	Woods, who is the Chief of Surgery, says she was an employee.
05:20:06	10	He took the position she would be entitled to immunity.
	11	They are trying to take something away from Dr.
	12	Gilliam that was absolutely the basis of her understanding. I
	13	do not believe that they've sustained that burden.
	14	Your Honor, counsel says that this contract with U. of
05:20:27	15	I. couldn't be more clear. Plaintiff's counsel pointed out
	16	five inconsistencies within the contract. If we had more time,
	17	we could point out dozens. Ms. Bond testified that it's
	18	boilerplate. There's nothing to indicate that this doctor
	19	should be denied this type of immunity.
05:20:50	20	As the Court pointed out in Quilico and has pointed
	21	out in Ezekiel with immunity granted to residents and need to
	22	provide teaching, that's why they recruited Dr. Gilliam. No
	23	one is going to be able to recruit to a VA the quality of
	24	Dr. Gilliam if immunity is taken from her. It would be
05:21:15	25	improper.

# Case: 1:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 158 of 161 PageID #:1657 closing argument - by Mr. Lumb

	1	The U.S. says that this contract takes it away, but
	2	they have not dealt with the Quilico decision, the Ezechiel
	3	decision, the Williams versus United States decision. Even in
	4	documents filed in this case, early on in the case when we
05:21:38	5	first filed on behalf of Dr. Gilliam the motion for summary
	6	judgment, the government was taking the position that she was
	7	an employee back then. In fact, in the opinion issued by this
	8	Court, the memorandum opinion and order entered on March 13th,
	9	2007, says the facts that Dr. Gilliam, and I'm quoting:
05:22:02	10	" Dr. Gilliam, a VA employee, performed a cervical
	11	biopsy on Regina Romero at the VA hospital"
	12	period close quote.
	13	The government has only come up with this fact that
	14	she's not an employee when we sought to have the case dismissed
05:22:19	15	based on the immunity provision.
	16	Your Honor, I believe despite Ms. Bond saying what's
	17	normally done in contracts and her understanding of what's
	18	done, she has no knowledge as to this particular situation.
	19	There's been testimony by Dr. Woods, who was her
05:22:42	20	supervisor, that Dr. Gilliam was treated exactly the same. So
	21	again, I would like to make our position clear that Dr. Gilliam
	22	should not be deprived of the immunity for which she understood
	23	she was applying when she took on this position at the VA and
	24	the government has not produced anything.
05:23:03	25	As a fallback or secondary argument, a strict control

#### Case: 1:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 159 of 161 PageID #:1658 closing argument - by Mr. Lumb

159

1 test, and I know Your Honor discussed that in your decision, 2 but under Ezekiel and the Quilico decision, the strict control 3 test does not apply to professionals such as a physician.

4 Here, Dr. Gilliam had the same level of control over 5 her as everyone else at the VA, all the other surgeons, and 6 therefore, on that ground, the government should fail.

7 And on the third level, Your Honor, again, it's only 8 if the Court would get past our first two positions, I believe 9 the government just should not be able to induce someone to 10 work under the concept of immunity and then take it away. And 11 as been overwhelmingly established, a contract that was entered 12 into more than a year, assigned literally 18 months -- or not 13 18 months, August 1st through December of the following year, 14 so a year and 5 months, shouldn't take away her right. The 15 government should not be allowed to do that.

16 So I believe for all those reasons the Court should 17 not allow the government to induce a situation where they have 18 taken away this immunity from her. Thank you.

19 THE COURT: You want to come up here. Both of you. (Brief pause) 20

21 THE COURT: I'll give you a written decision fairly 22 A couple of observations. I think the burden of proof soon. 23 is not going to be a significant factor here, because the 24 burden of proof is really important when you end up in a tie, 25 and you're not going to end up in a tie. So it doesn't matter

05:23:28

05:23:50

05:24:20

05:24:49

05:25:09

#### Case: 1:04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 160 of 161 PageID #:1659 closing argument - by Mr. Lumb

160

1 whether the winning side has the burden of proof or not. The 2 winning side will have prevailed and the tie breaker burden of 3 proof won't apply.

4 The second observation I would make is. although this 5 is not a deciding factor and probably may not be a factor at 05:25:37 6 all, it would help sometime if the government actually used 7 plain language in its contracts. You could've used fewer words 8 and made it much clearer to any possible reader of it. And we found this over and over again with people who use the word 9 "contractor" and "employee" which are words that the average 10 11 person does not understand. And, in fact, there are times when 12 lawyers don't understand it, and, once in a great while, a case 13 where a judge doesn't understand it.

> 14 But I'll try to get you something within the next week 15 It will probably be in a minute order form since the or two. 16 basic principles has been laid out. And I'm assuming you no 17 longer need to depose the witness which you have not previously 18 deposed.

> > MR. HICKEY: She already testified.

20 THE COURT: Yeah. She answered questions, which I 21 thought was going to happen.

22 With that, the ruling, we'll set another date one way 23 or the other. Thank you.

24 MR. LUMB: Your Honor, plaintiff hasn't had a chance 25 I'm just going to assume that it's better to shut to argue.

05:26:03

05:26:23

05:26:41

19

05:26:55

Case: 1:	04-cv-07358 Document #: 173 Filed: 02/27/15 Page 161 of 161 PageID #:1660 closing argument - by Mr. Lumb 161
1	up.
2	THE COURT: Yeah, I think that's a good idea.
3	
4	(Which concluded the proceedings had on this date in
5	the above entitled cause.)
6	
7	
8	* * * * * * * *
9	
10	
11	I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE
12	RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER
13	
14	
15	/s/Blanca I. Lara August 18, 2014
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
25	