

Date : 12/16/2022 3:46:12 PM
From : "Paul Dulberg"
To : "Law Office Of Alphonse Talarico"
BCc : "Paul Dulberg" , "Tom Kost"
Subject : Re:

I don't see what we talked about on the phone within these cases.

From the phone conversation I believed your looking for something within these that goes with;
Rule 211 (c) (1)
"... objections to the ... admissibility of testimony may be made when the testimony is offered in
evidence."

Is there something else I should have been looking for within these 2 cases?

Austin v St Joseph Hosp is about using only one deposition in the motion for summary judgment

Townsend v Gaydosh is about suing state workers in the coarse of the jobs and is venue question
(circuit court vs court of claims)

What am I not seeing here?

On Dec 16, 2022, at 2:12 PM, Alphonse Talarico
<contact@lawofficeofalphonsetalarico.com> wrote:

Please see attached

<Austin v St Joseph Hosp 187 IllApp3d 891 543 NE2d 932 135 IllDec 364 Ill App
1989.pdf><Townsend v Gaydosh 554 NE2d 648 197 IllApp3d 339 143 IllDec 713
Ill App 1990.pdf>