Snell & Wilmer LLP. LAW OFFICES 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510

Respondent.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF THE GUARDIANSHIP OVER THE PERSON AND ESTATE OF,
ADEN HAILU,
An Adult Ward.

FANUEL GEBREYES,
Appellant,
vs.

PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES, LLC dba
ST. MARY'S REGIONAL MEDICAL
CENTER.

No. 68531 Electronically Filed
No. 68531 Aug 07 2015 02:55 p.m.
Tracie K. Lindeman
District Court Clerk of Supreme Court

NOTICE OF FILING JULY 21, 2015 HEARING TRANSCRIPT

Notwithstanding the requirements of Nev. R. App. P. 9, Respondent Prime Healthcare Services, LLC dba St. Mary's Regional Medical Center ("St. Mary's"), by and through its counsel of record, Snell & Wilmer LLP, hereby files the transcript from the district court's July 21, 2015 hearing, which provides the basis of Appellant's Notice of Appeal and was filed on August 3, 2015.

Dated: August 7, 2015 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

By:

William E. Peterson, No. 1528 Janine C. Prupas, No. 9156 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510 Reno, Nevada 89501

Attorneys for Prime Healthcare Services, LLC, dba St., Mary's Regional Medical Center

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This document was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on August 7, 2015. Electronic service of this document shall be made in accordance with the Service List as follows:

William M. O'Mara, Esq. David C. O'Mara, Esq. The O'Mara Law Firm, P.C. 311 East Liberty Street Reno, Nevada 89501

Holly W. Longe

	-5-
1	
2	
3	IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
4	OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
5	-000-
6 7	IN THE MATTER OF THE GUARDIANSHIP : OVER THE PERSON AND ESTATE OF : Case No. GR15-00125 ADEN HAILU, :
8	: Dept. No. 12 An Adult Ward.
9	FANUEL GEBREYES,
10	Petitioner, :
11	vs. :
12	PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES, LLC, : dba ST. MARY'S REGIONAL MEDICAL :
13	CENTER, :
14	Respondent. :
15	
16	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
17	July 21, 2015
18	Reno, Nevada
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	Transcribed by: DIANNE M. BRUMLEY, NV CCR #205 California CSR #6796
25	BONANZA REPORTING: 1111 FOREST, RENO, NEVADA Telephone: (775) 786-7655

1	
2	APPEARANCES
3	
4	
5	FOR THE PETITIONER:
6	WILLIAM O'MARA, ESQ. 311 E. Liberty Street
7	Reno, Nevada 89501
8	
9	FOR THE RESPONDENT: Snell & Wilmer
10	BY: WILLIAM E. PETERSON, ESQ. JANINE C. PRUPAS, ESQ.
11	50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 510 Reno, Nevada 89501
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

		Page 3
1		
2	INDEX	
3		
4	WITNESS	PAGE
5	BRIAN CALLISTER, M.D. Direct examination by Mr. O'Mara	13
6	Cross examination by Mr. Peterson Re-direct examinatin by Mr. O'Mara	18 37
7	Re-cross examination by Mr. Peterson Re-direct examination by Mr. O'Mara	43 48
8	SCOTT MANTHEI, M.D.	
9	Direct examination by Mr. O'Mara Cross examination by Mr. Peterson	49 53
10	Re-direct examination by Mr. O'Mara Re-cross examination by Mr. Peterson	57 59
11	MR. GEBREYES	-
12	Direct examination by Mr. O'Mara Cross examination by Mr. Peterson	67 69
13	ANTHONY FLOREANI, M.D.	
14	Examination by Mr. Peterson Cross examination by Mr. O'Mara	74 80
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 * * * 2. RENO, NEVADA, JULY 21, 2015 4 Good afternoon, your Honor. THE BAILIFF: is case number GR15-00125, the Hailu matter. 6 THE COURT: Good afternoon. My name is Frances 7 Doherty. Do you mind saying your names for the record if you're at the front of the table at one of these two tables? 10 My name is William O'Mara. MR. O'MARA: 11 represent the plaintiff in this case, the Guardian --12 THE COURT: Pleased to see you. 13 MR. O'MARA: -- Mr. Gebreyes. 14 MR. GEBREYES: Fanuel Gebreyes. 15 Bill Peterson again, your Honor. MR. PETERSON: 16 We represent the defendant in this case, Prime 17 Healthcare. Jacey Prupas is with me. We also have 18 Helen Lidholm who is the CEO of Saint Mary's Hospital; 19 we have Tammy Evans, the director of nursing; and we 20 have Dr. Floreani who is a pulmonologist and has been 21 seeing Aden Hailu since April. 22 THE COURT: All right, thank you, and Dr. 23 Byrne, you're here at the table. You've been a witness 24 in this case and it just is more accommodating for you 25 to sit at this table so you can hear better; is that

1 | correct?

DR. FLOREANI: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, that's fine. Nice to see you again as well. So counsel, where are we on this case?

MR. O'MARA: Your Honor, at the last hearing, I have the transcript redone, so we're here to find out whether or not that physician determines -- not whether, we're not here to determine death or life. We're here to determine that the physician is going to treat the patient, prescribe a protocol for the patient that the Guardian is hoping for and works with the Guardian to accommodate a transfer.

In that regard, your Honor, we have Dr. Brian Callister from Reno who I believe is willing to take on the care of the young lady.

We've made arrangements with American Med
Flight to transport the patient from Saint Mary's
Hospital by air. First of all, it goes ground
transportation to air, and air transportation to ground
down in Las Vegas, and then she will go to St. Rose de
Lima Hospital.

In Rose de Lima Hospital, Dr. Scott Manthei will take over the care of the young lady. The Pulmonary Associates associated with St. Rose de Lima will cake care of the pulmonary problems that she may or

1 | may not have.

I think that's a broad outline of what has to be done. I will remind the Court that under the statute, doctors don't have any say on what treatment can be done if they have the right -- the parents have the right to have a doctor and if he recommends the treatment, then they can receive that treatment, and that's in 449, NRS 449. So with that, I'll call Dr. Brian Callister.

THE COURT: I'm going to hear from Mr.

Peterson. I asked for both counsel's report on the status of the case.

MR. O'MARA: Sorry.

MR. PETERSON: Thank you, your Honor. First of all, I'd like to say that we've been at this for quite some time. We spoke with Mr. O'Mara yesterday, we spoke with him this morning.

Not once did he ever give an indication that he was going to call these witnesses. Not once did he provide the information to us that he just informed the Court about. We are hearing it for the first time just as you are hearing it today, and I take umbrage at that sort of practice in this community to begin with.

Secondly, there is a written order in the case signed by you, reviewed by Mr. O'Mara, also signed by

Mr. O'Mara, and signed by us. That order provides that what he was to provide to you, and to us, by today was a proposed written medical plan and a discharge plan for Aden Hailu. He was supposed to provide to you a written plan regarding a proposed plan of care, including all of the details, some of which he described in general terms just now, none of which has been provided.

Furthermore, the plan was supposed to have been prepared after -- according to your order at paragraph one and five, after an evaluation of Aden Hailu which has not occurred, and such evaluation to take place or to be performed by a physician, and a doctor of osteopathic medicine is not a physician or licensed by the Medical Board in the State of Nevada or credentialed at Saint Mary's which is a requirement, and therefore unless we've got a lot more details here and great specificity with actual commitments to include a plan for your Honor since you've indicated that you believe that your duty here is to look after the best interest of Aden Hailu, that's on the assumption, of course, that she is still alive, which she is not, but one of those elements was to determine how all of this was going to happen financially.

Mr. O'Mara informed the Court that Medicare stops paying -- he told us last time Medicare stops

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

paying on July 31st, and therefore there's been no mention made of that.

All of these, your Honor, basically are kind of surrounding, I guess, the parameters of what you wanted to hear today, but which I think maybe are aside from the point, and Mr. O'Mara has said that is not the point which is whether or not Aden Hailu is alive or dead, which is why I thought that you had ordered, and that Mr. O'Mara had agreed, that there would be a licensed, credentialed, qualified medical practitioner who would perform an evaluation on Aden Hailu to determine whether or not any of this is appropriate. None of that has happened.

THE COURT: Can you respond to that, Mr.

15 | O'Mara?

MR. O'MARA: Yes, your Honor. Obviously I was out of town until yesterday --

THE COURT: But you knew that going into it.

MR. O'MARA: I did, and I advised the Court of that. I did not hear from my client until yesterday that there was a possible plan. I did not know about the doctors at all until this morning.

Dr. Brian Callister, who is a licensed physician in the State of Nevada and is qualified at Saint Mary's Hospital, and I have his curriculum vitae

- for the Court to review, arrived from Dallas at 10:30 this morning and went over to evaluate the young lady.

 He will testify with regard to that.
 - The plan is just as we indicated, Medicare will take care of the flights -- not Medicare. Medicaid will take care of the flights and the transportation on the ground. Saint Mary's Hospital will then take care of her and it will be out of the hands of Saint Mary's Hospital or Prime and her life will continue.

Despite the fact that they say she's brain dead, there is still movement in the brain that can be enforced or helped with thyroid treatment and that was the testimony of Dr. Byrne the last time, so we still have the situation.

Unfortunately, I did not get Dr. Callister's report until late this afternoon just before coming into court.

THE COURT: Have you given it to Mr. Peterson?

MR. O'MARA: I haven't gotten a written report,

your Honor. I just received word from him because he
had just finished the evaluation of how she is and what
she's doing.

THE COURT: Is he here now?

MR. O'MARA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think Mr. Peterson has a right to

1 talk to him about what he's going to testify to.

MR. O'MARA: I have no problems with that.

THE COURT: Let me be very clear. There was medical evidence presented at the last hearing. That medical evidence suggested substantial credible information upon which a reasonable person would rely from Dr. Heide indicating that your child is in a state of continued life support and that she meets the statutory definitions for death should that life support be discontinued, and so what you were to do and what you're doing are two different things.

What you were to do was obtain, as offered, additional medical information that would help this Court and help the Guardian reach a conclusion different from what the overwhelming medical evidence had established at the last hearing.

Dr. Byrne's evidence was not medically acceptable, was not compelling, was not credible, and was not sufficient for the Court to reach a conclusion consistent with ongoing continued and extended care, so the plan was, Mr. O'Mara, to allow you additional time to provide other credible evidence and a plan of care.

I don't have that. I'll listen to your testimony from your witness, but I'm not redirecting this case because redirection inconsistent with medical

evidence that will be in the record will then go to other issues, issues of best interest decision making, issues of whether or not you're asking for experimental medical care and treatment approval, so this is not just the issue of whether or not Saint Mary's remains involved in the life of your child or her circumstances.

The Court will not facilitate an impractical course of treatment, so you've already not met the expectations of the Court and the order of the Court.

I will again allow supplementation of the record to hear what you have, but be aware this is not just about Saint Mary's and whether they're in and out of this case. It is the responsibilities of the Guardian, it is the best interest of your child, it is the medical information in the record and whether or not the Guardian is acting consistently with what is credible in this record.

I will not extend impractical, imprudent, unsupported measures, and I had hoped to have that information to suggest that what you're hoping for is none of those, is not impractical, is not imprudent, is not inconsistent with the balance of the evidence. I hope you have that now because that's what I'm looking for.

MR. O'MARA: I'll do the best I can, your

Honor. The only thing that I would disagree with the Court is the law does not give them the right to decide whether she's dead or not.

The Guardian, or the parent, has the right as to whether or not treatment can be given or withheld, and even the case law says that that's true, so it's really his decision, not the Court's decision, and there is a method of care that can be given to her.

I don't know that I can show that she's going to be up and running and doing magical things or anything else. That's for the future. All we know is that she's not in a great condition now, but she does have an opportunity to get better.

THE COURT: So it's the Court's responsibility to oversee the appropriate judgment of the Guardian, and it's the Guardian's responsibility in a circumstance such as this to evidence that that judgment and decision making is consistent with best interests, with supported evidence, with prudence and reasonableness, so you're right, it's not just Saint Mary's, it's the Guardian and the quality of the Guardian's decision making that the Court is reviewing.

So we'll take a break. Mr. Peterson, you may interview the witness if that's your desire, and then we'll hear from the witness and go from there.

```
1
              MR. PETERSON: Would it be permissible, your
2
    Honor, since we're talking with experts to talk to the
 3
    witness with Dr. Floreani with me?
              THE COURT: Yes, and then Mr. O'Mara may talk
 4
 5
    to Dr. Floreani if you're going to call Dr. Floreani.
6
              MR. PETERSON:
                            Yes.
                                   Thank you.
7
              (A recess was taken.)
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. O'Mara?
9
              MR. O'MARA: Yes, your Honor. I call Brian
10
    Callister to the stand.
11
                       BRIAN CALLISTER, M.D.
12
                      having been duly sworn,
13
              was examined and testified as follows:
14
                            EXAMINATION
15
    BY MR. O'MARA:
16
        0
              Please state your name.
17
              Thomas Brian Callister.
        Α
18
              And are you a doctor?
        0
19
              Yes, I'm a physician. I'm a medical doctor,
        Α
20
    not an osteopathic doctor.
21
              And how long have you been a doctor?
        0
22
              Since 1988.
        Α
23
              And is this your curriculum vitae?
        0
24
              Yes, it is. Yes, sir.
        Α
25
              Exhibit 1.
        0
```

- THE CLERK: This will actually be Exhibit A,

 Quardian's Exhibit A.
- THE COURT: Are we continuing the exhibits from
- 4 | last time?
- 5 THE CLERK: We are, but all of the exhibits
- from the previous hearing are the interested parties
- 7 exhibits which are numerical.
- 8 THE COURT: And just for the record, I don't
- 9 think any of the exhibits from the last hearing were
- 10 offered for admission.
- MR. PETERSON: I offer all my exhibits, your
- 12 | Honor, and I have no objection to his.
- MR. O'MARA: I have no objection to his
- 14 exhibits, your Honor.
- THE COURT: All right. Mr. Peterson's exhibits
- on behalf of the hospital will be admitted from the last
- 17 hearing. Exhibit A will be admitted from today's
- 18 hearing. Go ahead.
- 19 BY MR. O'MARA:
- Q Do you have any specialties?
- 21 A Internal medicine and hospitalist medicine.
- Q Do you take care of acute care patients?
- A Yes, I take care of acute care cases.
- Q Have you had an opportunity to look at Aden
- 25 | Hailu?

- A Yes. I first met her at around 11:00 a.m. this morning and I was in the vicinity, in and out of her room and performing an evaluation, review and exam between approximately 11:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. today.
 - Q And you're aware of what this hearing is about; is that correct?
 - A I believe so, yes.
 - Q You've had conversations with me as well as you've read the Court's order in this particular case?
 - A Yes, I did read the Court's order.
 - Q And you know that Saint Mary's does not wish to care for her any further?
 - A Yes, that's my understanding.
 - Q So is she in a position where she can travel?
 - A I believe she's in a position where she could travel with advanced life support services to another facility or another city if that's what the family wishes.
 - Q Okay. Can you give me your opinion with regard to what her status is?
 - A In brief, I believe that her status is quite grim. I think that her chance of survival, her chance of awakening from her current state is a long shot.
- However, I do not think that the chance is zero.
 - Q Okay. What initial care would you believe is

2

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 necessary?

A The initial care at this point if further treatment was to be continued would involve tracheostomy and a gastrostomy tube placement in order to continue the mechanical ventilation that she needs. Albeit it's relatively high-risk in her, the alternative is death, so like anything risk versus benefit, I believe the potential benefit of a tracheostomy and G-tube if we are to continue care would be in her best interest.

I also believe that different therapies that have been offered that I read proposed in some of the Court's documents by Dr. Byrne, I am not an endocrine expert on the concept of trying what we would call an empiric trial of different modalities of the care.

That's different than an experimental therapy.

An empiric trial, once again from the point of view of risk versus benefit, there's not really any risk to trying modalities to reduce brain edema and see if there is any response at all.

Do I think there would be a response? Probably not. But I cannot say that there would not be a response with certainty, and there lies the difficulty.

Q Do you have any other opinions, Doctor?

A The other concern that I had was the original electroencephalogram on this patient performed in early

April was really pretty different or inconsistent with the findings on the MRI and the transcerebral Dopplers in that the transcerebral Dopplers and the MRI's showed extensive damage at the initial EEG on April 6th and the neurologist's notes, which I know you have the medical record, said it was essentially normal.

The electroencephalogram, which by itself is not something that can tell you a patient will recover or not. The electroencephalogram, the EEG, was repeated twice more, two more times in the following approximately a week, but all in early April.

It did show deterioration, but what gives me pause is there were still diffuse brain waves. They were abnormal and they were slow, but there were brain waves diffusely recordable throughout the EEG and the neurologist commented on that.

Now, is that a sign that should give us hope that she's going to suddenly wake up and recover? No. But it's also something that should give you just enough pause to say you can't say with certainty that her chances are zero.

Q So is this the type of thing that you would leave the decision to the parent?

MR. PETERSON: I'm going to object to that, your Honor, he's not a doctor that --

- THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained.
- MR. O'MARA: That's all the questions I have,
- your Honor.
- 4 THE COURT: Mr. Peterson?
- MR. PETERSON: Thank you, your Honor.
- 6 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 7 BY MR. PETERSON:
- Q And thank you for letting me speak with you earlier.
- 10 A Sure.
- Q I just wanted to get a few things clarified, mostly all the things you and I already went over.
- 13 A Okay.

Α

14

15

18

25

- Q The first time you were involved in this case was Sunday night?
- 16 A By telephone.
- Q And you got a call from Dr. Walsh, was it?
- physician in rural Nevada, I believe in Yerington and
 Schurz, that had met me in different medical venues or
- 21 heard me speak, I'm not sure which, but he called me and

Tom Walsh, I think that's his name. He's a

- 22 I actually initially thought he was calling about
- transferring a patient to Reno, but then he told me it
- 24 was about an existing patient.
 - Q Okay. And then subsequent to talking with Dr.

- Walsh, you talked with Mr. O'Mara here and you talked with Dr. Byrne sitting over here on the side?
 - A Next Dr. Byrne called me and gave me his background and perspective on the case. He sent me his statement for the Court, and then I talked to -- the patient's father called me.
 - Q Yes.

5

6

- A And I actually didn't speak to Mr. O'Mara until -- when did we speak?
- MR. O'MARA: After you got off the plane today.
- THE WITNESS: That's right, today. I let them know that I would be willing to do an evaluation and
- give my recommendations, or at least state my opinion of
- what I thought, but that I was in Dallas, Texas and
- would not be back until Tuesday morning.
- 16 BY MR. PETERSON:
- Q And under no circumstances would you undertake the responsibility for caring for Aden Hailu?
- A I physically cannot due to my travel schedule and my chief medical officer job.
- Q So you will not be her doctor?
- 22 A I will not be her doctor.
- Q And you have not been her doctor?
- 24 A I have not been her doctor.
- Q Okay. Subsequently your next involvement in

- the case was after the conversations on Sunday night was
- 2 today, right?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q And today you went down to Saint Mary's
- 5 | Hospital at 10:30?
- 6 A 11:00, right.
- 7 Q 10:30, 11:00. You spent about two hours there?
- A Yes.
- 10 | medical records?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q And then you also went into look at Aden Hailu
- 13 and evaluate her?
- 14 A Correct.
- Q Okay. And the medical records you looked at
- 16 were the EEG, correct?
- 17 A Three of them.
- 18 Q The MRI?
- 19 A Yes.
- Q The apnea test?
- 21 A Within the progress note of Dr. Bacon. That
- 22 particular thing is a very common thing and the results
- are usually incorporated within the progress note of the
- 24 pulmonary physician, so that was in the progress note of
- 25 Dr. Bacon on May 28th.

- 1 Q Did you know she had two apnea tests?
- 2 A I did not see the second one. I actually saw
- Dr. Bacon and he pointed out to me that one. He didn't
- 4 tell me there was another.
- $\mathsf{S} \mid \mathsf{Q} = \mathsf{Okay}$. And nor did Mr. $\mathsf{O'Mara}$, nor did Dr.
- 6 | Byrne, and nor did the father?
- 7 A No.
- Q None of them told you he had two apnea tests --
- 9 she had two apnea tests?
- 10 A What was the date -- no. What was the date of
- 11 the second one?
- 12 Q The next thing you examined was the medication
- 13 | list, right?
- 14 A Correct.
- 15 Q And you looked at the neurological notes?
- A And other progress notes, but a smattering of
- 17 | them. I certainly didn't review every day for the past
- 18 three-and-a-half months.
- 19 Q All right. And then you went into Aden Hailu's
- 20 room, right?
- 21 A Correct.
- 22 Q You spent about 20 minutes examining her,
- 23 | correct?
- A Twenty to 30 minutes, yes.
- 25 Q The first thing you did was you took an initial

- look and you did a visual examination of her as she was
- 2 laying in the bed, correct?
- A Right, and I looked at her monitor to look at
- 4 her vital signs and records.
 - Q All right. You examined her lungs?
- δ A Yes.
- 7 Q And you do that the way we all see it on
- 8 television with the stethoscope?
- 9 A Yeah.
- 10 Q Lungs were working?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Which would be consistent with a ventilator,
- 13 | correct?
- 14 A Yes.
- Q Then you examined her -- or you did the same
- thing and listened to her heart? Her heart was working?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q Also consistent with being operated under a
- 19 ventilator?
- 20 A Not necessarily. A ventilator per se does not
- 21 keep the heart beating.
- Q Okay.
- 23 A If you are not breathing, a lack of lung
- function can cause your heart to stop, but a heart can
- stop for other reasons than not having a ventilator.

- You're not the telling the Court that her heart 0 is not -- that her heart is beating independently of the mechanical devices that are keeping it beating? Are you telling the Court that?
 - Α Not directly. Indirectly.
- All right. You then -- you're not a 7 neurologist, correct?
 - Α No.

2

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- And you're not then familiar with the standards of practice that are applicable to the practice of neurology in the State of Nevada?
- 12 Α I am not intimately familiar on a daily basis 13 as far as reviewing it to have it at the tip of my 14 tongue, no.
- 15 You're not an expert in neurology?
- 16 Α No.
 - Nonetheless, you did perform some neurological procedures or tests on her?
 - Which would be consistent with a board certified internal medicine and hospitalist scope of practice, and interpreting these exams would also be consistent with that.
 - Are you familiar with the definition of brain death under the Uniform Determination of Death Act as it exists in Nevada and throughout the United States?

1 A Yes.

7

10

11

14

- 2 0 What is it?
- A I can't read it to you word-for-word, but I'm familiar with it.
 - Q What is your understanding?
 - A My understanding, there's several separate tests that you can use, including an apnea test and other evidence of coma and lack of responsiveness that you can use summarily to determine whether or not a patient meets the criteria for brain death in a legal sense.
- Q Uniform Determination of Death Act provides for none of those things, do you know that?
 - A Okay. Well, then I'm thinking of something else then.
- THE COURT: Provides for what, Mr. Peterson? I didn't hear that question fully.
- 18 BY MR. PETERSON:
- Q Do you know the Uniform Determination of Death
 Act provides for none of the things that you just
 described to the Court?
- A Okay. Then I'm thinking I guess of the
 American Association of Neurology criteria or something
 else.
- Q Based upon those criteria, do you agree that

- 1 those standards are, so far as you understand them or
- 2 know them, the standard medical practice for
- 3 neurologists in the State of Nevada for determining
- 4 brain death?
 - A What's the question? I'm sorry.
- 6 Q The question is, for purposes of applying the
- 7 | medical standards that exist in the State of Nevada, you
- 8 | would agree that the tests promulgated by the American
- 9 Association -- excuse me, the American Association of
- 10 Neurologists is the standard of practice in Nevada?
- MR. O'MARA: Objection, your Honor. I believe
- 12 that's a legal standard.
- THE WITNESS: That's what I was going to say.
- MR. O'MARA: Not a medical standard.
- MR. PETERSON: I'll ask it a different way,
- 16 your Honor.
- 17 BY MR. PETERSON:
- 18 O Are you qualified to tell this Court what the
- 19 medical standards of practice are in the State of Nevada
- 20 | for neurologists?
- 21 A From a legal definition?
- Q No, I'm not asking for anything legal.
- A As a neurologist, no, because I'm not a
- 24 neurologist.
- 25 Q All right. Then you would not be able to

- testify to this Court what the medical standards of
- practice are for -- the medical standards now, not legal
- 3 standards, medical standards for neurologists in the
- 4 | State of Nevada?
- $ar{b}$ A Not as a neurologist, no.
- Q You are not familiar with the tests that are
- 7 established and promulgated by the American Association
- 8 of Neurologists to determine brain death under the
- 9 Uniform Act?
- 10 A I am familiar with them. I am not an expert in
- 11 them.
- 12 Q All right. Nonetheless, you did perform some
- neurological tests or procedures on Aden Hailu, correct?
- 14 A No procedures.
- 15 O Just tests?
- 16 A No, no tests. I did a physical examination.
- 17 Q Under your physical examination, you first
- 18 | examined her arm, correct?
- 19 A Not first, but I did examine her arm.
- Q And got no neurological response?
- 21 A No.
- 22 O You examined her hand?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q Got no neurological response?
- 25 A No.

		Page 27
1	Q	You examined her feet?
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	Got no neurological response?
4	А	No.
5	Q	You did a pressure test on her fingers and
6	toes?	
7	А	Yes.
8	Q	You got no neurological response?
9	А	Correct.
10	Q	You tested the reflex on her knees?
11	А	Yes.
12	Q	You got no neurological response?
13	А	Correct.
14	Q	You did a Babinski test?
15	А	Yes.
16	Q	You got no neurological response?
17	А	Correct.
18	Q	The Babinski test is a test that you just rub
19	your han	d on the plantar area of the foot?
20	А	Correct.
21	Q	Normally the response you get would be a
22	curling	of the foot, correct?
23	А	Correct.
24	Q	You got none of that, correct?
25	А	Yes.

- Q The examination of the records that you looked at, did you look at the Doppler test?
 - A I looked at the neurologist's report of the Doppler test. I could not find the actual Doppler test itself.
 - Q You were informed that the Doppler test showed that there was no brain flow to the brain -- no blood flow to the brain?
- 9 A Not to the entire brain, to the cerebral 10 cortex.
 - Q No blood flow to the cerebral cortex generally results in necrosis of the brain, does it not?
 - A Generally, if it's untreated or --
- 14 Q You would expect Aden Hailu's brain --
- MR. O'MARA: Can you let him finish, Bill?
- MR. PETERSON: I'm sorry.
- THE WITNESS: That depends on interventions and reversibility, and that's where things can get into a
- 19 | little bit more of a gray area.
- 20 BY MR. PETERSON:
- Q She has been, under the Doppler test, under a reduced blood flow -- significant reduced blood flow to the brain for many months, correct?
- 24 A It would appear so.
 - Q Does that not result in necrosis of the brain?

4

7

11

12

1 A It can.

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

Q You would not -- to a medical degree of

certainty, wouldn't you agree with me that if you get

reduced blood flow to the brain over a period of months,

like three months, you are going to sustain significant

necrosis of the brain?

A Based on the fact that her last transcranial Doppler was performed in April, at least the one that I reviewed, if there was one more recent I would like to know that, I can tell you that it was reduced, decreased and not flowing to the cortex in April. I can't tell you what it is in May, June or July.

- Q You checked the ocular -- you checked her -- among the neurological tests is an ocular test, is it not?
- 16 A Right.
 - Q You performed two of those, did you not?
- 18 A Yes.
 - Q And one of those was to open her eyes and put a cotton swab near the eyes in order to determine whether there was a reflex?
- 22 A Yes.
- Q Got none, correct?
- 24 A Correct.
- Q The next one is -- I forget the name of it, but

- you moved the head to the right and to the left checking
- the pupils of the eyes, correct?
- 3 A Correct.
- 4 Q In a normal brain when that happens, the
- 5 pupils -- when the head turns, the pupils continue to
- 6 look straight, correct?
- 7 A Correct.
- Q That did not happen here, correct?
- 9 | A No.
- 10 Q That's an indication of brain death, is it not?
- 11 A It can be one of many, many signs.
- 12 Q All right. The other --
- 13 A It cannot be used solely to determine brain
- 14 death.
- 15 Q You also did whatever you call the -- I don't
- want to call it a laser, but the light test on the
- 17 pupils --
- 18 A Pupillary reflex.
- 19 Q Got none, correct?
- 20 A Right.
- 21 Q All of those are consistent with brain death,
- 22 | are they not?
- 23 A They could be.
- Q I'll ask it again. All of those are consistent
- 25 | with brain death?

- 1 A They can be.
- 2 Q They're either consistent or not consistent.
- 3 A It depends on the situation. We have --
 - Q If you got a response, it would not be consistent with brain death, would it not?
- δ A That's true.
 - Q Then if you do not get a response, why wouldn't that be consistent with brain death?
 - A It would be consistent with a severe metabolic encephalopathy as well with severe cerebral edema.
- Q And none of that is reflected in the medical record, is it?
- 13 A No.

7

10

17

18

21

22

23

24

- Q And if there was such a thing, you would see it in the medical records, would you not?
- A Not necessarily.
 - Q Do you have any occasion at all that she suffered from such a thing?
- 19 A No.
- Q Thank you.
 - A The one thing I should be able to mention where I think it's very pertinent to your line of questioning, if I may add, is the fact that we have one neurology group and one pulmonary group that's been managing and making the recommendations and the interpretation and

- 1 clinical opinion was of one particular neurologist.
- Now, I'm sure he's a fine, upstanding
- neurologist, but in a situation like this, and this is
- 4 part of my review of the medical record, I was a little
- bit surprised that there wasn't an outside neurologist
- 6 in to evaluate the patient that wasn't having anything
- 7 to do with the same group or same hospital, and if there
- 8 | was such one, then I didn't see it.
- 9 Q You're suggesting that Saint Mary's doctors,
- 10 are, what, incompetent or --
- 11 A No, not at all.
- 12 Q They're competent?
- 13 A Not at all.
- 14 Q They are competent?
- 15 A Often we request second opinions in difficult 16 cases or contentious cases.
- Q You're not challenging the competency of the Saint Mary's physicians, are you?
- 19 A No, I am not.
- Q You're suggesting they may be biased?
- 21 A I don't know.
- Q All right. Are you familiar with the three cardinal signs of brain death under the standards promulgated by the American Association of Neurology?
 - A I can't repeat them off the top of my head, no.

- 1 Q Let's talk about coma. Is she in a coma?
- 2 A Yes.
- Q Do you recognize a coma as one of the three
- 4 signs?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 O Is the coma irreversible?
- 7 A I don't know.
- Q To a medical degree of certainty, would you garee that it looks like it's irreversible?
- 10 A It look like it's irreversible, but I a
- 10 A It look like it's irreversible, but I am not 11 certain of that.
- 12 Q Thank you. After coma, brainstem reflexes, a
 13 number of tests to determine brainstem reflexes. You
 14 performed some of those, correct?
- 15 A Yes, I did.
- 16 Q The brainstem reflex test that you undertook
 17 which is part two of the American Association of
 18 Neurology test indicates no response, no reflexes from
 19 the brainstem, correct?
- 20 A Correct.
- Q Consistent with brain death, right?
- 22 A It can be, yes.
- Q The last one, apnea test. You only saw the
- record on one apnea test, right?
- A From May 28th, correct.

- Q And the apnea test that was conducted confirmed, if you looked at the record, unequivocally brain death, did it not?
 - A It was consistent with brain death based on those applications.
 - Q Thank you.

7

10

11

12

13

14

- A Unequivocally, I would not use that term. It is one other piece of information.
- Q I'm sorry, I did not have an opportunity to examine your background and credentials in detail. I'm not going to go over them, but one thing I was confused about, it looks like you are associated in some way with facilities that take care of patients that are in a vegetative state?
- 15 A Correct.
- Q When a patient is in a vegetative state, they
 are not brain dead; those people do have certain
 brainstem reflexes or other reflexes to indicate they're
 not dead, right?
 - A Most of them do. There are always exceptions.
- Q You found none of those in this patient,
- 22 though?
- 23 A No.
- 24 Q But back to your --
- MR. O'MARA: Your Honor, would you please allow

- 1 him to finish his answers?
- THE COURT: Would you slow down a bit, Mr.
- 3 Peterson, please?
- 4 MR. PETERSON: I'm sorry.
- \overline{b} THE COURT: I'm taking notes.
- THE WITNESS: The clinical presentation of a

 patient in a persistent vegetative state can be

 extremely variable, from many reflexes or all of them

 being present to many, if not most, or all reflexes

 being difficult to elicit or even absent, so there's a

 wide spectrum there which is why there's so many

different varieties of tests and clinical exams.

- That's why there's apnea tests, MRI's and EEG's, by the way, to try to get an overall better picture of what these patients have functioning or not inside their brain.
- 17 BY MR. PETERSON:

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

- Q And all of those tests that you just described for the purposes of which you just testified about were performed and they are consistent with brain death, are they not?
- 22 A Except for the EEG.
- 23 O The EEG was performed before both apnea tests?
- 24 A I understand.
- 25 Q And they were early on, like first week of

1 April?

6

7

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A There was three of them in the first two weeks
 of April.
 - Q And they were gradually deteriorating you said?
 - A They were deteriorating, but they were not without brainwave activity throughout the -- it's a diffuse slowing, diffuse meaning the entire brain.
 - Q Okay. And back to your background and credentials. Are you associated in some way with facilities that care -- take care of for compensation patients like Aden Hailu?
- 12 A Yes.
- Q Okay. So you are a direct economic beneficiary of patients like Aden Hailu being discharged?
 - A No, not directly. I'm a salaried employee at a corporate level. I'm a chief medical officer. I get nothing if there's a patient that comes or doesn't come.
 - Q All right. Do you have any knowledge, facts or information as to the mechanics, the details, the procedures for transporting Aden Hailu to Las Vegas to be cared for in a facility in Las Vegas?
 - A The specifics that are set up, or how would it occur? I don't understand the question.
 - Q No, I'm talking about the actual where is she going, who has agreed to take her, what's going to

- 1 | happen to her when she's there?
- 2 A What I understand --
- Q From whom?
- A Mr. O'Mara and Dr. Byrne, is that she would go
- 5 to St. Rose Hospital in Las Vegas, that there's a
- 6 pulmonary group down there that is willing to assume her
- 7 care, and that there's ear, nose and throat doctor
- 8 that's willing to assume her care and do the
- 9 tracheostomy.
- 10 Q Okay. Have you ever spoken personally with Dr.
- 11 | Manthei?
- 12 A No.
- 13 Q Do you know who he is?
- 14 A No.
- Q Do you know that he is the person that is
- presumably making arrangements to do all of the things
- 17 | you've just described?
- 18 A I understood that as of about a half hour ago
- 19 because I heard he was on the phone.
- 20 Do you know that none of those things have
- 21 occurred?
- 22 A I don't know one way or the other.
- Q Thank you. No further questions.
- THE COURT: Mr. O'Mara?
- 25

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. O'MARA:

Q Would the treatment that has been recommended, is that experimental treatment or empirical?

A I would put it in the category of what we would call an empirical trial. It's not something that would be on an experimental protocol.

Often in cases that are very difficult where there's very little potential downfall because the patient is so seriously ill, physicians will often try things that may be towards the unorthodox, but wouldn't be called experimental.

THE COURT: It would be call empirical?

THE WITNESS: Empirical therapy. So in other words, I guess I should give an example, but unrelated. If I really wasn't sure, if you had a certain infection and we've been worrying about it for weeks, but it's not going away, maybe we do an empiric trial of an antibiotic for a week to see if it made a difference and that might help us tell the difference between a cellulitis or just a rash from an allergy.

THE COURT: And in this case, what would be the empirical trial?

THE WITNESS: One of the things I was reading about was in Dr. Byrne's statement, the consideration of

thyroid therapy, but the other part of it that wouldn't be just an empiric trial, and theoretically I haven't seen a lot of data out there, but what I have seen is from a physiologic standpoint, the idea that if thyroid was indeed way too low, reducing swelling of the brain by adding thyroid hormone could potentially help.

Do I think that is likely? No. Do I think it is impossible? I can't say that, either.

In addition to that, I think there's more standardized therapies that need to happen to reduce risk and continue to improve the condition of the patient.

Specifically if care is going to be continued,

I believe she does need a tracheostomy and I believe she
needs a feeding tube and she needs enteric nutrition.

Nutrition through the IV, which she's getting now, is never as good as nutrition through the gut, and so if treatment is to continue, that would be something I think that's not an empiric trial. In a sense it would be changing her nutritional status, but some basic things that I think would need to happen that would happen in a patient that there wasn't this question on.

Most patients would have already had a tracheostomy placed in the first week-and-a-half to two weeks of their hospital stay and a feeding tube at the

1 | same time.

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. O'Mara.
- 3 BY MR. O'MARA:
 - Q Let me just go into this. As I understand your testimony, as a chief medical officer, it doesn't make any difference what life care facility Aden would go to, it wouldn't have --

A She wouldn't have to go to one of our facilities. In fact, St. Rose is a short-term acute care facility, not an LTAC. I work for an LTAC.

If she did go to a St. Rose and then they determined that an LTAC was appropriate, assuming that she continued to survive, it would be up to that hospital, the family and the physicians at St. Rose to determine which LTAC was appropriate.

There are many, many LTACs in the Las Vegas area. My company is associated with one, and in fact that one is in the extreme northwest, and if I got it right, St. Rose is in the southeast, so they would probably utilize a different LTAC if they indeed chose to go that route.

THE COURT: And what is LTAC, sir?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, long-term acute care, and what that is, the LT confuses people. The long-term does not mean nursing home or skilled nursing.

It would be better labeled as extended acute care. It's for people that need acute hospitalization and even ICU level care for weeks and months instead of days or weeks, and the idea is that a seriously ill or medically complex patient, after being in a short-term acute care facility like a Saint Mary's or St. Rose, to continue an acute level of treatment, not opposed to acute downstream nursing home, you would transfer them to this type of facility and they're set up to manage patients, again, for weeks or months, and again, my particular hospital group has one in Reno. We have two satellites.

We have one in Las Vegas, but in Las Vegas, I want to say there's at least five or six others, many more, and St. Rose I think generally uses the other LTACs, but my understanding is that if this is to continue, the patient would initially go to a short-term acute care and then they would decide from there what would be best for her and the family as far as location.

THE COURT: Do you have the impression that the empirical study will directly benefit Aden, will be of a direct benefit to her?

THE WITNESS: Do I think it would? I would guess probably not, but I have a lot of pause. I can't say no, and any time we are faced with something on the

- medical side, I know it's different than the legal
 definition, but when there's a doubt and it's life and
 death, we tend to err on the side of life.
- THE COURT: Okay. Mr. O'Mara?
- 5 BY MR. O'MARA:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q If the patient is transported by air, is a critical care nurse and a critical care paramedical sufficient to take care of her while she's in the air?
- A In my opinion, yes, with the caveat that any transfer of a patient like this is going to increase her risk of an acute event or catastrophic issues en route, so the risk will increase because any time you move a very sick patient, there's risk.
- Given that elevated risk of the transport, critically ill patients are transferred by air ambulance routinely using critical Care Flight nurses and respiratory therapists.
- That's how we get all of our patients from the rural hospitals in here. They'll go from a critical care airplane to the critical care ambulance right to the ICU. A lot of times they'll bypass the ER which can be appropriate.
- MR. O'MARA: That's all the questions I have, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Any follow-up on my questions that

- 1 | you weren't given an opportunity --
- MR. PETERSON: Just one, your Honor.
- RE-CROSS EXAMINATION
- 4 BY MR. PETERSON:

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Doctor, you testified that you like to err on the side of life, your profession does. I think that's true of all professions, even lawyers.
 - A All right, I'll take your word for it.
- Q But as I understand it, the sum and substance of your opinion here is basically you think that there's some chance, some remote possibility based upon some aberration that you saw in an EEG in early April that there's a possibility maybe of some improvement or something, is that basically it?
- A Well, it's not just based on an EEG. In cases like this, you also have to look at her age, her underlying what we call her pre-morbid condition, and was she a healthy young person, not someone with nine decades of deteriorating organs?
- She certainly had damage, I'm sure, over these months, but the rest of her body -- to get overly simplistic, the rest of her body appears to be functioning quite well. She's having bowel movements, she makes urine. Her skin is in remarkably good condition.

In fact, for the different medicines she's been on, I was quite honestly surprised at how good the blood flow was to her hands and feet.

Q But all of that is simply because she's being kept alive by the ventilators and --

A No. Most people who have been kept alive by a ventilator who are truly brain dead really start to have -- most, not all, start to have a lot of other issues. Not that she hasn't had her issues, but a lot of other signs of deterioration of the rest of the body, different organ failures, necrosis of the hands and feet.

Again, not everybody gets all of these things, but I really would have expected more deterioration in her organ systems and her skin, her muscles. She's certainly weak, but --

Q Why wouldn't all of that just be consistent with the fact that it's a young body that died?

A Even when young bodies lose all brain function, they tend to start to shut down.

Q But there isn't a single iota, not a scintilla of evidence that either you deduced yourself or the medical records of any brain function?

A Well --

Q Answer that question.

1 Α Okay. That's not entirely correct. Let me 2 tell you why. We talk about brain function. We really are talking about upper brain level functions. Cerebral 4 cortex, where we think and have our consciousness. 5 Below that, we have the mid brain in a simplistic way. That's where the pituitary and those hormones would be 7 made. Below that, we have what we might call the hind brain or the medulla oblongata. That controls the respiratory center which, as you said, she's not 10 breathing past the ventilator. It also controls the 11 heart.

If there was absolutely zero neurologic input from anywhere from the top of the spinal cord above, her heart couldn't beat for very long, or her heart couldn't beat well, or she would need a pacemaker.

Q Which would stop beating the minute -- you agree the minute the ventilators are taken off?

A But the point is, you still need neurologic input from a higher center to have these things function.

Q Doctor, name me one, just one criteria identified or test to be performed as promulgated by the American Association of Neurology that is indicative of anything other than brain death. Give me one.

A I don't understand what you're asking. Give

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 | you one --

6

7

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q I want you to identify for me one of the

 accepted criteria for determining whether or not there's

 full brain function or not as promulgated by the

 American Association of Neurology, just one.
 - A No, I don't -- I'm not saying at all that she has full brain function.
 - Q Well --
 - A I'm questioning how much brain function she has, whether it's just hind brain or mid brain, if there's any possibility of recovery of the cortex.
- 12 | Q No, no --
 - A Right now with a non-functioning cortex, all of those tests are going to be abnormal and consistent with brain death by the definition.
 - Q Let me start over again.
 - The Uniform -- I know you're not a lawyer and I'm not going to pretend that you are, but the Uniform Declaration of Death Act promulgated for cases just like this one, people come to court to determine whether or not a person is brain dead or not, can you accept that?
 - A Sure.
 - Q Under the Uniform Act, it applies standard medical practices in a community. We apply here in Nevada the standards that are promulgated by the

- 1 | American Association of Neurology. Can you accept that?
- 2 A I understand that.
- Q Do you understand that the American Association
 of Neurology for purposes of determining brain death
 have promulgated a series of procedures and tests
- 6 that --

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

- 7 A No, I understand.
 - O You understand that?
 - A Yeah. I don't read them as bedtime reading, but I'm quite familiar with them.
 - Q Then if you understand all of that, I'm asking you to tell the Court to identify just one of those that would be indicative of anything other than brain death, just one.
 - A By a strict definition, she would meet their category.
 - Q Okay. Then I'm going to restate it my way and if you disagree with me, I want you to tell me why.
- 19 A Okay.
 - Q The proposition is all of the criteria and standards promulgated by the American Association of Neurology for determining death have been satisfied in this case, and if that is an untrue statement, I want you to tell me why.
- A I'm not going to say it's -- I would say from a

- 1 check the box criteria statement, it is true.
- 2 | Q Thank you. That's all I want.
- $3 \mid A$ Okay.
- 4 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 5 BY MR. O'MARA:

10

11

12

- Q And if you didn't check the box, what would your statement be?
 - A I would say that there's enough variables and enough questions based on the condition of her physical body, the EEG's and the fact that no further neurologic testing has been done in several months, and the fact that no outside third party neurologist has looked at her that I would have pause.
- Do I think that her situation is extremely grim and her chance for recovery is remote, is a long shot?

 Yes, I do. But once again, what I started with, I don't think it's zero.
- MR. O'MARA: That's all the questions I have,
 your Honor.
- THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much,
- 21 Doctor. I appreciate it.
- THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. O'Mara?
- MR. O'MARA: I'd like to call Dr. Manthei.
- 25 He's in Las Vegas, your Honor.

```
1
                          That's fine. What was the name
             THE COURT:
2
    again?
             MR. O'MARA: It's M-a-n-t-h-e-i.
 4
              THE COURT:
                          I'll ask counsel to remain seated
 5
    and speak closely to the microphone so the caller may
6
    hear you.
7
              THE WITNESS: Hi, this is Dr. Manthei.
              THE COURT: Dr. Manthei, my name is Frances
9
    Doherty. I'm the Judge in this case. Can you hear me
10
    all right?
11
             THE WITNESS: Yes, very well.
12
                          Thank you for being available.
             THE COURT:
                                                          So
13
    I understand that you are being called as a witness by
14
    one of the parties. I will let Attorney O'Mara lead you
15
    through those questions, but first I will ask you to
16
    stand up and raise your right hand.
17
                        SCOTT MANTHEI, M.D.
18
                      having been duly sworn,
19
             was examined and testified as follows:
20
             THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. O'Mara?
21
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. O'MARA:
22
23
        0
             Please state your name.
24
                  This is Dr. Scott Edward Manthei,
25
    M-a-n-t-h-e-i.
```

- Q Doctor, are you qualified to be a doctor in the
- 2 | State of Nevada?
- A Yes.
- 4 Q Are you a member of the American Medical
- 5 Association?
- 6 A No.
- 7 Q Are you a member of the American Osteopathic
- 8 Association?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Okay. And is there a difference between the
- 11 two as far as being certified in the State of Nevada?
- 12 A They have different certification boards in the
- 13 State of Nevada.
- 14 Q And does that limit your practice in any way?
- 15 A No. My qualifications are certified by the
- 16 State of Nevada to practice medicine and surgery in the
- 17 | State of Nevada.
- Q Okay. You sent to me earlier today a copy of
- 19 | your curriculum vitae?
- 20 A Yes.
- Q And it has all the certifications?
- 22 A Correct.
- Q Has your licensure?
- 24 A Correct.
- Q Has your education?

- 1 A Correct.
- 2 Q It has your publications?
- 3 A Correct.
- 4 Q Your professional experience?
- 5 A Yes.
- Q And it has the listing of the various hospitals
 that you are licensed by? Or not licensed, but --
 - B A Yes.
- 9 Q -- practice. One of those is St. Rose?
- 10 A Correct.
- Q And that's in Las Vegas area, in Henderson
- 12 actually?
- 13 A Yes. They have three facilities. One is in
 14 Las Vegas and two of them are in Henderson.
- 15 Q Thank you. May I have this admitted?
- 16 THE COURT: You may, yes.
- THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, I didn't get the last
- 18 question.
- 19 THE COURT: I'm sorry, the attorney is just
- approaching the bench to admit your vitae and the Court
- 21 | will admit the document without opposition.
- 22 | BY MR. O'MARA:
- Q Doctor, with whom have you talked about this
- 24 case?
- 25 A I was introduced by Dr. Sharon Frank,

- F-r-a-n-k, as well as Dr. Paul Byrne, B-y-r-n-e, as well
- 2 as the two attorneys.
- Q Okay. Did you have any documentation that was
- 4 delivered to you?
- A Yes, Dr. Byrne forwarded some medical records
- 6 about Aden.
- Q Was that his only affidavit or was that actual medical records?
- 9 A No, that was just affidavit.
- Q Okay. Now, can you tell us what it is that
 you're prepared to do for Aden Hailu?
- 12 A Yes, a tracheostomy.
- Q And a feeding tube?
- A No, I would not -- the feeding tube, that's usually performed by a gastroenterologist.
- Q And would that be done by St. Rose?
- A That would be done by a surgeon who has privileges at St. Rose.
- 19 Q Okay. You have privileges at St. Rose?
- 20 A Yes.
- Q And is there any arrangements made through St.
- Rose to accept this patient?
- 23 A Not at this time.
- Q Is it something that you can do or you will do?
- A It's something that can be done. I just have

1 not been able to arrange timing because she'll need an 2 intensive care bed and they're full right now. Okay. So that's something that can be 4 coordinated between the parties? Α Yes, I believe so. 6 MR. O'MARA: That's all the questions I have, 7 your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Peterson? MR. O'MARA: Let me just ask one more. 10 THE COURT: Go right ahead. 11 BY MR. O'MARA: 12 On the air transportation on this client, if 0 13 they have a critical care nurse and a critical care -- I 14 forgot what the other term is, medical person --15 I'm sorry, I didn't get the whole guestion. Α 16 If they have a critical care nurse 17 available to them, would that be sufficient for the 18 flight? 19 Α Correct. 20 Okay. No further questions, your Honor. 0 21 Okay. Mr. Peterson? THE COURT: 22 MR. PETERSON: Just a couple, your Honor. 23 CROSS EXAMINATION 24 BY MR. PETERSON:

0

25

Dr. Manthei, you just got involved in this

- 1 | matter, I believe you told me last weekend?
- 2 A Two weeks.
- 3 Q Two weeks, and that's through discussions with
- 4 Dr. Byrne you said?
- 5 A Correct.
- 6 Q So during that two-week period, you did not, if
- 7 | I understand what you said, and I may have
- 8 misunderstood, you did not review any of Aden Hailu's
- 9 medical records?
- 10 A No, I have not.
- 11 Q And obviously you have not examined Aden Hailu,
- 12 | correct?
- 13 A No, I have not.
- 14 Q All right. And obviously whether you're
- 15 | qualified or not, you have no opinion one way or another
- 16 as to whether or not she is brain dead or not? You have
- 17 | no opinion?
- 18 A I don't think that's what you asked me before.
- 19 You asked me if I was qualified to say if she was
- 20 qualified as brain dead or not.
- Q I may have asked that. You're not qualified,
- 22 are you?
- A I'm not qualified to declare her brain dead,
- 24 no.
- 25 Q Okay.

1 Α But that's different than an opinion. 2 0 I'm sorry about that. At the present time, you 3 are independently employed, are you not? Α Correct. And you are -- you have I guess over the last 0 6 several weeks been attempting to make some sort of 7 arrangements with the hospital for purposes of taking on I think was your terminology, taking on Aden Hailu? Α Taking on as in performing the tracheostomy, 10 but not in directing her care. 11 Q All right. Then I misunderstood that as well. 12 But you have not succeeded in that, correct? 13 Well, like I said, I've been working with the 14 hospital trying to find time and I've also secured a 15 pulmonary specialist to care for the trach and her care 16 until she's transferred to long term. 17 My question was, you have not succeeded in 18 accomplishing that yet? 19 No, I have not secured OR time, no. 20 Okay. Do you have any idea at all of the 0 21 financial arrangements under which any of this could be 22 accomplished? 23 Α I have none. 24 THE COURT: What was the answer?

25

No, I do not, none.

THE WITNESS:

- 1 BY MR. PETERSON:
- Q You have no knowledge or understanding, you
 have not worked on any plan of discharge or plan of care
- 4 | for Aden Hailu?

10

- A Yes, I have.
- δ 0 Where is that?
 - A At St. Rose Dignity for inpatient care, the intensive care unit under the direction of the pulmonary specialist after a tracheostomy.
 - Q This is what you're working on, what you've already talked about, right?
- 12 A Correct.
- Q And again, just to be clear, you're continuing to work on it, but it hasn't happened yet, right?
- 15 A No.
- 16 Q No further questions.
- THE COURT: So Doctor, what are the barriers to that occurring?
- THE WITNESS: Well, we need approval to have
 her transferred from the Reno area to the hospital and
 then the hospital is requesting greater information on
 long-term care availability in the area before accepting
 her care.
- THE COURT: Did you say you have not secured
 the OR care, is that what you said?

1 Right. So in order to admit a THE WITNESS: 2 patient for a procedure, there has to be an operating room time and that's dependent upon her having a bed at 4 the hospital to recover after the surgical procedure. 5 THE COURT: And what are the challenges in that 6 regard? 7 The challenges is the hospital THE WITNESS: wants to be assured that there is a space for her for long-term care after she's recovered from the surgical 10 procedures. 11 THE COURT: And have there been efforts made to 12 secure that second placement? 13 THE WITNESS: No. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Anything further, Mr. 15 O'Mara? 16 MR. O'MARA: Yes, your Honor. 17 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. O'MARA: 19 What will it take to find out what efforts have 20 to be made to get the long-term care after the acute 21 care at St. Rose? That's usually performed by a nursing 22 23 supervisor who will gather the payment information as 24 well as the requirements for long-term care, and so they 25 require complete medical records and patient information

1 in order to initiate that, and then I don't know how 2 long it would take to secure long-term care. I've seen 3 it take anywhere from a day or two to a month or two. 4 So she would stay in St. Rose Hospital until such time as the long-term care was obtained? 6 Α Correct. 7 And that would provide adequate care for her while she was in the hospital, correct? Α Yes. 10 MR. O'MARA: No further questions, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: And is St. Rose willing to accept 12 her without the security of the placement? 13 THE WITNESS: That they have not agreed to. 14 THE COURT: Okay. And I'm sorry, you may have 15 said this, are you the physician agreeing to perform the 16 tracheotomy? 17 THE WITNESS: Correct. 18 THE COURT: And that's without reviewing the 19 records? The records I have reviewed are 20 THE WITNESS: 21 adequate with the care of the pulmonary specialist, yes. 22 THE COURT: And what would your plan of medical 23 care be? 24 THE WITNESS: As a surgeon, we perform surgical 25 procedures and then we are securing the airway and then

- we depend upon the subspecialist within pulmonary
 medicine or internal medicine to care for the patient
 and the dynamics of the rest of her medical state to
 assure that the tracheostomy is not only working, but is
 benefitting her care.
- THE COURT: And who is that specialist who is quing to do that?
 - THE WITNESS: The pulmonary specialists are being determined now, depending on the timing of when the patient would be coming down from Reno.
 - THE COURT: And do you have confidence based on the condition of Miss Aden that she will sustain the surgery that you're contemplating?
- 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- THE COURT: All right. Anything further, Mr.
- 16 | O'Mara?

9

10

11

12

- MR. O'MARA: No, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Peterson?
- MR. PETERSON: Yeah.
- 20 RE-CROSS EXAMINATION
- 21 BY MR. PETERSON:
- Q Dr. Manthei, I thought you told me that you had
- 23 not reviewed any of the medical records. Is that
- 24 untrue?
- 25 A No, I didn't say I didn't review the medical

- records. I reviewed the excerpts and the information provided by others.
 - Q Are you talking about Dr. Byrne?
 - A Correct.

7

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q But you haven't obtained or received any records from Saint Mary's Hospital where she is located now, those medical records?
 - A No, not all of them.
- Q You are not going to continue treating her after you do the procedure; somebody else is going to do that?
- 12 A Correct.
- Q Have you ever spoken with anyone from Saint
 Mary's about this, like Dr. Heide?
- 15 A No.
 - Q In your practice, and I have to confess, I'm not that familiar with the standards of practice for osteopathic medicine, would it be appropriate to do a tracheotomy on a person who has been declared or determined to be dead?
 - A The circumstances that you're saying are a case by case basis and would have to be determined on a complete review of the medical records and acceptance of her care, and those parameters are to be determined.
 - Q You're making my question harder than it is.

- 1 I'm asking you to make an assumption. The assumption
- 2 I'm asking you to make is that under standards
- 3 promulgated by the American Association of Neurology,
- 4 | Aden Hailu is dead. Do you understand the assumption
- 5 I'm asking you to make?
- 6 A Yeah, but I'm not willing to make an assumption
- 7 on medical care, so theoretically I'm not willing to
- 8 accept that. Any time a surgical procedure is being
- 9 contemplated, we look at the care of the patient and
- 10 | will it benefit and is it clinically indicated.
- 11 | O Let's --
- 12 A I'm not able to declare whether she's brain
- 13 dead or not --
- 14 Q I'm not asking you to do that.
- 15 A -- so I'm not willing to accept that
- 16 theoretical.
- Q Doctor, please listen to me. I'm asking you to
- 18 assume a fact. I'm not asking you to agree that it's
- 19 true.
- MR. O'MARA: The question has been asked and
- 21 answered. He doesn't assume medical care.
- THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Peterson.
- 23 BY MR. PETERSON:
- Q Doctor, I know you understand what an
- assumption is. I'm not asking you to agree with me that

- the assumption -- I'm asking you to assume a fact, okay?

 You understand that?
 - A Yes, but you're asking me the exact same thing of making a clinical judgment on assumption, and I'm not willing to make a judgment on an assumption.
 - Q I think you're arguing with me, Doctor.

 Doctor, I'm asking you to make an assumption that a Dr.

 Heide -- make this assumption for me. I know it did not happen. I'm asking you to assume that it did. It's an intellectual game. I'm asking you to assume --
 - MR. O'MARA: Objection, your Honor.
 - THE COURT: Sustained. It's not an intellectual game. Go ahead, Mr. Peterson.
- 14 BY MR. PETERSON:

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q I'm asking you to assume that the doctor that is in charge of this case, Dr. Heide, has informed you that Aden Hailu has been determined to be dead under standards promulgated by the American Association of Neurology. Do you understand the assumption that I'm asking you to make?
- A Yes.
 - Q Based on that assumption, would it be appropriate as a doctor of osteopath -- or as an osteopath to perform a tracheotomy on such a person?
 - A I am not willing to make a clinical judgment on

- an assumption of care. It will be based on clear medical evidence and the physical status of the patient.
- Q So are you telling me then, Doctor, that even though the assumption that I'm asking you to make, and that is, that Dr. Heide has told you that she is clinically brain dead, that you would not accept that assumption; you would just want to do your own examination to make that determination, is that what you're testifying to?
- A No, I'm not testifying to that at all. I'm telling you that I am not going to base my clinical judgments on an assumption, and so there is no theoretical.
- We deal with absolutes, and so that will be based on clear medical evidence that the tracheostomy is indicated, and I've indicated I'm willing to do the tracheostomy, but I'm not willing to make a clinical decision on whether she's brain dead or not.
- Q A couple more questions, Doctor. You're not a college graduate, are you?
- A Actually, I did not get a degree in college. I went into medical school early.
- Q And you told the Judge here that you're not a member of the American Medical Association?
 - A I don't believe I am, no.

1	Q Even though your curriculum vitae says that you
2	are?
3	A I may have been at that time, but currently I
4	do not have a membership in the American Medical
5	Association.
6	Q I don't have any further questions.
7	THE COURT: So this is the Judge again. Are
8	you able to say today that a tracheotomy is indicated
9	based on the medical evidence that you have?
10	THE WITNESS: Yes. From what I have read as
11	provided by Dr. Byrne, I am saying that clinically the
12	tracheostomy will benefit her airway and is clinically
13	indicated.
14	THE COURT: Have you read the medical
15	records separate and apart from Dr. Byrne's
16	recommendation, have you read the medical records before
17	reaching that conclusion?
18	THE WITNESS: No.
19	THE COURT: Is there a possibility your
20	conclusion would change if you read all of the records?
21	THE WITNESS: That is always a possibility as
22	we get further into this, that if there is additional
23	medical information that is provided, that that decision
24	could change.
25	THE COURT: Are you interested in the

neurological information and medical evidence in 1 relation to Aden? 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Do you realize this Court has been 5 given medical testimony from a neurologist that suggests 6 she meets the definition -- the statutory and medical 7 definition of death? THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm aware of that. THE COURT: And you have no hesitation today 10 saying that a tracheotomy is indicated? 11 THE WITNESS: With the information that I've 12 been provided, no, I think a tracheostomy is indicated. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. O'Mara, anything 14 further? 15 MR. O'MARA: No, your Honor. 16 Doctor, thank you very much for THE COURT: 17 being available on short notice. 18 THE WITNESS: You're very welcome. 19 THE COURT: All right, bye-bye. Anything 20 further, Mr. O'Mara? 21 MR. O'MARA: I'll just call Mr. -- of course, 22 we can call the co-quardian who would agree to the 23 recommendations that he's made, but she's in Russia and 24 I understand that we can't get it in this room.

25

Did you recall the discussion of

THE COURT:

1	having the co-guardian participate in the affidavit at
2	our last hearing after the hearing on how we were going
3	to have her involvement represented without objection by
4	Mr. Peterson? Do you recall that?
5	MR. O'MARA: I do not, your Honor. I'm sorry.
6	THE COURT: All right. Did you make
7	arrangements or make any request to try to have this
8	Court make the co-guardian available before today?
9	MR. O'MARA: I thought we could call. I talked
10	to Mr. Gebreyes and he indicated that he talks to her on
11	the cell phone, so I figured that a cell phone could be
12	used here for the purposes of asking that simple
13	question.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Sir, do you mind coming up
15	to the witness stand? This is a continuation from the
16	last hearing, so you're still under oath. You're
17	comfortable with that, aren't you?
18	THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat, thank you.
20	MR. GEBREYES
21	having been previously sworn,
22	was examined and testified as follows:
23	THE COURT: Okay, Mr. O'Mara, you're free to
24	
25	

1	DIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. O'MARA:
3	Q Have you talked to the co-guardian?
4	A Yes, I did. I have talked to my niece who is a
5	co-guardian. Her name is Metsihate.
6	Q And have you talked to her on the cell phone?
7	A Yes, I did. Actually, just before court break.
8	Q Did you make arrangements for her to talk on
9	the telephone?
10	A Well, yes, I did, but I find out that the Court
11	use only a landline which I believe makes it difficult
12	to
13	THE COURT: So I don't know about this issue.
14	I don't want it on the record that the Court is denying
15	you access to a witness. Did you call the Court ahead
16	of time to make arrangement to have a telephonic
17	participation by someone in Russia, did you do that, Mr.
18	O'Mara?
19	MR. O'MARA: No, I did not.
20	THE COURT: All right. I don't know what
21	you're asking or saying otherwise. All I know is the
22	Court has not been contacted ahead of time to make
23	arrangements for a Russian witness, so if Mr. Peterson
24	is going to allow testimony from this witness without

hearsay objection about the position of the other

- 1 co-guardian on this matter, then that's fine.
- MR. O'MARA: Can we use the cell phone and put
- 3 | it on speaker phone so that the Court can hear her
- 4 testify?
- 5 THE COURT: Are you going to object to the
- 6 hearsay --
- 7 MR. PETERSON: No, your Honor. I wish I can
- 8 think of a hearsay objection so you can get me off the
- 9 hook. I'm not going to object.
- 10 THE COURT: All right, then I'll allow it.
- 11 Then have him represent what his understanding is of the
- 12 co-quardian's position in this case.
- 13 | BY MR. O'MARA:
- 14 Q Did you hear the question from the Judge?
- 15 A No.
- Q Please explain what the co-guardian's position
- is with regard to the care of Aden.
- 18 A Well, she want her care to continue and she's
- 19 | 100 percent onboard with everything that I said, and I
- 20 did talk to her, as I said, a few minutes ago and I
- 21 explained what the situation is and she's aware of it.
- Q She's aware that she would be transported out
- of Saint Mary's by land -- by ambulance to the air, that
- 24 she would be transferred by air with the ventilator down
- 25 to Las Vegas, and then she would be transported on land

- 1 to St. Rose?
- 2 A Yes. I explained each and every fold which is
- 3 exactly what you just said, that she will be transported
- 4 to the airport by land transport and then by air down in
- 5 Las Vegas, and she will be admitted to a hospital which
- 6 is St. Rose and then care will be continued from there,
- 7 and I did explain that to her and she agreed and she's
- 8 very much aware of it.
- 9 MR. O'MARA: That's as far as I wish to go with
- 10 regard to the co-guardian, your Honor.
- 11 THE COURT: That's fine.
- 12 BY MR. O'MARA:
- 13 Q And you personally as a guardian are in
- 14 agreement with that treatment?
- A Absolutely, yes.
- Q Okay. That's all the questions I have of this
- 17 gentleman.
- THE COURT: Mr. Peterson?
- MR. PETERSON: Just a couple, your Honor.
- 20 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 21 BY MR. PETERSON:
- Q When did -- I'm sorry, what is your --
- A My niece, her name is Miss Asfaw.
- 0 When did she last see Aden Hailu, when did she
- 25 | leave?

- 1 Α I'd say about a month ago. 2 So sometime in June? Α Yes. 4 Did you speak with her about the prior 5 proceedings, what happened in court here last time? 6 Α Yes. 7 Did you tell her about Dr. Heide's testimony? 0 Α She knows that all along. She knew that all along? 0 10 Α Yes. 11 Q Okay. No further questions. 12 Any further, Mr. O'Mara? THE COURT: 13 MR. O'MARA: No, your Honor.
- 14 THE COURT: Okay. You can have a seat, sir.
- Anything further, Mr. O'Mara?

MR. O'MARA: The only thing I can tell you is that I made arrangements with regard to the air flight from American Medical Air in Reno here to make the transfer available and the agreement has been made. He has to sign the contract, but what happens is that they bill Medicaid first, and then if there's a refusal by Medicaid, then he pays for the transportation.

THE COURT: Has Medicaid been approved right now for the hospitalization?

MR. O'MARA: Yes. For the hospitalization,

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 1 yes, but not for the air transport.
- THE COURT: All right. That's fine. Mr.
- 3 Peterson, anything?
- 4 MR. PETERSON: We have two things, your Honor.
- 5 You asked me to bring the Ethics Committee minutes.
- 6 THE COURT: Are you going to object to that,
- 7 | Mr. O'Mara?
- MR. O'MARA: I haven't read it. This is the
- 9 first time he gave it to me.
- 10 THE COURT: I'll give you time to read it.
- MR. O'MARA: Thank you, your Honor.
- MR. PETERSON: And I can authenticate it, your
- 13 Honor.
- 14 THE COURT: You can?
- MR. PETERSON: I can. The witness is here, but
- if there's no objection, I see no point in it.
- 17 THE COURT: Is there any other documentary
- 18 evidence you plan on admitting?
- MR. PETERSON: No, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Let's take a five minute break or
- 21 so and let Mr. O'Mara read the document. I won't read
- 22 | it until Mr. O'Mara has.
- (A recess was taken.)
- THE COURT: Did you get a chance to read that,
- 25 Mr. O'Mara?

1 MR. O'MARA: I did read it, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: And are you maintaining your 3 position that you're not objecting to exhibits? 4 MR. O'MARA: Well, yes and no, but I'm not sure 5 that the exhibit says anything because the last two pages which talks about an evaluation is not filled out 6 7 and nobody signed it, but I think it's well within the Court's knowledge and they should -- the Court should be aware of it, but I do want to comment on it. 10 THE COURT: All right. I'll let Mr. Peterson 11 do so first if he wishes. 12 MR. PETERSON: I just wanted to -- your Honor, 13 part of what you asked me to do is provide -- you asked 14 whether we had one and whether I would provide it and 15 that's really all this is. 16 I don't think there's anything in here of any 17 substance that I really wanted to elicit any testimony 18 It's just more corroborative of stuff you've on. 19 already heard. 20 You'll note that Dr. Heide is on the committee 21 and you heard his testimony. 22 This looks like the ethics THE COURT: 23 discussion with respect to performing the apnea test; is 24 that correct? 25 MR. PETERSON: That is correct, your Honor, and

1 as Dr. Heide testified, that apnea test was conducted. 2 It's in the testimony in the record. Also, in testimony in the record is that there was a second apnea test 4 conducted and that was by Dr. Gomez. We didn't hear very much THE COURT: 6 information from Dr. Gomez's report other than --7 MR. PETERSON: Now that you mention it, I'm trying to think how the testimony came in. I know that what I represented to the Court, which I'll represent is 10 true, that Dr. Gomez was retained by Cal Dunlap, the 11 predecessor counsel for the petitioner, and he was 12 discharged by the petitioner, but nonetheless performed 13 the apnea test and it's part of the medical records. 14 think Dr. Heide testified to it, but --15 Right. I don't recall, so does the THE COURT: 16 record reflect whether Dr. Gomez was a neurologist? 17 MR. PETERSON: The record doesn't reflect that 18 because I don't believe that he is a neurologist. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: General and trauma 21 surgeon. 22 Anything further, Mr. Peterson? THE COURT: 23 MR. PETERSON: Yes, your Honor. We wanted to 24 call just very briefly to confirm the status quo if

25

you're interested in hearing that only, and that would

1	
1	be Dr. Floreani.
2	THE COURT: All right.
3	ANTHONY FLOREANI, M.D.
4	having been duly sworn,
5	was examined and testified as follows:
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. PETERSON:
8	Q Dr. Floreani, please tell the Court who you
9	are.
10	A I'm Anthony Floreani, medical doctor, pulmonary
11	doctor who takes care of patients in the critical care
12	unit, ICU unit, and I've taken care of Aden on a number
13	of occasions since she's been in the intensive care
14	unit, including the night that she came in from the
15	surgery following her surgery.
16	Q So at least in some respects, Aden Hailu has
17	been under your care from the time she entered the
18	hospital in April of this year to today; is that right?
19	A Yes. Intermittently, yes, including all of
20	last week.
21	Q Okay. Now, obviously you are not a
22	neurologist, you're a pulmonologist; is that correct?
23	A Right, I am not a neurologist.
24	Q But nonetheless, Aden has been under your care
25	for the period of time that I just described for the

- 1 last three months or so?
- 2 A Yes, sir.
- Q All right. And just cutting right to the

chase, you're already aware, Doctor, of what had

- transpired with her care and treatment in the past, are
- 6 you not?

- $7 \mid A \mid I \mid am.$
- 8 Q And you are aware that she was determined to be
- 9 brain dead by Dr. Heide who performed the neurological
- 10 test?
- 11 A Unfortunately, yes, I am.
- 12 Q All right. And you're familiar with those
- 13 tests yourself, are you not?
- 14 A I am, including the UDDA.
- Q Say the last one?
- 16 A The Uniform --
- Q Yes, all right. And actually, the apnea test
- was performed by a pulmonologist, your partner; is that
- 19 correct?
- 20 A One of my partners, Dr. Bacon.
- 21 Q And you're aware that based on the clinical
- 22 examination and the tests performed by Dr. Heide and
- others, that the hospital -- that Dr. Heide has
- 24 concluded that Aden Hailu meets the definition of brain
- 25 death under the Uniform Act?

1 A Yes.

- Q All right. And Dr. Heide, unfortunately, could not be with us today, but since you have been seeing Aden Hailu for this entire period of time, could you tell the Court whether there has been absolutely any change whatsoever in her situation or condition since we were last in court which was about a month ago?
 - A In terms of neurologically?
- O Yes.
 - A No, there has been no change.
 - Q All right. I'm detecting a little hesitation and I'm almost afraid to ask, but I know the Judge with will. What do you mean by not neurologically?
 - A Well, I mean a lot has been stated about her skin and having urine output and her heart is beating.

 Those things will continue in this state even if someone is declared brain dead.

I would say that in terms of her neurological status, that based on the criteria from established consensus guidelines by the American Academy of Neurology, as well as other Academies of other countries, that components of brain death were met before at a certain point in her care and have continued to be met, that being a persistent coma that has not changed off of any sedation.

Secondly, an abnormal neurological exam. That is, the purview of not only a neurologist, but has been suggested other individuals such as myself and other internists who take care of patients in the ICU; the absence of any reflex activity; the absence of any response to verbal and physical or tactile stimuli; and an apnea test.

Those are the major determinants of the brain death. The prior EEG, the prior MRI really do not -- are not considered primary determinants of brain death by the established consensus and evidence-based criteria.

Q Okay. Those being essentially three, the coma --

A The coma, the exam that is consistent with brain death, and an apnea test that shows no voluntary ventilation or spontaneous breaths during the test with an appropriate increase in carbon dioxide indicating absolutely no ventilation during the period of the test.

The test done by Dr. Bacon was done by the book exactly how you should do it and determined that she had no breathing for ten minutes and that her carbon dioxide increased from 40 to over 100. That is not compatible with brainstem activity, and unfortunately and tragically it is not compatible with human life.

- Q Now, you heard Dr. Callister testify; you were here in court when that happened?
- A Yes.

- Q All right. And how we all try to make -- if we're going to err, we err on the side of life, you heard that testimony?
 - A Yes.
- Q I would ask you your opinion to a reasonable -do you have an opinion about whether or not Aden Hailu
 is dead as defined under the Uniform Act, meaning no
 brain function to a reasonable degree of medical
 certainty?
- A Well, unfortunately -- let me put it this way:
 We can all have opinions. I struggle with this opinion.
 I struggle with Aden.
- I have a 22-year-old daughter who I love and I can't imagine, I can't imagine what her father has been going through, so I give great pause to any consideration of brain death.

The reason we have evidence-based guidelines and consensus-based guidelines is so that we don't offer opinion, that we have some guidelines to help us as a template in the most horrible decision that we have to make, to have a young person in the youth around us die like this, so we need those guidelines. So based on

those guidelines, it's irrelevant what my opinion is.

What's important is that at the time her exam evolved and there was a point in time where it became very evident that things were wrong and that there might be brain death. Subsequent exam was consistent, and the apnea test showing no evidence of brain function is, unfortunately, and I was -- no one was happy to see that test be the way it was, shows no evidence of breathing.

Aden has a pulse, she has a blood pressure.

Dr. Callister is right. There is intrinsic beating in the heart, but if you remove Aden from life support, she will not breathe as evidenced by the apnea testing.

Her carbon dioxide levels will predictably and progressively rise to a point where she will develop a severe respiratory acidosis which will cause her heart to go into arrhythmias and subsequently go into asystole or stop beating. That is what's keeping her alive.

The fact that her skin looks the way it is, the fact that she looks so well is because she's a beautiful -- or was a beautiful young woman, a beautiful young woman who has gotten incredibly good care by the nursing staff, respiratory therapists and the physicians at Saint Mary's. She's been in a bed for three-and-a-half months without a bedsore. That's remarkable.

- 1 So then once again, thank you for that answer. 0 I just want to make it clear for the record. 2 opinion as to -- I understand we can all have opinions, 4 you want to apply the clinical diagnosis. To a 5 reasonable degree of medical certainty, does she satisfy 6 the definition of brain dead? 7 Yes, unfortunately she does. 0 Thank you very much, Doctor.
 - THE COURT: Mr. O'Mara?
- MR. O'MARA: I have a couple questions, your
- 11 | Honor. Can we show him the ethical report?
- 12 THE COURT: Yes.
- 13 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 14 BY MR. O'MARA:
- Q I show you Exhibit 8. Are you familiar with that document?
- 17 A I'm familiar with this policy and procedure in general.
- Q Okay, and that's good. Just so we understand what it is, the first three pages are the hospital's policy; is that correct?
- 22 A Yes.
- Q The second two pages are the actual case consultation form; is that correct?
- 25 A That's what it looks like, yes.

- Q And then the last two pages are the Ethics
 Committee report?
 - A Yes.
- 4 Q Or evaluation and assessment, correct?
- A Yes.
- Q Would you look at the -- if you look at the ethics case consultation form, it shows that it was requested on 4-16-15 and that it was reviewed on
- $9 \mid 4-18-15$. Do you see that?
- 10 A Uh-huh.
- 11 Q Do you understand that to mean that there was a 12 request and then they had the hearing on 4-18?
- 13 A That's what it appears.
- Q Okay. And then the consult was requested by
- Dr. Defew. She's a hospitalist, right?
- 16 A She's an internist and hospitalist, yes.
- Q And she was caring for Aden?
- 18 A Yes.
- Q And then there was Dr. Mashour, but that's not really the correct spelling of the name?
- 21 A Yes, it's M-a-s-h-o-u-r.
- Q And he's a member of your group?
- A He is one of my colleagues who was rounding in the intensive care unit for a week at that time.
- Q Right. And then Dr. Heide is the gentleman

- 1 that testified here earlier?
- 2 A Correct.
- Q Okay. I notice on the committee, there's
- 4 only -- well, there's two doctors, Dr. Defew who was a
- 5 treating physician, and then there was Dr. Brian Barnes.
- 6 He's not a neurologist, is he?
- 7 A No, I do not believe he is.
- Q He's actually an ER specialist?
- A Right. Brian Barnes, emergency room physician.
- 10 Q So he's not internal medicine, he's not in your
- 11 | field at all?
- 12 A No.
- Q He's just an ER okay. And then Dr. Defew,
- 14 she's the treating physician so she would be part of the
- 15 committee, so she could explain the situation, correct?
- 16 A Correct.
- Q Okay. And then nobody signed this consult, so
- we don't know what it was that they did?
- 19 A I don't see it signed, you're correct.
- Q Okay. And then the recommendation on this was
- 21 just to perform an apnea test, correct?
- 22 A That's what it says.
- Q And since it was on the 18th that they got
- permission, why did they do the apnea test on the 16th?
- 25 A I don't know of any apnea test that was done on

- 1 the 16th. It was done in May by Dr. Bacon.
- 2 O That was the second one.
- A I'm not aware of any apnea test that was done on the 16th.
 - Q Okay. Do you know why the record shows that she was clinically determined brain dead on 4-16 then?
 - A I'm only speculating, so it should go on the record that I'm speculating. That had to do with Dr. Heide's evaluation at that time.
- 10 Q Okay.

6

- 11 A That preceded the apnea testing later done.
- Q Okay. And if I understand correctly from this,
 the recommendation was to obtain permission to perform
 the apnea test in order to provide additional criteria
 for brain dead confirmation, correct?
- 16 A Correct.
- Q And it was also recommended that they seek legal consultation for guidance?
- 19 A That's what it says.
- Q Okay. That's all the questions I have, your
 Honor.
- MR. PETERSON: Nothing, your Honor.
- THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Doctor.
- 24 Anything further, Mr. Peterson?
- MR. PETERSON: Nothing, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. O'Mara?

MR. O'MARA: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Would you summarize your positions for the Court?

MR. O'MARA: Yes, your Honor. The law provides in 449.626 that the parents of the patient are the ones to make decisions with regard to withdrawal or the authorization for treatment.

The Guardian here, who is also the parent of the child, has authorized additional treatment, is denied the withdraw of treatment and now the Saint Mary's group wishes to countermand that decision.

This is a hard question because we're dealing with life and death. We have doctors on both sides vehement about their positions. We have a situation where we have a life on one side or death on the other side, and all of the doctors have indicated when there's a question, we lean towards life. That's what the Guardian wants is an opportunity to do so. So what is it that we need?

We need to get her to a facility that's willing to provide those procedures. One, Saint Mary's has refused to do so. We made arrangements with American Medical -- Med Flight I guess it's called to transport her on the ground and in the air to Las Vegas to St.

2.

Rose. We have a problem with St. Rose because there's no beds available right now, but that's a transient situation.

So we eliminate the problem with Saint Mary's as a third party interest because once the child is moved from that hospital, they're no longer involved or required to do anything.

The second thing, and I want to get through this quickly, is the status quo is the same as it was on the time of the apnea test. The records I read indicated 4-16, but the doctor today just testified that it was in May that he saw Dr. Bacon's apnea test, but the interesting part of it is Dr. Callister's statement about nothing else has changed.

Her skin is still good, she's still passing urine, she's still passing her bowel movements. Those things aren't geared on the ventilator. They have to have something else in the lower part of the brain that signals those things to work. It's not caused by the breathing phenomenon, so we see some type of brain activity.

Even Dr. Callister said it was diffuse -- it was really -- in the EEG originally it was okay, and then it got diffuse, but there was always that action. Then we have the ethics report which, to me, is what

they were doing was they were covering up the fact that the apnea report two days before they got permission to do so, or got a legal opinion to do so.

It's irrelevant at this point because what we're concerned about is the life and death of this young lady, and when you talk about life and death, there isn't any question. There is no question at all. The question is, you have to lean towards life and we have two doctors, three doctors that have testified.

One has been made out to be, what do they call it, a crazy, which is not true. He's different because he's done different research which the other doctors have not done, but they disagree with him. That doesn't make him a crazy.

He's involved with life. Dr. Callister is involved with life. Dr. Manthei is involved with life. That's three doctors that have indicated life is available for this young lady. We need that treatment. If we don't get the treatment, obviously she will die, but the question is, can we get treatment which Saint Mary's has basically forestalled all this time.

Dr. Callister indicated in his testimony, and nobody has denied this, that the tracheotomy should have been done between the 8th and the 10th day. We're still asking for it. We need that treatment. We need the

1 feeding tube.

Where can we get it? We can get it if we are allowed to transport her out of Las Vegas and down to Las Vegas to St. Rose. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. O'Mara. Mr.

6 Peterson?

MR. PETERSON: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. I will try to keep my remarks brief.

The way I break it down is we have two things going on here. One is narrow and specific and the other is broad and more general and policy driven.

I would first like to focus on the narrow because that is the easiest, and that is, you entered an order, the parties agreed to the order, and the order was, I believe, a fair order and it was a compromise and you entered it because it was — it implemented what I believe to be the policy implications underlying the statute, so what you ordered, your Honor, was that Mr. O'Mara obtain the services of a physician licensed in the State of Nevada, credentialed at Saint Mary's Hospital, willing to order whatever medications or procedures that licensed physician deems necessary and appropriate for Aden, including preparation of a written plan to be presented to you outlining details about the manner of

discharge and the manner of transportation, and the manner for which that is paid.

They produced two witnesses today to satisfy that obligation that you imposed on Mr. O'Mara and which he agreed to accept, and one is Dr. Callister.

Dr. Callister made it very clear he is not undertaking any responsibilities whatsoever for Aden Hailu. He had absolutely no clue, no idea with respect to any of the details, at least firsthand knowledge because he wasn't involved in it, with respect to any of the plans and details that you ordered Mr. O'Mara to comply with in order to prevent a ruling from the Court on the TRO, so Mr. Callister did not satisfy the obligation that Mr. O'Mara willingly assumed in this case.

The other witness, of course, is Dr. Manthei. It seems to me that what Dr. Manthei, who is osteopath, testified to, and you heard it yourself and maybe your understanding is a little different from mine, but I basically thought what he said was if St. Rose de Lima is willing to accept this patient, and if I obtain the services of a pulmonology group down there, neither of which has happened, then he's willing to perform a tracheotomy.

Incredibly he's willing to perform a

tracheotomy without, as you asked him yourself, without having reviewed any of the medical records whatsoever pertaining to this case, just an affidavit I presume that Dr. Byrne sent him and he's willing to perform a tracheotomy, but again, the fundamental point here is he can't do that unless and until he finds and secures the services of that pulmonary group he mentioned and the hospital down there is willing to accept that person. That is a critical thing because nothing can happen, nothing can happen until such time as that occurs.

In other words, there has to be, as you required Mr. O'Mara to prove that there is a destination and a place that will take her. It is just pablum for Mr. O'Mara to state to you without the benefit of a single scintilla of evidence that Medicaid is going to pay for transportation and Medicaid will pay for the hospitalization.

There's been no evidence or proof of that.

That does not happen until such time as the hospital,
who is willing to take the patient, has agreed to take
the patient. They don't agree to take the patient until
there's a doctor who is willing to admit the patient,
and there's no doctor willing to admit the patient until
there's a doctor willing to take care of the pain. None
of those things have happened, so none of the things

that you gave Mr. O'Mara three weeks, and the petitioner in this case, three weeks to obtain has not happened, and they are basically nowhere closer as far as I can tell today than they were three weeks ago accept, again, promises on, well, I think that maybe when a bed opens up, maybe there will be an opportunity to be admitted there, but again, there's no testimony from a licensed physician that they're going to take care of the patient, that they're going to discharge that patient or care for that patient or that the hospital is going to accept the patient that is clinically dead, and that goes now to phase two of the argument.

And that is, your Honor, that absent a finding -- I'd like to go back to the legal argument where we started, and I think you did say we were going to resume the hearing, so I'd like to go back to where we started.

The plaintiff is here on a motion for temporary restraining order and they have a burden of proof in order to obtain that kind of relief from this Court.

They have to proof first that there's irreparable harm, they have to prove that the balance of hardships tilts in their favor, and three, they have to prove at least that the order may not be implemented or implement public policy, but at least it won't

contravene public policy.

1

2

3

4

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What we have here is a complete inability, and this requires your Honor to make the hard choice that Mr. O'Mara was alluding to, inability to prove any irreparable harm.

There cannot be as a matter of law irreparable harm from disconnecting life support mechanical equipment from a person who is dead. I have cited cases to the Court establishing that proposition.

I think I've alluded to the Court that if you look at the literature on this, we're not making history We're basically repeating history here. This goes on and has gone on for years in courtrooms throughout the United States because some people view this as life and death decisions when it's really only a decision to confirm that a death has already occurred, and that is why the Uniform Act was enacted and applied throughout the United States, including in Nevada, because of the extreme advancements in medical technology that allows mechanical devices to be applied so that the heart keeps beating and that the lungs keep operating, notwithstanding the fact that a person -- and you can do that indefinitely, like cryogenics, which is different, of course, to a person that is dead, which is why -- which is why the laws throughout -- in all the

states of the United States, including Nevada, says you've got to narrowly focus on the issue here, and that is, is the criteria satisfied.

That is the legal question and that is the medical question that is presented to the Court and that is really the fundamental crux of the issue here, because if in fact Aden Hailu satisfies the definition of death under the Nevada law, then none of the elements of a temporary restraining order can be satisfied here and the evidence presented to you in court today, your Honor, satisfies that test unequivocally.

I say that because Dr. Heide, who testified before you last time, went through all of the elements of the requirements of the -- I forget what it's called, the National Association of Neurologists, or AAN, American Association of Neurologists. That does apply here in the State of Nevada.

There are essentially three elements that are required. This was testified to today by Dr. Floreani. One, your Honor, is coma. There's only three. One is coma. Coma is irreversible. Dr. Floreani testified that she's in a coma, it's irreversible.

Dr. Callister likewise stated she's in a coma. He said likely irreversible. We don't deal in theory here in courtrooms, unfortunately. We deal in medical

certainties. Test one, unequivocally satisfied. A coma irreversible.

The second test was the test of brain functions or brainstem functions, and there are a number of tests that the profession has agreed upon in order to determine those.

I went over each one of those with Dr.

Callister. Dr. Heide went over them as well and there are a series of those, the pupillary test. Basically what they're testing for is whether there's any response from the brain to any of the things that a living brain would respond to.

I had a hard time getting Dr. Callister to admit it, but you will recall I hope that at the very end, I said name me one test, one test that was not satisfied to satisfy -- that was not satisfied to meet the definition of death under the Uniform Act, and his testimony was, if I'm required to testify by checking each of the boxes, each of the boxes is testified.

He might have a different opinion. He might say there's a possibility, one in a million maybe that she'll survive or come out of it. The father hopes for a miracle here.

That is not the way it operates in this courtroom. That is why we have the Uniform Act in order

to get around precisely those kinds of debates.

Again, the focus of the Court should be on the principles of law outlined in the Uniform Act and the case law underneath that act, and I submit to the Court that if you apply the law, however difficult it might be, however painful it might be, then that is the way it is supposed to be, unfortunately, because that is the outcome of determinations of this type in courtrooms, and it's supposed to make things easier, not harder, easier, which is exactly what Dr. Floreani was testifying to.

He said my opinion doesn't matter, I'm telling you that we utilize the tests. We need guidelines. The medical profession needs them, the legal profession needs them as well. Those guides unequivocally point to one thing, and that is that Aden Hailu is clinically dead.

If that is the case, there can be no irreparable harm, there's no point in balancing hardships, and I submit to you that the public policy here is much maligned, much damaged if courtrooms in Nevada are going to engage in debates among experts as to facts regarding whether or not someone who meets all the clinical definitions of death can somehow experience a miracle and come out of it.

Those kinds of ideas, concepts, hopes, desires, dreams, no place in this courtroom, so I exhort the Court, as painful and as hard as it might be, to stick to the straight and narrow, look to the law, apply the law and come to the conclusion which I think is very clear that they have not satisfied their burden of proof for a temporary restraining order in which case the motion should be denied and that Saint Mary's should be permitted to disconnect the equipment from the body of Aden Hailu. That's all I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything final, Mr. O'Mara?

MR. O'MARA: I'll just comment on a couple things, your Honor. Life and death is the question.

Despite what Mr. Peterson says, they have declared death.

Do you see a death certificate here? Do you see a death certificate here? No. Have you seen medical records saying, well, we claim that she's dead? Well, the doctors have said that, but there's other doctors that said that's not the case, so what is it?

If she has a chance to live, that chance must be given to her under the law and the law says that he, the parent, has the right to determine if they withdraw or give treatment.

He's made his choice. He's expressed it to the

Court. We think that we can get it done. It obviously is going to take a little time because St. Rose is full right now, but that doesn't make it impossible and it doesn't make it difficult. It just makes it -- there's going to take a few more days or weeks, but the point is he indicated, Dr. Manthei, that it would be somewhere between a week and a month before they would get a bed and that would happen.

Now, in order to do that, you can't set a time and a date for the air people to pick up the child until we know that the bed is available down in Las Vegas, so what we're doing is we're waiting so that we can do those things and they're already arranged except for the date and time and place type of thing.

Now, it's interesting because he cited a lot of cases, but here's a case, California, Bovey vs. Superior Court where the performance of one duty conflicts with another. The choice of the patient or his family or legal representative, if the patient is incompetent to act in his own behalf should prevail. Life prolonging medical treatment includes medication, artificially or technologically supplied, respiration, nutrition and hydration, so those are things that the law has indicated.

Now, many times it doesn't happen where the

family says it's time for the person to go. That's not his case. His case has got a 20-year-old with skin that's still good after three months, still having urine, still having bowel movements. Is that all because she can respirate? No. It's because the lower part of the brain is in fact sending signals to those organs so that they can function.

Obviously if she didn't have respiratory or if she didn't have the ventilator, it would all stop, but that doesn't mean the brain stopped with it. The ventilator there keeps the brain functioning so that the signals go to the various organs that are still functioning. Thus, she is still alive whether we like it or not, and whether or not it satisfies the standards of neurology because standards are just that, they're cookie cutter places, and I have never seen a law that says we do it all by cookie cutters because every fact -- every case is different based on the facts.

I just don't see in 47 years that any single case was always the same, that you just did the cookie cutter. That's not the case here, it's not the arguments that have been put forth. I believe that in fact the requirements of the preliminary injunction are in order.

There's a risk here, life or death. No

- question. If they pull the ventilator, she's dead.

 There is no coming back, there's no way to get back,

 she's dead, and you've heard the testimony of at least
- two doctors that say that she is functioning. Her brain is functioning even at a lower level.

The second -- and I believe the law says that there's -- it's respiratory and circulatory system, okay. Both of those are working because if they weren't working, you would have a problem because nothing else goes, but you've also heard the testimony of him saying that, well, why is it that when she came in and she had bruises, they healed. They healed.

Isn't that what the doctors do, heal people? I mean, are you saying that the ventilator heals the wounds? It doesn't make sense. There's brain function sending things to heal the body, so this is in fact a question of life and death, and because of that, I indicate to the Court that mea culpa, I did not give you a written plan, my fault. Obviously I had a couple of things happen, but as the Court knows from the testimony, I didn't know about it until late myself. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: So thank you very much. My decision will not be based on whether your proposal was in writing or not in writing, and I have listened very

closely.

These two people have revealed to Mr. Gebreyes that they have a child of your daughter's age. I have a daughter who goes to UNR and she's 21. Is it Aden? And so I think of what Aden -- what decision making she went through that night when she first went to the clinic and then went to the hospital, and she did what my daughter would do because we've kind of raised them to take care of themselves, and so when she wasn't feeling well, maybe on your advice, maybe on her own, she went to the clinic, and if my daughter did that I would have been so relieved that she went to the clinic.

And then when they told her you better go to the hospital, she did that, too, and so it's very clear to me that your goals as a parent are very similar to my goals as a parent. Get your child into school, get them started on their independence.

She's -- my daughter goes to UNR. I live in Washoe County, she's right next door, but you had so much confidence in her independence and strength as a person and knowledge of her intelligence, not that I don't have those in my daughter, but you said go ahead and go to UNR, we'll be a little bit further apart, but I think it will be good for you and I trust that what we've raised you to be is who you are, and so your

daughter is very much real to me and your feelings are very much real to me in a personal way in addition to in a judicial way, and Dr. Heide also talked about having a daughter who was a little bit younger than yours, I believe, who had brain damage and he tried to connect with you in that regard, and Dr. Floreani also made that connection, and maybe people feel a need to say those things to you and maybe I would hope they would say those things to me because there is no human emotion as a parent that is more difficult than the loss or potential loss of a child, and out of dignity and respect, that just needs to be said.

No parent should bury a child and no parent should face these decisions, and I'm just sorry you're facing these decisions.

So I would like to find the case that is cookie cutter in family court, but I don't think there's any cookie cutter cases and this certainly wouldn't fit in a cookie cutter case because I think this case starts much more broadly in some components of it than a Uniform Act or an ANA protocol, because why are we even here when these issues are so intimate and private?

So I recognize from the highest level of our non cookie cutter system that we're talking about a privacy issue, we're talking about a family issue, and I

put that on the record because I acknowledge the responsibilities of those constitutional privacy issues, of those familial right issues, and they overlay in every case, but particularly in this case because they're in the middle of this courtroom, all of those things, and Uniform Acts and protocol are in existence for all the reasons that Mr. Peterson said they were, to allow some objective criteria, to afford everyone, to afford the medical community, the legal community and those associated with it when their circumstances arise some criteria to let us rely on and use, but I would not hesitate, I would not hesitate to disregard the Uniform Act or the American Neurological Association protocols if there was a basis to do it that was sufficient to negate or render those protocols or legal directives inapplicable to this case.

Uniform Acts are helpful until they are no longer relevant because the facts or the circumstances bring it outside the realm of those acts.

So as Mr. Peterson said, there are kind of different areas of this case. The issue is whether or not to grant the restraining order, and the interested party is arguing that it should not be granted because the medical evidence from Dr. Heide, from Dr. Floreani, from the protocols that were followed dictate in every

1

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

respect medical standards were met, the outcome and criteria were satisfied in terms of the statute, the protocol was followed, the outcome of the various three step tests under the protocol all direct certification of death, and I agree, but I don't in that agreement disregard other issues and other evidence.

There were five thoughtful doctors who participated in this hearing, Dr. Byrne, Dr. Callister, Dr. Manthei, Dr. Heide, and Dr. Floreani, it's a beautiful name, and I listened to each and every one of those statements very, very closely for several things. Are their statements negating the substantial evidence that I've heard of a compelling and credible nature such that that evidence is placed in question, overshadowed, negated, even just placed in doubt.

None of the evidence, none, Dr. Byrne, Dr. Callister, and Dr. Manthei, none of their opinions do that, and it's not because I don't want those opinions to do that. I listened to them the way I imagine you listened to them, with the ear of a Judge and the ear of a parent.

Dr. Callister, whose testimony was really forthright and I appreciate it and it was helpful to the Court, Dr. Callister referenced the outcome of restorative capacity for Aden to be grim, to be remote,

to be a long shot.

He indicated that the likelihood of returning any functionality upon the treatment suggested was not likely. He indicated that there was not likely a direct benefit of all of the proposed plans to result -- not likely to result in a direct benefit that would change the functionality of the child's condition.

Dr. Callister indicated that the risk of transfer in and of itself was a risk for your child to the extent of implementing this plan, and Dr. Callister agreed that the protocols could not be disputed in terms of their outcomes and the conclusions identified from those outcomes.

Dr. Byrne's testimony was just simply inconsistent with the standards of medical practice, insufficiently supported, theoretical, and not sufficient to allow the Court to re-direct, to even approve the proposal as a non-experimental appropriate therapeutic course of treatment for purposes of directly or even potentially re-directing and reconstructing and regaining functionality for your daughter, and Dr.

Manthei, who was very narrow in his testimony, so narrow that the Court really could not rely too much on the information provided.

He has concluded that he will conduct one of

the two necessary protocols that is theorized to be appropriate for this experimental, or as Dr. Callister suggested, it may be more appropriately called an empirical trial for Aden.

Dr. Manthei said that he would conduct a tracheotomy. He made that statement without reviewing what this Court considers to be the most substantial component of the medical information about your daughter which is the medical information from Saint Mary's, from Dr. Heide, from Dr. Floreani, from the results of the various tests.

I have to say I was slightly taken back by the level of his confidence in the appropriateness of that course of surgery in light of not having recent medical review of anything other than Dr. Byrne who limited his testimony in the first place to a very significant degree. Dr. Byrne's suggestions were limited to a very significant degree in the first place.

Now, Mr. Peterson is right, the Court expected more and hoped for more because hope is in everyone's heart, right? None of us can survive without hope, but at some point -- well, let me just say, this case didn't start at the last hearing. You've already had a hearing in front of Judge Steinheimer where there was an agreement between the parties to extend time so that the

hope could be pursued, through identification of a physician, through identification of a plan, and then you came back to this Court because that wasn't successful.

A neurologist from Stanford wasn't produced, but that's all right because we said let's do it again. Even though the Court had heard substantial evidence, let's extend this a little bit more, but I don't really care if you didn't cross your T's and dot your I's, I don't really mind that this isn't a written proposal, that the proposal is deficient in so many ways, but even if it were a perfect proposal, even if, which you do not have, someone is in Las Vegas who will perform the GI surgery, and even if Dr. Manthei had reviewed all the medical evidence, and even if the hospital had a transfer placement for Aden, even if all those things were in place, and even if we were to assume that Medicaid would be the entity to pay, which we would all hope it would, that plan of care is not compellingly convincing to this Court as a best interest plan of care for your child, and the reason is it's insufficiently supported to a significant degree by the medical evidence which actually overwhelmingly supports by clear and convincing evidence an opposite course of intervention.

1

2

4

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

No one disagrees with erring on the side of life. I don't disagree with the concept of erring on the side of life. We want all of our loved ones to live, and those we've lost, we continue to mourn them because their presence is so significant, and I go back and think could we have done something different in my loved one's lives to extend their lives, but we also do something very significant in our lives.

We raise our children, we care for our children, we teach our children. We hopefully never bury our children, but sometimes their life is also their death, and we parent our children through that as nobly and with as much dignity as we parent them through their lives, and I must say not only is the plan not supported by evidence to a sufficient degree to consider this anything other than experimental and not meeting the criteria of experimental protocols that the Court would approve under 159.0805. Those protocols are not met.

I am struck by the conflict and the challenge of honoring Aden as living while disregarding that part of us who have to honor her if and when she dies, and there's a dignity to that and there's a respect to that, and this plan does not do that both objectively and legally, but quite frankly, if we're talking about

policy and human dignity and privacy and familial rights, we are disregarding the most important person's right to exist and to pass with dignity and respect.

So today I don't find that there's a basis to approve the alternative plan, and I find that specifically it's not in her best interest, and going to your point with respect to 439, Mr. O'Mara, or 449.262(1) to (2), I won't argue that issue, I'll say two things.

Mr. Gebreyes is both Aden's father and Aden's guardian, and the Court will look in both of those circumstances to all of the certainly directives of an individual and then to the individual's family, but keep in mind that statute goes to withholding treatment.

It does not go to the right to force treatment on a person who has qualified, medically and legally, to no longer be alive, and I do not find either under the best interest statute and provisions of 159 or under your reference the right to make those decisions and make those medical calls as you're suggesting and I disagree 449.626 provides, you are not in a place to ask this Court to force the continued treatment of Aden both in your alternative plan or in your desire to refrain from withholding the treatment.

I will conclude that the restraining order is

1	denied, that the medical evidence substantially
2	establishes by clear and convincing evidence that Aden
3	has met the criteria, both under the Uniform Act with
4	respect to declaration of death at NRS 451.007(1), sub
5	part B, and two, that those provisions are met, and that
6	the American Neurological Association protocols have
7	been thoroughly complied with such that Saint Mary's is
8	not restrained from terminating, withholding or
9	withdrawing life support system for Aden, but upon your
10	oral request, I will consider granting further
11	injunction pending your appeal to the Supreme Court on
12	your oral motion today.
13	MR. O'MARA: And I make that motion.
14	THE COURT: And how much time do you need?
15	MR. O'MARA: I think ten days is fine, your
16	Honor.
17	THE COURT: Ten days is granted. I need you to
18	prepare the order.
19	MR. PETERSON: Yes, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Good luck.
21	MR. O'MARA: Thank you, your Honor.
22	
23	
24	
25	

	·
1	STATE OF NEVADA)
2	COUNTY OF WASHOE) ss.
3	
4	I, DIANNE M. BRUMLEY, a Certified Court Reporter
5	and Notary Public for the County of Washoe, State of
6	Nevada, do hereby certify that on, the
7	day of, 2015, I transcribed the
8	above proceedings from a CD;
9	That the foregoing transcript is a true and
10	correct transcript of the CD taken by me in the
11	above-captioned matter to the best of my knowledge,
12	skill and ability.
13	I further certify that I am not an attorney or
14	counsel for any of the parties, nor a relative or
15	employee of any attorney or counsel connected with the
16	action, nor financially interested in the action.
17	Δ
18	(- Kianne M. Dumley, As
19	DIANNE M. BRUMLEY, NEVADA CCR #205
20	CALIFORNIA CSR #6796
21	BONANZA REPORTING - RENO
22	
23	
24	
25	