

CERTIFIED COPY

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

SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PAUL M. DOUGHERTY,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.)
)
LUCIEN C. HAAG, ASSOCIATION)
OF FIREARMS AND TOOL MARK)
EXAMINERS, an Illinois)
nonprofit corporation, ANN L.)
DAVIS, LOREN A. SUGARMAN, ANTHONY)
L. PAUL, TORREY J. JOHNSON,)
GERARD DUTTON, RAYMOND E. COOPER,)
RONALD N. MARRS, and JOSEPH M.)
SALOOM, Does 1 through 100,)
inclusive,)
)
Defendants.)

No. 05CC06993

DEPOSITION OF LUCIEN HAAG

VOLUME I

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

SEPTEMBER 28, 2006

Reported by:
KIMBERLY A. THORNTON
CSR 11994



1 reasons he was rejected, he would do so. Mr. Nixon never
2 qualified or tried to qualify as an expert in that trial.
3 So it became a moot point. He showed some photographs and
4 that's all.

5 Q BY MR. GOLDEN: And Claire Bradley is the deputy
6 prosecutor attorney in Crown, Indiana; is that correct?

7 A Yes. I think so.

8 Q And you prepared a report for her?

9 A Yes.

10 Q In case 104NCR?

11 A I don't know the name or number. State versus
12 Jeter.

13 Q The State of Indiana versus Darrel Jeter. This
14 is the first page of your report; is that correct?

15 A Yes, it is.

16 MR. CADY: I'm concerned we're infringing on work
17 product here.

18 MR. GOLDEN: I believe this was introduced as evidence
19 into trial.

20 MR. CADY: Sounds safe then.

21 MR. GOLDEN: Actually, I better take that back. I
22 have that from a secondhand source. He answered the
23 information with reference unless you remember for certain
24 because I got it actually third hand. So let me go ahead
25 and withdraw this. The information is in -- that certainly