

DELMAR ADAMS, ET.AL.,  
PLAINTIFFS

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS

FOR CASS COUNTY, TEXAS

ABB LUMMUS GLOBAL, INC.,  
ET.AL.,  
DEFENDANTS

5<sup>TH</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT

FILED FOR RECORD  
CASS COUNTY, TEXAS  
2009 FEB - 7 AM 10:07  
BECKY WILBANKS  
DISTRICT CLERK  
BY *M.W.* DEPUTY

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT


On this day, came on to be considered the following Motions  
for Summary Judgment:

1. Defendant Vilter Mfg. Corp.'s Motion For Summary Judgment;
2. Defendant Shreveport Rubber & Gasket's Motion for Summary Judgment;
3. Defendant IMO Industry's Motion for Summary Judgment;
4. Defendant The William Powell Company's Motion for Summary Judgment against Plaintiffs Johnny Mahomer, Lloyd Coyne, and Earnest Starnes;
5. Defendant H.B. Fuller's Motion for Summary Judgment against Plaintiffs Johnny Mahomer, Lloyd Coyne, and Earnest Starnes;
6. Defendant Sepco Corp's Motion for Summary Judgment;
7. Defendant LGS's Motion for Summary Judgment against Plaintiffs Johnny Mahomer, Lloyd Coyne, and Earnest Starnes;
8. Defendant Lufkin Industries' Motion for Summary Judgment;
9. Defendant Guard Line's Motion for Summary Judgment;
10. Defendant Parker Seal Co.'s Motion for Summary Judgment;
11. Defendant Honeywell's Motion for Summary Judgment;
12. Defendant Pneumo Abex Corp's Motion for Summary Judgment;
13. Defendant General Electric's Motion for Summary Judgment; and
14. Defendant Texas Mill Supply's Motion for Summary Judgment

The Court, having considered the said Motions and Summary Judgment Evidence, together with any responses, finds that the Motions for Summary Judgment are not well-taken, and should be DENIED.

ACCORDINGLY, the above-referenced Motions for Summary Judgment are DENIED.

Signed this 7<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2006.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ralph K. Burgess". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "R" and "B".

Ralph K. Burgess  
Judge Presiding  
5<sup>th</sup> District Court