

DISTRICT COURT, MONTROSE COUNTY,  
COLORADO  
Montrose County Justice Center  
Montrose, Colorado 81401

**FILED Document**  
**CO Montrose County District Court 7th JD**  
**DATE FILED: March 19, 2012 3:16 PM**  
**CASE NUMBER: 2011CV94**  
**Filing Date: 3/19/12**  
**Filing ID: 43169640**  
**Review Clerk: marianne dolan**

Case Number:  
2011CV94

\_\_\_\_\_  
Plaintiffs:  
CRAIG MacCRAIGER and SARAH MacCRAIGER

v.

Defendants:  
ROBERT G. KILBOURNE, M.D. and  
STEVEN J. SAWYER, M.D.

\_\_\_\_\_

DEPOSITION UPON ORAL EXAMINATION OF  
DR. JAMES J. STARK  
ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT ROBERT G. KILBOURNE, M.D.

Norfolk, Virginia  
Tuesday, January 24, 2012

1 anterior resection on this man earlier would still be  
2 seeing him anyway for just exactly those issues.

3 He might have referred him back sooner than  
4 normal.

5 But I don't think any surgeon would -- again,  
6 this is a little bit outside of my range of expertise --  
7 but no surgeon I know would have discharged this man  
8 from his practice yet --

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. -- because it's too soon.

11 Q. Okay. And you're right, and I don't mean to  
12 imply that he would have been.

13 But my point is that the result of  
14 Dr. Kilbourn's misperception of the path report is only  
15 that Mr. MacCraiger goes to see the surgeon again,  
16 right?

17 A. Yes, arguably sooner than he otherwise would  
18 have.

19 Q. All right. But you would agree that medical  
20 oncologists don't obtain informed consents for surgery,  
21 correct?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. So when Dr. Kilbourn tells Mr. MacCraiger that  
24 he needs to go see Dr. Sawyer sooner rather than later,  
25 there's a whole other set of events that are presumably

1 going to occur after that, right?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Mr. MacCraiger's going to see Dr. Sawyer.

4 Dr. Sawyer's going to do whatever the standard of care  
5 for a general surgeon requires in terms of informed  
6 consent, evaluation --

7 A. Right. Dr. Sawyer has his own separate duty.

8 Q. Right.

9 A. Which I'm not going to opine upon at trial.

10 Q. Right.

11 But for purposes of the impact of  
12 Dr. Kilbourn's mistake, the impact, the sole impact of  
13 that is that Mr. MacCraiger sees Dr. Sawyer sooner,  
14 right?

15 A. Well, I think he -- maybe a little more than  
16 that in the sense that Dr. Kilbourn has now set in  
17 motion a sequence of events by virtue of telling  
18 Mr. MacCraiger that he thinks he has recurrence, and it  
19 creates a mindset in everybody else's mind.

20 But formally speaking, you're correct in the  
21 sense all he's done is to make Mr. MacCraiger go back  
22 sooner.

23 But there is a subtext here which is he's  
24 created a certain set of expectations on everybody  
25 else's part by imparting this news.

1 Q. Well, he certainly created an impression in  
2 Mr. MacCraiger's mind and in his wife's mind, correct?

3 A. Right, and possibly, and I have no way of  
4 knowing this, in Dr. Sawyer's mind.

5 Q. Could be he created an impression in  
6 Dr. Sawyer's mind, too.

7 But, again, Dr. Sawyer has an independent set  
8 of obligations before he performs surgery, doesn't he?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And I'm not asking you what those are.

11 I'm just saying --

12 A. Right.

13 Q. -- he certainly does, correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. So several things are true. First,  
16 Dr. Kilbourn -- the doctrine of informed consent does  
17 not apply to Dr. Kilbourn in this case, does it?

18 A. You mean with respect to surgery?

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. It does not.

21 Q. That's the only doctrine of informed consent  
22 there is, isn't there, surgical consent?

23 A. I mean, most oncologists now obtain informed  
24 consent before they give patients chemotherapy.

25 Q. Okay. But, I mean, certainly what we're

1 talking about in this case is the question of whether  
2 Mr. MacCraiger needed an APR in January of 2010, right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And for purposes of the doctrine of informed  
5 consent as it involves discussions of risks, benefits  
6 and alternatives to that surgery, that doctrine doesn't  
7 apply to Dr. Kilbourn.

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. So hypothetically if assuming -- and I'm not  
10 saying one way or another what Dr. Sawyer's obligations  
11 are -- but assuming that Dr. Sawyer has an independent  
12 obligation to obtain and review the correct pathology  
13 report and to have a detailed discussion with his  
14 patient about surgical alternatives, the risks and  
15 benefits of those alternatives, then the misinformation  
16 by Dr. Kilbourn would have had no impact whatsoever if  
17 Dr. Sawyer had done those things, right?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. When you see cancer -- rectal cancer, colon  
20 cancer patients -- let's stick with rectal cancer  
21 patients who have had a surgery, have had chemoradiation  
22 before surgery and have had some neoadjuvant  
23 chemotherapy after surgery and they have clinical  
24 information which is suspicious for recurrence, do you  
25 make recommendations as to the type of surgery that they