

<u>Location</u>	<u>Leased or Owned</u>
Cypress, California	Leased
Los Angeles, California.....	Leased
San Juan Capistrano, California	Owned
Tampa, Florida.....	Owned
Atlanta, Georgia.....	Owned
Chicago, Illinois (2)	One owned, one leased
Baltimore, Maryland.....	Owned
Teterboro, New Jersey.....	Owned
Horsham, Pennsylvania	Leased
Norristown, Pennsylvania	Leased
Dallas, Texas.....	Leased
Chantilly, Virginia.....	Leased

Item 3. Legal Proceedings

In addition to the matters described below, in the normal course of business, we have been named, from time to time, as a defendant in various legal actions, including arbitrations, class actions and other litigation, arising in connection with our activities as a provider of diagnostic testing, information and services. These legal actions may include lawsuits alleging negligence or other similar legal claims. Certain of the actual or threatened legal actions include claims for substantial compensatory and/or punitive damages or claims for indeterminate amounts of damages, and could have an adverse impact on our client base and reputation.

The Company is also involved, from time to time, in other reviews, investigations and proceedings by governmental agencies regarding our business, including, among other matters, operational matters, certain of which may result in adverse judgments, settlements, fines, penalties, injunctions or other relief. The number of these reviews, investigations and proceedings has increased in recent years with regard to many firms in the healthcare services industry, including our Company.

We maintain various liability insurance coverages for claims that could result from providing or failing to provide clinical testing services, including inaccurate testing results and other exposures. Our insurance coverage limits our maximum exposure on individual claims; however, we are essentially self-insured for a significant portion of these claims.

The Company contests liability or the amount of damages as appropriate in each pending matter. In view of the inherent difficulty of predicting the outcome of such matters, particularly in cases where claimants seek substantial or indeterminate damages or where investigations or proceedings are in the early stages, we cannot predict with certainty the loss or range of loss, if any, related to such matters, how or if such matters will be resolved, when they ultimately will be resolved, or what the eventual settlement, fine, penalty or other relief, if any, might be. Subject to the foregoing, and except for the NID Matter which is discussed further below and in Note 14 in “Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements” in Part II, Item 8, we believe, based on current knowledge, that the outcome of all other pending matters will not have a material adverse effect on our consolidated financial condition, although the outcome of such matters could be material to our results of operations and cash flows in the period that such matters are determined or paid, depending on, among other things, the levels of our revenues or income for such period.

NID Matter.

NID, a test kit manufacturing subsidiary, and the Company each received a subpoena from the United States Attorney’s Office for the Eastern District of New York during the fourth quarter of 2004. The subpoenas requested a wide range of business records, including documents regarding parathyroid hormone (“PTH”) test kits manufactured by NID and PTH testing performed by the Company. The Company has voluntarily and actively cooperated with the investigation, providing information, witnesses and business records of NID and the Company, including documents related to PTH tests and test kits, as well as other tests and test kits. In the second and third quarters of 2005, the FDA conducted an inspection of NID and issued a Form 483 listing the observations made by the FDA during the course of the inspection. NID responded to the Form 483.

During the fourth quarter of 2005, NID instituted its second voluntary product hold within a six-month period, due to quality issues, which adversely impacted the operating performance of NID. As a result, the

Company evaluated a number of strategic options for NID, and on April 19, 2006, decided to cease operations at NID. Upon completion of the wind down of operations in the third quarter of 2006, the operations of NID were classified as discontinued operations. During the third quarter of 2006, the government issued two additional subpoenas, one to NID and one to the Company. The subpoenas covered various records, including records related to tests and test kits in addition to PTH.

During the third quarter of 2007, the government and the Company began settlement discussions. In the course of those discussions, the government disclosed to the Company certain of the government's legal theories regarding the amount of damages allegedly incurred by the government, which include alleged violations of civil and criminal statutes including the False Claims Act and the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act. Violations of these statutes and related regulations could lead to a warning letter, injunction, fines or penalties, exclusion from federal healthcare programs and/or criminal prosecution, as well as claims by third parties. During the third quarter of 2008, the Company and the United States Attorney's Office reached an agreement in principle to resolve these claims. As part of the agreement, NID, which was closed in 2006, is expected to enter a guilty plea to a single count of felony misbranding. The terms of the settlement are subject to the final negotiation and execution of definitive agreements, which is expected to include a corporate integrity agreement, the approval by the United States Department of Justice and the United States Department of Health and Human Services and satisfactory resolution of related state claims. There can be no assurance, however, when or whether a settlement may be finalized, or as to its terms. If a settlement is not finalized, the Company would defend itself and NID and could incur significant costs in doing so.

The Company has established a reserve of \$316 million in connection with these claims through charges reflected in discontinued operations. The reserve reflects the Company's current estimate of the expected probable loss with respect to these matters, assuming the settlement is finalized. If a settlement is not finalized, the eventual losses related to these matters could be materially different than the amount reserved and could be material to the Company's results of operations, cash flows and financial condition in the period that such matters are determined or paid.

Other Matters.

During the second quarter of 2005, the Company received a subpoena from the United States Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey. The subpoena seeks the production of business and financial records regarding capitation and risk sharing arrangements with government and private payers for the years 1993 through 1999. Also, during the third quarter of 2005, the Company received a subpoena from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Inspector General. The subpoena seeks the production of various business records including records regarding our relationship with health maintenance organizations, independent physician associations, group purchasing organizations, and preferred provider organizations relating back to as early as 1995. The Company is cooperating with the United States Attorney's Office and the Office of the Inspector General.

During the second quarter of 2006, each of the Company and its subsidiary, Specialty Laboratories, Inc. ("Specialty"), received a subpoena from the California Attorney General's Office. The subpoenas seek various documents including documents relating to billings to MediCal, the California Medicaid program. The subpoenas seek documents from various time frames ranging from three to ten years. During the third quarter of 2008, the Company received a request for additional information. The Company and Specialty are cooperating with the California Attorney General's Office.

In the first quarter of 2008, the United States Department of Justice informally requested records from the Company regarding AmeriPath's billing practices for flow cytometry testing panels performed on blood, bone marrow and lymph node specimens. The inquiry sought to determine whether AmeriPath may have billed for laboratory tests that were not medically necessary. The Company cooperated fully with the inquiry. In December 2008, the government declined to intervene in the underlying qui tam complaint that led to the inquiry. Following the government's declination, the qui tam relator voluntarily dismissed his complaint.

We understand that there may be pending qui tam claims brought by former employees or other "whistle blowers" as to which we cannot determine the extent of any potential liability. We also are aware of certain pending individual or class action lawsuits related to billing practices filed under the qui tam provisions of the civil False Claims Act and/or other federal and state statutes, regulations or other laws.

Item 4. Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders

None.