1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA
3	
4) IN RE: STRYKER REJUVENATE) Case No. 13-MD-2441(DWF/FLN)
5	AND ABG II HIP IMPLANT) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION)
6	
7)) St. Paul, Minnesota This Document Relates to) December 19, 2013
8	All Actions) 9:39 a.m.
9	
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DONOVAN W. FRANK
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
12	AND BEFORE THE HONORABLE FRANKLIN L. NOEL UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13	STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
14	APPEARANCES:
15	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
16	Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel
17	Committee Chairperson: Meyers & Flowers PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ. 225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 1515
18	Chicago, Illinois 60606
19	Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Members: Zimmerman Reed
20	GENEVIEVE M. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ.
21	1100 IDS Center 80 S. 8th Street
	Minnoanolia $Minnoanota$ 55402 2015
22	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2015
22	Official Court Reporter: JEANNE M. ANDERSON, RMR-RPR Suite 146 U.S. Courthouse
	Official Court Reporter: JEANNE M. ANDERSON, RMR-RPR

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):	
2	For the Plaintiffs:	
3	Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Members (Conti	
4		Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell
5		Rafferty & Proctor, P.A. BEN GORDON, ESQ.
6		316 S. Baylen Street, Suite 600 P.O. Box 12308
7		Pensacola, Florida 32591
8		
9		Cory Watson Crowder & DeGaris ANNESLEY H. DeGARIS, ESQ.
10		2131 Magnolia Avenue South Birmingham, Alabama 35205
11		Leiff, Cabraser,
12		Heimann & Bernstein, LLP
13		WENDY R. FLEISHMAN, ESQ. (APPEARING BY TELEPHONE)
14		250 Hudson Street, Eighth Floor New York, New York 10013
15		
16		Weisman, Kennedy & Berris Co., LPA DAVID LANDEVER, ESQ.
17		1600 Midland Building 101 Prospect Avenue West
18		Cleveland, Ohio 44115
19	Plaintiffs' Liaison Cour	nsel:
20	Liaison Counsel to the District of Minnesota:	Maghbaghar (Spanga I+d
21	District of Minnesota:	Meshbesher & Spence, Ltd. ANTHONY J. NEMO, ESQ. 1616 Park Avenue South
22		Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404
23	Liaison Counsel to The State Courts:	Kelly Bernheim & Dolinsky, LLC
24	The State Courts.	JESSE BERNHEIM, ESQ. 8151 Peters Road, Suite 3200
25		Plantation, Florida 33324

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	For the Plaintiffs (Continued):
3	Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Members:
4	Bowersox Law Firm, PC
5	JEFFREY A. BOWERSOX, ESQ. Kruse Woods One, Suite 320
6	Lake Oswego, Oregon 97035
7	
8	
9	
10	
11 12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
3	Defendantal Load Councel.
4	Defendants' Lead Counsel:
5	Sedgwick Law RAFAEL A. CAMPILLO, ESQ. KAREN E. WOODWARD, ESQ.
6	KAREN E. WOODWARD, ESQ. 801 S. Figueroa Street, 19th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017-5556
7	LOS ANGELES, CATITOTHIA 90017-3330
8	Defendants' Liaison Counsel:
9	Leonard, Street and Deinard
10	TIMOTHY P. GRIFFIN, ESQ. 150 S. 5th Street, Suite 2300
11	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 PROCEEDINGS IN OPEN COURT 2 3 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: You may all be Thank you, both the individuals on the telephone 4 5 listening in, and in the courtroom. Our apologies for the late start. Even though we have had counsel with us since 6 7 8:15 this morning in chambers, obviously it is not 9:00. It is 9:40. 8 9 Why don't we have introductions for the record? 10 We can start with Defense counsel's table and move over to Plaintiffs' counsel table? 11 12 MR. GRIFFIN: Your Honor, Tim Griffin on behalf of the Defendants. 13 14 MR. CAMPILLO: Ralph Campillo on behalf of the 15 same Defendants. 16 MS. WOODWARD: Karen Woodward on behalf of the Defendants. 17 18 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Genevieve Zimmerman on behalf of 19 Plaintiffs, Your Honors. 20 MR. FLOWERS: Good morning, Your Honors, Pete Flowers on behalf of the Plaintiffs. 21 2.2 MR. LANDEVER: David Landever on behalf of Eric 23 Kennedy for the Plaintiffs. 24 MR. DeGARIS: Good morning. Annesley DeGaris on

25

behalf of the Plaintiffs.

1	MR. NEMO: Good morning, Your Honors. Tony Nemo
2	here on behalf of the Plaintiffs.
3	MR. BERNHEIM: Good morning, Your Honors, Jesse
4	Bernheim on behalf of the Plaintiffs.
5	MR. GORDON: Good morning, Your Honors. Ben
6	Gordon, Lead Counsel Committee, on behalf of the Plaintiffs.
7	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: We have an
8	agenda here, and there will be some other items that Judge
9	Noel and I bring up at some point during our conference
10	today, including and perhaps not limited to oh, by the
11	way, Judge Noel, I don't have this in my courtroom. I see a
12	sign Judge Kyle put up, here. It says, "cell phones off."
13	Is yours off?
14	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL:
15	Yes. I hope. I better look and see.
16	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: I am joking.
17	Maybe it has a holiday song if I call it?
18	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: It
19	does not have a holiday song.
20	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right.
21	Back to the are we okay, Brenda? Did you
22	THE CLERK: Yes, fine.
23	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right.
24	For those of you that are listening in, we actually moved
25	from the courtroom at the end of the hallway because we
	-

had -- for some reason we learned the hard way yesterday during four hours of oral argument that our phone was not working on another case. And they have been unable to diagnose and fix it, so we are here in a different courtroom.

2.2

At some point, we will be -- before we adjourn this morning, we will be discussing -- and it is going to come up through presentation by counsel, a number of things will be addressed both as agenda items and motions and briefing items for the next status conference. So, it looks like it will be a busy day when we are next together on January 23rd.

And we will set up a specific schedule beyond the agenda items. So, we will be bringing up -- and maybe in response to some of the comments the lawyers for each side are bringing up on what we expect to happen, we will probably be adding a couple of things where the parties aren't necessarily on agreement on. And then when we get to the appropriate -- when we get to the appropriate spot, we will address the -- well, maybe I can address it now.

It is likely what we will do, but we will let counsel say what they need to say when we get to that agenda item. It is likely that we won't hear from Mr. Crowley today, but what will happen is that with all of these meet and confer sessions between now and the early part of

January, we will need to be kept informed, because we will likely set up a situation to have -- if some of those ESI and other issues haven't been resolved, to have -- if they are available, one representative for plaintiff and one for defendant, not necessarily in an adversarial context, but it could be part of that, to educate the Court. And then we will decide whether we need our own person to make a decision on it or we will have enough information to go ahead so we can move forward expeditiously. And our goal is going to be not later than the next time we get together, including an order to follow from there, unless there's aspects of it that are premature.

2.2

Do you want to add anything to that, Judge?

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: No.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right.

And then this isn't my attempt or our attempt to cut discussion off of this issue when we get to that agenda item.

The other issue that we will probably leave you with is we will be -- we will see if we can get that whole day filled up on January 23rd -- is proposals from each party, for lack of a better word, whether you want to call it a 26(f) report, customized to an MDL, or more informally just some deadlines for discovery, any proposed motion dates, trial dates. And then if one or more of you, and I

know that defense feels that one aspect of that, some or all of it may be either unnecessary or some of it is premature at this point to be focused in on, then obviously, that can also be so stated. And then we will make some decisions at the next conference, but with input from everyone.

2.2

So, whether there are some issues decided on meet and confer in terms of necessity, or lack thereof, for any type of order in place, we will ensure input to all parties. I thought I would wait, or we would wait until -- as we move through some of these agenda items -- both the letter I sent out in the last couple of weeks to all of the known State Judges, also my telephone conversation with Judge Henning a little over a week ago now, and before the case management conference there, and then also my anticipated conversation. This week we played telephone, a New Jersey Judge and I played telephone tag, more my fault than his because of my schedule, so that we have the high, high priority on coordinating a number of these issues.

Then I will wait until probably the end, unless it comes up sooner, for us to discuss any issues that are relevant to settlement. So, with that, we can go through the agenda, unless -- anything you want to state at this time, Judge Noel?

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: No.
THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right. We

can go forward, then, with the agenda? And then I will just remind you, and that was a note that Brenda sent me, that with counsel listening in -- and these aren't, like I said before at other times or get-togethers, these aren't fancy entertainment mikes. So, you have to stay fairly close to them. And if we don't speak into the microphones, the folks on the phone cannot hear us. So, whenever you are ready?

2.2

MS. WOODWARD: All right, Your Honor. So, we have our update on case counts for you. This is updated, cases filed through December 17th. It is an approximate number.

And I can tell you in the past two days there have been many more filings.

Cases in the MDL are on their way, 415. Cases in New Jersey State Court, 546. Cases in other State Courts, and there is quite a long list of those, though most of them are removable, I would say, is 79, which is a total around the country of 1,040 cases.

MR. FLOWERS: And Your Honor, I will just add to that, because we did some updated numbers. I think there is at least another 50 cases that were filed in the MDL since that time.

There is also -- one of the PSC members who is here, Jeff Bowersox, is from Oregon. He has filed 20 to 30 cases in Oregon that are going to removed here, as well, so I suspect we will be well over 500 cases or probably are

right now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Well, and as I said, as we said back in chambers, I sent out that list. And if there are lawyers in the room who either didn't get access to the letter or want the letter I sent out with input from counsel to all Judges in the country, if I have missed somebody or we get people added to the list, whether it is the letter and/or phone call. Because like I had said the other -- this morning, I sent Judge Henning, after she and I had a very, I think, useful conversation, I sent her a copy of all of our orders here, gave her some website descriptions, and then also all of the orders that -- I have a book of orders from the New Jersey Court. And so, if counsel either listening in -- and they can after the hearing is over e-mail or contact, or if someone in the courtroom didn't get a copy of that: Well, what is this letter the Judge is talking about? And it was e-filed, as well. But, in terms of, to all of the Judges in the country that have cases.

But, any questions on the MDL count?

MS. WOODWARD: Your Honor, the Defendants will provide you with an ongoing list as new cases are filed around the country of updated Judges' names and addresses. And I also brought with me the usual map and list of Plaintiffs' counsel, if you would like to have those?

1 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: I would, yes. 2 Thank you. Shall we -- unless there is something else on that issue, we can move on to the status of State Court 3 4 proceedings. 5 MS. WOODWARD: That would be fine, Your Honor. THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Maybe you 6 7 wanted to handle it -- I mean, if you had something else in 8 mind, we'll --9 MR. FLOWERS: Did not, Your Honor, Mr. Bernheim is 10 Liaison, so --11 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right, 12 fair enough. 13 MR. FLOWERS: He can attest to --14 MR. BERNHEIM: Good morning, Your Honors. 15 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Hello? 16 MR. BERNHEIM: New Jersey, additional documents 17 have been produced since the last conference. We don't 18 believe that there are any depositions that are currently 19 set in New Jersey, the next case management conference there 20 is on January 28th. 21 As Your Honors are aware in Broward County the 2.2 first case management conference in front of Judge Henning 23 in the Complex Division was on December 11th. The Judge 24 asked for master discovery, Plaintiff fact sheets. 25 in the process of preparing those down there. There is no

second case management conference currently set, but we anticipate it will be sometime in January.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Right, and I can tell you in my conversation with Judge Henning, I had — and I would call it a very constructive, worthwhile conversation, I have kind of promised her — and I think she has done the same to me — and I suppose it is not personal, it is to the cases here and cases that — since they are kind of at the incipient stages of their case, the key word here is coordination. We are going to try to work together so lawyers and clients don't have to double down, so to speak. Well, we are doing this in the MDL. We are going to try to work together. Obviously, she has her responsibilities, and we have ours.

We kind of committed to each other that we will try to coordinate this and work with the lawyers so that we can proceed at the same time, and kind of have an awareness of -- well, something that one of us might do might directly or indirectly affect the cases there.

And obviously, there is a host of other cases, I believe, in another county down there, I believe, if I remember correctly.

MR. BERNHEIM: Yes, Your Honor, there are seven cases filed in Palm Beach County that was just consolidated in front of Judge Crow.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Right. So, I will reach out to them, as well. But, I think we kind of have a mutual commitment that, hopefully -- and that is frankly the intent of an MDL, generally, is to -- if we can coordinate these, we can maybe save some time, money and delay, minimize delay for everybody on both sides.

2.2

MR. BERNHEIM: Yes, Your Honor, Judge Henning made that clear at the case management conference, as well.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right.

MS. WOODWARD: I will just add briefly that in New Jersey they did complete the first phase of the mediation program there. And I believe there were 6 cases mediated.

4 of those cases settled. Judge Martinotti expressed at the status conference earlier this week that took place in New Jersey his delight with the success of that program, and they are gearing up for additional mediations to take place in January and they are talking about what Phase 2 of the program might look like. They are also meeting and conferring in New Jersey on additional discovery issues.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: We will make sure we chat. And I think in fairness to him, he was probably trying to reach me. But, no complaints by me, we have been in court a lot, but we will touch base this week.

But, a question I have, and he and I have discussed it, is just the nature -- and we discussed this

1 last time, if I may say so. I think you each described, 2 meaning, kind of characterized how these cases were selected 3 there a bit differently. But, in terms of the selection 4 process, the access people have to the specifics of each 5 case and the nature of the settlement, because that would be the first question. In other words, if a lawyer was in 6 7 front of me now and said: We just settled three cases in 8 State Court, I would say, I will request the terms. 9 that is exactly what happened in the Guidant case, not that 10 one size fits all. I want to see the specific terms of the 11 settlement and the nature of the case to see how 12 representative it is, so it can be helpful. 13 Do you know what the terms -- and I will ask the 14 Judge the same thing, because I wasn't quite clear on what 15 the nature of the program was. 16 MS. WOODWARD: Well, just in general, my 17 understanding is that the plaintiffs selected some sample 18 cases to submit to the program. The defense selected some. 19 And the Judge chose some at random. 20 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Do we know how 21 they were selected? I may have asked this last month, so 2.2 T --23 MR. CAMPILLO: I can try to address that, Your 24 Honor. 25 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Okay.

MR. CAMPILLO: Judge Martinotti selected 6 cases, presumably from his review of the pleadings, and possibly the preliminary -- I don't think he even gets a disclosure. So, from the pleadings, at random. And then each side was allowed to select 2 cases for any reason, without any criteria given as to how to select those. So, 6 were from the Judge, 2 from the plaintiffs, 2 from the defendants.

2.2

For the second round or second phase that is going to be done early next year, the Judge is only going to pick 4 cases, and each the plaintiff and defendant is going to be allowed to select 3. Again, no criteria spelled out for how they select those three.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: May I ask, who has access to the terms of the settlement? And of course, if you have the name of the case, I guess you could look at the pleadings; but, who has access to the specific terms of the settlement?

MR. CAMPILLO: Well, the terms of each settlement I believe are confidential as between the parties.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Because if they were in front of me, I would say, my -- as we proceed in an MDL, I don't believe the confidentiality would hold, frankly. And I would say -- we will put some protections in, but we in order to administer -- I am not criticizing the process, whatsoever. I am just curious, especially when

there are 500 and some cases.

2.2

And I realize when I say this that transcripts will be produced and everybody will be reading what I am saying. But, I am just curious how they will be used, since there are lots of cases down there.

MR. CAMPILLO: Well, my understanding is that at least the hope is that since you are using the same mediators for future negotiations, that I guess the mediators will have some idea of values and so forth. But, in terms of disclosure of the actual terms of each settlement, I believe they are confidential.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right.

And maybe I am saying it in the context of kind of kind of the underlying purpose of the bellwether selection system that everybody gets to know -- and of course one of the criticisms of that system, and you could arguably apply that to, I guess, settlement approaches in MDL's, as well, with or without the help of the Judge, if you don't truly pick representative cases, as opposed to the best cases for the plaintiff and best cases for the defendant, all of the other cases will say: Well, my case is not like that at all. I have got a much better case. Or, oh, no, I don't have that, so that settlement or that trial is meaningless to my client. That was why I asked the questions in terms of -- and I will probably be repetitive here, and I don't mean to

get us too far off the agenda, and I think His Honor might have something to say about this, too.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

But, again, using -- whether it is premature or not at some point today, or soon, to talk about what decisions or discovery is needed before we discuss some type of settlement modality of some kind, or process. so helpful, and I had to decide a few other issues in the case, as they picked -- we carefully picked criteria for the selection of bellwether cases. And then I won't go through that now, but then when we went to the settlement, we had 6 or 7 categories of settlement with a range of settlement, even though we used two mediators, special masters, Judge Boylan and Pat Juneau out of New Orleans. And Pat Juneau got picked because that is what the parties agreed on, to work with Judge Boylan. And it really couldn't have worked out any better than it did in my humble opinion of how we all worked together. But, going in, all parties at large could see the categories so that one size didn't fit all. But, it is a little premature to be having those discussions But, that is why I inquired about the selection criteria down in --

MR. CAMPILLO: The only thing I can add from personal knowledge, I think, is I believe there was some effort to have different Plaintiffs' firms engaged. And I believe all 4 cases that were resolved involved, as lead

1 counsel for each of those Plaintiffs, a different firm. 2 I think that bodes well for getting that knowledge, at 3 least --THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: That is 4 5 probably true, yeah. 6 MR. CAMPILLO: -- across the board, which I think 7 makes a lot of sense. 8 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Do you want to 9 get in here? 10 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: 11 Yes, and if I could just add a couple of questions? And if 12 you were asked this already, I apologize. The total 13 universe of cases that were in this range were 10? There 14 were 6 that the Judge picked, and 2 from each of the plaintiffs and each of the defendants? 15 16 MR. CAMPILLO: That is correct. 17 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: so of those 10 cases, 4 settled, is that correct? 18 19 MR. CAMPILLO: Yes, 4 settled; 1 the negotiations 20 continue, it hasn't been completed; and 1 has been not 21 resolved, and it looks like there's no further talks on that 2.2 other one. The remaining 4 cases from that first group of 23 10 is scheduled for January, I think the middle of January, 24 to be mediated. 25 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL:

1 They haven't even engaged in the process, yet? 2 MR. CAMPILLO: Exactly. 3 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: The 6 that did, 1 of them you said is continuing and the other 4 5 goes back in the pool of cases? MR. CAMPILLO: Yes, the settlement was not 6 7 achieved. And there is no follow-up to that. THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: 8 9 Okay, thank you. 10 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Any of the 11 Plaintiffs' lawyers want to -- and I will say something that 12 I said back in chambers. It wasn't necessarily in the context of settlement; but obviously, if there are issues, 13 14 maybe they will come up in January. If the parties say, 15 well, here, it could be premature, or we could say: Here 16 are the issues we need the Court to decide in order to give 17 us meaningful direction on where to go, whether it is 18 selection of cases or settlement, and they can range 19 anything from theories of liability to expert witnesses and 20 the list goes on. 21 And it may be premature, but that is why I was 2.2 kind of asking those questions, because one way or the other 23 when there are settlements, directly or indirectly, or in 24 some other way, they impact the case.

And I will just say this, and maybe we can move

25

I know that as Pat Juneau and Magistrate Judge Boylan sat down with the parties, one of the first questions they had, and they had an appropriate protective order in place, and there was not really any strong objection, as long as they knew it was coming from the Court. Everybody laid out every single settlement they were aware of in the country, the terms of the settlement, the amount, everything, the type of case. And in part so that the Court has a lot at stake, as do a lot of lawyers to say, well, now here are two And when were you going to tell us that the settlement for two, almost exactly the same cases, one was this amount or one was that amount, whatever the case may be? So, at some point, as I said back in chambers, if there are issues we can be helpful with, without trampling on somebody's rights, because sometimes it is my criticism of some judges, state and federal, that, well, they refuse to decide any issues and say, go over and mediate your case and we decline to do anything.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Well, sometimes you need us to make decisions, and we are just saying, that is part of the MDL process and we will make ourselves available. That is why we had a very brief discussion back in chambers in that regard. It may well be that one or more of you, or all of you, are thinking: Well, way to soon. We will need this discovery. We need this, or we need that. One size doesn't fit all.

Maybe enough said about that, unless you have something else. And anything else before I move on to another item, here?

2.2

MS. WOODWARD: I did want to comment very quickly on the Florida status conference with Judge Henning. It was very positive. And I think the Judge recognized that there were a lot of preliminary issues that need to be resolved and ordered the parties to meet and confer on those issues. One of those issues is now resolved, which is the protective order that will be entered. It will be the one that Your Honor hopefully gets the chance to sign later today. So that is a good development.

MR. BERNHEIM: That is right, Your Honor. And the other state litigations, there's the two cases that are filed in Massachusetts, there's -- Mr. Flowers was talking earlier about the filings in Oregon. We anticipate that those -- none of them are going to be transferred to the MDL. 3 do have Oregon Defendants, so we believe that they are going to remain in State Court there.

There are 4 cases filed in Michigan, 1 case filed in Philadelphia, 1 case filed in West Virginia, and 1 case filed in Louisiana.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: I will just as a footnote, even though I promised to move on from settlement, as a footnote I will just say that apart from

the involvement of His Honor Judge Noel in any settlement issues, because, you know, we haven't really addressed that yet, I don't think Judge Boylan would mind me saying, he turned 65 yesterday and he is retiring as our Chief Magistrate Judge in a few weeks. He is ready, willing and able, as his first task, to lunge into this MDL.

2.2

And actually, there is a Magistrate Judge out in -- or not Magistrate Judge -- a mediator out in California, Mr. Polsky, who has contacted me, I suppose in part because he may know Ms. Fleishman, her firm. And in part because his daughter was my law clerk years ago and is now a partner in a firm here in town.

I have not talked to him, but I kind of half serious, half in jest say this, because I have had discussion with Judge Boylan, because he and Pat Juneau did everything. Well, Judge Boylan doesn't need my explanation of his reputation. So, that would be something, a tag team of Noel and Boylan; wouldn't it? So, but we will, at the appropriate time, the parties may have something entirely different in mind and may think it is entirely premature to be having such discussions at this stage of the case. And I will just renew anything that I hear from any of the State Judges that I talk to, I will say what I said before, I will pass through. There is no side agreement that Judges have that: Well, let me tell you something, but don't tell the

1 lawyers. Arguably, that would be inappropriate, to begin 2 with; but, that is not the way these conversations go. 3 would call you. 4 Although last week when I called -- not on this 5 MDL, they call them Justices up in British Columbia, they said it is the first time they ever had a call in 14 years 6 7 from a Federal Judge. I don't know what that means, because 8 we -- that was a dispute under another law, treaty. But, 9 let's move on, then. 10 But, like I said, we will revisit some of those 11 issues when one or more parties feel it is appropriate. We 12 can move on to the next agenda item. Thank you very much. 13 Thank you. 14 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, the next thing is the 15 electronic service of process, where we have worked out an 16 agreement and submitted an order essentially allowing 17 service on both Howmedica and the various Stryker 18 Corporations via e-mail. The e-mail address is set out in 19 the order. 20 MS. WOODWARD: That order is final and ready for 21 Your Honor's signature. 2.2 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: We will take care of that. And for the record, the number attached to 23 that order? Is there a number? 24

25

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL:

Number 7.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Under the B7 -- it's not bingo today, but --

MR. FLOWERS: Number 7, Your Honor. And also, the corporation Stryker Ireland, we have reached an agreement about that corporation for those who have sued it, and that is that Stryker is agreeing to toll the statute of limitations on that particular entity, in order to kind of put it aside for a while until we conduct discovery.

MS. WOODWARD: Right. Just one caveat. We will work out the language of the tolling agreement. I don't anticipate any problems on that front. But, of course, the agreement depends on what the tolling agreement actually says.

MR. FLOWERS: Agreed.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Obviously, as you are both well aware, that is a common arrangement to make which seems in the cases I have had to benefit both parties.

MS. WOODWARD: On the interim protective order, Your Honor, the parties have reached an agreement as to the language of an interim order. We will be submitting a final order for your signature this afternoon. The order that was submitted with the joint report earlier this week will be supplemented to add a footnote in section -- or in paragraph

1	15(b), rather, by the agreement of the parties.
2	MR. FLOWERS: That is correct, Your Honor. I just
3	add one caveat to that. This morning we had agreed to
4	assuming that the order is okay with you and signed, that
5	the production that has occurred in New Jersey thus far will
6	be given to the MDL within 10 days so we can get moving on
7	reviewing those documents.
8	MS. WOODWARD: That is agreeable.
9	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Is there an
10	issue, then, on how you are going to handle with the Rule
11	15(b) or not the rule, paragraph 15(b).
12	MS. WOODWARD: An issue about the language, Your
13	Honor?
14	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Yes. In other
15	words, we kind of discussed, if you can't agree
16	MS. WOODWARD: Well, I believe Mr. Flowers and I
17	talked about that this morning and I read to him the
18	specific language which I am happy to put it on the record
19	so there is no dispute later
20	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: No, that is
21	not necessary. I will turn it off.
22	MS. WOODWARD: I'm sorry, I misunderstood, I
23	believe.
24	(Discussion off the record.)
25	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right.

So, on the permanent protective order, we have this meet and confer and briefing in mind to take up at the next hearing.

It is the footnote that we are all on the same page on?

MR. FLOWERS: Correct, Your Honor. We are all on

2.2

the same page in the footnote. In terms of this being an interim order, the permanent order we intend to brief, letter-wise, to you for the next hearing.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: So we are on the same page on that procedure.

MS. WOODWARD: That is correct, Your Honor.

MR. FLOWERS: Then, Your Honor, we had on the next two items, the next item is a common benefit order. We had prepared and circulated this to the Defendant and they have had some time to review it, despite the fact that we don't think they need to review it.

As a courtesy, we have allowed them to do it. And we have now agreed this morning -- they are going to do that. We are going to have a meet and confer on January 3rd about any problems they may have with it. And if there is an issue, we intend to bring it to the Court soon after June 3rd in order to get this particular issue out of the way before the next court hearing, if possible.

MS. WOODWARD: That is correct, Your Honor, we were recently provided with this draft order. We want some time to look at it. And I think we can meet and confer on

January 3rd and then move forward expeditiously from there.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: And I think you are about to tell us you are going to do -- with a similar time line and process on the master log and short form complaints?

MR. FLOWERS: Same process, Your Honor.

MS. WOODWARD: Correct.

2.2

of you that weren't in -- you can ask your fellow

Plaintiffs' counsel on the Committee, or Defense counsel on
the time process, because anything that isn't worked out, we
will address it in January here, and with a decision from
the Court, and we have set up a briefing -- a letter
briefing schedule in the event that is necessary. So,
moving on.

MS. WOODWARD: The order relating to fact sheets and preliminary disclosures, Ms. Zimmerman is actually going to be submitting later this afternoon an order for Your Honor's signature that cleans up some formatting, typographical issues, so that will be ready for Your Honor's signature right after that. We did reach a side agreement on the timing of the disclosures at Plaintiffs' request, because we are working out -- or they are working out the digitization of the order or rather the fact sheets and the disclosure forms.

1	And that timing is, Plaintiffs will have 50 days
2	from the date of the order to submit their preliminary
3	disclosures, and 80 days from the date of the order to
4	submit their fact sheets.
5	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: And this is, I
6	believe, preliminary order 8?
7	MR. FLOWERS: Correct.
8	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Could you
9	submit an order reflecting those changes in the dates?
10	MR. FLOWERS: We will, Your Honor.
11	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: So we make
12	sure we get those right, then we will sign it?
13	MS. WOODWARD: That would be fine.
14	MR. CAMPILLO: Just to clarify, that is for the
15	initial fact sheets and complaints that are on file now, but
16	future ones will go back to the 60 and 30-day time frames?
17	MR. FLOWERS: Exactly.
18	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: That is our
19	understanding as you explained it back in chambers. All
20	right?
21	MS. WOODWARD: Thank you.
22	MR. FLOWERS: The next issue on the agenda, Your
23	Honor, was the introduction to the MDL website.
24	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: As you know,
25	we had two different approaches back in chambers. What we

will do is we will look at those, and we will draft and put a -- send it out a day or two before it goes up on the website, but we will draft, based upon your input from your two proposals, and we will put it up on the website.

2.2

And I guess I will relieve you from the -- Judge
Noel has persuaded me that it's more cumbersome to say:
Well, let's send it out and then have a letter brief on what
you don't like about it. We will go ahead, based upon your
input draft something to go up online. And then obviously,
whether it was this issue or another issue, once that is
done, if at some point sooner or later the parties say:
Well, we have now reached an agreement, and here's -- it is
just like your order or a summary for the website, or here
it is, I guess we won't know that if and unless you contact
us. But, we will handle it in that way so we are not
anticipating or requesting anything further from either
counsel.

MR. FLOWERS: Thank you.

HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: Just so that I am clear, the two proposals that are before us are Exhibits 5 and 6 to this joint report, correct?

MR. GRIFFIN: Your Honor, Tim Griffin. That is correct. Exhibit 6 was the original proposal by Defendants. Exhibit 5 contains Plaintiffs' red lines and additional information about contacts.

1 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: 2 That is what we are supposed to be working from. 3 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right. MR. GRIFFIN: Yes. 4 5 MR. FLOWERS: Then, Your Honor, there are 6 additional issues here that under agenda item 4 were matters 7 subject to ongoing conferral. The first one is ex parte 8 contacts with treating physicians that we are dealing with 9 with the permanent protective order. Proper Defendants, 10 which I should probably speak about. 11 MS. WOODWARD: Well, Your Honor is aware of our 12 position on that. The Stryker -- the non-HOC entities should not be defendants in this matter. We think after the 13 14 master complaint is resolved, we can move on to that as the 15 next issue. But, we will keep talking about it in the 16 interim. 17 MR. FLOWERS: That is fine. 18 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right. 19 MR. FLOWERS: The next issue is production of 20 device exemplars, Your Honor. And we had a long 21 conversation about this, this morning. This is an issue 2.2 that is very serious from our perspective. We need device 23 exemplars in order to analyze them, to identify and show what the defects are in this device. 24

Since the last hearing, we were provided with a

25

list of devices that Stryker has still. That list, we are going to do some discovery on, frankly, because we are wondering why potentially 31,000 of these devices were implanted in the United States and so few remain. Or manufactured -- may not have been implanted -- so, we as Plaintiffs intend to do some discovery on that issue, itself, as to where all those devices went.

2.2

And number two is, we understand that Stryker is unwilling at this stage to turn over any exemplars to us for several reasons. And our intention is to bring a formal motion for the next status hearing in order to address that issue, some type of motion to compel, frankly, in order to bring that issue to a head.

MR. CAMPILLO: Yeah. I did want to add one thing, Your Honor.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right.

MR. CAMPILLO: And that is if this helps, in using very rough numbers, 31,000 is the number of products implanted worldwide, approximately 21,000 of which were implanted in the United States. That doesn't suggest or should suggest that there's 10,000 exemplars or products that were made that were not used; that is not the case.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Now, as kind of an update to this, and this is just going to mirror something that was said in chambers this morning during our

conference. But as I understand it, at least it was the view -- it seemed to be the view of all of the lawyers in chambers, that as far as counsel knows, this issue hasn't been addressed yet, or the issue may be on the table, but it hasn't been addressed. There is no order in place in any other court in the country that we know of, at least right now? Is that a fair assumption on my part?

2.2

MR. FLOWERS: We are not, the Plaintiffs are not aware of any order.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: And the Defense?

MS. WOODWARD: We are not aware of any order.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: I will not create an issue where there isn't one, of course, but I will just let any communications I have with any of the State Judges -- I will just make sure they know that is something that is being discussed. And maybe they are aware of that.

So, hopefully, we can coordinate, whether it is by agreement or part court decision, part agreement, we can coordinate it. So, everybody can benefit so we don't have two, three, four more orders out there. And I think that is one of the concerns that some of you have that, well, the availability of exemplars and when and how they are tested, and the conditions of that, that could be affected by, well, how many judges are going to be addressing this?

So, I think I would be frankly surprised -- I hope
I am not being naive -- if we can't coordinate this with the
other courts so that we can make part of this a non-issue,
apart from what the parties can agree or not agree on. So,
I intend to just indicate that to any Judge I communicate
with. So -
MR. FLOWERS: Okay. Thank you. Our last issue

2.2

MR. FLOWERS: Okay. Thank you. Our last issue deals, Your Honor, with ESI information. Mr. Gordon is going to come up and deal with that.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right.

MR. GORDON: Good morning, Your Honors. Ben

Gordon for the Lead Counsel Committee. Your Honors, I will

try to be brief on this. As you know, we have Mr. Crowley

here. And I just want to talk briefly as to why we have him

here.

I understand that you are not prepared to hear him today, but I want just want to at least forecast the issue a little bit for Your Honors, because I think it is going to be something that is going to require ongoing work with the Defendants and with the Court.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: All right.

MR. GORDON: The ESI, the electronically-stored information in this case is critical to where we are going in the case, and the liability aspect of the case. To understand a lot of the underpinnings of our factual

allegations, we have to get the discovery moving forward in this case. And at this point we feel like we have been stymied to some extent in getting that critical information.

2.2

As Your Honors know, in past mass torts, we frankly have been criticized, plaintiff's bar and others on how willy-nilly we tend to hire document companies to do this work.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Well, and frankly courts have been criticized, too, for not managing it early on and the cost of the whole show.

MR. GORDON: Precisely. And honestly, Judge, I realize that maybe Ms. Woodward is skeptical of our motives, here. But, the truth is we want to do -- I told her this in court at the last in-person status conference to do what we think is going to help prevent that here.

We have spent millions of dollars in other big cases on these kinds of costs because it is a complex and a time-consuming process. But, we believe that things have changed enough in the last two to three years that the state of the art is such that with the right group doing the work and with the right shared understanding of the process and transparency from inception, we can sharply reduce the amount of time it takes to do the review process and to get the documents, and to frankly get through the liability analysis and get cases set for trial. And harkening back to

the points earlier, Your Honors, it is our position, I believe — at least my position that any discussion of settlement in the case is highly premature if we are not at a point that we can even analyze the liability aspect of the case and have the cases somewhat prepared for trial. So, those discussions to me can only be done and only be moved forward once we've completed this analysis. And to do it, we need to sit down with the defense, and I understand now they are prepared to do that, and their technical people and someone like Mr. Crowley — and I want to talk briefly about his credentials — so that we can ensure reliability and transparency of the process.

2.2

We are not looking for their mental impressions,

Your Honor. We are simply looking to get factual

information about the way the documents and other responsive

materials have been organized, collected, and the way they

intend to produce them.

We understand they produced some segment of the documents in New Jersey already, a small segment, I believe. From what we know about the order that is in place there, we frankly do have more questions than answers at this point as to how that process has been done and whether or not it has led to a thorough going and reliable production of the critical documents, here.

We are not certain that it is not adequate, we

just don't have enough answers. And Mr. Crowley with his background and credentials can help us get to that information. That is the entire reason we retained him. He has worked for corporations and for plaintiffs groups in other cases. He is very experienced.

2.2

Just by way of background, let me tell you a little about him. He is the Chair of the Sedona Conference Working Group on Best Practices for Electronic Discovery, Retention and Production.

He is the Editor and Chief of the Sedona

Conference Commentary on Information Governance, and the

Sedona Conference Commentary on Proportionality in

Electronic Discovery.

He is the Senior Editor of the Sedona Conference

Commentary on Legal Holds -- I'm sorry -- on Legal Holds and
the Sedona Principles. I will abbreviate this.

He is a Member of the Advisory Board for
Georgetown University Law Centers Advanced E-discovery
Institute, and a Member of the Board of Advisors for
Bloomberg BNAs Digital Discovery and the Evidence.

The point with all of this is that we were advised to find someone who could help us do our due diligence as the Lead Counsel Committee, to ensure that the process is both as efficient and affordable as it possibly could be here.

And we believe based on what we have done with Conor's help over the last several months in interviewing many of these different software vendors for this process, that we could reduce the cost from a seven-figure number, to a much more modest -- a fraction of that amount. And we can expedite the process by doing it correctly.

2.2

Now, in terms of the math involved and all of the statistical sampling that is required, the various algorithms these companies use is frankly way over my head. Someone like Conor and the other groups we interviewed can do a much better job explaining why that is. But, I am sure Your Honors are familiar with the studies that are out there to show how this process can be expedited and made more efficient.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: And separate from the MDL process, I suspect that most Federal Courts are doing what we are doing. The expectation of when you meet in the initial Rule 16 conference is to either have talked to your tech expert, whatever, and be prepared to come in and talk about cost, protocol, retrieval, and that type of thing. Because as you said, apart from this case, the legal profession and courts are criticized for not managing this and doing it early and defining its scope.

And yes, the issue of proportionality comes in almost in every case these days. I don't know if you have

anything further to say about that?

2.2

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: No, I don't.

MR. GORDON: Precisely, Your Honor, that is really it. I mean, the only concern we have at this point about what we know about the New Jersey production is that there are a lot of questions raised in the Order that would lead to multiple meet and confers that I don't know have been resolved yet. So, to the extent there has been a company retained there that has been doing the work, and some of what Mr. Crowley has seen so far at least suggests to us or gives us pause as to whether the quality of the production is such that we can be confident in the process.

So, we want to be able to sit down -- we are prepared today, frankly, but I understand that there are other people that need to be here for Stryker. But, certainly, we believe this process won't be done in one meet and confer. It will take multiple meetings. So, we are really ready to get to it as soon as possible.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Well, I think, not to interrupt your comments or opposing counsel, but I think our expectation is that through some of the get-togethers, meet and confers on some of these other issues, that this topic should be addressed by the parties with the help of your respective experts. And then there

may or may not be an agreement on, well, the time has come where we are going to ask the Court as soon as the next January conference that is, I believe, the 23rd, to address this issue. And then if you can't -- depending on the aspects you can't agree on, if one of those is: Well, we not only want this issue raised with time set aside in January, but we want -- we think both our respective experts should be here. In the patent context they call them tutorials, rather than an adversarial process. But, whether it is that context or a combination, then if you can't agree on that, like we said in chambers, I assume we will get a phone call saying we need an immediate telephone conference just for the Judges to say yes or no to what is going to happen in January, because we not only can't agree on how to proceed, but one of us wants to have folks here in January so we can get an order, and one group doesn't. I assume that is kind of what we talked about, I think, Judge Noel? THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: Yes. THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: That should give you both input into both, how we do this and when we do it. I think that is a great idea, Your MR. GORDON: Honor. We appreciate it. I think we have a tentative

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

meeting set, or we would like to be ordered to, if
necessary, to meet on January 10th to work through this that
day. And then if we can't work through some of these
issues, we would certainly appreciate the opportunity to
revisit it with the Court even before January 23rd. Thank
you.

2.2

MS. WOODWARD: Your Honor, I will be brief. We believe we have been meeting and conferring with the Plaintiffs over the past couple of months about ESI issues. They have been very vocal in their desire about discussing these issues.

We shared with them the New Jersey Order of production, which is a key order, because our ESI process has been based off that Order. And millions of dollars on our end has already been spent on that process. Some of the Plaintiffs' leadership were in attendance at a deposition that was all about ESI back in August.

So, they have some ideas of what has been done. The process, I think, got a little bit stalled when we asked them to outline for us what they wanted to talk about. And when we got that letter, it was more than just technical issues. The issues that they outlined did cross over into mental impressions. And that is a key red flag for us. So we, I can confirm, will have a telephone conference with the Plaintiffs with our ESI team on January 10th, and hopefully

we can work through some of these issues and that Mr.

Gordon's words here about the issues, he is concerned about not crossing over into mental impressions, are true and accurate.

2.2

MR. GORDON: I just want to -- thank you, Your Honors. I just want to, if I may, briefly say I don't want to be unnecessarily contentious, Your Honor. I am not sure the chronology that Ms. Woodward spelled out is exactly accurate. And certainly, this idea of us needing to answer questions before they could meet and confer with us only came up after Thanksgiving.

We had discussions before Thanksgiving, and I brought this up briefly at the Thanksgiving hearing over the phone, and it was only after that that we received a request to have a list of questions which I don't know that that is necessary. But, in order to try to foster the process, we talked with Mr. Crowley, we came up with some topic areas on the fly quickly to try to move the process forward.

And those were then, I guess, passed back. Maybe there were some issues with him, I am not sure. But, that was a recent development. We have been asking for the meeting to figure out what the questions are, frankly, before that request was ever made of us. And that was only, you know, in the last couple of weeks.

MS. WOODWARD: It is fair when someone asks you

for a meeting, to ask them what topics they want to cover at the meeting so you can be prepared to address those topics.

And that is what was asked for, and received, and on January 10th we will be prepared.

2.2

MR. GORDON: My point was only that it was belatedly received. I have been asking you for it since the last hearing. That is my only point.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: I think where we are at, in order to be fair to both of you, regardless of what has happened up until today, we have kind of a timeline and system in place, because I think the one thing is some decisions should be made, whether it is by agreement or court decision soon, so we have something in place, and a way to get back to the Court. So, did you want to get in here?

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN NOEL: My understanding of what you have just told us is you are going to meet on January 10th with your respective e-discovery experts and what I hope the Court would get at some point then is what decisions you need made by the Court. And if we can do that before January 23rd, that would be fine. If it is going to be on January 23rd, so be it.

MR. GORDON: Yes, sir, we will do that. We appreciate that.

MS. WOODWARD: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Where does 2 that leave us, counsel? 3 MR. FLOWERS: That leaves us done, I think, Your 4 Honor. 5 MS. WOODWARD: Happy holidays. THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: So, we will be 6 7 together on January 23rd. And is there any questions Plaintiffs' counsel has in terms of whether it's something 8 9 we have said or not said, whether it was in chambers or 10 here, about what is going to be happening between now and 11 the January 23rd date? 12 No, Your Honor, thank you. MR. FLOWERS: THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: For defense? 13 14 MS. WOODWARD: No, Your Honor. 15 THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Well, thank 16 you, everybody, for their appearances. And I hope everybody 17 has safe travels, and happy holidays. And we will be in 18 touch with everyone. 19 And I think I have already said it, but I know I 20 said back in chamber -- well, I have said it here, too. 21 But, if I do have some contacts, and I will be in the next 2.2 few days with a couple of the State Judges, I will -- if 23 there is anything that I think seems like, well, I think the 24 lawyers should know this, at a minimum I will just send out 25 a -- have Brenda send out an e-mail just confirming that I

made the contacts. And if there is anything unusual, hopefully, in a good way, not a negative way, either way I will update you with an e-mail to your respective offices.

2.2

So, can I ask a question of Mr. Nemo that has absolutely nothing to do with the MDL? Have I -- do I understand that Ron Meshbesher is formally retiring?

MR. NEMO: Yes, after decades of service he has decided to wrap things up.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: He is getting an award on February 20th, it is?

MR. NEMO: Yes, he is. So, as of the end of the year, he will be finished practicing law. Although, I imagine he will be at the office until the day he dies.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: I suspect that is true. Well, if you would greet him for me -- unrelated to the MDL, of course, really -- even though I have had a couple of cases with him as a Federal Judge, one of the true privileges -- and I frankly think that he sets an example for -- he, of course, is one of the few lawyers, too, who has done both this highly-specialized civil and criminal work. But, he sets an example for all of us.

I had the privilege of getting on the Supreme

Court Criminal Rules Committee back in 1985 as a young

ignorant State Court Judge and got to know he and his wife

Kim and family very well. And then, of course, when I came

1	here in '98, I could no longer stay on the State Supreme
2	Court's Committee. So, and I have had little contact with
3	him. But, if you would but I did see that somewhere,
4	another lawyer not from your firm said he is retiring.
5	And I said, maybe in our definition, but I bet he will be
6	coming into work everyday.
7	MR. NEMO: Well, he speaks very highly of you,
8	too, Your Honor.
9	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: Well, thank
10	you all. And I assume we will keep everybody in the loop,
11	here, and we are adjourned. And Mr. Crowley, I hope at
12	least the weather wasn't 20 below zero.
13	MR. CROWLEY: No, Your Honor, it was quite
14	delightful.
15	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN FRANK: We are
16	adjourned. Thank you.
17	(Adjournment.)
18	* * *
19	I, Jeanne M. Anderson, certify that the foregoing
20	is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in
21	the above-entitled matter.
22	
23	
24	Certified by: <u>s/ Jeanne M. Anderson</u> Jeanne M. Anderson, RMR-RPR
25	Official Court Reporter