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) January 23, 2014		
8	All Actions) 9:17 a.m.		
9			
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DONOVAN W. FRANK		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE AND BY TELEPHONE THE HONORABLE FRANKLIN L. NOEL		
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
13	STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS		
14	APPEARANCES:		
15	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:		
16	Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Chairperson: Meyers & Flowers		
17	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. 1100 IDS Center		
21	80 S. 8th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2015		
22			
23	Official Court Reporter: JEANNE M. ANDERSON, RMR-RPR Suite 146 U.S. Courthouse 316 North Robert Street		
24	St. Paul, Minnesota 55101		
25	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography;		

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):	
2	For the Plaintiffs:	
3	Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Members (Contin	
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		Cory Watson Crowder & DeGaris
9		ANNESLEY H. DeGARIS, ESQ. (APPEARING BY TELEPHONE)
10		2131 Magnolia Avenue South Birmingham, Alabama 35205
11		,,
12		Leiff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP
13		WENDY R. FLEISHMAN, ESQ. 250 Hudson Street, Eighth Floor
14		New York, New York 10013
15		Weisman, Kennedy & Berris Co., LPA
16		DAVID LANDEVER, ESQ. 1600 Midland Building
17		101 Prospect Avenue West Cleveland, Ohio 44115
18		,
19	Plaintiffs' Liaison Coun	sel:
20	Liaison Counsel to the District of Minnesota:	Meshbesher & Spence, Ltd.
21	District of Alimesota.	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
4	Committee Members: Pittman Dutton & Hellums, PC
5	CHRIS T. HELLUMS, ESQ. 1100 Park Place Tower
6	2001 Park Place North Birmingham, Alabama 35203
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	Defendants' Lead Counsel:	
5		Sedgwick Law RAFAEL A. CAMPILLO, ESQ.
6		(MR. CAMPILLO BY PHONE) KAREN E. WOODWARD, ESQ. 801 S. Figueroa Street, 19th Floor
7		Los Angeles, California 90017-5556
8		
9	Defendants' Liaison Counse	1:
10		Leonard, Street and Deinard TIMOTHY P. GRIFFIN, ESQ.
11		150 S. 5th Street, Suite 2300 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

IN OPEN COURT

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Judge Noel, you may be seated. For those of you on the line, Magistrate Judge Noel is appearing by phone, but we thought it was only correct, Your Honor, that we announce both of us. So, I just for, I guess -- now one or more lawyers in the room is thinking that Judge Frank is hallucinating because I turned as if you were here and said, "You may be seated."

Did you hear her announce you, Judge Noel?
Anybody on the phone?

It's muted? All right. That's an issue for -- yeah, because I will have -- let me explain.

(Discussion off the record.)

So, Judge Noel, you are also muted. It's another example of our fine technology. So, whether we Sametime, or I guess we're too old to be texting each other, but if there's something you need to get ahold of me on for the hearing, you can get ahold of someone -- Becky, or someone in my chambers, and we'll make sure we get the information -- if we need it for the hearing. Although in light of our participation and your participation in the status conference, I think we have the course set for this hearing today.

So why don't we go ahead, for the benefit of the

1 people on the phone, and have the lawyers present note their 2 presence for the record and in what capacity they appear in. 3 Should we start with the Plaintiffs first? 4 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Genevieve Zimmerman on behalf of 5 the Lead Counsel Committee --THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And actually, as 6 7 awkward as it is, you'll probably have to speak into the microphone; otherwise, the people on the line cannot hear 8 9 you. 10 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. 11 Genevieve Zimmerman on behalf of the lead counsel committee for Plaintiffs. 12 13 MR. GORDON: Do that again. 14 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. Take 3. Genevieve 15 Zimmerman on behalf of the Lead Counsel Committee for 16 Plaintiffs. 17 MR. GORDON: Your Honor, Ben Gordon on behalf of 18 the Lead Counsel Committee. Sorry it's so loud. 19 MR. FLOWERS: Good morning, Your Honor. Pete 20 Flowers on behalf of the Lead Committee Counsel for 21 Plaintiffs. 2.2 MS. FLEISHMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Wendy Fleishman on behalf of the Lead Committee Counsel for 23 Plaintiffs. 24 25 MR. LANDEVER: Good morning. David Landever here

1 for Eric Kennedy on behalf of Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs. 2 MR. BERNHEIM: Good morning, Your Honor. Jesse 3 Bernheim as State Court Liaison. Thank you. 4 MR. NEMO: Good morning, Your Honor. Tony Nemo 5 from Meshbesher & Spence, Liaison Counsel. THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Moving over to 6 7 Defense? 8 MR. GRIFFIN: Good morning, Your Honors. Tim 9 Griffin on behalf of the Defendants. 10 MS. WOODWARD: Good morning, Your Honors. 11 Woodward on behalf of the Defendants. 12 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And absent objection, 13 unless objection from counsel, I'll decline from announcing 14 either the temperature outside or the windchill factor. I do apologize for those of you that have probably come here 15 16 in good faith and experiencing this quite extraordinary 17 temperature swing. I guess we're going to experience it 18 tomorrow, too, the other way. 19 I'll first indicate that I think we had a very 20 productive discussion in chambers, as we generally meet at 21 8:15. So, absent objection from Defense counsel, I will 2.2 call upon Mr. Flowers or whoever is -- you've agreed that 23 we'll -- maybe you could go through and give us a status 24 report with respect to -- frankly speaking, not only, if

that's agreeable, maybe two of you together can come up and

25

do that. And not only on what we discussed and the issues, but kind of anything else that you think those present and on the phone would be helpful to know kind of where we are and where we're headed, so...

2.2

MR. FLOWERS: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. WOODWARD: Sure. Your Honor, with regard to the current case filings in the MDL and around the country, we actually submitted with the Joint Report, the map, and the Plaintiffs' list. That was at the request of your courtroom staff --

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Yes.

MS. WOODWARD: -- and that's what we'll do going forward.

Those numbers were up to date as of January 16th.

As of yesterday, I can tell you we have 542 cases that are either in the MDL or on their way. 597 cases in New Jersey. In other states, a combination of 74 cases; some of those are removable, some are not. And our total right now is 1,213 cases.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Thank you.

MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, moving to (b) on the agenda, the Plaintiffs had submitted a proposed Pretrial Order No. 10 which included a master long and short-form Complaint, I believe it was a week ago, for your consideration.

We also had talked about and were in the process of submitting an order which would be PTO No. 11, which dealt with service of fact sheets and preliminary disclosure, electronically. We have talked about it between the parties and there is a slight issue in terms of privacy that we're trying to work out. We clearly want to make sure that this happens, but we would hope within the next week we can work out the issue of privacy in terms of HIPAA-related information so that we can get this done and submit an order to you.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, as we discussed in chambers -- it's not an unusual subject to come up. It comes up in a number of contexts. It came up in the *Guidant Boston Scientific* case, that MDL. So, with or without complete agreement, we'll probably get that resolved and I'll do whatever is necessary to help do that in fairness to both parties in the interest of -- you know, we can do it and still, I think, maintain the privacy as is contemplated. So, as we discussed in chambers, it's not an unusual issue to come up.

MS. WOODWARD: And so Your Honor, I just want to add: The Defendants are supportive of PTO No. 11. We think it's a good idea from a case management perspective.

Until we work it out, though, Plaintiffs should serve their disclosures and fact sheets by mail, rather than

electronically. We've gotten a few electronically and they've come to my inbox directly. And that's fine; we're not going to raise an issue about that. But I don't want to wake up one day to 800 fact sheets in my inbox.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Now, this will make everybody's day. We have a Sametime system. They have now some other issue with the conference bridge where it appears that nobody can hear what we're saying. So, whether someone wants to break out in song for the next minute or two, why don't we sit tight just for a moment or two and see if -- they're working on it -- to see if they can get it resolved.

I am not sure what -- it's not unique -- we had both, on our video bridge, for some things between British Columbia this past week and some other state courts -- similar issues. But if we can maybe just sit tight for a couple of minutes -- I'm not going to leave the courtroom and we will -- because I think the concern is until they verify it, that no one can -- we assumed, because it's not unusual to mute the other way, but we assumed they could hear us. Well, it looks like they cannot. So -- and I wished I could put on some music for someone, but -- so, unless there's an objection, while we're sitting here waiting, why don't the other individuals, whether they're lawyers or nonlawyers, I recognize a number of you, unless one or more of you are saying: Look it. This is a public

1	courtroom. We can anonymously come and go if we want. It's	
2	none of your business who we are.	
3	Why don't we just have people introduce	
4	themselves. I know some of you, maybe not all of you. So	
5	we can start over on this side of the room and go my right,	
6	your left. We'll work all the way over to	
7	MR. TALLEY: Stuart Talley from Sacramento,	
8	California.	
9	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.	
10	MS. RASO: Ashleigh Raso from Meshbesher & Spence.	
11	MR. WILSON: I'm Gary Wilson from Robbins, Kaplan	
12	Miller & Ciresi.	
13	MS. PEARSON: I'm Gale Pearson from Pearson,	
14	Randall and Schumacher.	
15	MS. SPAULDING: Good morning, Your Honor. My name	
16	is Pam Spaulding with Meshbesher & Spence. I work with	
17	Tony.	
18	MR. SCHLUETER: Good morning, Your Honor. Richard	
19	Schlueter from Atlanta, Georgia and I'm really enjoying the	
20	weather.	
21	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I thought you might,	
22	yes.	
23	MR. DAVICK: Andrew Davick, Your Honor, with	
24	Meshbesher & Spence.	
25	MR. HELLUMS: Chris Hellums with Pittman, Dutton	

1 and Hellums in Birmingham, and I'm enjoying the weather, as 2 well. 3 MS. OLSON: Good morning, Your Honor. Jackie Olson from Zimmerman Reed. 4 5 MR. JOHNSON: Good morning. Jason Johnson from Zimmerman Reed. 6 7 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Now, for those of you from Meshbesher & Spence, obviously someone who I've known 8 9 for many years, the claim is that Ron Meshbesher is going 10 to, in addition to receiving this award soon from the state 11 bar association, he's going to be retiring. But, his 12 definition of retire may be different than -- is he really going to retire, semi-retire? 13 14 MR. NEMO: He is, Your Honor. I don't think from an observer's standpoint he'll look any different than he 15 16 does now. I think he'll still come to the office every day; 17 but yes, he's officially retiring. 18 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I will believe that 19 when I see it. 20 MR. NEMO: So will I. 21 (Discussion off the record.) 2.2 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: With apologies to 23 whatever the technology problem is -- and if somebody needs 24 to blame somebody, it's my case, my courtroom. I can be 25 blamed. We're not sure what the issue was, but we'll start

over, actually, with permission of counsel, so that we -once we discovered that everybody couldn't hear because some
of you, thankfully, called in. And Brenda, my calendar
clerk, will make sure that people can hear now and then get
that message to me; otherwise, we'll stop again.

We'll start over. And so that we can try to at least make amends to a limited extent. So, shall we begin as if we just came into the courtroom?

MR. FLOWERS: Sure, Your Honor.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: If, in the unfortunate circumstance, I get a note saying it's still a problem, I will let you know.

MR. FLOWERS: We'll become good at this on the third try, Your Honor.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, just so it's I'm hoping this is just a second try, because, you know, for the baseball fans out there that -- what's that phrase? Three strikes and you're out.

Whenever you're ready. Thank you.

We're going to go down the agenda now for those listening on the phone. And then at the end of this -- at the end of this hearing, I will -- we'll be passing out -- I made some changes we discussed back in chambers on some of the upcoming couple of the months' schedules, and that's mostly my trial schedule and so that's my doing, not the

1 lawyers. 2 But, we'll announce those and we'll put actually a 3 sheet out on line and pass one out today on a couple of changes. The first one comes in April and May. So, but we 4 5 can proceed whenever you're ready, Counsel. And I'm wondering, since no one could hear 6 7 anything, if you don't mind, if I could just have both counsel at the podium and then counsel just repeat their 8 9 introductions and in what capacity they appear. 10 So we can start with Mr. Flowers. 11 MR. FLOWERS: Good morning again, Your Honor. Pete Flowers on behalf of the Lead Counsel Committee for the 12 13 Plaintiffs. 14 MS. WOODWARD: Good morning, Your Honors, Karen 15 for the Defendants. 16 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Good morning, Your Honors, 17 Genevieve Zimmerman, the Stryker, LCC. MR. GORDON: Ben Gordon for the LCC also. 18 19 MR. NEMO: Good morning, Your Honor. Tony Nemo 20 Liaison Counsel for the District Court. 21 MR. BERNHEIM: Good morning, Your Honor. Jesse 2.2 Bernheim, State Court Liaison Counsel. 23 MR. LANDEVER: Good morning, Your Honor. David 24 Landever here for Eric Kennedy on the Lead Counsel 25 Committee.

MS. FLEISHMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Wendy Fleishman on behalf of the Plaintiffs.

2.2

MR. GRIFFIN: Good morning, Your Honors. Tim Griffin on behalf of the Defendants.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Whenever you're ready.

MS. FLEISHMAN: All right, Your Honor. So dealing with Item 1 on the agenda, we submitted with the filing of the Joint Report and Status Conference Agenda, the list of Plaintiffs' counsel, the number of cases by counsel, as well as the map that we typically provide to the Court at each status conference. That will be the procedure going forward. Those numbers will be provided at the staff's request with the filing of the Joint Report. But I do have some updated numbers.

Those numbers that were filed with the Joint Report were updated as of January 16th. As of yesterday, the cases that are in the MDL are on their way, total of 542, cases in New Jersey State Court, 597. In the other states where there are cases, we have a total of 74. Some of those — that's actually different from what was previously submitted because some of those have now been transferred to the MDL, so that number actually dropped. And that gives us a total at this time of 1,213 cases.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And actually, before you move on to the next item, even though on the agenda it

1 says "Report on Judicial Contacts," I'll just mention something that I think, hopefully, is self evident, in 2 3 addition to stating it appears the system is now working. 4 But, consistent with prior weeks -- and I think what's 5 really contemplated by the MDL Panel, Counsel when we were in chambers for the conference earlier this morning 6 7 indicated a couple of cases with new state judges. And it's 8 my practice, I will reach out and give a call just in the 9 interest of: One, they have the contact information; and 10 two, that they know that one of our primary goals is to 11 coordinate things together if at all possible, without 12 compromising the rights or responsibilities of whether it's 13 the Court or the parties. 14 So, I will do that with a couple of the newer 15 cases filed. So, with that, we can move on with the agenda. 16 MS. WOODWARD: So, Your Honor, with regard to 17 judicial contacts, we identified two new judges. And we'll 18 provide that information to you, but wanted to point out 19 that there is a new consolidated proceeding in Palm Beach 20 County, Florida that's been assigned to a Judge Hafele and 21 we'll provide you his information --2.2 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And I will reach out to him. 23 24 Then on Agenda Item No. 2, MR. FLOWERS: 25 Your Honor, back in January we had drafted a master

long-form and short-form complaints, provided them to

Defendants. They made comments. And then we submitted on

January 14th to you PTO No. 10 which includes both an order,

as well as the long-form and short-form complaints, and

we're just waiting for your ruling on it.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We'll do that today.

MR. FLOWERS: Terrific. Thank you. The next item 2 (b), Your Honor, is proposed PTO No. 11, which deals with electronic service of fact sheets and preliminary disclosures. While we all generally agree that that is something that we want to accomplish for efficiency purposes, there is a privacy issue that we need to deal with concerning the electronic service of HIPAA-related information. We're working together to solve that problem. Hopefully, we'll have it solved by next week so that these documents can be served electronically on the Defendants.

MS. WOODWARD: And I do want to state, Your Honor, until that problem is solved, if the parties could serve their fact sheets and preliminary disclosures the old-fashioned way, service by mail, that would be appreciated.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And then I'll just indicate as I did earlier so that the folks listening in can hear, this is not a unique issue to come up in cases, and oftentimes -- not every case, but oftentimes if there's some

specially-tailored order that needs to be done so the responsibility is placed on the shoulders of the Court so we can make sure there's no concerns by either party -- without minimizing the importance of it, of course -- we'll work with you on whatever is necessary to do that.

2.2

MR. FLOWERS: Thank you, Your Honor. Agenda Item No. 3 are matters subject to ongoing conferral. The first one is Defendants' response to master complaints, which we've talked about and continue to talk about.

Similarly, (b) is Defendants' fact sheets. We have talked about this, and are proposing something similar to New Jersey. We'll continue to talk about that and hopefully have that issue, as well as (a), set for either briefing or entry of an order here before the next status conference.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

MR. FLOWERS: And then C concerns alternative dispute resolution, Your Honor. We've had preliminary conversations about that, and we're going to sit down and have a long conversation about that whole potential process. At the same time, however, we're going to continue to plow ahead obviously with the case, with the discovery, with the litigation, itself. But maybe we can see if there is a possibility to go through some sort of ADR on some cases. However, we want to make sure it's very structured from both

sides so that it's efficient and actually accomplishes its intended purposes. That is why we're going to sit down and really refine how to potentially do this.

2.2

MS. WOODWARD: And Your Honor, Defendants feel that it makes sense for the parties to sit down and discuss implementing a mediation program similar to what's in New Jersey. But, I think, as Mr. Flowers stated, we will — there will be some differences, most likely, to accommodate for this litigation in the MDL. The New Jersey mediation program, from our perspective, has been very successful. They settled another case yesterday. They're moving on to identifying ten more cases for mediation from what they call the general pool of cases that are eligible to be mediated. And then five additional cases that will be mediated involving Plaintiffs who are over the age of 80.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Now, are these cases -- and I'll repeat a couple of things in a moment that I said back in chambers. Are these cases being -- and this came up at a prior status conference. Are they being randomly selected, or are they kind of trying to pick representative cases, you know, with an eye towards the bellwether system, if you know?

MS. WOODWARD: Well, I think the way they set it up was a general pool of cases was created. Plaintiffs had an option to go in, put their cases into this general pool.

From that general pool, the Judge chose some at random, and then each side chose some cases to participate.

I'm sure, as the sides chose their cases, they had certain parameters in mind. I don't know that they have, however, gotten into the details about, you know, buckets of injuries and that sort of thing, which is what I think Mr. Flowers and I want to sit down and talk about.

MR. FLOWERS: Agreed.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: The other question on that, and then I'll just repeat a couple of things I said in chambers about that. Are the terms of the settlement and the very specific details -- not only the settlement, but the characteristics of the plaintiff and the merits of the case, are they then disclosed to everyone?

MS. WOODWARD: No, Your Honor. The terms of the settlement have been held confidential.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Because that's,

like -- as I said in chambers, there's all sorts of

different techniques, but apart from New Jersey, one of the

-- even though I'm a -- I've said before in these hearings,

that apart from settlement issues, I'm going to be a poster

child for the bellwether system.

But the key to that, and I would suggest the key to kind of settlements that are meaningful, and there is more than one way to do these things, we discussed this in

chambers. On the one hand, the criticism of the bellwether system is, well, if one side picks their best case or the other side the weakest case, and then they get settled or tried, the majority of the people look at it and say: Well, that case -- and it's public -- that case bears no resemblance to mine, so my case is worth a lot more than that or less. So picking truly representative cases becomes so crucial; and again, emphasizing that one size doesn't fit all. There are many useful ways to customize, whether it's the case management plan, which to the credit of the attorneys here, I know you've been discussing that, so we understand that.

2.2

And consistent with my responsibility to structure a case management plan with trial dates and bellwether cases in back, at the same time discuss where settlement or ADR fits into that in our District. Of course, as I've mentioned, in the past we've had one of our Magistrates; in this case, it would be Magistrate Judge Noel. And then, of course, in the *Guidant* case, the parties could agree on one additional person, and that was Pat Juneau out of New Orleans.

And I'll just use *Guidant* as an example. They picked five categories of recovery. And there was some discussion about, well -- and there was five bellwether trials set. And I think I've said before, some of the

parties said: We need some decisions. So, I think I decided eight or nine or ten summary judgment motions, maybe 15 Daubert motions and some other issues.

2.2

I don't -- frankly, I'd have to retrace the steps -- I don't claim those were crucial to these five categories of settlement, but there were five categories with numbers associated. Like examples would be explant with complications, explant without, no explant, and we had five categories. And, amazingly, as a number of lawyers know, out of a couple thousand cases, all cases settled because they could all see the range of recovery. And even though there were rights of an appeal, to me, I think I heard one or two.

And so there's more than one way, but whatever we can do, because -- I won't say this more than once today, hopefully, but obviously one of the ongoing criticisms of the MDL process is it's very costly. And so, as the saying goes, if the Judge can't help all parties realize the economies of scale and spend less money and move the case along without compromising your rights, there is no other justification for an MDL. So, whatever we can do to assist in that. I know both Magistrate Judge Noel had some questions when he was on the phone back in chambers this morning and we had, I think, a very useful discussion. And I do appreciate the high level of communication going on

between all parties.

2.2

And maybe more than enough said by me. I don't know if either one of you want to say anything further on that because I think we're all kind of on the same page on moving along both with a case management order in the near future, and to discuss where in there a mediation or ADR process would fit and what decisions need to be made or what discoveries are needed, if any, to make that meaningful. So, probably enough said by me, so...

MR. FLOWERS: That's all from our perspective,
Your Honor.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We can move on.

MR. FLOWERS: Sure, Your Honor. So moving on to (d), which is ESI and (e) which is discovery, since they kind of run hand-in-hand. We had a productive ESI meeting in New York in December where some of us were in person, for instance Mr. Gordon was there, and some of us were on the phone. And we worked out a lot of the issues, a lot of key issues.

Obviously, there are a lot of ongoing issues. We have another meeting scheduled today right after court where we're going to sit down probably for several hours and go through some of the issues.

In terms of discovery, documents have been turned over to us, the same documents that were turned over in

New Jersey. In going through those documents, or beginning to go through those documents, one issue that we're going to discuss today is a lot of the documents are in French. And some may be in German, as well. And we're going to try and work out some issue on that, because we're not sure if they've been translated in English or not. But it's clearly going to be -- potentially be an issue that we have to deal with going forward.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: You're not fluent in French?

MR. FLOWERS: Mr. Gordon actually is.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, I guess.

MS. WOODWARD: Problem solved, right?

MR. FLOWERS: However, he only has 24 hours in a day, so we figured it might be a little bit too much for him. So that is an issue. We're also hoping to discuss the beginning of how Stryker is going to roll out the remaining discovery, including custodians and all of the stuff that you would normally see in any litigation. But that's something that hopefully we're going to have a discussion today. This will undoubtedly be on every agenda and we'll just slowly and surely move forward. Because, to me, the key to having a successful litigation from everyone's perspective is to get the discovery, move through the discovery, so we can continue to push forward.

MS. WOODWARD: And Plaintiffs actually did serve discovery on Tuesday, so I think that will help guide the issues in the discussions in the coming weeks.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

MR. FLOWERS: Then on (b), Your Honor, which you've alluded to, we will submit to the Defendants a proposed case management plan, full case management plan early next week and we will meet and confer and talk about it.

Our goal is if we cannot reach an agreement, we will set it up for briefing prior to the next hearing so that you can rule on it.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: So, if some of the other parties that are either present in the courtroom or listening -- and you probably recall the understanding that we have, and it just seems to have worked in other cases. The lawyers understand, the parties understand they can submit letter briefs, then, to hold down costs and extra hearings absent some emergency, because then we promise to be available, not just when we get together for these conferences. That then we, with or without oral argument -- oftentimes with brief oral argument -- we will hear those the day that we're here. So it would be the next conference, if there are any issues. And that system has usually served us well in the past.

So that's what we -- so when they refer to briefing schedules, they understand that we've agreed that those would come in in advance of the hearing consistent with the existing orders. Then we'd hear those when you're here in town, so to speak. So, all right?

2.2

MR. FLOWERS: The next issue on the agenda is (g) which is tolling. We have agreed on -- the parties have agreed on tolling for Stryker Ireland Corporation, which we will submit an order to them on. We're also asking for tolling on a French entity, given the production that we've received thus far and potentially the issues. I believe that's an issue that we're going to get a response on early next week.

Similarly, we asked for previously and discussed today, potentially tolling non-revised Stryker cases in order to not clutter up the MDL system and the Court.

Obviously there is a concern always from the Plaintiffs' perspective on not filing a case because of the statute of limitation. But the flip side of it is if you're filing cases where the person hasn't been revised yet, that can be inefficient. So, our suggestion to the Defense was to toll those cases. And I think they're taking it under consideration.

MS. WOODWARD: Yes. This issue was raised as we were putting together the Joint Report. And as Your Honor

recognizes there are lots of concerns around that issue. So, it's going to take some careful thought.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, and as we discussed in chambers, one of the observations -- and I guess, frankly speaking, sometimes apart from this case, criticisms of MDLs is well, the cases -- the very best cases maybe don't recover what they should recover, and then there's a lot of cases that wouldn't be free-standing cases that kind of get grouped in.

Well, that's in part where tolling comes in, because on the one hand, the added expense and everybody's saying: Well, the two-year statute is up or the three or the four. So in comes a bunch of cases, so there are pros and cons to both that and the expense associated with it, and the inventories versus some type of tolling agreement. So, there are issues important to both of you, and I understand that.

I guess that comes up in almost every one of these cases. So, hopefully, with or without court decision, we'll -- the important thing it's obviously something on your radar. And I'm sure there are other people out there, as you've mentioned a couple of examples in states with two-year statutes where those are things being discussed probably as we speak. So --

MR. FLOWERS: Right. Then, Your Honor, moving on

the disputed items, proposed PTO No. 12, which is the common benefit proposed order. We have talked on that. We circulated a newer version of it more recently. What's clearly going to happen is we're going to need to letter-brief it.

2.2

Ms. Woodward and I are going to come to some agreement today on the letter briefing schedule, and we'll file our briefs and wait for you to rule.

MS. WOODWARD: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: So hopefully we can coordinate that, too, so maybe even at the next hearing.

Usually, again for those of you listening and some of the folks in the courtroom, depending upon what the schedule is, like on a day like today, then we in advance of people arriving in town, everybody is given notice that goes out on the website, in addition to notice of the parties.

We'll hear those arguments -- it would be late in the morning, or depending on what's going on, right away in the afternoon.

That will all be set up in advance, so that -- and hopefully, the goal is for either a ruling off the bench or a ruling within a couple of days so that we can move on. So that has served us well in the past, kind of, that approach. Because for some people -- and perhaps there are not many -- new to MDLs, they might look at our Local Rules and say:

Oh, no. They're looking at briefing these issues. Well there's 40 days for this if it's a dispositive motion.

2.2

Well, that does not work absent some extraordinary circumstance, until we get to truly dispositive motions. So we owe it to the parties to use this schedule. And as long as there is not someone saying, We deserve input before you drop the gavel or make a decision. So that will be up on the site, as well, when that briefing is done. And then we'll say here's -- when we're hearing it. And if at possible, to respect all of your respective times, if we know that the conference gets over, you know, mid-morning or 10:30-ish or whenever it is, then we usually will try to hear those in the morning. So, all right?

MR. FLOWERS: Okay. And then similarly, 4(b), which is proposed -- well, it's PTO No. 9, which already has been entered, which is an interim protective order. There were two issues -- and this is why it was interim. There were two issues, one dealing with essentially the definition of competitor and how that relates to Plaintiffs' selection of experts.

Similarly, a secondary issue concerned contact by either party with treating physicians. That similarly is going to have to be briefed. We'll also agree upon a briefing schedule to file simultaneous briefs today, because I don't think either of those issues can be resolved between

the parties.

2.2

MS. WOODWARD: I'm not convinced we've concluded our meet and confer efforts on that issue. So it is an issue that does need to be decided, but I hope we can take one more run at it later today.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, as I mentioned in chambers, it's not, again, an issue unique to this case.

Not the exact same issues, although there were some related.

I'll just use again, not to overuse or over-reference the
Guidant case, because there are others as well, whether they are freestanding or MDLs.

Similar issues came up with not just the nature of contact with the treating physician, but then availability of certain of those attending physicians or others as witnesses and expert witnesses. And so I don't think we'll have to reinvent the wheel. We'll just take into account the concerns that each of you have, and then we'll get an order in place that hopefully will be workable for everyone and your clients. So...

MR. FLOWERS: We will work on it this afternoon.

If we can't reach on an agreement, Your Honor, we'll agree on a briefing schedule so that it's decided before the next hearing.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Certainly.

MR. FLOWERS: The next agenda item here is other

1	issues, which I can't think of any other issues.
2	MS. WOODWARD: Nor can I.
3	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, and I'm just
4	going to send back a note, because I promised to pass out a
5	schedule and announce a couple of changes in the schedule.
6	So, I'll just and they were going to bring me unless
7	you want to poll the group and see if there's any other
8	issues that want to come before the Court today?
9	MR. FLOWERS: Not from our perspective,
10	Your Honor.
11	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Do you want a when
12	you say you're going to be meeting, do you want a conference
13	here to be provided to you?
14	MR. FLOWERS: Mr. Griffin has been nice enough to
15	buy us lunch today, so
16	MS. WOODWARD: No. Mr. Gordon is buying lunch.
17	Mr. Griffin is no teasing.
18	MR. GORDON: Two tacos.
19	MR. FLOWERS: So, we will take them up. We're
20	planning to do it back in Minneapolis at one of the offices.
21	But, thank you.
22	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Not the other city,
23	St. Paul?
24	As we speak, Brenda's coming down the hallway with
25	the schedule. So, I'll put a couple of things on the record

even though we'll put those up on the website, as well. But I'll have a sheet to pass out that will be consistent with what we discussed, obviously. Because what we discussed in chambers was that if unless, essentially, everyone on the respective Lead Counsel Committees for each side could not be here, if we're going to make a couple of changes, frankly speaking because of my trial schedule, then we would have to go to Plan B.

So I'll go over those just very briefly in a

2.2

So I'll go over those just very briefly in a moment and give you hard copies. But, we'll put this up on the website. It's just two or three changes to the prospective dates. Most everything stays the same. So we'll do that just shortly if she brings them down.

Anything else for the Plaintiff other than me going through that, briefly, or defense?

MS. WOODWARD: No, Your Honors.

MR. FLOWERS: No, Your Honors.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Can I just have one?

And then I'll just put a couple of things on the record here

and you can just take those back there to everyone.

(Discussion off the record.)

As Brenda passes those out, I'll just indicate for the record, all the dates remain the same as we've had this model. And so, for example, it'll be same time and place. February 20th remains the same, March 20th remains the same.

We will have no status conference in April for two reasons. Well, actually -- well, probably three reasons. It doesn't really matter.

2.2

The primary reason is, any date that would work for me because of a trial I'll be in wouldn't work for a fair number of attorneys involved here. So, there will be no status conference in April, with my promise to make myself available, as well as Magistrate Judge Noel. If there is some issue that needs to be decided. We won't say, See you in May. Then here come the changes, in addition to — and there are just two — in addition to no status conference in April. In part we're doing — we felt justified in doing that because we're moving up the date in May, which is again, because of my trial schedule. From May 15th, we're going to go on May Basket Day — but that doesn't mean we have to exchange May baskets — on May 1st of 2014. So it will be May 1st. And then in June, we're moving from June 19th to June 12th of 2014.

And I'm hoping, both Plaintiff and Defense counsel, does that square with kind of what we chatted back there to make sure, as we hand this out? And all the other dates, until otherwise noted, after June remain the same; no changes.

Now, does that mean if something comes up, we couldn't change it or cancel one or add an additional

1 hearing, depending upon what is needed from the Court? 2 course not. But, those are the changes, and we'll put those up on the website today, as well. 3 And so, one thing: Did you want a conference room 4 5 here or you're going to go to -- you're going to head for beautiful Downtown Minneapolis? 6 7 MR. FLOWERS: We are, Your Honor. Thank you. THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Anything further on 8 9 behalf of the Plaintiffs at this time? 10 MR. FLOWERS: No, Your Honor. 11 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Defendant? 12 MS. WOODWARD: No, Your Honor. 13 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, my apologies for 14 the weather for those of you that -- unless there are some hardcore folks that say: This is what we come to Minnesota 15 16 And if you would have been back in chambers, you would 17 have heard Magistrate Judge Noel say on the phone: Well, 18 don't be too negative about the temperature because 19 sometimes we use that as a settlement tool, because people 20 don't much like it. 21 But, thank you everybody for being here today. 2.2 And I do want to note before we adjourn that I do appreciate 23 -- I don't think anybody has pulled the wool down over my 24 eyes. So I believe that all the appearances are, and maybe

contrary to the stereotype some of the nonlawyer public has

25

1 of lawyers and judges, but I do appreciate what seems to be 2 like a lot of open discussion and communication because 3 that's kind of a key, especially, to -- maybe any case, but 4 especially MDL. So, I appreciate that very much. 5 Regardless of when you're leaving the area, if you're leaving the area today or the next couple of days, 6 7 safe travels, take care, and we will see you soon with the same commitment that if something comes up, we'll schedule 8 9 some on-the-record telephone conference. So we are 10 adjourned. 11 ALL COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 (Adjournment.) 13 14 15 16 I, Jeanne M. Anderson, certify that the foregoing 17 is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in 18 the above-entitled matter. 19 20 21 Certified by: s/ Jeanne M. Anderson Jeanne M. Anderson, RMR-RPR 2.2 Official Court Reporter 23 24 25