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 ) July 17, 2014		
8	All Actions ) 9:55 a.m.		
9			
10	BEFORE <b>THE HONORABLE DONOVAN W. FRANK</b>		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE AND  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, PLLP		
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 (Contir	nued):
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		Comp Weters Consider & DeConta
9		Cory Watson Crowder & DeGaris, PC ANNESLEY H. DeGARIS, ESQ.
10		2131 Magnolia Avenue South Birmingham, Alabama 35205
11		Leiff, Cabraser,
12		Heimann & Bernstein, LLP WENDY R. FLEISHMAN, ESQ.
13		250 Hudson Street, Eighth Floor
14		New York, New York 10013
15		
16	Plaintiffs' Liaison Couns	sel:
17	Liaison Counsel to the	Markhards of Grands The
18	District of Minnesota:	Meshbesher & Spence, Ltd. ANTHONY J. NEMO, ESQ.
19		1616 Park Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404
20	Liaison Counsel to	
21	The State Courts:	Kelly Bernheim & Dolinsky, LLC JESSE BERNHEIM, ESQ.
22		8151 Peters Road, Suite 3200 Plantation, Florida 33324
23		
24		
25		

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
3	Defendants' Lead Counsel:
4	Sedgwick Law LLP
5	KAREN E. WOODWARD, ESQ. 801 S. Figueroa Street, 19th Floor
6	Los Angeles, California 90017-5556
7	
8	Defendants' Liaison Counsel:
9	Stinson Leonard Street LLP
10	TIMOTHY P. GRIFFIN, ESQ. SHUBHA HARRIS, ESQ.
11	150 S. 5th Street, Suite 2300 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
12	minicapolita, minicapola 30102
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## PROCEEDINGS

## IN OPEN COURT

2.2

thank you. First I would welcome everyone, including the lawyers who are on the phone. And just remind counsel, for those that are here, that whether they are speaking from the podium or from counsel table, that unless we speak into these microphones, and Judge Noel and I will try and do the same thing, then the folks on the phone cannot hear.

Something that wouldn't be apparent to anyone other than the individuals who were in chambers with Judge Noel and I up until a few moments ago, but so then -- and then whether counsel wants to address it when we get to that on the agenda, I will leave that up to counsel. But, we will go ahead and rule now.

There was an issue on the August 1st date in the context of PTO Order No. 20 with respect to Defendant Fact Sheets being submitted. First of all, of course, the Order presupposes, and this won't be a surprise to counsel for either party, that these — that you will work in good faith with each other and use best efforts to comply with the Order, because I think the Order is doable.

And in that context, the Court doesn't claim there is a stipulation between the parties, but Judge Noel and I had a chance to discuss it back there. And we will -- to

1 the extent that the Defense has requested August 21st, I 2 will note their objection. To the extent the Plaintiffs 3 have said to give some extension, because we don't claim 4 there is an agreement, I believe August 11th is a Monday, 5 Judge Noel? So, knowing the respective objections of each party, we will extend the submission date to the end of 6 7 business day, which I will define as 5:00 Central Standard 8 Time, Monday, August 11th, and modify that from August 1st. 9 Did you have anything else you wanted to add? 10 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: That is the 11 Defendants Fact Sheet we're talking about. 12 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Fact Sheet, yes. So that's -- and we will reflect that. 13 14 And when we get to that provision on the agenda 15 item, if there is further inquiry or requests for 16 clarification, we can take it up at that time. So, perhaps 17 we could have counsel note their respective -- who is here 18 and your role. We can start with Plaintiffs' counsel first 19 so everybody, not just in the courtroom, but on the phone, 20 knows who is here. 21 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Good morning, Your Honors. 2.2 Genevieve Zimmerman for the Plaintiffs. 23 MR. GORDON: Good morning, Your Honors. Gordon for the Plaintiffs. 24

MR. FLOWERS: Good morning, Your Honors.

25

1 Flowers for the Plaintiffs. 2 MS. FLEISHMAN: Good morning, Your Honors. Wendy Fleishman for the Plaintiffs. 3 MR. DeGARIS: Good morning, Your Honors. Annesley 4 5 DeGaris for the Plaintiffs. MR. NEMO: Good morning, Your Honors. Tony Nemo 6 7 for the Plaintiffs. 8 MR. BERNHEIM: Good morning, Your Honors. Jesse 9 Bernheim for the Plaintiffs. 10 MS. WOODWARD: Good morning, Your Honors. 11 Woodward for the Defendants. 12 MR. GRIFFIN: Good morning, Your Honors. Griffin from Stinson Leonard Street for the Defendants. 13 14 I have with me an associate, Shubha Harris, who is making 15 her first appearance. 16 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Good morning to you 17 all. And something Judge Noel and I didn't discuss, but 18 perhaps we should have is, have you thought about maybe at 19 the next conference with the microphones there, you could 20 kind of come up with an introductory song of some kind, you 21 know, with the harmony on the good morning piece, you know 2.2 with the different tones, and both for Plaintiff and 23 Defense. I am not suggesting we would have to do it 24 altogether, but we can maybe take that up as an agenda item

at the next meeting or have a telephone conference.

25

MR. NEMO: We'll put something together.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: With that in mind, absent an objection, we will walk down through the conference agenda. And then, of course, at the end we can cover anything that is not here that we covered in chambers. So whenever counsel is ready?

And I understand, unfortunately, perhaps for both parties, we have a couple of your lawyers, and you can even feel free to say so, that have been stranded at airports in various parts of the country, one for Plaintiffs, one for Defendants.

MS. WOODWARD: That is right, Your Honor. They were both on the East Coast. Mr. Campillo, I think, might be on a flight right now. He tried to get out last night, but he was unable to do so.

MR. FLOWERS: And Mr. Kennedy extends his apologies. He was in Boston, as well. And his flight got cancelled. He had no way to make it.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And perhaps I could say something I said in chambers. I won't reference the MDL it was or the lawyer's name, but I said in chambers for those of you who weren't there and those of you on the phone that are also listening, that I am surprised, since in one of my former cases I had to disallow -- I just assumed everybody was flying private charter jets into St. Paul,

here, down the street. Because I actually did get that request and did disallow it, and after the plane was sitting on the runway down here. But, unfortunately, with all kidding aside, because that did happen; but, that probably has happened to a number of us in personal and professional situations. So, it is unfortunate. But, we will somehow try to go on without them this morning. So, whenever you are ready.

2.2

MS. WOODWARD: Thank you, Your Honor. A brief update on the MDL filings. We will note that there have been a quite a few filings over the past three weeks. And our numbers are changing daily in terms of actually even being able to process them through our system.

Right now we have a total number of cases filed or on their way to the MDL of 1,857, which I believe is close to where we are on the Plaintiffs' side, is that right?

MR. NEMO: Yeah, we are real close, Judge. We have 1,867 plus 10, which would be that Consolidated Complaint.

MS. WOODWARD: Our New Jersey number hasn't changed. They are at 2,108. And according to our numbers we have about 112 total State Court cases pending.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And perhaps, and maybe if Judge Noel -- should we just have them -- you had made that observation about the parallel increase. And maybe for

1 the benefit of those listening you could just touch on that. THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: 2 Sure. I was going to say that it appears that since I have been coming 3 4 to these conferences starting in, I guess, last September, 5 it appears that the New Jersey numbers and the MDL numbers have sort of grown in tandem. So that now we are both 6 7 hovering around 2,000 cases. And I just made that 8 observation for whatever it is worth. And it appears that 9 people still keep filing cases in New Jersey and people 10 still keep filing cases in the MDL. 11 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And I think there was some suggestion back in chambers that, well, some of this 12 13 may be tied to statute of limitations, as well. 14 MR. FLOWERS: Yeah, there's reasons I think we have seen increases --15 16 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Right. MR. FLOWERS: -- and will continue to see filings. 17 18 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right. We can 19 move on. 20 MS. WOODWARD: With regard to State Court 21 developments, Your Honor, there are a few things we do want 2.2 to bring to your attention. The hearing on the Plaintiffs' 23 motion in Broward County regarding ex parte contact with 24 treating physicians, that did take place in mid-June. 25 An order has not been entered, though the Judge

did ask for further information on a couple of those issues. So, the parties are working with her on that. Though, I do note that she did put in place an interim order that we've not contacted the eight physicians that are identified in that particular motion. So, obviously, we are complying with that Order.

2.2

In addition, in Broward County, the Plaintiffs have filed a Motion to Compel Discovery that we want to bring to Your Honors' attention. We will provide you with a copy of that motion. It covers a number of areas, but could significantly increase the scope of document production in this litigation. So, it is a motion that needs to be carefully considered and coordinated.

Our opposition to the motion is due July 28th, and I believe the hearing date is set for August 6th. So, we will provide that to you right away so that you can reach out to Judge Henning and have some conversations with her about it.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, and I will just indicate as I did in chambers that the lines of communication are open with both Judge Henning and the other Judges, including the presiding Judge in the Palm Beach area. So, I think we have open lines of communication and we have all expressed a willingness and obligation to try to -- you know, everybody has to carry out their own

1 responsibilities, but to coordinate with one another, hopefully, to the benefit of all parties. 2 3 So, I will reach out to them, just as I did with 4 the issue with the ex parte contact with the physicians. 5 And I have said to them what they have said to us, that our goal is to coordinate with, as much as we can, with one 6 7 another. So hopefully, everyone on all sides benefits. 8 we will reach out to them. I will do that, if not today or 9 tomorrow, early next week. 10 MS. WOODWARD: Also, in the State Court case 11 pending in Indiana, there is pending discovery that we would 12 also appreciate Your Honor assisting with coordination of. 13 We will provide you the judicial contact information --14 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right. 15 MS. WOODWARD: -- shortly after the status 16 conference. 17 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right. 18 MS. WOODWARD: That is all I have on State Court 19 developments. 20 MR. FLOWERS: I remain silent, Your Honors. 21 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, and I would just 2.2 indicate, without suggesting that we may not touch on this 23 later on another agenda item, that I continue to have 24 conversation with Judge Martinotti in New Jersey. And he 25 and I are going to -- again, we will try to have some

additional discussions this next week, just because of the -- we know there was a get-together in Philadelphia this past few days. So, we will keep the parties informed of that, as well.

2.2

MS. WOODWARD: Moving on to the next section on the agenda, the report on discovery, I believe our proposed Second Amended PTO 8 has been submitted. And both sides are in agreement with the language that is in that draft amended PTO. And it lays out the fact sheet obligations or lack of obligations for Plaintiffs who have not yet been revised, and what they will need to do if and when their revision surgery does occur, in terms of submitting fact sheets.

MR. FLOWERS: Just for the benefit of -- the people that are on the phone may not have seen this, Your Honors. This specifically deals with not having an obligation to file a PFS if you have not been revised. The obligation switches when you get revised.

MS. WOODWARD: With regard to PTO No. 20, in the Parties Joint Report, we set forth an agreement related to some of the scope of obligations within PTO 20, and I would refer folks who are present or on the phone to section of the Joint Report 2B(i), Parties Agreement.

MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, this basically deals with some obligations that were associated with the bellwether pool PFSs. And essentially, the bellwether pool

remains to be cases that are filed before, or as of April 28th of 2014. And then alleged deficiencies we're dealing with and I've had multiple conversations. And hopefully we'll reach some agreements on some of the issues there, otherwise we will seek your assistance.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: As we said in chambers, that we'll -- and Judge Noel maybe you want to respond to that? We have -- well, just rather than me characterize it, I will go to Judge Noel.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: So, Judge

Frank and I talked about it. In chambers there was some

extended conversation regarding the deficiency letters that

Defendant has been sending pursuant to Pretrial Order No. 20

identifying and highlighting ways in which certain Plaintiff

Fact Sheets are deficient.

There was concern that the Defendant was nitpicking or flyspecking the Plaintiffs Fact Sheets.

Plaintiffs requested that we have some hearing to identify which pieces of the fact sheet are material, or at least to identify some that are immaterial.

Judge Frank and I chatted and concluded that we think that PTO 20 speaks for itself. It will continue to govern. And we are confident that the lawyers will comply with it and administer it in good faith for the purpose that it is intended, which is to come up with a list of a

category of bellwether cases that are bellwether eligible, and then to nominate cases that will ultimately be the bellwether cases. And we have to rely on the lawyers to operate in good faith in getting to that end.

2.2

MS. WOODWARD: Thank you, Your Honor. We will do that. Thank you also for the extension to August 11th for submission of Defendants Fact Sheets in connection with PTO 20.

MR. FLOWERS: Yeah, document production is next, Your Honor. For the record this is Pete Flowers.

The Defendant has produced, and hopefully the remaining 26 materially relevant custodians are in my office by now, but they have produced the other custodians which we have reviewed a majority of the records. We remain concerned, as we pointed out last time in court about the lack of document production in this case, the lack of email production, the lack of any text. And we are very concerned that the production has not been complete.

And we have a 30(b)(6) that is set to proceed in the last week of August, which I think is going to get to this issue. My point just is, at the end of the day is, at the next status hearing, if we do not have a good feeling in terms of where this production is going, you will likely see some sort of motion directed at that, or it may happen after the 30(b)(6) deposition, as well.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

2.2

MS. WOODWARD: And our response to that, Your Honor, is that this issue has come up at several consecutive status conferences. And we believe it is inappropriate to be poisoning the well with this type of information at this time.

There are a lot of reasons why the document production in this case may not be comparable to other litigations. And it is very difficult to compare one litigation to another, even where the products might be products that treat the same part of the body.

For instance, the size of the company, the number of divisions or groups overseeing the product, the number of employees or custodians, how long the custodians worked for the company, how long they worked for a specific product, what their precise responsibilities were, I could literally go on and give you a list of 20 other variables that might be influential.

We are responding to discovery subject to certain parameters of which the Plaintiffs are aware. And it is simply not appropriate at this time to suggest that there is something that would be a cause for concern.

After the deposition is taken -- and I will note that the Plaintiffs participated in a deposition of a witness on electronic discovery last August. So, they are

getting another deposition on this topic. And if there is something that concerns them after taking some depositions, they should raise that issue. We should meet and confer and see if we can't resolve whatever issues are raised, and then that issue should be brought to the Court.

2.2

MR. FLOWERS: Just briefly Your Honors, understanding we truly hope that all of these variables play a role, but being involved in litigations against big medical device companies -- this is not a small company -- we typically see 20 million documents on a case like this. We have seen 78,000 documents. The discrepancy is too big to not have some problem.

In terms of the deposition that previously was conducted, it was actually stopped based on the lack of knowledge of the witness. So, that is why we are going forward. But, Ms. Woodward, I do agree with we will bring this to the Court's attention in the appropriate motion at the appropriate time.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And there is probably no need for us to repeat what we said back in chambers.

Absent an agreement or protocol that is worked out, we will do what we need to do if you put it in front of us. So --

MR. FLOWERS: One additional point on document production, separate, Your Honor, is we are today actually forwarding correspondence to Ms. Woodward with an additional

20-ish custodians that we believe are relevant and asking for their production.

2.2

There's also some document requests we made before where we are asking them to answer them. We have to meet and confer about that, but there are other discovery issues out there is, I guess, my point.

MS. WOODWARD: And that would be our expectation.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

MR. FLOWERS: The next thing on here, Your Honor, is the deposition protocol. What we did on this is we reached out to the New Jersey Plaintiffs and the liaison Mr. Bernheim for Florida. And we had a joint call with Stryker and agreed upon a protocol for depositions, a general protocol which involves two days, generally, for the depositions of an individual, as a general rule. There could be one. There may be instances where we request three, seven hours a day. One questioner, typically from each jurisdiction. The Plaintiffs, themselves, from the jurisdictions are going to have to agree on the split of time. But, I think we've essentially decided on that protocol, agreed on that protocol with one maybe issue with videoing it, but we are going to try and deal with that before we do anything else.

MS. WOODWARD: Our expectations on protocol will be submitted --

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

MS. WOODWARD: -- before the next status conference.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

MR. FLOWERS: The next agenda item, Your Honor, is depositions. The MDL has served, they served -- we served five 30(b)(6)s and two regular dep notices. The dep notices are for two individuals who are involved in testing and premarket actions involving both the Rejuvenate and the ABG.

The five 30(b)(6)s we met and conferred on, we actually reduced some of the topics in those. We agreed upon three deps to go forward. One deals with this whole issue of e-mail retention, litigation holds, things of that nature. The second deals with device failures, the analysis of device failures internally at Stryker. The third deals with marketing of the devices.

We agreed that the depositions will begin to proceed the last week of August. I have actually forwarded correspondence two days ago to Mr. Campillo with the order in which we would like them to proceed, and that was pursuant to an agreement amongst the jurisdictions, as well. So, we are off to the races on depositions, and we have got a lot to do, obviously.

MS. WOODWARD: We do. We have had some very successful meet and confers on these deposition topics. So,

1	that is a success that we should note for the future.
2	MR. FLOWERS: Celebrate?
3	MS. WOODWARD: Celebrate.
4	MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, we had previously both
5	submitted letters consenting to Judge Boylan being involved,
6	as you deem fit. So, that's kind of all we have
7	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, and what I said
8	in chambers is I will send out, before we sign the order
9	confirming that or making it official, I will send you out
10	an order as the statute and rule requires. And we will act
11	accordingly in the next few days. So
12	MR. FLOWERS: Okay, thank you.
13	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Yes, and that includes
14	Judge Noel getting a copy, too. So
15	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: Thank you.
16	MS. WOODWARD: Your Honor, I am going to turn the
17	podium over to my colleague, Mr. Griffin.
18	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.
19	MS. WOODWARD: Thank you.
20	MR. FLOWERS: The next thing on here, Your Honor,
21	is the deadline for Stryker to answer the Master Long Form
22	Complaint, Short Form Complaint, or bring some type of
23	motion. Prior to court today, we agreed on a deadline of
24	August 18th if that meets with your approval.
25	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I think we confirmed

that, yes.

2.2

MR. GRIFFIN: That was a deadline to respond to the Master Long Form Complaint, August 18th?

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Yes.

MR. FLOWERS: The next two things, I should let you deal with.

MR. GRIFFIN: Sure. As the Court noted, there was a Motion to Amend the Complaint in one of the member actions. The Plaintiff's last name was Jenks. I have had communications with Plaintiff's counsel in Jenks. And the Defendants have consented to amendment and Plaintiff's counsel has agreed to file a Short Form Complaint prior to August 1st.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

MR. GRIFFIN: The next item as the Court noted is the recent transfer of a Consolidated Complaint naming 10 Plaintiffs. Here, too, I had communications with Plaintiffs' counsel and requested voluntary severance of those Plaintiffs' claims. Plaintiffs' counsel is not in a position to agree to that. And I am hopeful that absent a court order, the parties are able to resolve the issue without motion practice.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And I don't know if Plaintiff wants to be heard on this? And whether you do or not, then I will indicate what the Court said it would do in

fairness to all parties, including the counsel in this situation.

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

MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, this particular complaint is not from anyone that is sitting in the room right now, so we will just defer to the Court.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Yeah, and what we said in chambers was that this was a Consolidated Complaint naming 10 Plaintiffs from 8 or 9 different states.

And relevant or not, it's rarely permitted in most MDLs across the country. And it is the exception, not the rule, here in this District. And in fairness to the counsel who filed it, even though we have had no direct contact, he had requested to be heard, formally or informally today. But, since there was no -- and I asked my chambers to contact him and indicate through, either directly or through counsel, that I wouldn't permit that today, in part, because we have not generally had that informality with counsel across the country, in any case. But to maximize fairness, what I said in chambers, and I will put it on the record now, we will be reaching out to him through Ms. Brenda Schaffer in my chambers, stating that we will accept a five-page -- not to exceed a five-page letter brief. And this, of course, assumes no agreement, short of either an order to sever and transfer the cases, or other agreement.

And I will reserve the right to seek a response

1 from Plaintiff and Defense counsel and reserve the right to 2 either rule -- we will rule either without further hearing 3 or reserve the right to set it. But, either way, we will 4 resolve this in the immediate future without formal motion 5 practice, because I don't think that would serve the best interests of any of the parties. But, I will permit counsel 6 7 to make a submission to the Court. 8 So, Judge Noel, did you have anything further on 9 that? 10 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: No, nothing 11 further. 12 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And unless either of 13 you have anything further, we can move on. 14 MR. FLOWERS: Thank you. 15 MR. GRIFFIN: Nothing further, Your Honor. 16 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right. 17 MR. FLOWERS: The next thing, Your Honor, is on 18 the stipulation to toll the statute of limitations on the 19 French entities. This is something we agreed a while ago to 20 and we are just putting it in the form of an order. We have 21 exchanged drafts of it and there has been some hold-up in 2.2 terms of getting authority to sign off on the draft and 23 hopefully that will be accomplished within the next two 24 weeks. 25 MR. GRIFFIN: That is correct, Your Honor. At the

last status conference there was a Motion to Amend and the parties were able to resolve that through a tolling agreement. We received a draft. I believe we have a finalized draft subject to authority on behalf of a French entity to execute it, which we hope will be coming in the next day or two.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

MR. GRIFFIN: Your Honor, on the agenda, the last one is the appeal of the Common Benefit Order to the Eighth Circuit.

My understanding is that the Plaintiffs wanted this on the agenda in order to advise the Court of the briefing schedule, which the briefs will be required to be submitted over the next couple of months. We will be seeking to coordinate with Plaintiffs an adjustment to the briefing schedule.

MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, it is factual, but one issue that did arise is whether the Defendant intends to comply with the Order pending this appeal. There has been no stay filed, and we would ask that they do comply with it.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, and I think Ms. Woodward -- and well, all, both Defense counsel said in chambers, and then they will soon correct me if I mischaracterize it, then I will have a suggestion, as well, it is not unique to this type of situation when there is an

appeal and the issue of stay comes up. And that is, "they," meaning Defense counsel, are evaluating that issue at this time and will soon take a position.

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

My suggestion would be is regardless of the outcome of that, because obviously the Plaintiff had said, well absent an order of the Court that the law requires compliance with the Order, that the -- I mean, the way I have seen these handled in the past, separate from the merits of the issue with respect to, not the motion, itself, but the interlocutory appeal issue and the rest of it, that aside, when there is a stay issue sometimes the parties are able to agree to: Well, can we agree to this aspect being stayed, but we will carry out and comply with the rest? Or no, we can't, so the Judge is going to have to rule up or It seems to me there should be that brief discussion. And if we need to make the call on it, we will hopefully in the interests of all parties, we can do that without some -you can file a motion, but we won't have to go through the Local Rules that builds in an extraordinary delay and doesn't help either party. So, if we can't agree on either the status of some type of compliance or whatever the issue may be, or you can't agree once that step is reached, say you can't agree -- well, we can't either agree on how to submit it to the Court, I assume we will get the phone call and then we will just promise to expedite it.

1 Judge Noel, do you have anything further on that? THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: 2 3 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right. 4 MR. FLOWERS: The only other issue, I believe, is 5 just reporting on the status conference being at 2:00 on August 21st, Your Honor. 6 7 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Yeah, and I can say 8 that I am the -- and we will come back to any other issues, 9 and Judge Noel, we may have -- go ahead if you want to 10 consult with counsel. That is an afternoon. 11 And actually, it contemplates that we get together 12 at 1:15 in chambers that day, and then we head to the courtroom at 2:00, or shortly thereafter. And I am kind of 13 14 the culprit with moving it from the morning, because I am 15 trying to, out of respect to the trial, I will in all 16 likelihood still be in -- out of respect to the lawyers and 17 the parties and the jury in that case, I moved it to the 18 afternoon to get in part of a day. 19 And then also we discussed that counsel will be 20 discussing with one another and with Ms. Schaffer in the 21 next -- in the upcoming days trying to adjust a date in 2.2 September, because of the unavailability of one or more 23 counsel. 24 So, we will do our best to work with you on that.

And I guess that is where that sits. And there may be -- I

25

1	will first check with counsel before I check with Judge Noel
2	on other issues you want to put before the Court today, or
3	add to the agenda.
4	MR. GRIFFIN: Your Honor, may I confer with Mr.
5	Flowers for one second?
6	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Oh, certainly. And
7	don't get too close to the mike, or we will hear everything
8	you have to say.
9	(Discussion off the record.)
10	MR. GRIFFIN: Nothing further from the Defense,
11	Your Honor.
12	MR. FLOWERS: Same for the Plaintiff. Nothing,
13	Your Honor. Thank you.
14	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And I don't believe
15	the Court has anything further, unless there was something
16	either Plaintiffs or Defense counsel said, we were hoping to
17	address this or raise this issue of any upcoming events. We
18	weren't going to go any further unless either Plaintiffs'
19	counsel or Defense counsel had something they want to raise.
20	MR. FLOWERS: No thank you.
21	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: Okay. We
22	talked about some stuff in chambers, and
23	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We will leave it
24	there.
25	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: we will

1 leave it there.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, I thank you for -- unless there is anything further, safe travels. I hope you -- your respective co-counsel, if they get to wherever they are trying to head to, I mean we have all been in that situation probably with personal or, personal or professional issues in travel these days. So, we will adjourn the hearing.

And other than please reach out to us if there is an issue between now and the August get-together. And then you will be hearing from us with a proposed order on just finalizing the presence of -- it is always hard not to say, Judge Boylan -- what do they say now that he is retired?

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: I call him

Art. And he calls me Frank.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Yes, and of course, if he were here, he would correct us and say: Don't use that judge stuff. But, it is always more, probably, uncomfortable for a lawyer saying: Well, do we say retired judge? Or, we are not going to say Art or Artie, or something else.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: Artie is his son, who also appears before us.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Yes. We see him on a frequent basis.

1	With that, I wish everybody safe travels. And
2	obviously, I think there was a couple of things said here in
3	the courtroom. As soon as I get the information on, whether
4	it is the presiding Judge in Indiana and the other
5	information, I will reach out to them. And whatever
6	exchanges I have with the Florida Judges and the New Jersey
7	Court, we will update the parties as that goes along. And
8	we will stand adjourned at this time.
9	ALL COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
10	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Thank you all. We are
11	adjourned.
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
22	Official Court Reporter
23	
24	
25	