1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA
3	
4)
5	IN RE: STRYKER REJUVENATE) Case No. 13-MD-2441(DWF/FLN) AND ABG II HIP IMPLANT)
6	PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION))
7	
8) St. Paul, Minnesota This Document Relates to) July 16, 2015 All Actions) 9:46 a.m.
9)
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DONOVAN W. FRANK
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE AND MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRANKLIN L. NOEL
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13	STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
14	APPEARANCES:
14 15	APPEARANCES: FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel
15	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Chairperson: Meyers & Flowers PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ.
15 16	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Chairperson: Meyers & Flowers
15 16 17	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Chairperson: Meyers & Flowers PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ. 225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 1515 Chicago, Illinois 60606 Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel
15 16 17 18	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Chairperson: Meyers & Flowers PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ. 225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 1515 Chicago, Illinois 60606 Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Members: Meshbesher & Spence, Ltd. GENEVIEVE M. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ.
15 16 17 18	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Chairperson: Meyers & Flowers PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ. 225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 1515 Chicago, Illinois 60606 Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Members: Meshbesher & Spence, Ltd.
15 16 17 18 19 20	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Chairperson: Meyers & Flowers PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ. 225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 1515 Chicago, Illinois 60606 Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Members: Meshbesher & Spence, Ltd. GENEVIEVE M. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. 1616 Park Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404 Official Court Reporter: JEANNE M. ANDERSON, RMR-RPR
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Chairperson: Meyers & Flowers PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ. 225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 1515 Chicago, Illinois 60606 Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Members: Meshbesher & Spence, Ltd. GENEVIEVE M. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. 1616 Park Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404 Official Court Reporter: JEANNE M. ANDERSON, RMR-RPR Suite 146 U.S. Courthouse 316 North Robert Street
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Chairperson: Meyers & Flowers PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ. 225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 1515 Chicago, Illinois 60606 Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Members: Meshbesher & Spence, Ltd. GENEVIEVE M. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. 1616 Park Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404 Official Court Reporter: JEANNE M. ANDERSON, RMR-RPR Suite 146 U.S. Courthouse

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	For the Plaintiffs:
3	Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Members (Continued):
4	Zimmerman Reed, PLLP
5	CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. 1100 IDS Center
6	80 S. 8th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2015
7	Minneapolis, Minnesoca 33402 2013
8	Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.A.
9	BEN GORDON, JR., ESQ. 316 S. Baylen Street, Suite 600
10	P.O. Box 12308 Pensacola, Florida 32591
11	
12	Cory Watson Crowder & DeGaris, PC ANNESLEY H. DeGARIS, ESQ.
13	2131 Magnolia Avenue South Birmingham, Alabama 35205
14	Taiff Calamagan
15	Leiff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP WENDY R. FLEISHMAN, ESQ.
16	(Appearing by telephone) 250 Hudson Street, Eighth Floor
17	New York, New York 10013
18	Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel:
19	Liaison Counsel to the
20	District of Minnesota: Meshbesher & Spence, Ltd. ANTHONY J. NEMO, ESQ.
21	1616 Park Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404
22	MIIIIIeapolis, MIIIIIesota 30404
23	Liaison Counsel to The State Courts: Kelley Bernheim & Dolinsky, LLC
24	MICHAEL E. GALLANT, ESQ.
25	2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. 4th Floor Washington, D.C. 20037-1701

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):	
2	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:	
3	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:	
4	Defendants' Lead Counsel:	
5	Gibbons, P.C. KIM M. CATULLO, ESQ.	
6 7	One Pennsylvania Plaza 37th Floor New York, New York 10119-3701	
8		
9	Defendants' Liaison Counsel:	
10	Stinson Leonard Street LLP 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 2 IN OPEN COURT 3 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: You may all be seated. 4 Thank you. Why don't we have introductions of counsel, 5 first. And then I will remind everyone -- I will welcome everybody who is appearing by telephone, as well -- and I 6 7 will just remind everyone of what Ms. Schaffer reminded Judge Noel and I: Please speak into the microphone. And 8 9 these aren't the fancy microphones, as you know like 10 entertainers have. 11 So, if you are too far away from them, it won't 12 pick you up. So, maybe we can start with Plaintiffs' counsel first? 13 14 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Good morning, Your Honor.

15 Genevieve Zimmerman for Plaintiffs.

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

16 MR. GORDON: Good morning, Your Honors. Gordon for Plaintiffs. 17

MR. FLOWERS: Good morning, Your Honors. Pete Flowers for the Plaintiffs.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Good morning, Your Honors. is Bucky Zimmerman for the Plaintiffs.

MR. DeGARIS: Good morning, Your Honors. Annesley DeGaris for the Plaintiffs.

MR. NEMO: Good morning, Your Honors. Tony Nemo for the Plaintiffs.

1 MR. GALLANT: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael 2 Gallant for the Plaintiffs. 3 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We will go over to the 4 Defense. 5 MS. CATTULO: Good morning, Your Honors, Kim Catullo for the Defendants. 6 7 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I think -- is the 8 little green light on there? 9 MS. CATTULO: There we go. Good morning, Your 10 Honors. Kim Catullo for the Defendants. 11 MR. GRIFFIN: Good morning, Your Honors. Tim Griffin for the Defendants. 12 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And I would welcome 13 14 everyone else who is here, whether they are in the 15 courtroom, on the phone. 16 If we can then proceed with -- we have two agenda 17 items, and then there will be something as Judge Noel and I 18 mentioned in the get-together in chambers this morning that 19 we always have beforehand, that we would be discussing with 20 you not just the settlement program status, but also some 21 important issues, not unique to this case at this stage of 2.2 reaching out with and coordinating things with the lawyers 23 in both the MDL, the State cases, whether they are in other 24 states like New Jersey, Florida, Michigan or other states.

And so, we will talk about that as well so we can all try to

25

work together cooperatively.

2.2

But, before we do that, why don't we proceed first with the settlement program status, and then maybe as part of that, because we had asked it in the chambers, as well, about any updates on the registration data and any update issues with the registration.

So, shall we start with Plaintiffs first? Mr. Flowers?

MR. FLOWERS: Thank you, Your Honor. In terms of the settlement, Your Honor, we are happy to report that everything is moving forward smoothly. We reached the 95 percent necessary threshold nationally, I believe, and all of the dates have been followed in the MSA. The first funding of a large portion of the case is occurring, frankly as we speak, with additional fundings to come shortly. So, we are happy to report that that is going forward as planned with the super majority of the filed cases involved in that.

MS. CATTULO: I agree, Your Honor. Kim Cattulo for the Defendants. Mr. Flowers is correct. We have met all of those dates. The first funding has occurred, and the second funding is already in process.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Do you want to also address -- and any other issue that you feel you would like to update the Court on on the registration issue, as well?

MS. CATTULO: Sure, Your Honor. If I may, on that

issue, I think the Court is correct to raise that. As folks may recall, pursuant to the first Order that was entered by the Court after the settlement was announced, registration did occur. That was the first step, to know what the universe is out there. And that was cut off, as agreed, by December 20, I believe, was the date, 2014.

2.2

So, we have had some folks ask to update, and then we let that happen. And then it got to a point where we just were in the middle of dealing with the actual settlement process, itself. So, that stopped.

And so, there are a number of people, either registrants who have updated status, for example, people who registered as unrevised, who are now revised, as well as other people who have since retained counsel, have since, you know, been identified who are not part of that registration. So, I do think it makes sense actually across the country, probably, including the other litigations, to have an updated registration. That is not enrollment, it is different than that. But, just to know what that universe is both for court purposes and, I think, the parties, as well.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Mr. Flowers?

MR. FLOWERS: We agree, Your Honor. We think it is a good idea.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: I'm sorry,

1 could I just ask, the original order for the registration, can you refresh our recollection as to the date of that 2 3 order or the number? Or --4 MS. CATTULO: I believe, Your Honor, I believe it 5 was right around the time of, literally, the settlement announcement, November 3rd --6 7 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: Back in November? 8 9 MS. CATULLO: -- but I will -- I don't have that 10 Order in front of me, here. 11 MR. FLOWERS: We will have it shortly, Your Honor. 12 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: 13 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: It is that short-term 14 memory loss, Judge Noel, that we experience. Not you, of 15 course, but me. 16 Is there anything in that context that would be 17 helpful? For example, I can state now -- we will talk about 18 it more before we conclude, but we had indicated during our 19 status conference that I will be reaching out in the next 20 couple of days to the Florida Judges, and once I have the 21 contact information of the Michigan Judge, and then the

Judge I have had the most contact with, who is by the way

nominated for a Federal Judgeship, Judge Martinotti, to have

another status conference that led to the May Order, and I

will talk more about that.

2.2

23

24

25

1 And Brenda -- PTO Order 25. 2 MR. FLOWERS: That is what Ms. Zimmerman just 3 handed to me, as well. 4 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I would like to 5 pretend that I recall that --THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: Thank you. 6 7 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: But Brenda Schaffer 8 just brought it up and handed it to me. So -- but, since I 9 will be reaching out to and setting up a status conference 10 with them, much like we did before that May Order when we 11 all were working together. 12 Is that something -- it seems like that is 13 something that I should discuss with the other Judges, as 14 well? 15 MS. CATTULO: I think that makes sense, Your 16 Again, I think Judge Martinotti actually entered an 17 order right around the same time that this Court did for 18 registration. I believe the other Judges recommended 19 strongly that counsel participate in registration, so I do 20 think that makes sense. 21 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right. Anything 2.2 else before, perhaps, the Court -- we address a couple of 23 things we did in chambers that we raised on the settlement 24 piece.

MR. FLOWERS: The only other -- not on the

25

1 settlement piece, Your Honor. Not from the Plaintiffs' 2 perspective. 3 MS. CATTULO: Agree, Your Honor. THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, why don't you go 4 5 ahead, Mr. Flowers? You were about to say, "The only 6 other," and then you stopped and said, "not on the 7 settlement piece." 8 MR. FLOWERS: And I stopped myself. 9 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Go ahead. 10 MR. FLOWERS: I actually was just going to the 11 second agenda item which is short. 12 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Why don't you go 13 ahead? 14 MR. FLOWERS: A short thing. There were some cases that were voluntarily dismissed that the Plaintiffs' 15 16 lawyers who represent those individuals would like 17 reinstated. There is a series of five cases. If it is okay 18 with you, Your Honor, I was just going to read them into the 19 record. 20 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Sure. 21 MR. FLOWERS: There is the Bowles case, 2.2 B-o-w-l-e-s, that is 14-01790. The *Hogan* case, 13-2053. 23 The Williams case, 13-2054. And the Reed case, 13-2055. 24 Those were all represented by the McGlamry Pope firm, who I 25 believe is on the phone, and has indicated that they would

like those cases reinstated.

2.2

MS. CATTULO: Your Honor, there is one other case, as well, which is filed by the Aylstock Witkin firm. I have spoken to and emailed with Doug Kreis about that being reinstated. The name of that case is *Henrietta Palmer*, and the case number is 14-5077. That was re-filed in Broward County, Florida. And Mr. Kreis has agreed to dismiss that from Florida as long as it is reinstated into the MDL.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, I would just say two things. One, I would like to commend the lawyers on all sides on how they have kind of resolved this, because it makes sense to me.

And then secondly, as I said in chambers, part of this the Court has to take responsibility for -- not the commendation part, but I will criticize myself, because I am not going to criticize the Clerk's Office.

As I was signing the orders, and it is my responsibility to know how our filing system works, I wasn't aware, but that is my responsibility -- no one else's -- that until that order gets done, all parties aren't notified.

And so, that responsibility lies with the Court, no one else, not the lawyers. And so -- but I do appreciate how it was resolved. That makes perfect sense.

Other items, by either counsel?

MR. FLOWERS: No, Your Honor.

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

MS. CATTULO: No, Your Honor.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well maybe this is -and feel free to jump in, Judge Noel. I think it would be fair to say so those that are in the courtroom who weren't as part of the status conference in chambers that we always have, and those that are on the phone, one of the things we will be doing is -- not unlike what we did, but for similar but additional reasons, what we did prior to the May Order that we discussed with the stay through September 1st is, one, as I said not just today, but in other days, to the extent that a criticism for many years of MDL's, and sometimes that criticism comes to the Federal Bench, sometimes to the State Bench, sometimes to all of us, is not working together and meeting and conferring, reaching out to one another, coordinating, not just a discovery plan to hold down costs, but also giving the cases that remain, opt-out cases, other cases, calendar priority to come up with a trial management plan.

I will give you an example I didn't give in chambers. We did such a thing in the Guidant cases, as some of you know in here. And so, I actually sat down with two State Judges, and we coordinated -- the discovery plan, the lawyers reached out to one another both in the State cases and the MDL with, I think, few disagreements. And we got

involved, worked out a discovery plan.

2.2

And then also, they worked out, but they needed the Judges to work together to coordinate a trial management plan. We actually, as a group, sat down and came up with a trial management plan and coordinated trial dates, hearing dates, for every remaining case. Because it was many of the same witnesses with the experts, other things, and without delay and with calendar priority.

So, we actually coordinated day certain settings, because sometimes it involved, if not the same lawyers, people who wanted to be at the -- so, sometimes the same witnesses, sometimes not. We coordinated everything together. Neither side said: I am going. I am not going to talk to you.

So, my goal will be -- and that part I didn't -because that, specifically, as one or two lawyers in the
room know, that is kind of what we ended up doing when we
came up with that plan so one wouldn't conflict with the
other. And we already agreed then to a coordinated
discovery plan, where everybody met and conferred in the
State and Federal cases and we worked out a coordinated
plan.

I will, much like what predated the May Order, I will get on the phone immediately with the Judges that we talked to, Judge Martinotti. And he and I have had -- I

have had more contact with him than the other State Judges.

But, the two Judges, including Judge Henning in Florida, and then the Judge in Michigan, and any others that are involved, and I will set up a status conference.

2.2

And as I will say here on the record in the courtroom, and I actually don't think -- and Judge Noel can jump in if he wishes. I think you would all agree to this before we even discussed it and encouraged it, and that is for the lawyers to reach out to all of the Plaintiffs' lawyers in the state cases and see if we can all work together, meet and confer. And then I will be doing the same with the State Judges.

So we can try to come up with one discovery plan that will be consistent with the existing order that took us through September 1st. But, I think we should go to work on that immediately and all work together and see if we can come up with one plan. That will be my goal to work with the State Judges and set up something immediately. And I will frankly tell them that we have asked all of the lawyers in our case to reach out and work with the State lawyers and see if we can come up with one plan that suits everybody's needs.

And then we will keep our end up on the May Order that promised calendar priority and expedited schedules.

Because, let's phase it, the largest criticism of these

cases is that State and Federal people don't work and coordinate together and move things along. And we will do our very best to do that.

2.2

And I think, Judge Noel, as we said, if all of this meet and conferring is going on and trying to come up with a package both on the discovery plan, including all cases across the country that are left in a trial package plan, including, we can discuss coordinated day certain settings and other issues as we have done in other cases.

If for some reason, either to seek agreement on an issue that the lawyers have agreed on before our next get-together, which will be Wednesday, September 2nd at the same times, or you reach kind of an impasse trying to coordinate, nationally, cases, we will be accessible before that date. And I will have that same discussion with the State Judges.

In fact, before the day is out, I am going to try and set up a conference call much like we did in the -- that predated the May Order, because I know that that is on the mind of a lot of people. Judge Noel, did you want to --

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: No, I have nothing to add to that. That sounds good.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: So, and then whether or not -- I will start with both counsel at the podium, here, anything you want to either agree with, disagree with,

or say: Okay, we understand what the expectations are here and the time frame and the plan, so --

2.2

MR. FLOWERS: Yeah, Your Honor, from the Plaintiffs' perspective, we understand the Court's expectations. And our intention, just so it is clear to everyone out there is for the Plaintiffs' side, we are going to meet with the leaders in each of these other jurisdictions and come up together with a mutual plan that suits everyone's needs across the country.

MS. CATTULO: And Your Honor, from the Defendants, we did understand from the May Order that coordination is key. We agree with that. And as I mentioned to Your Honor, there was a stay entered in Michigan on Monday of this week. And we would very much like the Michigan Judge to participate, as well. But, I think that makes sense. Thank you.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, and it is so important. It is not unique to this case. At this stage of the case, obviously, a lot of the folks have been in settlement, and I know everybody will do what they have to do in that area.

But also, obviously, I think now we can -- which is not, again, unique to this case, to come up with a coordinated plan that seems to be fair to everyone, but also moves things along and kind of reducing duplication and

saving money and time for everyone.

2.2

And so, that will be the goal of the Court, to work with, and coordinate with, as it was back prior to the May Order. So, that is why I think it is our obligation to reach out to everyone. And that is what we will be doing.

And I will -- and I assume if there are any issues that counsel has from either side of the aisle, if you need access to one or both of us, you have it before September 2nd. And we have always tried to -- not unique just to this MDL of mine, but to tell the -- all of the other Judges, let's work together. If you need us to do something, or if there is an issue, please pick up the phone and give a call. We will work with you.

So, I think that is all I have at this time. I would note, without trying to be a poster child for it, that I believe that September 2nd date, whether you believe it is coincidence or not, is also a time when the State Fair is on here in Minnesota. Judge Noel did you have --

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: Just one more question I had, I guess. In terms of updating the registration list, did the parties anticipate submitting a similar order as the PTO No. 25 for the Court to issue requiring that updating to occur?

MS. CATTULO: Yes, Your Honor.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: Okay.

1 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Anything else by the 2 Plaintiffs? 3 MR. FLOWERS: No, Your Honors, thank you. 4 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Defense? 5 I see people shaking their head no, so -- well, I appreciate everyone coming in. Safe travels to everybody 6 7 who had to come in from out of the area. And I sincerely 8 mean it. Good luck everyone as we start trying -- not that 9 people haven't reached out before to all of the attorneys 10 and individuals involved with both the State and Federal 11 case, but we will do the same, immediately. 12 And then absent other contact, which may or may 13 not come up between now and September 2nd; and then if there 14 are any proposed orders that come in like on the updated 15 registration, we will promptly respond to that, as well. 16 Unless there is anything else, we will stand in 17 And I will thank everybody who is on the phone, 18 too, for participating. And we are adjourned. 19 MR. FLOWERS: Thank you. 20 MS. CATULLO: Thank you. 21 (Adjournment.) 2.2 23 24 25

1	
2	
3	* * *
4	
5	
6	
7	I, Jeanne M. Anderson, certify that the foregoing
8	is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in
9	the above-entitled matter.
10	
11	
12	Certified by: <u>s/ Jeanne M. Anderson</u> Jeanne M. Anderson, RMR-RPR
13	Official Court Reporter
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	