	TES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRIC	T OF MINNESOTA
IN RE: STRYKER REJUVENATE AND ABG II HIP IMPLANT PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGA)
This Document Relates to All Actions))) St. Paul, Minnesota) January 26, 2016) 2:30 p.m.)
UNITED STAT: AND MAGISTRA UNITED STATES DIS'	ONORABLE DONOVAN W. FRANK ES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE TE JUDGE FRANKLIN L. NOEL TRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE NFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
APPEARANCES:	NFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:	
Dlointiffe! Took Come 1	
Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel Committee Chairperson:	Meyers & Flowers PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ. 225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 1515 Chicago, Illinois 60606
	PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ. 225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 1515
Committee Chairperson: Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel	PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ. 225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 1515 Chicago, Illinois 60606 Meshbesher & Spence, Ltd. GENEVIEVE M. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. 1616 Park Avenue South

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	<u> </u>
8	Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.A.
9	BEN GORDON, JR., ESQ. 316 S. Baylen Street, Suite 600 P.O. Box 12308
11	Pensacola, Florida 32591
12	Cory Watson Crowder & DeGaris, PC ANNESLEY H. DeGARIS, ESQ. 2131 Magnolia Avenue South
13	Birmingham, Alabama 35205
14	Leiff, Cabraser,
15	Heimann & Bernstein, LLP WENDY R. FLEISHMAN, ESQ.
16	250 Hudson Street, Eighth Floor New York, New York 10013
17	102 , 1 102 20010
18	Weisman, Kennedy & Berris Co., L.P.A.
19	ERIC KENNEDY, ESQ. 101 W. Prospect Avenue
20	Midland Building, Suite 1600 Cleveland, Ohio 44115
21	Cleverand, Onio 44113
22	Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel:
23	Liaison Counsel to the District of Minnesota: Meshbesher & Spence, Ltd.
24	ANTHONY J. NEMO, ESQ.
25	1616 Park Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	
3	APPEARANCES (Continued):
4	Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel:
5	Liaison Counsel to The State Courts: Bernheim & Dolinsky, LLC
6	The State Courts: Bernheim & Dolinsky, LLC MICHAEL E. GALLANT, ESQ. 8151 Peters Road, Suite 3200
7	Plantation, Florida 33324
8	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
9	
10	Defendants' Lead Counsel:
11	Gibbons, P.C.
12	KIM M. CATULLO, ESQ. One Pennsylvania Plaza
13	37th Floor New York, New York 10119-3701
14	
15	Defendants' Liaison Counsel:
16	Stinson Leonard Street LLP
17	TIMOTHY P. GRIFFIN, ESQ. 150 S. 5th Street, Suite 2300
18	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

IN OPEN COURT

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: You may all be seated, thank you.

For those of you in the courtroom, other than the lawyers that were in chambers and those of you on the phone, the Court apologizes for -- obviously, we are not -- well, we are in a different time zone than some of you, but it is 2:30 here, not 2:00. And so one of my -- this is Judge Frank talking -- one of my character defects, not that I have just one, is I talk too much. And so, if there is frustration with the length of the in-chambers conference, it shouldn't rest on the shoulders of the Plaintiffs or Defense lawyers.

It was discussions that led -- in fact, it wasn't Judge Noel's doing, either. It was mine. So, what we will do, and I will just emphasize the same thing to counsel, as Brenda Schaffer just emphasized to Judge Noel and I, that with people listening in, we have to speak directly into these microphones, otherwise people will not hear that are listening in.

So, why don't we just -- we will start with the Plaintiffs' side of the counsel table if you want to indicate your presence for the record? And then we will go over to the Defense.

1	MS. ZIMMERMAN: Good afternoon. This is Genevieve
2	Zimmerman for Plaintiffs.
3	MR. GORDON: Ben Gordon for Plaintiffs.
4	MR. FLOWERS: Pete Flowers for the Plaintiffs.
5	MS. FLEISHMAN: Wendy Fleishman for the
6	Plaintiffs.
7	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Charles Zimmerman for the
8	Plaintiffs.
9	MR. KENNEDY: Eric Kennedy for Plaintiffs.
10	MR. DeGARIS: Anthony DeGaris for the Plaintiffs.
11	MR. NEMO: Tony Nemo for the Plaintiffs.
12	MR. GALLANT: Michael Gallant for the Plaintiffs.
13	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And shall we proceed
14	over to Defense counsel? I don't know if we should assume,
15	Judge Noel, are they kind of ganging up on the Defense
16	lawyers?
17	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: There is
18	definitely an imbalance between the
19	MR. GRIFFIN: Tim Griffin for the Defendants, Your
20	Honor.
21	MS. CATULLO: Kim Catullo for the Defendants.
22	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: What I thought we
23	would do, and I will say one other thing before we begin and
24	go down the joint agenda items. If there are people,
25	whether they are in the courtroom or listening that are

frustrated about, well, how did this date get set? It is being done at a different time, a different day than in the past. Well, that would again -- even though my chambers tried to work and coordinate, I am not claiming that any particular attorney on either side requested this date or time, it was rather the Court saying, well why don't we get back together, because of all of the different holidays, find a date -- I didn't plan on the East Coast blizzard, but try to find a date just to get an update on where we are at.

2.2

Because as we will explain in a few minutes, part of this is to coordinate as best we can with the courts around the country, in addition to getting an updated report. And since it had been a time, I thought that we should do that. And so that is how the date was selected. And then before we leave today and adjourn, I think we should try to agree on the next date, as well.

So, with that, if we could go to the update on cases filed in the MDL and the status report? And if counsel both -- however you've worked this out to come to the podium, that would be great.

MR. FLOWERS: Thanks, Your Honor, this is Pete Flowers again for the Plaintiffs.

The first item is the update on the cases filed in the MDL, Your Honor. The newly filed cases have pretty much plateaued in terms of new filings. There's also a

significant number of cases that have been dismissed pursuant to the settlement. I think we have reached kind of a flat area in terms of what is there.

2.2

MS. CATULLO: I would agree, Your Honor. This is Kim Catullo for the Defendants. We have seen -- it is just a trickle in at this point of complaints, and most of the new complaints are actually unrevised cases.

And as Mr. Flowers mentioned, we had quite a few dismissals come in through the Settlement Program and we do have some additional ones, as well, that will come through once the process completes itself.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And I think we discussed in chambers, right now we probably, if we want to have an estimate of cases we have remaining in the MDL that are either opt-outs or -- we will just let either counsel be -- because I was going to bring it up, a ballpark idea, for another reason before we conclude today.

MS. CATULLO: Your Honor, we don't have a precise number of what the cases are out there because so many of them, the huge percentage is actually unrevised. And then we have also cases that are opt-outs. That is a number that is well under a hundred cases. And then we do have cases — it is not a huge number, we don't know the precise number, but of cases where the persons did not qualify for the Settlement Program because there was that 11/3/14 revision

date cutoff. So, the universe is primarily made up of -- it is made up of those different categories of cases. And that is the same, by the way, in the other jurisdictions, as well. THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Agreed, Mr. Flowers? MR. FLOWERS: I do. THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Unless there is something else you intended to -- unless you have any questions Judge Noel? THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: No. THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We can go on to Settlement Program status. MR. FLOWERS: In terms of this, Your Honor, as you know, there are well over 95 percent of the people in the MDL, and in New Jersey enrolled in this process.

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

In terms of the first part of the process, the super majority have received their payment and are moving forward. There is an enhanced benefit part of this, which is, I kind of call it, part two of the Settlement Program. And that is moving along, as well, in terms of processing those claims, reviewing those claims, processing those claims, people receiving notice and the payments have been coming forward and will continue to come forward in the near future.

MS. CATULLO: And that is accurate, Your Honor.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We can move on to the updated registration process.

2.2

MR. FLOWERS: So, Your Honor, this is something we talked about before and this is something in place previously, which requires, ultimately, each attorney to register their plaintiff and identify that plaintiff has had one of the products that is in this litigation combined with where they are at in terms of kind of medical status, have they been revised or not revised.

We have been talking about this, and I think it would be of great benefit to our side to understand what the numbers are, and also to understand that the cases that are currently in here are not resolved -- or are the right product. I mean, in the past, we had a number of cases that turned out not to be the right product. So, we have been talking about getting this process re-set up and ensuring that in that process the product is identified so that we are all working off the same numbers, ultimately.

MS. CATULLO: Your Honor, as I think you asked me questions about what is on the docket, I think that is probably the best way to find that out. Because just looking at the complaints, I can tell you, is not an accurate assessment of that.

We have talked about that. I think the Court hasn't even urged us to do that. And we do plan on doing

that most likely sometime in March or April. So, we will open up the registration, really, for docket management reasons to know what is out there.

2.2

But, one thing I would urge, actually, is we did learn through the Settlement Program that not having accurate product identification is a real hindrance. So, one of the things that Mr. Flowers and I had talked about, having true product ID as part of that registration. So, I think we both would urge counsel out there to start -- if you don't have that, which frankly I think you should have, but if you don't have it, start getting that information together, primarily product labels that would show it is in fact one of the products at issue in this litigation.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: The question I had is, do you need or are you asking for the Court to issue some kind of order regarding the registration? As I recall, part of the Settlement Order included the registration requirement, is that correct or incorrect?

MS. CATULLO: Yes. We will be submitting something that we will work on together. And it will include, for example, this aspect on product identification. So, I think we are going to take, frankly, what was used in the past and just update that, but also include this provision, having lived and learned on the product ID issue.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: Okay, thank

you.

2.2

MR. FLOWERS: The next issue, Your Honors, is the discovery update.

Next week a deposition is going forward of Robert Tust on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week, which we have noticed in coordination with several other jurisdictions, including New Jersey, as well as Florida.

We have discussed with the Defendant and have reached an agreement, and I am talking now from the MDL perspective, that this will go forward. This person is a significant player, I believe. And the MDL and Stryker have reached an agreement that we are going to have one questioner at the deposition. I think that same agreement, but I will let Ms. Catullo speak to, has been reached in New Jersey, as well.

MS. CATULLO: Your Honor, this deposition which is scheduled for next week was -- originally, we also negotiated the number of days. So, Plaintiffs wanted two days. Defendants wanted one day. And the Defendants did in good faith negotiate and agree to two days.

We are negotiating with the different jurisdictions on the number of questioners. Obviously, this can't turn into a circus, with a room that just anyone can ask questions, given all of the coordination efforts here.

And we have reached an agreement with the MDL that there

will be one questioner. And my understanding is the same will occur with the New Jersey group, as well.

2.2

We are trying to reach that with the Florida group, which is comprised of attorneys with cases in other jurisdictions like Michigan and Massachusetts. And we have had some disagreement at this point. So, we are going to continue to try to resolve that. And if we can't, then we will consider other options, as well.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, maybe, as I think Judge Noel brought up in the in-chambers conference, rather than being concerned or getting -- for lack of a legal phrase -- caught up in some jurisdictional issues, if we know prior to the date of deposition -- unless for some reason it unfortunately gets cancelled, but I don't think -- hopefully that would not serve anyone's best interest.

If we know that, we could even reach out to any of the other jurisdictional Judges and say, let's agree on a plan and who is going to be available, in the event you need to ring one of us up. And I would predict that we could probably agree on something like that to who would be available. It doesn't mean we have already decided you are going to need us, but sometimes that acts as a small deterrent, if not a large deterrent. And it wouldn't be the first time we had done something like that to coordinate that to say, let's agree so that each Judge knows, well, who

is going to be available if there is an issue about: Well, what is a Federal Judge telling a State Judge to do -- or not a State Judge, but a plaintiff's lawyer in another state, or vice-versa. I think we can resolve that early on so you know exactly who to pick up the phone and call.

MR. FLOWERS: Okay, thank you.

MS. CATULLO: Thank you.

2.2

MR. FLOWERS: In terms of other discovery issues, Your Honor, there's some outstanding written discovery and third-party discovery that Ms. Catullo and I have talked about and agreed upon some dates in the near future where they are going to make these productions. So, I think we are pretty much square on that.

They've also produced some additional custodians back in December, I believe it was, of additional people that we asked for. So, at least for the time being, in terms of that, that's where we had the same understanding in that, as well.

MS. CATULLO: I agree, Your Honor.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And I may have an observation to make about the coordination of discovery, but I will sit tight until we get down to state litigation update, because I think it all kind of -- it relates to both issues. So, we can move on to the next item.

MR. FLOWERS: Okay, Your Honor. We had filed a

motion, albeit yesterday, for payment for our third-party vendor Providio, who handles all of our liens and was actually written into the Settlement Program.

2.2

I understand Ms. Catullo hasn't had a complete opportunity to look at the motion. And as we talked about prior to walking into court, we are going to make sure she doesn't have any issue, and proceed forward. But, I will give her the time to review the motion before asking the Court to enter it.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We will just agree there won't be any delay and downtime. If that happens, we will have an immediate turnaround time for it.

MR. FLOWERS: All right, thank you. Then I think we are at State Court litigation update, Your Honor.

MS. CATULLO: And Your Honor, you are aware of the different places that we have some of the litigation, primarily in Florida, in both Broward County and Palm Beach County. I know that Your Honor has reached out to those Judges, and I will let the Court speak on that.

But, we also do have a pocket of cases in Massachusetts, as well as a few in Michigan. The good news is that we do have counsel from Florida who are in these other jurisdictions, so there is some continuity there, as well.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And I -- first of all,

I probably didn't say this back in chambers, I don't recall.

But, to the extent it would be helpful or necessary, I

think -- well, I don't think -- I have the names and have

talked to all of the Judges in each of these states with the

exception of Massachusetts. And I know Judge Boes in

Michigan. And so the other judges I am familiar with and I

have contact information.

2.2

What I will say, substantially consistent with two things, two categories, I said in chambers. The first is there were some -- I don't know if the right word is rumors, but somebody had heard that, well, was the Court -- or the Court is trying to set up a nationwide conference call. And the answer is back in mid-December, early December, which probably was the first mistake that we made, we were going to try to set up a, just for informational purposes -- I had talked to Judge Martinotti, Judge Henning, Judge Hafele, Judge Boes, and we were going to -- and then we had sent out some information to Judge Miller in California.

We are trying to set up a coordinated call where all of the Judges would have been on video and/or audio, audio for sure, but I think we are setting up the video, but audio for sure. And then people couldn't -- to make a long story short, separate from some concerns that one or more Judges had that, well, how exactly -- what would we accomplish by that? We weren't able to kind of get it all

set up. And frankly speaking, I suppose we were trying to re-create what has been done in some other nationwide cases over the years.

2.2

But that shouldn't be -- so that didn't occur and that may or may not occur in the future. But, that shouldn't be confused with there has been one or more calls and get-togethers since the last time we were together by telephone conference with the other Judges around the country, with the exception of -- I am not familiar with the Judge in Massachusetts.

And as I said back in chambers, I was glad we had a couple of these calls. One, so that it wasn't known by some of the courts that even they had heard the word settlement in 95 percent of the cases. And so, and I said, well, we still have a vested interest.

So, even though we promised in our Order back when we stayed discovery to give expedited treatment once we got to the next stage, we still haven't lost interest in trying to coordinate things and see what cases are truly going to be tried, because their outliers are quite different than the cases in the settlement group, and what cases maybe could be resolved or settled. Because, as it turns out, and this was a surprise to some of the Judges who thought, well, the MDL may not have the same interest anymore in the cases because, quote, "settled." Well, we still have the most in

the country.

2.2

So, I said, we still have actually more incentive than the rest to help coordinate discovery and see what needs to be tried with truly meaningful deadlines and dates, and what needs to be -- how can you rule out settlement.

And so, hence, the need to coordinate discovery.

Because, I mean, I am very straightforward. One of the biggest criticisms of State and Federal Judges is, as I told them, and some people blame more the Feds than the States and vice-versa, is why can't you all work together without compromising the rights of Plaintiffs or Defendants, and save time and money for everybody and figure out what truly needs to be tried? Because they are that type of case.

So, those discussions have been going on, so I don't know if there is any -- if Judge Noel has any observations there. Then any, maybe, comments or recommendations that counsel has today about: Well, here is what we are hoping the Court will do and here is the status from where we see it. Because we will continue to reach out -- I have the most contact with Judge Martinotti. But then I have talked to each of these Judges in the last, I will say, from early December through now. I have talked to him at least once. And I think we have coordinated some phone calls with each of them.

And so, that is kind of where that is at. We will continue to do that. Because I have some concern that, well, if we could identify those cases that truly are those outliers, and then let's get some meaningful trial dates and coordinate discovery, versus, well is there a second phase? Or we could move on to -- okay, now that we are here, should we now be focusing some efforts on seeing the next stage of mediation or settlement?

2.2

So, I don't want to oversimplify it from

Plaintiffs' point of view or Defense. And I don't know if

Judge Noel you have anything in that regard.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL: No, I think we have covered it in chambers and here for now.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: So, I will defer to counsel if there are things that either you feel that should be stated here or requesting the Court to do or not do, or --

MR. FLOWERS: From the Plaintiffs' end, Your
Honor, we are not requesting anything at this stage. What I
would say is, we are doing our best, and I am personally
remaining in contact with these other lawyers from other
jurisdictions, attempting to make sure that this is done in
the most efficient manner. But, I have limitations,
obviously. We are trying do this in an efficient way.

MS. CATULLO: And I would echo that, as well. I

mean, everyone agrees that logically coordination makes sense. And the Court has made it clear that that is what should occur. I think we are all trying for that. I think there are just some lines that some folks have made in the sand of, I will coordinate on this, but not that. And so, we are trying, but it is not completely successful.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, and maybe this doesn't need to be said. I have said it at other hearings, but I truly believe it, notwithstanding sometimes some of the criticism in the cases. Well, the Federal Court comes in, and it is our way or the highway. When we have these get-togethers by phone, whether it is with one Judge or not, or more than one, because we have had both types, that is not the approach at all we are taking.

We are saying, let's keep each other informed and please let us know what we can do to kind of promote coordination and cooperation without compromising anyone's right, because everybody has their responsibilities.

Because obviously, it doesn't work to say: My way or the highway. That is rarely constructive.

And so, we will continue to do that. We will continue to reach out. And just assume that if there is something that Plaintiffs' counsel or Defense counsel feels that, well, it would really be helpful if the Court would do this or not do this, that you won't be bashful about

contacting. I don't think either one of you fit the characteristic of the bashful type. And so, I don't know anybody over at this table or on either side that would fit that definition, either.

MR. FLOWERS: Okay, Your Honor, thank you.

MS. CATULLO: Thank you.

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Miscellaneous docket matters we have, and then also, let's not forget before we adjourn to -- I don't think we have a date set yet for the next get-together, so we will talk about that, too.

MR. FLOWERS: This is just cleaning up the docket, Your Honor. There are some cases where the Defendant has provided me a list of folks that filed cases that are not the proper product. And we have contacted most of them, if not all of them, in trying to get those cases into wherever else they are going to go, because they are not properly here. And there's some representation issues of multiple people representing the same Plaintiff, which I think will overall clean up the docket again. So, I just wanted to bring it to your attention and say that we are working on it to get it cleaner.

MS. CATULLO: Yeah, I agree. It is those two categories: So, it is the products that don't belong in this litigation; and people who have duplicate cases, multiple firms.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Your view, and if you need to consult one another or other co-counsel, I will leave that up to you. And I don't want to create an issue where there isn't one, but your view on when the next get-together should be? I do think that we should set a date.

2.2

The only issue is, well, should we do it at the end of February or March? I know March is a tough time for a lot of people for breaks and other issues -- or, if you feel that, well, let us chat amongst ourselves and get back to you in the next few days, that is fine. We will do whatever works best for -- if you would rather circulate a date amongst yourselves and maybe get back to us, we will work with you on that, too.

MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, given the multiple folks, if it is okay with the Court if we could just have -- we will confer amongst us and then we will contact Brenda --

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Oh, sure.

MR. FLOWERS: -- and see if we can figure out a date.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: That makes perfect sense. Yes, I think that would be the fairest for everyone. And then we will make sure we get that not just on the docket, but on the website.

And then obviously, it goes without saying that if

1 I am reaching out to other courts or they are reaching out 2 here and we get any updates, we will get that information to you. And I hope you will also get that information to us. 3 If there is something, well, we didn't know about it when we 4 5 were there in January, but now that we know this, it would be really helpful for the Court to do this or do that, I 6 7 assume you will reach out to us. 8 MR. FLOWERS: Yes, we will, Your Honor. Thank 9 you. 10 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Anything else for 11 Plaintiffs' counsel or Plaintiffs' co-counsel or anybody 12 else? MR. FLOWERS: Not from us. 13 14 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: For Defense? 15 MS. CATULLO: No. 16 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, if you had to 17 leave the East Coast and you were trying to camp out in that 18 snow, I am sorry we ruined your -- and actually I shouldn't 19 joke about such things, because a couple of you did get here 20 from the East Coast, which that is the Eighth Wonder of the 21 World, probably. 2.2 Unless there is anything else, I will thank you 23 all for coming to beautiful Downtown St. Paul/Minneapolis. 24 And Judge Noel? 25 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE NOEL:

1	nothing else. Thank you.
2	THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We will stand in
3	recess and then we will come up with another date very soon.
4	All right? Thank you.
5	MR. FLOWERS: Thank you, Your Honors.
6	MS. CATULLO: Thank you, Your Honors.
7	(Adjournment.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	* * *
14	
15	I, Jeanne M. Anderson, certify that the foregoing
16	is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in
17	the above-entitled matter.
18	
19	
20	Certified by: <u>s/ Jeanne M. Anderson</u> Jeanne M. Anderson, RMR-RPR
21	Official Court Reporter
22	
23	
24	
25	