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 M O R N I N G S E S S I O N THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 2010 (COURT CALLED TO ORDER)THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.
THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Call the case, please.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL 2047, In re: Chinese Drywall.
THE COURT: Counsel, make your appearance for the record.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court, good morning, Judge Fallon, Russ Herman for plaintiffs.

MR. WITTMANN: Good morning, Phil Wittmann, liaison counsel for the homebuilders.

THE COURT: Anybody from the defendants Knauf? Kyle, do you want to make your appearance?

MR. SPAULDING: Good morning, Your Honor, Kyle Spaulding on behalf of the defendants' liaison counsel. Kerry Miller is supposed to be on the phone. I'm not sure if he is.

MR. HAYDEN: Your Honor, this is Don Hayden. I'm on the phone with Kerry Miller.

THE COURT: Fine. We have 215 others on the phone. We are meeting today as our monthly agenda. I've met with lead
counsel for the various interests, as well as liaison, in advance and worked out the agenda. I'll take them in the order presented. First, pretrial orders, anything on that?

MR. HERMAN: Good morning again, Judge Fallon. The pretrial orders are all listed at www.laed.uscourts.gov with a link directly to Drywall MDL.

Counsel should review particularly pretrial order number 1 F , which sets deadlines for profile forms and responding to complaints.

There is a new pretrial order number 19, entered March 18, 2010, and which Your Honor has appointed a state and federal coordination committee.

THE COURT: Right. There are three new ones on the 19th. I conferred again with my colleagues in state court and appointed a committee under the leadership of Dawn Barrios as chair to coordinate the state matters. I also appointed a committee for the insurers with Judy Barrasso as chair to coordinate the insurers' aspect of the case, so hopefully we'll be able to get a profile form specific to those entities. Then on 21 I did a retailers profile form to be more specific to the retailers.

Property inspections anything on that?
MR. WITTMANN: Yes. Andrew Lemmon's clients' property, a Louisiana property, has been inspected. I understand from Dan Bryson (spelled phonetically) this morning that the Romano --
his clients, the Romano properties in Mississippi will be inspected today. That would leave, as far as the June Louisiana trials, MDL trials, Skip's clients' properties in Slidell to be inspected.

THE COURT: That's important from the manufacturer's standpoint. I need you to focus on those cases because we're good to go in the last 2 weeks of June, and my thinking is that if we could do two or three of those cases together, I think a jury can deal with those, and then we can, in the future, take more cases at one time, but I would like to give the jury an opportunity to look at 3 cases at one time and see whether or not that presents any problems.

That's important to at least have the builders focus on those cases, and it's my thinking with bellwether cases is that you get a couple informational points out of them, one is just the organizational aspect of the case. All of us have been there and done that. We know you can think about and theorize on a trial, but until you actually do it, you really don't know the full aspect of it.

We've now had two opportunities, and I've had the seven Germano cases. By the way, I just issued an opinion on that case, but that was 7 cases, and then the other case we just tried, so that gives you some information. But it also gives you information on type of cases, so with these picks, let's see if we can get some diversity in the interest because that's another
aspect of bellwether that gives you some information on the various cases. So my point is don't pick 3 cases that are the same. Let's try to pick 3 cases that that have some difference in them so we can get some intelligence out of it.

I would like those cases given to me by next week, so let's get on the ball with that.

Plaintiff and defendant profile forms, anything on that?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, we would like to have the cases selected by Friday of next week so we can begin discovery.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, with respect to the next issue, profile forms, there are -- there is a manufacturers profile form; a contractor/installer form, which I'll address in a second; a builder defendant form; a distributor form; an exporter form; a retailer form; and, I believe, we've reached or close to agreement will reach an agreement on an insurers profile form. With respect to the retailer profile form, it's been submitted to the Court after negotiation, and we're awaiting for Your Honor's review.

THE COURT: I'll draft a final on that one.
The profile forms, again, it's not an attempt to stop you from getting discovery. It's not an attempt to short circuit or do away with interrogatories or any of the other devices that are present under the federal rules. It's really an
opportunity to shorten it, to get some information to you as quickly as possible so that your subsequent discovery vehicles can be targeted so that you're not asking questions that are so broad that nobody knows what you want except you, and you're not sure because you just want everything and for all times. So it just doesn't work that way. Then I get a lot of motions for not wanting to answer and motions to produce and motions to compel and all of that sort of thing, so this is an opportunity to get some information, but the profile form can't be so specific that it defeats its own purpose. It has to be kind of a capsule of the critical information that you need, and so don't feel that if you don't put it in the profile form you're not going to be able to get it later. That's not purpose of the profile form.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, may it please the Court, there is one issue on profile forms. There have been negotiation between the installers and plaintiffs. We had proposed, that is, plaintiffs have proposed one single form for contractors and installers. There was a discussion, Your Honor, I believe, by Mr. Fitzsimmons as to wanting a separate installer form. We're waiting on Your Honor to advise us as to whether there should be a separate form or not.

THE COURT: Preservation order, anything on that? MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, on the installer profile form, I understand there were some discussions about perhaps changing the installer profile form.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. WITTMANN: There has been some discussion about a change in the form. I don't know that it has been submitted to you yet.

THE COURT: No, it hasn't.
MR. WITTMANN: They are discussing that and they may present something to you later.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, nothing new under preservation orders, and Ms. Barrios is here.

THE COURT: State/federal coordination committee.
MS. BARRIOS: Good morning, Your Honor, Dawn Barrios for the federal/state committee. We've had a lot of activity this past month, and I want to thank all those attorneys, particularly Ms. Barrasso, for providing me with additional state court case information.

We have just this week sent letters out again to all the state court judges that we know about advising of your web site and of your recent rulings. I will be sending out your Germano opinion and your Hernandez opinion as soon as it's rendered to the various state court judges.

I have been working with Mr. Richard Serpe to get Judge Hall, who is the coordinating judge in Virginia, to perhaps adopt LexisNexis. I understand from Mr. Serpe that the defense are in favor of electronic service. We're trying to get that
on-line for you.
Judge Hall has a hearing, a large hearing on April 21st, at which time I understand that she'll probably select some cases for trial in the fall. We just hope that we do get her on LexisNexis so that we can keep up with all of her information. I also understand that she's considering adopting some of your pretrial orders.

THE COURT: I've been in touch with Judge Hall, who is enthusiastically proceeding with this particular case. We're trying to work together on it so that we can coordinate our efforts. She has been very helpful to me in pointing me in the direction of the appropriate Virginia law and other aspects, so hopefully we'll get that on board.

I really do think that LexisNexis is the way to go with service. It's important to give everybody an opportunity to get the information as quickly as possible, and our clerk's offices, even from the federal system, it makes it a little difficult. They have a better facility for doing that and it works better, so I do encourage her to favorably consider that.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, I present to Your Honor and to all liaison counsel the CD that has all of the state court cases with the judge's contact information through CTO 14.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Motions in the MDL.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, the state court trial settings.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, state court trial settings. MR. HERMAN: First I want to acknowledge the work that Dawn has done very quickly in contacting folks and judges to assemble the material.

With regard to state court trial settings, in Florida there appear to be three cases, either one or more of them which will be tried in Florida in early June. For identification purposes, one client is Victor Diaz, another is Jeremy Alters (spelled phonetically), and the third is Irvin Gonzales, and the PAC will be meeting Monday, our trial team members, with those folks in Florida.

With regard to other trial settings, Your Honor has directed that in the last two weeks or so of June, there well be cases tried in Louisiana. Andrew Lemmon's clients' property has been inspected, Dan Bryson's clients' property in Mississippi will be inspected today, and we're also advised that there are several properties of Skip's clients in Slidell that will be quickly scheduled for inspection.

The other trial settings that we're familiar with at this point are the seven Germano intervenors will be scheduled for trial in late August or September against the distributor, Venture Supply; the builder, Porter-Blaine, and potentially installers that were subcontracted by Porter-Blaine, and that will be a contested litigation.

THE COURT: Judge Farina and I talked several times a
week, and I know he's moving forward with his aspect and doing it very well. He's got a massive amount of issues in his cases, and he's working through them, so I am in touch with him, and I've tried to coordinate our trial dates with his, and hopefully we'll be able to do that.

Next item is the motions in the MDL. I have a number of motions now, several hundred of them. I've asked the parties to get together and give me a listing of the motions. They have done so, and now what we need to do is group the motions in some grouping that makes sense, and then I would like their input on picking one or more of those motions from each of those groups that have a representative group of issues so that I can focus on those one time as opposed to 250 times.

Discovery issues.
MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. There are several that need to be addressed. The Marsh report indicated there might be as many as 40,000 CDW properties based upon the amount of drywall shipped; however, there are some warehouses that have CDW that has not been used. We have given to manufactures' liaison counsel a list of those. We will be making joint inspections and conducting inventories of what's there, and they are proceeding next week.

Also, both the builders and the plaintiffs, the PSC plaintiffs want to move forward with Knauf discovery, and we would like to get that coordinated with the manufactures and the
builders. Steve Herman from our office will meet with Mr. Whitman and attempt to work out a process for the Knauf depositions and then liaison with Kerry Miller to establish dates and protocols to present to Your Honor.

MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, with respect to the 30 (b) (6) notices that have gone out in connection with the plaintiffs' request for documents, these are set to go forward on April 19th and April 16th. It's created a lot of confusion, as we mentioned at the conference with you this morning, in terms of what should be done. There are lawyers whose clients are being served with 30 (b) (6) notices. They haven't had time, really, to deal with them. We believe they should be simply treated as Rule 34 requests. Your Honor directed me to meet with Mr. Davis and work out a protocol to do that and have these go forward as Rule 34 requests as opposed to subpoena duces tecum because it's creating a lot of confusion among the homebuilders and other defendants as well.

THE COURT: Yes, the issue that presents itself is that some of the entities haven't been in yet, and some of the entities haven't either formally come in or even retained counsel or, if they have retained counsel, they retained what they call monitoring counsel. So it's unclear as to who's in and who's out, and so the plaintiffs have just issued it to everyone. Some of the individuals, of course, hopefully a lot of them, have counsel, and in that type situation it creates
confusion, so my suggestion was that Phil get with Lenny or someone from the plaintiffs' committee and work out some protocol so that the plaintiff committee knows who's represented and who's the individual that is representing those entities, and in those just treat it in the regular way so we don't have that problem.

MR. WITTMANN: In the meantime I understand Mr. Davis is granting extensions of time to people who have called in. Correct, Lenny?

MR. DAVIS: What we've done, Your Honor, is when counsel has contacted us we have been willing to grant extensions of time. It gives us an opportunity to speak with counsel and let them know that we're looking for, the information, and hopefully we'll get it promptly.

MR. WITTMANN: We will meet, though, and discuss that, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, one more statement on that issue. We need from defense counsel a list of who they represent.

THE COURT: Sure. Well, that's what I would hope would be forthcoming in the meeting. We've got to know who they represent and who is unrepresented or who's not represented or whatever it is and then send the subpoenas to those who are not represented and hopefully they'll get representation.

Freedom of information act, anything on that?

MR. HERMAN: No. Your Honor, as folks know, the CPSC issued an interim report on April 2, 2010. There are no FOIA requests outstanding of the CPSC.

THE COURT: Trial settings in federal court. We talked a little bit about that. The other thing that I want to say with trial settings, we look to the builders to pick a case, and from that standpoint $I$ really am interested in them focusing on a defendant or defendants as opposed to cases in which they have been sued. I'm looking for them to be a plaintiff in the case that they pick so that we have at least their input.

They have been on the ground doing some of the work, and I've heard testimony as to the work and the nature and the scope of the work, but I think it would be helpful from their standpoint to pick the case. I've given everybody else an opportunity to pick cases.

MR. WITTMANN: We will do that, Your Honor. I think you're looking at trial date sometime in September maybe.

THE COURT: Yes, some time in the fall. I'll check with you all after you've had an opportunity to think about it first.

Filings the MDL. It's important to check the web site. I've tried to put everything on the web site. I've got some frequently asked questions and methods of doing it, and it's important to check the web site before you call the Court because we have anticipated most of your questions and put the solutions to those questions there.

Notices of appearance and default judgments, anything on that?

MR. HERMAN: No, no matters, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Insurance issues? As I mentioned, I appointed an insurance committee, made Judy Barrasso lead counsel of that. Anything on it from the insurance committee, counsel?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor --
MS. BARRASSO: I think Mr. Herman was going to say about appointing a committee. We have a steering committee now on the insurers' side. We're working with the plaintiffs on the profile form which we hope should be back to the Court in a day or two to talk about that.

THE COURT: I have received some cases from the MDL on insurance matters, so I don't know, we have been talking about that, what that situation is.

MR. LEVIN: Arnold Levin. Your Honor, the MDL transferred the first insurance case yesterday. There are several others, many others in federal courts. They will be the subject of filings as tag-alongs to get those cases to Your Honor should the MDL panel deem fit.

THE COURT: Right.
Service of pleadings.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, there is no issue at the present with service of pleadings. I believe that lead counsel, Mr. Levin, has furnished the Court and all other liaison counsel
a listing showing which complaints have been served on whom. With respect to the next two items --

THE COURT: Master complaint and class action.
MR. HERMAN: And the omnibus class complaint, Arnold Levin, lead counsel, will discuss those with Your Honor.

MR. LEVIN: First, the master complaint is easy because we're not in a position to do it as yet because we're still in the situation where service is being effectuated on various foreign defendants. We've given Your Honor the status of that service today in chambers.

In any event, the Gross complaint, which is the indeterminate defendant complaint, has started to hit China, and we've gotten responses from some defendants. They are not in the nature of a Rule 12 or a motion for a summary judgment. They are narratives, and they are quite revealing.

That complaint, the Gross complaint, has been the subject of a motion to amend which has been filed with the Court this week, and in that regard, the first omnibus complaint, the Payton complaint, a motion to amend will be filed some time in April to correct deficiencies and some new allegations based upon new information that we received.

It's my opinion that -- it's mine -- that until
that amendment is effectuated in Payton, which is the first complaint that's really out there, Rule 12 motions or any other motions should be held in abeyance because the allegations in the
amended complaint might be of significance with regard to those motions.

We have filed that motion in a very abbreviated form to avoid destroying forests and destroying our bank accounts because these complaints, two complaints cost in excess of $\$ 200,000$ to translate and file, so we've used an abbreviated matter. Should Your Honor have any questions, you know, we'll meet with Your Honor with regard to Gross. Payton will be structured the same way.

Omnibus III and IV are in the process of translation and service. The insurance omnibus complaint is in the process of being served. Of course, that's an easier task because it's all domestic.

With regard to Germano, upon receipt of Your Honor's ruling today, it is our intention to move for class certification in Germano as against Taishan. That's the way the protocol was set up, and we should be able to file that within two weeks, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Yes, go ahead, Phil.
MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, if I may, with respect to these amendments to the Omni complaints, could we simply have an order issued by the Court that would relieve defendants from responding to those until some reasonable time after they have been amended and served?

MR. LEVIN: Yes, we have no problem with that,

Your Honor.
THE COURT: Yes. What you need to do is just get me some kind of an agreement and I'll just do that.

MR. WITTMANN: I'll check with Mr. Levin and get that done.

THE COURT: Okay. While I'm on that master complaints and class actions and omnibus complaints, let me mention something that's also on number 11, and that is my feeling about this litigation is that a challenge is to get our arms around it to see how big or small or whatever it is out there and how many parties are out there and what the issues are. I think that's helpful because the parties ought to know what the universe is so that they can begin assessing their specific liability in that particular universe, whether it exists or not, and, if so, the extent of it.

Also, the plaintiffs have to get some assessment as to whether they are talking about 3,000 claims or 40,000 claims. That's a big, big difference there. The truth of the matter is we just don't know at this point. So I think we need some technical assistance on pulling together a database in an attempt to get the universe established.

I was suggesting to the parties that they consider BrownGreer. Orran Brown. I've worked with him in several cases, and he's very technically efficient and does a great job in matters of this nature particularly. I suggested to the parties
that they get together and see whether they can work out some sort of payment agreement and agreement to at least get Orran Brown aboard so that he can begin pulling together this litigation.

I think it's helpful. It's very helpful for the defendants. I would think the insurers would be interested in knowing their potential, if any, exposure, and so would the defendants. I think from the plaintiffs' standpoint, they ought to know what their universe is, whether it's 3,000 cases or less or 40,000 cases or more. I think that has some effect on the litigation. So the parties are going to be doing that, and hopefully we'll have somebody of Orran Brown's qualifications aboard to help us in that regard.

Knauf Gips personal jurisdiction, anything on that?
MR. HERMAN: Nothing on that, Your Honor, except we need to move the discovery along, and I know that our colleague Kerry Miller, who is liaison counsel for the manufactures and represents Knauf, hadn't had an opportunity to address the status conference report at all yet orally, and if he's on the phone he may have some comments he would like to make.

THE COURT: Kerry, do you have anything on that?
MR. MILLER: I'm here, Your Honor.
It's my appreciation that we are making significant
progress in the review of the voluminous documents. I think some productions have been made, and we're looking to continue with
the rolling production over the next, you know, month or so and hopefully be able to wrap up that production probably at some point early this summer and then move into the next phase of that discovery.

THE COURT: Kerry, do you have any opinion in the 706 Orran Brown situation?

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, from my perspective, I would tend to agree that there is a need to get some uniform data in place about the size of this issue. I share your comments that it's a whole different case if it's 3,000 than if it's 40,000, and one of the problems we've all had is I have certain limited data, other defendants have certain limited data, plaintiffs have certain limited data. It's a lot of data and it's hard to get it to match up. We need, I think, a centralized database that's going to be the court data that can be relied upon.

THE COURT: Yes. I agree with that.
MR. MILLER: So I'm happy with meet with Russ and Phil and the insurers and whoever about how -- to see if we can come to an agreement as to how their services are funded.

MR. HERMAN: Kerry, if you're available and Phil is available, we need about eight participants, I think, in a conference call, eight counsel representing each of the various levels of involvement, and if we could do that Monday afternoon, we could get a start on that.

THE COURT: I've asked Phil to kind of take the leading
oar on that since he expressed some concern about costs; although, he's interested in the concept. I think that if you can pull together the group and let's move on that.

MR. WITTMANN: I'll contact everybody after this conference and set it up with Russ.

THE COURT: Get with Russ and get all of the names and addresses.

MR. MILLER: Monday afternoon would work for me, so I would be happy to participate in a call then.

MR. WITTMANN: I know it won't work for me at this point but maybe we could do it Saturday.

MR. HERMAN: Or Sunday.
MR. WITTMANN: Or Sunday.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, there are no other issues on the status conference report that need explication.

THE COURT: May 27th is the next status conference. Anything from anybody?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, we will have our lead trial counsel, Chris Seeger, contact Kerry Miller and Lexy in order to get a meeting of counsel involved in the June trial some time between now and before the May 27th conference, as Your Honor's calendar permits.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Court will stand in recess.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
(WHEREUPON, at 9:57 a.m. the proceedings were concluded.)
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| F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FORMS................. }{ }^{[1]} \\ & -4: 7 \end{aligned}$ | Hayden ${ }_{[1]}-5: 22$ HEARD ${ }_{[1]} 1: 10$ | IN ${ }_{[3]}$ - 1:4, 4:11, 4:14 indeterminate [1] - | $14: 23,16: 2,19: 22$ <br> issues [6] - 13:2, |
| ```facility \({ }_{[1]}\) - 11:18 fall \([2]\) - 11:4, 16:18 FALLON [1] - 1:10 Fallon [2]-5:14, 6:4 familiar [1] - 12:19 far [1] - 7:2 Farina \({ }_{[1]}\) - 12:25 favor [1]-10:25 favorably [1] - 11:19 FEDERAL [1] - 4:14 federal [5] - 6:12, 8:25, 11:17, 16:4, 17:18 federal/state [1] - 10:13 file [2] - 19:6, 19:17 filed [3]-18:17, 18:19, 19:3 filings [2] - 16:20, 17:19 FILINGS [1] - 4:15 final \([1]-8: 21\) Fine [1]-5:24 fine \({ }_{[1]}\) - 10:8 first \([7]-6: 3,12: 2\), 16:19, 17:17, 18:6, 18:18, 18:23 FISHBEIN \({ }_{[1]}-1: 19\) fit [1]-17:20 Fitzsimmons [1] - 9:19 FITZSIMMONS \({ }_{[1]}\) - 2:19 FL [3]-2:11, 2:20, 3:4 FLOOR [1]-2:16 Florida [3] - 12:6, 12:7, 12:11 focus [3]-7:6, 7:14, 13:13 focusing \({ }_{[1]}\) - 16:7 FOIA [1] - 16:2 folks [3]-12:3, 12:11, 16:1 FOR [5]-1:15, 2:6, 2:14, 3:7, 3:11 foregoing [1]-24:14 foreign [1] - 18:9 forests [1] - 19:4``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FORT }_{[1]}-3: 4 \\ & \text { forthcoming }[1]- \\ & 15: 21 \\ & \text { forward }[4]-13: 1 \text {, } \\ & 13: 24,14: 7,14: 14 \\ & \text { FRED }[1]-1: 20 \\ & \text { FREEDOM }[1]-4: 13 \\ & \text { freedom }[1]-15: 25 \\ & \text { FREEMAN }[1]-3: 12 \\ & \text { frequently }[1]-16: 22 \\ & \text { Friday }[1]-8: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { heard }{ }_{[1]}-16: 12 \\ & \text { hearing }[2]-11: 2 \\ & \text { held }{ }_{[1]}-18: 25 \\ & \text { help }[1]-21: 13 \\ & \text { helpful }[5]-11: 11, \\ & 16: 13,20: 12,21: 5 \\ & \text { hereby }[1]-24: 14 \\ & \text { HERMAN }[23]-1: 15 \text {, } \\ & 1: 16,5: 13,6: 4,8: 9, \\ & 8: 12,9: 14,10: 9 \text {, } \\ & 11: 25,12: 2,13: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 18:12 <br> indicated [1] - 13:16 <br> individual [1] - 15:4 <br> individuals [1] - 14:24 <br> INFORMATION [1] - <br> 4:13 <br> information [13]- $\begin{aligned} & 7: 23,7: 24,8: 1,9: 1 \\ & 9: 9,9: 11,10: 16 \\ & 11: 6,11: 16,11: 22 \\ & 15: 12,15: 25,18: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { 13:12, 13:14, 17:4, } \\ \text { 20:11, 23:14 } \\ \text { ISSUES................ } \\ \ldots . . . . . . . . . . . . ~ \\ {[2]} \end{array}-4: 12, \\ & 4: 17 \\ & \text { item }[1]-13: 6 \\ & \text { ITEMS }[1]-4: 3 \\ & \text { items }[1]-18: 2 \\ & \text { itself }[1]-14: 18 \\ & \text { IV }[1]-19: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | FRILOT [1] - 2:14 full [1]-7:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:17, 16:1, 17:3, } \\ & \text { 17:7, 17:23, 18:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { informational }{ }_{[1]}- \\ & 7: 15 \end{aligned}$ | J |
|  | funded [1]-22:19 <br> furnished [1] - 17:25 <br> future [1]-7:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:15, 22:20, 23:12, } \\ & 23: 14,23: 18 \\ & \text { Herman }[3]-5: 14, \\ & 14: 1,17: 8 \end{aligned}$ | ```input [2]-13:11, 16:10 inspected [5] - 6:24, 7:2, 7:4, 12:15,``` | JEFFREY [1] - 3:3 <br> Jeremy [1] - 12:9 <br> job [1] - 20:24 |
|  | G | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hernandez }[1]-10: 20 \\ & \text { hit }[1]-18: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 12:16 } \\ \text { inspection }[1]-12: 18 \end{array}$ | joint [1] - 13:20 JUDGE [1]-1:11 |
|  | GAINS | homebuilders [2] - $5: 16,14: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { inspections }[2]-6: 22 \text {, } \\ & 13: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { judge }[2]-10: 23, \\ & 12: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1:22 } \\ & \text { GARY }_{[1]}-3: 16 \\ & \text { gentlemen }[1]-5: 9 \end{aligned}$ | HOMEBUILDERS' [1] - 2:6 <br> Honor [39]-5:19, | INSPECTIONS $\qquad$ $\qquad$ [1] - <br> 4:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Judge }[6]-5: 14,6: 4, \\ & 10: 23,11: 2,11: 8, \\ & 15: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | GERALD ${ }_{[1]}-1: 23$ | 5:22, 6:11, 8:9, 8:12, | installer [3] - 9:19 | judge's [1] - 11:22 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Germano [5] - 7:21, } \\ & \text { 10:20, 12:20, 19:14, } \\ & \text { 19:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 14,9: 18,9: 20, \\ & 9: 23,10: 9,10: 12 \\ & 11: 20,11: 25,12: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 9:23, 9:25 <br> installers [3]-9:16, 9:18, 12:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { judges }[3]-10: 18, \\ & \text { 10:21, 12:3 } \\ & \text { judgment }[1]-18: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Gips [1] - 21:14 | 13:15, 14:4, 14:5, | INSTALLERS' [1]-2:6 | judgments [1]-17:1 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GIPS }_{[1]}-4: 22 \\ & \text { given }[4]-8: 5,13: 19, \\ & 16: 14,18: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:13, 15:9, 15:17, } \\ & \text { 16:1, 16:16, 17:3, } \\ & \text { 17:7, 17:16, 17:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { insurance }[6]-17: 4, \\ 17: 5,17: 6,17: 14, \\ 17: 17,19: 11 \end{gathered}$ | JUDGMENTS. $\qquad$ $[1]-4: 16$ <br> JUDY [1] - 3:12 |
|  | Gonzales [1] - 12:10 grant [1] - 15:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 23,18: 5,18: 9, \\ & 19: 7,19: 8,19: 20, \end{aligned}$ | INSURANCE ${ }_{[1]}$ - 4:17 insurers [4]-6:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Judy [2] - } 6: 17,17: 5 \\ & \text { June }[5]-7: 2,7: 7 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | granting [1] - 15:7 | $20: 1,21: 15,21: 22$ 22:7, 23:14. 23:18 | 8:17, 21:6, 22:18 | $12: 7,12: 13,23: 20$ |
|  | great [1] - 20:24 |  | INSURERS' ${ }^{[1]}$ - $3: 11$ | jurisdiction [1]-21:14 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GREENBERG }[1] \text { - } \\ & 2: 10 \\ & \text { Gross }[3]-18: 11, \\ & 18: 16,19: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Honor's [3] - 8:20, } \\ & \text { 19:15, 23:21 } \\ & \text { HONORABLE } \\ & \text { 1:10 - } \end{aligned}$ | ```insurers' [2]-6:18, 17:10 intelligence [1] - 8:4 intention [1] - 19:15``` | JURISDICTION $\qquad$ [1] - 4:22 jury [2]-7:9, 7:10 |
|  | ground [1] - 16 | hope [3]-11:4, 15:20, | interest [1] - 7:25 | K |
|  | 13:12, 23:3 <br> grouping [1] - 13:10 <br> groups ${ }_{[1]}$ - 13:12 | ```hopefully [8] - 6:18, 11:13, 13:4, 14:24, 15:12, 15:24, 21:12, 22:2 hundred [1] - 13:7``` | ```21:6, 23:2 interests [1]-6:1 interim [1]-16:2 interrogatories [1] - 8:24 intervenors [1] - 12:20 inventories [1] - 13:21``` | KATZ ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:15 keep [1]-11:5 <br> KENNETH [1]-2:22 <br> KERRY [1] - 2:15 <br> Kerry [8]-5:20, 5:23, 14:3, 21:17, 21:21, |




| ```SPAULDING [2] - 2:15, 5:19 specific [4]-6:19, 6:20, 9:9, 20:13 spelled [2] - 6:25, 12:9 stand [1] - 23:24 standpoint [4]-7:6, 16:7, 16:14, 21:8 start [1] - 22:24 started [1] - 18:12 STATE [1] - 4:10 State [1] - 24:12 state [10]-6:11, 6:14, 6:16, 10:15, 10:18, 10:21, 11:21, 11:25, 12:1, 12:5 state/federal [1] - 10:11 STATE/FEDERAL [2] - 3:7, 4:9 statement [1] - 15:17 States [2]-24:13, 24:23 STATES [2]-1:1, 1:11 status [4] - 18:9, 21:18, 23:15, 23:16 STATUS [2]-1:10, 4:23 steering [1] - 17:9 STEERING [4] - 1:15, 2:7, 2:14, 3:12 STENOGRAPHY [1] - 3:21 Steve [1] - 14:1 still [1] - 18:7 STONE [1] - 2:7 stop [1] - 8:23 STREET [9]-1:20, 1:24, 2:3, 2:8, 2:16, 2:20, 3:8, 3:13, 3:19 structured [1] - 19:9 subcontracted [1] - 12:23 subject [2] - 17:19, 18:17 submitted [2]-8:19, 10:3 subpoena [1] - 14:15 subpoenas [1] - 15:23 subsequent [1]-9:2 sued [1] - 16:9 suggested [1] - 20:25 suggesting [1] - 20:22 suggestion [1] - 15:1 SUITE [7]-1:20, 1:24, 2:3, 2:19, 3:4, 3:8, 3:13 summary [1] - 18:14 summer [1] - 22:3 Sunday [2]-23:12,``` | 23:13 <br> Supply [1] - 12:22 <br> supposed [1] - 5:21 <br> system [1] - 11:17 <br> T <br> $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a g }}[1]-17: 19$ <br> tag-alongs [1]-17:19 <br> Taishan [1] - 19:16 <br> targeted [1] - 9:3 <br> task [1] - 19:12 <br> team [1]-12:11 <br> technical [1]-20:20 <br> technically [1] - 20:24 <br> tecum [1]-14:15 <br> tend [1]-22:8 <br> terms [1]-14:9 <br> testimony [1] - 16:12 <br> THE [48]-1:10, 1:15, <br> 2:6, 2:14, 3:7, 3:11, <br> 4:11, 4:15, 4:23, 5:7, <br> 5:8, 5:10, 5:11, 5:17, <br> 5:24, 6:13, 7:5, 8:11, <br> 8:21, 9:22, 10:1, <br> 10:5, 10:8, 10:11, <br> 11:8, 11:23, 12:1, <br> 12:25, 14:18, 15:16, <br> 15:20, 16:4, 16:18, <br> 17:4, 17:13, 17:21, <br> 18:3, 19:19, 20:2, <br> 20:6, 21:21, 22:5, <br> 22:16, 22:25, 23:6, <br> 23:16, 23:23, 23:25 <br> theorize [1] - 7:17 <br> thinking [2] - 7:7, 7:14 <br> third [1] - 12:9 <br> THIS [1]-1:7 <br> three $[3]-6: 13,7: 8$, <br> 12:6 <br> THURSDAY [2] - 1:6, 5:3 <br> TO ${ }_{[2]}-1: 7,5: 4$ <br> today [5] - 5:25, 7:2, <br> 12:16, 18:10, 19:15 <br> together [7]-7:8, 11:10, 13:8, 20:20, <br> 21:1, 21:3, 23:3 <br> touch [2]-11:8, 13:3 <br> TOWER [1] - 3:13 <br> transcript ${ }_{[1]}$ - 24:15 <br> TRANSCRIPT [2] - <br> 1:10, 3:21 <br> transferred [1]-17:17 <br> translate [1]-19:6 <br> translation [1] - 19:11 <br> TRAURIG [1] - 2:10 <br> treat [1]-15:5 <br> treated [1]-14:12 | ```TRIAL [2] - 4:10, 4:14 trial [15] - 7:18, 11:4, 11:25, 12:1, 12:5, 12:10, 12:12, 12:19, 12:21, 13:4, 16:4, 16:6, 16:17, 23:18, 23:20 trials [2] - 7:3 tried [5] - 7:23, 12:7, 12:14, 13:4, 16:21 true [1]-24:14 truth [1]-20:18 try [1] - 8:3 trying[2]-10:25, 11:10 two [7] - 7:8, 7:20, 12:13, 17:11, 18:2, 19:5, 19:18 type [2]-7:24, 14:25``` U unclear [1] - 14:22 under [3] - 6:15, 8:25, 10:9 uniform [1] - 22:8 UNITED [2] - 1:1, 1:11 United [2]-24:13, 24:23 universe [4]-20:12, 20:14, 20:21, 21:9 unrepresented [1] - 15:22 up [5]-11:5, 19:17, 22:2, 22:14, 23:5 USDIN ${ }_{[1]}$ - $3: 11$ VA [1] - 2:24 various [5] - 6:1, 8:2, 10:21, 18:8, 22:22 vehicles [1] - 9:2 Venture [1] - 12:22 Victor [1] - 12:8 VILLAGE [1] - 2:23 Virginia [2] - 10:23, 11:12 voluminous [1] - 21:24 <br> waiting [1] - 9:20 <br> WALNUT [1] - 1:20 <br> WALTHER [1]-2:7 <br> warehouses [1] 13:18 | ```WARSHAUER \({ }_{[1]}\) - 1:23 web [4]-10:19, 16:20, 16:21, 16:23 week [6]-8:5, 8:10, 10:17, 13:1, 13:22, 18:18 weeks [3]-7:7, 12:13, 19:18 WEISS \({ }_{[1]}-2: 2\) WHEREUPON [1] - 24:1 Whitman [1] - 14:2 whole [1]-22:10 willing [1] - 15:10 Wittmann [1]-5:15 WITTMANN [16] - 2:7, 2:7, 5:15, 6:23, 9:23, 10:2, 10:6, 14:5, 15:6, 15:14, 16:16, 19:20, 20:4, 23:4, 23:10, 23:13 works [1] - 11:19 wrap [1]-22:2 www.laed.uscourts. gov [1]-6:5 yesterday [1]-17:17 YOSS [1] - 3:3``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

