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## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

FRIDAY, APRIL 17, 2015
M O R N I N G S E S S I O N (COURT CALLED TO ORDER)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
THE COURT: Be seated, please.
The first motion we have is the Motion to Strike the Highly Confidential Matter. Taishan says that the Court has ruled that the privilege is removed, but they feel that there is a distinction between confidential and nonconfidential, and would like to keep some of them not open to the public.

MR. HERMAN: May I approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. HERMAN: I have a copy of this bench book that I'm going to argue from for each of the defense firms, BNBM, Taishan, and CNBM.

May it please the Court, Russ Herman for plaintiffs on this issue.

The issue really is whether or not documents which indicate an exception to privilege under crime fraud should be made public.

Preliminarily, we note that in the past China has
brought into the United States defective toys that are lead based, defective built, defective pet supplies, defective drywall and, recently, defective flooring.

We believe that there is no reason why these documents should not be made public, so I'm going to address them by number in the bench book.

If we turn first to Item 21, Your Honor, we see that BNBM and Taishan, as we look there, knew before they shipped substantial defective drywall to the United States it was defective. They sent it to a lab, and on May 11, 2006, it was reported that USG said the board had a sulfuric smell to it, and the lab said that both types of board had a very distinct sulfur smell to them.

This was between an exclusive agent appointed in the United States and BNBM. You'll see the BNBM cards attached to this communication.

This is in spite of the fact that Taishan denied in depositions in Hong Kong that they knew in advance that the drywall was defective.

Then, if we look at item 22, we look at the states where the drywall was brought into the United States, the Gulf States primarily and North Carolina and Virginia. As we turn the pages, we see that after 2006, substantial shipments were made by Taishan of board which they knew was defective.

09:50:17 1

09:50:32 2

09:50:35 3

09:50:38 4

09:50:42 5

09:50:49 6
$09: 50: 57 \quad 7$

09:51:06 8

09:51:08 9
09:51:16 10
09:51:26 11
09:51:30 12
09:51:37 13
09:51:42 14
09:51:48 15

09:51:53 16
09:51:59 17
09:52:05 18
09:52:12 19
09:52:19 20
09:52:29 21
09:52:30 22
09:52:38 23
09:52:44 24
09:52:52 25

That brings us to, Your Honor, the Hogan Lovells e-mail. Now, the defendants -- I've put in their bench book these e-mails. I know that they are under seal. I know they are marked highly confidential. But there has already been an ego, alter ego, single enterprise finding, and so these are, in fact, their documents. Therefore, whatever was released to us has been given today to defense counsel for Taishan, BNBM and CNBM.

If we look at page 26, we see -- I'm sorry, Item 26, we see several things that CNBM and BNBM were notified about the litigation, and they were determined to withdraw from it. We believe that these some-odd three thousand people who have been victimized since 2006 deserve to know that.

The next page says that Chairman Jia of Taishan is not able to make a decision, it's got to be made higher up. And who are the higher-ups, BNBM and CNBM.

There are other e-mails. The next one relates to CNBM, BNBM and SASAC.

Then it follows that Your Honor's contempt order and the injunction was reported up the line to CNBM and BNBM by Taishan.

Now, we looked at the actual relationships among these folks who are defendants before Your Honor. If we look at pages 2 through 11 -- Items 2 through 11 -- and I'm not going to go through all of them, I'll just take the 2010
report -- you'll note that it has a BNBM logo. It shows that March 17, 2011, the 2010 annual report of BNBM makes reference not only to the lawsuit, but the amount of attorneys' fees that BNBM and Taishan Gypsum are expending in defense of the case. They total some -- I'll round it off -- $\$ 4,300,000$ as of that date.

Further on, it says, "This company and our subsidiaries, Taishan Gypsum Company," so it's clear, in all of these reports. We've put the ones we've been able to discover and interpret in this binder through 2014.

I'll just turn to 2014. Under material litigation, we find that BNBM, again, is reporting Taishan Gypsum litigation as of that date.

The next set of documents, Your Honor, that I would like to address is the documents numbered 12 through 20 -- again, I'm not going to labor the Court with an argument that could last several hours -- that show directly that CNBM and CNBM Group are the puppeteers and masters of BNBM and Taishan.

Indeed, the annual report, tab 13, of CNBM makes certain admissions, including a chart, which I think Your Honor will find interesting, at page 10, because it shows the parent, it shows then the BNBM and the CNBM, and then the company which controls. If we go down to lightweight building materials, and we see Taihe, Shandong Taihe, as we do for every year.

The only thing that's added are more affiliates and controls. We note on the page before that it has, that is, CNBM has the same executive committee virtually for every year from 2007 through 2014. As discovery goes forward on other issues, we intend to pursue that.

Under tab 14, Your Honor, the company profile, at page 2, lists the largest gypsum board producer in Asia. When you get to 2014, the statement is that CNBM is the largest in the world.

You can follow as they add affiliates year by year, but always Taishan and BNBM appear.

It's interesting that there is some admissions against interest in which CNBM admits that it controls Taishan through its subsidiary BNBM.

So here is the question, Your Honor. I don't doubt -- I'm often in error, but never in doubt -- but I really do not doubt that we are going to show the affiliates, at some point when we're allowed to, and that at the present time and in 2006, at the time that Taishan and BNBM knew that they had defective drywall and determined that they would export it to the United States, particularly to the Gulf States and Virginia and North Carolina, that CNBM was aware, BNBM was aware, and that CNBM and BNBM were the people upstairs that Taishan had to report to that they weren't going to participate in this case.

Now, that brings down to what is equitable. Is
the public, and particularly those folks that have been endangered by this drywall, some of them have been foreclosed upon, some of them have lived in deplorable conditions, some of them have had to sell properties for much less than value, are they entitled at least to know that Taishan and their Chinese puppeteers, CNBM and BNBM, knew that they were shipping material to the United States that would cause them substantial damage, and they did it anyway. Why is that not of public interest that outrides any highly confidential documents revealed in the Taishan documents.

The last thing I want to say about it is we took depositions in Hong Kong. Had to take them twice, Your Honor will recall. It would have been of some interest to the Court, to the public, and to counsel if this information had come forward in the Taishan depositions in Hong Kong.

We note now that, unfortunately, the two chief individuals at Taishan, one doesn't work there anymore, his whereabouts are unknown, and the other is ill and can't testify. At that time, the information, had it come forward in their deposition, would have been public. There would have been no reason to hide it.

Most respectfully, Your Honor, in this situation, we don't see how these documents should be highly confidential. There is a straight linkage, they're relevant, and they will give at least some balm to those folks, those 3,000-plus folks
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who now have updated plaintiff profile forms, as to what really happened here.

Thank you, Your Honor, for the opportunity.
THE COURT: Thank you very much. Thank you.
Since you're just seeing this document, too, I'll give you an opportunity to write a reply, if you need it. MS. EIKHOFF: Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate that.

The bench book that we have just been handed, we haven't had a chance to review it.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. EIKHOFF: It's the first we're seeing it. It contains a lot of documents that were not produced by Taishan and seem to come from other sources, and we're going to need a chance to digest that and review it.

Based on counsel's arguments, however, it seems that this bench book is being used as a platform to make alter ego arguments that the plaintiffs want to make, and otherwise to cast aspersions on Taishan.

We understand that's their position. There is going to be a time and a place for those arguments to be made. It does not strike us that -- on a motion to de-designate confidentiality notations on certain documents under the Court's standing protective order does not seem to be the time and the place to be making such broader allegations and
arguments.
Now, just to be clear, these documents that are actually at issue in the motion to de-designate are the documents that were produced by Hogan Lovells. Those documents are discovery materials that are now available for everyone in the case. All counsel of record get them.

So in terms of redaction and, you know, whether other defendants can see them or not, of course, we understand that, under the PTO, this Court's PTO 16, that these are discovery materials that can be used for discovery in this case. There is no argument about that.

We also understand, Your Honor, that you have ruled that certain content of those documents are not privileged. The privilege, any privilege that may have protected them has been removed by this Court's ruling, and we absolutely understand that.

It does not follow, however, Your Honor, that just because they are no longer privileged for purposes of this litigation, that they no longer have any confidentiality protection under PTO 16 and under Rule 26(c).

Rule $26(c)$ and your protective order, Your Honor, recognize that there is a difference between privilege and confidentiality. Of course, the parties may designate certain documents as confidential that are not privileged documents.

When these documents were produced by

Hogan Lovells, they were deemed by Hogan to be designated as highly confidential, and they were so designated.

The PSC has moved, the plaintiffs have moved to remove that -- have moved to have that highly confidential designation removed, and we object to that because we do believe that these are documents that, although they can be freely used for purposes of this litigation among counsel and among parties, that they are discovery materials that do have confidential and proprietary information, business communications, communications made with attorneys with an expectation of confidentiality, and for those reasons we believe that they were properly designated.

Now, I would like to direct the Court's attention to the Supreme Court case Seattle Times v. Rhinehart, which is 467 US 20. In that case, the Supreme Court has ruled that discovery materials are a horse of a different color from other materials that are subject to open courts and First Amendment issues.

Just because a document is produced in discovery does not mean that it becomes automatically a public record, which is what the plaintiffs are arguing.

So those are generally our arguments and our position on keeping the designation as it is currently designated, which we think creates no restriction on the use -would create no restriction on use for depositions, but simply
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just prevents it from becoming a document that is a public document and could be widely disseminated through the press or otherwise.

THE COURT: You want these documents kept under seal, is that it?

MS. EIKHOFF: Yes, Your Honor, because once they are filed in PACER, it essentially does become a public document.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. EIKHOFF: So we understand that the documents are being used for purposes of this litigation. We received from the parties, the other side, the unredacted versions, and we can deal with that. The Court receives unredacted.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. EIKHOFF: But for what gets published on the web, that would be protected from public consumption.

THE COURT: Now, what happens if a deposition is taken, and the document is used in a deposition; or, if a trial proceeds, and the document is used in trial? What would you say to that? Keep the trial private, too?

MS. EIKHOFF: Well, Your Honor, the PTO does address that, Your Honor, and so we would follow the procedures that are set forth in the PTO.

Respectfully, we'll cross that bridge when we come to it. I mean, I understand that that does change the analysis; but, to date, they have not been introduced into any

10:07:05 18
$10: 07: 0919$
$10: 07: 1420$
$10: 07: 2221$

10:07:2622
$10: 07: 3023$
$10: 07: 4024$
$10: 07: 4425$
trial.

Really, the motion that we're dealing with is a motion to say these documents are not entitled to any confidentiality protection for any purposes. Since they've been produced in discovery, they must become public documents, and we don't believe that's appropriate.

THE COURT: Okay, I understand your argument. MR. HERMAN: A short rebuttal.

May it please the Court, I don't think a highly confidential designation can cover up a fraud.

Secondly, I don't think embarrassment by what you've done is enough to assert something is highly confidential and nonprivileged.

Lastly, most of these documents were published in English and circulated by these parties. For example, in 2006, CNBM had a public offering in -- that was published, and, indeed, they attracted shareholders, potential shareholders.

This isn't a question of discovery. It's a question of notice. Who knew, when did they know, and how were they related to a decision, number one, to distribute defective drywall that they knew was defective in the United States, which was not previously disclosed, and is not a privileged -or deprivileged document; and, when did -- when did they make a determination that they were going to ignore, on the basis of some legal counsel, that United States law, judgments of this

Court would not apply.
There is a bigger issue here that extends beyond the case, and that is the fact that a United States manufacturer is held to a defective product balancing the books, but a Chinese manufacturer is not. I think, to keep that document -- or those documents that are Hogan Lovells' deprivileged documents because they may prove embarrassment or because they contradict what Taishan was saying is just not proper, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: I understand your argument, both sides.
MR. FENTON: May I say something?
THE COURT: I'll give you an opportunity, too, as I said, to supplement your brief because you've just seen these documents.

MR. FENTON: Rick Fenton, Your Honor, on behalf of BNBM.

I had not planned on addressing this motion this morning, but Mr. Herman did make a couple of remarks in his opening statements that I think I do need to address.

I would like to direct the Court's attention to tab 21, which is the document that Mr. Herman said evidences some core knowledge of BNBM -- I'm not sure which BNBM entity he's talking about because they are very different entities -about the problems with the drywall.

As I was looking at the document, Your Honor, it
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was produced by Guardian Building Products. There is a mention of ASTM testing, but neither of the substantive e-mails are shown, unless I'm missing something, as having gone to BNBM or any of the other Chinese companies.

The other thing that caught my eye is that at the very end -- and Mr. Herman referred to the business card of a person at BNBM Company, Ltd, but I noticed that on the Bates numbering, that business card is entirely out of sequence with the other documents, the e-mails that were referenced.

Specifically, the first two e-mails, which did not go to anybody at BNBM, they are Bates number of GBT 925 and 924, respectively, the Bates number on the business card is GBT 7912.

Now, I don't know how these documents got arranged in this order, but I think it is -- and the next business card is 7914 -- but I think it's fair to say that it raises some questions about the statement that this is somehow evidence of prior knowledge by BNBM.

I wanted to make that very clear. This is the first time I've seen these documents, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No, I appreciate it.
Well, in your argument, then, you wouldn't have any objection to 924 and 925 being removed as confidential, since they don't apply to you?

MR. FENTON: Your Honor, these are not the Hogan
documents, I don't believe. These are -- were, I believe, in the notebook.

I think the point that Mr. Herman was trying to make is that, based on what he said was the foreknowledge of these companies, the public has a right to know. I'm saying I'm taking some issue, at least based on these documents, with that assertion.

THE COURT: No, I understand. Yes.
So these may not be -- no one may mind these being removed from confidential since they don't apply to --

MR. FENTON: Your Honor, I really don't know what these documents are, and I don't know whether they are still confidential. I just don't know.

THE COURT: I understand. All right. Okay. MR. FENTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I got it.
I will take this under advisement. I'll give you five days to do that, and two days for response, if plaintiffs need it.

Another argument that I have, too, is the alternate service that's being made.

MS. DUGGAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Sandra Duggan for the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee.

Nine months ago, the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee filed its Complaint Omnibus 19, and the defendant in
that complaint, the principal defendant is the State-Owned Assets Supervision and Administration Commission for the People's Republic of China, which we refer to as SASAC.

We proceeded to serve SASAC under the Hague Convention. The steps that we took are set forth in the affidavit of our agent, APS International. It took us about six months, until February 3rd of 2015, for the Ministry of Justice over in China to reject service. The Ministry invoked Article 13 of the Hague, said it would infringe on the sovereignty of China, and also told us that SASAC is an agent of the government.

So based on that statement, we sought the Court's intervention to use the service provisions of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act at Section 1608, 28 USC Section 1608 (b) .

Now, we understand that CNBM has objected and said we should have proceeded under $1608(a)$.

Whether SASAC is a foreign state or an agent of a foreign state really doesn't matter at this point because the statute sets forth a hierarchy of steps that must be followed.

Step one is, if there's a special arrangement between a plaintiff and the defendant, we follow that. We don't have any special arrangement.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. DUGGAN: Step two is you proceed under the

Hague Convention. We've done that.
We're interested in strictly complying with the statute. So now we're at Step 3. Step 3, if they are a foreign state, would suggest that the Clerk of the Court can dispatch notice of the suit, which the Fifth Circuit has said is a brief paragraph explaining what the suit is about, by any form of mail that requires a signed receipt upon the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

We don't think that's the subsection that we should be proceeding under, but, at this point, we're willing to do both.

If SASAC is an agent, which they've told us they are, then we need to proceed under any forum that is designed to give them actual notice. That could be the Clerk of the Court dispatching the summons and the complaint by any form of mail that would give us a signed receipt.

THE COURT: How about if they are the government?
MS. DUGGAN: If they are the government, then 28 USC $1608(a)$ would apply.

THE COURT: Would they have immunity if they are the government?

MS. DUGGAN: Well, we're going to argue that they don't because, under the exception to the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, our argument is that a foreign state shall not be immune from the jurisdiction of the Courts of the
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United States or of the states in any case in which the action is based upon an act outside the territory of the United States in connection with a commercial activity of the foreign state elsewhere that causes a direct effect in the United States. That's at 28 USC $1605(\mathrm{a})(2)$.

The statute defines commercial activity as either a regular course of commercial conduct or a particular commercial transaction or act, and that's at $1603(d)$.

The allegations in our complaint suggest that this is a commercial activity that has had a direct impact on 4,000 plaintiffs with Taishan drywall on their property.

THE COURT: Let me hear from the respondent. Any argument on the other side?

MR. TAYLOR: Not from us.
MR. STENGEL: No, Your Honor. As the motion was originally styled, they were seeking to serve SASAC through us, counsel for CNBM. As I understand where the PSC is now, they have abandoned or withdrawn that aspect, so we have no interest in the resolution of this issue.

MS. DUGGAN: I just want to point out, Your Honor, in our surreply that the Court granted us permission to file, at Rec Doc 18679-3, we submitted a revised proposed order that would use both prongs of the statute, (a) and (b), as a means to achieve service at this point.

THE COURT: Yes. We're talking about service, we're
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not really talking about the substance of it. It seems that the two -- the fact that they are served doesn't mean that they are engaged in a commercial activity or not engaged in a commercial activity, but it seems to me that the service, we've got to allow service to get them here. That was my thinking originally. So I deny any opposition to it. Go with the service.

MS. DUGGAN: Thank you so much, Your Honor. We will provide all the proper documents to the Clerk of Court.

THE COURT: As a courtesy to counsel, give counsel -not that it means anything, but at least a courtesy copy of whatever you're going to do.

MS. DUGGAN: We will do that.
THE COURT: You can give it to Taishan, so they can do it, so that there is no issue of accepting something and violating any responsibility to your client.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court.
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. HERMAN: I was advised after the first part of the status conference that a Garretson representative was here to report on the Virginia settlements. If Your Honor would entertain that, I don't think it will take much time.

THE COURT: Sure. Okay.
MS. BARRIOS: Good morning, again, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios, on behalf of Garretson Resolution Group.

Mr. Bower was here. He had to leave to catch his plane. He asked me just to give you a brief summary of his report.

The real property damage portion of their settlements, out, paid, everything done.

The other loss determinations have gone out in the mail, and they expect to have everything wrapped up within 90, 120 days, depending on if there is any appeals.

THE COURT: How many residences are we talking about?
MS. BARRIOS: Between three and four hundred.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Okay. Those are the cases that we tried. They were very helpful to us in the whole litigation. I'm glad that the Virginia matters, at least at this level, were taken care of. I know they have some other issues that are still outstanding, but we'll have to deal with those.

I also understand that we have a claimant in the audience. Do you wish to say something, ma'am? Come forward. One of the things I do, in having these open court matters, is that I put all of this on my website, so that all of the litigants, as well as their lawyers, know that they have access to the Court.

So this is --
MS. FERCHAUD: Yes, Your Honor. My name is
Jodi Ferchaud. I spoke with you last month.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. FERCHAUD: Since that last meeting, I have met with Phil Adams and also Tim Harris of Moss Construction, and we have made progress, serious progress in remedying the problems.

We're not completely finished. Nothing is in writing and signed off on, but we're continuing to work out the details.

What I'm here for today is I'm here to plead with the Court for lost rents or some sort of form of financial relief. I've been here since December 15th. I haven't received rents on the right side of the property since January of 2014; and, the left side, the tenant -- one tenant moved out, like right before the kickoff party.

I thought that I qualified for lost rents. I filled out everything that I was supposed to fill out. Then, I was told that I signed a release. I'm not exactly sure or I wasn't familiar with the nuances of that settlement agreement, but if I signed a release to negate what I thought I was actually qualified for, it was my mistake.

So I'm asking the Court to consider that, you know, I haven't received the rents.

I haven't been home -- I live in Hawaii. I haven't been home, I haven't seen my daughter in four months. I'm hoping that we can resolve all of the issues, but -THE COURT: You're still in the discussion phase.

10:21:01 1

10:21:05 2

10:21:07 3
10:21:07 4
10:21:09 5
10:21:15 6
10:21:22 7
10:21:25 8
10:21:29 9
10:21:32 10
10:21:35 11
10:21:40 12
10:21:4313
10:21:46 14
10:21:50 15
10:21:53 16
10:21:56 17
10:22:00 18
10:22:06 19
10:22:13 20
10:22:14 21
10:22:19 22
10:22:24 23
10:22:27 24
10:22:29 25

Mr. Balhoff, if you want to say anything about this one. Are you all talking and working toward some resolution?

I know he has his mediator hat on at this time. MR. BALHOFF: Yes, Your Honor.

My name is Dan Balhoff. I'm the Court-appointed mediator and also the Special Master. As Your Honor said, for the time being I have my mediator hat on.

I've explained to Ms. Ferchaud that I'm trying to mediate this matter for the time being. If it doesn't succeed, I will put my Special Master hat on and make any decisions that are called upon -- that I'm called upon to make.

The parties have been working together. I've been speaking with the parties. I spoke to them, as a matter of fact, outside the courtroom just now.

As I understand it, Ms. Ferchaud is asking for something beyond what she is discussing with Moss. She's asking for a remedy from the Court of some monetary figure. I told her that, until called upon as Special Master, I'm in no position to award her any money.

THE COURT: Yes. We have a process, ma'am, of doing this. You make a claim, and the Special Master looks at it and discusses it and then rules on it, and then it comes to me, but we've got to go through the process.

But I'm glad that you're able, at least, to work
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out some -- I understand, it's been reported to me that you all have made progress with Moss.

MS. FERCHAUD: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: I appreciate Moss' work, and I appreciate yours, too.

MS. FERCHAUD: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you very much for bringing it to my attention.

Anything else from anyone?
MS. EIKHOFF: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Yes.
MS. EIKHOFF: Your Honor, on behalf of Taishan, I wanted to seek clarification from the Court on a minute entry that was entered for the April 7th discovery telephonic conference that we had.

For about two weeks now, Your Honor, we have been asking for -- for purposes of the damages discovery and getting ready for the damages hearing, we have been asking for raw data and information from BrownGreer and the Garretson Group, which we believe are highly relevant to damages, that includes actual remediation information from Moss \& Associates, results of inspections, including identification of which claimants had Taishan drywall, supporting claim information for claimants that are currently identified as being part of the class, and amounts of compensation already received.

To be clear, we are not seeking any thoughts, mental impressions, analysis, from any attorneys or from these groups. We're really just seeking raw data.

We filed a Motion to Compel. We had a hearing on that Motion to Compel. Your Honor held that that information was discoverable for purposes of damages, but made a notation to say that at this time that Knauf's proprietary information was not discoverable.

We've reached out to Mr. Miller. Knauf did file a paper after we had that conference, and we reviewed it. The essence of the paper was that it's all proprietary, and therefore Taishan should not be able to get any of it.

We have been trying to work this out with Mr. Miller for the last several days. We have been in pretty frequent communication. As it stands now, Your Honor, we're almost there, but we have one hurdle that we haven't been able to overcome, and that is a condition that Knauf has placed on their consent to us getting that information.

We have already agreed that we will pay BrownGreer's and Garretson Group's time and expense associated with gathering this information and sending it to us. That is not an issue.

Knauf has also said that they will refuse to allow us to have any access to this raw data unless Taishan agrees to pay BrownGreer's travel expenses, starting today,
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related to them coming to the Court to give their presentation to the Court about the status of the Knauf settlement.

That strikes us as completely unrelated and not an issue that should be raised as an obstacle to us getting data that every other party in this case has. From our discussions with the PSC, we have been told that they are working actively with BrownGreer to get these updated plaintiff profile forms, to have that information aggregated and presented to them. We're the only ones that are locked out of getting this raw data that we need in order to analyze the damages and to prepare our defenses on damages.

THE COURT: Okay. Just to put this matter in perspective, there was a motion made. As I try to do, as soon as a motion is made, $I$ try to deal with it immediately. So I got counsel on the line for the parties that seemed to be involved in this case.

Now, oftentimes, in cases of this sort, I just have two sides, the plaintiff and one defendant. In this case, the difficulty is I have 1,000 defendants in this case, in addition to the regular plaintiffs.

So when I get people on the line, it's hard for me to get 1,000 defendants. Many of them have absolutely nothing to do with this issue. They are installers, they are mom and pop outfits, things of that sort. They are not even available to talk to the Court. So -- and many of them don't
have attorneys even.
So I have to make a judgment and call the people -- I always get two sides to it. One makes a motion, the other responds to it. Whoever responds in writing or moves in writing, those are the individuals that I generally get in front of me or on the phone, they talk to me, and I hear from each of them, I have a court reporter there, and I rule immediately. That's what $I$ did in this situation.

But during the argument, it was mentioned to me that Knauf may have some interest in this. Knauf wasn't on the phone. So I said, if Knauf has an interest in this, I'm not going to make any decision until I hear from Knauf, to hear what their side of the story is. So anything that deals with Knauf, I'm going to except from the order. That's what we're here today for.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Judge. Kerry Miller for Knauf. As you pointed out, we actually put in an opposition, I think, as the phone conference was occurring that afternoon. I think it was last week on Monday, maybe.

Your Honor, to clarify Knauf's position, first of all, we don't have any problem at all with Garretson providing Taishan and BNBM and CNBM data for Virginia.

The reason for that, Your Honor, is because Knauf wasn't involved in Virginia. We didn't pay for Garretson, we didn't have any homes. So if Taishan and the plaintiffs can
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work out an arrangement with Garretson, I don't have any issue with that at all.

Secondly, Your Honor, with respect to raw data, which, in my mind, is Taishan plaintiff profile forms that were collected in this MDL, BrownGreer became the central clearinghouse for that collection. I don't have any problem, as long as Taishan pays for it, with BrownGreer sending Taishan all of the profile forms, the actual pieces of paper. I think we covered that last time. No problem with that.

Third, I heard Mr. Herman in chambers mention that total square foot data of Taishan claimants had been provided to Taishan. Again, no problem with that at all.

Here are my issues, Your Honor, is when it comes down to BrownGreer, as the administrator of the Knauf settlement and of the settlements that are related to Knauf, the Banner, the InEx and the Global builder and installer settlement -- Your Honor is very familiar as to how they all work together -- the agreement was, with respect to all those settlements -- and I think you asked a question when Jake Woody was giving his presentation as to the relationship -- because Knauf receives assignments from homeowners, we have rights to certain of the GBI -- Global, Banner and InEx claims.

As part of the negotiation of all those settlements, with all the lawyers who were involved in all the settlements with the PSC, Knauf agreed to pay all the
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administrative costs of all of those settlements, administrative costs being BrownGreer in this particular instance.

So we paid for BrownGreer not only to administer the remediation program, which is more specific to Knauf, but all of the payouts from Banner, from InEx, and from the builders and installers that participated in the settlements. We paid for everything, including the payments to homeowners who made Banner claims and InEx claims and Globals claims who have no Knauf, who have Taishan. We paid for BrownGreer to cut those checks and process those claims, even though we have no role in those claims at all. These are participants in GBI who have Taishan.

Certainly Knauf is reviewing and analyzing its own claim against Taishan and BNBM and CNBM. One portion of that claim would be reimbursement of what we've spent, what we've incurred in connection with the administration of Taishan-related claims and damages.

It would have been terrific if Taishan joined us back in 2010. We could have worked this out. We'd pay for the Knauf share, they'd pay for Taishan share. It would have been easy, but it didn't happen that way.

So where I have a problem is when Taishan talks about raw data that BrownGreer possesses, and they spoke specifically about remediation data, they spoke specifically
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about inspections, the remediation data starts with Moss doing an estimate. We pay for Moss to do the estimate. Nobody else pays for Moss to do the estimate.

The inspections, there are separate inspection companies that go out and inspect the homes to see what kind of drywall they have in it after they provide qualifying material to Mr. Levin. We pay the independent inspectors. We pay the independent inspectors regardless of whether or not it's a Taishan home or a Knauf home or a mixed home. We pay for that.

Opposing counsel made a reference to the other side has the information. Well, there is a reason why the other side has the information. We have a contract with the other side to share that information with them.

Taishan doesn't have a contract with me. The only reason the plaintiffs have it is because of the settlement agreement, the contractual relationship. The negotiations that Knauf had with them is part of a very complicated negotiation, where there was give and take on both sides.

The proprietary argument that I have, Your Honor, is when you get into -- let me say what else that I'm -BrownGreer can run summary reports on averages, even on the Knauf side. What's the average size of a Knauf home that's been remediated, what's the average cost, what are the averages in Florida, what are the averages in Mississippi, what are the averages in Louisiana?

I don't have a problem with BrownGreer running that report and giving it to Taishan, if Taishan pays for it, which would give them the useful data I think they are looking for.

Where I have a problem, Your Honor, is, is when you look at the 4,000 or so Knauf homes that have been settled in the BrownGreer database, what they told me they wanted when they explained what raw or empirical data meant, they want every piece of information, line by line, homeowner by homeowner, on all those claims.

Your Honor, it's inaccurate to say that even the plaintiffs have that information, because the way the BrownGreer portal is set up is one plaintiff lawyer can only look at his clients' claims. So, Mr. Davis can't look at Mr. Seeger's clients, and Mr. Seeger can't look at Mr. Davis' clients, at that level of detail, because -- Your Honor has worked on these cases for a long time -- what BrownGreer has is it has every piece of information about that homeowner's claim, how much was paid to do this, were there any change orders, how much did they get for rent and relocation, how long did it take, you know, so on and so forth.

So what we didn't want to have happen is we have one guy on the street, hey, so how much did your house cost? Well, mine cost $\$ 132,000$. The guy down the street, well, it was $\$ 104,000$. So that's why only the plaintiff lawyer himself,

10:34:46 1
the way BrownGreer has it set up, can look at the portal of information.

What Taishan has specified it wants is it wants the keys to everything. It wants a line item with 20 or 30 fields of data, by address and by home. That's all been paid for by Knauf, and it's all been handled as proprietary information between the parties to that contract, that individual release, Knauf and that homeowner, and Knauf and that homeowner's counsel.

So, like I say, if they want summary information, that's fine, if they pay for it; but, to get the information, line by line, and make that part of the public record, part of what they are doing -- the PSC has made some relevancy objections, $I$ don't think it's relevant either because it's a different set of circumstances -- that's what my -- that's what I mean by proprietary, not my mental impressions, but the consultants that we've paid for, pursuant to a contract with the PSC, that built this machine on a line-by-line basis, that's my objection.

THE COURT: I understand. I understand the issues.
With regard to the Taishan homes, let's provide the Taishan-only homes information. That's relevant to them. With regard to the -- and they'll pay for it. With regard to the mixed homes or the -- I'm mainly concerned about the Knauf homes -- give them the summary
information. Let them pay for that. Let's get that information first, and see where you are with it.

I'll listen to you. We're talking about amounts, we're talking about money, and I can deal with money.

Also, let's get together -- do you know the total cost of all of that?

MR. MILLER: Yeah, I think that BrownGreer can tally up what that total cost is.

THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll get together that, and I'll decide who pays it. You may well have to pay it. If you want it, you may have to pay it. You probably ought to know whether it's $\$ 10$ or $\$ 10$ million before you make that decision.

MR. MILLER: The total cost of what Knauf has paid BrownGreer and the others, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. MILLER: Yes. I mean, that's what the issue is, and that's why, at one point, I made the request, really before I understood what the data request was, was for these services, Knauf and BrownGreer entered into a fixed rate contract for fees. So it's set. BrownGreer has reached that amount of work. It's $\$ 2.5$ million, Your Honor, is what we've paid just for BrownGreer, but then they are talking about Moss, then they are talking about the inspection companies, so that's on top of that.

The ombudsman, the pro se cure, I mean, you know, the list goes on and on and on and on and on. All that data is captured by BrownGreer because they are the central clearinghouse. So there's more than that --

THE COURT: Well, some of it may not be necessary. I mean, it doesn't seem to me to be necessary. If you've got the square footage, if you've got the general average, if you've got all of the Taishan homes -- you know, if you need any additional information after you get all of that, I'll talk with you about it, and I'll see who bears the cost for that.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you both.
Anything else?
All right. Folks, thank you very much. I'll see you next time.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
(WHEREUPON, at 1:27 p.m., the hearing was concluded.)

*     *         * 
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