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

$M O R N I N G \quad S E S S I O N$ THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2009
(COURT CALLED TO ORDER)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise. MDL 2047, In re: Chinese Drywall.

THE COURT: Would counsel make their appearances for the record, please.

MR. SEEGER: If I told you I was Russ Herman would you believe it?

THE COURT: That's okay. He's representing the plaintiffs. How about the defendants?

MR. WITTMANN: Phil Wittmann here for the Homebuilders, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Please use the microphone. We have between 60 and a hundred people on the phone, so I would like them at least to be advised of what's happening.

MR. WITTMANN: Phil Wittmann, Homebuilders' liaison counsel, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. The first item on the agenda is Pretrial Orders. Anything on that? Anything from the plaintiffs on the pretrial orders?

What about Property Inspections? Let me hear from inspections?

MR. MEUNIER: Jerry Meunier for the PSC, subject to Mr. Herman supplementing this later, Judge, I have nothing to report on property inspections.

THE COURT: Let me hear from -- he is not here either.
MS. BAAS: I think Lexy just went to get them, Your Honor.

MR. SERPE: Your Honor, Richard Serpe also with the Plaintiffs Steering Committee. I can report with respect to inspections that the homes for the seven intervenors were made available for defense inspections. They had two full days of inspections last week. They were back in this week. We were able to work out all inspection issues, including protocols for removal of samples, and the inspections, at least as far as the intervenors for the Germano trial, have been complete.

THE COURT: We're on the property inspections. Anything from the plaintiff further from the plaintiff on the property inspections?

MR. LEVIN: Your Honor, you were so quiet, we didn't realize.

THE COURT: That's alright. Would you speak into the microphone. As I mentioned at the outset, we have about a hundred people on the phone, so I would like them to be kept advised of what's happening.

Anything on the property inspections?
MR. HERMAN: No, Your Honor. Other than that, we will announce today the property for the March trial, present the Court with a letter. We have already advised Knauf it's a single property -- property only, single defendant in the New Orleans area to be tried here. I've advised Kerry Miller for Knauf just to let me know when they would like to have their inspections in. THE COURT: Just to remind everybody, the first matter will begin in January and flow into February. It will focus on the remediation and scope of remediation, and that case will proceed on schedule. Then we'll follow that with the plaintiff's selection and then the defendant's selection, and then I've also extended the opportunity to the Homebuilders to pick a case so that we can go with that for the trial.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, excuse me for not introducing myself. I'm Russ Herman, liaison counsel for plaintiffs. Good morning, Judge Fallon.

THE COURT: Good morning. Plaintiff and Defendant Profile Forms, the next item on the agenda.

MR. HERMAN: Mr. Miller will address that.
MR. MILLER: Good morning, Your Honor. Kerry Miller, defense liaison counsel. With respect to the status of the plaintiff and defendant profile forms, as the Court is aware, the Defense Steering Committee filed a Motion to Dismiss certain plaintiffs who have not submitted profile forms. That Motion to

Dismiss was filed before the last status conference.
Since the last status conference we have not had many profile forms from plaintiffs' liaison counsel, and what we had put together or are putting together today or tomorrow is a list that will indicate who has not responded to the plaintiff profile form obligation.

I understand that opposing counsel at Mr. Herman's office and Mr. Levin's office have worked very hard in trying to reach out to the plaintiffs and their lawyers who have not submitted profile forms in accordance with your pretrial order.

So what we'll be doing in connection with the next hearing is we will look and obtain the list of plaintiffs who have not submitted profile forms. We are going to make sure the due process is complied with, notify those plaintiffs and their counsels likely by certified mail that I think Your Honor will set Rule to Show Cause hearings with respect to claims, and we will seek dismissal with prejudice in connection with the next status conference of the plaintiffs who do not submit timely profile forms.

THE COURT: Let me speak on that. The profile forms are an opportunity for the parties to cut through some of the initial discovery aspect of the case. The profile forms are vital, they are necessary, and I'm giving people an opportunity to respond and to fill in the profile forms, but they need to know that after a period of time, after they have been given an opportunity
to fill it in, if they resist and do not file the profile forms, I will assume that they are not interested in proceeding with the litigation and dismiss their case with prejudice.

Now, I have before me a number of motions to dismiss the case with prejudice for failure to file profile forms. I will issue an order to show cause why those cases should not be dismissed. I'm not going to dismiss them now. I'm not going to deal with the motions now. I'll issue an order to show cause why those cases should not be dismissed and directing the defendants to let me know which individuals should be notified by court order of this opportunity for them to fill in the profile forms. If they haven't done so by next meeting, I'll entertain a motion to dismiss those cases with prejudice.

Preservation Order.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, there are defendant profile forms -- may it please the Court, there are defendant profile forms which are incomplete. We have not yet brought a formal motion. We believe we've got enough facing us right now, but we are reserving our right to bring a motion in the event that those defendants' profile forms are not complete, and we don't assume to know what remedies would be provided in the event of those failures.

THE COURT: No, it's a two-way street. The defendant has to produce profile forms; the plaintiffs have to produce profile forms. If either side doesn't do that, then the Court
will act on it. If it's the defendant, I'll deal with that situation by dismissing their defenses and proceed accordingly.

MR. MILLER: Another issue, Your Honor, we do get updates from Mr. Herman's office with respect to what their information shows in terms of defendants not submitting profile forms. We then turn that list over electronically to all defense counsel who have signed up to LexisNexis, get their feedback back, get in touch with Mr. Herman's office, so we're in a pretty constant information exchange on that issue.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, while we're on that, we've had a lot of inquiries from both plaintiff and defense lawyers, and we want to point out the Court's web site for those here and those on the phone. It's www.laed.uscourts.gov. All of Your Honor's pretrial orders and transcripts are there. If the lawyers would look to those first, it will help answer the questions that we have been getting.

THE COURT: With that web site on the left-hand side of the page you will see a button for the drywall cases. Click on that button and then you'll have the Drywall web site. I've tried to give maximum transparency to this particular case. I put these transcripts on the web site. I put all of the court orders on the web site, all of the motions coming up and things of that sort, so not only do the lawyers have access to it but the public as well, so that's the web site. If you have any
questions, go to the web site and look at it.
MR. MILLER: Judge, a particular issue that has been generating a lot of questions, phone calls and e-mails, I think, on my end and maybe on the Court's end as well pertains to Pretrial Order 1, 1(c) and a minute entry that was issued in connection with what's known as the Gross matter.

The Gross matter is an indeterminate defendant class-action case filed by the PSC. The parties have agreed and I think the Court has given an order that all you need to do in Gross is file a notice of appearance. Services are being made in piecemeal fashion, and I think the agreement, as reflected in the Court's order, is that no defendant in Gross that has been served needs to do anything other than file an appearance at this time until further notice.

MR. LEVIN: No, we do need a profile form and a letter is going --

THE COURT: Speak in the mic.
MR. LEVIN: Arnold Levin. We do need a profile form, and we have a letter going out advising all unrepresented defendants as well as represented defendants of the relevant pretrial orders and also the Court's web site and their need to file an entry of appearance. That will go out. Some of the addresses are bad, and they are being checked now. That letter will go out early next week and it will be filed with the Court. THE COURT: I will post that on the web site.

MR. HERMAN: I think, Your Honor, for the record and because there are folks on the phone, the relevant trial orders are 1, 1(b), 1(c), and 5(a), the preservation order, what I call the registration order, and the profile form order.

THE COURT: The next item on the agenda is State/Federal Coordination. Anything on that?

While counsel is approaching the podium, let me say in a case of this sort, you have not only a number of cases in federal court under the MDL proceeding, but we have a number of cases in state courts. Presently it looks like it will be about 42 state courts, but the majority of the claims are being filed in Louisiana, Florida, Virginia, and Alabama. There are some in New Jersey and in other places, but those are the areas that I'm seeing most of the claims being filed in state courts.

I've contacted the state judges in those state courts. I've made available to them all of the material that we have been generating in the MDL. I've gotten their wise counsel and their cooperation, and we frequently discuss the matters coming up on the phone, and I need to again express my appreciation to my state colleagues for all of the help that they've given to me in this litigation.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios for the State Liaison Committee. Pursuant to Your Honor's directive, we had sent letters out to every judge in the country who had a Chinese drywall case, inviting them to participate in the
conference, encouraging them to discuss it with Your Honor and exchange information, so we hope that that has been helpful to you. I have gotten calls from several of the judges, and I've directed them to your law clerk and yourself.

Your Honor, since the last status conference, we've only had one remand filed, and that was filed in West, et al v State Farm Fire and Casualty. It was rejected by the Clerk's Office because of the stay order in effect, so the MDL actually has no remand motions pending before it.

I'm providing for Your Honor and for all counsel a CD, updated $C D$ containing all of the state court cases of which we are aware. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Ms. Barrios is the chair of the state court committee. I've endeavored to give the state courts an opportunity to participate in the MDL proceedings. She coordinates that activity. I have appointed a committee from the various states to be represented on that committee, and they should feel welcome at these meetings as well, of course, as the judges who are participating today.

The next item is State Court Trial Settings. Is there anything on state court trial settings?

MR. HERMAN: There are none, Your Honor.
THE COURT: We've talked about the Motions in the MDL.
Discovery Issues. Any discovery issues?
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, the motions are all indicated
on your status report which Your Honor posts on a web site.
Very briefly, under PSC motions under A, the Court granted that motion on December 7th.

Under B the PSC motions were deferred by agreement. They are still deferred.

Under C, the depositions are now set. I'll take those depositions of Venture Supply and Porter-Blaine next week on the -- on Wednesday and Thursday. I believe that's the 17th and 18th, and I've advised the Court in the event that something comes up during that deposition we'll contact the Court.

Under B, the DSC motions, the first was under 558. Your Honor heard argument on that in Florida, and there was a briefing here on that issue. It's under advisement.

Under B, Interior Exterior, made a discovery motion, was denied but with the right to refile.

Under C, the transfer order and motions were denied filed by Venture Supply and Porter-Blaine.

Under D, distributor defendants have filed a motion which has been taken under submission to strike plaintiffs' claims for economic damages under Florida law. Your Honor heard argument on that as well as Louisiana law, and it's been submitted.

Under E, the DSC filed a Motion to Dismiss certain defendants based upon failure to provide profile forms. Your Honor has addressed that issue.

Under C, other motions, on all other motions, and there are numerous, it's Page 8, 9, 10, and 11, they are not -no hearing is needed at this time. No dates have been set by the Court, but we do note that PTO $1(\mathrm{C})$ at page 11 of the record allows parties to file motions before the MDL court and provides that those motions will be considered without date unless a motion is filed specifically to be accepted from the continuance of those motions. I don't believe that there are any of those pending before Your Honor.

THE COURT: Freedom of Information Act. Anything on that?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. At the last pretrial status conference, Your Honor directed that plaintiffs should provide contact information for the various government agencies in order that the Court may assist in facilitating discovery from those various agencies. I do think at this point, Your Honor, it is necessary to point out, and I do -- may I approach?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. HERMAN: I have a list. Thank you. It's necessary to point out that the federal agencies have not provided and refused to provide plaintiffs with the discovery that we believe is necessary. Evidently under federal law, if you're a plaintiff, you have no access to the CPSC if you're in litigation, but the corporations who are defendants do have access. They have met numerous times with the CPSC, and,
therefore, we give an advance indication to the court that the plaintiffs do not accredit any CPSC report to have any value because they've had one-sided input. We hope to pursue that matter before these trials come to a fruition.

THE COURT: I'll look into the material that you've given to me and talk with the U.S. Attorney's Office here and ask them to contact the necessary agencies and get their position on it. If necessary, I'll order that they be present at the next meeting to explain why they haven't delivered the material.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, on the issue of responses to FOIA requests, I just want to make sure, we have received a CD from the plaintiffs, from plaintiffs' liaison counsel containing the responses that they have received as of the last status conference. I also received a hand delivery yesterday containing information from the Environmental Protection Agency.

I just want to make sure nothing slips through the cracks. If we realtime have what the plaintiffs have, we're happy to reimburse them for their costs, but as this information rolls in, particularly as we get close to the scope of remediation hearing, we will want to have the same information that the plaintiffs have, so I'll --

THE COURT: I think that's right on either side. If you have any information from any of the agencies, you need to give it to the plaintiffs and vice versa. There is no sense in having both of you all write the same agencies and get the same
material.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, first of all, we'll be happy to be reimbursed. We'll provide contemporaneous information, and since Your Honor has spoken to this, we would appreciate the minutes and dates of the meetings that you folks have had with the CPSC as part of the information which we believe we should receive, and I'll be happy to discuss that with you after the conference.

Your Honor, with regard to the omnibus complaint, we have a letter, first of all, we have to present to the Court the acceptance of service by Knauf, and I'll call on my colleague Mr. Miller to make any comments that he would like to make about that, and then, Your Honor, followed by that, we have an announcement regarding the second trial for the March 15th trial date.

THE COURT: Okay. We're dealing with the tenth item on the agenda, the Trial Settings in Federal Court.

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: As everyone knows, an omnibus class action complaint has been filed. Some 2,000 individual claims have been logged in that complaint, or thereabouts. The service has been accepted by Knauf on that claim. Anything more on that?

MR. MILLER: No. I think that's right, Your Honor. As you will recall, at prior status conferences we often had debates with respect to certain numbers of impacted homes or properties
we read about in the press and the number of claims we're having in the MDL. I would point out we were at 300 for quite some time, and now it appears that there are 2,000, or thereabouts, homeowners represented by various members of the plaintiff group who have asserted claims against Knauf Plasterboard (Tianjin) and other defendants.

My client, pursuant to pretrial order Number 17, I believe, did yesterday effectuate a waiver of service on behalf of that Knauf Plasterboard (Tianjin) for that particular complaint.

As set forth in Pretrial Order 17, I want to be clear that was a one-time agreement by my client who worked well with Mr. Herman and Mr. Levin's office and certainly appreciate their efforts in putting it together and all those who contributed to it. Our next steps, of course, are going to be to start to evaluate that census and that information and move on. THE COURT: One of the purposes of the omnibus complaint, or the significant purpose of omnibus complaint is to try to get our hands around this particular litigation. The way of doing that is to find out how many claims are out there. While there are obviously more claims than have been filed, it is some indication of the claims. Hopefully this will give an opportunity to take some sampling and design some kind of sample that reflects the litigation in general or certain aspects of the litigation from the standpoint of the defendants involved.

Once that grouping is analyzed to see whether or not it's a reliable sample, whether it's enough of a reliable sample, if it is, then you can explore more about the type of claims in that sample, and the nature and extent of the claims in that sample, where they are from, how many in that sample have drywall in over 50 percent of the house as opposed to under 50 percent of the house or 10 percent of the house or whatever it is.

You're better off with a grouping like that than you are with simply one claim, in order to get some indication of total census in the case and the nature and extent of the claims in the case. That's one of the aspects of the omnibus complaint that hopefully we can now begin mining that data.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, one more aspect. In Pretrial Order 17, I think we ought to remind everyone that there is an obligation for those plaintiffs who are in the omnibus complaint to follow up with the plaintiff profile forms. In discussions with Mr. Levin, I understand that some of those are en route to me. We will make all earnest efforts to evaluate those right away because that's probably the first cut at mining the claims, as you say.

THE COURT: The next is filings in the MDL. Anything on that?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, I have a couple of other matters, if I might.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. HERMAN: Excuse me, Your Honor. First of all, I want to present the Court with the service of acceptance. If I may approach the Court, I have an original and a copy.

Secondly, Your Honor, we indicate that there were several hundred Knauf cases provided that did not make the cutoff. Knauf is firm that this acceptance was only one time; however, we emphatically state to all plaintiff attorneys and those individual claimants who are representing themselves to please provide us with information as to Knauf and any other Chinese manufacturers with regard to their homes and encourage them to have their homes inspected and identified.

With regard to profile forms, the reason the profile forms were not submitted yesterday is we were waiting for the docket number to be placed on the profile forms. They are being provided seriatim. We have the profile forms. The only thing needed now is to imprint the case number on it, and they will be provided forthwith.

Your Honor has set a schedule for trials at page 19. And Your Honor had directed that today plaintiffs pick and designate the case to be tried before Your Honor on March 15th. I have a letter to Your Honor with copies to defense liaison counsel that states that the plaintiffs propose that Tatum B. Hernandez and Charlene M. Hernandez, individually, and their minor children, Grant Hernandez and Amelia Hernandez $v$

Knauf Gips in the USDC, Eastern District, 2:09-CV-06050 is the selection for trial services confirmed, and I would like to approach and provide the Court with a copy -- with the original of that letter and defense counsel with copies.

To that end -- I'm sorry, Your Honor, I didn't mean to move from the mic. To that end, Your Honor, Chris Seeger and Steve Herman have worked out a proposed scheduling order. We provided it to Knauf. They'll meet and confer and shortly make a recommendation to Your Honor of a scheduling order for the March trial. We also were meeting and will meet to set up a fair and reasonable deposition schedule that will not cause Knauf to have to take all the depositions at once.

I appreciate the opportunity to address Your Honor on those points.

THE COURT: All right. Then by the next status conference, I would like Knauf to designate the trial that they wish to proceed for the following trial, and then the following one I'll give the opportunity to the Homebuilders to pick a case that they wish to try and we'll go on that way.

Filings in the MDL? Anything?
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, the only thing that I wanted -I felt -- I feel necessary to report to Your Honor is that one of the declaratory judgment actions was not sent to the MDL; however, there are some other declaratory judgments out there, insurance issues, which do impact the MDL.

I want to advise that sometime between now and the end of the year plaintiffs will be filing a large number of direct actions directly in the MDL which will not only have coverage issues but substantive issues, and it's our belief that that may somehow have an impact as to whether the insurance actions end up here. I thought I would alert Your Honor to that in advance.

MR. LEVIN: Arnold Levin. One of the coverage actions involves the insurance in the Taishan issue that's before the Court. The panel has not transferred a similar action, although it was not here, with damage actions that were related to an action that was being tried. We'll be filing papers before the panel and will copy Your Honor with those papers, sir.

THE COURT: The initial issue is going to be whether or not that is MDL fodder, whether that's appropriate for the MDL or whether the insurance coverage issues are specific enough for the local courts to deal with those. I think some thought has to be given to that because the MDL has discussed some of this with me, the panel, and I haven't concluded, frankly, that this is part of the MDL or should be resolved individually because it's not something that will impact the entire litigation. It's so sui generis, it's so case specific, it's so insurance-policy specific that some analysis has to be made on that. Notices of Appearance and Default Judgments in the Germano case.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, we just remind all counsel, particularly in connection with those recently involved in Gross and those in the omnibus complaint who have not appeared before, that there is an order requiring that all counsel file appearances. Again, we direct all counsel to laed.uscourts.gov and the drywall signal in connection therewith.

THE COURT: Preliminary default has been issued in the Germano case. We're now at the stage where the default will be proceeding, as I mentioned earlier, to file a default, and I'll be dealing with the scope of the mediation in that particular case.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, I have now received three notes from three different attorneys. As usual, I'm often in error but not in doubt. I want to make everyone aware that the depositions of Venture Supply and Porter-Blaine are scheduled next week in Norfolk, will be on-line in the event that they wish to observe or tune in.

THE COURT: Everybody is aware that in these particular cases oftentimes, at least in the beginning and during the course of the litigation, there are certain depositions that everyone wishes to participate in. I can't have everybody at the deposition because we would be using the Superdome, and that's already committed for the next couple of weeks. So in order to allow everybody maximum participation, we have arranged for these depositions to be put on-line so that you can pull them up with
your Social Security Number or predesignated number. You can look at it on your computer. On the left side of the page is the realtime transcript, and on the right-hand side is voice and image.

If you wish to participate in the deposition, you simply type in whatever questions you want, and it goes to your representative, the plaintiff or the defendant. At the appropriate time that individual elbows his colleague who is asking the question and indicates that New Orleans wishes this, or Hawaii wants this and so forth and so on in the transcript. Everybody is able to participate in it and watch the deposition as it goes on. It's worked in other cases, and hopefully it will work in this instance, too.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, there is one other matter that is not necessarily set out in the status conference which we want to bring to your attention and those individuals here in the courtroom and that are on the phone. After some extensive meet-and-confers with counsel for Knauf, we have reached an agreement on ESI. It's now being reviewed by Ms. Bass and members of the builders.

We do want to remind, particularly the defendants, that many, many privileged logs pursuant to PTO 15 have not been provided. The plaintiffs have deferred bringing motions before the Court regarding the absence of these privileged logs, but we would appreciate those defendants who have partially complied
with defense profile forms to please get us their privileged logs as soon as possible.

THE COURT: With the ESI information, the electronically stored information, this is my thinking on that: I want to give the parties an opportunity to explore and look this over. This is not the type of material that has any smoking guns generally in it. That's not the issue here. Oftentimes in cases that's a problem, and it has to be worked out through privileged logs.

Here I think the main hurdle is just logistics
issues. There are some defendants that are keeping it in certain format and others in another format. Really, to make it meaningful it should be stored or presented in the same format and also searchable information because it's not any good if it's not searchable information.

So the individuals should get together and discuss the format, discuss the formulating searchable terms and things of that sort. This shouldn't be a real problem in this particular case. It's just logistical issues, and I can deal with that by sharing costs, by swapping costs, by dealing with it in some easier manner. Let's not get hung up on that. You need to get the material, and you need to meet and confer on that. Bring it to me if you can't resolve it and I'll resolve it.

The next item is Service of Pleadings
Electronically or are we on Master Complaint?
MR. HERMAN: I think, Your Honor, the Master Complaint.

Really, there is no issue as to that presently. Again, the Court's web site, folks really have to look at that and look at Pretrial Order Number 6. We're getting calls and e-mails daily, and there seems to be some misunderstanding at the bar as to what they are supposed to do.

They have to use the ECF for filing pleadings, and then we get them, and they are posted on LexisNexis, and they can be accessed on LexisNexis or the ECF system. We still are having new lawyers, of course, coming into the case. I suspect that due to the work of the PSC and lead counsel Arnold Levin, there will be a lot more attorneys visiting New Orleans, and we wish them well, and we wish they would look at number 6, Pretrial Order Number 6.

THE COURT: Let's remember that if you're going to file something, you need to file it in court. You don't file it with LexisNexis. You file it with the Court. Then the liaison counsel for each side gets word of it, and they make sure that LexisNexis gets it. LexisNexis then uploads it and gives the notice to everyone. If you have any question, you can access LexisNexis and see what's filed and what's not filed, but to file something, you don't file it with LexisNexis. You file it with the Court.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor --
THE COURT: We talked about the omnibus.
MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor has spoken to the omnibus
complaint.
THE COURT: Special Master. As I mentioned last time, I appointed Michael Rozen to be Special Master, he and his firm, on this particular case. He's been discussing and working with the parties on some preliminary matters in this case.

Anything you want to report on, Michael?
SPECIAL MASTER ROZEN: Thank you, Your Honor. Michael Rozen, Special Master. All I would say, Judge, is that I've been meeting with all of the relevant parties. Everybody has been extremely cooperative, as you would expect, in those meetings. I expect we will continue from now till the end of the year into January, and I'm always optimistic in these regards, Judge, but we will see.

THE COURT: Fine. I appreciate your work on this. I've been in touch with the Special Master on a number of occasions. He's kept me advised of his discussions, and I do urge the parties to access him.

As I mentioned, in a case of this sort, because there are so many defendants, it's very difficult for me to discuss the case because I need an open courtroom to have everybody present at it, and I don't want to talk with one defendant or one side without the other side, and so it's a problem for me.

A Special Master is not inhibited in that same fashion. He can talk to each individual, and I've given him
authority to do so, so he can discuss the case with each party by themselves or with any combination that he feels is appropriate to do so. I think that will move the case, and my sense of it is that that is helping in this particular matter. It's too soon to determine the extent of his assistance, but I think it's moving properly.

## Nineteen is Knauf Gips.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, we have had discussions frequently. The last was about an hour ago, and we will work out a reasonable schedule with Mr. Miller with regard to jurisdiction depositions. We don't anticipate problem in scheduling those and having them taken. I'm certain we'll be meeting again on that in the next few days.

THE COURT: The next item is Default Proceedings in Germano.

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor has put forth a scheduling order. I want to indicate to Your Honor that every member of your Plaintiffs Steering Committee in one way or another has pitched in in terms of the plaintiff side of Germano to keep it on schedule for trial, both in providing their own intellect and experience and their own resources. We have no reason to think that that matter will not be -- will not go to trial. It will go to trial as Your Honor has directed.

THE COURT: In that particular case, the plaintiffs have sought to get a cross-section of the houses, to the extent it can
be done, to give some indication of the nature and extent of the claims. Seven cases have been selected, and these are the cases that will be affected by this particular proceeding. Hopefully, it will have some informational effect for the parties in other cases, but it's not binding on the other cases. It's for informational purposes.

In that spirit, I have invited anyone who wishes to intervene in the case to do so so that they can have an opportunity to present their evidence or present their information or present their experts. We've gotten some interventions, but the parties need to take a look at this because it's an opportunity for them to get some information and not necessarily be bound or not be bound by the ruling of the Court.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, with respect to interventions, the intervention cutoff date has already passed; however, we were advised that there are other folks who may want to intervene. We ask that those folks communicate directly in writing to Mr. Miller, to Arnold Levin, lead counsel, to myself, liaison counsel, and to Richard Serpe, $S-E-R-P-E$, who is lead trial counsel in Germano so that if there are ways to adjust in recommending to Your Honor without disturbing the trial date, we'll attempt to accommodate that as long as they don't prejudice the plaintiff's case.

My only concern is that there has been substantial
work done by plaintiffs in preparing this case, and we'll be happy to accommodate any reasonable intervention in recommending to Your Honor unless it somehow, in our view, would affect the presentation of the case which would require us to get more experts, more Daubert, more information, et cetera.

THE COURT: That's my thinking on it. I don't have any problem extending the time for intervention, as long as it does not present a prejudicial problem for the parties involved now. So these dates are really for the litigants, for the lawyers, and not necessarily for the Court. My interest is in the trial date, not necessarily in the cutoff dates that do not prejudice the parties.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, Kerry Miller on behalf of the Defense Steering Committee. We agree with those comments. Input is good, so long as it doesn't prejudice the parties that have already intervened, so we'll work with Mr. Herman and Mr. Levin to try to accomplish that.

Also, there have been some discussions, now that there have been inspections of the properties -- at least we know who the initial three intervenors are -- that there may be a more streamlined way to exchange information, to deal with experts, things of that nature, so I'm going to work with Mr. Seeger and Mr. Levin and Mr. Serpe in maybe crafting some things that will streamline our information exchange efforts moving forward.

THE COURT: Keep me in the loop. If there is a problem,
get to me immediately and I'll work it out.
The last item is Next Status Conference. Counsel has asked that we set a status conference in the next couple of weeks, particularly focused on the upcoming trial date so it will be really focused on that aspect of this litigation, and that date is December 29th, at 9 o'clock. It will be focused on that aspect of the litigation. When is the other one?

THE CLERK: January 14th.
THE COURT: January 14th is the overall status conference. I'll start that when I meet with the liaison counsel at 8:30 and I'll meet in open court at 9 o'clock on that particular matter.

Anything else while we are all assembled? We've got about a hundred people here the courtroom and a hundred on the line. Anything from anyone else?

Again, I thank my colleagues who are on the line for their interest in this matter, and I appreciate all the help that they've been giving to me. I'll see you at the next status conference. We'll stand in recess.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.
(WHEREUPON, at 10:05 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.)
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