UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

IN RE: CHINESE-MANUFACTURED )
DRYWALL PRODUCTS LIABILITY )
LITIGATION )
) MDL DKT NO. 09-2047 "L"
) NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA
) TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 2014
) 9:00 A.M.
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
)
)
All Cases
********************************

TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE AND MOTION PROCEEDINGS HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

SUSAN A. ZIELIE, RMR, FCRR
OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
500 POYDRAS STREET
HALE BOGGS 406
NEW ORLEANS LA 70130
susan_zielie@laed.uscourts.gov
$504.5 \overline{89} .7781$

PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY. TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY COMPUTER AIDED TRANSCRIPTION.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS' STEERING COMMITTEE:

THE PLAINTIFFS:

## DEFENDANT:

FOR THE STATE/FEDERAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE:

ARBITRATOR:
LAW OFFICES OF
ROBERT J. JOHNSTON, LLC
BY: ROBERT J. JOHNSTON, ESQUIRE 400 POYDRAS STREET
SUITE 2450
NEW ORLEANS LA 70130

NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA; TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 2014 9:00 A.M.
(COURT CALLED TO ORDER)
THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
Call the case.
CASE MANAGER: MDL 2047, in re: Chinese Manufactured
08:55AM

09:00AM

09:00AM

09:00AM

09:00AM

THE COURT: Counsel, state your appearances, please. 09:00AM
MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court, good morning, 09:00AM
Judge Fallon. Russ Herman for plaintiffs.
MR. MILLER: Good morning, Your Honor. Kerry Miller 09:01AM
for the defendants.
THE COURT: We're here today for our monthly status
conference.
I've met with liaison lead counsel for the parties, discussed the agenda with them.

Let's take it in order. Pretrial orders, anything?

MR. HERMAN: Nothing new, Your Honor.
And may it please the Court, at this time, on behalf of all counsel, we wish your staff and Your Honor a happy Thanksgiving, all those assembled.

THE COURT: Same. The same for you all, have a good and safe Thanksgiving.

What about state court trial settings? Dawn?

MR. HERMAN: Ms. Barrios is here, Your Honor.
MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios. With regard to state court trial settings, there are three cases that are set forth in the Norfolk court in front of Judge Hall, and they are all set for 2015. And we have high hopes that we will be able to resolve them.

With Your Honor's permission, I'd like to jump
forward to XI, which is the Porter Blaine Venture Supply settlements.

Your Honor issued an order last week approving the allocation as recommended by the Garrison Resolution Group, reduced attorney fees from thirty-two to thirty percent. And the Garrison Resolution Group is doing everything in its power to get those checks to the claimants prior to Thanksgiving.

THE COURT: I talked to Judge Hall about that, and she was comfortable with my suggestion that the attorneys fees be reduced. So we did it.

And, as I've said, I was hopeful that those funds

## Omnibus class action, anything?

MR. HERMAN: Not at this time, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Anything on the complaint, class action complaint?

```
MR. HERMAN: Mr. Miller, I believe, may have something to say about the Alabama class action suit regarding Knauf property.
MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. Kerry Miller again on 09:03AM behalf of Knauf.
To notify the Court, for the first time in several years, last week, one of the Knauf clients was served in a Chinese Drywall complaint filed in the Northern District of Alabama.
Your Honor, we've commenced to transfer proceedings to your court in this particular case. We have not heard back from the JPML yet, but we expect the matter to be transferred because it is a Chinese Drywall case.
THE COURT: Okay, yes.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, with respect to item No. VI, plaintiff's motions to establish the expense fund, nothing new.
Item No. VII at page 9, the remediation program,
Mr. Miller.
THE COURT: Anything on remediation?
MR. MILLER: No, Your Honor. It continues.
And the phase now is into the new claim settlement
that we reached late last year, and we'll have a report on some pro se issues coming up. But we're getting to the bottom end of the list. Moss anticipates being completely through with the remediation program by mid-next year.
```

THE COURT: As always, I have a Moss representative 09:04Am here in the event anyone in the courtroom needs to talk with 09:04AM them about anything affecting their client's property. Please 09:04Am feel free to do so. I also invite the litigants to come so they can talk to them.

I have received a couple of letters commending Moss on their work. Often times in matters of this sort, people are frustrated and they make a lot of complaints. So it's nice sometimes to see that they express their appreciation. So I 09:04Am pass that along to Moss.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, there are a number of properties where the ombudsman has been called to take some action, is declined. I think it's getting repetitive issues, but there are only about four properties right now. And that goes along with commending Moss for the work that they've done.

THE COURT: Yes. I think that ombudsmen work pretty well too in future cases. It's helpful sometimes to have someone that the claimant can talk with and to, and then they can take their complaints to the Moss people and deal with it on a professional level.

How about IN/EX?
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, this might be an appropriate

```
            THE COURT: Sure.
```

MR. WOODY: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Jake Woody from BrownGreer. I'm here to give the monthly status report for the Chinese Drywall settlement program.

Start, as always, with the total number of claims received.

To date, we've received 22,460 claims. The claims 09:06AM submission deadline was a year ago, October 25, 2013. So this 09:06Am number is very static at this point.

Our largest claim type is what we call the Global, Banner and IN/EX repair relocation claims. Those are claims made against three settlement funds: The Banner settlement, the IN/EX settlement and the Global Banner settlement for repair and relocation damages. Essentially, it's a pro rata settlement based on the number of square footage submitted.

To date, we have 9,982 eligible claims. 1,637 denied. Only one incomplete at this point. And 166 withdrawn.

The number of eligible, if you look at the last 09:07AM few status reports, is actually going down because we're in the process of reconciling duplicate claim filings. And, in many cases, one claimant will withdraw a claim. It moves it from the eligible to the withdrawn. In some cases, we find that a claim

09:07AM has been assigned, in which case we deny the assigned claim and pay the eligible claim.

THE COURT: Why withdraw a claim?
MR. WOODY: Many times, we receive two claims -- from a
husband and a wife, for instance. And from the same law firm. It's easiest to just withdraw one and pay the full amount to the other.

THE COURT: I see.
MR. WOODY: The allocation agreement allows us to make one payment per claim per address.

The pro rata numbers are calculated by taking the total amount available for each of the three settlements, dividing it by the total eligible under air square footage.

Under air square footage is essentially the heated areas of the home that you can live in all year-around.

For Banner, the amount per square foot is \$2.97. For IN/EX, it's .36. The Global fund is divided into three separate pools: The builder pool, the supplier pool and the installer pool. For Global builder, it's \$2.03. For Global supplier, it's \$3.36. And, for Global installer, it's .95. This is a per square foot amount. So, if your home is 1,000 square feet, you'd multiply it by the per square foot to come up with the final payment number.

These numbers were approved in CAP-9, Claims number. The three percent hold back we made for contingency. Right now, we're paying ninety-seven percent. And the numbers
gac here are the ninety-seven percent.

THE COURT: Do you want to review the numbers for the people on the phone?

MR. WOODY: Sure.
For Banner, the total amount available is $\$ 32,407,975.79$. The total eligible under air square footage in the Banner settlement is $10,588,086$ square feet. The ninety-seven percent per square foot amount for Banner is $\$ 2.97$.

For IN/EX, the total amount available is
2,068,286.11. Total eligible square footage in IN-EX is
5,575,028 square feet. Which leaves us with a . 36 per square foot payment for IN/EX.

For Global builder, the amount available is $\$ 18,779,229.25$. The total square footage for Global builder is 8,974,310. And the per square foot amount for Global builder is \$2. 03.

For Global supplier, our amount available is 13,980,092.89. Total eligible square footage is $\$ 4,041,779$. Which gives us a payment of 3.36 for Global supplier.

Finally, for Global installer, the amount available is $\$ 8,972,298.42$. Total square footage for Global installer is 9,170,409. Which leaves us with a per square foot payment for Global installer of .95. Total amount available is $\$ 76,207,882.46$.

We filed CAP-9 on September 11th of 2014 and began 09:11AM making payments on September 12th. To date, we've issued 11,245 09:11AM
payments. The number of payments is greater than the number of claims because many claims received payment from more than one fund.

To date, we've distributed $\$ 52,032,437.36$, which 09:11AM is about seventy percent of the amount available to us to distribute. We have remaining $\$ 24,175,445.10$.

At this point, there are a couple reasons why we would not have paid an eligible claim.

One reason is the claimant has not submitted the W-9 or verification of the claims form. We need both before we can issue payment.

Both forms are available on our website under the Paper Form section. I'll give that out at the end of the presentation.

We only need those forms once per claimant. If you have multiple claims, we just need one set of forms for that.

The other reason is slightly more complicated, it's the duplicate claim issue that I mentioned earlier. As I mentioned, we are in the process of going through those and reconciling those as best we can. As we resolve them, we issue payment.
At this point, we've made -- we're issuing payments every day. Still, not as many as were issued a month ago. We've issued -- most people have received payment at this
point, but we are still issuing payment. It's slowed down for the reasons I just mentioned.

THE COURT: How long do you think it will take before

MR. WOODY: It depends in large part on the responses we receive and when people submit the documents. But I would 09:13AM expect, by the end of the year, we'll have almost all the money out of the door, if we can.

Finally, our other loss claim types. We call them other loss. These are bodily injury, foreclosure and short sale, lost rent due to sales and pre-remediation alternative living expenses.

We've finished reviewing all of these claim types and are in various stages of receiving responses to incomplete notices.

We have, across all four claim types, $\$ 2,359$ eligible claims. 170 bodily injury. 531 foreclosure and short sale. 1,134 lost rent due to sales. And 524 pre-remediation alternative living expenses. Those are eligible claims.

The best measure of where we are with these claims is the number of incomplete claims. This month, we have 206 incomplete across all four claim types. That month, that number was 400. So it's dropped by half in the lost month.

And you can tell, we have one incomplete for bodily injury and ten for pre-remediation alternative living
expenses. That means that those claim types are essentially done. We have more for foreclosure and short sale and lost rent, and that's simply because we reviewed those after we did bodily injury and pre-remediation, which meant that the deadlines for people to respond to incomplete notices are in some cases still open.

I would expect that that number will continue to drop pretty rapidly because we have issued notices on all those claims, in many cases, within the last month. And any deadine extension should end before the next status conference.

So we have 206 incompletes across all claim types. 1,485 denied claims. Total claims submitted for these other loss claims is 4,050.

As I mentioned, our web portal is the best source to get those required documents if you need to submit them. That address is www3.BrownGreer.com/drywall. You can email if you'd like us to send you the documents or if you have questions at cdwquestions@BrownGreer.com. And, if you need to call us, our number is 866-866-1729.

Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Next item is shared costs fund. Anything on that?
MR. HERMAN: Nothing new on that, Your Honor. THE COURT: Taishan defendants, anything on the Taishan?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, the details of all of the 09:15AM Taishan pursuit and its related entities occurs at page 14 to 22 of the current report and details, for those that want to review the report, the ongoing activities that lead counsel Arnold Levin, Gerry Meunier and Leonard Davis have pursued.

With respect to Venture Supply and Porter Blaine 09:16AM defendants, at page 22, Dawn Barrios has already reported. And 09:16AM that occurs at pages 22 to 25 of the current report.

There's nothing new at page 25 for plaintiff and defendant profile form.

Nothing new under at page 25 under frequently asked questions.

I do want to repeat the Court's website so that 09:17AM anyone interested may access this status conference report and 09:17AM review it. It is www.laed.uscourts.gov/Drywall/faq.ftm.

Your Honor, at page 26 of this status conference report, are matters set for hearing. There are nine of them, as I understand it. You will --

THE COURT: I'll take those after this meeting. We'll take a quick break and then I'll come back and deal with it.

One is the physical evidence preservation order. 09:17AM We've had a lot of physical evidence preserved, and it's time to get rid of that. Anybody has any issue, let us know. But let's prepare an order for me to look at, and I'll post it on the website and deal with it.

There are a lot of fees connected with storing this material, and it's getting to the point now unless it's involving Taishan there's no reason to keep it. Even moving it 09:18AM 09:18AM is going to be expensive. And then dealing with where to put it is also going to be expensive. So I'm trying to minimize some of the expenses.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, on behalf of plaintiffs, we're cognizant of that. We are concerned that some facilities have mixed boards stored and they've got to take efforts to separate the Taishan board or other manufactured board, other than Knauf. And continue to at least advise the Court and advise counsel once they've done that.

THE COURT: Yes. Prepare the motion from the owners of the drywall, and then send it to plaintiff's counsel. And, if there's an issue, I'll deal with it.

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
At page 26 of the status conference report, item 15, pro se claimants, Mr. Johnston is here.

MR. JOHNSTON: Morning, Your Honor. Bob Johnston, curator for pro se plaintiffs.

I've filed with the Court my 33rd status report and have some news for the court. So I'm going to turn it over to Kerry Miller to advise the Court of what the gist of that is.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Bob.
Kerry Miller again on behalf of Knauf, Your Honor. 09:20AM
For the last two or three status conferences at
least, Mr. Johnston has given a report of a list of alleged KPT
or Knauf homeowners that he has kept and maintained. That list
has grown to something in the range of 55, something of that
order.
MR. JOHNSTON: Something like that.
mith MILLER: And that's a list Mr. Johnston has shared
regular basis. and shared with me and plaintiff's counsel on a
those from him because that's the first step in the process. And then, secondly, once there is indicia such 09:21AM that it makes sense to set up an inspection, the homes will be inspected pursuant to the usual court protocol we've had in place for some time to define the extent of the Chinese drywall in the home.

At that point, if the home passes inspection, then Moss will be contacted to do a cost estimate of the home pursuant to the protocol. Moss will then generate that document.

And then, at that point, Your Honor, the homeowner has three basic options. Number one is to go with Moss under option one to get the home remediated. Number two would be to hire his own licensed contractor and proceed under option two. Number three, Your Honor, would be to take a discounted cash amount and do with that what he wants with it, subject to certain requirements, including getting a release from the mortgage company, posting the fact that the home contains Chinese Drywall in the public records.

But the requirements are set forth and adopted for the settlement.

In addition, Your Honor, the settlement does not apply to anyone who is unrepresented or otherwise meets the requirements if they purchased the home with knowledge or when they purchased a home and failed to do reasonable diligence to
ascertain whether or not the home contained Chinese drywall.
So I just want to make sure that, even though you may be on Mr. Johnston's list, it doesn't mean you're automatically eligible. You've got to meet the regular eligibility requirements that are set forth in the initial Knauf class action complaint with the PSC as well as the Beane complaint from last fall.

THE COURT: As I understand it, that's another agreement. It's not really part of this agreement, it's a whole new agreement that you and Mr. Johnston have worked out.

MR. MILLER: That's correct, Your Honor.
The eligibility requirements are adopted from the previous agreement. This is a new arrangement.

MR. JOHNSTON: Your Honor, because this has just happened, I think it's appropriate for me to make sure I've got the four corners of what my communication to the pro se plaintiffs should be.

We start off with 56, 57 certainly intend -because of their dealings with me and my office, I want to advise them of this very positive development.

There are a couple of things I think it's appropriate to come away from this status conference so that I can make sure that what my communication to the pro ses will be will pass with the Court and certainly with Kerry.

As he indicated, there are the three options,
which we all know, most of which would involve Moss type remediations.

There are what I call secondary features of the earlier settlements which don't apply.

But will there not be an alternative living expense factor based upon the square footage?

MR. MILLER: Yeah. You get your lump-sum amount.
MR. JOHNSTON: Number two, there are about 16 or 17 of attorney or there may have been some attorney. I believe it would be appropriate when $I$ send this letter to say that please

THE COURT: Yes.
This is, as I say, a new settlement as I see it. It's not part of what you all have agreed to before.

MR. JOHNSTON: The final thing is that Peter and
the Court if the Court believes that this can certainly be passed on because he's on the list.

THE COURT: Yes, okay. We'll make it moot.
MR. LEVIN: Having heard that, Your Honor, we'd like to say the PSC are not orphans to this agreement. It's Thanksgiving week. We created the table for your clients to feast on. So we're very much a part of it and want to see every paper.

MR. JOHNSTON: And a delicious meal it will be. That's great.

MR. MILLER: One point on this, just to be clear to the extent information gets out about this. This agreement that I reached with Mr. Johnston as pro se curator, Your Honor, only applies to those pro se claimants who are on his most recent list dated yesterday. It is not an open-ended arrangement or offer and it will not apply prospectively, Your Honor.

I mentioned earlier on in this status conference in connection with the regular remediation report that Moss intends on completing all of its activities, the inspection activities and the construction activities by mid-2015. This new agreement with these pro se homes will dovetail into that workflow. While my client has fulfilled its obligations under the settlement, it is anxiously awaiting the end of its involvement in home construction in the gulf south. And, from their perspective, Your Honor, it has to come to an end. These
additional homes can dovetail into Moss's workflow. But from our perspective, from Knauf's perspective, Your Honor, there is no longer a need for Mr. Johnston to maintain a list of folks who called him prospectively who might have Knauf Chinese Drywall. I am not authorized to even receive that information from Mr. Johnston. And that position is not going to change.

So I want to be very clear with respect to another list: There is no need or no basis for another list, there is no reason to maintain a list, there's no reason to collect inspection reports, because my client has simply fulfilled its obligations under the settlements and is not going to entertain any new claims at this point.

MR. JOHNSTON: And I have heard what Kerry has said. 09:28AM He's certainly said it to me very clearly.

My question is -- I look to the Court -- because, if between now and Christmas and the next six months I have communications that I receive, what am I supposed to do? Should I simply, if they want to send me an inspection report, simply put it somewhere, tell them that at this point -- I'm not sure where, from the Court's perspective, I'm to be going with regard to this. So I look to the Court for some guidance.

THE COURT: Right. I think from -- we're going to have probably a motion to relieve the pro se person from his responsibility, and I'll hear that motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Will Kerry file it?


Call that, please, first because counsel has a 09:36AM scheduling problem. So record document 18087.

MR. REDFEARN: Robert Redfearn, Junior. I'm here on the Motion for Reconsideration with regard to Preservation Alliance of New Orleans, better known as Preservation Resource Center, our appeal from our payment out of the settlement fund. THE COURT: This is one involving the settlement that it was --

MR. REDFEARN: New Orleans area Habitat For Humanity. THE COURT: Habit for Humanity. And they supplied material, you say. And the material they supplied was contaminated.

MR. REDFEARN: Yes.
THE COURT: And it's an issue of whether or not you fit into one bucket or the other bucket, so to speak.

MR. REDFEARN: It's really not. It's very clear what 09:37AM bucket we fit into.

The problem really -- and, Judge, let me make clear, I'm not asking anybody to change the settlement agreement or rewrite it. The problem is at the front-end. As I understood the settlement agreement before we even agreed to all of this, wherever you're settling defendant fell, you went into that pot. Our settling defendant was Habitat For Humanity. With respect to Habitat For Humanity, they were only a supplier. They did no building. In fact, we went up and picked up the
drywall ourselves. We were clearly a supplier, no ifs ands or butts. That's not even contested by the settlement administrator or anybody.

The problem was -- and it's never been explained to me why this was done -- somebody decided, because New Orleans area Habitat for Humanity also acted as a builder, they just took the full amount of Habitat for Humanity settlement funds and plopped them all into the builders fund. They didn't segregate out for the portion for people who were only suppliers, to whom they were only supplies. Which, frankly, would be a very easy mathematical thing to do. You could look for the claim forms and see whether people are claiming against Habitat as a builder or supplier. Nobody did that.

So what happens, when we come up, they tell us: Our hands are tied, all Habitat's money went into the builders fund so we're just plopping you into the builders fund.

You probably are aware of this, but what we are 09:38AM talking about, these are buildings which -- no good deed goes unpunished -- Preservation Resource actually remediated. They end up getting Chinese Drywall, and so they had to go back and refix it. These are for poor, underprivileged people. This is Taishan. There's no other money coming back.

Preservation Resource Center uses its money to help these poor, underprivileged people to fix up their homes. So, by throwing us in the wrong pot, as you saw from the
numbers, we're actually being shorted by a third. It's not -in the scheme of this whole settlement, we're probably taking about an additional 25, $\$ 30,000$ for our particular claims. Not a lot of money in the scheme of this. Huge amount of money to Preservation Resource Center.

And, quite frankly, there's no reason to throw us we got from a supplier only. Our settling defendant was a supplier only. Somebody, for administrative purposes, decided $\quad$ 09:39AM not to put any money in the supplier fund. Just figured, people like us, what the heck, the baby being thrown out with the bath water. It's really not proper, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me hear from the other side. Who is 09:40AM here for --

MR. REDFEARN: Judge, for what it's worth, I never saw any response to this motion.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court --
THE COURT: In essence, he's taking the position that Habitat occupied two roles. One, they occupied the role as a 09:40AM builder. Two, they occupied the role as a supplier. And, from his standpoint, they were occupying the role as a supplier only. And that he takes the position that he's looking to them as a supplier, not as a builder.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, may it please the Court, as an
officer of the Court first, and as lead liaison for plaintiffs, learned counsel's presentation is absolutely correct. And I know that, personally, as far as Habitat's roles, because in connection with a lawsuit that we tried on behalf of Habitat and others against an insurer of IN/EX, it was very clear to us that Habitat performed several roles. And I can affirm factually that -- I don't think there's a need because I know learned counsel -- but I will affirm that his recitation as to the facts regarding Habitat are absolutely correct.

MS. BARRIOS: May it please the Court, I filed a motion, a memo in support of Mr. Redfearn's motion.

I have several clients in that same position. They got their drywall from Habitat. We made a claim as a supplier. We were approved as a supplier. And we were paid out of the building fund.

And it's a substantial difference for these underprivileged people. The per square foot amount if you are a supplier is $\$ 3.36$. But, for a builder, it's $\$ 2.03$.

So we'd just ask the Court to recognize that those who actually got the drywall from Habitat as a supplier be paid as a supplier.

THE COURT: The issue is one that the administrator looked to the specifics of the agreement.

And the agreement takes the position that class 09:42AM members shall be entitled to recover their repair and relocation 09:42AM

| payments from only those participating defendant funds to which | 09:42AM |
| :---: | :---: |
| their respective builder or installer or supplier contributed. | 09:42AM |
| Habitat contributed to the Global fund as a | 09:42AM |
| builder. So the administrator's looking at the wording, and he | 09:43AM |
| feels that he's constrained. | 09:43AM |
| The difference is a builder is \$2.03 a square | 09:43AM |
| foot, a supplier is \$3.36. So I'm going to have to know what | 09:43AM |
| effect does this have, how many are we dealing with and how do | 09:43AM |
| we go about reclaiming those funds. Because, if the funds have | 09:43AM |
| all been paid out, it's one issue that's going to be | 09:43AM |
| complicated. | 09:43AM |
| MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, may we approach sidebar with | 09: 43AM |
| counsel? | 09:43AM |
| THE COURT: Yes, sure. | 09:43AM |
| (Discussion held off the record.) | 09:44AM |
| THE COURT: I've talked with counsel to see if they can | 09:45AM |
| creatively work this matter out. | 09:45AM |
| I'll take it under advisement; and hopefully, with | 09:45AM |
| their efforts, this matter will go away. | 09:45AM |
| The next motion, at the top, is a motion for late | 09:45AM |
| filed claims. I have a number of those claims. | 09:45AM |
| Let me just speak to the overall problem of late | 09:45AM |
| filed claims. | 09:45AM |
| We've heard during the initial status conference | 09:45AM |
| that counsel have worked out another agreement. So I don't have | 09:45AM |

anything to do with that agreement. I'm really talking about late filed claims under the original agreement.

The original agreement provided certain cutoff dates. Now, we kept moving those cutoff dates back and back and back, until I really had to put one cutoff date that I couldn't resolve. I couldn't keep pushing it back because I was interested in starting the payments. And some of these funds are pro rata payments, depending upon how many people have applied and how much money is in that particular bucket. That's why I had to put a particular date that was written in stone, after we moved it back and back and back, had to come to some type of final dates, so that we could begin paying. Because you can't pay the money unless you know how many are involved in that particular bucket. And that's why the October the 26 th or $22 n d$-- I forget the exact date -- of 2013 was eventually put in place.

So it's a problem to deal with late filed claims. Doesn't mean that they're not valid claims, it just means that they may have to pursue those by another vehicle. They have to file suit and see where it goes.

But the money, as you've heard early on, a lot of it's already been paid. So that's a problem for late filed claims.

So I'm going to have to adhere to that date. It 09:47AM doesn't mean that they don't have a claim. Doesn't mean you
can't file a claim. It doesn't mean you can't work out some
agreement for your claim. But to get in this settlement program is, I'm afraid, late.

There are two motions to extinguish settlement.
This is somewhat similar.
The claimants who are making claims have to fill out certain paperwork. And they have been noticed to get the paperwork in. And then they're asked two and three and four times and letters were written, return-receipt-requested. And still no documents. And then the notice was sent out that, if you don't send the documents, your claims are going to be dismissed. No response.

So there's two motions to extinguish the
settlement. I haven't received any response on those motions. I'm going to grant the motions. That's record docket 18046 and 18066.

There's a defendant, Trial Creek, motion to dismiss --

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I apologize for interrupting the Court. Kerry Miller again for Knauf.

On document 18066, that's one of the motions to 09:49AM extinguish that we filed, Your Honor.

In our reply brief, Your Honor, we filed a proposed order which set forth the exact properties that had not responded to the motion. Since we filed our reply last

09: 48AM 09: 48AM

```
Thursday, we did receive two additional affidavits yesterday.
                    So, Your Honor, if it's permissible with the 09:49AM
Court, if I can approach, I have a revised order which takes
those two homes off of the list that was attached to our
proposed order.
    THE COURT: Thank you. Give me the ones that haven't
responded.
    MR. MILLER: That's what it is, Your Honor.
    THE COURT: Good.
            And I'll grant that motion.
            There's a motion for defendant Trout Creek's
        motion to dismiss the claimed complaint.
            I haven't received any opposition. I'll take that
        on the briefs and I'll deal with that one.
    MR. LEVIN: Your Honor, the PSC is not involved in that
        motion, but we would respectively request and suggest that this
        Court has jurisdiction under CAFA.
    THE COURT: There's no response, so I'll have to deal
    with that.
            The Motion to Reconsider the special master, we've
        already talked about that.
            Villalago's consent judgment approval, any comment
        on that one?
    MR. MASON: Your Honor, this motion arises from a
        potential conflict between various individuals of Villalago.
```

I'm Gary Mason. I represent the homeowners of Villalago and the Villalago class.

We have persons that are the current owners that
were never named plaintiffs in the lawsuit that bought these units rather cheaply, but are the current owners, and the units are going to get remediated. Some of them, if they'd had Knauf homes, have actually got lump-sum payments or are in this category of lump-sum payments. And we have a conflict between certain individuals in that category and the prior owners who 09:51AM are named plaintiffs who actually lost their units to foreclosure or short sale and meet all the definitions.

There's various pools of money that I'm 09:51AM responsible for. And the reason I have come forward to the Court with this motion is so that I have direction from the Court and a court order that tells me what I should do and I don't have to be faced with this conflict.

I have money from the costal settlement. And, all this money's available, that's not the issue. It's just a question of who gets it. We have money from the costal settlement that's available that, my judgment and we've argued get to in a moment -- that that money should go to the prior
we wanted Knauf to refrain from paying this money to the current owners and reserve that money for the prior owners. And we resolved that particular motion through a consent order which put those funds into escrow.

Your Honor, just so you have the scope of what we're talking about here, it's roughly $\$ 221,000$, is what we're talking about.

So it is our proposal, Your Honor, for all the reasons set forth in our brief and that we have behaved consistently with the available money that what we characterized as the lump-sum payment of the $\$ 8.50$ per square foot go to the individuals on our charts that are the prior owners, the named plaintiffs in the litigation.

Pursuant to the consent order that Your Honor entered, notice went out. So everyone's been notified, both the prior owners and the current owners. We've had a couple of returned envelopes, of course. And we re-sent those out to the best addresses. And we think we've pretty much got everybody, either by mail or by email, who has an interest in this motion.

We did get three objections. And, as I set forth in my papers, Your Honor, it is our view that all three of these individuals are not eligible for any of these funds. All three of these individuals are persons that are current owners that were never named plaintiffs that bought these units at bargain-basement prices and with knowledge of Chinese Drywall.


MR. MASON: I should point out, Your Honor, that in $09: 55 \mathrm{Am}$
addition to go what Your Honor just said, those individuals are also getting their units remediated and will be able to sell those units at market prices.

THE COURT: They will benefit from the amount because the property's being remediated. That's where they have been made whole. Really, it's something that they really are not entitled to, but they should be well satisfied with it.

So I'm going to grant that motion. Thank you very much.

MR. MASON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anyone else, anything further from anyone else?

All right, folks. Thank you very much. And have a good Thanksgiving, you and your families.

Court stands in recess.
(9:56 a.m., proceedings concluded.)
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|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | front [2] - 4:4, 22:20 <br> front-end [1] - 22:20 |  |
|  | entertain [1]-20:11 | feet $[3]-8: 18,9: 6$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hardship [2]-32:2, } \\ & 32: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | entities [1] - 13:2 <br> entitled [2]-25:25, | 9:10 9ell | frustrated [1] - 6:8 | hear [2] - 20:24, 24:14 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fell }[1]-22: 22 \\ & \text { few }[2]-7: 18,32: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fulfilled [2] - 19:22, } \\ & 20: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { heard }[5]-5: 12,19: 4, \\ 20: 13,26: 24,27: 21 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | entitled [2]-25:25, 33:8 |  |  |  |
|  | envelopes [1] - 31:17 | figured [1] - 24:11 | full $\left.{ }^{2}\right]$ - 8:2, 23:7 | HEARD ${ }_{[1]}-1: 11$ hearing [1] - 13:17 |
| DOCUMENT [1] - 1:7 | escrow [1] - 31:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { file }[4]-20: 25,21: 1, \\ & 27: 20,28: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { fund }[15]-5: 16,8: 13, \\ 10: 3,12: 22,15: 17, \end{gathered}$ |  |
| documents [5] - 11:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ESQUIRE }_{[5]}-2: 4, \\ & 2: 7,2: 11,2: 17,2: 21 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | heated [1] - 8:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12: 15,12: 17,28: 10, \\ & 28: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 20,28: 1 \\ & \text { filed }[12]-5: 8,9: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:3, 12:22, 15:17, } \\ & \text { 22:6, 23:8, 23:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { heck [1] - 24:12 } \\ & \text { held [1] }-26: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | essence [1] - 24:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { filed }[12]-5: 8,9: 24, \\ & 14: 21,25: 10,26: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:6, 23:8, 23:16, } \\ & \text { 24:7, 24:11, 25:15, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| dollars [1] - 32:7 <br> done [4] - 6:15, 12:2, | $\begin{gathered} \text { essentially }[4]-7: 13, \\ 8: 10,12: 1,18: 14 \end{gathered}$ | 26:23, 27:2, 27:17, | 26:3, 32:5 | help [1]-23:24 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 22,28: 22,28: 23, \\ & 28: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { funds [9] - 4:18, 7:11, } \\ 23: 7,26: 1,26: 9, \\ 27: 7,31: 4,31: 22 \end{gathered}$ | elpful [1] - 6:1 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 14:12, 23:5 } \\ \text { door }[1]-11: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8: 10,12: 1,18: 14 \\ \text { establish }[1]-5: 16 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  | estimate ${ }_{[1]}-16: 8$ |  |  | Herman [1] - $3: 10$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { dovetail }[2]-19: 21, \\ & 20: 1 \end{aligned}$ | evacuate [1] - 32:8 <br> event [1] - 6:2 | fill $[1]$ - 28:6 <br> final $[3]-8: 19,18: 21$, | 27:7, 31:4, 31:22 <br> future [1]-6:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HERMAN }[19]-2: 3, \\ & 2: 4,3: 9,3: 19,4: 1, \\ & 4: 23,5: 1,5: 15,6: 11, \\ & 6: 22,12: 23,13: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { down }[2]-7: 18,11: \\ & \text { drop }[1]-12: 8 \end{aligned}$ | eventually [1] - 27:15 <br> evidence [2]-13:21, | 27:12 <br> finally [2] -9:19, 11:9 | G |  |
| pped [1] - 11:23 |  | fine [1] - 21:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Garrison [2]-4:11, } \\ & \text { 4:13 } \end{aligned}$ | 14:7, 14:16, 21:6, <br> 24:18, 24:25, 26:12 |
| DRYWALL ${ }_{[1]}-1: 4$ drywall [7] - 14:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { exact }[2]-27: 15, \\ & 28: 24 \end{aligned}$ | finished [1]-11:13 | Gary [1] - $30: 1$ <br> general [1]-21:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:18, 24:25, 26:12 } \\ & \text { high }[1]-4: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| $16: 5,17: 1,23: 1$ |  | finished [1] - 11:13 $\text { firm [1] }-8: 1$ |  | high [1] - 4:5 <br> hire [1] - 16:14 |
| 25:13, 25:20, 32:22 | except ${ }_{[1]}$ - 30:21 <br> exception [1]-32:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { first }[5]-5: 6,16: 1, \\ & 21: 24,22: 1,25: 1 \end{aligned}$ | generate [1] - 16:9 | hit [1] - 32:18 <br> hold [1] - 8:23 |
| Drywall [10] - 3:7, 5:8, |  |  | gentlemen [1] - 3:4 |  |
| $5: 13,7: 3,15: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { expect }[3]-5: 12,11: 7 \text {, } \\ & 12: 7 \end{aligned}$ | FISHBEIN ${ }_{[1]}-2: 7$ <br> fit $[2]-22: 14,22: 17$ | Gerry $[1]-13: 5$gist $[1]-14: 23$given $[1]-15: 2$Global $[15]-7: 9,7: 12$, | $\begin{gathered} \text { home }[12]-8: 11,8: 17, \\ \text { 15:24, 16:6, 16:7, } \\ \text { 16:8, 16:13, 16:18, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 19, 20:5, 23:20, |  |  |  |  |
| $31: 25,32: 20$ | expense [2]-5:16, 18:6 | folks [3] - 4:19, 20:3, |  |  |
| due [2]-11:11, 11:18 duplicate [2]-7:19, | 18:6 expenses [4] - 11:12, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Global [15] - 7:9, 7:12, } \\ & 8: 13,8: 15,8: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:24, 16:25, 17:1, } \\ & \text { 19:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:19 } \\ & \text { during }[1]-26: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 11:19, 12:1, 14:6 } \\ \text { expensive [2] - 14:4, } \end{gathered}$ 14:5 | following [1] - 15:12 <br> foot [10]-8:12, 8:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 12,9: 13,9: 14, \\ & 9: 16,9: 18,9: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { homeowner }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 16:11 } \end{aligned}$ |
| E | expensive [2] - 14:4, $14: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { foot }[10]-8: 12,8: 17, \\ & 8: 18,9: 7,9: 11,9: 14, \\ & 9: 21,25: 17,26: 7, \end{aligned}$ | grant [3] - 28:15, | homeowners [2] - $15: 3,30: 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { early }[1]-27: 21 \\ & \text { easiest }[1]-8: 2 \\ & \text { EASTERN }_{[2]}-1: 2, \\ & 1: 20 \end{aligned}$ | extension [1] - 12:10 <br> extent ${ }_{[2]}$ - 16:5, | footage [9] -7:14, 8:9, | great [1] - 19:10 | $\begin{gathered} \text { homes [10] - 15:13, } \\ 15: 16,15: 19,16: 3, \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | 8:10, 9:5, 9:9, 9:13, <br> 9:17, 9:20, 18:6 <br> FOR [2] - 2:3, 2:16 <br> foreclosure [4] - $11: 10,11: 17,12: 2$ $30: 11$ <br> foregoing [1] - 34:5 <br> forget [1] - 27:15 | Griswold [1] - 32:2 <br> Group [2] - 4:11, 4:13 <br> grown [1] - 15:4 <br> guidance [1] - 20:21 <br> gulf [1]-19:24 | $19: 21,20: 1,23: 2$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { extent [2] - 16:5, } \\ & \text { 19:12 } \\ & \text { extinguish }[3]-28: 4, \\ & 28: 13,28: 22 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Honor [54] - 3:11, } \\ & 3: 19,3: 21,4: 1,4: 2 \\ & 4: 10,4: 23,5: 4,5: 10 \\ & 5: 15,5: 20,6: 11 \\ & 6: 22,7: 1,12: 20 \\ & 12: 23,13: 1,13: 16 \\ & 14: 7,14: 16,14: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| easy [1] - 23:11 <br> effect $[1]-26: 8$ |  |  |  |  |
| efforts [2] - 14:9, | F |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { either [2] - 18:10, } \\ & 31: 19 \end{aligned}$ | faced [1] - 30:16 <br> facilities [1]-14:8 |  |  |  |




| $\begin{aligned} & 19: 14,19: 21,20: 23 \\ & 27: 8 \end{aligned}$ | R | $\begin{aligned} & \text { regard }[3]-4: 3,20: 20, \\ & 22: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:21, 27:6 } \\ & \text { resolved }[1]-31: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:23, 19:13, 19:14, } \\ & \text { 19:21. 20:23 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { problem }[7]-22: 2, \\ & 22: 18,22: 20,23: 4, \\ & 26: 22,27: 17,27: 22 \end{aligned}$ | range ${ }_{[1]}-15: 4$ <br> rapidly $[1]$ - 12:8 <br> rata [4]-7:13, 8:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { regarding }[2]-5: 2, \\ & 25: 9 \\ & \text { regular }[3]-15: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Resource }[4]-22: 5 \text {, } \\ & 23: 19,23: 23,24: 5 \\ & \text { respect }[5]-5: 15, \end{aligned}$ | seated [1] - 21:21 <br> secondary [1]-18:3 <br> secondly [1] - 16:2 |
| Procedure [1] - 8:21 proceed [1]-16:14 | $\begin{gathered} 8: 22,27: 8 \\ \text { rather }[1]-30: 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 17:4, } 19: 18 \\ \text { related }[1]-13: 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 6,15: 10,20: 7 \\ & 20 \cdot 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { section }[1]-10: 13$ SEDRAN [1] - 2:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROCEEDINGS [2] - } \\ & \text { 1:10, 1:24 } \\ & \text { proceedings [2]- } \\ & 5: 11,33: 17 \end{aligned}$ | RE [1] - 1:3 <br> re [3]-3:6, 24:8, 31:17 <br> re-do [1] - 24:8 <br> re-sent [1] - 31:17 | RELATES [1] - 1:7 <br> relating [1] - 18:25 <br> release [1]-16:17 <br> relieve [2]-20:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { respective }[1]-26: 2 \\ & \text { respectively }[1]- \\ & 29: 16 \\ & \text { respond }[1]-12: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { see }[9]-6: 9,8: 4, \\ & 18: 19,19: 7,23: 12, \\ & 26: 16,27: 20,32: 17, \\ & 32: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| Proceedings [1] - 21:20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { reached }[3]-5: 22, \\ 15: 14,19: 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 3 \\ & \text { relocatio } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { responded }[2]-28: 25 \text {, } \\ & 29: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seem }[1]-32: 23 \\ & \text { segregate }[1]-23: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { process [3] - 7:19, } \\ 10: 20,16: 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { really }[11]-17: 9, \\ 22: 16,22: 18,2 \end{gathered}$ | $7: 13,25: 25$ <br> remaining [1] | $\begin{array}{r} \text { response }[4]-24: 17, \\ 28: 12,28: 14,29: 18 \end{array}$ | $\text { sell }[1]-33: 3$ $\text { send }[5]-12: 1$ |
| processing [1] - 15:13 | 27:1, 27:5, 32:2, | remediate [1] - 32:9 | responses [2]-11:5, | 14:14, 18:12, 20:18, |
| PRODUCED ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:25 | 32:18, 32:24, 33:7 | remediated [7] - | 11:14 | 28:11 |
| Products [1] - 3:7 | reason [7] - 10:9, | 5:20, 16:13, 23:19, | responsibility [1] - | sense [1]-16:3 |
| PRODUCTS ${ }_{[1]}-1: 4$ professional [1]-6:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 18,14: 3,20: 9 \\ & 24: 6,30: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 6,32: 5,33: 3, \\ & 33: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $20: 24$ <br> respons | sent [2]-28:10, 31:17 <br> separate $[2]-8: 14$ |
| profile [1]-13:10 | reasonable [1]-16:25 | remediation [10] - | 30:13 | 14:9 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { program }[4]-5: 17, \\ 5: 25,7: 3,28: 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reasons }[3]-10: 7 \text {, } \\ & 11: 2,31: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 17,5: 19,5: 25, \\ & 11: 11,11: 18,11: 25, \end{aligned}$ | return [1]-28:9 return-receipt- | September [2]-9:24, 9:25 |
| proper [1]-24:13 | receipt [1] - 28:9 | 2:4, 15:16, 15:22, | requested [1]-28:9 | served [1] - 5:7 |
| properties [3]-6:12, | receive [5]-7:25 | 19:18 | returned [1]-31:17 | ses [1]-17:23 |
| $6: 14,28: 24$ | $11: 6,20: 5,20: 17$ $29: 1$ | remediations [1] 18:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { review }[3]-9: 1,13: 3 \text {, } \\ & 13: 15 \end{aligned}$ | set $[11]-4: 4,4: 5$, 10:16, 13:17, 16:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { property }[3]-5: 3,6: 3, \\ & 32: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:1 } \\ & \text { received }[7]-6: 6,7: 5, \end{aligned}$ | 18:2 <br> rent [3]-11:11, 11:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:15 } \\ & \text { reviewed }[1]-12: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:16, 13:17, 16:3, } \\ & \text { 16:20, 17:5, 28:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| property's [1] - 33:6 | , 10:2, 10:25, | 2:3 | reviewing [1]-11:13 | 31:9, 31:20, 32:6 |
| proposal [1] - 31:8 | 28:14, 29:13 | repair [3]-7:10, 7:12, | revised [1] - 29:3 | settings [2]-3:25, 4:3 |
| proposed [3]-28:24, | receiving [1] - 11: | 25:25 | rewrite [1]-22:20 | settlement [29]-5:21, |
| 29:5, 32:13 | recent ${ }_{[1]}$ - 19:14 | repeat ${ }_{[1]}-13: 13$ | rid [1] - 13:23 | 7:3, 7:11, 7:12, 7:13, |
| prospectively [2] - | recess [3]-21:19, | repetitive [1]-6:13 | RMR [1] - 1:19 | 6, 15:13, 15:14, |
| 19:16, 20:4 | 21:20, 33:16 | reply [2]-28:23, $28: 25$ | ROBERT [2] - 2:20 | :15, 15:17, 16:21, |
| protocol [2]-16:4, | recitation [1]-25:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { report [14] - } 5: 22, \\ & 6: 23,7: 3,13: 3,13: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 2:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 22,18: 14,18: 19, \\ & 19: 23,22: 6,22: 7, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 16:9 } \\ \text { provid } \end{gathered}$ | reclaiming [1]-26:9 recognize $[1]-25: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:23, 7:3, 13:3, 13:4, } \\ & \text { 13:8, 13:14, 13:17, } \end{aligned}$ | Robert [1] - 22:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:23, 22:6, 22:7, } \\ & 22: 19,22: 21,23: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| providing [1]-15:23 | recommended [1] - | 17, 14:21, 15:2 | 24:22 | 7, 24:2, 28:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PSC }_{[3]}-17: 6,19: 5, \\ & 29: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 11 \\ & \text { reconciling }[2]-7: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 23,19: 18,20: 18 \\ & \text { reported }[1]-13: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { roles }[3]-24: 20,25: 3, \\ & 25: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 4,28: 14,30: 17, \\ & 30: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| public [1] - 16 | 10:21 | REPORTER [1] - 1:19 | roughly [1] - 31:6 | settlements [4] - 4:9, |
| purchased [2]-16:24, | reconsider [1]-21:23 | Reporter [1] - 34:4 | Russ [1] - $3: 10$ | 8:8, 18:4, 20 |
| 16:25 | Reconsider [1] - | reports [3]-7:18, | RUSS [1] - 2:4 | settling [3]-22:22, |
| purposes [1]-24:10 | 29:20 | 15:25, 20:10 |  | 22:23, $24: 9$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { pursuant }[3]-16: 4, \\ 16: 9,31: 14 \end{gathered}$ | Reconsideration [1] - 22:4 | represent [1]-30:1 representative ${ }_{[2]}$ - | S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seven }[4]-8: 22,8: 24, \\ & 8: 25,9: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| pursue [1] - 27:19 | record [3] - 22:2, | 6:1, 6:23 | safe [1] - 3:24 | seventy ${ }_{[1]}-10: 5$ <br> several [4]-5:6, 25:6, |
| pur |  | $8: 1$ | $12: 2,30: 11$ | $25: 12,30: 21$ |
| pushing [1]-27:6 | records [1] - 16:19 | request [1] - 29:16 | sales [2] - 11:1 | shall [1] - 25:25 |
| put [7] - 14:4, 20:19, | recover [1] - 25:25 | requested $[1]-28: 9$ | 1:1 | shared [3]-12:22, |
| 24:11, 27:5, 27:10 | REDFEARN [5] - 22:3, | required [1] - 12:15 | satisfied [1] - 33:8 | 15:7, 1 |
| 27:15, 31:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:9, 22:13, 22:16, } \\ & 24: 16 \end{aligned}$ | requirements [7] 15:21, 15:22, 16: | saw [2]-23:25, 24:16 scheduling [1]-22:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { short [4] - 11:10, } \\ & \text { 11:17, 12:2, 30:11 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Q | Redfearn [1] - 22:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 20,16: 24,17: 5, \\ & 17: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { scheme [2]-24:2, } \\ & 24: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shorted }_{[1]}-24: 1 \\ & \text { side }_{[1]}-24: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| questions [2]-12:17, | reduced [2]-4:12, | reserve [1]-31:2 | school ${ }_{[1]}-21: 6$ | sidebar [1] - 26:12 |
| 13:12 | 4:17 | Resolution [2]-4:11, | scope [1]-31:5 | signed [1] - 18:10 |
| quick [1] - 13:20 <br> quite [2]-4:20, 24: | $\operatorname{refix}_{[1]}-23: 21$ | $4: 13$ | se $[10]-5: 23,14: 18$, 14:20, 15:11, 17:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { similar }[1]-28: 5 \\ & \text { simply }[5]-12: 3, \end{aligned}$ |



