2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

1415

1617

18 19

2021

22

2324

25

PROCEEDINGS

(October 15, 2009)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.

(WHEREUPON, the Court called into session.)

THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Call the case, please.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL-2047 in re: Chinese drywall.

THE COURT: Counsel, make their appearance for the record, please.

MR. HERMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Judge Fallon, Russ Herman for the PSC.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, good morning. Kerry Miller on behalf of the defense steering committee.

THE COURT: We're here today for our monthly status conference. We have a full house and also several hundred people on the phone. I also have on the phone a number of judges from both Florida and Alabama. I appreciate their attendance and look forward to working with them throughout the course of this proceeding.

I have met with the committees this morning and discussed with them an agenda. I'll take it in the order in which they have proposed.

Pretrial orders is the first item on the agenda.

MR. HERMAN: Good morning, Judge.

Your Honor has indicated that you have coordinated with, I believe, Judge Farina on an economic loss issue, which ...

THE COURT: Right. Let me flesh that out a bit.

Judge Farina is going to hear motions on economic loss claims under Florida law on November the 13th at 10:00 eastern standard time in Florida. I will participate by phone and participate actively in those proceedings. We'll consider the claims in Florida state courts. They'll have a number of judges present in Florida to deal with those claims; and also, from my standpoint, the Florida cases that are filed in the MDL, I'll consider that as the hearing on those particular cases.

The following week on November the 20th, I will have a hearing here in New Orleans on the economic loss issues in the non-Florida cases, and the Florida courts will participate by phone in that matter.

We'll confer and work out the differences. I said November the 20th. I think we did November the 19th. We agreed upon the 19th because the Florida courts, they have some motion day on the 20th. So I'll move my conference to the 19th, and I'll deal with it at that time.

Hopefully, we'll be able to coordinate and issue our opinions around the same time. I don't know whether or not

they'll be consistent, but we'll at least have an opportunity to confer and discuss the issues and, hopefully, we'll have consistency on our rulings.

Property inspections. Anything on the property inspections?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Russ Herman. The inspections are going forward. They've been coordinated through PSC member Jerry Meunier's firm, Gainsburgh. Floor plans have been provided to Crawford & Company in advance, as well as the cosmetic plugs.

THE COURT: Anything from the defendants on the property inspections?

MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We had some difficulty originally with the protocol for property inspections. I met with counsel, as well as the inspectors, and discussed it with them. They've worked out a better protocol, and that protocol now is in place.

Is it working?

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, yes. As the Court recalls, we did 10 initial inspections pursuant to Pretrial Order

No. 13. We had a couple of court meetings with respect to that and found that that particular protocol was too time consuming and too destructive in some ways to the home.

After that, there were a series of meetings in

which I participated primarily with Mr. Lambert on behalf of the PSC. We developed what we believed was a much more streamlined inspection protocol; but a protocol that was still objective and aimed at creating the census, detecting the drywall that was on-site at the property, and not being destructive.

We sampled -- or we used that protocol last week in a couple of homes in the Slidell area. We were able to complete the protocols in about five hours, Your Honor. And so the plan moving forward is we have 18 -- there were 30 houses initially that were identified for inspection. We did 10 initially under the old protocol, two under the revised protocol to see if it worked, did the two, then further tweaked the revised protocol.

By the way, Your Honor, we have a final document, if the Court wants to enter it, that will supersede Pretrial Order 13. It is this revised protocol. We could give it to the Court this afternoon. And next week we're going to roll it out on the remaining 18 in Louisiana, and Florida, and Mississippi and North Carolina.

We had previously agreed that after we were done with that shift, we would have another meeting to see if this particular protocol was working. Hopefully, it is, and it can be rolled out to more properties. If further modification needs to be made, then the Court will entertain a hearing or a

meeting at that time.

THE COURT: Yes. I think that to some extent we're dealing with trial and error, but hopefully we can get it down to a meaningful and accurate protocol.

As I mentioned several times, you can sit with experts and design a protocol that they feel and you feel is best. But until you actually do it and put it in place, you don't know whether it's going to work. So counsel met with the experts. I met with the experts. And they came up with a design that looked to be perfect.

But then when we started putting it in place, it didn't work out that way. So the parties had to go back to the drawing board. This is just the way it's done and the way it has to be done. But, hopefully, we'll come up with something very shortly that can be used throughout the country and will be helpful.

I think that's one of the benefits, frankly, of the MDL is coordination; and with the great help of my colleagues in state court, we've been able to do that with motions and also with protocols. Hopefully, we'll be able to do that with the preservation of evidence protocols, so that the attorneys know that the method that they preserve evidence will be useful both in state as well as in federal courts.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I wanted to highlight that item, actually. It's item 1B on Page 1 of the pretrial order

on the Physical Evidence Preservation Protocol. That is a change from our last hearing. It was actually entered by the Court earlier this week, submitted by the parties last week. So now there's something in place. I'm not quite sure if the state court jurists who are on the phone are aware of that new development, but that is in place now.

THE COURT: Right. I did send it to everyone and, hopefully, it represents their views also and they'll be able to adopt it in their respective courts.

Plaintiff and defendant profile forms. Anything on that?

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, one issue that we have, and that is there is still outstanding a retailer profile form issue. Apparently, the parties have been in touch, retailers and PSC, but there has been some hiatus in discussions. So those should be brought to fruition relatively soon. I think there are two retailers currently in the case.

THE COURT: Okay. And I do have some motions on the profile forms which I'll take up after the hearing.

The preservation order. Do we have anything on that? We have a motion also on the preservation order. We have a preservation order for the physical evidence. The issue that is more challenging is the preservation order on e-discovery and on documents and e-documents.

State/Federal Coordination?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, Ms. Barrios has, in electronic format, her report.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Mr. Herman.

Good morning, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios for the Federal/State Committee on the plaintiff's side.

Your Honor, through Pretrial Order 8, there have been no motions for remand filed. So I think everybody's enjoying being in your court. We have had an opportunity to meet and confer with the defense Federal/State Committee one time this week and both sides have pledged to coordinate and cooperate as fully as possible in this multiparty case, and we pledge to do that.

THE COURT: Yes. I think that what we're trying to do, both the state and federal court, is to see if we can get an environment in a forum so that you can just do things one time. We have 18 states involved in this litigation, and there may be a couple more coming on board.

It doesn't seem satisfactory to have to do these things 18 or 19 times, taking depositions 18 or 19 times, the same deposition, filing interrogatories and so forth and so on. So we're trying to construct it as well as we can so that you can do this work one time and use the material throughout the country, both in state and federal court.

So I've appointed a committee to coordinate that, and I appreciate all their efforts. I know my colleagues

in state court also appreciate it.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, I have a presentation to the Court, and defense liaison counsel, and homeowners' counsel, as well as the PSC, a CD that will replace the CD that we provided last month. We have a substantial list of cases broken down by states with the contact information for each jurist. So I hope Your Honor finds it very convenient to use when you reach out to your state court colleagues, and we'll continue to update this every month.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, if I might. Kerry Miller addressed the issue concerning retailer forms, and if Mays' counsel is present, I'd like to meet with Mays immediately following the arguments.

THE COURT: Any trial settings for state court?

MR. HERMAN: None reported, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Motions in the MDL? I've got several motions, three to be exact, that will follow this hearing.

Discovery issues. Anything we need to talk about there?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. In conference this morning, Your Honor discussed the issue of a rolling document production. There will be a meeting in Mr. Wittmann's office

at 8:30 central standard time on Tuesday with call-in for the various parties. At that point, the parties will swap lists of who they want to depose and the priority.

And plaintiffs yesterday received the defendant's first request for production, and we're going to be responding with objections and production as quickly as we can, but certainly within the 15-day limit. Hopefully, next week. Basically, those are the discovery issues that were discussed this morning.

THE COURT: Okay. I need everybody's cooperation on that, both plaintiffs and defendants. The material that you have no problem with, give it up immediately or on a rolling basis. The material that you have problems with, meet and confer, discuss the objections. If you can't resolve them yourself, then bring them to me, I'll hear them immediately, and we'll get over the objections.

I understand that the parties are going to meet Tuesday, as was said, and begin setting depositions on some basis that everybody's comfortable with.

MR. HERMAN: I would like to request that Mr. Davis and Mr. Levin be served by defense counsel with all motions, et cetera, while I'm absent. I'll be absent for about 10 days.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, on the issue of discovery.

I am hopeful that the meeting on Tuesday will produce some progress and some setting of depositions.

As mentioned in chambers to the Court this morning, I took a survey of the defendants last night, and I know that documents from various defendants are starting to roll in. Some rolled in on Tuesday, others yesterday, and I know more today and tomorrow, and then again early next week. And then we're going to have a meeting on Tuesday morning. In connection with the production of documents, also our piece that has been served on the plaintiffs, to try and minimize the chaos, I would suggest the following:

When a party produces documents, they file a notice of production with LexisNexis. The LexisNexis service has been working very well. In the notice of production, the parties identify who to contact to get a copy of the documents. If it's a vendor, if it's a paralegal, if it's someone of that nature, so that's set forth in the LexisNexis notice of production. Those parties who want to get a copy can order it and get it. Those parties who don't want a copy, they don't need to do it.

What I'm trying to avoid, Your Honor, in a case that now has 50 parties, maybe more, maybe going up to hundreds, hundreds of phone calls, how can I get a copy of the documents, who do I need to call, calls to the Court. I had a full-time job a couple of weeks ago when we posted the pictures of the different drywall markings, that we've talked with the Court about that and were able to get that information on the

Web site.

We're not to the point, Your Honor, I think where we can have a central document depository. I think that's too ambitious for this particular group. But I think if we can do a notice of production on LexisNexis, that will streamline a lot of aggravation and frustration.

THE COURT: Is there any way you can upload those documents and anybody who wants them can pull them down? At least you can discuss it with them.

MR. MILLER: Yes. That's another thing that we're exploring doing, and that's a different issue. We may do that, Your Honor, upload them through FTP sites.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. MILLER: But that would be on the LexisNexis notice.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. MILLER: That we've uploaded documents to X, Y and Z Web site, here's a pass code, this is how you access them.

THE COURT: You need to flesh that out or talk about it, because that's the beginning of the document depository. So you then just simply import that to some other place and that becomes your document depository. So it's one document depository in process. Give that some thought.

MR. MILLER: I think what we're going to see, Your

Honor, is a range, depending on the level of sophistication of the defendant. I think some will do exactly that, send the notice, you can access these on the Internet through the X, Y and Z Web site at A, B, and C pass code, all the way to the mom and pop builders whose got a box and file cabinets and a storage shed. But there ought to be one way in which that notice goes out.

THE COURT: And the reason for that is that, although now when it comes in piecemeal, you'll be able to keep a handle on it. But if we get to millions and millions of documents, you're going to need some searchable way of getting those documents. So think about that when you're beginning to coordinate these documents and you need to have them in some kind of searchable form eventually.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, I want to reserve comment on that suggestion. I had not heard it before. We do have a motion scheduled with regard to ESI and format following this conference.

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

MR. HERMAN: We have listed in Your Honor's status conference report the materials that have been received -- or the departments of government from which materials have been received. They're incomplete. We're providing -- will be providing those on a rolling basis to defense liaison counsel.

THE COURT: Okay. And then trial court settings? 1 2 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, before we go on to that, I 3 think we made an agreement if we're going to evolve into 4 depositions next week, we want to go ahead and get whatever FOIA information plaintiffs have so we have that to review. 5 6 THE COURT: Sure. 7 MR. MILLER: So I'll hook up and, hopefully, get that information. 8 9 MR. HERMAN: You'll receive ours probably by this 10 afternoon or tomorrow morning. 11 MR. MILLER: Great. Great. 12 MR. HERMAN: And we hope to receive whatever the 13 defendants have received. 14 THE COURT: All right. The next is the trial court 15 I mentioned before that what I had anticipated doing settinas. is having each side pick ten cases, do some quick discovery on 16 17 the ten, come down with five, and then each side have two 18 strikes and we'll come down with six, and then deal with it and try five of them. 19 20 Time is moving up on me, so I'm going to have to 21 alter that. I've given the plaintiff first choice to pick that 22 case. I've given them a week to pick that case. A week 23 thereafter the defendants will pick the second case. We'll 24 start those cases January and February.

Filings in the MDL. Anything on that?

25

MR. HERMAN: Nothing new, Your Honor, on the particular issues of direct filing and acceptance of service.

THE COURT: Okay. Notice of appearance, default judgments. Anything?

MR. HERMAN: No, Your Honor, nothing new.

THE COURT: I gave a preliminary default against a company. I'm waiting for a motion to confirm the default so that I can enter a monetary judgment against that defendant. I don't know whether that defendant has any resources in the United States, be they cash, or vessels, or anything of that sort.

But if a judgment is entered, I do sit, as an MDL judge, as a district judge in every district in the country, so I can issue orders seizing either vessels, or bank accounts, or transfers, or anything of that sort that's brought to my attention.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, if I might look again at the bellwether trials. I believe Your Honor has indicated that first trial would be property damage only. The plaintiffs would select it. And you require that plaintiffs and defendants meet and accelerate a jury questionnaire.

THE COURT: Right. I think that in a case of this sort, it would be helpful to have a jury questionnaire so that we don't have to have people come to the court the morning of the jury selection and find that they should be excluded

because they have drywall in their house and they have difficulty with it.

So I've asked the parties to get together and come up with a jury questionnaire which I'll send out. I'll notify 100, 150 jurors that they're going to be selected for this particular jury. I'll send the questionnaire out to them, and I'll tell them to come to court to fill out a questionnaire.

They'll fill out the questionnaire in court.

I'll immediately make it available to the parties. I'll give them a week to look it over. Then I'll confer with the parties and make some strikes for cause, and hopefully the questionnaire will be of help to the lawyers in their voir dire examination.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, a couple of follow-up comments or questions to what was discussed in chambers regarding the bellwether trial selection and the altered way in which we're going to proceed in that manner.

As I understand it, the eligible plaintiffs for the initial selections would be those who either have profile forms in as of now or will have profile forms in as of a week of today.

And then secondly, Your Honor, you mentioned that the selections, either the first selection or the first couple, should involve, I think you used the term "one

defendant follow-up question" on that. Since most cases involve a claim by a plaintiff against a builder, maybe an intermediary and a manufacturer, are you suggesting that the initial selections involve one brand of drywall, albeit you may have a supplier and builder in the mix, or are you suggesting just one defendant?

Because if it's just one defendant, albeit a builder, a supplier or a manufacturer, you're going to have a comparative fault analysis going on, even in a property damage case.

THE COURT: Not so much with the manufacturer. With the builder, I can imagine some issue there. From the standpoint of a manufacturer, I think that that probably is not as prevalent. A builder or a distributor or an installer, I can understand that there probably would be some issues of that sort. But I don't know if I see that particular issue from a manufacturer's standpoint.

So the first cases I would think, certainly the first case, ought to be focused on the manufacturer of the drywall, at least that's the way I see it presently.

Also, when we get down the line apiece with some of these cases and learn from them, we need to focus on whether or not we should have some summary trials. We need to focus on whether or not we should have some issue trials, and see whether or not we can get some jury information from those

areas.

I'm not really wedded to any particular method.

I just think the lawyers function better when they get some input from juries.

Okay. Tolling

agreements/suspension/prescription. Anything on that?

MR. HERMAN: No, Your Honor. There is no new insurance issue before Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything on service of pleadings, electronically? We've now instituted electronic service of the initial pleading. We have over the period of time gone from electronic service of filing of everything but the initial pleading. Now we have electronic filing of the initial pleadings, so keep that in mind too.

Master complaint. Anything?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, there's nothing with regard to the master complaint. There are some alternatives. I'll ask Mr. Levin to address the class action indeterminate defendant complaint and the omnibus complaint.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LEVIN: Your Honor, as you know from the inspections, a lot of the Chinese drywall is unmarked, indicates "made in China," and there are a number of claimants that have that type of drywall in their homes.

The PSC has filed what we would call a class

action indeterminate defendant complaint against a host of manufacturers. It's filing an amended complaint against several others that we believe are involved in bringing that product into this country. That's where we stand. We will make service through the Hague. It will be translated into German and Chinese and, hopefully, we won't be ignored abroad.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LEVIN: Just briefly, the PSC will be filing an omnibus complaint. We anticipate filing several of them on a rolling basis, where all of the existing plaintiffs that have product I.D. will be suing everybody in the chain of commerce, builders, importers, brokers and manufacturers.

The first one should be filed within the next ten days.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LEVIN: It will be about 300 or 400 plaintiffs; and it will be followed very quickly by a second one.

THE COURT: Generally, in cases the challenge is to figure out whether or not there's any fault and, if so, the nature and extent of the fault. In this case, and probably in addition to that, but maybe even dwarfing that is the location and identification of the parties, the manufacturers, the product, the distributors.

And with regard to distributors, and installers, and suppliers, when they knew, if they knew, and, if so, when

did they know and what-did-they-do-about-it kind of thing. But the big challenge in this particular case for everybody, and certainly for the installers and the builders, and the plaintiffs in general, is to find out the location and participation of the manufacturers, who manufactured it and where are they located.

So we're going to have some pleadings that throw out a net to get everybody, and that's probably the process that we're looking at. But eventually we're going to be culling down, because we're going to find that some people who are caught in that initial net don't belong in the net.

And I want to make sure that if they do not belong in the net, they don't have to spend a lot of resources to get out of the net. We've got to identify them as quickly as we can and get those folks out. I think it's to everybody's benefit. But that's going to be a challenge, culling them down.

The next status conference. Anything further other than the motions?

MR. HERMAN: Just one other matter on the omnibus complaint. It's the PSC's intention by filing that complaint that where manufacturers and other defendants have been identified, that we'll only have to spend one amount to get service through the Hague rather than having a thousand cases served through the Hague. With respect to that issue, that's

the only comment that I have, Your Honor.

Your Honor, the next status conference ...

THE COURT: The next status conference is November the 19th. I'm told that we've got some construction going on in the courtrooms, so please watch the Web. I'm going to be moving it to another courtroom, but I'll also have directions here. We're going to have some updated electronic equipment and so forth that we're going to be installing in this courtroom, and it will take me about a month to get that done.

Okay. Anything further from anyone in the audience or on the phone?

MR. HERMAN: If counsel for Mays is here, I would like to talk to them.

THE COURT: All right. We'll take a ten-minute break at this time and then I'll come back and discuss the motions with you. Court will stand in recess.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.

(WHEREUPON, the Court took a recess.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Jodi Simcox, RMR, FCRR, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability and understanding, from the record of the proceedings in the above-entitled and numbered matter.

S/ Jodi Simcox, RMR, FCRR
Jodi Simcox, RMR, FCRR
Official Court Reporter