1		
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA	
3	*********************	
4	IN RE: CHINESE-MANUFACTURED DRYWALL PRODUCTS LIABILITY	Docket No. 09-MD-2047 New Orleans, Louisiana Thursday, October 14, 2010
5	*********************	
6	EDINGODIDE OF GENERAL CONFEDENCE DROCEEDINGS	
7	TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
8		
9	A DDE A DA MCEC.	
10	APPEARANCES:	
11	В	ERMAN, HERMAN, KATZ & COTLAR Y: RUSS M. HERMAN, ESQ.
12		20 O'Keefe Avenue ew Orleans, LA 70130
13		EVIN, FISHBEIN, SEDRAN & BERMAN
14	5	Y: ARNOLD LEVIN, ESQ. 10 Walnut Street, Suite 500 hiladelphia, PA 19106
15	FOR THE DEFENDANT: F	RILOT L.L.C.
16	В	Y: KERRY J. MILER, ESQ. nergy Centre - Suite 3700
17	1	100 Poydras Street
18	N	ew Orleans, LA 70163-3700
19		OGAN LOVELLS Y: JOE CYR, ESQ.
20		75 Third Avenue ew York, New York 10022
21	<u>=</u>	aren A. Ibos, CCR, RPR, CRR
22	N	00 Poydras Street, Room HB-406 ew Orleans, Louisiana 70130 504) 589-7776
23	·	,
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript	
25	produced by computer.	

PROCEEDINGS

(THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2010)

(STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS)

2.0

(OPEN COURT.)

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

THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL No. 2047, in re: Chinese Drywall.

THE COURT: Counsel make their appearance for the record.

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

MR. MILLER: Good morning, your Honor, Kerry Miller on behalf of Knauf entities and the Defense Steering Committee.

THE WITNESS: We're here today for our monthly status conference, I have a full courtroom, several hundred people, and we have an overflow courtroom with an equal amount. I have several hundred on the phone, and in addition to the attorneys I am pleased to report that I have with me Judge Joseph Farina from the 11th Judicial Circuit Court in Florida and Judge Scott Vowell from the 10th Judicial Court in Alabama.

The difficulty in these cases in an MDL is often that they're filed both in federal courts as well as state courts throughout the country. I've been blessed with the help of state court judges who have been very helpful to me. I've counted on their wisdom, on their suggestions in trying to gather all of the

cases and move them forward, and I am delighted that Judge Farina and Judge Vowell can be with me today. Judge Farina and I have been working together now for nearly a year on these cases and I treasure his views and wisdom on these matters, and I appreciate his being here.

2.4

One of the reasons for this conference is because at my suggestion, as well as the state court judges, the parties have tried to look at this matter globally. We have been through a number of cases, I've tried or resolved about ten of these cases already, and the parties have had an opportunity to see what results of those judgments have been. They've listened to the evidence and the state courts have done likewise in their particular areas. So it's given the parties an opportunity to look at these matters and see whether or not some global resolution could be worked out.

And we've got the first step in that global resolution reporting today, so I'll hear from the parties. First from the plaintiffs.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the court, Judge Fallon, Judge Farina and Judge Vowell. I am the court appointed liaison counsel for the Plaintiffs Steering Committee in the MDL. My name is Russ Herman. I am going to outline the major deal points of a pilot program which we signed off on yesterday at approximately four o'clock.

As I understand it, Judge Fallon will post the complete

agreement with its exhibits at www.laed.uscourts.gov and you can link to the Chinese drywall from that. And you can find the pilot program.

2.0

At inception I want to thank Leonard Davis from my office, lead counsel Arnold Levin and Fred Longer from his office, and Chris Seeger, our lead trial counsel in all of these cases, who represent the negotiating team on behalf of plaintiffs.

We learned many of us in law school that two thirds of the world's law today is a civil code law that comes from the Roman civil code and in Louisiana through the French Napoleonic code and the Spanish /HRAS pee a/TES par tee /T*EUZ tissue, and the concept or one concept in that law is the difference between a hope and an expectancy. With this pilot program we have both a hope and an expectancy that it will work, it needs to be tweaked as we go along, and hopefully can be expanded to all Knauf homes.

Primarily the Knauf entities, without admitting jurisdiction or alter ego for any purpose, have entered into a pilot program with the PSC that will remediate up to 300 homes that have substantially all KPT Plasterboard, but plasterboard of no other Chinese manufacturer. And there are other issues of eligibility. Those that are predetermined as eligible are listed on Exhibit A to the agreement and it is anticipated that by Monday 41 of those homes will begin the remediation process outlined in the agreement.

The agreement covers homes in Florida, Louisiana, Alabama

and Mississippi. Currently we know that there are homes in Texas, North Carolina and Virginia that are now affected by Chinese drywall, but they are not included in this agreement. Suppliers such as Interior Exterior Builders and their insurers, are "other participating companies". What that means is that those folks are contributing funds to Knauf in order to effect the pilot program. They shall be released to the extent they contribute funds to the pilot program; however, the release is voidable under certain circumstances if the homes are not remediated and indeed the homes require, among other things, a contractor's warranty, the contractor, a major contractor Moss has been fully vetted to perform the pilot program, there will be other contractors down the road.

2.0

Also the contractor will have to give a certification to the homeowner that there is no Chinese drywall left in the home, that all electrical's been replaced, et cetera, and that there is no odor. There will also be a qualified environmental inspector who will have to issue a certificate, and following substantial completion, which is defined, the contractor and the homeowner will have a punch list which must be performed, as well as an all clear lien certificate or any liens will be bonded off.

Knauf entities stand behind the contractor's performance and warranties.

A number of the features of the program are as follows:

Removing all drywall, replace -- once a home begins remediation it

must be completed even if other situations are found. All electrical wiring, including switches and receptacles, will be replaced. Replacement of all fire safety and home security equipment and low voltage electrical, replacement of fixtures damaged by problem drywall, restoration of the home to the same construction quality and finishes that existed prior to the start of the remediation work, compensation to the homeowner for alternative living costs, which include move in, move out, storage and personal property damage in the amount of \$8.50 a square foot. A reservation of all rights for any bodily injury and all attorney's fees and expenses to be paid by KPT and not by the homeowner, that would be negotiated on a separate agreement. If we cannot agree on attorney's fees, it will be submitted to Judge Fallon and Judge Fallon will determine both the fees, expenses for attorneys on contract as well as common benefit fees without any appeals.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

In the event that there is controversy between a homeowner and a contractor, it will be resolved by a very quick mediation paid 50 percent by each side, that is the homeowner and the contractor, it will be submitted to John Perry and those he selects. We expect a 24 hour, 48 max turn around. If the agreement, the master agreement needs interpretation, it will be submitted to binding mediation to John Perry and Knauf and the PSC will pay those costs.

There's an additional payment of \$1.50 a square foot in

the event that remediation is longer than three months. What do we expect? We expect that possibly 2,000 to 3,000 homes that could be eligible if this program works. The PSC has vetted the Moss contractor and is responsible for vetting all of the qualified environmental experts, as well as any substitute contractors.

The cost of inspections for environmental certificates, permits under state law, inspections by governmental authorities, et cetera, will be at Knauf's cost.

Knauf will escrow 110 percent of the estimated cost with U.S. Bank and under conditions stated in the agreement will release those funds to the contractor in step payments. All electrical and plumbing subcontractors must be fully licensed. Work will be warranted by contractor and Knauf. And the courts will have oversight.

We want to thank all of the judges for directing that we proceed to attempt to resolve. The negotiations with Knauf have been rigorous, professional, at arm's length, and frankly very complex.

I want to the negotiators for Knauf, the primary negotiators, Kerry Miller and Greg Wallins for their professionalism and the fact that they have met with us on numerous occasions in New York, Philadelphia, Florida and New Orleans, face-to-face and in addition to that status conferences and updates.

We want to thank the CPSC, the Consumer Products Safety

Commission, and it's fair to say that Exhibit D to the agreement which gives the general scope of work conforms with the judge's, Judge Fallon's rulings in the Hernandez v. Knauf case and the reasons for his judgment as well as the CPSC recommendations for remediation contained in its April release.

Lastly, I should have indicated that you need to really look at Exhibit D as to replacement and testing of appliances and that all copper plumbing will be required to be replaced.

Your Honor, I thank you for the opportunity to address this. Kerry Miller, my counterpart, has a statement to make, and I think both of us are available for any questions your Honor might have.

THE COURT: All right, fine. Judge Farina, I know you have to run. Can you listen to the defendants or do you have to sign off?

JUDGE FARINA: No, Judge, I am able to listen to Mr. Miller and then I need to be back in my court at 10:30.

THE COURT: Okay. Fine.

JUDGE FARINA: Thank you so much, and then if I can have a brief thank you opportunity as well.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Judge Fallon and Judge Farina, I will be quite brief.

Mr. Herman's outline presentation is a good summary of the demonstration project that we're going to offer to the court and importantly to homeowners in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida.

2.0

I would like to start off on behalf of myself and my co-counsel Greg Wallins and also thanking the professionalism shown by Mr. Herman, Arnold Levin, Fred Longer, Lenny Davis and Chris Seeger. Top notch lawyers, your Honor, a pleasure to deal with them.

I would also like to thank, your Honor, from my perspective a pivotal contribution made to this pilot program settlement by Interior Exterior Supply, Louisiana Building Supply Company here in New Orleans. As the court is aware from the history of the negotiations on this settlement, we initially looked at homes in Louisiana and Mississippi primarily because of the fact that there's a lot more KPT product here than in Florida. Florida unfortunately presents a quagmire of a lot of mixed homes and real difficulty.

But Interior Exterior was a supplier of the KPT board here out of New Orleans and they really stepped up and participated with us in the mediation and is contributing to the settlement of these homes, they've inspected a lot of homes, provided us with a lot of information on those homes, so we want to thank that company and their counsel Mr. Rick Duplantier.

Your Honor, other contributing parties to the pilot program include State Farm insurance, QBE Insurance Company Group and Louisiana Builders Indemnity Trust. Again, they really stepped up, came to mediation, put differences aside and contributed on

behalf of their insured builders to this pilot program in Louisiana and Mississippi.

2.0

2.4

Your Honor, to go back to where Mr. Herman started.

There's a lot of hope and expectation here. And the hope and expectation is that this program is going to be expanded and it's going to be expanded through the cooperation that we have with the lawyers for the homeowners and that we've had with Mr. Duplantier and Exterior Interior Supply, that we will have with other suppliers and other home builders. I can tell you since the word has gotten out about the settlement, I've had a tremendous response from lawyers representing various defendants and insurers that want to participate in this program, that want meet and discuss that participation, so that's very encouraging.

Certainly I encourage them to contact us, work with us, we'll have mediations, we'll have meetings. It's our goal to get as many participants in the program as it involves. Obviously the issue is we're just dealing with Knauf TMG board, so those are really the only eligibility requirements that Mr. Herman talked about, dealing Knauf Plasterboard Tianjin, and we also need to have a situation where you have a particular home or groups of homes, everyone who was involved in the supply and the building of that home sitting down and talking about dealing with it. Once we have that in place, your Honor, we think this program can really grow and the foundation is already in place right now.

So we're here, ready, willing and able to work with

folks. John Perry has been a great mediator. He sat with a number of us on several occasions over the last six weeks, produced some good outcomes. Our mediation sessions have been long, tough, but they've been productive. We welcome more sessions. In fact, we have one on Monday involving 29 additional homes in the state of Alabama, so the idea would be after Monday we may be offering additional Alabama homes into some settlement context and we're very optimistic about that.

2.0

Your Honor, with that I would like to close. If there are any questions from the bench. Any bench, either the bench here or the benches that are on the phone, we would be happy to address those questions.

THE COURT: Fine. From my standpoint I thank counsel. I know that it's taken a lot of effort to do this, and hopefully this will be a program that as both sides said will be rapidly expanded to include all of Knauf. Then that'll give the judges an opportunity then to focus on the remaining producer of the drywall Taishan and we'll move forward with their claims and try to expedite those remaining claims.

I do again reinforce the concept that this is a joint effort. I appreciate and am grateful to Judge Farina for all of his work and counsel over this period of time and feel I couldn't have done it without his cooperation and help. And I look forward to working with Judge Vowell in the future.

Judge Farina, would you like to say anything?

JUDGE FARINA: Yes, Judge Fallon, thank you so much.

This is Joe Farina. I want to echo Judge Fallon's remarks as well as the lead plaintiff and Defense Steering Committee counsel.

Listen, I am fortunate to be working with and guided by Judge

Fallon throughout these proceedings, and I believe we're all blessed with his leadership. A special thanks, if you don't mind, Judge Fallon, to Victor Diaz who represented the Florida plaintiffs in the Harrell case; Mr. Todd Erinright, who was involved with Banner Supply, and I did personally deal with Mr. Kerry Miller and Mr. Greg Wallins and Mr. Don Hayden representing Knauf through some discussions.

2.0

Again, a special thanks to the Plaintiff and the Defendant Steering Committees on both the federal and the Florida level, as well as my appreciation to the national and local counsel on behalf of Banner, Knauf entities and the insurance companies, and we couldn't do it without John Perry and his extraordinary efforts, and I'm glad he is going to continue to be on board.

So I am appreciative, I look forward to this being the beginning of many more successes. To paraphrase an old saying, success has many parents, and so I am hopeful that we can continue to expand and continue to be successful.

Judge Fallon, it has been an honor and a pleasure. Folks, I have to dash off to my trial, but thank you for making all of this possible, each and every one of you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Judge. Anything from Judge

Vowell?

JUDGE VOWELL: No, I just appreciate very much being included. And from a case management viewpoint, I will be in touch with you to see how our state court cases in Alabama can be tied in to this great effort.

THE COURT: Great. Well, thank you very much Judge Vowell and thank you Judge Farina, I appreciate all of the help that both of you have given to us.

JUDGE FARINA: Our pleasure.

JUDGE VOWELL: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Now, we will go into the other aspects of the conference. I know the judges have other things to do.

JUDGE VOWELL: All right. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: You bet. Thank you, Judge Vowell.

Okay. We'll take it in the proposed agenda in the order given to me.

Pre-trial Orders discussion.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the court, good morning, your Honor, under Pre-trial Orders, your Honor will be presented order 1H which has been agreed to by the parties, and that will be submitted to your Honor for consideration later today. Other than that, all of the pre-trial orders, of which there are 24 and some subparts, are listed on your Honor's web site.

With regard to Property Inspections, there's nothing new other than the fact that the other eligible homes can be qualified

through inspections under the agreement reached in the pilot program.

2.0

Under Plaintiff and Defendant Profile Forms, there's nothing new, other than we have been advised that I'll say generically Taishan, quote end quote, will be providing the Defendants Manufacturers Profile Form and filing it today.

Under your Honor's Preservation Order, there's nothing new.

Under State/Federal Coordination, as far as we're advised, there's nothing new. There are state court cases --

THE COURT: Dawn, do you have anything on that?

MS. BARRIOS: Yes, your Honor, I do, thank you. Thank you, Judge Fallon, Dawn Barrios for the State Steering Committee. We have for you our usual discs that will lay out all state cases of which we are aware of the contact information and pending motions in the various cases.

I would like to use this opportunity to ask all counsel who are listening to this conference to please alert either the defense or the plaintiff state steering committee dealing with state cases. If you know of anything, please alert either one of us so that we can provide the information to Judge Fallon. Our contact information is on the web site.

Through PTO No. 19 we have all remands that are current, there have been no CTOs filed since the last status conference. We have received notice from Mr. Gonzales that Judge Farina has

ordered a case set for trial on January 10th, 2011, the Alvarez v.

Banner Supply in Miami Dade, and I have a copy that I will give to

Lexy of the order setting it for trial.

I'd like to thank both Galloway Johnson and Minor Pipes for assisting me in putting all of these CD's together.

THE COURT: Dawn, Judge, get with Judge Vowell and I told him you would be talking to him about making sure that he has some representative on your committee so that you can keep him advised because he is going to be moving fast in the case.

MS. BARRIOS: Certainly, your Honor. And Judge Vowell, I will be happy to contact you today.

MR. HERMAN: I want to apologize to Dawn, I also want to indicate, your Honor, that we had some notice yesterday that Taishan had filed a jurisdictional motion for hearing, which was to be heard today in Alabama. We'd appreciate in the future since Taishan is before your Honor that they provide us in advance with any motions that they're going to file and have heard in state court.

THE COURT: I talked to Judge Vowell about that and hopefully we'll get those motions, and he is going to be in touch with the judge before whom that matter was set and see if we can coordinate it.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, with regard to State Court Trial Settings, the *Harrell* trial is scheduled to commence December 1st, 2010. The Virginia cases are now set, were set in January,

February and now are off the calendar. However, they are listed, these particular cases are listed at page 6 of your Honor's pre-trial order.

2.0

2.4

With regard to Trials, I think it's fair to say that without your lightening docket and the fact that *Germano* was tried and the *Hernandez* case was tried, your Honor set two other cases for trial, we would not be where we are today.

Motions committee has communicated with the court's directive regarding Pre-Trial Order 1G and the potential for amendment to that order, and they're being addressed by the motions committee.

With respect to Discovery Issues. It should be clear, may it please the court, to everyone who is listening to these proceedings that discovery and litigation against Knauf continues and will continue till this ultimate resolution. To that end, the Stuermer continuation deposition is tomorrow in New York City. Professor Hummel, the research and science director for Knauf, his deposition is October 19th and October 20th in New York. The Norris deposition is November 11th and November 12th in Hong Kong. The Robson deposition is November 17th and 18th in London. The Isabel Knauf deposition is December 7th and December 8th in Germany. And Director Grundke's deposition is set for December 15th and December 16th in Germany.

Both of those depositions will occur in Frankfurt at the Frankfurt office of Kaye Scholer, the London deposition will be the

at London office of Kaye Scholer, and the deposition notices reflect dates, times, et cetera. And I believe that we have not posted them on your Honor's web site but we shall so that everyone will have notice.

Your Honor, the Taishan Gypsum depositions are a matter of discussion and potential argument before your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HERMAN: At this time I would like to present, as briefly as I can, the PSC's position as to why these depositions must go forward and why written discovery must go forward.

\$100,000 a pop. To say that the Haig Convention is a horse and buggy and we're in an international economy is an understatement.

Every time Taishan has been served it's been 100,000 a pop. We had a very expensive trial, expensive for the court, the court's time, expensive for the attorneys that were involved. Your Honor had seven cases before your Honor, those cases cost about \$1 million to try, Taishan never appeared, even though they were served.

A legitimate default in our view was taken, your Honor rendered a legitimate government. Taishan has now appeared. We're very pleased that they're here, we welcome Taishan's counsel, they are excellent attorneys. They contest jurisdiction and by inference alter ego, and we have claimed that the People's Republic of China actually and BNBM which we understand was served yesterday, and CNBM are actually the puppets of an alter ego.

We want discovery. We think we're entitled to discovery. They may contest jurisdiction, but we're certainly entitled to discovery on jurisdiction and alter ego, and we ask that it go forward and that it be accelerated under your Honor's aegis as the MDL judge designate.

I believe that failing puts our issues in a context, and either Mr. Stanley, local counsel, or Mr. Cyr are present, I'm sure that --

THE COURT: This is a motion to lift the stay on the class certification in *Germano*, and I'll hear from the other side.

Let's make your appearance and tell us who you represent.

MR. CYR: Thank you, your Honor. My name is Joe Cyr and I am with Hogan Lovells, and we represent Taishan. Thank you very much, your Honor, it's a privilege to be before you. I will try to address the couple of issues that are before you with respect to Taishan as briefly as I can.

I think it is important though for the record and for others to appreciate that we appeared on behalf of Taishan within a few months after the default judgment was entered. You and I and Mr. Stanley had an opportunity to confer. You made it very clear to me that you expected Taishan to proceed expeditiously, even though you did show some sensitivity to the position that we were in and that our client does not have any representatives that speak English and that we were new to the case and that it would be a real challenge. And I promised you that we would do everything we

could to get up to speed on the case as soon as possible.

We've had two groups of lawyers go to China already investigating the facts, as well as educating our client through interpreters with respect to the U.S. judicial system and everything that's going on here. And as I mentioned to you in a call, there was a likelihood that we were going to attempt to move to vacate the default judgment in *Germano*, which was one of the few cases in which Taishan Gypsum has been served.

And after our investigation we decided to do two things:

One, we appealed to the Fifth Circuit and that divested this court

of jurisdiction. But at the same time, we moved to vacate the

default judgment.

And as your Honor knows, that does provide this court limited jurisdiction to do one of three things under 62.1: The first to defer the motion to vacate the default judgment. To grant the default judgment -- I'm sorry, the second is to deny; and then the third is to grant or indicate to the Fifth Circuit that there is a substantial issue. And if the court does indicate to the Fifth Circuit that there's a substantial issue, then the Fifth Circuit can remand for the purpose of allowing the court to continue to address the default judgment.

And so under those circumstances, Judge, respectfully, we're just all dealt with the very real fact that this court's jurisdiction is limited. And you recognize that when you denied our motion to actually have our brief, excess pages, you said you

lacked jurisdiction to do that and you were right about that.

2.0

And so point number one, and I have other points that I want to make briefly, is that the court actually doesn't have jurisdiction to order the discovery requested. Nor does it have jurisdiction to entertain the motion for class certification while this case is on appeal. It can only do the things that I've mentioned under Rule 62.1.

But I would rather in addition to that just offer this, your Honor, the one thing -- and please, I don't mean to preach to anybody in this courtroom -- but representing a Chinese company I am very sensitive to the international comedy issues and the expectations that they have that we go by the rules. And one of the rules, of course, is that you do proceed under the Haig Convention.

And by the way, just for the record, the default judgment was based on the second amended complaint in *Germano* which was never served on Taishan, nor was the motion to intervene on behalf of the intervening plaintiffs that obtained that default judgment rather than the named plaintiffs.

Our company asked the court that we go by the rules and the rules require us that it's not an accident what 62.1 does. The rules require that we go step by step. Now, we've moved based on the facts that we've investigated, Judge, for vacation of the default judgment in this case as well as in *Mitchell* because we believe that the appropriate, that the relevant courts lack

personal jurisdiction and we filed all of the papers in that regard.

And by the way, I apologize for not notifying the PSC with respect to the motion before the Alabama court, and we will make a serious effort to always coordinate any activities we have going on in the state.

But again, just for the record, is that Taishan Gypsum manufactured some drywall in 2006 and 2007 and all of that drywall was sold in China to distributors that were covered by arbitration agreements. And they have no expectation whatsoever that they were going to purposely avail themselves of the state markets of any particular state in the United States. And I, also, I know this is a very positive day for a lot of people that are involved with all of the Knauf negotiations for the past year, but since I have these brief moments, I have to say, your Honor, is that based on our investigation and our discussions with the client, they absolutely do not understand why their high quality drywall allegedly emitted excessive amounts of hydrogen sulfide. They don't understand the causation issues. We are not right behind Knauf in any kind of settlement negotiations, even if the court finds that it has personal jurisdiction. I wanted to be upfront with you about that.

THE COURT: Sure, okay. I understand.

MR. CYR: I have just a couple of other things to say, your Honor. One is that, as I mentioned to you in the phone call in June, and I am not trying to be critical because I know how

these things happen, but in the gross class action the PSC named I think approximately 20 subsidiaries who have been served, subsidiaries of Taishan. Now, our investigation, as I told you, revealed that these subsidiaries are spread throughout this very huge country of China and that they have nothing to do at all with the drywall that was manufactured in China that apparently was distributed to some extent in the United States and found its way into some homes. And we see no good faith basis for including those subsidiaries in the gross complaint.

2.0

I suspect that they were added because somebody went on Google, did a web site, saw a whole bunch of subsidiaries and threw them in the complaint. Again, I am not trying to be preaching, your Honor, but we are not the only country that thinks you should have a good faith basis for suing somebody before you sue them.

And then the second point of that is: It's very unfair then to then require those subsidiaries to subject themselves to discovery, offer declarations, declaring their innocence unless the first step is taken and that is that the PSC demonstrates the answer to this question: What was the good faith basis for suing those companies? We've tried to have this discussion with them because we join your Honor in wanting to narrow the issues. We know what the companies are that manufacturer drywall that eventually was distributed into the United States by others, we want to address the personal jurisdiction issue, and if the court finds that Taishan is subject to personal jurisdiction and Taishan

is in the lawsuit, that's the first step and then we go to the next step.

Thanks for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you very much for your time.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, just a brief response statement, and Mr. Levin has a brief statement.

While learned counsel was sending lawyers to China who couldn't speak Chinese, his client was on a web site in English that said that it did business in the United States of America. We think that there should be no delay in going forward with jurisdiction and alter ego discovery.

In terms of good faith, we're not subject to cross-examination at this time, but we believe that we've acted in very good faith given the non-appearance of Taishan after they were served.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. LEVIN: Does your Honor want to hear a response?

THE COURT: I really don't need to. I understand the

issue.

2.0

MR. LEVIN: I wanted to give one but I didn't think you wanted to hear one.

THE COURT: I understand the issues. I make no decision on jurisdiction, that's another issue. But both sides ought to have a right to at least look into this matter. I think counsel for Taishan makes a point about he's interested in why some of his

individual companies or why the individual "subsidiaries" are brought into the litigation, I think he has a right to discover that and pursue that with the plaintiffs. He should know why.

2.0

But likewise, I think the plaintiffs ought to have a right to discover whether or not they have jurisdiction over it.

To the extent of lifting the stay to permit discovery, particularly on jurisdiction, I am going to do so for those reasons.

Let's move onto the next. I have in addition several motions before me, the motions to enjoin the state court in Georgia from proceeding further. The case has taken a different turn now. Under the law that's developed, until there is some *** rees or program, settlement program, it's very difficult for federal courts to enjoin any state court from proceeding.

The situation has changed now, I am involved in a rees, it is a settlement program, a pilot program, but it is a settlement program. And so I am very conscious of protecting that particular program. So I really do now have to take a look at whether or not it is appropriate for the federal court to act on that to protect its jurisdiction and protect its program.

So I am going to set the motion within ten days to determine whether or not to enjoin the state court in Muskogee County. I'll take briefs on that particular. I'll check my calendar and set it sometime within the next ten days alerting all of the parties.

The other motions for class certification of the Florida

homeowners class for claims against Banner and claims against other Florida homeowners against Knauf, it seems to me that both of those should be delayed. I am going to delay moving on those for at least 30 days and I will talk with you all about that at the next conference.

I really want everybody to put their attention and all of their resources into making this pilot program work. I think everybody is looking at this pilot program. If it works then this may be an avenue to resolve this whole matter globally, and it's going to take a lot of effort to get this matter off the ground and I don't want to distract the parties with other matters.

There's a motion for leave to amend third-party complaint in the Vickers. I am going to grant that motion, I think that it's essential for me to get all of the people before me. That doesn't mean they're going to stay there, but I want them present so that they can at least speak for their respective interests, so they can participate to the extent they wish to participate. If they're not a party, they can't, they're a spectator. When they're a party, they're a participant and they can actively advocate for their client. Again, doesn't mean that they're going to stay in it, they may well get out and they may get out quickly, but at least they ought to be given an opportunity to participate and I see that by allowing an amendment not third-party complaint, so I am going to grant that.

Are there any motions that I haven't dealt with? Lowe's

Home Centers opposition to plaintiff's motion intervening Gross.

2.0

MR. HERMAN: No further motions. I do want --

MR. LEVIN: I do. Excuse me, your Honor, I seldom push Russ aside, he's pretty difficult to push aside. We filed intervention claims and you granted them, and there's another set that's pending that we haven't moved for, we just filed. Lowe's objected to being named in that intervention complaint because of the All Writs Act that was pending. You did not grant the Lowe's intervention at that time. So it's hanging there and I guess it should hang there until we deal with the all writs.

THE COURT: Yes. And by all writs that means enjoining a particular state court. It's an All Risk Act and that's what we're talking about.

MR. HERMAN: He pushed so hard I'm bruised. Your Honor, two things on discovery: We're continuing to negotiate various discovery issues with Knauf; secondly, following this conference there is an issue that involves a Banner Supply subpoena.

Your Honor, it's listed at page 12, there is no Freedom of Information Act pending.

The Trial Settings under 10, your Honor has already stated and it's in the status report.

Nothing new in terms of Filings in the MDL.

Nothing new on the notices of appearance and default judgment.

That brings us to 13 insurance issues. There is an issue

brought by Robert Pate as trustee for the Chinese Drywall Trust, motion to compel. Mr. Steckler has been handling those issues, he is in court, and I suggest your Honor may want to hear that after this conference.

THE COURT: Sure, I'll do that afterwards.

MR. HERMAN: Nothing new on Service of Pleadings Electronically.

1.3

2.0

Nothing new under item 15, Master Complaint.

Mr. Levin has already addressed class action complaints and indeterminate defendants, and it is spelled out; as well as in No. 17 along with a class action complaints to be posted on your web site, there really is nothing new to really discuss there.

Nothing new under article 18 regarding special master.

As far as the court appointed mediator, again we want to

acknowledge John Perry and his good offices in helping us reach a

pilot program. The Knauf Gips KG, personal jurisdiction matter was

already addressed at page 8.

Section 8, nothing new under item 20. Database management.

Nothing new under frequently asked questions that have again been posted at www.laed.uscourts.gov/drywall/faq.htm. Knauf attorneys Mr. Wallins and Kerry Miller and Arnold and myself and Chris will attempt to have some additional Q and A's regarding the pilot program to submit to your Honor for potential posting on the web site.

Your Honor has under item 22 detailed the various motions and determinations as to those motions.

Under item 23 motion to establish a Plaintiff's Litigation Expense Fund that's deferred.

2.0

2.4

Your Honor has under consideration the re-appointment and/or appointment of members of the Plaintiff's Steering Committee.

There is under item 25 a mediation schedule in Alabama, as Mr. Miller, Kerry Miller originally indicated it's October 18th in New Orleans and it is in regard to a significant number of Alabama properties.

THE COURT: Kerry, keep me advised of that. If you need me in any event, give me a call and I'll get to it.

MR. HERMAN: I believe that Mr. Levin for the PSC is going to attend that mediation.

Regarding class certification motions, they're pending.

And really there has been no determination of when those matters have been set. And as I understand it, it's the court's directive that they be continued for at least 30 days.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. HERMAN: With regard to the Lowe's settlement, your Honor has addressed that issue, that's at page 25, it's item 27.

And, your Honor, the next status conference is what remains. I don't know if Mr. Miller --

THE COURT: The next status conference is December the

2 2nd, and I'll meet with the parties again, lead counsel at 8:30 and the open court at nine o'clock.

Does Knauf have anything to anything to add to any of this, Kerry?

2.0

2.4

MR. MILLER: No, your Honor, I think that's it for today. We thank the court.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. The other matter that we have talked about or that's listed is in the *Harrell* matter and the parties will discuss that. It's the court's urging that that matter be resolved so that we can integrate it into the program and give everybody an opportunity to be equally treated.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, since we ended a little bit earlier today, we're prepared to discuss that matter right now in your Honor's courtroom.

THE COURT: That's fine. So I'll ask counsel for Harrell to meet with the parties here, get me involved in it if you need me. I know that Judge Farina's also interested in having this matter resolved, and I am confident that I would like somebody from the PSC to participate in those conferences.

MR. HERMAN: We'll participate, your Honor. I want to point out that PSC and Knauf are in New York beginning tomorrow for virtually a week and it may be an opportunity if those matters aren't resolved that perhaps John Perry could be notified and in the event it's okay with Victor's schedule maybe we could resume there.

THE COURT: I hope it's not necessary to resume, I hope 1 2 that you all before you leave today will resolve it, that's my 3 strong hope. All right. Folks, thank you very much. 4 5 MR. HERMAN: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: The court will stand in recess. 6 7 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise. (WHEREUPON, THE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED.) 8 10 11 12 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 1.3 14 I, Karen A. Ibos, CCR, Official Court Reporter, United States 15 District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana, do hereby certify 16 that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of 17 my ability and understanding, from the record of the proceedings in 18 the above-entitled and numbered matter. 19 2.0 21 22 Karen A. Ibos, CCR, RPR, CRR 23 Official Court Reporter 2.4 25