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P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S<br>WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 2018<br>M O R N I N G S E S S I O N (COURT CALLED TO ORDER)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
THE COURT: Be seated, please.
JUDGE HALL: Is anybody on this call? This is
Judge Hall speaking.
THE COURT: Hello, Judge Hall. This is Eldon Fallon. How are you?

JUDGE HALL: Hi there, Judge Fallon. Long time, no see.

THE COURT: I appreciate you being with us today. Let me give some background information first.

I should start at the beginning. From 2004 through 2006, the housing boom in Florida, as well as the rebuilding efforts necessitated by Hurricanes Rita and Katrina, led to a shortage of construction materials, including drywall. As a result, drywall manufactured in China was brought into the United States and used to construct and refurbish --

JUDGE HALL: Judge Fallon, could you turn your mic up? We're having trouble hearing you.

THE COURT: Can you do that, Dean?
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Is it coming out now? JUDGE HALL: Yes, that's much better. Thank you. THE COURT: Fine.

In any event, sometime after the installation of Chinese drywall, homeowners throughout the country began to complain of emissions of foul-smelling gas, corrosion, blackening of metal surfaces and various objects in the home, and the breaking down of appliances and electrical devices.

These homeowners then began to file suit in various state and federal courts against homebuilders, developers, installers, realtors, brokers, suppliers and others, as well as the manufacturers of the Chinese drywall.

Because of the commonality of facts in all of these cases, the litigation was designated as a multidistrict litigation. Pursuant to a transfer order from the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, on June 15, 2009, over 10 years ago -- or close to 10 years ago, all federal cases involving drywall were consolidated for pretrial proceedings in MDL 2047 before this Court.

The Chinese drywall at issue was largely manufactured by two groups of defendants, the Knauf entities and the Taishan entities. Litigation is focused on these two entities, as well as their downstream associates.

The cases which form the subject matter before the Court today are cases filed in Virginia. This has given me
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the opportunity to work with a great jurist, Judge Mary Jane Hall, whose efforts and work has played a vital role in bringing about the favorable conclusion in these cases. The cases involved indemnification claims against Taishan and its downstream associates and distributors.

After nearly 10 years of litigation, involving extensive discovery, as well as a number of trials, a class settlement was reached in these cases due to the good work of Judge Hall. The settlement includes these indemnification claims which were assigned to the Plaintiff's Settlement Class as part of the settlement.

On March 13, 2018, class counsel filed a motion seeking preliminary approval of the assigned claims settlement.

On April 17, 2018, the Court preliminarily approved the assigned claims settlement and directed counsel to send the approved proposed notice, class notice, and established a protocol for disseminating the notice to the various class members.

In addition, the Court required that any objections to the proposed settlement be postmarked no later than June 27, 2018; and, that any response to any objections or other papers in support of final approval would be filed on or before July 5, 2018.

A formal joint fairness hearing before this Court and Judge Hall, of the Norfolk, Virginia, Circuit Court, was
scheduled for July 18th, 2018.
It is now July 18, 2018. Judge Hall and I are now available to participate in this final fairness hearing. We'll hear from the parties at this time. We'll hear from class counsel.

MR. SERPE: Good morning, Your Honor. Richard Serpe, as class counsel for this settlement class.

I thank the Court for conducting this joint fairness hearing, during which we'll seek approval pursuant to FRCP 23 of the assigned claims settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate.

Again, thank you to Judge Hall, whose conduct of the state court litigation has served as a model of state/federal coordination. Without the efficiency gained by that cooperation, we would not have been able to have achieved this settlement. I know I speak for all the parties when we say how grateful we are for her and her court.

JUDGE HALL: Thank you.
MR. SERPE: Your Honor, a very brief procedural history is necessary to understand the nature of this assigned claims settlement.

In April of 2009, state court litigation began against various builders, installers and, critically, the supplier of Chinese drywall in Virginia, Venture Supply, and its sister company, Porter-Blaine, which was a drywall
installation company.
By December of 2011, those cases had been consolidated, and Venture Supply and Porter-Blaine, in state court, filed a third-party motion to bring Taishan into the litigation, seeking indemnification for whatever amounts that they might be held responsible for.

Judge Hall conducted a hearing, found that service had been perfected against Taishan, and entered a preliminary default against Taishan on behalf of Venture Supply and Porter-Blaine on December 1, 2011.

Two years later, in July of '13, I acted as class counsel, with Mr. Herman and Mr. Levin, when we settled the Venture Supply and Porter-Blaine claims here in federal court.

That settlement was approved by the Court on July 9th of 2013, and included all of the remaining insurance coverage that Venture Supply and Porter-Blaine had available to it; but, in addition, we sought assignment, as part of that federal settlement, of the default judgment that had been entered in state court against Taishan on behalf of Venture Supply and Porter-Blaine, and that was a material term of the settlement.

Thereafter, the Allen claimants, who were the plaintiffs in that state court matter, pursued the default judgment. Motion practice, expert witnesses, Judge Hall conducting litigation over a period of years, and, ultimately,
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we reached a proposed settlement of the assigned claims, that is, Venture Supply's default against Taishan, for $\$ 1,978,528.40$.

It was on behalf of the class, that is, the class that had applied for and had claims approved through the Venture Supply-Porter Blaine class from 2013. So it was a discrete class. The members were specifically identified. We knew who they were.

Minus, Your Honor, the seven Germano plaintiffs, who served as intervenors. Their cases had been fully litigated. Your Honor entered judgments. Taishan ultimately had paid those judgments on behalf of the Germano seven. So those seven now have been excised from the class that we're talking about today.

As Your Honor noted, we sought preliminary approval of this settlement in March. Your Honor gave preliminary approval April 17th, including the form of the notice to those class members, as well as a proposed pro rata distribution of the funds.

By April 25th, Your Honor, I supervised notice going to all the class members. I have filed a declaration in the record demonstrating that everyone in the class received notice via first-class mail. We redundantly sent it via e-mail. It was posted on all of the Court's websites, as well as the Chinese Drywall website in this Court.
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The notice that was sent to the members provided the following things: First, that this is a settlement only of the assigned claims, that is, of Venture Supply-Porter Blaine's default judgment to Taishan. It does not settle any of these claimants' litigation with Taishan and its affiliated companies.

It is subject only to a setoff for the monies that they actually received, so that, by way of example for Your Honor, if an individual class member here has a final judgment entered against Taishan, there would be a credit for the amount that Taishan is now paying to them through this class supplement vehicle, as a setoff.

The notice provided for an attorney's fees to be paid for the PSC and class counsel at 32 percent, plus the costs that were incurred in pursuing this litigation.

The notice provided that there be a bar entered, that no one could pursue this default judgment that had been entered against Taishan after the approval of this settlement. The notice told the class members that there would be a pro rata distribution in accordance with the way that the money was distributed initially in 2013 from the insurance proceeds that were provided.

Finally, Your Honor, there was an objections deadline of June 27th for anyone who objected to this settlement. It gave very specific instructions on how
objections were to be made.
Your Honor, as class counsel, we heard from many of these class members in the ensuing three months. Everyone uniformly was grateful and appreciative of the settlement that had been achieved today; but, every call included a request to ask, as class counsel, when does this case end, and, you know, explain that in context.

But, really, I would say it was the fervent desire of every class member to have their case remanded to the Virginia court, so that their cases could seek a conclusion, here approaching the 10th year of this litigation. But, Your Honor, no objections to the settlement from any class member.

For all of those reasons, we ask today for this Court to approve the settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate under FRCP 23.

THE COURT: Judge Hall, do you have any questions of class counsel?

JUDGE HALL: No. Thank You, Judge Fallon. I have no questions.

I will just note that present in Norfolk, Virginia, are only two lawyers, one for the plaintiff class, Mr. Breit, and a lawyer for Taishan is here.

What's your name?
Ms. Sanny (spelled phonetically) is here for

Taishan. But there are no objectors or other persons of interest. Mr. Breit has checked to be sure that no one else is here, and no one is.

THE COURT: Thank you, Judge Hall.
You mentioned attorney's fees. Would you flesh that out a little bit. You said something about 32 percent. How about the common benefit fees?

MR. SERPE: Your Honor, the 32 percent would be a cap on total fees to be paid, both common benefit as well as private counsel that are involved in the litigation, subject to this Court's previous rulings and any additional motions that would be appropriate with respect to how that would be allocated between common benefit and the private counsel.

THE COURT: So you would anticipate any common benefit fees to be dealt with in separate motions filed by common benefit counsel to seek common benefit fees from that 32 percent?

MR. SERPE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SERPE: Any other questions, Your Honor?
THE COURT: No, I have none.
Anybody in the audience? I don't see any other than attorneys here and some other individuals who are not associated with this case.

I have had an opportunity to consider this
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matter. I've had it now for over 10 years.
After reviewing the documents and hearing from counsel, and having conferred with Judge Hall over many years of this litigation, working closely with her and receiving from her a lot of information and a lot of advice which was very key in trying to resolve this matter, the Court finds that the assigned claims settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate, and was entered into in good faith and without collusion, a word that has been frequently used by some in the current times.

I also find that the settlement represents a negotiated agreement.

The Court also finds that the revised proposed allocation plan provides a fair and equitable basis upon which the allocated funds among the eligible class members can be perfected.

Finally, pursuant to Rule $54(\mathrm{~b})$ of the Federal Rules, it's appropriate to enter a final judgment with respect to the assigned claims. I ask counsel to submit a proposed judgment to the Court, and it will be executed.

Thank you, Judge Hall, for all of your good work in this case. I appreciate the cooperation that you and I have been able to give to each other. Hopefully, some of my comments were helpful to you.

Anything further from anyone?
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MR. SERPE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Hearing none, the Court will be adjourned. Thank you, Judge Hall. You can go back to your trial now.

The Court will stand in recess.
JUDGE HALL: Thank you, Judge Fallon.
THE COURT: Thank you, Judge Hall.
JUDGE HALL: There are a lot of people here who say thanks, too.

Take care, you all. Thanks again, Mr. Serpe. (WHEREUPON, at 10:15 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.)
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