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MORNING SESSION

FRIDAY, AUGUST 5, 2009
(COURT CALLED TO ORDER)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
THE COURT: Good morning. This is the status conference for the MDL-1873, In Re: FEMA Trailer Formaldehyde Product Liability Litigation.

Before we begin with the reporting from liaison counsel, I want to thank all of you for the change in schedule. When we were last here, we had agreed that we were going to have this conference on July 31st, and I had a conflict on my calendar, so I apologize for changing the date, and I appreciate your indulgence in that regard.

Let me start with a few housekeeping matters first, and I know counsel is going to touch on some of these things. First of all, Pretrial Order Number 40, and for those of you who are not familiar with them by number, it is the order that sets forth the procedure for filing new complaints, including multiple plaintiffs, hopefully matched to a particular manufacturing defendant. If you haven't looked at Pretrial Order Number 40, whether you're a plaintiff or defendant, you need to look at Pretrial Order Number 40. It applies to all actions, not just to
those that precipitated the entry of that particular order. It applies to all actions, so you need to be very familiar with that. And it sets forth a procedure for filing new claims and/or if they are not matched already to a defendant at the time of filing, for that process to take place on a hopefully expedited basis.

Also, on the plaintiff side, if you are filing a complaint for a plaintiff who has not been matched to a particular manufacturer on or a group of plaintiffs that are not matched to a particular manufacturer, you need to state clearly in boldface capital letters underneath the case heading, you need to state, "PLAINTIFFS UNMATCHED TO MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS." That appears in Pretrial Order Number 42 in the record, so you really need Numbers 40 and 42. If you have not read those two, you need to get copies of them and abide by them.

On unmatched plaintiffs, we are not going to prepare and issue summons for those defendants. If you're filing a complaint for a plaintiff or plaintiffs and you are having to undergo the matching process, after you file the complaint, we will not be issuing summons to all of the defendants that you have named because as we appreciate the circumstance, you have named certain defendants out of an abundance of caution who are not truly going to be defendants in your case. So rather than undergo the expense on both your part as well as the defendants' part of having to respond to an action that that particular
defendant does not belong in, we will not issue summons in those cases until you have made that match pursuant to Pretrial Order Number 40. So, again, the key numbers here are 40 and 42; look at them and that will be the process that we follow.

Okay. We do have the Joint Report Number 12, which has not yet been entered into the record. I've reviewed it with counsel earlier this morning. There are some changes that need to be made to it before it's entered, but we'll go through its provisions with you at this time. If you have questions as we go through, please feel free to ask either me or the appropriate counsel.

Which one of you wants to begin? Mr. Glass.
MR. GLASS: Joe Glass on behalf manufacturing Liaison counsel.

Before we start, I think it was appropriate, as Your Honor pointed out, many of us knew that Mr. Jim Carroll, a colleague, had a heart attack a couple days ago, and unfortunately the Court informed us today that he passed away. So he is a friend and a colleague to all of us in this room, and we should keep his family and him in our thoughts and prayers.

MR. MEUNIER: Yes, all plaintiffs' counsel want to join in, Judge. Jim was a friend, and for many years appeared on the opposite side for a long time in maritime cases and then later in other cases. And it would be hard to come up with the name of a guy who was just a finer man and a truer professional. And our
thoughts and prayers go out to his family at this time.
THE COURT: I appreciate your bringing that up. For those of you who did not know or practice with Jim Carroll, he'll be sorely missed. He's a fine lawyer. He was very active in this case in many respects and there is actually an obituary in the paper this morning. If you want to take a look at it, I'm sure his family would appreciate it.

And on a professional level, I know he's certainly going to be missed. He's a very ethical and professional lawyer who is going to be missed in the legal community here and also in this particular case. I know several counsel were relying on him and working with him very closely, so he'll be missed in this case for sure.

MR. GLASS: With that sobering news, we'll start with Joint Report Number 12. The report of the claims in the case inventory. As we report to the Court, there are 443 actions now filed or transferred into this MDL.

Since the last joint report on pages 1 through 7, we've listed out that inventory. Plaintiffs' liaison counsel has also notified us of the fact that there were about 50 actions that have been filed in various state courts throughout Louisiana. These actions were added as an Exhibit A, listed out in that Exhibit A.

And we've also been informed that since the government, certain of the defendants have filed removals in
those cases based on the government contractor defense.
The plaintiffs' counsel has informed us that individual counsel will remand or attempt to remand some of those cases back to the respective state courts.

THE COURT: We have in Exhibit 1 or Exhibit A, however it's designated here, we have suits that have come in from the 14 th JDC, the 16 th, the 19 th, the 22 nd, 24 th, 25 th, and 34 th, along with Civil District Court for the Parish of Orleans.

If you would, when you do get this Joint Pretrial Submission Number 12, you might want to double check to make certain that the action that you are involved in is listed on here. Or if it is an action that was instituted in federal court, that it's listed on pages 1 through 7 of the joint report.

MR. GLASS: It's my understanding that there are going to be continually a number of filings that will be coming in, so you probably will not see some of yours in the most recent filings. But please go through liaison counsel, notify them if they have been filed, and notify the appropriate parties so that we can try to keep track of all of these filings.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MEUNIER: Let me just add, Judge, the PSC is
prepared now with nearly 500 lawsuits filed, including those in state court, to prepare a census and a spreadsheet for the Court and for opposing counsel that will name plaintiffs who have filed suit, line them up in all match cases with a manufacturer as well
as a contractor as well as the government and give the civil action number a case number. And we will publish, when that is prepared, we'll publish that to all plaintiffs' counsel. It's an important informational profile of a case that we think will help all of us going forward, and I'm pleased to say that Matt Moreland of the PSC has agreed to take the lead on that project.

THE COURT: Good. That will be helpful, I'm sure. All right. The next part of the report relates to plaintiff fact sheets. Mr. Meunier, do you want update us on that.

MR. MEUNIER: Yes, Your Honor. We have now delivered 5,256 plaintiff fact sheets to the defendants. We've cured 1,447 deficiencies which were cited by the defendants.

I want to remind plaintiffs' counsel that particularly with the recent increase in filings, that in turn means, pursuant to this Court's previous orders, that deadlines are in place for the completion of plaintiff fact sheets. Once you have named yourself as a plaintiff in a lawsuit, you are obliged by the orders of this Court's MDL procedure to complete a fact sheet within a certain period of time.

I want to reiterate that the PSC stands ready through its claims office to make available to any plaintiff's counsel appropriate training and guidance on the completion of fact sheets. We're not in a position to do the fact sheets for
every plaintiff lawyer, but we're in the position to show them how it's done. And with the deadlines looming, it's important that they take advantage of that as soon as possible.

THE COURT: I think I've said this every time we've had one of these conferences, and I'll take say it again, even though you may be tired of hearing it: It's critical on the plaintiffs' side that you have a completed fact sheet. You'll be helping yourself and your client tremendously if you can get that done on the front end and get all of that information. You'll really be expediting things and make it a lot easier on everybody else in the case in order those things handled.

When I mentioned Pretrial Order Number 40 at the outset, that delay for matching, when you, if you haven't read it, when you read it, you'll see what I'm talking about, the delay period for you to make a match starts when that case arrives here in the Eastern District. Although you should do it as soon as possible, preferably before you file, if you can find out, if you can make that match, that would be great.

But once the case hits the Eastern District and gets lodged in the MDL, that is when the time delay for matching begins as opposed to when you file it, if you're filing in state court or in other another district. But please don't wait until it gets here and then assume that then you're on the clock. You really should do it as soon as possible.

So the two things I think so far we've talked about
is as always the plaintiff fact sheet, which is critical, and the matching to the extent that that is over and above what the fact sheet calls for. You really need to try to get those two things done posthaste.

Let's talk about motion practice. I have earlier this morning spoken with counsel to try to update the listing that they've given me. The Court has disposed of certain matters within the last few days, and so they are going to update it. We still have an arm full of motions that are still pending, and we'll get to those as promptly as we can.

Mr. Glass.
MR. GLASS: Yes, Your Honor. Just to emphasize one particular point that will greatly assist the Court: Whenever motions are filed, please identify whether they are opposed or unopposed. It short circuits the Court having to track down and determine that information and will allow for the more quickly, the disposal of those particular motions.

It's also my understanding that they're more relevant to the first bellwether trial but the motion for summary judgment deadline that was currently set for Monday has now been pushed back to Friday for the parties with the understanding that the parties are going to speak to each other and kind of give a heads-up as to what's coming so that the plaintiffs don't get jammed in that particular case.

THE COURT: Did it get pushed back to Friday or the
following Monday?
MR. MILLER: The following Monday.
MR. GLASS: The 17th, I believe.
THE COURT: For the first bellwether trial, the motion deadline was this coming Monday, the 10th, and I've conferred with counsel and we've agreed to extend that by one week, to the 17th.

MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, I would just mention for those here, plaintiffs' counsel in particular, who are tracking activity in the case, there are over 20 motions listed as pending. But what plaintiff counsel should understand is that the vast majority are particular to cases, particularly bellwether cases.

On the other hand, there are some motions which by title you can readily discern are common issue motions. And as we discussed with you this morning, with the arrival of now the Alexander case as the first case, it turns out that there are going to be some motions and issues raised that are going to by nature be common issue motions that are going to affect other cases.

So I just want to urge plaintiff counsel not to assume that because a motion may have the Alana Alexander caption that it only pertains to something you need for the case. That's not necessarily true. So any plaintiff lawyer should be alert to all of the motions that are filed, even those that are particular
to a case.
THE COURT: By way of example, the Court currently has under advisement the government's motion pursuant to 12 (b) (1) and 56, on the discretionary function issue, I understand that a week from Monday or hopefully sooner there will be some motion practice to be filed by the third-party contractors relative to the government contractor defense. And I think what Mr. Meunier is referring to is a ruling on those motions, even though it may be in the context or attached to a bellwether case, might well be and likely logically will be applicable to the issue as it's raised in other cases.

Anything else on the pending motions? Let's move on then to the mobile housing unit track.

MR. MEUNIER: As the Court knows, there is a non-led track established with respect to the manufacturers of mobile housing units which are subject to HUD regulation. And through a recent decision by Your Honor at the request of the parties, that track has been extended. There is contemplated the selection of a bellwether plaintiff in the trial on the merits. As to that group of defendants, however, the Court has agreed with us requesting that that be deferred.

I just also need to make mention, even though it's not expressed in the report, that there is an important appeal issue with respect to this part of the case. This Court has ruled that the plaintiffs' tort cases are preempted with respect
to certain HUD regulations applicable to manufactured housing.
The plaintiffs have asked the Fifth Circuit to review that on an interlocutory basis. We are awaiting word as to whether the Fifth Circuit will agree to do that.

Certainly any plaintiff attorney who is either filing those cases, are already involved with those cases, needs to be aware of the pendency of that appeal, as well as the fact that we have now extended the time to go forward on the merits in this MDL.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MEUNIER: I think the next section, Judge, you've already alluded to, which is matching and the importance of matching. I want to encourage all plaintiff counsel to be mindful of the requirements for information needed in order to conduct a successful matching process. The government does need to have certain information. That information is to be channelled to the government through the PSC and through liaison counsel.

As this Court has already said more than once today, and it's important to emphasize, when a suit is filed naming a plaintiff, there now is triggered, particularly in unmatched plaintiff cases, a deadline by which to complete the matching process. So if counsel, out of an abundance of caution have filed unmatched plaintiff cases, they need to be aware that there is certain information that we need to match and they've
got a deadline in place by which to match or else those cases are subject to dismissal consistent with the Court's earlier analysis on the lack of standing when you don't match a plaintiff.

THE COURT: And to be specific, according to this report, plaintiffs' counsel should provide to the United States the claimant's full name, the FEMA ID number, which would be very, very helpful if you have that, Social Security number, date of birth, and address or state where the trailer unit was installed, the FEMA unit was installed.

If you have a client who lived in more than one unit, you should provide as much information as possible as to both. And as Mr. Meunier just indicated, submit that through liaison counsel so that we don't have information flooding in to those with the government who are assisting in this task. It will all come through a single avenue.

Mr. Miller?
MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. I would point out to all of the plaintiffs' counsel who have claimants and are seeking to match, that we have been doing this in a timely manner except for two which we had a week delay on; but we're turning this around within 30 days. We are throwing a substantial amount of government resources to achieve this so that you'll get this information. But it is imperative that you get this in as soon as possible because hurricane season is upon us, and once that happens, these FEMA resources are going to have to be rededicated
to disaster response and there is a substantial chance that there is going to be extended delays, possibly, in providing this information. So please get this information in as quickly as possible. You're also running up on a statute of limitations deadline, so you need this information.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Miller. Mr. Glass.
MR. GLASS: The next item in the report is the bellwether trials, and of course we all know that there are five sets. They are listed out. Subsection B of that section indicates that there have been amendments in several of the bellwether cases to incorporate the specific allegations. I don't think there is anything that really needs to be added to that.

THE COURT: Yes, there have been amended complaints or will be filed amendment complaints relative to each of the bellwethers in order to segregate out the particularities of the allegations, vis-à-vis each manufacturer in each of those bellwethers and each third-party contractor.

Those bellwether trial dates are currently
September 14th in the Alexander matter, October 26th in the Dubuclet matter or what we have been calling the Dubuclet matter, December 7th in the Wright matter and January 11th in the Bell matter.

There has been a fifth one that has been calendared for May 17th, Carrie Smith versus Recreation By Design, L.L.C.

Those are presently the bellwether trial dates. I have urged counsel and we will continue to work very, very hard at getting each of these cases tried within a two-week span, a five-day trial week; so in other words, ten trial days starting on those dates I just gave.

My goal is to have the case tried in a two-week span, and counsel have been working hard to try to whittle the cases down such that they could fit and be exposed to the jury during that window.

There is a motion pending that suggests that some alteration of this schedule might be in order, and I've spoken to counsel about that; however, we have not made any decisions with regard to that. I think it's unlikely that the first bellwether trial on September 14 th will be continued or in any way altered.

The others create some scheduling issues which I've talked to counsel about this morning and will certainly keep you apprised of any changes in that schedule. But as of right now, they are set on the dates that I just said, and those will appear under Roman numeral VI of the joint report that's going to be filed.

MR. MEUNIER: Judge, may I point something out on the amendments. We talked about this in chambers and I think it's important for plaintiff's counsel to be aware. Pursuant to a ruling that you made consistent with federal law, it's not possible in a pending case to, by amendment assert for the first
time claims against FEMA. For example, you can't by amendment add plaintiffs to an existing case and say, These plaintiffs now want to go forward against FEMA because their case has become ripe. It's logical, it's practical, unfortunately it's not doable legally. And that's consistent with a ruling this Court has made in one of the bellwethers, the Dubuclet case.

Mr. Miller has made it known to us this morning, and to you, that he's finding that there are amendments to existing cases being presented which seek to do that, and I just want to urge all plaintiff counsel to be aware of the Court's legal ruling in Dubuclet, the consequence of which is that if a plaintiffs' FEMA case becomes ripe, it is necessary for that plaintiff to file a new independent complaint rather than to amend that plaintiff by name into an existing complaint.

And I hope that plaintiffs' counsel are aware of that so we don't go through the unnecessary part of an amendment that doesn't have effect and then you've not pursued your remedy under the FDCA.

THE COURT: Does anybody have any questions about that? It's an important point and it may sound like a legal technicality, but my appreciation of it is that it is jurisdictional in nature. The government raised the motion. I've ruled on it. And it's an important point, although as Mr. Meunier just suggested it, it might seem illogical to you or counterintuitive based upon common practice. I think it's an
important point that you really need to be familiar with.
MR. SCHMIDT: I'm Douglas Schmidt. I have a question and I guess you could answer this. Mr. Miller could help. In the State of Mississippi, there is a two-year statute of limitation. In Louisiana there is one. Now, it's my understanding with FEMA that they have a two-year window to notify the I-95 or some statutory period.

If you pick up a client, let's say, in November of this year and his case is ripe because there is a two-year statute against the manufacturers, does he lose his right to go against FEMA because of the I-95 issue?

THE COURT: Mr. Miller, would you like to state the government's position on that.

MR. MILLER: Certainly, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'm not going to issue an advisory ruling. It's a good question, though. But I'll go ahead and let the government weigh in on what the argument might be one way or the other.

MR. MILLER: There are several law review journal articles that you can look up on this, but the statute of limitations for the government is not controlled by any state law. The statute of limitations for the government is that you have to file an administrative claim within two years of the accrual of your action, which is controlled all by federal law, not state law.

After your claim is denied, you can then file suit after you've filed your administrative claim, which is a standard Form 95. You can complete the standard Form 95.

Six months after you file that, you can file a lawsuit or institute an action, commence an action.

After the government issues a denial letter, you have to file your suit within six months, and if you do not file within six months, you'll be forever barred.

So there are essentially two statute of limitations provisions related to the FDCA: One, filing your administrative claim within two years of the accrual of the claim, and once a denial letter is issued, filing or commencing your action within six months of that issuance of the denial letter.

THE COURT: Does that answer your question?
MR. SCHMIDT: Mostly. I do have a follow-up.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SCHMIDT: Now, he said two years is accrual of the action. Now, are we talking about when the plaintiff learned of the action or are we talking about when Katrina hit? And that's --

THE COURT: That sounds like --
MR. MILLER: We're not talking about when Katrina hit.
I can answer that.
There is a pending motion relating to Christopher
Cooper. It addresses the legal standard and I suggest,

Mr. Schmidt, you read that motion.
MR. MEUNIER: In fact, the opposition brief for the plaintiffs is due today. So we're very much aware of this legal matter, and the Court will be asked to rule.

THE COURT: So liaison counsel will give us guidance on that.

MR. MEUNIER: I can tell you what the --
THE COURT: Give him a docket number and he can certainly check the docket and read the arguments that are made in there. Of course, something filed later today doesn't yet have a number but you can read the motion.

MR. MEUNIER: The defendants' motion is document number 2317.

THE COURT: 2317 in the record.
MR. SCHMIDT: That's almost a towed car article.
MR. GLASS: Mr. Miller is going to be filing his
intervention for a contingency fee contract, too.
The next section is section 7, severance and bellwether plaintiffs under Rule 21. And it's my understanding that the Court has requested that all the defense counsel in the bellwether trials issue or file a motion by next week to have the claims of the individual plaintiffs in those suits severed from the vehicle that they are currently in.

THE COURT: Counsel for each of the manufacturing defendants in each of the bellwethers shall file a Motion to

Sever, which will be unopposed and the Court will enter promptly. My appreciation of that is to make certain that those cases are in the proper procedural posture in order to go forward as a bellwether trial.

MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, the next section of the report deals with bankruptcy and in particular the bankruptcy of Fleetwood, and the reason we pinpoint that one is that there are other bankruptcy filings by certain manufacturers, but in the case of Fleetwood there is now an announced bankruptcy claim deadline of August 28th. The bankruptcy case is proceeding in California in bankruptcy court there. The PSC has bankruptcy counsel engaged, and we are working with our counsel to determine exactly what the nature of the responsibility is for information to be put in the bankruptcy claim form.

Our hope is that in many cases, the claimants' information has already been gathered for purposes of either a Form 95 for the FTCA case against FEMA or the plaintiff fact sheet. So it may simply be a transfer of information to a new form.

I don't want to make it sound easier than it is, but I do want to confirm that we are going to be publishing to all plaintiff counsel some educational information about that, and if you have a Fleetwood client, it's important that you not let the August 28th deadline go without that client filing the bankruptcy claim form that's required.

We are not, as a PSC, assuming responsibility for completing or submitting the bankruptcy claim forms of Fleetwood claimants, but we are going to provide education as to how that's done.

THE COURT: That's very, very important for those of you who have plaintiffs who resided in Fleetwood-manufactured units. Since we were just talking about time delays and time barred and that type of issue, August 28th, which is a few short weeks away, what, three weeks from today, is the deadline with regard to the bankruptcy proceedings. So you absolutely have to give that your immediate attention.

All right. Master discovery?
MR. GLASS: Your Honor, as laid out in the report, obviously discovery is in full swing. General discovery, there have been some issues on the electronic discovery that Magistrate Chasez has been dealing with.

The United States has also responded to the plaintiffs' steering committee's initial written discovery. And they will respond within the time allowed by the rules.

Additional requests for files have been filed at the IA/TAC disaster files for each of the certain plaintiffs. I think the number is about 5,000, if I'm not mistaken. The government has filed an opposition to that request. It's already, been, I think, discussed a little bit. Did you want to add anything to that?

MR. MILLER: It's, the plaintiffs have filed written discovery for 5,000 IA files. The United States responded to that discovery request, which was not an answer that the plaintiffs' steering committee wanted, and they filed a Motion to Compel. The initial motion was struck as deficient, but I believe they filed one, either last night or early this morning.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. GLASS: There is also carryover from some earlier reports on insurance discovery. There has been some insurance discovery in each of the individual bellwether plaintiffs' cases and a lot it was completed early on. But that is still, there is still a discovery track available for that discovery.

And, of course, Gulf Stream Coaches, bellwether trial number 1, all of the written reports for the experts have been exchanged. It's my understanding that we've completed all of the expert depositions. We're working on a trial plan with the magistrate after this conference, which we hope to be able to submit to the Court by the middle of next week.

Discovery is scheduled to be completed as of today, but the parties have agreed to continue with depositions as agreed upon by the parties as ordered by the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything to add relevant to the discovery?

MR. MEUNIER: No, Your Honor.
MR. GLASS: Additionally, obviously, as we talked about
earlier, the bellwether discovery or the discovery in the other bellwether trials is continuing and the parties are working closely to try and avoid conflicts on those issues.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. GLASS: As far as miscellaneous?
MR. MEUNIER: Judge, in the miscellaneous category of the report, and specifically at page 15, it's paragraph C, reference is made to the United States having now announced its intention to dispose of or sell certain temporary emergency housing units that were involved in the post-Katrina/post-Rita response. And pursuant to our request and to this Court's earlier ruling, the government is obliged to first announce and publish the identity of the units to be sold. That then triggers a deadline by which we are to furnish information as to those units that we wish to test, and then there is a deadline for the testing.

I want all plaintiffs' counsel to be alert to the fact that on Monday, July 27th, at 10:12 a.m., they got an e-mail from our office, and that e-mail carried with it the government's list, which is document number 2315. If you haven't looked at that e-mail and that list, do so now, because today, in fact, we are obliged to advise the government of the identities of the units on that list that we wish to test.

We already know about some and there will be a list given to the government today. But any plaintiff counsel that
has not paid attention to this needs to do so before this afternoon so we can include on the list of units to be tested, assuming that's the desire of counsel, that information. The government is holding these units. They've been put in the queue to be disposed of. We're told that it's imperative that we tell them now and we intend to do that, tell them which ones need to be tested.

And then there is a pretty short fuse for the testing, so we need to jump on that, too. The deadline for testing these units is August 30th.

THE COURT: This relates back to something that came up last year and I think we discussed in our general status conference, that as of Labor Day of last year, and of course now we're over 11 months down the road here, but the government had expressed a desire to begin to dispose of trailer units, mobile home units that are costing taxpayer dollars to store. And the government has now indicated an intent or has designated certain units which they would like to dispose of promptly. And they have filed into the record a notice, and that's what Mr. Meunier is talking about, that certain of the units will be destroyed absent some further request from the plaintiffs, which would have to be today insofar as the government has indicated that particular units are now on the chopping block here.

Mr. Miller?
MR. MILLER: Yes. For all counsel, the docket number to
look at is docket number 2315. That is the official notice that the government filed. I would note that about a week to 10 days before that I provided to liaison counsel an Excel spreadsheet version of that document, and that spreadsheet will allow you to search by VIN number or barcode number and it will identify the location of the facility where those units are located to assist you in your searches for those documents.

I would further note that this applies to both the defense counsel, defendant manufacturers IA/TACs, as well as the plaintiffs' counsel and would request that when the plaintiffs' liaison counsel provide me with a list they provide it to the IA/TAC liaison counsel and the defense manufacturing liaison counsel. So if you're going to test, you can mutually agree on when the testing, and you can monitor each other's testing if you believe it's necessary or appropriate.

FEMA will be taking generally the lead in making the units available, and Jan Jones from FEMA, a trial counsel from FEMA, will primarily be in charge of arranging that since the Department of Justice counsel is primarily dealing with the trials that are going to be going on very shortly.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MILLER: Also, all of the plaintiffs' and defense counsel should be aware that there is an indemnity hold harmless agreement that all persons who enter a FEMA facility must sign and execute in advance.

Secondly, as a result of various dealings with these inspections, we have developed certain requirements and rules that all parties must comply with when they are in FEMA facilities. I urge everyone who goes onto the FEMA facility to read these very closely. FEMA security guards are big, they are armed, and they will escort you off the facility if you violate these. It's very clear and you have to comply with it, so I encourage you that you do so.

THE COURT: This has come up in the context of testing for the bellwethers, so I think some of the attorneys that are involved in the bellwether trials are very familiar with these provisions. Some of them have been controversial and the Court has been made aware of certain of them. But I think that now we have established a protocol that everyone would be expected to follow, so you need to be familiar with that if any of you intend to participate in that process.

Mr. Glass?
MR. GLASS: The last two miscellaneous provisions that we haven't talked about, just to keep everybody in the loop, with the influx of filings, we're working on a possibility of some kind of open-ended extension to deal with getting the appropriate responsibilities and preservation defenses for the amount of filings and in light of the other time concerns that are occurring right now.

Secondly, due to some issues that came up with some
witnesses who also happen to be plaintiffs in other suits, we're trying to work on making sure there is a procedure in place so that liaison counsel ensures all counsel of record are receiving all notices, filings, pleadings and other documents.

THE COURT: Mr. Meunier, do you want to add anything?
MR. MEUNIER: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let me point out by way of a general announcement, the Court has determined that the bellwether trials will utilize nine jurors in those trials, in hopes that all nine will deliberate. But if we do lose a juror or two, which I think is unlikely, we would be able to continue the trial with less than nine and more than six.

But the choice has been made to go with nine jurors and the challenges have been divided. Perhaps counsel has disclosed that to you, the challenges have also been divided.

The Court has issued and has now collected completed questionnaires for all persons in the jury pool. We have almost 200 prospective jurors who have filled out questionnaires and another 20-something that have yet to do so, but will hopefully do so shortly.

I will have the completed jury questionnaires provided to counsel involved in each of the bellwethers so that we can begin to familiarize ourselves with not only the potential jurors but any particular cause issues or challenges for cause that the Court can resolve prior to the date of the trial.

So that process is well underway. We will continue to do that. We will also have a preliminary jury charge conference with regard to the first bellwether on Tuesday, August 18th. That will involve those counsel who are going to be trying that particular bellwether case along with liaison counsel.

So things are well underway with regard to all of them, but the first bellwether we're getting close on. In that regard, I discussed with counsel this morning when we could have our next status conference. And obviously, given that it's August 7th and the first bellwether is on September 14th, and assuming that we do start on the 14 th, it will be very difficult to have another conference between now and then. Moreover, if we do have another conference between now and then, I'm not sure that there will be anything that's particularly newsworthy that would cause us to want to gather here again.

Having said that, I'm very sensitive to those of you who are not on committees that you do need to stay in the loop and you want to stay in the loop and you need information. I think liaison counsel and the committees have been doing a pretty good job of making information available, but my preference would be to meet sooner or more frequently rather than less frequently, but given that we have a bellwether starting on the 14th, we will probably have to schedule the next meeting, and rather than me pick a date today, I'll confer with counsel and it
will probably be sometime in the first half of October the next time we convene here.

If you have questions or you feel as though you need some information in the meantime, of course, feel free to contact liaison counsel and get updated. If we do run into a problem where we have to have another status conference, a general status conference, then I certainly intend to do that if it looks like it would be productive. But it's going to be difficult to have one between now and September 14th.

We'll get the date to you as soon as we pick it, and it will be the same format where we start at 8:45 with the committees. We will have our conference at 10:00 a.m. here.

Before we break, out of all that we've covered today, are there any questions about anything we have talked about?

Mr. Schmidt?
MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, Your Honor, I have a question in regards to the August 28th deadline for bankruptcy court. You know, we filed these unmatched plaintiff lawsuits, and Mr. Miller is going to cooperate with us, obviously. He said within 30 days or sooner, to get us the information. But, that's going to give us a problem with the August 28th federal court, what if some of those are delinquent?

THE COURT: That is definitely a problem. I'm not going to order that the bankruptcy court extend the date. The problem
is that it's an uncertain date here. I mean, we have people who will be filing actions through the fall, perhaps. And perhaps even longer than that. That's why I have been saying every time we've had a conference here since day one, I have been saying you have got to get your plaintiffs matched to a defendant. Because we all knew that either through bankruptcy court or through my pen or through the laws of prescription or statute of limitations, the day would come when a claim is no longer going to be a valid claim due to the fact that it's legally stale. The first date to come up, unfortunately, is this August 28th date. The bankruptcy court has to have a bar date and that's the date that's been selected. So if you haven't matched and you still have some concerns, I mean, I'm not going to tell you what is the prudent course of action because that's for you to decide. Perhaps you want to take the issue up with liaison counsel, and he may have some advice for you, but you're very perceptive to identify that as a problem.

MR. MEUNIER: I don't practice bankruptcy law and I don't have the answer, but I've got to believe our bankruptcy counsel will have some ideas on perhaps requesting that that bankruptcy judge acknowledge that if someone comes along after August 28th and can truly demonstrate that there was no way through whatever diligence could be exercised that they could have known they were in a Fleetwood unit before August 28th and only found out later that a later filing would be permitted. But
we will have to check with our counsel.
MR. SCHMIDT: One other thing. I had a lawyer ask me for a continuance for 30 days or something like that on the August 28th, September 30th, but Mr. Miller already said in 30 days he is going have it to us. So why can't we do a motion to --

THE COURT: Let me back up a little bit because I want to be clear and certainly any counsel here can correct me on this. The bar date that was set in the bankruptcy court is one that is commonly set for any of you that have been involved in bankruptcy law. There is a bar date for claims against the debtor, and it's one that the bankruptcy court is going to choose, and in this case, it's August 28th. Can it be extended? That's for you all to research and seek an extension.

But to be clear, the commencement period for you to match doesn't start when you file the lawsuit. So don't tell the bankruptcy judge in California that, Well, Judge Engelhardt and Mr. Miller put on this show way back on August 7th, and I couldn't have even matched until after I filed suit and then Mr. Miller promised me, I'm not picking on you and I'm not paraphrasing you, but I could see someone making the argument that with, Well, gee whiz, because you're going to have some people who aren't going to file these actions, as I said, until the fall. And then they are going to say, Well, my 30 days started, Bankruptcy Judge, how could you bar my claim because I
didn't find out who my defendant was until 30 days after I filed. I didn't file them until October.

So that's not going to be the argument because I think that judge will probably first ask why did you not attempt to make a match until you were butted up against the August 28th date? The presumption is going to be that a match could have been made earlier and perhaps much earlier, and perhaps, and I know what you all are dealing with, but in California, the judge may say, Well, why did you not know who the manufacturer was if you had a claim? They may not be as sensitive to the circumstances of Katrina and the assignment of units and this whole exercise that we have been conducting here. So understand that they set a date and that's the date that you're going to have to deal with in that court.

Mr. Miller?
MR. MILLER: Your Honor, just to make it very clear, the United States has offered to match up claimants with units since April of 2008.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. MILLER: This has been ongoing. The fact of the matter is is that no request was submitted for matching until January of 2009. And so this is not, there is a whole bunch of issues here. And so this is not, as you're identifying, Mr. Schmidt, if you put a request in now, we get it, we will respond to that generally within 30 days. There has been a
couple of instances where it took a little bit longer. But generally within 30 days we'll provide you with that information to the extent it's in our database. That's all I'm saying we'll match up. We're not promising to match everybody up if they haven't submitted a request for it by August 28th.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anything else about what we've covered? I'm going to take any more questions you have about what we've covered and then we'll open the floor to anything else that you might want to discuss. Does anybody else on any of the topics that we have talked about that you haven't had the opportunity to ask? All right.

Does anybody else have any other issue that they would like to raise at this time for either me or for counsel? Thank you all again for your indulgence on today and for all of your attention here this morning. Could I see liaison counsel real quick.
(WHEREUPON, the proceedings at 11:04 a.m. were concluded.) REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
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