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## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2008
M O R N I N G S E S S I O N
(IN OPEN COURT)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.
THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL docket 1657, In re Vioxx.
THE COURT: Would counsel make their appearance for the record, please.

MR. WITTMANN: Good morning, Your Honor, Phil Wittmann representing Merck.

MR. HERMAN: Good morning, Your Honor, Russ Herman representing plaintiffs.

THE COURT: This is our monthly status conference. I met with the committees in advance of the meeting to discuss the order in which we would take the items today. The first item is the settlement agreement. Do we have any reports on the settlement agreement?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, we do, Your Honor. Mr. Birchfield is going to make a report.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Good morning, Your Honor. I want to give a report on where we stand. Orran Brown is going to report
for BrownGreer, and he will give us specific numbers. But I want to focus our attention for a few moments on the enrollment process. Over the course of the last few weeks, we have, we have been talking with a number of firms that represent a larger number of clients to see, to get a feel for where everybody is in the process of getting their enrollment forms in.

And the response that we have got is very
encouraging, from firms that have a large number of clients to firms that represent, you know, one or even a small number, everyone is engaged. They are in the process of getting their enrollment materials in and submitted to BrownGreer.

And although Orran will give the numbers in a few minutes, we have seen the numbers of enrollment forms and the releases increasing on a daily basis. So we're very encouraged where we stand overall in this process.

One of the things --

THE COURT: Let me ask you first, as we understand it, there are two steps. One is the registration step, and how many people have registered?

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Just over 58,000 have registered, and --

THE COURT: Registered simply means that they have a case or they feel they have a case. It doesn't bind them to anything. The enrollment is when they buy into the program?

MR. BIRCHFIELD: That's right. As Your Honor has
described it, the registration process is akin to a census, and anyone that had a case that was filed or told at the time of the settlement announcement, under court order to register those claims, to identify those claims and identify whether it was an alleged heart attack claim, an alleged stroke claim or some other injury. But there was no commitment as to whether or not you would be engaged in the settlement program or not. It was just a registration or a census.

That was the deadline for January 15th. We have now moved from the registration process to the enrollment process. And the enrollment process entails two steps essentially: One, you must enroll, an enrollment form must be completed identifying the client name and information about the client and committing to being a participant in the settlement program, to go through the process. And that's where we are now. That's the first step is submitting an enrollment form.

The second step, which is typically done all together, is submitting the exhibits or the paperwork with that, which would include a release that is signed by the client, and medical authorizations and an employment authorization form for those that would participate in the extraordinary injury fund.

As we have, members of the negotiating plaintiffs' committee have reached out to talk to firms and see where they are in the process, we have learned that they are making tremendous progress but we have also learned that with a small
percentage, there are difficulties in actually getting the paperwork back from the clients. And that arises in a number of situations.

Sometimes there is difficulty in the mail, clients have moved. There are also situations where it's received, the release is received by the law firm, but it's been signed in the wrong place or not properly notarized. And so sending those back and getting the clients, we have learned that there is a need for additional time to actually get the paperwork submitted.

And so we have worked with Marvin and Merck, and we have arrived at an accommodation. And that accommodation is that the enrollment deadline will remain intact. It is February 29th in order to be eligible for an interim payment. And that deadline, February 29th, to enroll a client remains in place. But we are going to provide an accommodation, a 30-day grace period to actually submit the paperwork, the release form and the medical authorization forms.

So what that means now is that a lawyer or law firm is to complete the enrollment form for any client that is choosing to participate in the settlement program, there must be an enrollment form completed.

And last week, BrownGreer launched an online enrollment process to make that much more efficient and an easier process. So a law firm would identify the clients that they wish to enroll in the settlement program, and they would complete an enrollment
form listing all of the clients that are going to be participating in the settlement program.

That step must be completed by February 29th. But if the release is not actually received, then the law firm and the client have a 30-day grace period, 30 additional days to actually submit that paperwork.

So we want to, I want to thank Doug Marvin and Merck for that accommodation. We know that it will help for the small percentage of clients that are, that need the additional time to get that paperwork in.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any report from Orran?
MR. BIRCHFIELD: At this time, Orran, do you want to step up and BrownGreer will make their report, Your Honor, on registration of claims. I might add that all of the pretrial orders that Your Honor has initiated since November 9, 2007, pretrial orders 28 through 34 are not only noted in the status report but are also noted on the Court's website.

We also, for the record, ask Mr. Brown to please, if he would, even though it's in the status report again, give the website for those who choose to access the website on registration enrollment.

MR. BROWN: Good morning, Your Honor, Orran Brown from
BrownGreer in Richmond and we're the claims administrators. With me today is Lynn Greer. We have a lot of activity going on right
now at the claims administrator office, including working with the parties regularly for each step of the program. We have met with Special Master Juneau and we're starting that process to work together and make his function be ready to go when it's needed. We work with a lien administrator for the lien administration aspect of the program, which the Court will hear more about this morning as well. We're starting the process to be ready to receive claims packages and review claims. We already have about 120 claims packages, which is the next step in the program beyond today.

But the main focus of the day, as the Court and Mr. Birchfield have already mentioned, is the tail end of the registration phase and the enrollment phase, which we and the parties are in right now.

After the January 15th registration period, the enrollment phase really began in earnest. We are still receiving some registration materials, and parties are still submitting them and we're still taking those. And as Mr. Birchfield reported, we're over about 58,000 claimants who were counted in that census phase of the program. And now we are in the point where we are receiving from primary counsel and from unrepresented claimants the documents that Mr. Birchfield described that are necessary for a claimant to really be enrolled in the program, including the release and stipulation of dismissal, medical authorization forms. There are about six
documents that are required of a claimant to be enrolled. If you want to seek the extraordinary injury payment, you also submit an authorization for release of employment records. And there is a claimant spreadsheet that was used in the registration phase in which --

THE COURT: Do you want to put that up on the overhead? You've got, you have it here, if you could project it, it would probably be helpful.

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. I could certainly do that. Is this good enough, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, that's fine.
MR. BROWN: This is a list of the documents that a firm has to submit to us for each claimant to be enrolled. And with some indication as well as where they are coming from. The enrollment form itself, as Mr. Birchfield described, is a form that a firm fills out, maybe for one or more claimants to say, I'm enrolling these people. And that was supposed to, under the program, come in with the claimant's spreadsheet, which is the same spreadsheet used in the registration phase where you had to answer about five more questions per claimant to say, I am now enrolling this claimant.

The other documents Mr. Birchfield mentioned, the release form itself, signed by the claimant, the stipulation of dismissal, signed by counsel, if you have a pending lawsuit, this medical authorization form is required of every claimant to be
submitted for enrollment. This employment authorization is required if you're seeking the extraordinary injury payment part of the program.

And then once a firm is finished, it's supposed to send us a certification of final enrollment saying, I have enrolled everyone that I have who will enroll.

This also tells us where these documents come from. These firms can enroll online. And I'd like to describe that in a little more detail in a moment. But we also provide the claimants, the counsel the claimant's spreadsheet that's been reconfigured and we send it back to them. They can use that spreadsheet. The release itself they get from us with a barcode on it that is unique to the claimant, which makes the processing come back to us a lot faster.

The stipulation of dismissal is a form that firms download from the settlement website, and our website is browngreer.com/vioxxsettlement, and, available to everyone publically.

And each firm also has its own unique website portal with a unique user ID we issue to them so they can obtain all this information from us.

But these are where the documents come from. And these are how they are supposed to send them back to us in hard copy or an Excel spreadsheet or online enrollment. These are hard copies. Some of these they can send in electronic PDF. But this
is the material that we're now getting back from firms.
THE COURT: Before you take that, Andy, what document do you need by the 28 th and which ones are you giving 30 days for?

MR. BIRCHFIELD: The enrollment form, Your Honor,
number 1. That is the form that is completed online that Orran is going to go through in detail a few minutes.

THE COURT: And you need that by the 28th?
MR. BIRCHFIELD: By the 29th.

THE COURT: The 29th of February. The rest you're giving 30 days to obtain?

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Yes, sir. You can either enroll by completing the enrollment form, and that is the preferred method. That's the most efficient way of doing it, or you can enroll a client by completing the claimant spreadsheet. But those first two, the first two items are the options that are available to actually enroll the client. And then the paperwork, the release, stipulation of dismissal, medical authorization, and employment authorization can follow within the 30 -day grace period.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, let me show you the online enrollment method, because the idea that we've had in working with the parties to make this possible is that counsel can go online to their secure website and -- that's not very visible because it's too small.

Your Honor, we're using the button that says "zoom" so
we assume that's the right button.
The accommodation that Mr. Birchfield mentioned will allow firms to submit claimants for enrollment by sending us an enrollment form which is a two-page document with a list of their claimants. And that's what they are now, will be required to get to us by February 29th with the rest of those materials trailing behind until March 30th.

And this is the system we created to make this happen for law firms easier, because they can go to their website portal. This a firm's website portal, and once a firm signs on with their secure password, they get this home page which allows them to then access a number of functions, including their enrollment page.

And these are just artificial names that we made up; it's nothing confidential up here. But a firm can then go to this page and click on submitting claimants for enrollment. And then they will get a screen that tells them the steps in that process that they can follow online to just tell us who it is they would like to submit for enrollment that day.

And if they hit "next" here, they will go to a screen that lists all their clients. Again, these are artificial names. They are not real people. But at this stage, the firm can pick from this pick list and select them all, and this will list all of their clients that have not yet been submitted for enrollment previously in alphabetical order with a claim number that we
assign to them here. And it allows them to pick all of their claimants, select them all or select individual ones and allows the firm very quickly to answer the questions here that you would otherwise be answering in this claimant's spreadsheet. And what we have heard from firms is that a lot of firms, because some of them have these spreadsheets that have hundreds or even thousands or more people in them were waiting until they had everybody ready in the spreadsheet. Rather than to have to send that entire thing more than once with answers for a few people, they were waiting until the end of the process. And we have been encouraging firms to send us the materials as they are ready. Send us the paperwork as they get them ready. We would like to process them immediately.

And this system allows a firm not to have to use the big entire spreadsheet to enroll persons, but instead they can pick them online this way whenever they are ready to say, This person wants to be enrolled. And skip the spreadsheet step. And this allows them to do it now instead of waiting until the end to get their entire spreadsheet ready.

And once they pick these people and answer these questions, which would be the ones required in the spreadsheet, they will then get the enrollment form.

This is the enrollment form which we're not going to try to read on the screen, but it's the form that the settlement agreement requires, and this is what would now be in by

February 29th, and this will print with the list of claimants that they have now picked today to be enrolled, down here at the bottom. And they agree to the form, they get a screen that tells them they can print it, and it tells them where to send it to us.

And this step, we actually developed this with the parties, started it February 14th, late in the day, and in the essentially three or four business days that occurred since then, between then and yesterday, we had about 135 firms who had already used this for over 5,200 people to send them in for enrollment this way in the online enrollment method.

So this is the way we are encouraging firms now to list the people to us that they would like to enroll. But already, Your Honor, we are receiving the actual documents. We have been receiving them in increasing volumes. Each day, we receive more releases and stipulations and materials that are coming in and processing them in our office to identify what we have.

And this right here, gives us some numbers. And the reason this has some handwriting on it is that the numbers change every minute, and we work into the night to be able to process these. And when we printed this yesterday afternoon to bring it down here, the numbers changed more last night.

What this means is that this number down here tells us that we have heard from 183 firms already who have sent us some of these materials, some of the paperwork. And those firms in the census part of the program submitted claimant spreadsheets
that listed over 30,000 now people. It was $29,000-\mathrm{plus}$ yesterday afternoon and this morning it's 30,041. So these people, these firms that have already sent us some paperwork represent over 30,000 people, and they have sent us in something. They have sent us in some of the papers that are necessary to complete the entire enrollment package. And as of this morning, we have gotten over 13,000 releases. Yesterday afternoon it was 12,000-plus. We've gotten now 6,700-plus stipulations of dismissal. We've gotten over 12,000 of these medical authorization forms. And we've gotten 6,400-plus of the forms, the employment records authorization forms.

So firms are really trying to do this, and we're hearing from them and they are working on it and trying to get their clients and reaching out to their clients to sign these papers and send them in to us. And each day we are receiving increasing amounts of them.

And this is very typical of a program like this, where a lot of it is really back loaded. We receive the bulk of submissions whenever the deadline is or clustered around the deadline. And particularly in a situation like this where there are a number of components and claimants sign some, lawyers sign others, there is paperwork to put together in a package, we would expect most of those to come in in the last few days of the period.

THE COURT: What's the census from the standpoint of MI
and ischemia and strokes from the standpoint of, what are we dealing with, how many are there that the 85 percent is going to be figured on, do you know?

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Your Honor, it's 47,000, roughly 47,000. There is approximately $30,000 \mathrm{MI}$ cases and 17,000 stroke cases that have been registered.

THE COURT: And the 30,000 that have registered, those are either stroke or MI?

MR. BIRCHFIELD: I think that includes, that would include the others. I think that's the total number. The 30,000 represents the total number of cases that had been registered by a firm that have submitted; is that correct?

MR. BROWN: That's right, Your Honor. The 30,000 is everybody. I think that number right there, if you take out the ones who in their registration spreadsheet put themselves in other injury category, that number would fall, would be about 26, 27,000 people that you really expect to finally get these papers from because those are the ones who have the qualifying injuries.

THE COURT: But 58,000 registered and now 30,000 has enrolled, have enrolled?

MR. BROWN: 30,000, 30,000 people represented by those firms have sent us in something. The numbers across the bottom, if you add them all up, these tell the people that have really sent in the whole package, but we've had pieces of it coming in from a lot of people. We've gotten over 39,000 documents of some
type. But what this tells us is that law firms representing about 30,000 people, of whom about 26 or 27,000 said they had qualifying injuries, have already sent us in some of their materials and they are still working to fill them out.

There are only a few firms that have finished and those are firms with lower numbers. So we've heard from these. We've heard from a lot of firms who are waiting to send them in. As they get them all ready, we encourage them to send them in as they have them and not wait to send them.

We think this online enrollment step, which really allows the firms to tell us who they want to enroll online, and they have to do that by the 29th now, that that will make that step easier and all the paperwork will come in now and behind that.

Your Honor, I think that pretty much covers our report. Do you have any other questions for us?

THE COURT: No, I have nothing.
MR. MARVIN: Your Honor, Douglas Marvin for Merck. I want to echo Mr. Birchfield's comments. We really are very encouraged by the number of enrollments received so far. It really is what we were anticipating. We know that firms are working toward the deadline of February 29th, and that's still a week away.

And if the registration is any guide, we know that more than 20,000 registered in the last 24 to 48 hours before that
deadline. So we're expecting some of the same results here. And it's also very encouraging that now that we have gone to the online process, where we had 5,000 enrolled in a matter of three or four days, that also is making it much more efficient.

As Mr. Birchfield said, we do appreciate, because we've heard from firms as well, that in getting some of the backup documentation collected, compiled, processed, and submitted requires a little bit of additional time, and that's why we agreed to the grace period for the additional backup documentation.

But on the whole, Your Honor, we fully expect to meet the thresholds and, in fact, we expect to exceed those thresholds.

THE COURT: We've covered the first and second item on the agenda, registration. The next item is lien administrator. MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor, and Mr. Garretson is here to make a report.

THE COURT: As I mentioned before, one of the complications in a case of this sort is that there are oftentimes a number of liens, medical liens, and so forth involving the census of the people. I think in this particular litigation, it probably is more so because the type of medicine that we're dealing with was traditionally given for musculoskeletal problems, and those individuals with those problems generally
tend to be a little older in the population, and therefore, they qualify for Medicare, Medicaid, things of that sort. So we now have to deal with the reality of liens. I'll hear from the person in charge of handling liens.

MR. GARRETSON: Matthew Garretson. As I shared with the Court at our last status conference, we had been preparing claimant educational materials. Those were completed, they were sent to all the plaintiff attorneys and plaintiffs' attorneys by the claims administrator BrownGreer with instructions for them to be distributed to all of the enrolling claimants. So those, by now, should be in the hands of all of the claimants.

And essentially, Your Honor, those explain to the enrolling claimants the formalized process, and that is being utilized to address these Medicaid, Medicare and other governmental healthcare problems.

BrownGreer also worked with us to incorporate a page on the Vioxx web portal that allows plaintiffs' counsel to seamlessly enter the governmental lien information that we might need to complete our assignment.

We have also recently sent out correspondence to all the plaintiffs' counsel through the claims administrator just making sure that they know this process of responding to our needs on the lien resolution front should not in any way interfere with their efforts to get their clients enrolled and get the appropriate documentation in.

Your Honor, also at the last status conference, you signed a qualified protective order that allows us to verify the Medicare, Medicaid and other governmental entitlement with 54 federal and state agencies, and I will report briefly on that.

With respect to Medicare, we're very pleased. Medicare has been very cooperative. We'll have inside the month of February all the information we need to determine who is, in fact, entitled to Medicare. And I expect that actually as early as next week.

We've had multiple discussions with officials at the Medicare secondary payor program about a mutually agreeable methodology that allow us to establish what we call an initial global resolution holdback. And, Your Honor, this would be the amount of money, the maximum amount of money that Medicare would require us to set aside for their interests to be satisfied with them.

That, therefore, would serve really as a high water mark and as we learn more working with the parties, working with the claims administrators and the special masters about the points finally awarded to those who are entitled to Medicare, we'll be able to refine that number down within that initial global resolution holdback amounts.

With respect to Medicaid, we have received entitlement information back from states and territories for about 4,000 of the claimants to date. The entitlement rate of Medicaid for
these enrolled claimants is holding at about 34 percent, I believe that's what I informed the Court I thought it would be at our last status conference.

We're doing some very good work with the centers for Medicare and Medicaid state operations. That's the federal side of the Medicaid program, the liaison between the federal and state agencies, as well as leaders from the state Medicaid third-party liability subcommittees.

Specifically what we've done, Your Honor, is we've introduced to them what we believe are recommended voluntary protocols that would allow us to satisfy Medicaid's interests in a very cost-effective uniform and nationwide basis that would serve public policy here.

Essentially, what those processes and procedures are is we've asked them to agree to a holdback, and that holdback would serve on an individual basis as a maximum amount in which a lien could be resolved. And of course, the value in having established a holdback for these Medicaid-entitled claimants is that they would know, they being the claimants, that no matter what the size of the lien, it would not exceed a certain amount.

And then of course to the extent we resolve the lien, which we would expect to resolve the vast majority, greater than 90 percent of these liens within that holdback amount, as we do resolve those liens within the holdback amount, the balance would of course be distributed to the claimant.

We've also asked for them to consider uniform procurement offsets. And procurement is a term of art in the lien resolution world which basically means that the states should recognize a proportionate reduction in their interest commiserate with the pro rata amount of attorney fees and expenses, or I should say the proportion amount of attorney's fees and case expenses being paid by the claimant.

Every state varies on the amount that they will do that, but we've asked them to come together and find a uniform approach.

Thirdly, we've asked them to agree on the prioritization of recovery when we have beneficiaries that are entitled to both Medicaid, Medicare and perhaps even military benefits.

So with respect to Medicaid, Your Honor, we have very good dialogue and we expect that those states that are willing to voluntarily agree to those procedures will do so within the month of March. So I'm very hopeful that at our next status conference I'll be able to share with you those states that have agreed to those procedures.

With respect to other governmental healthcare liens such as Tricare, the Department of Defense and the VA, we've had wonderful dialogue with the Department of Justice. They are identifying the contacts, and I believe for the first time in any aggregate mass tort settlement, we will find efficient ways to
deal with those military benefits in a manner that's similar to Medicare and Medicaid.

The bottom line, discussions with all the governmental healthcare agencies are proceeding. I believe we're ahead of schedule in terms of the dialogue, and it's all very positive momentum, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I appreciate your work, Matt. This is a very important part of the process. One advantage of looking at these cases globally in an MDL setting is that you can deal with these liens in a global fashion.

There are claims in 50 states. We have cases represented from the 50 states. In addition, there are 54 federal and state agencies to deal with, and their various liens. When the cases can be grouped together in a global fashion, oftentimes the claimants benefit from that packaging, and that's what we're trying to do here, and I'm happy that it's working so well. I appreciate all of your work.

MR. GARRETSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, Special Master Juneau is here, and Your Honor has issued certain orders.

THE COURT: I appointed Special Master Patrick A. Juneau as a special master under terms of the settlement agreement. To assist him as his deputy, I appointed Justice John Trotter, a retired jurist from California, and Judge Marino Corodenus, a retired jurist from the State of New Jersey, to be deputy
masters, to be of assistance to Special Master Juneau.
SPECIAL MASTER JUNEAU: Your Honor, very briefly. Just to confirm, I have, in fact, met and coordinated with both BrownGreer and with Mr. Garretson's firm. We're all in sync as to what the policies and procedures would be. As a matter of fact, we are already establishing forms and procedures that have been used by the special masters in the discharge of their duties, which would be coordinated and consistent through the network established by the administrator. So we are ahead of the learning curve in that regard.

I might also add, Your Honor, that we have scheduled in March, the early part of March in this, through the consent of your office, Your Honor, an orientation program we're going to use to the special masters to be onboard. And that's done in coordination with the defendants and the plaintiffs. We'll have an orientation program that I'm familiar with because I've seen that. But we're going to expand that through the good services of BrownGreer to incorporate a lot more detail in that orientation as to exactly the processes and the procedures. And we'll even be talking about specific forms and details and access to information and how that will be done.

THE COURT: Good, I'll meet with the three of you-all. SPECIAL MASTER JUNEAU: Yes, sir. And that's all been coordinated in that set and hopefully through today, through the end of the business day today, we'll have firmed up the actual
involvement, participation of the deputy special masters in this program that I've laid out for you.

I think insofar as policies and procedures, Your Honor, a lot of the kickoff work insofar as the Special Master would be concerned will actually take place at a later stage in maybe May or June, but we're going to be ready to pull the trigger because we're doing our work now to activate when that occurs, it will occur on time, so it will put us on schedule with everything else that has taken place. And that's pretty much it up to date, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you for your work, Mr. Juneau. State court trial settings is the next thing on the agenda.

SPECIAL MASTER JUNEAU: One other point, Mr. Herman reminded me, I am including in the orientation program that's set for March, Bob Johnson who is going to serve in the capacity as court appointed to deal with pro se plaintiffs, I've already coordinated and talked to Mr . Johnson and he will be and be a participant in these discussions.

THE COURT: With regard to the pro se claimants, the Court has been contacted by several of the pro se claimants, and they have also contacted members of the PSC. The PLC lawyers have conflicts in representing pro se claimants and so they are not able to represent them or to give them advice. So I've appointed a person to be available to answer questions posed by
the pro se claimants regarding the scope of the program and what they have to do, and that person is attorney Bob Johnston.

MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, the only state court trial setting that we have to report on is the Smith case, which is set for trial in West Virginia on May 19th.

THE COURT: Next item is class actions, anything on that?

MR. WITTMANN: Subject to being corrected by Arnold, I don't know of anything that we have on the class action front before us.

THE COURT: The next item is discovery directed to Merck.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, that particular discovery has been stayed, and the FDA discovery has an exception noticed and Your Honor's order is preceding.

THE COURT: The next item is discovery directed to third parties.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, the FDA is the only ongoing third-party discovery.

THE COURT: What happened with the ESI matter?
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, it's been resolved. After Your Honor convened representatives of ESI and representatives of plaintiffs and defendants and Your Honor gave us guidelines, the matter was successfully negotiated yesterday, and we'll be providing the details for publication to the attorneys who have
clients who may be prescription benefit managers, ESI's pharmaceutical reports.

THE COURT: I had a motion regarding ESI, so I'll deny that motion as being moot.

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The next item is deposition schedule.

MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, some depositions that were scheduled were rescheduled and are being negotiated right now for new dates.

THE COURT: Next item is state/federal coordination. Let me hear from the state liaison.

MS. BARRIOS: Good morning, Your Honor, Dawn Barrios for the state liaison committee. If you might indulge me a compliment from a private attorney to BrownGreer to let the Court know how efficient they have been. Within the past 30 days, one night about 10:00, I wrote to my assigned personal representative there a whole list of questions my paralegals had put together for me. When I got up the next morning and checked my e-mail before 7:00 a.m., there were complete answers already given to me. So I do thank them for that, and that is what $I$ hear from all the attorneys.

Having that personal liaison for the attorneys in the office has gone, is a great step in the process.

THE COURT: The Court is aware of their good work, and we look forward to working with them throughout this process. I
know they are doing a great job and I appreciate it.
MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, my first item of business is the statistics for the pending remands. I've given the parties and your law clerk a document that gives the statistics, and your MDL has 752 cases that are pending remand.

Your Honor, it dawned on me that most of these remands will probably be taken off the docket because of the settlement, and I realize how busy everybody is now with the enrollment date, but I seek Your Honor's permission to, after the March date settles down, allow me to communicate with BrownGreer what cases I have appending and then we can really give you some valid statistics on what you actually have in front of you after the settlement.

THE COURT: Yes. I think that's the way to do it. I think that after, as I will say now and later when we address some other issues, but my thinking is that while I can put on track the other matters now, I mean, immediately, I've been resisting because I know that there is some overlap with counsel, and I really would like counsel to focus on the enrollment process and settlement and evaluation and making decisions regarding their representation of each individual client as to whether it's good for that particular client. Discussing matters with each particular client, that can take some time. Rather than having the lawyers distracted by doing other things, I really have stayed everything, to give them an opportunity to
focus their attention solely on settlement program.
But when that's over, then I'm going to see what's left, then we're going to have to deal with what's left, either by remanding, either by trying, or by resolving any issues that are outstanding, either by grouping and trying bellwether matters. There are many ways of doing it, but at this point, I really want everybody's attention to be focused on the settlement project and program.

MS. BARRIOS: Yes, Your Honor, I am fully aware of the segments, and I agree totally. My guesstimate is of the 750 approximate remands you have, at the end of the day after the settlement program, you may be down to about 50 that you have to deal with.

I've also provided Your Honor a spreadsheet updating the one that I provided at the last status conference regarding the consumer and third-party payor cases that are presently in the MDL. I've been coordinating with the PSC and Dorothy Wimberly from Merck's attorney on trying to give you a sense of what economic cases are before you that are outside of the settlement.

Thirdly, Your Honor, along the lines with the state-federal coordination, I've been trying to gather information on what state cases are out there that are driven by an economic damage-only recovery. And the only, besides New Jersey, Judge Higbee has several, we don't believe there are
any in the Texas MDL, and I'm trying to find out about the California proceedings.

We're only aware of two state court cases. One is the Texas Attorney General suit which Ms. Shelly Sanford is involved with, and the other is a state court case in Indiana, Donna Cantor versus Merck, and I've been in touch with the plaintiff's counsel in that case and I'm getting the judge's name and contact information for you on any possible coordination.

THE COURT: Okay. And that's key. When we get all of that together, I would like to get the counsel involved and determine what can be done from a global viewpoint. If I can resolve any common issues, that's a benefit of the MDL. If I can give you the opportunity to try some of the cases that would be helpful in evaluating the matter globally, I'll do so. And then when I'm finished with that, giving you a global look-see, then I'll, if necessary, send them back to the places from which they came.

That's one thing that's always difficult to deal with, namely, remand. The cases are sent here, then they are followed by motions to remand or accompanied with motions to remand. And I have to make some decision as to whether or not to send them back immediately or to give the people who are before me an opportunity to at least participate to some extent in en globo discovery and also to participate, if it's available, in the global settlement.

I don't like to hold remand motions a long period of time, but I got this case less than three years ago, and so with the help of counsel and their diligence, we were able to resolve it. I don't say that it's good to hold remands for six, seven, ten years. That's too long. But a three-year or less period, I think, would be a reasonable point. And while I've been a little concerned about having the remands and having 700 remand motions on my docket, I felt that the parties were getting some benefit, some benefit out of the global discovery, some benefit out of the global discussions. And so that's why I held them. And we'll see what happens, how many of them are still viable, and then I'll direct my attention to those.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you for your help.
MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court, in the pro se claimants. Recently liaison counsel handled the contacts and approximately 340 pro se registered but a number of them had substantive questions, and at that point we felt we would be a conflict and the matter was referred to Your Honor and Your Honor appointed Robert Johnson. Robert, I spoke with, he's going to be meeting with us on March 4th to review the entire program, and I believe it's tentatively scheduled that he would meet with Mr. Juneau and the deputy special masters and the parties at BrownGreer on March 5th. There are approximately, about 750 pro se's who are still out there who need contact.

THE COURT: Merck motions. Anything?
MR. WITTMANN: Yes, Your Honor, I have indicated in the joint status report there are several motions that are under advisement of the Court, but there is nothing new to report on those.

THE COURT: Issues related to pretrial order number 913?
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, as a practical matter, it's resolved. De bene esse depositions are going forward. The Texas and California and New Jersey and New York attorneys who have issues with cross-noticing now have agreed. We have had no further issue come up really since December.

THE COURT: Vioxx statistics?
MR. WITTMANN: Yes, Your Honor, we have the December 31, 2007, statistics now. As of that date, Merck has been named as a defendant in some 26,500 lawsuits, which included about 47,275 plaintiffs. Of that group, 9,025 of those suits representing 26,275 plaintiff groups as Merck classifies them, are slated to be in the MDL. And approximately 15,575 lawsuits are in the New Jersey coordinated proceeding.

There are more plaintiffs than there are lawsuits because some of the lawsuits had multiple plaintiffs in the caption, as Your Honor is aware.

In addition, there are approximately 13,230 claimants who have entered tolling agreements with Merck and approximately 6,350 plaintiffs have had their suits dismissed as of

December 31st.
THE COURT: And the 13,000 are here in the MDL?
MR. WITTMANN: The 13,000 that have entered tolling agreements are in.

THE COURT: So that's what, about 40,000 in the MDL? MR. WITTMANN: Correct.

THE COURT: Motions to conduct case-specific discovery, anything on that?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, the PSC withdraws its request for the case-specific discovery and article 15 will not appear with any narrative in the next report that we have in May.

With regard to the next item, item 16, Your Honor, the PSC MDL trial package, as Your Honor is aware, the MI package is complete, it's been viewed by the Court. We had a PSC conference telephonically yesterday. I received a report from Levin, Pat Antonio, Pete Kaufman that we are awaiting two expert reports, and as soon as they are received, that package will be complete. I expect to notify Your Honor and have the outline of that report and a presentation in camera to the Court sometime within the next three weeks.

THE COURT: One of the responsibilities of the PSC, when I appoint them, is to conduct common discovery and also to keep an eye on and potentially resolve the case by conducting settlement discussions. But also, a significant responsibility of the PSC is to prepare a trial package so that those who are
not on the PSC or those who are not on any committees and those who are not interested in settlement will have the benefit of the PSC's work product assembled during the discovery phase of the case. So this trial package could then be sent back to those individual claimants who want to try their case in state or federal court, and they will have access to the trial package and be able to put their trial on with both live testimony as well as deposition testimony, visual deposition testimony, as well as have access to various documents which will be helpful for them in the trial.

And a trial package has been prepared in the MI cases and now one is being prepared in the stroke cases. And I saw the one for the MI, and it's a fine job, and will be of help to those individuals who wish to try their cases.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court, with respect to other motions, there are two motions, one by Florida parties who seek an amendment to the Vioxx MDL settlement agreement set for today. All the briefing has been complete. One, another motion was filed by Mr. Jeffrey Lowe for a plaintiffs group, and we understand that that matter is to be continued. There are conferences ongoing between Mr. Seeger and Mr. Lowe.

THE COURT: Let me skip over that because I'll finish this conference and then I'll go into the motion, if anyone has oral argument on it.

The last item on the agenda is third-party payor cases.

Any comments on that?
MR. SEEGER: This is Mr. Lowe. He just indicated, I think what he heard today is that the motion is moot.

MR. LOWE: We filed a motion for an extension on the enrollment deadline. If you enroll by the 29th, the enrollment form has a 30-day grace period. That's basically what we're asking. We'll withdraw the motion.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lowe. I appreciate it. The other motion is still set?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: I'll take that after this meeting. We'll take a five-minute break.

MR. WITTMANN: There is nothing on the third-party payor.

THE COURT: Nothing on that?
The next date for the next meeting is when?
THE CLERK: March 20th.
MR. WITTMANN: March 20th, 9:00 a.m.
MR. HERMAN: Thursday, March 20th. I think the 21st was Good Friday, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What about the 13th? Is the 13th available, Counsel?

MR. WITTMANN: 13th of March.
THE COURT: Will that work?
MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, I'll unfortunately be in

Hawaii, but I'm sure Mr. Marvin can handle it.
THE COURT: Can we do April?
MS. BARRIOS: Thursday, April 3rd?
THE COURT: The 20th gives some people problems with religious holidays.

MR. HERMAN: April 13th?
THE COURT: April 3rd.
MS. BARRIOS: What about Tuesday, March 25th?
THE COURT: Will that work for everybody, March 25th?
MR. BIRCHFIELD: Yes, Your Honor.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: 9:00.
THE COURT: And I'll meet counsel with the committees at the same time, 8:00, 8:30.

MR. WITTMANN: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'll take a five-minute break and we'll come back and deal with the motion. Thank you very much. Court will stand in recess for 5 minutes.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.
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