1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
2	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
3	AT NEW ORLEANS
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN RE: VIOXX PRODUCTS) Case No. MDL 1657 LIABILITY LITIGATION) June 14, 2012
9) Status Conference)
10	
11	
12	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	SUSAN A. ZIELIE, RPR, RMR, FCRR Official Court Reporter
21	HB 406 500 Poydras Street
22	New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 susan_zielie@laed.uscourts.gov
23	504.589.7781
24	
25	Proceedings Recorded by Computer-aided Stenography.

		2
1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	For the Federal/State Committee:	DAWN M. BARRIOS, ESQ. Barrios Kingsdorf & Casteix, LLP One Shell Square 701 Poydras Street, Suite 3650 New Orleans LA 70139-3650 barrios@bkc-law.com 504.524.3300
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	For the PSC:	RUSS M. HERMAN, ESQ. Herman Herman Katz
9		& Cotlar, LLP 820 O'Keefe Avenue
10		New Orleans LA 70113 504.581.4892
11		
12	Plaintiff Liaison Counsel:	ANN OLDFATHER, ESQ. Oldfather Law Firm 1330 South Third Street Louisville KY 40208 502.637.7200
13		
14		
15		
16	For Merck:	DOUGLAS MARTIN, ESQ. Williams & Connolly 725 12th Street NW Washington DC 20005
17		
18		202.434.5000
19	Also Present:	JOHN BEISNER, ESQ.
20	AISO TIESENC.	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
1
             NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA; THURSDAY, JUNE 14, 2012
 2
                                 8:30 A.M.
              THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
 3
                   Call the case, please.
 4
              CASE MANAGER: MDL 1657, in re: VIOXX Product
 5
 6
     Liability Litigation.
 7
              THE COURT: Counsel make their appearance for the
 8
     record, please.
 9
              MR. HERMAN: Good morning, Judge Fallon. Russ Herman
10
     for plaintiffs.
11
              MR. MARVIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Douglas Marten
     for Merck.
12
13
              THE COURT: Okay. We're here today for our bi-monthly
     status conference in the case.
14
                   Before we take up the agenda, I mention that my
15
16
     law clerk Joe is leaving me. He's going to the Fifth Circuit.
     He's leaving the search for the truth to start on the search for
17
     error, and he will be with Judge Jacques Wiener for the next
18
19
     year.
20
                   His replacement is Kathy Pressley. Kathy hails
21
     from the Boston area, comes to us from Harvard Law School, and
22
     she will be here.
23
                   So I appreciate Joe's help in this matter, we
24
     couldn't have done it without him. He's worked in a yoman
25
     fashion, and I know he'll be a successful practitioner wherever
```

he decides to light. 1 2 Thank you, Joe. 3 I met with counsel and lead liaison, discussed the agenda with them. I'll take it in the order. 4 5 Anything on class actions? MR. HERMAN: No, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: State federal coordination committees. 8 MS. BARRIOS: No, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: We're getting down to the few cases now. 10 Pro se claimants. 11 MR. HERMAN: I don't believe there's anything new since 12 the last time, Your Honor. 13 MS. WIMBERLY: Dorothy Wimberly for Merck. 14 I did receive a communication from the curator's 15 office. They have been contacted by a pro se plaintiff, Morris 16 Robinson, whose claim has been dismissed. And apparently the 17 order of dismissal wasn't clear that the derivative claim was 18 also dismissed. But Mr. Robinson has been contacting the 19 curator's office, and we've indicated that we'll look into this 20 and try to get the dismissal cleaned up so that there's no 2.1 question as to the status of his case. Which is, that it's 22 gone. 23 THE COURT: Okay, fine. Thank you. Government actions. Is that the AG's? 2.4 25 MS. BARRIOS: Yes, Your Honor.

Good morning, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios for liaison counsel for the AG's.

As reported in chambers, since your entry of Pretrial Order 39B, we have no open issues with the Court. The AG's are presently choosing what track of discovery they want to go on, and also amending their complaints per your order within the time that they need to.

But, Your Honor, like to take the time to thank

Joe myself, because I probably called him more than anybody in

the case, and he's always been most professional and most kind.

The only thing, my only complaint about Joe, is, I couldn't get

him to call me Dawn. He kept calling me Ms. Barrios.

So, Kathy, I hope you won't fall into his footsteps and be more casual with me.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Dawn.

We're at the point now where a number of attorney generals, a number of states -- we started with about 30 states, and a number of them now have resolved their cases, their differences. We do have several states, four or five, that are going to be pursuing their claims, at least at the present time. And I felt that they could get some benefit from the MDL process to clean up their final stages of the discovery, and then I'll be dealing with their remand motions.

Third-party payors, anything on that?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. The fee committee for third-party payors began meeting in August 2011, and have proceeded on a number of occasions, exceeding six, and numerous telephone discussions. We have now sent to the Court and filed of record a proposed fee distribution for the third-party payor fund, which is on deposit, which is a fund negotiated with Merck for the payment of fees in those cases.

Your Honor, also on the case, Mary Plubell, et al. vs. Merck, we received not only a Notice of Appeal but other pleadings in connection with that appeal, and it's pending in the Fifth Circuit.

THE COURT: All right. With regard to the third-party payors' fee aspect of it, as you all know from the last time, my procedure is that I create a committee called the Fee Allocation Committee from the people who have the most experience with a particular issue. I ask them to take information, to get information, take any affidavits, any other testimony, whatever it is from the people who are applying for fees. Those who are applying of fees, I ask them to submit any documentation that would justify their participation and the amount that they're requesting.

Then I get from the Fee Allocation Committee a detailed recommendation. It's just a recommendation to me. I then give people an opportunity to make objections to that recommendation. If there are a number of people, a number of

objections, then I have to put some structure in the process and appoint a liaison and lead counsel for the objectors so that I don't have to meet with 13, 14, 15, 18 objectors at one time.

But, once that's done, then I appoint an outside, a third party, to look the matter over to give me some other recommendations. That person takes depositions, that person takes testimony, affidavits, gets information, documentation, has before them the Fee Allocation Committee's recommendation, and then they come out with a recommendation of the distribution and gives it to me.

At that point, I post that, as well as any further objectors.

Then I take a look at all the material that I have before me, and I write an opinion making the allocation as the Court sees it. I'll be doing that in the same fashion with this one.

Any pending personal injury claims?

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court, before we get to that issue, I'm not sure where this would fit. We didn't get it in time to add it to the status conference report.

Peter St. Philip, Junior, on behalf of the Lowey firm in Afnee vs. BrownGreer, PLC, et al., has requested a telephone conference or status conference. It's been responded to by Sol Wise of the Anapaul firm, who would also like the benefit of a telephone conference, status conference.

THE COURT: I'll do that. I'll set a status conference
with them on the phone and I'll talk through what their issues
are.

MR. HERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.

Any pending personal injuries, PTO 28, 29, 43?

MS. OLDFATHER: Good morning, Your Honor. Ann

Oldfather, liaison and lead counsel for certain of these cases.

First of all, I want to apologize for our plane problems last status conference, and I appreciate the Court's accommodation of the travel problems. First time in two or three years, so I thought that was a plus.

Secondly, I'd like to just take a moment to say that I'm going to miss Joe, too. I won't say I competed with Dawn in terms of numbers of calls, but I was talking to a federal law clerk last week who told me that his judge did not allow the attorneys to call the law clerk, and I gast. The notion to not call Joe is scary.

Now, Kathy, you've got shoes to fill.

I'd like to report on the personal injury case for the benefit of those on the phone, and as I hope they all know from updated reports that we've disseminated the Court entered PTO 58 setting deadlines for these cases when certain expert reports were due, when certain fact discovery needed to be completed and the like. And that's all available of course on

the Court's website.

We have also prepared and brought today and have available for anyone who emails and requests it a VIOXX case census which lists the remaining personal injury cases. The count still remains somewhat flexible, but it is about 69.

There are in the heart attack and stroke categories a combined total of 27 cases. That's Group C on PTO 58.

There are 29 cases in the VTE, the venous thromboembolism group, and that's Group A on PTO 58.

And then, in the other injury group, which is Exhibit B on PTO 58, there are 13 cases.

So that would available. And I also have a list of the VIOXX deadlines established under PTO 58. If any of the or pro se plaintiffs or counsel would like to see a list, I'd be happy to email that around.

Would Your Honor like me to go through these issues on Section 6?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. HERMAN: The first issue under Section 6 deals with a pending motion that's been partially addressed by the Court's order of April 25, 2012, record docket 63585, and it deals with the question of cost assessments and common benefit fees on the remaining cases.

We had an informal conversation before the status

conference, myself and the original PSC, and I believe we have an understanding of the some types of information that will be exchanged.

THE COURT: Yeah. I think that counsel's entitled to get the full information as to what has been held, where it is, any methods that can be suggested by the PSC as to procedures for collecting the same kind of expenses that they were successful in collecting and so forth. Whatever information they have in that regard will be helpful.

MS. OLDFATHER: Thank you, Your Honor.

And then we also had asked the Court to informally help us with a discovery dispute regarding the expert depositions disclosed by Merck on the VTE cases.

With the Court's guidance, it's my understanding that the discovery deposition of identified experts, both from the plaintiffs and of Merck on the VTE issue will now commence after Merck's supplemental reports are filed on August 31st.

THE COURT: Yeah, this is my thinking on it. Usually, with the typical case, the plaintiff's responsibility to produce their experts first and expert reports, and then the defendants, their expert reports, and then oftentimes the plaintiff has a supplemental report. All of that paperwork is done, and then the depositions start. Otherwise, you wind up having to have three or four depositions of the witnesses because the facts change or the concepts change. And we just don't have time in

this VIOXX case to proceed in that fashion.

MS. OLDFATHER: The remaining matters under Section 6, Your Honor, are really more just reporting that Merck has filed two motions for summary judgment -- well, actually, this needs to be updated, because I believe the Court has ruled on the Joanne Roach motion for summary judgment and granted that. There is a motion for summary judgment on Stanley Long which is still pending. Merck has also filed motions for summary judgment on the Elena Strujan claim, on the Mary Ann Nolan claim and on the Lynn Hudnut and Janice Baum claims. So anyone monitoring the status conference who is interested in those claims needs to be aware of those filings and of the appropriate deadlines for response.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

Any other pending motions on the matters?

Dorothy?

MS. WIMBERLY: Your Honor, the only other pending motions are listed in Section 7, and one was the remaining straggler plaintiff Louise Young. The estate matters that were holding up payment of that claim were resolved. The plaintiff has been paid, and the motion is now moot. We can either submit an order if the Court wants to include it in its --

THE COURT: Yeah, I'll do it ex-parte, and we'll dismiss it.

MS. WIMBERLY: And then the only other matter was the

motion to strike class allegations in the Gene Weeks' case, which the Court entered its order and reasons last week granting.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. OLDFATHER: Thank you, Your Honor. Ann Oldfather again.

Also, in the other pending motion/matters category, on September 15, 2001, I filed a motion and a supporting memorandum asking that the Court require that liaison counsel Michael Stratton request court approval of the monies that he unilaterally elected to withhold from monies that passed through his hands from the PSC to various attorneys who had objected to the original application for common benefit fee.

Working through the math, I have computed that Mr. Stratton must have given himself an assessment of nine percent.

We and other attorneys that I'm aware of assumed and believed and were expressly told, depending on who you asked, that the Court would set Mr. Stratton's fee, not by the Court, by Mr. Stratton. And we are now asking that Mr. Stratton be required to seek that court approval.

And we would also ask that, if the Court is inclined to order Mr. Stratton to submit a motion for approval of his fee, that he also be required to provide a complete accounting of the funds that passed through his hands.

And I believe that Ms. Snapka has come today,

given that, on June 6th, that the Court entered an order record 1 2 document 63900 by which this Court added this item to the status 3 conference, and I believe Ms. Snapka has an interest, too. THE COURT: Sure. 4 Before I deal with that, what I'm going to do is 5 6 I'll set up a status conference with Mr. Stratton and Ms. 7 Oldfather, and I'll see what the situation is. And then I'll put it on the docket, and we'll deal with it that way. 8 9 MS. OLDFATHER: Mr. Herman told me that I said I filed 10 my motion in 2001, which would have been very pressing on my 11 part. 12 Thank you, Mr. Herman. 13 It was 2011. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Let's deal with the motion. I set that on this 15 16 status conference because I recognized that that had not been 17 done from the standpoint of distributing the funds. And, I did it I think with Mr. Becnel, I cut his funds lose, and I'll be 18 19 doing the same. 20 MS. OLDFATHER: That actually has been done, Your 21 Honor. 22 THE COURT: Yes, all right. 23 Any other issues? 24 There's been an appeal on the injunction. John, 25 do you want to respond to that?

1	MR. BEISNER: Yes, with respect to the Plubell case,		
2	Your Honor.		
3	THE COURT: Yes.		
4	MR. BEISNER: Yes, there has been an appeal filed. The		
5	Fifth Circuit has granted a motion for expedited treatment of		
6	that appeal, although a schedule has not been set up.		
7	THE COURT: All right. The next meeting will be on		
8	August the 16th, and the following one will be on October the		
9	11th.		
L O	Anything else from anyone? Thank you very much.		
L1	The court stands in recess.		
12	(9:03 a.m., proceedings concluded.)		
L3			
L 4			
L5	CERTIFICATE		
16			
L7	I, Susan A. Zielie, Official Court Reporter, do hereby		
L 8	certify that the foregoing transcript is correct.		
L 9			
20	/S/ SUSAN A. ZIELIE, FCRR		
21	Susan A. Zielie, FCRR		
22	daban n. Zielie, lenk		
23			
24			
25			