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MS. BARRIOS: Good morning, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios for the governmental action liaison counsel.

Mr. Juneau reports that there is progress on the mediation front. He's continuing to work with both sides on trying to have a successful mediation this time.

The only other issue that we have is that discovery is feverishly ongoing, and we may have a couple of discovery disputes that we need to bring to Your Honor. We would like to just do it by telephone as we have done in the past.

THE COURT: Yes, let's do that so that it can minimize travel, particularly from the attorney generals.

As we all know, this case involved about 50,000 claims of individuals and also about 26 states through their attorney generals have filed claims seeking to receive reimbursement for Medicaid expense by their states.

We are finished with the 50,000 claims. We still have several of them that are set for trial, but the attorney generals, many of those have settled but we still have now about five or six states that are in the process of finishing either their discovery or engaging in settlement discussions. So that part of the case has been focused on at this point.

All right. Third-party payors.
MR. BIRCHFIELD: Yes, Your Honor. At our last status
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conference, the Court recalls the Court had entered a scheduling order. We have posted the fee allocation committee's recommendation, and you set a schedule for objectors.

There were six objections that were filed. We currently have one objector, and we received -- in fact, I was just handed a copy of a letter requesting some information from that objector. We asked the Court to allow us to reply to that letter and then perhaps set a status conference as it pertains to the one remaining objector.

THE COURT: Yes, this issue involves the allocation of fees for those individuals who have filed, who are involved in third-party payor claims. Yesterday or the day before I received a letter from Robert Arceneaux, who indicates that he represents the objector, and that in order to pursue and evaluate his client's claim, he asks that he be given access to material that may be relevant to the claim.

The material was sealed just for reasons of privacy because some of the issues have that issue involved in it, but it does seem to me that the committee has had access to that material, and if they base their opinion on what they have seen, Mr. Arceneaux ought to have access to the same material so he can either rebut or agree or disagree with the parties.

So it may just be a devil in the details of how we go about it, but I just got the letter, and I found that the
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lead counsel hadn't had an opportunity to receive it so that I made a copy of it and gave it to him; so, I'll give him an opportunity to look it over.

My thinking is that at least it just seems to me everybody ought to have access to the same material. When you do, then we'll get together and talk about what issues you all see in the case and how $I$ can be of help to you in resolving those issues.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Yes, sir. Thank you.
MS. WOODWARD: If I may be heard momentarily, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure.
MS. WOODWARD: Good morning, Your Honor.
Margaret Woodward. I also represent Mr. Weinberg with Robert Arceneaux and Mr. Calogero, who is here today, and also here is Mr. Dassow, who represents a number of other objectors.

We have all had some interest in the same
material. I appreciate the Court's indication of its ruling. There are some confidentiality issues with respect to this material. We've entered into agreements with the FAC before about that. I'm sure we can craft an appropriate order to protect the material again. Thank you.

THE COURT: Sure. That's what I see. You all need to be sensitive to the fact that some of the material may be confidential, so we just may have to enter into some kind of
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agreement so that you both are satisfied of that requirement, but we ought to be able to get through it.

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, Leonard Davis on behalf of my partner Russ Herman, and I just want to point out a few things. Certainly we'll deal with the confidentiality matters, and we'll continue to do that.

As a matter of courtesy, I just want to let folks know that Russ is out of town right now, so if you could copy me on the correspondence, that would be very helpful. I noticed on the letter that Russ got it by e-mail, but he is not checking his e-mail as we speak, and so, just so if you would please do that.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DAVIS: I'll circulate it to those.
MS. WOODWARD: He actually responded to me about it; so, I was unaware that the rest of the group had not received it because we had some communication about the content of the letter.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. The next item then is pending personal injury cases.

MS. OLDFATHER: Good morning, Your Honor.
Ann Oldfather, liaison and lead counsel for certain personal injury cases.
Just a brief report, Your Honor, to track what
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we've got in the joint status report. The parties are still discussing and hope to not necessarily have to involve the Court in my motion that deals with the common benefit expenses, how they have been spent and what's remaining that might be available for application toward the expenses that we've incurred on the same issues that were investigated by the PSC and for which members of the PSC were paid, so that's pending.

We are also in the midst of discussions regarding the escrow of common benefit fees and expenses from the nonsettlement cases.

In that regard, Your Honor, Mr. Ronald Benjamin settled I believe it was 16 cases several months ago, and he first asked the Court to waive any assessment of common benefit fee, which the Court overruled. He now has a motion pending to be assessed at the very favorable two percent rate rather than at the four or six percent rate that's been charged to many other counsel, and that's before the Court for resolution.

We are in the process of taking discovery from the seven experts who have been disclosed on the VTE general causation issue, five disclosed by the plaintiffs and two disclosed by Merck. Those depositions started on September 25th, and the last one right now is scheduled for October 26th.

In addition, Your Honor, to the other items that are adequately discussed in the joint status report, we
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have had discussions with Merck about extending the deadline under PTO 58 applicable to the other injury cases. Right now there are six other injury cases -- Butterfield, Harrison, King, Nolan, Rarick and Sanjanwala. The deadline for fact discovery under PTO 58 is November 1st; experts is November 16th.

Merck has already entered into an agreed extension with Mr. Harrison, and I'm not totally conversant on those dates, but it's consistent with what we are now discussing, which is an extension of the fact deadline to January 1st -- fact discovery deadline to January 1st, and the expert discovery deadline to January 16th.

We also have asked the Court to consider and sustain the ex parte motions of Mr. Preuss and Mr. Foster to withdraw from and to be allowed to withdraw from their leadership responsibilities under PTO 45.

I'll pause there for a moment to see if there is any input from Merck.

THE COURT: Okay. No, the personal injuries that are still there, we have seven heart attack cases, we have about eight stroke cases, and we have about 29 VTE , which is venous thrombosis, and other injuries; we have six other injuries.

The way I see it proceeding is that perhaps some of those, particularly the heart attack cases, when you get enough information, maybe you can take a look at those and
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see whether or not there is common ground in those areas. The stroke may also lend themselves to evaluation. Some of the others may not, so the discovery is proceeding.

I expect that at a particular point we may then take a look at some Daubert motions and then proceed through the motions, and then if any survive Daubert, we proceed to trial in those.

I've got to get with you to see where the trial should be held. I can either hold them here or I can move the Court to other areas if that's necessary to do so.

MR. MARVIN: Three quick points, Your Honor. As to the schedule we agree to the extension, and Ms. Oldfather proposed to January 1st. Then I understand that the plaintiff's expert reports will be due January 16th or thereabouts. I think we probably would need at least 14 days for defendants, so we'll work on those dates.

MS. OLDFATHER: We can just track what's already there. MR. MARVIN: We can. That would be fine.

There are two cases that are part of the other injuries on the list there. One is the Nolan case, Your Honor. We have the plaintiff's counsel withdrew from that case. There is an order to show cause why the case should not be dismissed. That time has now run and there has been no response.

THE COURT: Anybody here on Nolan?
All right. I'll grant the motion because we've
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tried every opportunity, everything. This has been now 10 years; so, it's time to move the case one way or the other. We don't do that Willy-nilly. I give them opportunity to present information. I order them to present information. I give them an opportunity to show cause why they shouldn't be dismissed. We do it two or three or four times, and after a period of time, I just assume that they have given up on pursuing their case, so I have to dismiss it.

MR. MARVIN: Your Honor, in the King case another one of the other injury cases, Counsel has filed a motion to withdraw in that case and it's the same situation, so we would ask that an order to show cause be entered in that case as to why that case --

THE COURT: I'll grant the motion to withdraw and then file a motion to --

MS. OLDFATHER: We've done the motion to withdraw. I think it's submitted.

THE COURT: Yes, you have. I'll grant that. MR. MARVIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thanks. Let's see. Any other issues? I notice Mr. Denson, are you present, sir?

MR. DENSON: Yes. Good morning, sir.
THE COURT: Come forward, Mr. Denson. I know that you have some issues with your brother. How is he doing, by the way?
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MR. DENSON: Good morning, Your Honor. I was lucky enough to have Mr. Leonard Fischer to represent Antonio. I'm going to leave everything in his hands.

THE COURT: Okay. Fine.
MR. FISCHER: Actually it's probably better in y'all's hands, but I was just contacted last night, and I was coming more as a friend of the court or whatever, but if I'm competent enough to deal with it I surely will.

THE COURT: Sure. Mr. Denson, let me tell you, since you visited with us last time -- by the way, how is your brother doing?

MR. DENSON: Just pray for him, Your Honor. He's still trying to get a transplant -- heart transplant and monies to pay for it. We were hoping by some type of settlement with Merck or Celebrex, some of the drugs that he did take, that it would be some compensation to get some healthcare for him, but --

THE COURT: I'm not sure about that but I know that everybody in the room is concerned about him and wish him well.

MR. DENSON: We pray for him and we would welcome prayer.

THE COURT: Let me mention this to you, Mr. Denson. Your brother is represented by counsel in New Jersey, and he filed a suit in New Jersey. He didn't file a suit in federal court. It was in New Jersey. As I understand it, the
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requisite statutes have been interrupted so that his case is pursued or, at least as $I$ understand it, is still alive in New Jersey.

It was stayed because he expressed an interest in being in the settlement program, and not only as an MDL judge but I was the administrator of the settlement program, so I did have some jurisdiction in the sense of my administration of that program, so he participated in the program.

Ordinarily when you participate in a program, there is various stages in the program, but you reach a stage where there is a fork in the road and if you take one, that means you can't come back and take the other. So when he took that one fork in the road and pursued that avenue, he was denied recovery on that avenue. Now, technically, once you do that, you can't come back and pursue any other claim because that's part of the program. You commit to doing that.

The problem with your brother is that it looks like that his injury was such that he didn't qualify to even participate in the program. He just didn't satisfy the requirements of the program. That was for a specific type of injury, and he didn't have that type of injury, but he wanted to join and he did join.

What I think I can do for you is to, as the administrator of the program, indicate that he wasn't qualified to be in the program; therefore, when he wasn't qualified to be
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in the program, he didn't give up his rights to pursue his state court case.

So if he does have a right and he does have an interest, it looks like that it is preserved but it's preserved in state court. It's in New Jersey presently. That's where the suit was filed. It was a state court suit.

It's before Judge Higbee, a very fine judge. I've worked with Judge Higbee over the years, and I'm very familiar with her work, and she is an excellent judge. So you're lucky to that extent. You've got somebody who is very competent to look at the case.

That's the best I can do from my standpoint, my seat in the bus, so to speak. You can pursue the claim, as I see it, and I'll so issue an order on that that you can pursue that claim to the extent that you have a claim to the extent that New Jersey law allows you to pursue the claim, but that's where it has to be.

Counsel, I'm not sure, you've had an opportunity to read the voluminous materials. We have been here now since 2005, so a lot has passed down. Luckily most of the cases were settled in three years, which was unusual, but because of the quality of the lawyers in this case, they were able to get it resolved in that short of time, but we do have some issues with cases that have not been able to be resolved. One of those is Mr. Denson, who is a very fine person, and I
hope you are able to help him.
MR. FISCHER: Exactly, Your Honor. Basically what I'm here for is basically get them to understand what's going on. So essentially what you're saying is they filed a claim within the class, they didn't qualify, so now they need to pursue their state law claims.

THE COURT: That's it. He's in state court. You see, I don't have jurisdiction over him. He's sued in state court and he sued the state interests in New Jersey. New Jersey is the location of this defendant, so there is no diversity to get here.

How did he get into the settlement program? Well, he got in because when I saw that every state in the Union was involved in this particular litigation, I had cases from every state in the Union, and there was diversity with everybody except New Jersey because New Jersey is basically the headquarters of Merck. That's where they are located.

So I started working with many of the state court judges, one of whom was Judge Higbee, and so we agreed that her cases could come in the settlement program, those who wanted to come in the settlement program or those who were eligible to come in the settlement program, because the settlement program just dealt with heart attack and a couple of other areas.

It wasn't a settlement program of everybody
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who's taken Vioxx and feels they have a claim come in to the settlement program. That wasn't it. It was a specific injury, that target injury that the parties agreed to settle. Mr. Denson really didn't have that target injury. He just didn't have it, but he felt that he wanted to still take a shot at it, so he came into the settlement program.

The deal is if you come into the settlement program, there are various stages, but once you pass certain gates and you continue to pursue it, you give up your claims in that program, but as I say, technically, I can see an argument that he has foreclosed his right to pursue a claim. That's an argument. That's an argument that Merck may well use.

It seems to me from my standpoint as the administrator of the program, Mr. Denson probably didn't even deserve to be in the program, so that means that he has a right or an opportunity or certainly an argument to pursue his claim in New Jersey. It's on file. It's there. It just needs to be moved.

MR. FISCHER: Let me ask is there an order or judgment about denying him from the claim, or is there a letter or anything he has saying why he wasn't allowed?

THE COURT: Yes, several. Several steps. He was denied, I think, three times, maybe four from the various steps.

MR. FISCHER: For the specific injury he didn't have
qualified?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. FISCHER: That's why. Okay.
THE COURT: That was the reason. There is no question that he had an injury. I don't know whether it's related or not, but he's had an injury.

Just like some of these other injury cases, there are injuries that are claimed. One of them, I think, has a broken foot or something of that sort. Now, that may not be related to taking Vioxx unless, I guess, you dropped it on your foot or something. There are various claims that it didn't cover.

MR. FISCHER: So basically I just need to explain to them that basically y'all found that he doesn't qualify to be into the claims program, and if he has state court claims he could pursue that.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. DENSON: Let me just say one more thing, Judge. Really, I have the utmost respect for you and thanks again for hearing me without being counseled, but we had spoke basically with Judge Higbee, and she has been found to be a nice, competent judge and everybody is well thought of, but Antonio had suffered congestive heart failure after taking Vioxx for nine months, and then in '06 when Mr. Christopher Seeger received Antonio's case from Parker \& Waichman, who also sued
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Celebrex, which Antonio ingested that also, so I know it's not a Celebrex litigation, but you being a federal judge and me just being a layman, it just looked like to me it's a lot of stuff been happening whereas Mr. Seeger could qualify for common benefits of $\$ 32$ million and Antonio get a defibrillator and on hospice.

So, Judge, you know, some injustice somewhere been done, and it just seemed like to me if nothing more, it's either been some incompetent lawyering and probably some malpractice as it relate to him not getting, you know, something from him ingesting the Celebrex and ingesting Vioxx and only coming out with a defibrillator and winding up on hospice.

THE COURT: I don't know about that, Mr. Denson.
MR. DENSON: Well, I know about it because I live with him.

THE COURT: I know Mr. Seeger did very fine work in this court.

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, if I may, I represent the Seeger firm, and I just need to respond to that, if I may. The Seeger firm disputes that.

MR. DENSON: Sure.
MR. FISCHER: Your Honor, I'll explain to him how he still has opportunities. He's asking for a remedy here and there still is a remedy and I'll explain that to him.
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THE COURT: I appreciate your help, Mr. Fischer, and I hope you can help Mr. Denson.

MR. FISCHER: I hope so too. Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thanks for coming again, Mr. Denson.
MR. DENSON: Thank you very much. Just pray for my brother.

THE COURT: Okay, sir.
What's the next date? December 11th, 2012, at two o'clock is the next status conference.

Andy, let me get with you all. You and Marvin ought to get together while you're here and talk about what you need to talk about, and if you are able to ferret out some issues, rather than set a status conference, and put some structure into it.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Thanks very much. Court will stand in recess.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
(WHEREUPON, at 9:37 a.m. the proceedings were concluded.)
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