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THURSDAY, AUGUST 15, 2019

A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N<br>(COURT CALLED TO ORDER)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
THE COURT: Let me just double check before we get started. So my first noncompliance dismissal list. That's where the parties have voluntarily dismissed. I just want to make sure I'm understanding it because every time I'm confused.

MS. BARRIOS: I'm going to let Kate answer that question because she's put that together.

MR. INSOGNA: The shorter list, Your Honor, with 17 entries?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. INSOGNA: Yes, voluntarily dismissed.
THE COURT: Those have been dismissed. Okay. Fine.
MS. BARRIOS: We have two more to add to that that came in, but I'll put it on the record.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Good afternoon. We're sorry.
THE COURT: Good afternoon. That's okay.
Then the noncompliance declarations, those are the ones that we received the declarations for, correct?

MS. BARRIOS: And the declarations said --

MR. BRILLEAUX: Yes.
MS. BARRIOS: -- they can't contact the client.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BARRIOS: By default the others should be, I have no opposition to the motion. Is that right?

THE COURT: That's --
MS. BARRIOS: Noncompliant statement list.
THE COURT: They have no --
MS. BARRIOS: No opposition to the motion.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BARRIOS: We tried to be real fancy and give them different names.

THE COURT: Noncompliant list are those that we have to actually address this afternoon.

MS. BARRIOS: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, I think we're ready to proceed.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's proceed.
Those of you that are on the telephone, I'm going to ask you to please place your phones on mute until you're called. Thank you.

I think we have some that are being dismissed.
Let's proceed.
MS. CALLSEN: Good morning -- good afternoon. We have
a 120 -- we have 128 to be heard, which we'll address. We have -- on the noncompliance declaration list we have a total of, let me see, 43 plaintiffs, and I'll just provide the list to the court reporter. On the noncompliant dismissal list we have 17.

MS. BARRIOS: We do have 17, Your Honor, and there will be two more dismissals that have been filed since the list came in. Those two that will be added to the list that we'll give the court reporter is Gail Linnette, $\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{E}$. It's Record Doc. 7977, and the second one is Charity McGee, M-C-Capital G-E-E. That's Record Doc. 7981. Your Honor, for your knowledge, those are numbers 105 and 107 on our large list that we'll have to go through.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. CALLSEN: Then the last list is the, excuse me, the noncompliant statement list of which there are 30 plaintiffs. Dawn, since you've written the two additionals, do you want to give her your copy of those?

MS. BARRIOS: Sure.
MS. CALLSEN: I have these two, if you want to give her this one.

THE COURT: As to those first two lists, the first one which covers 17 plaintiffs, those matters are dismissed with prejudice.

Then the second list, which are noncompliance
declarations, and those the Court has received declarations from counsel advising that they were unable to reach their client, that they were not able to cure the deficiencies, those matters are dismissed with prejudice.

I believe we have a noncompliant statement list. MS. CALLSEN: Correct. Noncompliant statement list. MS. BARRIOS: Yes, Your Honor. On that we have 30, and I think we've given that to the court reporter, but I could be wrong.

THE COURT: These are matters that are dismissed with prejudice.

MS. BARRIOS: Correct.
MS. CALLSEN: Yes.
MS. BARRIOS: Because they have no opposition to the motion.

THE COURT: They is no opposition to this motion, so those matters are dismissed with prejudice.

Now we will proceed to those that have an opposition and we will proceed.

MS. CALLSEN: Okay. The first group of plaintiffs, there is number 1 through 24, represented by The Mulligan Firm. There have been some substitutions of counsel that were filed by Allen \& Nolte. The Mulligan Firm was the sole proprietor firm, and Mr. Mulligan died suddenly on May 1, 2019.

We have been in contact with the Allen firm, and
we have agreed, both Sanofi and the 505 (b) (2)'s, to carry those over to the next show cause hearing in order to fully assess them at that time.

We have talked to the Allen firm about filing notices of substitution for those that they plan to go forward with so that we can address the appropriate counsel.

THE COURT: As I appreciate it, Ms. Nolte,
Jennifer Nolte is on the phone. Ma'am, are you on the phone?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor, I'm here. This is Jennifer Nolte.

THE COURT: I just want to confirm that you're going to work with defense counsel to make the necessary substitutions, and we'll carry these over till next month.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. That's what we plan to do.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, Dawn Barrios for the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee. I would just like to thank the defense counsel for talking with Ms. Nolte and actually providing an extension for a situation that is very tragic, but they have been very cooperative, and I wanted to let the Court to know.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. CALLSEN: Thank you. Ms. Brilleaux is going to start with the next.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Kelly Brilleaux for Sanofi.
The next cases we have -- there is a number of them. I know that, just for matter of explanation, we usually go to people who have the least amount to the most amount. We have several that are represented by Marc J. Bern \& Partners, L.L.P.

The reason we have these at the top of the list is because there was the largest number of plaintiffs with cases that were supposed to be held at the July 11th show cause docket that was canceled due to the inclement weather.

Just by way of context, the show cause call
docket that we submitted earlier this month both included cases that were supposed to be heard at the July 11th and for the new notice that was filed at the beginning of August.

We spoke with plaintiffs' liaison counsel about this and decided that because so many of these cases were intended to be heard in July and had originally been put on an April notice, that these were appropriate to be heard today because of the amount of time that has passed since they have received that notice.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BRILLEAUX: So with that said, the first case on this list is Maria Anderson represented by Marc J. Bern \& Partners, L.L.P. The deficiency is the PFS is not
substantially complete because of no before photos, no after photos, and no PTO 71 certification. Just as a reminder, that is the certification that they have completed a review of the ESI and have either produced it or have reviewed it and have nothing to produce.

THE COURT: Mr. Kessler.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Good morning, Your Honor. We actually received a lot of documents today from the client. We are in the process of reviewing them and uploading them. We just ask for seven days to get those uploaded and for defense to review them.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kessler, I'm going to give you seven days, but this has been a couple of months now, so it's not eight days, it's seven days.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor. The next case that we have, Your Honor, is by the same firm, Margaret Bachop, and this is a number of PFS deficiencies, and I want to be clear about what the issue is here. The deficiencies that we have listed is no PFS declaration, no proof of use, no before photos, no after photos, no authorizations, no CMO 12, and no PTO 71.

Your Honor, I know we've discussed this before, and unfortunately we've seen this in a number of instances with this firm today where they have filed a true shell of a PFS. It literally only has the plaintiff's name, address,

Social Security number and gender and has absolutely nothing filled out beyond page 2. I have copies of it, if I could show Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Kessler.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, there are actually a few cases that would be carrying of the hearing last month we would have submitted the declarations of no contact. This is one of those cases. It kind of got lost in the shuffle. We did submit some of those declarations. I can give you the list of them if it's easier to go that way.

THE COURT: Wait, did you file a declaration? Is that what you're telling me?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We had filed declarations in numerous other cases where we hadn't heard back, but because of the carrying of the hearing here there were a couple that we missed.

THE COURT: This is one you missed. This matter is dismissed with prejudice.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
The next case on the list for Marc J. Bern \& Partners is Stacey Bowling. This is no PFS submitted.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, this is another one of those cases where we made attempt to contact the client but have been unsuccessful. In the interest of time, do you want me to just give you the numbers of those plaintiffs?

THE COURT: Okay. Right now this one is dismissed with prejudice.

Do you have other ones? Give me the names. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Cruz. That's number 30. THE COURT: That matter is dismissed with prejudice. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Evans. That's number 33. THE COURT: That matter is dismissed with prejudice. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: King, which is number 36. THE COURT: This matter is dismissed with prejudice. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Miller, number 39.

THE COURT: Dismissed with prejudice.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Pierce, number 42.
THE COURT: Dismissed with prejudice.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Rottier, number 45.
THE COURT: Dismissed with prejudice.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Schroeder, number 46.
THE COURT: Dismissed with prejudice.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: The last one is Watts, number 51.
THE COURT: Dismissed with prejudice.
MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, Dawn Barrios. I would like to send a message to Mr. Kessler. If you know that you are going to have these cases dismissed, even though the time period has expired to tell the defendant, please call my office.

My paralegal, Kate Robinson, keeps meticulous
lists of people who need to be dismissed but don't formally do it before the hearing; so, I would appreciate if this occurs in the future for you to call my office because it's just really a waste of the court's and counsel's time.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Ms. Barrios. I want to echo that on behalf of defendants. It's extremely frustrating to us that the plaintiffs, not all of them, some of them who are doing this, they are essentially gaming the system. They are doing this to get off of the no PFS submitted list by just submitting the most basic of information, and it's frustrating for us to have to spend the time preparing to present that to you only to be told that they intended to dismiss them. I don't think that any disingenuous PFS's should be submitted through the process for the purpose of avoiding this list. THE COURT: Mr. Kessler, I agree.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yeah, I'm sorry that that happened, Your Honor. We will certainly be more diligent on that.

THE COURT: All right. Lisa Buckley.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor. For that we have the PFS is not substantially complete because there are no after photos and no proof of the CMO 12 process being initiated. This was also a case that was to be heard on July 11th, so it has been -- the plaintiffs have been on notice since April 30th. And --

THE COURT: So where are we, Mr. Kessler?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, I believe the Plaintiff Fact Sheet was uploaded on July 9th, and we sent an email of our attempt to obtain product ID on July 10, 2019.

THE COURT: But you understand that there was a question about no after photos.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Just give me one second. I'll pull that up. I believe we have submitted the photos.

Your Honor, I have the MDL Centrality page in
front of me. I do see that photos were uploaded on July 9th. THE COURT: After photos?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Counsel --
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Just before -- after. I'm sorry. THE COURT: Wait, you have before photos but not after photos?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We have a photo from May 2015 and June 2015.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Counsel, I have the plaintiff's chemotherapy took place on August 2015, so those would be before photos.

THE COURT: That's what he just said.
MS. BRILLEAUX: So he has no after photos.
THE COURT: All right. You have seven days to get after photos, but this is already three months late. I know
that when you get your deficiency you're notified as to what the deficiency is. There is no reason for us to be doing this.

Okay. Carol Burkhardt.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, this is no PFS submitted. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, verified Plaintiffs Fact Sheet was submitted yesterday.

THE COURT: I'm going to give defense counsel seven days to verify.

Okay. Carol Sue Dellos.
MR. INSOGNA: Yes, Your Honor, this is a 505 case. There is no proof of injury documentation submitted, no proof that the CMO 12 process has been initiated, and no PTO 71 documentation.

THE COURT: You have to help. 71. What's that?
MR. INSOGNA: Sorry, that's the ESI certification document, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, all authorizations, PTO 71 statements, photos, and the Plaintiff Fact Sheet were uploaded yesterday, as was an email sent regarding the CMO 12 process.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to give seven days for defense counsel to verify.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, with regard to the deficiency that's listed, no CMO 12A, I don't really know what that means,
because we had always talked with you about the fact that we're not looking at product ID now, manufacturer's ID. We're only looking at proof of use. So if I'm confused of what they mean by no CMO 12A, I can't imagine that plaintiff's counsel is confused as well.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, we have been over this at several hearings. It's not that they have product ID, it's they've undergone the obligations and the timeline (speaking simultaneously) --

THE COURT: I think the issue is -- I think I've indicated that I would not dismiss the cases if they were undergoing -- if they were doing the due diligence in the search and beginning 12A process. I think that's been the frustration.

I know that there is proof of use, which is one matter. Proof of injury, clearly that's an issue that we're covering, but I think if people have engaged in the 12A process, I'm not going to dismiss any of those cases. I think some of the people, though, have -- the concern is that they have begun the process.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Exactly. Just to clarify it, that is exactly what it is. We do not -- we are not enforcing any obligation to produce proof of product ID. It is that you've taken the steps that are outlined in CMO 12.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, I totally understand that,
and I preach that on a daily basis, but the first two steps of CMO 12 is the plaintiffs' counsel communicating with the facility. How would they know if they communicated with the facility or not to say no steps have been taken?

MS. BRILLEAUX: Because CMO 12 requires that you send an email to the defense counsel explaining which steps you have taken that's listed out in CMO 12A.

THE COURT: Would somebody please put their phone on mute. Please.

Okay. I don't have 12A in front me, but I thought that there was some coordination at least in the beginning of the process, and it's just a verification of the process that has begun.

MS. BARRIOS: I understand that, Your Honor, and I have to admit that I have no specific recollection of it, but I thought the obligation to notify the defendants was more in Step 3 and 4, not in Steps 1 and 2. If I could just have that continuing on the record, I would appreciate it.

THE COURT: Right. Right. I don't think anybody's case is being dismissed for no product ID. I think the issue is that the process needs to be begin.

MS. BRILLEAUX: So Ms. Barrios' point, just to close this discussion, we understand Ms. Barrios' point, and that is why there is a Step 3 that requires plaintiffs to notify defendants if they are unable to get the records, and any case
listed on here is beyond that point.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Are we at Patricia Dukes?
THE COURT: Patricia Dukes.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, for that case there have been no authorizations, no CMO 12 process initiated, and no PTO 71 certification.

THE COURT: Mr. Kessler?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, PTO 71, the statement was uploaded yesterday, the CMO 12 email was sent earlier today, and the Plaintiff Fact Sheet and all authorizations were uploaded in to MDL Centrality on July 25th.

THE COURT: Okay. The Court is going to grant seven days to verify.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, just my notes on this, two of the authorizations, specifically HIPAA and psych, were not dated, and then insurance disability and Workers' Comp were not witnessed. That's the deficiency with the authorizations.

THE COURT: Has that been corrected, Mr. Kessler? PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: If it's not dated, we'll resolve those. If the HIPAA wasn't dated and the psych was not witnessed.

THE COURT: I think that's what I'm hearing from

Ms. Brilleaux.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I'm looking at it. That is correct. We request seven days to get the correct authorizations.

THE COURT: I'm going to give seven days, but I think -- do you tell the people what the exact deficiency is?

MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes.
THE COURT: So this should not be a surprise. Okay. All right. Geraldine Foxx.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Geraldine Foxx, no PFS submitted.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: PFS was submitted earlier today. MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, just for the record, I just want to note that the plaintiff in this matter filed a declaration of no contact indicating a number of attempts, and the case was filed in March.

THE COURT: He just said he filed something today. MS. BRILLEAUX: But just pointing out an inconsistency with this is that the case was filed in March of 2018, and we received a notification that he was unable to reach his client on March 15th and when it was filed on March 18th.

MS. BARRIOS: But, Your Honor --
THE COURT: I'm -- I don't know. I mean, if there was a Plaintiff Fact Sheets submitted this morning, it's the first time it's before me, I'm going to give you seven days to verify it. I hope against all hope it's not a shell Plaintiff Fact

Sheet, but I'm going to give you seven days to verify that, but --

MS. BARRIOS: For the record, Your Honor, just to complete the record, the declaration that was filed, which was Record Doc. 7959, was withdrawn.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Okay. We agree.
MS. BARRIOS: Record Doc. 7967.
THE COURT: I've already given seven days for you to verify it.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's go. Gail Hill.
MS. BRILLEAUX: This is no before photos, no after
photos, and no CMO 12 process initiated.
THE COURT: Mr. Kessler.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I'm sorry, this is Gail Hill. The documents were uploaded through MDL Centrality, and the CMO 12 email was sent earlier today as well.

THE COURT: Seven days to verify.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Kessler, I don't mean to beat the proverbial dead horse, but if you did it this morning my guess is you could have done it yesterday or the day before, and I would not have this on my list.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, I apologize about that. We'll be more diligent in getting these things done in a
few days before the hearing.
THE COURT: Janice Madison.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor. This no PFS submitted.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Plaintiff Fact Sheet is another one was submitted yesterday.

THE COURT: Seven days for defendants to verify. Phyllis Mayo.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, this is another PFS that is not substantially complete.

THE COURT: What's missing?
MS. BRILLEAUX: Let me see my notes. It's another shell PFS. I have a copy of it for you.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, just for the record, amended Plaintiff Fact Sheets was uploaded July 23rd. The initial one may have not been substantially complete, but the July 23rd Plaintiff Fact Sheet which was verified included all relevant information.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, the one that I have is not dated.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to give you seven days. He's telling me that he filed another one in July, but I'm going to give the defendant seven days to verify that it's more than what you presented to me.
Valerie Olin.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, I just want to go back to that one. There was an additional deficiency that I didn't mention. There are no after photos from within the past five years and no current present day photos for Phyllis Mayo.

THE COURT: I thought there was nothing.
Okay. That would include photographs. Did you submit photographs?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. Those photographs were uploaded on July 23rd, as well.

MS. BRILLEAUX: The current photographs, Counsel?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I'm not sure. I do not have it right in front of me. If it's not, we'll get current photographs within the next seven days.

THE COURT: All right. You've got seven days. Defendants have seven days to verify that the new ones have been submitted.

Valerie Olin?
MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. This is a no PFS declaration, no proof of use, no before photos, no after photos, no authorizations, no CMO 12, no PTO 71, and, again, this is a shell PFS with nothing after page 2. I have a copy of that as well.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, a new Plaintiff Fact Sheet that is substantially complete was uploaded and verified, I verified one earlier today, along with before and after
photos, PTO 71 statements, and authorizations.
THE COURT: Defendants have seven days to verify.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, I just wanted to point out whether plaintiff had purportedly cured the proof of use deficiency?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Let me check. I believe we had sent an email.

I don't have the record in front of me. I request seven days to get this resolved.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Tammy Pendelton.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. No PFS submitted.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we're under the belief that Ms. Pendelton passed way recently based on her obituary we found online. I request 30 days to locate the next of kin.

THE COURT: I'll grant 30 days.
Felicia Rhodes.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, this is no PFS declaration, no before photos, no after photos, no authorization, no CMO 12 process initiated, no PTO 71. We had a primarily blank PFS but a little bit more than the shell PFS that we have been referring to today.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, this is another plaintiff who passed way. We've actually been in contact with
her son who doesn't recall a lot of information on the Plaintiff Fact Sheet or doesn't know it, and he's unable to find before photos. We request 30 days to get this resolved; if not, we will stipulate to dismiss this matter.

THE COURT: When did she pass way?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Give me one second to find that. Your Honor, I'm going to look that up. If you want to move it, I can certainly come back to it. I just don't want to take up more of your time.

THE COURT: Sandra Rose.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. This is no PFS submitted.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: The Plaintiff Fact Sheet, a verified one was uploaded through MDL Centrality yesterday.

THE COURT: I'm going to give the defendant seven days. I will tell you, if they are -- if it's a shell PFS, I'm going to dismiss the case.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: But I will tell you this, if it's shells that you're asking me to dismiss within seven days, I want to see the Plaintiff Fact Sheet. I know we do a lot by letter, but I want to see those to satisfy myself that there has been no fundamental information provided.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, just to reiterate, I know that Mr. Kessler has been mentioning a lot of things that were
uploaded yesterday and today. Before every show cause hearing, I work with Ms. Barrios to set a cutoff date for all of these things, and all of this is obviously well beyond that cutoff date, not just stuff that happened today but even yesterday and even the day before that, just to make it clear.

THE COURT: I know.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you.
THE COURT: I am aware.
Jacqueline Scott.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. This is another shell PFS. No PFS declaration, no proof of use, no before photos, after photos, authorization, CMO 12 process, PTO 71 certification.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, complete Plaintiff Fact Sheet and all authorizations were uploaded yesterday to MDL Centrality.

THE COURT: I'll give the defendant seven days to confirm.

Grace Stomps Baringer.
MS. BRILLEAUX: No PFS submitted, Your Honor.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, I spoke to Ms. Baringer earlier today. We have been trying to get in contact with her. We finally did. She recently was released from the hospital, and she is planning to get in touch with us later today so we can finish up the Plaintiff Fact Sheet and
get it uploaded. We request 14 days for that to be completed. THE COURT: This complaint was filed in March of this year. I'm going to give you 14 days.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
Shirley Thompson. This is another shell PFS. No PFS declaration, no proof of use, before photos, after photos, authorizations, CMO 12 initiated, PTO 71 declaration.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, this is another one that was cured yesterday. A fully complete Plaintiff Fact Sheet with a verification was uploaded to MDL Centrality, and the CMO 12 email was sent yesterday as well.

THE COURT: I'll grant the defendant seven days.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Eneida Torres is the next one that I have. Same situation -- shell PFS, no PFS declaration, no proof of use, before photos, after photo, authorization, CMO 12 and 71.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, Ms. Torres, I told her as well today. She doesn't want to proceed with the case, but she said she's having issues with panic attacks and just needs a little bit more time to --

THE COURT: She's not getting any more time. This complaint was filed in December 2018, and I don't know how her condition changes today in 14 days that it wasn't there 14 days ago. Now, if you can make me understand why things are somehow going to change in the next two weeks, I will reconsider my
position.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, I understand your point, and I have no further comment on that.

THE COURT: This matter is dismissed with prejudice.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
Rosemarie Way Garrett, no PFS submitted.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we uploaded
authorizations from Ms. Way Garrett yesterday. She's another one who has been in and out of the hospital. She's working through the Plaintiff Fact Sheet with our office, and we hope to get it uploaded as soon as possible. We request seven days to get that uploaded to MDL Centrality.

THE COURT: Has she been in the hospital?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes. She recently was released. She said she had a few trips to the hospital.

THE COURT: I'll give you seven days.
MR. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor. Mary Wheeler, no PFS submitted.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, Ms. Wheeler's PFS with verification was uploaded earlier today along with authorizations, PTO 71 statements, and medical records.

THE COURT: I'll give the defendant seven days to verify.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor. Shelley Williams. The deficiency here is no

HIPAA authorization, and this was a case that was supposed to be heard on July 11th. We've had ample time to get a HIPAA authorization.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, both those authorizations were uploaded on July 9th, including, I believe, the HIPAA authorization. I re-uploaded it earlier today just to make sure.

THE COURT: I'll give the defendant seven days to verify that they have received the HIPAA authorizations either from July 9th or today.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
The next few, we have a couple that are a little out of order by firm. I would like to stick to the order, if that's okay with Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's fine with me.
MR. BRILLEAUX: The next case is represented by Davis \& Crump. It is Barbara Briggs. This is a PFS not substantially complete, no before photos from within five years of treatment.

THE COURT: Mr. Rockstad.
PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. This is
Trevor Rockstad. We've asked Ms. Briggs to search her house and ask family and friends, and she's been unable to turn up any pictures from that timeframe.

THE COURT: Seriously? She doesn't have a photograph? Are we looking at photographs before?

PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: Before, the five years before the chemo, Your Honor.

THE COURT: When did she get chemo?
PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: 2009.
MS. BRILLEAUX: The most recent photo we have from her is dated 1990.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, I've done this before with Bachus \& Schanker. I'm happy to work with Mr. Rockstad and see if I can assist in possibly opening up other avenues for him to get the photos.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, on behalf of defendants we're fine with that, but we also think there needs to be a next step after the plaintiffs' liaison counsel assists plaintiff's counsel with that process if photos still are not produced.

THE COURT: Let me tell you, Mr. Rockstad, she's going to have to get a photo within five years. We had a situation where people, because of extraordinary reasons, could not have a photograph, but I mean there is a photograph somewhere, and I'm going to give you 30 days so that you have an opportunity to work with Ms. Barrios in finding it but we've got to. Okay. We'll push him till the next time.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor. Next case on the list is represented by Goza \&

Honnold. The plaintiff is Nancy Boldenwoodruff. Your Honor, this is -- the deficiency for this one is before photos not dated, and we initially identified the deficiencies for no dates at all.

Plaintiff in this case provided a photograph dated March 6, 2012, and then resubmitted the same picture with a range of 2007 to 2012. The photographs -- I have copies of the photographs with me, Your Honor, just because -PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Good afternoon. THE COURT: Ms. Joyce?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, I'm here, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BRILLEAUX: Just there are some discrepancies. I think it might just be easier, I can show you the photos, but I can also put them on here if $I$ can turn it on.

This is a photo from 1975 with two children and then attached is a photo that purports to be between 2007 and 2012, and purportedly 30 years have passed between the two photos that I just showed you, and she's supposed to here be between 60 and 65 years old.

While we certainly can only rely on the representations, I think the bigger issue is providing a range of dates between five years. The date that was assigned to this photo by plaintiffs' counsel is somewhere between 2007 and 2012, and we don't really know what we can do with this as
defense counsel.
THE COURT: When was chemotherapy administered?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: 2012, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes. We are working with the client and her daughter to nail down, get more accurate dates. There were additional photos uploaded to MDL Centrality on August 8th, and then this morning I received some more dates from the client's daughter who took the photos, and I submitted those or we submitted the photos with dates showing that they were approximately between 2007 and 2008.

THE COURT: That would be within the five years?
MS. BRILLEAUX: I mean, Your Honor, if they are able to assign a date --

THE COURT: That's what -- I'm listening to Ms. Joyce. I'm going to give you seven days to get this straight, Ms. Joyce, and then verify, but I'm going to ask you to work with Ms. Barrios' office, liaison counsel.

MS. BARRIOS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: To make sure because it's got to be -- the dates have to be exact.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I understand. Thank you.
MS. BRILLEAUX: The next case that I have is the
plaintiff is represented by Kirtland \& Packard, L.L.P. The plaintiff is Cheryl Wingate. This is a different firm but another example of basically a shell PFS.

Your Honor, the particularly disturbing thing about this is that plaintiffs submitted a verification for basically just only the name and address. I do have a copy of the PFS with me, if you would like to see a copy of it. Thank you.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Kyle Benkie here for Kirtland \& Packard. Yes, it was originally submitted on 8/12, and then we received an actual deficiency notice this morning, so we're thinking -- I have a copy of the PFS. Everything should be cured as of around 9:00 a.m. this morning.

I believe it was inadvertently submitted without all of the information contained the first time around.

THE COURT: So it was submitted this morning? PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: With all the additional information. I believe it was originally submitted maybe inadvertently with just a name and a verification, but this morning we have all the details within the PFS. That was done by copy from my staff, which I can pull it over to defense as well.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to give the defendants seven days to verify that it's cured. MS. BRILLEAUX: Just to clarify, Your Honor, any
allegation that the notice came any time before 30 days before today is completely baseless.

THE COURT: Ruth Brown.
MR. INSOGNA: Yes, Your Honor. This is no PFS
submitted. I am told that there is a suggestion of death filed in Ms. Brown's case. I have not heard from counsel whether there is next of kin.

THE COURT: This is McDonald Worley.
MR. INSOGNA: Yes, Your Honor, McDonald Worley. Mr. Barfield?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I don't believe Mr. Barfield is on the line this but Meagan (inaudible) for Mr. Worley. Yes, that's correct. Ms. Brown has --

THE COURT: Wait. Ma'am, I need your name, please. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Meagan, M-E-A-GA-N, last name Philip, P-H-I-L-I-P.

THE COURT: Thank you. The court reporter needs it. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So there is a suggestion of death? PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor, that's correct. We recently found out our client passed away in May, and we filed a suggestion of death, and we're just asking for 60 days to see if we hear back from next of kin.

THE COURT: When did she pass away; do you know?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. She died

May 16, 2019.
THE COURT: I'll grant 60 days.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Michelle Rosser, which is Ms. Rados. Are you on the phone?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, I am, Your Honor.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, the deficiency for this one is no PFS submitted.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we submitted the PFS this morning with a verification.

THE COURT: The Court is going to give the defendant seven days to verify.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. BRILLEAUX: The next plaintiff is represented by the Seithel Law, LLC. The plaintiff is Susan Shinn, no PFS submitted.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: This is Lynn (inaudible) firm and (inaudible) PFS verifications and clarifications for PTO 71 was -- I believe the PFS was submitted yesterday and most of the medical records and the before and after pictures and the certification were submitted this morning.

THE COURT: The Court is going to grant seven days. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you.

THE COURT: Listen, while you all are on the phone, I cannot convey my frustration with the inability to comply with
the deadlines so that instead of giving the defendants an opportunity to review that before we get here and remove 70 percent of this call docket, we're having to then continue it so that I can fairly give the defendants an opportunity to review this, and we're not having to, after this, dismiss cases.

I don't know how many times I have to say this, I wonder if those of you on the phone have any idea of the amount of work that's put into this by myself, by staff, and counsel here in the courtroom.

What's going to happen in very short order is that there will be no seven-day opportunity for defendants to review. If it's not filed in time to be properly before this court, it's going to be dismissed, and you'll have to answer to your clients for that.

If you can do it this morning, if you could do it yesterday, you could have done it on time, unless your client is in the hospital or some other emergency, but it is extraordinarily frustrating for those are us here working through this list.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Angela Allen, Cutter Law firm.
MR. INSOGNA: Yes, Your Honor. We have no proof of use and no evidence of the CMO 12 process.

THE COURT: Ms. Domer.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Hi, Your Honor. We found out through our company that they ordered from the wrong VATA facility. I've conferred with the facility that it is the correct one because we received multiple thenars (spelled phonetically). Apparently kept going to the wrong facility. So I've spoken with them today. They're trying to process as quickly as possible to get that to us, so we're working as quickly as possible as we can. We've asked if they could push this through to rush. We asked them that last week as well, but they said as per their hospital procedures, you know, they have stuff they have to follow as well.

THE COURT: I'm going to move this to the next hearing. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor. We did upload the PTO 71A on July 30th. That's Document number 395305.

MR. INSOGNA: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Mary Edwards.
MR. INSOGNA: Yes, Your Honor. This is no declaration and no authorization submitted.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I believe we did already submit the declaration. I apologize, I don't have the document number ready because it wasn't on the list I submitted last night. That's what would be on the order, but we've already submitted the declaration.

The authorizations she provided were not filled out correctly, and we tried to re-send it back to her, but we have been informed she's out of the country. We've emailed them to her. She's trying to figure out a way to print them and send them back.

MR. INSOGNA: Your Honor, I did check prior to standing up here that there is not currently a declaration.

THE COURT: Do you have a document number for the declaration? As to the authorization, we can bump that to the next time. I mean, if she's out of the country, I don't expect --

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I show -- I apologize, Your Honor. I was able to pull up MDL Centrality. I show that she had a declaration submitted May 17, 2019, but upon reviewing that document, I do see now that she had fail stated.

THE COURT: Okay. What I'm asking is to perhaps email and maybe work with -- would you contact Ms. Barrios and see if you can work this issue through.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, if I could say something for the record, because I've heard two plaintiffs complain that they didn't get the exact deficiency last night. My office is not responsible to tell them the exact deficiency. That is already given by the defendants in the deficiency notice, so what we have is just a shorthand blurb that defense counsel kindly gives us.

So please don't rely on the charts that my paralegal and myself do. You need to rely on the official record done by the defendants in Centrality.

Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Ms. Barrios.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Conswello Davis. That's the Maher Law Firm and that should be Mr. Bradley Morris.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, and the deficiency for this one is no PFS declaration, no photos from within five years of treatment, before photos, that is, and no PTO 71, that's the ESI certification.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. We had contacted Ms. Davis several times. She would rarely answer but we've managed to schedule a few appointments with her to discuss the fact sheet and offer assistance if she needed it; however, she missed every appointment, and she's not sent that completed fact sheet back to us.

THE COURT: Well, this is what I think: I think it appears to me, Mr. Morris, you have done everything you can, and your client is failing to cooperate. This matter is going to be dismissed with prejudice.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. BRILLEAUX: We have one more for the same law firm, Your Honor. This is Gwendolyn Williams, and this is no
initiation of the CMO 12 process. Just to clarify again, this is not that they have not identified product ID. They have not followed the steps that are outlined in CMO 12A.

THE COURT: Okay.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we -- we were notified on August 2nd that this was an issue and we took corrective action on August 5th. We believe we fulfilled our obligation under CMO 12A thus far. So, you know, if there are additional issues with it, I would like to meet and confer with the defendants to correct any deficiencies on this at a later time.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to grant the seven days for that meet and confer to take place.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
We have two cases represented by Reyes
Browne Riley. The first is Elizabeth Provencher. This is no before photos from within five years of treatment.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Hello, Your Honor. Ryan Browne for the plaintiff, Ms. Provencher. We actually have uploaded a very large photo from about nine years beforehand that shows a full head of hair. It's a very nice photo.

We have worked with Ms. Provencher and tried to talk with her on numerous occasions to try to get something
additional and convinced her to check with other family. Based upon what you've discussed here with others, maybe we can work with Ms. Barrios and get a little more time here to be able to work with Ms. Provencher and find something hopefully within the five-year timeframe.

THE COURT: Can I ask a quick question? Where is Ms. Provencher from?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Go ahead, Dana. We're finding that out, Your Honor. New Hampshire.

THE COURT: Thank you Okay. Thank you.
Victoria Vincent.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Victoria Vincent, Your Honor, this is a woman that, again, we've talked with her on a number of occasions. I have spoken with her myself. Her immediate family is all dead. She does not really have friends that have pictures.

We uploaded a picture that is from her -- right, from her -- it's from the chemotherapy, right? It is within the five years. It is a black-and-white photo. It's her ID when she would go in for her infusion, and it clearly shows her hair. I mean, we have tried and tried. She is -- we actually even --

THE COURT: Do you have that picture?
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, just to respond, we have that we received two photos from between 12 and 17 years prior
to chemotherapy. Her chemotherapy treatment was in 2012, and the before photos are dated 1995 and 2000.

THE COURT: I think I just heard him say that he had her ID from when she would present herself at the hospital -MS. BRILLEAUX: (Speaking simultaneously) So then thereafter on July 31st, we have a black-and-white photo, so a photo of a photo that's in black and white, and it's just it's a poor quality of the photograph provided rather than a portrait style. It's a black-and-white photo of an ID that's blurry.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you to work with Ms. Barrios on this.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you very much.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, we would just ask on behalf of defendants that to the extent Ms. Barrios is able to speak with plaintiffs' counsel on these and submit something on behalf of plaintiffs to the Court, that defense be on that call to discuss that.

THE COURT: Wait a minute, what? If she's going to work with them to assist? No, I'm not going to put you on the call.

MS. BRILLEAUX: If no photographs are able to be produced to cure --

THE COURT: Then that's going to come to me. MS. BRILLEAUX: Right.

MS. BARRIOS: I've done this in the past, and I have notified them. I've copied them, Your Honor, on your letter, so I do provide notification to them and I continue to do that.

THE COURT: Right. But I'm not going to say that you need to be on the phone call when Ms. Barrios is talking about --

MS. BRILLEAUX: Sorry.
THE COURT: I thought that's what you asked for, and I said that's not happening.

MS. BRILLEAUX: No, that is not what I meant to say. What I meant to say is if the deficiency is not able to be cured and photographs aren't produced and Ms. Barrios is coming to the Court with reasons why plaintiff is not able to produce the photographs, the defendants would like to be a part of that conversation with the Court to explain what additional steps maybe could be taken.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, I would never come to you personally. I would just send a letter and send a copy to defense counsel, and they could do with it as they see fit to represent their client.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. BRILLEAUX: I think next we have Valeria Graves represented by Davis \& Crump. This is no PFS submitted, and this was a case that was supposed to be heard on July 11th.

THE COURT: Mr. Rockstad.
PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: Your Honor, Ms. Graves passed away after we filed this case. We've been unable to reach any of her heirs in the last couple months. We learned that she passed away on May 3, 2019. We are not exactly sure when she passed away, but we did get a voicemail from her late husband or her husband, and that's the last contact we've had. We have not been able to get in touch with anybody again. So we would just request a little more time to do our due diligence and advise them of the consequences.

THE COURT: When did her husband leave the voicemail? PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: On May 3, 2019.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, we heard from plaintiffs about this on May 31st, nearly a month later, and they did tell us that she passed away on March 17th, so we think that there has been plenty of time that has passed here.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Rockstad, I'm going to dismiss this matter. Even if I would have given you 60 days, that would have passed, and not having any contact, I think, puts it a little different. Thank you. Jacqueline Harris. MR. INSOGNA: Yes, Your Honor. There is no declaration submitted for this plaintiff.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rockstad.
PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: Your Honor, that's a very similar situation to Ms. Graves. Ms. Harris passed away December 6, 2018, about three months after we filed the case, and we have not been able to contact anybody ever since.

MR. INSOGNA: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Okay. This matter is dismissed with prejudice. If you told me you were working with the family, with the succession or probate, I would have it, but sorry.

PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: Understood, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Marsha Kirby.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. This is no before photos from within five years of treatment.

PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: Your Honor, this is
Trevor Rockstad again. So we actually have a picture on Centrality that I apologize to defense counsel and the Court for wasting everybody's time, but we got a date yesterday, and it's May 15th is the date on that picture. The picture has been up for the last, I think, since June, and I guess it just slipped by, and we didn't get a date on it.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Counsel, the photographs that we have
are dated 1991 and 1994 and chemo was in 2016.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yeah. What I'm telling you, though, there is one that is now dated May 2015 that was up. The picture was up before but it was undated. It's a picture of her with her -- with some relative who's graduating from, it looks like high school or college. He's wearing a multicolored Hawaiian lei.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Counsel.
THE COURT: I'm going to grant seven days to verify all of this.

PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: Counsel, if you could -- feel free to email me if you don't see it or if there is some issue with it, feel free to reach out, and we can work through that. But, again, I apologize for not having that date on there before.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you.
The next case is Rena Landry. This was -- she's represented by Morris Bart, L.L.C. This is no before photos from within five years of treatment, and this was one that was supposed to be heard on July 11th.

THE COURT: Mr. Root.
PLAINTIFF'' COUNSEL: I apologize. There were two that I came over to talk about. I did not know this was on here until just beforehand, so I quickly looked at MDL Centrality to look at the affidavits. You're telling me it's a photograph?

MS. BRILLEAUX: Correct. We have a before photo from 2000 and chemotherapy was in 2007, so we're hoping to get a picture within five years of treatment pursuant to PTO 65.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. I mean, honestly, this somehow fell through the crack. I looked and saw the affidavits, and everything else was fine and didn't realize that was the issue. I know it's not an excuse. I just thought -- and she's a very responsive person. She's recently had a stroke and one of the affidavits is an X with her daughter signing. I thought that was the issue. But --

MS. BRILLEAUX: Just a photograph.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: So we can get to her.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you.
THE COURT: Seven days.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you so much, Your Honor. MS. BRILLEAUX: The next one Tiana Scott. No PFS submitted.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. We are so sorry that we just recently uploaded it. Last week she said she sent it all to us. We waited every day until the 12th, and it never arrived. So we made arrangements for her to take off work, her husband go to Birmingham and have the thing. Of course, after we did that, they came in, and we uploaded them yesterday -- in the mail.

THE COURT: Seven days to the defendant.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Just to note, Your Honor, we have noticed that one has been submitted, and on the cursory review we were able to do in the short amount of time, it has several important things missing, like days of treatment and very critical information, so just for the record.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Seven days.
MS. BRILLEAUX: I think the last one we have for
Morris Bart is Geraldine Sylvester. This is no before
photos -- sorry. Go ahead, Counsel.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We had indicated we have no opposition, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No opposition?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Correct.
THE COURT: This matter is dismissed with prejudice. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, the next few cases we have are represented by Niemeyer Grebel \& Kruse. So just to clarify, there is Teresa Arthur and Diane L. Higgins. There was a declaration that was filed for Higgins, so that one can be removed.

THE COURT: All right. So that one you're satisfied? MS. BRILLEAUX: Correct.

For Teresa Arthur, the deficiency is for no PFS
declaration, no before photos, and no PTO 71 submitted, and that's what we have.

THE COURT: Mr. Kruse?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. We corrected the deficiency. It was uploaded this morning. We sent an email to the defendants notifying them of that. I apologize for the delay in getting that on file.

THE COURT: Seven days for the defendant.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Counsel -- does counsel allege that he has purportedly cured all three?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
The next case is Ruby Pratt. This is no PFS declaration, no authorizations, and no PTO 71.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, Ms. Pratt is deceased. Her family members have applied. They have an estate paperwork pending in Parent (spelled phonetically) County. We're just waiting for the judge to sign off on the letters of administration. As soon as he does, that will be rectified. We would ask for 30 or 60 days.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, this is one that we previously addressed back in January when counsel first noticed that they were needing to file those papers, and we would just ask which date that was taken to make sure that this is being done in a timely manner.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: What date the estate paperwork was filed on?

MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Counsel. Because when we went through this at the July -- at the January 19th hearing, Your Honor granted 45 days.

THE COURT: Has it been filed? The paperwork has been filed?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: The letter of administration is pending. I don't can't tell (speaking simultaneously) --

THE COURT: Okay. All right. You know what we're going to do, we're going to put this off for 30 days. Sometimes, unless he's the lawyer handling the estate, sometimes that takes a while, and sometimes judges don't sign things as soon as they hit their desk, so we'll put this off for 30 days, and we'll see the status at that time.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. BRILLEAUX: The last one we have for this firm is Angela Young. The deficiencies are no PFS declaration, no before photos, no authorizations, and no PTO 71.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we learned that Ms. Young passed away in June. We've spoken with her husband, who has not expressed an interest in opening an estate. She's deceased. We don't have a client right now, so we would only ask should the Court wish to dismiss the case, it be done
without prejudice so her family can do what they wish to do going forward.

THE COURT: Let's do that. I'm going to dismiss it without prejudice.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. BRILLEAUX: The next case is Jamie Archer represented by the TorHoerman Law firm. This is no before photos, no after focus, and no PTO 71, and this was on the list that was supposed to be heard on July 11th.

THE COURT: Mr. Davis.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. I apologize. I just overlooked -- I should have filed a no contact declaration for this. I apologize for not having done that before today. THE COURT: All right. This matter is dismissed with prejudice.

Penny Knobel Besa.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, the deficiency I have for this one is no before photos from within five years of treatment.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: My understanding it was uploaded on July 8th of 2019, so $I$ would ask for seven days to confirm that because I thought we uploaded those.

THE COURT: Are those dated?
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, they are. They are dated

1991 and 1993. So, as I said, within five years of treatment.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: And, Your Honor, I apologize, I'm on the road for depositions in another case, and I don't have Centrality in front of me, but I thought we were good on that, so I would ask for seven days so we could confirm that we've got pictures that are uploaded because I think we've got them.

MS. BRILLEAUX: I'm concerned that he is
misunderstanding what is I'm saying.
THE COURT: No, I think he understands. You said -PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: (Speaking simultaneously) Before but not close enough before. I think we have those in our possession. I don't know. But I thought they were uploaded, so I would ask for seven days to confirm that we uploaded what we've got.

THE COURT: Seven days.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you.
THE COURT: Judy Oakeson.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: That PFS was submitted yesterday, Your Honor. Again, I apologize for not having done that before yesterday.

THE COURT: I'm going to grant seven days for the defendant.

> Cynthia Villarreal.

MS. BRILLEAUX: No PFS submitted.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Same thing. That was submitted
yesterday. Again, I apologize for not having done it sooner. THE COURT: Give the defendant seven days to verify. Carol Wearingwilliamson.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. So this is we have no proof of use, undated photographs, and no PTO 71 certification. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, this has only been in good contact with trying to get the information and then lost contact with her around the beginning of July. It wasn't enough time, in my feeling, to file a declaration, so $I$ would ask this be moved to the next one, at which point we would have everything cured or I'll file a no contact declaration.

THE COURT: Wait. What?
MR. BRILLEAUX: I don't think declaration was listed as one of the deficiencies.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I'm sorry. I will file -- I will file -- if we don't have it cured on the next case, I will file a no contact declaration.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Declaration of no contact.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BRILLEAUX: So can we dismiss that one with prejudice, Counsel?

THE COURT: Are you telling me you're not contacting her?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: No, we've reached out to her and she has not responded. Typically when I file a no contact
declaration it's because it's been months and months of us trying and not getting a response, and that's just not the case here. It's relatively recently, within the last month to six weeks, we've lost contact with her, and that we've done all of the appropriate contacting.

I just don't like filing a declaration with that short of time. She could be in the hospital, and I don't know it. I don't know that it's wildly inappropriate for Your Honor to dismiss the case. I just wasn't comfortable filing a declaration of no contact based on that relatively short time frame yet.

That's why I asked that this case be moved to the next docket, and then that will get another, you know, however long it is, month or so, for us to try and contact, and at that point if we haven't heard from her, it will be more than two months, and I'm comfortable filing a declaration at that point.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, this case has been pending since September of 2018.

THE COURT: I understand that. I think your problem is specific pieces of information, and this is the first time, and if he's had contact with his client -- I don't know if she's in the hospital. That's what I'm hearing. I'm going to give him the 30 days.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. BRILLEAUX: The next cases that we have had

Bachus \& Shanker, Vera Bonds, no PFS submitted.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Melanie Sulkin on behalf of Bachus \& Shanker plaintiffs.

This is actually a duplicate filing from our firm, and so we do ask that this Case number 19-cv-02690 be dismissed but that not affect 19-cv-01479.

THE COURT: So ordered.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
The next case that we have is Sarah Dunlap. The deficiency is not accurately dated photos from within five years of treatment.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we -- this client treated in 2010, and we uploaded two photographs from 2006 and 2007. We were notified after we resubmitted the Plaintiff Fact Sheet of a deficiency a day later where defendants indicated they didn't believe it was 2006 and 2007, but we have a certification from the plaintiff with the photographs stating that to the best of her knowledge those photographs were from 2006 and 2007.

Additionally, if you look at her photograph 10 years later, the present day photo, she hasn't aged that much, and so -- and I have photographs if you need to see those.

MS. BRILLEAUX: I have copies of them as well. And I can put those --

THE COURT: Is that the problem, that you don't believe the dates?

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, so these are supposed to be from the same day. Just for context, this plaintiff was born in 1946, and this is a photograph from 2007. To be candid, Your Honor, there are some more instances of this plaintiff certification that are coming up that may shed some more light on this.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me tell you what, this one we're going to wait until the end because I'm not going to start looking at photographs while people are on the phone.

MR. BRILLEAUX: Thank you.
THE COURT: Let's just sit tight and go to the next. This is Diana Graves.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. This is no proof of use.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we had issued a subpoena to the facility. Yesterday afternoon we actually got 500 medical records. I tried to go through them as quickly as possible.

I could not find any proof use in those medical records; so, I'm asking if this case is dismissed it is without prejudice, and that is because the client is adamant that she did receive Taxotere. It is possible that she might have received it at a different facility; so, if it is dismissed, we
just ask that it is dismissed without prejudice at this time. MS. BRILLEAUX: Defendants don't think that dismissal without prejudice is appropriate for not being able to prove use of the product.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, the medical records indicated that she was supposed to have four cycles of Adriamycin and Cytoxan followed by Taxotere. The records indicate that she had three cycles of Adriamycin, Cytoxan, at which point the chemotherapy was discontinued for the time being, and then she was lost to follow up.

So what I'm concerned with that --
THE COURT: Does she know if she had another cycle?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: She believes she does, and sometimes clients -- she believes that she continued chemotherapy for a lot longer than that, but sometimes clients' memories aren't the greatest, and so I just ask it be dismissed without prejudice just in case she does come up with the proof of use.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Defendants have reviewed the same records, and I guess we have a different take on exactly what it means, but our records show that it was discontinued, and we have no other records to show it was ever restarted.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, I received 500 medical records yesterday, so they were not reviewing the same records. I plan on disclosing those records to them.

THE COURT: Okay. This is what I'm going to do: I'm going to give you 15 days to review those records. I'm not going to through 500 records today, but I'll give you 15 days to review those records and see what you find.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, I reviewed those records, and her Taxotere usage wasn't in those records, but I think she may have received chemotherapy at a different facility.

THE COURT: Is there no one who knows where she went to receive her chemotherapy?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: A lot of clients sometime misremember where they had chemotherapy.

THE COURT: I understand that. Is there no one that knows where she had her chemotherapy?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: She did have the first three cycles of the Adriamycin Cytoxan at the facility where we did receive the records from.

THE COURT: That's really not my question. Is there no one -- I'm presuming she didn't drive herself to chemotherapy?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I don't know that at this time, Your Honor, but I can certainly find out.

THE COURT: Okay, okay. So you're asking me to dismiss a case without prejudice because she's got no evidence that she took Taxotere?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. At this time
she's adamant that she did take Taxotere. I'm just concerned with if she does come up -- I informed her just yesterday, after I received these records, that we don't have proof of Taxotere usage, and so she may on her own be able to come up with it. We've had that situation occur with other clients. THE COURT: Oh, I know. I know. I'm familiar with what chemo brain is. I'm familiar.

MS. BARRIOS: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios. I'm more than happy to help them. If you give her 30 days, we can go through the insurance records to see if she finds anything about subsequent chemotherapy. I hate to use the term chemo brain but many of my clients have chemo brain.

THE COURT: No, I know. I know patients refer to that. MS. BARRIOS: Right. So I'm more than happy to help her within 30 days.

THE COURT: I'll give you 30 days.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. BRILLEAUX: The next case is Helen Hallum.
Your Honor, this is another case with examples of photographs that just kind of get to the point of why we have been challenging the dates of some of these photographs.

Just for some context, I'm going to put down this sheet that was provided by counsel here. You'll see that in blue ink, this says that this photo was taken in 2008 and in 2006. It was signed here in June of 2019.

Then if you focus in here, I'll try and zoom in so you can see it a little bit better, but there is a revised addendum at the top. It says, "The approximate date of photo is late 1970's with her cousin at a family reunion." This was corrected one month later.

This is the reason that we are challenging some of the dates of photos because we can look at them and tell that they are probably not from the 2000's, and then we're getting revisions like this.

The same thing happened with the same plaintiff here. Originally it says 2008, and now it says 1989.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, this is a case in which I re-reviewed the photographs, and I directed my staff to question the plaintiff harder.

THE COURT: Do we have a current photograph of this plaintiff or within five years of chemotherapy?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we have one from ten years prior to chemotherapy. This is one of those extenuating circumstances in which this plaintiff lost her husband, lost her daughter-in-law and became sole caretaker in 2005. She had chemo in the year 2000. The photograph that we labeled in the year 2000 is five years before that.

This plaintiff had stated that she had gone through menopause at the age of 40 on her Plaintiff Fact Sheet, so I do not believe that she had maybe changed much hormonally
in the five years between 2000 and 2005. I believe that her photograph in 2000 is probably reflective of what she looked like in 2005.

This plaintiff lived in a really rural area, Dahlonega, Georgia, so I don't think she has access to a lot of photographs. She's asked family, she's asked friends, and the closest thing we have is a photo from the year 2000.

THE COURT: Which is 10 years before chemotherapy? PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: It is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think you need to be within five years. While she might not have changed much, I think the protocol requires five years, and so I'm going to tell you that you need to cure that within 15 days.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Within 15 days. Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: This is Hallum.
MS. BRILLEAUX: This is Hallum.
I know that we still need to revisit Dunlap, but we can do that on Your Honor's --

THE COURT: Yes, please.
Linda Nichols.
MR. INSOGNA: Yes, Your Honor. This deficiency is for no PFS submitted. I checked earlier today, and it appears that Bachus \& Schanker has a Plaintiff Fact Sheet submitted under
this name but a different case number. I don't know if it's a duplicate. It's not such a rare name that I'm sure.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: There are two Linda Nichols. This second Linda Nichols, we just got in contact with her. We actually have an appointment to go to her house and help her complete her Plaintiff Fact Sheet later this week.

We just ask for a 15-day extension, and if she hasn't cured those deficiencies by then, there will be no opposition to dismissal.

THE COURT: This was filed in April of this year. I'm going to give you 15 days but that's it.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. INSOGNA: Can I briefly say before we move on, I may need to leave before we finish the entire list.

THE COURT: Actually, I was going to tell you you probably need to leave now because I think the traffic is going to get tight for you.

MR. INSOGNA: Thank you. I just wanted you to know it's not poor planning. My flight home was canceled, and the one I'm taking now is the only other one that gets me home tonight. Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, Dawn Barrios. I want to make a statement for the record that my learned coliaison counsel reminded me. When we were talking about the Bachus \& Schanker case of Helen Hallum and you gave her 15 days to cure to get
the photo, I want to remind the Court that you had said at one time that you would do a verification, that after you gave people the opportunity to cure and if they really couldn't, explain why in the verification, and then you would make a determination if the verification actually supports not having a photo, and I would ask that that be implemented on this case. THE COURT: So ordered.

Let me just say, living in the country is probably not going to be good cause. When we talked about extraordinary circumstances, it was I lost everything in the flood, or my home was, you know, there was a fire, and then you are required to show why there are no digital photos. Okay?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, just to be clear, you've already seen examples of where a plaintiff has signed a verification that turned out to be inaccurate.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thanks.
I think now we are on Lisa Sheard. This is no before photos and no after photos.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We've -- Your Honor, we've cured this deficiency. I believe it was only no before photos. We had previously provided after photos.

We found out in this past month that Ms. Sheard had passed away in January of 2019, and this week we were able
to get in touch with her daughter, who very late last night did provide before photographs to us. We submitted them to Centrality, and then we did also send an email to both defendants' and to plaintiffs' liaison counsel this morning. So I do apologize about getting those in to you so late, but -THE COURT: I'll give seven days for defendants to verify.

All right. Okay.
MS. BRILLEAUX: The next group of cases, Your Honor, are represented by Gori Julian \& Associates. The first one I have is Debora Dye. This is the before photo not dated and no after photos. This was one that was on the list for July 11th. THE COURT: Ms. Gabriel.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, hi, Your Honor. With regard to Ms. Dye, we're in the situation that a few other counsel had stated. We have those two photos that we have uploaded, and admittedly there is not enough, and they are not dated.

We have reached out to her on multiple occasions, but we had had contact with her in June, and so I just didn't feel comfortable filing the declaration saying that we, you know, had totally lost touch with her, but that is where we are.

We have been trying via all the different ways in which to communicate with her to tell her we need to do this or else her case will be dismissed. So I understand and defer
clearly and respectfully to the Court however you want to handle it, Your Honor, but that's where we are with Ms. Dye, unfortunately.

THE COURT: This matter is dismissed with prejudice. I think you've done all you can.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Gloria Enriquez.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes. This is also no before photos, no after photos, and no PTO 71 ESI declaration.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, with regard to Ms. Enriquez, she's a client of ours who is Spanish speaking. She has also been -- it's our understanding we do have a paralegal who has been in communication with her. The last time we talked to her was July 8th and told her that we needed her to sign that verification and that we were lacking photos and, again, that the Court would dismiss her case if we didn't hear back from her.

I'm sad to report that her cancer is back. She is somebody that we just are not able to stay in good contact with, Your Honor, unfortunately, so that's what $I$ have to report with regard to Ms. Enriquez.

THE COURT: I understand. But her cancer has recurred. Is she in the hospital? Is she being treated at home?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: You know, Your Honor, I don't know. John spoke with her July 8th and I don't know that he
got any more details than she's undergoing, Your Honor, additional treatment, but I did not ask him to find that out. I don't have any knowledge that she was in the hospital at this time. I guess perhaps I could just ask for the additional seven days.

THE COURT: I'm going to give you 15 days. I don't want to be in a situation if this lady is undergoing chemotherapy right now and she's just unable to do it; so, I'm going to give you 15 days and see what information you can find.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you. Thank you so much, Your Honor. I will let defense counsel know one way or the other via email what we find out so that we don't have to involve you hopefully.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Angela Hutcheson.
MS. CALLSEN: Yes. This is Julie Callsen showing up again. PFS is not substantially complete. We don't have proof of injury or after or present photos. We've confirmed that this morning through a check.

THE COURT: Okay. Ma'am.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. So for Ms. Hutcheson I was just looking as well, so maybe I am confused in terms of the dates that we have, that we have before photos that are within the time of her treatment --

2012, 2011, and 2013 that are dated. There are during and after photos that it looks like they do not have dates, and I thought there were dates, Your Honor, I apologize, but I can cure that and ask her for those dates.

There was also a declaration that was uploaded on August 6th, so that's what I thought was the deficiency in terms of the PFS, so if there was something else, the defense -- I will certainly cure whatever you need.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to give you seven days to work through that.

Lois Moore.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. No after photos from within the past five years. No current photos is what that is. THE COURT: Okay.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, I, again, I have noted that we did upload on August 14th some after photos that were dated. If it was not within the current -- in the time frame that the Court is requesting from the time that she finished her chemotherapy, I can double check that, Your Honor, and make sure we are within that, and if we're not then we'll cure that, but there are photos that were uploaded August 14th; so, if I can request that seven days again I would appreciate it.

THE COURT: Seven days.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Brenda Nine. This is a no CMO 12 process initiated.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. Dawn noted this earlier and I appreciated the note because I was not following up with defense counsel with my repeat contacts with the facility in terms of this woman's chemotherapy.

I would be happy to send those letters. We have been given this back and forth with regard to the MBC code page. We've been told that they do have that information, but they haven't submitted it to us. They actually sent us one form that was blank, and so my medical retrieval services have gone back to them, and we have been doing that, honestly, Your Honor, since April. I can send the letter to defense counsel to let them know that.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Okay. Okay. Okay. I'm going to give you seven days to communicate with defense counsel.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Della Whitehead.
MS. BRILLEAUX: This is no accurately dated photos from within five years of treatment.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, this is our last one. Ms. Whitehead, again, I'm looking at them, and they were within
five years of her chemo. The before pictures are dated, and I believe the after. There may be some during ones that are the issue that aren't dated, but if we can have that seven days, then we'll get that taken care of.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, if I could just show you the issue that we're having. This is one of the before photos. It's dated 1953 and plaintiff was born in 1963.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Can you -- Counsel, can you tell me which document number you're looking at, because I really do want to make sure that I'm producing, you know, what the Court is wanting us to give here. Which number are you looking at?

MS. BRILLEAUX: I only have hard copies with me, Counsel, because I'm not working off a computer.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: That doesn't sound familiar with regard to Ms. Whitehead. When I was looking through them right now, you know -- of course, I just got kicked out of Centrality.

MS. BRILLEAUX: We have two photos. There is one dated 1953 and one dated 2002. I think there is only two photographs that we have, so -- and, you know, there is just a discrepancy with both of them.

MS. BARRIOS: Ms. Gabriel, this is Dawn Barrios. I have a docket number for a photo. I don't know which photo it is but it's from Centrality. It's 369062. If that would help you look on Centrality.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Okay. Thank you so much, Dawn. I apologize, Your Honor. I'm trying to get back into Centrality right now, and, of course, my computer is not cooperating at all. So I will absolutely look into this. Certainly if there is --

THE COURT: This is what I think we ought to do instead of reviewing the photographs in this manner is I'm going to ask you to contact Ms. Barrios over the course of the next week and see if you all can work through what the photographs are.

My guess is the 1953 photograph was an error, if it was 10 years before she was born, but there has to be some mistake here, and I'm going to ask you to work with Ms. Barrios and Ms. Brilleaux.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, I appreciate that and I apologize for that, and I will reach out to Dawn next week and we'll get it fixed.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
The next set of cases we have are represented by the Pulaski Law Firm. The first one is Sharon Atkins, which is no CMO 12A process submitted.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we're in -- this is Leslie LaMacchia with the Pulaski Law Firm. We do have proof of use. We are -- again, it's our fault for not sending the

Certificate of Compliance to defendants, so we're in the process of serving the subpoena. I can get those Certificate of Compliances with CMO 12A to defendants today.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to grant seven days to make sure we verify that.

What about Dana Bell? Is it the same issue?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: It's the same issue, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'm going to give the defendants and you seven days for you to provide that information, but I want this completed by seven days. So when I grant seven days that means you need to take care that that information is sent within the next 48 hours so that defendants have an opportunity to adequately assess that everybody is in compliance. Pamela Blair.

MS. CALLSEN: Yes. This is a 505 plaintiff, and we have PFS is not substantially complete. It's specifically a proof of use issue. The medical records use show Taxol use. Obviously this is not that litigation, so we don't have any use of Taxotere.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: The records do not show Taxol use. They show Carboplatin and Taxol followed by Taxotere, and we did provide a statement of chemotherapy that does specifically state Taxotere.

MS. CALLSEN: Again, the records reflect Taxol use, so... .

THE COURT: What she's saying it was Taxol something else followed by Taxotere.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Right. There was one dose of Taxol, and then she was given Taxotere.

THE COURT: Okay. My guess is we're not going to pull up the pages today. I'm going to ask you to contact Ms. Barrios, and then we're going to work through what the confusion is. Thank you.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Okay.
MS. CALLSEN: Within the next seven days again; is that
what we're doing?
THE COURT: Yes.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
Bonnie Clark. This is no proof of use and before photo is not dated.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: The dated before photo was submitted on 7/1/2019.

THE COURT: What about proof of use?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: The proof of use, we do have
medical records from 2006 that state she was given four cycles of TC, which it could either be Taxol or Taxotere, and we're in touch with the corporate office of the cancer center right now to get that clarified.

THE COURT: What about the photos?
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.

First of all, we have not received the records that counsel stated. Have they been uploaded to MDL Centrality?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: They should have been. Give me one second.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Just while you're looking for that, Counsel, we have no record -- we have an undated before photo was uploaded, but we do not have any indication that a date was added to that.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: The date was -- the date was 2001.

MR. BRILLEAUX: Is that visible on MDL Centrality?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, it was uploaded on July 1st.
THE COURT: Ms. Brilleaux, is this something that you could at your office just -- I don't know what to do under those circumstances. Perhaps the thing to do is to have a telephone conference with you to review.

Ms. Barrios, if you have any better ideas I'm all ears.

MS. BARRIOS: I would love to work with Ms. LaMacchia and look at the medical records myself, and I'll be in touch with defense counsel and make sure that they get the medical records, so we just ask that --

THE COURT: Sure.
MS. BRILLEAUX: I just know that in past we've had
issues with plaintiffs' counsel truly believing that the date is visible but it not being visible, and that has been a technical issue, so we just ask that --

THE COURT: Why don't you contact Ms. Barrios and see if we can work through whatever technical problems we have. Thank you. I'm going to ask that you do that within the next week.

MR. BRILLEAUX: Seven days. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Jennifer Forsman.

MS. BRILLEAUX: No CMO 12A procedure initiated.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, this will be the same issue as with Ms. Atkins and Ms. Bell and also the next plaintiff, Ms. Glenn. Again, we do have proof of use. We have done everything. We're ready to send the subpoena.

THE COURT: Okay. This is what I'm going to ask you is to forward that information to defense counsel to verify that you're in compliance, and I'm going to ask that you do that immediately, within the next 48 hours -- even though today is Thursday afternoon -- so that defendants can review it within the next seven days. So that would take care of Jennifer Forsman, Jacqueline Glenn, right?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. We are now with --
MS. CALLSEN: Theresa Hayes. We have no proof of use, there is no reference to Taxotere or docetaxel in the medical
records, and there is no CMO 12 documentation.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we spoke with the facility yesterday. They are pulling the chart.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to give you 15 days. I don't know what to do.

MS. CALLSEN: Okay.
MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, with all due respect, dealing with a facility in 15 days is almost an impossibility. THE COURT: I know.

MS. BARRIOS: I would appreciate it if you would -THE COURT: Let's just push this to the next show cause docket.

MS. BARRIOS: I'll work with her in making sure this happens and we have a resolution by the next call docket.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. CALLSEN: I appreciate that but at the same time these were put on notice, so it wasn't like they were just told yesterday they need to get them.

THE COURT: I understand that, but --
MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Wait. I may be helping you. I know when you send a request for records, they don't pull those records upon receipt, but that would be my inclination as to what occurred; so, I think we all know that.

Thank you.

MS. CALLSEN: Okay. We will carry it over.
THE COURT: Narvella Thomas.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. This is no proof of use. We've received no medical records.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we did receive a statement from the facility, and the records have been destroyed. So we are in the process of going through her insurance records and any other way we can get proof of her treatment.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's carry this over to the next month.

Victoria Thomas.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
This is one -- another CMO 12 but then also no before photos from within five years of treatment. Treatment was in 2001. We have before photos that are dated 1990 and 2005. Similar to the ones that we showed you earlier, we believe that they are, for whatever reason, inaccurately dated just because of -- this is an example of a photo that was alleged to be taken in 2005, and as you've been able to see, for whatever reason, mistakes can be made, and we don't believe that this one is representative of the date that it's associated with.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I'm going to address this in two parts, Your Honor. The first one is with the record and the
proof of use. It's through a VA and she first was at the Syracuse VA and then pointed the finger to the Buffalo VA, and then the Buffalo VA pointed them back to Syracuse, and then sent us back to another VA, Bath VA. So we are now at Bath VA pulling those records, but we were given the runaround on the different VA's, so that's that issue.

Now, with the photo, I specifically had a question for Ms. Thomas the other day when I spoke with her. I said, "Listen, these photos look really old." She said, "We wear really old clothes," is what she told me. She specifically remembers this in December 2005 because it was right before she went on an overseas trip.

So, I even questioned it because I looked at it and I said, "Well, it looks a little antiquated," you know, but I don't know how people dress. I don't know hairstyles.

People dress differently in different parts of the country, different hairstyles. This was 14 years ago. I just -- I had to take her word for it. So --

MS. BRILLEAUX: I mean, the other thing that seemed off about this, Your Honor, and also counsel, is that this plaintiff was born in 1943, which would make her over 60 years old in these two photos. So, again, just because we are obviously looking at the timing of the photos and trying to make sure that they are when they say they are, these are things that would just raise red flags for us, and we wanted to
raise that.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I agree. I also brought that up to her, and she indicated to me that, she said, "I've always looked young," is what she told me. So, I'm being honest with you because I also had the same suspicions that you did.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, my Dawn Barrios. Might I suggest that I get on the phone with the client. I've found that when I've done that before, it's a little more serious by saying, "I'm court appointed and you have to give me the information;" so, I'm more than happy to do that in this case.

THE COURT: All right. Let's do that. Thank you.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So we're going to defer that one to Ms. Barrios.

Okay. We have --
MS. BRILLEAUX: I think now we are to the last large -no, we have two large sets. We have Fears Nachawati next. Margarette Brown. This is no before photos from within five years of treatment.

THE COURT: Fears Nachawati. Who do we have on the phone? Hello?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Can you hear me?
THE COURT: Yes. Who is this?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Tarek Abassi. I'm counsel for the plaintiff --

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: -- Margarette Brown. In regard to the before photos for this case, we have submitted the photo of an ID that is from 2001 that is a bit outside of the required range; however, it has been impossible for our client to obtain photos as she has lost the majority of her belongings and -- including photos because of floods.

THE COURT: Because of what?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Floods.
THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you to work with Ms. Barrios on this issue. Within the next 15 days I need you to contact to begin that process.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Edit Davis.
MS. CALLSEN: PFS is not substantially complete. We have no proof of use or no CMO 12 documentation.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Hi, Your Honor. This is
Charlotte Long at Fears Nachawati, counsel for plaintiff. It looks like we submitted an amended Plaintiff Fact Sheet on the 12th -- on August 12th.

And CMO 12, we inadvertently missed it, but this morning we did send it after we realized that we missed it. We apologize for that oversight, but we did send it and get everything in.

THE COURT: All right. So the Plaintiff Fact Sheet
that you amended on August 12th, are you telling me includes the records that would show proof of use?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to grant seven days to the defendant to verify.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Your Honor, no. That's my mistake. I doesn't include proof of use. It looks like there was a HIPAA issue with this one that delayed the order for a few months, and then we received an updated HIPAA July the 16th, and we were able to resubmit a request, but we haven't gotten the request back in. The records are still pending.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. CALLSEN: Because we did confirm that there is nothing been submitted. It's still outstanding.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: The Plaintiff Fact Sheet, yes. THE COURT: Okay. So when did you request the records with the proper --

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: July 15th is when we received the HIPAA from -- the updated HIPAA from the client we requested. Prior to that we had, you know, sent out the records request, and there was a HIPAA issue. It was delayed and we were not able to get the records until the client had updated the HIPAA, but, again, that was July 16th, so we haven't been able to get the records back in. So we just ask for 30 days to get those
records in and get the proof of use.
THE COURT: I'm going to grant 30 days.
MS. CALLSEN: The next plaintiff Gail -- I'm not sure how you say her first name, Linnette -- Linnette Gail. I'm sorry, I had a --

THE COURT: I thought that one was dismissed.
MS. CALLSEN: Oh, is that the one? I have too many lists here.

THE COURT: Yvonne Horne.
MS. CALLSEN: We don't have proof of use. The records say Taxotere and Taxol, so they are ambiguous of what we do have, so we still have no proof of use.

THE COURT: Hello?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we have uploaded medical records -- proof of use medical records as of July 15, 2019.

THE COURT: Mr. Abassi, what I'm hearing is that the records -- are you telling me it says "Taxotere" then "Taxol" or is it interchangeable?

MS. CALLSEN: It's ambiguous, right. The records don't -- they are not clear as to proof of use.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, Dawn Barrios. I'm more than happy to look at those records with the plaintiff's counsel and then get back to --

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you to contact Ms. Barrios
within the next week to review this information.
Okay. Then I think we go to number 108, which is Judith McShea.

MS. CALLSEN: PFS is not substantially complete.
Again, we have no proof of use, and there is no documentation regarding CMO 12 efforts.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we sent a CMO 12 last night. Again, this was just an oversight. We missed it and we apologize for wasting the Court's time today. We did try to send the email last night.

We submitted an uploaded photograph. The Plaintiff Fact Sheet is substantially complete. We went ahead and provided as much as we can with that Plaintiff Fact Sheet. THE COURT: Okay. The Court is going to grant seven days for you to verify -- for the defendants to verify.

MS. CALLSEN: What I specifically said was no proof of use, though, so she didn't address what -- I heard the CMO 12 but proof of use is needed.

THE COURT: Do you have proof of use?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I didn't have that on my list, Your Honor.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, we do have proof of use. The medical records were uploaded yesterday with Judith McShea. She is limited in mobility and doesn't really have anyone around to help her out. The facility was giving
her the runaround and required her to show up in person to sign a HIPAA. So we did receive the records yesterday and uploaded them yesterday.

THE COURT: Seven days for the defendant to verify. MS. CALLSEN: Seven days to verify. Got it.

THE COURT: Okay. Then we go to Lisa Newton.
MS. CALLSEN: Right. We have substantially incomplete. We have no before photos, and there is no PTO 71 certification. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We have -- Your Honor, this is Charlotte again. We've uploaded photographs on August 7th, and PTO 71 was uploaded the 15th after the client was able to get that over to us.

THE COURT: Is that everything?
MS. BRILLEAUX: We have a no dated before photo. So we have four purported before photos, but it's an issue that I mentioned earlier, Your Honor, where we have photos within a range, 2010 to 2013, and they also just appear to be photos that are dateable.

They appear to be at special events, holding a newborn, as a good example, and we just don't believe a three-year range. I think that the plaintiffs can work a little bit harder to nail down the dates that these photos were taken on.

THE COURT: I agree.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: If you give us time we can
certainly cure those issues.
THE COURT: Well, you got seven days.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay. Alvera Ray.
MS. CALLSEN: We don't have any proof of injury. We have no before photos.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. In this case the plaintiff is 64 years old. She's (inaudible) --

THE COURT: I can't hear you. Wait. Please stop. I can't hear you. Please speak up.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Can you hear me?
THE COURT: Just speak up.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I might be having some issues with my phone.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Alvera Ray.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. Our client is not the most tech savvy person and has been dealing with some health issues lately. We made contact with her, and the after photo that we uploaded earlier this week was the best that we could get out of her personally, but on Monday she did assure me that her sister was coming in to town from out of town and would help not only take some better after photos of her current situation as well as assist in locating a photo that fits the time frame.

So we would ask that you grant us 15 days for her
sister to come in and help get those photos.
MS. CALLSEN: The issue was the no before photos. I mean, we appreciate updated photos, but did you say -- I thought you said you do have photos before but you haven't uploaded them yet?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: No. Your Honor. We uploaded one after photo.

THE COURT: You uploaded one after photo. I think the issue is before photos. Do you have any in your possession within five years of chemotherapy?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: The client has assured me that she does, and I tried to walk her through the process of taking photos of those to send to us, but she has been having some difficulty finding them, and that's where her sister was going to come in to help her go through her things and send the appropriate photos to us.

THE COURT: I think you need to talk to Ms. Barrios about that. I'm going to send you with Ms. Barrios. I don't know, has her cancer recurred or something that she is unable to do this? I'm sending you to Ms. Barrios.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: All right. I don't want to go too much into it, but the client is dealing with some possible early onset dementia.

THE COURT: Okay. Please work with Ms. Barrios, and I'm sure her sister can help her. Thank you.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: All right. Thank you.
THE COURT: Nettie Roberts.
MS. CALLSEN: Again, we don't have proof of injury.
The before photos are not within five years of the chemotherapy administration.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Bernay (spelled phonetically) Roberts, we have -- we've uploaded both before records and after -- I mean, excuse me, before photos and after photos. I'm seeing photos uploaded from August 7th.

MS. CALLSEN: They are not within five years. They are older than that.

THE COURT: Do you understand the problem?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I do but I'm seeing a 2014 photo, and it looks like she had chemo in 2015; so, I'm pretty sure that that's within the five-year time frame from August 7th.

MS. CALLSEN: We'll re-review and work with Dawn to the extent we need to, if that's okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Seven days. Thank you.
Caroline Vann.
MS. CALLSEN: We don't have proof of use. There is no documentation of use of docetaxel or Taxotere.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, this is the -- kind of the same situation as Judith Davis where we did order records, but there was a HIPAA deficiency. We were able to cure that deficiency, and we received a new HIPAA, and so the
records are pending, but we don't have them back, so we can't provide what we don't have.

THE COURT: I'm going to grant 30 days but --
MS. CALLSEN: The authorization -- can you just confirm that the authorization has been submitted with the request?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, it has. I realized today as we were on the phone that that CMO 12 hasn't been sent to you but I will send that over.

MS. CALLSEN: Just to confirm, you received an updated authorization and you've submitted it?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, yes, I have. And I can give that to you as required in the CMO 12.

MS. CALLSEN: Please. Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you. Ora Vaughn.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. This is no before photos and no CMO 12 initiated -- process initiated.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, the CMO 12 issue email was sent yesterday. I know it was after the deadline. It was an oversight on my part.

THE COURT: Are you talking on a speakerphone maybe?
Maybe if you pick up your phone. We are really having trouble.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I'm sorry. It's a headset that I'm using, and I think there are issues with it.

THE COURT: Well, there are issues, so if you can pick up the handle and just hold it because I'm really struggling to
hear you.
Okay. Ora Vaughn.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: All right. As for the CMO 12
issue, the email was sent to defense counsel yesterday. It was an oversight on my part because in compiling the two noncompliance lists that were sent out in late June, the 505 (b) (2) list did not have CMO 12 as an issue, and it was an oversight on my part when I was compiling those lists.

THE COURT: Okay. So that's CMO 12, was that the issue you had?

MS. BRILLEAUX: I just had that we had no contact about the CMO process.

THE COURT: Okay. I think he said he sent the email yesterday. I'm going to give you seven days to confirm that. Thank you.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Then with the photo.
THE COURT: Okay. There was a photo.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: A before photo?
THE COURT: Is it a before photo that you're missing?
MS. BRILLEAUX: It is, Your Honor, and we did receive a photo, but it does not have plaintiff's face. It's just of the back of her head. I have a copy if you would like to see it. Okay.

THE COURT: All right. Could you get a photograph that shows the plaintiff.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We could certainly get that from her.

THE COURT: Okay. That's seven days. All right. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Loretha -- this is Reich and Binstock. MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes. I think we're on our last -no -- well, yes, our last set of Exhibit A cases.

THE COURT: Then we're going to look at photographs. MR. BRILLEAUX: Yes.

MR. LAMBERT: Your Honor, we've been going for two hours. Would you like to take a quick break -MR. BRILLEAUX: I think we only have about 20 cases left.

MR. LAMBERT: Thank you.
MS. BRILLEAUX: But thank you, Mr. Lambert.
THE COURT: Thank you. If you need to leave -MS. CALLSEN: Do you need a brief moment?

MR. LAMBERT: I'm not having to wear those shoes.
MS. BRILLEAUX: This is the most challenging part of the process.

THE COURT: Loretha Bronson. Who do we have on the phone for Reich and Binstock? Mr. Roth? PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes. Good afternoon, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Fine. We have Loretha Bronson. MR. BRILLEAUX: Yes. That is no proof of use.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We have a committed request for records, Ms. Bronson. Asked for just -- we do have proof of use for Loretha Bronson. We will get that loaded immediately. It is an oversight on our part that we did not get that into MDL Centrality, so we do have proof of use.

We let the defendants know on August 1st of our cure attempts, and we'll have that literally loaded here in 30 seconds.

THE COURT: Okay. Within seven days. That will give you an opportunity to review it, Ms. Brilleaux, because I want this uploaded within 48 hours so that Ms. Brilleaux can report back to me in seven days. Tamara Gabreilyan.

MR. BRILLEAUX: Yes. This is photos are not dated. Initially the deficiency was for no before photos and no after photos, and then we received photos but none of them are dated.

PLAINTIFES' COUNSEL: I'm going to hop on the Centrality. We did request photos from Ms. Gabreilyan, and she was having difficulty finding them. That may be updated and I'll let you know here in just a second. Centrality is a little slow right here. We may have done a photo affidavit for her. I'll let you know here in just a second.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, this was a case that was supposed to be heard on July 11th; so, I'm just not really understanding why this isn't something that has been dealt with
weeks, if not months ago.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I can answer that. Your Honor, we loaded photos on July 12th.

THE COURT: Are they dated? That's the issue.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I believe that they are. I think
I did a photo affidavit. If you bear with me for one second.
Yeah, we have gone through and -- if we don't have those dated, we will certainly get that done but $I$ think we have.

THE COURT: Can you talk to Ms. Barrios about this. I mean, I'm not going to sit on the phone for --

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: No, I understand but we do -- we have, you know, within the last --

THE COURT: It may be a technical problem.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Counsel, just to be clear, we
understand that photographs have been uploaded. But there are no dates on them. The issue is the dates.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We talked to the client, and if we don't have dates on the photos --

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you to visit with
Ms. Barrios. We've got to move on. Okay. Then let's get this done within seven days.

All right. Carol Jean Hill.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
This is no PFS declaration, no proof of use, no before photos, after photos, no authorization, and no PTO 71
certification.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We've had a lack of cooperation from our client. We did talk to her last week. We would ask for more time. I cannot honestly sit here and tell you that more time will get us a result, but it will give us an opportunity to pound on her and try to get her to do this, but there has been an awful lot of contact with this client.

THE COURT: And you haven't gotten it yet?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We have not?
THE COURT: All right. This matter is dismissed with prejudice.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
The next one is Loretta Kerr. No proof of use, no before photos, and no after photos.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We got Loretta submitted on Friday, and we let the defendants know. We are waiting on more records regarding the proof of use. I think we've taken care of every other deficiency on her.

THE COURT: What's the status of the records? First I'm going to give defendants seven days to check that the other items were cured, but what's the status of the records?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: They are ordered and we can light a fire under our records service to expedite it. We feel we have everything else in order for her. If we don't come up with proof of use records, we'll be the first one to dismiss
her.
MS. CALLSEN: When were they requested?
THE COURT: I know but can you tell me when they were requested?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I'm going to research that. I can get that to you here momentarily.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you to contact Ms. Barrios within the next seven days so that we can satisfy ourselves that the records are being ordered timely.

All right. Laurie Lardner.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, just on Kerr, we have someone checking live. We do not have any indication that anything has been cured, and we would like to request that if it's not done within seven days we can move to dismiss the case.

THE COURT: You can, yes, but I'm asking him to get with Ms. Barrios because there may be technical difficulties.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT: Laurie Lardner.
MS. BRILLEAUX: That is no proof of use.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: She is a similar situation to Loretta Kerr. (Inaudible) everything else. PFS.

THE COURT: I think the only issue was proof of use, and you've requested those records; is that what you're telling me?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes. Absolutely.
THE COURT: This is what I'm going to ask you to do is to email, because it sounds like everything, Ms. Brilleaux, within seven days, defense counsel to advise status of the requested records. Okay?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Perfect.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you.
THE COURT: Cheria Markos.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes. This is no proof of use.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: It would be similar to Ms. Kerr and Ms. Lardner, everything else, and we will follow the same procedure.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm going to order that the same procedure be followed, that he advise you when the records were requested.

Jerri McDowell. Let me ask you: Are these all
the same issues?
MS. BRILLEAUX: We also have some photo issues with the same cases.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's go.
Jerri McDowell.
MS. BRILLEAUX: No proof of use, no before photos, and no after photos.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I thought we procured the photos from Jerri McDowell. I'll look at MDL Centrality.

She's looking for photos. I think I'm going to -- she was looking for some photos. Let's see if she's got them loaded.

THE COURT: Who is looking for photos?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Our clients.
THE COURT: Are they loaded or not?
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: (Inaudible).
THE COURT: Mr. Roth, you're going to have to contact Ms. Barrios. I was hoping that, particularly since you've been sitting on the phone for two hours, that perhaps you had gone through this and would able to respond quickly.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We're in the process of getting photos for Ms. McDowell. If we don't come up with them, again, we will be the first ones to move for dismissal.

THE COURT: Probably not. I'm guessing that the defendants are going to move before you.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Right. Maybe so.
THE COURT: Yeah. This was requested when? When did you --

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: July 26 th was our last request to Ms. McDowell via email with suggestions of where she could look for photos.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to ask you to visit
with Ms. Barrios because, I have to tell you, I'm losing my patience.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I understand.
THE COURT: Within the next seven days.
All right. Hattie Meadows.
And then the proof of use, you need to send the defendants information regarding when the records were requested.

## All right. Hattie Meadows.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. This is no before photos within five years of treatment.

THE COURT: Okay.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We loaded photos on May 22nd, and I believe we do have before photos. I'll look at Centrality and see but for Ms. Meadows --

MS. BRILLEAUX: Counsel, within five years of her chemotherapy treatment.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I believe so.
MR. BRILLEAUX: I'll represent to you, counsel, that my notes show that we do have one, but it's 13 years prior to her 2013 treatment.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: That may be what she was able to come up with.

THE COURT: Not good enough. I'm going to direct you to liaison counsel because this --

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We have recent photos.
THE COURT: Are these post chemotherapy, the photos that you do have? What we're looking for is prechemotherapy photos within five years.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: That one 13 years may be the best one we've got.

THE COURT: She's got to do better.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I understand. I agree.
THE COURT: No.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We have one from 2013, which may be during chemo. We have a photo affidavit.

THE COURT: You know what, I'm going to direct you to Ms. Barrios because I'm losing my patience and I don't want to --

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Sure.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor. We can --
THE COURT: Charlene Robson.
MS. BRILLEAUX: No before photos from within five years of treatment.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I think that we do on her.
THE COURT: Did you download them, upload them, or whatever you call it?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Mr. Roth, did you look at this before you got on the phone?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: I did. And it says we do have
photos loaded for Ms. Robson.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Are they within five years of her 2016 treatment, Counsel?

PLAINTIFF'' COUNSEL: It must be -- they appear to be after.

THE COURT: If he's saying that they uploaded them, he has seven days.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We have some during chemo. I thought we had some before.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Counsel, I'll represent to you that we have some from 1999 and 2003, but this is 16 years and 12 years, respectively, before her chemotherapy treatment, and the Court has required photos within five years of treatment.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We can reach out to her again. We may have gotten all the photos that she has.

THE COURT: I'm going to direct you and ask you to talk to Ms. Barrios because I think you need to understand that the photos, there is a requirement that they be within five years, unless there are extraordinary circumstances that can be clearly articulated.

Angela Schuyler.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor. This is no proof of use, no before photos, and undated after photos.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Ms. Schuyler. We do have a lot of photos loaded for her. A proof of use, I think that she is
also an ongoing records order situation.
THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you to contact defense counsel and advise them of the request you've made and when requests were made for medical records.

As to the photographs, I'm going to ask you to visit with Ms. Barrios on all of these issues related to photographs.

All right. Our last one is Christine Simcox. MS. BRILLEAUX: No proof of use and no before photos from within five years of treatment.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: She has some photos.
THE COURT: I think that's going to fall in the same bucket. I'm going to ask you to visit with Ms. Barrios about the photo issue, and I'm going to require that you contact defense counsel and advise them as to what steps have been taken to provide proof of use.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Just to be clear, Your Honor, the ones that you have ruled on, this is all seven-day time frame?

THE COURT: Yes.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you, Your Honor.
Okay. Then the last set that we have, we have four cases left, Your Honor, that are rollover cases from prior hearings to revisit.

THE COURT: Yes, please.
MS. BRILLEAUX: The first one is Deborah Edwards
represented by Kennedy Hodges, and this is no proof of use. THE COURT: Mr. Green?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes. Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Donald Green representing the plaintiff.

So this was an issue we filed in this case because we had reference to Taxotere usage in the oncology records, and then there was later medical records from a hospital that referenced previous Taxol administration. We obtained additional records, and we did find that Taxol was, indeed, used.

We tried to contact the client to obtain permission to terminate the case through a stipulated dismissal. We sent correspondence to her. We tried to call her numerous times. We cannot get ahold of her to get her authority to agree to a dismissal.

THE COURT: This matter is dismissed with prejudice. I'm sorry, sir, you had to stay on the phone so long for your one case.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: No problem. Thank you.
THE COURT: Barbara Falk with the Simmons Hanly Conroy. Mr. Foley, are you on the line?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Where are we with that one, Ms. Brilleaux?
MR. BRILLEAUX: So this is no before photos from within five years of treatment.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: (Inaudible) Your Honor, where we received a photo on Monday, and we uploaded it before the time deadline. Unfortunately, we have not sent an email notification to defense. It was drafted and left in somebody's draft folder. They didn't hit send. So a photo that's dated 2006 has been uploaded as of Monday morning.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, this is another case where this has been flagged as something that we do not believe is accurate for whatever reason.

This is the 2006 photograph that we got. I would like to highlight right here. It's a 1988 issuance. I know that's unclear. We got another driver's license for comparison. 1988. Expiration 1994. 1988, 1994. This is not a 2006 photograph or a document.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: We reached out to Ms. Falk and asked her about the date on the photo. The back of the photo. I think we had submitted two pages or they submitted two pages, and the second page was the -- had the expiration date of the license as 2012. And a little bit of research into the time frame of Florida licenses, how long they are good for was six or eight years. Both would be in the relevant time frame. We asked her if she ever renewed or line or if she always went in and renewed and had her picture taken, and she told us she always went in and renewed.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, again (speaking
simultaneously) --
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: The photographs -- I'm sorry, Counsel, go ahead.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Thank you. This is just obviously something that's being represented as a photo from 2006 that is raising a very clear red flag as to why it should be questioned for whether -- its accuracy.

THE COURT: Ms. Barrios.
MS. BARRIOS: Mr. Foley, do you have a copy of the back of the license that you could show us that indicate the expiration date?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, and it was supposed to be uploaded but maybe that was not uploaded.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, I'll deal with getting that to him and getting that to Ms. Brilleaux.

THE COURT: I think perhaps a conversation with the client would be appropriate, Ms. Barrios.

MS. BARRIOS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
I'm going to ask you to contact Ms. Barrios within seven days. Ms. Barrios is going to be busy for the next week.

MS. BARRIOS: I don't have anything else to do so that's quite okay.

MR. LAMBERT: Your Honor, I will help Ms. Barrios with
some of these.
THE COURT: I thought you needed a little break.
MS. BARRIOS: The person sitting next to me is going to be very busy.

THE COURT: Deborah Hutchinson. That's with Davis \& Crump. Who do we have on the phone with Davis \& Crum? Mr. Rockstad?

PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. I'm here.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, this is, again, no before photos within five years of treatment. I think when we last spoke Mr. Rockstad said that he would be trying to locate them, and we still have not had that deficiency cured.

PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: Your Honor, I talked with Ms. Hutcheson. I attempted to call all the family members that she told me might have pictures. No one has been able to find any pictures or they are refusing to cooperate or assist. I'm at a loss as to say where to go from here, Your Honor. There are no more pictures to produce.

MS. BARRIOS: Are there any extenuating circumstances, Mr. Rockstad, as to why Ms. Hutcheson doesn't have photos, like a flood or a fire or a theft or --

PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL: I'm sorry to cut you off. Right before she was diagnosed with cancer, her husband passed away, and a lot of their belongings were in a storage unit, and I guess the storage unit, the best I understand, the storage unit
passed to, I guess it was also in the name of his parents, and they don't have any contact or won't have any contact with us or Ms. Hutcheson, and as far as she knows, all of their belongings that were in that storage unit have been sold or given away or otherwise disposed of. She says there were pictures in there, all their old family pictures, but that's all there is, and there is no digital copies of anything.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, that sounds to me that that may be justification for not having photos. At least give him an opportunity to maybe sign a verification.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you to contact Ms. Barrios within the next seven days and see where we are.

All right. Guyann Peterson is with Fernelius Simon. Mr. Perdue, are you on the phone?

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. Ryan Perdue here for Mr. Fred Peterson.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Yes, Your Honor, and this is no before photos.

THE COURT: Okay. No before photos.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor. This matter has been before the Court a couple of times. Just by way of refresher, Ms. Guyann Peterson passed away on June 2017. Her son, Fred Peterson, prior to our last show cause hearing, had gone through every belonging that he was aware of that belonged to his mom that she would have left after her death. He could
not find photos.
Your Honor, at our last show cause hearing, suggested that Mr. Peterson talk to family friends, which he did so. He talked to every family member he could, and no one was able to find a photograph of Ms. Peterson prior to her May 2012 chemotherapy; so, similar to some of the other cases and at the risk of adding one more case to Ms. Barrios' list --

THE COURT: Well, the problem we have is with a deceased plaintiff and no photographs, I'm not sure how you would show proof of injury.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Mr. Peterson has said that he would be happy to submit an affidavit that would describe -THE COURT: How are we going to determine there is indeed an injury? Your plaintiff is deceased, and there is no photograph of what her hair looked like before or afterwards. MS. BRILLEAUX: Just to note, Your Honor, this case was filed by the representative.

THE COURT: I'm listening.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, there are after photos. Ms. Peterson, following her 2012 chemotherapy, lived for another five years. We have produced several after photos that depict hair loss that $I$ think is consistent with claims in the case, but we just unfortunately, because she passed away, we don't have access to any photographs that predate her chemotherapy.

If this case were selected for trial, we would have testimony regarding what her hair looked like prior to her chemotherapy, so I think there would be some evidence of that, but it may not be the best evidence, but it would be some evidence.

THE COURT: Ms. Barrios. Do you have something?
MS. BARRIOS: Yes, ma'am. I wanted to ask if I could work with Mr. Perdue to see if there are school pictures, if she has a driver's license picture. They may have taken a picture when she was admitted to the hospital. I understand when you to go in the chemo unit they take a picture.

If there is anything like that, Mr. Perdue, that I could help you to try to explore to find a before picture, I'm more than happy to do so.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you. I would like to take you up on that. I had asked my client those questions (speaking simultaneously).

THE COURT: Mr. Perdue, I'm going to tell you, this case will not proceed without a before photo. I'm going to give you one last shot. You can call Ms. Barrios, but this is even more problematic.

Just so you understand, I know that they were able to produce after chemo photographs, but it will not proceed. So I'm going to give you an opportunity to visit with Ms. Barrios, but this is the last time.

Okay. I believe that's everybody on the phone. We can hang up the phone now.

MS. BRILLEAUX: I think we had one more Marc J. Bern that we said we needed to go back to, Felicia Rhodes.

MS. BARRIOS: What number is it, please?
MR. BRILLEAUX: It's number 43, Ms. Barrios.
MS. BARRIOS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Which one was that? Oh, that's right. I don't remember why. Oh, that was the photograph you wanted to show me.

MS. BRILLEAUX: I don't think that that was for Rhodes that was the issue. I'm looking at my notes. We had -- when did she die?

MS. BARRIOS: My notes indicate -- you said when did she die?

THE COURT: Hello. Who do we have on the phone for Marc Bern?

MR. BRILLEAUX: He may have forgotten we were supposed to go back to it.

MR. LAMBERT: Your Honor, this is Palmer Lambert. I have the same note as Ms. Callsen that this was an individual who passed away, and you had given 30 days to check on that survivor.

MS. BRILLEAUX: For number 43?
MR. LAMBERT: That's what I have, yes.

MS. BRILLEAUX: I have for 43 --
THE COURT: I'll be honest with you, what I have is a highlighted and no -- so I don't think -- this is what -- I could go back through the transcript, which this is -- I believe I did ask when did she die or when something had happened, and what my guess is that the attorney forgot that this matter was ongoing, just like I forgot, so --

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, I volunteer to contact Mr. Kessler. I'll get together with both defense counsel, we'll put our noggins together and read the wonderful transcript that we're going to get for this and figure it out.

THE COURT: Thank you. I believe that there are photographs that you wanted to show me.

I think everybody else on the phone can hang up. Thank you very much.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, do you mind if I stay on? This is Kelly Bieri for Sanofi as well. Is that okay with you?

THE COURT: If you want to.
PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Okay. So the one I wanted to go back to, this is actually just one, is Sarah Dunlap. This was kind of the first of the photos that, again, we had just flagged because we have been seeing some things that have raised some red flags.

We've seen -- we have a photo from -- that's supposed to be -- states that it was dated December of 2007, and you can see, compare that to this one which is supposed to be earlier, May 2007, and I just don't think that those look like they -- those dates would be accurate.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, the hairstyles and the fashion in the photos, along with the photo quality, do seem to be -- indicate that this was taken in 2007. Additionally, I think this plaintiff just ages very well.

I have her present day --
THE COURT: This is only six months difference.
MS. BRILLEAUX: Your Honor, just to point out also the difference in the hairstyle, while I certainly do not claim to know, it looks like there is a possibility that one of these pictures may be a wig. I'm certainly not sure of that, but it may be something that can be looked into, if these are supposed to be six months apart.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: That is something we can definitely look into. I think the issue here is she's claiming that she looks to be too young to be her age in this photograph, but this client doesn't age -- she ages very well.

I have her present day photos, and this is, I believe, 12 years and 13 years later, and if you look at these photographs --

THE COURT: I understand but if you look, this is May
and this is December of the same year. This is not the same year.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Our client is telling that us that this is the same year. I will look into whether or not she maybe had a hairpiece or something like that that she put in, but people change their hairstyles, and I think both of those hairstyles are definitely in line with what people were wearing in 2007 and 2006.

THE COURT: Mr. Lambert, do you have something else to say?

MR. LAMBERT: Yes, Your Honor. Palmer Lambert, coliaison counsel for plaintiffs.

I'm happy to get on the phone with this plaintiff, as Ms. Barrios has offered on different ones.

THE COURT: Ms. Sulkin, let me be perfectly frank with you. It's not just the hair. These are supposed to be photographs taken six months different and look at them.

MS. BRILLEAUX: Just to add, Your Honor, they both have plaintiff's verification signature, so to the extent --

THE COURT: I know. But please tell me you can see the concern.

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Your Honor, I can see the concern because she does look different, but people do look different in different photographs that could be taken weeks apart. One of them is also admittedly not a great -- it's a photograph of
a photograph in a frame, so it's not quite as clear as this one that's actually a photograph, so that could account for some discrepancy also in the look of the photographs.

But I do want to show you the present day photographs because I am concerned that they are going to argue that she looks too young in 2007. I think if you look here, she was born in 1946. I would not guess that she was born in 1946, looking at this photograph right here. If she would have had a hairpiece or had hair, she looks significantly younger than her actual age.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Lambert, I'm going to ask you to talk to Ms. Dunlap.

MR. LAMBERT: Yes, Your Honor. We will. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor. MS. BRILLEAUX: I believe that's all we have. THE COURT: Okay. We can go off the record. (WHEREUPON, at 4:28 p.m., the proceedings were concluded.)
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { motion }[4]-5: 5,5: 9, \\ & 7: 15,7: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 2,47: 9,47: 18, \\ & 47: 24,48: 9,48: 12, \end{aligned}$ | N |  | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { move [7] - 24:7, 36:12, } \\ \text { 61:13, 90:20, 92:14, } \\ \text { 94:16, 94:18 } \\ \text { moved [2] - 52:10, } \\ \text { 53:12 } \\ \text { MR }[39]-4: 14,4: 17, \\ 5: 1,15: 10,15: 15, \\ 27: 17,28: 16,30: 13, \\ 33: 4,33: 9,35: 23, \\ 36: 16,36: 19,37: 6, \\ 44: 2,44: 9,52: 13, \\ \text { 52:20, 55:12, 60:23, } \\ 61: 13,61: 18,72: 12, \\ 73: 8,88: 9,88: 12, \\ 88: 14,88: 18,88: 25, \\ 89: 14,95: 19,99: 24, \\ 101: 25,106: 6, \\ 106: 18,106: 20, \\ 106: 25,109: 11, \\ 110: 13 \\ \text { MS }[262]-4: 12,4: 19, \\ 4: 21,4: 25,5: 2,5: 4, \\ 5: 7,5: 9,5: 11,5: 15, \\ 5: 17,5: 25,6: 6,6: 15, \\ 6: 19,6: 20,7: 6,7: 7, \\ 7: 12,7: 13,7: 14, \\ 7: 20,8: 16,8: 23, \\ 8: 25,9: 2,9: 23, \\ 10: 15,11: 19,12: 20, \\ 13: 5,13: 20,14: 13, \\ 14: 19,14: 23,15: 4, \\ 15: 24,16: 6,16: 21, \\ 16: 25,17: 5,17: 14, \\ 17: 22,18: 3,18: 5, \\ 18: 7,18: 17,19: 7, \\ 19: 10,19: 12,19: 17, \\ 19: 21,20: 3,20: 6, \\ 20: 7,20: 10,20: 12, \\ 20: 19,21: 3,21: 9, \\ 21: 12,21: 19,22: 1, \\ 22: 10,22: 18,23: 3, \\ 23: 10,23: 12,23: 19, \\ 24: 11,24: 18,24: 24, \\ 25: 7,25: 10,25: 20, \\ 26: 4,26: 13,27: 5, \end{gathered}$ | 50:7, 50:18, 50:25, <br> 51:7, 51:24, 52:4, <br> 52:18, 53:17, 53:25, <br> 54:8, 54:24, 55:3, <br> 55:15, 56:2, 56:19, <br> 58:8, 58:14, 58:18, <br> 60:16, 60:18, 61:22, <br> 62:14, 62:18, 63:9, <br> 64:6, 64:8, 65:17, <br> 66:13, 67:1, 67:3, <br> 67:22, 68:5, 68:12, <br> 68:18, 68:22, 69:19, <br> 70:15, 70:24, 71:10, <br> 71:13, 71:25, 72:6, <br> 72:20, 72:25, 73:10, <br> 73:24, 74:6, 74:7, <br> 74:10, 74:13, 74:16, <br> 74:20, 75:1, 75:3, <br> 75:13, 76:19, 77:6, <br> 77:12, 77:16, 78:15, <br> 79:14, 80:3, 80:7, <br> 80:10, 80:20, 80:22, <br> 81:4, 81:16, 82:5, <br> 82:7, 82:14, 83:5, <br> 84:2, 85:3, 85:10, <br> 85:16, 85:20, 86:4, <br> 86:9, 86:13, 86:15, <br> 87:11, 87:16, 87:20, <br> 88:6, 88:15, 88:17, <br> 88:19, 89:23, 90:14, <br> 90:23, 91:12, 92:2, <br> 92:11, 92:18, 92:20, <br> 93:10, 93:20, 93:24, <br> 95:10, 95:16, 96:16, <br> 96:18, 97:2, 97:10, <br> 97:22, 98:9, 98:17, <br> 98:20, 98:25, 100:7, <br> 100:25, 101:4, <br> 101:9, 101:14, <br> 101:18, 101:23, <br> 102:3, 102:9, <br> 102:19, 103:8, <br> 103:17, 104:16, <br> 105:7, 106:3, 106:5, <br> 106:7, 106:11, | $\begin{gathered} \text { Nachawati [3] - 77:17, } \\ \text { 77:20, 78:18 } \\ \text { nail [2]-31:6, 82:22 } \\ \text { name [10] - 10:25, } \\ \text { 32:6, 32:19, 33:14, } \\ 33: 15,61: 1,61: 2, \\ 77: 24,80: 4,103: 1 \\ \text { names }[2]-5: 12,12: 3 \\ \text { Nancy }[1]-30: 1 \\ \text { Narvella }[1]-75: 2 \\ \text { NE }[1]-2: 7 \\ \text { nearly }[1]-43: 19 \\ \text { necessary }[1]-8: 12 \\ \text { need }[21]-13: 1, \\ 33: 14,38: 2,42: 7, \\ 54: 22,60: 10,60: 12, \\ 60: 19,61: 14,61: 16, \\ 63: 24,66: 8,70: 11, \\ 74: 1,78,78: 11,84: 17, \\ 85: 17,88: 16,88: 17, \\ 95: 6,97: 17 \\ \text { needed }[5]-38: 16, \\ 64: 14,81: 18,102: 2, \\ \text { 106:4 } \\ \text { needing }[1]-48: 23 \\ \text { needs }[4]-17: 21, \\ 26: 20,29: 13,33: 17 \\ \text { Nettie }[1]-85: 2 \\ \text { never }[2]-42: 19, \\ 46: 21 \\ \text { new }[4]-9: 14,22: 15, \\ 22: 23,85: 25 \\ \text { NEW }[5]-1: 6,1: 17, \\ 1: 21,1: 25,3: 9 \\ \text { New }[1]-40: 9 \\ \text { newborn }[1]-82: 20 \\ \text { Newton }[1]-82: 6 \\ \text { next }[57]-8: 2,8: 13, \\ 8: 24,9: 3,10: 15, \\ 11: 20,22: 13,23: 15, \\ 26: 13,26: 25,28: 12, \\ 28: 16,29: 14,29: 23, \\ 29: 25,31: 25,33: 7, \\ 33: 23,34: 14,36: 12, \end{gathered}$ | ```Nichols [3] - 60:22, 61:3, 61:4 Niemeyer [1] - 47:19 night [5] - 36:23, 37:21, 63:1, 81:8, 81:10 nine [1] - 39:22 Nine [1] - 67:3 NO [1] - 1:6 noggins [1] - 107:10 Nolte [5] - 7:23, 8:7, 8:8, 8:10, 8:18 NOLTE [1] - 2:10 noncompliance [5] - 4:9, 4:23, 6:2, 6:25, 87:6 noncompliant [6] - 5:7, 5:13, 6:4, 6:16, 7:5, 7:6 none [1] - 89:16 note [5]-19:13, 47:2, 67:6, 104:16, 106:21 noted [2] - 66:17, 67:5 notes [5] - 18:17, 21:12, 95:20, 106:12, 106:14 nothing [5] - 10:5, 11:1, 22:5, 22:21, 79:15 notice [8] - 9:15, 9:19, 9:21, 13:24, 32:11, 33:1, 37:23, 74:17 noticed [2] - 47:3, 48:22 notices [1] - 8:5 notification [3] - 19:19, 42:5, 100:4 notified [4] - 15:1, 39:6, 42:4, 54:14 notify [2]-17:16, 17:24 notifying [1] - 48:6 number [28]-7:21, 9:3, 9:9, 10:17, 10:23, 11:1, 12:4,``` | Oakeson [1] - 51:17 <br> obituary [1]-23:15 <br> obligation [3]-16:23, <br> 17:16, 39:8 <br> obligations [1] - 16:8 <br> obtain [3]-14:4, 78:6, 99:11 <br> obtained [1] - 99:9 <br> obviously [4] - 25:3, <br> 70:18, 76:23, 101:4 <br> occasions [3] - 39:25, 40:14, 63:18 <br> occur [1] - 58:5 <br> occurred [1] - 74:24 <br> occurs [1]-13:2 <br> OF [2]-1:1, 1:11 <br> offer [1]-38:16 <br> offered [1] - 109:14 <br> office $[7]$ - 12:24, <br> 13:3, 27:10, 31:18, <br> 37:21, 71:22, 72:15 <br> official ${ }_{[1]}-38: 2$ <br> Official ${ }_{[2]}$-111:5, <br> 111:13 <br> OFFICIAL [1] - 3:7 <br> OHIO [1] - 2:4 <br> old [6] - 30:20, 76:9, <br> 76:10, 76:22, 83:8, <br> 103:6 <br> older [1] - 85:11 <br> Olin [2]-21:25, 22:17 <br> oncology [1] - 99:6 <br> one [93]-6:10, 6:21, <br> 6:22, 11:8, 11:17, <br> 11:22, 12:1, 12:18, <br> 14:7, 16:15, 21:6, <br> 21:16, 21:19, 21:22, <br> 22:2, 22:25, 24:6, <br> 24:14, 26:8, 26:13, <br> 27:9, 30:2, 34:7, <br> 36:4, 38:10, 38:24, <br> 45:3, 45:19, 46:9, <br> 46:17, 47:3, 47:9, <br> 47:21, 47:23, 48:21, |


|  | ```overseas [1] - 76:12 oversight [6] - 78:23, 81:8, 86:19, 87:5, 87:8, 89:4 own [1] - 58:4```  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86:1 } \\ & \text { penny }[1]-50: 17 \\ & \text { people }[13]-9: 5,13: 1, \\ & 16: 17,16: 19,19: 6, \\ & 29: 19,55: 11,62: 3, \\ & 76: 15,76: 16,109: 6, \\ & \text { 109:7, 109:23 } \\ & \text { Pepper }[3]-111: 3, \\ & \text { 111:11, 111:12 } \\ & \text { PEPPER }[1]-3: 7 \\ & \text { per }[1]-36: 10 \\ & \text { percent }[1]-35: 3 \\ & \text { Perdue }[5]-103: 14, \\ & 103: 15,105: 8, \\ & 105: 12,105: 18 \\ & \text { PERDUE }[1]-3: 4 \\ & \text { perfect }[1]-93: 6 \\ & \text { perfectly }[1]-109: 15 \\ & \text { perhaps }[5]-37: 16, \\ & 65: 4,72: 16,94: 12, \\ & 101: 16 \\ & \text { period }[1]-12: 23 \\ & \text { permission }[1]-99: 12 \\ & \text { person }[4]-46: 9, \\ & 82: 1,83: 17,102: 3 \\ & \text { personally }[2]-42: 20, \\ & 83: 20 \\ & \text { Peterson }[8]-103: 13, \\ & 103: 16,103: 22, \\ & 103: 23,104: 3, \\ & 104: 5,104: 11, \\ & 104: 20 \\ & \text { PFS }[59]-9: 25,10: 17, \\ & 10: 19,10: 24,11: 21, \\ & 13: 9,13: 21,15: 4, \\ & 19: 10,19: 11,21: 3, \\ & 21: 9,21: 13,22: 18, \\ & 22: 21,23: 12,23: 19, \\ & 23: 21,23: 22,24: 11, \\ & 24: 16,25: 11,25: 20, \\ & 26: 5,26: 6,26: 14, \\ & 27: 6,27: 18,27: 19, \\ & 28: 17,32: 3,32: 7, \\ & 32: 12,32: 20,33: 4, \\ & 34: 8,34: 9,34: 15, \\ & 34: 18,34: 19,38: 10, \\ & 43: 4,46: 17,47: 25, \\ & 48: 13,49: 19,51: 18, \\ & 51: 24,54: 1,60: 24, \\ & 65: 18,66: 7,70: 16, \\ & 78: 15,81: 4,90: 24, \\ & 92: 22 \\ & \text { PFS's }[1]-13: 13 \\ & \text { Philip }[1]-33: 16 \\ & \text { phone }[25]-8: 8,17: 8, \\ & 34: 5,34: 24,35: 8, \\ & 42: 7,55: 11,77: 7, \\ & 77: 21,83: 14,86: 7, \\ & 86: 21,88: 22,90: 10, \\ & 94: 12,96: 24,99: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:6, 103:14, } \\ & \text { 106:1, 106:2, } \\ & \text { 106:16, 107:14, } \\ & \text { 109:13 } \\ & \text { phones [1] - 5:21 } \\ & \text { phonetically }[2] \text { - } \\ & \text { 48:17, 85:6 } \\ & \text { phonetically) }[1] \text { - } \\ & 36: 5 \\ & \text { photo [54] - 14:17, } \\ & \text { 26:15, 29:5, 29:18, } \\ & 30: 16,30: 17,30: 24, \\ & 39: 22,39: 23,40: 19, \\ & 41: 6,41: 7,41: 9, \\ & 46: 1,54: 21,58: 24, \\ & 59: 3,60: 7,62: 1, \\ & 62: 6,63: 11,68: 23, \\ & 71: 15,71: 16,72: 7, \\ & 75: 19,76: 7,78: 3, \\ & 82: 14,83: 19,83: 23, \\ & 84: 7,84: 8,85: 13, \\ & 87: 16,87: 17,87: 18, \\ & 87: 19,87: 21,89: 21, \\ & 90: 6,93: 20,96: 11, \\ & 98: 14,100: 2,100: 5, \\ & 100: 16,101: 5, \\ & 105: 19,108: 1,108: 7 \\ & \text { photograph [25] - } \\ & 28: 24,29: 20,30: 5, \\ & 41: 8,45: 25,46: 12, \\ & 54: 20,55: 5,59: 15, \\ & 59: 21,60: 2,69: 10, \\ & 81: 11,87: 24, \\ & 100: 10,100: 14, \\ & 104: 5,104: 15, \\ & 106: 9,108: 21, \\ & 109: 25,110: 1, \\ & 110: 2,110: 8 \\ & \text { photographs }[41]- \\ & 22: 6,22: 7,22: 9, \\ & 22: 10,22: 13,28: 25, \\ & 30: 7,30: 8,41: 24, \\ & 42: 14,42: 16,44: 25, \\ & 52: 5,54: 13,54: 17, \\ & 54: 18,54: 22,55: 11, \\ & 58: 19,58: 21,59: 13, \\ & 60: 6,63: 2,68: 19, \\ & 69: 7,69: 9,82: 10, \\ & 88: 8,90: 15,98: 5, \\ & 98: 7,101: 2,104: 9, \\ & 104: 24,105: 23, \\ & 107: 13,108: 24, \\ & 109: 17,109: 24, \\ & 110: 3,110: 5 \\ & \text { photos }[149]-10: 1, \\ & 10: 2,10: 20,13: 22, \\ & 14: 6,14: 8,14: 10, \\ & 14: 11,14: 15,14: 16,14,25, \\ & \text { 14: } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 57:4, 58:10, 58:23, | 89:9, 89:12, 90:21, | SIETHEL [1] - 2:15 | sounds [2] - 93:3, | stipulate [1] - 24 |
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