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P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S<br>WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 2018 M O R N I N G S E S S I O N (COURT CALLED TO ORDER)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
THE COURT: You all may be seated.
For the record, this is a status conference in the multidistrict litigation pending in the Eastern District of Louisiana, MDL 2740, In re: Taxotere (Docetaxel) Products Liability Litigation.

Welcome to all of you who are here in person, and I understand we have several that are participating by phone, several counsel that are participating by phone.

Also, it's my understanding that we may have a few of the state court judges in whose courts there are claims related to this case that are pending. If I could, I believe we have a telephonic setup where those judges, if he or she would choose to do so, could actually ask questions. Do we have anybody on that line? Anybody?

Okay. Well, assuming, which may be a generous assumption, that the phone system is working properly, I take it that there are none or they would have responded, but if there are and for some reason they can't communicate back, then

I would welcome them as well.
Why don't we go ahead and get started. We had a Draft Joint Report Number 9 of liaison counsel. If one of you would like to go ahead and to begin that report.

Ms. Barrios, if you would do that.
MS. BARRIOS: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning.
MS. BARRIOS: A special welcome to Judge Milazzo, and also our Special Master is here as well to make a report to the Court today, and I believe we have over a hundred participants on the phone, several of which are state court counsel, so I welcome them to my MDL.

I'm going to go through the joint report in a slightly different manner than usual. I'm going to try to summarize it rather than going through every line because the joint report, for all of those on the line, will be filed either Friday or Monday. It will have all of the appendices attached to it. It will be circulated through Centrality as the service provider, so everyone will get to read the real details of it, but I don't want this to be boring to people and then they tune it out.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. I know most of you all, I recognize, have been here for each of the conferences or many of them prior to today. Our normal procedure is to go
ahead and have the report presented by counsel. We will discuss what needs to be discussed as we go through.

If anyone has a question either while the report is being presented or thereafter, we'll afford you the opportunity to ask any questions, for those of you who are here, or if we do have any of our state court judicial colleagues on the phone can inquire. Then after we go through the report, I'll open the floor for questions or comments. Then lastly we will open the floor for any other issues that have not yet been covered during the course of our conference, so that will be our procedure.

Ms. Barrios, if you would like to proceed, that will be fine.

MS. BARRIOS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
The Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation named you the transferee judge in October of 2016. Since that time there have been 8,557 cases that have come into the MDL either directly or through transfer and removal.

As for the state involvement, we have had many conversations with state court counsel. There are cases that are currently pending in California, Illinois, Missouri, New Jersey, and Delaware.

With regard to plaintiffs who are seeking to remand any case, particularly in California, Your Honor has entered Pretrial Order 77A, which provides for a special
expedited procedure so you can piggyback on the work that has already been done.

There is a motion still under submission in this court regarding two California multiplaintiff cases on the issue of severance and remand and what procedure is the exact proper one to use.

We communicate and send depo notices and anything of any import to all state court counsel as well as to all MDL counsel, and I really do appreciate the state court counsel's cooperation with me on that.

We know that in Delaware there are many cases before the Honorable Judge Vivian Medinilla. Counsel in Delaware has requested on at least two occasions that I am aware of that Judge Medinilla set a status conference and were waiting for some movement in Delaware.

As for New Jersey, an application pursuant to Rule 4:38A, Centralized Management of Multicounty Litigation, to designate Taxotere as essentially an in-state MDL has been filed. It will take a couple of weeks because it is now published in The Bar Journal, and it has to go through their regular cycle. The parties are seeking that the Honorable James Hyland of Middlesex County be the -- I'll use the term transferee judge in New Jersey.

In California there are six cases in six different counties, and I know the parties under 77A, if they
have any issue with McKesson, will be discussing any remand issues and any procedures pursuant thereto.

THE COURT: By the way, I appreciate the chart. I was given this morning by liaison counsel a chart of the various state courts in which there are pending cases related to the MDL and also the particulars of each of those cases, including the presiding judge.

Upon the identification of the presiding judge, I have corresponded with -- and I think you all have been copied on it, liaison counsel -- with each of the state court judges in whose courts there is pending a related case.

I have not heard from any of the state court judges. I think the letter is self-explanatory. Indeed, Counsel even had input in preparing the letter in order to disclose what we're doing here generally, but the letter does invite any communication that a state court judge would like to have with me as the presiding judge in the MDL. I haven't heard from any of them, but if $I$ do, then we'll cover that. MS. BARRIOS: Yes, Your Honor.

This might be the appropriate point to discuss the fact that the defendants have pointed out to us that there were many duplicate cases filed around the country. We had some issues with some firms, and I'm very happy to report that all of those have been resolved that I know are outstanding.

I reached out to the defendants yesterday to ask
if there were any more duplicate case issues, and I haven't heard back from them, but I stand ready, willing, and able to get those resolved. I had offered on the prior round to do it, and they did it on their own; so, I can't take any credit for it. It was all through Chehardy and through the Shkolnik firm. THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BARRIOS: Since our last report in court, you've issued two pretrial orders. For the audience, all pretrial orders will be listed on Appendix A to the joint report when it's filed.

The pretrial orders that were entered since our last meeting was Pretrial Order 77A, which is the one that I had previously referred to regarding a streamline process for filing motions to remand California cases.

I think just this week you entered Pretrial Order 44 Amending, which replaced settlement counsel. Your Honor had appointed settlement counsel committees at the beginning of the litigation. New counsel will be Matthew Moriarty for Accord Healthcare, Inc., and Russell "Chip" Gaudreau for Sandoz, Inc. Mr. Gaudreau was also named as chair of the $505(\mathrm{~B})(2)$ Settlement Committee. THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BARRIOS: Moving on to Item 4, Case Management Orders, will be listed on Appendix B to this report when it's filed.

You issued Case Management Order 13 on March 9th, which set forth the four bellwether plaintiffs who will go up for the first trial, and they are listed in a ranking order that you had requested. For the record, those cases are Antoinette Durden, Tanya Francis, Barbara Earnest, and Lisa Tuyes, T-U-Y-E-S.

With regard to the plaintiffs for the second trial that were identified in Pretrial Order 8A, we've had a substitution for circumstances beyond anybody's control, and the Cazayoux case will be replaced by Kerry Bland's case.

Item Number 5, this is the pretrial order which is nearest and dearest to my heart, and that is the Counsel Contact Form. Anyone who files a new case in the MDL must follow Pretrial Order 7, complete the Counsel Contact Form.

That Counsel Contact Form gives us information regarding your case and the paralegal on the case, so when we communicate, we communicate both with the attorney and the paralegal.

We then give this list to BrownGreer. BrownGreer is the servicing agent, so if you don't send the Counsel Contact Form, then you will not receive any pleadings, and you will not receive any information from plaintiff liaison counsel.

Paragraph Number 6 is the Master Complaint and the Short Form Complaint. This is where anybody on the phone
needs to get out their pencils because I'm going to read record docs.

The Plaintiffs' First Amended Long Form Complaint was filed on July 25, which is Record Doc. 689. The defendants filed Master Answers. The Court then entered Pretrial Order 73, which is Record Doc. 1463, adopting the approved Short Form Complaint. So anyone who is to file a Complaint after January 2018 has to use the Complaint that is attached as Record Doc. 1463-1.

If you have filed the Complaint using the prior Short Form Complaint, you need not file an Amended Complaint just to take advantage of the new form.

The Clerk's Office, when they are logging in any Amended Complaints, will only pick up the defendant listed in the amending complaints. So if you had a case, in your initial complaint you had six defendants but in the Short Form Complaint as amended you only have two defendants, only two defendants will be listed in the Clerk's office.

We caution all plaintiffs' counsel, when they are filing the Short Form Complaint, to look at the Master Long Form Complaint because the Short Form Complaint incorporates causes of action and facts in the Plaintiffs' Master Complaint.

If a plaintiffs' counsel has additional causes of action arising under state law of that plaintiff, or whatever state law the choice of law provides, you must add that in to
the Short Form Complaint. We have only the causes of action approved by Judge Engelhardt, so if you have any other ones, you must list them.

If you need to file an Amended Complaint, and this arises oftentimes once counsel gets product IDs, it's very, very important to follow the Local Rule 7.6 and Pretrial Order 37A.

There is very specific steps that must be taken by counsel to effectuate the filing of an Amended Complaint. If those steps are not specifically taken, the Clerk's Office will issue a deficiency.

So please make note of the Court's Local Rule 7.6 and Pretrial Order 37A, which requires contact with the defendants in getting their approval and then ultimately doing the filing. If they don't approve it, it has to go in as an opposed motion.

The amendments to any complaint that requests a voluntary dismissal of all defendants without prejudice -these are plaintiffs who are going to dismiss the case but they don't want it to go away permanently, it's just without prejudice -- please be mindful of Pretrial Order 54, which is Record Doc. 671, because there are very, very specific rules that have to be followed.

Section 7 is a very lengthy section and deals with Plaintiff and Defendant Fact Sheets. There are several
different areas that I'm going to go through, and I would like to just tell everybody this is the part where you really, really pay attention because we're talking about your fact sheets. The defendants are known to file motions to dismiss because of failure to properly file and serve a Plaintiff Fact Sheet; so, plaintiffs' counsel, this is another place you get your pencil out.

There are certain pretrial orders that counsel should be aware of just out of the box on Plaintiff Fact Sheets. The first is Pretrial Order 18, which provides the form of the current Defendant Fact Sheet.

Amended Pretrial Order 22 sets forth the process for service of Plaintiff and Defendant Fact Sheets and the deadlines and deficiency process regarding those fact sheets.

Pretrial Order 23, which is Record Doc. 280, is the form of the authorizations that plaintiffs must file along with their Plaintiff Fact Sheet.

Pretrial Order 24 provides additional details on the service and the authorization that must be given through Centrality and the fact that all Plaintiff Fact Sheets and Defense Fact Sheets will be filed through and served through Centrality.

Although last, it's probably the most important for those plaintiffs who need to file something, it's Pretrial Order 55, which is Record Doc. 688, which is the
current form of the Plaintiff Fact Sheets. That can be found, the current form of the Plaintiff Fact Sheets, can be found at Record Doc. 236-1. It's also on the Court's website under Forms. It's also provided in Centrality.

Amended Pretrial Order 22, Your Honor, as well as ESI order -- Pretrial Order 71A, both of these orders contain staggering provisions. Now, if you recall in the staggering provisions in Amended Pretrial Order 22, if you had more than 25 fact sheets due on the same day, you've got to stagger the completion and service.

Likewise, in 71A, there is a staggering provision, but the number is increased to 50. There has been some -- not some, much dialogue between counsel on the proper method to count on staggering, and we are going to work with, hopefully, Jake Woody at Centrality to see if he can help us, because it's very difficult for them, the defendants, to understand how many cases are due on the same day, and in this time, we're doing our deficiencies on their Defense Fact Sheets, they have a staggering provision, and that's difficult for us.

The real difficulty is going to be for Your Honor to figure out what case is really subject to staggering. So we're going to work on that together to come up with a solution --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BARRIOS: -- that will help the Court and all the parties.

As of April 24, 2018, the plaintiffs have served 6,505 Plaintiff Fact Sheets. 1023 Plaintiff Fact Sheets are in progress.

Based upon the Plaintiff Fact Sheets received as of April 24th, the defendants named are as follows: Sanofi is named in 3,288 Plaintiff Fact Sheets, Hospira in 465, Sandoz in 194, Accord in 141 Plaintiff Fact Sheets, Sun in 1 Plaintiff Fact Sheet. Plaintiff Fact Sheets which indicates Unknown Manufacture is 1,164 fact sheets.

On the Plaintiff Fact Sheets, if the plaintiff's counsel leaves the answer to Who is your manufacturer blank, that's in 637, and counsel who list Other/Miscellaneous Manufacturers, that's 633.

We have advised all plaintiffs' counsel to be timely in the filing of their fact sheets and to file them completely to make sure they are substantially complete. We also continue to remind them about their ESI obligations, as well as Your Honor's guidance on the photographs that you counseled us need to be put into evidence in Centrality.

The next section, Your Honor, I would like to explain -- I'm sorry, Mr. Coffin, would you like to go now? MR. COFFIN: That would be fine.

Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt Ms. Barrios,
but as we discussed in the plaintiffs' steering committee in joint session with the defense counsel, we have come to a point where, from the plaintiff's side, we're feeling that the process for the PFS and the ESI documents has become very inefficient.

We are spending an inordinate amount of time, energy, and resources to get through that process, and then you stack on top of that the deficiency or alleged deficiency process, that is creating a lot of what we feel is unnecessary work on behalf of the parties and eventually on behalf of the Court, in some situations where cases are added to an Order to Show Cause and hundreds are then removed from that order because either they are cured or there was a mistake somewhere in the alleged deficiency made by the defendant.

So I know we've talked about this in the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee meeting, but as Mr. Lambert indicated in the meeting, we've heard from a number of plaintiffs' counsel. This has become an issue for us that is really leading to dismissals of cases for technical reasons, not because these plaintiffs don't have meritorious claims but because these women are feeling overburdened by having to file, you know, repeated responses to deficiencies when, in fact, they've actual actually met their burden.

I understand the defense has a different view of this, and Your Honor has instructed us that we need to sit down
and talk about whether or not we can reach other efficiencies. We are going to work on some solutions to that, but it's important for me to bring this up here in the open hearing so that you understand and those lawyers on the phone understand that this is an important issue to the PSC, and we're going to address it with the defendants.

THE COURT: Well, that's what I indicated in our committee meetings was that if there is a better way, a more efficient way to do this, then that's fine. You all need to discuss it with each other. If you can up with a common plan, then I'm all ears. I think there are multiple ways of doing this, and if there is one that's better, then let's do the one that works better for everybody.

I'm just reflecting on the time period when, at the outset, when we came up with the perfect Plaintiff Fact Sheet as designed by defendants and the perfect Defendants Fact Sheet as designed by plaintiffs, and the exercise at that time was for you all to come together and maybe do some horse-trading and some discussion and decide what it is that you truly need and maybe make some concessions.

Although I don't doubt that that process happened to some degree or another, it was ultimately left for the Court to decide, on both counts, what would be included on the fact sheets. So I rolled up my sleeves and made an evaluation and gave you what I thought were the fair fact sheet fields of
information, and so that's how we did it.
If you want to revisit that with opposing counsel, that's fine. If you want to change it, that's fine as well. I'm not going to simply reopen the process and hear arguments about what should and should not be on the fact sheet because I've already done that.

MR. COFFIN: Understood and we get that. It's just the reality of the inefficiency, especially of the deficiency process when there is over 2,000 alleged cases that are deficient, and then all of a sudden over 40 percent of those are removed from the list, and counsel is having to respond, because you've issued an Order to Show Cause, they have to respond to that, it's putting the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in a very bad spot because of the timing.

So, some of this, Your Honor, quite frankly, might just be able to be worked on it with a timing exercise.

THE COURT: Maybe so.
MR. COFFIN: Some of it may need to be in working on the core data, the core information that the defendants really need and, quite frankly, that the plaintiffs really need from the Defendants Fact Sheets, so I understand what you're saying.

We are going to sit down with the defense. I've already reached out with Mr. Ratliff to start that process, and we'll see if we can come to a solution together, and if we can't, then we'll come to you separate separately.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. COFFIN: Thank you.
THE COURT: I don't intend to revisit something that I've ruled on unless there is an error in my ways that you can show me, but if there is an idea that the fact sheets are -you can't come to an agreement on a better way to do the fact sheets, then we're going to live with the ones that I -- I've been through this already on the fact sheets, so it's going to have to be something new, whether it's timing, as you suggest, or whether it's a way to negotiate away some of the fields on both fact sheets.

Mr. Ratliff, did you want to --
MR. RATLIFF: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.
Harley Ratliff on behalf of Sanofi.
As Mr. Coffin mentioned, we did talk about this in the steering committee meeting, but since I have a broader audience for this meeting, one of the things I wanted to address was Mr. Coffin's statement about the inefficiencies of this process.

What I'll tell you, Your Honor, is the only inefficiency in the fact sheet process that we see right now is the failure, the ongoing failure of plaintiffs to complete even just the basic information in these fact sheets.

The reason that there are so many fact sheets that go or cases that go on that show-cause list is because we
have to review them, determine that they are deficient, send out those deficiency notices, and then the plaintiffs at the last second cure them to get off the show-cause list. They are given wide latitude to do this. All of this can be made more efficient by completing those fact sheets on the front end with the information that we're looking for.

One of the things that we have seen recently, and it's becoming a growing problem across the inventory, is the practice of attorneys submitting fact sheets that essentially have the name and address and that's it. That is the only information that is in the fact sheet, and we have hundreds of those. That really is just a mechanism by which we then have to issue a deficiency for the entire fact sheet, and it just buys those plaintiffs more time.

So my concern is when Mr. Coffin and the PSC say, "Well, this is really burdensome on us, this is really inefficient," what we're seeing is massive noncompliance with the fact sheet process, which, as I mentioned in the steering committee meeting, is our really only mechanism for learning about these plaintiffs, learning about the merits of their claims, learning about their medical history.

So when we see plaintiffs submitting by the hundreds fact sheets that have a name, an address, maybe two other boxes checked but all of the other information left blank just so they can meet that deadline, that is something that is
of very much concern to us and something that we anticipate -I think we've already raised it with PLC -- but we may be back before Your Honor seeking relief on that type of issue and a way to -- we talk about timing.

Right now we see a very long time period by which plaintiffs are given multiple avenues to cure these deficiencies, but when we see what seems to be negligence on the part of finishing these fact sheets, we may be wanting to revisit the schedule to compress that, to move those types of fact sheets directly to the end Show Cause Order to have those ruled on.

So we will talk with Ms. Barrios, with Mr. Coffin about this issue, but $I$ want to raise that not only for Your Honor but for all of the attorneys who are on this phone call, who are listening, who are having to complete these fact sheets that this is an issue that's out there, and we are very well aware of it.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. COFFIN: I think what Mr. Ratliff just said illustrates the point that we need to sit down and talk.

THE COURT: It's very Newtonian -- "For every action taken there is an opposite and equal reaction."

If I thought one of you would eventually sit down and agree with the other, I would go ahead and have what amounts to an oral argument.

I don't mean to bore you all with a childhood story, and I'm probably giving away my age: When I was a kid we collected football cards of football players, and at some point after the Brian's Song thing happened, everybody wanted a Gale Sayer's card. I didn't I have a Gale Sayer's card, but I had a couple of Fran Tarkentons and a couple of Dick Butkus cards.

So the endeavor became to see what it would take to pry the Gayle Sayer's card away from a friend of mine. Ultimately, we concocted some deal where $I$ had to throw in a Tommy Nobis card, and he threw in a Fran Tarkenton card, and somehow we got a deal, and I got a Gayle Sayer's card. I don't know where it is now.

At any rate, my point is: Find out what it is that is going to be satisfactory to both sides, whether it's more time on this or something else. You're going to have to be reasonable about it, and you're not going to get everything that you want, both sides, but you're going to have to start by sitting down and putting things on the table and finding out what the other side wants and seeing if there can be some type of an accommodation, is what I'm suggesting, is that there be an accommodation.

We can stay in our trenches, and like I said, we already did this exercise on the fact sheets. They were brought to me and put on my desk, I'm sure, with the best of
intentions, and I rolled up my sleeves and went through, and I take it that the response that both sides got was probably no like small amount of grumbling about what I had decided, but I did decide it and we moved on.

The fact that it's burdensome is probably -- they were probably burdensome when you first got my ruling, both sides. You didn't get exactly what you wanted. So, you know what, you come together, decide what fields are important, what's the best way to get the information, and get it efficiently and promptly and quickly and work on that basis.

The plaintiffs have the burden of proof in this case. Every time we try a bellwether, that's the one thing that's not going to change, and the plaintiffs who come to court come with a body of information about their claim that they will have to disclose certainly to opposing counsel whether it's through the normal discovery process, which we're trying to eliminate by making the fact sheets more complete.

Yes, they are burdensome, they are burdensome, but it's better than getting a list of interrogatories and multiple requests for production of documents individually over the next 16 months. Let's see if we can get everything together and give a packet.

I know it's burdensome, but that's the nature of litigation. When you expect compensation for a claim or when you expect to mount a defense in court, you participate in
discovery and it costly and it's burdensome. I don't know of any way -- I've not had a case here, since I've been doing this since 2001, that hasn't been burdensome to somebody.

MR. COFFIN: Those examples that Mr. Ratliff brought up, it would be difficult for me to defend somebody who puts their name and address. That's not what we're talking about. I think it's really more in the deficiency process and the nitpickiness of whether or not this woman straightened her hair three times a week versus two times a week or the examples of PTO 12 where there were alleged over 600 deficiencies, and they removed over 500 of those. That causes offices to scramble and be concerned.

THE COURT: Well, we've given a lot of cure opportunities, and I suspect that -- Mr. Ratliff, you don't need to stand up and deny that those are the examples of things.

I take it there is some middle ground where there is a fact sheet that has been filled out probably in good faith by plaintiffs' counsel, subject to the deadline, they submitted it, now has to go back and complete the exercise, which, yes, consumes time and resources, and it's either satisfactory or it isn't.

Ultimately, we have a mechanism that is the Show Cause Order to try to address where those efforts fall short. If there is a better way to do it, get together and
come up with it and I'm all ears. I'll be happy to sign an order that alters a process that we currently have that isn't working as well as we would like.

I have addressed fact sheets. I, frankly, thought at the outset, when I gave it to you all to come up with fact sheets at the outset of the MDL, my expectation was that you all would come together and say, "Here is the Plaintiffs' Fact Sheet that we are going to be using. Here is the Defendants' Fact Sheet." Instead, I got quite a divergence of what should be, so I resolved them.

MR. COFFIN: Understood. We'll get together and see what we can do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's going to take giving. It's going to take some giving and accommodation. I know you don't want to do that, and that's not the nature of the adversary process, but that's what it's going to take.

MR. COFFIN: I will be reluctant to give up my Drew Brees card but I'll talk to him about it.

MS. BARRIOS: No reaction from me, Your Honor. Opposite reaction.

Returning back to our process of the deficiencies, for those on the phone we have numerous appendices to every joint report. There is rhyme and reason to it, and I would like to explain that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BARRIOS: Sanofi has exhibits -- I mean, I'm sorry, Appendices C.9, D.9, and E.9. Those three relate to a plaintiff that did not file a fact sheet at all.

The second one is the plaintiff filed the fact sheet, the defendants provided a deficiency notice, and there has been no follow-up by plaintiff's counsel.

The third, shall we call them bucket, the third bucket is that situation where a plaintiff has not substantially completed the PFS as per the definition in Amended 22.

So those lists will be attached to the final joint report that is filed on either Friday or Monday. I apologize to the Court, no party was able to give you an exact number of those today.

That same process, numbering process in buckets follows for the $505(\mathrm{~b})(2)$ 's. They have Appendix F.9, G.9, and H.9. Those are the same three buckets that I just explained. No Plaintiff Fact Sheet filed, no response after deficiency notice, and then substantially incomplete Plaintiff Fact Sheets.

Appendix I.9, and this is some -- I don't want to say somewhat confusing. It's not exactly clear, but Exhibit I. 9 are the same cases that are on Show Cause Order Number 4. This causes great confusion, and this is what I alluded to in our conference, Your Honor.

I would like to work with Kelly Brilleaux and Nick Insogna, who works with me on this, to figure out an easier process because, essentially, what we're doing is we're doing the same two lists under two different names and giving it to Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BARRIOS: So I would like to work on that with them, but I think that I can say it's approximately 1,300 cases that would be on I.9. This is the appendix that I referred to as the guillotine appendix. This is the one you have the Show Cause for.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. BARRIOS: This is the first time that the plaintiffs have now pointed out deficiencies on the Defense Fact Sheet. We have three buckets, and our appendices are J.9, K.9, and L.9.

Under the first bucket, where -- I'm sorry, Your Honor, I just lost my place on here.

THE COURT: I'm following you on page 9.
MS. BARRIOS: I'm really on page 10.
THE COURT: Okay, maybe I'm not following you. Oh, you must have a different draft.

MS. BARRIOS: It's a draft. I'm sorry, yes,
Your Honor.
THE COURT: We're on Centrality on 10. This is the
earlier draft.
MS. BARRIOS: I apologize. Appendix J. 9 is our first bucket where no Defense Fact Sheet has been filed.

Appendix K.9 is where a Defense Fact Sheet has been filed, we have issued a deficiency, and there has been no response. These buckets, for everyone, are really the same as the defendants used. It's just the opposite way around.

Our last bucket is L.9, and that is where the defense believes that he's cured the deficiency, but we believe it hasn't cured the deficiency.

For everyone's knowledge, the Court has issued an order on the responses on the Order to Show Cause Number 2, and we have pending before you Number 3, and today we will file Number 4.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BARRIOS: I do appreciate all counsel's cooperation when Mr. Lambert and I send out numerous e-mails alerting them to deadlines, encouraging them to follow the deadlines and to complete everything, and we get a really good response, so I do want to thank everyone on the phone for that.

Paragraph Number 8 is MDL Centrality. For those who don't know what it is, it is a -- well, I wish I had Mr. Oot here -- a platform that all Plaintiff Fact Sheets and Defendant Fact Sheets are put on Centrality.

Each plaintiff has her own portal, so I can go to
every one of my plaintiff's portal and look at all of the information there. No one else can look at mine on the plaintiff side. So that is really important.

I got an e-mail this morning saying, "Okay, do I file my Plaintiff Fact Sheet in court?" No. Please look at Amended Pretrial Order 22. It gets filed on Centrality. They are very easy to work with. You can send an e-mail to Taxotere@BrownGreer to ask your question, and they'll be happy to set you up on a portal and get all of the information to you.

All the defendants have agreed that the records that they pick up from the various authorizations that are attached to the Plaintiff Fact Sheets are put in Centrality in every plaintiff's portal; however, there is a charge for that.

So each plaintiff must pay $\$ 25$ for all the records, and they will be unblinded, and each plaintiff will get everything that the defendant has picked up. We do appreciate the defendants' agreement on that, and we worked that out with Mr. Woody.

So please look on every one of your client's portals to see this little button that says Centrality $\$ 25$ due. That means that you put your credit card information in, and then you'll get the records that have already been collected.

For those of you who have filed complaints, the Short Form Complaint, please be advised that you must serve
your defendants. I have heard of issues from the defendants where counsel just file the Plaintiff Fact Sheet, and they don't do any service on it. So, for your convenience, Counsel, we have entered into different streamline service procedures.

For the domestic Sanofi entities that's in Pretrial Order 9, Record Doc. 160, if you get a product ID that says Winthrop, the correct defendant is sanofi-aventis U.S. LLC, and that is contained -- the streamline service for that entity is in PTO 9.

The other streamline service procedures for Accord Healthcare is PTO 2. For Sandoz, Inc., PTO 3. For Actavis Pharma, Inc., PTO 32A. Note that it was amended, so -the Pretrial Order was amended so it's 32A. For McKesson Pretrial Order 33. For Sun Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Pretrial Order 39A and for Hospira Worldwide and Pfizer, it's Pretrial Order 40A.

Our next item in the joint report is the Product Identification Order. This is an order that was negotiated by the parties over many, many months. It is very detailed so I warn plaintiffs' counsel out there that they must follow every step of paragraphs numbered 1 and 2 in the Pretrial Order.

The following paragraphs provide that if plaintiff issues the requisite information to a facility and that facility does not provide the product ID, they notify the defense, the defense -- I'm sorry, sends one letter identifying
themselves as the manufacturer of a docetaxel product in asking for the information on product ID.

Once the defendant gets that, it has to go to the plaintiffs. If the defendants don't get that, it also goes to the plaintiffs, but we've noticed that there is no time frame for that to happen.

It's important for counsel to know that the next step is that plaintiff can issue a subpoena to do the individual discovery necessary to find out the product ID if you didn't get the information from either the plaintiff's request for or the defendant's request.

THE COURT: Have we had to go through the subpoena route very often up to this point?

MS. BARRIOS: Oh, yes, sir.
THE COURT: And with a result that ultimately accomplishes the discovery of the product ID?

MS. BARRIOS: I'm sorry, I can't answer that because I just get copies of the subpoena. I don't know.

Do you know if the subpoenas have been productive?

MR. MOORE: I don't know the answer to that, Your Honor. We have been receiving subpoenas. I think the typing to begin issuing those subpoenas is upon us now, so I'm not even sure that any are returnable as of yet. But I know that they are going out, and then the process will follow from
there.
THE COURT: Okay. Good.
MS. BARRIOS: Assuming that the plaintiff get the product ID through the subpoena process or even having to file a Motion to Compel or a $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ in some facility, once that information is given, the plaintiff must go to her own portal and upload the product identification to the drop-down tab that says CMO 12, Product Identification.

Once the plaintiff gets the product identification, then they have to go through the dismissal process to dismiss the other defendants who they named in an abundance of caution.

We're currently negotiating with the defendants, and I think the negotiations are almost at end for an easy dismissal method that we will circulate, obviously, to all counsel. Ms. Anderson is going to work with the Clerk's Office to set up a special tab or form or whatever the Clerk's Office uses for these so they will fly through and not get a deficiency.

MR. MOORE: Douglas Moore on behalf of Sanofi.
Just very quickly, Your Honor, on the streamline process for affecting dismissals under CMO 12. Obviously the point of the order is to place these cases in the right defendant's bucket. The way that happens under the order, it was specified that the improperly named defendants would be
dismissed, but because of the other orders, PTOs, existing -you have 37 -- existing in the case, voluntary dismissals require consent of the defendants. We have received -- both named and unnamed.

We have received Consent Motions to Dismiss, Stipulations of Dismissals, Notice of Dismissals, requests just to amend the Short Form Complaint, all variety and manner of ways to accomplish what the goal of CMO 12 is.

We are trying our best on the defense side to timely respond to the requests for consent, but because they require some due diligence on our side if it's a stipulation, we've begun discussions on coming up with the streamline process where under the CMO that we would propose to the Court you won't be required to get consent from the defendants. So long as you follow the form we agree on, the consent is on the front end, and we hope that will make the process much more streamlined.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BARRIOS: Exactly. I think the language in it will indicate that the plaintiff is dismissing based upon the information received in CMO 12, so in the very unlikely event in the future that they find out it's the wrong defendant, we have some recourse to come back.

THE COURT: Right. Okay.
MS. BARRIOS: Item number 11 is the Preservation Order.

The Preservation Order came out in Your Honor's very first pretrial order, and everyone who practices in any court knows the rules about preservation, so I'm not going to go into any more details.

Judge North entered a Protective Order, which is Pretrial Order 50. I would like to take this opportunity, since I mentioned his name, to thank Judge North because he has handled some very contentious matters and handled them in a way that provides very practical results on all occasions.

We met with him yesterday. We have some further briefing to do, and we already have another date -- I think it's March 5th -- that we will meet with him, and we do appreciate that.

THE COURT: Yes, I know he's expended a considerable amount of time and energy on this case on a variety of fronts, and the Court certainly appreciates that as well.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor.
Item Number 13 is Electronically Stored Information. Every plaintiff must understand that the Plaintiff Fact Sheets and the requests for production requires that the plaintiff provide certain electronically stored information.

The Court entered, at the defendant's request, Pretrial Order 70, I'm sorry, 71, and we, by consent, amended it, 71A, to provide additional time for the plaintiffs.

This information is information that is important for the Court. It's important for the plaintiffs to follow this procedure. It's important information that the defendants believes it needs, whether through litigation or through settlement.

Plaintiffs' counsel, please note that you have to upload the statement that must be made under Pretrial Order 71A under the drop-down tab Pretrial Order 71A ESI. Because if not, it gets lost in all of the information in everybody's portals, and I know the defendants oftentimes are upset that things are not put in the correct -- on the correct portal, so I just ask people in advance to do it that way.

Item Number 14 is the Discovery of the Defendants and the Trial Case Discovery that has gone on to date. The plaintiffs have taken approximately 20 depositions of Sanofi custodians and sales and marketing representatives.

The four trial plaintiffs identified in CMO 13, the four women whose names I mentioned earlier are in the Phase Two discovery process, and there are depositions being taken of different relatives, anyone who the defendant thinks may have relevant information.

There is also written discovery that went out to these plaintiffs, and there have been more than 30 depositions with the first pool of trial plaintiffs, so that has gone along.

As for the second round of plaintiffs, plaintiffs served merit discovery on Accord Healthcare, Hospira/Pfizer defendants, and Sandoz. We have begun to receive production, and we're in the process of working on search terms so that we can begin the electronic receipt of their documents.

Item 15 is Motion Practice. There are actually only two motions that are currently fully briefed and awaiting rulings for Your Honor. The first is the Motion to Remand the Ernyes-Kofler and MaCallister cases to Delaware. Your Honor, that is Record Doc. 473. The plaintiffs have filed supplementals, the defendants have opposed, and we have gone back and forth, but that is all fully briefed and awaiting your ruling.

The second motion is the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss based upon CMO 12, failure to provide product ID. This is one of the motions that Mr. Coffin was referencing.

The defendants filed, I think, 674 plaintiffs on that Motion to Dismiss list. They sent the list, as is customarily done, to Mr. Lambert and myself, we reach out to plaintiffs, and we were able to convince the defendants that over 500 of these 674 actually had product ID on their Centrality portal, but it was not uploaded to the correct tab.

The situation that has occurred, Your Honor, is that people put, my office included, people put their product identification up on a tab that you can label prior to
identification before CMO 12 came out. So although it was there when the defendants ran a report on Centrality to see what was under that special tab, they got the 674.

So, we have been working together, and I appreciate all of the plaintiffs' counsel who consistently answer Mr. Lambert and myself, because what we want to do is take people who should not be on the list and take them off so Your Honor doesn't have to rule on them and so they don't have to file very lengthy responses in the court.

MR. MOORE: Real quickly, Your Honor. Douglas Moore on behalf of Sanofi.

The 522 cases that Ms. Barrios refers to are cases that we identified as not having uploaded product ID information or having sent us an e-mail telling us they've been unable to obtain it, which was required under CMO 12.

When we learn from Ms. Barrios that those plaintiffs did, in fact, have product ID, they just hadn't uploaded it because they had gotten it before the entry of CMO 12, we agreed to remove them from our motion and ask the Court for different relief, not to dismiss them but to order them to actually put the product ID information in the right place. I believe they have all done it now anyway.

THE COURT: Okay. So that leaves a remainder of how many that are subject to this motion?

MS. BARRIOS: 152, Your Honor.

THE COURT: 152.
MS. BARRIOS: Since this was done in mid-March, it may very well be that many of these plaintiffs have already done that. With Your Honor's permission, I'm happy to send out a reminder to them and see if we can even reduce this 152 down.

THE COURT: Okay. Yeah, please do because that's a motion that $I$ think $I$ have in a binder in my office right now.

MS. BARRIOS: That's the first big binder you got.
THE COURT: In light of our conversation at our liaison counsel meeting, I haven't delved into that yet, but now with the update today, let's go ahead and see if we can go ahead and complete the product ID exercise and uploading of information. MS. BARRIOS: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. COFFIN: Your Honor, could I just make a brief point on this? This is a good illustration here. I'm going to personally talk about my office.

104 of those cases that were in that motion were from my office. It took my staff about four days to go back and figure out for the defense that we actually had uploaded the information. So what Mr. Moore said isn't exactly correct. We had uploaded the correct information; it's just that they didn't look in the correct place.

So this is where kind of the efficiency, you know, burdensome stuff starts to come in. I'm speaking personally for me now. 104 of the cases in my office did have
product ID, and we spent all of that time. That's not an exaggeration. I can image what other plaintiffs' attorneys' staff are going through, because I've had to go through it. Now, I only say that because I wanted to correct the record. We had uploaded that information, but we're going to work it out with them, as Ms. Barrios and Mr. Moore said. That's the kind of thing that we need to sit down and talk about and we will, but I can't stand here and let him say that we didn't --

THE COURT: Would it not have been easier to just pick up the phone or send an e-mail and say, "Where are these?"

MR. COFFIN: I think they tried.
THE COURT: I can enter an order that says, Counsel shall look in the right place for this, that and the other." Here we are with, again, the Newtonian principle.

MR. MOORE: Equal reaction, right. We did look in the right place. The product ID documentation was under a different area.

We can only know product ID -- part of the reason we created CMO 12 was to have the specific information that we identified in CMO 12 as being sufficient to establish product ID. We can only identify that if it's in the proper place on MDL Centrality.

The place he's referring to as the other place, it was a proof of use. In some of those uploads, there were
two or three pages; in others, there were 800 pages of chemotherapy records that we would have had to sort through to figure that out.

At the end of the day, even though we filed a motion on it, we now have what we think we're entitled to under CMO 12, and this was the only time that was going to happen, was the first time, because those 522 cases were already possessing a product ID before CMO 12 was be entered. No one else is going to fall into that category moving forward. They are either going to comply with the order or they are going to be like this other 157 other people who just didn't do it at all.

MR. OLINDE: Your Honor, I have one comment there, which is that CMO 12 is a negotiated order. It is says where it is that things need to be placed. In these cases, it was not in the right place, so that's why they got put on a list. They didn't do what the order agreed upon. We all talked about it; we said it together. It was not in the proper place.

THE COURT: Well, I hope I'm not incorrect in saying this, but in light of this experience, we all know where to look, where to post, so we don't have to have this conversation again.

MS. BARRIOS: No reaction from me; although, I would like to give one.

MR. BACHUS: Your Honor, Kyle Bachus.

We have a hundred of those cases that are left on the list, and the representation that was made about those is not accurate because what actually happened there is that all of those product IDs -- all the requests for product ID had been made before CMO 12 was ever entered.

There was a mix-up on lists, and there was a delay in e-mailing them notice for them to do their part. So, I mean, really, you're probably down to less than 25 cases, so long as we can work that piece out.

They now know that we made the request for product ID, that we were unable to get it. We asked them to make their request; yet, they wouldn't remove them from the list of cases that is pending before Your Honor right now. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Bachus. MS. BARRIOS: In light of all these comments, I'm going to make it happen. I'm going to get these people to move it in the right place and reduce the numbers.

Item 16 is the Settlement Committees. I don't believe the Plaintiffs' Settlement Committee representative is here. I don't know if Mr. Strongman wants to make any mention. MR. STRONGMAN: I have nothing specific to report at this time.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BARRIOS: I do appreciate that Your Honor said in, I think, in the second-to-last liaison counsel meeting that if
the settlement committees wanted to talk to you at all, just to provide you with some dates and times and you would be available. We appreciate that.

THE COURT: That will be fine. I'll coordinate with Judge Milazzo so that if we do have need to convene a meeting, either with the representatives or with the entire committees, I'd be happy to do that and that's fine.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor.
Item 17 is the Special Master for Plaintiffs'
Time and Expenses, and we're honored to have Special Master DeJean.

THE COURT: Mr. DeJean, did you have anything you wanted to report to us?

SPECIAL MASTER DEJEAN: Your Honor, if I could just report a few things essentially for people who may be on the telephone.

Your Honor, I've completed an overall review of the time portion of everything, and I'm now doing the official audit. I wanted to give everybody a notice that they will be getting e-mails. If you've done work, you will be getting e-mails pointing out either questions that I have, deficiencies or rejection of time with reasons.

If you get one, nobody is going to the penalty box. I ask that they not overreact. Simply pick up the phone, e-mail me, do what we can to try to work these out, and we'll
move forward with them. So, it's progressing is nicely. The program is working fine.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Does anybody have any question for Mr. DeJean at this point? Anybody present here? Okay. Thank you.

SPECIAL MASTER DEJEAN: Your Honor, I did meet with the PSC yesterday, so they had various questions at that time, and we resolved some of those.

THE COURT: Ms. Barrios, anything further?
MS. BARRIOS: The only thing to add to what the Special Master said, once he gets to a point where he has a specific time period done, official letters will go out to everyone as the Pretrial Order requires, so that will be going out within the next 30 to 60 days.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BARRIOS: The last item is the date of our next status conference. You've given counsel three different dates in June and we respectfully ask --

THE COURT: Judge Milazzo.
JUDGE MILAZZO: I just have to find out the dates.
MS. BARRIOS: The dates are June 15th, 22nd, and June 29th.

THE COURT: Those are all Fridays. Again, subject to Judge Milazzo's availability, if you all want to canvas your respective sides and pick one of those three that is best for
everyone, that's fine. If those three don't work out, then let us know that, and we'll try to offer you a couple of others that, perhaps, will be more convenient.

MS. BARRIOS: Sure. Thank you.
JUDGE MILAZZO: I am available on 15th and the 29th, but I would prefer the 15th.

MS. BARRIOS: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor. We'll try to make that happen.

THE COURT: The 15th is the preferred date. If you all can work with that one first, that would be appreciated.

Anything further?
MS. BARRIOS: No, just to state for the record, the 22nd will be off the table, Judge Milazzo, and then the fallback will be the 29th.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Moore would you like to follow up?

MR. MOORE: Yes. Just one point of clarification. When Ms. Barrios talked about the duplicate filed cases, and she indicated that the issue was resolved, that there is an issue with a firm in particular, that is correct.

The motion remains pending. We continued the submission date so that we can affect the resolution that we are working out, but it was -- I was asked to mention that there are other duplicate filed cases that we are identifying and that we will work with plaintiffs' liaison counsel to clean
up.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Moore. Mr. Olinde, anything?

MR. OLINDE: John Olinde, the defense 505 (b) (2) liaison, and I want to thank Ms. Barrios for the joint report.

One thing she had mentioned with regard to this one plaintiff in the second trial pool, who is Priscilla Cazayoux, it was mentioned it was beyond anyone's control that the case was dismissed.

We don't know from the defense side what the reason for the dismissal was. It was a case which was selected by the 505 (b) (2) defendant, who is Sandoz, and a replacement through an unopposed motion, a replacement case which was mentioned is before Your Honor as an unopposed motion to have that case instead of the Cazayoux case.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
Does anybody have any questions or comments about anything we have already covered at this point? MR. EXNICIOS: If I may, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. Come on up.
For purposes of the record, if you could identify yourself, please. I know who you are, but I want to make sure --

MR. EXNICIOS: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Val Exnicios on behalf of the plaintiffs.

Your Honor, the Plaintiff Fact Sheet issue has obviously consumed a considerable amount of Your Honor's time this morning, and I don't wish to add to that burden, much less incur your wrath by doing so.

By the same token, I wanted to share with Your Honor and maybe even more importantly for the defendants' edification, it's my understanding, Judge, that there is a growing perception amongst plaintiffs' counsel across the country that the Plaintiff Fact Sheer in this particular case is being perceived as one of the most onerous in MDL litigation, the practical effect of which is discouraging lawyers from joining in this MDL and, instead, inducing them to litigate their cases in state court.

To the extent that defendants have an interest in cumulating as many as these cases as possible here before Your Honor, or Judge Milazzo as the case may be later, perhaps they may want to consider that disincentive versus whatever perceived benefit they may think is available to them from dismissals via purported technical difficulties or deficiencies or what have you.

So, I'm not suggesting, Your Honor, that anecdotal information is accurate, but it's being reported to me as a perception, and to the extent that people believe what they hear and they act upon it, that has a negative result in cumulating as many of these actions as possible before this
court, I want to share that both with Your Honor and also for the defendants' edification.

Thank you very much, Judge. THE COURT: Thank you.

Counsel?
MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Exnicios. That was something, I think, that was mentioned to me anecdotally by Mr. Palmar recently not with respect to the fact sheet.

We believe the fact sheet is reasonable. It was not everything that we asked for. It will be comparable to what we request the courts in New Jersey and Delaware to use, in the event we proceed with consolidated proceedings in those state jurisdictions. It will be significantly less than the written discovery that a plaintiff would have underwent if they would have litigated their case in their home jurisdiction.

We understand the concern. We are aware of the desire to place cases in an MDL and then not have to go through this process, but we think it's an important one. We think that the fact sheet that the Court, although it was not everything that we asked for, we think it's entirely reasonable and certainly consistent with fact sheets that have been entered in numerous other MDLs involving pharmaceutical products.

I make that comment. We will take Mr. Exnicios' comments into consideration in our decision-making with them
when we talk about the fact sheet, but I did want to state that we do believe, having done MDLs my entire career, that this fact sheet is comparable, that it's not more burdensome or more onerous than what is typically employed in an MDL of this nature.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Moore. Anybody else?

Does anybody have any issue or comment about something that has not yet been covered here today? Anything new?

Okay. I appreciate all the work that's been done on this, and I understand a lot of the vexations. We're probably at the point in the MDL where I think this is a fairly -- at least in the ones I've had and the ones I'm very familiar with in this building handled by others, I think that we're probably at a point where a lot of these issues are starting to come to a head in terms of fact sheet, the backlog, show cause, discovery. Some of the burdens of getting the work done are starting to catch up, so I appreciate the constraints you all are operating under and, you know, the efforts that you're putting forth to meet these deadlines.

We did have a conversation this morning, which hasn't come up here today -- is there some way I can talk without it hurting people's ears other than changing my voice? All right. It's still kind of an echo. I feel like I'm in
cave. All right. That's better. That's better.
We did have a conversation this morning in an attempt to address the first bellwether trial and its date. We had a lengthy conversation about that, both with liaison counsel as well as with the committees, and so I'll await further word.

Again, I expect there to be some concessions -some degree of concession on both sides in order to accomplish what we want to accomplish, particularly with regard to getting that first bellwether to trial, whether it's in September or whether it's in January.

There were some issues that came up with regard to that I was unhappy to hear, but I'm certain they can be addressed and resolved either with counsel's cooperation or by the Court in the event that counsel are unable to come up with a comprehensive plan. I didn't think it was going to be that complicated, but apparently there are some other issues that have arisen, so keep working on that.

If there are no other questions, we'll go ahead and adjourn for the day.

All right. Thank you all very much. MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor. THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. (WHEREUPON, at 11:21 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.)
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| 42:19, 42:21, 43:8, 44:4, 44:11 <br> PRODUCT ${ }_{[1]}-6: 15$ production [3] - $26: 20,37: 20,39: 3$ <br> productive [1] - 34:20 <br> Products [1]-7:11 <br> PRODUCTS [1]-1:4 <br> products [1] - 50:23 <br> program [1]-46:2 <br> progress [1]-18:5 <br> progressing [1] - 46:1 <br> promptly [1] - 26:10 <br> proof [2]-26:11, <br> 42:25 <br> proper [4] - 10:6, $17: 13,42: 22,43: 18$ <br> properly [2]-7:23, 16:5 <br> propose [1] - 36:13 <br> PROTECTIVE [1] - <br> 6:17 <br> Protective [1] - 37:5 <br> provide [6] - 33:22, 33:24, 37:21, 37:25, $39: 15,45: 2$ <br> provided [2]-17:4, 29:5 <br> provider ${ }_{[1]}-8: 20$ <br> provides [5]-9:25, <br> 14:25, 16:10, 16:18, 37:9 <br> provision [2]-17:12, 17:19 <br> provisions [2] - 17:7, $17: 8$ <br> pry [1] - 25:9 <br> PSC [3]-20:5, 23:15, 46:7 <br> PTO [5] - 27:10, 33:9, 33:11, 33:12 <br> PTOs [1] - 36:1 <br> published [1]-10:20 <br> purported [1] - 49:19 <br> purposes [1] - 48:21 <br> pursuant [2] - 10:16, <br> 11:2 <br> put [10]-18:21, 25:25, <br> 31:24, 32:13, 32:22, <br> 38:11, 39:24, 40:21, <br> 43:16 <br> puts [1]-27:5 <br> putting [3]-21:13, <br> 25:19, $51: 21$ <br> questions [7]-7:20, $9: 5,9: 8,45: 21,46: 7$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 48:17, 52:19 } \\ \text { quickly }[3]-26: 10, \\ 35: 21,40: 10 \\ \text { quite }[3]-21: 15, \\ 21: 20,28: 9 \end{gathered}$R <br>  <br> RACHEL $[1]-2: 8$ <br> raise $[1]-24: 13$ <br> raised $[1]-24: 2$ <br> ran $[1]-40: 2$ <br> RAND $_{[1]}-2: 12$ <br> ranking $[1]-13: 3$ <br> rate $[1]-25: 14$ <br> rather $[1]-8: 16$ <br> RATLIFF $[2]-4: 3$, <br> $22: 13$ <br> Ratliff $[6]-21: 23$, <br> $22: 12,22: 14,24: 19$, <br> $27: 4,27: 14$ <br> RAZMARA $[1]-3: 7$ <br> re $[1]-7: 11$ <br> RE $[1]-1: 4$ <br> reach $[2]-20: 1,39: 19$ <br> reached $[2]-11: 25$, <br> $21: 23$ <br> reaction $[5]-24: 22$, <br> $28: 19,28: 20,42: 16$, <br> 43:23 <br> read $[2]-8: 20,14: 1$ <br> ready $[1]-12: 2$ <br> real $[3]-8: 20,17: 21$, <br> $40: 10$ <br> reality $[1]-21: 8$ <br> really $[1]]-10: 9,16: 2$, <br> $16: 3,17: 22,19: 19$, <br> $21: 19,21: 20,23: 12$, <br> $23: 16,23: 19,27: 7$, <br> $30: 20,31: 6,31: 19$, <br> $32: 3,44: 8$ <br> REALTIME $[1]-5: 14$ <br> Realtime $[2]-53: 3$, <br> $53: 12$ <br> reason $[5]-7: 25$, <br> $22: 24,28: 23,42: 19$, <br> $48: 11$ <br> reasonable $[3]-$ <br> $25: 17,50: 9,50: 20$ <br> reasons $[2]-19: 19$, <br> $45: 22$ <br> receipt $[1]-39: 5$ <br> receive $[3]-13: 21$, <br> $13: 22,39: 3$ <br> received $[4]-18: 6$, <br> $36: 3,36: 5,36: 21$ <br> receiving $[1]-34: 22$ <br> recently $[2]-23: 7$, <br> $50: 8$ | ```recognize \({ }_{[1]}-8: 24\) record \([7]\) - 7:9, 13:4, 14:1, 42:5, 47:12, 48:21, 53:8 Record [9] - 14:4, 14:6, 14:9, 15:22, 16:15, 16:25, 17:3, 33:6, 39:10 RECORDED [1] - 5:18 records [4]-32:11, 32:16, 32:23, 43:2 recourse [1] - \(36: 23\) reduce [2]-41:5, 44:17 REESE [1] - 4:22 referencing [1] - 39:16 referred [2]-12:13, 30:9 referring \({ }_{[1]}\) - 42:24 refers [1]-40:12 reflecting \({ }_{[1]}\) - 20:14 regard [5] - 9:23, 13:7, 48:6, 52:9, 52:12 regarding [4]-10:4, 12:13, 13:16, 16:14 REGISTERED \({ }_{[1]}\) - 5:15 Registered [1] - 53:3 registered [1]-53:13 regular [1]-10:21 rejection [1] - 45:22 relate [1]-29:2 related \([3]-7: 18\), 11:5, 11:11 RELATES \({ }_{[1]}\) - \(1: 8\) relatives [1] - 38:20 relevant [1] - 38:21 relief [2] - 24:3, 40:20 reluctant [1]-28:17 remainder [1] - 40:23 remains [1]-47:21 remand [4]-9:24, 10:5, 11:1, 12:14 Remand [1] - 39:8 remind [1] - 18:19 reminder \({ }_{[1]}\) - 41:5 removal [1]-9:18 remove [2]-40:19, 44:12 removed [3] - 19:12, 21:11, 27:11 reopen [1]-21:4 repeated [1] - 19:22 replaced [2] - 12:16, 13:10 replacement [2] - 48:12, 48:13 Report [1] - 8:3``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { REPORT }{ }_{[1]}-6: 4 \\ & \text { report }[19]-8: 4,8: 10, \\ & 8: 14,8: 17,9: 1,9: 3, \\ & 9: 8,11: 23,12: 7, \\ & 12: 9,12: 24,28: 23, \\ & 29: 12,33: 17,40: 2, \\ & 44: 21,45: 13,45: 15, \\ & 48: 5 \\ & \text { reported }[1]-49: 22 \\ & \text { Reporter }[7]-53: 3, \\ & 53: 4,53: 5,53: 12, \\ & 53: 13,53: 13 \\ & \text { REPORTER }[3]-5: 14, \\ & 5: 14,5: 15 \\ & \text { REPORTER'S }[1]- \\ & 53: 1 \\ & \text { representation }[1]- \\ & 44: 2 \\ & \text { representative }[1]- \\ & 44: 19 \\ & \text { representatives }[2]- \\ & 38: 16,45: 6 \\ & \text { request }[6]-34: 11, \\ & 37: 23,44: 10,44: 12, \\ & 50: 11 \\ & \text { requested }[2]-10: 13, \\ & 13: 4 \\ & \text { requests }[6]-15: 17, \\ & 26: 20,36: 6,36: 10, \\ & 37: 20,44: 4 \\ & \text { require }[2]-36: 3, \\ & 36: 11 \\ & \text { required }[2]-36: 14, \\ & 40: 15 \\ & \text { requires }[3]-15: 13, \\ & 37: 20,46: 13 \\ & \text { requisite }[1]-33: 23 \\ & \text { resolution }[1]-47: 22 \\ & \text { resolved }[6]-11: 24, \\ & 12: 3,28: 10,46: 8, \\ & 47: 19,52: 14 \\ & \text { resources }[2]-19: 7, \\ & 27: 21 \\ & \text { respect }[1]-50: 8 \\ & \text { respectfully }[1]- \\ & 46: 18 \\ & \text { respective }[1]-46: 25 \\ & \text { respond }[3]-21: 11, \\ & 21: 13,36: 10 \\ & \text { responded }[1]-7: 24 \\ & \text { response }[4]-26: 2, \\ & 29: 18,31: 6,31: 19 \\ & \text { responses }[3]-19: 22, \\ & 31: 12,40: 9 \\ & \text { result }[2]-34: 15, \\ & 49: 24 \\ & \text { results }[1]-37: 9 \\ & \text { returnable }[1]-34: 24 \\ & \text { returning }[1]-28: 21 \\ & \text { review }[2]-23: 1, \\ & \text { a } \end{aligned}$ | ```45:17 \\ revisit [3]-21:2, 22:3, 24:9 \\ rhyme [1]-28:23 \\ rise [2]-7:7, 52:23 \\ RMR [2] - 5:14, 53:12 \\ ROAD [2] - 4:12, 4:20 \\ rolled [2]-20:24, 26:1 \\ ROOM \({ }_{[1]}\) - \(5: 15\) \\ ROUEN [1] - 4:23 \\ round [2]-12:3, 39:1 \\ route [1]-34:13 \\ rule [1] - 40:8 \\ Rule [3] - 10:17, 15:6, 15:12 \\ ruled [2] - 22:4, 24:11 \\ rules [2]-15:22, 37:3 \\ ruling \({ }_{[2]}-26: 6,39: 13\) \\ rulings [1] - 39:8 \\ Russell [1] - 12:20``` <br> S <br> s/Cathy [1]-53:11 <br> sales [1] - 38:16 <br> SANDOZ ${ }_{[1]}-4: 18$ <br> Sandoz [5] - 12:20, <br> 18:8, 33:11, 39:3, <br> 48:12 <br> sanofi [1] - 33:8 <br> Sanofi [7]-18:7, <br> 22:14, 29:1, 33:5, <br> 35:20, 38:15, 40:11 <br> sanofi-aventis [1] - <br> 33:8 <br> satisfactory ${ }_{[2]}$ - <br> 25:15, 27:21 <br> Sayer's [4]-25:5, 25:9, 25:12 <br> SCHANKER [1] - 2:22 <br> schedule [1] - 24:9 <br> scramble [1] - 27:11 <br> search [1] - 39:4 <br> seated [1]-7:8 <br> second [7]-13:7, <br> 23:3, 29:4, 39:1, <br> 39:14, 44:25, 48:7 <br> second-to-last [1] - <br> 44:25 <br> section [3] - 15:24, <br> 18:22 <br> see [13]-17:15, <br> 21:24, 22:21, 23:22, <br> 24:5, 24:7, 25:8, <br> 26:21, 28:11, 32:21, <br> 40:2, 41:5, 41:11 <br> seeing [2] - 23:17, 25:20 <br> seeking [3] - 9:23, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```10:21, 24:3 selected [1] - 48:11 self \([1]\) - 11:13 self-explanatory [1] - 11:13 send \([7]-10: 7,13: 20\), 23:1, 31:17, 32:7, 41:4, 42:11 sends [1]-33:25 sent [2] - 39:18, 40:14 separate [1]-21:25 separately [1] - 21:25 September [1] - 52:10 serve [2] - 16:5, 32:25 served [3]-16:21, 18:3, 39:2 service [8]-8:20, 16:13, 16:19, 17:10, 33:3, 33:4, 33:9, 33:10``` SERVICE ${ }_{[1]}-6: 14$ servicing [1]-13:20 session [1] - 19:2 set $[4]-10: 14,13: 2$, 32:9, 35:17 sets [1]-16:12 SETTLEMENT ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6:21 settlement [4]-12:16, 12:17, 38:5, 45:1 Settlement [3]-12:21, 44:18, 44:19 setup [1] - 7:19 several [4]-7:14, 7:15, 8:12, 15:25 severance [1] - 10:5 shall [2] - 29:7, 42:14 share [2]-49:5, 50:1 Sheer [1] - 49:9 Sheet [15] - 16:6, 16:11, 16:17, 18:10, 20:16, 20:17, 28:8, 28:9, 29:18, 30:15, 31:3, 31:4, 32:5, 33:2, 49:1 sheet [15]-20:25, 21:5, 22:21, 23:11, 23:13, 23:18, 27:18, 29:3, 29:5, 50:8, 50:9, 50:19, 51:1, 51:3, 51:17 Sheets [21]-15:25, 16:10, 16:13, 16:20, 16:21, 17:1, 17:2, 17:19, 18:4, 18:6, 18:8, 18:9, 18:10, 18:12, 21:21, 29:20, 31:23, 31:24, 32:13, 37:20 sheets [23]-16:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:14, 17:9, 18:11, } \\ & \text { 18:17, 20:24, 22:5, } \\ & 22: 7,22: 8,22: 11, \\ & 22: 23,22: 24,23: 5, \\ & 23: 9,23: 23,24: 8, \\ & 24: 10,24: 16,25: 24, \\ & 26: 17,28: 4,28: 6, \\ & 50: 21 \end{aligned}$ <br> SHEETS................ [1] <br> -6:12 <br> SHKOLNIK [3]-2:7, <br> 2:7, 2:8 <br> Shkolnik [1] - 12:5 <br> SHOOK ${ }_{[2]}$ - 4:3, 4:6 <br> short [1]-27:25 <br> SHORT [1]-6:11 <br> Short $[9]$ - 13:25, 14:7, <br> 14:11, 14:16, 14:20, <br> 14:21, 15:1, 32:25, <br> 36:7 <br> Show [7]-19:12, <br> 21:12, 24:10, 27:24, <br> 29:23, 30:10, 31:12 <br> show [4]-22:5, 22:25, <br> 23:3, 51:18 <br> show-cause [2] - $22: 25,23: 3$ <br> side [6] - 19:3, 25:20, <br> 32:3, 36:9, 36:11, <br> 48:10 <br> sides [6] - 25:15, <br> 25:18, 26:2, 26:7, <br> 46:25, 52:8 <br> $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i g n }}[1]-28: 1$ <br> significantly [1] - <br> 50:13 <br> SIMMONS [1] - 2:19 <br> simply [2]-21:4, <br> 45:24 <br> sit [5]-19:25, 21:22, <br> 24:20, 24:23, 42:7 <br> sitting [1] - 25:19 <br> situation [2]-29:8, <br> 39:23 <br> situations [1] - 19:11 <br> six [3] - 10:24, 14:16 <br> sleeves [2]-20:24, <br> 26:1 <br> slightly ${ }_{[1]}-8: 15$ <br> small [1]-26:3 <br> solution [2] - 17:24, <br> 21:24 <br> solutions [1] - 20:2 <br> somewhat [1] - 29:22 <br> somewhere [1] - <br> 19:13 <br> Song [1]-25:4 <br> sorry [8] - 18:23, <br> 18:25, 29:1, 30:17, <br> 30:23, 33:25, 34:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 37:24 } \\ & \text { sort }[1]-43: 2 \\ & \text { speaking }[1]-41: 24 \\ & \text { special }[4]-8: 9,9: 25, \\ & 35: 17,40: 3 \\ & \text { SPECIAL }_{[4]}-5: 11, \\ & 6: 22,45: 14,46: 6 \\ & \text { Special }[4]-8: 10, \\ & 45: 9,45: 11,46: 11 \\ & \text { specific }[5]-15: 8, \\ & 15: 22,42: 20,44: 21, \\ & 46: 12 \\ & \text { specifically }[1]-15: 10 \\ & \text { specified }[1]-35: 25 \\ & \text { spending }[1]-19: 6 \\ & \text { spent }[1]-42: 1 \\ & \text { spot }[1]-21: 14 \\ & \text { stack }[1]-19: 8 \\ & \text { staff }[2]-41: 18,42: 3 \\ & \text { stagger }[1]-17: 9 \\ & \text { staggering }[6]-17: 7, \\ & 17: 11,17: 14,17: 19, \\ & 17: 22 \\ & \text { stand }[3]-12: 2, \\ & 27: 15,42: 8 \\ & \text { start }[2]-21: 23,25: 18 \\ & \text { started }[1]-8: 2 \\ & \text { starting }[2]-51: 17, \\ & 51: 19 \\ & \text { starts }[1]-41: 24 \\ & \text { State }[1]-53: 4 \\ & \text { STATE }[1]-5: 4 \\ & \text { state }[18]-7: 17,8: 12, \\ & 9: 6,9: 19,9: 20,10: 8, \\ & 10: 9,10: 18,11: 5, \\ & 11: 10,11: 12,11: 16, \\ & 14: 24,14: 25,47: 12, \\ & 49: 13,50: 13,51: 1 \\ & \text { statement }[2]-22: 18, \\ & 38: 7 \\ & \text { STATES }[2]-1: 1,1: 12 \\ & \text { States }[2]-53: 5, \\ & 53: 14 \\ & \text { status }[3]-7: 9,10: 14, \\ & 46: 17 \\ & \text { STATUS }[2]-1: 11, \\ & 6: 23 \\ & \text { stay }[1]-25: 23 \\ & \text { steering }[3]-19: 1, \\ & 22: 16,23: 18 \\ & \text { STEERRING }[2]-1: 15, \\ & 3: 20 \\ & \text { Steering }[2]-19: 16, \\ & 21: 13 \\ & \text { STENOGRAPHY } \\ & 5: 18 \\ & \text { step }[2]-33: 21,34: 8 \\ & \text { steps }[2]-15: 8,15: 10 \\ & \text { still }[2]-10: 3,51: 25 \\ & \text { stipulation }[1]-36: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\qquad$ STORED [1] - 6:18 $\text { stored }[1]-37: 21$ $\text { story }[1]-25: 2$ straightened [1] - 27:8 <br> streamline [6] - 12:13, 33:4, 33:9, 33:10, $35: 21,36: 12$ <br> streamlined [1] 36:17 <br> STREET [15] - 1:16, 1:20, 1:24, 2:16, <br> 2:20, 2:24, 3:4, 3:16, <br> 3:21, 3:25, 4:7, 4:23, <br> 5:4, 5:8, 5:15 <br> Strongman [1] - 44:20 <br> STRONGMAN ${ }_{[2]}$ - <br> 4:7, 44:21 <br> stuff [1]-41:24 <br> subject $[4]$ - 17:22, <br> 27:19, 40:24, 46:23 <br> submission [2]-10:3, <br> 47:22 <br> submitted [1]-27:19 <br> submitting [2] - 23:9, <br> 23:22 <br> subpoena [4] - 34:8, <br> 34:12, 34:18, 35:4 <br> subpoenas [3] - <br> 34:19, 34:22, 34:23 <br> substantially [3] - <br> 18:18, 29:9, 29:19 <br> substitution [1] - 13:9 <br> sudden [1] - 21:10 <br> SUFFERN [1] - 5:8 <br> sufficient [1] - 42:21 <br> suggest [1]-22:9 <br> suggesting [2] - <br> 25:21, 49:21 <br> SUGUNDO ${ }_{[1]}$ - 2:5 <br> SUITE [13]-1:16, <br> 1:20, 1:24, 2:13, <br> 2:24, 3:8, 3:12, 3:17, <br> 3:21, 4:8, 4:15, 4:24, <br> 5:9 <br> summarize $[1]-8: 16$ <br> Sun [2]-18:9, 33:14 <br> SUN [1] - 5:3 <br> supplementals [1] 39:11 <br> suspect [1] - 27:14 <br> system [1] - 7:23 <br> T <br> T-U-Y-E-S [1] - 13:6 <br> tab [6] - 35:7, 35:17, | ```38:8, 39:22, 39:25, 40:3 table [2]-25:19, 47:13 Tanya [1]-13:5 Tarkenton [1]-25:11 Tarkentons [1]-25:6 Taxotere [2]-7:11, 10:18 TAXOTERE [1] - 1:4 Taxotere@ BrownGreer [1] - 32:8 technical [2]-19:19, 49:19 telephone [1]-45:16 telephonic [1] - 7:19 term [1]-10:22 TERMINUS [2]-4:11, 4:19 terms [2] - 39:4, 51:17 TEXAS [2] - 2:13, 3:13 THAT [1] - 6:5 THE [57]-1:11, 1:15, 3:19, 6:5, 7:7, 7:8, 8:8, 8:23, 11:3, 12:6, 12:22, 17:25, 20:7, 21:17, 22:1, 22:3, 24:18, 24:21, 27:13, 28:13, 28:25, 30:6, 30:12, 30:19, 30:21, 30:25, 31:15, 34:12, 34:15, 35:2, 36:18, 36:24, 37:14, 40:23, 41:1, 41:6, 41:9, 42:10, 42:13, 43:19, 44:14, 44:23, 45:4, 45:12, 46:3, 46:9, 46:15, 46:19, 46:23, 47:9, 47:15, 48:2, 48:16, 48:20, 50:4, 51:6, 52:23 themselves [1] - 34:1 thereafter \([1]\) - 9:4 thereto [1] - 11:2 they've [2]-19:23, 40:14 thinks [1] - 38:20 third [2] - 29:7 THIS [1] - 1:8 THORNTON [1] - 3:7 three [8] - 27:9, 29:2, 29:17, 30:15, 43:1, 46:17, 46:25, 47:1 threw [1] - 25:11 throw [1]-25:10 TIME [1] - 6:22 timely [2]-18:17, 36:10 timing [4]-21:14, 21:16, 22:9, 24:4``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```TO [2] - 1:8, 7:4 today [7] - 8:11, 8:25, 29:14, 31:13, 41:11, 51:9, 51:23``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { under [16] - 10:3, } \\ & \text { 10:25, 14:24, 17:3, } \\ & 30: 4,30: 17,35: 22, \\ & 35: 24,36: 13,38: 7, \end{aligned}$ | voice [1]-51:24 <br> voluntary [2]-15:18, 36:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| together [10]-17:23, | 38:8, 40:3, 40:15, | W |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 26:22, 27:25, 28:7, } \\ \text { 28:11, 40:4, 43:18 } \\ \text { token }[1]-49: 5 \end{gathered}$ | understood [2]-21:7, 28:11 <br> underwent [1]-50:14 | waiting [1] - 10:15 <br> wants [2]-25:20, |
| $\text { Tommy }{ }_{[1]}-25: 11$ $\text { took }[1]-41: 18$ | unhappy ${ }_{[1]}-52: 13$ <br> UNITED [2] - 1:1, 1:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 44:20 } \\ & \text { warn [1] - 33:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
| top [1] - 19:8 <br> trading [1] - 20:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { United }[2]-53: 5 \text {, } \\ & 53: 14 \end{aligned}$ | WARSHAUER ${ }_{[1]}-$ <br> 1:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TRANSCRIPT [2] - } \\ & \text { 1:11, 5:18 } \\ & \text { transcript [1] - } 53: 7 \end{aligned}$ | Unknown [1] - 18:10 unless [1] - 22:4 unlikely [1] - 36:21 | WASHINGTON ${ }^{[1]}$ - <br> 4:8 <br> ways [3]-20:11, 22:4, 36:8 |
| TRANSCRIPTION ${ }_{[1]}$ - $5: 19$ | unnamed [1]-36:4 unnecessary [1] - | website [1]-17:3 |
| transfer [1] - 9:18 transferee [2]-9:16, 10:23 | 19:9 unopposed [2] 48:13, 48:14 | WEDNESDAY ${ }_{[2]}$ - <br> 1:7, 7:2 <br> week [3]-12:15, 27:9 |
| ```TRAURIG[2] - 4:10, 4:18 trenches [1]-25:23 Trial [1] - 38:14``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { up }_{\text {[31] }}-13: 2,14: 14, \\ 17: 23,20: 3,20: 10, \\ 20: 15,20: 24,26: 1, \end{gathered}$ | weeks [1]-10:19 welcome [4]-7:13, 8:1, 8:9, 8:13 |
|  | 27:5, 27:15, 28:1, | WHEREUPON ${ }_{[1]}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{TRIAL}_{[1]}-6: 19 \\ & \text { trial }[7]-13: 3,13: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 5,28: 17,29: 6, \\ & 32: 9,32: 12,32: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 52:24 <br> wide [1] - 23:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 38: 17,38: 24,48: 7, \\ & 52: 3,52: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 13,35: 17,36: 12, \\ & 39: 25,42: 11,44: 6, \end{aligned}$ | willing [1] - 12:2 <br> Winthrop [1] - 33:7 |
| tried $[1]-42: 12$true $[1]-53: 7$ | 45:24, 47:16, 48:1, | wish [2] - 31:22, 49:3 |
|  | 48:20, 51:19, 51:23, | woman [1]-27:8 |
| truly $[1]-20: 20$ try $[6]-8: 15,26: 12$, | 52:12, 52:15 | women [2]-19:21, 38:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 27: 24,45: 25,47: 2, \\ & 47: 7 \end{aligned}$ | upload [2] - 35:7, 38:7 <br> uploaded [6] - 39:22, | Woody [1] - 17:15 woody [1] - 32:19 |
| trying [2] - 26:17, 36:9 | 40:13, 40:18, 41:19, | word [1] - 52:6 |
| TUCKER ${ }_{[1]}$ - 4:14 tune [1]-8:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:21, 42:5 } \\ & \text { uploading }[1]-41: 12 \end{aligned}$ | works [2] - 20:13, 30:2 <br> Worldwide [1] - 33:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuyes [1] - 13:6 } \\ & \text { two [11] - 10:4, 10:13, } \end{aligned}$ | uploads [1] - 42:25 <br> upset [1] - 38:10 <br> URQUHART [1] - 3:20 | wrath [1] - 49:4 <br> written [2]-38:22, <br> 50:14 <br> WYNKOOP [1]-2:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:8, 14:17, 23:23, } \\ & 27: 9,30: 4,39: 7, \end{aligned}$ | uses [1] - 35:18 usual ${ }_{[1]}-8.15$ | WYNKOOP [1]-2.24 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 43: 1 \\ \text { Two [1] - 38:19 } \end{array}$ |  | Y |
| type ${ }_{[2]}-24: 3,25: 20$ | V |  |
| typically [1] - 51:4 <br> typing [1] - 34:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Val}_{[1]}-48: 25 \\ & \operatorname{VAL}_{[1]}-3: 15 \\ & \text { variety }[2]-36: 7, \\ & 37: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 10,46: 7 \\ & \text { YORK }[2]-2: 9 \\ & \text { yourself }[1]-48: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| U |  |  |
| U.S ${ }_{[1]}-33: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { various [3] - 11:4, } \\ & 32: 12,46: 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ULMER ${ }_{[1]}$ - 5:7 ultimately $[5]-15: 14$, | versus [2]-27:9, $49: 17$ |  |
| 20:22, 25:10, 27:23, | vexations [1]-51:12 |  |
|  | via [1] - 49:19 <br> view [1]-19:24 |  |
| 34:15 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { unable }[3]-40: 15, \\ & 44: 11,52: 15 \\ & \text { unblinded }[1]-32: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \mid \text { view }_{[1]}-19: 24 \\ \text { VINE }_{[1]}-5: 8 \\ \text { Vivian }_{[1]}-10: 12 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |  |

