UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

IN RE: XARELTO (RIVAROXABAN) * 14-MD-2592

PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION *

Section L

Relates to: All Cases August 6, 2018

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

MONTHLY STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Appearances:

For the Plaintiffs: Gainsburgh Benjamin David Meunier

& Warshauer, LLC BY: GERALD E. MEUNIER, ESQ. 1100 Poydras Street, Suite 2800 New Orleans, Louisiana 70173

For the Defendants: Irwin Fritchie Urquhart

& Moore, LLC BY: JAMES B. IRWIN, ESQ. 400 Poydras Street, Suite 2700 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

Andy Birchfield, Esq. Also Participating:

Steven Glickstein, Esq. Susan M. Sharko, Ésq. Jacob S. Woody, Esq.

Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR Official Court Reporter:

500 Poydras Street, Room B-275 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 (504) 589-7778

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography using computer-aided transcription software.

PROCEEDINGS

(August 6, 2018)

 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Call the case, Dean.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL 2592, In Re: Xarelto Products Liability Litigation.

THE COURT: Liaison counsel make their appearance for the record.

MR. MEUNIER: Jerry Meunier, co-liaison counsel for plaintiffs.

MR. IRWIN: Jim Irwin for defendants. Good morning,
Your Honor.

THE COURT: We are here today for our monthly status conference. I met with liaison lead counsel a moment ago to discuss the agenda. We will take it in the proposed order.

MR. MEUNIER: Yes, Your Honor. On the joint report in Section 2, in the discussion of case management orders, we report that for the plaintiffs' and the defendants' selection of cases in Wave 2 under CMO 6, that deadline has been extended until September 17, 2018; and that the random selection of cases for Wave 2 by the Court, that deadline is extended until October 1, 2018. Although it's not set forth in the joint report, Your Honor has entered a joint stipulating order

setting forth those new deadlines in the amendment of CMO 6,

- '

and that order is Rec. Doc. 10340.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MEUNIER: Counsel contact information, we always just encourage plaintiffs' counsel to do what they have been doing with that and maintain currency with respect to letting Lenny Davis and I know about their contact information as soon as they appear in the case.

On plaintiff and defendant fact sheets, Your Honor, I think we have a report today from Jake Woody.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WOODY: Good morning, Your Honor. Jake Woody from BrownGreer. I have an update for you on plaintiff fact sheets that we have collected through MDL Centrality.

To date, we have 21,823 fact sheets submitted. That's an increase of 45 since my last report. We certainly received more than 45 new fact sheets in that time, but we have also have been marking cases as dismissed, so the net increase was 45. When we mark cases as dismissed in our system, we don't count them as an active case, but we do retain the information and the records in the event that they are ever needed.

We have 1,349 fact sheets in progress but not yet submitted. That gives us a total of 23,172 plaintiffs in our system, in our database.

In July 2018 we received 355 fact sheets, in

June 468. Our average for the last two years has been 466 a month, and July was the lowest that we have seen in that time. I don't know if that trend will continue, but I did note that it was lower than many months in years past. So we will keep an eye on that and update it as necessary.

THE COURT: It looks like that's the lowest in the whole period.

MR. WOODY: It's the lowest probably since we started. Yeah, it is the lowest we have had since the early days of this. Although we do have ups and downs, we will see if it continues that way.

I do have a new slide here that shows the details of the CMO 6 cases that were selected by the parties and randomly. There were 600 selections, as you recall. Of those, 146 cases have been dismissed. That's 24 percent of the 600 that were selected. 87 of the dismissed cases were defendant picks, 55 were random selections, and 4 were plaintiff selections.

I think that that has sort of stabilized. I'm sure there will be more dismissals, but I think most of the dismissals are over with. So we will keep that in mind when we do the next round and see if there's anything we can do to pick a more useful pool or ones that won't be dismissed, although I'm sure some of it is inevitable.

THE COURT: Now, these are from the 200 selected?

selected.

MR. WOODY: These are from the 600 that were

THE COURT: 600, I mean, right.

MR. WOODY: It was 200 defendant, 200 random, and 200 plaintiff selections.

THE COURT: Right. Okay.

MR. WOODY: Our key indicators for the MDL as a whole remain unchanged. This slide shows the plaintiffs' age information. You can see that 20 percent are between 60 and 69, 30 percent are between 70 and 79, and 26 are between 80 and 89. That's three-quarters of the MDL right there between 60 and 89. If you add in the 90-plus people, that gives you over 80 percent that are over the age of 60. So it is on older population, as we have mentioned before.

The main alleged injury is gastrointestinal bleeding. 49 percent of every plaintiff in the MDL alleges that that was their injury, at least one of them. After that it drops down to 21 percent, which is the "Other" category, where people list a variety of injuries. That remains unchanged since my last report.

Finally, the indication or the reason that people took Xarelto, the highest indication is reduction of risk of stroke. 53 percent of all plaintiffs allege that that's the reason they took Xarelto, and again that's unchanged.

These indicators, because of just the sheer numbers of plaintiffs that we have, it takes a lot to change these numbers. It would take a large number of plaintiffs answering differently for these to change at this point, so they are pretty static and pretty steady. When we did the bellwether selections and the CMO picks, we weighted the pools to reflect these main indicators. I think this has been a useful exercise to try to get good pools.

THE COURT: Yes. No, that's very helpful because that's exactly how we picked them.

MR. WOODY: That's my update, Your Honor. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Jake.

Jerry, what's the reason for the dismissals when you have the 80 percent?

Andy, do you want to speak to that?

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Judge, it runs across the gamut. One of the things that we are seeing is that there are -- I mean, there are a significant number of clients, when they are faced with going forward with deposition -- this is an elderly population.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Their health is declining. They are balancing that issue of going forward versus not. So we are seeing a lot of the cases that are falling out for that reason.

Your Honor, in fairness, there are also situations where, when the plaintiffs are looking more intently at the case, as they are getting ready for these depositions, plaintiffs are seeing some issues that were not really brought forth as they were just filed and going through the fact sheet process. So it's across the board.

THE COURT: Okay. Steve.

MR. GLICKSTEIN: Realistically, Your Honor, I do think some of the dismissals have to be related to the results to date. We know that the three bellwethers here were defense verdicts. The first two cases in Philadelphia were a JNOV and defense verdict. Some of the folks are undoubtedly also looking at their damages and whether, in light of the results to date, it's worth pursuing a claim.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, the next thing to mention in the joint report is in Section 7, the preservation order. It's just important to keep reminding all parties, particularly plaintiffs' counsel as their cases might be selected under CMO 6, of the preservation obligation with respect to voicemails, instant messages, etc., set forth in PTO 15B.

Your Honor, on bellwether cases tried here in the MDL, as you know, all three of those matters that were tried are consolidated on appeal in the Fifth Circuit. There was an issue with respect to completing the record for appeal,

and because of that issue there was an agreement by the parties to suspend any further briefing or scheduling of argument, etc., until we have a complete record for purposes of that consolidated appeal.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. MEUNIER: State/federal coordination, in Section 11, Judge, we report on the trial settings. As the Court knows, today, August 6, is actually the start date of one of the cases being tried in Pennsylvania state court in Philadelphia. It's the Cooney v. Janssen, et al. case. The court is hearing motions this morning and opening statements will take place this afternoon.

The next case to be tried in Philadelphia, although it's not specifically mentioned in the joint report, is the case of *Rush v. Janssen*, *et al.*, and that's set for trial commencing December 3, 2018.

The presiding judge in that case has not yet been identified. The presiding judge in the *Cooney* trial, which is starting today, is Judge Teresa Sarmina.

Your Honor, I think that completes the main items of the joint report. We just have to confirm the October status conference. The next status conference in September will be September 5.

THE COURT: September 5 and then the following one is October 11.

Susan, do you want to report?

MS. SHARKO: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

On the CMO 6 cases, as Mr. Woody noted, 146 of the pool has been dismissed. There are an additional 16 cases that, after conferring with the plaintiffs, both sides agreed to remove them from the pool because they presented off-label use issues or just weird fact patterns or complicated discovery issues.

We have three plaintiffs in the pool who have not yet submitted a PFS. That's down from 25 last month. With Mr. Birchfield's help, we are making substantial progress. We still have 17 cases -- and these people were on an order to show cause -- who have not submitted an updated certification or an updated PFS. That's down from 29 for the order to show cause.

We still have 22 plaintiffs who have died since the filing of the complaint and the documentation needed has not been submitted. That's down one from last month.

Last month we had eight cases with subject matter jurisdiction. We still have four that need to be resolved. Basically, those lawyers either need to dismiss a defendant or dismiss completely and refile in state court. We have form stipulations of dismissal that will assist them, but they need to come forward and get that resolved.

On service of process, last month we had six,

this month we have 27 where a key defendant has not been served. The big increase is Bayer took a second look at it. The Bayer issues seem to be moving along and people are working together.

As to the Janssen cases, there are still four cases where Janssen hasn't been served. They all belong to one law firm, the Fears law firm, and they have to serve us. It's not that hard, but those cases are on hold until that happens.

THE COURT: I urge all of the plaintiff lawyers to either serve or send the material in. If not, I will have to be dismissing the cases. When I dismiss them, I dismiss them with prejudice. Let's do your best to get that information in.

MS. SHARKO: Thank you. Duplicate filed cases for the CMO 6 Wave 1 pool, we are down to zero. Last month we had three, so that's been resolved.

Cases missing authorizations, we are now down to zero. Last month it had been one.

Looking ahead to future order to show cause and other issues, on the PFSs for the Wave 1 group, we have 61 that have significant deficiencies. We have written to the lawyers. That process is moving along, but we are at the point now where unless the deficiencies are cured, we are going to need to seek relief from the Court.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. SHARKO: Finally, on duplicate filed cases, so

thing?

there are by our count now 209 people in the MDL who have two, three, or more cases filed with different lawyers. Of that 209, 46 are proceeding both in the MDL and Philadelphia. I will give Mr. Birchfield the latest list. We have written to all these lawyers, and I think we are going to have to move to an order to show cause process because we don't want this to gum up the selection of the Wave 2 cases.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SHARKO: Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, can I mention one other

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MEUNIER: We, as you know, are about to enter into the nuts and bolts of conducting discovery for the Wave 1 cases. You were given in chambers this morning a pretrial order that the parties have proposed which sets forth some of the details about how matters such as scheduling and the order of depositions will be worked out.

I have been designated as the liaison for the plaintiffs' side and then Ms. Sharko and Ms. Dupont on the defendants' side to work things out as they come up on difficulties. The reason I mention it is that perhaps at the September 5 conference, if both sides agree, the Court could get back to scheduling the biweekly calls with Your Honor --

THE COURT: Sure. 1 09:16 2 MR. MEUNIER: -- just so we can expedite the handling 3 of any things we can't work out on our side. I think that will 4 keep us on track. That worked well. Let me know and I will 5 THE COURT: schedule them. 6 7 MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Judge. 8 **THE COURT:** Anything else? 9 All right, folks. Thank you very much. Court will stand in recess. 10 11 THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. 12 (Proceedings adjourned.) * * * 13 14 **CERTIFICATE** 15 I, Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District 16 17 of Louisiana, certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability and understanding, from 18 19 the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 20 21 22 /s/ Toni Doyle Tusa Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR 23 Official Court Reporter 24 25