UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

IN RE: XARELTO (RIVAROXABAN) MDL 2592 "L"

PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

February 27, 2017

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO

ALL CASES

Judge Eldon E. Fallon

Mag. Judge Michael North

REPORTER'S OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON, UNITED STATES JUDGE.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS'

LIAISON COUNSEL: GAINSBURGH BENJAMIN DAVID

MEUNIER & WARSHAUER BY: GERALD MEUNIER

1100 POYDRAS ST., STE 2800 NEW ORLEANS, LA 70163

FOR THE DEFENDANTS'

LIAISON COUNSEL: IRWIN FRITCHIE URQUHART &

MOORE

BY: JAMES B. IRWIN, V, ESQ.

TEXACO CENTER

400 POYDRAS ST., STE. 2700 NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130

Mary V. Thompson, RMR, FCRR REPORTED BY:

Official Court Reporter 500 Poydras, Room B-275 New Orleans, LA 70130

(504) 589 - 7783

mary_v_thompson@laed.uscourts.gov

INDEX

	PAGE	NO .
Pretrial Orders		3
Case Management Orders		4
Counsel Contact Information Form		6
Plaintiff Fact Sheet		6
Defendant Fact Sheet		6
Service of Process on Defendants		12
Preservation Order		
Order Governing the Parties' Interactions with MD Plaintiffs' Prescribing and Treating Physicians	L 	13
Bellwether Selections		13
State/Federal Coordination		14
Matters Set for Hearing Following the Status Conference		15
Next Status Conference		15

AFFICIAL TRANSCRI

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (Call to order of the court.) THE COURT: Be seated, please. 3 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. 5 Let's call the case, please. 09:02:07 6 THE CASE MANAGER: MDL No. 2592. In Re: Xarelto 7 Products Liability Litigation. 8 THE COURT: Liaison counsel, make your appearance for 9 the record, please. 10 MR. MEUNIER: Jerry Meunier, co-liaison counsel for the 09:02:14 plaintiffs. 11 12 MR. IRWIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Jim Irwin for 13 defendants. 14 THE COURT: We're here today for our monthly status 15 conference. I had an opportunity a moment ago to meet with 09:02:24 liaison lead counsel to discuss with them the proposed agenda. 16 17 We'll take it in the order presented. 18 MR. MEUNIER: Good morning, Your Honor. Jerry Meunier 19 for the plaintiffs. 20 Referring to the Joint Report No. 26, we list only the 09:02:36 21 pretrial order that has been entered since the last status 22 conference, and that's Pretrial Order 13B which sets forth the 23 process to re-date in order to make more current the 24 authorization forms that are being used to secure plaintiff 25 medical records. 09:02:55

09:03:11

09:03:26

09:03:46

09:04:08

09:04:28

Section 2 of the report references case management orders. And, Your Honor, the parties have been working hard through meet-and-confer efforts to come up with a joint version of CMO No. 6, which will deal with the remand of cases which the Court has ordered. A proposed order is in the works and will be finalized and submitted shortly. In fact, I think the Court has already seen the proposed version.

THE COURT: Right.

Just for those on the phone, in this matter, as you know, we've had a number of bellwether cases; two in New Orleans and one in Mississippi. And one case was filed in Texas and that case was dismissed.

The purpose of the bellwethers is really multiple purposes. One of the main purposes is to give the lawyers an opportunity to see their case tried. It's kind of the concept that you can read a play or you can watch a play being performed, and by and large, whatever good read you have, it's a different play when you see it acted out.

And it's the same way with litigants and lawyers. They think they know their case, but until they see it tried, it's not really known to them. So it gives them an opportunity to look at the case and see it in a real setting.

We moved it around so they could see it as numerous juries took a look at it. The verdict of the jury is somewhat important, but it's also not the only thing. The important thing

3 4

5

6

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

25

09:04:49

7 8

09:05:06

12 13

09:05:34

18

09:05:52

24

09:06:11

is for the lawyers to see their case presented and all of the things that come with that. We did that.

But at that point, the bellwether system is exhausted. It's not designed for the purpose of resolving cases. That's not the purpose of it. The purpose of it is to give the parties an opportunity to see their case in action.

We've done that. So now we have to go to Phase II and It's not fair for the litigants, it's not fair move the cases. for the lawyers, it's not fair for the system just to keep the cases in one place and just let them marinate and just sit there. So it's time to begin focusing on sending them back.

I met with the parties earlier and we decided that it would be appropriate to send 1200 cases back. The parties have met and conferred and feel that it's wise to send 600 back at a time.

There's a mechanism for the plaintiffs picking 200, the defendants picking 200, and the Court picking 200 at random with the assistance of counsel. That's what we're in the process of doing now. So they have given me a proposed case management order setting that.

The first selection date would be April 16th where we pick the first 600 in wave one, and the second wave will be picked on August 16th. That's what we're in the process of doing now.

MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, the PSC leadership has

09:06:45

09:06:27

09:07:05

09:07:21

09:07:40

already sent out emails and will send out additional emails to plaintiffs' counsel because their efforts are going to be critical in helping us select an appropriate first wave for the remand, which, as you say, is due in April -- selection in April.

THE COURT: Right.

And we get some feel for the courts. I probably ought to at least talk to the judges so that they know that a number of cases are going to be coming their way so that they don't just find it in their mail one day.

So I'll be doing that. It's helpful for me to give some heads up.

MR. MEUNIER: Section 3 of the joint report refers again to the Court's process for counsel contact information forms. And both Mr. Lenny Davis, my co-liaison counsel, and I do appreciate plaintiffs' counsel continuing to be attentive to the need to submit those contact forms to keep the inventory information accurate.

Sections 4 and 5 discuss plaintiff and defendant fact sheets, Judge. And as you know, under an earlier order you had set up a protocol to assist in addressing plaintiff fact sheet deficiencies. We think that process is working.

Lenny Davis, as well as Sindhu Daniel, have been active on the plaintiffs' side working with defense counsel to streamline the process by which deficiencies can be addressed.

And that will be, again, even more important a process

going forward as we begin the selection of cases, to the extent that eligibility to be selected will be dependent on the value and validity of the plaintiff fact sheets that are in the --

THE COURT: Right. That's really dependent upon counsel and the litigants themselves. The litigants have to participate and fill out the forms. If they don't fill out the forms or will not fill out the forms, then the Court has to step in and dismiss their case.

So that part is going to depend not only on the counsel here, but also counsel representing those individual entities.

MR. MEUNIER: MDL centrality will be an important and vital tool for the litigants in the process of selection for the remands, and Jake Woody is here from BrownGreer to report on the data in that system.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WOODY: Good morning, Your Honor. Jake Woody from BrownGreer. I have a quick report for you on the status of plaintiff fact sheets in this MDL.

So far we have 20,294 plaintiff fact sheets that have been submitted to us.

We have another 1,589 in progress.

That gives us a total of 21,883 plaintiffs in our system.

Of the fact sheets that have been submitted, 26 percent have been amended at least once and in some cases more than once.

09:07:58

09:08:20

09:08:41

09:09:15

09:09:27

1 In January of 2018, we received 491 plaintiff fact 2 sheets. 3 So far in February, we've received 391. The average for the last 12 months is 472 fact sheets a Obviously it varies a little bit each month, but the 5 month. 09:09:45 6 average is pretty steady. And it's been at about the same level 7 throughout the whole MDL. 8 THE COURT: I think we've seen the same thing in the 9 court filings. 10 MR. WOODY: Yes. I think our fact sheets lag behind 09:09:58 11 the cases because of the deadlines, but the fact that we are so 12 steady means that new cases are coming in at about the same rate. 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 MR. WOODY: We have plaintiffs from all 50 states. I've listed them all here. 15 09:10:11 16 I won't go through all 50, but I will note that Texas 17 has 1,688 plaintiffs; Florida has 1,651; and California has 18 1.045. Those are the top three states. This is based on the 19 residential information that the plaintiffs list on their fact

09:10:31 20

21 22 sheets.

23 24

09:10:42 25

So I have two slides with all the states, and they -the bottom -- Hawaii is at the bottom with just 15, and everyone
else is in-between.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WOODY: As far as the information about the actual

1 plaintiffs who filled out fact sheets, we're able to calculate 2 their age based on the date of birth that they list on their 3 plaintiff fact sheet. 20 percent of all the plaintiffs are between 60 and 69. 30 percent are between 70 and 79. 5 09:10:57 26 percent are between 80 and 89. 6 7 That's 76 percent of all the plaintiffs in the MDL are 8 in that age range of 60 to 89. 9 And then all the other age ranges are significantly lower than that. 10 09:11:14 11 So that's a pretty good group of plaintiffs within 12 those age ranges. 13 It seems like 70 to 79 is where you have THE COURT: 14 the most. MR. WOODY: That's right. You have 30 percent. 15 09:11:23 THE COURT: And 80 to 89 after that. 16 17 MR. WOODY: This does shift a little bit as people age. 18 The 80 to 89 I don't think started out quite as high but over the 19 years has increased slightly as people have gotten older. THE COURT: 20 That's the helpful thing about the fact 09:11:40 21 And I think centrality has helped a lot in this 22 particular case because we're able to get a feel through the fact 23 sheets. And through the digital world of working these, you can 24 search them. And the advantage of that is that you can pick

certain cases as representative of that particular area and see

25

09:12:01

09:12:25 09:12:36 09:12:51 09:13:08

09:13:24 25

what the workup involves and what the witnesses say and what the jury's response is. So it's been very helpful.

MR. WOODY: Turning quickly to the alleged injuries on the plaintiff fact sheets, by far the most common alleged injury is gastrointestinal bleeding. 48 percent of all the plaintiffs allege that injury.

After that it drops down to 21 percent, which is the "other" category, which is generally a combination of different injuries.

And then from there it drops down to 7 percent, which is brain and cerebral hemorrhage.

And all the other injuries listed here are quite a small percentage of the MDL.

So gastrointestinal bleeding is obviously the most common alleged injury with about half of all plaintiffs alleging that injury.

THE COURT: Do you have any feel for the death situation, how many of those are brain bleeds or gastrointestinal bleeds or anything of that sort?

MR. WOODY: I don't. But I know that some of the information we collect has to do with cause of death, and I can extrapolate that and figure that out.

 $I^{\prime}m$ not sure -- I know that because we are dealing with sort of an older population, there can be many other reasons for that.

3

5

6

7

09:13:34

8 9

09:13:52

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

25

10

11

14

09:14:05

18

09:14:21

24

09:14:35

But I can check and see if we're able to extrapolate out how many of the deaths were related to the injuries listed here.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WOODY: Similarly, with indication or reason that people were prescribed Xarelto, we do have a very common theme where reduction of risk of stroke is 54 percent of all the cases listed in the MDL centrality. So more than half of the people were prescribed Xarelto for that reason.

Then from there it drops down to treatment of deep vein thrombosis, which is only 16 percent.

And it descends from there.

So we have a very common theme where people were taking this to reduce the risk of stroke.

THE COURT: The interesting thing to me, and, of course, throughout this has been that the main situation is prophylactic. It's not treatment as much as it's preventative measures.

> MR. WOODY: That does seem to be the case, Your Honor.

And then finally, at the last status conference you asked if I could tell how long people had been hospitalized. We were able to do that. I've done it here.

You can see that 6 percent were hospitalized for less than one day.

59 percent were between 1 and 5. That's by far the

09:14:47 09:15:00 09:15:14 09:15:29

09:15:49

highest category.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6 to 10 days is 20 percent.

11 to 30 days is 12 percent.

31 to 99 days is 2 percent.

And then people over 100 days are only 1 percent of the MDL.

So, again, we have a very common theme where people were hospitalized -- most people seem to be hospitalized for 1 to 5 days if they were hospitalized at all.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WOODY: That's my report for this month.

I've included our contact information at the end. We do still have, occasionally, new firms coming into the MDL who need help or need to get set up with the portal. They can email us at mdlcentrality@browngreer.com and we'll help them out as best we can.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Jake.

MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, the next section of the joint report, which is Section 6, deals with the service of process on defendants.

And we've called the Court's attention to an issue that relates to your order of February 15, 2018. It's in the record as Document 8628. It addressed the backlog of cases in the clerk's office and set forth a 60-day deadline for service running from the issuance of summons.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

09:16:07

09:16:20

09:16:42

09:16:57

24 25

09:17:17

And with the Court's permission, we've been working with defendants. John Olinde and I have been discussing this at length, and we will submit to you a proposed revision of that order which will alleviate the possible problem of those cases in which a summons has not yet been requested.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MEUNIER: And so that way we'll have a way of not letting that situation lapse.

THE COURT: Yeah. I just had assumed that the summons would be requested, because the people were calling to find out, you know, what the situation was. And that was the problem from our standpoint.

But I didn't intend to simply let somebody file a suit, not request a summons, and just keep it forever in suspension, so we needed to clarify that.

> Thank you, Judge. MR. MEUNIER:

The next section I mentioned is Section 8. reiterate the order that stands regarding the interactions of plaintiffs' counsel with prescribing and treating physicians.

It's simply to note that in the proposed CMO 6 there will be some modification of that to provide for the parties' ability to jointly contact the treating and prescribing doctors in order to set up the necessary deposition schedule.

Section 9 in the report discusses the three MDL bellwether cases of Boudreaux, Orr, and Mingo. Those three cases 09:17:39

09:17:56

09:18:20

09:18:35

09:18:50

now are on appeal in the Fifth Circuit. *Boudreaux* and *Orr* had been consolidated previously. More recently the court has consolidated *Mingo* with those two as well. So now all three of those cases, *Boudreaux*, *Orr*, and *Mingo*, will be handled in a consolidated way by the Fifth Circuit for briefing and argument purposes.

Section 10, Your Honor, is a reference to the state/federal coordination that's ongoing between this court and particularly the court in Pennsylvania.

I will report on behalf of Mr. Weinkowitz and Mr. Longer that the next trial date in the Pennsylvania litigation is April 2nd, and that is the *Russell* case.

And the next trial is the *Cooney* case which I'm told will begin on April 19th or April 26th. That has not yet been determined.

Judge, I think that concludes the joint report except for the scheduling of the next -- oh, I'm sorry. I did want to mention one other thing which has to do with the ongoing discussion about discovery, and particularly the completion of the record for purposes of the preemption motions that are pending in *Ibonez*.

We mentioned to the Court we thought it would be helpful to have a telephone conference with you to discuss the status of meet-and-confer efforts on the remaining discovery for that, and you have scheduled that telephone conference for

1 Friday, March 9, at 9:30 with counsel. 2 THE COURT: Okay. And the next conference is on March 3 21st, and the following one is April 24th. MR. MEUNIER: Yes, Your Honor, April 24th, which will 4 5 be at 9:00 a.m. with the 8:30 meeting in chambers. 09:19:08 6 THE COURT: Right. The same way for the next one. 7 MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Judge. 8 THE COURT: Anything else from anybody? 9 (No response.) 10 THE COURT: Okay, folks. Thank you very much. Court 09:19:16 11 will stand in recess. (Proceedings adjourned.) 12 13 14 15 **CERTIFICATE** 16 17 I hereby certify this 1st day of March, 2018, that the 18 foregoing is, to the best of my ability and understanding, a true 19 and correct transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled 20 matter. 21 22 /s/ Mary V. Thompson 23 Official Court Reporter 24 25