Ī	II		
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA		
2			
3	***********	*********	
4	IN RE: XARELTO (RIVAROXABAN)	MDL NO. 2592	
5	PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	SECTION "L"	
6	This document relates to:	THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2020	
7	This document relates to:  Various cases  **********************************		
8			
9	TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE AND MOTION HEARINGS		
10		ORABLE ELDON E. FALLON DISTRICT JUDGE	
11			
12	<u>APPEARANCES</u> :		
13	FOR PLAINTIFFS' LIAISON COUNSEL:		
14		Gerald E. Meunier, Esquire GAINSBURGH, BENJAMIN, DAVID,	
15	-	MEUNIER & WARSHAUER 1100 Poydras Street Suite 2800	
16		New Orleans, Louisiana 70163	
17	EOD DIATMETERS!		
18	FOR PLAINTIFFS' STEERING COMMITTEE:	Andy D. Birchfield, Jr., Esquire BEASLEY ALLEN	
19		218 Commerce Street Montgomery, Alabama 36104	
20		Morregoniery, Arabania 30104	
21	FOR DEFENDANTS'	Kin B. Maran Bannina	
22		Kim E. Moore, Esquire IRWIN, FRITCHIE, URQUHART & MOORE	
23		400 Poydras Street Suite 2700	
24		New Orleans, LA 70130	
25			
	OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT		

Ī	I	I	
1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:		
2			
3		Susan M. Sharko, Esquire Chanda A. Miller, Esquire	
4		DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH 600 Campus Drive	
5		Florham Park, New Jersey 07932	
6			
7		John F. Olinde, Esquire CHAFFE, McCALL	
8		1100 Poydras Street Suite 2300	
9		New Orleans, Louisiana 70163	
11			
12	FOR YVONEE GOSNELL		
13		Timothy M. Farris, Esquire TIM FARRIS LAW FIRM	
14		6645 US Highway 98, Suite 3 Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39402	
15		5,	
16			
17			
18			
19	Official Court Reporter:	Alexis A. Vice, CCR, RPR, CRR 500 Poydras Street, HB-275	
20		New Orleans, LA 70130 (504) 589-7777	
21		Alexis_Vice@laed.uscourts.gov	
22			
23			
24	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY. TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY COMPUTER.		
25			
	OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT		

## 1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2020 3 (STATUS CONFERENCE AND MOTION HEARINGS) 4 5 (The Court was called to order.) 6 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Call the case. 7 8 DEPUTY CLERK: MDL No. 2592, In Re Xarelto Products 9 Liability Litigation. 10 THE COURT: Counsel, make your appearance for the 11 record, please. 12 MR. MEUNIER: Gerry Meunier, co-liaison counsel for 13 plaintiffs. 14 MS. MOORE: Kim Moore, co-liaison counsel for the 15 defense. 16 MR. OLINDE: And Your Honor, John Olinde as liaison 17 for the Bayer defendant. 18 THE COURT: Okay. We're here today for our monthly 19 status report. As you all know and the people on the phone 20 should know that we have monthly status conferences, in 21 addition to other matters, but we always have a monthly status 22 conference at which time the parties generally report as to the status of the case. We'll take up any issues that might be 23 involved with that. 24 25 I'll hear from the parties at this time. OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT

MR. MEUNIER: Good morning, Your Honor, Gerry Meunier for the plaintiffs. We would like to begin with the Court's permission with a report on the settlement from our lead counsel Mr. Birchfield.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Good morning, Your Honor. The settlement program is proceeding in an efficient manner. We're pleased with the current status. There are just shy of 29,000 claimants that are enrolled in the settlement program.

BrownGreer is processing each of those claims. They will evaluate the claims according to the criteria of the settlement agreement, and then they will issue a preliminary points awards notice advising the claimant and the claimant's counsel of their assessment of the case and how many points that claimant would be entitled to.

The claimant and the counsel have an opportunity to review that, to make sure that it is correct. If there's any issue, they have an opportunity to request reconsideration from BrownGreer. Once they go through the reconsideration process, if they still disagree, then they have an opportunity to appeal that to the special master. So there are a number of checks and balances in place to make sure that we get this right on behalf of the claimants.

So BrownGreer has currently processed about two-thirds of the total number of claimants for their initial

points award. We're on pace to complete this process -currently, we're on pace to be able to pay the claimants by
early June is our -- that may slip, but we're pushing for that,
and right now we're on pace for that.

And the current point value is projected at 80 cents. That too may change slightly. We don't anticipate a significant change since two-thirds of the claims have been processed.

Once the base award is determined, then the payments can be made to the claimants at that time. We also have an extraordinary circumstances fund that is part of the settlement agreement. Those are being evaluated, you know, as well now, but those will not be completed until probably toward the end of the summer. So those awards will follow later.

But we're pleased with the way that the process is working. We have special masters both here and in -- two special masters that are processing these claims, and that process is working well.

THE COURT: How about with the state court? I know Philadelphia has a number and also California did have some.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Yes. So the cases, the claims that were pending in California, the ones that are pending in Philadelphia, they are all being processed all through BrownGreer all part of the same settlement. And any claims that elected not -- and there were only a small, small

percentage. But any claims that are outside the settlement program are being addressed by those courts.

My understanding is that all of the cases in California have been cleared. They're either in the settlement program, or they have been dismissed. And I think Judge New is following a similar process as Your Honor in addressing any claims that have not complied with court orders through an order to show cause process.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Where are the funds, Andy? Have you gotten the funds?

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Yes, Your Honor. The settlement was finalized, and the defendants have made the deposit in the QSF pursuant to the Court's order.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, before proceeding in the joint report, I do want to give the document reference for what Andy just mentioned which that since the last conference of December 12, 2019 the settlement has been funded. In accordance with that, on January 6<sup>th</sup> of 2020, this Court entered a QSF order which is Document 17548 which sets forth the specifics of the bank and the administration responsibilities with regard to the funds.

Your Honor, the joint report at pages 2 through 7 set

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

forth a series of important case management orders which relate both to the settlement and also to those plaintiffs who are not enrolled in the settlement. These are CMOs 9 and 9A, 10 and 10A, 11 and 11A, 12, 12A, and 12B. And we want to call particular attention to the deadlines set forth under CMO 11 which are specified at pages 3 through 6 of the joint report so that plaintiffs' counsel are certainly conscious about the deadlines that their cases face if they're not enrolled in the settlement.

And there will be a hearing following the status conference today dealing with a number of cases where the defendants are addressing the failure to comply with CMO deadlines.

In addition, on December 23<sup>rd</sup> of 2019, the Court entered CMO 8A which is Document 17530 which fixes deadlines for non-settling plaintiffs to submit through MDL Centrality a signed and dated authorization for the release of medical and pharmacy records.

And finally, in the category of CMOs, Judge, the defendants submitted to you a proposed CMO 13 which sets forth the process for continuing order to show cause hearings as to plaintiffs who are not in compliance with CMO 11 deadlines, and it also proposes further proceedings in this MDL, including, discovery for those plaintiffs who are going forward with litigation, Your honor, in compliance with the CMO deadlines.

At the last status conference, we addressed the proposed CMO 13. Your Honor directed us to put that proposed order on the Court's website and invite any comments or feedback from plaintiffs' counsel. That was done. Counsel were invited to give feedback before January 15, 2020. My understanding is that there has been no comment received or feedback received in response to the posting of that order.

THE COURT: Okay. This is an opt-in agreement that has been reached in the beginning of May. It was reached with some of the deadlines have -- it took a while to get that program up and working. Thereafter, we've got to focus on the people who have not opted in, who have decided not to opt in. There's going to be a number of people who have simply lost interest in litigation for various reasons. Some of which may be that they're doing well and haven't had any problems or whatever it is. In any event, they have a right to do that. They're not interested in proceeding. We have to give those individuals an opportunity to get back into the swim of things and move the case. But if they don't, then we have to dismiss the cases.

Then the cases left are those individuals who want to proceed, and we then have to get some case management orders in place so that the Court can finish its responsibility to those individuals for discovery and finish the discovery aspect of the case, and thereafter, make a decision as to whether the

case can be tried here or the case can be tried or should be tried some other place. But we're not there yet. We're at the point in deciding who is left and who is interested in proceeding with their case, and then we'll design a program to allow them to proceed. MR. MEUNIER: Judge, I think that concludes, save for the setting of the next conference. We want to confirm that March 19<sup>th</sup> is the next status conference, and Your Honor has assigned --THE COURT: Right, March 19<sup>th</sup> is the next one, and April the 21<sup>st</sup> is the following one, 9:00 o'clock. I'll need liaison and lead counsel to discuss the agenda and then proceed with the conference thereafter. MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Judge. I think we have the show cause. THE COURT: Anything from the defendants on that side other than the rule to show cause? MS. SHARKO: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Dean, are we ready for rule to show cause?

DEPUTY CLERK: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let's move onto the rule to show cause in this matter.

In connection with that, let me just say that the

Court was assigned this case in December of 2014. It took us a month or so to organize the case insofar as appointing committees and establishing some initial case management orders, but then we proceeded in rapid pace with the discovery aspect of the case. The discovery consumed hundreds of depositions, millions of documents, and a lot of motions in between that the Court has handled.

Then we began keying up some trials, bellwether trials, so that the parties could get a handle on litigation. It's my view that the transferee judge's responsibility is to give the lawyers an opportunity to discover the case before them. It's a different type case. It's not a one plaintiff one defendant case. In this particular case, we had over 30,000 individual claims. It's hard to get your hands around those claims; but the lawyers, the capacity and ability of the lawyers who handle these cases, it's able to be done.

But my job as the transferee judge is to give them an opportunity to really drill down and know the case. And I'm not talking about one case. I'm talking about 30,000 cases. And then we proceeded with discovery, with the various bellwether trials. We coordinated the litigation with my colleagues in state court, primarily, Judge New in Philadelphia. We proceeded also with some trials.

Then in May of 2019, after those trials and after a great deal of discovery, the parties began looking at looking

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for potential global solutions to resolve the entire census of the litigation. And finally, in May of 2019, we were able to formulate a program, a settlement program. The program is an opt-in program. Anyone interested in it can opt in to the If they're not interested, then they do not opt in. program.

The question then is what to do with the people who have not opted in. A large percentage of this census of the litigation has opted in, some 99 percent, whatever it is, of the census; but there are a number of claims that haven't opted Those claims are about maybe 50 or so that have not opted in.

But a large number of those individuals, either for various reasons, are not interested in opting in. And they're the master of their complaint, and they're the master of their case. They can do so. But if they haven't opted in to the litigation, then we have to deal with this non-opted-in census to organize that aspect of the case. And those individuals, and after if they have not opted in and they wish to proceed, have to abide by some rules so that we can get a handle on those cases. And that's where we are now.

I've prepared a number of CMOs in October and November, and primarily, CMO 8, 11, 9, which requires them to fill out certain forms, to instruct the medical facilities to keep their records, to obtain some records or allow records to be obtained, and they have to do that by a certain time frame.

If they don't, I try to encourage them to do so and give them

another 30 days or whatever it is.

So I'll hear from Defense.

But we get to the point where many of them have not done anything, and so we then set rules to show cause why those cases should not be dismissed. And that's where we are today.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Chandra Miller on behalf of the Janssen defendants. I'll be speaking for all of the defendants.

We're here this morning on three orders to show cause, Rec Doc 17557, 17558, and 17559. There were originally 95 total cases in those three orders, and we're here today to present a motion to dismiss on 45 of those cases. And I can go through them.

Before I start, I just wanted to make a few remarks that are applicable to all of the cases that we're seeking dismissal for today. As Your Honor noted, it is for failure to comply with this Court's case management orders, specifically for these cases, Case Management Order 11 which was entered by the Court in March of 2019.

All of the plaintiffs who are before the Court today elected not to participate in the settlement program, and all of the plaintiffs who are before the Court today, each one individually signed a notice of intent to proceed that acknowledged that CMO 11 and the Court's other orders set forth

3 4

> 5 6

7

13

14

12

15 16

18 19

20

17

21 22 23

24

25

various obligations and deadlines that they had to comply with. And they signed the forms acknowledging that those orders were in place and that they would be complying with them in a timely manner.

Each of the plaintiffs who are before the Court today received notices from the defendants when their deadlines came and went without submitting the required documents. And for each of the plaintiffs before the Court today, they had more than 30 days notice before defendants filed a motion seeking an order to show cause. So at this point, the defendants believe they've had ample notice and opportunity to comply with the Court's orders.

The first order, Rec Doc 17557, there were originally 29 cases listed in the Court's order. One case at Line No. 28, the Kathryn Rizor case has since been dismissed with prejudice. The case at Line No. 23 is not going to be presented for dismissal today, but the remaining 27 cases, defendants would seek dismissal with prejudice.

It might help, Your Honor, if I could call them by The Leonard Gabbay firm has 15 cases listed on the firm. order. They were in Lines 1 through 15 of the order. plaintiffs in these cases have not filed or served any of the documents required by CMO 11. They did not submit a Plaintiff Profile and Consent Form, Short Form Plaintiff Fact Sheet, medical records indicating proof of use, medical records

indicating proof of injury, and they did not submit

Preservation Notice Statements. Those are the reasons why we
filed the motion, subsequently filed the motion. All of the

CMO 11 deadlines have passed, and we haven't received any of
the required documents from these 15 plaintiffs. Defendants
would, therefore, seek dismissal of their cases with prejudice.

THE COURT: Anyone on the line for these particular -- DEPUTY CLERK: Judge, nobody is on the phone.

THE COURT: Okay, nobody is on the phone.

Anyone in court? Hearing none, I'll dismiss those 15 with prejudice. Dismiss those individual claims 1 through 15 with prejudice.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

The next cases are in Lines 16 through 22 of the order. They are all cases that were filed by the MacArthur, Heder & Metler firm. These plaintiffs have also failed to provide any of the documents required by CMO 11. At this point in time, defendants do not have the Short Form Plaintiff Fact Sheet, the Plaintiff Profile and Consent Form, anything to prove use of Xarelto, and anything to prove any bleeding that was caused by Xarelto. We would ask that the cases be dismissed with prejudice in Lines 16 through 22.

THE COURT: Anyone in the courtroom for those individual claims? We've set this notice and sent it to everyone and put it on the Court's website. They had an

opportunity not only to be in court, but also to call in court if they had some issue with transportation. No one is here.

I'll dismiss those cases with prejudice.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The next two cases are in Lines 24 and 25 of the They were cases filed by the Martinez & McGuire firm. Similar to other plaintiffs, we have not received the required documents, including, the documents that would prove use of Xarelto and injuries caused by Xarelto.

We did have the opportunity to meet and confer with the Martinez & McGuire firm on the cases listed in Lines 24 through 25, and they advised that despite their best efforts and attempts to contact their clients they have been unable to obtain their clients' cooperation and cannot bring them into compliance with CMO 11.

THE COURT: In these matters, there's a requirement and a duty to certainly keep in touch with the client, but there is also a duty on the client's part to keep in touch with the lawyer. And if the client moves, the client really should let the lawyer know that he moved, how he can get in touch with him if he needs him. He can't just forget the lawyer and not tell him where you're going or where you're going to live or respond to his request.

I'm sure that this firm has done everything possible, but their clients haven't wished to proceed. They have a right

to do that. So I'll dismiss them with prejudice.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. That was the cases at Lines 24 and 25.

The last three cases on Rec Doc 17557 were all filed by the law firm Mike Love & Associates. Those are the plaintiffs appearing in Lines 26, 27, and 29. Similar to the other plaintiffs we've already presented, these plaintiffs did not submit the Short Form Plaintiff Fact Sheet, the Plaintiff Profile and Consent Form, or records demonstrating that they used Xarelto or had any bleeding events that were allegedly caused by Xarelto. We would ask that these three cases in Lines 26, 27, and 29 be dismissed with prejudice.

THE COURT: I received an objection that applied to the Mike Love & Associates requesting that the cases be dismissed without prejudice. In these particular cases, an end has to be brought about. The case has been now pending before this Court since 2014. A lot has been done, a lot of expense, a lot of work has been performed in the cases. It's not fair to simply dismiss them without prejudice and let them continue on and on and on.

We've given them enough time to answer. We've given them enough time to follow the rules. We've given them enough time to make any objection if they have any objection at the hearing. I'll dismiss them without prejudice.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. That concludes

the cases listed in Rec Doc 17557.

Moving on to Rec Doc 17558, there were originally 53 cases listed in this order. 42 of the cases will not be presented for dismissal today. If Your Honor would like, I could read those into the record or I could --

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. MILLER: Okay. The cases that will not be addressed today are those appearing in Lines 1, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, Lines 20 through 23, Lines 26 through 50, and then Lines 51 through 53. Those are the cases that will not be presented today for dismissal.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. MILLER: The first cases that will be presented for dismissal on Rec Document 17558 are those appearing in Lines 2, 3, 4, 8, and 9. Those are all cases that were filed by the Martinez & McGuire firm. With respect to these cases, although the firm attempted to submit some of the documents on behalf of these plaintiffs, they were not able to completely fill out the documents. And at this point in time, we don't have sufficient medical records to move the cases forward regarding the plaintiffs' medical histories, their proof of use, and proof of any alleged bleeding events caused by Xarelto.

And the Martinez & McGuire firm have advised that they have, despite their best efforts, been unable to obtain

bleeding events that could have been caused by Xarelto. would ask that these cases be dismissed with prejudice.

23

24

25

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT

THE COURT: Let them be dismissed with prejudice.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. That completes the cases on Rec Doc 17558.

For the cases on 17559, there were originally 13 cases listed in the order. Seven of those cases will not be presented for dismissal today. Those are the cases in Lines 1 which is Amanda Bedard; 2, Loriann Davis; Line 3, George Eitel; Line 4, Tammy Graves; Line 6, Murray Mayor Malkowski; Line 7, Gustena Napier; and Line 8, Johnetta Schoonver. All of those cases were filed by the Beacon Legal Group, and as I mentioned, we'll not be presenting them for dismissal today.

For the six that we are presenting for dismissal today, the first case is appearing at Line 5. It's the case of Angel Hedgepath filed by the Beacon Legal Group. Although there were a few forms submitted on this plaintiff's behalf, the forms essentially gave us little more information than the plaintiff's name, address, and date of birth. We don't have the identity of the doctor who prescribed Xarelto to the plaintiff. We don't have the identity of the doctors who treated the plaintiff for the alleged bleeding events, and we don't have records related to those events. And we don't have any information or records regarding the plaintiff's key medical history. We would ask that that case be dismissed with prejudice.

THE COURT: Which one is that?

MS. MILLER: That is Line 5, Angel Hedgepath case.

THE COURT: Yeah, in these matters, oftentimes, at least in the beginning, an individual thinks they took Xarelto, or if they did take Xarelto, they think they've had problems with Xarelto, and they put in a claim.

But as time goes on, they either discover that they have not taken Xarelto, or it was another pharmaceutical that they took, or they feel that they haven't had any adverse result from taking it. And as a result, they're not interested in pursuing the case. Sometimes people make the decision not to pursue it for other reasons, but that's one of them.

In this particular case, they haven't filled out the appropriate forms. They haven't followed court orders. We've given them enough notice, given them an opportunity to do so. I have no alternative, but to dismiss the case with prejudice. I'll dismiss it.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

The next case to be presented to Your Honor is in Line No. 9. It's the case of plaintiff Rafic Redwan, and it was filed by the law firm Mike Love & Associates. This case is before Your Honor today for failure to produce the medical records that the plaintiffs are required to produce regarding their relevant medical history and medical records to prove their failure to warn claims.

We gave the plaintiff's firm ample opportunity to produce the necessary records, and they have not complied at

this time.

THE COURT: I'll dismiss that with prejudice.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

The next case to be presented is the case in Line 10, the case of David Miller on behalf of the estate of Barbara Miller. This is a pro se plaintiff. Defense counsel gave the plaintiff written notice of today's hearing. I understand that the PSC spoke with the plaintiff and gave him notice of today's hearing as well.

We brought this case before Your Honor because the documents that we have received were only partially completed. We don't have records indicating the time of Xarelto use, for treatment from any alleged injuries, records regarding the relevant medical history. The plaintiff didn't answer all of the questions regarding the alleged bleeding events that were apparently caused by Xarelto. So at this point in time, we're not even sure what injuries they're alleging were caused by Xarelto.

And the plaintiff also indicated that he is the apparent representative of the estate, but didn't provide any indication that he actually has legal authority to proceed with a lawsuit. And so for those reasons, and it's outlined in our motion, we would ask that the case be dismissed with prejudice.

THE COURT: The plaintiffs have contacted the individual about the hearing?

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Your Honor, we've made a number of

attempts for this hearing. But this case was actually set on

the December 12<sup>th</sup> order to show cause, and Your Honor continued it then. We had contact with him then. We have tried to follow up.

The case was originally filed by a law firm. That law firm moved to withdraw, and the Court granted that order. So we had followed up to provide notice to this claimant. But as of recently, we have not received any response from him in our efforts.

THE COURT: Okay. Dismissed with prejudice.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

The next case to be presented is the case appearing in Line 11. The plaintiff is Patricia Foss, and her claim was filed by The Tuttle Law Firm. Ms. Foss has alleged multiple bleeding events were caused by Xarelto, but failed to produce records verifying all these events were caused by Xarelto. We have not heard from the plaintiff's counsel to demonstrate these records, whether they were going to appear today.

But because they have not complied with CMO 11, we would ask that the case be dismissed with prejudice.

THE COURT: Anyone for the plaintiff Patricia Foss? Dismiss it with prejudice.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. The last two cases appearing on the order are in Lines 12 and 13. Both of

those are represented by the Tim Farris Law Firm. I understand that Mr. Farris is here today. I can speak on the cases, but I know Mr. Farris wants to speak as well.

MR. FARRIS: Good morning, Your Honor. Yes, Your Honor, the two cases are Yvonee Gosnell and Annette Price.

Regarding Ms. Gosnell, my office has made numerous attempts. We've sent out letters. We've sent Fed Ex documents. All of the letters, all the Fed Ex documents have been delivered. We've sent various emails to the client, and we've gotten absolutely no response in the last three months from her. I had filed a motion to withdraw in the case. I would ask for leave of the Court to at least get my affidavits on file of everything that we've done just so that my firm can be protected in that regard.

THE COURT: Please do. I'm familiar with the firm. I know they've done good work, and they've tried their best, herculean efforts, to locate the individual, to keep in touch with the individual. But the individual also has a duty and responsibility to keep in touch with the attorney, to respond to the attorney. It's not fair for the attorney to incur time, effort, expenses to keep in touch with them to try to get the party, their client, to respond. Apparently, this person is not interested in doing it notwithstanding the efforts of counsel. So I'm going to dismiss the case with prejudice.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. FARRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

The second case is Ms. Annette Price. The issue that we have with Ms. Price is that all throughout her medical records, she's been diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia and delusional behavior. We will talk to her one day, and she is fine going forward with the settlement and opting in. The next day, we talk to her, and she does not want to go forward with it.

We've attempted to gather the medical records that are required. For the last 12 years, she has given us the name of the medical providers. We have attempted to request those records from the medical providers, and they do not have any records that she's been at that facility. She is unable to provide us with any information that would help us to gather that information.

And the same situation on that case, we filed a motion to withdraw, and we'll file our affidavits.

THE COURT: That's fine. I appreciate you being here, and I know you've tried everything you can do to keep in touch with your client. Notwithstanding your efforts, the client doesn't wish to proceed; so we're going to dismiss the case with prejudice. But I appreciate all your efforts.

MR. FARRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate it.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. That concludes

1 the cases we had listed for hearing today. The parties can 2 prepare joint draft proposed orders and submit those to the 3 Court. THE COURT: Good, thank you very much. 4 5 The Court's in recess. (Whereupon this concludes the proceedings.) 6 7 8 9 **CERTIFICATE** 10 I, Alexis A. Vice, RPR, CRR, Official Court Reporter for 11 12 the United States District Court, Eastern District of 13 Louisiana, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability and 14 understanding, from the record of the proceedings in the 15 16 above-entitled and numbered matter. 17 18 /s/Alexis A. Vice, RPR, CRR Alexis A. Vice, RPR, CRR 19 Official Court Reporter 20 21 22 23 24 25 OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT