UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

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

PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION *

Section L

Relates to: All Cases

January 23, 2019

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

PROCEEDINGS HEARD 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 Plaintiffs: Beasley Allen Crow Methvin

Portis & Miles, PC

BY: ANDY BIRCHFIELD, ESQ. Post Office Box 4160

Montgomery, Alabama 36103

For the Plaintiffs:

Baron & Budd, PC BY: SINDHU S. DANIEL, ESQ.

3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 1100

Dallas, Texas 75219

For the Defendants: Irwin Fritchie Urquhart

& Moore, LLC

BY: KIM É. MOORE, ESQ.

400 Poydras Street, Suite 2700 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

Appearances:

For the Defendants: Chaffe McCall, LLP

BY: JOHN F. OLINDE, ESQ.

1100 Poydras Street, Suite 2300 New Orleans, Louisiana 70163

For the Defendants: Drinker Biddle & Reath, LLP BY: SUSAN M. SHARKO, ESQ.

600 Campus Drive

Florham Park, New Jersey 07932

For the Defendants: Drinker Biddle & Reath, LLP

BY: CHANDA A. MILLER, ESQ. One Logan Square, Suite 2000

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Also Participating: Michael McGartland, Esq.

Candice McNabb, Esq. Roopal Luhana, Esq. Laura Lumaghi, Esq. Christopher Pinedo, Esq.

Christopher Quinn, Esq.

Official Court Reporter: Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR

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

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

<u>INDEX</u>		
	<u>Page</u>	
Monthly Status Conference	4	
Motions	13	

1 **PROCEEDINGS** 2 (January 23, 2019) 3 **THE COURT:** Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies 4 and gentlemen. 5 Let's call the case, Dean. THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL No. 2592, In re Xarelto 6 7 Products Liability Litigation. **THE COURT:** Counsel make their appearance for the 8 record, please. 9 10 MR. MEUNIER: Jerry Meunier, co-liaison counsel for 11 plaintiffs. 12 MS. MOORE: Kim Moore, co-liaison counsel for 13 Janssen. 14 MR. OLINDE: John Olinde, co-liaison counsel for the 15 Bayer defendants. 16 **THE COURT:** We are here today for our monthly status 17 conference. I met with lead and liaison a moment ago to 18 discuss the agenda. We will take it in the order presented. 19 Jerry. 20 MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please 21 the Court. The joint report is lengthy. Due to the fact that 22 it provides certain written notifications about PFS 23 deficiencies, that length is required in this case. 24 The first thing to discuss, though, is CMO 6,

just to report to the Court that there is very active discovery

25

now proceeding for the Wave 1 and Wave 2 cases. We want to assure the Court that the meet-and-confer process that you have encouraged for counsel is working in that any discovery issues that are arising with respect to CMO 6 cases thus far, those issues are being effectively addressed and resolved by counsel without need for any disputes for the Court to resolve.

THE COURT: Why don't you mention where they are, the Wave 1 cases, things of that sort.

MR. MEUNIER: Andy, do you want to --

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Your Honor, in regard to Wave 1, starting this month several of those cases will have completed their 7-month discovery period. There are others that will be staggered over the coming months, but those depositions are proceeding well with the plaintiff prescribing and treating doctor depositions and the detail rep depositions.

THE COURT: Susan, anything?

MS. SHARKO: I would agree they are moving along. We have also agreed that the detail rep deposition may be deferred until the case is remanded. That will streamline the process.

In Wave 1, 268 cases have been dismissed, so that's 46 percent of the pool. Really, the only issue right now are 10 cases still are missing PFSs. Mr. Birchfield has been extraordinarily helpful in moving those along. There are issues that are percolating, but we have been able to resolve them.

1 2

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SHARKO: Wave 2 depositions are just starting up. 197 cases have been dismissed so far. That's 33 percent of the docket. Then we have the similar issues that we had with Wave 1. 24 cases don't have a PFS. 107 have discovery on hold because of issues; two cases have subject matter jurisdiction, two cases haven't been served, and the like. Wave 2 seems to be moving along faster than Wave 1 did, so things are good.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Your Honor, in regards to the detail representatives, the CMO provides for the detail representative. If it's okay with the Court, we have told plaintiffs' counsel if they choose to defer that until the case is set for remand, they could do that, or they could proceed with it before the end of the discovery period.

In working with Ms. Sharko, we have agreed to a process for any issues regarding the scheduling of detail representatives to be handled as we have handled issues regarding the doctors. If they cannot resolve it with the defense lawyer that's assigned to that case, then they would bring that to the PSC's attention.

Mr. Meunier is serving as the liaison, and he and Ms. Sharko will try to resolve those issues. We have put that process in place to see if we can resolve it before bringing it to the Court's attention and before any subpoena

would be issued for the detail representative.

THE COURT: Okay. Makes sense.

MS. SHARKO: So all detail rep issues go to one lawyer for Janssen. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. MEUNIER: Of course, Your Honor, the CMO 6 discovery activity is all triggered by the completion of fact sheets. There is motion practice, as you see in the report, to address deficiencies with fact sheets.

We continue to implement the process under PTO 31, which is to try to work out those deficiency questions when we get notice of them. On our side, we have Sindhu Daniel and Lenny Davis working hard with plaintiffs' counsel, again, to try to minimize motion practice and get those things resolved.

THE COURT: The fact sheets are essential for the process. It really is. We have used fact sheets in these cases in lieu of interrogatories because it just makes more sense and it's quicker, but you need the cooperation of the parties to get to the fact sheets. You need the litigants to answer the fact sheets. If they don't, then we are going to have to dismiss their case. It's as simple as that.

MR. MEUNIER: Again, looking at the CMO 6 cases, of course, the deficiency of the fact sheet is important as a trigger to discovery and remand.

We also have now a deficiency process that's pretty active on non-CMO 6 cases, and I want to call attention for counsel to the Court's Pretrial Order 31(a), which was entered last month, which sets forth a new process of added notification for the purpose of non-CMO 6 cases where the fact sheet is either overdue or is deficient in some respect.

The first notification that counsel get about those deficiencies is through the MDL Centrality notice system, so I encourage all plaintiffs' counsel to stay current with that system because that's the first time they will receive official or formal notification of there being a deficiency or an overdue situation.

Beyond that, Judge, what we now do on the joint report, as you will see starting at different pages of the joint report, is under PTO 31(a) will begin the process of giving a first and, if necessary, a second notification by listing in the joint report of the overdue and deficiency issues. After two such listings and two status conferences at which the joint report provides those listings, those cases are then subject to a request for a show cause order and hearing at the next status conference. So plaintiffs' counsel should now pay close attention to the joint report listings under PTO 31(a) as well as the MDL Centrality notice.

THE COURT: The process gives everybody due process.

That's the whole concept. It's actually three notices that

2

1

3 4

5

7 8

9

11

12

13

1415

16

17

1819

20

22

21

2324

25

individuals get. So if they don't heed those three notices, the case is going to just be dismissed. There's no reason not to dismiss it at that point.

MR. MEUNIER: I believe it was recommended by Ms. Sharko in chambers -- and we will do this. We will index the joint report so it's an easier reference document. For purposes of today, counsel should know that starting at page 11 of the joint report, which is Rec. Doc. 12358, is the first-time listing of overdue fact sheets.

MS. SHARKO: Right. There are 128.

MR. MEUNIER: Starting at page 18 is the second-time listing of overdue fact sheets.

MS. SHARKO: There are 54.

MR. MEUNIER: Starting at page 78 of the joint report is the second-time listing of core deficient fact sheets.

MS. SHARKO: Right. There's 42.

On page 21 is the first-time listing for core deficient fact sheets.

MR. MEUNIER: I'm sorry.

MS. SHARKO: There are 200 of those.

MR. MEUNIER: Then at page 98 is the listing of cases which are now subject to the show cause hearing because they have been twice listed as overdue on the joint report.

MS. SHARKO: Correct. The good news is that two cases can come off the list of the four. The *Carrington* case,

No. 2, that's been resolved. The *Christie* case, No. 3, we have agreed to carry that because the plaintiff, who is pro se, had some uploading issues.

MR. MEUNIER: Then at page 99 of the joint report is the notification of core deficient fact sheets which have already been listed twice on joint reports and are now subject to a show cause order.

MS. SHARKO: There are four cases that can come off that list because the issues have been resolved: No. 8, the *Harden* case; No. 14, the *Posey* case that's on page 103; No. 21, on page 106, the *Valantiejus* case.

I'm sorry. There are three of those. I would just note we had 24 cases. Now we are down to 21, but 12 of those cases are with the same law firm, the Driscoll law firm.

MR. MEUNIER: So, Judge, those matters will have to be addressed following the joint report.

So returning to the report on other matters, we wish to report that on the Fifth Circuit appeal -- it's a consolidated appeal of the three bellwether trials in this MDL, the two that were conducted in the Eastern District of Louisiana and the one that was conducted in the Southern District of Mississippi -- there was a holdup on the briefing because of a problem with completing the record for appeal, but that's now been resolved.

So this Friday, the 25th, will be the deadline

for what I believe is the final brief to be submitted. It is a plaintiff reply brief to the defendants' cross-appeal in those cases. The cross-appeal deals, among other things, with preemption. So that will complete the briefing in the consolidated appeal of those three bellwether cases.

On state/federal coordination discussed in the joint report in Section 11 at page 9, we have submitted to the Court a written spreadsheet of the various state court actions. By far the most active and populated case, of course, is the one before Judge New in the Pennsylvania court. There is a trial set in that matter in the *Rush* case. The trial will begin on May 6, 2019. Then starting in September there are additional trials which have been now designated as taking place, with 60 days spacing between trials.

Your Honor, I think other than the matters to be heard after the conference, the only other issue is the scheduling of the next conferences. We have agreed that the next in-person status conference will be on March 12.

THE COURT: The following on April 11.

MR. MEUNIER: And the following on April 11. We have also scheduled a telephone conference for the leadership and the Court on February 12. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anything else?

Let's go into the motion. Do we need a break?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Judge, we have one matter in

person.

THE COURT: We have a motion on the filing fees.

Sindhu, do you want to take care of that? Then we will break and get the rest on the phone.

MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Your Honor. Sindhu Daniel for the plaintiffs.

Your Honor, Document 12164 contained 45 cases where there were unpaid filing fees. All of those have been resolved, with apologies from plaintiffs' counsel on any misunderstanding as to why they weren't paid, except for four cases with the law firm Fears Nachawati.

Is anyone on the line from that firm to explain to the Court why those cases are unpaid?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: It was an in-person show cause.

MS. DANIEL: Is anyone in court?

They are not.

THE COURT: Well, if they are not in court, then they are not heeding the rule to show cause. I will hold them in contempt of court. I will issue an order holding them in contempt. I will impose a fine also.

MS. DANIEL: Your Honor, I will personally reach out to them. I'm not certain what happened, but I will get Majed Nachawati to pay this immediately.

THE COURT: Tell him I will issue this order holding them in contempt within a week if I don't hear from him.

MS. DANIEL: You will hear from him, Your Honor. 1 09:15 2 Thank you. 3 THE COURT: Thank you very much. Let's take a 4 five-minute break at this time to get them on the phone. 5 THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. (Recess.) 6 7 Be seated, please. THE COURT: We have a number of motions on a rule to show 8 9 cause. I will take them in the order presented by counsel. 10 MS. DANIEL: Good morning, Your Honor. Sindhu Daniel for the plaintiffs. 11 12 MS. MILLER: Good morning, Your Honor. Chanda 13 I will be speaking on behalf of the defendants. Miller. MS. DANIEL: Your Honor, this morning, for CMO 6 14 15 cases, there are 90 cases listed. We will go generally in 16 order, as No. 12 in the joint agenda states, so we can stick to 17 some order for the Court. 18 The first, Document 12020, is the case of Lee Robert that is being heard to address the deficiencies in 19 20 the fact sheet pursuant to CMO 6. This case was previously heard on November 19 and is being heard again today. 21 22 Mr. McGartland is on the line, Your Honor, to address the Court 23 in this matter. 24 Mike, did you want to go ahead now?

MR. MCGARTLAND: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor.

25

1 2

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. MCGARTLAND: Per the Court's admonition on the 19th of November, we reached out via telephone again and left voice messages for the client and his daughter, no return of those voice messages.

We went and took the extra effort of sending out Federal Express overnight letters to both the client and to the daughter. On December 11, 2018, the client's packet was returned undeliverable. The daughter received her packet, but we have since that time still not heard back from the client or his daughter. With that, Your Honor, we would defer to you as to how you want to proceed.

THE COURT: Yes. Well, you have done everything you can, Mike. In fact, you have gone above and beyond what's required by ethics and professionalism. You need to know the Court appreciates that. Notwithstanding that, the client doesn't respond; the client doesn't want to proceed. It's their case. They have a right not to proceed. If they decide not to proceed, that's fine.

It's obvious to me that they decided not to proceed. They won't respond to their lawyer. Notwithstanding the Herculean efforts of the lawyer in this case, I will dismiss the case with prejudice.

MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mike, for your help.

MR. MCGARTLAND: Thank you, Your Honor. 1 2 MS. DANIEL: The next is Document 12025. There were 66 cases listed on this document, Your Honor, for order to show 3 4 cause regarding plaintiffs who have allegedly failed to serve a 5 fully complete, updated plaintiff fact sheet pursuant to CMO 6. The first case, *Raymond Rogers*, is being removed 6 7 from Wave 2 with consent of the defendant. 8 MS. MILLER: That's correct, Your Honor. 9 MS. DANIEL: The next 26 cases are cured. They are: 10 Janice Anderson, Michael Blankenship, Cindy 11 Cain, William Carl, Roger Colvin, Darrell Condry, Louis Csoka, 12 Charles Dennis, Joann Deunger, Arthur Edwardson, Birder Hunt, 13 William Martin, Sara Mongan, Glenn Newsom, Jimmie Ross, Randall Roush, Joline Rutkowski, David Schwartz, Annie Seward, Loretta 14 15 Shepherd, Robert Sladick, Billy Lou Sturgill, James Watson, 16 Kimberly West, Rosemary Wilkinson, and Sally Wilson. 17 Those cases are cured, and we can remove THE COURT: 18 them from the list. Is that it? 19 MS. DANIEL: Yes, your Honor. 20 MS. MILLER: Your Honor, we are just conferring on one more potential cure. 21 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MS. MILLER: Sorry. The one additional case that's cured is Robert George. 24 25 MS. DANIEL: Your Honor, the next 13 cases, counsel

has either already dismissed the case with prejudice or has agreed to a stipulation of dismissal with prejudice. They are:

Raymond Blakely, Doris Coleman, Judith Deustch, Harry Griggs, Junior Haller, Philip Hasselquist, Douglas Koch, Georgie Martin, Annette Powell, Aurora Saldivar, Ola Virga, Sonja Walcott, and Patty Wilson.

I think Susan Sharko stated *Annette Powell*, during the regular CMC, that that case is resolved. The client has now agreed to a dismissal, so it will be dismissed.

MS. MILLER: There are four additional cases defendants learned last night on that list that will be dismissed. That's *Billie Mills*, *Bettie Ferguson*, *Fannie Watkins*, and *Jimmy Martin*.

THE COURT: Let those cases be dismissed.

MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

For the next 22 cases, Your Honor, although the firms have been diligent and made all best efforts to cure the deficiencies, through no fault of their own the following cases have been unable to be remedied. There may be some overlap with what Chanda just said here. They are:

Cecelia Baird, Bernardo Diaz-Maldonado, Anthony Dichiaro, Bettie Ferguson, Mattie Hall, Renee Hampshire, John Hatten, Jerry Hunt, Lacy Johnson, Kathleen Marie Kaylor, William Lyons, Grace Mallette, Cynthia Messina, David Michael, Billie Mills, Mira Moshchinsky, William Parkins, Paul Rose,

Richard Strand, Virginia Wanat, Fannie Watkins, John Wilson, and Ronald Wright.

Your Honor, on the next three cases, they would like to be heard by the Court. The first one will be Jimmy Martin. The law firm is Kirkendall Dwyer.

Is anyone on the phone with this law firm for Jimmv Martin?

MS. MCNABB: Candice McNabb representing the plaintiff.

We have been in contact with them. We have been sending letters. Initially, he wanted the case dismissed. Then as of two days ago, they decided that they did not want their case dismissed but wanted to find another attorney, so we were going to ask for an extension.

THE COURT: What's the reason? They want a new attorney, is that it?

MS. MCNABB: That's it, yes. They wanted to just dismiss for weeks, and then all of a sudden not dismiss but just wanted another law firm.

MS. MILLER: Your Honor, this is a defense pick. The case has been pending since 2016, and then it was a defense pick into the pool last September. The plaintiff fact sheet was due in October. We were told on January 22 -- so yesterday we thought the case was going to be dismissed. We are now months overdue for a plaintiff fact sheet. The case is set for

1 2

dismissal today.

MS. DANIEL: Your Honor, if we could give them 10 days to find additional counsel; and, if not, the case will likely be dismissed because they would have to make a motion to withdraw as counsel.

THE COURT: I will do that. I'm going to dismiss the case in 10 days if I don't hear from anybody.

MS. MCNABB: Okay. Thank you.

MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. DANIEL: The next case is Carol Anglin Beckford, Your Honor. This is a Simmons Hanly Conroy case. Counsel filed a motion to withdraw September 25, 2018. Plaintiff has discharged counsel and fails to communicate. That was stated in the response. They wanted the Court to grant the motion to withdraw and allow the client to proceed pro se or allow her to find additional counsel.

Is anyone on the line who would like to state anything more?

So, Your Honor, the client has discharged them anyway and fails to communicate. The client is aware of the hearing. Your Honor, I think they would like you to do what you need to do.

THE COURT: I'm going to dismiss the case with prejudice.

1 2

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

The next case is *Daniel Barney*, Chaffin Luhana. Counsel filed a response and stated that the client is now deceased. I think someone from their law firm is on the line.

Roopal, are you on the line?

MS. LUHANA: I am.

Good morning, Your Honor. Roopal Luhana for the plaintiff, Daniel Barney.

THE COURT: All right. What's the problem?

MS. LUHANA: As our motion to withdraw details, our client, Daniel Barney, died a couple years after we filed his Xarelto case. We learned of this in January 2018. We located his next of kin. We have made all reasonable efforts to contact him, but we have been unable to get him to commit to take action. We have done all we can here. We request that the Court allow us to withdraw and give the next of kin about 120 days to appear and comply with discovery.

MS. MILLER: Your Honor, the case was filed in 2015. It sounds to us like the plaintiff passed away in 2017. I understand that current counsel has been communicating and that the family is aware of the deadlines. This was a random selection into Wave 2, so the PFS was due in early November. At this point discovery is stalled without the PFS.

THE COURT: I think current counsel has done

5

everything they possibly can do in the situation. They have satisfied not only ethics and professionalism, but they have gone above and beyond the call of duty. They have done everything they possibly can. Notwithstanding their efforts, the next of kin has not done anything. I'm going to dismiss the case with prejudice.

Thank you very much for your help.

MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. DANIEL: The next 23 cases, Your Honor, were individual documents that were filed for individual cases, Documents 12026, 12028, 12029, 12294, 12297, 12298, and I will read them by name. Fred Haney, David Alejandro, Edith Daniel, Mary Fay Harkins, Leonard Snoddy, and Howard Owens are all cured.

The next four cases, Your Honor, they have already been dismissed or will stipulate to a dismissal. They are James Billiot, Linda Lynch, Brad Osborn on Behalf of the Estate of Donald Osborn, and Patricia Williams on Behalf of the Estate of Charles Williams.

The next cases, Your Honor, through no fault of their own and per counsel's filed responses, counsel has done everything in their power to cure these fact sheets but have been unable to remedy and unable to cure pursuant to CMO 6. They have no basis to oppose the motions. They are *Jimmy*

Strickland, Jerry Cooney, Raymond Mitchell, Gregory Clowers, Lonzo Brown, and Roy Johannessen.

THE COURT: We will dismiss those with prejudice.

MS. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. We appreciate their cooperation in working with us.

MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

The next case is *Reuben Cox*, Your Honor. I think last month Laura Lumaghi was on the line, but we couldn't hear her in the court. She is here, Your Honor, to discuss her case.

MS. LUMAGHI: Good morning, Your Honor. Yes, there was something wrong with my phone because I could hear you; but when I went to unmute it, no one could hear me.

Mr. Cox is a Wave 1 defense pick. When we called to let him know, we found out he had had a massive stroke. We have had some issues, you know, deciding because he was on hospice, but we have gone ahead and gotten an attorney in Suffolk County, Virginia, who has filed a petition for guardianship. It's set for hearing next Tuesday, so we are just requesting 60 days. Hopefully we will have that order --

THE COURT: I'll give you that. Let's pass it for 60 days.

MS. MILLER: It could be passed to the March hearing, if that would be fine. If we could ask for an update on the 30th as to what happened, I think --

MS. LUMAGHI: January? 1 09.35 2 January 30, if you could update us as to MS. MILLER: 3 what happened at the hearing on the 29th, and then we could set 4 the case for --5 THE COURT: Sure. We will pass it until March. MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 7 MS. LUHANA: Thank you. 8 MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 The next case is *Piper Legrand*, Document 12190. 10 Chris Pinedo. are vou on the line? MR. PINEDO: Yes. Chris Pinedo here for the 11 plaintiff, Your Honor. 12 13 Hello. Chris. THE COURT: 14 MS. DANIEL: Go ahead, Chris. 15 MR. PINEDO: The aspect of this particular case is 16 that the plaintiff, Piper Legrand, had passed away, and this 17 was heard by the Court in November. I had told the Court that 18 we were searching for probate counsel to get the daughter, 19 Vickie McDonald, named as representative of the estate. 20 That did happen. Orders were issued on December 18, and we have uploaded those to MDL Centrality, as 21 22 well as on January 11 we filed a motion to substitute Vickie 23 McDonald, the daughter of Piper Legrand, as the plaintiff in a

representative capacity. That was done. We have also uploaded

authorizations, HIPAA and Medicare, and an updated fact sheet

24

25

verified by Vickie McDonald as representative of the estate. So it's my position that we have taken care of the deficiencies referenced by defendant.

MS. MILLER: Your Honor, if I could just speak to that matter.

THE COURT: Yes. Sure.

MS. MILLER: We did see that a motion to substitute was filed on January 11. It was filed as a consent motion that defendants had consented to. We, unfortunately, weren't given notice and didn't have the opportunity to actually evaluate whether we were going to be consenting before it was filed as a consent motion. We have subsequently reviewed it and do consent.

In terms of the PFS and the HIPAA authorizations, the authorizations were uploaded very late last night. We haven't had the opportunity to evaluate all of them. There were 12 providers that we were not able to order records from because of the outstanding authorizations. We do want the opportunity to look and make sure that all of those were cured before we agree that the case can proceed. I would suggest maybe 10 days to report in to the Court and work with counsel to obtain any additional authorizations that weren't submitted last night.

THE COURT: In any event, I will pass this one,
Chris. I'm not going to dismiss it. Get with counsel and see

if there's any problem. If there is, then I will talk about it 1 09:37 2 at the next meeting. We will pass this to the next meeting and 3 see what the situation is. MS. MILLER: Thank you. 4 5 MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Your Honor. MR. PINEDO: Yes, Your Honor. Could I just have 6 7 identification of the specific counsel I need to confirm that with? 8 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 MS. MILLER: Chris, this is Chanda Miller. You can 11 confer with me. 12 MR. PINEDO: Thank you, Chanda. 13 MS. DANIEL: Your Honor, the next two cases, Shemeca Rhinehart and Peggy Gorman, Surviving Sibling of 14 15 Richard Brent, they received a further deficiency on January 22 16 from MDL Centrality, so they have not had an opportunity to 17 submit an uploaded amended declaration. We would request 18 10 days to let them upload the additional declaration. 19 MS. MILLER: Your Honor, what had happened there was 20

21

22

23

24

25

we filed the motion. In response to the motion, they submitted a PFS that cured only part of the deficiencies. Yesterday they submitted a PFS that cured the rest. We have agreed to 10 days to get a new declaration verifying the PFS submitted yesterday.

THE COURT: That's fine. Let's do it that way.

MS. MILLER: It's a very similar situation with the

1 2

3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

18 19

17

21

20

22 23

24

25

Brent case.

Right. Just for Your Honor's MS. DANIEL: understanding, these motions were actually filed much later. think they were only filed about 15 days ago. They are trying to cure those.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MS. DANIEL: For Doris Wallace, Chris Quinn, are you on the line to discuss this case?

MR. QUINN: I am, Your Honor. We actually have three of these that we still want to talk to the Court about today, Your Honor. All three of those were cases that, as Ms. Daniel mentioned, these motions for order to show cause were only filed about two weeks ago. This is the first time that these cases have been up.

Doris Wallace is a case in which the claim appears to be viable based upon the documentation that we submitted several years ago. Ms. Wallace had passed away. After ascertaining that, we late last year and early this year submitted the death certificate, next of kin medical record authorization forms, a probate affidavit, and other documents that we were hopeful would allow defense to obtain medical records. The bottom line is since this motion was filed two weeks ago, we have been unable to communicate with the client's family ascertaining the status of any estate and figure out what they are willing to do.

5

We believe we have cured the issues with the PFS, but we have not had the opportunity to communicate with the family and figure out where estate plans are, what's going on, should we need to file some sort of motion to substitute parties or something along these lines.

The bottom line is I think the PFS issues are resolved. We have done what we have to produce next of kin affidavits and authorizations signed by the widower to allow defendants to attempt to obtain medical records, but we are not in a position to file any kind of motion for leave to substitute parties at this point.

MS. MILLER: Your Honor, if I could just clarify the timeline a little bit.

THE COURT: Okay. Sure.

MS. MILLER: Ms. Wallace passed away on September 3, 2015. Then eight months after her passing, a complaint was filed naming her as the plaintiff. Then three years later, in the fall of 2018 -- so three years after her passing -- is when the case was selected for workup. It's a plaintiff selection into the Wave 2 pool.

In terms of notice, they have been on notice of the death for three years. The issues that were raised in the motion were raised earlier, including in a letter sent on November 18.

At this point in time, there's no plaintiff who

is proceeding with the case. We don't have all of the answers in the plaintiff fact sheet. We understand that the deadlines will all be tolled, but we would like, given the long passage of time, some resolution by March.

THE COURT: Yes. I will pass it till March. If it's not resolved by then, I'm going to have to dismiss it. This has been going on too long. It seems like the case was filed after the person became deceased.

MS. MILLER: Yes.

MR. QUINN: I understand, Your Honor. Obviously, we didn't learn until subsequently of some of these facts, and when we sorted this stuff out -- we have done, again, everything we can to try to make sure that they are in a position to get medical records and that sort of thing as we try to sort this out.

THE COURT: All right. I will pass it until the next conference. If it's not resolved, we are going to have to dismiss the case, Chris.

MR. QUINN: I understand.

MS. DANIEL: Chris, did you want to discuss

Dorothy Lamar and Jacqueline Matthews as well? They are the last two cases.

MR. QUINN: If counsel and the Court want to take those up right now, I would be happy to.

THE COURT: Sure. Yes, let's do that.

1 2

MS. MILLER: That's fine.

MR. QUINN: So Dorothy Lamar, Your Honor, this again appears to be -- to be clear, some of the cases that were dismissed today without counsel appearing to object were our files. When we exhaust all efforts to try to resolve these things, obviously we don't continue to try to burden the Court and counsel with discussing these.

This case, again, this is one of these the motion was filed about 15 days ago. The claim appears meritorious based upon the medical documentation that was submitted. Unfortunately, since this case was selected, we have been completely unable to contact Ms. Lamar by phone, mail, or any other means. Because the case appears viable and because we simply have been unable to contact this client, we would ask that the Court give us a little bit additional time to attempt to do so.

THE COURT: How do you see it, Chanda?

MS. MILLER: Well, Your Honor, this was a defense pick into the CMO 6 Wave 2 pool. The plaintiff fact sheet was due on October 17. We have received a partially completed fact sheet, which I understand was completed by counsel, not the plaintiff herself. At this point they have had three to four months. If she is not responsive, it sounds to me like they have done everything they can. They can't find her and are not able to find someone who wants to proceed with the case, so it

1 2

should be dismissed.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond, Chris?

MR. QUINN: Again, Judge, we try to pick our battles. This is a case in which only relatively recently have we had issues trying to communicate. Again, the claim appears viable. We haven't been able to find any kind of obituary or something like that that suggests that Ms. Lamar has passed, which unfortunately happens with some of these cases.

We have been trying by phone and letter, particularly in the last two weeks since this motion has been filed, to communicate with this client. We just haven't been able to. Under those circumstances because the Court -- and I understand the reasons, but because the Court dismisses these cases with prejudice, I feel obligated to ask the Court for additional time.

Those cases that came up on the docket in

December -- and we were granted additional time, of course -we didn't appear to oppose dismissal this time when we were
unable to reach those clients, but that's not quite the
situation with this case. Under these circumstances, I just
think it's fair to ask the Court for a bit more time to try to
locate a person who appears to have a viable case.

MS. MILLER: Your Honor, if I could just clarify the timeline. CMO 6 was entered last year setting the deadlines. The PFS was due on October 17. We sent counsel a notice on

October 18 of the issues. This isn't a matter of only having two weeks. I understand the Court is going to do what the Court wants to do, but I just want to clarify the timeline here.

THE COURT: What's the other case, Chris?

MR. QUINN: The last case is Jacqueline Matthews,
Your Honor. For the record, suffice it to say we have not been
just trying to contact these clients for the last two weeks. I
want to make sure the Court understands that.

Jacqueline Matthews, this was a case that we learned late last year that the address we had on this file for this client was no longer accurate and she had relocated. Since we learned that, we have been attempting to get the PFS materials back in. I do not have authority to stipulate to dismiss this case.

We have tried multiple times to get the materials back. There was a phone call with the client in December in which we learned that for some reason materials hadn't been received. We understand that as of Friday, the 18th, the materials were supposed to have been overnighted back to us. We have not received those yet.

Under the circumstances, with my understanding that materials have been recently mailed to us and that the client had relocated and we were unable to reach her until late last year, this is another case in which we would ask the Court

for additional time to try to sort this out. We understand, of course, that if we get additional time and aren't able to sort this out that the Court will rule the way the Court will rule, but under these circumstances we would ask for a bit more time.

THE COURT: In the last two cases that you talked to me about, I will pass it to the next time. If it's not given by that time, I'm going to dismiss the case with prejudice, both of them.

MR. QUINN: I understand, Your Honor.

MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. DANIEL: Now we go, Your Honor, to the non-CMO 6 cases, and there were 28 cases listed on Document 12286.

Your Honor, the first case is Jennifer Christie. She is a pro se plaintiff, Your Honor, that Susan Sharko mentioned. We will carry that, with defendants' consent, to the next hearing. We are trying to help her upload this into MDL Centrality, if she chooses, but obviously there are other documents she will have to upload as well. We will pass that.

The next three cases, Your Honor, are cured. The are Terrance Carrington, *Darryl Posey*, and *Jeannine Valantiejus*.

The next case, *Nellie Harden*, Your Honor, the defendant agreed to an extension on that matter.

MS. MILLER: On the Harden matter, counsel explained

2

1

4

5

6 7

8

10

1112

1314

15

16

18

17

19

20

2122

23

24

25

that the records that were outstanding were unfortunately lost in the Federal Express system. We understand they are on their way a second time and agree to carry that one.

MS. DANIEL: The next case, Your Honor, was already dismissed. It's *Glenn Cooper*.

For the next 19 cases, Your Honor, although the firms have been diligent and made all best efforts to cure the deficiencies, through no fault of their own the following cases have been unable to be remedied. They are:

Mary Brennan, Robert Collins, Victor Deeb,
Virginia Durden, Leon Freeman, Forough Gadim, Timothy Helton,
Stephen Holland, Andrew Lewis, Nancy Mitchell, Kristi Moreno,
Jamie Royal, Willie Sherman, Richard Tavernia, Robert Taxacher,
Louis Thompson, Anthony Turner, Wilneisha Walton, and Georgine
Williams.

The last three cases, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Let those others be dismissed.

MS. DANIEL: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you, Your Honor.

The last three cases, Your Honor, counsel would like to address the Court. They are *Loretha Bohannan* and *Dorothy Reese*. They are with the same firm.

Is anyone on for the Stern law firm?

MS. MILLER: Your Honor, this is a case where the PFS was due in August. The motions were filed in the case in October. Because of the hybrid switching from the old process

to this process, this case was heard at the November hearing and given an extension.

THE COURT: Is that the Bohannan case?

MS. DANIEL: Yes.

MS. MILLER: Yes, that's the Bohannan.

MS. DANIEL: Yes, Loretha Bohannan and Dorothy Reese, Your Honor. In Loretha Bohannan, I emailed this firm and have been in constant contact with them. They have actually placed an ad in the newspaper to locate this client that I have actually seen. They sent it to me. On Dorothy Reese, they are getting letters of administration on this matter.

Your Honor, we would ask that they be given some additional time to try to figure this out just because this is the first time. This is a new process. Everybody is getting used to it. So we would ask for this time that they be allowed to pass to at least the next hearing. For letters of administration, I know it is always difficult.

MS. MILLER: If we could take these one at a time, Your Honor. The *Bohannan* case, it sounds like they have really gone above and beyond.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. MILLER: This isn't actually the first time the Bohannan case has been up. It was before the Court in a hearing in November. It sounds like they have done all they can, and the plaintiff is not responding.

THE COURT: I think that's right. Bohannan I will dismiss with prejudice. We will pass the Reese case.

MS. MILLER: For *Reese*, too, so the record is clear, we have no records showing that the plaintiff -- in addition to letters of administration, we have no records showing that Dorothy Reese took Xarelto and no records showing that there was any alleged bleeding event or injury associated with any use of the medication.

THE COURT: I will pass the *Reese* case. If that's not clarified by next time, we will dismiss that with prejudice.

MS. DANIEL: Your Honor, the last case is Dennis Walquarnery.

Is anyone on for the law office of Christopher Johnston? Is anyone on the line?

MS. MILLER: Your Honor, like the other two cases, this is one where the plaintiff fact sheet was due in 2018. This one was actually due July of 2018. The motion was filed in October. Because of the conversion from the old process to this process, this case was, in fact, heard in November at the November show cause hearing. Your Honor agreed to give them an extension of time. It was then listed in December and now is set today again for hearing. Given the passage of time and the fact that the plaintiff hasn't submitted the information, I think it should be dismissed with prejudice.

MS. DANIEL: Your Honor, it's your decision. 09:51 1 2 Obviously, we have nothing further to add. 3 THE COURT: We will dismiss it with prejudice. MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 5 MS. MILLER: Thank you. THE COURT: Is that it? 6 7 MS. DANIEL: That's it. We will see you in March. 8 MS. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: See you next time. 10 MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Judge. 11 THE COURT: Thanks. 12 (Proceedings adjourned.) 13 * * * 14 **CERTIFICATE** I. Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR, Official Court 15 16 Reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District 17 of Louisiana, certify that the foregoing is a true and correct 18 transcript, to the best of my ability and understanding, from 19 the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 20 21 22 <u>′s/ Toni</u> Doyle Tusa Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR 23 Official Court Reporter 24 25