UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA 3 4 IN RE: XARELTO (RIVAROXABAN) * 14-MD-2592 PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION * 5 Section L Relates to: All Cases November 7, 2019 6 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * 7 8 9 MONTHLY STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 11 Appearances: 12 For the Plaintiffs: 13 Herman Herman & Katz, LLC BY: LEONARD A. DAVIŚ, ESQ. 14 820 O'Keefe Avenue New Orleans, Louisiana 70113 15 For the Defendants: Irwin Fritchie Urguhart & Moore, LLC BY: KIM E. MOORE, ESQ. 16 17 400 Poydras Street, Suite 2700 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 18 Also Participating: Andy Birchfield, Esq. 19 Susan Sharko, Esq. Mike Love, Esq. 20 Gerald Meunier, Esq. 21 Official Court Reporter: Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR 500 Poydras Street, Room B-275 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 22 (504) 589-7778 23 24 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography using 25 computer-aided transcription software.

09:09 1

2

3

5

6

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1516

14

18

19

17

2021

2223

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

(November 7, 2019)

THE COURT: Be seated, please.

Let's call the case.

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

THE COURT: Counsel make their appearance for the record, please.

MR. DAVIS: Good morning, Your Honor. Plaintiffs' co-liaison counsel, Leonard Davis.

MS. MOORE: Good morning, Your Honor. Kim Moore,
defense co-liaison counsel.

THE COURT: This is our monthly status conference.
We have a large number of people on the phone monitoring this,
so please speak from the microphones.

This is the status conference in the *Xarelto* case. I will hear from the parties. I met a moment ago with lead liaison counsel to discuss the proposed agenda. I will take the items in the order given to me in the proposed agenda, first the settlement.

MR. DAVIS: Yes, Your Honor. Counsel recognizes that Your Honor is in the middle of a trial.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. DAVIS: We will try to be as prompt as possible. We also realize that there are 20-some-odd people on the phone.

I would encourage those individuals that are on the phone that if they have questions specifically regarding matters, in particular those who have not enrolled in the settlement, to contact lead or liaison counsel on the plaintiffs' side.

We are available, and they should feel free to reach out to us rather than addressing those matters today, unless Your Honor cares to deal with those matters today, which I know you may have. We are available to answer questions specifically with respect to some of the Court's orders and the applications which the plaintiffs have done with respect to trial package, remand, and things like that.

THE COURT: Right. Okay. We have now 33,000 individual claims that have been filed in this matter. We have gone through six bellwether trials, one in Mississippi as well as five in this area. We have also had some in state court with my brothers and sisters in the state court bench. The parties have had an opportunity now to discover the case for a number of years. They have produced thousands of depositions. I have had maybe 1,500 motions that I have dealt with.

About three or four months ago the parties began discussing a global resolution of this matter, and they have apparently reached a satisfactory global resolution. I will hear from the parties as to what's happening with the settlement.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Good morning, Your Honor. Andy

Birchfield.

On behalf of the plaintiffs' leadership, we are pleased with the current status of events. The response from the plaintiffs and plaintiffs' firms has been overwhelmingly favorable.

Where we are in the process of finalizing the settlement agreement now is that BrownGreer is vetting the enrollment documents. There are some deficiencies that need to be cleared up, and then the defendants will have an opportunity to verify the information.

I cannot say anything official, but from the plaintiffs' leadership standpoint, from our viewing the enrollment process and working with BrownGreer through the process, it has been an overwhelmingly favorable response. I foresee us moving forward and issuing points awards in the near term. I anticipate that we will be in a place to start getting payments to claimants in the first half of next year.

I'm pleased with where we are and how the overall litigation is progressing. I understand that there are a handful of firms who represent claimants who chose not to participate, and the Court urged those firms to either appear today or be here by phone.

I understand that the Court is wanting to move forward with those cases in a rapid fashion. I'm here and Brian Barr is available and Jerry Meunier and Lenny Davis. If

you want us to work with them in developing a scheduling order or something along these lines, we can certainly do that based on our experience of what the Court has done in the past.

THE COURT: This settlement is an opt-in settlement. Anybody who doesn't want the settlement doesn't have to opt into the settlement. The deadline for doing it is passing. Once the settlement gets solidified, which looks like that it will be done by the end of December, then there will be no further opportunities to get into the settlement because the amount will be locked in.

The amount is \$775 million. That amount will be allotted based on various criteria to the individuals inside of the settlement. So once that's done, then there will be no further opportunity to get into the settlement.

What will happen at that point is that we will start trials as quickly as possible with the individuals who have chosen to opt out of the settlement. I would like to have a status conference on December 12 with those individuals who intend to try their cases so that I can work with them on a scheduling order for them to begin getting their cases ready for trial.

They will have the opportunity to have at least six of the trial transcripts from the various trials that have been going on in this case. They will know the experts. They will see the experts who have testified at the trials. They

will have an opportunity, then, to contact those experts and decide whether or not they are going to use those experts at the trial.

Hopefully I will get finished with the trials in a matter of months after the scheduling. We will do what we can do in the MDL area. I will have a number of motions that undoubtedly will be focused on the MDL aspect of the case. Some of the deadlines are closing in or are imminent. Those deadlines, if they haven't been met, I expect that the defendants will be filing motions to dismiss. I will have a rule to show cause why the case should not be dismissed. If the cases survive those motions to dismiss, then we will be able to get them on a trial track as quickly as possible.

I will deal with the MDL motions. Those cases that I will be remanding to state court, I've already talked to the judges in state court. They are ready to proceed, and they hope to finish those cases within six months to a year. We will fast-track them, and hopefully the entire litigation will be able to be resolved in a short manner.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Your Honor, you had entered a minute entry encouraging the lawyers representing those claimants that had elected not to enroll to be here today for the purpose of discussing that schedule. For December 12, is it your anticipation that those lawyers and the defendants be proposing a scheduling order?

If that's the case, Your Honor, I know that Mike Love and maybe other lawyers representing claimants that opted out have appeared here today. I can meet with them after the status conference, give them the vantage point that I have about what the Court will be looking for in a scheduling order, and I will be glad to provide that assistance.

THE COURT: It seems to me that those individuals who are going to be trying their case ought to be meeting as quickly as possible with lead counsel to find out what's available, if they don't know what's available, and which cases have been tried, how to access those records, what records they don't need to access because they already have copies of them, things of that nature so that they are able, then, to be able to, on December 12, have some idea of what's doable in a scheduling order that needs to be put in place.

So I would urge that they get in contact with lead liaison counsel to at least discuss some of the parameters to inform them as to what's available because they will be trying their cases. They ought to know what has been utilized or what is available for them to have in the trial of their case.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Yes, Your Honor. So the executive committee, we will meet with those after the status conference, those that are here, and then we can follow up with those that are attending by phone. Thank you.

this.

THE COURT: Let me also hear from the defendant on

MS. SHARKO: Thank you, Judge. On behalf of the defendants, we are pleased with the overwhelming positive response to the settlement. We look forward to getting to December, when we make our final decision on whether to go forward with it.

As to the cases who have chosen at this point to proceed with litigation, I would just like to emphasize that the CMOs in place -- and I think maybe Mr. Davis will go through those in a little more detail -- provide a very clear statement of what has to be done before a case can be actually listed for trial and that we on the defense side intend to aggressively enforce those deadlines that Your Honor set many months ago.

I would note for the record that the deadlines are on a rolling basis, but for the people who have deadlines, virtually all of them are delinquent.

There's a filing fee payment deadline. I can't speak to that. I suspect those fees have not been paid to the Court.

The preservation order requirement, 89 out of 93 plaintiffs have failed to meet that deadline.

The affidavit of compliance and medical records, 92 out of 93 plaintiffs have failed to meet that.

The PFS and consent form and records, production of medical records, 352 out of 442 plaintiffs have failed to meet that deadline. The short form PFS, 351 out of 442 plaintiffs have failed to meet those deadlines.

The defense firms have sent deficiency notices out and will continue to send deficiency notices out. We intend to move for dismissal with prejudice and orders to show cause for people who don't comply.

Then thereafter we have a robust list of motions that will need to be addressed, either here by Your Honor or in the remand courts, including a renewal of our preemption motion, which we think is very significant post the recent Supreme Court decision that came down after the settlement was announced. There's statute limitations motions, which Your Honor has granted before under Louisiana law, learned intermediary motions, and Michigan case motions, among others. So we intend to pursue people aggressively on that, and we are starting because a certain number of plaintiffs have indicated that they are not going to proceed with the program.

I would urge these plaintiffs, to the extent they don't understand the deadlines in the orders or what they are supposed to do or how they are supposed to do it, to please talk to Andy Birchfield, Brian Barr, or really anybody on the PSC so they can offer their guidance.

THE COURT: Yes. Case Management Order 11 details

all the requirements of the parties. There are several requirements that the parties have to deal with in order to be eligible for trial in the case.

In these matters, we try to streamline them. We have fact questionnaires as opposed to interrogatories. There are various motions that need to be dealt with. I have set all the deadlines in CMO 11. If you have any questions at all, anybody who is thinking about not opting in, please contact lead liaison counsel to discuss it with them so that you have access to whatever information they have.

MS. SHARKO: Thank you.

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, just so that it's very clear, the joint report, specifically at page 3, Section 4(c) addresses CMO 11 and CMO 11A.

I point out that CMO 11 was entered about seven months ago, back in March, and 11A was in September. There were certain deadlines that are set forth in those CMOs. I won't go through what each of the requirements are, but there were deadlines that began on October 4 for preservation notice requirements. Those are laid out in the order as well as in the joint report. There's also a deadline of October 9, 2019, which required certain services, and then another deadline of October 21. Those deadlines have passed.

I point out that there is another deadline that's coming up soon, which is January 2 for case-specific

reports, all of which Your Honor has ruled upon in prior orders. Individuals who are not enrolled in the settlement need to be aware of those.

THE COURT: We are talking about deadlines and CMOs. This is an MDL matter, a multidistrict litigation matter. As we all know, the MDL was created in the '30s. It has taken a very active role since the 1990s. Presently 40 percent of every case filed in the United States courts is in an MDL proceeding, and it looks like that it is growing.

These cases have to be managed by one court. The court is designated by the MDL court, which is a court of seven judges appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States. One court then is designated, and all of the cases filed in the federal system, from wherever they may have been filed, are transferred to that particular court. I am the MDL court for the *Xarelto* case. All of the cases in the United States federal courts throughout the country have been forwarded to us.

We have to have some method of doing it. To alert everybody and to make it easier, I created a website for this particular case. I put everything on the website. I have status conferences every month. We have a transcript prepared of that status conference. I invite anybody who wishes to participate to come to court. If they can't come to court, I give them a phone number for them to come. I have oftentimes

hundreds of people on the phone listening in.

In addition to that, the transcripts then are posted on the website for those individuals who may not have had an opportunity to listen to the monthly proceeding. They can look at it. In addition to the transcripts, I post the calendar. I alert everybody. Every deposition that is being taken is placed on that calendar, so anybody who's interested in the deposition will know when it is taking place.

I put all of the Court orders on the website so that they have access to those Court orders. All of the decisions that the Court has made are on the website. The website is available to everyone. Everyone can access the website and know what's going on in this case.

Once I put the material up and once the deadlines are established, then I have to enforce the deadlines. I don't do it willy-nilly. I give people an opportunity to show cause why their case should not be dismissed if they haven't followed the deadlines, if they haven't followed what the requirements are. I invite them to court. I listen to them. If they don't show up or don't wish to proceed, I dismiss the case. I have to enforce the deadlines to keep this matter moving.

Litigation has to come to an end. It can't just linger forever. This case, I hope we will be seeing the end of it if not this year, hopefully next year.

Anything further from anyone?

I will have a status conference on December 12.

On that date we ought to have significant motions filed.

Is anybody in the courtroom that wishes to speak at this time? Sure. Come forward, please.

MR. LOVE: Your Honor, Mike Love.

My office represents a number of nonparticipating plaintiffs. I just want to make the Court aware that we are anticipating filing today or tomorrow an objection to certain terms of the settlement agreement and requesting relief from the Court with regard to that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LOVE: Those issues play into some of the scheduling issues that we have talked about. There are a number of terms in the settlement agreement that have nothing to do with compensating plaintiffs that are settling or the release of the defendants. There are terms that are punitive to everyone outside of that agreement, the nonsettling plaintiffs.

Specifically as relates to what you are talking about today, Your Honor, there's numerous terms that say that everybody that's participating, which includes the PSC, is not going to have anything to do with ongoing litigation. They are not going to assist ongoing litigation. They are not going to provide discovery. They are not going to provide experts.

They are going to tell their experts not to help. If those terms are allowed to stand when we are asking -- the motion we will be filing will be asking the Court to strike those terms. But if those terms are allowed to stand, then we are going to have to essentially start a do-over. We are going to have to do new depositions, new experts, all kinds of things.

We talked about discovery being made available. I'm hoping the Court will order those terms be stricken so we have access to it. In my request to the PSC for all the discovery and stuff that's been filed -- because my firm is new to this litigation -- I was told no. I was told that all that would be available was the transcripts from trial and the expert testimony depositions that were played at the trial; not everything they did, just the things that somebody else decided to play is all that would be made available.

If those terms are allowed to stand to the detriment of nonsettling plaintiffs, we are going to have motions in front of the Court to start all over again. One of those things is going to be to appoint additional PSC members that can represent nonsettling plaintiffs. There's some issues with that I will bring in my motion, but I just wanted the Court to be aware of that. We have some struggles.

THE COURT: No, I appreciate you bringing that to my attention. Let's file your motion.

What I would suggest that you do, Mike, is

contact the PSC, discuss it with them so that you can at least in your motion -- if there is an issue, I will get involved in it because it's not my intention that you have to start all over again.

MR. LOVE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond, Andy?

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Yes, Your Honor.

I will be glad to sit down and discuss this with Mr. Love because it's apparent that there is some misinformation about the terms of the settlement agreement. There is no provision that says the PSC will instruct our experts not to cooperate. That's misinformation.

There is a tremendous amount of information that has been put together through the trials of the bellwether cases, both the cases here in New Orleans and Mississippi and in Philadelphia, that is available to nonparticipating claimants. All that is available will be made available to these.

So I will be glad to discuss this with Mr. Love and the terms of the settlement agreement, and we will respond to the motion as filed.

THE COURT: Yes. It's the intention of the Court that anybody who opts out of the settlement will have access to material that has been developed during the process. It's just not fair for them to have to start all over again. I will be

interested in monitoring that. Whatever it is, let's talk to make sure that there's a problem first.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. LOVE: Your Honor, just so the Court understands what I'm looking at, in Section 1024 of the settlement agreement it says: No member of the XPCL -- which includes the PSC -- will make any experts retained by them for the *Xarelto* litigation available to other plaintiffs' counsel with claims in the *Xarelto* litigation or facilitate the retention of experts by any other plaintiffs' counsel.

That's a contractual term that they have agreed to, and that's my concern.

THE COURT: I think the way that at least I interpreted that is that you have a right to contact the experts and to make arrangements with the experts to work with you as opposed to having the PSC contact the experts and pay the experts to work for you. At this point they're off the hook from the experts' costs. You're on the hook for the experts' costs, but you have access to the experts. I don't see how you can't have access to the experts.

If that needs to be clarified with me, I will do so, but see whether or not it's a problem first. It's not my intention that you have to start all over again. That's not the process that we go through.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Your Honor, your interpretation

certainly aligns with mine and the plaintiffs' leadership committee.

Just two issues. We can address that. Then the second part is that the master settlement agreement itself is a confidential agreement, and all the parties agreed to maintain the confidentiality. It's available to every lawyer and claimant, but it's not for public consumption. I just want to make sure that everyone is reminded of that fact.

MR. LOVE: Your Honor, it does contain a confidentiality agreement, but I'm not a party to it. I'm not bound by that. I have complaints about it. I need to file it as an exhibit potentially.

THE COURT: File it in the record. That's fine.

MR. LOVE: I will. Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. SHARKO: On behalf of the defendants, this is a private settlement agreement. It was not a Court settlement agreement, number one. We will deal with the motion when we see it.

Number two, it is a confidential document. I understand that the plaintiffs' lawyers had to sign something to get access to it, and so I would ask that it be filed under seal.

THE COURT: Well, you need to file it for sure.

Let's do this. To make sure that you get it filed, let's file it under seal. I'm not going to keep the seal forever. To get

you in court, I don't want to have to deal with this issue, so 1 10:02 2 let's file it. You can file it under seal with the 3 understanding that I may lift the seal immediately, but let's 4 not create an issue that doesn't exist. 5 MR. LOVE: I understand, Your Honor. I will file it under seal as directed. I do not believe it should be 6 7 confidential and should be public record. I understand. I'm not making any 8 THE COURT: 9 decision on that at this point. I just want you to be able to 10 file your motion as quickly as you can so that I can take it 11 up. 12 MR. LOVE: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, Mr. Norris said he would be 14 filing that motion soon. We would ask that it be set for the 15 December 12 date, please. 16 **THE COURT:** Are you okay with that? MR. LOVE: He said "Norris," but he meant me? 17 18 MR. DAVIS: Yes. 19 MR. LOVE: I didn't know if there was somebody else 20 we were talking about. I will be filing it very soon. 21 THE COURT: Why don't you do that, and I will set it 22 for December 12. I hate to ask you to come back again, but it 23 would be helpful if you would be in person to argue the matter.

I will be, Your Honor.

24

25

MR. LOVE:

THE COURT: Okay. Great.

Anything else from anybody?

MR. MEUNIER: Judge, specifically there are rules for filing an opposition, deadlines in the Local Rules of the Court. I think it's 15 days before the hearing for motions and eight days before the hearing for opposition. If we could stay as close to that as possible, I think it would be appreciated.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. LOVE: You're talking about filing it before so you have time? Absolutely. Absolutely.

THE COURT: I suggest, Mike, that you talk to Andy or someone at least to find out whether or not there's an issue. On the issues, bring them to me and I will deal with them. On the issues that are nonissues, get something in writing that makes it plain that it's a nonissue and we don't have to deal with it.

MR. LOVE: I will follow that instruction, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good. Anything else?

Folks, thank you very much. The next status conference, then, is December 12 at 9:00 a.m.

MR. MEUNIER: 8:30 in chambers, 9:00 a.m. in open court, and then we will have the motion practice after the status conference?

THE COURT: Right.

MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Judge.

Court will stand in recess. THE COURT: Thank you. 1 10:04 2 THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. (Proceedings adjourned.) 3 * * * 4 5 **CERTIFICATE** I, Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR, Official Court 6 7 Reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana, certify that the foregoing is a true and correct 8 transcript, to the best of my ability and understanding, from 9 the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 10 11 12 13 /s/ Toni Doyle Tusa Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR 14 Official Court Reporter 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25