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## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

 MORNING SESSION TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2016 (COURT CALLED TO ORDER)THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
THE COURT: Be seated please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

VOICES: Good morning, Judge. Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's call the case.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL 2592. In Re: Xarelto Products Liability Litigation.

THE COURT: Would liaison counsel please make their appearance for the record, please.

MR. MEUNIER: Jerry Meunier of Gainsburgh Benjamin, coliaison counsel for plaintiffs.

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

THE COURT: Okay. We're here today for our monthly status conference. I met a moment ago with lead liaison counsel to discuss the agenda. We'll take it in the order that was suggested.

MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please the
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Court, Jerry Meunier for plaintiffs. The joint report first lists the pretrial orders which have been entered during the pendency of the MDL.

There is one new pretrial order entered since the last status conference, and that is PTO 23A, Record Document 4455. In effect, it supplements the earlier provisions in PTO 23 regarding deposition guidelines and makes specific reference to expert deposition guidelines.

In Section 2, under the case management orders that have been entered, we note that since the last conference, the Court has entered CMO 2B, which sets forth new deadlines with respect to the third and fourth bellwether trial, the Mingo and Henry trials.

We also mentioned to Your Honor in chambers an issue that has come up with respect to deadlines that are set forth in CMO 2A, specifically insofar as the deadlines for Daubert motion practice are concerned.

The parties are dealing with having to schedule depositions to make sure that they don't conflict or cause problems with respect to the existing Daubert deadlines, and we will continue to work on that and present to the Court an amended set of deadlines that will address that problem. THE COURT: Okay. I anticipate the Daubert hearings will be mainly on paper. I'll take the opportunity to have oral presentations, but there won't be any witnesses' testimony
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as sometimes we have, so that will shorten the matter a little bit.

MR. MEUNIER: Nothing new to report on Section 3, bellwether selections.

Four, counsel contact information forms, that just, as always, Lenny Davis and I emphasize to all plaintiffs' counsel the importance of keeping us current on your contact information pursuant to PTO 4A.

On plaintiff fact sheets, which are discussed in Section 5, Judge, we have, as you know, a system in place with respect to deficiencies and fact sheets. The defendants will identify either fact sheets that have not been filed on a timely basis or fact sheets which have been filed but which contain inadequate information particularly concerning product use.

Under the system that we've had, the PSC assists in those matters by the defendants first furnishing us a list of those cases in which those problems are said to exist. This gives us an opportunity to contact plaintiffs' counsel, gives us an opportunity to try to work those problems out, and we have been successful in many cases.

In those cases where no problem -- the problems cannot be solved and defendants bring a motion for dismissal, which, of course, is a serious matter, and we make sure that plaintiffs' counsel are available by phone or in person when
the day comes to argue those motions.
What the parties are now doing is working on a PTO -- a new PTO that will set forth the protocol that I've just described in a more formal way with appropriate deadlines and spacing of the events. We hope to have that to the Court in a short while.

THE COURT: Okay. We have several motions later after this conference, and I'll take those motions, but the fact sheets in cases of this sort, they are the substitute for interrogatories. We can't have interrogatories in a matter of this sort. So far I have 16,000 individual cases, and it's growing, so interrogatories just is not a good vehicle for this type of case.

Instead of interrogatories, we have fact sheets. Each side gets together and decides what information they need. They prepare it in the form of a fact sheet after discussing it with opposing counsel, and then they submit the fact sheets.

The fact sheets are very important for the plaintiffs to fill out, just as they are very important for the defendants to fill out. I need the plaintiffs to take them seriously and to fill them out. I give you an opportunity to fill them out. I give you an opportunity to fill them out partially if you don't have all of the information.

But if I get to the point where you're not filling them out and you haven't filled them out, and there is
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no reason for not filling them out other than I didn't get around to it or I don't have the information or I don't want to give you the information, then the case is going to have to be dismissed.

Maybe there is an indication that the individual wants to be in another litigation. That's their prerogative, but if they are in this litigation, they have to comply with the rules. They are, in effect, not answering interrogatories, and that's a defective discovery failing and I take it seriously.

MR. MEUNIER: Nothing further or new to report, Judge, on Section 6 dealing with defendant fact sheets; Section 7, dealing with service of process on certain Bayer defendants; Section 8 dealing with the bundling of complaints, except to note, again, that the deadline for filing bundled complaints was May 20, 2016.

Nothing further to report on Section 9 dealing with the preservation order.

Section 10 refers to the Court's earlier order by Pretrial Order 28 setting forth the limits and guidelines for interactions between counsel and treating physicians.

As we mentioned in chambers, the terms of that order dealt with discovery related contact. We now are in a phase of the case where contact might be made with physicians for purposes of their trial testimony, so the parties will be
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working on an update revision or supplement to PTO 28 which specifically addresses contact with physicians for trial purposes.

In discovery, Your Honor, we continue to have our biweekly calls with you. They are very helpful to us in resolving things, and the last call we had with you, in fact, led to the resolution of many of the discovery issues which are identified briefly in Section 11 of the report dealing with discovery.

There are, however, a couple of discovery matters which, unlike others, are not either in the process of being resolved or have been resolved, and those will be the subject of some further meet and confer and/or motion practice.

One, in fact, is the subject of a motion that is set for hearing following the conference, which is the PSC's motion to compel sufficient responses by defendants to our request for admissions.

This deals with the status of the voluminous amount of documents that have been produced, and we would like to be briefly heard on that; although, we understand from our discussion in chambers that there is, perhaps, more meet and confer work to be done on resolving that area, but it is time critical, and Fred Longer for the PSC will briefly state what the PSC's concerns are in presenting that motion today.

The other matter in the discovery area which has
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not been resolved has to do with material to be produced by experts at depositions. Plaintiff experts in particular. We have an earlier pretrial order which defines and describes what experts are to produce in connection with giving their expert reports. The defendants have sought additional material from certain experts in deposition. We've had some meet and confer discussions about this, and the defendants yesterday have filed a motion to bring that matter to court for your input and assistance

We will work with the defendants on getting an appropriate time for the hearing -- the further briefing and hearing on that motion. It currently is set, I believe, for mid-December, which is just a regular hearing date, but we'll try to coordinate with the defendants and get that date fixed in a time that's convenient to the parties.

Nothing new to report on Section 12 dealing with discovery to third parties.

That brings us to Section 13, state/federal coordination, and I think Ms. Barrios is here to make a report for the PSC.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Mr. Meunier.
Good morning, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios for the federal/state committee.

I have given your law clerk two different charts, and they are a little different than what $I$ usually do.

Because Philadelphia now has trial dates that begin in September 2017, and it will be every two weeks, I gave Your Honor and the defendants a chart with the different plaintiffs that will go forward, their indication, and how they were selected. Judge New did use some random selections. He had BrownGreer do six random selections.

Ms. Sharko advised me today that two of the plaintiffs have to be substituted out, so I will -- when I learn those names of those plaintiffs, I'll substitute that for Your Honor.

Mr. Weinkowitz had asked me to please make sure that I report to the Court the cooperation between the MDL and Philadelphia. About two weeks ago, Mr. Roger Denton hosted a meeting between MDL attorneys and all the Philadelphia attorneys who had cases.

I want to thank him, Kurt Goza, and Emma Kingsdorf from my office, and I went and we did presentations of all the issues that we thought would be pertinent for the counsel for Philadelphia since we were so far in front of them.

It was well attended and there was about 25 different Philadelphia attorneys. We gave them access to special databases with information in it, so Mr. Weinkowitz wanted to thank the MDL and to make sure that you're aware of that level of cooperation.

The second chart, Your Honor, it looks like the usual chart. It's state court stats. As usual, the highlighted judges are the new judges; however, if you'll note, California now has the JCCP, so those cases that are now in front of other California judges will ultimately be transferred.

California has a status conference on December 12th, and I'll be able to give you a report as soon as that is over.

There is a large number of cases in Delaware that have been filed basically by one firm, and I understand that the majority of that firm's filings, the defendants have filed dispositive motions, so I'm to follow up with that firm and get further information on the Delaware cases.

In St. Louis, the city of St. Louis, there is a trial date set, Ms. Sharko advised today, of January 2017. I'll try to get some further information on that for Your Honor.

Your Honor, I know that in that court the motions judge is not necessarily the trial judge, so I'm going to try to find out who the trial judge will be for that trial and get that information to you.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Sharko, do you want to say something?

MS. SHARKO: 2018.

MS. BARRIOS: 2018.

So, of all of the stats that we have, the number of state court cases filed is 1373, and the number of current Xarelto users in suit is 1588, and the vast, vast majority of that is in Pennsylvania with 1093 cases.

THE COURT: Okay. I've been trying to coordinate with my state colleagues, and they have been helpful to me, and I appreciate all of the work that they've done and their help to the MDL.

I'm going to make sure that they know about the Daubert hearing, any oral presentations that we have. I'll make arrangements for them to either participate in person or to participate by phone or video or whatever means they would like to participate in.

Some of the issues may be a Frye issue for them, some of them maybe be Daubert issues, but at least they'll have the benefit of hearing the presentation, and I'll give them copies of all of the documents that's filed with me so that they can have access to them.

MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, I'll get together with Ms. Sharko and give you the judges' names of the cases that are most developed that may be ready for Daubert when you are.

THE COURT: Okay. So, no cases are set before the MDL trials are set?

MS. BARRIOS: No, Your Honor. You're first.

MS. SHARKO: That's correct. The MDL first.
THE COURT: All right. Okay. We'll make sure that they have the advantage of knowing what's happened and how we are doing it.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much, Dawn.
MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, would you like to hear a report now from BrownGreer on MDL Centrality? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. WOODY: My name is Jake Woody from BrownGreer. I have just a brief report for you on the fact sheets which we talked about a few minutes ago, and I can flesh out some details for you on that.

So far we have 13,335 fact sheets submitted. That's an increase of 736 since the last status conference. Another 1,268 fact sheets in progress. They haven't been filed yet, which gives us a total of 14,264 plaintiffs in our system. Of the 13,000 fact sheets that have been submitted, 3,166 have been amended at least once.

I believe that that total of 14,200 roughly aligns with the number of cases. There is a lag time between when a case is filed and when they register with our system, so that might explain any gap between the two numbers.

This is our monthly submission timeline. As you know, we received a significant number of fact sheets in August
of $2016,3,515$ in that month, but since then the numbers have returned to normal -- 641 in September, 618 in October, and 513 so far in November.

Those numbers align with our typical average of between five and 600 fact sheets every month, and I don't see any reason why that number will change in any way going forward for the next -- for the foreseeable future.

Our demographics are stable despite the increase in fact sheets -- 51 percent male, 49 percent female. Our largest age group is between 60 and 79, which are rows four and five on the age chart. As you can see, 53 percent of all of our plaintiffs are between 60 and 79 , so that makes up our largest age group there.

When we look at our demographics and compare them to the discovery pool, we've done this over the last few status conferences, these numbers are stable and aren't changing much. As I mentioned, 51 percent male in the MDL, and 52 percent of the discovery pool is male, so it it's aligned well.

60 to 79 age group is 53 percent of the MDL,
77 percent of the discovery pool. I believe when the discovery pool was created, the most prevalent factors were weighted to try to get the discovery pool to be as representative of the MDL as possible, so this is a little bit higher percentage in the discovery pool, but that's intentional for most of these factors.
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The alleged injury, gastrointestinal bleed, is 54 percent of the MDL, 72 percent of the discovery pool, and the indication -- the largest indication is reduction of stroke risk. That's 52 percent of the MDL and 72 percent of the discovery pool.

Finally, hospitalization, 92 percent of the MDL alleges some hospitalization, and 97 percent of the discovery pool does the same.

So the MDL and the discovery pool match up well. Obviously, there is some weighting to try to get the discovery pool to find the most representative chases, which is why the discovery pool is, in some cases, a little bit higher percentage than the MDL as a whole.

THE COURT: You see, that's the importance of the fact sheets, folks. When we get the fact sheets in digitally, we are able to massage them and make some sense out of them insofar as various categories -- male, age, GI bleeds, stroke risks, and hospitalization. Then we try to create a discovery pool that mimics the census of the litigation.

The discovery pool then is discovered in detail, and both sides, after they are finished with the discovery pool, has the opportunity to participate in selecting the bellwether cases which we select from the discovery pool.

That gives us an opportunity to pick representative cases that mimic the census of the whole
litigation to give the attorneys and give the litigants an opportunity to see how juries act under various matters that are presented in those cases. That's part of the whole litigation, and that's why it's so critical that we get fact sheets.

MR. WOODY: Finally, Your Honor, just some brief numbers on our system. We had 436 firms using the system. 1651 individual users. We've identified 117 duplicate plaintiffs by using Social Security numbers so that we can resolve those issues earlier rather than later.

We have 163,000 documents that have been uploaded into the system -- medical records, HIPAA authorization, things of that nature.

Finally, we have distributed 6,260 of the Court's pleadings and orders to plaintiffs' counsel.

That's all I have, Your Honor. I appreciate your time. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Anything more, Jerry?
MR. MEUNIER: No, Your Honor. The next conference is --

THE COURT: Okay. The next conference is December 20th, and the following after that is January 20th, both at nine o'clock.
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Okay. Steve, you have something?
MR. GLICKSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor, one question about what Jerry had said. My understanding from our chambers discussion is that the issue on request for admission concerning admissibility of documents was to be the subject of a further meet and confer between the plaintiffs and defendants in light of Your Honor's guidance.

I'm certainly prepared to argue the motion, if that's what plaintiffs want to do and what the Court wants to hear. It seems to me, Your Honor told us what you wanted to happen, which is that there would be a smaller number of exhibits, and we work out a scheduling. I think it's probably most productive.

THE COURT: Okay. That was my understanding.
Fred, where are you on this point?
MR. LONGER: Your Honor, it was my understanding that was Mr. Glickstein's position. Our thought was that we would at least make our presentation, and hopefully we could narrow some of the issues.

I do think that the motion -- well, let me put it differently. I do think that the objections that they raised are simply placeholders and that it's important for us to get deadlines in place fast so that we can get to a point where our exhibit list is due on February 10th, and we need to have the information in advance of that February 10th deadline.

I understand that's their position, which is, well, we're trying to basically hop-skip over the February 10th deadline, but we need this information to prepare for the February 10th deadline.

That's why I think it's important for us to at least nail that down. Whether it's done by motion or whether it's done by agreement, that's one thing, but we haven't gotten the cooperation on this end, which is what got us to a motion.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's do it this way: Let's split the difference, and I'll give you all an opportunity to confer, but I'll take this up on our next Wednesday conference, which is, what, this Wednesday or next Wednesday? Next Wednesday?

MR. IRWIN: December 8th, I believe, Your Honor.
MR. MEUNIER: Next week.
THE COURT: Yes, December 8th.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: At 3:30.
THE COURT: December 8th at 3:30. We'll do it on the telephone, and I'll hear from you all at that time.

Get together, Steve, with Fred and see whether or not you all can narrow the issue.

My thinking there is that we're dealing with about 1,600 documents, and some of the objections are in the 800 category of the Federal Rules. Some of that can be dealt with a little more easily than others, and it takes some scrutinizing of some of the issues; therefore, time presents a
problem.
So from the plaintiffs' standpoint, you ought to try to shrink the number, and then the defendant can answer on those numbers, and then I'll deal with it, but 1,600 is too many for this period of time. See if you can refine it a little bit.

Then some of the decisions that were made, there may be a need for presentation for some of the others, but at least it ought to be streamlined a little bit. I think the plaintiffs are asking for too many at this time.

I do think you ought to know, just as I said in chambers, I would like you all to know long before which documents are admissible, which are not admissible so that you don't have to deal with that. You deal strictly with the trial and not worry about evidence issues.

I'll have those streamlined for you and ruled on immediately. You'll be able to deal with the trial issues and know what's getting in and not getting in.

I hear you on the time. I agree with that. Both sides, I think, profit from having decisions made prior to the trial, but in order to make it doable, I think you have to have a smaller number of issues.

MR. LONGER: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, since that will be heard next

Thursday, the 8th, perhaps we could have an agreement that by Monday we'll report to the Court on the further discussions so it will narrow and the Court will know what is actually still at issue for purposes of the (speaking simultaneously) -THE COURT: Yeah, I don't have problems with that. MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's see. We'll take a break at this time and come back for the motions. We have a couple of motions.

MR. MEUNIER: Yes, we have a motion to withdraw.
THE COURT: All right. The Court will stand in recess five minutes.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
(WHEREUPON, at 9:31 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.)
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