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

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 2016
A F T ERNOON S E S S I O N
(COURT CALLED TO ORDER)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
THE COURT: Be seated, please. Call the case, please.

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

THE COURT: Counsel, make your appearances for the record, please.

MR. MEUNIER: Jerry Meunier, co-liaison counsel for plaintiffs.

MR. IRWIN: Jim Irwin for Bayer and Janssen, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We're here today for our monthly status conference. I've had the opportunity to meet with counsel, lead counsel and liaison, a moment ago to discuss the agenda with them. We'll take it in the order that's proposed.

MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Judge.
Referring to Joint Report Number 14, with respect to the first section, Pretrial Orders, no new pretrial orders have been entered by the Court since the last MDL status
conference of February 23rd, 2016.
Nothing new, Your Honor, to report on Section 2 dealing with the Case Management Orders entered by the Court, Numbers 2, 3 and 4.

With respect to Section 3 of the report, Bellwether Selections, we would point out that on March 7, Your Honor entered an order which listed and identified the 40 discovery pool plaintiffs who have been selected through the process set up by Your Honor. That's Record Document 2626.

A number of inquiries were being made of liaison counsel as to who those plaintiffs were, so we appreciate the Court identifying them for the record.

THE COURT: The reason for the bellwether pool, so to speak, is that we're trying to select bellwether cases so that those cases can be tried, so that the lawyers and the litigants can have some idea as to how juries look at cases and how much it costs and how the cases are effectively tried.

So rather than have a discovery of the entire litigation before the bellwether cases are selected, and all of the costs and problems that that engenders, we select a number of cases, in this case 40, that we hope mirror the census of the litigation.

In those 40 cases selected, they are posted so that everybody knows the cases that are going into the discovery pool. Those cases are then discovered by both sides.
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Those plaintiffs are discovered. Those treaters are discovered. All of the information involving those cases are discovered.

Then, when that's finished -- and hopefully that can be finished in a reasonable time -- then, from that bellwether pool comes the bellwether cases, so that each side then will have a better idea of the cases that they respectively pick.

I'll go over, eventually, with them as to methods and time and things of that sort, but we're not there yet.

MR. MEUNIER: Nothing new on Section 4, dealing with Counsel Contact Information, except to emphasize the importance of counsel providing that information to liaison counsel, and we appreciate all of the attorneys who have been doing so diligently.

On Section 5, dealing with Plaintiff Fact Sheets, Your Honor, following the status conference today, the Court will hear two motions for orders to show cause filed by the defendants, one dealing with the category of plaintiffs who have failed to serve a plaintiff fact sheet on a timely basis under the Court's orders, the other category dealing with plaintiffs who have failed to prove or document Xarelto use through the fact sheet process.

We understand that there are a number of attorneys appearing for the individual plaintiffs involved, and
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that will be heard after the --
THE COURT: Right, we'll get on to that right after this conference, and then I'll hear from the parties.

The purpose of the fact sheets, as the attorneys know -- maybe the litigants don't -- in a case of this sort, and usually in civil cases, each side propounds a large set of interrogatories to each other, to the other side. They're questions fashioned by lawyers, and they're questions generally answered by lawyers.

As a result of that, very little gets done in that method, except a lot of motions to dismiss and a lot of other motions, and it takes a longer period of time.

In a case of this magnitude, we try to do away with the interrogatories, and in their place come up with fact sheets, the information that each side feels they need from the other side.

They propose these fact sheets. They have some agreement on the fact sheets. The fact sheets then take the place of interrogatories.

It's important that the fact sheets be filled out by both sides. The plaintiffs have fact sheets, and the defendants have fact sheets.

But I need the plaintiffs to understand that they have to fill in the blanks, the information that the fact sheets call for.

I try to give you enough time to do it. If you need additional time, I'm sensitive to that; but, we get to the point where some folks are not interested in filling out the fact sheets, or some folks are not able to fill out the fact sheets.

Frankly, in a litigation of this sort, some individuals, unfortunately or fortunately, haven't taken the drug, and if that's the case, then they may be in another litigation, but not in this litigation.

This has to do with Xarelto and the alleged maladies resulting from consuming Xarelto. If a person has not even taken Xarelto, then it seems to me logical that they shouldn't have a case in this court; maybe in another court, or maybe at another type of litigation, but this is the Xarelto case.

But we find that out in some fact sheets, and that's the purpose of the fact sheets -- one of the purposes of the fact sheets.

MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Your Honor.
There is a comment made in this section of the joint report regarding withdrawal of counsel. We talked about this in chambers.

It appears that there are a number of situations in which attorneys for plaintiffs have been filing ex parte or unopposed motions to withdraw as counsel. This impacts not
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only the number of remaining cases that are pro se from that point forward, which requires the Court to come up with special safeguards in handling of those cases, but it also impacts PTO 11B dealing with filing fees, which are the responsibility of counsel in many cases.

So with defendant liaison counsel, John Olinde, it's been agreed that both sides will have a meeting, perhaps with the clerk's office, and be presenting to the Court a protocol and process that will assure that the withdrawal of counsel is properly done, and that, in fact, with respect to other dismissals, the filing fee provisions of PTO 11B are protected and enforced.

THE COURT: I'll await that protocol, and I won't issue any orders allowing anybody to be dismissed in the case or withdraw from the case until I hear from you all.

MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Judge.
We have been asked by the defendants to remind counsel that if they should decide to move for an extension of time on filing a plaintiff fact sheet, that they should contact, must contact defendants' liaison counsel first to determine whether or not there is any opposition.

Section 6 of the report deals with Defendant Fact Sheets, Judge. I would simply make note of the fact that, under PTO 14, it is the responsibility of plaintiffs' liaison counsel to actually send the written notification to defendants
when there is a perceived defense fact sheet deficiency in a given case. That's our responsibility. It remains our obligation.

We will continue as a PSC to have responsibility for the follow-up with the other side, with defendants, on how to resolve those deficiencies only as to the 40 discovery pool plaintiffs.

I just want to make it clear that for all other plaintiffs, other than those in the designated discovery pool of 40 cases, the follow-up on resolving any defense fact sheet deficiencies must fall to the individual plaintiff's counsel in those cases.

THE COURT: Okay. The reason that I'm agreeing with that is that I want the parties, both the PSC and the defendants' committee, to be focused on the 40 cases and the bellwether selection. That's where they need to put all of their attention at this point.

So I'm not going to forget the other cases, but the other cases will have to recognize that the 40 cases are going to be discovered first. The other cases will await further discovery, if necessary, and we'll deal with the 40. So I'll do that.

MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, the Plaintiff and Defendant Fact Sheets now having been discussed under the joint report, I believe Jake Woody, of BrownGreer, is here to make an MDL
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Centrality Report on the fact sheets.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. WOODY: That's a beautiful picture, but it's not my -- there we go -- not as exciting as the galaxy, but nonetheless.

Your Honor, my name is Jake Woody, from BrownGreer, here to give you just a quick update on MDL Centrality and the Plaintiff and Defendant Fact Sheet process in this case.

We have so far 4,420 plaintiff fact sheets submitted. That's an increase of 442 since the last status conference. We have another 1,829 in progress.

Of the fact sheets that have been submitted, 1,463 have been amended at least once. That's done through MDL Centrality, simply by changing the answers or supplementing the information that's already been provided. We automatically mark that as an amended fact sheet or second amended, however the case may be.

So the total number of plaintiffs in the system so far is 6,249. That's an increase of 632 since the last status conference.

Those numbers, 442 and 632, are in line with the average that we receive every month. Since October of 2015, we've received about an average of 500 Plaintiff Fact Sheets every month. So far in March, we have 279, and we're two weeks
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in, so that's in line to get another 500 in March.
I think that's in line, also, with the number of filings that are coming in. We don't see any sign of that decreasing. In fact, it appears to be slightly increasing over the last month or so.

Defendant Fact Sheets are very similar. So far, we have 4,811 Defendant Fact Sheets submitted, split almost equally between the two defendants here. We have 543 already in March, so we expect to see about a thousand in March as well.

Those are also done through MDL Centrality. If you're a plaintiff and you receive an e-mail from us that there is a defendant fact sheet available, you can log in to the system, view a PDF of the defendant fact sheet. We save it in the documents, with all the documents that the plaintiff's uploaded, so we have one file that contains all the documents.

If the defendants upload any supporting documentation, that will be available in the system as well.

Again, there are also certain limited instances where a defendant fact sheet is amended. If that happens, then we will mark it as an amended fact sheet, and plaintiffs will get an e-mail notifying them to log in and take a look at that defendant fact sheet.

Our demographics, our high level demographics, even with the addition of 440 plaintiff fact sheets since the
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last status conference, remain almost exactly the same: 51 percent male, 49 percent female.

You can see from the age chart there that about three-quarters of the population was between the ages of 60 and 89 at the time they were injured. I think those types of statistics are significant when you start to look at how the MDL as a whole compares to the 40 cases that are in the discovery pool, which is what I'm showing here on this chart.

The blue bars are the MDL as a whole, and the orange bars are the 40 cases in the discovery pool. Again, 51 percent in the MDL are male, and 52 percent in the discovery pool are male.

69 percent in the MDL are between the ages of 60 and 79; 77 percent in the discovery pool are that age.

60 percent list GI bleed as an injury in the MDL population, and 72 percent have that same injury in the discovery pool.

This next category is the indication, the reason that the people took Xarelto, or at least that they list why they took it. 52 percent in the MDL note that it was to reduce the risk of stroke, and 72 percent in the discovery pool have that same indication.

Finally, 93 percent of all plaintiffs in the MDL allege that they were hospitalized for their injuries, and 97 percent in the discovery pool make that same allegation.

So you can see, at least at a high level, that, on these factors, the discovery pool plaintiffs match the MDL as a whole.

THE COURT: That's the reason or one of the reasons that we are using the centrality, because it allows us to get these statistics early on and to make sure that the discovery pool mirrors the census of the litigation.

So now we know at least what the census seems to be presently, and the discovery pool closely mirrors that. So we should be able to get some representative cases from that discovery pool, from the various categories, so that we can see how juries react to those individual cases and get some information that the litigants and the lawyers can at least be aware of.

MR. WOODY: Again, even though we're receiving quite a few plaintiff fact sheets on an ongoing basis, those submissions are not really changing the overall demographics. So I won't expect that those numbers will change significantly, no matter how many plaintiff fact sheets we add to the system.

If there are other factors that the Court or the parties are interested in doing this kind of analysis on, I'm happy to do it. It's not a problem. It's fairly easy because we have all the information in a central database.

Just to conclude on some numbers about the system as a whole, we have 335 firms using the system. That's an
increase of about 20 since the last status conference.
1,235 people have log-ins to the system. That's an increase of about a hundred since the last status conference.

We have 70,000 documents in the system, uploaded by either the plaintiff or the defendants. That's an increase of about 20,000 since the last status conference.

So there is a lot of activity in terms of uploading supporting documents by both sides over the last month.

Our largest file is 883 megabytes. I mention that only to emphasize the fact that the system can accommodate very large files. I know that when you're dealing with medical records for people who have a number of medical issues, those can get quite large, and the system can accommodate an almost unlimited file size.

Finally, just to touch briefly on the pleadings aspect of MDL Centrality, as most everyone knows, we distribute pleadings that are filed through the Court's ECF system to all the registered users of MDL Centrality, with the pleading attached as a PDF document.

So far, we've distributed 3,084 pleadings. That's everything that's been filed since we started working on the case.

I know that many people may get tired of
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receiving tens and dozens of pleadings every day. If that's the case, we can opt you out of that and give you an end-of-the-day summary -- it's just a chart of all the pleadings -- and we can switch you back if you need to.

If anyone on the phone or in the courtroom wants to avail themselves of that sort of streamlined option, you can e-mail us at MDLCentrality@BrownGreer.com. Likewise, if anyone needs help with the system or needs help accessing it or setting up accounts, please e-mail us at that same address. THE COURT: Okay. MR. WOODY: Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you very much. That's been very helpful.

MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, that brings us to Section 7 of the report dealing with Bundling of Complaints, Answers, Responsive Pleadings.

We have already touched on the fact that dismissals in these bundled complaints do implicate the enforcement of the filing fee payments that are not excused, but rather deferred, under PTO 11B. We will be discussing that again with opposing counsel to present to the Court, a protocol to tighten that issue a bit.

The other thing that's discussed in this section of the report is the Timothy Martin case. As Your Honor recalls, this is the case that involves defendants that are
subject to another MDL, involving the Bair Hugger device.
I believe Mr. Irwin has heard from counsel for 3M, and we've presented to the Court a joint request that you defer any decisions about the status of this matter until we get beyond the --

Is it March 24th --
MR. IRWIN: March 24th.
MR. MEUNIER: -- MDL status conference that involves the Bair Hugger issue.

THE COURT: Is that -- are you all in this case?
MR. LANDRY: Your Honor, may I approach?
THE COURT: Yes, sure.
MR. LANDRY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jason Landry, Martzell, Bickford \& Centola.

We'd like to stand by our earlier position that we would not want the case severed, and also that we have no problem staying the action until the MDL has come to an end. THE COURT: But as I understand, you're going to table that until a judge in -- Minnesota, is it?

MR. IRWIN: That's right. I believe it's going to be discussed -- or addressed, at least, at the March 24 conference with the judge. I believe that 3 M counsel will be getting back to us, and we'll be discussing it.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.
MR. LANDRY: Thank you, Your Honor.
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THE COURT: Before we leave bundling, I mentioned to counsel that the bundling is helpful in an MDL to allow people to file into the MDL; but, we get to a point where we have to go back to the individual filing.

So I will be issuing an order. I'm going to give everybody some lead time on that, but the order will be that the bundling opportunity will cease in 60 days from the date of the order that I put out, so that people will have another 60 days if they do wish to file in bundle form. If not, then they will have to file individual cases.

MR. MEUNIER: Thank you, Your Honor.
Nothing new to report on Section 8 in the joint report dealing with the Preservation Order.

Section 9 deals with the issue of Plaintiffs' Interactions with Prescribing and Treating Physicians of Plaintiffs.

On March 9, 2016, this court issued an order and reasons, it's Record Document 2676, which ruled on the matter that was before the Court on opposing briefs and argument.

In your order, Judge, you requested that the parties begin to discuss and work on a joint pretrial order to implement some of the aspects of your analysis and ruling dealing with the contacts with physicians. We will be doing that and reporting to the Court shortly on our efforts.

In Section 10 of the report dealing with

Discovery, the main current issue deals with a matter that will be heard by the Court today. It is the PSC motion addressing the confidentiality designations of certain documents. We understand the Court will take that up after the presentation on the orders to show cause.

Paragraph 11 of the report deals with Deposition Guidelines.

Judge, there may be -- probably will be a need to present to you a supplement to the deposition protocol, and in this supplement deal specifically with issues that are unique to the depositions of plaintiffs and physicians.

Again, this will deal with the plaintiffs in the discovery pool only. We have a team on each side that's been assigned the discussion for that and the presentation of something to the Court, hopefully in short order.

THE COURT: I had mentioned to counsel, with the discovery pool, we have to move those depositions quickly. So I suggest that they have teams, so that you can have flights of depositions going on at the same time, as opposed to just the same counsel taking 40 depositions. That's problematic.

So hopefully we can shorten the time by doing it that way.

MR. MEUNIER: Section 12 of the report deals with Discovery to Third Parties. Your Honor, the PSC continues to receive, both from the FDA and from the Duke Clinical Research
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Institute, materials that are the subject of an earlier served subpoena on each of those entities.

We've discussed today with opposing counsel the need to secure a firm timetable whereby we transmit material that we receive from those sources to the defendants, without there being an undue delay in that process.

Section 13 of the report deals with State/Federal Coordination, and Ms. Barrios is here to make the report on behalf of the PSC.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Mr. Meunier.
Good afternoon, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios for the Federal/State committee.

I've provided liaison counsel with copies of what I gave to your law clerk. That's just the stats of the cases filed around the country.

Really, right now, we have no big change in courts, but there are 54 additional cases that have been filed, with an additional 141 users. So around the country, there are 715 cases, but 923 people who ingested Xarelto and have injuries.

THE COURT: Where are most of the cases, Dawn?
MS. BARRIOS: Philadelphia.
THE COURT: Philadelphia. Okay.
I understand that both Philadelphia and other places are teeing up some discovery orders or --

Susan, do you want to address that?
MS. SHARKO: Yes. We have our first -- we have our first case management conference before the coordination judge in Delaware on April 8th.

THE COURT: Who is he, Dawn, or she?
MS. BARRIOS: Judge Wharton.
MS. SHARKO: Ferris Wharton, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much.
MS. SHARKO: His contact information is on the chart.
MR. MEUNIER: Your Honor, other than the reference to the matters now to be heard following the conference, which we've already discussed and identified, the only other issue is the scheduling of the May status conference.

THE COURT: The next conference will be April 20th at 9:00 a.m.; 8:30, I'll meet with liaison counsel.

The May conference is May 24th at 9:00 a.m.; again, I'll meet with liaison and lead at 8:30 that day. (WHEREUPON, at 2:42 p.m., the status conference concluded.)
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