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THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

VOICES: Good morning, Your Honor.
THE COURT: First, call the case.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL Number 2592, In re: Xarelto Products Liability Litigation.

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

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

MR. DAVIS: Good morning, Your Honor. Leonard Davis, from Herman, Herman \& Katz, for plaintiffs.

MR. MEUNIER: May it please the Court, Gerry Meunier, co-liaison for the plaintiffs.

THE COURT: All right. First, I would like to welcome everybody to the proceedings. I look forward to working with you all in the coming period.

Let me make some general comments first.
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The procedure, just on procedure, as you know, or you should know, I have a website that I devoted to this particular case. On the website, I will put a calendar on all the events that are happening and will happen.

Any depositions that are set will be on the website and posted on the website. All of my orders, all of the transcripts of these meetings will be on the website, accessible to everyone, including your clients. If they are interested, give them the website, and they can keep up with the litigation also.

I'll have monthly meetings in open court. I have the meetings transcribed. The transcripts will be, in time, placed on the website, so that if you do miss a meeting, you'll be able to catch up by looking at it.

We'll start our meetings at 9:00. Half an hour before, I meet with liaison and lead counsel. You need to know that they give me a proposed agenda. They get together and talk with their leadership group and others and give me a proposed agenda.

They give me that two days before the scheduled meeting. I have an opportunity to look it over, add to it, subtract from it. At the premeeting, I tell them what the agenda will be, and what $I$ think they should emphasize and discuss in greater detail.

Nothing is secret at the meeting. I simply want
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them to be prepared, so that when they step in the court for the general meeting, they'll know what they are going to be talking about. So it's a little more efficient doing it that way.

The first meetings, this meeting, and perhaps partially another one, will be devoted to infrastructure. In the MDL's, it's unlike other cases. I think you need to deal up front and get some infrastructure set down, so that you don't have any problems along the way.

When I'm talking about infrastructure, I mean we need to have some process of notifying people of what's happening. That sometimes is difficult because of the numbers of attorneys in this particular case, so we need some procedure for notice.

Direct filing is another aspect of the infrastructure. Deposition protocol. In a case of this sort, you can't have a thousand lawyers asking questions. It just does not work. So we need some deposition protocol.

Tolling agreements, that's another infrastructure matter that I've talked to the liaison and lead about.

Protocol for serving foreign parties. In this particular case, there may be some foreign parties. There ought to be, if it can be worked out, some protocol for dealing with that.

A form for a privilege log. You ought to have an
agreed form for a privilege log. If a party asserts a privilege, it ought to be in the same type of structure as all of the other privilege requests submitted.

Protective orders, we ought to have a protective order issued. I believe strongly in the First Amendment, but my responsibility in this case is in the Seventh Amendment, and so I do the best I can to promote the Seventh Amendment and put the First Amendment in time, but oftentimes a protective order is necessary to allow adequate discovery so that the case can be prepared and be ready for trial. That's important to me in this particular case.

Form for fact sheets, or profile forms we sometimes call them. As you know, I've begun the process. Last time, we heard from Orran Brown -- we'll hear from him a little later in this meeting -- on the type of form that's possible.

In this particular case, I would like to see if we could step it out into electronically-produced forms. It's not only easy to do, but it is also searchable.

So, with the fact sheets, I will be able to get a better feel for the totality of the litigation, the census, so to speak, of the plaintiffs. We'll know how many cases there are, how many are male, how many are female, how many are under 50, over 50, prior problems and so forth and so on.

That's helpful because when we get to a later
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stage in the case, we'll have to devise a discovery pool and from there take some bellwether cases. Hopefully, they'll be representative and will be able to inform you as to the nature and type of this litigation.

So those are the infrastructure matters that I've asked the parties to be able to discuss with us here today.

After the infrastructure is established -- and hopefully we'll be able to do that within the next couple of weeks, nail down all of those aspects. Some of them have already been dealt with, some need to be dealt with in the future, but hopefully we can get that done in the next couple of weeks -- then I'm going to look to the parties to prepare a scheduling order.

The way I see this case -- it's just broad comments. They are not written in stone because cases take different turns, and some of these things may not be necessary -- but I see first a period of time, hopefully not any elongated period of time, but a short period of time where document discovery can take place.

I think it's got to come from both the plaintiffs and the defendants. The plaintiffs have to be prepared to put up any past medical that they have or opportunities for the defendant to get the past medical, a description of the injury, a bit about themselves, their age and things of that sort.

From the defendants' standpoint, they have to be
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prepared to give up material dealing with the design, production, distribution of the particular drug involved, and other documents from both sides need to be developed.

Then, from that, we ought to be moving into depositions. Deposition, at that stage, ought to be focused on the general causation questions.

In these cases, as you know, there are two causations that predominate. One is the general causation. That's generally meaning whether or not the drug has been designed properly, whether the drug has been marketed properly, whether warnings have been adequate and so forth. The focus is whether or not that drug can create a difficulty or malady.

Then, after the depositions of those individuals, I see expert exchanges because the experts need some information on which to base their opinions. So experts then need to come forward and perhaps be deposed and Daubert-ized.

After the Daubert motions, I expect that motions will be filed, substantive motions, summary judgment motions, either in whole or in part, to either dissolve the case or trim it down, if that's possible.

After the motions, if the case proceeds, then I think the focus then would be on creating a discovery pool.

I don't know how many cases there are at this point, but it doesn't make any sense to me to have to take the deposition of everybody out there. If there are thousands of
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people, we'll waste a lot of time in taking depositions of a thousand people.

So what I try to do is create a discovery pool. I'll give the plaintiffs an opportunity to pick 20 or 30 people. I'll give the defendants an opportunity to pick 20 or 30 people. That will be the discovery pool.

Hopefully, the discovery pool, with the use of the fact sheets, will be able to represent in microcosm the whole census of the litigation. So we'll have the scope of the litigation represented in that group, which we'll call the discovery pool.

Then the plaintiffs or defendants have to discover those individuals, and the focus of that is whether or not this particular drug caused that malady. If the question is bleeding to death, if somebody got shot in the head on Canal Street, perhaps the drug didn't cause that bleeding problem. So the defendants have to know what the individuals are.

Now, from that discovery pool, we'll pick the bellwether cases. I'll design a procedure for each of you to pick bellwether cases. I generally try to pick about six bellwether cases, and we start the process of trials, one after the other. If one case settles, then the next one comes in line. Hopefully, we'll be able to give you an opportunity.

Now, the whole purpose of this process is to give
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the litigators, the lawyers, as well as the clients, an opportunity to look at the case, to see whether or not this is a case that can be resolved globally.

That's one of the advantages of an MDL procedure. We've got all of the cases here. At that point, we will be able to give you an opportunity to look at the case globally and to see whether or not this is the type of case that can be resolved by creative attorneys in some efficient way.

If it can't be -- and cases can not be, all of them can't be resolved that way, for various reasons -- if it can't be, then you need to know that I will have exhausted my responsibility at that point.

I will have given you an opportunity to look at the case and discover the case and to analyze the case. I will have given your clients an opportunity to look at the case, analyze the case. At that point, if it cannot be resolved here, I will then send the cases back to the transferee court.

I think the biggest problem that an MDL has is becoming a black hole that just stores the cases, and they stay here. I don't do it that way. I give you an opportunity to look at the case, to work the case, but if it cannot be resolved, I send them back to be resolved.

That's what we need to do. The litigants deserve that. The litigants deserve some finality.

That's basically the approach that I expect to be
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taken in this case. After we get the infrastructure established, I'll be focusing the parties on a scheduling order which focuses on that procedure.

Well, with those general comments, let me turn the matter over to liaison counsel, and we'll go through the proposed order that they have given to me and that I discussed with them a moment ago.

First item on it is Pretrial Order. Is there anything on that?

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, thank you. Just so that it's very clear, co-liaison counsel and myself have discussed on presentations, and we've agreed that we'll alternate when we will make presentations. So, I'm here today, and Mr. Meunier will be present next time.

With respect to pretrial orders, my appreciation is, is that all of these records are posted on Your Honor's website, which I understand is at www.laed.uscourts.gov, and there is a tab for Xarelto. For those people on the phone, they may want to check that out.

THE COURT: Right. With regard to that, I do appreciate if you all use a microphone because we have several hundred people on the phone. I allow people to call in, and I will be posting the number and allowing you to call in if you can't be present. Sometimes you can't. Feel free to call in and monitor.
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I will also be touching base with the state court judges, and oftentimes they are interested in monitoring these meetings. I invite them to do it. If they have any comments, they can make their comments and discuss it with you all while you are here.

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, my understanding is, is that you post the call-in number on your website in advance?

THE COURT: I do. I post the call-in number, the date and time, so that everybody has access to it.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you.
Since the last status conference, there have been a few new pretrial orders that have been issued. They are listed in the joint report in Section Number 1.

In particular, Pretrial Order Number 5A, which allows the transferor court to retain the original file; Pretrial Order Number 6, which appoints defendants' co-lead counsel; Pretrial Order Number 7, which appoints the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee lead counsel, the executive and state liaison counsel.

Your Honor, most of the steering committee is seated in the jury box.

There is also Pretrial Order Number 8, which establishes the time billing items.

THE COURT: Let me reinforce that, because I know that from the standpoint of the plaintiff, it's a contingent fee, so
that means that you may or may not get to be paid, but I've got to assume that you will be paid because I have to establish some infrastructure and procedure for doing that.

I have approved the appointment of a CPA, Phil Garrett. He has worked with me in the past, and we designed together some software that can be used.

I need any lawyer who is doing work from the plaintiffs' standpoint, any lawyer, whether they are on the committee or off of the committee, on some subcommittee doing work, anybody who does common benefit work needs to be able to report that to Phil Garrett monthly, what they've done, and what time they put in, and what they've done during that particular time; if they've put any money in, what the cost is, and what it was for.

That's collected by Phil Garrett. You need to know that I meet with him monthly, and he gives me a report monthly in brochure form. I look it over, and I meet with him, and I discuss it with him.

I put those documents under seal because it's not fair for the defendants to see what the plaintiffs are doing. So I don't expose that report, but I look at it every month, and if I see something that jumps out at me, I talk to liaison counsel and get that message back to the person whose information jumped out at me so we can straighten it out.

Every month I meet with him, as I say. At the
end of the case, if the case is resolved satisfactorily, and there is a common benefit fee, then he prepares for me a summary of all of the time sheets, what everybody has done, what time they've put in, and what specific work they have done during that particular time. It's all categorized, and I'm able from that to make some intelligent-based decision on how much each person is to receive.

I mention that to you because it's important for you to keep in touch with Phil Garrett. You can do it online. I've asked him to remain at the end of the case to meet with all of the plaintiff lawyers to give them a presentation on what to do. I'll also have him do it presently now.

MR. DAVIS: You would like him to do that now?
THE COURT: Sure. Let's do that, and then we'll go to the next one.

MR. PHILIP GARRETT: Hello, Your Honor. Phil Garrett. We're going to make a short PowerPoint presentation this morning to show the system that we have developed that can be used online.

Jim is here. He's also a CPA. Between the two of us, unfortunately, we have about 80 years of accounting experience. So we're the one -- Jim handles most of the reviews on the end, so I'm going to have him do part of it.

The information that you see on the screen, the most important information is pgarrett@garrettco.com. If there
are any questions anyone has, you can always reach me by e-mail or reach Jim by e-mail, or Bridgett Rosa, who is one of our main reviewers, by e-mail, and you can get to us.

On the top left corner of every slide, you'll see where the site is that we have our program stored for this case. It's http://xarelto.garrettco-ccms.com. When you go to that site, you'll see some of the information that you have to complete and what you have to do on it.

What we're doing basically with our system is we're trying to take anywhere from 20 law firms to a hundred law firms that are working on these various MDL's, and we're putting them together as one law firm, so that, on one entity, that then the judge can review all of the time at one time, rather than we giving him a report on 40 different law firms and him having to sort through his.

By doing the system the way we're doing it, we can then give him who are the attorneys that work the most on the case, who are the attorneys that work the least on the case, which law firms have which jobs and so forth.

All of that is put into one major database, so it, in essence, becomes one giant entity composed of 20, 30, 40 -- as many as over a hundred law firms can be put into the system.

So we report all the time. It's totally searchable, so if there is a case that the Court or the liaison
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counsel would like to find out who put time in on this particular case, I can search the database for all of the descriptions and find wherever somebody mentioned that particular case.

Held costs, which is mainly the travel costs, printing costs, copying costs, LexisNexis costs, those costs are costs that the firms hold inside of themselves and hold within their firm until the end of the case. We ask that those costs be sent to us.

We have guidelines in Pretrial Order Number 8, which we will then apply those guidelines to your costs. So if you flew from Florida over to New Orleans, and you flew first class, we're going to have a little bit of a problem. Jim will show you where the problem comes into because there are guidelines about what costs you can use for airlines, what costs you can use for hotels and so forth.

We would also look at shared costs and assessments. Cash transactions we report to the Court as well, who has put up the cash to keep the case going. You don't have to report that stuff to us under held costs. We will pick that information up as we maintain the -- we oversee the checkbook of the PSC and balance it off every month, so I've got those transactions already.

The main thing about our system is when you get into the system, you will be putting your confidential
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information into our system, but only you will be able to see your information, other than the Court or whoever the Court decides can see the information, which will probably just be liaison counsel. But the information is password protected, and you'll be the only ones that can see it.

QuickBooks for the accounting, we have an online system that, again, we go through, and we record everything. All those costs, even the held costs, are put into there, so we have one financial report to give the court on the cash deposits and cash transactions that happen during the month.

Pro time tracking. One of the things we've found from the last 10 years is that as we get more and more firms involved in the MDL, some of the firms are plaintiff firms that have never had a time system within their firm.

I had our programmers write a very simple time tracking program. It's free for anyone that's involved in the MDL to use. All you have to do is go to this system. You can set up your people on this system. It's totally within your firm. Nobody else will see this system.

It will create, at the end of the month, the CSV file that you have to upload into the CCMS system in order to get the -- it will do some of the work for you. It does not keep your receivables. It does not keep your billing. But I've told every firm that uses it, if you like it, and you want to use it for other cases, that's fine with us. We're giving
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it away as part of the service of our CCMS system.
So if you have an interest in using a time system, and you don't have one currently, just send me an e-mail, and I'll be happy to set you up and let you all play with it and decide whether you like it or not.

Once you log in to
http://xarelto.garrettco-ccms.com, you'll need a user name and password. All you have to do, there is a point on the login sheet that says, "Download Data Sheet." You download that data sheet, complete it, have one of the partners sign it, and e-mail it to my assistant, Bridgett Rosa. Her e-mail is on the login site. She will e-mail you back your user name, your password, and your partner signature code.

The reason we have a partner signature code is at the end of every submission, when you submit your time and your costs, it has to be signed off by a senior partner in the firm. Rather than having you print it out, having him sign it, then scanning it and then sending it over to us, we use a partner signature code that he can then sign off on.

We've also changed a few of the task codes. So if you've been involved in the previous MDL's with us, we've changed a few of the task codes. You can download that task code list also on that site by just clicking a button.

Once you get into the system, you'll see these are the menu items for every firm. You can view your
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submissions. Viewing your submissions is important from the standpoint of you can go to a page that will show you what time you've put in, what's the month that you put it in for, how many hours or how much costs you put in, whether we accepted it or whether we rejected it.

You'll notice on the second line here a firm put in 483.8 hours. We accepted 183.8 hours, but we rejected 300 hours. On our site, you will see the reasons we rejected it. If we have to attach a spreadsheet, we will have the spreadsheet attached.

So everything is there, but we're trying to make it the responsibility of the firm to have access to go look at these sheets and see what there is.

You will also receive an e-mail. When we post that particular month's submission, you will receive an e-mail telling you, we accepted 183.8, and we rejected 300 hours. So you get the e-mail, and you have access to the site $24 / 7$ to go look at your particular firm, so there is no reason you shouldn't.

At the very bottom, again, I'll reiterate, there is a $\$ 25,000$ expense somebody submitted. More than likely, that was a cash assessment. We're not going to accept that because we're going to pick it up through the checkbook.

So you'll be able to view your submissions. You'll be able to submit expenses. In submitting expenses, Jim
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will go through it in detail in a little bit, but that's the held costs. You'll be able to upload your time.

CSV file. A CSV file is, in essence, an Excel file, but you can save it as a comma delimited file. According to the programmers, when you save all these files as comma delimited, they can merge them all together in one database. So just think of it as an Excel file, but when you save it, you have to save it as a CSV. Again, a little bit later, we'll show you exactly what it is.

Add the firm employees, very important. If you go through and you don't add any firm employees and you submit all the time, the program is going to come back and give you errors on every line because it doesn't know who the employees are.

So you set up your own employees. You have a three-digit code, it can either be alpha or numeric, that you can set up for every employee. Most people just use the initials of the person.

Then, from there, besides the view submission report, you have nine different time reports, you have sortable held cost reports. All of those reports can be copied into Excel, and you can do a thousand different other reports, which in almost every MDL, we find the need to do exactly that.

That's the menu stream you all will be dealing with. The first month is always a little bit hazy. After
that, it usually runs very clean.
So what do y'all need to do? You need to gather the cost and the time information. In this case, we've changed it to 15 days that you have after the end of the month to submit stuff.

If you can't make it within that 15-day period, just give us a call. The Court has given us the discretion to give an additional 60 days grace period, if there is a reasonable reason, and they are not continual offenders, of submitting the time.

So if there is a problem, it's a holiday season, your bookkeeper has been sick or whatever, and you needed another week, just call us up, and we'll be more than happy to do it.

But after you get past that 75th day, it's no longer in our ballpark. Now it goes to the Court, for the Court to decide whether they are going to allow you to submit that time or not.

In this case, in Pretrial Order Number 8, it says by March 15th -- or starting March 15th, all time is submitted for February and prior months. So it's time to get the data sheet downloaded, get yourself a user name and password, and get ready to start submitting all of this information because, in about two and a half weeks, you'll be looking to do it.

THE COURT: Let's do this, Jim. You can deliver yours
to the plaintiffs later on because that will be more effective. Thank you all very much.

All right, let's go to the next one.
MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Judge. I just want to add one comment to that, that needs to be very clear, that when Phil Garrett accepts the time, it doesn't necessarily mean that it's compensable. It will still be reviewed, in that all common benefit work must be approved in advance.

THE COURT: Also, as I understand it, the plaintiffs are meeting after this meeting, so Phil and Jim can go into it a little bit more with you and answer any questions that you might have.

MR. DAVIS: Yes, Your Honor. We do have an all-plaintiffs meeting in the courtroom after the status conference.

THE COURT: What's the next item on the agenda?
MR. DAVIS: Counsel Contact Information Form. It's just to remind people that if they haven't turned in the form under Pretrial Order 4A, it really needs to be turned in, or you won't be getting notice.

The next item on the agenda is the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee. We have had meetings and phone conferences, and your PSC that Your Honor appointed is up and running.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DAVIS: The next item is File \& Serve Xpress. We have received a proposal from File \& Serve Xpress. We have reviewed it. We have spoken with defense counsel about that. We've also received a proposal from BrownGreer, which we are considering, and we're in discussions. We will be back with a report to the Court very soon on that.

THE COURT: Okay. Tell us why that's important, some mechanism for serving people.

MR. DAVIS: What that enables, Your Honor, is the ability for all counsel to get copies of all documents filed with the Court.

Now, I know that we have the electronic court system where folks can get it, but this enables people to get not only what's filed, but also the discovery and items such as that.

THE COURT: We've found it more efficient to have outside providers take on the task of disseminating information. It just makes it easier and more effective.

So I've asked counsel for both sides to focus on whether or not we can do this. It's too much of a burden on the liaison counsel to be able to get it out to everyone timely, and outside providers are able to disseminate it almost immediately. So that's very helpful.

In a moment, I'll ask Orran Brown to discuss the fact sheets a little bit more, and he may also touch on the
file and serve.
MR. DAVIS: With respect to direct filing master complaint and answer, the PSC provided to defendants a draft order in response to their initial provided order.

THE COURT: The Clerk's Office is getting a lot of calls from litigants and lawyers asking about whether they can directly file in this Court. There needs to be some agreement by and between counsel in order to do that. It's more effective because it's quicker.

Otherwise, the case has to be filed in a local area, and then the local area then transfers it. Or the MDL, it gets to the MDL, and then the MDL court then transfers it here. It takes 60 to 90 days for that to happen. If it's directly filed, the party is in this Court immediately.

But it needs to be dealt with by stipulations, and so both sides have to be agreeable to it.

MR. DAVIS: We are in discussions, Your Honor, on that.
In addition to that, and I reference what's noted in paragraph 7 of the joint report, which is Service on Foreign Bayer Entities, there have been a number of individuals who have raised questions regarding the timeframe for making service and requested extension on the timeframe required by the Federal Rules.

What folks have done is file their own motion, but I believe the PSC will be asking for additional time to
make service; but, we are in discussions with defendants, both Bayer and J\&J, Janssen, to address service issues.

THE COURT: Jim, do you have any comments on any of this?

MR. IRWIN: Your Honor, I would only add that we think one of the things that helps to make this efficient is that we have prepared, in two meetings, with Mr. Davis and Mr. Meunier, and also lead counsel, to address each one of these issues.

There are contact people who are set up to do that, like for ECF it is me and Mr. Davis. For the Bayer service issues, it is Mr. Hoffman. So we've tried to make it efficient for purposes of follow-up and also for purposes of presentation today.

THE COURT: Yes. I would like to meet with liaison counsel in about two weeks to see whether or not these can be nailed down or have been nailed down, so that we can move on to the next phase of the litigation.

MR. IRWIN: Thank you.
THE COURT: Tolling Agreement is the next one.
MR. DAVIS: Tolling agreement, Your Honor. We're in discussions on that. We provided defendants a proposal on February 24th, and we will have more discussions regarding that.

I've addressed service on the Bayer entities. With that discussion, however, we are trying to make sure that
we align the proper Bayer entities that belong in the litigation, and we are addressing those issues.

THE COURT: With regard to tolling, oftentimes tolling is very helpful to individuals to get in this litigation, but, at the same time, refrain from having to put up the type of costs that's required.

If you have a thousand claimants, and you have to spend $\$ 300$ for each, pretty soon it's a lot of money. So tolling agreements are sometimes helpful to allow participation in the MDL.

Tolling agreements generally toll prescription and provide that if prescription is going to be enforced, that you have a month or two months in order to file a claim. So it's some comfort there, and we are able to move the cases in that fashion.

MR. DAVIS: We will continue to have those discussions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DAVIS: With respect to Item Number 8, the MDL Centrality, both sides have met with Orran Brown. We are having further discussions on that issue. Mr. Brown is here. THE COURT: Yes. Let me hear from Orran at this time. We call it either fact or profile forms. It's a form that is filled out by the parties, particularly the plaintiffs, to give information that is necessary for
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collecting the census of the case.
In the past, it's been a problem because it's had thousands of claimants and thousands of forms, and it's hard to group those forms in paper form.

Electronically, you're able to search them, and you're able to decide what the total census is. You're able to decide what the various parts are in the census, so that you can select from those various parts the discovery pool and bellwether cases.

Orran Brown has worked up some software that I think would be helpful. Perhaps we can do a pilot program and see how it goes to give the parties some comfort in confidentiality.

Let me hear from Orran Brown at this time.
MR. DAVIS: Both sides are very mindful of that, Your Honor. We have discussed that. One of the issues that we've discussed in particular is the security issue, and Mr. Brown will address that.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.
Thank you, Your Honor. I'm Orran Brown, from BrownGreer. Unless you want me to continue Mr. Garrett's presentation, I need to switch to my own.

What I want to do this morning, Your Honor, is update the Court on where we stand on the discussions I've had with the parties.

I need to get out of Mr. --
THE COURT: Do you want to help, Phil?
MR. PHILIP GARRETT: I think if you hit escape.
MR. BROWN: Yes, I've just got to get my -- there we go, right there.

Thank you, Your Honor.
I've been meeting with the parties and lead counsel for both parties on the fact sheet exchange program and the effort to modernize and automate the exchange and completion of the fact sheets.

I also want to report on the other discussions we've had, which are, if we're going to centralize electronic work in this program, whether some of the other infrastructure the Court mentioned could be put under this umbrella. So if it's really going to be centralized, let's centralize as much as we can in one place for one-stop shopping, so you all log in to one place and you can do a lot of things without having to keep track of multiple things.

So I've been talking with the parties, obviously, about our fact sheet effort, which we discussed a lot the last time I was here. I will mention some brief things about that, but I want to talk about the security aspect.

We've gotten some very legitimate questions from the parties about how this is secure internally and externally, and I want to review that very quickly.

We've also talked about the concept of the pleadings that were mentioned earlier. Matters that are filed in the PACER docket, we've developed a program that will automatically harvest those pleadings once they are filed in PACER and then distribute them with an alert e-mail to whoever is registered counsel who have signed up in this system. Then they can $\log$ on and view them.

The automatic harvest program eliminates the need to file in PACER and then file in another place, too, or upload to another place. This handles it in one step. So we have been talking to the parties about that system.

The other piece of it are matters that are not filed of record in PACER, but are discovery requests that are propounded and then responded, could also be done under this central system, where a party logs on who is issuing some discovery, directs who it goes to, it automatically goes to them, then they can respond to it.

The beauty of that would be that all of this is housed in one central place, including, if the parties want, a central repository and an electronic eRoom that will hold all the production, ESI, PDFs, Excel, native format documents and information and data, if they want to.

So the goal is, there is this smorgasbord of basically four mainstays of infrastructure that have to occur in a proceeding like this. All four of those or one of these
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or any number of these, if the parties wish, could be handled under this umbrella as part of all one place, one place to go to find them all.

This is the fact sheet process that we developed. It's just a sample screen. The parties have asked that we make up a test environment with a sample fact sheet or census document for this proceeding. We're going to program that in and make that available to them as soon as we can, so they can play around in it and see how it works and enter some data and then export it and get a feel for its functions.

We talked last time about the tasks that are involved, what the purposes are of fact sheets, and what they are supposed to serve, and how this automated feature will serve all of these goals to keep this process moving and to make it easy to use.

The goal is to enter this information once, and never have to enter it again for the life of this proceeding. So we have live data that then is used throughout every phase of it, as the parties move along, through discovery, through bellwether trials or anything else.

We've gotten a lot of questions about security. In this day and age, with reports of breaches and hacking, we worry about that a lot. We have to deal with this daily in all of the claims programs we administer because we have personal identifying information from claimants and Social Security
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numbers and HIPAA-protected medical records that we have to safeguard. This proceeding will involve very similar information.

So this is just a little diagram that shows our defensive approach. It's called defense in depth is the way the IT people talk about this. It's a three-tiered, layered structure to the databases that we build and the systems we build that are trying to safeguard these as much as possible from any sort of external penetration or internally preventing people from seeing things they are not supposed to see.

Because a lot of the fact sheet work, for example, involves drafting and materials that are not yet ready for prime time, not yet ready to be served, and our system is coded and set up to where if you're working in your own private workspace, no one else sees that until you click submit and serve, and you're ready for them to see it.

The CMO or order that adopts this, if it's used, would say that those private spaces are private, and that using this doesn't alter work product protections, and our code makes sure that that happens.

But the way that we deal with security is that the data that people enter in is in this database layer at the bottom. That's the treasure. That's the tables that we build that hold all the information about a particular plaintiff, and all the records about that plaintiff are all down here at the
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bottom in our tables and on our servers. This information all rests on servers that we own, that we maintain.

Security means two things: It means technical security and physical security. These servers are located in two locations, each one of them on an independent power source. One of them outside of Ashland, Virginia, in a secure physical location that's really like a bunker that's got 24-hour security, physical security. You have to have a thumbprint registered to get into the place.

And inside it, our servers are in their own cage that we only have access to, and we own and maintain those servers. There is a similar redundant facility in Charlotte, North Carolina, that's our disaster recovery site.

Both of those locations are all our equipment. Nothing is in the cloud. It's all something you can touch and protect from physical access. Security at those sites is very robust, more secure than, say, this courthouse is or can be, given the traffic that this place gets.

The technical security is based upon the structure that we build. The architecture behind this is people entering the system, users, claimants' firms, plaintiffs' firms, lead counsel, defense counsel, come into the system first through a firewall.

Now, these firewalls are virus protection, penetration or intrusion protection, vulnerability protection.
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They allow us to monitor everybody that's using it, where the IP addresses are. This is as secure as you can make one of these things, starting out with this first line of protection to get through to just try to log on.

You get to this presentation layer, and this is where people enter their login information. Like Mr. Garrett mentioned earlier in his system, you have a password, you have a login. Only people who have been authorized can get into this. Those credentials have to match.

The passwords are encrypted and hashed, meaning that when somebody enters it, the system assigns random numbers to it, so even we can't see what the password actually is. That changes as we go along.

So your credentials then allow you in, and if you don't have been the right credentials, you're locked out. It's up to the users to protect their password. Just like it's up to all of us to protect our online passwords to check our bank accounts, the user firms will have to safeguard their own passwords; but, if that person has a login and a password, they get into the system, and then the code that we build controls what their role is. They can only see what we have allowed them to see.

We find out from the parties from the start which users are uber users that can see everything, which are users that can only read, which are users that can access only parts
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of it. This role-based credentialing is what prevents people from seeing space in the tables down here that they are not supposed to. That's what protects the private work areas. We can guarantee that nobody is going to see what they are not supposed to.

If your credentials get you in, you go through another firewall, the same protection, virus and penetration protection. Then you get to our business layer, which is our code. That's where the code lies that we build and test and maintain that defines which part of this data down here you can see.

It's as robust as you can make one of these things for security protection. We're working with the IT and security experts at the defendants' firms and other -- the lead counsel to make sure they are comfortable with this. We're going to show them whatever they need to see to feel comfortable with it, but we feel that we can answer and solve any concerns about the protection that's afforded to this.

Beyond that, Your Honor, if there are any questions, I'm happy to address any questions.

THE COURT: I would like you to continue to work with the parties because I see this as an opportunity to solve some problems that we have in MDL's. One is to be able to, as I mentioned before, get a feel for the census, so that we can begin bellwether trials and bellwether selections promptly and
effectively.
Also, at the close of the case, to assist us with the close of the case, which is oftentimes a problem for the Clerk's office.

Thank you very much.
MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: The next item is?
MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, in connection with Item 8, MDL centrality, we provided to defense counsel a draft of a profile form for consideration, and we'll have further discussions on that.

On Item Number 9, Master Discovery, the PSC has provided a draft, and I say that again, a draft of a master set of requests for production of documents to defendants. We have told defendants that we will meet and confer on that before they are formally served. So that is in the works, and that's in our lines for further discussions with defense counsel.

With respect to Item 10, Preservation Order, we have exchanged e-mails regarding preservation issues, as well as had face-to-face meetings to discuss this. There will be further meetings with defense counsel on addressing both preservation order as well as document production protocol, which is Item 12 in the report. We have had those discussions, and we will be reporting back to the Court on those and scheduling further meet and confers.

Item 11, we have provided to defense counsel on February 24 th a proposal regarding a Privilege Log, which is one of the items that we know Your Honor is very in tune with, especially in light of prior litigations.

We have tracked what I'll call the Vioxx model, to use Professor Rice's type analysis in dealing with a privilege log, and we do have that on the items for discussion.

With respect to Item Number 13, Protective Order, that's another one of the items that's confidentiality. In accordance with Your Honor's earlier comments, we're mindful of that.

We did provide a response to defendants on February 24 th with respect to a confidentiality order, and we are having further discussions on that.

THE COURT: Jim, do you want to fill in on anything?
MR. IRWIN: Yes, thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Davis.
Our point person on these four infrastructure items is Mr. Tim Coon. We understand Mr. Birchfield will be dealing with -- no, it's Mr. Barr will be dealing with Mr. Coon on that.

I would add that we have also exchanged information with liaison counsel, including preservation order information, and we will be getting together and examining those two proposals and trying to work them out.

THE COURT: Okay. I would like to get some dates for you all. I would like to meet with liaison counsel in two weeks. Let me see whether or not we can resolve these issues and get them following form.

Steve, you had something?
MR. GLICKSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor. Steve Glickstein for Bayer.

I didn't know whether to step up while Mr. Davis was talking or wait until the end, and I decided to wait for the end.

Your Honor, I think, has set out very cogently sort of the course of proceedings in MDL's and has advised us, after we get through these infrastructure issues, to talk about a scheduling order.

I just wanted to emphasize that there are certain things that are peculiar to this case that may require a tweak here or there. I know Your Honor has always encouraged the attorneys to be creative and to tailor the schedule to the particular needs of the case.

For example, there may be dispositive issues that need early focus on beyond general causation. There may need to be some simultaneous discovery of plaintiffs and defendants.

I didn't take Your Honor's remarks to prevent that kind of substantive discussion between counsel as to what the ultimate scheduling order should look like.
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THE COURT: Yes. No, that's correct. The lawyers know the case better than the Court at this point, so I look to you all for guidance in fleshing out some of the details.

The general scope is what I was talking about, but you do need to tweak cases. I recognize that. Some cases present different issues, so I'll look to you all for some assistance there.

MR. GLICKSTEIN: Right.
The only other point that I wanted to make, as Mr. Irwin has said, we do have a point person on each one of these issues to discuss with our counterparts on the PSC how we might resolve each one of those.

The only one that I wanted to mention, particularly because Your Honor commented on it, was tolling agreement.

I don't want to get into the debate about tolling agreements at this early stage. Jim Irwin and I are tasked with speaking with Mr. Birchfield and others about the issue, but there are serious concerns among our clients about tolling.

We, of course, heard your Your Honor's comments about that, but since Your Honor commented about it, I did want Your Honor to know that that is a concern of our clients. I don't want for there to be an implication that necessarily there will be a tolling agreement.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, we will address the scheduling order in due course. We heard Your Honor's comments. We understand Steve Glickstein's comments as well. We are prepared to discuss dispositive motions at the appropriate time.

We have assigned a member of the executive committee to each one of those items for discussion, so we will be united in our dealings with defense counsel.

THE COURT: So I'll meet with liaison in two weeks to see which matters have been resolved, which matters need to be resolved by the Court, and we'll get them resolved one way or the other.

How about State/Federal Coordination?
MR. DAVIS: Your Honor has appointed Ms. Barrios as the state liaison committee member. She is here with us. We have already started that process.

Earlier today, defense counsel provided to us a spreadsheet of various cases that have been filed throughout the country. We'll be reviewing that. That also sets forth the judge and the jurisdiction of each of those cases.

We've asked that defense counsel also provide copies of the underlying complaint, so that we can review those.

Ms. Barrios may have something to add.
MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Mr. Davis.

Good morning, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios, State Liaison Counsel. Ms. Sharko and Mr. Irwin have provided a very detailed spreadsheet for us, and I think you have that -THE COURT: I do have it.

MS. BARRIOS: -- in your hands.
THE COURT: Right.
MS. BARRIOS: As you can see, there are only four jurisdictions right now who have other cases. I'll be preparing a spreadsheet, as I've done for you in the past, including the e-mail addresses for the judges as well.

We are discussing, as Mr. Davis said, I would like to get copies of the underlying complaint because it gives me information on the plaintiff's lawyer, if I need to talk them, and we have been talking about that this morning.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Fine. Thank you.
Anything, Jim?
MR. IRWIN: No, thank you, Your Honor.
MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, the only other comment I have is that we have had a number of meet and confers and a number of discussions with defense counsel. It has been very professional, and it is what you would expect out of opposing counsel. I just want to make that comment.

Our steering committee has met. They have been wonderful. We are off, we're ready to run, and we are prepared
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to meet Your Honor's expectations.
THE COURT: Okay. Anything further, Jim?
MR. IRWIN: No, I just want to thank Mr. Davis for that comment and return it in kind.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything from anybody that I haven't touched on? Any comment from the audience? MR. DAVIS: The next status.

THE COURT: The Next Status Meeting will be April 1st in open court. And the following one will be May 13th.

Before then, I'll be meeting with liaison counsel to just police some of these matters. We've discussed them, but some of them have been resolved, some of them need to be resolved, but the point that I make is that we need to agree on infrastructure.

I don't look to counsel to agree on substantive matters. They represent their clients. They do it very effectively. I suspect they have different views on substance; but, on procedure, we ought to be able to come together with some easy procedure that's comfortable with them that makes sense and gets the job done, so that we can move on and schedule the matter.

I really want to try to get this case over with in about two to three years, so that we can decide one way or the other whether there is a case that can be resolved, or it cannot be resolved here, so that you can go back to the various
jurisdictions and handle the cases that way. But they do have to be resolved, folks. That's what we need to focus on.

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, I just have one announcement, and that's for all plaintiffs' counsel, only plaintiffs' counsel, we're asking if they would meet after the status conference here in the courtroom.

THE COURT: Let me mention, too, that in this particular case, what I would like to do -- and I told the lead counsel and the PSC -- that I would like them to create subcommittees, so that anybody who is interested, any plaintiff lawyer who is interested in participating in this case in any fashion, get on a subcommittee.

You'll see in my pretrial order, check with liaison counsel. If you feel that you're not getting attention, as my court order says, get with the Court, and the Court then will make sure that you're on a subcommittee.

We've got to have some organizational structure. You can't have hundreds of lawyers doing things that nobody knows that they are doing. But if you're interested in doing it, whether you're on a committee or not, please participate and feel like you can participate, and you're welcome to participate in the litigation and, likewise, participate in any common benefit fee if you produce the work and put in the time.

Okay. Thank you very much. Court will stand in recess.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
(WHEREUPON, at 10:01 a.m., the Court was in recess.)
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