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## PROCEEDINGS

(December 20, 2016)
******
(COURT CALLED TO ORDER)
THE COURT: Be seated, please.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL-2592, In re: Xare7to Products Liability Litigation.

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

MR. DAVIS: Good morning, Your Honor. Leonard Davis from the law firm of Herman Herman \& Katz, representing the plaintiffs.

MR. IRWIN: And Jim Irwin for defendants.
THE COURT: Al1 right. I met a moment ago with the lead and liaison counsel to discuss the agenda with them. I'11 take it in the order presented.

Lenny?
MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, we are on Joint Report No. 22, and I'11 go through the agenda and the items listed in the joint report.

With respect to pretrial orders, there are no new pretrial orders to report on this month.

With respect to case management orders, the parties have submitted to the Court a proposed case management
order, 2C, which addresses dispositive motions, and I believe that's in the Court's hands. We're waiting action from the Court.

There's nothing to report on No. 3, bellwether selection.

On No. 4, I'd make the same comment that we've made before, in particular to any counsel listening on the phone, with respect to counsel contact information form, please look at Pretrial Order 4A. I know we've done this on a regular basis, but we are very much considering removing that from the joint report in the future because I think people are getting that idea.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DAVIS: But we want to remind people that that form is something that's out there and needs to be updated.

With respect to plaintiff fact sheets, there are motions set following this conference, and we'11 be prepared to address that with the Court.

Also, the parties are working on a draft pretrial order to submit to the Court that addresses the assistance that the PSC has been providing in respect to those motions. We should have that to the Court relatively soon.

On the next item, defendant fact sheets, there's nothing to report.

The next one is service of process on the Bayer
defendants. There's nothing to report.
Counsel are reminded with respect to the preservation order, PTO 15, and to look at the Court's Web site with respect to that matter.

The next item is the order governing the parties' interaction with physicians. That issue is being discussed further. The parties are addressing that, but there's nothing to report at this time.

On discovery, which is Item 10 of the report, the Court recently provided the parties biweekly dates for calls going through March of 2017. We appreciate the Court providing that, and the parties have noted those and will be prepared to address the Court as needed in those calls. The parties do appreciate those calls.

THE COURT: Yes. We've had some discovery issue with regard to formatting of the documents that the Court's up to speed on. I've talked to counse1, and, hopefully, we'11 be able to continue with our present schedule, but that's a potential if it can't be resolved. I hope that it can be resolved and we can continue on with our bellwether schedule.

Regarding the bellwether trials, I mentioned to counse1 in chambers that next time I'11 be meeting with the trial counsel for those particular cases to discuss a method of getting the Court's ruling on objections for exhibits before the trial starts so that we don't waste time dealing with
argument and the admissibility of exhibits. I'11 take care of that before the trial even starts.

Also, I talked to them about time limitations on the trials. It's been my experience that if you don't have some time set aside for the trials, they just go interminably. So, generally, a couple of weeks, two weeks and a couple of days is sufficient to get the trials underway. I'11 go early in the morning until the evening, and we'11 get a full trial schedule in. We can work on Saturdays if necessary. I'11 give them enough time, but we should have some time worked out.

Also, we may be able to have remote locations if that's the interest of the parties as to transcripts can be sent immediately to remote locations outside of the courthouse, if that's necessary for the parties. But oftentimes in these bellwether trials we have a full, packed courthouse and sometimes remote locations is helpful with the ability of the remote locations to write and send briefs directly to the Court.

But at least I want them to be thinking about that and other logistical matters that I can work with them on to make this more efficient.

MR. DAVIS: And, Your Honor, the parties will be prepared to discuss the trial issues at the January status conference, and we will have some dialogue before that so we'11 be prepared.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DAVIS: With respect to various discovery matters, just to give the Court an update, the funding issue matter that's addressed in section 10 was resolved, a response was provided, and we'11 remove that from the agenda going forward.

The collaborative development issue matter was resolved. Defendants provided responses, and we'11 remove that from the agenda going forward.

The Alere INRatio discovery issue, I believe was resolved. Again, that one will also be removed going forward.

With respect to the plaintiffs request for admissions to defendants that we've spoken about in the past, we're still working on that matter. It hasn't been lost, Your Honor. But, obviously, we've had other issues that have been pressing and we will get back to that. We'11 report to the Court at the next status conference on that.

Expert reports have been exchanged, as Your Honor is aware, with respect to the bellwether trial cases. The issue regarding certain documents requested and experts, that was resolved, and we'11 remove that one also from the agenda going forward.

With respect to the motion to compel and for protective order to require complete disclosure of documents, that's the native TIFF issue that Your Honor was; addressing
earlier. That issue is still alive.
The parties did meet and confer just before the conference as Your Honor asked us to do a few minutes ago. We've agreed that that matter can be set on January the 10th. The defendants (verbatim) will file a brief by January 5th, and defendants, if they file a response, will file one by January 9th, and we've agreed to a noon submission time on that.

And as Your Honor is aware, the PSC views that as a very important issue, and we may need discovery on other issues with respect to that.

The next item are some Pennsylvania issues that we discussed -- the next two items on the agenda are some Pennsylvania issues that were discussed briefly. The PSC has agreed to talk with Pennsylvania counsel to try to accommodate coordination, but we do believe that those issues are Pennsylvania state court issues. If there's further discussion on that and the Court's needed, we'11 let you know.

THE COURT: Yeah. Let me hear from Mike on that one if that's a potential problem. I've been working closely with the judge in Pennsylvania. He's doing a terrific job up there, and I want to be coordinating with him. Hopefully, we can get this done in a coordinated fashion so that both courts are satisfied with what's necessary.

Check with liaison counsel up there, Mike, and
if we can help them, fine, but I would like them to coordinate with our court.

MR. WEINKOWITZ: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Mike Weinkowitz. I'm on the phone.

THE COURT: Yes, Mike.
MR. WEINKOWITZ: I'm working with MDL in coordinating all of the discovery issues. So we're working hard and cooperating together, and nothing to worry about on that end.

THE COURT: Good. Okay. We11, thank you, Mike. I do look to you to coordinate. But if you need anything, you've got to let me know, and we'll deal with it.

MR. WEINKOWITZ: I appreciate it, Your Honor.
MR. DAVIS: The next item on the agenda is discovery issued to third parties. Your Honor, at this point I don't think there's anything to report with respect to third parties. State/federal coordination. Ms. Barrios is here and she can report.

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

I have previously provided to both sides, and to your law clerk, the Xarelto state court stats as of yesterday.

In California, there are 35 cases with 77
plaintiffs. Judge Freeman is the JCCP judge, and he had -- a
couple of days ago, they had a status conference. And he was going to hold -- pretty much hold everything until the end of your bellwether trials -- your Louisiana bellwether trials, and then they would really get going. They're working on initial orders. But my read of the minute entry is that he is going to allow the MDL to go forward and then he'11 follow it.

THE COURT: He needs to know that I appreciate his working with us on this. Whatever we can do to assist him, I certainly will do that.

MS. BARRIOS: And I appreciate the information that I get from Ms. Rothman's (phonetic) office on California.

In Delaware, there are 228 cases and the same number of plaintiffs, and dispositive motions in 166 cases. So I don't know how long that number will be that high.

In Illinois, there's seven cases and plaintiffs.
Missouri has four cases, but 282 plaintiffs. If you recal1, Missouri has a trial date. And I've asked Mr. Vincent -- Gibson Vance of Mr. Birchfield's office, he's checking with plaintiff's counsel there to see if there's anything that we can do to be of assistance to them to get some coordination going.

In New Jersey, the same five cases and plaintiffs.

Pennsylvania actually hit the four-digit mark this month. It's 1,142 cases. Mathematically, that's

80 percent of all -- out of the MDL cases that we have.
Your state court stat chart has all the new judges in yellow so that you can feel free to reach out to them.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.
MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Do you have anything, Jake?
MR. WOODY: Just briefly, Your Honor. I'11 give you a quick update on some of our numbers of fact sheets filed.

We have just under 15,000 plaintiffs registered and about 13,300 fact sheets filed. It's been somewhat of a slow month in terms of submissions. I suspect with the holidays, that's norma1. But we have about 280 fact sheets so far. And there have been no changes to any of the percentages that I usually go through, partly because there just haven't been that many fact sheets filed. And I think because that's sort of the norm for a plaintiff in this litigation.

THE COURT: A11 right. And the discovery pool and the rest of it's --

MR. WOODY: A11 the percentages are identical to last month, so nothing's changed. I'11 keep an eye on it and update as necessary.

THE COURT: A11 right. Thank you, Jake.
MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, the next item, No. 13, on matters set for hearing following the conference. The parties
are prepared to address that following the conference.
And the final item is the next status conference, which is on January the 20th at 9:00 a.m. As I understand it, Your Honor has set the February conference.

THE COURT: Right. February 10th of 2017. So the first one in January is January 20th, 2017, and then February 10th, 2017, at 9:00, and I'11 meet with liaison counse1 early on.

MR. DAVIS: I think that's it. I just want to wish and your staff and all counsel a happy holiday season.

THE COURT: Thank you. The same goes for the Court. All of you, and all of you on the phone, have a happy and healthy holiday season.

*     *         *             *                 * 
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