1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA	
3		
4		
5	IN RE: VIOXX PRODUCTS *	Docket MDL 1657-L
6	LIABILITY LITIGATION *	January 18, 2008
7	*	9:00 a.m.
8	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	
9		
10	STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE	
11	HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
12		313111111 30501
13	APPEARANCES:	
	ALL LAIVANCES.	
14		man Herman Katz & Cotlar
15	820	RUSS M. HERMAN, ESQ. O'Keefe Avenue
16	New	Orleans, Louisiana 70113
17	For the Defendant: Sto	ne Pigman Walther Wittmann
18	I 546	PHIĽLIP A. WITTMANN, ESQ. Carondelet Street
19	New	Orleans, Louisiana 70130
20	Also Participating: Dou	Douglas R. Marvin, Esq.
21	0rr	an L. Brown, Esq. y D. Birchfield Jr., Esq.
22	∥ Joh	n Eddie Williams, Esq. t L. Garretson, Esq.
23	Daw	n M. Barrios, Esq. ristopher A. Seeger, Esq.
24		iscopilei A. Seegei, Lsq.
25		

Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR 500 Poydras Street, Room B-406 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 (504) 589-7778 Official Court Reporter: Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer.

1 **PROCEEDINGS** 2 (January 18, 2008) 3 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise. 4 **THE COURT:** Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies 5 and gentlemen. 6 Call the case, please. 7 THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL 1657, In Re: Vioxx. 8 **THE COURT:** Counsel make their appearance for the 9 record. 10 MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court. Good morning, 11 Judge Fallon. I'm Russ Herman for the plaintiffs. 12 MR. WITTMANN: Phil Wittmann representing Merck, 13 Your Honor. 14 **THE COURT:** This is our monthly status conference. Ι 15 met with liaison counsel previous to this. I'll take the 16 material in the order in which it appears on Joint Report 31. 17 First, the settlement agreement. Anything to 18 report? 19 MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. The settlement 20 contract between the parties was entered November 9, 2007. 21 connection with that, Pretrial Orders 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 22 and 34 were entered on the Court's Web site and on the other 23 Web sites, as well as made part of the record. 24 On January 7, 2008, Your Honor extended the 25 Pretrial Order 28 deadline to mail record preservation letters

to health care providers and pharmacies by 30 days, which should give additional time for that material to be sent by individual law firms on behalf of their clients.

There were revisions to Exhibits A and B to Pretrial Order 29. Those were also posted and a notice went out.

Pretrial 30 stays, with very few exceptions, all activity in the MDL. Mr. Wittmann and I will be reporting on the activity that has been stayed and matters that are going forward.

Pretrial Order 31, there were revisions on December 4, 2007 and December 14, 2007, basically clarifying registration affidavits and the claim spreadsheets, which were clerical matters suggested by all parties.

Pretrial Order 32 was an appointment made by Your Honor, as stated and posted.

Pretrial Orders 33 and 34 direct pro se contacts. You'll receive two reports, one from Brown & Greer on registration, and then later today I'll give Your Honor a report. I have provided to Bryan and a copy to Your Honor of those individuals who have requested an attorney be appointed to represent them with all pertinent information. There are, I believe, 78 of those.

Attorney Ronald Benjamin has an appeal to
Pretrial Orders 28 and 31 in the Fifth Circuit. Both Merck and

the PLC have requested that the Benjamin appeal be dismissed on the basis that it's procedurally incorrect and substantively wrong.

Your Honor, at this time, if I may, I would like to ask Orran Brown and/or Lynn Greer both to step up and give Your Honor on the record a report.

Excuse me. I'm sorry. Thank you, Phil.

MR. WITTMANN: Mr. Marvin is going to discuss the amendments to the Pretrial Order.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HERMAN: Mr. Birchfield, on behalf of the negotiating committee, after Mr. Marvin speaks to those amendments, will have some comments about the amendments, and then I understand a representative of the Texas delegation will speak.

MR. MARVIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Douglas Marvin for Merck. Your Honor, the parties would like to announce that they have agreed on certain amendments to the settlement agreement. These amendments, Your Honor, are largely clarifications of the parties' original intentions. The amendments fall into three basic categories.

The first addresses the extraordinary injury fund. The original agreement, Your Honor, placed a cap on individual awards of \$600,000. In reviewing cases and talking to counsel, we understand that there may be some cases out

there -- relatively few -- that would exceed that amount in terms of on reimbursable damages. Accordingly, we decided to remove the cap on the individual awards under the extraordinary injury fund.

THE COURT: Why don't you explain to us what the extraordinary injury fund is. It's an extra fund.

MR. MARVIN: Certainly, Your Honor. Yes. All claimants, once they pass through the gates, are eligible for compensation according to the number of points that they have. There is then a fund that has been set up to compensate those individuals according to those points.

THE COURT: There's no limitation on that individual fund, although there's a limitation on the aggregate.

MR. MARVIN: That is correct, Your Honor. Now, there may be some instances where the person has sustained extraordinary damages. There are certain criteria that can be followed for those individuals who sustained those extraordinary damages. Once they meet those criteria, they can then go ahead and submit an application for funding or compensation from the extraordinary injury fund that will go to the claims administrator to review and determine whether they have meet the criteria and what the award would be recommended to be.

THE COURT: That is in addition to what they received under the regular fund.

MR. MARVIN: Yes, it is, Your Honor, exactly. Thank you.

So while the overall caps remain the same, we think that this is a way to address those relatively few cases that have the extraordinary injuries.

The second category, Your Honor, relates to Sections 1.2.8.2 [sic] and 11.1.5. These deal with participation in the program. Section 1.2.8.1 is -- I'm sorry. I said "1.2.8.2." It's actually 1.2.8.1.

We have amended the agreement to take account of this, but each enrolling counsel is expected to exercise his or her independent judgment in the best interest of each client individually before determining whether to recommend enrollment in the program. That has been the parties' intentions all along. We think it important that it be expressly stated here in the agreement so that it is clear that each client is and will be receiving the best judgment of the attorney representing that client individually.

The second amendment is to Section 11.1.5, and there the date has been changed. That has been changed so that there can be no mistake that there is a sufficient period of time for counsel to discuss the program with their clients and make their decision as to whether to enroll in the program.

The third category of amendments is basically miscellaneous. An important one, Your Honor, is that we have

amended the agreement so that your title is now "Judge Eldon Fallon."

We have also made a clarification with respect to the administration of the program when dealing with smoking, for example. There was some confusion as to whether a person who was an excessive smoker would be deducted once for smoking and then a second time for excessive smoking. We clarified that to mean no, we only meant the one deduction for the excessive smoker to be that deduction designated for an excessive smoker.

Your Honor, we have also amended the common benefit fund provision so that people not only who participated in working with respect to the four coordinating jurisdictions are eligible, but also those from other states as well.

So those, basically, are the amendments. They will be posted on the Brown & Greer Web site. We will also make those available to the Court for its Web site as well as, I believe, the plaintiffs' and Merck's Web sites as well.

THE COURT: On that last issue, with a common benefit, that means that any plaintiff attorney who feels that he or she is entitled to receive some common benefit funds, they have the right to petition the Court for that.

MR. MARVIN: That is correct, Your Honor.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Andy Birchfield for the plaintiffs' committee. Mr. Marvin has given the details of these

amendments. If I could take just a moment to give a background of how these amendments came about.

November 9, the Plaintiffs' Negotiating Committee held a number of conferences and meetings with lawyers across the country. We met in New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Houston, Denver, Los Angeles, and here in New Orleans. Through the course of those meetings -- and there were nearly 1,000 lawyers that attended those meetings -- as we focused on the settlement agreement and we talked to lawyers who were reading and understanding the agreement and attempting to understand and make sure that they appreciated the details of the agreement, we saw some areas where concerns had arisen and we knew that there needed to be clarity provided.

Some of the things we recognized immediately after the settlement, not long after it was signed, that it didn't reflect what we had intended, like with the extraordinary injury fund. There were some provisions about the claims administrator versus the special master, so we knew immediately that there needed to be changes made in that regard.

As we met with lawyers and we heard from lawyers, we saw some concerns that were raised regarding the ethical implications of the settlement agreement. I'm very encouraged at how diligent a number of lawyers were in making

sure that this settlement agreement in no way impinged on their ethical obligations to their clients. It was never the intent of the parties for the settlement agreement to in any way interfere with a lawyer exercising independent judgment to his client. It was never an intent of the parties for us to impermissibly restrict the practice of law, for example.

As these questions arose, we recognized that we needed to provide greater clarity in the agreement to make sure that that was the intent of the parties and make sure that it accurately reflected our intention in that regard and so we began those discussions. Now that we have had this amount of time, we have talked with the lawyers over these months, we are confident that we have addressed these issues and provided the clarity that is needed. I want to thank Merck's counsel for working with us to provide the clarity needed here. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. WILLIAMS: John Eddie Williams, Williams Kherkher law firm. We filed, along with other Texas firms, an emergency motion, which we have now withdrawn, that addressed three issues, ethics, a timing issue, and fees.

The fee issue we will reserve for another day, appropriately, I believe. The ethics issue, our ethics counsel have all informed us that they are now satisfied with the language changes. We appreciate the hard work of the

negotiating committee, Merck, and Merck's counsel in reaching that.

One caveat: One or more of our firms from Texas just got the information, wanted just a little bit of time to make sure that they have dotted the I's and crossed the T's, but I think I can represent to the Court that the ethics people have signed off on it. I think I speak on behalf of my firm, Williams Kherkher; Ranier, Gayle & Elliot; Provost Umphrey; the Watts firm; the Kaiser firm; Kathy Snapka's firm; Fibich Leebron law firm; the Mithoff law firm; Doug Allison's law firm; and Dave Matthews' law firm.

The ethical issues were tough ones, Your Honor, and obviously we wanted to make sure that we did it correctly. That was of utmost importance. There may be some time where we may have to say, "Judge, help us." If so, we will come back to you because we all want to make sure we dot the I's and cross the T's in that area.

THE COURT: You feel it has been done?

MR. WILLIAMS: Our ethics experts have told us and we have negotiated on this, as you heard, for weeks and we do feel that it has been done.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Thank you for your help in this matter and thanks for coming today and addressing the Court.

I might say that I'm, of course, familiar with

the document. I know that it was crafted by counsel over a number of months. For the last part of it, the state judges were kind enough to come to New Orleans and meet with me. We went over the document into the wee hours of the morning. There were some changes and some tweaking that was necessary at that time. Early on that morning -- 6:00 or 5:30, whatever it was -- I was back with counsel dealing with some issues that needed to be addressed.

It's not surprising to me that, in that type of process, there would be some aspects of the agreement that perhaps needed to be clarified. I was kept advised of the negotiations. I know early on in the negotiations the Plaintiffs' Negotiating Committee retained an ethicist to look over the matter and participate in its drafting. The efforts focused on the ethics involved in the agreement.

It was always the intent of the parties representing the plaintiffs, as well as parties representing the defendant, to recognize the interest, responsibility, and duty of the private attorneys in this matter. I am happy that the amendment so provides in clear language that each enrolling counsel is expected to exercise his or her independent judgment in the best interest of each client individually before determining whether to recommend enrollment in the program.

I do feel that nothing in the settlement agreement, including the amendment, contemplates or even

requires the attorney to undertake any action that would violate the Rules of Professional Conduct. Nothing in the Vioxx agreement prohibits a lawyer representing multiple claimants to exercise independent professional judgment when advising each client with a Vioxx-related claim. I'm satisfied that nothing in the agreement imposes upon a lawyer any impermissible restriction on the practice of law.

Some of the reports that have been made to me are that a large percentage of people have expressed an interest at least in registering for this program. I think the program will work and that it will be in the best interests of all concerned.

Let's move to the next item.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court. Your Honor, I want to amplify one thing. There will be an additional conference, mainly directed to enrollment, with Mr. Blizzard, Mr. Birchfield, myself, and Mr. Garretson discussing lien issues on January 27. In addition to that, Mr. Levin has been requested by the PLC to provide an up-to-date briefing on the preemption issue, which will be provided to all registering law firms between now and enrollment.

One other issue, may it please the Court.

Your Honor issued an order requiring lawyers to file individual lawsuits rather than a combination of claims and under one caption. On November 8 four suits were filed, Your Honor has

advised, that do not conform with the order. On September 14 two were filed and on November 11 one was filed. We will undertake to notify those law firms that they must comply with Your Honor's order.

THE COURT: That's a troubling situation, and I know that it's troubling particularly to plaintiffs' counsel. I'm not satisfied that we have the right approach for all times on this. The difficulty that a court has -- and it's not only my court, it's courts throughout the country -- is that filing a complaint in federal court costs about \$300. Now, I know that for an attorney who has 1,000 cases, it's a hefty amount to have to pay \$300,000 to file a lawsuit. The difficulty is that if one attorney has 1,000 cases and files one case with 999 cases behind it and pays \$300 and another attorney has three cases and files them separately, of course, then that attorney has to pay \$900, and that is inherently unfair. That's one issue. That is not as much of a concern as the other aspect of it because some adjustment can be made.

The other aspect of it is that oftentimes these cases that are filed with the 999 claimants are not even listed alphabetically. As the case proceeds, some of those claims are subject to dismissal, but they are embedded in cases. The clerk's office has difficulty finding the individual person in that situation and in drawing a line through that particular pleading. You can't dismiss the pleading because the pleading

is under one individual's name and that has not been dismissed. Now, if that individual's name is dismissed, then the issue is: Is everybody else on that pleading dismissed? There's some logistical problems that are very difficult to handle in a case where you have 30,000 claims filed. It's just rather difficult.

Now, initially I allowed people to join in group cases. We got to a point where that seemed not to be necessary as the proceedings moved on. I announced in open court months ago that I would be doing this and then I did it after a period of time and we are at this point. It is a troubling problem. I think that the courts, particularly the MDL transferee courts, are going to have to focus a little bit more on this issue.

Okay. Let's go to the registration.

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. At this time I would like to call Orran Brown and Lynn Greer to address the Court on the registration process.

MR. BROWN: Good morning, Your Honor. I am Orran Brown, from Brown Greer in Richmond, the claims administrator. Also present today is Lynn Greer of our firm who is with me.

We would like to give the Court and the parties an update on the registration and materials we have received thus far; and then also to look beyond that a little bit to the next phases in the settlement program and what has to happen

next; and then, of course, answer any questions the Court may have of us as we go through this.

First of all, on the registration phase, when we were here on the 14th of December, the Court referred to this as a census where the law firms and the unrepresented claimants needed to come forward and sign up for the program and identify themselves. For primary counsel, the Court's order required filing of a registration affidavit and a claimant's spreadsheet to identify their clients by January 15 of this year. It also required unrepresented claimants to submit, if they were doing it by mail, by January 8 and gave them, as well, to January 15 to send in their materials to register for the program.

We have been receiving those materials from law firms and unrepresented claimants since within a couple days after this settlement was announced publically on November 9 of last year. We have continued to receive them through the 15th. We received almost 200 law firm submissions that day alone.

After we got past the 15th, these are the firms and the claimants that we have heard from. We have registration affidavits and materials from 814 law firms who submitted them as primary counsel. We received separate submissions from 286 unrepresented claimants. Once we look at all of those and have done the process you need to do to take out what appear to be duplicate people submitted by the same firm more than once or by more than one firm, as of this

morning we have 57,067 claimants who have been identified in this process and have submitted the materials to us from those 814 firms and 286 unrepresented folks.

We are still getting the materials after the 15th. We have heard from another 11 law firms and another six unrepresented people for another 100 claimants. If you put all of them together, the people that we have heard from, the total is 57,167 people.

THE COURT: That's about what, 95 or so percent of the potential claimants in this case?

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. As I understand it, the parties originally thought there would be about 60,000 people. That in and of itself I think is a little bit of a rough number, trying to count plaintiffs in multiple cases as the Court just referred to, but I think that was the sort of number people had in mind.

It's important, also, to remember that our 57,000 number will continue to change some for a couple of reasons. One, there's still some cleanup that has to be done with the law firms in their spreadsheets. We are going back and forth with the law firms now to identify any places where there's information missing, because the spreadsheet required answers to about 70 data points on each person. We are going back with the firms to fill in where they didn't fill in.

There were some law firms, about 16 of them, who

sent us attachments that we really couldn't use. We couldn't open them or they were just electronic images of a spreadsheet and not a live Excel spreadsheet. Where we could, we counted their people. They are in the numbers I have just given you, but we have also had some others where the spreadsheet just had zero people in it or they failed to attach all the information.

So we will continue to have this number move about a little bit as we do that cleanup process and work with the firms to identify people that were put in the wrong place or spreadsheets that we couldn't use. We still expect it to move for that reason. In addition, we are still receiving these materials from firms and unrepresented claimants.

I think we are, as we do that, encouraging law firms, if they haven't sent in their materials yet -- and unrepresented claimants, if they haven't sent in their materials yet -- to do so as soon as possible because we are still receiving them. We are still counting them and putting them into the system. It will be ultimately up to the parties' efforts and the Court's decision as to the consequences of not getting them in to us by the 15th, as the Court's order said. I think at this stage we are, when people ask us, still encouraging them to send in materials, if they haven't done so already, as soon as they can.

THE COURT: Yes. I want to reinforce that. If anybody has not done it and it's an opportunity that they have

missed, let's send it in now. I would like to at least have them counted in that number.

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. Beyond that, looking to the next stages, we have the enrollment phase, which is upon us now, as well, and beyond that submitting claims packages.

First, about enrollment, the next important deadline is February 29 of this year for parties to send in their enrollment packages for each claimant to move further into the program. There takes for each person seven forms potentially to enroll in the program and move forward. Three of those forms are uniform forms, a release, a medical authorization form, and an employment authorization form, to receive employment records, if you are seeking the extraordinary injury payments that the Court referred to earlier today.

We prepare those forms for the law firms and for unrepresented claimants using information that they gave us in the claimant's spreadsheet. We can prefill the forms with the claimant's name, the law firm's name, and provide those to the forms, which we create from our system, with a unique bar code on each form. Then we have created for each law firm and an unrepresented claimant, if he or she wants it, a private Web site portal on our system where that firm, with a secure password, can go to their own private space or private Web site and look up any of their claimants and receive forms from us,

download them, print them, and then have their clients sign them and send them back to us. That process is the favored or preferred way right now that we are sending information and documents to the firms and for them to send information back to us.

As of last night, we had created over 157,000 forms for law firms to use for their clients for that purpose, and we have also sent them to all the pro se people, unrepresented people. We have sent them the forms by mail, which is generally the way most of those folks are wanting to communicate with us. They can use the Internet and the Web site, too, if they wish.

We are already getting back some of these enrollment forms. There are people already enrolling in the process. We have enrollment materials from 21 different law firms already. We, for example, received 3,165 releases already. So law firms and some of the unrepresented people are already moving into the enrollment phase to send us the documents necessary to proceed in the program. We are encouraging people to do that as soon as they can. The deadline, as I mentioned, is February 29. It is always best that not everything comes in at the deadline. We would like to receive these materials as soon as the law firms and the claimants get them ready.

Beyond that, we are already working on the

claims process because the first important deadline after the 29th is July 1, under the settlement agreement, where the claimants and the law firms have to send in a claims package that consists of a claims form and their medical records that the settlement agreement requires and some other materials. We are already receiving some of them. We have actually gotten ten claims packages already that we are reviewing.

We are setting up our own processes to make sure that we process and review and evaluate those claims according to the criteria in the settlement agreement, as to the initial gates that a claim must pass to move forward; and then if they do, the process for evaluation of the points and what the claims will actually end up with as a point value.

On that aspect of the settlement, we are also trying to make it as easy as possible for claimants/law firms to submit this information. We have created an online version of the claims form. The law firm can go to this secure Web site. They can search by their claimant name or claimant number that we have given them. They can show all of their claimants and then go to a preprepared claims form that we set up for them, for each person, with information already filled in it so they won't have to type it over -- the demographics, the name and the address -- from the claimant's spreadsheet they have already given us. Then they can fill out the rest of that form online and download it and print it and have it

signed. That information that they type in in that method is already on our server, so it collapses that data entry step and saves a lot of time and money for everybody.

That system is up and running right now for all the law firms we have heard from and also includes the two authorization forms. They can make changes, if the information has changed, online to that form and download it and print it with the bar code and send it in. All these steps, we are trying to make it as simple as we can and as fast as we can for law firms and unrepresented claimants to move through each step of the program. Thus far, we think it's working quite well.

Does the Court have any other questions?

THE COURT: No. I just want to verify the purpose of the registration aspect of the case is to get a census, to find out how many claims are out there, and also find out from those claims how many are covered by this agreement, that is to say, the MI's and the strokes and so forth. Once that's done, then those individuals, if they are interested, can enroll in the program to go to the next step.

In that regard, then their claims are evaluated, and that's done by a special master. I have appointed Patrick A. Juneau of Lafayette, Louisiana, to be the special master.

I have also met with Judge Higbee from the Superior Court in New Jersey, and she recommended Judge Marina

Corodemus and I appointed her to be a deputy special master. The deputy special master will be of assistance or will help the special master carrying out his tasks.

I talked with Judge Victoria Chaney of the Superior Court in California, and she recommended that I appointed Justice John Trotter, a retired justice, to serve as a deputy special master; and in the event Justice Trotter is unable to serve, that I appointed Justice Edward Panelli, a retired justice, to also be a special master.

Therefore, I have appointed Special Master

Juneau and the deputy special masters to assist him. I have

asked Special Master Juneau to contact the deputies and to

begin familiarizing them with the program so that they can be

aboard with him during this evaluation process.

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. On those lines, we have already met with the parties and Special Master Juneau. We have another meeting scheduled. We have set up a process to make sure that information flow back and forth works smoothly.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, I would like to call Matt Garretson to address you regarding Medicare and Medicaid and VA liens.

THE COURT: In a matter of this sort, particularly

with this type of drug, that is to say, a drug that targets musculoskeletal problems, it's not unusual for the census of that drug to include older individuals. Oftentimes, in that census these individuals have obtained Medicare or Medicaid and Medicare and Medicaid have statutory liens that have to be dealt with. I'll hear from the parties at this time on that.

MR. GARRETSON: Thank you, Your Honor. Just to give a general update, if I could, about the process today and where we are going from here, we have met so far several times with the claims administrator, Brown & Greer, to review our process, procedures, and timelines. We have also now had the opportunity to meet with Special Master Juneau to speak with him about those processes, procedures, and timelines so that we are all moving in appropriate lockstep.

Also, as Your Honor is aware, this morning we had signed the qualified protective order that will now allow for HIPAA compliant transfer of data to 53 state and territory agencies and to CMS. We are working today, now with the qualified protective order signed, to get all the data formatted in a way that the agencies each like. That will go out starting today, through the weekend, and on into Monday, so by Monday all of the states and territories and federal agencies will have a listing in the appropriate format of the enrolling claimants.

We have also had several meetings to date with

CMS, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. I'm pleased to report that they are very engaged with us in this process. I'll be meeting with them in their home offices in Baltimore in just a couple short weeks to review the progress and where we are to date with them.

Further, yesterday we met in Houston with the Veterans Administration. As Your Honor mentioned, because of the demographics of this population, there is a high percentage of veterans that will be in the settlement program. We want to establish the appropriate framework with the VA that we have in place with Medicare and Medicaid.

From an informational standpoint, we have finalized with the NPC and the claims administrator the frequently asked questions for attorneys regarding this process. It explains to them what our role is and what the procedures will be. Similarly, we have finalized a client education piece that all the claimants can see and review to be instructed about what is being done on their behalf with respect to governmental authority liens. All of that information will be prepared.

We spoke this morning with the claims administrator and we are prepared to list that both on their Web site and then we will have <u>vioxxlienresolution.com</u> as a separate Web site where this material will be kept and also made available and updated as required.

So all those things are occurring, as I have mentioned today, with respect to data exchange, which puts us in a nice position to report to you at the next hearing the number of states that have responded to us, the federal agencies that have responded, and the rate at which we are getting in the appropriate claims histories so we can start dissecting what we need to dissect. So at that time, at the next hearing, Your Honor, I would also be able to share with you any relevant statistics, based on our analysis of what we have received in-house at that time, and then just report progress in general.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. One aspect of a case of this sort is not only to locate the liens and to find out the amount of the liens, but when you're dealing with this many liens, oftentimes the lien holder is willing and able to reduce their liens when it's approached globally. So the individuals have some benefit from that aspect also. Thank you very much.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court. With respect to nongovernment health care providers such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield, Brown & Greer, as well as the liaison counsel and the PNC, have received correspondence from various nongovernment health care providers. We will ask the individual law firms who have registered not to undertake to provide information to any nongovernment health care provider

1 at this time. We intend to do that uniformly in order to secure the best situation we can for claimants. We'll be 2 3 coordinating that with Brown & Greer and with Matt Garretson. 4 We'll report to the Court at the next status conference and 5 attempt to have by then all such nongovernment health care 6 providers meet at one place and one location in order to 7 orderly handle the progress. MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, I think next is your 8 9 introduction of the special master, if you want to do that. 10 THE COURT: Right. I have already dealt with the 11 special master. Do you have any report? 12 THE SPECIAL MASTER: No, sir. I think Mr. Brown and 13 Mr. Garretson adequately described what we have done thus far. 14 THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Juneau. 15 MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, on the state court trial 16 17

MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, on the state court trial settings, the only case that's currently set is the *Smith* case in West Virginia, which is set to go to trial on May 19. The other cases have either been continued or are in the process of being continued. That's the only one that's actively set right now.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The next item on the agenda is Item VI, class actions. Anything on that?

MR. WITTMANN: Nothing new, Your Honor. You have those motions under submission.

THE COURT: VII is discovery directed to Merck.

Anything on that?

MR. WITTMANN: That was all stayed pursuant to Pretrial Order 30.

THE COURT: The reason that I stayed the matter is obvious. We need to focus on this aspect of the case. I need the energy of all the parties to be directed to this aspect of the case so that the claimants and the litigants on both sides have the attention of their attorneys on this aspect of the case. After this aspect of the case clarifies itself, after the dust settles a bit, then I will be meeting with counsel to determine what's left, if anything.

After we determine what's left, I'll try to group those issues, those areas, if they can be grouped, and then I will talk to counsel about the most efficient way of dealing with those groups. We can either bellwether try some aspects of the group or we can deal with them in some other way. The point is that now I've stayed everything, with the exception of a couple areas, to give everybody an opportunity to direct their full attention on this aspect of the case.

MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, I understand from Mr. Herman that there will be a limited lifting of the stay with respect to the FDA to allow some discovery go forward there.

THE COURT: I have done that in some aspects of the case.

1 Discovery directed to third parties. 2 MR. WITTMANN: The same situation, Your Honor. 3 There's a stay of all the deadlines that were set previously pursuant to Pretrial Order 30. 4 5 THE COURT: What about the records that we talked 6 about last time from Express Scripts? 7 MR. WITTMANN: I think Mr. Herman can report on that, 8 Your Honor. 9 MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. May it please the 10 We have been in contact and negotiation with 11 Express Scripts. We expect to reach an agreement with them 12 very shortly. That agreement will make available 90 percent of 13 the ESI records on claimants on a cost basis rather than a 14 private profit basis. Hopefully, we will be able to present 15 something to Your Honor next week. 16 **THE COURT:** I do urge the parties, particularly 17 Express Scripts, to get this material as quickly as possible. 18 We are dealing with deadlines, and it's not going to be helpful 19 if they wait until the eleventh hour to produce the material. 20 So I urge them to do so. If that's not forthcoming, I direct 21 counsel to let me know so I can get involved in it. 22 MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. 23 **THE COURT:** Deposition scheduling is IX. 24 MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, those were postponed by 25 agreement, and the parties are working together now to try and

reselect some dates.

THE COURT: X is state/federal coordination.

Anything from liaison counsel?

MS. BARRIOS: Good morning, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios for the State Liaison Committee.

Recognizing your comments at the last status conference with regard to the economic classes pending in the MDL that are really not touched by the settlement and recognizing your comments today on the need for a stay, we certainly are following that. However, I can't remain idle. What I have done, Your Honor, is I have put together a list that I would like to give to your new law clerk, Bryan, and welcome him to this litigation.

It's a list of 41 cases that we were able to pick out through PACER that appear to me to be economic classes or third-party payor cases to give you a sense of scope and number of cases pending before you. I will reach out to these attorneys for verification of this information and just, with your permission, continue to comply with that so when the time comes we'll have that information ready for Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's fine. Think about grouping them in some way that makes sense so that we don't have to try every case. See if they can be grouped into various categories and then deal with one case in each category if that's possible.

MS. BARRIOS: Yes, Your Honor, I will endeavor to do

that. I will also present Bryan with our two-disc set of the remand motions. I did not prepare another disc on the ten cases that we call the "double remand cases" because they remain the same. We haven't found any additional ones.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything on the pro se claimants?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, to supplement the report from Brown & Greer without repeating it, there were 1,160 pro se. They each were sent certified letters and e-mails. 546 contacted our office in one or another, either through submitting 286 registrations or requesting assistance and information. 138 of the 1,160, we have been unable to trace addresses or e-mails or other ways to notify them and the information has come back to us. 78 have requested that the Court consider appointing attorneys to represent them. We provided the Court and Merck with a list of those individuals.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll be meeting with counsel to determine that. My thinking is we can appoint somebody to represent people who do not have representation. Those pro se claimants that have not responded, I will in time appoint someone as curator to try to reach them. We'll try to reach them at the last known address. We'll try to post something in the newspapers to have them call. We'll do whatever is necessary to get the information out to them that they need to

call in. If they still do not call in, then I will entertain a motion from the defendants to dismiss the cases.

MR. HERMAN: I should make it clear to Your Honor that there are two types of pro se issues. Individuals that wanted substantive legal advice, because of our position as liaison counsel, we would not be engaged by them because it might portend a conflict. Those individuals have requested that a lawyer be appointed to advise them on substantive rights. We have undertaken approximately 600 advices on the technical issues of registration. Then there are another category of individuals, approximately 138, whom we have had no contact with.

THE COURT: Okay. What I'll be doing with counsel is to discuss the potential of appointing somebody as standby or advisory counsel. I'll discuss that with counsel and also get from them some suggestions as to the names of such a party. We'll deal with that in time.

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Merck's motions, XII.

MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, the motions that are listed you have under advisement right now. There's nothing new to report on those.

THE COURT: There are several motions that the last time I was asked to withhold ruling on them.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Your Honor, we would ask you to

continue to withhold ruling for a short while if you could.

THE COURT: I'll do it for a short while, but I do have to rule on the matters. I will withhold ruling.

XIII, issues relating to Pretrial Order 9.

MR. HERMAN: There are no further comments, Your Honor, necessary on that.

THE COURT: Anything on the Vioxx suit statistics, which is the next item on the agenda?

MR. WITTMANN: The new suit statistics will be out January 30, Your Honor, but there's not going to be much change from the statistics reported in the status report from the last time, so there's really nothing new to report on that.

THE COURT: I'm glad to hear that because one problem that I think MDLs traditionally have faced is that, once a settlement is announced, there are oftentimes a great number of cases filed after settlement to get in on the settlement. I expressed my concern about that. I'm going to be, as I mentioned the last time, skeptical of suits filed in mass numbers subsequent to the settlement announcement. I'm glad that that concern has been heeded and I hope that it continues to be heeded.

Motion to conduct case-specific discovery.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, the PSC will not proceed with case-specific discovery and it may not be necessary to do so. We will delay that matter at least until after the

enrollment period and the satisfaction of the contract 1 2 requirements with Merck. 3 **THE COURT:** Okay. The next item is Dr. Farguhar. MR. HERMAN: We have resolved that matter, 4 5 Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: It can be taken off of the agenda, then. 7 The next item is XVII, PSC MDL trial package. 8 Anything on that? 9 MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. One of the attorneys, 10 Mr. Stratton, asked for some oral information and indicated 11 that he was going to register and recommend enrollment to his 12 clients, but what would happen if this Court in a single case, for example, directed him to continue with representation with 13 14 a claimant that did not elect to enroll; would he, under those 15 circumstances, be able to get a trial package. I indicated he 16 would; if this Court directed counsel to continue with a 17 nonenrolled claimant, they would certainly be entitled to the trial package. 18 19 As Your Honor knows, the MI trial package is 20 I confirmed with Mr. Meunier, Mr. Rafferty, complete. 21 Mr. Tisi, and Ms. Sanford this morning that by the time the 22 next status conference meets that Your Honor calls we will have

the stroke trial package complete and available, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The next item is other motions. Anything

23

24

25

on that?

1 MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, those have all been 2 resolved, I believe. 3 The last item is --THE COURT: 4 MR. SEEGER: Your Honor, I just wanted to note that I 5 have been in contact with Joe Danis and John Carey. They are 6 in the group that filed the motions in Illinois. We have had 7 numerous discussions and they have had legitimate concerns 8 about what things said and didn't say, and the amendment that 9 has been signed this morning has gone a long way to clarify 10 their issues. I was informed this morning that they intend to 11 pull their motions down in state and federal court, which 12 pretty much mirrored the motions that were filed by John Eddie 13 Williams' group from Texas. 14 THE COURT: All right. 15 MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, that just leaves the 16 Oldfather motion, and we are working with them to try and 17 resolve that matter. 18 THE COURT: The last item on the agenda is 19 third-party payor cases. Anything on that? 20 MR. HERMAN: No further discussion on that. 21 THE COURT: Any new business that comes before the 22 Court? 23 MR. HERMAN: No, Your Honor. 24 MR. WITTMANN: No, Your Honor. 25

THE COURT: The next status conference, then, will be

on February 21.

MR. BIRCHFIELD: Your Honor, if I could just add one comment to what Mr. Herman raised. When he said we are working with them to resolve that, all that means is that we will give them, as it will be posted on the Web site, these amendments. Since their issues mirror what have been previously raised, we are confident that it will satisfy their concerns as well. That's where we are with it.

THE COURT: February 21 is the next date. Court will stand in recess.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.

(WHEREUPON the Court was in recess.)

* * *

CERTIFICATE

I, Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR, Official Court
Reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District
of Louisiana, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true
and correct transcript, to the best of my ability and
understanding, from the record of the proceedings in the
above-entitled and numbered matter.

Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR Official Court Reporter