1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA	
3		
4		
5	IN RE: VIOXX PRODUCTS	* Docket MDL 1657-L
6	LIABILITY LITIGATION	* November 2, 2006
7	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* 9:00 a.m.
8	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	· *
9	STATUS CONF	EDENCE DEFODE THE
10	STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
11	UNITED STATE	E2 DI21KIC1 JODGE
12	APPEARANCES:	
13	Ton the Dlaintiffe.	Hannan Hannan Kata (Catlan
14	For the Plaintiffs:	Herman Herman Katz & Cotlar BY: RUSS M. HERMAN, ESQ. 820 O'Keefe Avenue
15		New Orleans, Louisiana 70113
16	For the Defendants:	Stone Diaman Walthon Wittmann
17	FOI the Defendants.	Stone Pigman Walther Wittmann BY: PHILLIP A. WITTMANN, ESQ. 546 Carondelet Street
18		New Orleans, Louisiana 70130
19	Official Court Reporter:	Toni Dovlo Tusa CCD ECDD
20	Official Court Reporter.	Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR 500 Poydras Street, Room B-406 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130
21		(504) 589-7778
22		
23		
24	Drocoodings recorded by mach	unical stanography transcript
25	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer.	

(November 2, 2006)

PROCEEDINGS

_

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.

THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Sorry we had to move the status conference to another courtroom. I've got trial going on in another case in my courtroom without me. It shows how insignificant I am in that particular case. In any event, we are here today for our monthly status. I appreciate counsel being available and also moving from one courtroom to the other.

I have received from the parties a suggested agenda and I'll take them in order. Lexis/Nexis File & Serve, is that the first item on the agenda?

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court. Russ Herman for the PSC and Phil Wittmann for the defense. We have conferred, Your Honor. In light of the fact that you have a heavy trial schedule in a matter, I think if you will allow us we can move through this quickly because this will be posted on Lexis/Nexis.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HERMAN: There's nothing to report on Lexis/Nexis other than there's still a delay and the Lexis/Nexis people have been working with both liaison counsel and the Court to eliminate the delay and shrink it. The state court trial settings are listed for the next six months in paragraph II.

They will be posted on Lexis/Nexis.

THE COURT: Before you leave that, let me say that, with the state court and the federal court trial settings, one thing I've been giving some thought to is seeing if I can meet with the state court judges and perhaps counsel sometime probably before the end of the year to see if we can look at next year and try to coordinate some of the dates so that when the MDL trial is going on the states are not, and when the states' trials are going the MDL is not, and see if we can deal with some of the logistical problems and make it easier for the courts as well as the litigants. I may be contacting you to see if we can have a brief meeting with the states and with the Court.

Class actions.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, with regard to section III, which is cases for early federal court trial, the <u>Barnett</u> matter, Mr. Beck and Mr. Robinson are meeting at the Court's direction to choose a date. With the Court's consent, the plaintiffs' steering committee has been allowed to file an amicus brief in connection with the <u>Barnett</u> motions.

With respect to the class actions, Your Honor has that under advisement.

THE COURT: Right. I've been reviewing them and I'll be focused on them very shortly, at least on the areas that I can focus on, so you'll be hearing from me shortly on that.

Discovery directed to Merck.

MR. HERMAN: With respect to insurance issues, we are reviewing Merck's responses and we'll follow up on that. There is no FDA outstanding production issue. The Ogilvy and DDB third-party matters, in terms of discovery, plaintiffs and defendants have agreed to push those issues off. We are still in discussions.

With respect to deposition scheduling,

Your Honor has advised both sides, in the Farquhar matter, that
the deposition will go forth on November 21 and November 22.

If there's a problem, we'll notify the Court.

The plaintiff profile form, the Merck profile form controversy, Your Honor has had briefs from both sides as of today.

THE COURT: I appreciate the parties working together on this and recognize that they have resolved some of the issues, but there are some issues that need the Court's attention. Each side has given me the benefit of their thinking in the form of letters. I received letters yesterday. I'll be focused on them and I'll make a decision on those areas that there is an impasse on.

MR. HERMAN: The state/federal coordination, state liaison committee. I believe Ms. Barrios is here.

MS. BARRIOS: Good morning, Your Honor. Dawn Barrios for the state liaison committee. I have our usual CD-ROM I

would like to give to your law clerk, Jeremy. I have already distributed it to the parties. Your Honor, I will volunteer our efforts to help you coordinate with the state court judges before the end of the year. If you call upon us to do so, we'll be happy to.

THE COURT: Fine. Thank you very much. One of the other things that perhaps we can deal with is the remand issues. I would like to talk with them about that, too.

Pro se claimants.

MR. HERMAN: No issues today.

MR. WITTMANN: There's not an issue, but as Your Honor knows we have filed motions to dismiss with respect to plaintiffs who have not complied with filing plaintiff profile forms. We have a number of pro se plaintiffs who have done nothing. We intend to select some of those and start moving because, as Your Honor pointed out, we have to narrow this litigation down.

THE COURT: My view of that always is that I want to give everybody a lot of opportunities to get back on board. I notify them. I put it on the website. We call them. We do everything we can to get them to do what everybody else has done. You get to the point where if they haven't done it and you give them one, two, three notices and then you rule them into court to show why the case shouldn't be dismissed and they don't show up finally in court, I have to dismiss the case. We

can't just have these things hanging. It's not fair to the people who want to proceed with their case.

MR. WITTMANN: We'll follow the same procedure we did the last time.

THE COURT: I'll dismiss them with prejudice. I know the plaintiffs take issue with that, but I don't do it willy-nilly. I give them one, two, three opportunities and then we have to move on with it.

MR. HERMAN: I just have one comment. I feel it's necessary to state, on behalf of the pro se individuals, many of them don't have website access. They don't have electronic ability. We believe that when defendants move for dismissal on any ground they have a burden. Generally, under state law, they would have to have a curator appointed, advertise three times in the newspaper at the last known address, but I just make that comment because I feel it's necessary.

MR. WITTMANN: They get two written notices, Your Honor, as you know.

THE COURT: That is a legitimate comment, so let's take special precautions with people who don't have attorneys, and I'll be conscious of it.

MR. WITTMANN: We'll be happy to have Mr. Herman serve as curator ad hoc.

MR. HERMAN: Mr. Wittmann has done me many favors over the years and this isn't the least of them, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Many of the pro se, though, are housed at the expense of various states in this country, so we know where they are living and probably where they will be for some period of time.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, there are no generic trial performance issues before you. We believe on the IMS data there's an agreement. We will be receiving that agreement to review it in the next few days.

The preemption argument will take place before Your Honor on November 17. Your Honor has scheduled it for 9:00 a.m. As I understand it, if there's a time change, you'll advise.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. HERMAN: Tolling agreements. The parties are still discussing the potential agreement that we haven't arrived at as of yet. In terms of the motion for clarification, it is not necessary to do that. There were two people of the PSC in attendance at a meeting last night. We'll liaison with Texas counsel and attempt to work that matter out.

MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, the suit statistics are accurately set forth in paragraph XVII of the joint report and there's no change to report there.

THE COURT: Okay. What's the IMS data? Have we talked about that?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. The folks representing

IMS are considering an agreement that they will send us. We'l' report back to the Court after we have received it.

THE COURT: That's the insurance issue?

MR. HERMAN: Yes. Well, no. The IMS data has to do --

THE COURT: I understand. What about insurance?

MR. HERMAN: On the insurance issue, Merck responded to our interrogatories. We are reviewing those right now. We have issued a 30(b)(6) notice relating to the insurance.

Item XIX, Mr. Wittmann and I are conferring regarding the various matters raised in his recent correspondence about further proceedings and the Court's direction. Hopefully we'll meet next week with representatives of Merck to further discuss those issues.

THE COURT: I know, with regard to proceedings, I have those documents still to go through. I mentioned in chambers I'm aware of that and I'm trying to get to them. I just have had some scheduling problems. I went through them once and it took me a long time. I've been going about 10 hours a day for 10, 12 days. The clerk asked me to look at them again and I'm trying to deal with that, but I've been in trial so long for the last six months it's difficult for me to grab big amounts of time to do it. I've been having to work it in in less bites and it's just time consuming, but I'm aware of it and I'm working on it.

1 **MR. HERMAN:** No issue on item XX as to mandatory 2 electronic filing. 3 MR. WITTMANN: Except that I think counsel should be 4 aware of the recent order by the chief judge with respect to an 5 automatic 30-day extension. 6 THE COURT: We had to do that to try to deal with the 7 backlog of cases. Since Katrina, we have been getting not only 8 a lot of cases filed, but a lot of removals, so we are backed 9 up a little bit downstairs in the clerk's office and we are not 10 able to process them, so we extended the time. MR. HERMAN: There is not yet a statute of 11 12 limitations date for hearing. Some briefs have been filed and 13 more will be coming in, but there's no hearing date as of yet. 14 MR. WITTMANN: I think we are going to suggest a 15 briefing schedule and a hearing date, too, Your Honor. We are 16 working with plaintiffs' counsel. 17 THE COURT: On another issue with statute of 18 limitations, we really have to try to do our best at this stage 19 to get a handle on this litigation. Some states -- for 20 example, Minnesota -- will go for ten years or five years or 21 whatever it is. We really have to figure out a way of getting 22 a view of the case. Danny, you had something? 23 MR. BECNEL: Six years in Minnesota.

THE COURT: Six years. We can't wait six years in this case. I understand from the defendant's standpoint they

24

25

need to know what they are looking at, but the plaintiffs have to understand that, too. We have to come up with some creative way of just closing the door, giving everybody an opportunity to join in litigation either here or in state court, but if they don't they are out. One way of doing it is a Lone Pine situation, exempt everybody who is already in the litigation from the Lone Pine, give everybody an opportunity to get into the litigation; and if they don't get into the litigation, give them a period of time to fill out some material Lone Pine and, if not, I'll dismiss the cases. That will put an end to it. That's one way of doing it.

I suggest you all meet and come up with some creative way of closing the corral at this stage so we can take a look at this litigation globally.

Anything else? There's an issue of Mr. Harrison versus Merck. Is Mr. Harrison in the room? It's a pro se problem.

MR. WITTMANN: I don't think Mr. Harrison is here.

THE COURT: No. The record should reflect no one stood up.

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, however, he did contact our office. I know that he did want to participate and advised that he may try to do so by telephone.

THE COURT: If we were in my courtroom, I could access a phone, but we don't have one in this courtroom.

1	MR. DAVIS: We did tell him, however, that generally	
2	you did have telephone access and that often is allowed by the	
3	Court.	
4	MR. HERMAN: We'll contact him today, Your Honor, and	
5	advise him that at the next status conference there will be a	
6	telephone available.	
7	THE COURT: Fine. What's the next date?	
8	MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, you need to advise us as to	
9	when you would like to have it.	
10	THE COURT: How about December 14? Are you all	
11	available then?	
12	MR. WITTMANN: Preconference at 8:30 and conference	
13	at 9:00?	
14	THE COURT: Right. Will that work? Any other issues	
15	that we need to deal with anything from anybody? Thank you	
16	very much. Court will stand in recess.	
17	THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.	
18	(WHEREUPON, the Court was in recess.)	
19	* * *	
20	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>	
21	I, Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District	
22	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.	
23		
24	above-entried and numbered matter.	
25	Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR Official Court Reporter	